Redfern Station Upgrade – Submission
Max Middleton
24/6/2020

I urge NSW Department of Planning and Environment to **NOT APPROVE the proposed design** in upgrading Redfern Station. The **alternative community options** far more closely meet the stated objectives of the project, viz:

a. Provide accessibility to the station (i.e. lifts and access points)
b. Reduce congestion on station
c. Link the precincts
d. Maintain heritage sites and values.

The **alternative options** alleviate most of the issues below and should be revisited to ensure that the substantial costs expended by the NSW State will result in a positive and lasting legacy for the foreseeable future.

1. **TfNSW "Preferred" Solution – statistics!**

This was based on survey information mainly gathered from commuters who were mostly university students, others travelling to work/school, corporate and government body representatives. Accordingly, these statistics did not provide an appropriate balance to account for the broader local community and residents' input (i.e. the community) who in a simple count were the minority. We dispute these results as not at all validating the real community concerns.

2. **Pedestrian Traffic Management**

One of the stated aims of the new concourse is to reduce congestion on the station - this is welcomed. However the option proposed and touted as 'preferred' does NOT address the safety concerns of reformed congestion resulting from the spilling out of thousands of commuters from the station into the very narrow and unsafe parts of Marian and Little Eveleigh streets.

The presented proposal in the (May 2020) *Redfern North Eveleigh Precinct Renewal – New Southern Concourse* visually depicts the east side of Marian street entrance to the station where the road is at least 3 lanes wide, where the projected pedestrian traffic is not currently high and unknown moving forward. However it does not visually depict the west side (cnr Cornwallis & Marian St) where there is projected to be up 20,000+ people per day in peak hour pedestrian traffic being funnelled through an approximately 5 metre wide (1 lane) road accessing the South Eveleigh business precinct (Australian Technology Park). The EIS does not include any feasible safety mitigation measures to account for congestion of people, vehicles, bicycles and service vehicles converging in this constricted location.

The safe and practical solution is to design the entrance to the lift concourse south of the Cornwallis/Marian Street corner so the 20,000 people exit directly into the South Eveleigh precinct. Both alternative community group designs ("H" design and Option 5) depicted in the TfNSW's Scoping Report incorporating this solution were presented by the ReConnect Redfern action group but TfNSW has deemed this as not preferred on the basis of unsubstantiated objections.

3. **Connectivity to Surrounding Area**

TfNSW has deemed that a key benefit is *providing better connectivity with the surrounding areas including key destinations such as South Eveleigh (formerly known as Australian Technology Park), and education centres.*

This claim is counterfactual. Connectivity to North Eveleigh (e.g. Carriageworks, University, RPA, etc.) is not improved by the TfNSW's design solution. The existing train entrances/exits on Lawson street are a mere 50-60 metres from the proposed new entry on Little Eveleigh Street, and connectivity to South Eveleigh (ATP, CBA, etc.) is in fact further away than the current entrance/exit from Platform 10. Connecting Marian Street to Little Eveleigh Street via the newly proposed concourse bridge has no quantum benefits.

Both alternative community group designs ("H" design and Option 5) depicted in the TfNSW's Scoping Report clearly provided much improved and logical connectivity to all precincts - this was presented by the ReConnect Redfern action group but TfNSW has deemed this as not preferred on the basis of unsubstantiated objections.

4. **Noise and disruption Impact on The Watertower residents (during construction)**

There are no feasible mitigation measures in the EIS to counter the inevitable noise, disruption and traffic risk to residents during the planned construction phase of nearly 2 years. At a Watertower meeting held in June 2019 representatives from TfNSW suggested providing noise abatement barriers (walls) and double glazing.

