

TRACKING POWER AND MONEY IN SYDNEY

THE CASE OF ARTARMON STATION AND THE NORTH SHORE RAILWAY

(This study is dedicated to Kerry and Bob McKillop, who have a life-long active involvement in the conservation of the natural, cultural and built heritage within the Willoughby City Council area and elsewhere.)

STUART SHARP

28th July, 2016

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER NO.	CHAPTER NAME	PAGE NO.
1	Application of the Methodology and Definitions of Terms	5
2	The Duck's Guts – the Top Ten Messages	6
3	The relationship between power, wealth and topography	11
4	Impact of railway developments elsewhere in the Colony for the North Shore railway	22
5	The power players approve the railway - 1880 to the 1885 election	27
6	Between the approval and the opening of the railway line - 1885 to 1890	33
7	Early signs of muddled management of the railways	43
8	Opening of the North Shore railway in 1890	48
9	Between the opening of the line and the opening of Artarmon station 1890-1898	59
10	The opening of Artarmon railway station 1898	70
11	The second site of Artarmon railway station 1900	75
12	The promise of a new platform building 1909	82
13	Delivery of the 1909 promised building in 1916	89
14	What about the new Artarmon subway booking office?	94
15	The physical features of the 1916 building, when constructed	96

CHAPTER NO.	CHAPTER NAME	PAGE NO.
16	The materials of the 1916 building	103
17	Symbolism of the 1916 building	103
18	The family of buildings to which the 1916 building belongs	110
19	Artarmon station as a branch line junction	116
20	Why was the building erected during World War One?	118
21	The absence of goods siding at Artarmon – Impact Analysis	120
22	The epoch of new infrastructure 1920s	127
23	The beautiful railway garden 1928 to 1947	142
24	The end of improvements to the North Shore railway	146
25	The Time of Almost Nothingness 1940-1959	152
26	The Gradual Development of the Concept of an Urban Rail System 1960-80	157
27	Why did Governments loose interest the Sydney rail network 1930-1980? The Application of Contextual Analyses	171
28	First alterations to Artarmon station building in 66 years 1980-87	199
29	Management changes manifested by new station signage 1988	204
30	The Artarmon Station Sparkle Debut 1989-2005	209
31	The Death of the Sparkle and the Start of the Loss of the Customer Focus 2005-2010	221
32	The End of the Customer Focus 2011-2016	229
33	Artarmon Station Today - Why Study It?	230
34	Stations of the Station – A Self-Guided Tour Around	242

CHAPTER NO.	CHAPTER NAME	PAGE NO.
	the Artarmon Station Site	
Acknowledgements		252
Methodology		253
Appendices		267

1 APPLICATION OF THE METHODOLOGY

THE APPLIED METHODOLOGY

The word, methodology, has a number of meanings but in this study it includes the selection of the subject to be examined, the methods used to examine the subject, the collection and interpretation of evidence and, lastly, the way the evidence is presented to the audience. Methodology is one of the trickiest aspects associated with the production of a work of history but this historical enquiry tries very hard to apply a methodology that is practical and, more importantly, is capable of application.

The methodology is expressed at the rear of the text and contains seven components and 44 general aspects spread across the seven components. On the left-hand side of each page under the component heading, the relevant general aspects for that component are listed and on the right-hand side of each page is the responses in relation to the history of the North Shore railway and Artarmon railway station.

The components and the general aspects are applied in three stages – the first stage relates to matters considered before commencement of the project; the second stage relates to the collection of evidence and the last stage refers to matters to be considered during the documentation of the end product.

DEFINITIONS OF TERMS

Only a few words need definitions. The first word is power, which means the personal attribute of an individual to dominate other people in the pursuit of an objective. It is different from authority as authority is based on the attributes of a particular position, whereas power has nothing to do with the position but the person.

The second word that requires definition is money. This is used to denote the expenditure of money taken from individuals lawfully by and for use by the New South Wales Government.

“Railways” is a word used to describe the bureaucracy that managed and manages the State railway system, whatever was or is the name of the official organisation.

The expression, Artarmon station, refers to all the physical assets inside the Railway boundary fence between the pedestrian subways located at each end of the station. It includes the platform, the platform buildings, the stepway, the subway leading to the platform, the entrances to the platform subway, signage and landscaping.

2 THE DUCK'S GUTS - THE TOP TEN (OR SO) MESSAGES

MESSAGE NO. 1 – THE BUILDING CENTENARY

The year, 2016, is the centenary of the construction of the present, brick platform building at Artarmon station. The 1916 building has survived! Other examples of the same design family in the Sydney area have not been so lucky and examples have been destroyed since 1990 at Chatswood, Epping, Newtown, St Peters, Asquith, Burwood, Lidcombe, Meadowbank, Yagoona and Waterfall. Railway heritage is important.

MESSAGE NO. 2 – THE HILLS ARE ALIVE WITH MONEY

Elevated, leafy areas attract people with power and money. The North Shore region of Sydney has been an area where wealthy and powerful people have lived and this continues to be the case. Their ability to influence politicians and bureaucrats has been reflected in the priority allocated to the region for a long list of transport improvements. The list contains 33 projects that were publicly funded for the private benefit of North Shore residents and these are listed in Table 3.1.

MESSAGE NO. 3 – ARTARMON STATION HAS BEEN THE ONLY EXAMPLE OF THE RELOCATION OF A MASONRY PLATFORM BUILDING

In the 118 years of the existence Artarmon station, the dominant message revealed by the building fabric and extant documents is a reluctance to expend public money on the facility. There is one period that was the exception, namely the years 1982 to 1995, when large amounts of money were expended to create a positive message that both the customer and staff were important.

What's the evidence about the paucity of funds? Two timber platform buildings of small to moderate size and the use of a second-hand structure in 1916 that stands today represent good evidence. When the subway opened in 1900, it served the western side of the line only and it was only after sustained, local protest that it was extended to the eastern side four years later. It took the Chief Railway Commissioner seven years to deliver his 1909 promise for a new station building.

The almost complete omission of any capital improvements between the years 1916 and 1982 certainly indicates other, non-urban policies and priorities. Between the years 1928 and 1941, beautiful gardens were a feature of the station and this effort was driven by the local community but stopped when the community lost leadership. It is a

demonstration of the importance of leaders, primarily by Charles Wickham, and showed what could be achieved if a community could work together. Importantly, the gardens were funded primarily by private donations. It was a demonstration of the exercise of local power. After 1995, there was a series of technical changes to the way all railway stations operate, manifested by the appearance of lots of electronic gadgets and the gradual disappearance of staff.

Even in 2015, the provision of lifts to access the station is a display about spending as little money as possible in the name of customer care and ruining totally the ambience of the station. Just like the 1899 subway, the lift bridge serves only west side of the station. Why? No official explanation has been presented to the residents but there are two possible explanations – one is that it was the lowest cost option and the other is that the eastern side has been marked for future high-rise and/or air right development. What is amazing about the story of the lifts is that the local Member of Parliament was also the Minister for Transport at the time and what she approved to be built in her own electorate is proof of the present government attitude towards rail users and her electors. She was in a position of power to approve a much better solution and she chose not to act to implement a better outcome.

MESSAGE NO. 4 – CAPITAL EXPENDITURE IS LINKED TO THE WAY GOVERNMENTS VIEW THE NSW ECONOMY

The pattern of improvements to Artarmon station is not related to the nature of the political party forming the State government. Rather, change to and stability of station developments has been linked to the perception by governments of the way they see railway operations as supporting the State economy. Up until the 1970s, governments viewed the primary role of the New South Wales Railways as supporting primary industries. It is interesting to note that the massive expenditure in the suburban rail system in the 1920s, involving electrification and the City Railway, were done at a time when the urban manufacturing sector was growing rapidly and in fact reached a peak before the 1929 economic crash.

There was a notion in the 1960s and 1970s that the state economy was shifting its orientation away from farm products to mining and the support sector. The absence of large-scale improvements to Sydney's urban rail system before 1976 was related more to the backlog of urgent and essential repairs to virtually the States entire railway network than negligence of urban transport needs. Broken down stations were not essential for operational safety and, accordingly, not allocated the little funds available. In the 1980s and the first half of the 1990s, the identity of a Sydney urban network took shape and that was due to an acknowledgement by governments that the service and mining sectors were far more important than primary production. From 1995, state governments have aligned the urban network increasingly to the idea that it should look

like and act as if it were on a parallel with major overseas cities. In short, the role of the New South Wales Railways changed according to what products left Australian shores and what products and services arrived from overseas. Artarmon station looks like just a piddling, average little building but its history mirrors very important changes in the economy.

MESSAGE NO. 5 – THE ROLE OF ARTARMON STATION AS A MARKER BETWEEN THE LOWER AND UPPER NORTH SHORE

The station shows the pivotal role the station played in the division of the North Shore region into a lower and upper geographic district. Up to 1916, Artarmon station was the northern limit of the Lower North Shore because all the stations south of Artarmon inclusive were of timber construction but, by the construction of a platform building which matched all platform buildings between Artarmon and Hornsby, the northern limit of the Lower North Shore was relocated to St. Leonards station.

The role of Artarmon station in the division of the Lower and Upper North Shore did not end in 1916. With the destruction of the Federation-influenced platform buildings at Chatswood in 2004 and the provision of the poorly designed lift bridge at Artarmon in 2015, the station at Artarmon has once again played a singular role in the division of the North Shore. From 2015, the boundary between the Lower and Upper North Shore has moved back to Chatswood station and Artarmon station shares with all the other stations between Chatswood and Wynyard the worst features of contemporary design treatment of railway stations. Now, the Upper North Shore is a smaller group of Federation-influenced platform buildings between Roseville and Hornsby. Of course, an observer may say why so because the Federation-influenced platform building still exists at Artarmon. The tragedy is that the 2015 lift bridge has severely reduced the heritage values of the station as a whole entity. The difference between the Lower and Upper North Shore in 2016 is marked by the contrasts between ugliness and attractiveness of station facilities.

MESSAGE NO. 6 – ARTARMON WAS THE FLAGSHIP STATION TO ANNOUNCE THE BIRTH OF A PURELY URBAN RAIL SYSTEM FOR SYDNEY

In 1989, Artarmon station was chosen as the first application of the then improvement programme called Station Sparkle and it marked the start of a huge effort to improve platform buildings for the first time since 1855. The enthusiasm throughout the railway organisation from 1989 to 1995 was marked by a big effort to improve customer-staff relations. Artarmon station became the prototype for the creation of a purely Sydney urban rail network, with its own clear identity.

MESSAGE NO. 7 – THE STUDY OF ARTARMON STATION TELLS THE WAY GOVERNMENTS OPERATE

Artarmon station stands today is a monument to the way power has been used by governments to demonstrate their urban transport policies and that power is shown by the way public money is either spent or not spent on the station.

The provision of lifts between Hampton Road and the platform in 2015 is an excellent example of the absence of importance to provide the best available access solution, keeping in mind that the Minister for Transport who approved the lifts was also the local Member of Parliament.

MESSAGE NO. 8 – THE FAILURE OF GOVERNMENTS TO PLACE URBAN PUBLIC TRANSPORT ABOVE THE PRIVATE MOTOR VEHICLE

All governments in New South Wales have failed provide priority for urban public transport over the use of private motor cars. Labor Governments have done far more to support public transport since 1976 but they too failed to inculcate into the public mind that travel by urban public transport is morally and environmentally more important than sustaining massive expenditure on roads used by privately owned motor vehicles.

MESSAGE NO. 9 – WAS ARTARMON STATION TREATED FAVOURABLY OR THE SAME AS OTHER SUBURBAN STATIONS?

The answer is yes and no. Yes, the evidence suggests that it was favourably treated in 1916 when it received its present masonry structure. It was also treated favourably in 1989 when became the prototype example of the “Station Sparkle” programme. Again, in 2015 it received favourable attention when it received the lifts between Hampden Road and the platforms. Why? It seems that public servants and politicians acted beyond their officially granted authority and exercised personal power for their own advantage under the name of improvements for the community.

No, it was treated exactly the same as other suburban and country stations between the years 1930 and 1980 – a time when all New South Wales Governments moved away from the concept and reality of urban rail transport as a high priority.

MESSAGE NO. 10 – WHAT DOES THE STUDY SAY ABOUT THE DISCIPLINE OF HISTORY?

The study shows that one tiny, insignificant item, in this case Artarmon railway station, is capable of revealing much about how the world works, how power is exercised and how public money has been used and misused. The tragedy is that no one in a key

position of transport planning or management today is interested in using history to help the present generation of decision-makers make better decisions.

MESSAGE NO. 11 – WHAT DOES THE FUTURE HOLD FOR ARTARMON STATION?

Apart from the excellent work of Dr. John Bradfield in the 1920s and the 1974 Sydney Area Transportation Study, the dominant characteristic of urban transport planning for the rail system has been based on the personal views of politicians. What serving public servant would recommend the ripping up of existing railway lines and replacing them with either light rail or a Metro system?

The answer to the question is unknown.

FOR A QUICK SQUIZ

If the reader has another 30 seconds to spend, the chronology of events of Artarmon station is summarised in table form in Appendix 1 at the end of this document.

3 THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN POWER, WEALTH AND TOPOGRAPHY

THE LINK BETWEEN POWER, MONEY AND THE TOPOGRAPHY

The linking of political power and money existed well before the residential development of the North Shore in Sydney. Why did it occur on the North side of Sydney Harbour and why in the 1880s? The answer is found in a trait of humanity in which some people see opportunities to make a lot of money and take the opportunities. The answer is found in the extension of the residential development opportunities to which people with a need for a lot of money are drawn.

Also, the very idea of building a railway to serve elevated land was based on British notions that high hills and high society went together. The construction of the North Shore line was an example of the belief that important or rich people prefer to build on the highest possible ground so that their houses can look down on poorer and less powerful folk. In this way, the development of the North Shore line was and remains a statement of social expression which was based on a concept that has existed before Lieutenant James Cook chartered the east coast of Australia.

Space is an important ingredient in the provision of railways. Without space, there is no need for railways or any form of transport. Space and transport are utilities in economic terms and it is the function of railways “to supply the utility of place and transport”.¹ Put in simple non-economic terms, “the complexity of modern life provides endless reasons for movements of people and goods.”²

Tass wrote that urban areas usually start with “favourable geographic conditions.”³ The North Shore region of Sydney possessed such favourable conditions, with its increased vegetation, near-by waterways, elevation and vistas, compared with, say, the western suburbs of Sydney. It remains different to other regions because it is blocked by national parks on all sides. To the south is the Sydney Harbour National Park. To the east is Garigal National Park and to the west is Lane Cove National Park. The area is capped in the north by Ku-ring-gai Chase National Park. The region is similarly boxed in by water on all sides, being Sydney Harbour, Middle Harbour, the Lane Cove River and the Hawkesbury River. The region is extremely hilly and the road and rail corridors mainly use the mountain ridges. Houses were and are traditionally more expensive to

¹ R.W. Faulks, *Principles of Transport*, London, Ian Allan, Second Ed., 1982, p. 27

² G.W. Woellner & R.E. Delaney, *Schumer's Elements of Transport*, Third Ed., Sydney, Butterworths, 1974, p. 1

³ L. Tass, *Modern Rapid Transit*, New York, Carlton Press, 1971, p. 65

construct because of the steepness of many land sites. These higher costs have been passed on to subsequent purchasers of the land and, today, the North Shore remains an expensive place to live, in part because of the geography of the place.

At first, the North Shore railway allowed people to live in a specific area amongst their mental peers. This pattern lasted until 1947 when 97.9% of the Australian population was born in either Australia or the United Kingdom.⁴ From that time, overseas migration from non-English speaking countries has steadily expanded and accelerated greatly after 1973 when the then Whitlam Government removed the last vestiges of racial discrimination legislation relating to migration. The excellent railway service, a tolerance of apartment living and the location of business nodes at North Sydney, St. Leonards and Chatswood have contributed to a massive influx of most-welcomed, Asian residents.

Today, the North Shore has one geographic feature that many parts of Sydney do not enjoy – a multitude of trees. The bushland setting, especially adjacent to the waterways and in the Upper North Shore, has and does attract a certain type of resident but the large absence of flat land has also mitigated against the extensive establishment of features found in other parts of Sydney, namely noxious industries and large recreational facilities, such as racecourses and professional football fields.⁵ In Sydney, football was played in the past where workers lived or worked. Not so on the North Shore. The Gordon Football Club was and is not located at Gordon but much lower on the North Shore at Chatswood. North Sydney oval was located to cater for the leisure interests of workers. The first cricket pitch was laid in 1867 and the first spectator grandstand was erected in 1879. By 1929, it possessed the largest suburban grandstand in Sydney. Apart from North Sydney and Chatswood Ovals, there are no further large sporting facilities on the North Shore.

THE GEOGRAPHIC PRECEDENTS THAT MANIFEST THE LINK BETWEEN POWER, MONEY AND LOCATION

Six years before the opening of the North Shore railway, NSW politicians opened the railway line to Hurstville, as the first part of the Illawarra railway to Wollongong. The very direction of the railway between Hurstville and Sutherland was designed to maximise returns to property developers. Hatton and Muir identified that the route was selected because the “elevated localities were ideal for suburban homes.”⁶ A less hilly route lay via Rocky Point for loaded coal trains but it was the land speculators who persuaded the NSW political leaders to route the line via Hurstville. The link between high ground and high society was transferred to North Sydney and Willoughby, where

⁴ L.J. Aspin, *Focus on Australian Society*, Second Ed., Melbourne, Longman, 1997, p. 51

⁵ The existence of tanneries is acknowledged.

⁶ J. Hatton & L. Muir, *Triumph of the Speculators*, Southern History Group, 1984, p. 48

the hills were so steep that a cable tramway had to be used. The North Shore was developed because of its elevated position and the railway initially served the interests of local land speculators.

In the 19th century, civil engineers, while building railways, would avoid difficult or costly physical works if at all possible. In the 19th century, this was evident in the decision to build an almost straight line of trunk railway from Narromine to Bourke on the western line, bypassing all the established towns on the Macquarie River, including Warren and Canonbar and, again, on the southern line bypassing Yass. Considering the difficult terrain on the North Shore line, it is no wonder that the senior engineers in the NSW rail administration wanted to avoid constructing the line.

Mechanical engineers shared their civil colleagues' concern to avoid problems. There are several examples where the rail administration has opposed providing a station on a gradient. The omission of a station on the steep gradient of Como Bank between the Georges River and Sutherland until 1931 when Jannali was opened is a suburban example. The decision to avoid a station for Murrumburrah on the steep Demondrille Bank led to the provision of an inconvenient station three kilometres away at Harden. The delay between surveying the site for Artarmon station and its opening is explained by the engineers' reluctance to provide stations on gradients generally. Artarmon station was and is on the steepest gradient of the North Shore line and the difficulty of working trains on the line resulted in substantial modifications to both motive power and track.

The people who were involved in land development on the North Shore had a lot of prior experience with land speculation in other parts of Sydney well before development the opening up of the North Shore. Indeed, politics and the need to make large sums of money have long been important ingredients in the commencement, development and operation of the New South Wales Railways. It was the "overwhelming support and political influence of the large land owners and the public of Goulburn" that resulted in the opening of the first inland railway in the Colony of New South Wales to that city in 1869.⁷ The people of Goulburn were a powerful lot and were directly responsible for the introduction of the first elected Parliament in the Colony in 1856. What was their need for a railway? As Austin Mooney wrote, "to the people of Goulburn, who faced abysmal conditions using road transport, a railway was seen as a cure by creating a rapid transport system for the efficient delivery of produce and goods to and from the metropolis."⁸ Rail transport represented a substantial cost savings with the added benefit of a taxpayer subsidy.

⁷ A. Mooney, "How the Railway Arrived at Goulburn", *Australian Railway History*, volume 67 number 939, January, 2016, p. 10.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 9.

In the Sydney, the push for the opening of stations on the existing line to Parramatta was not related to freight traffic, as was the case for Goulburn, but to real estate development. When the Sydney to Parramatta line opened in 1855, stations were provided at Newtown, Ashfield, Burwood, Homebush and Granville. In addition to Petersham and Lidcombe, which were opened in 1857 and 1858, these were the only stations at which goods yards were opened in the next hundred years on that section of line. All other stations between Sydney and Parramatta were opened without the provision of freight facilities with the express purpose of developing adjacent real estate. It was a case of political power being discharged to serve the financial desires of property developers. This was the case at Stanmore, Summer Hill, Lewisham, Croydon, Strathfield, Flemington, Rookwood, Auburn, Clyde and Harris Park. None of these stations ever had a local freight yard. In essence, there were two types of stations. The first group of stations were all opened in the 1850s for freight and passenger business, and the second group, which were opened from the 1870s, were purely passenger stations.

DIFFERENT TYPES OF POWER

The Railway Commissioners had a different sort of power than politicians and on occasions were reluctant to open some stations where they considered that there was insufficient financial return from coaching business. In such circumstances, the Commissioners asked the local petitioners to provide not only the initial capital funds but also a guarantee of revenue, usually for three years. This was the case in the opening of Petersham and Lidcombe stations. It also occurred in 1885 when the Commissioners demanded and received private capital to rebuild Stanmore station in its present form. No such requests were made for stations on the North Shore line, despite the branch being opened in 1890 from Hornsby to St. Leonards and with the extension from St. Leonards to Milsons Point in 1893, which occurred at a time of great financial difficulty.

There was an interesting case involving the provision of a platform at Strathfield. Similar to other locations, local residents petitioned for a station but, in this instance, the Railway Commissioner demanded no financial contribution from the local community. Why was this location different? It was the case of the existence of yet another form of power. The answer lies in its political origins. Michael Jones, a local historian, wrote that “the people of Strathfield were most fortunate that powerful and influential public servants, especially those connected with the Railways, lived in Strathfield from early in its history.”⁹ Jones added that the “the opening of the prestigious Redmyre estate in 1867 established Strathfield as a high-class area for other alternatives on the North Shore became available.”¹⁰

⁹ M. Jones, *Oasis in the West – Strathfield’s First 100 Years*, Sydney, Allen and Unwin, 1985, p. 51

¹⁰ Ibid., p. 46.

Donald Vernon was one of those influential people. In 1873, he was appointed Traffic Manager and, not too surprisingly, the Railway Commissioner opened a “halt” not too far from Vernon’s private residence. Jones continues with the story. “The people of Croydon had asked him (i.e. Vernon) for a station at Croydon when he was Traffic Manager, but they had been refused on the grounds that it would interrupt the passage of trains. The residents of Croydon had been annoyed to find a platform opposite Vernon’s land at Strathfield.”¹¹ A station opened at Strathfield, then named Redmyre, on 9th July, 1876. It seemed that, without access to sufficient power, nothing happened concerning the provision of railway stations.

Despite the prestige of the suburb of Strathfield, it was a relatively sparsely populated area in the early 1880s, as reflected by the appointment in 1883 of a Porter-in-Charge as the senior staff member at the station rather than the more senior position of Station Master. Nevertheless, local historian, Michael Jones, wrote that senior Railway officials, namely Donald Vernon and his brother David, and David Kirkcaldie, the last two both Homebush residents, conspired “to prevent the working class from settling at Strathfield or similar suburbs” and achieve this by ensuring the timetable was unsuitable and the fares expensive.¹²

While Strathfield was growing as a suburb occupied by people of wealth, it was not as posh as Homebush in the mid-1880s. For instance, the construction of the railway line north from Strathfield in 1886 was not named the Strathfield-Waratah line but the Homebush-Waratah line. Homebush was also the major suburban stopping station for long distance trains until this role was transferred to Strathfield station in 1893. Moreover, the section of line had one additional Railway service not found elsewhere. This was a door-to-door parcels service that operated between Sydney and Homebush, whereby people were not required to attend their local railway station to send or receive parcels. It was only in 1893 that the railway Commissioners considered extending the scheme beyond Homebush.¹³

In an article about Homebush, one Sydney newspaper stated that:

“it is not surprising that so many of our merchant princes and financial magnets have chosen the district as their home. Doubtless the extra distance and, consequently, somewhat higher fares, have a tendency to make the population somewhat select and hence the large number of pretentious mansions and beautiful grounds which are a feature of the neighbourhood.”¹⁴

¹¹ *ibid*

¹² M. Jones, *Oasis in the West – Strathfield’s First 100 Years*, 1985, Municipality of Strathfield, p. 52.

¹³ *Evening News*, 8th June, 1893, p. 3.

¹⁴ *Sunday Times*, 15th August, 1897, p. 2.

Another server not far from Homebush was Burwood. There, the same newspaper stated that:

“the majority of the residences in Burwood are of a superior character, moderate sized villas, surrounded by well-kept gardens, predominating, though there are numerous very fine mansions.”¹⁵

Power and property have been inextricably linked by railways in Sydney.

Just as the railway connects people with leisure sites in other parts of Sydney, the tram system served North Sydney oval. However, the gradient to reach the grounds was beyond the capabilities of conventional steam trams and, hence, cable trams were introduced in 1886. The link between industry, jobs for workers and leisure facilities for workers is important. While this pattern existed in the North Sydney/Willoughby area, it was absent elsewhere on the North Shore. The reason is primarily about the increasing topographical difficulty of the land as the railway line nears Hornsby. Many early residents desired to use the North Shore as a place of seclusion. Unlike the main western line as far as Homebush, many of the large and expensive houses were built on the North Shore away from the railway line in secluded bush. This suggests two things – firstly, that residents preferred to live as a companion to the natural landscape and, secondly, that the high travels costs to reach the city were not an important consideration in deciding the residential location.

In New South Wales, it has been and remains the possession of money that has largely determined the pattern of settlement in Sydney. People with much money have mostly tried to combine a desire to live both away from industrial and poor locations and toward waterfront or elevated areas. In the past, those people with the smallest amount of money usually have had little or no opportunity to choose where they live. They have resided in locations adjacent to industry whereby both transport and housing costs have been low. Some people without large amounts of money have tried to convince themselves that they belong to the section of the population with considerable wealth and have chosen to live in areas of Sydney, including the North Shore, which were beyond their financial resources.

THE EVIDENCE OF THE LINK BETWEEN POWER, MONEY AND THE NORTH SHORE

What is the evidence that the grouping of wealthy and powerful people on the North Shore benefitted them above the people in other parts of Sydney? Table 3.1 shows the evidence and reveals a pattern of initiatives relating to technology and change that benefitted the North Shore before any other part of Sydney or the State of NSW. These

¹⁵ Ibid.

events are connected into a pattern by the use of the adjective “first”. It occurs over 30 times in relation to the introduction of new technologies.

TABLE 3.1 – FAVOURED TREATMENT (“FIRSTS”) RELATING TO THE NORTH SHORE

YEAR	EVENT
1883	First ferry service across Sydney Harbour services Milsons Point to convey road vehicles
1886	First purely suburban railway announced and built
1886	First attempt to build a private tramway/railway in Sydney
1886	First cable tram in NSW First and only tram terminus inside a covered terminal building – at Milsons Point First all-weather, intermodal transfer facility
1890	First exclusively suburban railway in Sydney
1892	First planned use (at Waverton) of cantilevered brackets to support platform canopies
1893	First electric platform indicators on NSW rail system at Milsons Point station
1893	First full-length platform canopies on NSW rail system at Milsons Point station
1893	First electric tram in Sydney
1902	First tram shed erected where ornate design features are located away from the open front
1905	First suburban railway line to be nominated for electrification to replace steam locomotives – by Henry Deane
1910	First line on NSW rail system to feature all consecutive buildings of the one standard, materials and style (between Artarmon and Hornsby)
1914	First use of audible cab signalling in NSW and first use of chemical treatment for steam locomotive water trialled on North Shore line
1916	First brick platform building to be relocated – from Old Glenbrook to Artarmon
1920	First line in Sydney to have tracks widened to 12’ centres to accommodate electric carriages
1921	First and only time that members of a steam locomotive class have had their boiler pressure increased and subsequently decreased – for exclusive use of North Shore line
1923	First use of asphaltic concrete to build the longest single length of seal road in NSW – 10km of Lane Cove Road between boundary Street,

YEAR	EVENT
	Roseville & Pearce's Corner, Wahroonga
1924	First use of concrete piles for the longest concrete bridge in NSW – over Middle Harbour at Roseville & first joint council/state government funding for a bridge
1924	First escalator in Sydney and first on NSW railways at Milsons Point station
1925	First use of steel-bodied carriages on NSW rail system
1926	First railway line in NSW proposed to be electrified
1927	Gordon electric traction sub-station was the first such facility to use the mercury arc rectifier system instead of rotary converters
1930	First time Parliament had passed legislation to provide a suburban connected line in Sydney – Chatswood to Epping
1932	First harbour bridge crossing First and only underground tram terminus in Australia – at Wynyard
1933	First Government bus service – between Manly and Chatswood
1939	First tram operations to be replaced by buses – from The Spit to Manly and Harbord to Narrabeen
1958	First time when a tram corridor has been dedicated for private motor car use – the former two tram lines on the Sydney Harbour Bridge
1958	First freeway in NSW – Cahill Freeway – served North Shore motorists
1960	First ground-level freeway (Warringah Freeway) decided to be started at Crows Nest
1965	First proposed air right development for residential use – at North Sydney
1989	First application of “Station Sparkle” programme at Artarmon
1989	First time a major temporary station has been provided at an alternative site, closed and the original site re-opened – in 2000
1992	First use of lifts to provide disable access at a suburban railway station – at Waverton
2005	First time any station has had all components of a heritage-listed station demolished for an air right development – Chatswood

Railway Historian, Cyril Singleton, in 1945 perceived the singular features of the area when he wrote that “the North Shore line is quite a unique feature of Sydney’s suburban railway system”.¹⁶ The favoured treatment of the North Shore continued with the construction of the first freeway, the Warringah Freeway in the 1970s and more recently

¹⁶ C.C. Singleton, “The North Shore Line – 1”, *Bulletin*, No. 87, January 1945, p. 4

with the completion of the Chatswood-Epping line in 2009, described as “a line of limited use.....”¹⁷

In his recently published book, historian and community activist, Bob McKillop provided an example of the connection between power, money and land development. At Chatswood, big-time land owner and developer, Richard Hartnett, persuaded Railway officials to locate a station adjacent to one of his large tracts of land to be subdivided. Bob explains that is why Chatswood railway station is located where it is today, which was not the location of the major commercial area some distance away at the junction of two key roads, Lane Cove Road (now the Pacific Highway) and Mowbray Road. In return for the political favour, Hartnett named some streets in one of his new subdivisions between Artarmon and Chatswood, auctioned in January, 1889, after several senior Railwaymen, with names such as Eddy Road, Goodchap Road, Whitton Road, Oliver Road and Moriarty Road.¹⁸

The dominance of wealthy people on the North Shore and the leafy nature of the geography prompt consideration of their juxtaposition. A key question on which to muse is whether the combination of location, geography and money ended up producing a distinct class of people. While many people on the North Shore today are relatively wealthy, some are not so fortunate. The position has changed over time. The poor physical condition in City of Sydney in the 1880s was so bad that it pushed people into the suburbs. It was only the wealthy who could afford the huge expense of time, personal effort and money to relocate to what was a fairly isolated area of Sydney. Their homes on the Upper North Shore were so isolated that they conveyed the symbolic message that neither the residents nor their residences did not wish to be seen by the public. This was different to the case along the Illawarra and Main West railway corridors where large mansions were built to be viewed by passing train travellers.

THE IMPACT OF THE OPENING OF THE NORTH SHORE RAILWAY LINE IN 1890

Suburbanisation of Sydney started in the 1880s with residential development, amongst other areas, on the North Shore at present day North Sydney and Willoughby. It is well established that the major public transport network in Sydney was provided by steam trams in the 1880s, which in turn fostered further development. Steam trams were very much restricted by steep gradients and it was for this reason that Sydney's first cable tram was opened in 1886 between the Milsons Point ferry terminal and Ridge Street, near St. Leonards Park. The outstanding spatial characteristic about Artarmon station

¹⁷ L. Besser, “A Line of Limited Use Without the Missing Link”, *Sydney Morning Herald*, 27-28th September, 2008, p. 6

¹⁸ B. McKillop, *Pictorial History Willoughby*, Alexandria, Kingsclear Books, 2015, p. 15.

is that it was located on a railway rather than a tram line. The explanation lies not on geography but politics.

With the opening of the North Shore railway, the area around Artarmon became inhabited by people with less wealth but with a strong desire to be considered or seen or both as wealthy. Building blocks around Artarmon became smaller in area but the social ambitions of the less affluent people found harmony with the residents dating from the pre-railway and early railway days. The North Shore railway has sociological relevance because it explains a major feature still current in the demography of Sydney. Physical location or relocation of residences equals mental location or relocation of the occupiers. It is a common trait of Australian born people of Anglo-Saxon descent to often hide and run away in preference to confronting other Australians who may possess different characteristics or views. Today, Anglo-Saxons dominate the fringe suburbs of Sydney in order to escape from perceived unpleasantnesses which they perceive as being prevalent in the middle ring of suburbs. It was the railway in 1893 that similarly allowed many people to physically escape to a location where they felt they shared similar views to the existing residents. The North Shore railway was itself used as a tool of segregation, especially after the completion of the Sydney Harbour Bridge in 1932, by the wealthy classes.

ARTARMON TODAY

The North Shore line was the first railway in the Sydney region which was built on a continuously rising gradient and it was the first line specifically nominated for electrification – in 1905 – as a means of addressing the problems associated with the terrain.¹⁹ Engineer-in-Chief, John Whitton, said in 1885 that “the works also on this line are heavier than on almost any other line in the Colony”.²⁰ Railway managers have a tradition of avoiding placing a station on a gradient, if other alternatives were available. It is of note that, when William Foxlee, Engineer for Existing Lines, proposed the location of the platform for Artarmon in 1894, he nominated two sites, one being the present one and the other 28 chains to the north near Mowbray Road.²¹ Both were generally on the same gradient of about one in 50. Although the North Shore line was regraded with electrification and later, Artarmon continues to have the steepest gradient on the line, with a one in 50 gradient on the St. Leonards side and a one in 45 gradient

¹⁹ H. Deane, *Interurban Railways and Electrification of the Steam Railroads*, 27th September, 1905, Legislative Assembly, 1905, no pag.

²⁰ Report from the Engineer-in-Chief to the Secretary for Public Works, 30th November, 1885, Volume 1885/86 Legislative Council, former SRA Archives, p. 5

²¹ unindexed plan entitled “proposed platform between St. Leonards and Chatswood, dated 29th October 1894 signed by W. Foxlee, former SRA Archives

on the Chatswood side with the station itself on a gradient of one in 69.²² Other factors must have been involved in the selection of the current Artarmon station site. The more northerly location had the benefit of being nearer to an existing public road, Mowbray Road, but the present site had no existing public street access at that time and, hence, no immediate residential development to act as a catchment for potential customers.

There were two types of railway workers. The first group contained men who wanted to live in one place and forfeited promotion and higher wages and the second group was comprised of men who were willing to relocate their residence to pursue higher wages and, mostly, ultimate transfer to senior positions in Sydney. Railwaymen were no different to their counterparts in other government departments and in the private sector. If they had sufficient money, they too wanted to live near water or at higher elevations. The North Shore was long desired as a place of residence for senior officers. The Engineer-in-Chief, John Whitton, moved his residence to Naremburn in 1865 and resided there for the next 30 years.²³ Whitton, like many others, regarded the North Shore as a place where money, power and geography came together.

Artarmon today reflects a pleasant Asian influence by the large number of retail shops adjacent to the station selling Asian products. For the last 36 years from 1980, the railway has helped with the destruction of the early visual attraction of the area and line. Now, people who live on the North Shore are joined largely by money and not by the desire to live with other Anglo-Saxons who share the attraction of a leafy and quiet environment. In short, the railway helped give and remove the once unique identity of the North Shore as a haven for self-considered Anglo-Saxons who combined wealth and a desire to live in harmony with the distinctive bushland setting of Sydney. Today in Sydney, wealth and ethnicity do not combine to form an expression of suburban dominance as was once the case on the North Shore.

²² Public Transport Commission, *Curve and Gradient Diagrams*, unpublished internal document, 1973, p. 231 says the gradient at Artarmon station is 1 in 73.

²³ R. Lee, *Colonial Engineer*, Redfern, ARHS, 2000, p. 309

4 THE IMPACT OF PRIOR RAILWAY DEVELOPMENTS GENERALLY FOR THE NORTH SHORE RAILWAY

THE USE OF THE NSW RAILWAYS TO OBTAIN PRIVATE, ECONOMIC POWER

Shortly after starting work in 1857, John Whitton, the 19th century Railway Engineer-in-Chief, had a clear focus of linking Sydney with the interstate capitals of Melbourne and Brisbane to facilitate trade. His vision gained little support because colonial governments and commercial enterprises in the colonies wanted to keep the trade within their respective borders. They had no regard for concepts of efficiency or improved services – simply making lots of money. Similarly, although much has been written about the desire of various 19th century NSW Governments to capture the trade of the Riverina area and prevent it proceeding to Victoria, that desire is not supported by the lethargy displayed by the Governments to build railway lines to the border areas at an early date.

The Victorian Government had built railway lines to tap the Murray River trade 20 years before NSW rails reached the area. Moreover, in the 1880s, the policy of the NSW Government was to ensure that existing urban centres in rural areas were linked by rail to Sydney. Towns such as Young, Gundagai, Queanbeyan, Cooma, Mudgee, Cobar and Bourke all received rail connections but very few lines were profitable. The mines at Cobar had closed before the railway reached the town. The route of the main northern line was established to reach the relatively large centres of Tamworth, Uralla, Armidale, Glen Innes and Tenterfield. The line never made a profit in its 100 years of operation.

Depending on the strength of local political power, railway lines were specially built or deviated to include towns such as Young and Armidale and to exclude towns such as Yass and Junee. Such action to deviate to some towns involved considerable extra public expenditure that was politically driven. It was the whim of powerful people who controlled the construction of all 19th century rail lines and the North Shore line was consistent with that pattern. She or he who held greater power dominated railway construction. There was also a third situation where the railway line passed a town with a 100 metres but the Railway Department built the station at a location that suited the Railway officials but not the local residents. Murrumburrah station in 1877 was one such example, where the station was nearly two kilometres from the settlement. In that instance, the expression of local political power obtained a second and more convenient station in 1879.

The NSW Railways developed into one of the most politicised government owned rail systems in the Western world. The railway system was dependent on rural produce for its revenue but existing economic production did not provide the only reason for rural

expansion of the rail network. On many occasions, governments used railway construction to keep a large number of unskilled labourers occupied and occupied away from Sydney.

THE BOND BETWEEN LAND DEVELOPMENT, RAILWAYS AND THE POWER OF POLITICIANS

There was a strong link between local landowners and politicians. Until 1889, there was no payment to members of the NSW Parliament. Moreover, landowners and graduates of the University of Sydney were entitled to more than one vote in Colonial general elections until 1893. Therefore, politicians had to have independent income in order to support their Parliamentary duties. By 1875, the majority of the members of the NSW Legislative Assembly came from a background in banking and commerce rather than rural industries.²⁴ Almost one third of the legislation considered by the Assembly related to “conservation and development”, including land management and railway construction. It is unsurprising that many of the people associated with land development on the North Shore were the very politicians who were enacting legislation to allow railway construction and land subdivision. One such politician was Alexander Stuart, who held large tracts of land on the north side of the Harbour. Although called by one of his banking contemporaries as “a dangerous man to have anything to do with a bank”, he was Premier of the Colony in 1882 and 1883, a time when the trial surveys of the North Shore railway were undertaken.²⁵

SUBURBAN TRAMWAYS AND RAILWAYS IN OTHER PARTS OF SYDNEY

Steam trams had been operating in Sydney since 1879 and in Newcastle in 1887 and were generally unpopular with residents along the tram routes because of the danger they brought to pedestrians in residential streets and the dirt and noise they laid at the front doors of houses on the various routes. In rural areas, trams of a different type had been operating to Richmond and Morpeth in 1864 and Camden in 1882. In all cases, they were again unpopular with residents and users because they inherently were perceived as inferior to trains due to their lower hauling capacity, their lower speed than railways and the necessity to change at junction stations to main-line trains.

Additionally, with the opening of the Illawarra line in 1884, land speculators, developers and purchasers identified suburban subdivisions for residential allotments with the steam train, not trams. This was again emphasised by the opening of a railway rather than a tramway to Belmore in 1895, the selection of trains to Carlingford in 1901 and the

²⁴ G.N. Hawker, *The Parliament of New South Wales 1850-1965*, Sydney, Government Printer, 1971, p.16

²⁵ Description from G. Souter, *Mosman - a History*, Melbourne University Press, 1995, p.90

conversion of the Castle Hill tramway to rail in 1923. It was the steam locomotive that was used by the NSW Government, as the owner of both the tram and train systems, to advertise broad social advancement and progress rather than steam trams. The general public happily supported the notion. Steam trams in Sydney were associated with existing urban development and not the physical expansion of Sydney.

Powerful residents of the Eastern Suburbs began agitating for a government owned tram system in 1873 and this became the big debate in that year in the NSW Legislative Council.²⁶ The similarity of powerful people and pleasant physical environment stimulated the preparation of a public petition to the NSW Government in 1874 by North Shore residents for a railway to serve the district.²⁷ It comes as no surprise that both the North Shore and the Eastern Suburbs were not long after recipients of government tramways, but not the type of steam-hauled trams provided for the rest of Sydney. These two locations received trams hauled by cables which eliminated the nuisances of smoke and noise from local streets.

THE ATTRACTION OF POWER AND MONEY TO ELEVATED LANDFORM

The North Shore of Sydney was part of a land system connected by natural beauty to the Eastern Suburbs of Sydney, the Southern Highlands and to the Blue Mountains to the west of Sydney. The four areas were connected by similar geographical features – hilly landscape and extensive vegetation. Powerful people were responsible for activating the NSW Government to build and operate a subsidized railway network over the Great Dividing Range to inland grazing areas in order to provide lowest cost transport of wool to the seaboard. In so doing, NSW became the first government owned rail system in the British Empire and about second or third in the World.

Apart from the Eastern Suburbs, the other three areas required considerable expenditure on railway infrastructure in the form of bridges and tunnels. A testimony to the adverse gradients is that the original tunnels in all three areas were ultimately abandoned for main line railway use. The Lavender Bay tunnel reflected the difficult and expensive railway construction involved in serving the four areas. It was situated on a “steep falling grade (1 in 50 gradient) and a ten chain curve”, making it the tightest curved tunnel on the NSW rail system²⁸. “Within a decade (of the initial line openings to the three areas in the 1860s) Sydney families who were prominent in politics, law or commerce began the move to the lower Blue Mountains”.²⁹ Belbin and Burke wrote that

²⁶ J. Jarvis, *The History of Woollahra*, Woollahra Municipal Council, no date, p. 83

²⁷ K. Cook, *The Railway Came to Ku-ring-gai*, Pymble, Genlin Investments, 1991, p. iii

²⁸ W.A. Bayley, *Tunnels on Australian Railways*, Bulli, Austrail Publications, 1972, p. 36 & NSW Railways, *Curve and Gradient Diagrams*, no details, passim

²⁹ P. Belbin and D. Burke, *Full Steam Across the Blue Mountains*, Methuen, 1981, p. 90

“the Southern Highlands offered a fair amount of competition where, at Sutton Forest, the Governor had his rural retreat (sic).”³⁰ Unfortunately, the Eastern Suburbs and the North Shore were not endowed with trunk railway lines running through their territory, though there was some effort made by local people to get the railway to Newcastle to start at Milsons Point and head north rather than form the present junction with the western line at Strathfield.

THE ALLUREMENT OF THE NORTH SHORE

Concepts relating to power, motive and clustering are relevant to understand the type of early settlers on the North Shore and why they made their first call for a North Shore railway in the 1870s. People lived on the North Shore of Sydney because they were either repulsed by the atrocious living conditions of the Sydney city centre or they were attracted by the pleasant natural environment. The position is summarised by Fitzgerald:

“Anyone who had the money for the bus fare knew that life in Woollahra or parts of the North Shore could compare favourably with the best in the world, both in terms of housing standards and environmental delights. And anyone who took the trouble to stroll through West Sydney or Alexandria knew that for many life was mean and cramped, with generous amounts of filth, disease and economic uncertainty”.³¹

At the end of the 1870s, James Inglis wrote that “the invasion of (residential) construction has bridged the Harbour, and laid out streets innumerable on the North Shore”³²

LOCAL PRESSURE FOR SURVEYS TO BE COMPLETED

One major factor that help push for the North Shore railway was the incorporation of the Municipality of North Willoughby in 1865, which included Artarmon, Lane Cove and Willoughby. At the right time, the Council of North Willoughby acted as an important pressure group and advocated improved public transport. Early in the 1880s, the then St. Leonards (present day North Sydney) Municipal Council, with its Mayor, William Tunks, was also a leading pressure group demanding improved transport in and to the

³⁰ *ibid.*

³¹ S. Fitzgerald, *Rising Damp - Sydney 1870-90*, Melbourne, Oxford University Press, 1987, p. 41

³² Quoted by J. Birmingham, *Leviathan*, Milsons Point, Random House, 2000, p. 202

area.³³ However, the suburb of Artarmon never got a press mention until 1889, at which time land subdivisions were under way.

Initial trial surveys for a railway line were undertaken in 1881 and 1882 but the plans were destroyed in the Garden Palace fire in the Botanic Gardens in 1882. In December, 1883, surveys were reported as being “incomplete” and no decision had been taken on the destination, though it was established at that time that the junction with the existing rail network would be “Pearce’s Corner (i.e. Hornsby).³⁴ Further surveys were carried out in 1884 and 1887. All throughout the 1880s, there was never-ending discussion in newspapers about a railway and other transport modes between the north side of Sydney Harbour and both the south side of the Harbour and northwards towards Newcastle.

Sydney’s first purely suburban railway was to be located on the North Shore because the place was inhabited by people who held social, political and monetary power. They did not want street tramways because they considered these inferior to railways. They associated the concept of progress exclusively with the steam engine, not the steam tram. Henry Parkes, the local Member of Parliament and Premier, supported the selection of trains over trams in 1886 because of his dislike of the latter – a dislike shared by many users of steam trams.³⁵

THE INSTITUTIONAL POWER-BASE OF RAILWAY STAFF

The institutional framework supported Railway staff. The most important institution provided for staff was the NSW Railway and Tramway Institute. The impressive headquarters for the Institute was being built when the North Shore line was being constructed and the Institute opened in March, 1891, at Devonshire Street in Sydney. It was designed to promote the educational and social needs of all staff and from its beginnings developed branches all over the state. Over 50 branches were established in the next 30 years, with suburban recreational facilities at Hornsby, Hurstville and Penrith. Also, in the 1880s, the organisation started a railway ambulance and first aid network in which the staff were trained to assist fellow workers in case of an industrial accident. Also, the NSW rail administration itself continued to provide a fatherly role of its employees until 1972, when the last Railway Commissioner, Neil McCusker, was sacked. After that time, there has been a steady erosion of the caring staff culture.

³³ For example, see *Australian Town and Country Journal*, 26th March, 1881, pp. 12 & 13.

³⁴ *Evening News*, 1st December, 1883, p. 6.

³⁵ D. Burke, *Juggernaut*, Sydney, Kangaroo Press, 1997, p. 88

5 THE POWER PLAYERS APPROVE THE NORTH SHORE RAILWAY - 1880 TO THE 1885 ELECTION

ARTARMON BEFORE THE RAILWAY

The NSW railway and tramway networks enabled large numbers of mainly well-to-do and affluent people to relocate their residences from the city to the suburbs, starting predominantly in the 1880s.³⁶ Between 1881 and 1891, the total population of the Sydney metropolis increased to 160,599 people, representing a 70% increase over ten years. The suburbs south of Sydney Harbour increased by 121% and the suburbs north of the Harbour by 116%, despite the transport difficulties.³⁷ The growth of the suburbs represented the birth of commuting in Sydney. As equally important was the introduction in 1881 of discounted workmen's weekly tickets, which made it cheaper for workers to use the transport networks. At the end of the 19th century, 71-90% of the City's population lived in rented premises depending on location. In Drummoyne the figure was 36% and in Willoughby it was 48%.³⁸ People wanted land on which to build and own their homes. The further the distance from the City of Sydney, the higher the degree of home ownership. The North Shore and the Eastern Suburbs were two areas of Sydney where building costs were higher because of the hilly terrain and where houses were more expensive to purchase.³⁹

It is the history of Artarmon station and its surrounding area that helps to understand the nature of the people who lived on the North Shore and also of human beings generally. Pert describes the 1880s around Artarmon as "the boom years" and cites the extensive subdivision of the Gore Estate.⁴⁰ He adds that the largest brickworks in NSW in 1889 were the nearby "Gore Hill Brickworks".

The reference to "Gore Hill Brickworks" is a little misleading as a considerable amount of brickmaking was occurring in the area generally. Gemmell listed the known brick makers in the area and he provided the details in the following Table.⁴¹

³⁶ R. Cashman & C. Meader, *Marrickville – Rural Outpost to Inner City*, Petersham, Hale & Iremonger, 1990, p. 21

³⁷ Bradfield, op. cit., p. 110

³⁸ L. Kilmartin, D. Thoms & T. Burke, *Social Theory and the Australian City*, Sydney, George Allen & Unwin, 1985, p. 95

³⁹ J. Connell, *Sydney – the Emergence of a World City*, Melbourne, Oxford University press, 2001, p. 224

⁴⁰ J. Pert in G. Warner, *Artarmon – Past, Present and Future*, Willoughby Municipal Council 1988, p. 14

⁴¹ W. Gemmell, *And So We Graft From Six to Six – The Brickmakers of New South Wales*, North Ryde, Angus & Robertson, 1986, pp. 63-65.

TABLE: BRICKWORKS IN THE ARTARMON, WILLOUGHBY AREA 1880-1914

NAME OF BRICKMAKER/ BRICKWORKS	LOCATION	PERIOD OF OPERATION	NOTES
John Gibson	Herbert Street, North Willoughby – two yards, one at Mowbray Road and the other near French's Road	1880 – 1892	Known as the pioneer of the dry- press, steam brick industry – most of the bricks used on the railway line between St. Leonards and Milsons Point were made by Gibson
Mr. Blunt – he was lessee of an existing brickmaking works	Lane Cove and Elizabeth Streets, North Willoughby	1885 – 1887	Mr. Blunt was a railway contractor who made the bricks for the Woy Woy tunnel and for the railway generally between what way in Gosford
Gore Hill Brickworks	Lane Cove and Elizabeth Streets, North Willoughby	1888 – 1893	
North Sydney Brick and Tile Company	Reserve Road, Gore Hill	1889 – 1914	When a further 9 ha of land was acquired at Herbert Street, a railway siding was provided in 1903. This site continued to

NAME OF BRICKMAKER/ BRICKWORKS	LOCATION	PERIOD OF OPERATION	NOTES
			operate until 1975.
Crown Plastic Fire Brick Company	Archer Street, Willoughby	1890 – 1892	Made fire bricks
Wilson's Brickworks	Herbert Street, Gore Hill – took over the site owned by John Gibson in 1897	1897 – 1914	Operated till 1930

From the above Table, brickmaking was well underway before the opening of the railway.

In the 1880s, the *Sydney Morning Herald* referred to the “social quality” of the North Shore and cited the “scenery, pure air, tranquility”.⁴² By 1884, there were sufficient people living on the North Shore, mostly in what is now North Sydney, Naremburn and Willoughby, that there was an all-night ferry service.⁴³ This ferry service started two years before the opening of the cable tram service from Milsons Point. While the area around Artarmon was relatively sparsely populated in the 1880s, there were indeed people living there though not necessarily close to the station site. In 1889, there was only one daily horse-bus from Milsons Point to Gordon and Hornsby.⁴⁴ The transport service through or near to Artarmon to serve the Chatswood/Willoughby area was far more frequent with seven return trips a day provided by two operators.⁴⁵ Despite the limited public transport facilities, people still lived there. Why? The answer lies in the psychology of people.

A trend existed over 100 years ago that involved politicians making secret deals with powerful individuals and organisations. In the 19th century, secret deals were not so secret and collusion was an acceptable part of normal business. In the 21st century, it is much harder to find the evidence because laws in NSW prohibit naughty and corrupt

⁴² cited in B. Carroll, *Getting Around Town*, Stanmore, Cassell, 1980, pp. 79 & 80.

⁴³ Ibid.

⁴⁴ D. Audley, “Sydney's Horse Bus Industry in 1889”, in G. Wotherspoon (Ed.), *Sydney's Transport*, Sydney, Hale and Iremonger, 1983, p. 95

⁴⁵ E. Leslie and J. Michaelides, *Willoughby: the Suburb and its People*, Willoughby Municipal Council 1988, p. 104.

behaviour, the irony being that it was the politicians themselves who enacted the legislation they so much wish to avoid.

In 1883, La Meslee wrote that the suburbs on the North Shore “have become so populous in the last few years that there is serious talk about connecting them with the city by a suspension bridge”⁴⁶ The *Sydney Morning Herald* told readers about the social quality of the North Shore and cited “merchants, gentlemen and others” who would be attracted to the area.⁴⁷

THE PROCESS OF PARLIAMENTARY APPROVAL

At the end of January, 1884, plans and specifications for the North Shore railway had not been completed.⁴⁸ In March, 1884, a public meeting was held at the Green Gate Hotel at Lane Cove to lobby for a railway to the region. The meeting discussed two routes and basically opposed one route that served Ball’s Head, saying that Ball’s Head was not only out of the way and unsuitable but had a bad anchorage.⁴⁹

By May, 1884, the trial survey of the proposed line had been made and plan and section drawings were under preparation.⁵⁰ In July, 1884, the deputation, headed by one of the local Members of Parliament for the St. Leonards electorate, Bernard Holtermann, met the government representative who at the time was George Dibbs, the then Colonial Treasurer and Acting Minister for Public Works, who was also the other Member of Parliament for the St. Leonards electorate, it being a two-member constituency. The objective of the deputation was to support the construction of the railway from Pearce’s Corner to St. Leonards and construction of a tramway from Milsons Point. Dibbs replied that plans and specifications would be submitted to Parliament within a fortnight and that he had a memorandum from Mr. Whitton to say that they would be submitted during the present Parliamentary Session. In relation to the tramway, Dibbs stated that the question required further consideration in order to decide “kind of Tramway that should be adopted.”⁵¹ Three matters are noteworthy in relation to the deputation, the first being that it was asking for a railway only as far as St. Leonards and, secondly, it was requesting a Tramway from North Sydney at the same time. The third aspect was that it was one electoral representative, namely Holtermann, having a deputation with the other representative, namely Dibbs.

⁴⁶ E.M. La Meslee, *The New Australia*, (translated by Russell Ward), Melbourne, Heinemann, 1973, p. 61.

⁴⁷ Quoted by B. Carroll, *Getting Around Town – a History of Urban Transport in Australia*, Stanmore, Cassell, 1980, p. 80

⁴⁸ *Evening News*, 30th January, 1884, p. 5.

⁴⁹ *Sydney Mail and New South Wales Advertiser*, 22nd March, 1884, p. 569.

⁵⁰ *Sydney Morning Herald*, 10th May, 1884, p. 8.

⁵¹ *Sydney Mail and New South Wales Advertiser*, 26th July, 1884, p. 161.

In August, 1884, one of the local Parliamentary representatives, George Dibbs as Colonial Treasurer, asked Parliament to approve the plans for the railway from Pearce's Corner to the North Shore, which were laid before the two Houses and approved in August and September, "without comment."⁵²

There is a problem with the absence of evidence to indicate when the New South Wales Parliament actually approved construction of line and, to date, it can only be stated with accuracy that such approval occurred between 10th September, 1884, at which time the Legislative Council approved the plans and March, 1885, when George Dibbs told his fellow St. Leonards representative, Bernard Holtermann, that, as soon as drawings were ready, tenders would be invited for the construction of the line from Pearce's Corner to the "water's edge at North Shore".⁵³

TENDERS CALLED FOR THE FIRST TIME

Unfortunately, Bernard Holtermann, who was a strong supporter for the railway, died on 29th April, 1885, at the age of 47 years. In May, 1885, a press report conveyed a disappointed attitude towards the construction of the proposed railway line with the words that residents of the North Shore "were to have a railway", it reporting that only a small amount of money had been spent on land acquisitions.⁵⁴ It also argued that it would be a mistake to take the railway to the proposed terminus at Ball's Head. At that time, the railway was officially known as the Pearce's Corner to North Shore railway.

An indicator of the important people who lived on the North Shore is reflected by the political history of the St. Leonards electorate. From 1882 to 1885, George Dibbs was one of the two Members of Parliament who held the North Shore electorate of St. Leonards, the area being inhabited by a strong elite group of merchants and others. Dibbs was regarded as a pier by elite electors but at the end of 1884 half of his electorate were unhappy with his performance, saying that they were being "disgracefully treated."⁵⁵

Dibbs was elected Premier on 7th October, 1885, one week before the Colonial general elections. Parkes recognised the time was right to make a political thrust when the NSW Government in 1885 announced the establishment of a committee to consider the construction of a tunnel under Sydney Harbour. When Parkes decided to battle Dibbs for his seat in 1885, Parkes was "known to be in financial trouble and suspected of opportunism".⁵⁶ Voting for the election was held between 16th and 31st October, 1885.

⁵² *Sydney Morning Herald*, 26th August, 1884, p. 7 and the *Newcastle Morning Herald and Miners' Advocate*, 27th August, 1884, p. 2.

⁵³ *Sydney Morning Herald*, 27th March, 1885, p. 4.

⁵⁴ *Sydney Morning Herald*, 19th May, 1885, p. 5.

⁵⁵ *Newcastle Morning Herald and Miners Advocate*, 12th November, 1884, p. 2.

⁵⁶ R. Travers, *Henry Parkes Father of Federation*, Sydney, Kangaroo Press, 2000, p. 195.

Despite his lack of social parity with many of the North Shore elite, Parkes won the seat and election by promising the construction of a Harbour bridge and the North Shore railway. In the month before the election, voters had been informed that:

“the plans for the North Shore railway are nearly completed and detailed estimates of the cost of the proposed work are being prepared. The arrangements for the shipment of coal at Ball’s Head have been attended with many difficulties, and have required much consideration.”⁵⁷

These assurances were not entirely accurate or even truthful because the route of the North Shore line was far from determined in 1884, 1885 and 1886. Nevertheless, tenders were called on 12th October, 1885, for the railway from “Pearce’s Corner to St. Leonards, with a branch line for coal traffic to Ball’s Head.”⁵⁸ The closing date for tenders was 1st December, 1885. Although the cable tram from Milsons Point to Ridge Street, North Sydney, had been proposed in 1884, it did not open until May, 1886.⁵⁹ So why St. Leonards? Because that was as far as all parties debating the route on which they could agree. The list of properties to be resumed was published in the *Sydney Morning Herald* on 4th December, 1885.⁶⁰

It was a good thing that the tenderers were a patient lot because the New South Wales government took over 18 months to make a decision on the successful tenderer. Eventually, the lowest tenderer got sick and tired of waiting and withdraw his tender. Parkes contributed to the disintegration of the ethical standards of the people of the Colony by not fulfilling his promise to build the line. Amazingly, he was re-elected subsequently as a “fit and proper person to represent the good burghers of the North Shore”.⁶¹ The electors even raised funds to overcome his bankruptcy and he continued to be one of two Members for St. Leonards until July, 1895, though after 1889 the electorate was represented by three Members of Parliament until 1894 when Parkes became the sole Member.

Jones says that the electorate of St. Leonards in the 19th century was known as “the electorate of the Premiers” because James Farnell, George Dibbs and Henry Parkes were all local members at various times in the 1880s and were also Premiers of the Colony of NSW.⁶² Henry Parkes, the many-times Premier of 19th century New South Wales, was the one-time Parliamentary Member for part of the North Shore area known as the St. Leonards electorate. He represented the seat between October, 1885, and July, 1895.

⁵⁷ *Newcastle Morning Herald and Miner’s Advocate*, 7th September, 1885, p. 3.

⁵⁸ *NSW Government Gazette* no. 474, 13th October, 1885.

⁵⁹ W. H. Polglase, *St. Leonards Railway Station*, privately published, no details, p. 5.

⁶⁰ *Sydney Morning Herald*, 27th June, 1887, p. 3.

⁶¹ Travers, op. cit. p. 195.

⁶² M. Jones, *North Sydney 1788-1988*, Sydney, Allen and Unwin, 1988, p. 158

6 - 1885-1890 - BETWEEN THE APPROVAL AND THE OPENING OF THE RAILWAY

THE FALSEHOOD OF HENRY PARKES' PROMISE TO BUILD THE RAILWAY

Despite the Parliamentary approval and much talk about the need for a North Shore railway line, all attempts before those of Parkes of 1885 had failed but Parkes' promise to his electors in 1885 also failed. He stood for Parliament in October, 1885, for the seat of St. Leonards, which covered much of the lower and middle North Shore. He chose to stand for the seat held by the then Premier, George Dibbs, and won.⁶³ He was basically a person to gamble with his public support and policies. Although Parkes is often referred to as the Father of Federation, he changed his views on that and other subjects several times to suit himself.⁶⁴

Parkes, when elected in October, 1885, held no official position of power until 20th January, 1887, and until then he was unable to implement his promise to provide the railway, at which time he regained the top power position. Parkes had played the railway card to the electors of St. Leonards in 1885 and he played the same card in the lead up to the January, 1887, elections though this time he promised to remove the management of the NSW Railways from political control.⁶⁵ From the January, 1887, election he started his fourth Ministry and again became Premier and he was still in the top office when the North Shore line opened in 1890. Parkes delivered on both the 1885 and 1887 promises. He opened the North Shore line and he did reform the NSW Railway Department.

A major problem that may explain the construction delay was the collapse in revenue from rural land sales in 1886, which had been a critical source of funds to the Government. For the first time in decades, the Colony of New South Wales encountered a budgetary deficit. It has been a long established rule that any Premier looks after his own electorate first and, thus, it is little wonder that, when he was Premier in 1887, he implemented his commitment to build the North Shore railway with the turning of the first sod in 1887.

The role of chance and whim have always been a feature of Australian public administration. Uhr stated that "an important factor in the quality of organisational

⁶³ In the 1890s, he stood against a subsequent Premier, George Reid, in his seat of East Sydney and lost.

⁶⁴ L.F. Crisp, *George Richard Dibbs 1834-1904 Premier of NSW – Prophet of Unification*, Canberra, no publisher, 1980, pp. 28-41

⁶⁵ R. L. Wettenhall, "Early Railway Management Legislation in New South Wales", *Tasmanian University Law Review*, July, 1960, p. 462.

leadership is chance – good or bad luck”.⁶⁶ The views of the chief government engineer, John Whitton, which were against the North Shore railway, were well known by both politicians and the public. The extension of the railway system from Pearce’s Corner to the North Shore region and the related harbour crossing is a case of the operation of chance. The candidate, Henry Parkes, took a chance before the 1885 general colonial election that the electors would praise his vision against the conservatism of the incumbent Member of Parliament, George Dibbs and engineer, John Whitton. Chance happened that the electors voted Parkes in and, with him eventually, came the railway. Whitton was the loser partly because of his anti-railway stance and his unpopularity in the area possibly contributed to his retirement in 1890. It was a case of good luck for North Shore residents and for the NSW Government Railways, which at the time was one of the largest railway bureaucracies in the world with a staff of nearly 12,000 in 1890.⁶⁷ It was bad luck for all future taxpayers in NSW. The line was funded by the creation of “big debts in London”. It did not and never did pay its way and contributed in part to the 1890s Depression.⁶⁸ Today, it continues as a loss-making venture – as do all Sydney suburban rail lines.

THE BOND BETWEEN MONEY AND MATES

Much has been written about the factional system of government in the 19th century and how it was different from the party system of the 20th century.⁶⁹ It is often argued that the factional system was inferior to the party system but the reality is that there is no fundamental difference in one major respect. What is consistent in both the factional and party systems is the role played by pressure group activity, through the use of local and common interest organisations, groups of individuals acting together and groups of parliamentarians working together. This pressure group activity was seen in the active role of the local government authorities on the North Shore.

Parkes biographer refers to the personal financial troubles in which Parkes regularly found himself.⁷⁰ Martin says that Parkes could never successfully mix his business and political interests.⁷¹ Parkes had both public and private standards. While Parkes was critical of the financial self-interest of members of the Ministry, he himself was likewise involved in dubious affairs. Parkes appointed his business partner and mate, Bruce Smith, to the position of Secretary for Public Works in 1889. Smith was a Director of the

⁶⁶ J. Uhr quoted in D. Corbett, *Public Sector Management*, St. Leonards, Allen & Unwin, 1992, p. 76

⁶⁷ John Whitton was not an officer of the NSW Railways but of the Department of Public Works.

⁶⁸ G. Blainey, *The Tyranny of Distance*, Melbourne, Sun Books, 1971, pp. 254-265.

⁶⁹ P. Loveday & A.W. Martin, “Colonial Politics Before 1890” in P. Loveday et al (Eds.), *The Emergence of the Australian Party System*, Neutral Bay, Hale and Iremonger, 1977, p. 12.

⁷⁰ A.W. Martin, *Henry Parkes - A Biography*, Melbourne University Press, 1980, p. 348.

⁷¹ *ibid.*

Colonial Mutual Life Assurance Society Ltd, which was the mortgagee of Parkes' Montpelier Estate in North Sydney.⁷²

It was a common practice of Parkes to return favours to the groups of people who shared business interests with him. Favours were shown in different ways. For the North Shore line, the favour was the line's construction amidst financial crisis and a contrary recommendation from John Whitton. On the Marrickville-Belmore railway line in 1895, he repaid political debts by the design features of the infrastructure. It was the first line opened with island platforms and the first line built without the use of level crossings. There was a special railway platform at Canterbury upon the line opening solely for passengers attending the horse races at the nearby racecourse. Moreover, Parkes funded the erection of high-class, expensive platform buildings.

Parkes was not alone amongst Parliamentarians in holding landed interests that would be well-suited to the construction of a railway line. One-time Premiers Alexander Stuart and Hercules Robinson also held substantial land interests in the North Shore area. These people strongly advocated the expenditure of public funds to build a railway that would serve their personal financial interests.⁷³ In short, it seemed that no matter who was holding political power in New South Wales, the North Shore railway line would be built. It was only a matter of time in view of the close links between those who held financial interests in local land holdings and their connection with Cabinet Ministers in various NSW Governments in the 1880s. This was no case of political factions at play but a grouping of self-interested businessmen and politicians. The idea of groupings of influential men for personal gain was nothing new in relation to Sydney's railways. For example, as early as 1858, three years after the opening of the first railway, Catholic priest, John Therry, was one of a number of local landowners who formed a group to successfully get a railway station opened at present day Lidcombe, in order to increase land values for his future residential subdivision.⁷⁴ If the clergy aspired to personal wealth, it is no surprise politicians wanted to do the same thing.

1886 CONSTRUCTION POSTPONED – SHORTAGE OF CAPITAL FUNDS

The year, 1886, was amazing, not because of the lack of construction work of the line, but what was said by key politicians. The series of unusual statements by several

⁷² L. Muir, *The Bankstown Line – Sydenham to Belmore 1895*, Kingsgrove, Canterbury and District Historical Society, 1995, p. 13.

⁷³ L. Muir, *Shady Acres – Politicians, Developers and the Design of Sydney's Public Transport System 1873-1891*, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Sydney, 1994, pp. 190-340

⁷⁴ J. Mitchell, "John Joseph Therry – His Lidcombe Property from 1823 to 1880", *Australian Railway History*, Vol. 59 No. 851, August 2008, p. 310

people reflected the desperation of the Colonial Government, which had insufficient money to undertake a wide range of capital improvements.

At the end of January, 1886, the Minister for Public Works, Jacob Garrad, travelled from “Crows Nest to Chatsworth”, which was the junction of the proposed branch line from Pearce’s Corner to Crows Nest and Ball’s Head. Apparently, he had decided to have an enquiry into the probable cost of the land to be resumed and he told the Legislative Assembly that the government had decided to postpone consideration of the Engineer-in-Chief’s recommendation in order to find a less costly route and develop a less costly scheme, whatever those words meant.⁷⁵ So, despite the legislation being in place, the Government was unsure of the objective of the proposed line.

