

**Submission  
No 231**

**INQUIRY INTO PLANNING PROCESS IN NEWCASTLE  
AND THE BROADER HUNTER REGION**

**Name:** Ms Bev Atkinson

**Date received:** 24/10/2014

---

To the Director,  
the Select Committee on Planning for Newcastle and Broader Hunter Region  
23.10.2014  
Submission by Bev Atkinson B.Arch

**Contents:**

This page

Photographs A, B, C separately sent later. It may help to see them before reading.

N RAIL Q BA-I Summary of Submission

N RAIL Q BA-2 Process Controlled

N RAIL Q BA-3 Pretences Contrived

N RAIL Q BA-4 Principles Contravened:

Usefulness,  
Numbers,  
Health physical and mental,  
Transport Efficiency,  
Funding,  
Safety,  
Global Precedent,  
Match to crowds,  
Match to destinations,  
Integrity in Urban Design: application of terms,  
Emergency and Security,  
Genuine impacts only please,  
ESD,  
Policies.

**Appendix:**

TRAWL: 2 pages, a summary of one-line reasons for keeping the rail intact.

SQUARE: 2 pages, my vision of and for Newcastle, recent editing.

Thankyou for the opportunity to help rescue this emerging world city of Newcastle, NSW.

The well-being of people in its growing regions will increasingly depend on the one sustainable artery to its regional City: the rail to Hamilton, Wickham, Civic, Newcastle old City and the beaches.

BA

To the Director,  
Select Committee, Planning Process in Newcastle and the Broader Hunter Region.  
Parliament House, Macquarie St, Sydney 2000

October 18, 2014

From: Bev Atkinson

B.Arch Hons UNSW 76, Thesis: World Railway Stations; social/planning aspects,  
Travers Morgan, London, Infrastructure design 1980's CMP Sydney (Urban design)1980's  
Urban Environment Coalition NSW, Section 22 Cttee, Warringah Peninsula 1994-5

**Thankyou for the opportunity of this Inquiry,**

**SUMMARY:**

My view is that any proposal to deprive Newcastle of its full working railway is wrong; an attack against a great city, and against the public interest. We see it being pushed by government using flawed process "to fulfil a promise" but not to us, the owners and users. Over thirty years, excuses for destruction of this vital public asset ring hollow.

**I see this attack as part of a pattern.** It is a culture of conceding to laymen who already have privilege and power. Cashbags are incidental. Previous instances have been within **new** projects (deprivation of rail, of stations, of rail extensions, all against public interest.) Ones I knew personally were:

NW Sydney freeway-before-rail, Minister B. Baird, 1990's,  
Warringah rail choice abandonment, (I was on the S22 Cttee)  
Killara Station cancellation, (I disproved government data used pro this)  
Epping-Chatswood trajectory change, which destroyed eastern rail extension potential,  
Woollahra Station cancelled under local pressure, they feared outsiders would do crime.  
and also the Bondi rail extension plan.  
*Relevant here:* Pressure against 'westies' enjoying Bondi beach, so we heard then. Social engineering to favour hopefully safe, well-heeled non graffiti-perpetrators; was that the idea?

*But disease only strikes undernourished, starved plants, not well fed, watched and loved ones.*

**Process was irregular then too.** In favouring partial parties' views, governments abandoned:  
\*wider public interest and service provision for both private people and business,  
\*cost benefit and economy of these new projects  
\*ESD and potential of the new projects for efficient growth for the State as a whole.

**BUT this at Newcastle** is by far the most callous, ignorant and destructive attack in this pattern, an act to close **existing** investment in place for 130 years; provisions which:

- 1) are visibly nourishing all four locations: Hamilton, Wickham, Civic, Newcastle,
- 2) mutually benefit Newcastle and its regional towns across 300 km.

The rail catchment for Newcastle City comprises a vast inland regional zone, economically symbiotic with greater Newcastle, and essential to its growth and future.

**\*\*But this has not been the chosen field for public information and consultation.**

The mismatch is too extreme and sustained to be a mere mistake.  
It favours effecting closure of the rail and stations with minimum fuss to the closers.

This Government's vaunted 'correct to rules' consultation covered a tiny fraction of the user zone; namely Newcastle (largely irrelevant), and eventually Maitland, which insisted.

Sales language eg "revitalisation" has not changed in decades. Meanwhile Newcastle has, revitalising itself since BHP and earthquake as I watch, vitally helped by rail being in place. Hamilton also has grown ever more active. Anyone can see the rail daily feeding its business. \*\*I see over 2 x the numbers on the train now, compared 12 years ago, along the Hunter line.

Governments must have noticed that major rail feeds and vitalises its four node locations; *or they wouldn't say a Wickham interchange could do likewise!!* Logically, closure has to deprive, starve, the losing locations, no matter what spin, what trams, are put forward.

Site facts indicating against closure have been inadequately researched or understood, and not accepted from others. No valid benefits of closure have been received by anyone I know.

I have noticed that furtherance of the closure notion has:

- \*Wasted money; would waste more money, & waste also our priceless public investment.
- \*Disregarded the mass of people, their needs, their ongoing mental and physical health.
- \*Suppressed the East to favour western interests, trashing jobs, small business and Tourism,
- \*Missed the crucial economic symbiosis between the Regional City and its Regions,
- \*Generated false positions, which have influenced current Ministers statements.

Processes were controlled. Pretences contrived. Planning Principles contravened.

Station ticketing and control has been designed to demonstrate a false case for closure along the entire Hunter, by producing minimal records of actual ticket revenues. Newcastle's ticket office position for example, and the loose ticket control there, and all along the line.

Since folk began to dread Christmas due to the closure announcement, the open question asked by many is: **"Who is intended to get what; who is promised what, on Dec 26?"**

The Government pressure against Fred Nile's request for stay of closure pending Inquiry is shocking, and *indicates urgent need that his request be granted.*

*# I ask that the plans for closure be withdrawn now and entirely.*

*# That any promises, contracts or deals (possibly behind the word "commitment" being used by Government so often), be **investigated with fullest powers**, made public, and dissolved.*

*# That the word 'truncation' (implying a legal, minor adjustment), be abandoned as a ploy, and 'closure' be allowed to convey the accurate degree of (illegal) collapse intended.*

ICAC can follow money trails. But it is Newcastle's sad planned fate, bought with that money perhaps, which must be reversed, thus keeping this vital City on track.

Halting closure will do a service also to those who ignorantly sought to make it happen. Their imagined benefits are just that.

BA

Maybe this new Government just decided too fast, lacking background, wanting to appear decisive; and so made this error. Their advice may have been inadequate.

### **Precedent personal experience, direct contact:**

The Summary refers to other moves against rail transport in NSW.

Bad consequences of each of these moves seem not to have reached successive groups of people whom Ministers call 'Key Stakeholders', nor governments.