5. **Noise and Light Impact on The Watertower residents (ongoing)**

TfNSW's Scoping Report (Section 7.3 Environmental Risk Analysis) indicates that the risk is very high (RED) in terms of operational noise impacts from upgraded station facilities and changes to pedestrian and traffic arrangements. There are no feasible mitigation measures to counter the ongoing noise (commuters, announcements, etc) and the EIS is silent on the issue of artificial light emanating from the proposed new station entrance impacting the Watertower apartments.

6. **Privacy**

There is no presented solution to counter the inevitable privacy issues emanating from the proposed new station entrance impacting the Watertower apartments, as it is apparent that the height of the public concourse is (while not depicted) is obviously high above ground level. (i.e. will commuters see into The Watertower apartment windows?). Again the EIS is silent on this matter.

7. **Natural Light**

The impact of the station entrance/bridge structure on the natural light and shadow lines for north facing Watertower apartments has not been made available to the public and is not addressed at all in the EIS.

8. **Street Parking**

16 street car parking spaces around The Watertower will be permanently removed. Other than finding parking elsewhere, there is no suggestion of any replacement parking spaces.

Community Options 5 and 6/H not progressed

TfNSW's stated justification to not progress these alternative community designed solutions are not substantiated by any compelling documentation nor evidence and many points have been coined or are frivolous to purposely influence away from these solutions. Refer my comments against each of these.

Option 5 – TfNSW's justification points and my response below:

- *visual impacts to residents of the nearby 'Watertower' building due to the concourse shape wrapping the corner-line of the building, effectively creating a wall to the rail corridor*

  The visual impact of all designs is an oblique concourse structure from the Watertower – this design does not greatly change perspective.
- *the build of the larger concourse and bridge structure would create a comparatively greater visual impact*

  same as above
- *challenges to constructability, such as limited space available to place the larger cranes that would be required to lift the extended concourse spans*

  Constructability challenges should not be a reason for not progressing this option – where is the documentation supporting this statement?
- *a cycleway ramp structure is illustrated in some of the plans provided between the concourse and the pathway connection to Wilson Street. To achieve compliant gradients, a significant ramp structure would be required, and would reach around 90 meters in length and approximately 4.5 metres in height. To complete a cycle route along the concourse, a second*

ramp would also be required on the concourse's other side. This cycleway configuration would be complex, and the changing gradients and additional ramps would also be unsuitable for those with accessibility needs.

Complexity is not a valid argument to discount this option – the changing gradients are no different to existing cycle ways around the city.

- *more complex way/finding with increased number of decision points and areas of pedestrian-cyclist cross-flow on the concourse could lead to congestion or collisions.*

  This is not relevant – most newly built stations already easily accommodate decision points with appropriate placards and directions.

Option 6/H – TfNSW's justification points and my response below:

- *significantly increased customer journey distance form street to platforms, which could impact ease of access for customers with limited mobility or other accessibility requirements.*

  This is only true for those travelling to ATP or the University, but this in fact eliminates the journey distance and complexities for those with limited mobility in the vicinity of the station (i.e. out of the station and in the streets). The issue of distance is therefore a misnomer.
- *increased construction time and complexity, including the need to realign tracks and relocated elements of the existing rail infrastructure.*

  Where's the documentation to validate this. Any additional construction time should not be a reason for not delivering the correct solution.
- *challenges to constructability such as limited space available to place the cranes that would be required to lift the extended concourse spans.*

  Constructability challenges should not be a reason for not progressing this option – where is the documentation supporting this statement?
- *the bulk of the larger concourse would create a significantly greater visual impact to station heritage.*

  Heritage buildings are maintained under all designs and do not need to have that level of visibility. For example, the ATP railway workshops have been overshadowed by Mirvac's high rise buildings.
- *increased distance to bus connections on Gibbons Street.*

  This is insignificant and frivolous point – there is provision for an exit into Marian Street from the main concourse that leads to Gibbons Street
- *increased distance for connection to Platforms 11 and 12.*

  This is insignificant and frivolous point – there is provision for an exit into Marian Street from the main concourse leading to platforms 11 and 12.