Jacob Garrard was the Member for Balmain in 1886 and also the Minister for Public Works between 22nd December, 1885 and 25th February, 1886. No doubt it was his reported speech on the North Shore railway that resulted in his demise as he maintained that a railway would be too costly, owing to the land resumptions and he thought a tramway along Lane Cove Road (now the Pacific Highway), without land resumptions, would be a better option than the railway.⁷⁶ In making that statement, he supported Whitton’s view. It was widely known that John Whitton opposed the construction of the railway and had recommended that a tramway be built but one newspaper thought Garrard and Whitton were the only two men in Sydney of that view.

Garrard was of the view that, on the basis of substantial topographical difficulties, the only reason for supporting the railway in the first place was the interest of “land sharks” and “land jobbers” and reportedly said that:

“the objective of the line was to allow “auctioneers to make much easy cash out of it (i.e. the construction of the railway); syndicates and land rings to make the fortunes out of it, and of land thieves to practice their jumping propensities in all directions. Really, it is impossible to come to any other conclusion than this – that land jobbers have profited immensely by the surveys and re-surveys of the North Shore railway line, and that the Department wittingly or unwittingly has been playing into their hands for the last four years.”⁷⁷

Garrard ended his speech by accusing Whitton and his Railway Construction Branch of incompetence. These are strange comments because, firstly, Garrard himself was an auctioneer and real estate agent. Perhaps Garrard was simply jealous of not being a party to the profits being made through land subdivision and income from mandatory

⁷⁵ *Evening News*, 2nd February, 1886, p. 5.

⁷⁶ *Freeman’s Journal*, 6th February, 1886, p. 15.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*

resumptions? The criticism against Whitton was as equally strange because Whitton actually agreed with Garrard's views and Whitton was doing only what he was told to do by his political masters. It is noteworthy, however, that Whitton did not refuse point-blank to build the North Shore line, to which he objected, as he had done in 1864 when he refused to have anything to do with the light-weight railway between Blacktown and Richmond.

Garrard was not a member of Henry Parkes' faction in 1886 and that may explain his opposition to the North Shore railway but Garrard's comments were not the end of unusual statements in 1886.

March, 1886, witnessed a "strong deputation" to the Minister for Public Works, William Lyne, to ask that the railway be constructed from Pearce's Corner to the "North Shore." The one person that everyone would expect to be present, Henry Parkes, was not amongst the deputation members. However, the second representative for the St. Leonards District who had been elected at the 1885 election was Isaac Ives, who held the seat until 1887 when the electorate was changed to a single member and was held by Henry Parkes. The Mayor of St. Leonards, the Mayor of Victoria and the Mayor of North Willoughby as well as Ives were present. They told the Minister that a public meeting had been held in late February which listed the following "reasons" for the construction of the line:

- land along the proposed route was rising in value daily, thus increasing the cost of resumption,
- the proposed line formed an important link in the railway system of the colony,
- the construction of the line would "open up the most beautiful, attractive and productive district existing within any miles of the city",
- the deepwater of the North side of Port Jackson could not be fully utilised until the line was constructed,
- the use of the line to bring coal from the Hunter area to Port Jackson,
- suburban lines had proved themselves to be the best paying lines in the colony,
- &
- the line had been approved by Parliament and its immediate construction had been promised by every government during the last five or six years.

The Minister replied that a delay had occurred but tenders were invited and "there the matter ended until now." Insufficient funds had been made available for resumption of land. Lyne stated that acceptance of the tenders was delayed in consequence of the large cost of resumption and requested that plan holders give their holdings to the government rather than seeking payment. In so doing, he said "a great objection to the

line would be removed". The Minister noted that some landholders had already offered their land free of cost but he said that "a great deal too much had been paid by the Government for reserved land and as far as possible he would have the system of owners giving land carried out." Lyne mentioned that the Government was considering another site for shipping coal – at Long Nose Point – and that might render the Ball's Head proposal unnecessary.⁷⁸

It was bad enough that Parkes did not attend the March deputation to the Minister for Public Works but that was not the end of his poor judgement. In November of 1886, Parkes disappointed many of his supporters in a speech at St. Leonards in which he argued the case for sale of the whole New South Wales railway system to private enterprise.⁷⁹ In support of his argument, he told his electors about the many railway lines that had been built that were unprofitable and that too much money had been borrowed for their construction and maintenance. Clearly, he did not think the North Shore railway would be amongst the loss making enterprises. He was mistaken. In their *Annual Report* for the year ended 30th June, 1894, the Railway Commissioners had listed the North Shore line as one of 17 non-paying lines.⁸⁰ At least, the concept of selling the railways to private enterprise was consistent with Parkes' involvement in the Free Trade Party, which was established in 1887.

1887 TENDERS CALLED FOR THE SECOND TIME

In early, 1887, there was a high level of sustained, public protest about the lack of action by the Government to proceed with the North Shore railway. In April, after yet another deputation to the Minister for Public Works, the Government announced that it would proceed to tender for a second time, the first time was in 1885.⁸¹ In addition to the on-going protests of residents and property developers, the Government was mindful of the need to employ the large number of unskilled labourers who had lost their jobs as a result of the overall slowdown in the extension of the Colonial rail network.

The tender box was opened on 7th June when it was discovered that 13 contractors had submitted tenders.⁸² On 24th June, 1887, Cabinet accepted a tender from Edward Pritchard for the construction of the North Shore railway "at once" from "Crows Nest" to "Pearces Corner" with the contract completion date of 31st December, 1888.⁸³ The way the tender was expressed was unusual as the traditional form dictated that the first station to be mentioned was the point closer to Sydney and the second location

⁷⁸ *Globe*, 23rd March, 1886, p. 5.

⁷⁹ *Freeman's Journal*, 13th November, 1886, p. 9.

⁸⁰ J. Gunn, *Along Parallel Lines*, Melbourne University Press, 1989, p. 226.

⁸¹ *Newcastle Morning Herald and Miners' Advocate*, 28th April, 1887, p. 5.

⁸² *Sydney Morning Herald*, 8th June, 1887, p. 9.

⁸³ *Australian Town and Country Journal*, 2nd July, 1887, p. 31.

mentioned would be the terminus. In this case, the terminus was mentioned first and the junction of the Main North line at Hornsby, being further away from Sydney, came second.

The proposed line had been truncated back to the present site of St. Leonards station, rather than the cable tram terminus at Crows Nest.⁸⁴ The tender was subject to settlement of land acquisitions, this being a very important aspect as not all landholders had agreed to financial settlement amounts. A lot of land had been given without cost, no doubt in the hope of large monetary windfalls from later subdivision. Within one month, the contractor was reported as being “exceedingly expeditious in making arrangements and getting the necessary plant upon the ground.”⁸⁵ Pritchard’s tender excluded the erection of platform buildings and houses for Station Masters and a separate tender was issued in 1888 for these structures. This accorded with the policy of the time of separating in the tender process the provision of structures from the building of the permanent way. Different sized buildings were intended for stations, depending on an assessment of likely traffic. For example, at Turramurra, the tender called for the erection of a waiting shed and a ticket office but no goods shed while at Gordon a passenger station and goods shed were to be provided.⁸⁶ At that time, the proposed railway line was officially called the Hornsby to St. Leonards Railway.

On 27th June, 1887, the list of approximately 157 property owners, both organisations and individuals, who were to be affected by land resumptions was provided for a second time in the *Sydney Morning Herald*, the first time being 4th December, 1885.⁸⁷ In the article, the *Herald* reporter stated that “about two and a half years ago, Sir Henry Parkes objected to the line on the grounds that it went through private property owned by Members of Parliament, that the detour was unnecessary and that it almost excited the suspicion that it was carried in that direction because it went through private property. The book of reference shows that considerable quantities of land required already belongs to the Crown.”⁸⁸ Although the specific “detour” is unknown, the evidence confirms that Parkes was using the provision of the railway as a political play thing to suit his own vested, political ends.

On 8th July, 1887, the Commissioner for Railways approved the insertion of a notice in the Government Gazette setting out the intention to proceed with the railway as far as St. Leonards, being a distance of 10 miles, 69 chains and 35 links. The notice invited

⁸⁴ W. H. Polglase, *St. Leonards Railway Station*, privately published, no details, p. 6.

⁸⁵ *Evening News*, 25th July, 1887, p. 6.

⁸⁶ Government Gazette, 25th September, 1888, p. 6752. Tenders closed for the Turramurra structures on 26 September, 1888 and on 3rd October, 1888, for the buildings at Gordon.

⁸⁷ *Sydney Morning Herald*, 27th June, 1887, p. 3.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*

people who had “any well-grounded objection that may have appeared to them to exist to the making of the said railway, or to the erection of the said works” to write to the Commissioner setting out the objections within one month.⁸⁹

Based on the timing of the next event, it would seem that no objections were received or, if any were received, they were dismissed quickly. The ceremony for the usual turning of the first sod occurred on 10th August, 1887, at Gore Hill, making it one of very few instances in NSW railway history of such an event occurred at the destination rather than the origin of the proposed project.⁹⁰ At least the place of the turning of the first sod accorded with the unusual order of locations expressed in the tender. One of the local Members, Sir Henry Parkes, was present and one of his daughters undertook the ritual. No Railway Department officials were reported as being present.⁹¹ One newspaper described the party at the ceremony as a “large and influential gathering”, including “the leading men of North Shore”.⁹²

On 24th July, 1888, Royal Assent was received for the provision of £70,500 for the railway as far as “Crows Nest.”⁹³ So, when tenders were called and approved in June, 1887, and when the turning of the first sod occurred in August, 1887, no money had been approved for construction. Yet, physical work commenced. How come? When the local Member of Parliament is the Premier, magic happens.

POLITICIANS REJECT DEPARTMENTAL ADVICE

Time and space are closely inter-related and the opening of the North Shore line in 1890 was one of those events that transcended both dimensions. Up to 1888, railway construction was determined by a mixture of decisions from public servants and politicians. In 1887, Henry Parkes, the Colonial Premier, was under much public scrutiny for possible deceitful conduct and, in order to deflect criticism away from him, he decided to announce a new way to approve the construction of new railway lines and manage the NSW Railways. He basically stole the idea but not the content of legislation from the Colony of Victoria, which had implemented such legislation in 1884. Parkes even adopted the idea of the Victorian government that the Colonial Treasurer should be responsible for railways, not the Minister for Public Works.

⁸⁹ *NSW Government Gazette*, 8th July, 1887, p. 4443.

⁹⁰ The only other instance known to the author was the extension from Temora to Wyalong in 1903.

⁹¹ *Sydney Mail and NSW Advertiser*, 13th August, 1887, p. 344 and One newspaper described the party at the ceremony as a “large and influential gathering”, including “the leading men of North Shore”.⁹¹

⁹² *The Protestant Standard*, 13th August, 1887, p. 9.

⁹³ Public Loans Act No. 17, 1888.

In 1888, the NSW Parliament passed legislation that stopped public servants from involvement in the decision making about new railway lines.⁹⁴ Now, politicians had the sole right to decide when and where lines were to be built. In a tricky way, Parkes' alleged promise to stop railway corruption in fact made it easier than ever for politicians to dominate the process. Thus, the decision to build the North Shore railway, had it not been approved in 1885, was to be totally the responsibility of Parliament or, more precisely, a dominant group of politicians within Parliament.

With the influence of railway officials reduced as a result of the 1888 Government Railways Act, it was left to the engineers to build a railway on the North Shore. As Schieldrop wrote, "the engineer builds what he has set to build, and takes his orders from the man who pays him".⁹⁵ He adds that "he fights his battles with Nature which he must combat, and natural obstacles which he must overcome".⁹⁶

In addition to removing power from public servants and into the hands of politicians, there was an added benefit for Parliamentarians in the creation of the Standing Committee on Public Works, which would consider and recommend/reject construction of lines. From 1889, Members of the New South Wales Parliament received remuneration for the first time. Politicians now were convinced that what they spoke and thought mattered more than ever before because they were now paid for doing no more than they had been doing prior to 1889. It was the creation of the Public Works Standing Committee, with all the time and effort required to take evidence near and far, the previous year that prompted Members of Parliament to vote themselves payment for their time. The Committee members were paid additionally for the hours spent on Committee deliberations. It was a case of more power and more talking resulting in more money for Members.

Trams were the mode of choice by both engineers and some politicians to serve as existing urban development in Sydney. Parkes' legislation had another devious side to it. As the Railway Commissioners were allegedly free of Parliament in relation to operations, Parkes was able to continually reply to Parliamentary Questions by pointing out that "members had no right to demand direct answerability of the Commissioners through Parliamentary questions, and that the Minister was a channel of communication who could not be compelled to answer".⁹⁷ In this quotation, Parkes was reminding his fellow Parliamentarians that he held power and was not accountable in Parliament for what he said or did.

⁹⁴ R. Lee, *The Greatest Public Work – the NSW Railways 1848-1889*, Sydney, Hale & Iremonger, 1988, p. 116

⁹⁵ E.B. Schieldrop, *The Railway*, London, Hutchinson, 1956, p. 20

⁹⁶ *ibid.*

⁹⁷ R.L. Wettenhall, "Quangos, Quagos and the Problem of Non-Ministerial Organisation", in G.R. Curnow & C. A. Saunders (Eds.), *Quangos – the Australian Experience*, Sydney, Hale & Iremonger, 1983, p. 18

In relation to Sydney, evidence of political favouritism was reliably seen in the provision of railway lines rather than the use of tram lines. This was the case with the Illawarra line in the 1880s, the Belmore line in the 1890s and the various attempts for an Eastern Suburbs Railway. The strong link between property development and railways was evident on all government railway lines in Sydney and also in the decision by property developers to build a private railway to Carlingford in the 1890s. The link between property developers and railways was also evident not so long ago in the demolition of the then existing stations and the provision of air right developments at North Sydney, St. Leonards and Chatswood stations.

As one would expect, there was no direct statement by Henry Parkes or others that indicated that they acted to help their mates but the evidence by which researchers are able to balance the spoken word against physical fabric allows the researcher to investigate a line of enquiry which Parkes and his supporters did not contemplate in their time – the physical evidence. Both ends of the North Shore railway were the subject of political interference. The actual physical location of the turnout at Hornsby for the new branch line provided evidence of the role of politics. The North Shore line diverges from the main northern line at Hornsby but the location for the actual junction station was moved from the present Normanhurst to its current location in order to maximise the interests of land developers in the region. The provision of the southern terminus at St. Leonards also witnessed the role of politics. The location of the terminus was still unknown to railway engineers when construction started. As an interim measure, the Government stopped the railway in a “bog at the foot of a mountain” three miles distant from the cable tramway that served the Lower North Shore from Milsons Point.⁹⁸ Such a statement was not a shock as the North Shore line had been described in 1874 as a railway “from nowhere to nowhere”.⁹⁹

The absence of a broad historical consciousness in Australia may or may not be intentional by the political leaders of the nation. Brady wrote, in relation to the 100 years that it took to build the Eastern Suburbs Railway in Sydney, that “expediency is an endless and useful tool of the adroit politician.”¹⁰⁰ Let us give the present politicians the benefit of the doubt and say that they have not intentionally manipulated the minds of their constituents to eliminate any historical consciousness. However, it is quite possible that they have discovered that there is not widespread public interest in Australian history and that they have realised that it is in the interests of those who hold political power simply not to improve the level of general education to a point where people remember that some things were better in the past than at present. For

⁹⁸ Freeman's Journal, quoted in E. Russell, *The Opposite Shore*, Surry Hills, John Ferguson Ltd, 1990, p. 142

⁹⁹ Quoted in no author, *Focus on Ku-ring-gai*, Gordon, Ku-ring-gai Historical Society, 1996, p. 13

¹⁰⁰ I. Brady, *Eastern Suburbs Railway*, St. James, Australian Railway Historical Society, 1979, p. 3

example, in rail transport, there is not any passenger train operating in Sydney to a faster timetable than was the case 20 years ago. Worse still, steam trains operated faster services to most destinations 80-100 years ago than exist today. More trains stopped at Artarmon platform in 2005 than they did in 2008. These are not statistics that are helpful to establishing community sympathy towards today's political leaders, who probably have a vested interest in discouraging any historical consciousness amongst the voting electorate. In this way, politicians use time to create a division of awareness between the present and past.

7 MUDDLED RAILWAY MANAGEMENT

TRAMWAYS VERSUS RAILWAYS

The majority of residents on the North Shore initially lived in the area around the present North Sydney, Willoughby, Naremburn and St. Leonards. There was a small population at Chatswood and only scattered homes with a very low density north of Chatswood. John Whitton, a local resident and Engineer-in-Chief for Railway Construction, maintained that the area could best be served by a steam tramway just like other parts of Sydney and elsewhere. Whitton was an astute reader of town dynamics and approved station designs which he considered reflected the social status of the centres they were intended to serve. However, in his own area he got it wrong, not because he misjudged the size of the centres to be served but because he under-estimated the power of the politics of the place.

The history of the North Shore is part of the epoch that followed European domination of Australia after 1788. Jeans wrote that “any system of land tenure requires preconceptions of social patterns, natural environment and the desirable spatial order of society.”¹⁰¹ The North Shore railway was another example of politicians using a public work to maximise political advantage and, applying Brady’s language, was an expediency.

Before the railway arrived at St. Leonards in 1890, there was evidence to the residents of Sydney that the North Shore was a place where people of status lived. The outstanding evidence of this was the opening of the first cable tramway in 1886 from Milsons Point towards St. Leonards. Not only was the tram built, but the line terminated in a magnificent arched terminal station that allowed undercover transfers between tram and ferry. This was the first time that people could interchange between modes in all weathers. The next time this was achieved in Sydney was 20 years later when the present Central railway station was opened in 1906. The people of the North Shore did not have to endure noisy, smoky steam trams like other suburbs. While the hills at North Sydney were too steep for convention tram operation, the matter of the fact is that the North Shore residents enjoyed a superior level of transport and intermodal transfer. The cable tram operation was so successful that Premier, Henry Parkes, said in 1888 that his Government was determined to replace steam trams in all other Sydney

¹⁰¹ D.N. Jeans “The impress of Central Authority Upon the Landscape: Southeastern Australia 1788-1850” in J.M. Powell & M. Williams, Eds., *Australian Space Australian Time*, Melbourne, Oxford University Press, 1975, p. 15

suburbs as soon as possible.¹⁰² No such replacement occurred and the North Shore retained its privileged position along with the Eastern Suburbs, it being another geographic area for wealthy Sydneyites.

Apart from Chief Engineer Whitton, Railway Commissioner Goodchap and Minister Jacob Garrard, there was never anyone on the North Shore who desired anything but a railway hauled by steam locomotives. William McMahon was one such influential resident who reflected the dominant attitude. He welcomed the cable tram in 1886 but insisted that the area needed a railway.¹⁰³ The virtual unanimous support for a railway was important because it showed the way governments were able to reflect social structure by the type of transport mode, in addition to the provision of ornamental buildings and other railway accoutrement. The Illawarra line to Hurstville had received large and elaborate platform structures when the line was opened in 1884 but the line passed through areas of relatively larger populations and more advanced plans for residential development. In the case of the North Shore line, there was only a relatively small population between the terminal points of Hornsby and St. Leonards in 1890. For example, in 1891 the density of population of the suburbs north of Sydney Harbour was 0.30 persons per acre, compared to 32 for the City of Sydney and 1.6 for the suburbs south of Sydney Harbour.¹⁰⁴ The use of heavy iron rails on which heavy steam locomotives pulled multiple carriages for very few people was a clear statement that the NSW Government willingly fashioned the social atlas of Sydney by using its authority to decide transport modes and the location of heavy rail corridors.

THE PATTERN OF POOR DECISION-MAKING

The construction and history of the development of the North Shore line is a story which contains many examples of management incompetence. There is a pattern of events that relates to decision-making in the NSW railway administration which suggests an ongoing disability to expend public funds unwisely. Table 7.1 below sets out the evidence.

TABLE 7.1 EVENTS THAT SUGGEST CONSISTENT POOR DECISION MAKING

YEAR	EVENT AND COMMENT
1887	Decision to pass over an experience contractor in favour of a new contractor, the latter whom failed to start the project and requiring fresh tenders to be called

¹⁰² D. Burke, *Juggernaut a Story of Sydney in the Wild Days of the Steam Trams*, East Roseville, 1997, p. 92

¹⁰³ J. Lawrence, *Pictorial History – Lavender Bay to The Spit*, Alexandria, Kingsclear Books, 1999, p. 13

¹⁰⁴ J.J. Bradfield, "Linking Sydney with North Sydney" in L. Coltheart & D. Fraser, *Landmarks in Public Works*, Sydney, Hale & Iremonger, 1987, p.110.

YEAR	EVENT AND COMMENT
1889	Termination of the North Shore line in a paddock without connection to the cable tram system – rail line described as “an expensive and largely useless railway” (Jones, p. 145)
1890	Absence of a run-round loop at Hornsby to allow a locomotive to change ends of a train
1890	Change of position at St. Leonards of the lever pit after the first one had been in service three weeks
1890	The provision of a station at Pymble was an “after-thought” and was the only occasion in NSW railways of an existing house being used as a station
1890	One month after the opening, staff were removed from Turramurra and Gordon
1890	The passing loop at Pymble was so short that only a loco and van could be placed there
1890	Incompletion of the terminal platform buildings and Station Master’s house at St. Leonards
1891	Introduction of the 11 class locomotive proved to be unsuccessful
1893	Lavender Bay layout “most unusual”
1893	Bay road station “unique”, with waiting room in overhead booking office and not on platforms
1893	Wollstonecraft provided with signals but not used until 1910
1893	The locomotive turntable at Milsons Point was “superfluous” as most engines did not require turning
1893	Electric trams introduced on North Shore on line to Mosman but not used for extension of the cable system, which was converted in 1900
1896	Platforms provided at Roseville on both sides of the single line described as a “freak arrangement”
1899	Plans for new site for Artarmon prepared but allows access only from western side of line – local council protests and subway not extended to eastern side until 1903
1900	Artarmon station was abandoned two years after opening and relocated to a new site
1903	Chief Commissioner proposed to electrify the North Shore line in order to utilise the abandoned power station that was built for the cable tram system but decides to stick with steam and orders large quantities of 30 class
1907	Work started to provide a new station at Artarmon but not achieved until 1916
1910	Access at Wollstonecraft changed and stepways to both platforms

YEAR	EVENT AND COMMENT
	removed and steelwork for proposed overhead booking office removed - new access provided by a new subway
1910	All stations between Chatswood and Warrawee have same design of platform structure but no two platform buildings have same measurements
1911	Duplication of tram line to Chatswood from Milsons Point commenced but not completed until 1934
1915	A new station at Lavender Bay opened only for six weeks and, after public protests, old station used until 1924 – was the station with the shortest life on the NSW rail system until it was re-opened between 1924 and 1932 – the only station to be opened, closed and re-opened using exactly the same buildings at the same location
1916	The only time a brick platform building was relocated on the NSW rail system – from Old Glenbrook to Artarmon
1918	Two arm lower quadrant automatic signals installed in 1914 replaced by three arm upper quadrant automatic signals between Lavender Bay and Bay Road – it was 10 years before further replacements were made along the line
1919	Side platform at Chatswood erected but “little used”
1920	Quadruplication earthworks undertaken from Waverton to Chatswood but extra lines not built
1920	Steel-bodied carriages introduced on line but were too heavy for 30 class locomotives, requiring alterations to both rollingstock and engines
1920	Selection of North Shore line to be first line electrified but there is a failure to produce infrastructure in time for installation – Illawarra line subsequently selected as first electric line
1925	North Sydney goods siding provided but “little used” and closed in 1931
1.7.1927	Date selected for full operation of electric trains on North Shore line but not achieved until 15.7.1928
1943-45	Re-grading of line occurs at several locations – no regrading done for steam locomotives – labour intensive work when labour was in short supply
1945	New meal and locker accommodation provided at Lavender Bay for male cleaning and other staff added to existing carpenter’s shed – this and 1942 female accommodation done when labour was in short supply
1974	Chief Commissioner announced quadruplication between North Sydney and Chatswood and is again announced in 2006 without any work taking place
1989	Press and public outrage at selection of elite Artarmon station chosen

YEAR	EVENT AND COMMENT
	for first location to receive “Station Sparkle “programme
1989	Temporary station planned and erected at St. Leonards and in use to 2000 – longest use of a temporary station in NSW rail history
1991	Staff at Artarmon receive dedicated staff toilet after protest at omission in 1989 alterations
1996	Provide a store room in the roof cavity in contravention of OH&S requirements – store removed in 2006
2002	New Millennium trains unable to operate on North Shore line because of insufficient available power – new sub-station built at Waverton in 2007/08
2015	Provision of an ugly lift bridge that ruined the station ambience and local streetscape

Table 7.1 above demonstrates that there is a pattern of consistent, long-term poor decision making in the NSW rail administration. This pattern is consistent with evidence relating to other aspects of train operations in NSW.¹⁰⁵ Although the NSW Railways was a large bureaucracy with numerous levels of management and supervision, there existed considerable opportunities in relation to the provision of fixed infrastructure to make a high level of poor decisions involving the on-going waste of public funds. There is much evidence to conclude that the organisation’s first priority was to sustain its own existence and little attention was paid to the level of competency of many of its management staff and to the wisdom of its capital works expenditure.

While construction work was underway at the present site of St. Leonards station in 1887, the Government was still surveying three routes - one to Cremorne, a second to Blues Point and a third to Milsons Point.¹⁰⁶ The Engineer-in-Chief, John Whitton, had inspected the three alternatives and recommended the line be taken to Milsons Point on the basis that it may be possible to take trams with their passengers on a ferry across Sydney Harbour to Circular Quay. Perhaps Whitton was joking; perhaps he was serious or perhaps he was exacting departmental revenge – something that he and other senior officers had done on a few occasions – because the New South Wales Government did not accept his proposal for a tramway rather than a railway. While the line was extended to Milsons Point, trams across Sydney Harbour to wait until a bridge was opened in 1932.

¹⁰⁵ See S. Sharp, *Destined to Fail - Management of the NSW Railways 1877-1995*, unpublished PhD thesis, University of Sydney, 1999, Vols. 1 and 2.

¹⁰⁶ *Sydney Morning Herald*, 22nd March, 1887, p. 7.

8 THE OPENING OF THE NORTH SHORE LINE - 1890

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE LINE OPENING

The branch line between Hornsby and St. Leonards opened on 1st January, 1890. The contract time for construction had been 18 months but this turned out to be 30 months or a construction rate of one mile every three months. Why so slow? The answer is found in the limited amount of capital funds available.

How many other railway lines were open for passenger traffic in 1890? None is the answer. How many were opened in 1891? None is again the answer. The next public railway line opened after the North Shore line was in April, 1892, and involved a mere three miles of track between Yass Junction and Yass Town. When was the last line opened before the North Shore line? It was eight months when the line between Michelago and Cooma was opened. The significance of the opening of the North Shore line is reflected in the knowledge that it was the only passenger line opened for a three-year period between May, 1889 and April, 1892. What was the reason for such limited rail construction activity between 1889 and 1892? Money or rather the lack of it is the answer.

Not only was the shortage of money reflected in the paucity of the construction of new railway lines, it is also shown in the decisions by John Whitton in relation to the provision of infrastructure on the line between Hornsby and St. Leonards. The following is a list of those aspects of construction that demonstrated a shortage of capital money:

- the near-exclusive use of timber for all buildings, including residences, for all stations except the terminus and all residences except those at Turramurra, Chatswood and St. Leonards,
- the re-use of the office for the Resident Engineer at Gordon as a residence for the Station Master,
- the use of the cheapest building design for the unattended stations, featuring for the first time the use of the single-pitched roof sloping to the rail head with a minimal, three-feet wide platform awning,
- the location of the residence for the Station Master on a much elevated position on the then Lane Cove Road, compared to the location of the platform (in order to save money in the provision of a road to the residence),

- the elimination of most gatehouses “for the unusually large number of level crossings”, except for one built at Chatswood and one proposed but not built at Pymble,¹⁰⁷
- the highly unusual utilisation of an existing house at Pymble to act as a ticket office and an existing cottage at Wahroonga as a residence for a gatekeeper,¹⁰⁸
- the large number of unattended stations – representing 50%, compared to the 1884 Erskineville-Hurstville line where there were no unattended stations,
- the provision of only two intermediate “passenger stations” – at Gordon and Chatswood, the remainder having more primitive structures called waiting sheds,
- the use of the small version of “passenger station”, measuring 33 feet in length, at Gordon and Chatswood, compared to the standard length of 55 feet used at St. Leonards,
- the absence of a porched entry from the road side of the “passenger stations”,
- the use of three-rail fencing at St. Leonards station, rather than the use of the prettier picket fencing applied to important stations,
- the incompleteness of the terminus platform building and the Station Master’s residence at the time of the line opening,
- the selection of the “temporary” terminus some three miles short of the intended destination.

The above standards adopted for the line clearly demonstrated that very restricted funding was applied to the infrastructure, in complete contrast to the large and magnificent structures that existed at every station on the 1884 line to Hurstville. The construction of the North Shore line had been approved under considerable pressure by the powerful owners of the land, many of whom were politicians. On that basis, it could be expected that the line should have had magnificent grand and attractive platform buildings and residences but this did not occur. Why? Perhaps John Whitton convinced his political superiors that money was really tight or that he was using that argument as a ruse to exercise departmental revenge. After all, the politicians approved the use of a railway against his wishes. It can safely be said that all the players – politicians and public servants – displayed the extent of their powers in the opening of the line.

Although the line to St. Leonards showed evidence of limited capital funds, there was a number of features about the construction of the line which marked the project as a transition from the days of John Whitton to the time of his successor, Henry Deane. These features were:

¹⁰⁷ There was no gatekeeper at Pymble as the Pymble Progress Association requested one in 1902. See *Sydney Morning Herald*, 18th October, 1902, p. 9.

¹⁰⁸ *Evening News*, 1st January, 1890, p. 6.

- the use of a new design for small stations, namely the application of the single-pitched roof sloping towards the line,
- the use of a new design for residences for Station Masters with the movement away from the use of roofs with symmetrically placed chimneys to smaller structures featuring gabled roofs and often asymmetrically placed chimneys,
- the increasing use of concrete, for culverts and building foundations,
- the large number of road overbridges, being 13 in total, compared to the rare use of road overbridges on previously built new lines,
- the substantial reduction in the number of gatehouses,
- the line being the last occasion when John Whitton's frequently used design, featuring a pyramidal roof, was used and it was used unusually for the residence of the Station Master at Chatswood, rather than the normal use for a gatekeeper,
- the floor plan of the terminal building at St. Leonards with the female toilets located between the main structure and the male toilet, compared to the previous arrangement of including the female toilets within the ladies' waiting room,
- the use of "air closets" for all toilet cubicles (to allow the discharge of unpleasant odours to the atmosphere), noticeable by the high terracotta air vents above each closet, &
- the use of both underground and aboveground freshwater tanks, previous stations and residences featuring below ground tanks exclusively.

These transitional features were measures of seeing the world differently through new bureaucratic eyes in powerful positions and were in themselves evidence of the significance of innovation at a time when capital funding was not plentiful.

There is one statistic that does not support the argument that funds were tight and that indicator is the number of stations on the line. No railway line previously opened had the stations so close together, representing an average station-to-station distance of 1.25 miles. Even the blatant politically funded line to Hurstville had stations set at an average of 1.5 miles. Perhaps Whitton was told what stations would be provided and the high number of stations probably reflects the powerful people who owned land at those locations along the line. The relatively high number of stations meant that lower levels of funds were available for essential infrastructure at each station.

THE STRANGE DECISION TO TERMINATE THE LINE IN A Paddock

The 1890 terminus of the North Shore line was not located at an urban centre but in a rural paddock. The line was the first line to be built in Sydney where the dominant, long term traffic was intended to be people. Urban structure and the creation of suburbs in

most modern cities owe their existence to the provision of railways.¹⁰⁹ The development of the North Shore was directly related to the actions of land developers and it was these people who were able to obtain political favours from a range of 19th century political figures, such as Premiers Henry Parkes and George Reid.

The pattern of railway goods facilities on the North Shore line demonstrated that our forefathers misused public funds to not only build the line in 1890 but to provide for its initial operation. One telling item of evidence that reflects the paucity of potential for freight traffic on the line is the 1888 parish map of Willoughby which describes the railway as “passenger railway line.”¹¹⁰ Crawford has referred to the speculative nature of urban and suburban development leading up to the 1890s Depression.¹¹¹ He said that the speculation rested on the assumption of continued prosperity. The extent of local goods traffic taken by rail from the North Shore line was minimal. All sidings except the North Shore Brick and Tile Co at St. Leonards were primarily used for inward traffic. A railway that went nowhere and served virtually no freight purpose, such as the North Shore line, was certainly in the class of speculative lines, even apart from the known links to local property developers.

The construction of the North Shore line does not mean much to many people alive today, apart from providing a local mode of transport. However, it does have meaning in an unconscious fashion because, like all lines before it and most after it, the North Shore railway was approved and constructed as testament to the dominance of political power over sound financial government. The rest of the residents in Sydney and elsewhere paid through their taxes to provide a transport system for a small elite group of land developers on the North Shore.

Since all railways opened prior to the North Shore line went from somewhere specific and arrived at another specific place, the construction of the North Shore line was inconsistent with previous railways in NSW. There was no consensus of the immediate destination and no agreement on the route between St. Leonards and the Harbour. The line terminated in an open paddock distant from any connecting mode of transport. The line was the only section of track up to that time to be built exclusively towards Sydney, rather than being constructed away from Sydney. All previous lines were built radiating from Sydney like extensions of an octopus’s tentacles. All branch line junctions with main lines, except Morpeth Junction between 1864 and 1915, faced towards Sydney. Not so the junction for the branch line to St. Leonards. The junction at Hornsby faced towards Newcastle. Such junctions were provided subsequently at a number of country locations, like Galong for the Boorowa line, Moree for the Inverell line and The Rock for

¹⁰⁹ L. Mumford, *The City in History*, Ringwood, Penguin Books, 1961, p. 573

¹¹⁰ A copy of the map is in W. H. Polglase, *St. Leonards Railway Station*, privately published, no details, Figure 4.1.

¹¹¹ R.M. Crawford, *Australia*, Third Ed., London, Melbourne University Press, 1970, p. 123

the Westby line but the junction at Hornsby is the only such remaining junction of a branch line existing in NSW. The physical characteristics of the line identify it as a hiatus in design and construction policy.

PHYSICAL FEATURES OF THE NORTH SHORE LINE

The North Shore Railway was constructed mostly along the ridge of a line of hills and gullies. This feature had been used for the Great Western Railway over the Blue Mountains. Strangely, both lines had other features in common. The Blue Mountains and the North Shore were perceived by Sydneysiders as places to escape Summer temperatures and to enjoy cooler climates. The elite component of Sydney society lived some of the time in the two regions. More importantly, both railways were constructed with the vaguest notions of the ultimate termini. Once the Great Western Railway had reached its first target of Bathurst and nearly reached the second target of the Darling River, there continued to be much interest about dreams of constructing the line to some inland Nirvana in the centre of Australia. Interestingly, and like the North Shore line, the terminus never reached the Darling River, stopping about four miles short of the River wharves at Bourke. Both were lines based on dreams where track construction stopped to ponder the direction of both the dreams and the lines.

Kilmartin and Thorns have argued that urban societies in Australia must be seen with an historical perspective.¹¹² The residential development of the North Shore of Sydney is understood by the decisions of politicians to provide a railway line to encourage the construction of suburban houses on estates owned directly by the politicians and/or their mates. The decision to plan the construction of the North Shore railway as virtually a straight line from the Sydney CBD was consistent with the then prevailing pattern of building rail lines in straight lines to the west in 1855 and the Illawarra coast in 1884. These three lines have been described as “tentacles of suburban building and led to a “finger-like pattern of city growth”.¹¹³

Sydney has a hilly topography in many parts but the North Shore line was the first and only railway line to be built in a hilly part of Sydney. The existence of hills attracted wealthy residents and the North Shore line was the only suburban line in Sydney to be associated with the elite in Sydney's society, up until the opening of the Eastern Suburbs Railway in 1979. Richard Twopenny had observed in 1883 that Sydney was much hillier than Melbourne and that, because of this, “the suburbs of Sydney literally revel in beautiful building sites”.¹¹⁴ The railway provided access to these sites and, in so doing, stimulated residential development north of North Sydney, especially when

¹¹² L. Kilmartin & D. Thorns, *Cities Unlimited*, Sydney, George Allen & Unwin, 1978, p. 34

¹¹³ D.N. Jeans, *An Historical Geography of New South Wales to 1901*, Sydney, Reed Education, 1972, p. 302

¹¹⁴ R. Twopenny, *Town Life in Australia*, Facsimile Ed., Blackburn, The Dominion Press, 1976, p. 25

the line was extended to the Harbour's edge in 1893. The modal interchange between water and heavy rail transport occurred in Lavender Bay, which was one bay to the west of the similar interchange where the ferries of the Harbour connected to the cable tram serving North Sydney. It was thus the North Shore railway that caused the then suburb of North Sydney to stagnate in development until the 1950s, because people were able to take trains beyond North Sydney to more elevated locations.¹¹⁵ The railway's construction was linked to the physical and social identity of Sydney unlike any other railway line or other item of large, public infrastructure.

When the line opened in 1890, the stations were regarded officially of low importance. Like virtually every preceding branch railway line, there was no major manufacturing industry and no industry of any size had a private siding to serve it. It was many years before the existence of the line helped to expand any industry of size and virtually all of the industry was located between St. Leonards and Chatswood. Thus, very few important bonds were established between the railway administration and the local captains of industry.

It should not be overlooked that the economy of New South Wales was very small in comparison with England, European countries and America. Coghlan reported that there had been no increase in manufacturing in New South Wales in the 20 years from 1862.¹¹⁶ Brick making and tanning were popular industries near Artarmon but, as far as the latter is concerned, it was located on the lower North Shore simply because legislation in 1849 barred noxious industries from the City of Sydney.¹¹⁷ Morts Dock on Sydney Harbour was a relatively significant supplier of locomotives for the NSW Railways but the number it produced never required a direct rail siding into its works. Noxious industries also started at the same time around Botany Bay because of the push from the City and the pull towards a secure water supply. There was also a traditional push away from the elite suburb of Homebush when in the early 1890s the Government was proposing the establishment of an abattoir in the area and this issue was not resolved in the negative until 1895, by which time the North Shore railway line was opened to receive people concerned about the possible smelly business of killing cattle.¹¹⁸

The North Shore railway opened in 1890 but along with trains, stations and other infrastructure the railway brought an invisible, institutional framework. Immediately, the railway administration placed itself in the position of being and remaining the largest

¹¹⁵ J. Birmingham, *Leviathan – the unauthorised Biography of Sydney*, Milsons Point, vintage Books, 2000, p. 225

¹¹⁶ T.A. Coghlan, *Labour and Industry in Australia*, Vol. 3, Oxford University Press, 1918, p. 1201, reprinted by Macmillan, 1969

¹¹⁷ G.J.R. Linge, *Industrial Awakening*, Canberra, ANU Press, 1979, p. 500

¹¹⁸ *Sunday Times*, 15th August, 1897, p. 2.

landholder between Hornsby and Sydney Harbour. Moreover, it retained its property dominance as land in private ownership progressively was subdivided. For over 120 years, the railway organisation controlled all types of property development along, over and under the rail corridor. The NSW Government Railways in many ways controlled the nature and extent of land development for the entire railway and this was particularly important for any industrial undertaking which desired to obtain direct rail to the railway line for loading and unloading of freight. The railway organisation's development role was manifested by the construction of stations, residences and bridges of similar brown paint, officially called "stone". Structures were painted externally in the 19th century in a mostly uniform colour scheme and all station staff wore a standard dark blue uniform. However, none of these features was unique to the North Shore region.

Each station was graded by the NSW Railways according to the complexity of operations at the various locations. Artarmon, when it was built, was less important than St. Leonards and Chatswood where there was some shunting of the freight sidings. Staff were selected for each station on a seniority system and the station officers would expect to work at a number of city and country stations as they progressed through the ranks to reach senior positions. The North Shore stations were regarded just as other stations on the system and the area was not allocated special staff simply because the stations were on the North Shore line. A major feature of the staffing system was its egalitarian basis, which provided opportunities for all staff to be eligible for the top position of Commissioner, subject to being of the preferred religion of the time. Indeed, the very last Railway Commissioner, Neil McCusker rose from the lowest position of junior porter and worked his way to the top.

The North Shore before the opening of the railway line in 1890 was very much a place of bush, farms and very small settlements. There was little in terms of freight to be moved and an extremely small population. Those facts alone are indicators of the political basis for building the line. In a classic railway management tome, it was argued that there cannot be changes in a geographical area without changes in the railway organisation that serves it because of the interaction of the two entities.¹¹⁹ This was not the case for the North Shore line and the NSW Railways. While there has been a radical change in land use in the North Shore area between 1788 and today, the NSW railway organisation has not been affected nor changed to any extent to reflect the opening and operation of the North Shore line. The official railway network and bureaucracy just got a little bigger with the addition of a few more staff and a few more stations. The extension of the railway system to the physical space of the North Shore made only a small dint on the organisation of railway management.

¹¹⁹ W.V. Wood & J. Stamp, *Railways*, London, Thornton Butterworth, 1928, p. 9

THE SWING IN THE BALANCE OF POWER BETWEEN POLITICIANS AND BUREAUCRATS

While politicians had sole control of new lines after the passing of the Government Railways Act of 1888, they lost input into the manipulation of management of railway affairs on existing lines under the legislation. Anything that affected railway lines already built was under the control of railway bureaucrats and they continued to exercise sole discretion until 1952, when the NSW Labor Government legislated to allow political control of any matter relating to the railway system, either new or existing.¹²⁰ Thus, if any one wanted to construct a new station on the North Shore line after 1890, he or she had to convince the railway administration rather than the politicians.

The timing of the decision to seek Parliamentary approval to build the North Shore line is explained by Parkes' intention to introduce legislation in 1888 to remove political control. He wanted to strike in his own favour before he announced his political reform. The strength of the authority of Colonial politicians was reflected by the line opening on 1st January, 1890, at a time of funding shortages at the start of the 1890s Depression, though it had taken 30 months to complete the ten miles of track.¹²¹ As Robert Lee points out, only 87 km of new lines, including the Hornsby-St. Leonards branch, were under construction in 1888 and this was the lowest level in 15 years.¹²² The spatial shape of Sydney is related to the deeds of land speculators and their work is manifested, in part, by the physical construction of the North Shore line. The construction of the line formed no part of any formal urban planning process relating to the growth of Sydney.

By the time the railway had opened to St. Leonards in 1890, the NSW Government had established the statutory requirement for large expenditures of public funds to be submitted to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works. The extension of the line from St. Leonards to the water's edge in Sydney Harbour was approved in the first year of the Committee's operation – on 27th August, 1889 – and it was the third report completed by the Committee.

THE EXTENSION FROM ST. LEONARDS TO MILSONS POINT

On 1st August, 1889 the extension from St. Leonards to Milsons Point was referred by Parliament to the Standing Public Works Committee, which voted against the extension

¹²⁰ NSW Government, *Report of the Inquiry into Industrial Relations in the Public Transport Commission of NSW*, Sydney, 1980, p. 15

¹²¹ SRA, *Station Information A to F*, Unpublished Reference Manuscript, SRA Archives, 1997, p. 20

¹²² op. cit.

of the North Shore line in any direction from St. Leonards. The 13 members submitted their report on 11th December, 1889, with eight voting against the proposal and five for it. The Chairman, Joseph Abbott voted against the proposal. Influential politicians in Parliament were unhappy with the outcome and on 19th December, 1889, they moved to resubmit the proposed extension back to the Committee. On 1st May, 1890, the Legislative Assembly formerly referred the proposed extension back to the Committee for further consideration. The further consideration did not take long and the Committee submitted its report on 21st August, 1890, this time supporting the project. The Committee voted seven votes to four but this time the Chairman abstained from voting as he declared a vested interest as his property in the area would increase in value from the construction of the line. One member, George Cox, was absent when the vote was taken. Of the 13 members of the Standing Works Committee, only one seems to have either lived in or represented the North Shore. Luckily, that single member was important, being the Chairman, Joseph Palmer Abbott, who lived at Cammeray.

The Standing Committee noted “fresh evidence” and this specifically referred to a lowering of the cost. This fresh evidence was a letter from John Hay, one of the executors in the estate of the late David Berry who agreed to give land free of cost to the government. While Berry was alive, he wanted compensation for the large tract of resumed land. It seems the absence of the need to pay for land resumption, following his demise, was a significant factor.

The Committee decided to increase the severity of the minimum gradient from one in 40 to 1 in 50. The Railway Commissioners gave evidence that the line from Hornsby to St. Leonards was unprofitable but “the Commissioners look upon the district (between St. Leonards and Milsons Point) as a splendid one for residential purposes, and they expect that a big population will settle there.”¹²³ The Chief Traffic Manager of the New South Wales Railways, David Kirkcaldie, had not given evidence during the first enquiry but said at the second enquiry that he was of the opinion “that the line to Port Jackson was the only way of making it (i.e. the North Shore railway between Hornsby and St. Leonards) yield any returns.”¹²⁴

Parliamentary approval for the line extension was notified in the Government Gazette on 12th September, 1890, and the legislation received Royal Assent on 26th November, 1890. Interestingly, the Chairman of the Standing Committee, Joseph Abbott, was made Speaker of the Legislative Assembly in October, 1890, and held the position for the next ten years. Was this promotion payment for the Committee’s wise re-consideration of

¹²³ Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, Second Report. *Proposed Railway to Connect the North Shore Railway with Port Jackson at Milsons Point*, Sydney, Government Printer, 1890, p. 13.

¹²⁴ Ibid.

the North Shore railway extension? Grigor wrote that transport “responds to changing needs of users.”¹²⁵ There was no physical “changing need” in the case of the North Shore railway to explain why the Committee disapproved then approved the project. How then is it possible that such a policy turn-around could occur in relation to the work of the Standing Committee? The answer is money, or rather the need to spend less of it on this occasion.

Charles Goodchap, who had been the Commissioner for Railways up to 1888, described the North Shore line that terminated at St. Leonards as “an undesirable and disadvantageous line - a white elephant”.¹²⁶ Like John Whitton, the Engineer-in-Chief, Goodchap believed that a tramway extension was a more cost effective option than a heavy rail line. The advice of both men was ignored. It was Henry Parkes’ financial backer, Bruce Smith, who had moved in Parliament that the extension from St. Leonards to Sydney Harbour be reconsidered by the Public Works Committee and the Chairman of the Committee complained that Members of Parliament who had initially opposed the railway extension had been threatened from other “plum” Government positions because of their opposition.¹²⁷

It was reported in the press in November, 1889, that construction work on the railway line had been completed and the contractor was ready to hand over the project to the Railway Department.¹²⁸ There was only one problem. While trackwork and the work associated with building stations along the line had been completed, the construction of the platform building at St. Leonards and the residence for the Station Master had not been included in Edward Prichard’s contract. Plans were only dated on 9th September, 1889, and the contractor, William Refshange, did not sign the plan 8th November, 1889.¹²⁹ So, the terminal building for the railway was not completed by the line opening date of 1st January, 1890. Was this unusual? Certainly not!

Refshange was a Sydney builder and that is known because construction of buildings on the branch line to Corowa were advertised only in the Sydney press. Refshange was involved in the construction in 1892 of the five timber platform buildings at the intermediate stations on the branch line between Culcairn and Corowa, as well as the terminal brick building at Corowa. On that occasion, the outcome was even worse than occurred on the North Shore line. In the case of the Corowa branch line, he walked

¹²⁵ I.R. Grigor, “The Influence of Major Technological Innovations on Transport Systems: a Freight Example” in R.B. Potts (Ed.), *Transport in Australia*, Canberra, Australian Academy of Science, 1978, p. 84.

¹²⁶ Report of the Standing Committee, quoted in *ibid.*, p. 147.

¹²⁷ Muir, *Shady Acres*, *op. cit.* p. 340.

¹²⁸ *Newcastle Morning Herald and Miners’ Advocate*, 20th November, 1889, p. 5.

¹²⁹ It was announced in the *Evening News* of 29th October, 1889, p. 8 that Refshange had been the successful tenderer.

away from his contract and work on all the buildings had to be taken over by the well-known Contractor, Charles Hardy, who was based in Wagga Wagga. The North shore line and the Corowa branch line were the only two instances where Refshange was involved the construction of railway buildings in New South Wales. No wonder he was not awarded any further contracts.

Quite often, Engineer in Chief, John Whitton, saved money by pushing back completion of certain works until after they were handed over to the Railway Commissioner, who then had to pay for completion of structures out of his recurrent budget rather than Whitton's capital budget. It is hard to believe that Whitton would wait almost 18 months after the signing of Prichard's contract for the issue of the contract for the construction of the St. Leonards platform building and residence. There is a good chance that this was another case of departmental revenge by Whitton, who would have been upset when his advice in favour of a tramway over the railway was neglected. Some people in powerful positions also said nasty things about Whitton and the one thing that Whitton could do to display his own power was to ensure that the terminal building was incomplete for the opening of the railway.

The opening of the North Shore railway line was at the start of a period when politicians dominated the railway decision making process. Up until 1888, public servants were influential to varying degrees in the decision-making process and achieved some favourable outcomes. This was seen in John Whitton's influence to bypass the towns of Yass and Gundagai on the main southern line. He was also able to exclude himself from the government decision to use a system of light-weight equipment on the Blacktown-Richmond branch line in 1864. By the early 1880s, Whitton was being dominated by strong political factions. In spite of Henry Parkes' 1888 legislation to reform the decision making process, Parkes entrenched the concept of political manipulation in railway construction rather than eliminate it. The North Shore line was opened under that regime.

9 BETWEEN LINE OPENING AND THE ARTARMON STATION OPENING 1890-1898

THE POWER PLAYERS PLAY

Transport and politics have always been closely aligned in NSW. Indeed, students today can benefit from learning the history of Artarmon station by understanding the length of the links between the political and administrative arms of government and private industry. The nature of the public/private partnership occurred at three levels at Artarmon. The first was the conflict of interest by Government Ministers to ensure the North Shore railway was built through or adjacent to estates owned by key Ministers of the Crown. The second was the links between Members of Parliament supporting construction of the line and their direct links with land speculators. The third level of the partnership between the public and private sectors was the involvement of railway officials. In this last level, it was the Railway Commissioners who gave public evidence to a meeting of the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works that they “look upon the district as a splendid one for residential purposes and that they expect that a big population will settle there”.¹³⁰ This was a complete reversal of the position not a year previously when Henry Deane, the Chief Engineer, described the question of providing a passenger service as a “Ministerial afterthought”.¹³¹ In 1889, the Parliamentary Standing Works Committee was reminded about the necessity of commuters having to change between ferry, tram and trains on a journey from the city to the North Shore. Such a transfer involving three modes was described to the Committee as “fatal to the residential value of the district”. Despite the advice, the Committee initially declined to extend the railway the four kilometres from the St. Leonards rail terminus to the ferry terminal at Milsons Point.¹³²

Not a year later, the Parliamentary Committee reviewed its earlier decision and approved the construction of the four kilometre link between St. Leonards and Milsons Point. Clearly, prior to this second examination of the subject, the public officials and Members of Parliament had been told by senior Cabinet members to speak positively about the North Shore line and approve the link. This was the first time that the New South Wales Parliament had rejected the advice of its Standing Committee and the December, 1889, recommendation against construction of the extension was reversed in a second report by the Standing Committee on the same subject in August, 1890.

¹³⁰ *Evidence by David Kircaldie, Chief Traffic Manager, in NSW, Report of the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, Second Report, Proposed Railway to Connect the North Shore Railway with Port Jackson at Milson's Point, Sydney, Government Printer, 1890, p. 13*

¹³¹ *NSW, Report of the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, First Report, Proposed Railway to Connect the North Shore Railway with Port Jackson at Milson's Point, Sydney, Government Printer, 1889*

¹³² *ibid.*, p. 6

When the approval was read by Sydney-siders, they realised that it was the Government which was directly supporting the residential development of Artarmon and the North Shore generally.

INFRASTRUCTURE ON THE ST. LEONARDS-MILSONS POINT EXTENSION

Whereas the line from Hornsby to St. Leonards was under the supervision of John Whitton, as Engineer-in-Chief of Railway Construction, the extension from St. Leonards to Milsons Point was supervised by Whitton's replacement, Henry Deane. Deane had started working for the New South Wales Railways in 1880 and had assumed the top engineering position in 1889 when Whitton retired.¹³³

Design was under way in 1892 of the proposed terminus at Milsons Point, this being only the second application of Edwardian style awnings with wide fascias using vertical boarding but it was the first time since the 1871 approved second terminus for Sydney that awnings over the full length of platforms were used. The awnings were similar in appearance to those used on the other stations where buildings were erected in 1892 for quadruplication between Redfern and Homebush. With the opening of the new Strathfield station in 1900, all stations had a similar appearance on that part of the rail network. That was also the case for the Illawarra line between St. Peters and Hurstville, though the architectural style was different. In the 1890s, work commenced on rebuilding the platform structures north of Chatswood on the Milsons Point-Hornsby line to a similar design.

The single line between Strathfield and Hornsby was duplicated on 7th March, 1892 and duplication of the Main North remained at Hornsby until 1907 when an isolated duplicated section between Cowan and Boronia was opened, with the entire section between Hornsby and Hawkesbury River being duplicated by June, 1909. By 1910, the entire length of the North Shore line had been duplicated.

When the railway line was extended from St. Leonards to Milsons Point on the 1st May, 1893, the Railway Department erected platform buildings at Wollstonecraft and Waverton in timber, thus indicating a continued shortage of capital funding. Only two station plans were approved for new lines in 1891, one being on the North Shore extension. The first station south of St. Leonards was Wollstonecraft. While the date that Henry Deane, the new incumbent Engineer for Railway Construction, approved the plans for overhead booking and parcels office and platform buildings, the date is not expressed on the plans. There is a notation on the plan reading "copy to Mr. Hutchinson 14/11/91 and to contractor 26/11/91". William Hutchinson was Deane's second in charge. Andrew and George Eaton, the successful contractors, did not sign the plans until 5th December, 1892, over a year after the plans were dispatched from

¹³³ *The Sydney Mail and NSW Advertiser*, 11th November, 1893, p. 1011.

the Railway office. The plans show a similar style of suite of buildings later to be approved for use at Waverton, but the awnings over the stepways were omitted at Wollstonecraft. On the Sydney-bound platform at Wollstonecraft, it was planned that a timber building, which contained both separate ladies' and gentlemen's waiting rooms, would be constructed. This signifies that Wollstonecraft contained some elite residents as gentlemen's waiting rooms were a rarity on the NSW Railways up to that time. The evidence suggests that the overhead and the platform buildings were not built. Money was tight and much simply timber buildings were erected on the platforms without awnings.

Twelve days after Henry Deane approved a magnificent brick structure at Kiama, he approved the station buildings at Waverton - on the 15th September, 1892. What seems surprising is that Deane did not approve a brick building for Waverton and he did not approve the use of an island platform – both features present for the Kiama building. Instead, he approved two side platforms with timber buildings with a timber, overhead booking and parcels office. The overhead building also contained a general waiting room and the office for the Station Master. An interesting feature of the overhead building was that timber posts were used on road side of the building, as was also done for the terminal buildings at Corowa and Cobar in 1892. Waverton was the first station to have side platforms with both side platform buildings using cantilvered brackets and featuring the large “O” motifs in the awning bracket gussets. Unlike the Wollstonecraft buildings, Waverton got the lot.

There were some features of the Waverton buildings that were consistent with the Kiama building. Firstly, the entry/exist was controlled to enable ticket inspection and collection. Secondly, there existed covered stepways to the platform, which extended along the platforms from the base of the stepways to the platform buildings. Thirdly, all the buildings had medium pitched gabled roofs. Fourthly, the roof featured small, ornamental ventilators. On the Sydney-bound platform was a gentlemen's waiting room, once rare but, by this time, becoming not so rare.

While there were some similarities with the Kiama building, the designs of the basic structures were dissimilar. Not only was the Waverton suite of buildings fundamentally different to the Kiama station, it was also different to the 1891 suite of timber buildings Eddy approved for use on the Redfern-Homebush quadruplication. What explanation could there be for such inconsistency of design? The Waverton plan was prepared before the Kiama structure, the draftsman's plan date being May, 1892. Yes, it may be easy to assume that the change in design for Waverton is explained by the approval prior to Kiama but a couple of other factors need to be remembered. The plan for Wollstonecraft station in 1891 was a mirror of what was proposed for Waverton. Although the Wollstonecraft station buildings were not erected, Deane probably thought they would be. Secondly, although Deane had introduced a degree of standardization

of buildings on rural lines, there were variations from line to line in relation to the detail. The evidence suggests that there existed at this time a degree of official independence amongst the design staff working on station plans. The history of the station buildings of the NSW Railways, in the 20th century especially, is a history of a considerable degree of actual building non-standarisation, even though standardization was frequently applied as a jargon expression and supposedly in force as policy. There may well be no other explanation for what happened at Waverton than the whim of individual designers.

The terminal structure for the rail extension from St. Leonards at Lavender Bay/Milsons Point was the second last time that a First Class building was approved in the 19th century. It was a hallmark of design innovation. Henry Deane approved a set of offices in a “L” shape at the end and around one side of the two, terminal side platforms. In a throw-back to Whitton days, he used timber posts with ornate cast iron brackets to support verandahs on the full length of both platforms but there were problems with the site, with a good proportion of the platform foundations being located in the water of Lavender Bay. There were very ornate wrought iron entry gates, required to monitor ticket checking and collection.

The Milsons Point station was incomplete when opened on 1st May, 1893. Apart from the Sydney Terminal building of 1906, this was the first station to have separate, full-length platform coverings.¹³⁴ Its design contrasted with the use of a single, overall arch over the tracks for the nearby cable tram terminal building erected in 1886. In 1882, George Cowdery, Engineer-in-Chief for Existing Lines, had used an arch roof for the Eveleigh locomotive running shed, which was the first such application for an engine shed in the World. However, the architectural thinking overseas in the 1880s in relation to the design of terminal stations was moving away from overall, arched roof train sheds towards awnings over each individual platform. What Deane had approved, was, in fact, a move away from 19th century thinking towards a new age of design. The use of illuminated platform train indicators capped off a station design which well-reflected the high social status of the North Shore area. The contractors for the Milsons Point station building complex, Andrew and George Eaton, had also won the contracts for the provision of Waverton and Wollstonecraft stations.

THE EMERGENCE OF A SEPARATE DESIGN IDENTITY FOR SYDNEY RAILWAY STATIONS

¹³⁴ P. Davies, *A History of NSW Railway Architecture 1890-1915*, B. Arch. 3 thesis, University of NSW, 1978, Vol. 1, p. 135

The interpretation of the physical assets built on the North Shore line up to and including 1893 suggests a confusion of purpose, as was the case with other lines between 1886 and 1893. The evidence might also appear to confirm that there was no immediate economic justification for the construction of the North Shore rail line. The line was not part of any planning process to meet identified freight demand. The occasional evidence of the line being intended to be used for long distance freight to and from the Newcastle area was nothing more than human chatter. Contrary to the best engineering and operational advice, the line was built. The line was a mirror of the nature of NSW politics. It was built as a political act rather than fulfilling an existing transport demand. The relevance of the North Shore line is that the themes that were current in the 1890s remain current in regard to Sydney's transport in the 21st century. There remains a sustained lack of genuine interest by NSW governments in addressing the public's transport needs of Sydney and an absence of interest in making correct decisions on any other basis except short-term political gain and whim.

There was nothing the Railway Commissioners or the top engineers could do to prevent the construction of the North Shore line but they were not prepared to sit by and see public funds wasted. This financial supervision was reflected in the very basic design and materials of buildings that were provided when the first section of the line was opened in 1890. A different tact was adopted for the extension from St Leonards to Milsons Point in 1893. That section of the line was used by Chief Commissioner Eddy to implement his ideas about the emergence of a purely urban identity of the Sydney railway system. Unlike his predecessors, Eddy started to use different designs and different standards between what he wanted for Sydney and for lines outside of Sydney, especially on new rural extensions of the network.

In the 1890s, Eddy altered the design of platform walls. As well as changing the overall design of John Whitton's platform wall design, from a single continuous face of brickwork sloping to the toe of the wall, which was featured north of St Leonards station, he made the wall vertical and introduced corbelling of the brickwork underneath the platform coping. However, he did this only for the Sydney area including the section to Milsons Point. For rural areas, Eddy used cheaper timber platform walls.

In addition to the new design of platform buildings Eddy approved of between Redfern and Homebush in this period, Eddy experimented with other designs that would not be seen outside Sydney during his period of management. It was Eddy who introduced overhead booking offices and subway access to island platforms with underground booking offices. The buildings that Eddy approved for the extension to Milsons Point were unusual but they were part of his plan to develop a special identity for the Sydney

railway system. Eddy trialled many of his new design ideas away from Sydney, where any new initiative was likely to be under a higher level of visual attention. For example, he had chosen Raglan in 1890 to experiment with island platforms surrounded by running lines on both sides of the platform. At the same time, he used the Raglan project to trial both timber structures and the use of small, cast iron brackets to replace vertical awning supports. He also intended to use the Katoomba site in 1891 in a similar fashion to Raglan in 1890 to trial further his new station designs. These were just two steps in a much bigger plan and it would not be until 1892 that Eddy ramped up his plan to create an identifiable urban railway. At Temora and a few other station buildings in the years 1892 and 1893, Eddy first experimented with the movement away from the use of posted verandahs and he replaced these with large, cantilevered brackets to support platform awnings, thereby eliminating the obstruction of vertical awning posts. As well as undertaking these experiments in rural locations, Eddy was wise enough to restrict his experimental use of cantilevered brackets by placing them only on the platform side of buildings and continuing to use posted verandahs on the road approach so that there was a degree of familiarity by approaching travellers. After playing with awning brackets of varying sizes, a standard design and standard sized awning bracket for the Sydney area was introduced from 1900.

On the North Shore extension in 1893, Eddy experimented with the use of overhead buildings to contain the booking office and also waiting room accommodation and, at the Milsons Point terminus, he experimented with the use of full length platform awnings, platform indicators and other initiatives. Eddy also introduced the provision of gentlemen's waiting rooms for both the Wollstonecraft and Waverton platform buildings and these were the only two suburban Sydney stations where plans were approved for special accommodation for gentlemen. Hence, what appeared as unusual buildings on the Milsons Point extension, were in fact consistent with Chief Commissioner Eddy's period of experimentation to provide a special identity for the Sydney railway system. Sadly, this experimentation and fulfilment of Eddy's dream ended with his death in office in 1897.

URBANISATION AND THE ZONE OF COMFORT

Australia was third in the World in terms of percentage of total population living in cities in 1891.¹³⁵ Only England, Scotland and Wales were ahead of Australia and by a mere small margin. After Australia, there was a large gap to the fourth country, Belgium,

¹³⁵ A.F. Weber, *The Growth of Cities in the Nineteenth Century*, Ithaca, Cornell University Press, 1967, pp.144 & 145

which had 17% of its population in cities over 100,000 compared to 29% in Australia.¹³⁶ The North Shore played a big part of the growth of Sydney.

The number of people in Sydney has grown mostly steadily from 1788 to the present. In 1881, the population of Sydney was 225,000. Ten years later, it was 383,000. This was a 70% increase.¹³⁷ The expansion of Sydney's population is not explained merely in terms of a growth in the total number of residents but in their desires. Cocks says that Australians made good use of the opportunities presented by nature.¹³⁸ He says that they have "sensibly concentrated in pleasant, medium sized, relatively unpolluted cities".¹³⁹ Settlers on the North Shore purposively lived there, notwithstanding the transport difficulties, because the area epitomised all the virtues that their personal psychology desired. They wanted semi-isolation, a leafy environment and relatively low-density living.

Not all people shared the same view and it is necessary to explain why some people moved to the area at different times when it was not so leafy and not so isolated. There is a link between the rise in population of the North Shore and the development of transport but it is not due solely to technological improvement. It is rather explained by the idea of individual residents' *zone of comfort* in which people have different ideas about being comfortable and happy in a particular place. As public transport improved, more people came to the North Shore, including Artarmon, because travel conditions became easier. Individual people accepted differing levels of comfort and dis-comfort in their lives and, when travel became easier and the personal feeling of isolation was overcome, more residents were attracted to the area. Thus, more people came when the railway opened to St. Leonards in 1890; more in 1893 when the railway reached Milsons Point; more people came when the platform at Artarmon was opened in 1898; more people came with duplication of the line in 1900; more people came when the present Artarmon building was erected in 1916; more people came in 1928 when the line was electrified and more people came in 1932 when the Sydney Harbour Bridge was opened. This process has never stopped.

THE NORTH SHORE RAILWAY STIMULATES POPULATION GROWTH

Once the railway line was opened to connect with ferries in 1893, more people chose to live on the North Shore because transport costs were lower and access was easier than was previously the case. Only wealthy people could afford long-distance suburban rail journeys before 1900 in addition to the cost of ferry travel but this was cheaper transport

¹³⁶ *ibid.*

¹³⁷ S. Glynn, *Urbanisation in Australian History 1788-1900*, Melbourne, Thomas Nelson, Second Ed., 1975, p. 43

¹³⁸ D. Cocks, *People Policy*, Sydney, University of NSW press, 1996, p. 266

¹³⁹ *ibid.*

for those who lived on the North Shore before the opening of the railway. Later Prime Minister of Australia, William Morris, stated that, when he was young, he had to represent a seat in Parliament in Sydney “within the radius of a penny tram section” in 1894 because he could not afford train travel.¹⁴⁰ High rail costs helped mould the subdivision of Sydney and the creation of a physical region where there was a juxtaposition of scenery and snobbery.¹⁴¹ That changed to some degree after 1932 when the opening of the Sydney Harbour Bridge, which brought still lower transport costs, easier travel and shorter travel times. These improvements enabled further development of the North Shore generally by the middle classes. With the Bridge opening, it was possible for those with money to be joined by those who possessed the pretence, if not the reality, of money.

The North Shore of Sydney has always been an attractive part of Sydney’s physical appearance. The area harmonized the “The Bush” with suburbia and provided a positive image of urban dwelling. This co-existence of nature and development was linked by some people to a component of individual psychology in which people possessed a fair degree of good sense, personal confidence and mental ability and were more easily able to live with nature’s presence. This contrasted with people not so blessed with a comfortable confidence in their cerebral understanding of their own physical and psychological position in a bushy, physical landscape. In other words, a lot of residents on the North Shore did not see the existence of any form of nature as a threat to their command of their suburban allotment.

The ability of North Shore residents to cope with the change of transport modes until the Harbour Bridge opened in 1932 created a journey to work which involved the prettiest and comparatively the most soothing transport corridor into the city. As Barnard wrote, “Travellers coming in by train through the slums and the railway marshalling yards see Sydney at her worst; those who come in from the sea to advantage”.¹⁴²

Birmingham wrote that the stimulus to suburban development was the decreasing quality of life in the City as the population increased.¹⁴³ It was the railway extension in 1893 that permitted stronger urban development on many parts of the North Shore. It was the combination of residents with more than a tolerance of large, native trees and a pleasant and relatively convenient railway corridor that created on the North Shore a picture of suburban life as the best expression of the Australian way of life.

