



THE LORD MAYOR OF SYDNEY  
**CLOVER MOORE**

26 September 2014

David Borella  
President  
BIKESydney  
By email

Dear David

### **Museum Station Easy Access Upgrade**

Thank you for sending a copy of BIKESydney's submission on the Museum Station access upgrade.

The City agrees with the comments in your submission. In conjunction with the Liverpool Street cycleway, the station upgrade is an opportunity to improve access and amenity for cyclists and the City's submission makes similar points. I've enclosed a copy of our submission for your information.

If you would like to speak with a Council officer about the City's submission, you can contact Tracey Hargans, Manager – Core Property Portfolio, on 9265 9333 or at [thargans@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au](mailto:thargans@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au).

Yours sincerely

Clover Moore  
**Lord Mayor of Sydney**

Encl.

Health and Building strongly advise further investigation be undertaken to determine whether the land is suitable for development in accordance with State Environmental Planning Policy 55 (SEPP55) – Remediation of Land.

## **Environmental Management**

- 7.2** All mitigation measures are to be implemented plus actions undertaken in response to the feedback provided by the City.

## **B. Museum Station Easy Access Upgrade Arboricultural Impact Assessment**

### 5.1.14 Arboricultural Impact assessment

“Certification of Tree protection measures by the Project Arborist is to be provided to the City’s Tree Management team at completion of Site Establishment”

Tree protection measures will need to be implemented during construction. This should be done to the approval of City staff ie captured in the Deed.

REF states all damage to landscape areas will be reinstated as per CoS requirements. The restoration to the City’s requirements needs to be formalised and any works should be inspected and approved by Council.

### **BIKESydney (bicycles and a liveable city) response based upon REF documents**

## **Prefacing Comments**

A) The REF clearly states a commitment to "...deliver seamless travel to and between modes ..and better integrate station interchanges".

B) Sydney Cycling Future (TfNSW) bears many references around the integration of cycling for this proposal.

## **Main Points of the Submission**

1) The REF (p47) grossly understates the relationship the CBD’s present and future cycling infrastructure has to the station. Indeed, by the time of completion of the station upgrade, it is likely that the College St cycleway will have been removed and new cycleways on Castlereagh, Liverpool and Park Streets completed. Notably each of these future cycleways will provide cycling links to the CBD and to Museum Station.

With this, there will be a significant increase in the number of riders seeking multi-modal (bike-train) use of Museum Station. The existing provision for bike parking is significantly inadequate. The REF rather should better analyse and account for the likely significantly increased future demand for bike parking at the station’s Hyde Park entrances. Such provisioning is remarkably easy and cost-efficient to provide. The introduction of additional bike parking should be viewed as an opportunity rather than an obligation.

2) The REF is not clear on whether Entrance 3 (see Figure 15) - the station entrance at the north-west corner of the junction of Liverpool and Elizabeth Streets - will be activated. If so, this will require that the Liverpool St cycleway be extended east to Elizabeth St (rather than stop at Castlereagh St) so as to avoid cyclists who have joined the footpath on the northern side of Liverpool St conflicting with the significant pedestrian flows that will access this station entrance;

3) **Section 3.3.2 Design Standards** - is there a design standard that specifies bike parking rates for public infrastructure, such as train stations? If so, this standard should be listed here. If not, the Proposal should articulate how it has calculated the bike parking quantum determined suitable for all station entrances.

4) **Section 3.3.3 - Table 1 - Point 7.34** - Safe pedestrian movement - this section states that "...there are no pedestrian / vehicular crossings within the scope of this project. For areas and items within the project scope, clear signage is being provided and passenger circulation areas are free of obstacles such as poles". The Proposal has a responsibility to allow for legal and safe cycling crossings of the (Elizabeth St) intersections at station entrances. It's inappropriate that the Proposal ignores this responsibility.

5) **Impacts on Cyclists during construction works - Section 3.4.1** outlines that "...Construction is expected to commence in late 2014. The overall duration to complete the Stage 1 works under this Proposal is approximately a year. This does not include the time it would take to undertake Stage 2 and 3 works."

The REF appears to have miscalculated that the Liverpool St and Castlereagh St Cycleways are expected to have been completed during the station upgrade's construction period. Accordingly, not only is it incorrect for the REF to assert that "...There are no designated cycleways in the area that would be affected by the project", indeed, there will be a significant increase in the number of cyclists accessing the Liverpool/Elizabeth Sts intersection. The REF's isn't clear on whether station construction works would impact these cyclists.

6) **Section 6.1.1** - there is no analysis on the Level of Service for cyclists. There should be;

7) New station lifts should be designed to accommodate bicycles, including cargo bikes used by families;

8) **Section 6.13 Cumulative Impacts** - the project should assure itself that the construction of the Liverpool St Cycleway (mid-2015) will not occur concurrently with construction of the project and therefore give rise to cumulative impacts.