

28 April 2023  
 10:00am to 11:30pm  
 Via Teams

# Minutes

## Medlow Bath Pedestrian Discussion

<b>Chair</b>	Radivoie Miletich
<b>Attendees</b>	<p><b>Blue Mountains City Council:</b>                  Kim Barrett –City Planning Manager                  Sarah Reilly - Senior Heritage Planner                  Siobhan Lavelle - BMCC Heritage advisory committee                  Elizabeth (Libby) Sullivan - BMCC Heritage advisory committee</p> <p><b>Community Design Briefings Team:</b>                  Shane Porteous                  Martin Howell                  Narelle Morrisey</p> <p><b>TfNSW:</b>                  Tomi Vasilevski                  Rad Miletich                  Sarif Ridoy                  Joanna Lesak                  Brittany Aiken                  Elisabeth Sacco                  Kerstin Boersma</p>
<b>Apologies</b>	Van Bardzhamian, Nicholas Stolk, Michael Patterson, Alistair Lunn, Kate Walsh
<b>Conflict of Interest Declarations</b>	N/A
<b>Preferred option discussion</b>	<p>Noted that this is an informal discussion, however, minutes will be taken and issued to all invited attendees.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is a briefing with Heritage NSW in the afternoon of where feedback from today’s session will be communicated</li> </ul> <p>*Please note, there was a correction issued before COB on 28 April confirming that the meeting referenced was not with the Heritage Council, it was with the Design Review Panel (DRP). The DRP is a committee independent of TfNSW which reviews and provides guidance on design issues on projects. The meeting with the Heritage Council will take place in late June. Elisabeth Sacco will advise the date once confirmed.</p>
<b>Items</b>	

---

**Item 1: Round table  
feedback on Design 3**

- Slide presentation with images and words, presented by Rad.

**Rad** – Welcome and thanks for coming to contribute. We have asked you to be involved so we can take you through the process and progress of the project to date.

**Rad** – discussed previous options briefly and showed aerial image. Confirmed the preferred option by all parties which is progressing was **Option 3**. Three images of option 3 were shown. The images shown are very simple as details about materiality are yet to be confirmed and developed.

**Rad** – Discussed planting and the footpath area. The Aboriginal community have expressed a preference in natives being planted along the garden areas which will be done. We will also provide a footpath that meets the Australian Standards in terms of width, depth of footpaths rising slightly up from the garden plant area. The existing footbridge within the railway corridor will remain as it is heritage and will still be used.

**Kim** – Question on whether bridge will be painted steel or whether corten will be used for maintenance reasons as the look and feel will change - has this been decided yet?

**Rad** - we will be consulting with Heritage NSW.

---

**Item 2: Feedback on lift  
shafts in Design 3**

**Kim** – Question - there were 3 lift shafts and now there are 2 and they are vastly different in design and look different from each other. Has the Heritage Council of NSW given their feedback on the cylinder shape of the lift shafts and the physical attributes of the lift shafts, and what materials will be used and developed for the physical appearance of the lift shafts?

Also, the glass platform at the top of the lift on the rail side – is the large area of glass for views outside or for another reason as it seems very large and high.

**Rad** – Glass has been used to reduce dominance and solidity of lift shaft. From a safety perspective the use of glass allows for more passive surveillance - the visibility for a person getting out of/into the lift. The use of glass is common in railway lift areas. The area on top of the lift shaft is for plant and this will be made as small as possible to minimise the lift shaft height.

**Sarah** – suggested making awning transparent.

We are meeting with Heritage NSW (in late June) and the lift design, materials such as glass, and height are all still to be considered again by them and feedback given. The physical appearance chosen will not change greatly but the outside appearance and materials to be used have not been finalised yet.

The design of the lift shafts is linked to the areas they are situated in – so the Hydro Majestic side of the pedestrian bridge has the white cylindrical shaped lift shaft and foot bridge area up to bridge itself – to match the Hydro and the rail side lift shaft joins into the design of the railway station.

---

---

**Shane** – commented that he supports the idea that the two lift shafts look different as they tie in more closely to their immediate surroundings.

---

**Item 3: Feedback on foot path on railway side**

**Narelle and Shane** – (with Elisabeth Sacco in person)

Narelle – Question regarding the footpath on the railway side and the re-grading of the path – how is that being done?

**Rad** - the re-grading is being done on the footpath area to meet current Australian Standards – and will be slightly raised above the garden area – so the plants will be landscaped slightly lower/down from the path. There will be a wider area up the footpath near the kiss and ride, that will allow people to leave the footpath and cross Railway Parade with safety.

**Item 4: Road width at Kiss and Ride**

**Shane** – With regards to the width of the road near the Kiss and ride area – can it be made wider, and some more land be taken back from railway, allowing 2 cars able to pass, instead of 1? It is quite narrow now. Sarif commented that the road design has been finalised and road widths conform to relevant road widths and local traffic management requirements.

**Martin** – can the width of the road be looked at as on the weekend there are more pedestrians, and the road becomes crowded on the kiss and ride side. Having one lane means that people stray onto the road to walk, and this is safety concern.

**Rad** – The Roads team are responsible for the design of the road, however we can ask the question of the roads team in Transport for NSW.