Apart from the visual dissection of some suburbs caused by embankments – as at Artarmon, the railway on the North Shore was not the agent of destruction to the

¹⁴⁰ T. Inglis Moore (Ed.), *A Book of Australia*, London, Collins, 1961, p. 235

¹⁴¹ R. Boyd, *The Australian Ugliness*, Ringwood, Penguin Books, 1972, p. 97

¹⁴² M. Barnard, *Sydney*, Melbourne University Press, 1956, p. 79

¹⁴³ op. cit., p. 204

surrounding vegetation because its alignment took advantage of the mountain ridge and, where necessary, large sums of money were required to cut through sandstone. The removed material was used for embankments. The rail corridor developed a narrow profile, which was demonstrated by the use of two tunnels, the only line in Sydney where tunnelling occurred twice and the only line where the original tunnels remain in use.¹⁴⁴ The relative discreteness of the North Shore corridor was aided by the minimisation of any large scale industrial development. As evidence itself of the lack of impact of the North Shore line on industry, the North Shore Brick and Tile Co. opened a siding into its brickworks at St. Leonards in 1903, 13 years after the line opening. When the Company opened a second brick pit in 1910, it served the site by the use of a tunnel under Reserve Road. This minimisation of the impact of the physical railway on the landscape became the only instance in NSW where a tunnel was erected on an industrial siding, apart from coal mining.¹⁴⁵

Railways allowed suburban development and the main western line to Strathfield brought wealthy people into the suburbs in the 1880s but, once the North Shore railway was opened to the Harbour in 1893, it was the bush setting that attracted wealthy people to the area who felt in harmony with the natural environment. It seems almost odd that the inner western suburbs “lost” their “high status” because of the co-existence of trees and trains.¹⁴⁶

The more frequent rail service on the North Shore line compared to other Sydney lines has continued to be one factor in drawing ever-increasing numbers of residents. Now, Artarmon along with many other North Shore suburbs has become a land filled with multi high-rise apartment blocks. Sadly, the stations at Chatswood and St. Leonards have been demolished and replaced by high-rise residential apartments. Thus, while the railway was one of the agents that stimulated more people to enjoy the bush, gardens and tranquility of in North Shore, the railway is now one of the agents that may well destroy the very features that attracted people in the first place.

Three factors have been noted to be of importance before the opening of Artarmon station that have mitigated the impact on the station. These are prior land sales, the prior opening of the North Shore rail line and the psychology of the people who were attracted to the area before 1898.

There was a link between the nature of change in both the physical region on the North Shore and changes in which the railway was operated and managed. The hilly

¹⁴⁴ The only other line in Sydney to feature a tunnel was the Illawarra line at Arncliffe but the tunnel was widened in 1924 with quadruplication to become a cutting.

¹⁴⁵ For details, see J. Oakes, *Sydney's Forgotten Quarry Railways*, Redfern, Australian Railway Historical Society, 2006, pp. 72-75

¹⁴⁶ Heritage Office and Department of Urban affairs and Planning, *Regional Histories*, Sydney, 1996, p. 27

topography of the area made it a challenge for trains to climb and brake on the gradients. The steepest gradient on the Sydney rail system was on the North Shore line and a number of engineering features had to be engaged to address the situation. These included increasing the power of passenger steam locomotives, the use of new brake shoe products, the replacement of steam traction with electric trains and increased supply of electricity. The erection of an additional traction sub-station at Waverton in 2008 was thus just another step to address special topographical problems.

WHAT WAS HAPPENING AT ARTARMON BEFORE THE STATION OPENING

Two things of note occurred before Artarmon station was opened in 1898. The first is the existence of the North Shore rail line eight years prior to the opening of the station at Artarmon. The second is the subdivision of land near to the future station site into residential building blocks in 1894. It was the NSW Government, and not private land speculators, which commenced selling Crown land in Artarmon.¹⁴⁷ Added to this was the further sale of private land, this time by private developers, in the year of the station opening.¹⁴⁸ Indicative of the pre-existence of residents is Leplastrier's remark that "there was much contention on the subject of roads of approach to the station and many conferences took place with the representatives of the Broughton Estate."¹⁴⁹

Enter the role of politics. It is not that Artarmon station had any impact on politics but the reverse. Politics used Artarmon station as a means to express the role of pressure group activity. There was a duration of four years between the planning and opening of Artarmon station. During that period, the local leading citizens and stakeholders lobbied the Railway Commissioners to have the station located in what they regarded as the preferred location. Leplastrier cites that Thomas Broughton was directly involved in the "many conferences (that) took place with the representatives of the Broughton Estate".¹⁵⁰ It is of little surprise that the newly formed street to gain access from the present Pacific Highway to Artarmon station is named Broughton Road. In other parts of Sydney, such a street may be called *Station Street* but the use of *Station Street* was rare on the North Shore, it only being used at one station – Pymble. Perhaps it was considered too inferior to be applied to the region.

In the understanding of the impact of the opening in 1898 of Artarmon station, the land development following the opening of the entire North Shore railway and the establishment of stations adjacent to Artarmon, namely at Chatswood and St. Leonards in 1890, mitigate the impact of Artarmon station on local residential development.

¹⁴⁷ Warner, op. cit., p. 66

¹⁴⁸ *ibid.*

¹⁴⁹ C. Leplastrier, *Willoughby Fifty Years*, Willoughby Municipal Council, 1916, p. 47.

¹⁵⁰ C. Leplastrier, *Willoughby's Fifty Years*, Municipality of Willoughby, 1915, Facsimile Edition 1988, p. 47

As has happened in other parts of Sydney, influential, local Artarmon residents started immediate lobbying for a station for their suburb. After four years, they started to see success. In 1894 William Foxlee, the then Engineer-in-Chief for Existing Lines, signed a plan showing the location of two proposed platforms between St. Leonards and Chatswood. One of these locations was near the south side of Mowbray Road and the other about 30 chains to the south, which is the present location.¹⁵¹ The Railway Commissioners took a further four years to respond to the request for a station. In 1896, Willoughby Municipal Council requested an increase in the existing passenger train service but the Secretary for Railways replied that the accommodation had been “already increased out of all proportion to the traffic”, an assertion the Council rejected. In the year of the line opening, trains consisted of only two passenger carriages and a guard’s van.¹⁵² The Railways pointed out that the North Shore railway was already losing £20,000 per annum and it was unprepared to increase that amount.¹⁵³ Also, Willoughby Council wanted a station between Chatswood and St. Leonards and not more than ten chains north of the existing level crossing at Elizabeth Street. This would become Artarmon station.

It was Thomas Broughton, a major local land owner and developer, who had applied pressure to which the NSW Railway Commissioner opened the station at Artarmon on 6th July, 1898. At that time, the line was known within the railway organisation as the “Milsons Point line”, the name itself a reflection of the authority of the Commissioners as opposed to the use of the non-bureaucratic title of North Shore railway which was not adopted until 1932¹⁵⁴ Even then, it was not a recognition of any geographic regional feature that prompted the change. The term “North Shore” was adopted to differentiate the line that went across the Harbour Bridge and through to Central from the former main line from Waverton to the water’s edge near the present-day Luna Park, which hereto was called the Milsons Point Branch. The construction of the Sydney Harbour Bridge also prompted the Main Roads Board in 1931 to rename Lane Cove Road the Pacific Highway, which had the effect of eliminating any local interpretation of the main arterial road through Artarmon.¹⁵⁵ Thus, it was the railway administration that gave the region its title of North Shore.

¹⁵¹ Plan entitled “proposed Platform between St. Leonards and Chatswood”, dated 29th October, 1894, SRA Archives.

¹⁵² R. D. Love, “The Old Suburban Depots of Sydney”, *Byways of Steam* 25, Matraville, 2006, p. 90.

¹⁵³ *Sydney Morning Herald*, 9th May, 1896, p. 10.

¹⁵⁴ Artarmon station sheet, ARHS Resource Centre

¹⁵⁵ R. Broomham, *Vital Connections – a History of NSW Roads from 1788*, Sydney, Hale & Iremonger, 2001, p. 116

10 THE OPENING OF ARTARMON STATION - 1898

THE QUICK STATEMENT OF EVENTS

For those wishing a quick understanding of the station history, Appendix 1 is a summary. The station opened on 6th July, 1898, just to the south of Mowbray Road. The present station is 624 metres south of the 1898 station.

PRESSURE TO OPEN THE STATION

Urban Researcher, Jago Dodson, wrote that the idea of “garden cities” took hold in Sydney after the publication in 1898 of a book by Ebenezer Howard entitled “Tomorrow: A Peaceful Way to Real Reform.”¹⁵⁶ The book, Dodson said, “encapsulated many contemporary ideas about urban improvement with an emphasis on space, fresh air and light.” Although the publication was British, Sydney’s North Shore the seen by many people as the place to achieve the relationship with Nature. Also, the bubonic plague of 1900, which affected greatly the slum areas at The Rocks and Miller’s Point, aided further consideration of the leafy North Shore as a desirable, residential location. It was a case of push and pull factors which increased the population of the North Shore, including Artarmon.

A railway station at Artarmon was needed. Willoughby Municipal Council discussed a reply in January, 1898, from the Railway Commissioners in relation to the provision of a station at Artarmon, or what the Commissioners called a “platform.” The Commissioners said that:

“the matter has received careful consideration but the Commissioners were not yet in a position to approve definitely of the platform being erected. As was previously intimated to the Council, the closing of the level crossing at Elizabeth Street is an important consideration governing the position of the platform.”¹⁵⁷

ARTARMON STATION LOCATION

Artarmon station today is located on the North Shore railway line that links the City Central Business District with Hornsby in the north. It is 10.2946 kilometres from the Central station in the City and nestled between large white-collar business nodes at St.

¹⁵⁶ J. Dodson, “Transforming Australia’s Housing Solution: How We Can Better Plan Suburbia to Meet Our Future Challenges,” in R. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Australia’s Unintended Cities*, Collingwood, CSIRO Publishing, 2012, p. 22.

¹⁵⁷ *Sydney Morning Herald*, 19th January, 1898, p. 10.

Leonards and Chatswood. The North Shore railway line has always been regarded as a branch line whose junction is at Hornsby on the Main Northern railway line. Hornsby is 25.2554 kilometres from Central via the North Shore line but is 34 kilometres distant on the Main North line that runs through Redfern and Strathfield. The North Shore railway climbs at an almost continual gradient from the City. At Wynyard, the elevation of the station is 14.0 metres; at Artarmon it is 80.4 metres and Hornsby is at an elevation of 180.1 metres, though the top of the gradient is reached before Hornsby.

ORIGIN OF THE STATION NAME

Before 1900, the pattern of station naming indicates that names were predominately based on British, Scottish and Irish themes. The names of stations are often derived from local property owners and are an acknowledgement of the possession of personal power and influence. Artarmon was named to acknowledge the power of William Gore, who was the one-time Provost Marshall in NSW and the owner of 150 acres, basically all land between present day St. Leonards and Mowbray Road. Artarmon was the name of his property in Ireland but use of the name in Sydney went no further than his front door until 1889.¹⁵⁸

ARTARMON STATION DESCRIPTION

The Artarmon platform building that exists at present can be analysed a number of ways. One method is to examine it in the context of the two previous platform structures at the station and also contemporary buildings at other stations on the North Shore line. The 1890s was a time when the use of timber for the construction of platform buildings accelerated, replacing brick to a large extent. This was a reflection of the impact of the 1890s Depression then gripping NSW. The first two timber buildings at Artarmon mirrored the system-wide building policy.

Photographs of structures at other stations on the North Shore line in the single track days show two types of architecture. Firstly, there were small timber structures with a mono-pitched or skillion roof, as exists today on platform No. 3 at Gordon. This was the most primitive and cheapest of all platform buildings and the North Shore line was the first line to feature this type of building with the pitch of the roof sloping towards the rails. The platform awning was formed by an extension of the roof rafters. This new design became the most prolific design of station building on the New South Wales Railways by the time of World War One. Secondly, there were small timber structures with a gabled roof and a platform verandah supported by vertical timber posts. They came in two standard lengths – a short version such as those built for the 1890 line opening at

¹⁵⁸ State Rail Authority, *How and Why of Station Names*, 1995, p. 4

Gordon and Chatswood and a longer version as at St. Leonards.¹⁵⁹ Longer versions survive today at Thirlmere, adjacent to the railway museum at that location and on the Sydney bound platform at Wingello and an example of the short version exists at Borenore, just west of Orange. The design of the first building at Artarmon is unknown but it is a pretty good guess that it was a small, utilitarian designed structure, void of design stylistic influences, with either a skillion or gabled roof.

When the station opened in 1898, there was a platform on the western side of the single line of railway. In the earliest years of its existence, the station was staffed by relatively junior officers. The Station Master at Chatswood controlled Artarmon and St. Leonards stations, as well as his own at Chatswood.¹⁶⁰ Very little is known about the first station building on the platform but the evidence indicates that the Commissioner did in fact erect a “waiting shed”.¹⁶¹ An undated plan of the proposed duplication of the line shows a small building approximately 15 feet x 12 feet.¹⁶² There was also a separate men's toilet towards the Sydney end of the platform. All buildings on all stations on the North Shore line at the time of their opening, except the terminus at St. Leonards, were of timber construction.

Although Artarmon got its platform, the steep gradient brought with it problems. The opening of the station eight years after the line opening is in part explained by the departmental reluctance to create operational problems – which it did by the erection of the Artarmon platform. Consideration of the role of the local physical setting applies not only to the location of the platform. The question should be asked whether there is any relationship between the design of platform buildings and the locations at which they are provided. Sharp has undertaken extensive research in which he examined the relationship between 2,000 platform buildings at the 1,300 station sites in NSW between 1855 and 1980. He concluded that there was no link between materials/design and local topography, local climate and any other local factor.¹⁶³ He concluded that “centralised decision making has dominated policies relating to the use of materials and methods of construction”. He added that engineers “had little regard for the suitability of designs to meet topographical features and paid no attention to the suitability of materials or designs to meet varying climatic conditions”.¹⁶⁴ The design of all three

¹⁵⁹ A photograph of Turramurra is in SRA, *How and Why of Station Names*, Second. Ed., SRA, 1982, p. 178

¹⁶⁰ W. Dempsey, “Wayne’s Story”, *Australian Railway History*, Vol. 65 No. 923, September, 2014, p. 4.

¹⁶¹ G. Warner, *Artarmon - Past, Present and Future*, Sydney, Management Development Publishers, 1988, p.44

¹⁶² NSWRR, Plan entitled “Milson’s Point Line - proposed Duplication of Line - Alterations at Artarmon”, undated, Former SRA Archives

¹⁶³ S.A. Sharp, *The Railway Stations of NSW 1855-1980*, Unpublished M. Ec. (Hons) thesis, Vol. 3, University of Sydney, 1982, pp. 172-274

¹⁶⁴ *ibid.*, p. 275

platform structures at Artarmon in 1898, 1900 and 1916 had nothing to do with local topographical or physical landscape factors at the station site.

THE STATION MASTER'S RESIDENCE

In the 1880s, a lot of people in New South Wales sought a new cultural identity, searched for employment security and thought about ways to replace foreign cultural luggage with something new and Australian.¹⁶⁵ The NSW Railways played a key part in the ability of working men to find political, social and economic happiness. In the 1880s, “many people joined the Railways because it was a major, stable employer with public service conditions that were relatively good by comparison with other industries.”¹⁶⁶ The informal culture of the organisation recognised that they would have a job for life, provided on their good conduct.

Not only did staff attain permanent employment, Station Masters were provided with rent-free or low rental accommodation. On the North Shore line in 1890, all Station Masters were provided with a residence for their families. Only two stations did not have a residence. These were Warrawee and Killara. As new stations opened, the railway organisation widened its housing policy to also provide Station Masters with a financial allowance so that they could rent on the open market, if no official house were available. Replacement residences continued to be built by or purchased by the NSW Railways. In addition, five residences on the line were built for Gatekeepers where the railway line crossed public roads at grade. The residence for the Station Master at Artarmon was purchased from an existing owner and was located in The Crescent at Chatswood.

THE LINK BETWEEN GOOD PUBLIC TRANSPORT AND URBAN GROWTH

In October, 1898, there was a report of the sale of a considerable number of residential allotments. The *Evening News* reported that:

“Considerable clearances by auction were made on Saturday afternoon by Messrs. Richardson and Wrench Limited (in conjunction with Messrs. Raine and a Horne). On the grounds at Artarmon, the new suburb on the North Shore line, the attendance was good and bidding spirited, resulting in the sale of 73 allotments of the first subdivision of Mr. Thomas Broughton’s Artarmon Estate, close to the new railway platform.”¹⁶⁷

¹⁶⁵ G.L. Buxton, “1870-1890” in F. Crowley (Ed.), *A New History of Australia*, Melbourne, William Heinemann, 1974, p. 166

¹⁶⁶ P. O’ Connor, *On Wooden Rails*, Sydney, Rail, Tram and Bus Union, 2005, p.111

¹⁶⁷ *Evening News*, 17th October, 1898, p. 3.

As well as the railway station being opened at Artarmon in 1898, a tram service was also opened on 25th April, 1898, from the cable tram terminus at North Sydney Road, Crows Nest, to Victoria Avenue, Willoughby, along Willoughby and Mowbray Roads and Penshurst Street. This line was extended to Chatswood railway station in 1908. The southern part of Artarmon was also served by another tram which was opened on 24th February, 1900, from Crows Nest to Westbourne Street, Gore Hill, along the present Pacific Highway. This line was extended in 1909 from Gore Hill to Burns Bay Road, Lane Cove.¹⁶⁸

FORTHCOMING TRACK DUPLICATION

In August, 1899, the proposed duplication of what was then known as the Milsons Point branch received a considerable amount of attention in the Sydney press. It was mentioned that duplication was proposed for the section of the line between St. Leonards and Lindfield and that new, island platforms would be provided at Artarmon, Chatswood, Roseville and Lindfield. The Commissioners said that it was their policy to eliminate the level crossings and, with this focus on safety, it was proposed that a subway would be constructed at Artarmon.¹⁶⁹ There was a big local protest towards the end of the year when Artarmon residents realised that the subway would only serve that side of the railway line to the west. People on the eastern side of the line protested vigorously to the Commissioners saying that, if the subway were not extended through to the eastern side, they wanted the existing level crossing to be retained. The Commissioners replied:

“it was a unique experience for the Commissioners to be asked to retain a level crossing, and with their knowledge of the inconvenience and risk of such crossings, they felt they could not proceed to the request of the deputation. The giving access to the station from Albert Avenue would involve an additional expense in working the station, which the Commissioners could not see their way to incur. With regard to the subway at Artarmon, there was no traffic to be served by continuing the subway as asked for but, if settlement arose in the future which would demand such a convenience, the Commissioners might be dispensed upon to meet requirements.”¹⁷⁰

¹⁶⁸ D. Keenan, *The North Sydney Lines of the Sydney Tramway System*, 1987, Petersham, Transit Press, pp. 15 – 18.

¹⁶⁹ *Sydney Morning Herald*, 26th August, 1899, p. 12 and *Evening News*, 26th August, 1899, p. 2.

¹⁷⁰ *Ibid*, 13th October, 1899, p. 5.

11 THE SECOND ARTARMON STATION SITE - 1900

WHY THE STATION WAS RELOCATED

There is no extant statement to explain why the Railway Commissioners relocated the station in 1900. Probably, it was simply the opportunity to build the new, island platform for track duplication at a location that did not disrupt services at the first location, with the added benefit that the present site is on an easier gradient, thereby improving operational conditions for trains starting and stopping at the present station. That desire to obtain a green-field site was common on the New South Wales Railways. It is also possible that local merchants and/or residents wanted the station relocated but it was not Departmental practice to place the interests of adjoining landholders and shopkeepers before Railway interests.

SYDNEY'S ELITE STATIONS, APART FROM THE NORTH SHORE

By 1899, the North Shore of Sydney was slowly overtaking Strathfield as the place where Sydney's elite people lived and it appears that the New South Wales Railways was aware of what was happening. Because of the high number of influential people who lived at Strathfield, the Railway Department responded to local concern about the possible loss of social status by deciding to provide a large, replacement station building. So, plans were prepared in 1899 and construction occurred following year. There was a very good case for arguing that substantial pressure was placed on the NSW Government by the elite residents of Strathfield for a new pace-setting station. They got it. It was big, highly visible, and innovative and different to anything that had come before it. As extant newspapers indicate, the residents of Strathfield did not like aspects of their new station, particularly the need to climb up to the new, elevated concourse and then climb down to the platforms – this often happening with a considerable amount of luggage. The Railway Department's attempt to placate the people of Strathfield, with the building of a new, attractive and innovative overhead concourse, had largely failed.

By a long way, Strathfield was not the main residential location for Sydney's elite component. New, high-quality brick platform buildings were approved at Epping, Chatswood and Turramurra in 1899 to meet the pressures of strong and powerful men. Also, the Belmore branch had been opened in 1895 with some of the Colony's most beautiful and expensive platform buildings. The Belmore line buildings were built at locations where the patronage was so low that all staff was withdrawn from the three major stations in the very year that they opened. A lot of public money was spent at

various locations throughout Sydney in response to the exercise of power operating on a local level.

TRACK DUPLICATION

There was such an increase in passenger traffic on the North Shore line in the 1890s that the Railway Department commenced duplication in 1899, the first section opened in 1900 – through Artarmon. Duplicating existing lines often provided the timeframe for the provision of replacement platform structures and this did occur at a number of locations on the North Shore line, including Artarmon.

A week before the relocated Artarmon station opened, there was considerable disquiet about the arrangements. The major problem was the level of the passenger service and it was said that, while two thirds of the population on the line lived between Milsons Point and Chatswood, the new timetable being introduced with the duplication of the line favoured people on the Hornsby side of Chatswood. So far as Artarmon station was concerned, the local community once again protested about the lack of subway access from the eastern side.¹⁷¹ For the next couple of years, both the level of service and subway access were issues that upset the Artarmon community.

Duplication of the section of railway line occurred through Artarmon occurred on 17th October, 1900, on the same date the station had been relocated to its present site. The Railway officials would have known that duplication was just around the corner and it would have been a logical move to transfer the station to the new site when the line was being duplicated. In so doing, both platform faces for the island platform could have been built simultaneously, thus avoiding a lot of inconvenience to passengers entering and leaving the first station site.

STATION DESCRIPTION

It is plausible that some of the buildings that existed on the single side platform at the opening of the station in 1898 were transferred to the adjacent new island platform in 1900. Architectural plans for the 1900 station do not survive. Photographs exist of the second building at Artarmon and show a timber framed building with timber cladding using the traditional NSW style of horizontal weatherboards. Park and Singleton wrote that the "island building was originally timber" but they did not comment on the building

¹⁷¹ *Sydney Morning Herald*, 9th October, 1900, p. 10.

style.¹⁷² The use of the singular number to describe the structure is of particular note for, in 1959, when Singleton expanded his 1945 history of the North Shore line, he again referred to a single building but drew a plan showing two small structures plus a detached men's toilet.¹⁷³

A photograph in the former State Rail Archives of Artarmon station building is dated 1900.¹⁷⁴ It shows a timber framed structure about 50 feet in length, sheathed with horizontal weatherboards. It is taken after duplication and the building on the island platform features canopies attached to each side wall supported by either steel brackets or timber struts. It features a gabled roof flanked at each end by small finials. A notable characteristic is the absence of brick chimneys. Winter heating for staff was provided by a free-standing stove with a metal flue protruding above the roof line. The curtain boarding at the ends of the canopies was finished in alternating light and dark paint colours, as was the Railway tradition at the time.

In the photograph, a separate barrel roofed combined toilet/lamp room is located at the Sydney end of the platform. It is timber framed and clad in corrugated iron. The position of the toilet/lamp room is consistent with the track duplication plan but the length of the main building is greater than that shown in the same plan. There is no evidence of a date for the construction of the main building shown in the photograph. The building is of the standard design used between 1892 and 1935 and is the same design as the current brick structure - the only difference is that the 1900 structure in the photograph is of timber construction. Examples of the standard building design were built in either brick or timber but timber was mostly used for this design between approximately 1900 and 1916 in country areas. The Artarmon timber building was extant in 1916¹⁷⁵.

Was it significant that both the first and second buildings at Artarmon were of timber construction? Timber up to 1887 was viewed by the NSW rail administration as an inferior building product for platform buildings. From 1887, when it was becoming more difficult to raise capital funds, cheaper timber designs were more extensively used. The Illawarra line and the Newcastle line, built in the second half of the 1880s, featured 95% of all platform structures made from timber. The widespread use of timber continued throughout the 1890s, with one notable exception being the Sydenham-Belmore branch in 1895 where ornate, brick buildings were provided. The use of brick for that project is

¹⁷² M.A. Park & C.C. Singleton, "The North Shore Line", ARHS *Bulletin*, Vol. 15 No. 88, February, 1945, p. 25

¹⁷³ C.C. Singleton, "The North Shore Line", ARHS *Bulletin*, Vol. 10 No. 262, August, 1959, pp. 114 & 115

¹⁷⁴ Photograph No. 1073, Former SRA Archives.

¹⁷⁵ Confirmed by Lephastrier's book published in 1916 which has a photo of the timber building.

explained by the personal intervention of the Premier, Sir Henry Parkes, as a political payback to the owners of the Canterbury racecourse.

With the exception of the building at St. Leonards, every newly-built platform structure on the North Shore line was built of timber, either in 1890 for the first part of the line or in 1893 for the second part of the line. It was only at the very end of the 1890s that the use of brick started again to be used for platform buildings, but mainly in the Sydney, Newcastle and the Illawarra areas. When the North Shore line started to be duplicated from 1900, all extant timber buildings were rebuilt in brick, except Artarmon. That occurred because the rail administration, at the time, did not view Artarmon as part of the Upper North Shore. However, by 1916 this view had changed, possibly because some influential, senior railway officials lived at Artarmon.

The caption on the official photograph of the 1900 Artarmon building indicates that the structure was moved from "Old Glenbrook" in 1900. There is no proof to say that this was the case or not the case but it seems very strange that platform buildings at one station, i.e. Old Glenbrook, were relocated to another station, i.e. Artarmon, on two separate occasions – 1900 and 1916. There is a great possibility that the officer working in the Railway Archives got mixed up about exactly which building had been relocated and incorrectly thought it was the 1900 structure. It was the 1916 building from Old Glenbrook that was "relocated."

The term "Old Glenbrook" generally refers to the location of the first Glenbrook station which dated from 1867 to 1913. This first station site served both the line when the Little Zig Zag was in use until 1892 and the single track deviation between 1892 and 1913 when the duplication deviation line between Emu Plains and Blaxland replaced the single track. Very little is known of the station buildings at the time of the opening of the western line over the Blue Mountains in the 1860s. All the evidence shows that the buildings were small and of timber construction, with the exception of the building at Mount Victoria. The only known evidence of a platform building at Glenbrook is an "old print".¹⁷⁶ It shows a timber building about 40 feet in length containing possibly four rooms. The timber building at Old Glenbrook became redundant in 1900 when the NSWGR planned new brick island platform structures at Old Glenbrook and at many other stations for the duplication of the western line which opened in 1902 between Old Glenbrook and Blackheath.¹⁷⁷ In 1902, the first timber building at Glenbrook was replaced with a brick structure and in 1913 the line on which the new brick building

¹⁷⁶ W.A. Bayley, *Lapstone Zig Zag Railway*, Bulli, Austrail Publications, 1972, p. 28

¹⁷⁷ Plan No. 54/77 entitled "Glenbrook to Blackheath Duplication Contract No. 1 Station Buildings - Glenbrook, Blaxland, Valley Heights, Faulconbridge and Linden", signed by contractor Chas. Palmer et al 20th January, 1900, former SRA Archives

existed was abandoned and replaced by a new route on which the present Glenbrook station is situated. The former Glenbrook site then became known as “Old Glenbrook” to differentiate it from “Glenbrook”.

THE PHYSICAL IMPACT OF ARTARMON STATION ON THE LANDSCAPE

The erection of a station at Artarmon had a physical and visual impact on the local physical area. The railway line in 1890 truncated Elizabeth Street into two parts and forced the formation of a new road system, featuring roads on either side of the rail corridor. Because Artarmon station is on an embankment, the tracks are elevated above the surrounding development on each side. The station acts as a visual block that terminates the vistas of the suburb. It dominates the landscape in the vicinity, something that does not happen at many other North Shore stations, as most other stations are at grade, in cuttings or behind or under commercial developments. Most North Shore platforms are accessed by overhead footbridges and steps down to the platform. The only other North Shore station accessed by a subway is Waitara. Both featured booking offices in the main platform building, as opposed to the regular practice on other Sydney lines of providing a booking office in the subway or on a footbridge. This absence of a separate ticket office at Artarmon suggests smaller numbers of passengers than other North Shore stations.

Artarmon station divided the landuse on either side of the rail line. On the western side, commercial development and high-rise apartments dominate the streetscape. On the eastern side, low-rise apartments and single/double storey bungalows dominate. It is the station rather than the line that has caused the split in landuse as the high-rise residential buildings have been placed purposefully adjacent to the station for easy access to the passenger platform. Artarmon station has also had a direct impact on the vegetation adjacent to the line. On the western side of the line, Willoughby City Council manages, under a formal Agreement with the RailCorp, two beautification areas opposite the commercial district and these have impacted positively upon residents by presenting a sense of civility to the shopping centre. On the eastern side, Council has a similar beautification tenancy but, generally speaking on the eastern side of the line, the native vegetation has been invaded by foreign species to give an unkempt appearance, as if to say that the eastern side is the “wrong” side of the line in which to reside.

Since the 1898 opening, the residents of Artarmon had, from time to time, protested about various aspects of the station’s operations, namely the poor quality of subway access, described by Warner as “depressing”, the lack of easy access caused by the stepway, the inadequacy of the toilet arrangements and the poor quality of on-time

running by trains serving the platform.¹⁷⁸ In 2016, the station subway is lost its depressing presentation.

AGITATION FOR THE SUBWAY EXTENSION AND OTHER IMPROVEMENTS

Land sales continued at Artarmon on both sides of the line at the turn of the century and in 1902 the Artarmon Estate No. 3 was available for subdivision by auction. The same pattern occurred in 1903 when 178 sites on the Chamberlain Hills Estate at Artarmon was put up for sale. As part of the advertising, it was pointed out that Artarmon station was only four miles from Milsons Point and was 300 feet above sea level. Lane Cove Municipal Council requested in 1903 the provision of a goods siding at Artarmon for the unloading of goods and produce but the Commissioners declined the request.¹⁷⁹

With all the increasing land sales, the question of extending the subway through to the eastern side of Artarmon station would not go away. An inspection of the eastern side of the subway provides an understanding of the reluctance by the Railway Department as the closest public street is well over 50 metres away and approximately 10 metres below the level of the subway floor. A lot of digging and a lot of money were necessary to provide the access on the eastern side. Some organisations selling land realised that the lack of the subway access inhibited the sale of residential allotments and the Trustees of the Estate of Thomas Broughton contributed funds for the extension of the subway on the eastern side in the middle of 1903.¹⁸⁰ In that year, one press report said the North Shore line was suitable for “both the capitalist and workingman”, enticing people to wait for a forthcoming auction at the Chamberlain Hills Estate at Artarmon. The paper described Artarmon as:

“this delightful suburban is situated at an altitude of 320 feet above the harbour and, in consequence, splendid views can be obtained. Artarmon is exactly the same distance from Milsons Point station as Petersham is from the Redfern station, viz., four miles and daily there is a service of 42 trains and on Saturdays 46 trains. The land is located between Gordon Road (Lane Cove Road) and Artarmon railway station.”¹⁸¹

Land sales continued and the Commissioners were not able to deny the campaign against the increasing demand for access and it was announced in the press that the extension of the subway to the eastern side would be opened on 5th December, 1903.¹⁸²

¹⁷⁸ For subway, see Warner, op. cit., p. 45

¹⁷⁹ *Sydney Morning Herald*, 20th April, 1903, p. 4.

¹⁸⁰ *Sydney Morning Herald*, 27th June, 1903, p. 7.

¹⁸¹ *Evening News*, 8th May, 1903, p. 3.

¹⁸² *Sunday Times*, 29th November, 1903, p. 3.

There were many land sales at Artarmon in the first decade of the 20th century. Despite having a new station; despite having an extended subway and despite having a new platform building in 1900, the train travellers at Artarmon were not a happy lot. For the first time since the station opened in 1898, the subject of fares received a considerable amount of attention in the press. One such Letter to the Editor said that:

“The first-class annual season ticket between Artarmon and Milsons Point, four miles, which is quite as far as poor men who wanted a breath of fresh air can afford to live from the city, cost over 30 shillings per mile; whereas between one located at a longer distance from Milsons Point (Warringah is where rich men can and do reside), the rate is under one pound per mile. It’s enough to make one turn socialist. Then, instead of running nine and ten car trains to the Point and eight car trains up the hill, overloading the engines and making slow time, why don’t they run a more frequent service of four or five car trains? The line is going ahead rapidly, in spite of railway incongruities.”¹⁸³

Complaints from Artarmon residents continued for years and the theme was the same – that Artarmon residents were paying 50% more per mile for a first class season ticket than those people travelling from stations closer to Hornsby, such as Warrawee. In 1906, Artarmon station ranked fourth in the number of tickets sold on the North Shore line and people argued that Artarmon residents should share “in a good thing.” It appeared to the commuters at Artarmon that the “up-liners” got a much better deal.¹⁸⁴

Land sales continued and developers kept mentioning the spectacular views overlooking the Sydney Harbour and the Parramatta and Lane Cove Rivers. Just as the auctioneers were selling building allotments, train travellers at Artarmon kept pointing out to the Commissioners that they were unhappy with the timetable with its positive skew to those stations further up the line. One newspaper reported that “Artarmon has an axe to grind.”¹⁸⁵

At the same time as the Railway Department relocated Artarmon station in 1900, the Minister for Public Works, E. W. O’Sullivan, called tenders for the construction of a Harbour Bridge. Although he was the Parliamentary Member for Queanbeyan, he lived at Mosman. No design was considered satisfactory and the process was repeated in 1901 with tenders closing in 1902. Because it was “a time of temporary financial depression, nothing came of the move.”¹⁸⁶

¹⁸³ *Sydney Morning Herald*, 8th August, 1905, p. 8.

¹⁸⁴ *Evening News*, 25th October, 1906, p. 2.

¹⁸⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁸⁶ T. J. Hartigan, *Paper Read before the Catholic Historical Society*, 1st May, 1945, p. 11.

12 THE PROMISE OF A NEW PLATFORM BUILDING - 1909

GROWTH AT ARTARMON STATION

Sydney's population increased 30% between 1901 and 1911 and a further 44% between 1911 and 1921.¹⁸⁷ There was considerable rail traffic growth at Artarmon. In 1910, there was a staff of three at Artarmon station and the total number of passenger journeys was 377,670.¹⁸⁸ Artarmon in 1912 had the third highest ticket sales on the North Shore line behind Chatswood and St. Leonards. Also in 1912, the Commissioners completed duplication of the line between Milsons Point and Hornsby. By 1915, the staff at Artarmon had increased to five and the passenger journeys to 833,200 - an increase of 120%.¹⁸⁹ In 1916, the staff had grown to seven and the passenger journeys to 893,128 and in 1917 the staff was ten and the journeys 964,991, the second busiest on the line behind Chatswood.¹⁹⁰ Warner indicates that the postal revenue increased from \$774 in 1917/18 to \$1,436 in 1919/20. Residential building approvals continued to rocket in the first half of the 1920s.¹⁹¹

THE ANNOUNCEMENT OF A NEW BUILDING

There had been local pressure for some time for the establishment of a post office at Artarmon and this was provided on 1st December, 1909. At least the postal authority had recognised the pressing demands of the local community. Surprisingly, the Railway Department notified the Artarmon Progress Association that plans for a new station were ready and that tenders would be called for new buildings at Artarmon "but they will not be erected for some time."¹⁹² Considering that the new building did not arrive until 1916, the warning of a delay was judicious. One curious feature about the announcement was that it was proposed to use competitive tenders rather than construction by departmental labour and it seems that the reference was an error as the

¹⁸⁷ I.A. Brady, "Eastern Suburbs Railway for Sydney", *ARHS Bulletin*, Vol. 30 No. 501, July, 1979, p. 147

¹⁸⁸ Railway Commissioners, *Annual Report to 30th June*, 1910, Sydney, Government Printer, 1910, Appendix 18, p. 40

¹⁸⁹ Railway Commissioners, *Annual Report to 30th June*, 1915, Sydney, Government Printer, 1910, Appendix 20, p. 49

¹⁹⁰ Railway Commissioners, *Annual Reports to 30th June*, 1915 and 1916, Sydney, Government Printer, 1910 and 1911, Appendix 20, pp. 49 and 60

¹⁹¹ op. cit., pp. 39 & 55

¹⁹² Ibid., 21st August, 1909, p. 7.

tender system, especially for works on existing lines, had not been used since 1897 throughout the railway system.

In November, 1909, a list was printed in the Sydney press of those railway stations which featured free public telephones and Artarmon station was included on the list. Only 29 suburban stations and 13 country stations were provided with these free telephones and it would seem that the residents of Artarmon must have had some powerful friends to receive such a facility.¹⁹³ Readers of the Sydney press were also promised that the existing telephone poles on suburban streets would be replaced by underground conduits and this new program was to begin at Petersham station. It need hardly be mentioned that the pole replacement programme never reached Artarmon and, in fact, never reached any suburb of Sydney. Nevertheless, the fact that the Commissioners announced that Artarmon would receive a new station building in 1909 indicated an acknowledgement by the Commissioners that they understood that the existing timber platform building was beyond its use-by date and also an acknowledgement of the growing importance of both the suburb and the station. Although the underground conduits never arrived at Artarmon, at least the new station became a reality after a long wait.

The year, 1909, closed and the months ticked by and they ticked by also in 1910 without a whisper of information about the publicly announced new station building. Although Artarmon did not receive its new station building, it did receive a new timber coal bin in 1909 that would hold two tons of coal for the open fires in the existing building. It was located off the Sydney end of the platform. Its basic construction was an indicator of the tough time the Railway Department was having squeezing money from the Government. The coal bin measured eight feet two inches square internal and was formed by ten inch wide by five inch high by nine feet long old sleepers "laid loose on the ground." It was one foot two inches high. Eight other stations on the North Shore line received the same design and size of coal bin, though Pymble and Wahroonga stations were the only locations on the line to receive the larger version which held three tons. Was it much colder further up the line? Anyway, the Artarmon Progress Association was not satisfied with the construction of the new coal bin at its station and insisted it wanted a new platform building. The Association decided to go to the top of government and approached the Premier in 1910 who assured the Association that the new building had been approved and would be "gone on with as soon as funds are available."¹⁹⁴

The same story was told to the community in 1911 when the Chief Railway Commissioner assured the people of Artarmon that plans for the new station building

¹⁹³ *Sunday Times*, 7th November, 1909, p. 4.

¹⁹⁴ *Evening News*, 21st June, 1910, p. 1.

had indeed been prepared but there were no funds available to carry out the work. While the local people were assured that their proposed station would be a reality, the press reported the Commissioners as saying that “the matter..... will be noted for future consideration when allocating funds under the new estimates.”¹⁹⁵

JOHN BRADFIELD HIGHLIGHTS THE POULATION GROWTH ON THE NORTH SHORE

From what we know today, the more interesting news was the conduct of a Royal Commission in 1911 and a study by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works on the need for a City Railway. Guess what name comes to light in that development? Of course, it was John Bradfield who put forward his plan for a harbour bridge. He just happened to be a resident of the North Shore.

There are exceptions to all rules and the outstanding exception to the tradition of the intellectually lazy people in charge of Sydney’s public transport system in 1911 was John Bradfield. It was Bradfield who brought to attention the population increase on the North Shore. In 1911, he wrote about the peak hour congestion of the ferry service and stated that, if construction of the Sydney Harbour Bridge were not started then, the ferry service “will have to cope with at least double the number of passengers”.¹⁹⁶

Between the opening of the North Shore railway in 1890 and 1911, the population of the northern suburbs had trebled and the density of population had increased from 0.65 to 1.99 per acre over the same period.¹⁹⁷ In 1911, the North Shore population was 95,416 and, without the bridge, the then Acting NSW Government Statistician estimated that the population would grow to 164,000 in 1921 and 276,500 in 1931, representing an increase of 65% in the population.¹⁹⁸ Bradfield used statistical analysis to plan for the establishment of the railway corridor, with the Sydney Harbour Bridge possessing four train tracks. Not only was Bradfield able to use statistics to demonstrate publicly the need for a bridge, he had sufficient character to personally lobby Parliamentarians to build it. This is an occasion when the study of the past does reveal examples of past times when it appears that strategic public transport planning was much better implemented than it is today. Sydney needs desperately another Bradfield in 2016.

¹⁹⁵ *Sydney Morning Herald*, 11th August, 1911, p. 3.

¹⁹⁶ J.J. Bradfield, “Linking Sydney with North Sydney” in L. Coltheart & D. Fraser, *Landmarks in Public Works*, Sydney, Hale & Iremonger, 1987, 1.111

¹⁹⁷ *ibid.*

¹⁹⁸ *ibid.*

COMMUNITY PRESSURE RATCHES UP FOR THE PROMISED NEW BUILDING

The President of the Artarmon Progress Association continued to emphasise in 1912 the “great necessity” for a new building at the station. Alderman Molesworth said that they wanted a new brick building similar to the one at Chatswood. Artarmon, he claimed, had been passed over four or five years ago and said that the accommodation at the present station was “more than inadequate”. He told the local community that the Commissioners would do nothing if they were not pushed and considered their claim more than just because in 1912 Artarmon station now recorded the second highest ticket sales on the North Shore line. He said this statistic alone demonstrated that Artarmon was entitled to better accommodation.¹⁹⁹ Of course, this better accommodation ultimately did not mean the provision of a larger building but one erected of brick with pretty adornments which would provide a strong symbolic message about the status of the community served by the station. The one theme that dominates the history of New South Wales stations up to 1930 is that local communities regarded their station building as an identifier of the progress of the community and people and local government organisations were irritated when a nearby centre, in this case Chatswood, received a higher status structure than the one at their own urban centre.

Throughout 1912 the people of Artarmon wanted to know where was their so-called approved building and the same question was on their mind and unanswered in the years 1913, 1914 and 1915. Was Artarmon subject of especially poor treatment, compared to other stations? The Table below indicates platform buildings that were approved but not built from 1909, when the Commissioners announced their approval for a new building at Artarmon, up to and including 1916, at which time the Commissioners had given up erecting a new building and had decided to relocate an existing, redundant structure.

TABLE: STATION BUILDINGS APPROVED BUT NOT BUILT 1909-1916

YEAR APPROVED	LOCATION
1909	Gloucester
1909	Gloucester
1909	Narellan

¹⁹⁹ *Evening News*, 7th March, 1912, p. 8.

YEAR APPROVED	LOCATION
1909	Wingham and Taree
1910	Gloucester
1911	Artarmon
1911	Gunnedah
1911	Narrabri
1912	Redfern
1912	Junee
1912	Gunnedah
1912	Narrabri
1912	Young Chilling Works
1912	Wallerawang
1912	Roxburgh
1912	Piambra
1913	Gunnedah
1913	Trangie
1913	Bendick Murrell
1913	Victoria Street
1913	Yanco
1914	Holts Flat
1914	Canterbury
1914	Jincumbilly
1914	Bukalong
1914	Humula
1914	Mooren
1914	Middlefield

YEAR APPROVED	LOCATION
1914	Pullabooka
1914	Garoolgan
1914	Binya
1914	Beelbangerra
1914	West Wyalong
1914	Calleen
1914	Umbango Creek
1914	Humulla
1914	Mooren
1914	Murrawal
1914	Deringula
1914	Middlefield
1914	Myambat
1914	Sandy Hollow
1914	Binnaway
1915	Marrickville
1915	Warrell Creek
1916	Branxton
1916	Belford
1916	Rosewood
1916	Lake Cargelligo
1916	Murwillumbah
1916	Singleton
1916	Locksley

It is obvious from the above Table that Artarmon was not alone in not getting what had been promised to it. It was a case of too many demands on the limited finances available but the big question is, if that were the case, why did the Commissioners approved the construction of these structures for construction when they probably had a pretty good idea that funding was tight?

13 AT LAST, DELIVERY OF THE 1909 PROMISED BUILDING - 1916

CONTINUED POULATION GROWTH

The population of Artarmon continued to increase during World War One and into the 1920s. This trend is shown in the Table below showing statistics of the Willoughby Municipality.

TABLE: - WILLOUGHBY MUNICIPALITY - POPULATION, RAIL USAGE & LENGTH OF ROADS 1910 & 1916

INDICATOR	1891	1910	1916
Population	3, 411	13,280	24,835
Usage of Artarmon station in passenger journeys	Statistics for Artarmon station do not appear until 1902 when 17,237 tickets were sold	377,670	893,128
Length of roads in Willoughby Municipality	-	90	130

SOURCE: E. Russell, *Willoughby – A Centenary History*, Willoughby Municipal Council, 1966, p. 34 and B. McKillop, *Pictorial History Willoughby*, Alexandria, Kingsclear Books, 2015, p. 17.

The population increased between 1910 and 1916 by 37% and the increase in the length of local roads and streets by 44%. However, the use of Artarmon station escalated by an explosive 136%. More people than the percentage increase in the population of the local government area were using the station. Clearly, this was a time when Artarmon station had a very significant functional impact on the local population and this trend continued for the next decade.

CONSTRUCTION BEGINS

Nothing is recorded in the press about the start of construction of the building at Artarmon in 1916 and the first mention is in March of that year when it was reported that the foundations were being made and, if there were ever an indication that the leafy environment of the area was an important carrot in enticing people to live in Artarmon, it was the concern expressed at the time of early construction that two palm trees and one peppercorn tree on the platform had to be “sacrificed” to accommodate progress. It did not seem to worry the press or the community that Artarmon was receiving a second-hand structure and not a word adverse was recorded in the surviving newspapers about receiving a second-hand building. Quite the opposite. One report said that the future premises were “more commodious” and that the structure would “look new”. However, there was a call for the booking office, where tickets were purchased, to be located in the subway rather than in the platform building in order “to obviate excessive walking.”²⁰⁰

THE ORIGIN OF THE 1916 BUILDING

Bayley wrote 40 years ago that the Old Glenbrook station building was relocated to Artarmon in 1916.²⁰¹ However, there is some conflicting evidence which appears to introduce a degree of uncertainty about the origin of the present building. The options are whether the existing 1916 building at Artarmon is derived from five possibilities, these being:

- from the 1902 brick building at Old Glenbrook either hollis-bollis or in part,
- was a completely new structure erected from scratch at Artarmon,
- used components from either the 1867 and 1902 Old Glenbrook buildings,
- used components from the 1900 Artarmon building, &
- was a combination of any one of the above possible explanations.

There was a spare building at Old Glenbrook and someone remembered that Artarmon was promised and needed a new structure. It is possible that the Old Glenbrook building could have been moved to Artarmon but it is also possible that some materials from the 1900 timber building at Artarmon were re-used to provide the present structure. Inspection of the roof rafters at Artarmon revealed that the timbers had been in use prior to their installation at Artarmon in the 1916 structure.²⁰² The relocation of buildings had been undertaken at Oatley and Penshurst just before 1916 but both of these were timber structures. Signalling and Safeworking Historian, Dr. Bob Taaffe, established the

²⁰⁰ *Evening News*, 6th March, 1916, p. 4.

²⁰¹ Bayley, Lapstone Zig Zag Railway, op. cit., pp. 43, 50 & 51

²⁰² Thanks to Dr Jim Longworth for undertaking the inspection of the roof space on 14th April, 2005.

relocation of an entire signal box in about 1911, without dismantling the structure. He wrote that it involved "the movement of a signal box from Alexandria to Rhodes on a tubular framed wagon during daylight, with 40 minutes being allowed to unload the signal box at its destination."²⁰³

It was also not entirely foreign for the NSW Railways to consider the complete relocation of a brick building. Three other instances are known where this was considered. These involved a two-storey residence at St. Peters which was apparently relocated to Newtown in 1896 and a large single-storied residence from Redfern to Campbelltown in 1897.²⁰⁴ In 1922, a small brick cottage for the Station Master at Demondrille was relocated about 500 metres because it was in the path of track duplication works. It is the only one of the three relocated buildings that survives. No brick platform structure had ever been relocated.

Since 1855, the NSW railway administration was a major recycler of materials of all types and the re-use of the bricks from Old Glenbrook was consistent with the prevailing departmental philosophy. The NSW railway administration introduced pre-cast concrete station buildings in rural areas which were aimed at portability, starting with a structure at Lake Cargelligo in 1917. Hence, the concept (but not the reality) of moving masonry structures was common, not uncommon at the time.

From the evidence of the NSW Government Railway Contract Book, the Department of Railways proposed to erect a new station building at Artarmon in 1912, three years after the Chief Commissioner made a public commitment to provide it.²⁰⁵ Seven years after the initial promise, there was another entry in the Contract Book for 1916 which read "Removal of station buildings from Old Glenbrook and re-erection at Artarmon £998".²⁰⁶ The official history card for Artarmon station shows an entry for 1916 which states "Removal of station buildings from Old Glenbrook" at a cost of £995.²⁰⁷ An old index book shows an entry for Artarmon in which the 1912 plan is crossed out and the words "new drawing 1916" appear.²⁰⁸ Perhaps the most significant piece of evidence is a

²⁰³ Email from Dr. Bob Taaffe to author on 23rd June, 2016.

²⁰⁴ Plan Nos 59-41 and 59-50 of St. Peters dated 15.12.1896 and Redfern dated 14.5.1897, former SRA Plan Room

²⁰⁵ NSWGR, Contract Book No. 257, entry "provision of new station 1,130 pounds authorised 4th October, 1912". A notation appears in red at the entry "Cancelled", Former SRA Archives

²⁰⁶ NSWGR, Contract Book No. 258, entry dated 12th July, 1916, Former SRA Archives

²⁰⁷ NSWGR, Station History Card - Artarmon, Former SRA Archives

²⁰⁸ Index Book No. PRM 268, Station Buildings", RIC Plan Room.

plan, dated 10th February, 1916, for the present Artarmon station which indicates under the plan heading the words "from Glenbrook".²⁰⁹

An undated photograph in the former State Rail Archives shows the present Artarmon structure captioned as "the second station building".²¹⁰ This was a mistake. It was the third structure.

The NSW Railways moved station buildings and other structures around the railway system with some frequency. However, the difference between the general rule and the case at Artarmon is that the Old Glenbrook structure in 1916 was brick. The Department of Railways seldom moved a brick building. With the use of cement for mortar, the task of cleaning every brick would have been very substantial, especially since labour was at a premium in World War One when the relocation occurred. However, it is not an impossible proposition. The length of the Old Glenbrook and Artarmon buildings vary by only inches. The stylistic features of each structure match. The dates line up. Across the family of examples of which Artarmon and Old Glenbrook are specimens, there is a general application of reduced levels of ornamentation on the buildings over time from 1892 until 1935 but, because of inconsistencies in this trend, it is impossible to say whether the present building at Artarmon is a typical 1902 or a typical 1916 building, based on stylistic and ornamental features. Buildings in both years appear pretty much the same.

In New South Wales, replacement platform structures were often related to improvements in other sectors of engineering at the same location. For example, the first building at Artarmon was related to the opening of a new platform. The 1900 structure was tied to duplication but there were no other improvements occurring in 1916 at, near or involving Artarmon. It just seems a case of whim by a powerful bureaucrat who may have lived at Artarmon. Despite an increase in both staff and customers using the station, the present building represented no increased internal space over the then existing 1900 building. The only change was a transfer of external appearance from timber to brick. The NSW Railways adopted face brick construction for platform buildings in Sydney generally about 1912, with Berala being virtually the last timber building in 1911.²¹¹ Therefore, there was no question that, if Artarmon were to have a new building, it had to be brick.

²⁰⁹ Plan No. 57/62, entitled "Artarmon Station Building", RIC Plan Room.

²¹⁰ Photograph No. 1073/1, Former SRA Archives

²¹¹ The sole exception was the provision in 1931 of two side platform structures when Jannali was opened.

The question of the origin of the present Artarmon building is not an aspect of great importance. The enduring question is why it happened in World War One when no other station was subjected to a similar improvement.

14 WHAT ABOUT THE SUBWAY BOOKING OFFICE?

In conjunction with the erection of the 1916 building, the Railway Commissioner proposed to erect a new, wider subway much closer to the brick platform building.²¹² The reason for this action seems three fold. Firstly, the 1900 subway was too narrow for the rising patronage from the adjacent housing estates. Secondly, the railway administration wished to place the booking office in the subway, no doubt because increasing traffic required the use of more than the two ticket office windows in the platform structure, not to mention the increase in staff numbers at the station. Thirdly, the employee who collected the tickets at the top of the stairs from arriving passengers would have had a shorter distance to walk from the subway than from the platform building, hence making him a more efficient employee.

Despite the benefits, the work for the proposed subway was not carried out, possibly due to staff and materials shortages during World War One. The more plausible explanation is that the placement of a booking office in the subway would not have increased the perspicacity of Artarmon station to passengers passing by in trains or to nearby residents. Visibility of structures was important to the Railways because buildings were used as identifiers to display the significant power of the Railway Department at the time. Access to the platform remains much the same as it was in 1903 when the subway was extended to also provide access from the eastern side of the rail corridor. The overhead footbridge and lifts opened in 2015 supplements the subway access.

The anecdotal evidence relating to passengers avoiding the purchase of tickets goes some way to understand why it would have been preferable to have the booking office in the subway. The distance between the station building and the ticket barrier at the top of the steps was substantial. Between the top of the steps and the present building, the 1900 timber station building existed. There was simply no room to erect the 1916 in the preferred location in the middle of the length of the platform. The present brick building was erected towards the Sydney end of the platform and, when erected, the 1900 timber building was “removed”. The resulting long distance between the 1916 building and the stairs worked to the advantage of platform-wise commuters. In the late 1960s, Bill Laidlaw commuted to and from the station. He explained that the distance was so great that regular travellers would sit in the train at the correct spot and, when the train stopped, they would be at the top of the stairs and would run down the stairs

²¹² Plan entitled "Artarmon - Proposed Subway and Booking Office", dated 19th September, 1916, former State Rail Archives

before the junior porter had time to walk from the platform building to collect tickets. The result was a free ride. If there were ticket “snappers” (i.e. ticket inspectors) at the barriers, the people without tickets would go to the ticket window and buy a return ticket to an adjoining station and hand the return portion to the ticket inspector.²¹³

Bill Laidlaw also refers to the techniques of savvy commuters. In the Sydney bound direction, there was a signal, known officially as SH 6.47, located just away from the Sydney end of the platform. When trains were slowing down to stop at the signal, quick travellers could illegally jump on a non-stopping, but slow-moving train in the days of manually operated carriage doors.²¹⁴ The reverse also happened. For passengers to the city in a hurry, travel consisted of simply springing up the stairs, jumping on to a non-stopping train and a quick sprint at the other end to avoid buying a ticket. This meant another free ride. Passengers jumping on and off moving trains was something that happened frequently in the days when trains had manually operated doors.

²¹³ Discussion with Bill Laidlaw, 22nd August, 2002

²¹⁴ *ibid.*

15 THE PHYSICAL FEATURES OF THE 1916 BUILDING, AS CONSTRUCTED

THE SOURCE OF STATION DESIGNS

All designs of station buildings in NSW up to 1965 were based on architectural trends that were occurring in the general, residential market. There was no design which was unique to the NSW Railways. After 1965, station design has been based on commercial precedents.

In the 160 plus years of railway operations in NSW, there have been only been six major stylistic changes in the design of platform buildings. The Artarmon structure is grouped in the third of the six changes, a design starting in 1892 and ending in 1935, which reflected a Federation-influenced style that was common in general residential construction. The building at Artarmon is of a standard design.

THE ESSENCE OF THE DESIGN OF THE ARTARMON BUILDING

The platform building erected at Artarmon in 1916 – and the structure at Old Glenbrook approved in 1901 - were planned and erected at a time when the Federation style of architecture was influential outside the railway fence. The elements of the platform building at Artarmon that reflected the Federation influences were:

- The use of face brickwork for all external building walls,
- The square-headed windows,
- The use of small, multi-coloured window panes for the top sash for all windows and for fanlights above doors,
- The corbelling of the brickwork on the chimneys,
- The style of the terra cotta pots on top of the chimneys,
- The position of the moulded string course around all four sides of the building exterior,
- The application of a soldier course of brickwork above the windows,
- The moulding under the window sills,
- The gabled ends of the building, &
- The design of the finials on the gables.

Charles Oliver was appointed the first Australian born Chief Commissioner in 1906 and this appointment signalled a gradual reduction in the level of ornamentation and decoration of platform buildings generally. The design featured some characteristics of Federation architecture but, at the same time, the Artarmon building also possessed features of the fabric that had their origin in the preceding period of 19th century Victorian architecture. These were:

- The use of four-panel doors with the smaller panels at the bottom of the doors,
- The use of render on the building exterior as a design feature,
- The existence and design of the chimney pots of any style,
- The use of gables to end the roofline, &
- The use of corrugated iron on the roof rather than Marseille tiles.

The major materials used in the Artarmon building denote it as a classic example of NSW railway platform architecture of the period between 1901 and 1916.

MODERATE SIZED PLATFORM BUILDINGS FOR A MODERATE SIZED POPULATION

Sydney did not reach a population of 1,000,000 people until 1926. Australia was a small country, with a small population and only needed small station buildings. Burnley writes that Australia has had a long tradition of urbanization and cites that Australia was third highest in the world behind Japan and the United Kingdom.²¹⁵ Australia may have been urbanized but it is wrong to consider that Sydney had anywhere the population levels and especially density of other countries. The fact that the vast majority of station buildings in NSW were never replaced with larger structures is a testimony that most were erected with spare space or had no post-construction pressure for increased floor space. No platform building on the North Shore was ever enlarged. The dominant building alteration on that and some other lines was the conversion of former signal boxes and General Waiting Rooms for the expansion of parcels traffic. It also needs to be stated that the position of the station building at Artarmon in the middle of the two tracks on the elevated platform rather than at street level on the trackside was a huge inconvenience for customers wanting to deliver and pick up weighty or large parcels.

With approximately 34 feet of platform width at Artarmon, two 11 feet wide canopies were provided on each side of the Artarmon building. When people were seated on the

²¹⁵ I.H. Burnley, "The Urbanisation of the Australian Population 1947-71", in I.H. Burnley (Ed.), *Urbanisation in Australia*, Melbourne, Cambridge University Press, 1977, p. 3

platform furniture, there is only room for a single customer to walk along the platform without infringing the yellow warning line that marks the platform edge. The relatively moderate size of the Artarmon building is more than a manifestation of financial conservatism. It and its many fellow examples are statements of the relatively small size of Sydney and the diminutive nature of the NSW economy at the time of construction.

Artarmon station had a building that the rail administration wanted to provide according to its own departmental parameters. Railway officials guessed fairly correctly by building a structure of modest size for a relatively smallish population. The ticket purchasing arrangements and the building location reflected the organisation's formal culture of caring as much about itself as the customers who used the structure. Max Weber was correct after all when he wrote that the primary purpose of large bureaucracies is self-perpetuation.

THE DESIGN CRITERIA FOR THE CLASSIFICATION OF STATION BUILDINGS

There are three features which are used to denote changes in the design of all platform buildings on the New South Wales railway system. These are:

- roofscape,
- floor plan, &
- the method of support for the platform canopies.

The dominant 19th century roof style of NSW railway buildings, other than mono-pitched roofs on waiting sheds, is the double-pitched roof stopped by gables on which simple finials were mounted. This roof style was one of the features that was continued into 20th century design, as evident at Artarmon. It is the features of the roof, called the roofscape, which are an important design element. At Artarmon, the roof is devoid of any ornamentation, such as the use of ornate ventilator gables that were applied to Chatswood and Turrumurra 15 years before the Artarmon example. Ventilation to the toilets in 1916 was provided by two metal "cowls" through the roof ridge. The only other penetrations to the roof line were two brick chimneys through the ridge serving fireplaces in the Booking Office and the General Waiting Room. On this particular example, no fireplace was provided in the Ladies' Waiting Room, contrary to what is indicated in all standard drawings of the "A8" type to which the Artarmon building is an example – with variations. The chimneys did not possess complex strapwork, as was the case in 19th century structures, but showed two restrained bands of plaster moulding. The roof at Artarmon was very clean in appearance and its simplicity was one of the agents which showed the "no frills" symbolism of Australian culture.

The floor plan is the second element to separate NSW railway platform buildings into different types. The design at Artarmon is lineal in expression. Seventy-one examples, including Artarmon, were known to have been built with the roof extended to protect a signal interlocking frame at one end and 19 of these, including Artarmon, had the interlocking frame enclosed by walls.²¹⁶ The dominant time period in which signal boxes were built at the end of buildings was 1910-1917, of which Artarmon was a member. The juxtaposition of the Booking Office with the General Waiting Room was an arrangement dating from 1858 and continued to be used up to 1957. The idea behind this arrangement was the ability of staff to supervise people through the ticket office window who were sitting or standing in the adjacent General Waiting Room.

The outstanding feature of the floor plan was the placement of the entrance to the men's toilet at the opposite end of the building to the signal box. This idea of locating the male toilet at the furthest part of the building away from the entry point was first introduced in 1892 and used widely until 1960. Very few examples were built where the entrance to the male toilet was located at the building end where the pedestrian access point to the platform was located. The urinal in the men's toilet was visible from the toilet entrance and, in order to protect the mystery of masculinity, a screen was provided in front of the entrance. This screen was traditionally made of timber and covered with vertically placed boards. In so doing, brick platform buildings were topped and tailed with timber elements – the timber signal box at one end and the timber vanity screen at the other end. The Artarmon example accorded with these principles.

The tradition of the NSW Railways was to set timber boards horizontally on external walls but vertically set boards were used as design features. The first two buildings at Artarmon accorded with the tradition of horizontally set weatherboards on the external walls. Vertically placed boards were mainly used internally but signal boxes and privacy screens were usual exceptions to the policy.

The final building element that separates platform design is the way the platform canopies are supported. In the case of Artarmon, the canopies are supported by metal brackets which were fabricated in railway workshops and erected on site. These became known as “standard brackets” from 1912 and were used in a range of different types of buildings, including stores and offices. The metal brackets rested on corbels which, in the case of Artarmon, were carved from sandstone. This use of stone was the normal practice at the time of construction of Artarmon station. The corbels rested on

²¹⁶ R.T.T. Taaffe, *The Use and Selection of Materials in Signal Box Construction 1912-1990*, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Sydney, 1990, pp. 87-90

14" wide engaged piers, again normal. Concrete was used for corbels after World War One in order to save money.

SIGNIFICANCE OF MINOR DETAILS OF THE ARTARMON BUILDING

Two other elements of the Artarmon building are noteworthy. The first is the small size of the ticket window. Measuring about 18" high and 12" wide, the relatively tiny opening was a throwback to English practice. The construction of the small openings to communicate with customers remained the standard way of communication between staff and passengers until 1973, after which open counters started to appear. The 1916 ticket window arrangement, whereby tickets were sold to customers in an internal space continued to be used until 1982. The use of tiny ticket windows typified the informal culture of the staff of the Department of Railways to minimize face-to-face customer contact. It emphasized the idea that communicating was done by officials not by desire but obligation. The reticence of staff to communicate with members of the public was further stressed at some stations where the ticket window was only opened for business some minutes before train arrival time. The reluctance of the Railway Department to improve the way staff and customers interacted over the sale of tickets reflected the formal culture of the organisation to avoid change. The ticket window was, thus, a building element that was a key reflector of both formal and informal culture practices of the NSW rail organisation.

The second additional important building element is the overall moderate size of the building. The Artarmon building was only 11' wide internally and made daily work conditions cramped. It was an official obsession of the NSW Railways to minimize building widths in the 20th century. There were exceptions but these were mostly at locations where side, not island, platforms were used. A 12 feet wide external building envelope was the norm for the years between 1892 and 1960. The narrow width of the structure was a reflection of the narrowness of platforms generally, which, in turn, was a mirror of the relatively narrowness of the rail corridor. Less land resumed for a railway line resulted in less money being required for property acquisitions.

There is a third item of note. The "Ladies" sign attached to the external wall of the Artarmon building and the omission of a sign indicating a female toilet denote the special importance that society gave to women before 1960. The 1916 building thus is a conveyor of the ideology that treated women with a different status as men were treated. Although the original "Ladies" sign is now gone, the advertisements and signs

that today are affixed to the walls of the platform building are the shop window that advertise the current ideologies that the building owners wish waiting commuters to absorb.

16 THE MATERIALS IN THE 1916 BUILDING

Materials tell stories. Artarmon station was built using a dirty dark coloured brown face brick set in Flemish bond, which was used far less than the normal English bond. The brickwork was tuck-pointed. There was an inner layer of bricks without a cavity inside the external skin of bricks. The internal walls were rendered. The selection of bricks accorded with standard NSW Railway practice for buildings erected in urban areas (basically Sydney, Newcastle and Wollongong) after 1912. Brick remained the preferred building product for load-bearing walls up to 1987.

The Labor Government in 1912 established a State Brickworks at Homebush. While the intention was to obtain lower prices for bricks, the intended market was not retail sales but two Government Departments, namely the New South Wales Railways and the Department of Public Works. Bricks from the State Brickworks were widely used on the New South Wales Railways up until 1935, though the number of stations being built after 1925 was dwindling fairly rapidly. The dominant characteristic of the Homebush bricks is their unattractive colour, which the building at Artarmon shares.

Because of the colour of the bricks in the Artarmon building, it is doubtful that they were recycled from the building at Old Glenbrook, which was built in 1902. The Artarmon bricks show an unattractiveness which only a government could find visually acceptable. The Railway Commissioner decided on the use of brick to lower maintenance costs, saying that maintenance was “an important factor in these days when labour costs are high”.²¹⁷ While the evidence of the roof timbers in the ceiling cavity indicates a use prior to Artarmon in 1916, the colour of the brickwork suggests manufacture after 1912.

The iconic Australian building product was not brick but corrugated steel sheeting. It is possible that the corrugated iron roof sheets from the Old Glenbrook building were re-used at Artarmon. Over 90% of all station buildings in NSW had roofs sheeted with corrugated steel. In the 19th century, imported slate was used for some larger buildings but these number less than 20 out of a total of approximately 2,000 platform buildings. Terracotta roofing tiles were rarely used for platform structures. Only one platform building, which was a small timber structure at Mortdale, possessed a tiled roof before the provision of the 1916 building at Artarmon. The Mortdale building was demolished in 1920 and only seven additional platform buildings from a total of 2,000 buildings were built using terracotta roofing tiles after 1916, all between 1935 and 1955.

²¹⁷ J. Fraser, “The Development of the NSW Rail System, *An Address to Interstate Gathering, Institute of Civil Engineers*, October 1919, no. pag.

17 THE SYMBOLISM OF THE 1916 BUILDING

CULTURAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE NORTH SHORE RAILWAY

The arrival of the railway and the opening of Artarmon station encouraged residential development on the North Shore generally and at Artarmon in particular, stimulating the subdivision of the Artarmon Estate into residential building blocks.²¹⁸ Even before the opening of Artarmon station, the North Shore region was formed of two classes of residents. The powerful and affluent upper class resided in the Upper North Shore. Broomham cites the way the area was favourably regarded by the Gas Board. She argues that the Board was “favourably impressed” with the “well-to-do” people who lived between Roseville and Hornsby.²¹⁹ On the other hand, the area towards the Harbour was perceived as a middle class suburb in much the same character as Canterbury.²²⁰ These middle-class people had lobbied the NSW Government against the provision of a steam tram service on the North Shore because the trams were associated with transport for working classes. A railway was perceived as a superior mode for superior people and it is noteworthy that both Canterbury and the North Shore got trains as well as trams.

Urban consolidation brought additional rail patronage, thus making rail transport more viable and less of a burden on both customers and the State Government, which had to provide deficit funding for suburban railway services. The decision to provide a new building at Artarmon was aided by the increase in local passenger business but this does not explain why other old platform structures in Sydney were not replaced. It is possible that, among the hundreds of new residents in Artarmon between 1898 and 1916, there was one or more senior railway official who lived there and was in an influential position to allocate resources to the project. After all, who else would have known about the availability of the Old Glenbrook station building and who would know how to circumvent the Labor politicians controlling capital funds?