I also saw the Liberal Government's heroic reversal of a bad plan against historic First Fleet Park, involving a secret part 3A. The Planning Dept under Haddad did a second and more truthful set of documents to show, after Minister Hazzard found out, ordered reversal of the devious process, and ordered proper public consultation. That saved the situation for the Australian people.

\*\*So I know the Planning Dept can deceive the Ministry, letting it take blame. And I know that a Liberal Ministry was at that time capable of correcting the problem through appropriate public consultation.

*The same Department had then been, and is still working on destroying the railway at Newcastle. That would have irrevocable consequences, worse than the above threats.*

### **Beginnings in Newcastle: PROCESS starts up.**

I hear that Mayor Joy Cummings' plan for foreshore greening was going really well. But then, property speculation people (not themselves planners, economists or transport experts) began to imagine that a successful, attractive East with Rail might get to steal some of their own future profits. They felt they could do better somehow, NOT by using similarly good planning, NOR profiting from the market coming in by rail, but instead by suppressing the success of Newcastle's unique, world beating East by cutting off its mass transport and building on it.

They may have aimed to house and hold a rich market (but in the bigger picture a very small, local market) for themselves and their businesses.

This could be done at public expense too, if the Department were to portray it as "revitalisation" of something. They should have just supported the East.

(The same was tried with the West Circular Quay scheme too, but at that time, the Planning Minister was not taken in.)

This all sounds exaggerated, ludicrous and illogical, but it is consistently reported.

I found out about Newcastle's danger when I was in Sydney, through Urban Environment Coalition of NSW, late 1980's.

Now I live in Scone, changing trains at Newcastle for beach breaks often since 2002.

I have admired the research done by Coal River people at Uni of Newcastle, and the learned defence of public interest, consistently put forward by Parks and Playgrounds.

### **Actions to Suppress the East:**

Astonishingly, Tourism as an enduring jobs generator and long term economic hope of Newcastle, focussed in the Old City and the East, has been treated as a threat.

\*The East Newcastle Tourism office was closed down.

\*The book “NEWCASTLE see change, Conference and Meeting Planners Guide” emphasises West in its actual spending recommendations, alluding to East features as bait only, even though they have brought the crowds for two centuries.

\*A recent ‘consultation’ was purely diversionary, asking us only ‘which tram?’ Its information maps were cut off just east of the Station position. No East. Issued commercial maps have shown less and less of the Rail and the Stations.

\*Another recent Transport ‘consultation’ for the Wickham Shed focussed on the west.

\*Consultations have not to my knowledge specifically reached East user groups, and residents, even though those people have direct life investment and personal interest in the Rail and its effects.

### **Quashing Objection from the Regions: Consultation deficiency.**

Information sessions and Consultations have been offered in only selected zones at short notice, over short duration, and with prior information sessions to which “Key Stakeholders” only, are invited.

These have influenced the Minister (see below, her letter to me.)

The Inland lines collect across populations of a loose million, over 300km length and surrounding the Regional City. Inlanders would not agree to losing this access if fully awake. *So they were not awakened*, despite the Regions supplying an ongoing market for Newcastle business, and themselves requiring Newcastle for many reasons.

I understand that only Newcastle was initially informed and “consulted”. (!)

And then, SOR Maitland insisted, so Maitland was included.

*\*But this did not stimulate inclusion of other regional areas.* Looking at Maitland, it is clear that the more is known by the public, the greater their objection.

*Spelling it out, Newcastle itself is not the major rail market. The lines take the mass of regional people through its built up area, that is all.*

For very few Novocastrians is rail as essential as it is for the Inlanders. They have a wide choice of transport, and a wide choice of shops and beaches.

*And yet, Newcastle was the only chosen field of ‘consultation’ as if it were a local project! Maybe to perpetrators, that’s all it is!* If this omission were not deliberate, it would have been corrected by competent individuals in Departments.

**Public responses have evidently not changed the ‘commitment’ to destruction.**

This applies to at least three consultations, the latest being the Wickham Shed.

I have submitted comment to all that I knew about. The Wickham Shed consultation information, which had no postal response addresses on it, stated to the effect that proceeding with the project *would depend on this consultation*.

It proceeds the government insists, but surely *not* with any public OK.

### *The Nub.*

*A question has to be: “what contracts, sale arrangements or promises are made, to inspire such ‘commitment’? When were they made; to whom, by whom?*

*How do their dates relate to the dates of ‘information and consultation’ days in the limited areas chosen?”*

**Shires and Councils may have been informed**, but apparently with no binding request to consult the people before responding. I have heard of no local consultations.

The Upper Hunter Shire first wrote to me that it could not take an informed view. It later wrote that it had been asked its views by the State. (Letters available.)

It was clearly imperative to ask Councils to consult their people, before responding.

**\*\*My Request, that full evidence be summoned and investigated into the extent, wording and nature of information about rail closure, between State and Shires.**

### **Advertising**

If standard **advertisements** were duly taken out by the State to satisfy the letter of the Law, nobody I know has seen them. Suppression has been achieved.

**Result:** a small sector of affected people yet know about the implications of this, between Hornsby and Scone and Dungog. They still hear only casually, from individuals. They are shocked.

A common reaction is disbelief; “they wouldn’t do that...”

### **“Stakeholders” in the Process.**

“Stakeholders”: perhaps by this Government means people *it sees* as being affected *positively, financially* by changes: Industry, big Business.

**\*\*The Minister for Transport in Hansard 19.8.14 said “it was very clear on the public record what key stakeholders felt about the issue”. She insisted “ the government had consulted widely”. (refer to that question above, about Council consultation?)**

She did not refer to views of the **majority** who are not “key”, to the Minister.

### **Entitlement; Prerogatives.**

But the asset wanted by so-called key persons and bodies, is fully Public Property. The already financially established among us *have no inherent prerogative*, and no right to disadvantage any of the public, let alone the entire Regions and their access to their Regional City, whether or not windfalls could come to them thereby.

So it is morally wrong that they were invited to private-invitation “Information meetings” days before briefer, public ones were held. (As if it were perfectly obvious that the public would disapprove, that this is taken as understood. And ignored.)

Considering that the ‘key’ sectors were also proposers of the change, the relationship between Government and profiteers appears too close.

**STAKES:** The term Stake is wrongly understood as Money. Life offers us more fundamental stakes than that. *This difference should be investigated further.*

**The true STAKEHOLDERS are Inlanders. At STAKE, our health and lifestyle. STAKEHOLDERS too, are the entire Public; we own and use the asset.**

(Excuse us for saying this, but we pay for it, and employ everyone concerned in this.) Our numbers exceed those of local “key” people. Yet we are simply left out, in effect.

