

**INQUIRY INTO SYDENHAM-BANKSTOWN LINE
CONVERSION**

Name: Name suppressed
Date Received: 15 September 2019

Partially
Confidential

15 September 2019

Submission to the inquiry into the Sydenham-Bankstown Line conversion

I am a resident of Canterbury. I catch the train most days into my workplace at a university in the city and I use the train from time to time on the weekend. It is a good service and meets my needs.

Since 2010 I have owned and live an apartment on the Cooks River. Over the past almost nine years substantial degrading of the amenity of my home and its environs has occurred. Traffic congestion, poor signaling on main roads and unbridled, weakly conceived high-rise development, much of which is not inhabited, are my main concerns.

Active in local associations I have witnessed first hand the corrupt practices of the former Canterbury Council now awaiting ICAC – Operation Darsha deliberations and I have followed with interest the questionable activities of local and state government officials.

There is little attention, for example, from some councilors and senior officers in the current Canterbury-Bankstown Council (CBC) to the needs of residents in my local precinct because the council is simply too large with too few resources to, for instance, keep parks maintained and garbage services up to speed in a timely manner.

This reality too has manifested in eagerness by CBC to embrace the idea of a metro on that has been deemed a perfectly adequate heavy goods line. City of Bankstown residents stand to gain the most from a metro but the negative impacts for residents throughout the rail corridor closer to the city end alongside the suburbs of Hurlstone Park- Canterbury- Campsie - Belmore – Punchbowl is significant.

I have several questions and concerns about the conversion that to date remain unanswered:

1. What is the rationale for the metro? What current urban growth projections is it based on?
2. What statistics have underpinned the need to pull up the heavy goods rail line?
3. What growth figures are being used to make *the case* when apartment growth has plateaued in Sydney – i.e. there are many unoccupied units/shop fronts and who is chasing up corrupt officials who have ‘land banked properties’ in the streets nearby and who stand to gain the most from any developments associated with a metro service?
4. What evidence has been gathered on the impacts of a privatized rail line in some of the low SES communities who live along the existing corridor?
5. What inconvenience and safety factors for residents have been factored into construction plans while the conversion takes place?

6. What will the state government do to transport people during the construction period when thousands of people movements will need to be provisioned each day when the only major transport thoroughfare is Canterbury Road – a road that is already congested with cars and buses?
7. Heritage must be preserved for the stations and surrounding homes that will be erased, for example, at the cost of straitened platforms.
8. The choice of MTR in the current political climate is problematic when the major political parties are questioning its links to the Chinese Communist Party.
9. How many more seats are provided per metro movement?
10. How will students with heavy school bags, and the elderly and frail be able to stand for long journeys without adequate seating?

I have many more questions and appeal to this Upper House inquiry to ask the state government to recalibrate its thinking around the need to abandon the heavy rail and convert the line. Instead spend money on upgrading the existing rail line, the trains and provide better access at some of the stations along the route where they are no lifts or limited wheelchair options.

A metro is a poor choice for this area when accurate stats, growth projections, political undercurrents and the aspiration of zealous developers have not been resolved.

Sincerely

Please publish my submission but not my name or address.