THE CULTURAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE 1916 ARTARMON BUILDING

²¹⁸ W.A. Bayley, *Sydney Suburban Steam Railways*, Bulli, Austrail Publications, no date, p. 45 and Warner, op. cit., p. 43

²¹⁹ R. Broomham, *First Light – 150 Years of Gas*, Sydney, Hale & Iremonger, 1987, p. 94

²²⁰ M. Hogan, “1889”, in M. Hogan et al (Eds.), *The People’s Choice*, Sydney, Federation Press, 2007, p. 317

While politicians try as hard as possible to leave no evidence of their suspicious dealings, they cannot escape their own “achievements”, in this instance the construction of the North Shore railway line. No matter what extent politicians and bureaucrats do to destroy traces of their mal-practices, they leave behind their monuments good and bad – in this case railway tracks, platform buildings and other structures – to expose their work. In the case of the North Shore railway, this includes the track junction at Hornsby facing towards Sydney, the construction of platforms, subways, bridges, tunnels and residences and the very corridor of railway. What the polities promised but did not deliver also survive to haunt them in newspapers and other documents.

The platform building at Artarmon reflects symbolism in two fashions. This is done, firstly, by the floor plan of the building and also by the provision of services from the building. Secondly, because the overall design is based on standard plans prepared in a centralized Head Office, the architecture symbolizes many of the cultural features of the rail administration.

Table 15.1 below sets out the physical aspects of the floor plan and services provided for the public by the 1916 building and indicates the social characteristics which these manifest.

TABLE 15.1 - BUILDING ELEMENTS AND CULTURAL MANIFESTATIONS

PHYSICAL ASPECT OF THE BUILDING	CULTURAL ASPECT OF AUSTRALIAN SOCIETY
Absence of room or space allocated specifically for Aborigines	Up until 1969, Aborigines not allowed on the platform until just before train departure time & under supervision by Europeans
Provision of Ladies' Waiting Room	Need to protect women from possibly bothersome men
Separate toilets for men and women	Respect for women
Placement of entrance to men's toilet out of sight of women – at end of building	Minimization of adverse odours caused by frequent use of open urinal
Use of Ladies' Waiting Room as an ante-chamber to Ladies' toilet	Confirmation that women's toilet habits were not a subject for observance by men
Provision of privacy screen in front of entrance to men's toilet	Need to protect women for possible unsightly habits of men

PHYSICAL ASPECT OF THE BUILDING	CULTURAL ASPECT OF AUSTRALIAN SOCIETY
Existence of a Cleaner's passage between toilets	Conservatism in building design – the passage had traditionally been placed in this location since 1892 to facilitate and removal of toilet pans
Provision of a General Waiting Room, with fireplace	Care for people, especially in winter
Softer colours applied to walls in Ladies' Waiting Room and General Waiting Room	Recognition of the more delicate nature of women
Allocation of moveable sets in Ladies' Waiting Room and fixed seats in General Waiting Room	Confirmation of the habit of women to perform a range of functions, such as child-minding, personal grooming
Allocation of a wall mirror in Ladies' Waiting Room	Recognition of that women need to maintain a high level of personal appearance
Location of internal ticket windows facing into General Waiting Room to enable direct staff supervision of waiting passengers	Care for people
Bubbler on platform	Care for people
Provision of subway to permit safe access between platform and adjacent streets	Care for people

Australian society has changed much since the building at Artarmon was erected in 1916 and all the cultural aspects listed in Table 15.1, except care for people, have not survived to the present. It could even be argued that today there is no official, genuine care for people, given the removal of many of the facilities once available at the station. Since 1916, telephones and "Help Points" have been provided nominally to assist people but such facilities exist more to prove to a court of law and insurance companies that the railway organization had fulfilled its legal duty of care in case of a possible prosecution for failure to provide a safe environment.

Now, electronic train indicators, in official language called Passenger Information Display Systems – shortened to PIDS, and electronic ticket issuing machines, departmentally named as Ticket Vending Machines – abbreviated to TVMs, have replaced the frequent presence of staff on the platform and this, in turn, has reduced the

perceived safety level of passengers. The situation has been worsened by the closure of the Ladies' Waiting Room and the General Waiting Room with its former direct visual staff supervision. These physical changes seem in line with the much higher level of anti-social behaviour in society generally. The physical fabric of the building at Artarmon, both in 1916 and today, reflect broad cultural standards and the historian is in a position to interpret the symbolic role of the fabric as primary evidence of social change – for the better and worse.

Apart from the symbolism reflected in the floor plan and services, the building as a whole conveys symbolic messages about the NSW rail administration, which designed the structure. The NSW Government Railways has a long-term history as a conservative organisation. When the first example of the building style as used at Artarmon was introduced in 1892, the structures had a considerable amount of ornamentation and presentation, featuring multi-coloured bricks, ornate awning brackets, small ornate roof vents, ornate door joinery and more complex rendering. By the time the present building was provided in 1916, most of the very ornate aspects had been removed from examples then being provided and this absence of attractive details was a reflection of social and other changes between 1892 and 1916.

The 1916 building at Artarmon was considered by the rail administration as a superior presentation, compared to the two previous platform buildings in 1898 and 1900. This perception was correct.

WHO WAS RESPONSIBLE FOR DELIVERING A NEW BUILDING IN 1916?

One or more railway officer who resided at Artarmon or an influential and powerful resident had a perception that Artarmon the suburb had developed from a middle to an upper class area and realised that the way to demonstrate this more elevated status was to build a brick platform building to join an unbroken line of brick platform structures that represented the Upper North Shore to rail travellers living north of Artarmon. There is one other item of evidence that suggests that key railway officers were involved in giving preference to works to the North Shore where many lived.

Up until 1934, the timetable for trains on the North Shore were located at the rear of the public timetable. From 1934 to 1976, someone decided to re-arrange the layout of the public railway timetable and placed the North Shore line at the very front of the book. In addition, the Department of Railways numbered the timetables and made the North Shore line Timetable No. 1. This followed the renaming of the former Milson's Point branch line to the North Shore line on 20th March 1932, when the Sydney Harbour Bridge opened.

Artarmon station performed a symbolic role as a statement to the community that told observers two things. Firstly, the platform building was a reminder of the one-time greatness of the NSW Department of Railways. The “standard” design of the building, as noted by Warner, is a reference to the Department’s use of a design that was almost universally applied to every new station building built in Sydney between 1892 and 1928. The design, as distinct from the timing of its construction, of the 1916 Artarmon station building had nothing to do with the importance of Artarmon as a suburb. Rather, it was a symbol of the massive size and influence of the NSW State rail administration and also a symbol of the strong link between governments, the rail organisation and property developers. It was the Railway Department which determined the style and size of all platform buildings and, with rare exceptions, a community got what the Department considered, not what the community desired.

The second aspect of the Artarmon station design lies in the evidence that Artarmon was the last station on the North Shore line between St. Leonards and Hornsby to receive a brick version of the “standard” design. The collection of 11 consecutive structures of the same design indicates that the NSW Department of Railways recognised the special importance of the North Shore line as having a common identity. Artarmon station before 1916 had a timber version of the “standard” design and the very initiative to replace timber with brick in the middle of World War One, when capital funds were virtually non-existent, clearly confirms the North Shore line as a special, elite entity because the Department believed that it was a special residential area.

The intention to eliminate the timber building in 1916 was an indicator that NSW Government railway policy, but not ideology, at that time was oriented to favour the city. The Bush was favoured between 1855 and 1915 and again between 1930 and 1980. The city fared better between 1915 and 1930 and between 1980 and the present. Ten times the number of timber buildings were erected compared with masonry structures and the timber structures were mostly built in country areas and when the policy and ideology favoured the country.

The NSW Railways was the first government owned steam railway system in the British Empire and the whole railway system in NSW was an ideological expression of the nature of the NSW Government. The rebadging of the railway entity with different names and the sale of various parts of the once great empire in recent years are signs of changes in government ideology.

The timing or design of the 1916 building at Artarmon does not reveal any features that identify a serving politician with powerful influence over the Railway Department. It was not built at the direction of local State and Commonwealth Parliamentary Members. Billy Hughes was the Commonwealth Member for North Sydney in 1916 and lived at Lindfield until 1922. Also, the NSW Ministers for Public Works around 1916, Arthur

Griffith and John Cann, under whose portfolio came railway construction, held electorates outside the North Shore railway.

Economic factors may also be reflected in building fabric. Up until 1972, the selection of materials for platform buildings generally reflected the amount of revenue the Department of Railways received in each financial year. The size of buildings, the materials used and the floor plan are indicators which may reveal the role of finance, including sourcing of funds by other than the railway organization. However, the Artarmon station building is one that is entirely consistent with other examples and does not manifest any clues that the lack of availability of finance was an issue in 1916.

The building at Artarmon symbolises the arch conservatism of the New South Wales Railways. Also, the building is relatively restrained in length and width. Both of these features characterise NSW railway station architecture from 1855 to 1980. Overall, the building at Artarmon shows an absence of pretension. The lack of ostentatious adornments symbolised the *no-frills/no bullshit* approach associated with Australian cultural identity. Artarmon is a plain-Jane looking building epitomising the *you get what you see* approach to Australian characterisation.

As well, the building at Artarmon symbolises much about the institutional culture associated with the NSW Railways generally. Table 15.2 below shows the symbolism associated with various elements of the station fabric that reflect the culture of the railway organisation.

TABLE 15.2 – LINK BETWEEN FABRIC & INSTITUTIONAL CULTURE

ELEMENT	CULTURAL CHARACTERISTIC
Use of different ceiling materials in rooms	The strict appliance of an organisational system based on seniority and rank
The sharing of booking office space for all levels of staff, including Station Master, Booking Clerks & Porters	Belief that there should be no idle time during working hours – clerks at ticket windows & porters on platform
Notice boards affixed to external walls listing official railway By-laws	High degree of organisational regimentation
Timetables affixed to external building	Confirmation of the importance of

ELEMENT	CULTURAL CHARACTERISTIC
walls	discipline of all types in organisation
Provision of signal box with external walls clad with vertical timber boards	Identification that the strict branch structure in the organisation (Signal Branch built and controlled the Signal Box whereas remainder of brick building built and controlled by Way and Works Branch)

In addition to the individual fabric items, the building as a whole conveyed messages about the rail organisation. For instance, it was widely known that the rail administration had a high degree of care for injured employees and for the relatives of deceased staff. This cultural trait was reflected in the attachment of a first aid box to the wall inside the booking office and the positioning of a stretcher adjacent to one of the doors in case of an accident to staff or passengers. The railway organisation was also publicly known as an institution in which the most junior official had equal access to the top job. At Artarmon, this egalitarian attitude was reflected in the absence of a separate room for the Station Master.

All staff were told to treat all customers equally and staff and customers were regarded as being equals. This policy was evident in a lack of dedicated staff toilets and absence of staff amenities in the 1916 building when it was constructed and up till 1990. A significant aspect of the informal culture of the organization was the importance of mateship. This was facilitated partly by the cramped working conditions, with all staff at Artarmon sharing the booking office space. It was also evident on the minuscule space on footplates of locomotives or in the small size of track gangs and track gang vehicles.

The consideration of the symbolism of the Artarmon structure demonstrates that the structural fabric tells much more about Australian cultural identity and railway culture than a mere analysis of materials as building products. The link back to the designer of the fabric and forward to the intended user provide the evidence and understanding of the invisible structural features that show by whom and for whom the building was constructed.

18 THE FAMILY OF BUILDINGS TO WHICH THE 1916 ARTARMON STRUCTURE BELONGS

WHY EXAMINE RAILWAY STATION BUILDINGS?

Railway stations form one of the few types of public buildings that have been in existence for a very long time, in this case 161 years in 2016. More importantly, examples survive for every year from 1856 to the present and this class of building provides a good example of the way they reflect and interact with their social, economic, geographic and political environment. About 2,000 platform buildings have been built since 1855 with about 600 examples extant.

THE FAMILY OF SIMILAR DESIGNED BUILDINGS

Because the focus of this research is oriented to railways, the comparison in this instance lies with other examples of the same design of platform building. Even here, the potential number of comparative examples is substantial. Artarmon was one of 267 examples of the same type.²²¹ This class of building represented 16% of all structures erected on platforms between 1855 and 1980. A total of 143 or 53% were of brick construction and these were mainly in urban areas. Now that says something about the location of power! The remainder were built of timber and tended to be located in rural locations. For example, every platform building on the North Coast line being planned between 1909 and 1919 was of timber construction, as was most duplication structures on the Main Southern line between 1912 and 1917.

The family to which the Artarmon building belongs has no formal label but it belongs to a group of buildings that was influenced by trends in architecture in the general community and, in particular, what is known as the Federation style. It would be incorrect to describe the Artarmon building as it an example of Federation architecture but it is reasonable to describe it as being influenced by the Federation style. It is also reasonable to describe the structure as the initial island platform building design as these were the very first structures designed and used specifically for island platforms. The Federation-influenced style was used by the New South Wales Railways between 1892 and 1935 in all parts of the State but the 43-year period can be divided into three distinct sub- periods. The first period was from 1892 to 1909 during which time the buildings usually but not always had a higher level of ornamentation and a degree of ornamental differences between the examples. The present building at Turramurra

²²¹ Sharp, op. cit., Vol. 2, p. 266

belongs to this first group. The second time period extended from 1910 to 1924 during which time the application of ornamentation was standardised on a less spectacular basis and the structure at Artarmon and the other similar buildings on the North Shore line date from this time period. The third period was from 1925 to 1935 and this was marked by a further but substantial reduction in the level of ornamentation on examples. The present platform building at Petersham is an example.

It was more likely to see brick examples in the Sydney-Newcastle-Wollongong rail corridor and timber examples in rural locations but there were quite a few exceptions to this generalisation. In the 19th century, platform buildings were either moderately sized or middle sized and large country towns featured large, magnificent masonry buildings. The explanation is all about time. There was a fundamental change of design policy after 1893 and this was brought about by the impact of the 1890s Depression. By that time, virtually all the major towns in rural parts of the State, apart from coastal centres, possessed brick and sandstone platform buildings but, without sufficient public money available, governments of all descriptions implemented from 1893 a policy which said that it was far more important to spend the limited finances available on new rural lines in wheat areas with cheap station buildings rather than building fewer new lines with more expensive buildings. That was a sound policy as most new lines in the wheat belt served towns of little importance with small populations.

The widespread use of the style of building as used at Artarmon station is reflected in the existence of other, similar examples near the Central Business District of Sydney. Artarmon is some 10 kilometres from Sydney Central station.²²² It is a brick platform structure situated on an island platform. The combination of a brick building, in the Federation-influenced style on an island platform with brick platform walls, is found on all other rail lines in the Sydney network. For example, within a ten kilometre radius from Central can be found Redfern station with four similar examples and Petersham on the Main Western line and Erskineville with three examples on the Illawarra line. It is also found on the North Shore line where all the buildings between Artarmon and Hornsby once had the same style of building. All examples on the North Shore line, except that on no. 1 platform at Lindfield date from the duplication of the line between St. Leonards and Hornsby in the 1900-1909 period.²²³ In a distance of 17 kilometres (11 miles), there were 11 stations with a similar styled building. There are slight stylistic and other changes amongst the various examples that denote slightly different construction dates. At first glance, the Artarmon building looks much like any one of the other adjacent ten examples of the Federation influenced design which the railway

²²³ SRA, *Opening Dates of Track Sections, including Duplications, Deviations etc.*, Unpublished Reference Manuscript, Former SRA Archives, 1985, p. 5

administration used between 1892 and 1935. Warner, the local historian for Artarmon, described the building as "the standard type of railway station building".²²⁴ She was largely correct.

Most of the Federation-influenced design features of the Artarmon building are also found on the other North Shore platform buildings. However, there is an old Serbian saying that an educated man never makes assumptions.²²⁵ With this in mind, the historian questions Warner's description that the Artarmon building is "standard". Every large railway system in the World in the 20th century prepared plans for standard designs of all types of structures. The NSW Government Railways was included in that category. Although standard designs were being used from 1858 in New South Wales, the use of standard plans dates from a much later time, namely 1897, five years after the first example of the Federation influenced design was introduced at Kiama.

DESIGN STANDARDISATION

Between 1897 and 1950, letters of the alphabet were allocated to different building types. The Way and Works Branch of the NSW Railways used the letters A, B, C and P to signify different styles of platform buildings. It was that Branch which designed and built the brick part of the 1916 building. The Artarmon building is closest to the standard A8 design. However, the rail administration approved three different standard drawings at different times for the "A" standard type²²⁶. Two were a shorter and a longer version of the same design but the third was completely different. The Artarmon station building was 87 feet long and this was made up of a platform building 75 feet long and a 12 feet long signal box. It is noteworthy that the signal box does not appear on any of the A8 drawings as this part of the structure, except the roof, was built of material (timber) by a different part of the railway administration, viz. the Signal and Telegraph Branch. The signal box was demolished in 1989.

COMPARISON WITH SIMILAR NORTH SHORE BUILDINGS

The design of the buildings between Artarmon and Waitara was originally based around the 74 feet long standard plan for the A8 platform building. However, there were variations amongst the various examples. Table 18.1 below sets out some dimensions

²²⁴ Warner, op. cit., p. 44

²²⁵ Discussion with author by Dragan Divjak, Serbian cultural author, 30th August, 2008

²²⁶ See State Rail Authority, *Station Building Diagrams*, no details, 1980, p. 8 which shows a plan dated 12.1915 for a building 74' 3" long; plan No. EDMS CVO235825 dated 23/5/1913 which shows a similar floor plan but 71' 7" long and a plan dated 2/8/1917 which shows a different design of a building 146' long (in standard plan folder)

that relate to the structures between Artarmon and Waitara when built with floor buildings of the same design family.

TABLE 18.1 - SELECT BUILDING DIMENSIONS ARTARMON TO WAITARA

STATION	COLOUR OF EXTERNAL FACE BRICKS	WIDTH OF AWNING	BUILDING LENGTH	INTERNAL HEIGHT TO CEILING	HEIGHT FROM CORBEL TO PLATFORM
Artarmon	Dark brown	10'	87'	N/A	N/A
Chatswood No. 1	Dark brown	11'	72'	N/A	5'3"
Chatswood No. 2/3	Dark brown	10'6"	87'	N/A	N/A
Roseville	Red	9'6"	72'	N/A	8'6"
Lindfield No. 1	Dark brown	11'		11'6"	5'9"
Lindfield No. 2/3	blonde	9'7"		11'1"	
Killara	Dark brown	11'	87'	11'7"	5'9"
Gordon No. 2/3	Dark brown	N/A	N/A	12'	
Pymble	Salmon	13'	76'	11'7"	Not extant
Turramurra	Light salmon	9'	87'	11'6"	
Warrawee	Salmon	9'	72'	10'7"	4'5"
Wahroonga	Light salmon	8'	87'		
Waitara	Salmon	11'	72'	11'	

SOURCE: various plans, former SRA Archives and site inspections

Table 18.1 indicates that the North Shore line buildings were basically of two lengths. The only basic difference was that the longer version included a signal box. In regard to building width, awning width and placement of awning corbels there was a considerable amount of minor variation. This was due to the use of different site supervisors and different builders. Four different colours of bricks were used. There were other variations. Circular awning gussets were used at Turramurra and Chatswood on Nos. 2/3 platform. There was no external moulded string course on the structure at Lindfield

Nos. 2/3 platform, a feature restricted to that station. The building on Nos. 2/3 platform at Chatswood used chamfered bricks on door openings but this feature was not used elsewhere on the North Shore.

No two platforms were the same width. No two subways had common internal dimensions. While there were broad common features in the official residences for Station Masters, it was an area where some individual architectural and design expression existed. The variations between examples of a particular standard demonstrate the will and desire of individual people in the design process to express their own ideas. The surprising aspect is that the designers' superiors approved these variations with impunity to the designers. In all periods of design standardisation and in all other areas of railway operations, it is easy to see the lack of standardization, which shows the extent of individual expression by railway staff. As one commentator expressed, there was a standard for every example.²²⁷ Whereas the NSW rail organization believed that it extensively engaged standardisation of nearly all everything, the opposite accorded much more credit. In this way, individual staff even at a relatively junior level in the design office were able to express a fair degree of personal power.

The large degree of variations amongst the North Shore platform buildings indicate that, despite the enormity of the bureaucracy in the NSW Railways, there was an abundant degree of tolerance of personal expression. There was no attempt to enforce a standard colour of brickwork, standard building width or standard awning dimensions. Of the 143 examples of brick Federation styled platform buildings, Artarmon was an example of the type most commonly built in that group of structures, a design group that existed between 1909 and 1923, though there were exceptions.

The surprising message that comes from the study of comparative examples is that the NSW Rail administration has had a long tradition of allowing expression by individual officers, despite the policies supporting standardisation. It was possible for people to work for a large bureaucracy but still express themselves officially, at least to some degree.

Not only did Artarmon receive a new, brick building in 1916, the NSW Government approved the construction of two similar buildings at Hornsby in the same year. The decision to provide similar designed buildings at Artarmon and Hornsby in 1916 were the final elements in a plan by the Railway Department to identify the North Shore as a distinct region of Sydney, and using the new Artarmon station structure as the starting point for the Upper North Shore.

²²⁷ Comment made by Jim Longworth, 28th June 2003.

It was the NSW Government Railways that acted to help define a region of Sydney known as the Upper North Shore. It did this by providing platform buildings between Hornsby and Artarmon of roughly the same material, design, size and standard.

Up until 1916, Artarmon possessed a timber building, as did every other station south of Artarmon to Sydney Harbour. Yes, St. Leonards possessed a brick building on the Sydney-bound platform in 1890, but it received a timber building in 1893 on an opposing platform when the line was extended to the Harbour. Up until 1916, Artarmon was linked sociologically to the Lower North Shore but, with its new brick platform building in 1916, it changed its social orientation 180 degrees. So far as the Railway administration was concerned, the Upper North Shore commenced at Artarmon from 1916. In this way, the NSW Government Railways said that, not only was the site of Artarmon sufficiently important to warrant a platform, a building and staff, it was of greater importance to the region and thus warranted a regional connection by the provision of the present brick building in 1916. In essence, the locality of Artarmon held a very high level of meaning to the NSW rail administration at the time.

Another profitable analysis would be the comparison of Artarmon station against residential and commercial architecture surrounding the station and radiating from the rail corridor. This may reveal information about the architectural impact of the station building on later residential development. That type of study may illustrate the subtle way in which governments can influence people about the design of their residences. However, the author does not possess sufficient time, knowledge and skills to make a comparative assessment between Artarmon station and the private, commercial and public buildings in the suburb that surround the station.

19 ARTARMON AS A BRANCH LINE JUNCTION

It was not only living people who were growing in number in Sydney but the dead.

The idea of a new cemetery at Field of Mars with a branch line from Artarmon was first raised on 19th December, 1912. Much like the promised new building for Artarmon platform, which was first approved by the Commissioners in 1909, nothing happened for a long time about the proposed cemetery line.

In 1916, the Department of Railways got serious and planned a junction to the north of Artarmon station and a branch line into the Field of Mars Cemetery to the west.²²⁸ It was never built but the timing of the construction of the building at Artarmon in 1916 might also be related to a future, increased status of the station, so far as the Railways was concerned, if Artarmon were to be a junction station. The similar application of brick buildings for junction stations where the branch line structures were in timber happened a couple of times around the same period, with two examples being the complete rebuilding of Fassifern station for the Toronto branch and Galong for the Boorowa branch. A thinking reader might say, well the Railways did not build the Cemetery branch so they built the new station at Artarmon as a replacement project. The fact that the branch line to the proposed cemetery was never built did not relate in any way to the construction of Artarmon station in 1916, as the planning of the two projects was undertaken by separate branches of the NSW Railways (i.e. the Railway Construction Branch for the new cemetery line and the Existing Lines Branch of the station building), both branches having a very large amount of autonomy and made decisions without reference to other branches in the same organisation. It is noteworthy that the Signals Branch proceeded to erect a new signal box at Epping for the proposed 1927 rail line between St. Leonards and Epping, even though the line was not built at that time. The Existing Lines Branch also built a new platform at Epping for terminating trains on the proposed line, trains from which never arrived which never departed.

By 1917, the idea of a branch line to the cemetery was just as dead as the intended occupants. The Commissioners pointed out that the proposed line would be a massive loss-making venture and they preferred a branch line from the Main North line at Eastwood, rather than a branch from the North Shore line. Additionally, the

²²⁸ Plan No. 927 10/203, entitled "Field of Mars Cemetery Junction Arrangements", dated 8th February, 1916, RIC Plan Room.

Commissioners were against opening up any further “residential country at present while so much land along the Northern line is unbuilt upon.”²²⁹

²²⁹ Reported in *The Cumberland Argus and Fruitgrowers' Advocate*, 10th February, 1917, p. 6.

20 WHY WAS THE ARTARMON BUILDING ERECTED DURING WORLD WAR ONE?

The absence of available public finance does seem relevant to explain the construction in 1916, despite the absence of documentary and physical evidence to confirm the hypothesis. The present building was provided in the middle of World War One. There were shortages of materials and men, yet both of these items would have been required for the erection of the station building at Artarmon. The notation, “from Glenbrook” on the 1916 plan relating to the relocation of the building at Old Glenbrook gives a little clue. Had a new building been provided, the funding would have had to come from the Department’s capital works allocation, which had been authorised by State Parliament. Without access to sufficient capital funds for passenger-oriented projects in urban areas, the Railway Department applied money from its recurrent pool of funds used for maintenance, which did not require Parliamentary approval in terms of where and on what priorities the Department allocated its operational budget.

The War had not stopped the provision of large sums of money in the capital allocation for the construction of several rural branch lines, the duplication and deviation of rural main lines and the provision and expansion of freight-only lines in Sydney. However, no money was spent from the capital works programme for works on the Sydney passenger network. Artarmon was the only station completely rebuilt in 1916 in the whole state.²³⁰ In fact, it was the only station to receive a replacement platform structure between 1910 and 1920. It was, thus, a rare event to rebuild a platform building. Relocation of the Old Glenbrook structure was one way that such a rare occurrence could be disguised from the political masters as the funding would have come not from capital works requiring Parliamentary approval but from the Department’s own current expenditure. It is how the fabric of the Artarmon building was obtained that is the important feature.

So far, it has been established that the provision of the platform building at Artarmon in 1916 was an event that was out of the ordinary. It was built during the War, hidden from Parliamentary scrutiny and opened as the sole replacement structure in Sydney for many years. Why in 1916? Spearitt wrote that the expansion of Sydney’s public transport system received a stimulus from the 1909 Royal Commission on the Improvement of the City of Sydney and its Suburbs which recommended, amongst other things, the construction of a Harbour Bridge which would link the North Shore line with the City.²³¹ Artarmon shared in that growth. In 1912, the Railway Commissioners

²³⁰ No changes were made to the existing buildings at Hornsby on No. 4 platform in 1916.

²³¹ P. Spearitt, *Sydney Since the Twenties*, Sydney, Hale and Iremonger, 1978, p. 141

submitted to the NSW Parliament proposals for suburban railways to meet the increasing population of Sydney. Nothing happened until the Labor Party, which had strong support in the Sydney metropolitan area, presented the City and Suburban Railways Electric Bill to Parliament, which subsequently passed the draft legislation. It was the report of John Bradfield in 1916 on which the legislation was based. Bradfield lived at Gordon and travelled past Artarmon on a daily basis. However, rural interests within the Labor Party stopped funding on Sydney rail projects and started the explosion of rural branch line construction.²³² It may have been this cessation of capital funding to the City Railway that prompted the use of a recycled building using current funding sources. How lucky was Artarmon to receive its new building in 1916, keeping in mind that absolutely no work occurred on Bradfield's City Railway after 1916 – a situation which remained until construction restarted in 1922.

The heritage values evident in the present building at Artarmon are not dependent on whether or not the structure was relocated from Old Glenbrook. The significance of the present platform building is related to its provision at a time of war and at a time when nothing else was happening to the existing Sydney passenger rail network. If the 1916 Artarmon station building were related to the overall growth of urban Sydney, many other old, timber structures would have been replaced and additional passenger infrastructure erected as priorities well before construction of the Artarmon building.

It is got to be a case of four things coming together in 1916. The first was having a powerful Railway officer to push the case for the construction the building who had a bias towards the suburb of Artarmon. The second factor was the knowledge that there was an available redundant building at Old Glenbrook. The third ingredient was the wartime shortages of manpower and materials, which forced consideration of something different to the normal approval process and, fourthly, the existence of a senior officer who was too old to enlist in the War but who understood how to circumvent the capital works approval system.

²³² I. Collins, "The 'country interest' and the Eastern Suburbs Railway, 1875-1932", in G. Wotherspoon (Ed.), *Sydney's Transport*, Sydney, Hale and Iremonger, 1983, p. 123

21 THE ABSENCE OF A GOODS SIDING AT ARTARMON – IMPACT ANALYSIS

THE IMPORTANCE OF TRACK GRADIENTS

The omission of a freight siding at Artarmon at first seems to be explained by the provision of such facilities at St. Leonards and Chatswood, either side of Artarmon. However, there is also another reason and this relates to the steep gradient on which Artarmon station is located. Table 21.1 below lists the gradients at each of the North Shore stations.

TABLE 21.1 - GRADIENTS AT NORTH SHORE STATIONS

STATION	GRADIENT – 1960 EXPRESSED AS A VERTICAL RISE ON 1 UNIT IN A MEASURED LENGTH OF HORIZONTAL UNITS	GRADIENT – 2005 EXPRESSED AS A VERTICAL RISE ON 1 UNIT IN A MEASURED LENGTH OF HORIZONTAL UNITS
North Sydney	Level	Level
Waverton	235	339
Wollstonecraft	306	342
St. Leonards	400	152
Artarmon (1898)	50	69
Chatswood	400	870
Roseville	Level	281
Lindfield	330	159
Killara	470	405
Gordon	170	180

STATION	GRADIENT – 1960 EXPRESSED AS A VERTICAL RISE ON 1 UNIT IN A MEASURED LENGTH OF HORIZONTAL UNITS	GRADIENT – 2005 EXPRESSED AS A VERTICAL RISE ON 1 UNIT IN A MEASURED LENGTH OF HORIZONTAL UNITS
Pymble	82	104
Turramurra	82	106
Warrawee	86	102
Wahroonga	70	128
Waitara	Level	2941

SOURCE: NSW Railways, *Curve and Gradient Diagrams*, no date, p. 231 and plan of Artarmon station signed by W. Foxlee, 29th October 1894

Table 21.1 indicates that Artarmon was placed and remains on the steepest gradient of all North Shore stations. Placing a freight siding on such a gradient would be inviting derailments and accidents by freight vehicles rolling down the gradient. It is possible to build freight sidings adjacent to steep gradients on the level but, because of the height of the required embankment, access would be denied to the adjacent public street system. The steep gradient for the main line also has been a problem for passenger trains endeavouring to stop and start on a hill.

EXISTENCE OF FREIGHT FACILITIES AT NORTH SHORE STATIONS

The most singular feature about the opening of the line was that it was the first purely suburban railway in Sydney. The western line to Strathfield and the Illawarra line to Hurstville were both built before the North Shore line and both supported local residential development but they were essentially rail lines extending further than the perimeter of Sydney into rural areas. They were initially country lines aimed at bringing freight through the suburbs to the Sydney market and port. Table 21 .2 below sets out the opening year of each station on the North Shore line and the opening and closing dates of the goods sidings at each station.

TABLE 21 .2 GOODS FACILITIES ON THE NORTH SHORE LINE

NAME OF STATION	DATE OF OPENING OF STATION FOR PASSENGER TRAFFIC	DATE OF OPENING OF GOODS SIDING/S	DATE OF CLOSING OF GOODS SIDING/S	TYPE OF SIDING/S
Waitara	20.4.1895	No siding		
Wahroonga	1.1.1890	3.10.1891	1.7.1940	General goods siding
Warrawee	1.8.1900	No siding		
Turramurra	1.1.1890	Unknown	1.7.1940	General goods siding
Pymble	1.1.1890	First reference 1897	1.7.1940	General goods sidings
Gordon	1.1.1890	First reference 1897	6.5.1952	General goods siding; siding for Kuring-gai Council opened 6.9.1927
Killara	10.7.1899	No siding		
Lindfield	1.1.1890	First reference 2.10.1913	1.7.1940	General goods siding
Roseville	1.1.1890	No siding		
Chatswood	1.1.1890	First reference 1897	19.3.1987	General goods siding; siding for Willoughby Council opened 10.8.1928; siding for Australian Portland Cement Co. opened Jan. 1969;

NAME OF STATION	DATE OF OPENING OF STATION FOR PASSENGER TRAFFIC	DATE OF OPENING OF GOODS SIDING/S	DATE OF CLOSING OF GOODS SIDING/S	TYPE OF SIDING/S
				Vanderfield & Reid siding opened by Feb 1969
Artarmon	6.7.1898	No siding		
St. Leonards	1.1.1890	1.1.1890	19.3.1987	General goods siding; siding for North Sydney Brick & Tile Co. opened 1902 & closed 1954; Riverstone Meat Co. siding opened 22.4.1921 Stewart & Lloyds siding opened 6.1.1938; siding for Blue Metal Quarries opened 21.2.1928
Wollstonecraft	1.5.1893	No siding		
Waverton	1.5.1893	1.5.1893	22.3.1927	General goods siding
Milsons Point	1.5.1893	1.5.1893	15.11.1920	General goods siding

SOURCE: Manuscript by John Oakes for forthcoming book on Sydney goods sidings

The pattern of existence of goods sidings for the North Shore line was consistent with those built from the opening of the first public railway line in 1855. In the 19th century, populations of all but the largest towns were small and the number of goods sidings was minimal between the origin and destination points of new lines. Also, sidings and goods facilities, such as cranes and goods sheds, were built as demand grew to a point where the Railway Commissioners considered expenditure of public funds was required. The complete range of freight infrastructure was certainly not provided at all stations upon line opening.

The provision of freight sidings, good sheds and loading/unloading facilities on the North Shore line was consistent with the notion that the North Shore line was passenger oriented, rather than an existing freight demand prior to 1890.

ASSESSMENT OF THE IMPACT OF ARTARMON STATION ON THE LOCAL SUBURB

What is the impact of Artarmon station? This is a question neither the disciples of history nor of the heritage industry try hard to answer. Historians generally have given little attention to the time after the event or period that they are researching. Examining the impact of a topic is a concept that is not formally a part of the curriculum of history. The heritage industry in Australia has moved closer to the consideration of impact analysis with its pivotal concept of cultural significance. Here, at least practitioners exercise broad descriptive notions about the role of some object but any comments are based on personal opinion without the citation of much evidence or presentation of a learned case. A more formal idea of impact is not used and any attempt at measurement is not even thought desirable.

Unlike Wahroonga, Turramurra, Pymble, Gordon, Lindfield, Chatswood, St. Leonards, Waverton, Milsons Point and North Sydney, Artarmon never had a goods siding or a goods shed. Because of this singular absence of freight facilities, the impact of Artarmon station as a totality on the neighbouring suburb is diminished, compared with those stations on the North Shore line that did deliver and take away freight for residents. However, there was a facility within the Artarmon station building for the receipt and despatch of parcels, which were small items conveyed by passenger trains and, from 1928 to 1989, by dedicated parcel vans.

It is significant that, despite the location of noxious and heavy industries not too far from the station, such as tanneries, potteries and brickworks, no freight siding was provided. Thus, the economic impact is restricted to the movement of parcels through the station and the use of the station to convey people to and from travel destinations. The station maintained a parcel facility between 1902 and 1987 and residents were able to send and receive parcels through the Parcels Office within the station building. However, this

function was relatively small and never expanded beyond the size of the 16 feet by 12 feet parcels room established in 1916 with the present building.

Artarmon platform building in 1916 was built as a symbol to indicate its inclusion of the area known as the Upper North Shore. With its construction, it acted as a beacon to people desiring to build a residence in the suburb. The railway building set the standard of construction which local residents duly noted and followed. How is this symbolic impact measured? It seems that the only way to ascertain the answer is to interview residents who settled in the suburb after 1916. This is a tall order and researchers find this type of enquiry daunting by cost and effort, even if the interviewees were still alive. Also, there is the possibility that individuals may not realise that the construction of the 1916 building was a subconscious influence in their decision to live in Artarmon.

After the construction of the building in 1916, things settle down in the community and there was little reference to the railway station at Artarmon in the press. This all changed in August, 1917, when the Government decided to increase fares by 10%.²³³ The only trouble with that increase was that the smart people living on the North Shore line realised that the increase was not uniform. In past years, the commuters at Artarmon argued that they paid far more per mile distance than the travellers further up the North Shore line. In 1917, the reverse was the case and the people from Chatswood and beyond were critical that they were paying far more than 10%, such as those at Warrawee who faced a 20% increase in the fare. Interestingly, train users at Waverton, Wollstonecraft, St. Leonards and Artarmon paid no increase. Why so? It is a reflection that the one-time lower status of the North Shore railway between Sydney Harbour and Chatswood was more middle-class than upper class but this division was changing. The decision to build the new station structure at Artarmon in 1916 and the treatment of fare increases in 1917 seem to demonstrate an increasing social status of residents on the lower part of the line and, with that increase status, increased geographically based, group power.

Artarmon station does not seem to have been used as a place for the collection of money from boarding or waiting passengers during World War One. For example, there is no mention in the press that the station was used to gather funds for Armenian Christians before, during or after World War One. There was one example noted in the press in 1917 of the station being used for charitable purposes and this was in connection with what was known as "Our Day" for the British Red Cross. The Artarmon branch of the Red Cross had a stall at the station to raise funds.²³⁴ This does not mean that station was not used for charitable purposes but that such events, if they did occur, were rarely recorded in the extant press.

²³³ *Sydney Morning Herald*, 4th August, 1917, p. 16.

²³⁴ *Sydney Morning Herald*, 3rd December, 1917, p. 8.

There is one final aspect to keep in mind about the impact of the station at Artarmon. The placement of advertisements on station notice boards for the recruitment of new Railway staff was widespread and in 1967 a survey established that 27.2% of new staff joined the Department of Railways after seeing an advertisement on railway property. Additionally, 32.6% of recruits were told of vacancies by a friend in the Department and 13.1% were told by a relative in the Department. Only 6.5% of new recruits joined because they read a newspaper advertisement and 8.5% were directed to the Department from the Commonwealth Employment Service.²³⁵ It is, therefore, fair to say that a number of people using Artarmon station would have joined the Railway service after seeing advertisements placed on the station notice board. In this way, the station acted as a recruitment office.

²³⁵ E. J. McCarthy, *Recruitment Policies in Selected NSW Statutory Corporations Since World War Two*, unpublished M. Ec. Thesis, University of Sydney, 1967, p. 40.

22 THE EPOCH OF NEW, URBAN INFRASTRUCTURE – 1920s

ARTARMON THE FASTEST GROWING SUBURB

The population of Artarmon grew in 1920 and beyond. In one article in October, 1920, a statement was made in the press that the suburbs of Artarmon and Northbridge were the fastest-growing parts of the Willoughby area and that Artarmon had much to recommend it. The primary advantage that was cited was its handiness to the city but its beauty and elevation were also mentioned as highlights. Oddly, in the press article an unusual and even adverse comment was made which said that “for some years a number of unimposing dwellings had a steadying effect on Artarmon’s growth but of late years their existence has been overlooked by many who coveted the delightful ridges which overlook the railway for the erection of well-appointed homes.”²³⁶

Despite the little hiccups at Artarmon station, land sales continued and in 1924 190 sites were up for sale at one time. As pointed out to prospective purchasers, the suburb was only eight minutes away to the city (a little optimistic); that there was a healthy atmosphere and natural beauty and that it was a “go-ahead suburban.”²³⁷ Later in the year, another 52 blocks were up for sale but this time the real estate agent said a little more honestly that it took 20 minutes to get to the city.²³⁸ Ever since the station opened in 1898, real estate agents had been using the station as an identifiable place where prospective residents would meet with local real estate agents. This was particularly important as not every estate agent selling land in Artarmon had an office in the suburb. The station was also used as an identifiable location when politicians gave public speeches on the footpath opposite the shops.

INCREASED TICKET SALES

It is reasonable to think that the construction of the Artarmon building in 1916 acted as a fillip to attract people to build houses in the area. It was the Government which had set the benchmark in physical and civic design via the 1916 platform building and its action was a beacon to newcomers to the area. Nowhere else in Sydney did such a uniformity of platform buildings exist in a continuous manner for a lengthy distance as it did on the North Shore. The buildings on the Blue Mountains line also possessed a uniformity about the same time. Both areas had similar geographical features, being hilly, with steep ravines and the railway running along the ridge of mountains. Both held fresh air, good panoramas and largely unspoilt landscapes. The only difference was that the

²³⁶ *Sunday Times*, 10th October, 1920. P. 11.

²³⁷ *Sunday Times*, 31st August, 1924, p. 7.

²³⁸ *Evening News*, 14th September, 1924, p. 2.

North Shore was in Sydney and the Blue Mountains was not. The physical features of the North Shore were given enhanced recognition by the railway organisation's uniform presentation of platform structures from Artarmon northwards.

The impact of the station can be measured by the number of people who used the platform to board and disembark from trains. Statistics are available easily to 1941. Table 22.1 below sets out statistics for Artarmon station.

TABLE 22.1 - NO. OF PASSENGERS USING ARTARMON STATION 1898-1941

YEAR TO 30TH JUNE	NO. OF STAFF	NO. OF PASSENGER JOURNEYS	NO. OF TICKETS SOLD	PERCENTAGE GROWTH
Artarmon not listed before 1902				
1902	1	86,185	17,237	
1903	1	131,600	26,332	52
1904	1	165,320	33,064	26
1905		208,275	41,655	26
1906	2	264,750	52,950	27
1907	2	315,010	63,002	19
1908	2	354,095	70,819	12
1909	3	360,807		2
1910	3	377,670		5
1911	3	402,811		7
1912	3	322,399		-20
1913	4	590,640		83
1914	4	711,043		20
1915	4	833,200		17

YEAR TO 30TH JUNE	NO. OF STAFF	NO. OF PASSENGER JOURNEYS	NO. OF TICKETS SOLD	PERCENTAGE GROWTH
1916	4	893,128		7
1917	4	964,991		8
1918	4	977,145		1
1919	4	1,055,520		8
1920	5	1,239,506		17
1921	5	1,321,093		7
1922	5	1,326,073		0.4
1923	6	1,360,548		3
1924	6	1,382,775		2
1925	7	1,355,257		-2
1926	7	1,533,151		13
1927	8	1,409,314		-8
1928	6	1,579,782		12
1929	7	1,624,340		3
1930	7	1,620,211		-0.3
1931	6	1,531,786		-5
1932	6	1,479,788		-0.3
1933	6	1,453,248		-2
1934	6	1,455,276		0.1
1935	6	1,621,153		11
1936	6	1,736,153		7
1937	7	1,827,225		5

YEAR TO 30 TH JUNE	NO. OF STAFF	NO. OF PASSENGER JOURNEYS	NO. OF TICKETS SOLD	PERCENTAGE GROWTH
1938	7	1,921,778		5
1939	7	1,831,746		-5
1940	7	1,701,620		-7
1941	7	1,664,421		-2

SOURCE: *Annual Reports*, NSW Government Railways, 1902-1941.

From the above Table, it seems that the absence of details about Artarmon station in the *Annual Reports* prior to 1902 suggests that no staff was appointed to the station or the level of passenger traffic was relatively low. Between 1908 and 1928, Artarmon became what is known as a block station. Signals were installed to control, stop and start trains and this facility increased the capacity of the North Shore line as trains no longer had to reach St. Leonards or Chatswood from Artarmon before following trains were despatched. To operate the signals, additional staff would have been required over at least two shifts – morning shift and afternoon shift. The staff reductions in the 1930s take into account the closure of the signal box and the dwindling number of passenger journeys.

Note that the statistics changed from tickets sold to the number of journeys in 1909. This was done because many people purchased weekly tickets and used them for each of five workdays and possibly on weekends. In order to provide consistency, the statistics between 1902 and 1908 have been multiplied by five.

Revenue generated by Artarmon station largely reflected the same trend as passenger journeys. In 1918, earnings were £10,266; in 1919, it was £11,751 and in 1920 £14,844.²³⁹

The railway station at Artarmon, like many other stations, was at several times the subject of burglary and this occurred again in February, 1920, but that occasion was on a significantly large scale and involved multiple staff. In 1922, there was widespread reporting of fraud and conspiracy by four of the staff at Artarmon station over the discounted sale of female season tickets. Two of the accused were acquitted and two were found guilty and sent to gaol.²⁴⁰ Also, in the same year, the station was attacked

²³⁹ *Goulburn Evening Penny Post*, 18th November, 1920, p. 4.

²⁴⁰ See *Evening News*, 28th November, 1922, p. 5 and *Sydney Morning Herald*, 29th November, 1922, p. 10.

by what today is known as a graffiti artist but in 1920 the term “scribbling” was used to describe the unwanted attention.²⁴¹

FORTHCOMING ELECTRIFICATION

The big news in 1921 was the large amount of work on the North Shore line “making platforms higher and narrower, widening tunnels, and altering the permanent way.” The press reported that rail travellers “had a vague idea that all this activity was preparatory to the electrification of the line.”²⁴² The work was necessary for the introduction of new, electrically powered carriages which were wider than the existing carriages used on steam-hauled trains on the North Shore line.

The *Sydney Morning Herald* stated that the introduction of electrification was necessary because of “the growth of the northern suburbs, and consequently of the railway traffic during the past 10 years. It is a development which shows no sign of slackening, as in the Willoughby Municipality alone 614 new houses were constructed last year bears witness. The phenomenal growth in the railway traffic is strikingly illustrated by a table showing the number of passenger journeys from the station for the year ended June, 1910, in comparison with the year ended June, 1920.”²⁴³ The table referred to in the press article is Table 22.2 below with an additional column showing the percentage increase over the 10-year period for each station.

TABLE 22.2: NORTH SHORE LINE – INCREASE IN PASSENGER JOURNEYS 1910 & 1920

Station	1910 Total Number of Passenger Journeys	1920 Total Number of Passenger Journeys	Percentage Increase	Ranking of Stations on the Line Based on Increases in Passenger Journeys
Milsons Point	844,220	1,004,401	18.9	16
Waverton	118,474	405,865	242.5	3
Wollstonecraft	123,237	401,723	225.9	5
St. Leonards	361,873	675,371	86.6	13
Artarmon	377,676	1,259,506	233.4	4
Chatswood	257,954	2,622,171	916.5	1
Roseville	289,653	1,222,680	322.1	2

²⁴¹ *Goulburn Evening Penny Post*, 21st February, p. 4 and 18th November, 1920, p. 4.

²⁴² *Sydney Morning Herald*, 10th January, 1921, p. 9.

²⁴³ *Ibid.*

Station	1910 Total Number of Passenger Journeys	1920 Total Number of Passenger Journeys	Percentage Increase	Ranking of Stations on the Line Based on Increases in Passenger Journeys
Lindfield	378,755	977,165	158.1	9
Killara	367,815	616,971	67.7	15
Gordon	252,280	668,337	164.9	8
Pymble	319,883	549,420	71.7	14
Turramurra	273,185	551,181	101.7	11
Warrawee	91,285	272,367	198.3	6
Wahroonga	290,224	578,338	99.2	12
Waitara	112,958	315,751	179.5	7
Hornsby	349,608	744,585	112.9	10
TOTALS	5,538,787	12,315,153	122.3	

The above Table 22.2 indicates that the greatest increases in passenger journeys were generally closer to Sydney Harbour. For the six stations between Milsons Point and Chatswood, four of the stations had the highest growth rate. Artarmon station was fourth on the list of increased passenger journeys and had the second highest total number of journeys, with its adjoining station, Chatswood, the only station with a higher number. The statistics do indicate that the Artarmon/Chatswood area was the most popular part of the North Shore line to attract new residents.

It was hoped in 1921 that the future electrification of the line would address the overcrowding during peak hours. The opportunity was taken to provide an additional platform at Milsons Point, increasing the number from two to three platforms. Later in the year, residents on the North Shore had a deputation with the Chief Commissioner for an improved service between Milsons Point and Chatswood but Chief Commissioner Fraser said there was no money for what he described as “minor inconveniences”. Fraser would have made no friends at Artarmon with that statement. Included in the deputation were representatives from Willoughby Municipal Council, local soldier settlements, and the Artarmon and Willoughby Progress Associations.²⁴⁴ Additionally, the representatives for Artarmon wanted improved facilities for ticket collection, the erection of a covering over the stepway between the subway and platform and an increase in the number of stopping trains. Fraser deflected attention by assuring those present that he would be able to resolve some of the issues on a future site inspection.

²⁴⁴ *Sydney Morning Herald*, 27th August, 1921, p. 14.

Fraser told the deputation that the carriages were of a high class and he said that he did not think that “there is a better class of carriage on any suburban line in the world.”²⁴⁵

Fraser said in August, 1921, that “the erection of ticket offices on railway bridges would be proceeded with important stations on the line. Booking offices will in future be opened for the sale of tickets half an hour before the departure of trains, instead of 10 minutes before as it present.”²⁴⁶ One month later, another deputation met the Chief Commissioner, this time from representatives further up the North Shore line. There were train delays and complaints were also made about smelly toilets. Fraser promised “immediate instructions would be given for the inspection of septic tanks.”²⁴⁷ It was also reported that the Chief Commissioner paid a visit to Chatswood and met again with officers from Willoughby Municipal Council and the Artarmon Progress Association and promised that the steps would be covered at both Chatswood and Artarmon.

Willoughby Municipality recorded an increase of 692 new residences during 1921 and it is utterly believable that Artarmon station showed a 6.4% increase in passenger numbers between 1920 and 1921.²⁴⁸

By October, 1923, the Chief Commissioner was in a position to reply to the request of the Artarmon Progress Association made in August, 1922, for a covering at the top of the stepway where the staff collected used tickets. Because it was a slow process, with one employee checking a possible 100 tickets for each train in the evening peak hours, there was often a substantial wait and the Association said that people got wet when it rained. For a start, it had taken the Railway Department 14 months to reply to the request and, secondly, the Chief Commissioner once again adopted an arrogance when he said that “the expense did not warrant it.”²⁴⁹ Eventually, the stepway was covered.

A WINDOW INTO THE DARK SIDE OF RAILWAY CULTURE

Often, relatively junior railway staff were given authority to implement the Railway By-laws and other official edicts and, unfortunately, sometimes this delegation of authority turned out to be a misdirected, personal pursuit of power and there was a case of such power being applied at Artarmon station in 1924 which ended up giving staff and the organisation a bad name. For 12 years, John Mansell was the newsagent who had a small stand in the subway to sell papers. He was a local resident and well-regarded but, when the NSW Bookstall Company secured the rights to sell newspapers at the

²⁴⁵ Ibid.

²⁴⁶ Ibid., 10th September, 1921, p. 14.

²⁴⁷ Ibid.

²⁴⁸ *Sydney Morning Herald*, 12th January, 1922, p. 10.

²⁴⁹ *Evening News*, 26th August, 1924, p. 7 and 16th of October, 1923, p. 4.

station, John was required to remove his business outside the subway. One day it was raining and John decided to move just inside the entrance to the subway and from there he sold one newspaper – illegally, as he did not have the right to do so. The railway detectives arrested him. When the case was heard before a Magistrate, the departmental representative “agreed magnanimously that it was only a technical offence” and the Magistrate declined to inflict a penalty.²⁵⁰ Regrettably, there were too many officers in the Railway Department who took pleasure in enforcing the rules and regulations not to ensure smooth, departmental efficiency but as a display of the personal authority and power at their disposal. The stupidity of the event relating to John Mansell was not lost on the Sydney press, which featured the circumstances on page one of one of the top-selling newspapers. It was a case of unwanted, unnecessary and adverse publicity for the Railway Department.

PRESSURE FOR AN ADDITIONAL SUBWAY AND OTHER IMPROVEMENTS

Willoughby Municipal Council and the Artarmon Progress Association continued fighting for improvements at the Artarmon station and towards the end of 1926 submitted a petition signed by about 700 residents requesting that the Railway Commissioners build a subway at the southern end of the station.²⁵¹ The Parents and Citizens’ Association also chipped in about the need for the subway, thinking that, if one were provided, there would be a booking office in the subway which would help relieve the high level of demand on the existing ticket window on the platform.²⁵² The Association complained about the delays in purchasing tickets and said there was insufficient time to buy tickets before trains arrived.

Surprisingly, the Railway Commissioners agree to the provision of a subway, but without the booking office.²⁵³ Was this absence of negativity by the Railway Department, and the short time taken by the Department to reach a positive outcome, evidence of the new political strength of the people of Artarmon? Well, there was a catch. Council had to pay for the subway and also enter an agreement with the Commissioners to maintain it. The two-year time delay before construction commenced indicated that the quick time to consent to the provision of the subway was an aberration, not a sign of some fundamental change in the speed of Railway decision making.

After requesting a subway at the southern end of the station in 1926; after approval was given in 1927 and after a formal Agreement was signed in 1928, the go-ahead for

²⁵⁰ Ibid., 25th October, 1924, p. 1.

²⁵¹ *Sydney Morning Herald*, 6th October, 1926, p. 14.

²⁵² *Evening News*, 10th June, 1926, p. 21.

²⁵³ *Construction and Local Government Journal*, 9th March, 1927, p. 18.

construction was not far away. It was in 1929 that the Railways indicated to the Council of the Municipality of Willoughby that excavation for the pedestrian subway at the southern end of the platform would proceed, though there was no provision for access to the island platform.²⁵⁴ The retaining wall on the ramped entry to the subway on the Hampden Road side was and is partly formed by old rails, illustrating the Department's position as a pioneer recycler. The subway was the subject of a formal Agreement between the railway administration and Willoughby Municipal Council for its maintenance, lighting and cleaning.²⁵⁵ The Property Branch of the Railway Departments always had a fierce tradition of ensuring that the Department did not end up with ongoing maintenance for any type of crossing in the railway corridor that it considered was non-essential, as was the case in this instance. These agreements usually took the form of a contract in which the Department of Railways would undertake the construction of the crossing with the local government authority undertaking to provide maintenance. The subway was built but, despite some local desire to provide a second access point to the platform, no connection was ever made.

For the first time, local, privately-operated bus transport got a mention in the press and this involved a request to commence a bus service between Artarmon railway station and "Northwood wharf".²⁵⁶ The proponent claimed that the existing trams were dirty and that buses were much better for the district. Willoughby Municipal Council rejected the request but it was approved by Lane Cove Municipal Council. It is easy to see that road space was and is pretty limited around Artarmon station. About 90 years after the 1924 request for a bus service from the station, Artarmon station is still without any connecting bus services. It and Wollstonecraft are the only two stations on the North Shore line at which there is no interchange with buses at stations indicated in the public rail timetable.²⁵⁷

The residents of Artarmon had requested a station and one had been built – open in 1898. The Naremburn Progress Association similarly requested in 1925 a new railway station between Artarmon and St. Leonards to make it more convenient for people living in the area.²⁵⁸ Rather than dispatch yet another arrogant reply, the Chief Commissioner simply ignored the matter. After patiently waiting nearly 23 years after 1925, it was reported in the press in 1948 that "provision of a railway station at Naremburn has been recommended to Transport Minister O'Sullivan following an investigation by one of

²⁵⁴ Card for Artarmon Station, Card No. 1/1, former SRA Archives.

²⁵⁵ Notation No. 59, Sheet 6, Working Plan DR 7A/2, State Rail Land Information Unit.

²⁵⁶ Ibid., 2nd September, 1924, p. 4.

²⁵⁷ CityRail, *Timetable North Shore Line*, August 2007, inside cover.

²⁵⁸ *Sydney Morning Herald*, 24th September, 1925, p. 14.

these officials. This decision climaxed months of campaigning by residents in the area.”²⁵⁹ Sadly, once again, nothing.

THE IMPACT OF THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE SYDNEY HARBOUR BRIDGE

The North Shore region continued to be the one geographic region in Sydney where dreams of local railway lines ended up costing all New South Wales taxpayers dearly. In 1925, the NSW Government accepted the tender of Dorman, Long & Co. to build the Sydney Harbour Bridge. The problem was, as Jack Lang wrote, that “the money was not in sight”.²⁶⁰ Lang added greatly to the State debt to fulfil Bradfield’s plan to electrify the Sydney suburban railway, build the City underground railway as well as construct the Sydney Harbour Bridge. While the Bridge was an excellent way for people on the North Shore to reach the city, unfortunately, every Sydney-sider and, indeed, every taxpayer in the State paid for the facility by taxes and a road toll for the next 50 years.

The Sydney Harbour Bridge Act was assented to in November, 1922 and provided for four railway tracks, one roadway, one “motor roadway” and one footway. Oddly, the cost to lay the physical tracks had not been included in the original contract price and supplementary Parliamentary approval was required to actually provide the railway sleepers and steel rails. At an early stage, it had been realised that two of the rail tracks would not be required until capacity reached 40 trains per hour and, as a temporary arrangement, trams used the two eastern tracks. The Bridge was to be funded with north-side local government areas paying one third and the remainder being funded by a vote of Parliament. No funds came from the Railway Department nor the Department of Main Roads. Although the Bridge was primarily intended for railway use, ownership of the bridge and the approaches was vested in the Commissioner for Main Roads under legislation enacted in 1932. The Railway Department only had control and management of that part of the Bridge used for railway purposes.

The Railway and Tramway Commissioner, James Fraser, said in 1926 that Sydney’s rail network was “moving at the present date, more trains steam hauled, per track per hour than any other system in the World similarly operated.”²⁶¹ Fraser was critical of the lack of government decision making on vital issues relating to the rail network in Sydney and, although he could not directly criticise the State Government, he referred to “the decision of the people as a whole” as the culprit.²⁶² Within two years of that remark, the

²⁵⁹ *Tribune*, 22nd May, 1948, p. 3.

²⁶⁰ J. T. Lang, *I Remember*, Sydney, Invincible Press, no date, p. 260

²⁶¹ J. Fraser, “The Railway System” in Institution of Engineers Australia, *The Electrification of the Sydney and Suburban Railways*, Sydney, 1927, p. 5 reprinted by the Australian Railway Historical Society, 1987

²⁶² *ibid.*

NSW Government sacked him as the “sacrificial lamb” to deflect blame from the Government about the state of the rail system.²⁶³

There was no change to the present Artarmon building in 1926 when the platforms were lengthened from 430 feet to 520 feet to accommodate eight-car electric train.²⁶⁴ As a result, the extension of the platform at the Sydney end gave the appearance of the platform building being in the centre of the platform. There was an unsympathetic penetration through the eastern side platform canopy for the erection of a stanchion to support the overhead electric wires, consistent with what also happened at other stations but, staunch and has been removed in the last few years. This demonstrated the dominance of engineering with the NSW Railways over all other aspects, included building aesthetics. Passenger traffic was moving upwards generally and the Department of Railways considered measures additional to the use of higher capacity electric trains. However, the Department shelved plans formulated in 1926 for the quadruplication of the line.²⁶⁵ In the late 1920s, Artarmon was still the third busiest station on the North Shore line and even did more business than either Hornsby and Milsons Point stations at each end of the lines. Passenger traffic at Artarmon reached 1,533,151 passenger journeys in 1928.²⁶⁶ That figure represented an increase of 21.7% over the 1920 figure.

The difficulty of working trains was made easier with the replacement of steam with electric traction. Partial electric services, shared with steam trains for nearly one year, commenced on 15th August, 1927, with steam traction eliminated from passenger service from 10th June, 1928.²⁶⁷ The public history of the North Shore railway states that electrification was “inevitable”, in view of the steep gradient of the line.²⁶⁸ As Dornan and Henderson wrote, “the North Shore line demonstrated more than anywhere else the advantages of power and acceleration that accrue with electrification – the running time of Down (uphill) trains from Milsons Point to Hornsby was reduced from 48

²⁶³ D. Burke, *Making the Railways*, Sydney, State Library of NSW Press, 1995, pp. 160 & 208

²⁶⁴ Plan entitled "Artarmon - Proposed Extension of Platform to 520 FT. Long", dated 17th July, 1926, Former SRA Archives

²⁶⁵ Plans No. 936 21/553 dated 1926 entitled "Quadruplication Arrangements - Artarmon", RIC Plan Room. Plans made for quadruplication in 1952 were also cancelled. See Plan No. 1056 40/289 dated 31st July, 1952, RIC Plan Room

²⁶⁶ Railway Commissioners, Annual Report to 30th June, 1928, Sydney, Government Printer, 1910, Appendix 20, p. 54

²⁶⁷ D.R. Keenan & H.R. Clark, *First Stop Central*, Sydney, Australian Electric Traction Association, 1963, p. 51

minutes to 36 minutes, while in the opposite direction a reduction from 41 minutes to 35 minutes occurred.”²⁶⁹

An interesting common feature shared by the buildings at Old Glenbrook and Artarmon was their positions on rising gradients against trains proceeding away from Sydney. Artarmon is located on a 1 in 69 gradient, with gradients of one in 50 and one in 51 on each side of the platform.²⁷⁰ Clark says that, of all the North Shore stations, Artarmon was, in the steam days, the “most difficult station on the line for drivers to start their trains.”²⁷¹ It is of no surprise, therefore, to find that the North Shore line was intended to be the first line in Sydney to be electrified. The problems associated with the gradient were not totally solved by the introduction of electrification.

The NSW rail organisation was large and its operational workforce was decentralised. In 1927, one year before electric trains started, the locomotive depot at Milson’s Point had a staff of 49 men.²⁷² With electrification, all drivers and other staff were transferred to a new depot north of Hornsby. As well as station staff, fettling gangs were allocated to every few miles of the line to keep the tracks maintained. There existed an informal culture where men of the various operational branches did not communicate with or enjoy the company of staff in other branches for the most part. This culture continued for the entire history of Artarmon station with electric train drivers being excluded from the inside of station buildings and train examiners and shunters using separate meal rooms and toilets to those enjoyed by platform staff. Workshops were the one big place where there congregated large numbers of staff within the same branch of the organisation. Even here, many different trade unions existed and the instances were few in number when all the staff agreed to support common causes. The 1917 strike was the most significant example but, even in this case, “the strike itself was too confined to warrant the adjective ‘general’”.²⁷³

One important event that is common to all periods after the opening of Artarmon station in 1898 was the proposal to expand the number of tracks passing the station. Despite increasing numbers of commuters, none of the five proposals to provide an additional platform was implemented. Increased passenger demand was met by increased carriage and train capacity. With the introduction of electric trains in 1929, the total

²⁶⁸ Willoughby Municipal Council, *Willoughby – A Centennial History 1865-1965*, p. 96

²⁶⁹ S. E. Dornan and R. G. Henderson, *The Electric Railway of New South Wales*, Sydney, Australian Electric Traction Association, 1976, p. 33.

²⁷⁰ NSW, *Curve and Gradient Diagrams*, undated, p. 231. There is other conflicting information, which states the gradient as 1 in 57 and 1 in 73.

²⁷¹ L.A. Clark, *North of the Harbour*, Broadmeadow, Newey and Beath Pty. Ltd., 1976, p. 127

²⁷² R. Love, “Milson’s Point”, in *Byways of Steam* 25, Eveleigh Press, 2006, p. 89.

²⁷³ D. Coward, “Crime and Punishment” in J. Iremonger et al (Eds.), *Strikes*, Sydney, Angus & Robertson, 1973, p. 51

compliment of passengers rose by 29% from 400 to 516 seats. This was further increased in 1964 by 53% with the introduction of double-deck trailing carriages, though not all trains contained double-deck cars and those trains with double-deck carriages had a maximum of four such carriages. From 1972, trains made up entirely of double-deck carriages began to operate with a total seating capacity of 976, some 89% above the figure for a train with all single-deck carriages.²⁷⁴ From the 1970s, the only increase in seating came from the replacement of the entire Sydney passenger carriage fleet by double-deckers on 18th August 1992.²⁷⁵

THE POSSIBLE RAIL CONNECTION TO THE BEACH

The Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works delivered its report in 1926 on a proposed railway three miles in length from Gordon railway station to Narrabeen on the coast. The report of the Committee was a statement that displayed the power of the Railway Commissioners. The project had been first raised 1911 but the views of the Railway Department were not sought at that time. It was not until 1920 that the Department was asked about the connection between the North Shore line and the coast but the matter was not referred to the Standing Committee until 1922. The Commissioners declined to furnish the statutory report in the stated time and the matter was allowed to rest. No one seemed to complain that the Commissioners had failed to meet a legal obligation. The Commissioners' report was received in November, 1923, with the Commissioner showing the usual slow response to do anything, even to reply to Parliament. The Commissioners did not support the project saying that "they cannot advise the expenditure of money on public works for this purpose (i.e. tourist traffic) in view of the present financial position of the State."²⁷⁶ They also stated their general view about new suburban lines and that was that there should be the use of the existing opportunities for residential development on existing lines before new lines are proposed. In this instance, they specifically referred to the Sydney-Parramatta section, the Illawarra and the Strathfield-Hornsby lines. Why did the Commissioners not include the North Shore railway? Probably because of the extensive subdivision that had already taken place by 1926, at which time only a few individual allotments were available at least at Artarmon.

THE ARTARMON RAILWAY GARDENS

²⁷⁴ S.E. Dornan & R.G. Henderson, *The Electric Railways of NSW*, Sydney, Australian Electric Traction Association, 1976, pp. 72-76

²⁷⁵ Churchman, op. cit., p. 104

²⁷⁶ NSW, Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, *Report together with minutes of evidence relating to the Proposed Railway from Gordon to Narrabeen*, Sydney, Government Printer, 1926, p. vi.

There was one very important event that marked the end of the infrastructure developments at Artarmon during the 1920s and would have major, beneficial consequences in the 1930s. That event was the decision by one person, namely Charles Wickham, to establish a garden on railway land on the western side of Artarmon station parallel to Hampden Road starting in 1928. The press started to report about the activities of this man in November, 1929 and one report said that:

“not many years ago, the garden plots parallel with and around the railway station at Artarmon were so poor and so plain that no one took any notice of the few plants and trees as the up and down trains rattled by. Today, the Artarmon garden is so pretty and attractive all those who are near the right-side windows (meaning the correct side of the train, not the right-hand side of the carriages) see as much pansies, the gladioli, the gazanias, the lupins, the lantana and the geraniums as is possible in the short time available.

The residents of Artarmon now know their home station without looking at the scenery. They recognise the plants and flowers which the honorary expert (Mr. Charles Wickham) has cleverly worked into the landscape. Mr. Wickham took the garden in hand with the pleasure of doing something worthwhile. In two seasons, he has done wonders. Good grass covers all the lawn space, nice paths run wherever a footway is necessary, and wherever beds with the flowering plants have been placed, there is good growth and plenty of colour to show that the handling of the arcotis, the calliopsis, the nemophila, the roses, and all the rest of the company is giving pleasure.

Mr. Wickham has made several gardens on the line. He began operations at Killara over 30 years ago and was in the golf centre when Mr. E. W. O’Sullivan’s unemployed were forming a highway to link up Middle Harbour with Lane Cove Road. A lot of his good work stands today on a well-known corner in the busiest part of Killara. By the time that the Artarmon garden has had his care for another season or two, the residents will be in possession of one of the prettiest and most popular railway station gardens on the Milsons Point line.”²⁷⁷

What was impressive about Mr. Wickham’s garden was that his work occurred at a very important time in the economy of the State, when capital funds for all sorts of improvements, including railways, basically dried up for a number of years. Wickham’s garden was used by Railway officials and the travelling public to divert minds away from the terrible impact of the 1930s Depression onto something that was pleasant but, more importantly for the Railway Department, mostly free – free of the demands for large

²⁷⁷ *Sydney Morning Herald*, 29th November, 1929, p. 9.

sums of public money and free of obligations by the Commissioners, though the Railway Department did help out in small ways during the 1930s.

Looking at the garden, travellers could forget about the robberies at the station; forget about the fraud by Artarmon station staff; forget about the graffiti on the building; forget about the poor treatment of Mr. Mansell selling a newspaper on a rainy day; forget about the way the Electrical Branch had ruined the elegance of the platform awning with a penetration of an overhead wiring staunch and they could forget about their disappointment about the absence of station to serve the people at the adjacent Naremburn area. There was certainly a lot for which thanks were due to Mr. Wickham. Some would say that the people of Artarmon were duped by pretty flowers to forget that a lot of their fellow train travellers would have lost their jobs as a result of the Depression. This was power working in its subtlest form – power by flower.