### **ICAC:**

Exchange of cash bags is one thing. Destroying a World City for it is worse. But worst of all is doing that freely, only to appease those who bully us, with determined disregard of lives made miserable, local economies ruined, traffic chaos generated, beauty despoiled, opportunities trashed, jobs lost and money wasted.

If a cash bag, or even nothing, can procure that, why trust the prevailing government?

### **INFORMATION generally**

\*I heard from a man that Mr McCloy and a Mr Grujon (sp?) owns land around the Wickham Shed. It is known to the friends of this man. No further info. I trust ownerships are public information and can be researched.

\*A lady approached me to say her husband has a Contract within works for change. She is distressed. She says she knows the change to be detrimental to her way of life and that of the group she was with, taking beachside breakfast having arrived by train. She wants to submit to the Inquiry, but not tell her husband. Poor woman.

\***The Transport Minister** was quoted in the Press and since, as saying that rail closure is not helpful to, or has nothing to do with, Transport; it is an Urban Planning decision.

She seems to be abandoning her powers to act appropriately in her own field, when prevention of a useless project is clearly required.

She only explained the Urban Planning necessity, sadly, by quoting the standard and irrational spin.

\*I phoned **the Planning Minister's** office, and on asking if she had been on the train and walked across to beaches, was told no, the Minister has not. Neither had the person speaking to me. He drives; and feels he knows Newcastle quite well enough.

Extraordinary. They are ruining forever a way of life they have not even observed, let alone experienced, and they are asking me to pay them for this.

\*Mr Baird (letter) speaks of Newcastle in terms pertaining to its status, but not to real people. He does not associate the two. He is on course to delete both status (which is now considerable internationally) and people.



\*Years ago, a Planning Minister Mr Hazzard, said the ‘decision about the rail was not made lightly’. Yet what heavy reason there may be was not explained. What is it?

\*Valid argument comes from objectors and researchers; they are always ignored. Being informed by others has had no effect over years. This is not normal.

I have worked for 30 years or so in Architecture, Planning and Infrastructure, so I look for professional treatment of the future of Australia’s best emerging World City.

***PRINCIPLES OF INFORMATION, relevant to Newcastle’s treatment.***

*Law Courts:* require listening, weighing, research, and a straight reply.

*Scientific Principle:* requires that one changes one’s views according to new data.

*Precautionary Principle:* when doubts are present, don’t act irrevocably.

**Material actions upon process, by various Governments:**

I have observed the following particularly over the last 13 years:

- to make the rail appear a barrier, a stair access was disabled across the western end of the Terminus station, linking city with ferry. It can be put back
- the morale of rail staff has been sadly reduced, deliberately? ..for years
- to support rail cutting, rail usage/ticket figures are evidently mis-represented
- ticket revenues were affected by neglect, and apparent staff depression
- Some major Hunter Stations have been left without ticket machines.
- the Newcastle Station has been badly adapted for ticketing and control; its ticket office is in a cupboard, with little direction to it. There is no ticket inspection or control gate system on leaving or entering, north or south. For a remote station this might be a matter of expedience. ***At an intercity Terminus it has to be deliberate policy to run down the service.*** It is however, easily reversible (as are all these tactics) again see the economical Newcastle Railway Square plan which was submitted to a Minister 20 years ago and ignored. I was involved in it, see Appendix.
- Timetables for Newcastle ran out ages ago; there have been no new printings to help people use the system recently.
- Rail staff not allowed to comment, as if it’s a free country but not for them. They are the people who most closely observe the use and potential of rail.

## HOW WOULD THINGS LOOK IF IT WAS ALL OK?

### **PROCESS for any genuinely needed change for the better:**

\*Would research the site, its entire context, total system rail usage, and forecasts for its growth. It would extensively survey the requirements of real travellers on the ground, their destinations and desires, and compare this to the present provision. *The process was initiated by other than professionals. The basic survey and research with a necessarily open mind has never occurred. This is a major breach of process.*

\* Would involve Government Ministers being flexible, heeding international Transport experts, say, Peter Newman who has contributed to discussion; or Planners independent of Government.

\*Would research any true areas of failure, and ensure a better system before acting.

\*Would not, only months before implementation, reply to fundamentally important travel questions with: 'that is detail' and "don't know, a lot of planning to do yet". That was as late as the end of March this year.

\*Would not publicise the proposed change in false transport terms.. 'seamless travel'

\*Would not lie about effects of the change .. "improving links to the beach", "new links to foreshore.." these ideas can be disproved and refuted with a map instantly. I saw the claims on TV c/e (David Antcliff, Project Manager)

\*Would not feel the false need to 'showcase world class urban renewal' or 'embrace a fresh identity' referring without any understanding, to a process which would remove from the City its existing world class distinction, character and potential.

\*Would seek and receive genuine understanding and support, confirming its direction.

\*Would seek to actually improve transportation to the City, fulfilling its obligation.

\*Would not seek to push public opinion, but would listen to it, and be flexible.

\*Would involve operational Ministers spending much time on site, not just observing a sparsely populated platform and citing it as justification for closing the railway, as occurred. Central in Sydney would have lasted about a week by that process.

\*Would not see Parliament ignore a full scale Petition 11K, very quickly procured.

\*Would ensure Councils consulted widely to gather maximum Regional views.

\*Would uphold Mr Baird's declaration on taking office: that he would "stand up for what is right"; and also a separate statement, that he "won't support any action (like cutting the rail) which undermines public confidence".

BA

**The west edge of the Harbour as a wealth creation tool.**

*Excuse to sceptics:*

Sorry but we have to clear the rail; the people want to get briskly to the harbour. (But they don't.)

*Spin (apparent reason) to the gullible:*

We are clearing the rail for you, so you can get to the harbour. (Actually so buyers can buy there)

*Bait to buyers:*

We are clearing the rail so you can build near the harbour edge for a price. (Give us money.)

**The Pacific Ocean and Eastern shoreline as a wealth creation hitch.**

*Excuse to sceptics:*

Sorry, but we have to clear the rail; no-one wants to get to the Ocean edges or City. (But they do.)

*Spin (apparent reason) to the gullible:*

Vitality is gone, it is needed, the Ocean is irrelevant. (But vitality abounds, underlined by the Ocean)

Removing the rail is what will make the City vital. (But rail is what brings people to City and Ocean)

*Bait to buyers:*

We are clearing the rail so you ...um....can build more carparks as well. (stinking bait; clearly off)

**CBD's versus Old City as wealth creation possibilities.**

*Excuse to sceptics:*

The old city is old hat. (But the Old City is respected, unique, vital already, attractive and reusable.)

Rail is underused; look: a thin train! (Here as world wide, rail is more used and needed every day.)

*Spin (apparent reason) to the Gullible:*

You want a western CBD. You want what is new, costly and high, and in Wickham. (No we don't)

You want light rail, it is exciting and modern and glamorous. (a costlier, very limited, bus on tracks?)

