



16 July 2015

The Chief Executive  
Sydney Metro City & Southwest  
Transport for NSW  
PO Box K659  
HAYMARKET NSW 1240

By email: [sydneymetro@transport.nsw.gov.au](mailto:sydneymetro@transport.nsw.gov.au)

Dear Chief Executive

**Re: Sydney Metro City & Southwest**

The Southern Sydney Regional Organisation of Councils (SSROC) is an association of sixteen municipal and city councils. SSROC provides a forum for the exchange of ideas between our member councils, and an interface between governments, other councils and key bodies on issues of common interest. Together, our member Councils cover a population of over 1.6 million, or one third of the population of Sydney.

In order to make this submission within the timeframe of the review, it has not been possible for it to be checked with councils or to be endorsed by the ROC. Please therefore consider this submission to be a draft, and I will get in touch if any issues arise as it is reviewed.

The details of SSROC comments are as below.

**General**

1. The Sydney Metro City & Southwest (thereafter referred to as “Metro”) is a vital transport infrastructure and the envisaged benefits of this public transport are keenly anticipated.
2. The transport infrastructure challenge in Sydney is huge. The Metro represents a major investment. None the less, the State Government should continue to plan for the extension of the Metro as Sydney’s population is projected to be 6 million by 2031.

**Environmental and related**

3. The Metro system and network should give priority to eco-friendly options, use of renewable energy, waste minimisation and waste recycling.
4. The approach to the management of wastes associated with Metro tunnels and other facilities should be transparently discussed with stakeholders and affected communities. Residents need to be given visibility of the process of implementing any pollution or waste minimisation and mitigation.

**Interagency collaboration for integration of transport and housing diversity**

5. The Sydney metropolitan plan, *A Plan for Growing Sydney* envisages housing densification and more houses on transport corridors. It is important that Transport for NSW liaises with UrbanGrowth NSW, Department of Planning and Environment, councils and other stakeholders on essential “social infrastructures” such as affordable housing and adaptable housing on the Central to Eveleigh Precincts, Bays Precincts and other key centres and strategic precincts. These have implications for community access and participation in employment and the economy generally.

### **Connectivity**

6. The Metro is a major transport corridor for Sydney. Transport and connectivity of the neighbouring and outer lying suburbs to the Metro stations are essential. It is important that the Metro is linked to regional plans to improve cross centre connectivity and access.
7. The Metro does not as yet demonstrate connectivity with other transport modes. For example, would there be alignment with the existing rail network and bus services. Would more bus interchanges be established? Would frequency of bus services be increased considering the frequency of Metro services? There needs to be more integration with existing transport services. Connectivity between metro, light rail and bus needs to be demonstrated.

### **Collaboration with Councils**

8. The transport, traffic, and development implications on Metro corridors need to be investigated. The breadth of implications need to be understood from Council as well as other stakeholders' perspective and considered in the process of project planning and implementation.
9. There is need for collaboration between the Roads and Maritime Services (RMS), the Transport NSW and councils in planning regional cycle networks. This will facilitate regional approach and plans, setting of targets, better connections across local government boundaries and connectivity to Metro stations.
10. New Metro stations and upgrading of existing stations will inevitably necessitate commuter car parking. The cost of provision of such parks could be prohibitive for councils. Councils do not usually regard the provision of such parks as core function. Metro needs to clarify its position on delivery of commuter car parking as part of the Metro system development. This is particularly important, considering that local streets around urban centres and train stations are often already congested by on street resident and employee parking.

### **Cycle ways and pedestrian networks**

11. The frequency of the proposed Metro is unlikely to be matched by bus interchange services. This will have implications for preference to walk or to cycle to and from the Metro stations. In the absence of a collaborative approach and due recognition of 'knock on effect' of the Metro and acting to address this, Councils will be burdened with cost of having to upgrade road, bicycle and pedestrian networks and facilities to link to Metro. Most councils would not be able cope with the financial cost and this matter needs to be addressed.
12. An analysis of ancillary or support transport networks and issues should be undertaken in partnership with councils that have Metro stations proposed in their areas.

### **Sydney University versus Waterloo as Metro Station**

13. There are potential strong cases for each location. Is there is a possibility of having both stations? This should be explored by Transport for NSW.

### **Active transport**

14. The Metro offers opportunity to encourage active transport. As bus services are unlikely to keep pace with Metro passenger numbers and frequency, there is an opportunity to encourage walking and cycling. There could be need for spaces for bicycle racks at Metro stations and securing of pedestrian and bike routes.
15. The design of the Metro carriages need to make provision for special spaces for bikes on board trains and also make the stations user friendly for bike user to disembark.
16. Regional Active Transport Plan needs to be developed and implemented in collaboration or partnership with councils and other key stakeholders such as bike peak agencies, Department of Planning and Environment, UrbanGrowth NSW, local community and other relevant state agencies.

### **Replication of existing network**

17. The Metro is essentially replicating and reinforcing the existing network. Thorough analysis needs to inform any decisions that are based on the assumption that the Metro is a response to Sydney's 'choked' transport system. Apart from replicating existing network, in the case of Sydney to Bankstown, Metro could be replacing the existing train network. Are there alternative options or scope for some adjustments to Metro that could further 'diversify' the Sydney rail network?

### **Extensions possible?**

18. The Metro is largely CBD and inner city centric. The Sydney Rapid Rail had envisaged a network that will extend to Hurstville to the south and Cabramatta to the south west. The Metro excludes both centres. It is worth considering extending the Metro to Hurstville-Sutherland axis and to Liverpool, considering the forecast growth for Sydney, the economic benefits and the likely increased cost if the extensions inevitably take place in the future.
19. An extension from Bankstown to Parramatta, the second Sydney CBD and as part of creating cross axis and better linkages between southern Sydney to Parramatta/western Sydney (Hurstville/Sutherland-Bankstown-Parramatta) will likely yield immense benefits and economic opportunities.

### **Business Case and Implementation**

20. The business case should be transparent and alternative options considered. An implementation steering committee or board should include representation from councils, community and other key stakeholders.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Project Overview for the Sydney Metro City & Southwest. I look forward to hearing from Sydney Metro on the results of the review.

Yours sincerely



Namoi Dougall  
**General Manager**  
**Southern Sydney Regional Organisation of Councils**