On review, the 1920s was an absolute boom time for Artarmon railway station and the commuters who used it. The outstanding benefit they received was the introduction of electrically powered trains which resulted in shorter travel times, more seats especially during peak hours and cleaner carriages. The station platforms were lengthened, enabling the station to accommodate more passengers and there was the replacement of the manual signalling system with automatic signals, making for safer journeys. The stepway between the subway and the platform, with its 25 steps and intermediate landing, had been covered at the northern end and a new subway provided at the southern end. Contracts had been let for the construction of the Sydney Harbour Bridge and the most pleasant advancement in the 1920s was the arrival of Mr. Wickham's garden.

23 THE BEAUTIFUL RAILWAY GARDEN – 1928 TO 1947

The above heading were the words used by the Sydney press in 1931 to describe the Artarmon railway station garden. There was no shortage of articles praising the beauty of the presentation and it was so attractive that the press reported on one occasion that someone had been stealing plants “from this popular community garden.”²⁷⁸

An interesting feature of Artarmon station is the way in which the surrounding landscape is divided by the railway line. With the railway line on an embankment, it is not possible to view the land and urban development on both sides of the station simultaneously. This arrangement has allowed those who control the land around the station to be treated as two distinct entities – the eastern and western sides. The immediate western side of the rail corridor is much more attractive than the eastern side, so far as concerns the section between the railway boundary fence and the footpath along Hampden Road.

Willoughby Municipal Council acquired leases for land beautification on both sides of the station. This was consistent with the actions of Ku-ring-gai Municipal Council to the north. There are two facts to note about the gardens within the boundary of the latter Council. The first was that it was the gardens of Killara and Wahroonga stations that were featured on the covers of the Sydney suburban railway timetables in the 1960s²⁷⁹. In fact, these two locations have been the only suburban station gardens to be illustrated on railway timetable covers at any time since 1855. The use of colour photographs on the cover of the suburban timetable commenced in the early 1960s and it is significant to note the Upper North Shore was chosen at an early and the only time when colour photography was introduced. Killara station reached an even higher status when another colour photograph of the garden was used by railway historians, Singleton and Burke, in 1963 to emphasise the link between station and suburb. They wrote that, “on Sydney’s North Shore line, stations such as Killara feature well-tended gardens that harmonise with the surroundings of a high class suburban area”²⁸⁰. Thus, the railway gardens on the North Shore line have been an important aspect of the gateway herald of the suburbs they serve. Colin Grimshaw, who was a resident of

²⁷⁸ *Sydney Morning Herald*, 19th February, 1931, p. 7.

²⁷⁹ These were timetables dated 11.11.1962 (Killara) and 5.5.1968 (Wahroonga).

²⁸⁰ C.C. Singleton and D. Burke, *Railways of Australia*, Sydney, Angus and Robinson, 1963, p.33.
Thanks to Henry Smith at the ARHS RRC for this illumination.

Pymble, wrote in 1979 that “Killara Railway Station, particularly at this time of year, must be the loveliest railway station in the World.”²⁸¹

The second point about gardens relates to the landscaping at Artarmon. Willoughby City Council continues to hold three beautification licenses from RailCorp. One is the large area on the eastern side between the railway line and the road south of Wilkes Plaza and two are on the western side, which form the Artarmon Village Green. Warner says that the gardens at the station on both sides were established by the Artarmon Progress Association in 1928.²⁸² Between 1928 and 1941, the gardens were well maintained by the local community support with 600-825 households contributing money for the employment of up to two full-time gardeners. 75% of households asked to contribute did so. The objective was to provide an attractive gateway to the suburb. The Department of Railways fully supported the community garden with the supply of manure, old sleepers, stones and white gravel and also extended the water supply system.

The very first photographs of Artarmon railway station in the Sydney press appeared in 1934, thanks to Charles Wickham.²⁸³ It was a series of photographs of the gardens, including Mr. Wickham. At that stage, between 700 and 800 residents were on the subscription list to support the paid staff. The annual garden competition had been stopped by the Commissioners due to the impact of the Depression but that did not stop Charles Wickham who soldiered on with the *Sydney Mail* saying that Artarmon station would have won every competition had they been in existence.²⁸⁴ It was in 1934 that it was stated that Mr. Wickham, for the first time, was working under the Artarmon District Progress Association but it was Wickham who not only conducted the physical gardening but formed a garden management committee and it was Wickham who collected the money from the hundreds of subscribers. At that time, the garden covered an area of two acres and employed three gardeners on an average of three days per week.

The development of a garden on the eastern side of the railway line had been banned by the Railway Commissioners on the basis that the land was required for quadruplication but in 1934 that dream was abandoned and Charles Wickham commenced a garden on that side, planning over 300 decorative trees and shrubs in that area alone. In addition, Wickham also took over management from the Willoughby Council a triangular area located close to the station at the southern end. Council

²⁸¹ Letter to Editor, *Sydney Morning Herald*, 19th September, 1979.

²⁸² G. Warner, *Past, Present and Future*, Municipality of Willoughby, 1988, p. 61

²⁸³ *Sydney Mail*, 12th September, 1934, p. 48.

²⁸⁴ *Ibid.*

provided some money but nothing else and Wickham established a rockery at that location. By 1934, £1350 had been collected and expended.

In the 1930s, the Department paid for a third full-time gardener. Tragically, in 1936, the leader of the community group, C.H. Wickham, died and his death was a lesson in the importance of leaders. The community group soldiered on until 1941 but community support was then insufficient and Willoughby Council assumed management of the leases and control of the gardens. Tragically, Council action did not match the previous local community enthusiasm and the gardens suffered a slow demise. In 1942, the Artarmon Progress Association noted that “the water shortage and consequent restrictions have caused such a general abandonment of public gardening activities throughout the Municipality that the Association’s defection is probably unnoticed.”²⁸⁵ A new effort was made by Willoughby Council to beautify the corridor adjacent to the station as evidenced by the formation of the Artarmon Village Green in 1968 on the western side of the railway.

Wickham’s death was a lesson in the importance of leaders. The Chief Commissioner and Secretary for Railways attended his funeral and Wickham received a considerable amount of praise in the Sydney press for his outstanding work.²⁸⁶ To commemorate Wickham’s contribution, the residents of Artarmon contributed money to erect a drinking fountain in the gardens of the station in 1938.²⁸⁷ The fountain was unveiled by Billy Hughes, the then local Commonwealth Member of Parliament and Minister for External Affairs, and the Railway Department was represented by Albert Denniss, the Chief Traffic Manager. It has now been removed, though Charles Wickham is remembered by the naming of Wickham Park in nearby White Street.

The last time Artarmon station garden received a favourable mention was in February, 1940, when it was stated that “community effort at Artarmon has provided a brilliant display under difficult conditions.”²⁸⁸ A favourable report was made in the same article about the garden at Roseville Station and, in respect of that project, the press article mentioned that “this work was brought about by an effort to provide work for returned soldiers.”²⁸⁹ This is an important reference as it displays the difficulties faced by both the New South Wales Government and the New South Wales Railways to ensure that returned soldiers did not idle their time and fall into large-scale, potentially anti-government activity or even protests. Gardens at railway stations had a double purpose – firstly to engage the brain of travellers and residents away from the unpleasant

²⁸⁵ Artarmon Progress Association, *Annual Report*, 1942.

²⁸⁶ *Sydney Morning Herald*, 17th February, 1936, p. 6.

²⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, 1st April, 1938, p. 9.

²⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, 16th February, 1940, p. 4.

²⁸⁹ *Ibid.*

economic conditions and, secondly, to provide physical labour to discharge any revolutionary potential from returned soldiers who had been trained to fight and kill.

It was in 1947 that the last reference to the beauty of the landscape at Artarmon was made but the reference in the press to “an oasis in suburbia” referred not to any garden that used to be on the western side of the line but to “a little patch of bushland to the east of Artarmon railway station.” “Through the belt of slim eucalypt saplings runs a winding path skirting a verdant gully” and Charles Wickham was once again cited as the man responsible for it was at that location that a newspaper said it was there that he fed his “possum family nightly”. Despite his death, the newspaper stated that “this bit of bushland continues to give pleasure to many people.”²⁹⁰

Like the gardens at Killara station continued to be maintained by Ku-ring-Gai Council, those at Artarmon are managed on the western side but on a less adventurous scale that Charles Wickham developed. Willoughby Council has committed resources to maintaining the gardens for a distance of about two metres from the footpath and is replaced all vegetation behind that line with grass. The eastern side of the corridor as the appearance of a different approach by Council and, rather than having flowering plants, as an overgrowth of native vegetation, which seems fair enough because it abuts the Artarmon Reserve. The comparison suggests that Willoughby Council did not consider Artarmon station to be as relevant or important as a symbolic entry to the suburb as once was the case. The lack of appreciation of the importance of local stations as gateways to the suburbs was further emphasised by Willoughby Council’s approval to the demolition of the rare 1893 station building at St. Leonards and the demolition of the 1899 station building at Chatswood.

Luckily, the lack of interest by Willoughby Council did not spread beyond its municipal boundaries and Lane Cove Municipal Council got involved in the Artarmon garden in 1953 for an unknown period.²⁹¹

²⁹⁰ *Sydney Morning Herald*, 19th November, 1947, p. 2.

²⁹¹ *The Sunday Herald*, 13th September, 1953, p. 19.

24 THE END OF IMPROVEMENTS TO THE NORTH SHORE RAILWAY – 1930-1939

PHYSICAL CHALLENGES AT THE STATION

Passenger, Ken Winney, used Artarmon station in the 1930s as he went to and from Artarmon Opportunity School. Ken mucked around on the platform with his school chums, waiting for their train, kicking the loose Locksley quartz pebbles that formed the platform surface at Artarmon and virtually every other NSW urban station prior to asphaltting. His most vivid memory was of electric trains frequently over-shooting the platform on the falling 1 in 60 gradient to Sydney.²⁹² Interestingly, Ken also recalled trains proceeding up the gradient to Hornsby over-shooting the platform because drivers miscalculated the momentum of the train as it accelerated in the valley between St. Leonards and Artarmon.²⁹³

Electric train driver, Jack Glennan, described Artarmon as “a tricky stop” because of the falling gradient towards Sydney.²⁹⁴ The elimination of steam trains did not resolve all the problems of Sydney bound trains over-shooting the platform. Jack’s first journey on the North Shore line co-incided with changes to the way trains were stopped. The Department of Railways introduced a composite brake shoe, called Ferrodo, to replace the cast iron shoes, which had been used for over a 100 years. He said that, at the same time, brake cylinder air pressure was reduced from 50 to 25 pounds per square inch. Jack overshot the platforms on a journey from Hornsby to Sydney, including the platform at Artarmon. This type of problem was bad enough but the situation could become difficult if other things happened at the same time. For example, Jack had more trouble than simply over-shooting the platform on one day. A female passenger banged on the driver’s door shouting that a man had exposed himself in the second car. At the same time, Jack had hostile passengers on the train who wanted to detrain. The guard quickly calmed the passengers by explaining that any passenger who jumped from the train on to the ground was liable to pay an excess fare because they had travelled past the platform at which they were supposed to alight.²⁹⁵ The guard directed the passengers to walk back through the train to a place where the doors lead onto the platform.

²⁹² Oral comment to author, 14th May, 1999

²⁹³ *ibid.*

²⁹⁴ J. Glennan, “Recollections of an Engineman”, Part 2, *Roundhouse*, Vol. 36 No. 3, July, 1999, p. 21

²⁹⁵ *ibid.*

PASSENGER GRUMBLES

Just as there was no change to the physical presentation of the station in the 1930s, there was also no change to the belief by rail travellers from Artarmon station that they were paying far too much in fares based on the mileage system and they claimed that they were subsidising those passengers further up the North Shore line.²⁹⁶ Despite the introduction of electric trains on the North Shore line, there were sustained complaints from travellers about overcrowding, especially in the afternoon peak hour. The *Sydney Morning Herald* sent a reporter to Wynyard station in 1939 to obtain an idea of what was happening and wrote that:

“complaints by first-class railway ticket-holders on the North Shore line that they are often unable to secure seats in first-class carriages during the peak hours were fully supported by the observation of the trains leaving Wynyard station last night.”²⁹⁷

The *Herald* reporter also observed overcrowding in the second-class carriages and that some carriages were incorrectly displaying the status of the class on the exterior. Interestingly, the reporter observed that the 5:33 pm train from Wynyard made its first stop at Artarmon and said that the crush was particularly noticeable in the smoking carriage.²⁹⁸

WHAT WAS NOT DONE WHEN THE BRIDGE WAS BUILT

There was a link between the absence of improvements to passenger facilities at Artarmon station and the rest of the Sydney railway network starting in the 1930s. There has only been a single period – between 1908 with the work of the Royal Commission for the Improvement of the City of Sydney and its Suburbs and 1932 with the completion of Bradfield’s Harbour Bridge – in which sound planning principles were applied to the development of Sydney’s public transport network. That period centred on the City and Suburban Railways Act in 1915 and the work of John Bradfield.

The Sydney Harbour Bridge opening in 1932 was an important event that linked the North Shore line to the Sydney Central Business District. However, it was only one of many parts, most of which were never implemented. As part of the Bridge construction, the railway line between Chatswood and Wynyard was to be quadruplicated. That

²⁹⁶ *Sydney Morning Herald*, 15th September, 1932, p. 10.

²⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, 12th July, 1939, p. 14.

²⁹⁸ *Ibid.*

never occurred. There were to be four train tracks, not two train and two tram tracks, across the Bridge. That never occurred. Trams were not to cross the Bridge but terminate at North Sydney. That never occurred. When the tram tracks were removed from the Bridge in 1957, they were to be used for trains and the North Shore line quadruplicated between the Bridge and Chatswood. That never occurred.

Jack Lang, when Premier between 1925 and 1927 and again between 1930 and 1932, pursued a vigorous railway expansion that would have favoured the area north of the Harbour more than any other region of Sydney. He had obtained in 1927 Parliamentary approval for a new railway line between St. Leonards and Epping and had intended to build a railway from North Sydney to Palm Beach. In 1930, the financial crisis was coming to a head. Lang wrote that “the railways were the crux of the trouble”.²⁹⁹ They were the problem because of rapidly falling revenue and rapidly increasing debt payments to repay the British loans for railway construction works.

THE CONNECTION BETWEEN RAILWAY IMPROVEMENTS AND POPULATION INCREASE

One of the benefits of the study of the past is the use of knowledge to “construct a picture of the determinants of an historical event or process”.³⁰⁰ The study of the people who moved to Artarmon and set up residence prompts consideration of a general notion which argues that people locate or relocate their place of residence only when they can cope with the available transport options. Humans live in a zone of comfort but that zone is widely different amongst those within a particular zone, depending on the individuals concerned. There was a pattern of evidence between the waves of people who set up home in Artarmon and the nature of public transport and improvements to the physical expansion of the rail (and tram and bus) system on the North Shore. The link is shown in the following Table.

TABLE: LINK BETWEEN TYPES OF PEOPLE AND EXPANSION OF THE NORTH SHORE RAILWAY

TYPE OF PEOPLE	LOCATION OF PEOPLE	TIME & EXPANSION STAGE OF NORTH SHORE RAIL NETWORK
Affluent & powerful – who like easy	North Sydney, Willoughby & Neutral	1884-1890 No North Shore Railway

²⁹⁹ J.T. Lang, *The Great Bust*, Sydney, Angus & Robertson, 1962, p. 339

³⁰⁰ R. Floud, *An Introduction to Quantitative Methods for Historians*, London, Methuen, 1976, p. 159.

TYPE OF PEOPLE	LOCATION OF PEOPLE	TIME & EXPANSION STAGE OF NORTH SHORE RAIL NETWORK
transport distant from workers	Bay	but cable tram exists to serve elevated locations
Affluent & powerful who wish to escape from the rest of society & do not mind the disconnection of the rail line	Upper North Shore	1890-1893 North Shore Railway opened between Hornsby & St. Leonards who have private transport at their disposal
Upper & middle class people who wish to like a semi-rural location, including Artarmon, who do not mind changing between trains and ferries	Upper and Lower North Shore	1893-1932 Extension of North Shore Railway between St. Leonards & Milsons Point
Upper & middle class people who wish to live among similar people but do not want to change modes	Upper and Lower North Shore	1932-1968 Extension of North Shore Railway between Milsons Point & Wynyard, including Sydney Harbour Bridge – increasing use of private motor vehicles
Middle class & lower middle class people wish to live in upper class suburbs, even in home units, who might not have a car	Upper and Lower North Shore, with a concentration in home units closer to the Harbour & around rail stations	1968-present slow revival of commuters back to rail as road traffic conditions deteriorate

When transport improved, it attracted people with an increasingly restricted zone of comfort who would not have tolerated the previous transport arrangements. As transport improved, those people with lower tolerances to perceived or real inconvenience moved to live on the North Shore.

People congregate with other people with whom they think they are similar to themselves in some way. The North Shore was particularly attractive to people who wanted a leafy environment, an elevated location with attractive vistas and relative large suburban allotments on which to build a free-standing house. They also wanted to avoid high-density living that was mirrored by the extensive existence of terraced houses south of the Harbour. Thus, there were both positive issues that attracted people to the North Shore and negative issues that repelled them from suburbs close to the City on the south side of the Harbour. Artarmon and other North Shore suburbs were attractive because of their relative close proximity to the Sydney Central Business District but without the problems associated with high-density housing. The people who took up residence on the North Shore with these aspects in mind were informally bonded together in a collective zone of comfort.

There were also those people who might be classified as being within a formal, collective zone of comfort. In this case, the North Shore may have been attractive because there was a strong family focus or a group with shared common religious views, ethnic similarity or some other common interest. The desire to create churches and establish various social and community organisations is related to the desire by people to connect with other people on aspects of common interest. The very way society is fragmented into geographic areas or otherwise divided identified by ethnicity, religion, money, families with children, marital status, sexual persuasion is a characteristic of the organisation and stabilization of society. These divisions bring their own structures, internal controls and other features that make it possible for large numbers of people to live together. Despite the importance on these collective zones of comfort, many people viewed public transport options as pivotal in making the decision to establish a residence on the North Shore.

MORE PASSENGERS – NO MORE FACILITIES

The number of passengers using Artarmon station has generally continued to grow since the establishment of the station. That increase is reflected in the number of trains stopping to pick up passengers at the station. From Appendix 2, the number of trains stopping at Artarmon between 0730 and 0830 rose from nine in 1931 to 13 in 1981 – a 40% increase. Thus, it is surprising that the 50-year period between 1930 and 1980 virtually saw minimal physical or other changes to Artarmon station. There was no increase in the number of ticket windows issuing tickets, no increase in the waiting room space and no increase in the toilet facilities. Despite the existence of three new buildings between 1898 and 1916, when the number of trains rose from one to four in the same period, no further increase in customer facilities were provided. After 1989, facilities for the public were even decreased despite increasing patronage. The

absence of improvements in the period between 1930 and 1980 seems a puzzle that requires investigation.

25 THE TIME OF ALMOST NOTHINGNESS 1940 TO 1959

MEASURES RELATED TO THE WAR

During World War Two, some of the platform signs stating the name of the station were removed in an effort aimed at possible enemy invasion, especially in coastal areas. In relation to those signs that remained, the colour palette changed from black letters on a white background to black letters on a background of gamboge, which is a yellow/mustard colour. Most of the platform signs at Artarmon were removed.

Lighting of the Artarmon building was also affected. Horace Butler had lived at Artarmon since 1916 and saw the first electric train operate through the station in 1927. During World War Two, he was a member of the National Emergency Service and patrolled the station on a regular basis to ensure that blinds covered all windows on the building and that all external lights were extinguished or covered. He was on duty at the station when the Japanese Navy bombed Sydney's Eastern Suburbs on 8th June, 1942.³⁰¹ No external alterations were made to the Artarmon building to meet War demands.

The goods sidings at four stations on the North Shore line were closed during World War Two as part of a broader policy to close as many metropolitan Sydney goods sidings as possible in an effort to make available train crews and other staff for military service. The policy also reflected lower available manpower.

ARTARMON STATION IMPROVEMENTS

The Railway Commissioner made only two improvements to Artarmon station during the period 1930 to 1980, both being approved in 1946. These were the asphaltting of the platform surface and the provision of a shelter at the top of the stairs to protect the junior porter collecting tickets in the rain.³⁰² At some time in the late 1940s or early 1950s, the Department granted a tenancy on the platform for a newsagent to occupy space adjacent to the ticket barrier, this facility being known in Departmental language as a "concession".³⁰³ The concession possibly dates from 1950 when the Department of Railways provided further "improvements" to the "shelter" at the barrier.³⁰⁴ A "ticket

³⁰¹ Oral discussion, 23rd March, 1999.

³⁰² Plan entitled "Artarmon - Alteration to Shelter Barrier at Hornsby end", Plan No. F 2176 dated 20th December, 1946.

³⁰³ Photograph No. 1385, ARHS Collection, taken on 31st March, 1956, shows the newsagent.

³⁰⁴ Artarmon Station Card, ARHS Railway Resource Centre

collection rail" provided at the top of the stairs in 1989 marks the approximate position of the concession and ticket booth. The 1989 apparatus saw intermittent use by ticket "snappers" (i.e. Ticket Inspectors) during random exit ticket checks. Although of only recent origin, the ticket collection rail also functioned as a reminder of a past before the introduction of automatic ticketing when staff collected tickets from passengers alighting from all trains at all stations. It has now been removed.

BOY SCOUTS REQUESTS FOR RAILWAY LAND

From time to time, the Property Branch acquired and sold small pieces of land in the vicinity of the station for various purposes, such as for the relocation of stanchions, access improvement and beautification. Many people in the community considered that the railway organisation was a cow to be milked. Requests for all types of favours were asked. One that affected Artarmon was a 1948 request for a long term, low cost lease of land fronting Elizabeth Street on the eastern side of the line by the Boy Scouts' Association for the construction of a hall. This request was rejected but a similar application in 1953 for land fronting Hampden Road opposite McMillan Street on the western side was granted. The land was given free of charge.

PLANNING FAVOURS THE MOTOR CAR

The first attempt to coordinate land use and transport planning in Sydney after World War Two was the County of Cumberland Plan in 1948, which proposed some new railway lines but nothing came of the initiative because the State Labor Government was uninterested in public transport, other than as an employer of low-skilled, trade union members.

Artarmon station was an important local identifier of the suburb until the 1950s but its continued relevance to local residents slowly declined, in alignment with the rise of the domination by the motor car. The spatial relevance of Artarmon station in the post-1950 period is not only diminished by the motor car but by the very comprehensive system of public bus transport that parallels and crosses the railway corridor.

The pattern of transport developments that emerges is one of priority for the North Shore area until the private motor car became a more convenient and acceptable form of transport for North Shore residents. Table 3.1 provides details of some road initiatives, such as the longest asphaltic road and the longest re-inforced concrete bridge in Sydney. This preference for private motor cars is confirmed by the subsequent denial of the former tram tracks on the Harbour Bridge for rail use, the construction of the Cahill Freeway in 1958, the Warringah Expressway in 1968 and later massive road improvements. Why was the Expressway open in 1968? The Parliamentary Member for Mosman between 1947 and 1972 was Pat Morton, who held

the key portfolios of Local Government and Highways in the Askin/Cutler Coalition Government between 1965 and 1972, during which time the Expressway constructed and opened.

The opening of the largest office block in Australia, the MLC Centre at North Sydney, in 1958, the progressive air right development over North Sydney platform, the forum complex at St. Leonards in 2000 and the development of triple towers over Chatswood station indicate that the North Shore is as much at home to the property developer as the private motor car. The contrast between funding for private motor cars and railways was no better reflected in 1968. When the Warringah Expressway was opened, the New South Wales Railways was still using Morse code for communications.

Jack Lang lamented the absence of transport planning in the 1950s. He asked “isn’t it time to start planning now for the future? Whatever our views we must realise that this city is growing fast.”³⁰⁵ The question remains relevant and largely unanswered 50 years later.

ADDITIONAL STEPS AWAY FROM INVESTMENT IN URBAN TRANSPORT

In November, 1957, an American consulting firm, known as Ebasco, submitted its report of the Department of Railways in which there were only two references to metropolitan Sydney services. The first was a cautionary note on expansion and a recommendation that bus services be considered to replace future railway lines.³⁰⁶ The second reference was contained under a heading “Operation of Passenger Trains and Stations” and in regard to this matter Ebasco recommended the “necessity for surveying station operations and effecting economies therein where possible. The study should be made as quickly as circumstances will permit.”³⁰⁷

Nothing resulted from the report relating to stations. Instead, the Department of Railways told the Minister for Transport on 31st December, 1957, that, apart from reducing the size of off-peak suburban trains from eight to four carriages and other issues related to train running, the Department would focus on:

- Workshop co-ordination,
- Solicitation of new business,
- main line electrification, &
- future acquisition & retirement of passenger & goods rollingstock.

³⁰⁵ Lang, *I Remember*, op. cit., p. 264.

³⁰⁶ Ebasco Services Incorporated, *A Study of the Department of Railways and the Department of Government Transport*, Sydney, Government Printer, 1957, p. 19.

³⁰⁷ Ibid, p. 21.

The adverse impact of the Ebasco report went further than an absence of action relating to station operations. Commissioner McCusker advised Minister Enticknap that:

“all available Loan Funds were to be devoted to such works or the purpose of such equipment as would provide a satisfactory return on the investment involved.”

Transport historian, Robert Gibbons, noted that, because the Ebasco report recommended that money should be spent in areas where the greatest savings would result from operational costs, the Department of Railways interpreted that recommendation to focus on rural freight operations rather than projects and services in the Sydney urban area.³⁰⁸ Chapter 27 sets out the evidence to support this rural freight priority after 1957 but also notes that the bias against Sydney and towards the rural part of the railway network dated back to the 1930s.

The Commissioner for Railways wrote in his 1959/60 Annual Report that the “the greatest proportion of the Department’s transport effort was expended in providing passenger services.....”³⁰⁹ The evidence shows such a statement to be incorrect for the period between 1930 and 1980, as indicated in Chapter 27. The Commissioner blamed the establishment of suburban shopping centres, television and the increase in private motor car ownership for declining patronage in the 1950s.³¹⁰ Perhaps the residents at Artarmon would say that the Commissioner had forgotten to modernize the carriages, improve on-time running and provide station signage so that people could find the station.³¹¹

One factor that mitigated against public transport improvements in Sydney was the culture of the management in the New South Wales Railways. Just as there was a management bias awards mechanical engineering and against civil engineering and architecture, there was a perception both in the Railways and in the general community that people who drove electric trains were not “real” drivers. “Real” drivers drove main line trains with steam and diesel locomotives, not suburban electric trains. This anti-Sydney organisational culture also extended into the railway workshops. The facility that undertook major repairs to electric trains called the Electric Car Workshops, which was officially abbreviated to ELCAR. It was described by one worker at ELCAR in the 1950s in the following terms:

³⁰⁸ R. Gibbons, *Transport Administration and Planning in Sydney*, unpublished M. Ec. Thesis, University of Sydney, 1978, p. 154.

³⁰⁹ Commissioner for Railways, *Annual Report for 1959/60*, Sydney, 1960, p.13

³¹⁰ *ibid.*

³¹¹ “Way-finding” signage on streets to identify stations was not provided on a system wide basis until 1987

“ELCAR was said to be the most militant workshop in the Railway. What they put that down to was when it was first opened about 1927 it was miles from anywhere. People were used to working at Eveleigh and this was out of the way (i.e. at Chullora) and they (i.e. Railway management) exiled people there. If you got under the skin (i.e. as a troublemaker) at Eveleigh – it was out to ELCAR. They made a breeding ground out of it (i.e. at ELCAR, Chullora) and it grew and grew.”³¹²

So, it was a part of formal railway culture exercised by management to treat the maintenance of the Sydney suburban fleet as a place of punishment. It was of little surprise then, in 1977, a lobby group called National Action for Public Transport criticized Sydney’s electric trains as being behind World standards, citing acceleration rates as an example. Sydney’s then newest electric trains had acceleration rates just over half of suburban trains in Philadelphia, San Francisco and Moscow.³¹³

³¹² Ken Stokoe, fitter and union shop steward, quoted by Alan Parkinson in C. Bull, “Alan Parkinson’s Railway Career,” *Australian Railway History*, June, 2016, pp. 5 & 6.

³¹³ National Action for Public Transport, *Getting on the Right Track*, no details, p. 16

26 THE SLOW DEVELOPMENT OF THE CONCEPT OF AN URBAN RAILWAY SYSTEM 1960-80

AIR RIGHTS DEVELOPMENT

This was a period when there was no policy that identified Sydney as a stand-alone entity of the State railway system. At least it was consistent with previous periods except Dr. Bradfield's planning between 1916 and 1932. Stations in Sydney looked just the same as those in any part of New South Wales from the Victorian to the Queensland borders between 1960 and 1980, just as they had previously except in the 1890s. The 1960-1980 period was identified as nothing more than a series of individual initiatives undertaken to address immediate problems. Nevertheless, at least some non-strategic attention was being given to the Sydney area even though the initiatives were small in number and lacked any cohesion.

Not only was there no plan in the 1960s but there was no money. A good financial summary has been prepared by economic historian, Robert Gibbons, who examined the structure of funding for transport for the time. He wrote that "as a percentage of the total State loan funds, public transport's share reached a peak of 42% in 1950/51, fell from 37% to 23% between 1952/53 and 1953/54, and bottomed at about 11% in 1963/64 and 1964/65".³¹⁴

The New South Wales Railways was the pioneer in Australia of air right development over railway lines. Senior officials would have been very aware of what the New York Central Railroad had done to approve of air right development on a massive scale in connection with the opening of Grand Central station in 1913 in New York. Not long after, the New South Wales Railways acted in a similar but much smaller manner. The first air right development on the New South Wales Railways occurred in 1920 at two locations in the same year. One location was above the branch line to Darling Harbour adjacent to George Street in Railway Square where Wembley House was constructed. The other site was at Newtown with the construction of Bridge House on the Pacific Highway. Both of these structures are extant in 2016.

When the Railways had opened the North Shore line in 1932, it planned and built as one of the component of the project, the foundations for the new, corporate headquarters of the Railway organisation, a building that was opened in 1936. It was an award-winning structure with strong Art-deco features and was the first purpose-built, air-conditioned building in Australia as well as being the first large scale building

³¹⁴ R. Gibbons, *Transport Administration and Planning in Sydney*, unpublished Master of Economics thesis, University of Sydney, 1978, p. 121

constructed over an operational railway line. At the same time, Wynyard Park in York Street became the first roof-top garden, being built above the multi-level Wynyard railway station.

The New South Wales Government examined in 1963 the scope for leasing both land and airspace on a major scale for commercial development across the entire railway network. This was the first time such an investigation had been made. A committee of public servants examined the land sale policy at that time which utilised direct negotiations rather than the tender system but it supported continuation of the latter arrangement. In its report, the committee listed 31 sites that had either been developed or were recommended for development with all but one site – at Wollongong – being within the Sydney metropolitan area. Air right development had largely kicked off in 1959 with small scale projects at Caringbah, Bankstown and Campsie and one enormous, commercial and residential project at Hurstville, the last-mentioned failing to get going then and ended up in 1965 as merely a car park. The development of the air rights in the portal area for the underground at Goulburn Street in the city opened in 1961 was listed in the report as a car parking project.³¹⁵ The only site on the North Shore railway that was listed for development was the air right development proposed for North Sydney. The development of air rights at Chatswood on a relatively small scale did not occur until 1976 with the much larger development commencing in 1989. Air right development at St. Leonards also started in 1989. Artarmon station, which would later receive consideration for air right development, was also not mentioned in the 1963 list of possible developments. The difficulties associated with air rights are reflected in the numerous attempts to develop the airspace above Hornsby railway station, the first of which occurred in 1979 and, despite several call for tenders, no one has come forward with a viable development proposal.

PROPOSED BUS/RAIL INTERCHANGE AT ST. LEONARDS

The main urban transport advisory body to the Minister for Transport up to January, 1975, was the County of Cumberland Passenger Transport Advisory Committee and in 1966 it examined a proposal of the then Minister for Transport, Milton Morris, to stop all buses crossing the Sydney Harbour Bridge and instead feeding them into a new interchange at St. Leonards on land occupied by the Royal North Shore Hospital. Basically, there was considerable opposition to the proposal because it would mean an increase in travel time, travel cost and passenger inconvenience but it was thought the idea was worth a trial, as long as funds were provided by the Government for the construction of an interchange. No funds were provided and no interchange facility was

³¹⁵ One observer, Vanessa Berry, stated on 24th November, 2014, that the car park “is generally considered to be one of Sydney’s ugliest buildings, if not the ugliest.” See <https://www.mirrorsydney.wordpress.com>.

built. It appeared that those people in key jobs were thinking that it was time to address some of the urban transport problems in Sydney.

COMMUTER CAR PARKING

In the 1970s, government officials were starting to realise the need to provide infrastructure to facilitate future residential growth and address current transport problems. In 1971, officials examined the need for additional commuter car parking at Gordon railway station and recommended an enlargement of the existing facilities to be paid by the introduction of a daily fee of 20 cents per vehicle.³¹⁶ One of the statistics the committee gathered was the estimated number of commuter cars parked in the streets at North Shore line stations. The Table below provides the estimates.

TABLE: ESTIMATED NUMBERS OF COMMUTER CARS PARKED IN THE STREETS AT NORTH SHORE RAILWAY STATIONS, 1971

STATION	ESTIMATED NUMBER OF COMMUTER MOTOR VEHICLES
Waverton	250
Wollstonecraft	250
St. Leonards	300
Artarmon	300
Chatswood	500
Roseville	300
Lindfield	300
Killara	200
Gordon	500
Pymble	230
Turramurra	260
Warrawee	100
Wahroonga	200
Waitara	270
Hornsby	300
TOTAL	4260

SOURCE: NSW, *Report to the County of Cumberland Passenger Transport Advisory Committee on the feasibility of establishing a major commuter car park at Gordon railway station*, unpublished internal report, 1971, p. 7.

³¹⁶ NSW, *Report to the County of Cumberland Passenger Transport Advisory Committee on the Feasibility of Establishing a Major Commuter Car Park at Gordon Railway Station*, unpublished internal report, 1971, pp. 7 & 10.

The Table indicated a large number of commuter vehicles at the streets near to Artarmon station and, although this problem has existed for 50 years, there is no solution in sight to the inconvenience caused to residents in the affected streets.

LIBERAL/COUNTRY PARTIES INVESTIGATE BUT DO LITTLE

After the introduction of the prototype, all double-decked suburban train in 1968, the first set of production double-decked carriages introduced on the Sydney suburban service on 8th May, 1972, being set number S.11. More seats became available to Sydney commuters.

The NSW Liberal/Country Coalition Government appointed a 'Government Parties' Committee on Suburban Train Services', chaired by Tom Mead, M. L. A., which presented its report to the Minister for Transport, Milton Morris in March, 1972. Mead wrote that "the Minister said recently 'The rail service is crippled for money at every turn. Make whatever criticism you will of the railways, but shortage of money is at the bottom of every one of them' ... Rehabilitation of the suburban railway system must be a top priority and the money must be made available to do it quicker than is being done at present."

Mead's report tantalisingly contained a section entitled "Tickets and Station Facilities" but, regrettably, there was no reference to the importance of or design of station buildings.³¹⁷ Nevertheless, the section recommended vending machines be installed for ticket sales and that additional exit barriers be opened to facilitate the departure of passengers from stations. Up to that date, no commuter car parks have been funded by the Department of Railways and the only such facilities that existed were those provided by local councils for shoppers, such as at Rockdale and Kogarah [in Mead's electorate of Hurstville]. The Commissioner argued that the Department of Railways does not believe that the provision for parking should be added to its burden of non-paying facilities and Mead agreed with that opinion, but he added that "somebody has to start thinking about this problem very soon." Commissioner McCusker considered motorists should pay parking fees to provide the capital and the Committee considered that car parks at key suburban rail centres could be undertaken by the new co-ordinated transport authority (i.e. the soon-to-exist Public Transport Commission) with local and state government.

³¹⁷ Liberal Party, *Report of the Government Parties Committee on Suburban Train Services*, no details, p. 22. Despite the title of the Committee, no Country Party politicians served on the Committee.

Other issues which the Mead Committee commented upon were the large extent of vandalism, a pattern of declining passenger numbers, the absence of work on the Eastern Suburbs Railway and the abandonment of work for the increase in the number of tracks from four to six between Erskineville and Tempe.

In the absence of any government plan for improved transport in the Sydney region, some private enterprise proposals were put before the government for consideration. One of these was a proposal by the State Member of Parliament for Manly, Douglas Darby, for a rapid transit system between Manly and the Pittwater region, together with an air right development over Manly wharf. Not surprisingly, the matter went nowhere despite an endorsement by Premier Askin who was reported as saying "I am overly impressed with the Pittwater/Manly Zenith project."³¹⁸

COMMONWEALTH FUNDING FOR URBAN TRANSPORT

Another significant event in 1972 was the election of a Commonwealth Labor Government under the leadership of Gough Whitlam. That was a significant moment in transport history as Whitlam offered to take over the operation of the New South Wales Railways. There was no way the Liberal State Government was going to accept that offer. Whitlam also initiated the first ever Commonwealth legislation to provide funding for urban transport including planning, research and construction, but, once again, the State Government was reluctant to give any kudos to the Whitlam Government, though the State Premier, Robert Askin, was happy to have any money, which he did willingly take.

What Askin decided to do was to except Commonwealth funds but allocate the money to minor station projects. Between 1972 and 1975, the following stations received Commonwealth funding for new but very basic platform buildings – Macquarie Fields, Quakers Hill, Canley Vale, Lysaghts, Marayong, Schofields, Adamstown and Woonona. In addition, other stations received Commonwealth funding for minor works, especially new male/female toilet blocks. Unfortunately, Artarmon station received a big zero. It was not alone and, in fact, its absence of any form of improvement was the norm for nearly every station in the State and even Australia between 1960 and 1980.

"MODERNISATION" IS THE BUZZ WORD

Funding for "modernisation" was the key policy that all Australian Railway Commissioners had desired since 1945 and they blamed the various State Governments for the failure to adequately finance the modernization of the railway

³¹⁸ Argus International Pty Ltd, *Manly/Pittwater Rapid Transit Railway and Manly Zenith Terminal Complex*, Kings Cross, 1972, no pag.

systems.”³¹⁹ Unfortunately, the political climate in New South Wales was antagonistic to co-operation with the Commonwealth Government. A formal Agreement was prepared in 1946 for the shared funding of track standardisation works in the various states but the New South Wales Government refused to sign the Agreement until 1958.³²⁰ This lack of co-operation was an example of the complacency that existed in the New South Wales Government between 1945 and 1965 in regard to the need to make the New South Wales railway system more competitive and efficient.

In the early 1950s, Commissioner Reg Winsor, published a booklet the title of which mirrored the official departmental language of the time. It was called *Modernising the Railways*. Throughout the document, the word, “modern”, was only supplemented by an even more exciting two-word combination of “ultra-modern.” Unfortunately, it seems the NSW Government did not receive its copy as the booklet resulted in no increase in capital funding for urban transport.

THE POWER PLAYERS CHANGE

Dale Tully wrote about the absence of party political platforms relating to public transport and stated that, “without an effective lobby, public transport languished in the post-war period up until the early 1970s.”³²¹ There was another important ingredient that stimulated changed attitudes towards public transport.

New South Wales Railway Commissioner McCusker was most aware that there were new games at play in the early 1970s and being played by new, powerful players, such as Gough Whitlam and Robert Askin, who both thought that the Department of Railways was extremely poorly managed and overstaffed to blazes. McCusker tried something new and his answer was a programme to encourage staff to “strive to improve the appearance of suburban stations throughout the metropolitan area”.³²² Nothing happened and that absence of action was a testimony to the hopeless management of the organisation.

McCusker in 1972 had proposed to the Askin/Cutler Government that a separate authority be established to manage transport in the Sydney metropolitan area and another, smaller organisation would manage transport outside of Sydney. For the first time in its life, the Ministry of Transport was a major player in public transport policy and it recommended that a new body, called the Public Transport Commission, be created

³¹⁹ G. T. Webb, *The Australian Government Railways Since Clapp*, a report presented to the Australian and New Zealand Railway Commissioners' Conference, Hobart, March, 1974, p. 3.

³²⁰ Ibid., pp.10, 21 & 40.

³²¹ D. Tully, *Urban Mass Transportation – Politics and Power and the Eastern Suburbs Railway*, unpublished Government 4 Honours thesis, Department of Government, University of Sydney, 1988, p. 111.

³²² *The Railwayman*, 6th September, 1972, p. 2.

to manage and, more importantly, co-ordinate all modes of public transport throughout the entire State. Premier Askin preferred the Ministry policy and McCusker was legislated out of his position on 17th October, 1972.³²³

The Public Transport Commission replaced the Department of Railways in late 1972 and that initiative alone was a step to address the management lethargy that had existed for many decades. The problem was that the New South Wales Government was not willing to allocate sufficient capital funds to rectify the many problems that existed in both freight and passenger services and facilities. Moreover, the Commission had to manage not only the railways but Sydney's Government owned bus services as well as the Government owned ferry services in both Sydney and Newcastle, freight services throughout the State and all ancillary operations, such as workshops.

It was not until 1973 with the coming of Chief Commissioner, Phillip Shirley, that changes to both the management of railways and Artarmon station were to occur. With the Public Transport Commission, which replaced the former Department of Railways, came an attempted emphasis on the customer rather than the employee. It failed. Despite system-wide improvements, nothing happened at Artarmon. The absence of alterations was both good and bad. The smelly toilets at most stations were past their prime and needed upgrading. However, there was a widespread desire within the transport portfolio to create a "metro" style of urban rail operations. In that dream, there would be no platform waiting rooms, no toilets and no staff. Each platform would be barren asphalt. At least Artarmon had retained its building during the 1970s. The official desire to remove all platform buildings was finally squashed in 1976 by strong lobbying to government by the then newly formed Interim Commuter Council lead by Kevin Parrish, who was a regular rail commuter from the Central Coast. Luckily, Kevin had a sympathetic ear in the Labor Party, which had taken power that year in the State Government.

THE SKEW TOWARDS ROADS WAS SUSTAINED BY THE CONSERVATIVES

The Coalition Government in 1974 decided to transfer the portfolio of Minister for Highways from the local government administration to the Minister for Transport. This was to be fatal for public transport as the then Department of Main Roads was in a direct position to ensure priority for roads funding over public transport.

There was a massively extensive study of all forms of transport in 1974 called the Sydney Area Transportation Study and it recommended construction of 15 new rail lines, the nearest to Artarmon was one to the Warringah Peninsula area, which would

³²³ B. Patterson, *The Co-ordination of Policy Making in NSW Public Transport in the 1970s*, unpublished Litt. B. thesis, University of New England, 1977, pp. 32 and 33.

have been underground from St. Leonards to Brookvale/Manly Vale, with one underground station being located in the Willoughby area. The idea was again examined in 1982 as part of the Commission of Enquiry into the Warringah Transport Corridor but, like the 1974 proposal, went nowhere. Apart from the initiation of some freeway proposals and the recommended completion of the Eastern Suburbs Line (in 1979), nothing much changed for public transport. The Liberal/Country Party Coalition State Government policy was squarely focused on the private motor car.

GOOD INTENT BY RAIL MANAGERS – INSUFFICIENT FUNDING BY GOVERNMENT

Another significant event in 1974 was the release for ultimate public consumption of the future plans of the Public Transport Commission. On 25th November, the Commission submitted to the Minister for Transport, Milton Morris, a glossy brochure entitled, *Looking Ahead*. Under the heading, “Investment Plan”, the report listed as one of its objectives, in relation to suburban services, “improvements to railway stations, bus terminals and the development of inter-change points”.³²⁴ Although there were photographs of workshops, offices and rollingstock in the publication, there were no photographs of railway stations either as they existed or were proposed to be in the future. In fact, apart from the foregoing quotation, there was no other reference in the 34 pages of the document to railway stations. Later in the document, it stated “unfortunately, there is so much to be done to improve the total quality of the service that it must be many years before all those things which should be done are done.”³²⁵ It had taken two years to come to that conclusion. The target date for implementation was 1985 – over a decade after the release of the publication. Barry Patterson wrote a thesis of the period between 1972 and 1976 on the administration and coordination of transport in Sydney. He wrote of the 1974 document, *Looking Ahead*, that “making the system more popular was the main tactic to achieve viability.”³²⁶

Patterson considered that the tactic was suspect even as it was written, based on the number of passenger journeys for rail transport in Sydney. In 1973, the number was 201,200 but had dropped to 199,077 in 1974 five months before the release of the document and declined further to 195,947 in 1975.³²⁷ Both from Patterson’s analysis and from an historical perspective, the Commission failed to make the system more popular. The total absence of regard for the role played by station buildings was part of the evidence of the failure.

³²⁴ Public Transport Commission, *Looking Ahead*, 1974, p. 20.

³²⁵ Ibid., p. 35.

³²⁶ B. Patterson, *The Co-ordination of Policy Making in NSW Public Transport in the 1970s*, unpublished Litt. B. thesis, University of New England, 1977, p. 52.

³²⁷ Ibid., p. 53.

The improvements to Sydney's rail system continued at a small pace and one of the rare initiatives occurred in December, 1975, when the first pre-recorded train announcements were made at a station – at Redfern. The year, 1975, was more significant from the transport planning perspective as it was in that year that the concept of a “balanced transport system” became the number one transport strategy.³²⁸ The conservative State Government explained the concept as a system “whereby each mode of transport performs the task best suited to it.”³²⁹ In reality, all it meant was that the capital works of the various government organisations in the transport portfolio were combined in a single, public document. There was no strategy; there was no co-ordination and no priorities. When the Government released its ten-year transport report in 1975 to the public, there was no specific reference to urban transport infrastructure and no mention of freight services.

THE LABOR PARTY PROMOTES AN URBAN TRANSPORT POLICY

The Australian Labor Party was committed to making public transport a big item in the State general elections in 1976. It undertook a comprehensive review of what the conservative government had done and not done. Since the Coalition Government's election to office in 1965, Askin had promised transport improvements but had not fulfilled his promises. The Labor Party said “the coalition stands condemned on its transport record which was one of stagnation. Services were cut throughout the State. Railways, the great promoter of decentralisation, was starved of funds, cut back to the bone, and put into bankruptcy. Staff morale was at rock bottom and a great career industry was being destroyed.”³³⁰ It had been a Coalition promise in 1965 to make adequate provision for parking at railway stations and, although the Commonwealth Government had offered capital funds for this task, hardly any work had been done on the subject. On 11th March, 1975, then Transport Minister, Wal Fife, summarised the crisis of funding when he said:

“Sufficient funds have not been available to public transport to improve passenger and freight services and to provide equipment. As a result, the undertakings are paying a penalty.”

Later the same year on 9th September, Minister Fife told Parliament that “over the years all we had had were increases in fares and freights, reductions in services and

³²⁸ Liberal Party of NSW, *1965-1975 A Decade of Good Government*, p. 19.

³²⁹ Ibid.

³³⁰ Australian Labor Party, *Liberal-Country Party Coalition Government 1965/76 – Transport Deficiencies*, Summary, pp. 1-3., no details.

economies in personnel.”³³¹ These was fairly typical statements of the 1960s and 1970s which consistently show that the dominant focus of government policy was on rollingstock for rural areas and that stations hardly ever got a mention in policy statements.

PUBLIC SERVANTS RETHINK FUNDING PRIORITIES

The evidence that urban public transport was gaining momentum as an important policy issue was reflected in the recommendations of the Urban Transport Advisory Committee, which reported to the Minister for Transport on 3rd February, 1976. The recommendations relating to public transport were:

- the highest priority be given to funding of urban transport services, which were estimated to be in the order of \$30 million per annum over the present rate of funding,
- the Commonwealth Government be requested to join the NSW Government to provide funding of \$270 million over the next 5 years,
- priority to be given to existing the public transport system rather than expanding it,
- concentration on capital works likely to produce benefits within the next 5 to 10 years,
- because of the urgent need to improve the existing system, work be deferred on major rail construction projects such as the Glenfield-East Hills line, quadruplication of the Strathfield-Hornsby and the Granville Penrith lines, &
- termination of work on the Eastern Suburbs Railway at Bondi Junction.³³²

The Report specifically referred to the need to upgrade railway stations but, sadly, proposed that only \$1 million be spent over the next five years on “station upgrading, public address systems, parking etc.” with no funds allocated for bus/rail interchanges.³³³ The \$1 million mentioned in the report was totally inadequate for the massive amount of repairs, maintenance and replacement of the many derelict station buildings on the New South Wales rail system. The good thing that came out of the report, released three months before the State election, was that it provided Neville Wran and the Labor Party with evidence that the Liberal/Country parties coalition were uninterested in the proper funding of the urban rail system. In short, Wran was given a gift.

³³¹ Ibid.

³³² Urban Transport Advisory Committee, *Report to the Minister for Transport & Highways and the Minister for Planning and Environment*, Sydney, Government Printer, 1976, p. 4.

³³³ Ibid., p. 17.

THE LABOR PARTY BACKS POLICY WITH MASSIVE FUNDING

On 1st May, 1976, the Wran Labor Government assumed office in NSW on an extremely dominant public transport policy. It was this election that marked public transport as an important election issue and every election since that time has identified urban public transport as a key plank in party platforms. At the time in 1976, the Railways were “in disarray”, despite the re-organisation brought about by the Public Transport Commission.³³⁴ The problems were typified by the ongoing high level of industrial unrest in the railway organisation, there being nearly 500 disputes from January 1978 to June 1980.³³⁵ Wran broke the long-term nexus that linked capital investment to farebox revenue and allocated millions of dollars in an upgrading programme affecting all parts of the urban rail network.

The Labor Party on taking office in 1976 provided a statement of the crisis in public transport when it said:

“We inherited a system struggling along with out-dated equipment and rollingstock, inadequate motive power, no locomotive acquisition program, and a frightening requirement for modernisation of freight facilities, bridges, track and almost every facet of the system. As the Premier has said, the system is ramshackle and requires a massive restoration effort. We are making that effort.....”³³⁶

From election day, the Wran Labor Government introduced a five year, \$1,000 million programme of transport improvement. The Minister for Transport, Peter Cox, described the programme as “the first really sustained effort to improve the system since the underground construction and carriage acquisition programmes of the 1920s.” He was correct! In 1981, Cox released a record of the works of the Labor Government which was called, *Achievements in Transport 1976-1981 – A Public Information Document Detailing Transport Developments in NSW*. Between 1976-80, the Labor Government had replaced 22 station buildings under its “improvement programme”, which were the new buzz words to replace “modernization”. This was the first time ever that a political party had stated that there would be a policy of platform building replacement. The first target by Labor was ‘the replacement of older, mainly timber stations, with modest low-maintenance buildings’. That had been the policy of the former Public Transport Commission since 1980, as evident in a publication named the *Ten-year Capital*

³³⁴ J. Black, “Transport” in T. Bramston (Ed.), *The Wran Era*, Sydney, Federation Press, 2006, p. 139

³³⁵ *ibid.*, p. 140

³³⁶ Australian Labor Party, *Liberal-Country Party Coalition Government 1965/76 – Transport Deficiencies*, Summary, p. 3., no details.

investment Conceptual Plan 1980-90. Unfortunately, the conservative Askin Government did not provide funds for the policy to be implemented.

The Wran Government adopted the view that all existing railway managers, though not front-line workers, were incompetent and that everything that was done in the past was bad. That view was largely correct. The management style of the Commission and its predecessors was described as “characterised by an insular approach to problems and challenges. Within the Department, each Branch was self-perpetuating, tending to recruit at the lowest level of the hierarchy and promote thereafter from within itself. This approach reduced to a minimum the adoption of new ideas and techniques and was not always conducive to good industrial relations.”³³⁷

Senior management staff had been employed from outside the Commission and were informed of the Government’s adverse perception of Railway staff and events in past time. These new recruits engaged similar-minded, external recruits and the position developed that anyone with a smidgeon of railway knowledge, practice or experience was almost automatically rejected for employment. Unfortunately, a lot of excellent, senior Railway staff were shown the front door along with the poor managers. There has been no change in the unstated policy under which a knowledge of the past is discounted as worthless. This aligned with a wider view in NSW Government that historical knowledge was useless.

One of the important philosophic features of transport policy since the Labor Government took office was the promotion of what had been the official policy of the ousted conservative coalition in relation to a transport strategy, namely a “balanced transport system”. However, this time the Labor Government expressed a new philosophy about the term. For the first time, the strategy moved away from a former over-emphasis on highways and road vehicles to one of enhancement of public transport services. Also part of the official policy was the modernisation and rationalisation of public transport services and resources and equitable access to public transport and mobility for the whole community, not just able-bodied people. More importantly, the new Labor Government backed the words with a lot of money and delivered results.

The capital works funding was accelerated after the January, 1977, Granville rail accident in which 77 passengers were killed. With increasing deficits in the rail organization, there was a climate for financial reform aimed at lowering staff numbers. Simultaneously, there was an ongoing programme to eliminate what governments viewed as adverse formal and informal cultural habits and work ethics that existing in

³³⁷ NSW, *Report of the Inquiry into Industrial Relations in the PTC of NSW*, Vol. 1, pp. 15 & 16.

the rail organizations for over a century. Unfortunately, most of the good cultural aspects were eliminated by mediocre managers recruited externally who were not sufficiently skilled to understand the uniqueness of railway culture, good and bad. Despite the organisational uncertainty that has existed after 1972, large amounts of capital funds were annually allocated to the urban railway system in Sydney in order to improve services. This ongoing capital funding was an indicator of the continued political importance of urban rail.

RAILWAY STATIONS AND URBAN CONSOLIDATION BECOME IMPORTANT FOR THE FIRST TIME

For the first time ever, railway stations became an important policy item in 1978. The priority of the Public Transport Commission was the reduction in station building maintenance and it was reported that priority would be given to stations most needing maintenance.”³³⁸ The new policy contained a fresh approach to station design and this was the result of a considerable amount of excitement by architects within the Public Transport Commission. Newspapers started referring to station design with the words “model” and “standard” design but these were not terms based on any official document.³³⁹

The result of the new policy was reflected by the calling of tenders in early 1978 for brick buildings to replace the former timber structures at Meadowbank, Normanhurst, Cheltenham, Wollstonecraft, Loftus and Warwick Farm.³⁴⁰ The platform buildings that stand on the Wollstonecraft platforms today are those that date from this once exciting period in 1978, though there has been an addition to the building on the Wynyard-bound platform using non-matching bricks. All the structures possessed a common design strategy and were based on a so-called “modular type of construction”. Sadly, there were insufficient funds to replace other than the initial six examples and, when funds did become available, new senior engineering staff who dominated the Architectural Section had other ideas about what platform building should look like.

In October, 1977, Sydney platforms were marked to indicate where trains were to stop. This was not an issue with eight-car trains as drivers had to stop at one end of the platform but with trains of two, four, six or seven carriages drivers stopped where they liked. At least from this time, commuters knew where shorter trains would be located along platforms.

³³⁸ *Daily Mirror*, 20th July, 1977.

³³⁹ *Ibid* and *Aeroplane Press*, 13th July, 1977, p. 1.

³⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 21st April, 1978.

The Chief Executive of the Public Transport Commission, Alan Reiher, gave a speech in August, 1978, to the Chartered Institute of Transport about commuter transport. The absence of a single reference to railway stations and platform buildings was an indication that the Commission considered that such facilities had no priority for public funding. He did make some references about fixed infrastructure, including:

- making modal interchanges easier to use,
- provision of additional car park facilities,
- the introduction of automatic ticket issuing equipment,
- the use of automatic barrier control equipment for entry and exit,
- television surveillance of platforms and other areas, &
- automatic station indicators with control from signalling centres.³⁴¹

Reiher did make some progress in relation to interchanges and car parks but there was no money either to do those things extensively or the other things he listed as priorities. The Minister for Transport, Peter Cox, announced in February, 1978, that parking areas had been provided at 13 stations but plans were underway for a further 38 stations.³⁴² In July of the same year, Cox announced 21 “park-and-ride” car spaces at Turrumurra Station and 77 at Waitara station.³⁴³ While this announcement was not spectacular, at least it showed that the Labor Government was serious about providing commuter car parking and, more importantly, was actually undertaking the physical work.

Concomitant with the rise in official recognition of the role of the suburban station was the topic of urban consolidation. In 1979, the Australian Institute of Urban Studies released its first report on urban consolidation and other related issues. Of the many key people interviewed, the only local government authority in New South Wales which provided a representative to be interviewed was Willoughby Council, which despatched Ian Costley to provide evidence and comment.³⁴⁴ Was that an indicator of Council’s enthusiasm even at that time for high-rise development around Artarmon station?

At the time of the replacement of the Public Transport Commission in July, 1980, there were perhaps hundreds of station buildings requiring urgent maintenance. There was a plethora of press reports of buildings that should have been condemned decades previously. The crisis was not so much the fault of the Commission but of conservative government policy which did not consider public transport in any way important, let alone essential. Artarmon residents were fortunate in having a brick building which

³⁴¹ A. S. Reiher, *The Public Transport Commission of the Commuter*, speech to a seminar of the Chartered Institute of Transport, 16th August, 1978, pp. 16-18.

³⁴² *Sydney Morning Herald*, 9th February, 1978.

³⁴³ *Ibid.*, 14th July, 1978.

³⁴⁴ Australian Institute of Urban Studies, *Urban Strategies for Australia*, First Report, Canberra, 1979, p. 47.

required minimal maintenance relative to the needs of timber structures. The replacement of the timber structures at Wollstonecraft in 1981 was testament to the maintenance needs of timber structures.

27 WHY DID NSW GOVERNMENTS BECOME DISINTERESTED IN THE SYDNEY RAIL NETWORK BETWEEN 1930 AND 1980? THE APPLICATION OF CONTEXTUAL ANALYSES

SELECTION OF A COMPARATIVE METHOD OF ASSESSMENT

Historians are trained to note what is different and what is the same. In the case of Artarmon station, the 1930-1980 period is different from other periods because of the paucity of physical improvement or other activity at the site. To find out why this occurred, an examination is made of what was happening to similar railway infrastructure and areas of capital expenditure in other parts of the New South Wales railway network.

The methodology adopts an examination of the absence of improvements at Artarmon in the 1930-1980 period through a comparative, incremental analysis based on the geography of the State rail network using ever-increasing distances of the rail network from Artarmon station. The task utilises the way the NSW railway administration categorised the various parts of the physical network. The initial comparison is with stations in other parts of the NSW railway system. The Table below shows how the comparative approach will be used.

TABLE: EXAMINATION OF PASSENGER FACILITIES ON THE NSW RAIL NETWORK 1930-1980

NAME OF THE GEOGRAPHIC PART OF THE RAIL SYSTEM BEING EXAMINED	IDENTIFICATION OF WHAT INFRASTRUCTURE IS INCLUDED IN THE PART OF THE SYSTEM	LOCATION OF THE DETAILS IN THIS STUDY
Artarmon station	Artarmon station	Appendix 1
North Shore line	All stations between Milsons Point and Hornsby	Appendix 3
Sydney rail network	All stations, except those on the East Hills line	Appendix 4
Sydney rail network in summary form by decade	All stations, except those on the East Hills line	Appendix 5

NAME OF THE GEOGRAPHIC PART OF THE RAIL SYSTEM BEING EXAMINED	IDENTIFICATION OF WHAT INFRASTRUCTURE IS INCLUDED IN THE PART OF THE SYSTEM	LOCATION OF THE DETAILS IN THIS STUDY
Intercity network	All stations beyond Sydney served by electric trains	Appendix 6
A sample of the country network	All stations between Goulburn and Albury	Appendix 7
Country railway stations where the existing platform buildings have been replaced	22 stations in the rural network, apart from the Goulburn-Albury section	Appendix 8

Subheadings are used in this Chapter to help with the interpretation of the methodology.

ARTARMON IN THE CONTEXT OF THE NORTH SHORE RAILWAY LINE

Initial attention commences with what was happening at other stations on the North Shore railway line during the period. Sydney's population reached one million people in 1926 and continued to increase until it reached two million people in 1958 and three million in 1972.³⁴⁵ When electric train services crossed the Sydney Harbour Bridge in 1932, the development of Sydney moved "dramatically northward" for the first time in Sydney's spatial history.³⁴⁶ Railway officer, Alfred Rayment, commented on the impact of the opening of the Sydney Harbour Bridge:

"The Sydney Harbour Bridge effected a transformation in railway communication on the north side of the Harbour, which makes the earlier conditions, even now, almost hard to realise; and, no doubt, the proposals for railways serving Manly, Narrabeen, Pittwater and so on, will in due course reach fruition."³⁴⁷

The optimism for further expansion of the rail network on the northern side of Sydney Harbour was never realised.

Despite the population increase, Appendix 1 and, to a lesser degree, Tables 3.1 and 15.2 reveal minimal activity to improve the provision of transport services for the travelling public on the North Shore line between the 1930 and 1980. Even worse,

³⁴⁵ NSW Department of Planning, *Population NSW Bulletin*, May, 2006, p. 5

³⁴⁶ H. McQueen, *Social Sketches of Australia 1788-1975*, Ringwood, penguin Books, 1978, p. 101 and P. Cuffey, *Australian Houses of the Twenties and Thirties*, Rowville, The Five Mile Press, 2007, p. 19

³⁴⁷ A. Reiner, *The Romance of the Railways*, Sydney, Boylan & Co., 1935, p. 39.

there appeared to be official dis-interest in serving commuters on the North Shore line by the absence of any improvements in the railway timetable between 1930 and 1945.³⁴⁸

Just as soon as the NSW Government could politically abandon rail investment following the widespread introduction of the motor car from the 1930s, it withdrew large-scale financial support for rail improvements. Before World War Two, seldom did the NSW Government supply sufficient funds to acquire new country passenger rollingstock; seldom did it consider the replacement of steam locomotives with diesel and electric traction; seldom did it provide funds for regrading steep main lines; seldom did it eliminate structural bottlenecks; seldom did it realign twisty main-line corridors and seldom did it rebuild stations to cater for increased passenger traffic. After World War Two, the position was reversed and funds were allocated to the country rail network but the Sydney system was not so fortunate.

Appendix 1 indicates an almost absence of events at Artarmon station between 1930 and 1980. The analysis of the absence of events can be just as important in history as their presence. Sydney was growing in population in this period yet virtually no improvement occurred at Artarmon station. There seems to be possible reasons relating to the social structure of Sydney. For example, the period was one in which the White Australia Policy was in force and the dominant population increase was due to domestic births. This resulted in a very homogenous Anglo/Saxon race in which white, older males dominated decision making. This period contrasts with the period prior to World War One in which there was a high proportion of overseas born people. In 1905, only 53% of members of the Legislative Council were born in Australia.³⁴⁹ The White Australia Policy was not abolished until 1972 and after this period the number of overseas born Australians reached a level compared to the pre-1920 period.

Although a lot more research is required, it seems that events at Artarmon station paralleled the extent of the number of overseas born residents of Sydney. Those people who lived at Artarmon between 1930 and 1980 would have endured two world wars, the 1930s Depression and economic recessions in 1952, 1961 and 1974 and the cautious habits of the people may have induced a conservative outlook on life. In reality, such an explanation provides no evidence to explain what was happening or, rather, what was not happening at Artarmon station.

Appendix 3 is a statement of capital works at other North Shore stations for the period between 1930 and 1980. An analysis of Appendices 1 and 3 indicates that the pattern

³⁴⁸ G. Churchman, *Railway Electrification in Australia and New Zealand*, Smithfield, IPL Books, 1995, p.91

³⁴⁹ Hawker, op. cit. p. 148

of expenditure relating to Artarmon and all other stations on the North Shore line is generally consistent. All capital works expenditure on the stations form a pattern that is explained by time. When money was spent on the North Shore line, there was a fair chance that Artarmon and all the other stations would receive similar treatment. Generally speaking, there was no bias in favour of any one station, though some unusual things did happen from time to time, such as construction of the brick building at Artarmon in 1916. What remains a puzzle is that not one North Shore station, including Artarmon, was enlarged to cater for the increasing number of train travellers. There were no expanded toilet facilities nor enlarged waiting rooms. Indeed, the opposite occurred. Some stations, such as those at Wahroonga, Pymble and Roseville lost their General Waiting Rooms to provide additional Parcels Room space. There was a system-wide policy of the Department of Railways against enlarging or replacing platform buildings unless the stations were adversely affected by track amplification requiring relocation of platforms or unless a building was destroyed by fire or termites. It was not sufficient to provide larger, let alone better, buildings simply because the existing structures were inadequate in size for a sustained, increased numbers of customers.

Appendices 1 and 3 indicate that, after the opening of the Sydney Harbour Bridge, only very minor structures were built on the North Shore line. No new stations were opened and no larger, replacement buildings were provided at any station. The North Shore line was divided into two sections, based on the design of and materials used for platform structures. The section of line between North Sydney and St. Leonards featured stations with timber buildings and those north of St. Leonards were brick. In this way, the railway provided a visual distinction between the Lower and Upper North Shore and the stimulus in 1916 to replace the timber building at Artarmon was done to confirm the alterations to the southern boundary of the Upper North Shore by providing brick platform structures at all stations. Up to 1916, the Artarmon platform structure was in the Lower North Shore but from 1916 it was officially regarded as being a part of the Upper North Shore – at least as far as the Department of Railways was concerned. This change of boundary was reflected in the change of building materials at Artarmon station.

The NSW Railways decided to improve work conditions for staff collecting tickets at seven stations, including Artarmon, by erecting small humpies but these were only tiny structures about one square metre in size. The other theme that emerges from the 1930-1980 period is the growth in parcels traffic, with expanded facilities at four stations and bookstalls also at four stations. Thus, the little activity that occurred at Artarmon between 1930 and 1980 is consistent with the pattern at other North Shore stations.

ARTARMON IN THE CONTEXT OF THE SYDNEY RAILWAY NETWORK

The search to find an answer to the puzzle of the absence of building improvements/enlargements at Artarmon is not explained by a study of other stations on the North Shore line. What about the rest of the Sydney rail system? Good question! For this reason, the limit of research is expanded to include the entire Sydney metropolitan rail network in order to examine any possible pattern of capital expenditure on facilities. Appendix 4 sets out the structures planned between 1930 and 1980 in Sydney. It excludes the East Hills line, which was planned in 1929 – one year before the period of analysis.

From Appendix 4, there are patterns in the nature of the works planned between 1930 and 1980 in the Sydney metropolitan area. Appendix 4 indicates that the few planned station building works that were constructed between 1930 and 1980 were approved for one of four reasons. These were:

1. The provision of new staff buildings at new stations or replacement buildings at existing stations,
2. The expansion of existing ticket and parcels offices by adding extra floor space through building additions,
3. The construction of separate buildings solely for parcels traffic, &
4. The provision of new or replacement toilets.

Appendix 5 is a summary of Appendix 4 and shows the developments for each of the five decades under examination. Appendix 4 highlights the paucity of replacement buildings constructed throughout the metropolitan Sydney network between 1930 and 1980. Virtually every platform building constructed before 1975 was associated with the provision of new stations, new lines or track amplification, especially on the Main Western line between Auburn and St. Marys. The vast majority of the funds for the work was paid for by other than the Department of Railways. Either local government, the NSW State Government, the Commonwealth Government or private land developers paid for the structures.

An examination of the Sydney rail network reveals that the very few stations that were rebuilt were the result of the impact of related capital works. It cannot be said that Artarmon station and the North Shore line was disadvantaged in terms of station developments compared to what was happening on the rest of the Sydney railway system.

ARTARMON STATION IN THE CONTEXT OF THE INTERCITY PASSENGER NETWORK

By 1930, the concept of improvement relating to rail transport in Sydney had stopped. In an attempt to see whether funds for station improvement were diverted from Sydney and applied to the Bush, an examination of the rail system outside Sydney is undertaken. Up until 1988, all railway stations from Sydney beyond Otford, Macarthur, Emu Plains and Cowan were regarded as being in the Bush. After 1988, the State Rail system was expanded from two parts, being Sydney and Country, into three, Sydney, Intercity and Country. This newly defined Intercity part of the network covered the following areas:

- ❑ Helensburgh-Nowra,
- ❑ Menangle Park-Goulburn,
- ❑ Lapstone-Lithgow, &
- ❑ Cowan-Newcastle.