Light rail will make it all wonderful!! (adds time, clogs streets, inefficient, miserably low cost-benefit.)

Taking the rail out will "revitalise". (Rail brings people to business. Take Rail, and custom wanes.)

*Bait to the buyers:*

A tram will be quieter as promised, for the flats you built. (Rail was there before the promises made).

A tram will "revitalise". (no; low capacity vehicles clog streets and take people past, not into, shops.)

Toaster-on-Track will give you customers. (rail-catchment population >> exceeds TOT, needs Ncle.)

Toaster-on-Track folk will shop locally. (see above. They are few, have cars; likely to shop anywhere.)

**State terms: all from the Minister of Transport's recent reply to MP George Souris and self.**

'truncating'. I heard that this implies a legal act, whereas the fact of the matter, (closure), is not.

'a fully accessible interchange'. Now, we have **4** fully accessible interchanges, + tourbus and ferry

'f.a i linking to light rail, will help reconnect the city with the foreshore' How so? False logic.

And what 'city' does she refer to? The City is very connected with the Pacific Ocean and Harbour.

No rail should exist anywhere if disconnection is a genuine problem, rectifiable only by demolition.

Anyone can go to western shores now on adequate existing ways, to this narrow strip of land.

**They prefer to reach the more inviting Eastern shores however**, there being hardly any distance or 'barrier' at all, between the Station and the Ocean shores which are tightly wrapped around it.

These Eastern, premium Tourism shores are *three times as long* as the western shore being used as a false bait for rail closure. As well, they are *amazingly varied*, unlike the line of hard, developed western edge. The range of provisions and in all orientations to weather and waves, is astonishing.

The Eastern, premium shores are more desirable, varied and lucrative for Tourism and local visitation; *just not for the western landowners immediately, maybe?*

But don't kill the golden goose. Rather, leave these shores accessible, and the western landowners would receive reflected glory. Kill it, and there's no glory for anyone.

***The premium shores are all only minutes' walk or even wheelchair, from the true HUB Station.***

It is these shores where folk gather from hours away by rail, for New Year celebration.. until now?

Along the Station shore is the Maritime War Memorial; across the road from the Station with a walker. I don't know if ANZAC day is celebrated there, but it would seem likely.

Streets eg Scott Street are barriers quite equal to rail. They are never mentioned as such, nor carpark.

*Re 'reconnecting city to foreshore', the Minister could have reinstated the sabotaged overbridge.*

**'bring residents, visitors to Newcastle city centre'..** to where? She is disconnecting the true City. By **'city centre'** she may mean a west-extending CBD.

But a City is not a CBD. A CBD can move anywhere. The City is the heart, the history; it endures. Visitors have been long discouraged from going where they do want to visit; the East and City.

**'the (tram?) route strikes best balance for Newcastle' ...** But the *best of what set of alternatives?* Presently the 'balance' allows for maximum relief of streets by mass transport, for normal business days, for weekend crowds on the East, for special crowd events like Surfest, and for future growth. The tram route etc destroys the system, and its balance. Her assertion is manifestly untrue.

The (route or entire scheme) **'will also support the next phase of the city's growth'..** again, what city, where?

Not the East City, if high-rise sadly lands there. World practice leaves or builds mass transport **to support** higher density building, as a matter of course.

Not the West CBD; same reasoning. So, again, the assertion is untrue.

**'community information sessions'..** the advertising she described: 'flyers distributed to residents, local businesses and and Newcastle and Civic Stations'. ***This amounts to almost zero advertising in the context of Newcastle Station's catchment area extending 300km.***

We know: We are left to try and tell those Regions, ourselves. Hardly anyone has any idea. Yet.

THIS IS CRUCIAL TO THE INQUIRY. All governments have not told nor asked the key Regions.

Clearly to the Government, **'community' just means folks who live and work around and about.** (!) **NOTE: This is a State, long distance railway system, not a localised project like a new building.**

Those getting first bite in restricted, invited meetings, were industry and business. Why?

**"Consultation was extended by a week'..** (on the Wickham Shed I assume). Thankyou; we asked for that; but I never knew it occurred, till this letter. ***No Regions were then included, despite requests.***

**'major projects'** on the Central Coast line were progressed involving trackwork stoppages, the Minister writes. OK, but the stoppages were along the Hunter as well. ***What project was so major it would take out 300km of transport, yet not be able to be divulged? Pre-emptive works maybe?***

Major reforms are to improve **'reliability'**. The Minister describes maintenance centres and modernisation. ***She omits to mention the deletion of the only really major destinations.***

Unacceptable. ***Perhaps "reliability" means only for coal transport then?***

To me, reliability means that I can arrive; and according to anticipation.

***'Increased reliability' can never mean getting there much later, with extreme disruption, forever.***

\*\*\* THE PREMIER's letter of 3 October confirms everything in my submission.  
I will not elaborate, as I am painfully conscious of the length of this submission already.

The above gives me no joy to write. Minister Berejiklian is reputed to be a good, friendly person. But her advice, from people who know Planning and Transport, is twisted. Why?

Initial rail cutting ideas came from lay people. They hoped this amateur concept may favour them. They should have been set right by professionals from the State, with integrity. But they were not.

***Test of the professional Planners in the Department:***

\*\*If bad advice is just humanly incompetent, then the course of proper public consultation would eventually correct the plans.

\*\*But if it is from persuasion or pressure, then consultation will be token and controlled, graphics and wording manipulated, and responses ignored and rebuffed irrespective of quality or truth.

There may even be sabotage. False positions will be put about. They will convince people, *even though the people cannot explain these positions in any words other than the spin they were given.*

All this we have seen as being the case for a long time now, regarding Newcastle Rail closure plans.

So I claim that Contravention of Principles, *ie. evident flaws in merit against the public interest, is a valid indicator of problems which should be examined, just as valid as an examination of Process.*

I claim that it is immoral to proceed at all, with plans that are seen by the people to be against all commonsense. Of those who do yet know, the more they know the less they are taken in.

Confidence in Government is not the issue. That is immaterial.

The issue is: Will the wonderful City of Newcastle survive this Government?  
That is what our children, and theirs, will see and care about.

BA

The following design principles have been twisted or contravened according to what I have so far learned professionally and as a non-denominational C. human being.

### **Principle:**

### **Preserve what people find good, useful, needful, enjoyable.**

Keep what is quick and easy and comfortable, what benefits everyone, whether wealthy and fit, or disadvantaged and encumbered:

The very young, old people with limited movement, people with children, with walkers, with luggage, without English; those who rise at 5am to get the Scone train to an appointment in Newcastle at 10am and shop until the return train.

