

From: [REDACTED]
To: [PAC Enquiries Mailbox](#)
Subject: Comment on Department of Planning's Environment Assessment Report on the so-called Redevelopment of the Australian Technology Park.
Date: Monday, 21 November 2016 12:59:33 AM

Dear Sir or Madam,

As a resident of Alexandria, and a user of Redfern Railway Station, I wish to raise issue with some key claims in the Department of Planning's Environment Assessment Report on the so-called Redevelopment of the Australian Technology Park.

This is not a redevelopment of a technology park – this is a conversion of a technology park into a company campus.

As the EIS notes, the building height and GFA only “generally reflect” the desired future characteristics of the area. As an aside, I wonder what response I might receive were I to perhaps explain to a policeman that, for example, my driving generally reflected what is legal. Building height and GFA should not be more or less compliant, they should be compliant or what's the law for?

The Response notes the proximity of Redfern Station, but fails to deal with the issue that Redfern Station is already at capacity – both in term of the trains which service it and the platforms themselves. It cannot cope with the increase in usage that would result from this proposed development, if it were permitted to continue.

The Response notes the proximity of bus services, but fails to deal with the existing congestion that hampers these same bus services, congestion that is set to worsen considerably as already approved developments come on line, not least, the WestConnex, which will add up to 100,000 cars a day to these already congested streets.

The path between Platform 10 and the ATP, which is shared with vehicles, is already congested. The increase in passenger movements would make it almost impossible for those of us that need to travel against this overwhelming flow of traffic.

The platforms at Redfern are smaller than average, and can already be dangerously overcrowded. They would not cope with a significant increase in passengers waiting for trains.

Platform access is already constrained. Most platforms have only a single narrow set of stairs, and struggle to cope with the current passenger load. Any significant increase in passengers would mean that passengers would be arriving faster than they can clear the platform. This would be impossibly dangerous.

Platform 10, the primary connection from the station to the ATP, is currently used by Sydney trains as their fallback platform when there are other problems on the network. In particular, it is regularly used to divert trains from underground platforms. This usage is not compatible with the proposed use as a thoroughfare carrying, during the morning peak, up to 4,000 people an hour.

To safely cope with the proposed increase in passengers, there would need to be increases in the capacity of platforms, in access to platforms, and in access to the station.

This may not be sufficient, but at a minimum:

- there must be an additional bridge added at the south end of the platforms to provide additional station access, and to moderate the increase in load on platform 10.
- the intersection of Marian St and Cornwallis St must be converted to pedestrian priority
- the existing tunnel from platform 10 to the ATP must be remediated and opened for pedestrian use
- the Goods Line must be extended to Redfern Station and thence to the ATP
- there must be an expansion and extension of bus only lanes to, at least, Central Station, Waterloo, Green Square, Erskineville and St Peters
- there must be an expansion and extension of bike lanes to, at least, Central Station, Waterloo, Green Square, Erskineville and St Peters

To be blunt, if the Department is serious about meeting its commitments, there ought to be a bus station provided onsite.

The costs of upgrading local infrastructure to deal with the load imposed by this development would be significant. They should be funded from developer contributions. The suggestion that it could be acceptable as a partial offset of developer contributions to simply add some recreational facilities and remediate the damage the development will do to existing roads and paths in the ATP is offensive. Making good damage done is not a contribution. Recreational facilities as proposed, while not unwelcome, are primarily of benefit to park tenants, and they are in no way shape or form, a substitute for transport infrastructure. The response claims that the proposal would increase connectivity in the site. This is not true. At best, it maintains existing connectivity – but given the increase in traffic, it seems more likely that effective internal connectivity will decline.

Any proposed solution must account for not only the existing, near or over capacity station and roads, but also the increase in density of vehicle, commuter and pedestrian traffic that will already inevitably follow the developments already approved in the immediate area, including to date, Green Square, Ashmore, and WestConnex, as well as the rest of Central 2 Eveleigh.

The report notes that the development will bring additional jobs into the City of Sydney. It does not acknowledge that these jobs will be removed from Western Sydney, running directly counter to the State Government's stated objective of increasing the number of jobs in Western Sydney.

There is no justification for the excessive size of the buildings – Mirvac was well aware of the controls already in place, and they should have planned to comply with them. They not be allowed to progress, unless and until there are approved infrastructure plans that address the massive increase in commuters that will inevitably result.

Instead, Mirvac have circulated to residents a letter announcing that they will start work, in 'anticipation of approval'. It should be made clear to Mirvac that they are not above the law.

Regards, Ben Aveling



Email sent using Optus Webmail