One of the great issues in NSW history is the clash between the City and the Bush. In the first three decades of the 20th century, there was a vision of “improvement” for Sydney.³⁵⁰ In respect of railways, this had involved the construction of the Sydney Harbour Bridge, the electrification of the suburban rail lines and the introduction of automatic signalling. What was particularly outrageous was the different standards that applied to City electric trains compared to the carriages operating in the Bush. On the Sydney network, electric trains were stopped automatically if they passed a “stop” signal. No such safety mechanism was in place for trains in the Bush nor Bush trains passing through the Sydney network.

Was the City treated the same as or different to the Bush? The only way to answer that question is to investigate what was happening in the non-Sydney rail network. Up to this point in an examination of Artarmon station, the limit of investigation has included the North Shore line and the Sydney metropolitan rail network. The investigation has revealed that both Artarmon and the North Shore line seemed to have fared no better nor no worse than any other part of the Sydney railway system.

Since there were issues obvious to decision makers that prompted the creation of the Intercity part of the rail network, the next limit of research over the rail system relates only to the above Intercity lines. Appendix 6 sets out changes to station buildings on these lines. In Appendix 6 it is seen that hardly any work was done on stations in the

³⁵⁰ J. Murray, *Sydney an Illustrated History*, Melbourne, Lansdowne Press, 1974, p. 88

1930s. World War Two had an immediate impact on the Port Kembla line. New buildings of varying size were provided at every station on the branch, including the junction station at Coniston. Fire was the stimulus for the other replacement buildings in the 1940s.

It was the 1970s when there was a move to improve the then existing timber and corrugated iron platform buildings on the Illawarra line. Railway commentators have named the Illawarra line as the *Cinderella line* because the oldest, slowest and most uncomfortable rollingstock was used on that line until 1986 when electric trains linked Sydney and Wollongong.³⁵¹ It also possessed some of the lowest quality platform structures on the entire NSW rail system. The pattern of new buildings was no different on the Main Northern line between Cowan and Newcastle. Only Morisset in 1937 and Woy Woy in 1979 were completely rebuilt in the 50-year period. Newly opened stations and the need to provide new sites for track realignment stimulated the remaining four examples of new brick or timber buildings. The development of the Intercity railway was evident in the provision of new brick structures at Broadmeadow in 1972, Adamstown in 1975, Gosford in 1978 and Woy Woy in 1979. Parcels business boomed in the 1940s and 1950s and stimulated the need for expanded facilities. Similarly, there was increased demand for refreshments and all the Railway Refreshment Rooms at Gosford, Broadmeadow and Newcastle expanded up to 1960. The pattern on both the Illawarra and Newcastle lines is similar. Only minimal expenditure was allocated to the modernization of timber buildings which had been in use for 50-100 years.

Unlike the Illawarra and Main Northern lines, the Main Western line between Penrith and Lithgow was by 1930 constructed entirely of masonry platform buildings with two exceptions (i.e. Katoomba and Hartley). The Blue Mountains of NSW was viewed by the NSW rail administration as an homogenous whole and, thus, when the line was duplicated between 1902 and 1910, every station but two received a larger, but still modestly sized, brick building. In the 1930-1980 period, two stations, both in 1956, received small brick structures. One of these was necessitated by bush fire. The only new station opened on the line was at Lapstone in 1961, which was privately funded by a property development organisation. To keep the homogeneity of the Blue Mountain stations, the Lapstone building was constructed of face brickwork. The only other activity on the Blue Mountains occurred in 1944 when there was a large increase in parcels traffic requiring expansion at three stations.

On the Main Southern line to Goulburn, there were no replacement stations provided in the 1930-1980 and only one station, Bundanoon, received additional waiting room

³⁵¹ For example, see "Cinderella's Christmas", *Railway Digest*, February, 1982

space and even that addition was minimal. There were minor changes to both the Moss Vale and Goulburn Railway Refreshment Rooms.

Overall, the Intercity lines received about the same level of attention as the Sydney metropolitan area. Apart from new or relocated stations, there was no overall replacement of the existing timber platform structures that dated between 50-100 years of age. The Intercity lines serve areas with a much higher level of natural vegetation and a general absence of pastoral and agricultural activity. Few people would regard the Intercity network as being part of the Bush even in the 50 years prior to the formal introduction of the use of the Intercity nomenclature in 1988. At what point does the researcher cease efforts to find explanations to issues relating to the topic of research? Birmingham et al wrote that “whoever questions long and walks far will live long and think far.”³⁵²

The examination of the Intercity passenger rail facilities does not reveal any favourable bias compared to what was happening or not happening at Artarmon, the North Shore line, the rest of the Sydney rail network and also the Intercity system. Now, the study turns to The Bush.

ARTARMON STATION IN THE CONTEXT OF THE RURAL PASSENGER NETWORK

Looking further beyond Sydney, Newcastle and Wollongong, there was a massive collection of railway stations serving hundreds of rural cities, towns and villages. As the rural network included approximately 1,000 stations, an exercise to examine all stations would be too lengthy to present and also unnecessary. A sample of the evidence has been prepared. The Main Southern line between Goulburn and Albury, a rail distance of 422 kilometres has been chosen as the sample of rural NSW railway stations. Appendix 7 sets out the changes to platform stations between 1930-1980 on that section of line.

There were 45 stations between Goulburn and Albury on the border with the Victorian railway system opened in 1930, being an increase of 14 stations from the time the line was opened in 1881 to Albury. Of these, 24 between Goulburn and Cootamundra were on duplicated lines up to 1942. Between 1942 and 1946, the section between Cootamundra and Junee containing five stations was duplicated. Of the 69 existing buildings at the 45 stations, only two were totally replaced (Illabo and Harefield) and these were associated with track duplication. Neither was provided with a brick structure. In regard to the five stations that received duplicated tracks with an additional platform, Illabo and Marinna only gained small waiting sheds on the second platform.

³⁵² J. Birmingham, I Jack & D. Jeans, *Industrial Archaeology in Australia – Rural Industry*, Richmond, Heinemann, 1983, p. 26

The only changes made to existing structures were basically internal alterations associated with large troop movements during World War Two. It is reasonable to speculate that the pattern on other rural lines in NSW between 1930 and 1980 is basically the same, based on previous research undertaken by the author on railway station construction throughout the State. The only instances in the remainder of the NSW rural network where existing station buildings were replaced or supplemented numbered 22 in the same period. These are shown in Appendix 8. Of those structures shown in Appendix 8, eight were modest brick structures. The remainder were small timber offices. The only large brick structure was Broken Hill, which was in the electorate of the Minister for Transport at the time of approval to provide the new station. No further comment is required for that station.

The conclusion is that the whole of the NSW rail system fared just the same as Artarmon and the North Shore line and Sydney in general. The construction of new buildings or changes to existing ones happened only occasionally between 1930 and 1980 and there was no policy to improve the quality of station facilities for travellers, either urban or rural. Artarmon station was neither favourably nor unfavourably treated by the NSW rail administration in comparison with station buildings in other parts of the NSW rail network.

From passenger stations, the study now examines what happened with fixed freight infrastructure.

ARTARMON STATION IN THE CONTEXT OF FREIGHT INFRASTRUCTURE

It would be reasonable to conclude the comparative investigation relating to passenger infrastructure at this point had it not been for the discovery of a single piece of evidence discovered during an analysis of station buildings on the rural network. The examination of the floor plan for the new platform building for Illabo in 1942 revealed a singularly unusual design feature.

From the opening of the NSW railways in 1855, there had been a uniform building guideline for the design of buildings on side platforms. That policy was the expression of structural symmetry. Passenger buildings were designed from 1855 with a symmetrical orientation based on the pedestrian access at the centre of the building. This centre access was the dominant design feature. The access lead to the ticket office window and general waiting room. Additional rooms and spaces were balanced evenly and outwardly from the centre access. However, at Illabo, the traditional centre

access point was expressed by the only set of double doors on the road elevation of the building. Rather than lead to a general waiting room and ticket window, the doors provided access to an “out-of” or freight facility. In other words, the whole building had a primary focus of freight, not people. Was this a clue to where capital funds might have gone if they were not spent on passenger accommodation? Such a discovery mandated further research.

The methodology adopts a segmented approach to the analysis of freight infrastructure. The Table below summarises the pattern of analysis.

TABLE: ANALYSIS OF EXPENDITURE IN RELATION TO THE PROVISION OF FREIGHT FACILITIES, 1930-1980

NAME OF THE GEOGRAPHIC PART OF THE RAIL SYSTEM	IDENTIFICATION OF WHAT IS INCLUDED IN THE PART OF THE SYSTEM	LOCATION OF THE DETAILS
Sample of the provision of additional or replacement good sheds	Stations between Goulburn and Albury on the Main South line	Appendix 9
Replacement goods sheds for the remainder of NSW rail system	22 stations, apart from those between Goulburn and Albury	Appendix 10
Construction of grain silos	NSW	Appendix 11
Construction of regional freight centres to replace goods shed operations	NSW	Appendix 12

The focus of research, based on the evidence of the Illabo building, now turns away from passenger facilities and examines freight facilities. The construction of new railway lines ceased in rural NSW in 1932. Apart from the Cronulla branch in 1939 and Captains Flat branch in 1941, no public railway lines were opened in NSW until the Eastern Suburbs Railway in 1979. There is thus an appearance that no capital funds were allocated for rural railways for nearly the same 50-year period in which Artarmon received virtually no improvements.

The business of general freight for most of the period was very much undertaken in less-than-carload traffic and handled in hundreds of goods sheds at many rural stations. Even at small stations where there were no goods shed, the NSW rail administration

provided other freight infrastructure, such as fixed cranes and loading banks to load and unload non-perishable freight and small freight items were deposited by the train crew in the waiting sheds for collection by the customer. To determine whether the Department of Railways allocated more expenditure to general freight infrastructure rather than passenger stations, an analysis is required. However, just as is the case for the examination of rural passenger stations in NSW, the task of examining every location where freight facilities existed is enormous and would reveal no additional information than would a sample illustrate. In order to make a comparison with the position relating to passenger facilities, a sample is made of the 45 stations between Goulburn and Albury.

Appendix 9 is a list of additional or replacement freight infrastructure between Goulburn and Albury from 1930 to 1980. It shows that only eight stations received additional infrastructure and that these tended to be the large centres of Goulburn, Cootamundra and Albury. Appendix 10 indicates the position for the remainder of NSW.,

Considering the hundreds of stations with goods sheds, very few were renewed. Only seven stations in the whole of NSW received replacement goods sheds. After World War Two, virtually no additional expenditure was allocated until stimulated by the provision of regional freight centres in the second half of the 1970s. The conclusion is thus that general freight facilities between 1930 and 1980 received no greater allocation of funds than did passenger stations.

Apart from general freight infrastructure, there were other freight facilities served by rail. The major programme for government expenditure in rural areas in the 1930-1980 period was the construction of bulk wheat silos on railway land, which were served by the construction of new sidings from existing tracks and improvements to rural roads from farms to the silos. The allocation of funds for wheat silos and associated infrastructure was a major project that was necessary because overseas competitors were lowering production costs through bulk handling. Appendix 11 lists the dates and locations of silos constructed between 1930 and 1980. The Appendix indicates that a huge capital works programme involving the NSW Government was undertaken in the 1930s to create bulk wheat facilities for conveyance by rail. The construction stopped in World War Two and in the immediate post-war period due to staff and materials shortages but recommenced in 1950 with the supplementation of the capacity of existing facilities at many centres. From Appendix 11, it is obvious that, while no funds were being allocated to passenger facilities, much activity was taking place for rural freight infrastructure.

At the same time as the NSW Government in the 1960s and 1970s abolished the statutes controlling road freight, the NSW rail administration continued to support rural dwellers by providing a comprehensive freight service for less-than-carload traffic. This service involved the construction of large freight centres throughout NSW. Appendix 12 shows that the Askin/Cutler Liberal/Country Party Coalition Government and the Wran Government allocated millions of dollars into the construction of rural freight centres but did not allocate a single penny to upgrade freight facilities in urban areas of Sydney. Appendix 12 shows that, while in the 1970s there was a start to the funding of urban transport, there was also a considerable allocation of funds to freight facilities in rural areas of NSW.

Appendix 12 shows that the programme of regional freight centres was virtually restricted to the years between 1975 and 1977 and overlapped the transfer of government from conservative to Labor. The selection of locations was politically driven and aimed at placating interests in marginal seats. All were closed within 15 years of opening and many stand unused today or are leased to external parties. Rural railway stations had to wait until the 1990s to receive allocations of funds to upgrade passenger facilities, such as raised platforms, ramped access for people with disabilities, public address systems, telephones, waiting rooms and toilets.

A considerable amount of public money was spent between 1930 and 1980 by NSW Governments on both rail, road and port infrastructure for rural and manufacturing industries. In the 1960s and 1970s, the Department of Main Roads made “a concerted effort to complete the bituminous surfacing of major State Highways”.³⁵³ The Port Kembla Inner Harbour was opened in 1963 and a new container terminal was opened at Glebe island in Sydney in 1973. At Newcastle, a high capacity coal loader was opened in 1967 and a container terminal in 1975. Port Botany container terminal opened in 1977.³⁵⁴ A policy of an “open transport market” - meaning competition - between rail and road was propagated by all NSW governments in the 1960s and 1970s with the unfortunate outcome that a sizable wastage of taxpayer funds occurred through inadequate policy development that resulted in misdirected financial allocations across all transport modes.³⁵⁵

The bias towards the provision of freight infrastructure in rural locations was emphasised by the absence of what were regarded as essential freight related track improvements in the Sydney metropolitan area. In an article celebrating the centenary of what are known as the “Metropolitan Goods Lines”, author, Neville Pollard, provided

³⁵³ National Association of State Road Authorities, *Bush Track to Highway*, 1987, p. 17

³⁵⁴ J. Bach, *A Maritime History of Australia*, Sydney, Nelson, 1976, pp. 406-408

³⁵⁵ NSW Government, *1965-1975 a Decade of Good Government*, no details, p. 20

a map of showing, amongst other things, the proposed track improvements to the freight network in Sydney.³⁵⁶ The Table below sets out proposed improvements that were planned but not built.

TABLE: FREIGHT RELATED TRACK INFRASTRUCTURE PLANNED BUT NOT BUILT IN SYDNEY

LOCATION	YEAR PROPOSED	NATURE OF PROPOSED PROJECT
Oatley	1921	Proposed freight only line from Enfield to Oatley
Belmore	1925	Triangular connection between Bankstown line and line to Enfield
Birrong	1927	Triangular connection between Bankstown line and Chullora
Regents Park	1927	Proposed freight only line from Regents Park to Wentworthville
Berala	1952	Proposed refuge loop
Lidcombe	1922	Proposed “dive” under main lines to reach the Abattoirs branch
Concord West	1964	Proposed 16 road goods yard
Lewisham	Unknown	Proposed connection between Main West and goods line to Rozelle
Glebe	1914	Proposed seven Road goods yard
Rozelle	1912	Proposed direct route from Darling Island to Rozelle
Balmain	1920	Proposed new line from Rozelle to Balmain
Wentworth Park	1919	Proposed additional double track relief lines between Wentworth Park and Darling Island

Of the 12 projects in the above Table, the greater number date from the period approximately between World War One and 1930, which was a time of bias towards the Sydney passenger rail network. The inability of the Railway Department to actually build these freight facilities confirms the bias towards Sydney train users. The approved works were freight-only facilities these proposed works were but they were in the wrong location – Sydney – at the wrong time. Pollard’s work confirms the bias to urban passenger improvements before 1930. It may have been appropriate for Neville Pollard to express amazement that anything relating to freight infrastructure in Sydney was built, considering what was not built.

³⁵⁶ N. Pollard, “City Meets Country: Centenary of the Metropolitan Goods Lines,” *Australian Railway History*, Vol. 67 No. 942, April, 2016, pp. 20 & 21.

The analysis of freight infrastructure in rural areas does explain in part why very little was spent on Sydney's passenger transport facilities between 1930 and 1980. It is of interest to consider whether the history of the acquisition of moveable assets, namely rollingstock, is consistent or inconsistent with the emerging picture of rural bias.

ARTARMON STATION IN THE CONTEXT OF ROLLINGSTOCK ACQUISITIONS

It is possible to smell the scent of an explanation for the almost absent allocation of urban rail funding between 1930 and 1980. So far, the analysis has examined fixed infrastructure. Did a similar pattern exist in regard to non-fixed infrastructure, namely rollingstock?

The methodology now examines the acquisition of the different types of rollingstock used on the NSW rail system. The Table below also includes details of relevant infrastructure.

TABLE: EXAMINATION OF ROLLINGSTOCK BY TYPE AND SELECT INFRASTRUCTURE, 1930-1980

NAME OF THE ROLLINGSTOCK TYPE/INFRASTRUCTURE	IDENTIFICATION OF WHAT IS INCLUDED IN THE CATEGORY	LOCATION OF THE DETAILS
Freight vehicles	All non-passenger rollingstock	Appendix 13
Electric carriages	All vehicles restricted to the suburban network	Appendix 14
Electrification of existing rail lines	All lines in NSW	Appendix 15
Delivery of electric parcels vans	Vehicles restricted to Sydney network	Appendix 16
New passenger carriages for country service	All locomotive hauled rollingstock	Appendix 17
New rail lines opened	NSW	Appendix 18

Appendix 13 sets out the acquisition of freight rollingstock between 1930 and 1980 in order to establish the level of expenditure that was directed to that area rather than to fixed capital works. The Appendix shows large expenditure on freight vehicles totalling 18,331 freight wagons and 2,043 containers. This means, for the 51 years between 1930 and 1980 inclusive, an annual average of 360 freight wagons, either newly built or conversions, were delivered to the NSW Railways for service. Every day of every year between 1930 and 1980 a new rail wagon was ready for freight service.

The extension of electrification in the 1960s of the existing rail network in Sydney paralleled the transition of the economy to the dominance of minerals. Appendix 15 sets out existing lines electrified. The Appendix illustrates that the vast majority of electrification projects were carried out for the transport of export coal from mines to the then export terminal at Sydney. The electrification of the Hornsby-Gosford line was undertaken because the NSW Department of Railways had surplus materials when the planned electrification to coal mines at Wallerawang was aborted due to the failure of contractual arrangements between the coal supplier and an overseas customer.

The record of freight vehicle deliveries can be compared with the delivery of new electric rollingstock for use in the Sydney metropolitan area. Appendix 14 is a list of such electric carriage acquisitions.

Only the East Hills and Cronulla lines were newly opened during the period. The other electrified lines took over from existing steam-hauled passenger services. Full details are given in Appendix 15. As well as requiring additional rollingstock for these ten new services, new rollingstock was needed to replace the 294 timber carriages used in electrified services that had been converted from steam-hauled services. These were gradually withdrawn from service between 1952 and 1975. Appendix 14 indicates that 795 carriages were acquired over the 51 years between 1930 and 1980. After allowing for the replacement of the 294 timber carriages, the Sydney suburban service received 501 carriages or the equivalent of 63 eight car trains. This represents an annual average increase of 1.2 trains for each of the years between 1930 and 1980. Keeping in mind the extra ten new services that had to be addressed, the number of eight car electric trains on all lines was lower in 1980 than it was in 1930, given the increased size of the electric network.

Cooke et al stated that “there were only two periods when a concerted effort was made to provide new rollingstock that was not specifically for service expansion.”³⁵⁷ These were for the 1890s and 1920s. They further state that “the one common thread that runs through the history is the lack of adequate funding to upgrade or replace old or

³⁵⁷ D. Cooke et al, *Coaching Stock of the NSW Railways*, Vol. 1, Matraville, Eveleigh Press, 1999, p. 6

obsolete rollingstock.”³⁵⁸ Churchman wrote that, “at the beginning of the 1960s, there was a pressing need for new suburban rollingstock.”³⁵⁹ Former Assistant Chief Mechanical Engineer (Electrical), Geoff Moss, explained that the Sydney suburban service had regard to the number of carriages available rather than the number of people who wished to use them³⁶⁰. In other words, the Sydney suburban service was supply driven. The rapid increase in the supply of carriages after 1976 was due to the awareness of the needs of urban transport by the newly elected Wran Government. Because of the steep gradients that trains encountered, such as on the North Shore line, the cost of rollingstock was higher for operation in Sydney than was the case for cities without steep gradients, such as Melbourne, as all suburban rollingstock had to be constructed with a high-performance capability.

Rather than replace urban rollingstock, the NSW Railways created appearances of improvement to convey the image of service improvement. The external paint scheme of suburban rollingstock was altered in 1921, 1939, 1957, 1972, 1976 and 1985. The railway organization enacted other superficial alterations, such as changing the internal end vestibule seating arrangement in 1940. Even this displayed a lack of commitment with 93 carriages still to be converted in 1963.³⁶¹ The NSW State coat of arms was affixed to the external sides of carriages for the first time in 1957. The interior colour scheme was changed in 1964 and forced air ventilation was applied between 1981 and 1985, even though it had been proven to be a failure in an earlier trial in 1939 with carriages used outside of Sydney.

In the 1950s, there was a string of infrastructure projects in Sydney that were started and which took decades to complete. The Eastern Suburbs Railway, the City Circle, quadruplication between Strathfield and Hornsby, sextuplication between Erskineville and Sydenham were all projects that took decades to complete or were never completed. It must also not be forgotten that the quadruplication of the railway line between Milsons Point and Chatswood had also been abandoned.

Parcels traffic expanded in Sydney between 1930 and 1980. The rail administration used electric rollingstock to deliver the service. This is another measure which suggests that the delivery of suburban rollingstock was inadequate to meet demand. Details of parcel van acquisitions are expressed in Appendix 16. There were three steel-bodied parcels vans built in 1928 and between 1930 and 1969 seven timber vehicles were converted for parcels use. For 20 years between 1935 and 1955, not a

³⁵⁸ *ibid.*

³⁵⁹ G.B. Churchman, *Railway Electrification in Australia and New Zealand*, Sydney, IPL Books, 1995, p.

96

³⁶⁰ Oral comment to author, 16th January 2006

³⁶¹ D. Keenan & H. Clark, *First Stop Central*, Sydney, Australian Electric Traction Association, 1963, p. 76

single addition was made to the parcels fleet, notwithstanding the massive increase in parcels business associated with World War Two and the post-War period. Appendix 16 sets out the paucity of allocation of rollingstock to parcels business in Sydney.

In addition to the absence of essential rollingstock for Sydney, the positive bias towards the Bush was also evident in passenger rollingstock purchased for use for rural services beyond the electrified network. Appendix 17 sets out acquisition of such vehicles between 1930 and 1980. The Appendix shows a strong, favourable bias towards ever increasing improvement in the provision of rural passenger services operated by NSW rail administration. Rural travellers continually had the benefit of improved rollingstock over the 1930-1980 period whereas Sydney urban travellers did not. When country rail customers had the benefit of air-conditioning, Sydney commuters did not. The position did change after 1980. Following the introduction of the XPT trains in 1982, there has been virtually no improvement in the quality of rural services. The pendulum then struck in favour of the urban rail traveller and since 1980 Sydney commuters have received substantial increases in the quality of rail carriages.

It may seem odd that the NSW rail administration would wish to provide capital funds for rural passenger trains but not rural stations. The answer lies in the culture of the organization. There has been a great preference or even passion for mechanical engineering over civil engineering. Things that move have received far greater organisational support than things that are static. There was no new technology introduced into Sydney's urban trains after electric traction in the 1920s until 1972 when double deck power cars were introduced into regular service. The prototype had been introduced in 1968, at which time it was the first time a powered, double-decked carriage had been introduced in the World. There was no widespread government support for suburban railways until the election of the Whitlam Commonwealth Government in 1972 and the Wran State Government in 1976. The 1964 introduction of double deck suburban trailers was an initiative of a manufacturer, Tulloch Industries, rather than some change in Railway Department policy. Thus, the only opportunity to express the Department's cultural preference for mechanical equipment was in rural rollingstock.

While the NSW Government funded the manufacture of the equivalent of one new freight vehicle for every day between 1930 and 1980, it ordered less than one passenger carriage every month. In the period, three major changes occurred in the way international freight was carried. Firstly, bulk cargo ships were introduced to replace the shipment of wheat by bag. This required a massive investment of rail infrastructure in silos, trackwork and especially bulk wheat freight wagons which started

in the 1920s. Secondly, there was massive international competition for the supply of coal, requiring large expenditure in coal loaders, balloon loops and high-capacity bulk coal hoppers from the late 1960s. Thirdly, the start of international containerisation in 1969 forced the introduction of very large numbers of specially designed freight wagons to transport international containers. This also included a major financial blunder to put in service the 2,043 “RACE” containers which were incompatible with not only international standards but the standards of other Australian State railway systems.

The NSW Government was virtually forced to change the way freight was conveyed by market pressure but it perceived or believed that there was no such stimulus for passenger traffic. In politics, if no one is pushing, governments do not move.³⁶² The factor that directed government funding to urban public transport was the fundamental change in the economy from rural products and manufacturing to mining and services. Spearitt cites statistics which show a 50% decline in the number of manufacturing industries in Australia between 1953 and 1983³⁶³ This resulted in a stimulus to the creation of specialized support functions, which required additional, skilled people. Sydney City changed from a place to shop to a place for specialized professional advice. This was particularly obvious in North Sydney where from 1971 to 1976 the growth in office employment jumped between 20 and 25%.³⁶⁴ It was these people working in Sydney’s offices that became the important elite of the economy rather than farmers and graziers.

There was a clear dominance of expenditure on freight facilities in rural NSW between 1930 and 1980. This was not related to the provision of general freight facilities such as goods sheds and loading banks but to a Government guarantee that NSW farmers and graziers were able to compete with international competition. In the 1960s, Government support for the rural sector declined in favour of support for mining. This change was not an initiative of the Government but the result of substantial pressure group activity by the mining industry, as well as falling prices for primary products. The opening of new lines to coal mines and the massive supply of coal wagons identify the trend. There was also support to accommodate containerisation and the creation of freight centres in NSW in the mid-1970s was a move to combine containerisation with the policy of closing local goods sheds serving agricultural and pastoral primary industries.

There was also a preference to improve country passenger rollingstock over carriages for the Sydney metropolitan area despite increasing percentages of the State’s

³⁶² Personal comment to the author by Peter Cox, Minister for Transport, 16th March, 1977.

³⁶³ P. Spearitt, “Money, Taste & Industrial Heritage”, in J. Rickard & P. Spearitt (Eds.), *Packaging the Past?*, Melbourne University Press, 1991, p. 41

³⁶⁴ State Transport Study Group, *Report to Transport Strategy Advisory Committee on 1976 Journey to Work Statistics*, unpublished report, 1980, p. 49

population living in Sydney, which grew from 43% in 1921 to 48% in 1933 and 50% in 1947 and kept growing.³⁶⁵ The desire to provide modern, replacement rollingstock for the Bush was related to a cultural feature of the NSW rail administration in which locomotives and locomotive-hauled carriages held an almost-romantic position amongst railway mechanical engineers. Civil engineers and architects were considered inferior to their mechanical brethren.³⁶⁶ The little attention paid to platform buildings is evidence of this position. There was also much cultural support for locomotives in society in general and the image of the locomotive driver as a superior being was held by many men and boys. Drivers of electric passenger trains were not regarded as equivalent to a steam locomotive driver. The bias towards country passenger rollingstock also supported the belief of the NSW rail administration that the image of Australia was tied to the country and not the city.

The country bias was aligned with the structure of the NSW economy. Up to and including the 1960s, primary products accounted for two-thirds of Australia's export. After that time, the importance of primary products declined and by the mid-1970s was less than half what it was 15 years previously.³⁶⁷ Mining had replaced rural produce as the dominant market sector. With that change, there was a tremendous growth in Sydney of businesses associated with the mining industry.

Despite the population of Sydney being three times that of the remainder of the State, the bias towards the Bush was reflected in the total rollingstock fleet. In 1974, there were 1,465 rail vehicles for use on the country passenger network and only 1,106 electric carriages for Sydney.³⁶⁸ There were 96 electric carriages for use on the Intercity network, which at that time extended only to Gosford in the north and Lithgow in the west.³⁶⁹ The Liberal/Country Party disguised any real progress by changing the 50-year old paint scheme on the exterior of suburban carriages from Tuscan to blue and white. However, at least it was recognition that urban rail transport was playing a more important role than previously was the case. Country rollingstock remained untouched in relation to the external paint scheme. It was not until the election of the Wran Labor Government in 1976 that a priority of urban over rural rail services began. It was from this time that the Labor Government announced an improvement programme in which it allocated and spent \$2 million per year for the next five years on urban rail projects. The programme committed the "reconstruction of two major stations each year", the

³⁶⁵ J.M. Powell, *An Historical Geography of Modern Australia*, Sydney, Cambridge University Press, 1988, p. 83

³⁶⁶ Assessment based on literature and employment in the organisation

³⁶⁷ M.T. Daley, *Sydney Boom Sydney Bust*, Sydney, George Allen & Unwin, 1982, p. 38

³⁶⁸ PTC, *Looking Ahead*, 1974, p. 1. A small proportion of country carriages were also used on the non-electrified portions of the Sydney system.

³⁶⁹ *ibid.*

“modernization of Sydney Terminal, the “upgrading” of City Circle stations and minor repairs and painting to 100 stations per year.³⁷⁰

Between 1930 and 1980, the electrification the Sydney suburban network expanded to include the following lines.

- ❑ Clyde-Rosehill
- ❑ Tempe-East Hills
- ❑ Sutherland-Cronulla
- ❑ Parramatta-Penrith
- ❑ Hornsby-Cowan
- ❑ Rosehill-Carlingford
- ❑ Rosehill-Sandown
- ❑ Liverpool-Campbelltown
- ❑ Blacktown-Riverstone
- ❑ Erskineville Junction-Bondi Junction

Appendix 18 indicates the new railway lines opened between 1930 and 1980. The Appendix shows the start of the transition of the economy to domination by minerals occurred from 1958. However, it was the opening of the Mount Thorley line in 1978 that commenced the boom. From that time to recent years, there has been ongoing opening of new lines to serve coal deposits. The other significant line opening in the same time period was the freight only line to the shipping terminal at Port Botany in 1979.

The transition of the NSW economy to mining and services also had external economies for banking, law, project management and specialist consultants. This resulted in a Sydney property boom and, with it, an increase in the number of people commuting to and from the centre of Sydney. With a much higher level of interest in urban travel, the focus of passenger transport transferred from rural to urban services. The competition for sites in the Sydney CBD was so intense that other business centres developed at North Sydney, St. Leonards and Chatswood.³⁷¹ The MLC building, which was opened in North Sydney in 1958, was at the time the largest office building in Australia but it was the opening of the Warringah Expressway in 1968 that was “a major factor in allowing the North Sydney office boom to commence in earnest.”³⁷²

³⁷⁰ NSW, *Five Years Ahead*, no details, p. 25

³⁷¹ *ibid.*, p. 65

³⁷² M. Jones, *North Sydney 1788-1988*, Sydney, Allen & Unwin, 1988, pp. 242 & 243

The election of the Askin/Cutler Government in 1965 was the start of the focus towards urban rail transport. However, in comparison with what Neville Wran's Government did in 1976, the Askin/Cutler effort was miniscule. Askin promised to complete the quadruplication of the Sydenham-Erskineville section of the Illawarra line and to restart construction on the Eastern Suburbs Railway. He did not do the first at all and never finished the second. Askin's urban interest was overly balanced by the dominance of the Country Party which was the driving force for the elimination of road transport charges on the operation of road trucks beyond 50 miles. There was not much difference between the policies of the Labor Government, which had been in office in NSW since 1941 and Liberal/Country Party coalition governments from 1965. Both kept reducing the amount of the state capital budget allocated to rail, which went from 38% in 1951 to 14% in 1973 but, at the same time, supporting a priority of rural over urban rail services.³⁷³ It was in the 1970s that NSW governments, of both political persuasions, commenced the closure of country branch railway lines, which was a primary indicator of the change in the overall composition of the NSW economy from rural to mining.

ARTARMON STATION IN THE CONTEXT OF THE RAILWAY ORGANISATION'S OFFICIAL VIEW OF FUNDING HIGHLIGHTS

For the sceptics who doubt the authenticity of the various appendices presented in this study, there is an official record of achievements between 1930 and 1980 prepared by the railway administration. The State Rail Authority published what it described as a brief history of the NSW rail system in April, 1988, in a publication entitled *Rail Chronicle*. The article listed what the Authority stated were the highlights in the history of the rail system and what did it show between 1930 and 1980? Have a look at the Table below!

TABLE: MAJOR EVENTS IN THE HISTORY OF THE NSW RAILWAYS NOMINATED BY THE NSW RAIL ADMINISTRATION

YEAR LISTED IN THE ARTICLE	NATURE OF THE EVENT	CLASSIFICATION OF PROJECT AS BENEFITTING EITHER SYDNEY COMMUTERS, NON- SYDNEY COMMUTERS OR NOT APPLICABLE	NO. OF YEARS BETWEEN PROJECT PLANNING & DELIVERY

³⁷³ For the capital decrease, see T. Bull, *Inside the Asylum*, Sydney, Woodhill, 2000, p. 181

YEAR LISTED IN THE ARTICLE	NATURE OF THE EVENT	CLASSIFICATION OF PROJECT AS BENEFITTING EITHER SYDNEY COMMUTERS, NON- SYDNEY COMMUTERS OR NOT APPLICABLE	NO. OF YEARS BETWEEN PROJECT PLANNING & DELIVERY
1932	Opening of the Sydney Harbour Bridge	Sydney commuters	60
1937	First operation of the Silver City Comet between Parkes and open Hill being the first air-conditioned diesel-powertrain Australia	Non-Sydney commuters	5
1939 – 45	The NSW railways plays a big part in WW 2	NA	NA
1952	First main line diesel electric locomotive used in NSW	Non-Sydney commuters	2
1956	Opening of Circular Quay railway station and completion of the city Circle	Sydney commuters	40
1956	Operation of the first electric locomotive in NSW	Non-Sydney commuters	7
1962	Opening of standard gauge railway between Albury and Melbourne	Non-Sydney commuters	20
1964	First double deck trailer cars operate on suburban service	Sydney commuters	4
1968	First complete double decked electric suburban train into service – see Note below	Sydney commuters	3/7
1970	Opening of transcontinental standard	Non-Sydney commuters	50

YEAR LISTED IN THE ARTICLE	NATURE OF THE EVENT	CLASSIFICATION OF PROJECT AS BENEFITTING EITHER SYDNEY COMMUTERS, NON- SYDNEY COMMUTERS OR NOT APPLICABLE	NO. OF YEARS BETWEEN PROJECT PLANNING & DELIVERY
	gauge railway line between Sydney and Perth		
1970	first double deck, air- conditioned interurban train operates	Non-Sydney commuters	3
1973	the Gold Coast Motor rail Express enter service	Non-Sydney commuters	2
1979	Eastern Suburbs Railway opens	Sydney commuters	106
1979	Sydney yard signalling computerised	Sydney commuters	5
1980	the State Rail Authority established on first July	NA	NA
1980	first container train operates on Botany line	Non-Sydney commuters	10
1980	The John Whitton bridge opens over the Parramatta River being the largest box bridge in New South Wales	Sydney commuters	40

SOURCE OF DATES & EVENTS: SRA, *Rail Chronicle*, April, 1988

NOTE: While the prototype eight-car trains entered service in 1968, production sets of eight-car sets did not commence until 1972.

In the above Table, a total of 17 events are listed and, excluding World War Two and establishment of the State Rail Authority, seven events relate to Sydney suburban rail commuters and eight events do not relate to Sydney commuters. On that basis, the split between the Sydney and non-Sydney passenger transport is balanced and the average number of years for each event between planning and delivery is 24 years. If those events which only benefitted Sydney commuters are considered, the average delivery time is 37 years and, if the five infrastructure projects are considered, the

average delivery time is 49 years. These long delays interestingly compare against the average of 5.5 years for the two rollingstock projects.

It should not be overlooked that, after the Sydney Harbour Bridge was opened in 1932, the next major infrastructure project listed was 24 years later at Circular Quay, then a further 23 years until the opening of the Eastern Suburbs Railway. Contrast these lengthy periods with the average delivery time of events of 11 years for projects that did not benefit Sydney commuters. Surely no further explanation is needed to demonstrate the gross imbalance of the expenditure of public money to projects that did not benefit the train travellers of Sydney. A total of eight of the events related to mechanical engineering, not civil works, and the average time span involved in these projects was 4.5 years. This much lower time span is evidence of the strong bias in the New South Wales Railway organisation towards locomotives and rollingstock, rather than infrastructure.

The recognition of the need to provide for increased capacity and improvements to the urban rail system in Sydney started in the 1960s with the introduction of double-decker trailer carriages in 1964. These carriages replaced vehicles that had been in operation for 50 years. The community unrest in the 1960s about the tardiness in completing the Eastern Suburbs Railway provided the Liberal/Country Party Coalition Government with ammunition to make urban public transport an election issue for the first time since 1916 when Bradfield presented his report to improve rail services, including the construction of the Sydney Harbour Bridge. In 1965 the Askin/Cutler Coalition won government in NSW, ousting the Labor Party which had held office since 1941. Hagan and Turner cite rail commuters and railway staff as two of the groups of voters who had been disaffected by the Labor Party's pre-1965 complacency about urban rail improvements.³⁷⁴

There were substantial social changes in the 1960s. There were more students staying at school longer, more migrants and especially the start of massive levels of Asian migration, more white-collar employment and far more women in the workforce. The 11 years of the Liberal/Country Party collation between 1965 and 1976 put urban rail transport on the political agenda and it has remained on the agenda until the present. Ever since 1972, the NSW urban rail transport has been re-organised time and again. The Department of Railways, the Public Transport Commission, the State Rail Authority, the Rail Access Corporation, the Rail Infrastructure Corporation and RailCorp have all come and gone. At present, the organization is named *Sydney Trains* but it operates only as a service provider with all the infrastructure approved by Transport for NSW and

³⁷⁴ J. Hagan & K. Turner, *A History of the Labor Party in New South Wales*, Melbourne, Longman Cheshire, 1991, p. 193

legal ownership of land and assets continues to be in the name of RailCorp. The organisational name changes and frequent change of chief executives both indicate ongoing organisational disquiet.

ARTARMON STATION IN THE CONTEXT OF THE THEORY OF CHANGE AND STABILITY

The study of Artarmon reveals two periods of building activity – 1898 to 1930 and 1980 to the present. Between those periods were 50 years of inactivity. Analysis of the inactivity is just as rewarding as the examination of the periods of activity. Even with the periods when there were building changes, there has been much non-change or building stability. For example, the same design of carriage used by Artarmon travellers did not change between 1919 and 1964. The designs of the 1898 and 1916 Artarmon buildings, both within the first period of change, had been applied throughout the NSW rail system for 43 years between 1892 and 1935, representing 28% of the time the NSW rail system has been in existence. Even in the second period of change, while many alterations have occurred internally to the Artarmon building, most of the same exterior brickwork, the entire roofline and awnings have largely been unaltered. In fact, during the second period of change from 1980, a significant effort has been made by the rail administration to maintain the external appearance of the 1916 structure. Matching awning brackets and near-matching bricks have been used when necessary.

When the awning on the Hornsby-bound platform at Artarmon had to be reduced in width in 2004, the awning on the Sydney-bound platform was also reduced to retain the symmetrical appearance. Despite the organisational emphasis on change, there has been widespread support by RailCorp, Sydney Trains, Willoughby City Council, the Artarmon Progress Association, the Heritage Council of NSW and the Artarmon community to ensure that change did not interfere with the basic visual experience of the Artarmon platform building. Unfortunately, that stopped in 2015. It is the evidence of the platform building that confirms that the concept of building stability is equal to if not more important than the concept of building change.

The definition of change was once an idea about doing things differently. Unfortunately, the idea has been misused as a management ideology, mantra, mania and a myth. Its meaning as a way of seeing and measuring different activities over time was at one time a tool used by business folk. The abuse that the idea of change has received has altered its status from being a means to achieve something better to being an end in itself. Much of the business community is now tuned only to managing change, implementing change and promising more change.

There appeared to be a pattern between the times when Australia wished to accelerate or improve the level the status of Sydney as a key, international destination or was fearful that it might miss out on some perceived opportunity, and the consequent decision to implement changes to the way the railways in NSW are managed. The explanation seems to be that, because of an increased international focus on Australia, there is a cascading feeling of the need to change the management and appearance of the rail system to manifest the belief that Australia is indeed an important player on the World stage.

The change in the form of management then cascades down to changes in railway operations. New names of railway organisations, new official letterhead, new telephones, new computers, new carriages, new tracks, new managers, new controllers, new signage, new garbage bins, new colours, new lights, new shelters and other new things are the evidence of the existence of change. All these were aimed at advertising to the international community and especially the controllers of international trade that Australia is a fit place to hold a position of importance. It showed this by exemplifying reform by change and “modernisation” of its railway system. Artarmon station has been a typical case study of change being implemented at the local or bottom level of the railway organisation.

The physical and documentary evidence shows in the case of Artarmon station that, no matter how much politicians endeavoured to cover their motives and manipulations, they could not cover up some of their overt and clandestine political and administrative actions. Artarmon station reveals the story of changing government values towards urban transport by the examination of the time periods in which building alterations were made and not made.

The Government used the rail system to support the role and imagery of rural NSW as being of crucial importance to the State and the country. When the State Government decided to endorse the structural change and imagery, it treated Artarmon station differently. The fabric of the platform structure and its surrounding setting bear the evidence of changing official policies and attitudes towards Sydney, The Bush and the international community. When economic factors changed, Artarmon and other Sydney stations received attention or no attention. The rail administration, which consistently consisted of mediocre management, should have asked Government for further funds for urban transport between 1930 and 1980.

The period between 1930 and 1980 shows little financial expenditure at Artarmon station but investigating the question of whether Artarmon was treated better, worse or

the same by the government and the rail administration has provided a lesson in the way the World works in NSW. By expanding the limits of research, evidence was obtained of the clash between City and Bush and the way public money was used to swing between the two places. The activity and also the stagnation of activity at Artarmon station also is testimony to the change in the structure of the NSW economy.

28 FIRST ALTERATIONS TO ARTARMON BUILDING IN 66 YEARS 1980-1987

A NEW RAILWAY ORGANISATION AND A NEW CHIEF EXECUTIVE MAKE A HUGE CONTRIBUTION

There were two very important things that occurred in the 1980s. The first was the establishment of the State Rail Authority and the reason why it was important was that the railway managers did not have to also manage bus and ferry services in Sydney and Newcastle, unlike the Public Transport Commission, which it replaced.

The second important thing was the appointment of David Hill as the new Chief Executive of the then State Rail Authority (SRA). He was more than the Authority's foundation Chief Executive in 1980. By the time he decided to resign in 1986, Hill had left a memorable legacy of achievement but it must be stated that he was personally backed by the Premier, Neville Wran. Hill had a passion for history and heritage and commenced the restoration of many old railway buildings, the first being the Mortuary station in Regent Street. He also established a Railway Heritage Committee with representatives from the National Trust and other like-minded organisations. By his results, he earned the title of Father of NSW Rail Heritage. With Hill's appointment and interest in heritage conservation, the future of the Artarmon railway platform building never had been more secure and it is noteworthy that alterations to the Artarmon building came after the Labor Party lost government in 1988 and a consequent change of Chief Executive with less appreciation for railway history.

Hill had the 100% support Premier Wran to "fix" the NSW Railways. The Labor Government also had a strong heritage conservation policy. The support Hill got from the Labor Government was massive in terms of capital funding and also reform policy. For the first time in the history of Sydney's stations, Hill actually had a strategy to improve passenger facilities. He decided that priority would be given to those stations whose role was fundamental to the efficient movement of customers, either as junction or interchange stations or locations used by large numbers of commuters. It was called the *Major Station Replacement Programme* and it commenced in 1981 with six stations to be completed by 1983. Those stations for which work was well advanced formed the initial stations in the Programme. The SRA soon realised that the so-called Station Replacement Programme was not the correct title because stations were not generally being replaced but merely upgraded. Hence, the *Station Upgrading Programme* was born.

One of the policies Hill implemented to the benefit of commuters was the splitting of the traditionally named Traffic Department, into two distinct components – freight and passenger. The title of Traffic Manager disappeared when the re-organisation of the management structure was carried out and a General Manager, Passenger (Barry Cooney), a General Manager, Freight (Vince Graham) and an Administration Manager (Ned London) were appointed. This occurred on 22nd September, 1983.³⁷⁵ For the first time, the conveyance of people by rail was given the status of a separate branch of the rail administration with the top occupant having the rank of Head of Branch.

In short, it was David Hill who implemented, rather than spoke about, the first steps in the elevation of the role of railway stations as a key component in the delivery of urban public transport.

FURTHER EXPOSURE TO THE CONCEPT OF BIG-TIME AIR SPACE DEVELOPMENT ABOVE STATIONS

One of the perks of being Minister for Transport was taxpayer funded overseas trips to look at what was new in the world of railways. Japan was a country of interest as in 1980 it was promoting what it termed as a new type of railway station called a “passenger station complex.”³⁷⁶ The idea involved a plaza of shops, space for recreation and relaxation with air right development on a large scale to accommodate offices and residences. While there was no immediate response in New South Wales to the concept, it did act as an enticement for railway property managers to actively think about the opportunities for major construction projects adjacent to and over stations, as such developments had the possibility to bring major financial returns.

ARTARMON STATION GETS A PUBLIC TELEPHONE

Artarmon station had been one of the first Sydney stations to receive a public telephone, which was available free of charge. That occurred in November, 1909. Whether the phone was installed is unknown but the New South Wales Government made a big deal in 1980 about a new initiative to help customers and this was for the installation of telephones at 25 city and suburban railway stations.³⁷⁷ You guessed it. Artarmon station was on the list of 25, which included St. Leonards and Chatswood on the North Shore line. Why did Artarmon station make it into the top 25? Someone was familiar with Artarmon and, as is often stated, knowledge is power.

³⁷⁵ Email dated 14th May, 2016, from Geoff Callingham, who was the last occupant of the position with the title of Traffic Manager. David Hill removed the adjective, “Chief” from the title in 1980 because Geoff said that Hill maintained he was the only Chief.

³⁷⁶ *Japanese Railway Engineering*, Vol. 20 No. 1, p. 4.

³⁷⁷ *Sydney Morning Herald*, 12th December, 1980.

A FEATURE ROLE FOR RAILWAY STATIONS

In 1981, the NSW Government released a document, called *Five Years Ahead*, which set out the railway achievement since 1976, when the Labor Party won office. It also outlined the station policy for the next five years, the objectives listed as:

- Reconstruction of two major stations each year,
- Modernization of Sydney Terminal (then underway in stages),
- City Circle stations to receive upgrades,
- 100 stations per year to be repainted and given minor repairs, &
- Weather protection at interchanges and terminals between modes.

In the State Rail 1980/81 *Annual Report*, 'station improvements' were given an elevated location in the document to the 'major projects' section. For the first time in an *Annual Report*, more than three sentences were allocated to stations. It mentioned work at "Sydney Central" and stated that those stations intended to be upgraded "possessed very old, timber buildings and it was intended to replace what were extremely unattractive structures that had been neglected for many decades. New brick buildings were completed at Loftus, Cheltenham, Normanhurst, Thornleigh, Wollstonecraft and Warwick Farm." Other improvements to stations had been completed at Towradgi, Woy Woy and Berala. Major improvements to Camellia, and Liverpool were under way as well as design work for Cabramatta, Macarthur and Murwillumbah, which was the first country station to be upgraded since Broken Hill in 1957. A special allocation had been made for painting and associated maintenance at about 100 stations throughout the State each year. This programme commenced in 1980/81 with an expenditure of more than \$1 million.

ACCESS FOR THE DISABLED

Because of the huge cost to reconstruct buses and railway rollingstock and infrastructure, Peter Cox, the Minister for Transport, recommended to Cabinet in June, 1981, that the best way to help with the transport of handicapped people was not to alter infrastructure but rather to keep disabled people in specially modified taxis. There was a sound basis to this policy as Cox argued that, even if station facilities were modified to accommodate wheelchairs, disabled people still required modified road transport between their place of origin/destination and railway stations. Cabinet agreed and the taxi transport subsidy scheme was introduced and continues to this day. Modifications to station infrastructure became policy some years later following the introduction of compulsory Commonwealth legislation. Nevertheless, in 1981 the State

Minister for Local Government issued Ordinance No. 70 under the Local Government Act, 1919, relating to access and facilities for disabled people which provided a minimum gradient of ramps of 1 in 12. The minimum gradient used by Sydney Trains is now one in 14.

In March 1983, the State Rail Authority published a brochure entitled *Travelling by Train is Easier* and in it was a list of stations “with built in access and facilities for the disabled”. At that time, the Authority had introduced a moveable platform on a guided rail known as ‘Stairmate’ which could accommodate a non-electric wheelchair to take people up and down stairs at selected railway stations. There were problems with the system. The maximum load was 90 kg and they were unbelievably slow and they generally fell out of use within a few years. There is one station remaining in 1916 using Stairmates and that is Clyde, where they are used between the overhead concourse and platforms. Artarmon station never received a ‘Stairmate.’

While station improvements were unimportant to the Liberal Party, the State Rail Authority was committed to make rail facilities more accessible and in 1984 established an advisory committee for transport for the disabled. No one at that time was thinking about the use of lifts and the focus was on the installation of ramps, which continued to be the policy until 1993.

ARTARMON STATION SUBWAY MURAL

The difficulty of pedestrian access at Artarmon station was reflected in the use of a subway to gain platform entry. Subways providing pedestrian access to island platforms have problems that footbridges do not possess. They have had a tradition of darkness due to the former Railway policy of providing minimal electric lighting. Moreover, darkness has always been the home of anti-social people. For these and other reasons, the railway administration agreed to requests from time to time for people to paint murals on the walls of subways and embankments. State Rail had no objection to this in 1982 when Willoughby Municipal Council desired to apply a mural to the Artarmon subway by artist, Malcolm King. The project was part of Council’s beautification policy for the area. As this was funded by the NSW Ministry of Arts, State Rail had no objection. The mural covered the subway with themes relating to transport from the 1920s to the 1980s. The artist commenced on the project in February, 1982, and the work was not completed until September, involving schoolchildren, senior citizens and unemployed people. At the time, there was a children’s television show called Simon Townsend’s Wonderworld and the mural became a feature on an episode of that show.

One report commented favourably on the mural, saying that the artist had transformed "the once dreary subway into a pleasant and interesting place."³⁷⁸ Establishing murals was always a relatively easy initiative, particularly when the Railways did not have to pay the initial cost. There is often considerable goodwill and publicity for everyone involved in such projects, as was the case at Artarmon. It is the payment of maintenance costs of murals that can be a problem. While the project was underway in the Artarmon subway, the State Rail Authority was faced with the maintenance of a similar mural at Orange railway station where the cost to maintain the mural was estimated at \$88,000. The Authority wanted to remove the mural to avoid the cost but Orange City Council requested that it be maintained. Although that wish was granted, the Authority subsequently adopted a policy against the provision of murals. The mural in the Artarmon subway has since been removed. That has not been the end of painting and subways, however, as the subway at the Sydney end of Artarmon station has been treated with what is called "wall art", which is a euphuism for legalised graffiti.

MAJOR DESIGN CHANGES AT ARTARMON STATION

In 1982, the then local State Parliamentary Member, Peter Collins, asked a Question With Notice in Parliament about the "little protection to rail commuters" in bad weather at Artarmon station.³⁷⁹ The Minister for Transport replied that "minor alterations to improve the operation of the station" were being considered.³⁸⁰ These alterations turned out to be the relocation of the ticket office windows, not weather protection. The signal box at Artarmon had been out of use since 1928 when automatic signalling, in conjunction with the introduction of a full service of electric trains, replaced the former block telegraph system.³⁸¹ The empty signal box had allowed the doubling of office space, which was particularly important with the growing number of staff at the station.

The former signal box at the Hornsby end of the Artarmon building was demolished in 1982 and the ticket windows in the Booking Office were relocated to the northern end of the room facing the stairs. This shortened the walls at the Hornsby end by about 7' 4", though the roof length was not altered. This provided shelter for customers standing at the ticket windows and, more interestingly, restored the station to the format when it was initially constructed at Old Glenbrook. Two windows for the sale of tickets were

³⁷⁸ *Railway Digest*, Vol. 20 No. 10, October, 1982, p. 324.

³⁷⁹ Legislative Assembly, *Questions and Answers No. 15*, 10th February, 1982, p. 267

³⁸⁰ *ibid.*

³⁸¹ S.E. Dornan & R.G. Henderson, *The Electric Railways of New South Wales*, Sydney, Australian Electric Traction Association, 1976, p. 33.

also provided in the northern wall of the Artarmon building in 1982, where the present single window now exists.³⁸² The two ticket windows that faced into the general waiting room and were closed but a third and fourth windows facing the Sydney-bound side of the platform were retained. This was the first major alteration to the building in 66 years since its construction in 1916. In 1982, Artarmon station had four ticket windows, which was a reflection of the high volume of ticket sales at the time.

THE POLITICAL PARTIES RELEASE POLICY PLATFORMS

The Leader of the Parliamentary Opposition, Nick Greiner, made a press release on 17th July, 1983, outlining what he proposed to do for public transport when he was elected. It would be another five years before the Liberals took office. There was not a single reference to the need to upgrade station buildings and the closest reference he made to stations was a commitment to a new, multimodal ticketing system, the off-station sale of tickets and the establishment of a programme to lease airspace over railway lines to private developers.

In February, 1984, the Minister for Transport, Peter Cox, released a transport document dealing with programmes and policies, which is listed achievements between 1976 and 1984 and proposals for the future. For the first time in any document for public consumption, “station improvements” occupied a separate listing in the index. While the document contained no direct statements of design policy, it did refer to the terms “major rebuilding” “new station”, “major restoration”, “upgrading” and mentioned that “a special allocation has been made for painting and associated maintenance (renewal of guttering et cetera) at around 100 stations throughout the State each year.”³⁸³ Commuter car parking was another major section of the report and it was stated that 7,139 spaces were in use at stations at the time. There were no statements about railway stations in the future, merely that the Government was supporting urban consolidation to reduce the demand for the provision of new infrastructure in developing areas.

In the 1980s, the travelling public’s attention was generally focused on non-infrastructure issues, apart from the topic of accessibility. Train reliability and the safety of commuters were the big issues. For instance, at the 1985 annual conference of the Australian Labor Party the dominant railway issues in the Sydney area were reported as

³⁸² Plan No. 180-230 entitled "Artarmon Station Alterations & Additions to Booking Office", dated 4th January, 1993, RIC Plan Room.

³⁸³ Minister for Transport, *Transport Programmes and Policies – Achievements 1976-1984 and Proposals for the Future*, 1984, p. 8.

vandalism to property, the need for further on-train security guards, the installation of vandal proof seats in trains and measures to convince passengers that the Sydney rail service was safe, as many potential customers were reported as being unwilling to use the suburban rail services at night because of the possible danger involved.

29 MANAGEMENT CHANGES MANIFESTED BY NEW STATION SIGNAGE 1988

THE CREATION OF THE FIRST URBAN PUBLIC TRANSPORT ORGANISATION

The most spectacular feature that the Greiner government introduced in respect of public transport was the creation of an urban railway system for the Sydney area, though that area was large taking in the provision of passenger services to Newcastle, Lithgow, Goulburn and Nowra. It was called *CityRail* and the good news was that it excluded freight train operations, which were hived off to another separate entity. This was the first time since 1855 that a body existed solely for urban, rail passenger transport. It did not even have to consider country rail passenger services.

NEW LOOKING MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS

In 1988, a Commission of Audit reported to the newly elected Greiner conservative government and its recommendations confirmed that the changes sought since 1965 to the State railway system in terms of improved organisational efficiency had not been achieved.³⁸⁴ The proposed rationalisation of middle and senior management and the elimination of the emphasis of the functional engineering branches had not changed. The most critical recommendation was the need for “profit-oriented objectives” and the need for the rail organisation to “operate on a more business oriented basis”.³⁸⁵ These last-mentioned items were a signal to future chief executives and senior management to implement any measure to reduce staffing levels. Unfortunately, this reduction most affected staff at the front line of customer service working at stations. Management numbers steadily increased to the point in 2008 when the NSW government was advised by its own external consultants that RailCorp was “top heavy” and recommended the reduction of 300 management positions.³⁸⁶ The report cited that the international benchmark was 10 management positions per 1,000 employees whereas RailCorp was staffed with 90 head office managers for the same number of front-line workers.³⁸⁷

From the day trains first operated on the North Shore line in 1890 until 1989, there had been basically no change in the way in which the North Shore line was managed.

³⁸⁴ NSW Commission of Audit, *Focus on Reform – Report of the State’s Finances*, Sydney, 1988, p. 112

³⁸⁵ *ibid.*

³⁸⁶ Report to the Independent Pricing and Regulatory Tribunal by L.E.K. Consulting cited in *Railway Digest*, Vol. 46 No. 8, August 2008, p. 23

³⁸⁷ *ibid.*

Traditionally, railways have been managed using one of two traditional forms. One is the departmental system, which is also known as the British or departmental system, whereby all approvals which are required from the bottom level upwards are taken by a Head of Branch for each functional branch of the organisation. The second system is the regional or American system in which regional managers make all decisions required to be made in a defined geographic area.³⁸⁸ The NSW Railways has always been operated in accord with the departmental system from 1855 to date. In 1989, the NSW rail organisation was split into quasi-separate organisations based on geography, one of which was *CityRail*. *CityRail* existed until 2012, when *Sydney Trains* replaced it.

Since 1989, *CityRail/Sydney Trains* has continually implemented varieties of sub-systems of line, cluster and regional management. These were intended to provide closer connections with customers and improving management. The continual changes have affected the number and nature of support staff allocated to each manager but the arrangements have not altered the basic way under which line managers seek approval from ultimately the functional Head of Branch. Titles of positions and functional units have been jazzed to reflect modern management speak but they are merely superficial to the traditional way the organisation is managed. Managers today with titles denoting some geographic connection are very little more than regional staff supervisors.

EVEN THE CONSERVATIVE PARTIES START MENTIONING STATIONS

The Leader of the State Opposition, Nick Greiner, released the Liberal Party transport policy in August, 1986, for the 1988 general elections. The early release of the transport platform was a reflection of the importance of public transport in the 1980s. The document included the following items in relation to stations:

- the installation of security cameras at key suburban stations to provide increased safety,
- the development of modern rail and bus interchanges at key suburban locations and above the railway lines at Central Railway,
- the franchising out of SRA booking offices in suburban and country areas which “could be integrated into local stores/travel agents, offices or newsagents’ shops with the aim of improving the marketing of SRA services”,
- the design of SRA booking offices to make them as attractive and efficient as airline booking offices,

³⁸⁸ For more information, see W.V. Wood & J. Stamp, *Railways*, London, Thornton Butterworth, 1928, pp. 142-148

- fully computerised booking systems as well as automatic ticket production, &
- the creation of a staff emphasis on service to the public.³⁸⁹

About half of what Greiner promised was done by the Labor Government before the 1988 elections. There was no franchising out; booking offices did not look like airline facilities and there was no air right development at Central station. On the other hand, there was a big push to create a much better relationship between staff and customers but the cultural change lasted only a few years until a change of Chief Executive. In addition, there was a big push to fund bus/rail interchanges though the design of some of these marked the dominance of engineers over architects. Safety did become a big issue but one of the unintended victims of the initiative was the almost complete removal of vegetation on platforms, though this policy did not kick in until the departure of the then Chief Executive.

A CUSTOMER FOCUS – AND BY THE CONSERVATIVES

At the General Election on 19th March, 1988, the Labor Party was defeated and the Greiner Government, which was a coalition of conservative city and country political parties, took office. The new government appointed consulting firm, Booz Allen and Hamilton, to carry out a review of the previous government's station upgrading program amongst other things, including the preparation of a future station upgrading program, with funding and priorities for all metropolitan stations over the next five years. This was different to the policy of the previous government, which targeted key stations. A senior bureaucrat from British Rail, Chris Green, who had some success in the Network Southeast region, was brought out by the new Chief Executive, Ross Sayers, to assist with the station upgrading program.

Ross Sayers endeavoured to encourage staff to leave their booking offices and be more visible on platforms but he faced a brick wall because of trade union opposition. Although Sayers could not get staff to be more physically visible to customers on platforms, he was extremely successful in creating goodwill through a variety of station promotions, such as breakfast sausage sizzles. It was the policy and position of the unions to keep their members working at stations hidden out of public sight as much as possible. The best example of this policy of staff invisibility was the provision of a railway information centre on the main concourse at Sydney Terminal station, which has since been demolished. While Sayers and his senior management team wanted to have an open counter, the unions objected and the building design featured a considerable amount of obscure glass so the staff could conceal themselves from public sight. Communication between staff and the public continued to be through a smallish sheet of glass in much the same way as communication had existed since 1855. It was

³⁸⁹ Liberal Part, *Liberal – 88 Transport – A Speech by Nick Greiner*, undated, pp. 5, 8-10.

not until 2015 that an open counter information centre was provided at Sydney Terminal.

CHANGES AT ARTARMON STATION

Changes occurred at Artarmon not long after the Commission of Audit handed its report to Government. The changes are dealt with in Chapter 30. These changes reflected the transformation that occurred in the general nature of rail operations and organisational structure. The shortening of the building and the attempted elimination of public toilets both were modern versions of the deeply-seated desire within the railway administration to eliminate all platform structures at all stations. They were not sought nor desired by commuters. While the stated intent was to provide an improved image to the public, the real intent was to lower maintenance costs. Smaller buildings equalled smaller capital and maintenance costs.

In the past, the entry into the subway to Artarmon station has been subdued on the western approach and almost hidden on the eastern approach. The main reason why this has occurred was a lack of official interest in identifying station entrances but the location of the subways, being some distance from the footpaths on the adjoining streets, especially on the eastern side, did not help. Whereas the western entrance adjoins a public footpath and road, that on the eastern side is obscured by buildings on land acquired from the railway administration and approved by Willoughby Council. Up to 1990, no signage was placed outside the rail corridor to indicate the existence of the station. This was consistent with the practice throughout the NSW rail system, apart from small signs similar to those used for street names. Railway staff believed that a station was so well-known to a local community that everyone within a station catchment would know where the station is located.

CityRail introduced from 1989 illuminated light boxes at railway entrances, projecting what was known as the “L7” corporate logo. The 1990 signs at Artarmon were replaced in 2015 with new, dumbed-down signs featuring the letter “T” to permit interpretation by pre-schoolers. At Artarmon, the surrounding landscape is pleasant on the western side but both the entrances were for long time unattractive but during 2015 were brightly painted and have a satisfactory appearance.

The eastern side of the rail corridor generally has negative aesthetics if one’s preference is for neat and tidy landscaping. It is suggestive of a lack of community interest or ability to lobby for an equality with the western side or the belief by some shrewd official of Council to say that the eastern-side vegetation is a natural expression of native plantings. So far as the built environment is concerned, the eastern side of the

station is a conservation area containing many fine examples of Californian Bungalows and other architectural styles. It is puzzling that it is this side of the line where the railway corridor and adjacent commercial development is the most unattractive. On the western side of the rail corridor, are the unattractive, high-rise apartments and a local shopping strip of once-attractive buildings. It is this side that possesses the more visually attractive garden setting adjacent to the railway fence.

THE PROMISED WORLD-CLASS RAILWAY

When CityRail was formed in 1989, the concept of developing a world-class railway at least took hold in official propaganda. For example, the staff journal, innovatively named *CityRail*, had the banner headlines “Sydney fleet to match world systems”.³⁹⁰ Sadly, even the written propaganda did not survive past the end of the term of the then Chief Executive, Ross Sayers, when he left the top position in 1992.

³⁹⁰ *CityRail*, Issue No.2, 1st October, 1989, p. 1

30 THE ARTARMON STATION SPARKLE DEBUT 1988-2005

THE ALTERATIONS AT ARTARMON STATION AS AN EXPRESSION OF THE CHANGE IN CORPORATE IDENTITY

The most significant and fundamental change to the appearance of railway stations occurred within the CityRail area in 1989. What happened was the most amazing thing to have occurred at Artarmon since the provision of the 1916 building. There has never been an official explanation that explains why Artarmon station was chosen, despite a plethora of station buildings requiring upgrading. The dominant position of the Artarmon station platform and building and its strong visual impact probably was a factor in the 1989 decision to make Artarmon the prototype for the introduction of the “Station Sparkle” programme, which lasted to 1995, when it was absorbed into other station upgrading programmes. With the addition of brightly coloured red paint on virtually every metal, structural item on the station, Artarmon station was able to be seen vividly and widely from either side and, hence, transfer a message from the railway administration to the general public that an effort was being made to brighten station areas.

CityRail was formed as a marketing entity to manage urban rail services in Sydney but ownership of the land and building was retained under the name of the State Rail Authority. The building at Artarmon mirrored the nature of the organisational and institutional change. CityRail announced the upgrading of every railway station on the network under the banner of a \$105 million station upgrading program.³⁹¹ Artarmon was not only within the first group of stations to be upgraded, it was the very first example. The work was completed in September, 1989.³⁹²

VERSION 1 OF THE ALTERATIONS TO THE ARTARMON PUBLIC TOILETS

The most fundamental and controversial aspect of the work was the elimination of separate male and female toilets. CityRail also chose to convert the General Waiting Room into a room for the Station Master. These alterations involved the truncation of

³⁹¹ *CityRail*, Issue No. 07, April, 1990, p. 1

³⁹² *North Shore Times*, 2nd September, 1989

the building at the Sydney end by about 12 feet six inches.³⁹³ As a result of the 1982 modifications (which demolished the signal box) and the 1989 alterations, the Artarmon building was then about 20 feet shorter than when built in 1916, making it approximately 50 feet in length. The State Transport Minister in 1989, Bruce Baird, was reported as saying that "Artarmon was chosen as a trial location to evaluate some of the station design features to be used at all stations".³⁹⁴ CityRail was recorded as indicating four reasons for the elimination of the separate sex toilets and general waiting room. These were:

- the need to provide security for travellers,
- the management of graffiti and vandalism,
- the elimination of meeting places for drug users, &
- the high cost of maintenance³⁹⁵

Not only had the NSW Government rail administration implemented a policy since 1855 of providing separate toilets for the two sexes, it endeavoured to separate the entrances to the facilities so that there was no loitering by men around the entrance to the ladies' toilet. The Artarmon alteration in 1989 was not an idle experiment but was regarded as "a model for many of the smaller suburban stations, although maintaining toilets at larger stations such as Chatswood."³⁹⁶ CityRail wished to monitor public reaction to the absence of station toilets, which situation existed on many overseas urban rail systems.

The reaction by the commuters of Artarmon to the building alterations was adverse. The local newspapers, *The North Shore Times* and *The Northern Herald*, carried nine separate articles of condemnation between July and September, 1989. *The North Shore Times* of 22nd July, 1989, was typical when it said that "the renovations to Artarmon railway station, which will make it a prototype for stations throughout Sydney, have raised the ire of commuters."³⁹⁷ A petition from 106 signatories to the Minister; protests by the Artarmon Progress Association and condemnation by Willoughby City Council were to no avail. Council was particularly upset because CityRail undertook the

³⁹³ Plan in Artarmon Maintenance Folder, entitled "Proposed Additions and Alterations to Artarmon Station", dated 25th August, 1989, RIC Plan Room

³⁹⁴ *North Shore Times*, 2nd September, 1989

³⁹⁵ *North Shore Times*, 12th August, 1989

³⁹⁶ *ibid.*

³⁹⁷ *North Shore Times*, 22nd July, 1989

work without consultation with Council.³⁹⁸ The non-provision of separate sex toilets was an issue that affected many stations in the early 1990s and the subject was often discussed, and opposed, by the Commuter Council of NSW which was the Government's peak community commuter advisory body.³⁹⁹

The elimination of the separate public toilets and the general waiting room were not the sole changes made at Artarmon. There were positive features including:

- the construction of platform canopies,
- paving in the pedestrian subway,
- new platform lighting,
- replacement of seats, bins and signs, &
- the provision of a public telephone.