**\*People who are blind or otherwise disabled urge us passionately, to rescue the rail; it is deeply touching.**

Young non-drivers, those with surfboards and bikes wanting independence.

The happy crowds at New Year who return home safe by rail to Muswellbrook on the 3am train. The Surfest crowds. (*Surfest, proudly on the Station signs*).

The visitors and tourists, shoppers, ball-game crowds .. like the indigenous soccer fans I met who saw the point immediately; were all horrified... elders, teens, they were all taking buses to Raymond Terrace from Newcastle.

Miners on their days off from coal work, who live for the beach days with boards or bikes, and the easy train arrival. They don't want more driving.

Drivers who prefer city streets safe, fast and freer of traffic, with parking.

The older people from Sydney and all the Inland towns, taking group days out at Newcastle. Travellers bound for the famous YHA.

People like me taking a beach and shopping break between trains.

But also:

*The future residents of high density zones; builders, staff, buyers, residents, visitors.. Could anyone **at all** be better off if the railway closes?*

*\*My experience is; when people find out initially, they are incredulous, then shocked; they often say: " but They wouldn't really do THAT!?" and then "what can be done?" The words "it's not commonsense" comes into about 50% of the reactions.*

*\*When people have known for some time, in their first words of reply, almost all will include the word "stupid", having quickly turned their faces aside. I feel helpless.*

I keep thinking of an old man, on the train with his walker. He had a jolly bearded face like Santa. He could hardly walk and was unable to speak. He saw my banner saying "Beach City~only with Rail" and his eyes danced in a warm, wonderful smile. He waved his arms in a victory sign, and straightened up a bit as he moved to the accessible platform.

He could never get on a bus. I dedicate this submission to him.

## **Principle: Greatest good for the greatest NUMBERS.**

The growing rail catchment population, (*say a million around the Sydney to Hunter track enabling known, regular trips to Newcastle*); is **more numerous** than the roomful, privileged with full access to Newcastle, who only want the rail gone, and us with it. It is really odd that their self centred, amateur idea is being taken seriously.

Parliament has ignored a full scale **Petition** of 11,000 got up in a few days. (Process)

Government has referred to its own supportive '**silent majority**': but it is a figment. Why doesn't this silent majority say something, valid, to support its case then?

**Numbers using my trains** are growing; over doubled in my 12 years here in Scone. Ticket numbers quoted in the service of closure are inaccurate. (Process.)

As to **numbers against the proposal**, for every rally attender or writer, huge numbers agree with us. (Many country people yet don't know it's ok to comment or protest.)

Most people in the regions **don't even know** what is happening yet. (Process)

Is the Press influenced, or just at fault? It could do far more investigation. Even this week, the Star pulled out my letter informing the upper Central Coast. Last week's Herald however, carried an article by Monteath who is I hear, a development surveyor; it was inaccurate propaganda for closure. (Process)

## **Principle: Design for public health; save on health expenditure.**

I wrote to Minister Skinner, citing the recent ABC report: "worst heart health in Hunter and Central Coast. Without preventative exercise, huge expenditures due." *Rail directly connects precisely these areas to the City and coast at Newcastle, which provide every kind of pleasant mental health aid and physical activity.*

Deprived Muswellbrook and Wyong kids from difficult homes and in danger of coal asthma and social problems, can take bikes and boards on the train in safely companionable groups to the guarded sea at Newcastle, without parental care.

Elders from all along the 400km of track need walk only minutes from the train, no steps, for refreshing days out. They do this often; last week I met a group "Senior Catholics" breakfasting at the beach; they took the early train from Muswellbrook.

**No State cash investment in health programmes could match this free provision.**

No reply yet from the Health Minister on this.

**Design for Public Health, contd: Mental health;** a current focus.

Many people quite unbidden, reveal to me their private intent never to return to Newcastle again if the rail ceases to reach that uplifting, magnificent, accessible Station-on-Sea. Me too; we have known the best; why ruin the memory?

This is not maudlin sentiment, it concerns our spirit, our keen appreciation of something intensely precious, unmatched anywhere else in the world. The harbourside rail brings us in a way, and to a place that a bus/tram could not; physically, emotionally, spiritually & aesthetically. It has mastered the secret of the very best URBAN DESIGN.

Tourists are people, with souls, who also seek refreshment and mental health. At Newcastle the best is free. At the moment it is available. (Yes, money follows.)

**1)The emotional medicine:**

It begins with the grand, slow arrival, the views opening, we see the horizon behind Nobbys headland itself. We are met by a gracious, ennobling building and amenity. We feel more human and uplifted, as a result. *Beauty: "the promise of happiness."*

Compared, a city bus/tram depositing us at a comfortless, exposed, mid-street stop. Bus or light rail, it is just a senseless let down, a mockery of what the City was before.

2) there is **dread of Christmas**, growing panic, and depression amongst people for whom Newcastle gives that chief recreation spiritually, mentally and physically. Their lives will be poorer. They have no alternatives; Newcastle offers us the best. It is an act that cannot be followed.

3) People are not fooled, "light rail" illusions dangled before us are neither desirable in themselves, nor problem-solving. People are acutely aware that we are all being taken for the wrong kind of ride, wasting our public money in destroying what is good and what is ours; **we are made into losers**. Not our fault, but we feel helpless, stupid.

4)That effect turns days of forced buses for 'trackwork' into a kind of mental torture. Buses long distance between rail stations make people feel physically sick, too. (I was the calmest on one of these full buses, on a day of no trains for 300km N to S.)

**Principle: Transport Efficiency. We HAVE:**

\*Four (4) smoothly working transport interchanges, one with ferry, over one 6 minute stretch of rail, distributing congestion optimally and rationally along the length of the growing CBD and City proper. **Ideal.** Any world city would be proud. Why not us?

\* Trains from three long distance directions and around two hours travel time in each direction, linking with: a complete bus system, taxis, a carpark, a tourist tour bus (which is called a tram and is very attractive), kiss and ride provision, and a ferry.



\*An ideal *dissociation* between peaks of urban congestion, and the actual Terminus.  
(this is twisted into a pro-closure argument, despite growing peak terminus use. The dissociation is an ideal separation; it should not be collapsed into the usual chaos seen at many world termini.  
Congestion is not ‘vitality’, it is uncomfortable and a problem.)

We HAVE, contd:

\*An ideal *connection* between coastal event crowds, and available Terminus.  
(this is ignored; just **cancel** the crowds, like NYEve fireworks)  
**Q:** There is a new crowd venue, proposed. Is it too, meant to divert crowds from the East and its smoothly working interchanges?

\*An ideal **sea link** between southern shore and Stockton/Airport via train and ferry.

*SO: What does the proposal do for us?*

One little example of project futility has to be a business in Morisset whose customers come from Stockton via direct rail from the Newcastle ferry.