**Sarif** – Road design standards generally suggest that narrow lanes slow down traffic speed. So, a narrow road could increase the safety in this area for pedestrians with drivers slowing down to drop off and pick up. A separated footpath is being provided as part of the design.

*Update – the Roads team have confirmed that Railway Pde will be **single lane traffic each way** to accommodate parking in front of the Pot Belly cafe, and to ensure the local road remains a low-speed road. The parking will be inset so not encroaching on vehicles driving on Railway Parade.*

**Martin** – how will you manage cars wanting to do a U-turn from the kiss and ride bay and also those coming from the Station Street lights? People will want to try and do a U-turn to go the other direction, and this is unsafe.

**Sarif** – The query about illegal U-turns being performed across double lines in this area has been identified. A road safety audit has been conducted and mitigations are being considered as part of our design.

**Siobhan** – The materials used for the lift towers and bridge overall need to be considered and we want to know that the Heritage Council is receiving the feedback and comments we make in these meetings. For example – is it preferred that the towers are similar or dis-similar to the environment they are in.

---

---

**Item 5: Materials and communications between stakeholders**

We want some assurance that our comments and feedback are being passed on the Heritage Council. It is a cynical exercise, as far as it seems a silo and we have meetings separate to the meetings with the Heritage Council. We do not know what happens in those meetings - do they know what we say in these meetings?

**Kim** – adding to Siobhan’s point - Can we improve the communication between the Heritage NSW meeting and the Transport NSW meetings? Can it be more transparent? Can we have a meeting between Heritage NSW, TfNSW, and all parties to communicate?

**Rad** – we have been as open and transparent as possible. We are happy to take suggestions that can help us how to improve transparency of the process. However, time is a factor as we have limited opportunities to access the rail corridor to make design changes etc. For example, we have a limited window of time before construction needs to commence in September as that is the next scheduled weekend shutdown possession. Works in the rail corridor are driven by scheduled possessions.

*Update – the meeting with the Heritage Council is to be held in late June. Comments on the materiality should be sent to TfNSW by mid-May.*

**Rad** – We are always happy to take your feedback back to the Heritage Council, however, Heritage Council is a legislative body with its own process, and we cannot direct how they manage these things. It is our understanding that the Heritage Council do not meet with multiple agencies in the way suggested.

**Kim** – Are minutes being taken for Heritage NSW to read after and see the comments on forms, details, lift shaft bulk, materials, and designs?

**Elisabeth** – minutes are being taken.

**Rad** – all projects must be assessed under several standard criteria applied to all accessibility projects – this is referred as a multi-criteria assessment (MCA). We must consider everything from maintenance, customer experience, safety, access, and community feedback when scoring the available options. However, depending on the project, weightings for some criteria are often higher than other criteria. Both Heritage and Community Feedback criteria were each given 25% weighting as heritage and community outcomes were considered very significant. This represents the highest weighting of all the other criteria.

**Item 6: MCA assessment criteria explanation**

The feedback from this group was given preference when scoring the community feedback on the options and despite this, Option 3 came up as the highest scoring option. This group expressed a preference for Option 2 as the first choice and Option 3 as the second choice. The formal scoring of community preference was based on Option 2 as a result from feedback in this group – despite the fact that informal feedback received by email from

---

residents in Medlow Bath being overwhelmingly in favour of Option 3. We did this largely because we could not be confident that the messaging to residents that inspired the feedback fairly represented all three options, as we did to the members of this forum. Despite this approach, Option 3 still came up as the preferred option.

Opportunity for remaining questions.

**Item 7: Questions and next steps**

We will book another meeting with you for early June when we will be 30% complete with the final design by that time. Most finishes and design features will be locked down. After the 30% design, we will submit a Section 60 application to Heritage NSW which takes up to 40 days to process.

**Matt** – when can we submit suggestions for finishes on the structures and potential for inclusion of Aboriginal structures and artwork? When would it be the time to consider these finishes on structures?

**Item 7: Aboriginal community consideration**

**Rad** – before the end of June. We aim to update our Aboriginal Community representatives in the coming weeks and seek their feedback on potential finishes.

**Matt** – Council and the local Aboriginal community want art included in the finishes to be meaningful to the local community and not tokenistic.

Suggestion – could you look at simple messaging near the bridge, or within the train station that said: “always was and always will be Dharug and Gundungurra land” ...these are relevant in Blue Mountains community?

**Rad** – Aboriginal representation in our projects always intends to be meaningful and representative of the local community. In a recent project, the local community artist designed a work inspired by their experience as a member/descendant of the stolen generation in the artworks and the artwork was tremendously meaningful and important to that community.

**Rad** agreed that each community is different, and that Transport wants to continue, and will continue to engage with our local Aboriginal representatives.

Action – Elisabeth to reach out to Aunty Jacinta and Aunty Carol and Matt to set up a follow up meeting to get feedback and input prior to s60 submission.

**Shane** – thank you for meeting with us and for taking feedback and being transparent.

**Item 8: final comments**

---

**Other business**

Meeting with Heritage Council in late June 2023. Any formal feedback that you would like presented to Heritage needs to be received by TfNSW mid-May.

---

**Next meeting**

Late June/early July, date TBC to discuss preferred option and materiality.

---