Paint was applied for the first time in the history of the rail administration to buildings as a dominant building element and as a means of identifying upgrading works. The red colour was designated as “Dulux Vermillion” and was nominated as the “standard” paint. Despite the nomination of the standard hue, other shades of red were also applied, including “Waratah Red”. One year after Artarmon received its red paint, CityRail formally launched the red paint programme, called “*Station Sparkle*”, to improve the image of suburban stations. The programme was a part of a larger vision by CityRail to build what it called “a world class railway”. Artarmon had become the first station on the rail system to receive what was to be known as the Station Sparkle treatment. Artarmon station was officially regarded as the benchmark for later applications and an artist’s impression of Artarmon adorned the cover of CityRail’s first official station *Design Guide* issued in 1989. The Station Sparkle programme was absorbed into other minor works programmes in 1995.

Most of the new works at Artarmon featured the use of red paint for virtually every item within reach of human hands. The red paint was not restricted to new elements. The platform indicator boards used to display details of the next trains were also painted red. The reaction to the red paint was mixed. Red indicator boards went a bit too far and Artarmon was the only station on the network to have red paint on this element. Artarmon resident and regular rail passenger, Tim Edwards, commented that it was “nice to see that the railway administration desired to provide an uplift of the station presentation but considered that the bright red paint was too garish, too extensive and

³⁹⁸ *ibid.*, 12th August, 1989

³⁹⁹ Interview with Paul Tuckerman, retired Secretary of Commuter Council, 2nd March, 1999

too revolutionary”.⁴⁰⁰ Being a long-standing railway observer, Edwards was aware of the history of the colour red in NSW railways and also knew that it was possibly the worst colour that could be used in the Australian outdoor environment as it quickly faded in the intense heat of Australian Summers. Bill Laidlaw was a much older and more seasoned rail traveller than Edwards. Laidlaw stated that the red paint peeled off metal when hosed. When he got the opportunity to express concern to a senior railway executive about the lack of preparation prior to painting, he was quickly assured that full undercoat preparation was standard practice. The opposite was the truth. Bill thought the officer did not ever use a railway station.⁴⁰¹

The application of red paint was a fundamental change to traditional railway practice. Since 1855, staff were instructed against the use of any red paint or other red material near running lines, including red clothing and red motor cars. The railway administration had considered that the use of red paint might be interpreted by a train crew to mean danger and require a train to make an emergency brake application. For some reason, there was a total reversal, almost overnight, of the paint policy. CityRail abandoned the use of red paint as a station upgrading element in December, 1998. By that time, nearly every application of red paint looked very faded and weathered. A decade of Australian sunshine proved Tim Edwards correct.

While CityRail did not provide separate public toilets at Artarmon, it did install separate male and female toilets for the staff members⁴⁰². A State Rail spokesman was reported as saying that staff would unlock their own toilet upon request by a member of the public.⁴⁰³ The toilet arrangement at Artarmon was a harbinger of the importance of staff toilets for the future. Uni-sex versus separate public toilets and the provision of separate staff toilets for different classifications (e.g. station operations, train crews, security guards) were significant policy issues after the changes at Artarmon. The existence of separate male and female staff toilets was a sign of the strength of the railway unions. They had the power to stop trains, which they had done on many times since 1965.

Another significant feature of the 1989 changes was the replacement of all platform station nameboards reading “Artarmon” with triple-level, double-sided nameboards that displayed “run-in” and “run-out” information advising passengers of the names of the

⁴⁰⁰ Interview with Tim Edwards, 7th August, 2002

⁴⁰¹ Interview with Bill Laidlaw, op. cit.

⁴⁰² There is no reference on the plan that indicates that the toilets were for the public or staff. Some conflicting interpretations are expressed by different people as to who was the intended beneficiary of the two toilets. The extent of concern expressed by the public in 1989 confirms the staff orientation. It was not until 1991 that the two toilets were marked on a plan for the public.

⁴⁰³ *ibid.*, 22nd July, 1989

last and next stations. The triple level signs had previously been restricted to the Eastern Suburbs Railway and had been first used in 1979. This tri-level sign arrangement fell out of favour and then came back in favour as quickly as senior managers were changed.

THE 1990 SUMMARY OF TWO YEARS OF ACHIEVMENT AND A PROMISE OF MORE TO COME – THE GOLDEN YEARS OF SYDNEY PASSENGER STATIONS

The Greiner Government was pretty pleased with itself having introduced the Station Sparkle Program in 1989 and decided tell everyone just how good the first two years in office had been. In 1990, it released a glossy brochure entitled “New Directions – Two Years of Achievement”. The document listed the following achievements and promises in regard to stations:

ACHIEVEMENTS

- Commencement of a \$112 million program to upgrade CityRail stations,
- The repainting and upgrading of all 34 stations between Mortdale and Wollongong,
- The introduction of new design standards, &
- Improved station information systems, seating, litter bins, signage, lighting and security measures.

PROMISES

- Upgrading of all 294 CityRail stations,
- Introduction of “Help Points”
- Improving lighting, safety zones and ‘Bluelight’ safety indicators on platforms, similar to the existing blue lights to mark the location of guards on trains,
- Closed circuit television monitoring of stations – with 13 already installed at ‘key’ stations, &
- The installation of vandal-resistant telephones – with 164 already installed at 42 stations.⁴⁰⁴

There is no doubt that the Greiner Government did introduce a massive change in the way the Sydney rail system operated by the creation of CityRail – the first attempt at establishing a separate organisation not only for Sydney but also only for passenger services. If proof is wanted of the pivotal part played by Artarmon station, look no further than the New Directions document as it specifically mentions the “major upgrade” at the

⁴⁰⁴ NSW, *New Directions – Two Years of Achievement – Transport in New South Wales*, 1990, pp. 4 & 5.

station.⁴⁰⁵ It is acknowledged that the 'Bluelight' safety zone concept was a failure but that was the only shortcoming in a list of credible achievements.

The number of travellers using Artarmon station in the early 1990s was considerable. A survey in 1994 between 6.00am and 9.30am indicated a total of 2,240 people leaving by train and 651 people arriving by train.⁴⁰⁶ This made Artarmon the fourth busiest station on the North Shore line after Chatswood, Gordon and marginally behind Turrumurra. CityRail did respond to the pleas by the travelling public, which continued through to 1991, for separate public toilets.⁴⁰⁷

VERSION 2 OF THE ALTERATIONS TO THE ARTARMON PUBLIC TOILETS

In 1991, CityRail planned modifications to convert the existing two staff toilets into separate male and female public toilets and provide a single toilet for staff.⁴⁰⁸ Security for both customers and staff was an important issue in the 1980s and the Artarmon building again reflected changes in organisational thinking. By the second half of the 1980s, it was State Rail policy to provide separate toilets for staff so that employees did not have leave the security of their ticket office to go to the public toilet. In accordance with this policy, provision for the separate staff toilets had been made.⁴⁰⁹ The employees' toilet was again relocated about 1996 to a new position inside the staff office.⁴¹⁰

The location of the two public toilets was a marked change from traditional station floor plans. There was a single entrance to the two toilets, requiring males and females to enter the same external passage. In former years, entrances to male and female toilets were placed on different sides of a platform building to avoid conflicting male/female pedestrian movements. Now, Artarmon station had a single toilet cubicle for each sex.

So far as male toilets were concerned, there was another fundamental change in 1991. At larger stations, but not at Artarmon, a new policy was introduced for male toilets. Rather than the former practice of a few cubicles and a large urinal for shared use, separate cubicles were provided for men, in the same manner as was done for female toilet facilities. The objective of this was to ensure that only one person at a time could enter a toilet, thus make it very difficult for two people to enter the toilet in order to

⁴⁰⁵ Ibid., p. 4.

⁴⁰⁶ No author, Passenger Survey - Barrier Counts, Folder entitled "Transport - Railways", Artarmon City Library.

⁴⁰⁷ See, for example, *North Shore Times*, 3rd April, 1991.

⁴⁰⁸ Plan No. 925 091 entitled "Artarmon New Staff Toilet", dated 24/10/1991, former RIC Plan Room

⁴⁰⁹ Plan No. 925 091, *ibid*.

⁴¹⁰ Inspection by author 5th December, 1998. Plan for alterations unavailable.

engage in illegal drug trafficking or other disgusting habits. The use of porcelain for the toilet bowls at Artarmon rather than stainless steel, which was widely used in the 1990s for the upgrading of public station toilets, was an indicator that the toilets were originally intended for non-public use. The staff had welcomed the reduction in the number of public toilets. Some members of the public had disgraceful toilet habits while others vandalised the equipment. Fewer public toilets equalled fewer problems for staff. From 1991, two public toilets meant double trouble for the staff.

TICKETS, TICKET WINDOWS, LUGGAGE AND STAFF WORKSTATIONS

From the 1980s, State Rail commenced developing a system to issue tickets through ticket vending machines. Unlike previous attempts to use machines, State Rail knew that it required to examine all issues that impinged on the system, not just provide machines. One major aspect that CityRail implemented was the basic design of booking offices. There was a fundamental change in the way staff would work from the early 1990s. Rather than stand at a counter manually operating the Edmonson ticket machine, staff would now sit on a stool and press buttons on a Booking Office Machine.

Once upon a time, people who were booked on long distance trains could deposit their luggage at a suburban station, including Artarmon, from whence the portmanteaux would be handed to the guard of the next suburban train for conveyance to the City. When the luggage arrived at Sydney Terminal station, it was transferred by Railway staff from the suburban platforms to the country concourse and would be placed in the guard's van of the relevant country train. Booked passengers could even send their baggage in advance of the date of travel by the passenger. All that stopped on Friday, 1st April, 1991, when the new rules terminated the practice. From that time, all luggage had to be taken by the traveller to Sydney Terminal where the effects were then placed in the guard's van. One further practice that was stopped was the elimination of the arrangement where baggage could be placed out of the guard's van at unattended stations.⁴¹¹

By 1994, CityRail rolled out a widespread programme to fit standard workstations and new bullet-proof ticket windows to stations. Artarmon received its workstation in the middle of 1994.⁴¹² This change resulted in the replacement of the two windows in the Hornsby end with a new, single window. The station had gone from four ticket windows in 1982 to two in 1994, though the one ticket window facing the Sydney-bound platform was not generally used. It seems that the restriction of passengers to a single window was insufficient, particularly for Monday mornings when there was a high demand for the issue of weekly tickets. This resulted in the re-opening of a third window, which had

⁴¹¹ Chris Banger, *Southern Aurora*, Redfern, ARHS, 2012, page 133.

⁴¹² Plan No. 94038 S 01 dated April, 1994, CityRail Architects

removed in 1982, on the Hornsby-bound side.⁴¹³ This third window was subsequently closed following the installation of a Ticket Vending Machine on the platform. Now both ticket windows on the Sydney-bound platform are closed, but still exist. Also in the 1990s, CityRail provided a store for paper in the ceiling cavity. Access was achieved by pulling down a retractable ladder. Air-conditioning of the offices was installed in 1996. In 2000, the station received Closed Circuit T.V. surveillance of the platform areas, the installation of two "Help Points" to seek assistance when the station was unstaffed and a digital voice announcer to provide recording messages about train running.

Until recently, public statistics of ticket sales were virtually unobtainable after World War Two. However, a barrier count on a day in 1994 taken between 0600-0930 gave the following results⁴¹⁴:

- | | |
|--|-------|
| • School students arriving at the station | 259 |
| • School students departing from the station | 74 |
| • Total arriving at the station | 2,240 |
| • Total departing from the station | 651 |

In that year, Artarmon stations lagged behind Chatswood, Gordon and Turramurra in similar barrier counts. More importantly, Artarmon in 1994 was handling 10% fewer commuters than it was doing in 1916, notwithstanding the increase in recent years of urban consolidation around the station. The number of commuters using Artarmon station in 2008 was about the same as in 1994.

In 1998, CityRail changed the designations of operational staff and the position of "Station Master" became "Station Manager". The external signage on the western side of the Artarmon building as at March, 1999, displayed the former title but it was eventually changed and, in doing so, reflected much broader reform of the organisation of urban railways in Sydney. This was the second time when a Chief Executive attempted to change the title of Station Master. In 1973, the then Chief Commissioner, Phillip Shirley, stated that the existing title was anachronistic and launched the re-badging of the title to Station Manager. There was so much hostility from staff that the new Chief Executive in 1980, David Hill, reversed the decision and allowed the former title to remain. In 2004, most of the external red paint was covered with the new corporate palette of blue and green. However, the manual platform indicator board frames retained their 1989 red paint until new electronic indicator boards replaced the manual, timber boards in 2006. In 2015, all rooms signage was removed and the only

⁴¹³ Interview with Eddie Blackwell, Project Manager, former Rail Infrastructure Corporation, 30th August, 2002

⁴¹⁴ *Passenger Survey Barrier Counts, 1994*, Transport – Railways File, Willoughby Council Library.

replacement room sign was one indicating the location of the single, combined uni-sex/accessible toilet on the Hornsby-bound platform side of the structure.

LANDSCAPING

It was not only the building at Artarmon station that was affected by the change of government in 1988. The landscape and gardens did not go unscathed. Improved security was the official reason. RailCorp pursued a policy since 1989 of removing trees and other vegetation from platforms, allegedly to eliminate possible hide-holes for miscreants desirous of implementing infamy. The cost of the policy was the provision of bituminous surfaced platforms with little or no visual interest, as at Artarmon.

The condition of the vegetation within the rail corridor near Artarmon station has been an indicator of the fluctuating importance of visual amenity to RailCorp, Sydney Trains, Willoughby Council and residents. There has existed for many years uncontrolled and unmanaged growth of weeds along the corridor but the problem has been caused by the owner of the land within the rail corridor (i.e. Transport for NSW) rather than the lesser on the other side of the fence (i.e. Willoughby Council). Even the park on the western side outside the metal corridor fence is overgrown with vegetation and is a statement indicating a lack of willingness by the Railway authority to manage the out-of-control growth that hangs from the fence. For the last 30 years or so, there has been a gradual decline in interest by Railway management in the condition of the RailCorp owned land between the tracks and the boundary fence in the vicinity of the station.

PLANNING – ENTER METRO STAGE LEFT AND RIGHT

In June, 2001, the State Government released a report into the review of future rail services. It was headed by Ron Christie and entitled *The Long-Term Strategic Plan for Rail*. It contained one indirect reference to the design of railway station buildings because it “introduced the idea of metro-style rail services.”⁴¹⁵ Although the design of buildings was not mentioned, an understanding of what was intended is possible by examining overseas metro systems. What was envisaged was a transport system with minimal fixed infrastructure and of minimal facilities provided for the travelling public. The proposed North-West railway line in Sydney will no doubt express these features.

The decision to build the North Shore railway is a story about the construction of what became the first wholly suburban railway line in Sydney and the first railway line with hilly topography. The selection of that geographical area for that first suburban line was unusual as the decision created the most operationally difficult and expensive railway

⁴¹⁵ C. Moutou and Corinne Mulley, “Transport”, in D. Clune and R. Smith (Eds.), *From Carr to Keneally – Labor in Office 1995-2011*, Sydney, Allen & Unwin, 2012, p. 187.

line in Sydney. The topographical problems that existed in the 1880s still persist today. The absence of Millennium trains on the North Shore line three years after their introduction in 2005 related to the steepness of the gradients. It was the only line on the Sydney rail network where the trains were unable to operate when the Millennium trains were introduced. The existing power supply was insufficient to permit operation of the Millennium trains and their introduction on the line was dependent on the construction of an additional electrical sub-station in 2008 behind the Sydney-bound platform at Waverton station.

The Station Sparkle period represented the last time when major design changes were made to railway station buildings. The period was marked initially by the use of red paint but over the time between 1989 and 2004 the years were also identified by the widespread use of transparent building materials, polished stainless steel and the use of overhead concourse structures with very high roofs. These design elements continue to be used in 2016.

THE IMPACT OF THE SPARKLE PROGRAMME ON THE HERITAGE VALUES OF THE ARTARMON BUILDING

Since 1950, the motor car has had a major impact on the population of Artarmon. By 2001, only 40% of the working population was travelling to either North Sydney or Sydney to work⁴¹⁶. A further 28% worked within the local council area. It is a reasonable assumption that many of the residents who worked locally and elsewhere would travel by a mode other than rail. Manning noted even in the 1970s that, in Willoughby and a couple of other centres, the “proportions able to work locally are high” as the areas contained more jobs than applicants⁴¹⁷. The role of the station has far less impact for the population of Artarmon today than other suburbs, such as Blacktown, where the vast majority of people have to travel outside their local government area to find employment. The further local residents live from Artarmon station, the more they use cars to travel to work⁴¹⁸. Therefore, Artarmon station today has less functional impact than it did in the years before World War Two when private motor car ownership was relatively low.

As far as the platform building is concerned, Warner described the Artarmon platform building as “the standard type” and nothing more.⁴¹⁹ While the building may largely be standard, its relocation in 1916 is certainly not standard. The structure contained design influences from the Federation period but much of the detailing of that period, as seen in

⁴¹⁶ Willoughby City Council Community profile – www.id.com.au

⁴¹⁷ I. Manning, *The Journey to Work*, Sydney, George Allen & Unwin, 1978, p. 66

⁴¹⁸ *ibid.*, p. 148

⁴¹⁹ *ibid.*, p. 45

fenestration, doorways and chimneys has been eliminated from 1989. The rail administration did not have a departmental policy to retain detailed architectural features and the various alterations to the building have been largely handed to external contractors. Despite the many changes since 1989 which have lowered the attractiveness of the building, Willoughby City Council has not generally opposed the alterations. Perhaps Council's sustained lack of opposition to changes was the reason why it was not consulted about the elimination of the separate public toilets.

Some of the original and what some may call "old" fabric of Artarmon station building is gone. This includes the following features:

- the general waiting room,
- the ladies' waiting room,
- the original public toilets with discrete entries on different walls,
- the parcels area,
- the Station Master's area,
- the ticket office,
- the ticket windows facing into the former general waiting room,
- original floor in the booking office,
- signage, seats and bins, &
- the signal box.

Moreover, the following physical changes to the external fabric reduced the aesthetic appeal and heritage values of the structure:

- Removal of chimneys,
- Replacement of doors and windows,
- Elimination of timber clad signal box,
- Use of different coloured bricks for alterations,
- Provision of a full-length canopy over the platform between the subway and the building,
- Truncation of the overall building length,
- Reduction in the width of canopies on each side of the building, with subsequent, reduction in the length of awning brackets,
- Use of inappropriate colour schemes,
- Elimination of original signage,
- Placement of excessive accretions, such as advertising, notices, help points, telephones, to the external wall surfaces, &
- Overdose of red paint as part of the "Station Sparkle" treatment.

Also in 2004, the platform canopy on the western side was found to foul the kinematic envelope by 245mm. This situation had arisen as a result of the removal of 150mm from the platform wall on the western side because track machinery was having difficulty passing the platform. This alteration to the platform in turn created a problem with the platform canopy being much closer to the track. In order to meet the engineering standards, the canopy had to be cut back. To sustain the overall building symmetry provided by the 1916 canopy arrangement, the canopies on both sides of the building were reduced slightly in width to accommodate the impact of non-stopping trains using the Chatswood-Epping rail line. There is no perceivable difference to the appearance of the canopies to the unobservant.

THE LEVEL OF KNOWLEDGE OF THE HERITAGE SIGNIFICANCE OF ARTARMON STATION

Interviews were carried out with commuters on Artarmon platform in order to sample the extent of personal impacts. The process produced varying assessments of the impact of the station as a whole, the building and the platform on people. People's view on the impact of the facilities differed according to the time of day, the length of residency in the surrounding area and the direction of travel. A survey of commuters was made during the AM peak on the 1st September before the introduction of the 4th September timetable in 2005, which resulted in a 50% decrease in off-peak trains stopping at the station. The survey revealed that not one person interviewed on the platform considered the building to be of interest. A total of ten out of 50 interviewees thought that the station as a total concept of the railway service was important and had had a personal impact on them but they considered that it was the service, not the facilities, that was the key factor in using the station. For these ten people, the impact was negative and complaints of poor service dominated the explanations. The other 40 people were disinterested and declined to be interviewed. In a group of another 50 commuters between the AM and PM peaks on the same day, 15 travellers said that the station building had an impact on them but all were positive, possibly because everyone was over the age of 65 years. Personal encounters with loved-ones dominated the explanations. Not one person born overseas attached any personal impact to the station.

Personal interest in the history of Artarmon station is going to be increasingly irrelevant as Artarmon and the Willoughby City Council area in general witnesses a steady decline in the number of residents with a long connection with the area. Increasing numbers of overseas migrants are moving to the area and in 2001 only 57% of the population were

born in Australia.⁴²⁰ New residents to Artarmon are less likely to have personal memories associated with the station and are more likely to have little understanding of the social and heritage significance of the station as their cultural heritage is to some extent based on their overseas country of origin. 20% of the population of the Council area are not Australian citizens.⁴²¹

No item relating to Artarmon station featured on the first edition of the State Railway Authority's Section 170 Heritage and Conservation Register issued in 1991. The sixth version of the Register, dated 24th March, 2016, published under the name of RailCorp thankfully lists Artarmon station.

⁴²⁰ Willoughby City Council Community Profile – www.ed.com.au

⁴²¹ *ibid.*

31 THE DEATH OF THE SPARKLE AND THE START OF THE LOSS OF CUSTOMER FOCUS 2005-2010

CUSTOMER CONCERNS NOT ADDRESSED

Changing colour schemes on platform buildings has consistently meant a change in the occupants of senior positions in the Railway bureaucracy or a change of in the colour of the political parties from conservative blue to revolutionary red. Between 2005 and 2010, the Labor Party reigned office. At this time, a change in senior officials explained the move away from red and white paint. The corporate colour of red, which identified the station with the 1989-2004 period, was replaced by blue and green and marked the time of the station between 2005 and 2010. The blue and green were replaced in 2015 by the orange and white scheme of the Liberal Government, which had assumed office in 2011.

The local conservative Member of Parliament, Gladys Berejiklian, was in the Opposition ranks during this period. On more than one occasion in 2005 and 2006, she expressed the concern of commuters about the “added pressure of not having easy access” for the “elderly, less mobile or disabled, or people with prams”.⁴²² She was appointed Shadow Minister for Transport in November, 2006. Some 30% of Sydney rail users surveyed in 2008 reported as having some difficulty getting onto or off platforms or trains.⁴²³ The limited space in the Artarmon subway increased the costs for the installation of a lift. RailCorp had an *Easy Access* programme under way since 1993 but Artarmon station was not a priority under the Labor Government while it was in office up to 2011.

Anti-social behaviour was a major problem for Sydney’s rail system. For instance, in 2006/07, 17% of peak train delays were caused by vandalism. Few measures were in place two decades ago to combat vandalism. Stations continue to have higher risk than trains.⁴²⁴ The NSW Auditor General stated that “the main purpose of CCTV is to record crime and assist Police to identify perpetrators”.⁴²⁵ Not one of the 6,400 CCTV cameras is able to prevent crime. 30% of train users in 2008 reported feeling threatened by the actions of other people on a train or at a station and this figure was consistent with the

⁴²² Private Members’ Statements, NSW Parliament, *Hansard*, 22nd March 2005, p. 14730 and 27th October 2006, p. 3672

⁴²³ Independent Transport Safety and Reliability Regulator, *Survey of CityRail Customers*, 2008, p. 5

⁴²⁴ NSW Auditor General, *Performance Reports 2002 – CityRail Passenger Security*, Executive Summary, p. 2 and *Valley Times*, 18th September 2008, p. 8

⁴²⁵ Auditor General, *ibid.*

position in 2007.⁴²⁶ 20% of people reported witnessing criminal activity and 26% reported harassment or verbal abuse.⁴²⁷ One regular off-peak commuter “travels in fear despite the millions spent on security by this inept NSW government”.⁴²⁸ The same commuter was critical of CityRail’s “ridiculous posters that state *every station a safe station* as it is simply not true and is nothing more than spin”.⁴²⁹ NSW Governments did and still do not appear very interested in implementing social welfare and other programmes in order to lower the need for some evil people to undertake criminal activity. The lack of official government initiative is evidence that crime prevention is not as high a priority for government as is crime apprehension. How high a priority is the safety of commuters standing on Artarmon platform?

VERSION 3 OF THE ALTERATIONS TO THE PUBLIC TOILETS

In 2006, CityRail provided a new store located on the Sydney end of the Artarmon platform within the existing building envelope to replace the store in the ceiling cavity. The ceiling store had provided very difficult access and did not conform to Occupational Health and Safety requirements. The staff had complained about the legislative non-compliance with CityRail management over a period of five years. In response, CityRail demolished the existing public toilets at the Sydney end and, once again, altered the public toilet arrangement. Now it was back to a single, unisex public toilet but was enlarged for use by handicapped travellers in wheelchairs. The only problem was that there was no provision for wheelchair travellers to gain access to the platform, even though the door to the toilet had been widened to accommodate them. This time there was hardly a whisper from commuters about the lack of separate male and female toilets. The new toilet had one advantage. It was no longer necessary for both men and women to enter a single, narrow door in very close proximity to enter the toilet accommodation. In the 27 years since the toilets were first altered, the number of Australian born residents using Artarmon station has decreased and the influx of welcomed Asian migrants, who were used to metro-style public transport systems, has meant a much higher tolerance level for the notion of minimal platform facilities.

There was one final touch to the public toilets and this occurred in 2015. The single unisex/accessible toilet was retained but the new room sign outside the door was marked “toilets”. Now the wise commuter just might think that there more than one toilet but, after a thorough examination inside and outside the toilet revealing no additional public toilet, the wise commuter would be compelled to consider the existence of human error in the design of the sign. How could that have happened?

⁴²⁶ Independent Transport Safety and Reliability Regulator, *Survey of CityRail Customers*, 2008, p. 5

⁴²⁷ *ibid.*

⁴²⁸ I. Randall, “CityRail Passenger Security”, Letter to Editor, *Railway Digest*, Vol. 46 No. 10, October, 2008, p. 57

⁴²⁹ *ibid.*

The pattern of alterations that occurred at Artarmon between 1980 and 2008 is one that was repeated at all North Shore stations. The same pattern also existed for the remainder of Sydney, the interurban stations and also at select rural stations at which the XPT passenger trains stopped. Just as the investment in urban rail accelerated, the investment in the provision of rural freight services dwindled. Hundreds of rural stations were closed; branch lines were mothballed or closed; some duplicated lines were reduced to a single track; rural freight centres were closed; rural freight services were re-organised; locomotive depots were closed and finally freight operations were sold from government ownership. The last act was the transfer of control of all rural railway tracks to the Commonwealth Government.

Just as Artarmon was an indicator of an overall pattern of urban non-investment between 1930 and 1980, it is an indicator of the massive funding for urban rail between 1980 and 2016. One would think that there would be nothing more of the physical fabric at Artarmon station that required alterations or replacement but this was not the case. RailCorp had undertaken an audit in 2006 for what it described as “disturbed asbestos at 65 priority locations.” Was it an indication of the demise of the former high, official status of Artarmon station when it was placed at the bottom of the list of 65?⁴³⁰

The State Government in 2006 released a document outlining its plans for Sydney’s transport and other areas of government activity. The Government recognized that “transport was one of the most commented upon issues”.⁴³¹ The frequency and capacity of services was the dominant issue raised, followed by amenity and cost. A review of suggestions made by members of the public was promised. Simultaneously, the government also released a document specifically dealing with Sydney’s urban transport. It showed Artarmon as being located on a “global economic corridor” but in its 74 pages not a word was mentioned about Artarmon.⁴³²

In October 2007, the then Minister for Transport announced a new “customer service improvement programme”.⁴³³ It included station operations. It is of interest that LEK Consulting submitted a report recommending removal of staff from stations which had fewer than 2,000 passengers a day.⁴³⁴ Artarmon survived that statistical yardstick but it was only a matter of time and a change of government that eliminated the position of Station Manager in 2013. The occupant of the former position was on borrowed time at Artarmon station.

⁴³⁰ RailCorp Press Release, 5th April, 2006.

⁴³¹ NSW Government, *A New Direction for NSW – State Plan*, Premier’s Department, 2006, p. 56

⁴³² NSW Government, *Urban Transport Statement*, 2006

⁴³³ Parliament of NSW, *Hansard*, 17th October 2007, p. 2768

⁴³⁴ Report by LEK Consulting cited in *Railway Digest*, Vol. 46 No. 8, August 2008, p. 23

The amenity of Artarmon station and the surrounding area was more important than ever because people had to wait longer for trains than they did 20 years previously. In 2007, Artarmon received 14 trains between 0730 and 0830 each weekday. The number has fluctuated in the 1989-2008 period between 8 and 13 trains but the total number of trains for Artarmon peak hour commuters was only an improvement of one train over a 50 period from the 1950s. A major timetable revision occurred on 4th September 2005 at which major stations on the North Shore line received between eight and ten trains in the peak.⁴³⁵ Artarmon station had eight trains in the peak hour and it may be thought that Artarmon was officially classified a “major” station. No. Not so. The Chief Executive at the time stated that the new timetable was “about running a safer, but slower network”.⁴³⁶ The “slower network” meant a reduction of 50% in the number of train services between the peak hours – from eight to four trains per hour. Journey times were also lengthened in both the peaks and non-peak. A 14% improvement occurred with the timetable issued on 11th October, 2009 when the number of trains between 0730 and 0830 was increased to 16 and from 23rd October, 2011, a further 19% improvement to 19 trains for the hour. No improvement was made over the next five years and, in 2016, 19 services are due to stop at Artarmon station between 0730 and 0830 on their way to the City.

THE IMPACT OF PRIVATE MOTOR VEHICLES

In 2008, the journey time between Artarmon and Central in the AM was 25 minutes, six minutes slower than in 1932 when the Sydney Harbour Bridge opened. This was an increase of over 30% in travel time. The extension of the total travel time between Artarmon and Central paralleled the increase in the dominance of the private motor car and the ever-increasing proportion of public funds for motorways in Sydney. Travel times did not increase until the 1950s and it was this period that the then NSW Government was ramping up expenditure on roads and buses to replace the Sydney tram system, which closed in 1961. The Sydney tramway network was “by far the largest in Australia, and ranked among the largest systems of the world”.⁴³⁷ It closed because of a deliberate policy of “tram-scrapping” in favour road transport. Travel time in 2016 between Artarmon and Central ranges from 25 to 27 minutes. In other words, there has been no reduction in travel times since 2005.

The widespread introduction from the 1960s of power-operated external doors on suburban rollingstock is sometimes blamed for slower journey times. When manually operated doors were in use, many young, agile male commuters would jump off and on

⁴³⁵ RailCorp Brochure entitled “2005 CityRail Timetable effective 4 September”, May 2005

⁴³⁶ *ibid.*

⁴³⁷ J. Richardson (Ed.), *Destination Circular Quay*, Second Ed., Canberra, Traction Publications, 1961, p.

moving trains. While this was unsafe, it did permit more people to transfer between platform and train in a shorter time. For whatever reason, current travel times are now equal to those operated a 100 years ago by steam locomotives. The introduction of electrification, Tangara carriages and Millenium sets did not improve overall journey times. The NSW Government also supported the extension of the definition of on-time running from three to five minutes. Now, a train from Artarmon can arrive five minutes late and be officially classified as on time. With a timetabled allowance of 25 minutes plus five minutes for a late running train, the total journey between Artarmon and Central can now be 30 minutes or nearly 60% longer than a train in 1932 and still officially be classified as on time. The Urban Development Institute of Australia (NSW) stated in 2008 that “a global city needs an efficient public transport system. And that’s something we lack”.⁴³⁸ Unless government leadership steps in to improve the situation, slow journeys to and from Artarmon and everywhere else in Sydney will continue.

THE IMPACT OF THE NORTHWEST METRO LINE

Railway Digest, a current affairs publication on railways, summarised the position with an editorial in 2008 referring to a “fairly steady string of announcements” about the North West sector of CityRail and claimed that “politicians talk of cutting-edge technology and grand schemes, but then lose their nerve and run off to spend money on roads and busways.”⁴³⁹

The editorial of the *Sydney Morning Herald* summed up the position about investment in rail transport. It stated in 2008 that, “given its abject failure to improve anything in the transport sector at any cost, Sydney’s long-suffering rail commuters are unlikely to be buoyed by the news [of proposed new trains consisting of single-deck carriages terminating at Central]”.⁴⁴⁰ Most of the problems affecting Sydney’s rail problems stem from the absence of wise and fact-based political leadership, a lack of dynamic leadership in the Railway administration and the best use and management of Railway staff, all of which money cannot address. In 2008, 27% of train users reported wanting to make a complaint about some aspect of CityRail services, the figure being the same as in 2007.⁴⁴¹

The number of trains passing through Artarmon station in 2016 is at a near maximum during peak hours and quadruplication of the track through the station is a subject that has been raised five times since 1900. There was a major, ongoing difference of

⁴³⁸ Urban Development Institute of Australia (NSW), *Essential Sydney*, special supplement in Sydney Morning Herald, 23rd October, 2008, p. 19

⁴³⁹ *Railway Digest*, Vol. 46 No. 4, April 2008, p. 4

⁴⁴⁰ Editorial, “Single-deck trains don’t stop here”, *Sydney Morning Herald*, 17th November, 2008, p. 12. The underlining is the author’s insertion

⁴⁴¹ NSW Independent Transport Safety and Reliability Regulator, *Survey of CityRail Customers 2008*, p. 5

opinion between the Transport Infrastructure Development Corporation, which built the Chatswood-Epping line and CityRail/Sydney Trains, which operates trains on it. One commentator stated that “these agencies are at war”.⁴⁴² Artarmon station is on a bottleneck stretch of track between Chatswood and the City where the number of train paths is finite. Without track amplification, the number of trains serving Artarmon commuters will be determined by the number and speed of express or non-stopping, longer-distance trains, not any increase in the number of commuters using Artarmon station. Organisational train running requirements will over-rule issues about local patronage. When the North West Metro is operational with trains terminating at Chatswood, commuters at Artarmon probably will have far more difficulty getting on a train to the city than at present. While the second stage of the Metro will involve an extension to the Sydney CBD, it remains to be seen whether a station will be provided on that system at Artarmon.

The current station strategy to manage the NSW urban railways is to replace men and women with machines, as far as is possible. The dollar price for the increased mechanisation and automation is the need for more and more electricity. Every item on the platform that replaces something once done by people and additional items, such as escalators and lifts, uses increasing levels of energy. The same strategy applies to rollingstock, where a range additional on-board equipment, including air-conditioning of every carriage on the network, adds to the need for more electric power. All this is being done at a time when every aspect of the economy is being asked to reduce its energy needs.

RailCorp started installing solar power at stations but its application is limited. At Werrington, the first station so fitted in late 2006, solar energy meets only 40% of the power requirement for the station. The implication for Artarmon will involve higher fares to pay for the higher energy charges and, ultimately, the limited use of renewable energy. RailCorp/Sydney Trains will continue to be ruled by engineers with their never-ending desire to dominate over other sections of the organisation. For 150 years, the functional branches of the railway organisation have reigned over the service delivery branches and this pattern will continue into the future. Why? Because there will be so few operational staff.

THE ORGANISATIONAL FOCUS ON NON-OPERATIONAL ISSUES

While operational issues have been the primary focus of travellers, RailCorp/Sydney Trains has increased its head office staff to accommodate a wide range of non-operational topics, including:

⁴⁴² L. Besser, “Rail Brawl over % 500m Overrun”, *Sydney Morning Herald*, 24th October 2008, p. 1

- Workplace Violence Prevention Action Plan,
- Safety Management Plan,
- Just Culture Programme,
- Anti-bullying & Harassment Programme,
- Equity & Diversity Programme,
- Harmony Day,
- Action Plan for Women,
- Women's Network,
- Establishment of Equity & Diversity Steering Committee,
- Pre-employment Programme for Aboriginal & Torres Straight Islanders,
- Code of Conduct,
- Employee Assistance Programme,
- Management Assistance Programme,
- Disability Action Plan,
- Ethnic Affairs Priority Statement,
- Equal Employment Programme &
- Buddy system for Aboriginal employees⁴⁴³

Very few of these initiatives existed in 1990 and none existed in 1972. On the 30th June 1998, a total of 9,317 people worked for the former State Rail.⁴⁴⁴ Nine years later in 2007, the staff totalled 13,800 representing an increase of 4,483 or 48%.⁴⁴⁵ In 2013/14, the total employment of Sydney Trains was 9,828 and in 2014/15 it was 10,370. The increase of 542 people represented an increase of 5.5% in one year. While that was a significant increase, the number of staff in the Senior Service increased from 406 to 460 over the same period, representing an increase of 13.3%

Any comparison between annual workforce figures is complex because of the absorption of the metropolitan section of the former Rail Infrastructure Corporation (RIC) into RailCorp and also the existence of key staff working for a sister body called Transport for NSW. To balance the absorption of RIC staff, the NSW Government hived off major upgrade and new works to the Transport Infrastructure Development Corporation and substantially reduced the staff engaged in Countrylink Travel Centres before totally closing all Travel Centres except the one at Central station. It would be worrying to believe that RailCorp has increased its staff complement to engage people to manage and implement the large number of non-core activities listed above. In the 2006/07 RailCorp *Annual Report*, there is a section entitled "Improving Efficiency" but

⁴⁴³ RailCorp New South Wales, *Annual Report 2006-2007*

⁴⁴⁴ State Rail Authority, *18th Annual Report 1997/98*, p. 14

⁴⁴⁵ RailCorp, *op. cit.*, p. 9

there is not a single word or statistic that indicates an increase in productivity per employee.⁴⁴⁶ The evidence does suggest more people are doing less in the Sydney rail network.

The employees of RailCorp are like other citizens of the State. Their lives are formed by the guidelines, rules and practices set by the Government. They do what they are told. The initiatives of RailCorp listed above have been implemented under government supervision and control. RailCorp/Sydney Trains is faced with responding to the type of society that the NSW Government desires. If the Government is not bothered about the impact of lower levels of staff presence on platforms; does not try to address genuinely the personal security of commuters and supports the creation of a top-heavy bureaucracy to manage the multitude of staff programmes, who is the beneficiary of government in NSW?

Every new senior manager working for RailCorp/Sydney Trains has held a fantasy of doing something different to what already exists and this desire has been endorsed as an automatic right-of-passage by Chief Executives. In 2010, the invention of the year was the fixing of blue and white station nameplates to the backs of platform seats. Artarmon was one of the station chosen for this exciting change but, like many other ideas, the programme did not include every station before the senior official departed the organisation. At the same time in 2010, the former stainless steel ticket collection barrier rail the top of the stairs was quietly rusting away. These two events identified what was important to the railway organisation. New gadgets were good and welcome because they provided opportunities for politicians to make announcements and make appearances. On the other hand, there was no buzz out of doing essential maintenance and, hence, no maintenance.

⁴⁴⁶ *ibid.*, pp. 28-33

32 THE END OF CUSTOMER FOCUS 2011-2016

THE LOSS OF GOVERNMENT EMPHASIS ON PUBLIC TRANSPORT

The Labor Party lost the state general election in 2011 and the Liberal/National parties formed government. Regrettably, the Labor Government had “failed to successfully create community consensus that good public transport could end the convenience of private vehicle travel.”⁴⁴⁷ The departure of the Labor Party from government had one singular adverse impact for public transport and that was its number two position a long way behind roads and highways so far as the Liberal Party was concerned.

THE REMOVAL OF PUBLIC TIMETABLES FROM ARTARMON STATION

For the first time since Artarmon station had opened in 1898, the local Member of Parliament was appointed Minister for Transport in 2011. What would Gladys Berejiklian do? Before she approved the lifts at Artarmon, she had another idea. Up to 2012, there were attached to the external walls of the Artarmon platform building large copies of the train timetable. The local Artarmon Station Master did not write the timetable. He merely placed them in position. Both the timetable and the building to which they were affixed belong to a railway system and it was those people in Head Office who controlled what happened at Artarmon station based on the directions of the Minister for Transport. The controller was not one person and not just one organisation. There were two players and each needed the other. These were the NSW Government and the state railway bureaucracy.

As Cocks writes, there needs to be a political will and an official bureaucracy that supports it.⁴⁴⁸ If the two are not in harmony, there will be a less than optimum service to the rail commuters on the North Shore line. Why did the Minister for Transport, who was also the local Parliamentary Member for Willoughby, direct the removal of public timetables on display not only from Artarmon station but virtually all stations served by Sydney Trains?⁴⁴⁹ Without timetables on display at the station anymore and without the ability to buy a ticket from a staff member at the ticket window, which commuters classify service at the station today as optimal? The explanation given to those who

⁴⁴⁷ Moutou and Mulley, op. cit., p. 192.

⁴⁴⁸ D. Cocks, *People Power*, Sydney, University of NSW Press, 1996, p. 37

⁴⁴⁹ Of 178 stations listed on the Sydney Trains website, the only known station to feature large timetables affixed to platform building walls as at July, 2016, was Mount Colah. Thanks to Gary Hughes for his inspection on 13th July, 2016.

made inquiries was that every rail customer could obtain timetables on their smart phones. How wrong could such a policy be?

RE-GIGGING THE RAILWAY BUREAUCRACY

One of the initiatives of the Liberal Party to rid the State of all things associated with the former Labor Government was the abolition of *CityRail*, which was an entity that had been established by the Greiner Liberal Government on 16th January, 1989. On 1st November, 2011, the Liberal/National Government established a new organisation called Transport for NSW. It represented yet another sad day for the Sydney commuter. Rail historian, Neville Pollard wrote:

“Passenger trains no longer have complete priority; the Act establishing Transport for NSW now gives passenger trains ‘reasonable priority only’”.⁴⁵⁰

From 1st July, 2013, the Government established a new entity called *Sydney Trains*. The new body split the formal organisation into two organisations – one dealing solely with the Sydney metropolitan area and the other dealing with longer distance rail services to Newcastle, Lithgow, Goulburn, Nowra and beyond. The split has been at times puzzling to customers because the “T” line numbering system is simply not helpful in any way to travellers.

Until 2013, the railway body for Sydney and the one for country New South Wales had distinct, unique corporate identities, reflected in the application of different colour schemes. Not so from 2013 where the orange and white platform station signage has been introduced for all railway stations no matter where they are located throughout the State. On the one hand, the present Government has created an organisation to operate only Sydney trains but, on the other hand, has diluted that separate identity. That separate identity has been further eroded by the juxtaposition of intercity timetables for NSW Train Link, the operator for all non-Sydney passenger services, with timetables for Sydney Trains on the Sydney Trains website. As equally strange is the omission of intercity services to Newcastle, Lithgow etc., which NSW TrainLink operates, from its own website, though it does direct users to the Sydney Trains website. Such issues have not been a worry to the incumbent Liberal/National Government.

⁴⁵⁰ N. Pollard, “City Meets Country”, Part 2, *Australian Railway History*, May, 2016, p. 22.

RE-AFFIRMATION OF THE 1934 DECISION TO MAKE THE NORTH SHORE LINE NO. 1 IN THE PUBLIC TIMETABLE

Following the opening of the Harbour Bridge, the North Shore line was placed first in the public timetable book and allocated the number one of about 20 different lines. When the present Liberal/National Coalition Government took office in 2011, one of its initial gimmicks was to show the public that it was doing things differently.

Why not re-confirm the 1934 policy decision? So the Government did just that. On 20th October, 2013, it allocated a number from one to seven to groups of lines in the Sydney urban area, preceded by the capitalised letter “T”. In which group was the North Shore line placed? In the “T1” group of course along with the Main Northern line and the Main Western line. Which of the three lines was mentioned first? Of course, it was the North Shore line and this position remains so in 2016. It seems the people along the North Shore line still retain a degree of political power. Then again, it may have been the simple whim of the Parliamentary Member for Willoughby, Gladys Berejiklian, who just happened to be the Minister for Transport when the “T” system of line classification was introduced. The initiative joins other Government decisions that have been made for display rather than any real improvement to the public transport system.

The introduction of the “T” system was not the end of the gimmicks. The Government then decided to replace all the lightboxes at all station entrances, which featured the CityRail corporate “L7” logo, with a new design of lightboxes that simply displayed the letter “T”. The poor design of the lightboxes looked like that they would be more at home on a child’s model train set. This policy initiative would have to rate as one of the most unnecessary and meaningless “achievements” in the previous 100 years. Artarmon station has a “T” sign at the subway entrances on both sides of the corridor, though the one on the eastern side is well on the way to be obscured with vegetation.

THE INTRUSIVE LIFTS

In January, 2014, a group of people, including some in wheelchairs, handed a petition of 4,750 signatures to their local Member of Parliament at Artarmon railway station, requesting the provision of access to the station for disabled people.⁴⁵¹ It was the perfect “photo op.” Gladys Berejiklian was all smiles standing in Hampden Road adjacent to the rail corridor accepting the petition, which recommended the installation of a single lift from the existing subway. Something was strange about the number of signatories as statistics published in 2012 showed that the total average number of people using the station on a weekday was 4,720. That figure was just under 30 people

⁴⁵¹ *North Shore Times*, 29th January, 2014.

who had signed petition. Considering that the use of the then proposed two lifts from Hampden Road to the platform would take an estimated five minutes compared to the two minutes for a single lift in the subway, it seems that nearly everyone using the station was happy to spend more time on railway property.

The Liberal Member for Willoughby and the Minister for Transport, approved the provision of lifts at Artarmon, it being announced on 2nd May, 2014. It is of course, hard to consider that someone would think of accusing her of playing favourites with her own electorate but they did. The residents of Unanderra had been promised a lift in 2010 by the then Labor Government and were waiting for the promise to be fulfilled. Both Artarmon and Unanderra were island platforms and it was proposed to provide lifts on each side of the line at Unanderra. At the bottom of the stairs at Unanderra on the western side, there was a sign proclaiming that lifts would be installed. The residents of Unanderra were informed by an unstated but correct source from the office of the Minister for Transport that the station's position on the priority list may be changed. Was that change going to be an accelerated position? Mrs Berejiklian approved a press release that had placed Artarmon ahead of Unanderra station and the residents of Unanderra were angry because the stations either side of Artarmon – namely St. Leonards and Chatswood – already had lifts. Mrs Berejiklian refused to deny a claim of self-interest but an official entered the discourse by pointing out that a mysterious body called the NSW Bureau of Transport Statistics stated that the number of people using Artarmon station in 2012 was 5,200, compared with 520 average daily commuters at Unanderra.⁴⁵² Such consistency of figures – a neat different of a multiplication factor of ten – was enough to make people suspicious of a numbers fiddle.

Neither the people of Unanderra nor the transport officials were revealing the whole story. According to the latest survey figures available to the public – taken in 2011 but released in 2012, the number of people using Artarmon station on a weekday was 4,720, not 5,200 and the number of people using Unanderra was 570, not 520.⁴⁵³ Of course, the Bureau was quoting figures stated to be 2012 statistics, which, if they existed, were unavailable to the public, but it is hard to believe that there was a 10% increase in patronage at Artarmon between 2011 and 2012. Similarly, one would have to question the alleged 10% decrease in train users at Unanderra over the same period. Were the figures altered to make Artarmon more attractive and Unanderra less attractive?

The other issue that was not stated by anyone was the potential vandalism problem at Unanderra. The station is in a very isolated area with a total absence of local

⁴⁵² *Illawarra Mercury*, 9th March and 27th May, 2014.

⁴⁵³ NSW, *Compendium of Sydney Rail Travel Statistics*, 2012, 8th Ed. Pp. 72-76.

pedestrian traffic, apart from those walking specifically to and from the railway station. On the eastern side of the railway, there was absolutely zero development and the provision of a lift on that side of the line would have been a waste of public funds. Although the Labor Government was committed to providing lifts at Unanderra, State Rail officials had some concern about the number of times the lifts would be out of service due to vandalism. Railway officers had evidence of the extent of local anti-social activity. The organisation had spent over \$100,000 restoring the former Station Master's residence adjacent to the station footbridge for placement on the private rental property market but the building had been severely damaged and vandalised within a matter of months after the completion of the work. The mischief was so expensive State Rail decided not to undertake remedial work. In a way, State Rail was almost happy to have a change of government and, as a result, avoid the obligation to provide lifts at Unanderra.

The go-ahead for the lift project was publicly announced by Ms Berejiklian in May, 2014.⁴⁵⁴ Gladys Berejiklian took the opportunity at the press launch for the public exhibition to throw in another statistic, this time saying that there were 50,000 "movements" at Artarmon station each week. This was not a reference to the high use of the public toilets but to the total of people arriving at and departing the station. Let's see how she arrived at the 50,000 number. Using her own department's statistics, the total number of average daily movements was 9,440. Multiply that figure by the number of weekdays in the week (five) and the answer is 47,200. Add some weekend users and, voila, we reach the 50,000 mark or so. Now let us re-examine the number who signed the petition handed to the Minister in January - 4,720. Assuming about the same people arrived at and departed from the station each week, 25,000 customers came and went yet only 4,720 people stopped to sign the petition. Could it be argued that only about 20% of rail users signed the petition?

The Minister told the press that the previous Labor Government had placed Artarmon station as priority No. 4 on the "list of most critical" stations but she "overhauled the process" and up popped up Artarmon station.⁴⁵⁵ In July, 2014, the public was invited to inspect the plans and supporting documents for the proposed, improved access.⁴⁵⁶ One of the first things the signatories to the petition noted was that their recommended single lift in the subway was not extensively mentioned. In fact, it was hardly mentioned at all, being noted as one paragraph in 100 pages of text.

⁴⁵⁴ *North Shore Times*, 6th May, 2014.

⁴⁵⁵ *Ibid.*

⁴⁵⁶ *North Shore Times*, 23rd July, 2014.

Not everyone was happy with the proposed design. Those Artarmon residents confined to wheelchairs did not care about the architectural component of the proposed facility. All that mattered to them was access and that view is most understandable. However, the proposed design of the project resulted in a high level of community dissatisfaction.

The Artarmon Progress Association had put in a submission to Transport for NSW and recommended, in accordance with the January petition, for a single lift between the subway and the platform. The Association referred to a similar project in 1998 using a single lift in the subway at Springwood station. While that was a good example to use as a precedent, it was not the best example Association could have used. The far better example was the outcome at Summer Hill station in 2002. In that case, there was a massive, local protest about proposal to provide Easy Access by the construction of a new footbridge, which was totally out of scale with the local, built environment. In the end, the then Minister for Transport approved the use of lifts connected to the existing subway rather than the construction of a new footbridge. The better outcome was only achieved by the preparation and presentation of a case of strong, learned, local resistance supported by professional advice to the protest group. The people of Summer Hill did not want a similar outcome to what had occurred at Ashfield in 1997. At that station, a new overhead concourse and building were approved on a scale that was far too big for the adjacent urban area.

So upset was the Artarmon Progress Association that it used the following words to describe the bridge – “white elephant”, “failure”, “monolith”, “completely inappropriate”, “industrial”, “unsympathetic” and “adverse”.⁴⁵⁷ The Association stated that the scale of the bridge was completely out of character with the local streetscape, had an adverse visual impact on the commercial centre of Artarmon and negatively impacted upon the gardens. In relation to the railway station, the Association correctly said that “the tall lift structure towers over the heritage character of the station are completely inappropriate” and that the bridge was “not a solution for Artarmon station.” That was not the entirety of the criticism by the Association. The Association thought that the design chosen by Transport for NSW had something related to the future consideration of the need to quadruplicate the rail tracks between Chatswood and St. Leonards. They suggested this explanation as the lift bridge only served the western side of the station, leaving the eastern side, which had been earmarked for quadruplication for almost 100 years, as a clean canvass. Who knows? Just as the 1900 subway was built to serve only the western side but later extended five years later, perhaps this may occur also with the bridge?

⁴⁵⁷ A copy of the submission is at www.artarmonprogress.org.au. A photograph of the lifts and lift bridge is in *Railway Digest*, January, 2016, p. 16.

There is a common thread that links the construction of the 1900 subway to the western side only and the construction of the lift bridge also to the western side only. The common link for both projects was the ease of construction. The easiest option will always be the selected option for the provision of station infrastructure in the New South Wales Railway administration.

Two urban planners, Jane-Francis Kelly and Paul Donegan, might have had the experience of Artarmon station in mind when they wrote in 2015 that “there is a big mismatch between what communities want and what governments are doing.”⁴⁵⁸ They also stated that “our politicians and public servants respond to difficult politics by offering easy answers.....”⁴⁵⁹ So a little bit of political science goes a long way to help understand why optimum solutions were replaced by tokenism. One senior officer in the railway industry wrote that “ease of construction seems to win out again and again over good design.”⁴⁶⁰ There was also one additional factor that explains what happened. While Sydney Trains operates the urban railway system including stations, it is not the construction authority for new works, this being within the ambit of another bureaucratic entity entitled, Transport for New South Wales. So what comes from bureaucratic competition and an absence of genuine inter-departmental consultation? The engineering dominance of Transport for New South Wales displayed in the Artarmon lift bridge has come from a lack of understanding about the high heritage values of Artarmon station. What has happened is not the fault of Sydney Trains.

Willoughby City Council also protested about the design but, from previous knowledge within the transport portfolio about Council’s ability to act and protest, the Transport for NSW officials probably considered that local protest action would probably go no further than a mild and unsustained protest.⁴⁶¹ What was not made known in July, 2014, to the public about the invitation to make submissions to the provision of improved access was the dominant purpose of the exercise. Consultation with local communities only takes place to determine the strength of the local community opposition to what is proposed. It is similar to one Cabinet Minister leaking information about another Cabinet Minister’s proposal in order to test the nature and strength of the community opposition. Although the Artarmon Progress Association was 100% correct in its assessment, there was no other opposition of sufficient power to thwart what Transport for NSW wanted to do. The invitation to make public submissions did achieve what Transport for NSW desired – to tick the box about community consultation and to gain intelligence in relation as to

⁴⁵⁸ J. Kelly and P. Donegan, *City Limits – Why Australian Cities are Broken and How We Can Fix Them*, Melbourne University Press, 2015, p. 137.

⁴⁵⁹ Ibid., p. 130.

⁴⁶⁰ Oral comment to author 26th April, 2016.

⁴⁶¹ *North Shore Times*, 15th January, 2016, p. 1.

who or what organisation had sufficient power to thwart the outcome desired by the bureaucrats.

Work appeared to commence in early 2015 with Sydney firm GartnerRose being the head contractor. The architectural firm was the Caldis Cook Group. Both organisations had an extensive involvement in “upgrading” Sydney’s stations. Work was completed in early December, 2015. As far as is known, no official opening took place. One wonders why not? The answer need not be expressed.

At the start of the project in 2015, all the station signage was blue and white but, at the end of the project, all the signage was orange with white lettering. GartnerRose listed the following as interesting features of the project:

- the prefabrication of most of the structural elements off-site,
- the provision of “emergency egress stairs”,
- the support of the structure on Hampden Road side on piles to a depth of 12 m,
- the raising of the surface of Hampden Road,
- the provision of a new disabled parking bay,
- the installation of a kiosk on the platform for use by staff, &
- increase in the power supply to the station.

GartnerRose should have checked the difference between what was stated in the official propaganda and what was actually provided. No kiosk was ever installed on the platform.⁴⁶²

The use of high-rise buildings on railway land at North Sydney, St. Leonards and Chatswood has allowed other stations, including Artarmon, to escape the impact of high-rise development of the airspace above and around the stations – until now. In the case of North Sydney, St. Leonards and Chatswood, the ambience and relationship of the modern railway stations with their immediate physical settings are now in parallel with the harsh appearance of big city property development. The absence of the lift bridge on the eastern side of Artarmon station may be related to the possible future high-rise development rather than track amplification.

If the visual displeasure caused by the lift bridge were not sufficient, Transport for NSW has placed a huge and repulsive “T” emblem on the Hampden Road side of the structure. Other examples are now popping up where the big “T” is being added to existing footbridges and lift towers. The application of this treatment to Artarmon station is amongst the first examples of such hideous mis-use of the current corporate symbol

⁴⁶² Inspection of the station and discussion with officials on 27th April, 2016.

on the Sydney rail system. The symbol could double as a target for archery practice and this possible double use of the signage could be interpreted as having a double meaning – corporate symbol and archery target - and, therefore be an intended expression of Post-Modernist design.

There are three aspects of the lift bridge that combine to reduce the heritage values of the station site. These are:

- The excessive scale of the facility,
- The brightness of the galvanised steel finish of the metal work, &
- The presence of the “T” symbol.

As well as each of the above factors combining to reduce the heritage values of the station, they individually draw the human eye to the facility. In other words, the lift bridge directs attention away from the former subdued nature of the landscape and station access towards the very large, very bright and very unattractive station “improvement.” Two of the aspects can be addressed to help reduce the adverse impact of the lift bridge. These are the painting of the structure in a suitable dark green colour and the removal of the “T” symbol.

Of the 16 intermediate stations between Wynyard and Hornsby, eight have lifts and eight do not. Interestingly, six of the eight are located between Milsons Point and Chatswood. Ramped access is available at Wollstonecraft, though it is non-conforming with a gradient of one in six. So every station between Wynyard and Chatswood has lift access but, on the north side of Chatswood, of the ten stations, only three have lifts (Lindfield, Gordon and Turramurra). Once again, it seems, the boundary of the North Shore line has been redefined into Lower and Upper parts based on station accessibility and structural unattractiveness, which all stations from Chatswood southward share. So, the boundary has once again shifted back to Chatswood. Once again, Artarmon station has been relocated back to its pre-1916 link with the Lower North Shore. Between 1916 and 2014, Artarmon station shared with virtually all other stations to the north the attractions of a beautiful platform building and garden setting. Now, with the poorly designed lift access, Artarmon is associated with the other unattractive, modern stations to the south and form the newly-defined Lower North Shore.⁴⁶³

OFFICIAL ENCOURAGEMENT HELPS ARTARMON COMMUTERS TO “BEAT THE SYSTEM”

⁴⁶³ The buildings at Waverton look old but they are fakes and are replica structures dating from 1993.

Another interesting policy decision was announced in late 2014 and reflected the full capacity of the Member of Parliament for Willoughby to help commuters using the Sydney railway system. Gladys Berejiklian, as Minister for Transport, announced in September, 2014, that she backed commuters to “manipulate their travel” to get the best possible deal from their Opal card, notwithstanding the arrangement was depriving the Government of legitimate revenue. She was quoted as stating that she wanted “people to beat the system”.

Andrew Constance, the politician who followed Ms Berejiklian into the Transport portfolio, did not agree with his predecessor’s policy and sentiment. He used words such as “unfair” and “cheating” to describe the arrangements allowed by the former Minister. In April, 2016, Constance changed the Opal card rules to remove the mis-use and rort.⁴⁶⁴

THE CLOSURE OF THE ARTARMON TICKET WINDOW

From the 1st February, 2016, the government put the knife further into customer goodwill by closing all ticket windows at Artarmon and every other station so that no longer did railway staff issue tickets. Now, staff, if they are in attendance, simply point customers to the automatic ticket vending machines and, if requested, will provide change to operate the ticket machine. Back in 1982, the General Manager of the Paris Transport Authority wrote the following words about the importance of the customer:

“We learnt that everything must be done to ensure that the passenger feels that he (and she) is really being looked after, welcomed, and guided on the journey; it is important that the transport environment is familiar to him (and to her) so that he (and she) notices the liveliness and vivacity of his (and her) surroundings.”⁴⁶⁵

Perhaps the customer was important in Paris but not in Sydney. Railway staff have clearly got the message from the State Government that they are unimportant and not part of any future plan for Sydney’s urban rail system. All positions of Station Manager have been abolished. Virtually all positions of ticket-selling staff have been eradicated. Next, it was the turn of railway retirees in 2016 to learn that the value of their former service had been revised and downgraded to unimportant. Retired staff with 30 years

⁴⁶⁴ See *Sydney Morning Herald*, 8th September, 2014 and 25th November, 2014 and *Railway Digest*, May, 2016, p. 11.

⁴⁶⁵ P. Essig, “Station Design Tailored to Suit Operating Changes”, *International Railway Gazette*, January, 1982, p. 36.

of service used to receive a “Gold Pass” for free rail travel in recognition of loyal service. The Government did not support the use of the word “gold” to apply to railway retirees and re-allocated the word to a new type of Opal card for older Australians. In March, 2016, the old railway retirees were informed that their Opal card would simply be named as an “Employee Opal Card”, a title which was incorrect in fact as they were retired. Gone were the golden days.

Unfortunately, all the Railway architects who would have appreciated the notion that station design should be welcoming have been removed from the organisation. Politicians might hide information and propagate misinformation but there is no denying that what they approve and build is evidence of the way they think. The horrible lift bridge at Artarmon is the evidence that neither the State Government, the Minister for Transport, the local Member of Parliament and the myriad of bureaucrats sincerely want to look after, welcome and guide railway customers. The evidence at Artarmon suggests that everyone involved in urban transport policy development and implementation think that delivering a product, i.e. the lift bridge, is a sufficient replacement for delivering the best possible product, i.e. a single lift from the subway. What a monument to money wasted and power abused!

In 1994, CityRail had issued a strategic transport plan for Sydney to the year 2016. Now, in 2016, it is timely to have a look at the 1994 glossy brochure. No one really expected the New South Wales Government to build the promised new rail line from Parramatta to Hornsby via Epping or a new railway line serving Sydney’s second airport at Badgery’s Creek. The failure to implement those projects by 2016 is no surprise. What is a surprise in 2016 that was not envisaged in 1994 was the existence of more than one type of railway system. The propaganda in 1994 argued the case for what was called “heavy rail” and cited roads system as the only alternative form of transport. The New South Wales Government in 2016 is working on another form of rail, called Metro rail.

Brian Langton, the then Minister for Transport, sacked the head of CityRail, Lucio Di Bartolomeo, in July, 1995, on the basis that Langton was going to re-organise Sydney’s public transport management and re-introduce the concept of the 1972 Public Transport Commission to combine bus with rail management. Of course that re-organisation did not occur. Perhaps Langton did not like or believe what he read in the 1994 strategic plan and gave the CityRail head the flick? The reported, “real” reason was that Di Bartolomeo had been appointed by the former Fahey conservative government.⁴⁶⁶ Something else that did not occur 1995 was Premier Bob Carr’s commitment to

⁴⁶⁶ *Sydney Morning Herald*, 27th July, 1995, p. 7.

“establish a new public transport authority as a forum of CEOs to co-ordinate timetables and ticketing.”⁴⁶⁷ What a pity that the idea went nowhere as Carr said:

“The community will benefit because improved co-ordination between trains, ferries and public and private buses will mean better services for commuters.”

In 2016, the New South Wales Government is converting the heavy rail into light rail on the already closed the branch line between Broadmeadow and Newcastle as an example of light rail or what were once called trams. What has light rail got to do with Artarmon? The new railway line from Sydney’s North West to Chatswood, presently under construction, will involve the conversion of the existing heavy rail line between Epping and Chatswood using the Metro style of infrastructure and operations. That railway line is proposed to be extended from Chatswood through Artarmon to the City, then to Sydenham and involves the conversion of the existing heavy rail line from Sydenham to Bankstown for use by Metro rail. We will have to wait and see whether Artarmon is served by both the existing heavy rail station and a Metro rail station and what both will look like in the years ahead.

⁴⁶⁷ SRA, Staff Report No. 124, 25th August, 1995, unpublished internal document.

33 ARTARMON STATION TODAY - WHY STUDY IT?

A walk on the platform today sees a building of much the same length as it was in 1916, minus the signal box component at the Hornsby end. The roof length is the same and some brickwork in the centre is original. However, a considerable amount of new fabric has been added to both ends. The two public waiting rooms and two large public toilets are gone. The building ends have been altered not once but several times. However, despite the alterations, the building still reflects some original fabric, including:

- some external brickwork, with tuckpointing,
- the original roof alignment,
- bracketed platform canopies attached to the building walls,
- the stepped nature of the floor,
- fenestration,
- some internal glazing &
- some joinery

The physical location of the station remains as it was in 1916. The station is on a steepish gradient, which is reflected by the three different floor levels inside the building. Even today in its present form, there are steps down from the former booking office into the entrance corridor, dropping 300mm and down again 150mm into the former Station Master's office. Interestingly, this tripping hazard also existed in the building when it was located at Old Glenbrook. Perhaps the change in floor levels was a factor that made the relocation of the building at Old Glenbrook more attractive.

Inside the Artarmon building, the ambient air temperature is warm and there is a constant, audible humming sound. These features have developed in the last 10-15 years with the introduction of a considerable amount of electronic equipment, which is housed within the offices. At a time when governments are introducing measures to reduce the impact of global warming, Sydney Trains is amplifying the role of and increasing the dependency on electric power to power the extensive range of gadgets introduced supposedly to improve the delivery of rail services. It is noteworthy that the contractor, GartnerRose, which carried out the work for the lift bridge, stated that the station was already working to capacity of the electrical system before construction commenced.

Today, Artarmon station shows a lot of “new” fabric, including

- Extensive platform canopies,
- New bins, seats & signs in latest corporate colours,
- New technology relating to ticket selling and communications,
- A single, uni-sex/accessible public toilet,
- Staff toilet & staff food preparation facilities,
- New signage,
- Multiple ticket machines located on the platform,
- A designated space for the former Station Manager inside the building, &
- The addition of lifts.

Some of the alterations, especially at the Hornsby end of the building, have not been undertaken with a high level of care. This poor workmanship reflects RailCorp's reduced staffing levels at the supervisory level to monitor the work of external contractors. Generally speaking, work designed and undertaken by employees of the railway organisation has a much higher level of execution than alterations designed and executed by external parties. Only an external observer could make such a public statement but it does not matter much in 2016 as there is no paid staff in Sydney Trains/Transport for NSW employed to undertake physical building alterations.

The whole area around Artarmon is a mirror of what has happened to Sydney generally as the city moves from an industrial base to a service orientation. The blue-collar workers have gone from the St. Leonards brick pits. Now, St. Leonards has a "technopark" in Herbert Street and commuters have their own Metro bus – the M20. The suburb of Artarmon has been a part of the change and is now listed as playing an important part as one of the centres for the Australian film industry.⁴⁶⁸

The most significant feature that the Artarmon building shows of the 1982-2011 period was the extent to which the local staff were recognised as an important element in building design. When provided in 1916, there was no staff toilet, no facilities to cook or eat food, no privacy to change clothes, no provision for security against harmful customers, no protection for non-smokers against smoking staff and no consideration of other occupational health and safety matters. All of these have been addressed to varying degrees in the past two decades and the building today at Artarmon is a significant heritage structure because it manifests the degraded values of the modern, urban railway in Sydney. It changed from a building for customers to a building for staff. There are only a few pockets of public service in NSW where unions have been very influential in the design and implementation of government policy. The Railways was one of them. It was a power related to the ability to take strike action that was capable

⁴⁶⁸ M. Long, "Screen Industries and the Cultural Economy of Sydney", in R. Freestone et al (Eds.), *Talking About Sydney*, Sydney, University of NSW press, 2006, p. 166

of stopping train services – something the unions did many times in the past. The power of the unions used to be reflected in the continued existence of station staff. What has happened to reduce or even eliminate front-line station staff today can be interpreted as pay-back by conservative governments.

Over the past 20 years there has been an erosion of staff functions by a series of policies, including:

- Customer-activated, automatic ticket vending machines,
- Computer-generated, automated platform announcements,
- contract cleaning,
- contract collection of money from the sale of tickets,
- computer controlled train indicator boards,
- roving security officers,
- the elimination of most of the platform vegetation &
- the abandonment of ticket checking by platform staff.

The amazing thing about Artarmon station is that the 1916 structure survives today. It was the power of the unions, the authority of the Wran Labor Government and the passion of the 1980-86 Chief Executive, David Hill, who can be thanked for this achievement. Sadly, the unions have now lost the fight, the Labor Party is out of office and David Hill has gone. No longer is it possible for a commuter to purchase a ticket from staff at the ticket window. Probably, all staff will be removed from the station and sooner than later.