**The Minister herself admitted to Press that it does nothing for Transport. Even if she does imagine it to be founded in Urban Planning, she should strongly test the validity of that, before abandoning her own duty to cancel the project.**

*The magic of the Wickham Shed;*

Each train can fill up to 3 or 15 buses. (if a tram is bigger, then why not just stick to the country two-car trains at zero added expense, and save the money?)  
Trains pass the crossings quickly. But their many buses must queue at every traffic light, including Stewart St, (with Station St’s traffic added to it as well.)

A full Sydney train for a crowd event (unless **all** are cancelled from here on) would need an hour to decant to the regularly spaced trams; by which time several country trains have come in from the north, and the next Sydney train has arrived.

**Does not work.** Buses and trams clog streets, inevitably cause more accidents than trains, and take say, 30mins including waiting, to do a 6 minute train trip (each way). It is ridiculous, sorry. If it DID work, there would still be no advantage in it.

**If bus and tram numbers are mismatched** to train travellers coming in, they run empty; or too full; or we wait for more to arrive from somewhere. Are there paid drivers on call then, somewhere? And extra buses waiting? All very costly.

**The efficiency of a train** covering all eventualities, with driver and guard, is superior.

*Practical transport dis-connectivity is overwhelming.*

A train arrives. I get off with my airport bags, tired from Mascot. Are there buses to match the train crowd? I don’t speak English, don’t know the bus for my destination. A tram may take me to Newcastle **where there may still be a bus station**; I may yet calmly find a bus. Does that bus come through here? I might go back to Sydney instead. I hate this.

If I have a seven foot surfboard or a bike, forget it.

Bike through city streets from here? No thanks. I’ll go somewhere else.

As for my friend the old man, he can never come in to town again. No chance of getting on a bus.

*Pity about Surfest. Pity help the Asian Cup in January.  
Forget New Year's Eve; no wonder they cancelled it. Poor Newcastle.*

**\*\* Aah... But there will be LIGHT RAIL!!**

Tram every 10 minutes!! But our trains offer far greater capacity, and good frequency locally, with at least equal comfort, and no mode change. Why swap?

*Light rail* is an illusion word; it sways the lay people; and is used for that purpose.

Practically, the **tram route** usurps something far greater; and complements nothing. Light rail should complement and link existing systems, not knock them out just as they are approaching their key, incentive destinations.

**\*\*** I think the 'light rail' ploy works at an emotional level because **people mostly do hate buses**, as against trains, (comfort, access, safety). So a tram is "*like a train*" *So stay with the train. The new rail cars are lovely; quite enough glamour there.*

**Car Parking: currently hard to find but not impossible. Parking areas set below train levels and along its fences, which makes them visually unobtrusive, and minimises the ugly barrier they would present without the rail boundary to mask them. There is a balance of parking and public transport. Train takes much pressure off parking demand. Without rail of course, parking need, and provisions, would explode.**

**\*\*Aaah ... but this new transport arrangement is "SEAMLESS!!"**

*"Seamless" means all of one piece.* In rail terms, a loop.

**Note, the old system where another steam train pulled the same cars back out and continued north or south...** very close to seamless! No mode change at all!

A seam connects differently oriented elements. WHAT IS WRONG WITH A SEAM?

**\*\* We currently have an efficiently distributing and collecting seam, stitched at Hamilton, Wickham, Civic, & Newcastle. This seam forces no mode changes.**

People sit comfortably looking at the harbour and the sea, arriving directly at Hamilton, Wickham, Civic, Newcastle, and on to a ferry or tourist vehicle of delightful character.

**Government's "seamless" transport involves ripping out the harmless seam, and patching up the ragged ends with unwanted, unnecessary, uncertain and feeble connections. Look! No Seam!!! Seamless! (Thin air)**

The torn ends and new connections are forced into a Wickham zone which will never be a paramount destination, nor a "vital vibrant hub" either; just a big accident.

## **Principle: Don't waste public money. Nor good jobs.**

**Some people say buses might be OK, but only because they are free in town. FREE??** We are to subsidise people 100% to keep them riding buses in town. The public purse gets no returns at all, to cover the eternal and rising costs of this!

Regional people still pay the same train fare but a mode change is thrown in. The train fare is still paid to the public purse, but train travellers are cheated of its main object; they reach only Broadmeadow or the Shed! Of course usage would drop!

Funds are drained to build this loss, and to pay for bus travel pointlessly employing many extra drivers, polluting the city air and clogging streets with slow, new buses. We pay to store buses, and drivers, used or unused, Inefficiency and waste.

\*Cars being added to the extra buses on the streets, make accidents more frequent.

**Under the principle of Socially Responsible Employment, it would be cheaper and healthier to let these extra drivers, maintainers, administrators, destruction workers do really needed work, while we continue to use the train.**

**Transport NSW** knows it would spend our money badly and get nothing from it. It said it expects to lose the custom which refuses or cannot use buses. So? Why do it.

### **Are trains Wasteful?**

Only a few people arriving at a station sometimes is not "wasteful".

Passengers get on, they get off; that is a fact. Where they get off is irrelevant.

**The train system is a generous system, with plenty of play.** It covers the full scope and range of eventualities. It needs minimum investment to maintain and run this, **the most crucial, cost-beneficial, 3 km of track in the eastern seabord system.**

**The old, true economy and efficiency of a train and staff, could never be matched, nor reinstated once lost. BUT, it can be retained now, however.**

It is embarrassing enough to have to describe this; would be mortifying to have to pay for it with public moneys, as well as with our lost way of life.

It is a triple loss, first wasting Port money, then destroying our vital infrastructure, and then, installing inferior systems with eternally high running costs.

And the Port.. a price should cover replacement!

Who could replace a natural and built system like Newcastle for that small sum?

It's a very small price; why should we waste any of it, let alone on destruction?

## **Principle: Design Transport for Public Safety.**

Health (above) mentioned the kids with boards, etc. from the disadvantaged towns giving Government large coal revenues; where their parents may be in gaol, and where social evils compete with employment opportunities.

Parents see kids to the station with their kit, knowing they will walk under 10 minutes from the Station to a monitored beach. They know there is surveillance all the way through the city, and that their kids will wait in a staffed Station, and return safe all the way home again. We have lost too many kids on the highways already.

The gratuitous death of the rail would be only the first death of many more; just a matter of time. The kids would aim to drive, fast, to lonelier unguarded beaches.

The safety and security of waiting in the Station, the comfort of the train in extreme weather while waiting, are immensely attractive, compared to remote dark bus stops.

Blaire is 13 and travels often to Stockton from the Upper Hunter. His father does not want him hanging around Wickham Shed. All the kids would have to hang around the Wickham Shed waiting. It is said to be a shady zone for crime. More policing is not an answer, though that was proposed by a conservative politician.

