

Reject Baird's Sydney Metro disaster!

If the Baird Government gets its way, you will lose your modern double-deck rail service – *and your community* – to the property developer MTR Corporation.

Comfortable double-deck trains will be replaced with sub-standard “cattle class” metro trains and thousands of homes and businesses will be acquired by the government for redevelopment by MTR as Hong Kong-style high rise precincts.

If you live in Waterloo, you may get a metro station but at the expense of losing your community, and being displaced to a Department of Housing development on Sydney's outskirts. Under Baird's plan, if you managed to return after a few years of urban redevelopment, you would have to share your Waterloo with 70,000 other residents stacked into a dense mass of new high rise apartments.

If you live in Erskineville, St Peters or Alexandria you may not have a rail service because the metro would speed through, under these suburbs. The Government has made no announcement regarding which, if any, trains would stop between Sydenham and Redfern.

Beyond Bankstown, the Baird Government metro plan would, at best, make you change from a comfortable modern double-deck train to “cattle class” metro to continue your journey, or, at worst, the line will be closed altogether and you would be forced to catch a bus to Bankstown.

The government says it must convert the Bankstown Line to metro so that a more frequent service can be provided. This is a lie. The existing modern double-deck trains can be run at 3 minute intervals without changing anything on the Bankstown Line.

Reject the metro proposal!

Have your say by making a submission in response to the Environmental Impact Statement for the proposal, either online at: http://www.majorprojects.planning.nsw.gov.au/index.pl?action=view_job&job_id=7400

Or use the submission on the reverse side.



• ecotransit.org.au
• <https://www.facebook.com/EcoTransit>
June 2016



Do you want your rail service to go from **THIS ...**



to **THIS?** This is what Hong Kong MTR metro trains look like in the peaks. There are very few seats. Most passengers stand.

METRO FACT & FICTION

- **FICTION** The metro is being built to provide improved public transport to existing suburbs.
- **FACT** Metro would represent a dramatic deterioration in passenger comfort and capacity. Metro systems characteristically operate over short distances with stations typically less than a kilometre apart. Metro is not appropriate for Sydney with its long commuting distances.
- **FICTION** Hong Kong MTR is primarily a rail operator.
- **FACT** Hong Kong MTR is primarily a property developer. They have the development rights around every new station they build – a form of “value capture” to profit a private company. The Metro is part of a dirty deal to enable MTR to turn large tracts of Sydney's suburbs into mini Hong Kongs.
- **FICTION** Only a metro can provide increased capacity and service frequency.
- **FACT** The existing Sydney double deck trains can, and do, run at 2-3 minute intervals through the CBD, in peak hour. The Paris RER system is progressively converting all of its lines to double-deck trains running at 2 minute intervals in the peaks to increase the capacity of the network.

For more, watch
**Four Passengers per
YouTube square metre**

Scan this or google
'EcoTransit Sydney YouTube'



Sydney Metro City & Southwest – Chatswood to Sydenham

Submission on EIS-Application Number: SSI 15_7400

TITLE FIRST NAME LAST NAME

ORGANISATION
(If submitting on behalf of an organisation)

EMAIL ADDRESS

STREET ADDRESS POSTCODE

I/we object to the building of the City & Southwest Metro on the following grounds:

- The metro is not about providing more passenger capacity across the suburban rail network; it is just a facilitation of overdevelopment of Waterloo, Sydenham, and around all the stations on the Bankstown Line. The metro would destroy communities by displacing existing residents and creating high-rise slums.
- The metro would not, as claimed, increase capacity across the Sydney Rail Network. The purported 60 per cent increase (stated in the “Have your say” brochure) relies on signalling improvements on existing lines. This not part of the metro proposal and has evidently been included to mislead the public about the actual capacity increase claimed for metro.
- Global experience demonstrates that double deck trains can run at the same frequencies as metro, offering a higher standard of comfort and carrying more passengers. The operation of the Paris RER network demonstrates this clearly. At 30 trains per hour (one every two minutes), the metro would carry only 36,000 passengers per hour. If the line were built and operated with double deck trains, the capacity would be 45,000 passengers per hour, based on the same frequency.
- The metro would have very few seats. In the peaks, 70 per cent of commuters would be forced to stand for up to half an hour. At present, with double deck trains, 70 per cent are seated.
- There are severe safety concerns in relation to the tunnels from Chatswood to Crows Nest, Victoria Cross to Barangaroo and Waterloo to Sydenham. The proposed evacuation procedure – through the end doors to track level – does not cater for people in wheelchairs or those with limited mobility. Evacuation would be very slow, and with no on-board staff, could seriously stress passengers and lead to loss of life in extreme events.
- At a cost of \$12 billion, the City and Southwest Metro is a very expensive way of increasing track capacity through the CBD. Utilising existing infrastructure, a heavy rail link for double deck trains could be built for less than \$4 billion.

I/we have have not made a reportable political donation (tick box)*

I have read the Department’s Privacy Statement and agree to the Department using my submission in the ways it describes. I understand this includes full publication on the Department’s website of my submission, any attachments, and any of my personal information in those documents, and possible supply to third parties such as state agencies, local government and the proponent.

SIGNED

* NSW law requires persons making submissions to an EIS to make a declaration disclosing political donations. Broadly speaking, a ‘reportable political donation’ is a donation exceeding \$1,000 to a party, elected member, group or candidate. However if separate donations to any one of these, when added up, exceed \$1,000 in the same financial year, they must also be disclosed. If in doubt please check with Department of Planning website.

POST TO
Major Projects Assessment Department of Planning and Environment GPO Box 39, SYDNEY 2001 Attentionn: Director, Infrastructure Projects.
Submissions close 27 June 2016