

# Save Dully submission to the Sydenham to Bankstown Metro Preferred Infrastructure Report

*July 2018*



## **About us**

The Save Dully Action Group was formed in mid-2015 in response to the Sydenham to Bankstown corridor urban renewal investigation. We have in the order of 300 members across the suburb of Dulwich Hill.

## **Introduction**

Save Dully recognises and welcomes the changes made to the Sydenham to Bankstown Metro line, including the:

- Reduction in line shutdown periods, particularly the decision to scrap the proposed annual July two-week shutdown and reducing the Christmas shutdown from six to two weeks
- Decision to retain existing station platforms and lines, which will lead to a reduction in noise and vibration impacts on adjoining homes and residents
- Decision to retain Dulwich Hill's historic overhead booking office as a station entrance
- The retention of all carparking in the Ewart Lane carpark
- An overall re-thinking of the urban design approach of each station, with individual station design plans now to be prepared, including for Dulwich Hill.

There is no question these changes substantially reduce the impact of the project on the Dulwich Hill community.

However, we still have concerns in regard to a number of issues, in particular:

- A large number of Dulwich Hill residents will still suffer from night-time noise impacts and we do not believe the proposed mitigation measures go far enough
- The failure to reveal the proposed alternative transport arrangements during the final six-month shutdown in 2024
- The decision to remove the proposed southern entrance to the station
- The lack of support to Inner West Council to manage parking impacts during construction.

In addition, we continue to be concerned that the Metro is being used as an excuse by the NSW Government to force overdevelopment on our historic suburb. Until the government rips up its urban renewal corridor strategy, and returns planning powers to Inner West Council, we will find it very difficult to support the Metro line.

We provide more detail on these issues below.

## **Noise**

According to your Preferred Infrastructure Report, Dulwich Hill will continue to have the highest number of residents on each precinct along the line with noise impacts.

According to the report, 126 'noise receivers' – that is residents - in Dulwich Hill are likely to require night-time alternative accommodation during the project's life during periods of 24/7 construction works. Residents in streets such as Bedford, Ewart, School, Wilga, Kays, The Parade and Challis will be among those likely to be offered alternative accommodation because of excessive noise impacts.

Noise monitoring will happen at the homes of another 186 Dulwich Hill receivers.

It is not clear why these impacts are still high, even though rock breakers will no longer be needed for the project and major noise generating construction such as line realignment and platform and bridge reconstruction, is no longer needed.

In our submission to the EIS, we requested that all residents who suffer potential sleep disturbance be offered alternative accommodation (which is 15 decibels above background noise level) but this has been denied. We again request that this is offered to residents, given the long five-year construction period.

We also asked in our submission to the EIS that noise attenuation works are offered free of charge to properties set to suffer severe noise exceedances during construction. This could include window or door screens.

This request also appears to have been denied, despite the Transport for NSW Construction Noise and Vibration Strategy (page 46) specifically supporting these types of works, for longer projects such as the Metro.

This Strategy states: "Additional management measures...may become less effective over time. At-receiver noise mitigation may be considered where feasible and reasonable, where all options for at-source noise mitigation and management measures have been exhausted. At-receiver mitigation may include temporary window and door screens, temporary localised shielding or permanent forms of mitigation."

### **Rail shutdown periods**

We remain concerned about the final rail shutdown period in 2024 of up to six months.

This is likely to be a highly inconvenient time for rail commuters, yet the Preferred Project Report continues to provide no detailed guidance as to how commuters will be offered alternative transport during this period and the impact of this shutdown period on traffic congestion.

We do not think it is possible to approve this project, without this detailed guidance being in place. We urge the Department of Planning and Environment to consider:

- Deferring approval for the final shutdown, given the lack of specificity about how this will be handled; and
- Ensuring any proposed alternative transport strategy for the final shutdown period be placed on public comment.

### **Parking**

Our submission to the EIS asked that Inner West Council is provided funds to hire additional rangers to monitor illegal construction worker parking, or parking which impacts existing residents, and to set up residential parking schemes.

This appears to have been denied, with instead the Preferred Infrastructure Report including a vague commitment to examine this issue in conjunction with local councils.

We repeat our request for specific funding to the council for this issue.

### **Cumulative impacts of property development and line shutdowns**

In our submission to the EIS, we raised concerns about the cumulative impacts of additional development happening in the corridor, due to the Sydenham to Bankstown urban renewal strategy, at the same time as line shutdowns. Our view was that this was a potential recipe for disaster for commuters in the corridor.

While the number of line shutdowns has been reduced, there will still be substantial impacts, including a Christmas shutdown, additional weekend shutdowns, a two-month station shutdown and a final shutdown of up to six months for the entire line.

We consider the response in the Preferred Infrastructure Report in regard to cumulative impacts between additional property development and line shutdowns to be inadequate, particularly for the final shutdown. If the corridor is to be intensively developed, then this development is most likely to be in place when the line is at its weakest – during the final shutdown of 2024.

We consider this to be another reason to defer any approval of the final line shutdown and for the government to not pursue the urban renewal strategy in this corridor.

### **Station design and entrance**

We note that the specific design for the Metro stations has not been confirmed. This appears to be a back-tracking from the EIS, which displayed a clear design for stations based on a generic 'ribbon' style architectural concept.

The Preferred Infrastructure Report says “the exact nature of the works required at each station would be confirmed as an outcome of the detailed design process. In addition, Interchange Access Plans and Station Design and Precinct Plans would be prepared for each station.”

We ask that a determination on this project require that these plans be placed on public exhibition, to allow community feedback.

In addition, we query why the southern entrance to the station, from Ewart Lane, has been dropped as part of the Preferred Infrastructure Report. This is not clear from the report.

We understand the concern that there could now be three entrances to the station if a southern entrance was included – which is unusual for Sydney stations - but consider that the Ewart Lane entrance could be highly useful.

Yours Sincerely –

Save Dully Action Group