St Peters School Maitland.. its boys on the train say their parents allow them to go together to the beach. (Their first time is always a day to remember for inland youth.) These boys say that without the Newcastle rail they may be forbidden to go, even if their boards or bikes fitted on a bus or tram, which they do not (ref Gold Coast data).

If the transport system is considered unsafe for kids, they won't visit Newcastle. Nor will they then, as adults. This enters the economic argument, by others.

Safety is a serious matter for those in any way impaired, not just the young.

Safety and security is offered at the Terminus for everyone.

It is crucial to the sight impaired and movement impaired people who entreat us to help them keep the rail at the terminus. It presents no steps, no barriers, and is only a short stroll from their restful sources of deep enjoyment at the promenade watching the fishermen, etc.

## **Principle: Be aware of Global Precedent; do not ignore it**

The rest of the world has long built, not deleted, mass transport nodes near intended dense residential and business development. This applies especially on a narrow peninsula, and even more so when that peninsula attracts crowds.

The parking problem created by removing rail is self evident.

Parking is now just in balance; not yet ruining the place it serves.

Absence of rail would tip that over immediately. Australia often ruins its attractions.

Refer Peter Newman's Australian and overseas examples. He urges keep this Rail.

## **Principle: match mass transport to crowd movement.**

Although Government is trying to suppress non-resident crowds to the East, in order to kill demand for rail, the crowds will keep coming. The shoreline won't go away. Shifting people from trains to buses is a lame exercise at normal times, but during crowd events, it would jam up badly. Even now, every week sees beach events. GROWTH is something desired by Government. GROWTH is something therefore that Government should allow for. GROWTH requires mass transport to be economical and to reduce its impacts.

Crowds come too to the Harbour foreshores, around the Station. Photos show how popular the place is, and how the pleasantness of the place is unaffected by the transport interchange close by. It brings and takes crowds, but sits quietly and low.

**We would like to see the New Year Fireworks back please.** Cancellation is supposed to be due to cost. Not so. Fireworks every year for a thousand years would cost less than destruction of this great railway which makes it successful and safe.

Events like that pay for themselves with visitor dollars; bad economy to cancel them.

## **Principle:**

### **Match mass transport to places where visitors wish to go.**

Govt may have closed the East end Tourist office, but the January 2015 Asian Cup people still want to stay in accommodation near the beach. The YHA on Pacific Street is famous; Lonely Planet Guide features it as a world class stay. It is.

Some visitors want to go to Civic, its galleries shopping streets, Town Hall, Conservatorium, University, parklands, Museum.. By bus just ain't the same. Taking Civic railway station is part of the same big mistake.

More and more I see Hamilton footpaths filled with people. Same there.

## **Principle: Honesty with the public. re “Connectivity” and other inventions.**

Fashionable term. Selectively used to favour the proposal, nothing to do with people. **Connectivity**, as in **connecting regional people to Newcastle** is not considered.

*The “premium attraction foreshores” are THREE (3) times the length of the western railside shores. Their essential “connectivity” is not at all blocked. They and the hinterland gardens are what bring the crowds. They are wrapped tightly around, what?? Newcastle Station.*

*Yes, kilometres of prime sea edges are all within ten minutes walk of Newcastle Station. World beating. \*\* How or why has this escaped Government Planners?*

*For the life of Newcastle, keep this Station working.*

The shore-side rail divides or prevents very little. But its removal closes Station Street. That does divide a large built up area, increasing traffic on parallels.

Scott Street and others, car parks, development, fences: all and each of these divide people from the western waters quite as much as the rail ever did. But the postulated intense desire of city people to quickly cross from business buildings across the tracks and through development walls to the western shore **is an invention**.

People wanting to visit just the **western harbour edges** would pour from train stations across to these shores...but no, they all stay on the train to Newcastle! People can get to the western edges easily now anyway, via existing accesses.

Town views to the western waters however, are blocked by development, not rail.

*Accesses over rail can be reopened. It is infinitely more cost effective to reinstate pedestrian overbridges and add lifts, than to negatively destroy the system..*

\*\*eg: At **the east end of the rail corridor**, where there is real demand and a ferry, Government can reverse its dismantling of the overbridge at west Newcastle Station, to once again 'reconnect' the ferry with the city. Immediate benefit, welcome reparations, acknowledgement of public will. A GOOD PROJECT TO DO.

Other crossings *can be added cheaply with rail in place*, as people say for years now.

\*\***Another invention** is that the rail strip could or should be a pedestrian corridor; it is totally unsuitable and unnecessary. Much of the rail corridor is enclosed by buildings new and old. Landscaping of the working rail corridor was planned by J Cummings.

\*\***Also invention** is the notion that World Class Urban Design means 'landscaping' the track area, and allowing people to sip coffee on this new, expensive sward. But the truth is that sippers will always choose the waters edge, and locations in the nearby, perfectly accessible, quiet and delightful Eastern gardens. That would not change.

I expect this sipping-on-track phase would soon be proved unsuccessful. Improve on the unused grass by some new buildings, and there goes the "Connectivity" pretence.

**\*\* Be honest about the need for "Revitalising". It is being used inappropriately, only as a way of imposing an agenda.**

The term, routinely used freely, has not changed in 30 years, but Newcastle has.

After the earthquake and the BHP changes, Newcastle is becoming, in its own time, a beautiful and lively place despite the Council allowing predatory shopping complexes both in suburbia, and in the delicate and dignified inner City which should be protected for its unique qualities.

Over 20 years, I see Newcastle rising and becoming more lively every year. A more vital city foreshore could not be imagined; including on Sunday. Any Australian or international City would envy its vitality.

And this is *with the rail in place. The rail is unobtrusive, and entirely nourishing.*

No credibility remains in assertions that Newcastle needs draconian Government interference to 'revitalise' it.

There is no credibility in assertions of any necessity to take out its rail artery.

Kids see through the stupidity of this arrogant notion, set in concrete decades ago.

Shopkeepers know that a tram is not going to fill shops in Hunter Street, if that is the only aim. Vehicles carry people past, not into, the businesses.

It is People walking, between active rail stations, that brings more custom to shops.

## **Principle: Urban Design needs Professionals and Integrity.**

**Ideas for Newcastle must not be dictated by self-centred, unschooled profiteers.**

**Newcastle Station setting constitutes truly world class Urban Design. It promises beauty and refreshment, and it is a promise which is fulfilled. It bestows a true sense of ARRIVAL to this magnificent Old City, and to its marvellous shoreline, and has capacity to offer more amenity than it does now. With its unobtrusive yet efficient transport interchange, Newcastle Station has been a working transport hub for 130 years, and operates smoothly.**

*The Government seems unaware that it intends to destroy one of the finest occurrences of Urban Design in the World, based on unique natural topography..*

*The Premier seems to believe that destruction "showcases world class urban design", because he writes this in letters. But the rest of the world is actually aghast at the crass destruction contemplated. Not another country anywhere, would do this, for transport reasons, urban design, or commonsense obvious to any layman.*

*If so many see the Government is being sold a lie, how can it still be happening?*

**\*\*Use of the term Hub,  
and recognition of a true Urban Design opportunity:**

Newcastle Station is a **real** hub of course. But UGNSW uses that word to mean "an active place". Like "light rail"; an empty sales pitch.

Newcastle Station has a fault, cheaply rectified:

Street widening has pushed the buffers too close to Watt Street. Taking them back 130 metres to half way along the Station building gives needed room for proper ticketing access space, and control-gate design, which is presently lacking.

But also it allows space for a true Railway Square, open 24 hours, busy, welcoming.

A City entry square on existing space between existing buildings, would retain the same harbour views, but allow space to enjoy them. It would offer refreshments, waiting areas, luggage repository services, beach equipment sales, etc.

The Square would cost very little, yet strengthen the spokes of this hub, and help direct visitors to the multiple destinations close by. THAT is ‘connectivity’.

It would preserve and use what is good and noble in the stunning setting, and the heritage buildings. Lit softly by reflection off the Customs House at night, it would be a **truly world class city Entry Square for Newcastle. THAT is Urban Design. The Newcastle Square idea has been overlooked since being submitted 20 years ago to a then State Minister, by the Parks and Playgrounds Association.**

Instead, the Planning Minister tells us she would allow Newcastle’s Toaster on Track, effectively blocking the entire old city from the harbour, and vice versa.

This would likely reduce ‘connectivity’ more than do any trackside railings.

### **Principle:**

#### **State should consider Security and emergency planning.**

This is a national Port. It is strategic, vulnerable, and subject to earthquake and sea surge.

It is crazy to annihilate the core mass transport directly connecting regions and all points along the city. This would be so even were it not a major connection to the ferry connecting, via Stockton, with the Airport and the north if bridges are down.

The usual bridges may be out of action by whatever agency at any time

The ferry port also connects heavy rail from Sydney and Hunter with ships in Harbour or standing out to sea, should civilian or troop movements ever require it.

The Station is overseen by Fort Scratchley. Modern Australia is complacent. Initial settlement needed and considered all this in 1804. Why are we not doing so?

### **Principle:**

#### **Minimise only Genuine impacts (not fictitious or trivial impacts).**

Apparently some people with interests near the rail line find ‘ugly’ the railings which protect them from occasional trains. The entire rail they say, is a ‘barrier’.

They don’t refer to other barriers like Scott street, the other roads, carparks and developments similarly, nor demand their removal.

Their complaint, in the broader context of 130 years of this vital public infrastructure which precedes them in time and in importance, is *trivial, and needs no address.*

The same folk may find more actual impact from 15 more buses past their door instead of a few short trains past their windows, and from longer queues at lights for buses and trams.



The present two-car trains zipping over crossings have far less impact than light rail on streets would.

It is unknown whether proposal impacts have been fully explained to people who were told they would benefit from exit of rail, to do with building of apartments.

I doubt it was pointed out that new blocks on the harbour edge would visually disconnect Civic from its inner Harbour; or that this effect will increase with more developments in the Wickham area.

The impact of the Toaster-On-Track would, of course, be mortal for Newcastle as a whole. That impact would infinitely exceed the minor rail 'impacts'.

That goes for any high barrier between city zones and Harbour, in valuable heritage zones. The sheer perversity and inconsistency of 'planning' argument is astonishing.

Impacts are only seriously considered if consideration can favour development.

For instance, rail cutters moan that they want to get to the shores, that the Regions are "selfish" for expecting them to use paths now provided. That we should give up our "selfish" expectation of reaching our only city, our only beach, to ease their pain! Yeah.

## **Principle: Preserve, enhance positive "impact!"**

**Notably absent in this process, the studied appreciation of what we have.**

It has to be emphasised again:

The great Newcastle Station, with its interchange for bus, taxi, tourist-tram/bus and ferry port, is excellent Urban Design and Architecture, because it suits its purpose, and because it is beautiful, uniquely so. \*\*Look at it :

against the strong shape of the Customs House and high pines,  
from the east broadwalk and horseshoe beach, set like a city jewel.  
from the harbour waters and Stockton,  
from Scott Street in both directions,  
from the Customs House,  
and from within its own enclosure.

It is in scale with the City behind it. It is unobtrusive yet still visible and beautiful. It is one of the most delightfully attractive transport interchanges in the World.

The bus station beside the Station, is a masterpiece of understatement, scaled down and softened by the towering pine trees.

The harbour views from the Station itself are not spoiled by that bus station nor by the ferry wharf position.

Taxis and the tourist vehicle stops do not block any harbour views.

All this works smoothly and in ideal proximity.

**Its continuation requires no land-take, no purchases, no huge expenditure, no destruction, no disruption. It works well. Leave it alone.**

(One would not describe the Wickham Shed on the same page.)

## **Principle: ESD; Ecologically Sustainable Development.**

ESD demands efficient public transport to free the roads, and to take from us the burdens of dependence on oil and private vehicle ownership. It reduces future road-building needs.

Heavy rail with the existing and complementary bus systems here is optimal.

Light rail here as proposed is not complementary; its cost-efficiency is negative, it supplants better capacity trains.

Climate change will raise sea levels. Development at sea level is unwise.

## **Principles towards Policy:**

- a) *Scientific Principle*: adjust viewpoint according to new data and objective advice. This, applied, would have reversed the rail closure early, willy nilly.
- b) *Legal Principles*: Listen, comprehend, respond to points made. This is not the experience of those dealing with governments on the rail issue.

## **Good policy should result: (examples)**

\*The population of Inlanders in a radius of 150km, for whom Newcastle is their regional City, will generally help its economy if they can get to it easily.

Conversely, Newcastle fulfils their needs in a way no ordinary City could do due to its unique gifts. Inlanders and Newcastle need each other. **Economic policy keeps rail.**

\*Deloitte Access Economics forecasts that Tourism, properly fostered, will take over from coal eventually in Australia. The jobs will be cleaner and healthier, the economic returns will be spread, rather than creating a two tier economy.

**Jobs, satisfying, educative and healthy jobs, are there for the youngsters in Newcastle's growing Tourism sector. Many of them will live along the Central Coast and Hunter lines.**

**Tourism keeps the Rail where it is, firmly.**

\* T4 coal loader; there is a threat from Mr Greiner's report of 2 years back, that coal will be allowed to shift **all** passengers from the Hunter line. No access, anywhere. This is feared by many of us.

It would be against the above principles and policies. Please resist it.

**End of submission, apologies for length.**

**BA**