The building at Artarmon is of value to the historian because it shows the way the policies and practices of the building's owner and operator are conveyed by fabric. It is not necessary for the official paper file to have survived because the historian is able to interpret the fabric of the structure. The Artarmon building is particularly important because it was built by taxpayer funds and operates under public funding. It was once an expression of social habits and mores, as interpreted by railway bureaucrats. The historian looks at the building and considers the extent of social, industrial and management factors that are reflected by the fabric.

No longer does the building serve customer needs in the provision of waiting rooms and toilet arrangements capable of accommodating more than a single passenger. Is this what society in general and commuters in particular desire? If so, it confirms the 2005 survey that showed that the building possessed little interest for travellers. It is the service – trains – that is far more important to most customers. Artarmon station building, just like any other structure, plays the role of a photograph at a point in time

and acts as a yardstick to indicate whether some of yesterday's railway policies and practices might just be more helpful than those of today.

The study of the history of Artarmon demonstrates that, what seems to be an ordinary, everyday looking structure, is both an interesting and significant asset of Australian culture and, more narrowly perceived, Sydney society. It also shows that observation of changes at a single station tell the story of much broader strategies and policies affecting the whole rail network, the political structure of New South Wales and the people served by the station. Artarmon, hopefully, will long be a “nice little station” for those who wish to learn from the past.⁴⁶⁹

Artarmon station is owned and managed by a state government organisation that has existed in various forms for over 150 years. Values play a very important part of the development of the railway organisation. Up until the dissolution of the Department of Railways in 1972, there was a very strong bond that existed amongst the 50,000 or so employees of the organisation. The major change for the employees has been the employer's intentional erosion of the worth of the staff's accumulated knowledge. From 1972, older employees have been continually regarded as less useful than external new recruits promoted directly to senior positions. Up until 1972, the most junior member of the staff new that all the senior staff had undertaken the dirtiest jobs at the worst hours with minimal rewards. That arrangement engendered a respect by officers for staff at all levels. That respect is now significantly eroded and is largely replaced by distrust or contempt or both. The result has been poor staff morale.⁴⁷⁰ It is the review of the values of the railway organisation over the past 35 years that suggests poor morale will continue unless there is a major turnaround in the owner's value of the importance of face-to-face, staff-customer contact.

Despite low morale, new senior recruits have the opportunity to demonstrate their perceived abilities by introducing new policy initiatives - change. Because of the low level of corporate past knowledge, many things introduced as a new concept have been attempted before. For this reason, it is likely that a new recruit will attempt to promote the development of air rights over Artarmon station. It has been on the agenda previously. In 1998, State Rail advertised for expressions of interest for air right developments at 35 suburban stations, including Artarmon. There was public protest and the then local Parliamentary Member, Peter Collins, announced that the Parliamentary Opposition would not sell the airspace above the station. Nothing happened. Nothing will happen as long as the air space above the station is more expensive than the land surrounding it. Being on a curve, on a gradient and on an embankment, these features make the site not as attractive as other locations. In the

⁴⁶⁹ Comment by regular Artarmon commuter, Michael Hare, 5th September, 2002.

⁴⁷⁰ *Railway Digest*, Vol. 46 No. 9, September 2008, p.17

50 years since the start of air right development, relatively few locations have been affected by air right initiatives.

There is a message in the pervasiveness of the concept of change and the absence of stability in the official jargon of the rail administration since 1972. At the same time, the evidence of the building fabric shows that stability is as equally important as is change to Artarmon station. It is the official words that are out of kilter with reality. The changes that have been made to the fabric and function of the station have resulted in a dehumanising impact on the relationship between staff and passengers. Staff once walked on the platform to do the following duties:

- Collect tickets on arrival of trains at the top of the stairs,
- Attend accidents on the platform,
- Talk to anti-social customers about the impact of their conduct,
- Flag the departure of all trains,
- Make announcements to waiting passengers,
- Transfer parcels between the Parcels Office and trains,
- Empty rubbish bins,
- Sweep the platform surface,
- Tend to plants on platform,
- Take fare revenue to local bank,
- Change the platform indicators advising of next train times &
- Walk to and from toilets.

Most of these traditional railway functions have disappeared and, with them, contact between staff and customers has been greatly reduced. This has helped create the appearance of a faceless railway bureaucracy. In line with the decrease in the presence of staff on platforms, RailCorp has increased platform security measures, including:

- Increasing the number of “transit officers” from 201 in 2003 to 600 in 2007 and later transfer of the patrol function to the State Police Department,
- Increasing the number of CCTV cameras at stations to 6,400,
- The allocation of more than 300 Police officers to patrol stations and trains with enhanced powers to search commuters,
- Using CCTV cameras in trains
- Installing more than 700 “Help Points”,
- Providing 7,000 high intensity platform lights,
- Using blue lights in toilets as an anti-drug measure,

- The adoption of anti-graffiti strategies,
- The introduction of drug and alcohol testing of staff,
- Eliminating late night & early morning trains &
- Changing the style of toilets from an open arrangement to separate cubicles to eliminate occupation by more than one person

The history of building alterations from 1980 is one in which the dominant factor was the intent by management to lower operational costs. However, a reluctance by the rail organisation to discuss proposals in a genuine manner with stakeholders before undertaking the alterations was a recipe for conflict. The outcome has been angry commuters, upset local council and frustrated staff. It would be nice to think that such lack of consultation is in the past. The way alterations were made, unmade and remade at Artarmon identifies a pattern in which planning for the good of people, other than for the good of rail managers, appears absent. Artarmon building today is a monument to departmental desire to cut costs through smaller buildings and the use of electronic equipment to replace staff. The historian learns not to believe some words expressed by politicians and bureaucrats. The study of Artarmon station is a lesson in understanding the power and priorities of government, as manifested by the building fabric.

The examination of the past time relating to Artarmon station makes for a wise student. It demonstrates that the facility is a means by which government power, in this case financial and economic power, is used. In addition to the expression of power, the station also shows part of the way in which the citizens are controlled – through the appearance of care for commuters. Sadly, the New South Wales Government has not revealed its motives for the removal of local staff, the withdrawal of facilities and the once pleasant ambience of the station. There are two motives behind the Government policy. The first motive is to make the Sydney rail system appear like Metro systems in large, overseas cities. In other words, to make Sydney seem more international in appearance so that the rail system has a similarity and familiarity to overseas visitors, compared with other large centres in Europe, Asia and North America. The present government in New South Wales possibly read a book published in 2004 which rated Sydney as a global city, but with a restricted status. The author wrote:

“Sydney, as the one city to be placed among the leading global cities based solely on housing centres of cultural industries (i.e. not economic industries), appears to be an anomaly.”⁴⁷¹

⁴⁷¹ M. Abrahamson, *Global Cities*, Oxford University Press, New York, 2004, p. 165.

That status of being a centre of cultural industries was related to the fact that Sydney was the home of *News Corp*, which is the owner of the *Fox Network*.⁴⁷² The position with public transport was not improving over the years. The present Government would have also noted a 2008 press headline that Sydney was “not quite a global player.”⁴⁷³ The reason why that was claimed to be so was that “not only has “the city’s transport network deteriorated in recent years but it compares badly with other global cities....”⁴⁷⁴

The second motive to remove most staff from Artarmon station, reduce customer services and lower the heritage values of the place is an assumption that most Sydney Trains employees are members of a trade union and, thus, more likely to support the Labor Party. Fewer staff means a reduction in the potential power of the unions and an increase in the power of the Liberal/National Government.

In short, the study of Artarmon railway station and the North Shore line is a study of the way power and money have been used for the alleged good of the community. It is the way democracy really works.

The study of Artarmon provides an insight into what is happening with urban life generally in Sydney. The removal of the former face-to-face contact between staff and customers is reflective of the broader social isolation and loss of personal contact between people in a big city. With the elimination of the platform landscaping that once made the station attractive; with the addition of the intrusive platform shelters; with the provision of the lift bridge and with the automation of everything that can be automated, commuters might start to believe that customer service by Sydney Trains is not a top priority of the NSW Government. Commuters just might be helped to think about this aspect when they cannot get on board a train already filled by people from the NorthWest Metro, or their trains are late or slow, or they cannot use the single-use public toilet on the platform or get a drink of free water from the former bubbler.

Future time will certainly reveal the next event in the history of Artarmon station.

⁴⁷² Ibid., p. 156.

⁴⁷³ W. Frew, “We’re Not Quite a Global Player”, *Essential Sydney*, special supplement in Sydney Morning Herald, 23rd October, 2008, p. 18.

⁴⁷⁴ Ibid., p. 19.

34 – STATIONS OF THE STATION - A SELF-GUIDED TOUR AROUND THE STATION SITE

This final chapter lists the visible features of the station. It is a walking tour starting on the platform that precedes in an anticlockwise direction around the site. Each of the ten places to see something has been called a station.

STATION 1 - SYDNEY END OF THE PLATFORM BUILDING

- six pairs of back-to-back platform seats with station name plates attached to the rear of the seats in the new corporate colours of orange and white – installed 2015,
- latest style of transparent garbage bins that allow staff to view the contents of the receptacles – installed 2015,
- the total absence of vegetation on the platform,
- the height of both platforms about 100mm below the floor level of train carriages,
- the over-abundance of vegetation on the fences on the corridor boundaries, &
- the store at the end of the building numbered “7” with vent for storage of wet and dry stores, the door marking the entrance to the former male toilet. Male toilets were traditionally placed as far as possible from the platform entry point and the entrance to the female toilet around the Hornsby-bound platform side of the building, &
- The platform end does not join in an elegant tip as in the 1890s but has been squared off.

STATION 2A - NO. 1 PLATFORM SIDE OF THE BUILDING

- The bizarre location of parts of awning brackets near ceiling level on the external wall at the Sydney end,
- Symmetry of awning brackets, except at the Hornsby end where major alterations were made in 1982 and 1989,
- The existence of two former ticket windows, one using a conventional window, with change tray still in place covered by bars and the other window covered by a roller shutter,
- Door No. 1 at the Hornsby end providing access to the former booking office, &
- The contrast between the 1916 Flemish bond of the brickwork and the alterations at both ends using Stretcher bond brickwork.

STATION 2B - NO. 2 PLATFORM SIDE OF THE BUILDING

- Door No. 9 to the “Toilets”, which is a single uni-sex/accessible toilet,
- Remnant tuck-pointing on Flemish bond brickwork,
- the colour pattern platform train indicators – old or new

STATION 3 - HORNSBY END OF THE PLATFORM BUILDING

- The 1994 bullet-proof ticket window
- The awning extension from the building to the brick columns marks the position of the former, timber-clad signal box,
- The vertical brick columns that used to held the platform train indicators from 1989,
- The crowded appearance of the area with multiple machinery,
- The narrowness of the platform width, &
- One single pair of back-to-back platform seats.

STATION 4 - TOP OF THE STAIRS

- The 1989 “Station Sparkle” platform canopy between the stairs and the building,
- The buttons in the lifts that call the deck of the footbridge a “concourse”
- Door No. 17 at the rear of the lift (note the numbers chosen for the doors – 1, 7, 9 & 17)
- Opal card readers poorly located at top of stairs, obstructing people using the handrails for stability

STATION 5 - BOTTON OF THE STAIRS – THE 1900 SUBWAY

- the narrowness of the subway,
- the shortness of the subway,
- the minimal vertical distance between the floor of the subway and the platform (25 steps),
- the use of arches for overhead support,
- the absence of the 1982 mural by Malcolm King, &
- the steep gradient on the eastern side.

STATION 6 - THE BACKLIT CORPORATE LOGO SIGN ON HAMPDEN ROAD

- The plaque in the pavement with details of the station – there are three errors in the text.
 1. the building from the first Artarmon station site in 1898 was not relocated to the second site in 1908. It is possible that some components of the first

- building were located to the second site but it would have occurred in 1900 when the second site opened,
2. electrification did not take five years to complete. Services were shared between 15th August, 1927, and 10th June, 1928, between steam and electric trains but the entire North Shore line was electrified at the one time, &
 3. the station was not relocated because the present site is level. The first site was on a steeper gradient of 1 in 45 and the second (present) site is on gradient of 1 in 69. The present site presented easier conditions for starting and stopping trains.
- The sandstone caps to the brick pillars at the subway entrance,
 - The distance from Central – 10.412 kilometres on the left-side brick pillar,
 - Steps to the garden built by Charles Wickham, &
 - Absence of 1938 bubbler commemorated to Charles Wickham,

STATION 7 - THE GARDENS, OPPOSITE BROUGHTON STREET

- the unattractive large “T” the framework of the lift bridge,
- the division of the Charles Wickham garden in two distinct areas – flowers and bushes in the front and lawn at the rear, &
- the extensive high-rise development.

STATION 8 - 1929 SYDNEY END SUBWAY, WESTERN SIDE

- The extensive application of “wall art” (subway maintained by Willoughby Council),
- The flat subway ceiling formed by mass concrete on timber boards, &
- a good interpretation of the construction of the railway line on the side of a ridge is facilitated by the height of the embankment and the lower levels of the natural ground on both sides of the subway

STATION 9 - LANDSCAPING AT EASTERN SIDE 1929 SUBWAY PORTAL

- The secluded location of the subway entrance, &
- The jungle of Artarmon Reserve

STATION 10 - SUBWAY ENTRANCE, EASTERN SIDE

- The steep gradient to reach the subway,
- Sandstone capping on wing walls, &
- Local map showing the streets naming after senior Railway officers including Eddy, Goodchap, Fehon and Oliver.

Stuart Sharp

28th July, 2016

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A number of people were interviewed in the course of this study and they are acknowledged in the text.

Bob McKillop was kind enough to read an initial version of the text and his effort is gratefully acknowledged.

A METHODOLOGY

FOR THE PREPARATION OF A HISTORY OF ARTARMON RAILWAY STATION AND THE NORTH SHORE RAILWAY

WHAT COMPRISES THE METHODOLOGY?

Methodology in the discipline of history includes three components which may seem strange but they are central to the way historical research is undertaken. These are:

1. the selection of the topic to be examined,
2. the methods (as opposed to the methodology) engaged in the study of the topic and the evidence.
3. the pursuit of evidence to be included in the examination, &

It is the selected topic that plays a major role in the scope of a study, the nature and extent of evidence and the form of presentation. For instance, a history of woop-woop will probably result in a linear, descriptive narrative whereas an investigation of factors leading to the development of woop-woop may more likely result in a widespread analysis of local, regional and national factors.

In addition to the above three seemingly unusual components, historical methodology also covers four further components, namely:

4. evidence classification,
5. evidence interpretation,
6. examination of the system of socio-economic and other philosophic principles that underpin the broad context in which the topic exists, &
7. issues related to the author of the study.

These seven components of methodology are expanded below. For each component, tables are provided which indicate the general aspect of the component and its application to the study of Artarmon railway station.

1. THE TOPIC

The topic of research is a component of the methodology as it determines the type of evidence to be examined.

GENERAL ASPECT TO BE CONSIDERED	THE APPLICATION OF THE GENERAL ASPECT TO THE STUDY OF ARTARMON STATION
---------------------------------	--

GENERAL ASPECT TO BE CONSIDERED	THE APPLICATION OF THE GENERAL ASPECT TO THE STUDY OF ARTARMON STATION
<p>What is the reason for choosing the topic?</p>	<p>The author has an interest in railways and especially in relation to the design of station buildings. The study examines a typical, small to medium suburban railway station, of which Artarmon station is typical, and examine its origin and development in the context of the overall New South Wales railway system.</p> <p>Why the North Shore of Sydney and the North Shore railway? Because the land there commenced to be developed later than other areas of Sydney directly as a result of the difficulty of public transport and, more than other areas of Sydney, the history of land use history of the railway are closely linked.</p> <p>On purpose, the study avoids the examination of a large station, such as Chatswood, and of a junction station, such as Hornsby.</p> <p>The study aims to examine the passenger catchment for the station and to assess whether the station met the passenger needs it was intended to serve.</p> <p>The station at Artarmon is also examined as an integral part of the North Shore Railway line.</p> <p>There were three unusual features about Artarmon station building. These were:</p> <p>1 the only known instance of a brick platform building having been initially erected at another location (i.e. Glenbrook), dismantled and relocated to another position, namely Artarmon.</p>

GENERAL ASPECT TO BE CONSIDERED	THE APPLICATION OF THE GENERAL ASPECT TO THE STUDY OF ARTARMON STATION
	<p>2 Artarmon station was at one time the division point for the Railway Department between the Lower and Upper North Shore. The study intends to examine why it will build this role and why stopped fulfilling this role.</p> <p>3 Artarmon station was also the first station which was subjected to the "Station Sparkle" program of City Rail in 1989. The reason for this selection is examined.</p> <p>The above three unusual features make Artarmon station an interesting topic because it provides the opportunity to examine both the ordinary life of a Sydney suburban railway station and a station with some extraordinary features.</p>
Selecting and defining any physical, temporal and other aspect to the study	<p>The physical site is defined as Brand Street in the North, Hamden Road in the West, Elizabeth Street in the East and the subway under the railway corridor joining Barrow Road and Hamden Road in the South.</p> <p>Time period selected is between 1880 and 2008. This is based on the range of dates that interest the author. Consideration will be given to extending the time period to 2016 to take into account the impact of the conversion of the Chatswood-Epping line to Metro style operations and the installation of lifts at Artarmon station.</p>
Finding and refining, if necessary, the key questions/issues to be investigated	<p>The conduct of an initial reading of the evidence, sorting of the evidence followed by a sustained review of the evidence focused on development of trends and the themes and, lastly, an assessment of the issues raised and not raised in the evidence.</p>

GENERAL ASPECT TO BE CONSIDERED	THE APPLICATION OF THE GENERAL ASPECT TO THE STUDY OF ARTARMON STATION
	After examining the evidence, consideration is given to the existence of any themes or patterns of interpretation or absence of themes and patterns. The question of changing, replacing or refining the key question/s is considered at that stage.

2. THE METHODS OF RESEARCH

In this document, a distinction is made between method and methodology. The word, “method”, is one component of methodology. Historical methods are the means by which the research is undertaken and the evidence collected. It denotes the different types of ways to investigate the topic.

GENERAL ASPECT TO BE CONSIDERED	THE APPLICATION OF THE GENERAL ASPECT TO THE STUDY OF ARTARMON STATION
Review of published material on the topic	All known published material to be considered
Examination of official Railway documents and other sources	All official detailed records of the station do not survive. The main surviving records available to the public are plans for the various buildings. Newspapers and other available reports will be examined.
Site inspection	Eight visits to the station have been from 1980 and one further visit will be undertaken
Photographs	All known photographs are examined, including those of the author
Interviews with current and retired staff and other knowledgeable local residents	Various staff members have been interviewed over the last 30 years, as well as key members of the Willoughby Historical Society. No retired staff have been located.
Discussions with knowledgeable peers	Select members of the ARHS have been undertaken, namely Bob McKillop, Ken Winney, John Beckhaus and Ian Brady

GENERAL ASPECT TO BE CONSIDERED	THE APPLICATION OF THE GENERAL ASPECT TO THE STUDY OF ARTARMON STATION
Preparation of surveys	One survey was undertaken in 2002 of passengers waiting on the platform for an AM peak hour train to the Sydney CBD
Examination of the records of organisation which had an influence on the topic	Some records of Willoughby City Council were examined, as well as surviving material from the Artarmon Progress Committee

3. THE PURSUIT OF EVIDENCE

The extent of evidence that potentially may be examined can range from almost nothing to an endless supply of documentation.

GENERAL ASPECT TO BE CONSIDERED	THE APPLICATION OF THE GENERAL ASPECT TO THE STUDY OF ARTARMON STATION
Nature of evidence to be included in the study	All, surviving, official Railway documents and select, non-official evidence. Non-official evidence is selected on the basis of the significance of the event to the topic, e.g. land sales involving multiple allotments are included but individual allotment sales are excluded
Evidence examined but excluded from the study. This includes two types of exclusion – 1 conscious exclusion of minor, irrelevant matters and - 2 unconscious exclusion of matters due to the personal bias of the author	Minor, day-to-day staff activities, such as a failure to start work on time or minor disciplinary events, crime including fraud by individual staff and burglary by non-staff. The author is aware of the issues related to unconsciously ignoring some evidence
Evidence excluded from the study	By conscious decision, accidents involving individual people who caused their own demise, such as injury or death caused by illegally crossing railway lines or tripping or falling over on station premises and minor criminal cases will be excluded

The absence of extensive evidence has significant implications for the study of Artarmon railway station. These individual methods do not give a detailed account of the history of Artarmon station. The reality is that it is impossible to recreate what may be expressed as the “the feel and smell” of railways, i.e. the very essence and experience of railway operations. No history will represent adequately or correctly the impact of dirty and corrosive smoke from steam locomotives nor the smell of brake dust from both steam and electric traction from trains to Sydney stopping on the falling gradient at Artarmon. No history will indicate the range of staff attitudes, from the very pleasant and helpful officers to the staff with rude and discourteous behaviour.

4. EVIDENCE CLASSIFICATION

GENERAL ASPECT TO BE CONSIDERED	THE APPLICATION OF THE GENERAL ASPECT TO THE STUDY OF ARTARMON STATION
Disaggregation of the evidence to the topic	<p>The evidence is sorted initially into the following categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provision of infrastructure, • train service, • fares, • gardens, • staff <p>The evidence is then sorted according to the extent of its relevancy to the growth and development of the local railway infrastructure and the degree to which the evidence demonstrates relevancy to the people living near and using the station.</p>
Is the evidence credible?	All evidence is checked as far as possible for credibility but it must be remembered that credibility is related to the person asking the question and the person or group which is the subject of the evidence.
Determination of the relevancy of the evidence to the topic	<p>The evidence is sorted initially into the following categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provision of infrastructure, • train service, • fares, • gardens, • staff

GENERAL ASPECT TO BE CONSIDERED	THE APPLICATION OF THE GENERAL ASPECT TO THE STUDY OF ARTARMON STATION
	The evidence is then sorted according to the extent of its relevancy to the growth and development of the local railway infrastructure and the degree to which the evidence demonstrates relevancy to the people living near and using the station.
Investigation of the details of relevant fixed infrastructure	Surviving building elements closely examined to establish extent of evidentiary, physical material
Interpretation of non-evidence – explaining the gaps in the evidence	an investigation of the overall history of suburban or country railways or the history of freight services
Interpretation of the insufficiency of the evidence	application of known published history of NSW railway history generally and knowledge and experience of the author

5. EVIDENCE INTERPRETATION

The major component of a methodology, in terms of critical importance, is the way the evidence is interpreted, as well as the way the absence of evidence is interpreted.

GENERAL ASPECT TO BE CONSIDERED	THE APPLICATION OF THE GENERAL ASPECT TO THE STUDY OF ARTARMON STATION
Interpretation is related in part to the skills and bias of the author	Author aware of the potential to skewer interpretation based on skills, prejudice and passion
The consideration of the topic <i>in vacuo</i> . This involves investigation of the topic contrast against the concept of a theoretical ideal notion of what the topic should be, not contrasted against other similar topics.	Adoption of a theoretical, normative position and determination of the station's origin and development, compared against the theoretical concept of a NSW railway station
The allocation of the dictionary meanings, or face value, of the words in the evidence	Words, phrases and sentences examined according to their everyday nominal meanings and placed in the context of other railway stations on the North Shore line and elsewhere on the NSW rail system

GENERAL ASPECT TO BE CONSIDERED	THE APPLICATION OF THE GENERAL ASPECT TO THE STUDY OF ARTARMON STATION
The allocation of significance of the evidence	it is acknowledged that significance is dependent the item in question and who is asked the question
Interpretation based on the knowledge that any aspect of a railway system is an integrated part of that system and requires examination in the context of the total rail system and also in the context of a non-rail environment	this study examines the horizontal or spatial context using an ever-expanding geographic regional context; making a comparison with other railway stations in the area or elsewhere and, ultimately, the state-wide rail system
Railways are what economists called a derived demand and exist because of the need to provide freight and passenger transport and the topic requires consideration of its various roles, including functional and symbolic.	Artarmon station examined to the extent it served the needs of the catchment population both as a functional facility and an architectural statue for the suburban of Artarmon.
The treatment of the evidence of rail accidents and staff misbehaviour couched as practical joking	All material, including accidents and miss behaviour, integrated into the main text and not treated as appendices
Determination of the form of the presentation of the evidence, such as description, linear narrative, thematic approach or some other idea, such as a memoir, an historical fiction, journalistic style, an interview style, a question and answer style, a tabular format or some or all of the above	<p>The form of the presentation will be a narrative in chronological form using the seven components set out in the methodology expressed in this paper.</p> <p>The presentation will provide the carriage of a concept that the curriculum for teaching the discipline of history should focus on the methodological process set out in this paper rather than product, i.e. teaching skills through hands-on research rather than reading texts.</p> <p>Although the presentation will be a demonstration, no reference to the concept will be mentioned in the final document. The objective years to demonstrate the concept in an applied form.</p>
Ensuring that every sentence in the work addresses the key question/s and provides an interpretation of evidence	The central feature of the study, namely the interaction between the station and the physical, social, economic, political

GENERAL ASPECT TO BE CONSIDERED	THE APPLICATION OF THE GENERAL ASPECT TO THE STUDY OF ARTARMON STATION
that systematically leads to a conclusion	catchment in which it exists, is placed on a piece of paper adjoining the keyboard and acts as a constant reminder of the need for sustained and accurate interpretation of the evidence and non-evidence

6. EXAMINATION OF THE SYSTEM OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC AND OTHER PHILOSOPHIC PRINCIPLES THAT UNDERPIN THE BROAD CONTEXT IN WHICH THE TOPIC EXISTS

This component, like component number 4, relates to the way the evidence is interpreted but the evidence in component number 5 requires much more than an ability to read the words in the evidence. It requires interpretation of what may be described as the secondary level of the evidence and concerns the various philosophic and theoretical frameworks in which the evidence was written, was preserved and is read and interpreted.

GENERAL ASPECT TO BE CONSIDERED	THE APPLICATION OF THE GENERAL ASPECT TO THE STUDY OF ARTARMON STATION
The vertical context - the evidence is viewed, not in regard to what is said about the topic, but in the context of the theories and philosophies in which the Railway organisation lists, such as the political ownership of the New South Wales Railways	Artarmon station is viewed as a tiny part of the NSW Railway organisation and, as such, subject to and reflective of the culture of that body. The relevance of the social, economic and political context in which the station exists for, more correctly, which underpins the station is examined.
The examination of words used in the evidence and the knowledge of the outcome of subsequent history to assess whether the evidence reflected reality or was tendentious. Do the words used in the evidence reflect the reality of the time?	The words used in the evidence are carefully examined as a totality in order to interpret the subliminal messages which they convey in relation to the broad spectrum of social, economic and political philosophies extant at the time. It is the weight and value of each word that is considered important as well as the superficial language used about the topic.
What does the evidence indicate about	The evidence is examined in the context

GENERAL ASPECT TO BE CONSIDERED	THE APPLICATION OF THE GENERAL ASPECT TO THE STUDY OF ARTARMON STATION
<p>subjects and issues that are not the subject of the evidence, such as the culture of the NSW Railway organisation, pressure group activity or prevailing social attitudes.</p> <p>In other words, what are the <u>messages and symbolism and storyline</u> conveyed by the evidence as a totality, as opposed to a dissection of the evidence into single words, phrases and sentences, in the evidence.</p>	<p>of its time especially in regard to the power of the Railway Commissioners, which varied over time. The same applies to specific pressure groups and pressure group activity generally, especially the Artarmon Progress Association and Willoughby Municipal Council. There is a substantial amount of indirect evidence that relates the nature of social attitudes, particularly in regard to the treatment of women.</p>
<p>the determination of meaning of the evidence, based on consideration of why particular evidence survived and other evidence did not survive</p>	<p>It is kept in mind that surviving, official evidence has survived for a ridiculous reason, namely to convey what was seen as the sustained progress of both the Railway organisation and the social, economic and political frameworks that changed over time.</p>

7. AUTHOR ISSUES

The conduct of research and especially its quality is dependent on a number of issues that relate not to the topic nor to the evidence but to the person reading and interpreting the evidence about the topic.

GENERAL ASPECT TO BE CONSIDERED	THE APPLICATION OF THE GENERAL ASPECT TO THE STUDY OF ARTARMON STATION
<p>The extent of evidence to be examined, the amount of time to undertake the research and the effort to consider various interpretations, are subject to the motive for undertaking the research.</p> <p>Research based on a financial budget will not produce comprehensive results.</p>	<p>The motive for undertaking the Artarmon project is the presentation of a study that is the expression of a conscious, written methodology, as outlined in this paper. Since payment is not involved, there is no limit on the author's time.</p> <p>There is no financial reward to the author and no time pressure for the completion of the study.</p>
<p>Conscious awareness of the complex issues that surround historiography and</p>	<p>The motive for the study of Artarmon station is to demonstrate the benefits of</p>

GENERAL ASPECT TO BE CONSIDERED	THE APPLICATION OF THE GENERAL ASPECT TO THE STUDY OF ARTARMON STATION
social theories.	the sustained application of a methodology that embraces historiography and social theories.
The selection and use of a methodology for application to the topic.	The issues set out in this paper provide the methodology that will be applied to the study of Artarmon railway station.
<p>The objective of the research and the means by which to address bias and balance.</p> <p>Research aimed at supporting a particular ideology will not be free of bias.</p>	<p>The objective is to demonstrate that a conscious methodology has the benefit of addressing author bias as well as a balance of interpretation.</p> <p>The author is free of any bias associated with the geographic area of Artarmon.</p>
The manner in which decisions are made about causation and interpretation of evidence	<p>The author is aware about the complexities associated with the application of causation and the many complications that can be associated with evidence.</p> <p>The words “therefore”, “then” and “hence” will not be used in the study document.</p>
The author’s view of how the world works.	<p>The study is undertaken in the context of a secular, Western democracy with a capitalist-based economy.</p> <p>The author believes that the world works on two fundamental premises. One is the exercise of many different types of power at various levels and the second is the individual pursuit of money. A two-word summary of the history of Artarmon station would be power and money. The title of the study reflects the author’s view of how the world works.</p> <p>The author acknowledges the existence of some exceptions to the above belief.</p>
The way the author perceives time –	Time is connected with the past, the

GENERAL ASPECT TO BE CONSIDERED	THE APPLICATION OF THE GENERAL ASPECT TO THE STUDY OF ARTARMON STATION
<p>connected, partially connected or unconnected.</p>	<p>present and the future closely linked. No event in the present is totally free from events in the past and events in the present do have some role in the future. The author terms this connection a sopffulogical view of time (i.e. study of the past, present and future).</p> <p>The study of Artarmon focuses on opportunities that existed for people in which they could exercise power and their need for money. Opportunities are time periods in which people, using information from the past, make decisions in the present based on some consideration of possible events in the future.</p>
<p>Self-awareness of the educational training that affects not only the author but those who ensured the survival of those records and those who have prepared published histories.</p> <p>The author needs to be aware of being a conscious observer as well a participant in the manner in which he or she is involved in the historical process. In other words, is the author aware that his or her educational training may unconsciously format certain beliefs, understanding and interpretation in the veracity of the evidence?</p> <p>The application of a sound knowledge of the English language and a firm understanding of the historiographical options available to the author</p>	<p>The author understands the theoretical framework responsible for the survival of select data.</p> <p>He is also mindful that, not only is he examining all aspects of Artarmon station, he is part of the story through his role as a rail passenger and a passionate member and supporter of the Australian Railway Historical Society.</p> <p>The documentation will use the active voice in order to identify those who are exercising power and responsible for expenditure of money.</p>
<p>The degree to which the author is conscious of all methodological issues and the need for the existence or all</p>	<p>The author is so conscious and has designed the methodology for his analysis of Artarmon station to be</p>

GENERAL ASPECT TO BE CONSIDERED	THE APPLICATION OF THE GENERAL ASPECT TO THE STUDY OF ARTARMON STATION
otherwise of an expressed methodology	applied and obviously applied consistently throughout the written outcome.
An appreciation by the author that truth is elusive and that any conclusions may be more guesswork than correct	The author understands that truth is an ideal which may or may not be achieved and understands the multiplicity of issues related to the concept of truth.

Methodology is not just an obligatory chapter in a work but is a tool used by the author constantly in both the examination of the evidence and the expression of the interpretation of the evidence. In essence, the methodology is indispensable in the expression of every paragraph in the completed text.

THE THREE STAGES OF THE APPLICATION OF A METHODOLOGY

Most published books relating to methodologies in the discipline of history focus on the wide variety of subjects to be examined, the various types of evidence that may be examined, the way events are interpreted and a few philosophic aspects such as whether it is ever possible to know the “truth” or even all the relevant issues that may have existed which relate to the subject at the time under consideration. In most cases, existing texts on the subject of methodology are not of any use in a practical manner.

In this methodology, the seven components contain a total of 44 general aspects for consideration and it is impossible in the way they are set out above to engage them in a practical manner. They are set out roughly in the order in which they would apply to any research, starting with selection of the topic, moving to evidence collection and interpretation and, finally, documentation. The largest number of general aspects of methodology requiring consideration are those that apply to the author and these 11 aspects are not engaged at the end of the study but in various stages throughout the research and writing.

History is not a discipline where the researcher has a single sheet of paper by her/his side as she/he decides on the topic, examines evidence and writes the text setting out the methodology. It seems that there is greater likelihood that the concept of a methodology will receive greater use in it is divided into three groups of components to be applied at different times. The first three components – selecting the topic, choosing the methods and pursuing the evidence – need to be considered initially before work begins. At this first stage, some general aspects relating to the author need

consideration. For instance, if the author is being paid to carry out the research, the author will decide at that time the following issues:

- the motive for undertaking the project,
- precisely what of the topic will be examined, including what questions will be asked,
- the selection of a methodology,
- how many hours of research will be devoted to each of the methods and to the various forms of evidence,
- acknowledge what evidence will be consciously and unconsciously omitted or disregarded,
- appreciate the author's responsibility to avoid bias,
- admit that the quest for truth is unobtainable.

The classification and interpretation of evidence form a second stage which also involves general aspects relating to the author. Included in this stage are:

- the concept of causation,
- the way the evidence is interpreted,
- the author's notion about how the world works,
- the author's idea about the connection or non-connection of the past, present and future,
- the impact of the level of education on the interpretation of data.
- The ability of the author to understand both the stated and understated meanings of words and messages,
- the author's ability to interpret the underlying socio-economic and other issues require addressing during the gathering of evidence.

The third stage in the application of a methodology involves documentation and review of the documentation. In this final stage, the general aspects relating to the author are:

- decision on the form of presentation,
- application of a sound education relating to the English language and a firm understanding of the historiographical options available to the author,
- acknowledgement that any conclusions are based only on surviving evidence and that other conclusions are also probably correct.

There are two issues where it is virtually impossible to escape hard-wired mental bias. The first is the author's selection and non-selection of items of evidence. Vincent wrote that "history is about evidence, but only about evidence we approval. Evidence we

disapprove of mind may as well not exist.”⁴⁷⁵ The second is the search for a concept called “objective truth”. There is no way any author can be totally objective and it is a fruitless exercise because the historian will never be in a position to know what truly happened in relation to a certain event.

Stuart Sharp

28th July, 2016

APPENDICES

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX NO	TITLE	PAGE
1	Artarmon Station – Chronological List of Events	272
2	Artarmon Railway Station – No. of Sydney Bound Trains Stopping between 0730-0830 1898-2002	279
3	Passenger Structures Planned on the North Shore Railway Stations 1930-1980, except Artarmon	281
4	Passenger Structures Planned on the Sydney Rail Network 1930-1980, except North Shore line	285
5	Summary of Sydney passenger Station Developments 1930-1980	301
6	Passenger Structures Planned on the Intercity Rail Network 1930-1980	302
7	Passenger Structures Planned on the Rural Rail Network Between Goulburn & Albury 1930-1980	311

⁴⁷⁵ J. Vincent, *An Intelligent Person's Guide to History*, Third Ed., London, Duckworth, 2006, p. 28.

APPENDIX NO	TITLE	PAGE
8	New Station Buildings in Rural NSW (except Goulburn-Albury) 1930-1980	313
9	Freight Structures Planned between Goulburn- Albury 1930-1980	314
10	New or replacement Freight Infrastructure in NSW (except Goulburn-Albury) 1930-1980	315
11	Construction of Bulk Wheat Silos in NSW 1930- 1980	316
12	Freight Centre Constructed in NSW 1970-1980	320
13	Acquisition of Freight Rollingstock 1930-1980	321
14	Acquisition of Electric Passenger Rollingstock for Sydney 1930-1980	325
15	Electrification of Existing Railway Lines 1930-1980	327
16	Delivery of electric Parcel Vans 1930-1980	328
17	Introduction of New Passenger Rollingstock for Rural Rail Services 1930-1980	329
18	New Rail Lines Opened in NSW 1930-1980	332

APPENDIX 1

ARTARMON STATION – CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF EVENTS

DATE OF CHANGE	NATURE OF PROPOSED CHANGE	PROPOSED CHANGE IMPLEMENTED – YES OR NO?
1881	First trial survey of the line	Yes
1882	Second trial survey of the line	Yes
September, 1884	Parliamentary approval for the plans and drawings	Yes
September, 1884-March, 1885	Both houses of Parliament pass legislation to allow construction	Yes
12 th October, 1885	Tenders called for the first time	No
24 th June, 1887	Tender of Edward Pritchard accepted	Yes
7 th June, 1887	Tenders closed for a second time	Yes
10 th August, 1887	Turning of the first sod	Yes
8 th July, 1888	Commissioner for Railways issues public notice for the intention to proceed with construction	Yes
24 th July, 1888	Royal Assent received for the allocation of funds	Yes
31 st December, 1888	Date for line to be completed	No
1 st December, 1889	First report of the Parliamentary Standing Works Committee for the extension of the line	No
1 st January, 1890	Opening of the North Shore railway between Hornsby & St. Leonards	Yes
21 st August, 1890	Second report of the Parliamentary Standing Works Committee for the extension of the line	Yes
26 th November, 1890	Royal Assent given to	Yes

DATE OF CHANGE	NATURE OF PROPOSED CHANGE	PROPOSED CHANGE IMPLEMENTED – YES OR NO?
	extend the line to Milsons Point	
1.5.1893	Opening of the rail line between St. Leonards & Milsons Point	Yes
29.10.1894	Locations identified for Artarmon station	Yes
6.7.1898	Opening of station	Yes
7.10.1900 (some sources say 17.10.1900)	New site to the west selected for station & conversion of station into an island platform upon duplication of the line – new platform building built & first subway constructed (not extended to eastern side) – Platform length 400' Waiting shed only on platform	Yes
17.10.1903	Proposed extension of subway to eastern side	Yes
9.1907	Proposed new platform building Quadruplication of rail lines proposed for 1 st time	No
1908	Opening of signal box to control local train movements	Yes
1909	One of only 29 suburban stations to receive a free public telephone	Unknown
1912	Whole of North Shore line duplicated providing most efficient train running for Artarmon	Yes
4.10.1912	Proposal approved to erect a new platform building	No
10.5.1913	Crown land 66' wide on eastern side nominated for acquisition for proposed quadruplication	Not acquired

DATE OF CHANGE	NATURE OF PROPOSED CHANGE	PROPOSED CHANGE IMPLEMENTED – YES OR NO?
10.2.1916	New platform building erected at the southern end of the then existing structure – new subway provided, using Fibro “slates” on roof	yes
8.2.1916	Plan drawn for the junction near Artarmon of a branch railway to the Field-of-Mars Cemetery	No
8.9.1916	Proposed provision of a booking office in existing subway	No
19.9.1916	Replacement subway planned between existing subway and platform building incorporating new booking office and “booking hall” – closure of subway at northern end of platform (“to be filled in”)	No
12.10.1923	1 st proposal for a subway at the southern end of the platform - Provision made for 2 nd platform at Artarmon and quadruplication of rail lines for 2 nd time	No
24.1.1924	2 nd proposal for a subway at the southern end of the platform - Provision made for 2 nd platform at Artarmon and quadruplication of rail lines for 2 nd time	No
16.12.1926	Proposed 2 nd platform at Artarmon - Proposed relocation of booking office to northern subway between new 3 rd & 4 th rail lines	No
1926	3 rd proposal for	No

DATE OF CHANGE	NATURE OF PROPOSED CHANGE	PROPOSED CHANGE IMPLEMENTED – YES OR NO?
	quadruplication of rail lines	
1926	Land acquired on eastern side for quadruplication	Yes
15.8.1927	Electrification of train services – stanchions built on platform	Yes
1927	Erection of Fibrolite troughing along railway to accommodate cables for automatic signalling	Yes
21.12.1928	Closure of signal box and introduction of automatic signalling	Yes
18.10.1928	Extension of platform from 430' to 520' to hold eight car electric trains – Lamp Room moved from ramp at southern end to northern side of northern subway Platform face on western side made of timber & on eastern side made of “standard concrete units”	Yes
9.5.1928	Land nominated for acquisition to “avoid building retaining wall” paralleling Elizabeth Street	No
1929	3 rd proposal for a subway at southern end of station	Yes
1.7.1929	Steps proposed from new subway at southern end to platform – Allowance made for track quadruplication	No
6.6.1930	Willoughby Municipal Council agrees to clean and light the subway at the southern end of the station	Yes
21.3.1938	Laneway access provided on eastern side behind shops in a southerly	Yes

DATE OF CHANGE	NATURE OF PROPOSED CHANGE	PROPOSED CHANGE IMPLEMENTED – YES OR NO?
	direction	
16.12.1940	Willoughby Municipal Council given a right of way over railway property for entry on eastern side	Yes
1940	Willoughby Municipal Council granted permission to place a seat on railway property on western side	Yes
1946	Asphalting of platform surface	Yes
1950	Provision of a shelter shed for porter adjacent to ticket barrier (plan approved on 20.12.1946)	Yes
31.7.1952	4 th plan for quadruplication of rail lines	No
10.1965	Regarding of rail line through station to ease gradient from 1 in 70 to 1 in 60 – subway lowered 4.8”	Yes
1974	Chief Commissioner, Phillip Shirley, advocates quadruplication of rail lines (5 th time)	No
1980	New telephone installed – one of 25 approved	Yes
1982	Signal box removed and building shortened by 7’4” – two ticket windows placed in the northern end of the building	Yes
1982	Artist, Malcolm King, paints mural on walls of subway entrance	Yes
1987	Closure of Parcels Office & end of parcels service	Yes
September, 1989	Application of the “Station Sparkle” programme – most visible by use of red paint on all surfaces, other than face brickwork	Yes

DATE OF CHANGE	NATURE OF PROPOSED CHANGE	PROPOSED CHANGE IMPLEMENTED – YES OR NO?
	Platform canopy built between subway and platform building Store in ceiling cavity built	
1989	Elimination of all public toilets & waiting rooms New ticket collection barrier placed at top of stairs	Yes
1990	Light-box signs provided at entrances to subway	Yes
1991	Provision of separate male and female public toilets	Yes
1993	Automatic ticket vending machines provided on platform	Yes
1994	Standard work-stations and bullet-proof glass fitted in ticket office & arrangement of ticket windows altered to provide one in the northern end of the building & one on the eastern side of the structure	Yes
1995	“Help Point” provided	Yes
24.1.1996	Platform offices air-conditioned and staff toilet relocated	Yes
1998	Expressions of interest for air-right development over Artarmon station	No (Responses received worth pursuing)
1998	Red paint replaced by blue and green colours – replacement of station nameboards	Yes
2000	Provision of a help Point	Yes
2001	17 CCTV cameras installed in subway and on platform	Yes
11.2.2004	Track drainage through station upgraded	Yes
1.5.2004	Platform canopy on down side reduced in width by 245mm & platform cut back	Yes

DATE OF CHANGE	NATURE OF PROPOSED CHANGE	PROPOSED CHANGE IMPLEMENTED – YES OR NO?
	150mm to comply with new structure gauge for rollingstock (up side canopy also cut back to maintain overall symmetrical appearance)	
2004	Red paint from “Station Sparkle” programme replaced by green, except for train indicator boards	Yes
17.11.2005	Quadruplication of rail lines announced for 5 th time (between Chatswood & St. Leonards only)	To be implemented
2006	New store & unisex toilet added to southern end of building, replacing separate male & female public toilets – store in ceiling cavity removed & new store at platform level provided	To be implemented
2006	Removal of asbestos from building fabric	Yes
2010	Blue and white nameplates affixed to rear of platform seats	Yes
2012	Public timetables removed from external walls of platform building	Yes
2013	Position of Station Manager eliminated; “T” signs replaced “L7” logo at subway entrances	Yes
2015	Provision of lifts between street and platform	Yes
1 st February, 2016	Sale of tickets at the ticket office window ceased	Yes

APPENDIX 2

ARTARMON RAILWAY STATION NUMBER OF SYDNEY BOUND TRAINS STOPPING BETWEEN 0730 & 0830

MONDAY-FRIDAY

1898-2007

YEAR	NO. OF TRAINS
1898	1
1908	2
1913	4
1916	4
1919	5
1921	7
1931	9
1941	12
1951	13
1960	11
1971	10
1981	13
1989	13
1990	11
1993	8
1999	10

YEAR	NO. OF TRAINS
2000	10
2000 (special timetable for Sydney Olympic Games)	11
2002	8
2007	14

SOURCES: Official timetables, various dates

APPENDIX 3

WORKS AT NORTH SHORE RAILWAY STATIONS 1930-1980, EXCEPT ARTARMON

STATION	YEAR	WORKS	COMMENT
MILSONS POINT	1932	Opening of station	In conjunction with Sydney Harbour Bridge
NORTH SYDNEY	1932	Opening of station	In conjunction with Sydney Harbour Bridge
	1938	Provision of bookstall on overbridge for the NSW Bookstall Co. Ltd.	
	1964	Two high-rise buildings using air-space over station	Proposed by Project Development Corp. Ltd. – not built at that stage
	1971	Travelodge Hotel air-right development at south end	First major high-rise over a rail station in NSW (constructed 1975)
WAVERTON	1948	New brick waiting shed on Hornsby bound platform	Required after run-away train demolished previous timber shed
	1962	Toilet block erected on Sydney bound platform	Previous facilities on overbridge too small
WOLLSTONECRAFT	1938	Provision of ticket collector's cabin	
	1938	Provision of bookstall on platform No. 1 for the NSW Bookstall Co. Ltd.	
	1978	Brick buildings erected on both platforms	Replaced original 1893 buildings
ST. LEONARDS	1936	Centralized booking office provided over tracks	Fronted Pacific Highway

STATION	YEAR	WORKS	COMMENT
	1938	Conversion of former booking office into newsagent	Carried out for NSW Bookstall Co.
	1948	Extension of centralized booking office	Need for increased shelf area for parcels traffic
	1956	Additional ticket office inserted in centralized booking office	Increased ticket windows from two to three
	1972	New brick building replaced 1893 timber building on Hornsby bound platform	
CHATSWOOD	1938	New parcels office & bookstall on overbridge	
	1943	New brick parcels office erected to cater for wartime traffic for Naval depots on Middle Head	
ROSEVILLE	1934	Erection of ticket collector's booth	For use of Porter collecting tickets in the rain
	1939	Separate Parcels Office provided by elimination of General Waiting Room – ticket window placed at southern end of building	No Parcels Office provided in original 1909 building (check to see if date is not 1901)
	1944	New ticket office proposed for foot of stairs – thought not to have been built	Proposed to either expand Parcels Office or provide a new General Waiting Room
	1975	New ticket office built at foot of stairs – external walls of metal siding – demolished in 1987	
LINDFIELD	1932	Provision of a bookstall on	Oral comment indicates that a

STATION	YEAR	WORKS	COMMENT
		overbridge for the NSW Bookstall Co.	similar facility was built at Artarmon but no other evidence has to date been located
KILLARA	1934	Relocation of bookstall from platform to overhead bridge	Required removal of out-of shed
	1936	Provision of small awning over entrance to bookstall	This is the only North Shore station not associated with adjacent commercial development (check)
	1938	Erection of ticket collector's cabin	For use by Porter to collect tickets
GORDON	1934	Provision of a concrete floor in Ladies' toilet	
	1938	Provision of bookstall on overbridge	
PYMBLE	1938	Erection of ticket collector's cabin	
	1938	Relocation of bookstall from platform to overhead bridge	Done at the request of the Pymble community Service Club
	1944	Conversion of General Waiting Room in an enlarged Parcels Office	
	1945	Asphalting of platform between bottom of steps and platform building	
TURRAMURRA	1938	Erection of ticket collector's cabin	
WARRAWEE	1938	Erection of ticket collector's cabin	
	1944	Additional space for the storage of parcels	

STATION	YEAR	WORKS	COMMENT
WAHROONGA	1938	Erection of ticket collector's cabin	
	1944	Additional space for storage of parcels	
	1954	Connection of the station to the sewer main	
WAITARA	1936	Extension of platform	
	1938	Erection of ticket collector's cabin	
	1946	New ticket office proposed for foot of stairs	Not built

APPENDIX 4

STRUCTURES PLANNED ON THE SYDNEY RAIL NETWORK, EXCEPT FOR THE NORTH SHORE LINE BETWEEN 1930 AND 1980, IN CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER

YEAR PLAN APPROVED	LINE AND STATION	NATURE OF CONSTRUCTION	COMMENT
1930	Jannali Illawarra line	New platform buildings	New station - constructed in timber
1934	Redfern Main Western line	Additional booking office at corner of Lawson & Gibbons Streets	Not built
1934	Redfern Main Western line	Provision of a "parcels shed" on No. 5 platform	
1934	Thornleigh Main Northern line	Additional of ladies waiting room and ladies toilet to existing timber building & corrugated iron men's toilet near end on platform No. 1	At this time, it was mandatory to provide an ante-chamber to the ladies toilet – hence, the ladies' waiting room
1934	Hurlstone Park Bankstown line	Provision of bookstall on overbridge	
1934	Concord West Main Northern line	8' wide awning added to timber building on No. 2 platform	
1935	Dulwich Hill Bankstown line	New platform building & overhead booking office	Replaced timber building
1935	Canley Vale Main Southern line	Provision of 10' wide bracketed awning on No. 1 platform building	Replaced narrower awning formed by extended roof rafters
1935	Pennant Hills Main North line	Replacement timber building on no. 1 platform	Previous timber building destroyed by

YEAR PLAN APPROVED	LINE AND STATION	NATURE OF CONSTRUCTION	COMMENT
			fire
1936	Thornleigh Main Northern line	Addition of booking office to one room timber shed to No. 2 platform	
1936	Denistone Main Northern line	New platform buildings & overhead booking office	New station – first requested by Ryde Municipal Council in 1930
1937	Belmore Sydenham-Bankstown line	Timber overhead booking & parcels office	New installation – to replace facilities on platform
1937	Guildford Main Southern line	Booking office on No. 2 platform	Plan has notation “no further action....owing to expenditure involved 22/6/38”
1937	Yennora Main Southern line	Provision of timber waiting shed on No. 2 platform	1 st time a waiting shed was provided on the platform
1937	Blacktown Main Western line	Timber shelter shed erected under existing awning on island platform	
1937	Circular Quay City Circle	New building at new station	Not built
1937-39	Kirrawee Gymea Miranda Carringbah Woolaware Cronulla Cronulla line	New stations built	New rail line
1938	Eastwood Main North line	New buildings	Replaced timber buildings – old timber booking office transferred to Wollongong

YEAR PLAN APPROVED	LINE AND STATION	NATURE OF CONSTRUCTION	COMMENT
1938	Wiley Park Bankstown line	New station	Paid for by Canterbury Municipal Council
1938	Parramatta Main Western line	1 st addition to 1924 parcels office on No. 4 platform	
1938	Auburn Main Western line	Provision of bookstall in subway for the NSW Bookstall Co. Ltd.	
1938	Merrylands Main Southern line	Provision of bookstall on platform No. 1 for the NSW Bookstall Co. Ltd.	
1938	Concord West Main Northern line	Provision of bookstall on overbridge for the NSW Bookstall Co. Ltd.	
1938	Burwood Main Western line	Shelters for ticket collectors	
1939	East Richmond Richmond line	New station	Small timber building
1939	Granville Main Western line	Cabin for ticket collector & awning extension on No. 2 platform	
1939	Ingleburn Main Southern line	An additional off- platform ticket/parcels office placed adjacent to No. 1 platform	To serve nearby Army camp
1939	Quakers Hill Richmond line	Replacement for small building	"temporary" timber building at new site
1939	Central	Extension of awning over No. 2 Parcels Dock	Behind NO. 1 platform
1940	Merrylands Granville- Liverpool line	Large brick structure on No. 2 platform	Replaced timber building – brick building proposed for No. 2 platform

YEAR PLAN APPROVED	LINE AND STATION	NATURE OF CONSTRUCTION	COMMENT
			not built
1940	Granville Main Western line	Conversion of part of General Waiting Room on No. 1 platform into Traffic Inspector's office	Traffic Inspector's former office on No. 2 platform becomes a "Parcels Store"
1940	Cheltenham Main Northern line	Proposed new building for No. 1 platform	Not built
1940	Regent Street (Mortuary) Central	Conversion of former mortuary station into parcels office	For increase in traffic due to World War Two
1940	Bankstown Bankstown line	Bookstall provided on overhead bridge	
1940	Central	Provision of Military Canteen	
1941	Central	Extension of RAAF office	For Railway Transport Officer (who allocates seats on trains for military personnel)
1941	Clarendon Richmond line	New station	Small timber building
1941	Leightonfield Cabramatta-Regents Park line	New buildings at new station to serve nearby "No. 3 Explosive Factory"	
1941	Ropes Creek St. Marys-Ropes Creek branch	New station on new line built by Commonwealth Government for World War 2 function	Although timber, heavy investment allocated to signalling the site
1941	Granville Main Western line	Cabin for ticket collector erected on western overbridge	
1942	Dunheved St. Marys-Ropes Creek branch	Built to serve World War 2 American Ammunitions Factory	Large timber building

YEAR PLAN APPROVED	LINE AND STATION	NATURE OF CONSTRUCTION	COMMENT
1942	Merrylands Main Southern line	Provision of booking & parcels offices on No. 2 platform	Added to existing timber waiting room
1942	Parramatta Main western line	First part of the track quadruplication between Granville & St. Marys – additional booking office facilities on No. 1 platform & conversion of booking office on No. 2/3 platform into porters' room	Done to serve trains proceeding to the St. Marys American stores in World War 2
1942	Rhodes Main Northern line	12' x 10' waiting room & booking office constructed on No. 2 platform	
1942	Warwick Farm Main Southern line	Small temporary timber booking offices 8' x 6' on new platforms – previously, on a short platform existed on one side for training people to Warwick Farm Racecourse	Platforms provided to detrain American troops in World War 2 moving between train and USA Army camp at Racecourse
1943	Warwick Farm Main Southern line	Male toilet provided for No. 1 platform	
1943	Lidcombe Main Western line	New, brick parcels office on No. 4 platform	To replace facility on overhead bridge
1943-1945	Westmead Wentworthville Pendle Hill Toongabbie Seven Hills Doonside Rooty Hill Mount Druitt St. Marys No. ¾	Large brick buildings replaced a range of concrete, brick and timber structures on conjunction with quadruplication of line between Granville and St.	Done to serve trains proceeding to the St. Marys American stores in World War 2 – paid for by Commonwealth

YEAR PLAN APPROVED	LINE AND STATION	NATURE OF CONSTRUCTION	COMMENT
		Marys – buildings placed on all platforms, eliminating overhead booking offices	Government – former practice of centralized ticket offices above multiple tracks
1944	Rhodes Main Northern line	Large brick building proposed to replace 2 side platform buildings	Not built – new elevated signal box built but never brought into use
1944	Concord West Main Northern line	Two new island platform buildings to replace small timber buildings	For quadruplication - Not built
1944	Canley Vale Main Southern line	Parcels office proposed to be added to existing timber building on No. 1 platform	Not built
1944	Fairfield Main Southern line	Enlarged parcels office	
1944	Liverpool Main Southern line	New cabin for ticket collectors on footbridge	
1945	Warwick Farm Main Southern line	Proposed large timber buildings on both platforms to replace temporary booking offices on both platforms – awning on No. 1 platform also provided	Structure on platform No. 2 not built – large toilet block on platform No. 1 also not built – 1 st platform building in Sydney to use Fibro sheeting on external walls
1946	Cheltenham Main Northern line	Waiting room, ladies' waiting room & ladies toilet provided to No. 1 platform	Simple timber shed with mono-pitched roof
1946	Guildford Main Southern	Two ticket cabins erected	

YEAR PLAN APPROVED	LINE AND STATION	NATURE OF CONSTRUCTION	COMMENT
	line		
1946	Riverwood East Hills branch	New ticket/parcels office attached to eastern end of brick building	To serve newly created migrant hostel, which was formerly USA hospital
1946	Engadine Illawarra line	Out-of room converted into parcels/cloak room & relocated on No. 1 platform	
1947	Broadmeadow Main Northern line	Addition to parcels office on overbridge	
1947	Warwick Farm Main Southern line	Male/female toilet block on No. 1 platform	This was the toilet block deferred from 1945
1947	Croydon Main Western line	Provision of new parcels office	
1947	Parramatta Main Western line	2 nd addition to 1924 parcels office on No. 4 platform	1 st addition in 1938
1948	Canley Vale Main Southern line	Parcels office added to existing timber station building on No. 1 platform	
1948	Canley Vale Main Southern line	Ladies toilet added to existing timber building on No. 2 platform	
1948	Bankstown Sydenham- Bankstown line	New overhead booking office	
1948	Towradgi Illawarra line	Proposed timber buildings on both platforms	Not built
1948	Auburn Main Western line	Provision of Porter's cabin & seats on new, additional platform	No building erected on new platform
1948	Woy Woy Main Northern	Barrier shelter for ticket collector	

YEAR PLAN APPROVED	LINE AND STATION	NATURE OF CONSTRUCTION	COMMENT
	line		
1949	Towradgi Illawarra line	Proposed timber buildings on both platforms	Although of different design to 1948 proposal, not built
1949	Guildford Main Southern line	Booking office on No. 2 platform	Another attempt to establish booking office following failure in 1937
1950	Central	Expanded loading platform for "bulk parcels" at West Carriage Shed	
1950	Bankstown Sydenham-Bankstown line	Large parcels office erected on new site	Detached from platform
1950	Rydalmere Carlingford branch	New building on new island platform proposed	Not built
1950	Clyde Main Western line	New brick buildings on three island platforms & timber overhead booking office to replace one side & one island platform with a brick building	Not opened until '60
1950	Warwick Farm Main Southern line	Small timber waiting shed built on No. 2 platform	
1950	St. Marys Main Western line	Porter's cabin on platform Nos. 3 & 4	
1950-52	Granville Main Southern line	New overhead booking office, large brick buildings on two island platforms & separate parcels office	Not built until 1960
1950	Auburn Main Western	New subway, new platform & new	For Quadruplication

YEAR PLAN APPROVED	LINE AND STATION	NATURE OF CONSTRUCTION	COMMENT
	line	parcels lift	
1950	Harris Park Main Western line	Porter's cabin on No. 2 platform	
1952	Kingsgrove East Hills line	Removal of bicycle shed	Transferred to Thirroul locomotive depot
1954	Sydney Terminal	Creation of an Interstate Booking Office	Replaced former refreshment room
1955	Circular Quay City Circle	New station on completion of City Circle	Proposed since 1916
1955	Blacktown Main western line	Conversion of 1886 brick building into parcels office & new overhead booking office	
1955	Doonside Main Western line	Expansion of parcels office	
1955	Bardwell Park, Bexley North, Kingsgrove & Beverly Hills East Hills line	Bookstalls for overhead bridges for Dymocks Ltd	Built at Kingsgrove & Beverly Hills but unsure about other two
1956	St. Marys Main Western line	Transfer of parcels office from platform to goods shed	
1956	Redfern Main Western line	Provision of a "parcels depot" on Wilson Street	Detached from station & not served by rail access
1957	Circular Quay City Circle	Provision of a parcels "receiving depot"	
1957	Mt. Colah Main Northern line	New toilets proposed at both ends of 1 room waiting shed	Not built
1958	Mt. Colah Main Northern line	New brick toilet block detached from waiting room built	Toilets provided for 1 st time
1958	Cowan	New overhead	

YEAR PLAN APPROVED	LINE AND STATION	NATURE OF CONSTRUCTION	COMMENT
	Main Northern line	booking office on new island platform	Not built
1958	Woonona Illawarra line	Building on No. 2 platform transferred from Roslyn on Crookwell branch	Waiting room remained at Roslyn
1958	Clyde Main Western line	New buildings on one island & two side platforms & timber overhead booking office to replace one side & one island platforms platform 7 overhead ticket office	In conjunction with western quadruplication & electrification of Carlingford branch (check)
1959	Blacktown Main Western line	New overhead booking office with public toilets	Last station designed with a Ladies' Waiting Room as an ante-chamber
1959	Mt. Colah Main Northern line	Booking office attached to end of existing toilet block	
1960	Granville Main Western line	Multiple brick platform buildings for new station at new site & timber overhead booking office	Last of the stations to be built for WW2 quadruplication between Granville & St. Marys – last Inter-War Functionalist station to be built
1962	Normanhurst Main Northern line	“Blockwork” male/female toilet block built on No. 1 platform	Replaced timber facilities
1963	Pennant Hills Main Northern line	Replacement male toilets on each platform	Constructed in timber & attached to end of existing buildings
1963	Cheltenham Main Northern	Brick male/female toilets to replace	Toilets also connected to

YEAR PLAN APPROVED	LINE AND STATION	NATURE OF CONSTRUCTION	COMMENT
	line	timber toilets on No. 1 platform	sewer
1963	Loftus Illawarra line	New timber building for No. 1 platform	First time booking office provided
1963	Casula Main southern line	Proposed 4 room brick station building on No. 1 platform	Not built
1964	Blaxland Main Western line	Addition of a parcels office to western end of building	Flat roof – did not conform to existing building (check to see if built)
1964	Sydney Terminal	Modernization of the intrastate booking hall	1906 timber booking offices replaced
1965	Guildford Main Southern line	Large, brick building on No. 1 platform	Iconic structure marking transition to new classification of platform building
1965	Meadowbank Main Northern line	Addition of awning to No. 1 platform booking office	
1965	Hurstville Illawarra line	New concourse	Provided as part of the air-right development of the station
1966	West Ryde Main Northern line	New overhead booking office	
1967	Epping Main Northern line	New overhead booking office	Previous facility destroyed by fire
1967	Burwood Main Western line	Change room for female staff in kiosk (external metal siding)	Not built
1967	Campbelltown No. 3 platform	Large parcels office replaced 1858 brick	Terminal station for

YEAR PLAN APPROVED	LINE AND STATION	NATURE OF CONSTRUCTION	COMMENT
	Main Southern line	building	extension of electrification from Liverpool to Campbelltown
1967	Rosehill Carlingford branch	New male toilet built on No. 2 platform	
1968	Canley Vale Main Southern line	New station at new site proposed for quadruplication	Not built
1969	Burwood Main Western line	Change room for female staff in kiosk (external face brickwork)	Not built until 1974
1970	Museum City circle	Bookstall & kiosk on southern concourse	
1972	Como Illawarra line	New, brick building on a new platform	New site chosen for station following opening of new bridge over Georges River
1973	Canley Vale Main Southern line	Small, brick waiting shed built on no. 2 platform	
1974	Marayong Quakers Hill Schofields Richmond branch	Temporary, pre-fabricated buildings made of compressed foam material	Erected for opening of electrification to Riverstone – paid for by Commonwealth Government
1974	Asquith Main Northern line	New brick toilet block on No. 1 platform	Paid for by Commonwealth Government
1974	Mount Druitt Main Western Line	New station on new site	Paid for by developer of adjacent shopping centre
1975	Canley Vale Main Southern	New building on No. 1 platform erected	External walls made of metal

YEAR PLAN APPROVED	LINE AND STATION	NATURE OF CONSTRUCTION	COMMENT
	line		sheeting – paid for by Commonwealth Government
1975	Macquarie Fields Main southern line	New “temporary” building replaced timber structure on platform2	External walls made of metal sheeting – paid for by Commonwealth Government
1977	Ingleburn Main Southern line	New brick male/female toilet block provided on No, 1 platform	Paid for by Commonwealth Government
1977	Heathcote Illawarra line	New brick building replaced timber structure destroyed by fire	
1977	Camellia Carlingford branch	New brick male/female toilet provided to replace timber toilets	Paid for by Commonwealth Government (?)
1977	Telopea Carlingford branch	New brick male/female toilet block	Replaced existing timber toilet
1977	West Ryde Main Northern line	New toilet block to replace timber facility	Paid for by Commonwealth government
1977	Redfern (ESR) Central (ESR) Town Hall (ESR) Martin Place Kings Cross Edgecliff Bondi Junction	New stations for Martin Place, Kings Cross, Edgecliff & Bondi Junction as part of Eastern Suburbs Railway	Woollahra station not built to save expenditure (first additional to Sydney network since 1939, apart from WW2 Ropes Creek branch
1978	Hurstville Illawarra line	First time escalators provided for station access since Wynyard in 1932	1 st air-right development that was associated with the railway

YEAR PLAN APPROVED	LINE AND STATION	NATURE OF CONSTRUCTION	COMMENT
			concourse
1978	Burwood Main Western line	New brick building on platform 2/3 replaced timber building	
1978	Normanhurst Main Northern line	New brick buildings on both platforms	
1978	Meadowbank Main Northern line	New brick building to replace timber building on No. 2 platform	Replacement brick structure not planned for No. 1 platform until 1981
1978	Loftus Illawarra line	New brick buildings on both platforms to replace timber structures	No. 1 platform building demolished was only 15 years old
1978	Cheltenham Main Northern line	Brick buildings to replace timber structures on both platforms	
1978	Thornleigh Main Northern line	Provision of brick buildings to replace timber structures on both platforms	
1978	Warwick Farm Main Southern line	New brick buildings replace timber & fibro structures on both platforms	
1978	Blacktown Main Western line	New parcels office built separate from station	Replaced former brick 1887 building – last new parcels office built on the system
1979	Villawood Regents Park-Cabramatta line	Provision of brick ticket and parcels office to replace timber structure destroyed by fire	
1979	Glenfield Main Southern line	New brick male/female toilet block on No. 1	

YEAR PLAN APPROVED	LINE AND STATION	NATURE OF CONSTRUCTION	COMMENT
		platform	
1979	Hurlstone Park Sydenham-Bankstown line	New brick overhead ticket office and toilets proposed to replace timber facility	Not built
1979	Hurlstone Park Sydenham-Bankstown line	New brick overhead ticket office	Toilets removed from plan – built
1979	Carlton Illawarra line	New brick overhead ticket office and toilets proposed to replace timber facility destroyed by fire	Not built
1979	Carlton Illawarra line	New brick overhead ticket office	Toilets removed from plan – built
1979	Waterfall Illawarra line	Brick staff amenities block added to northern end of timber building	For train trains in connection with 1980 electrification between Sutherland and Waterfall
1979	Minto Main Southern line	New male/female toilet block provided on No. 1 platform	
1980	Harris Park Main Western line	New overhead ticket office & toilet block erected on overhead footbridge	Previous timber platform building destroyed by fire – 1980 structure designed to accommodate quadruplication of track
1980	Kingswood Main Western line	“demountable” booking & parcels office erected on No. 1 platform	External walls constructed of metal sheeting - to replace timber building
1980	Camellia Carlingford branch	New brick Station Master’s office & signal box built to	Adjoined to 1977 brick toilet block

YEAR PLAN APPROVED	LINE AND STATION	NATURE OF CONSTRUCTION	COMMENT
		replace timber structure	
1980	Carlingford Carlingford branch	Brick male/female toilet block	Abutted to existing timber structure
1980	Sydney Terminal	Modernization of the main concourse with new seating, 4 new concessions, conversion of interstate booking office into lounge, new flooring & new roof	Inquiry office & "Main in Blue" relocated to within the intrastate booking hall

SOURCES: plans in PTC, SRA, RIC & RailCorp Plan Room

APPENDIX 5

SUMMARY OF STATION DEVELOPMENTS 1930-1980 SYDNEY

DECADE	TOTAL NO. OF NEW BUILDINGS	TOTAL NO. OF EXPANDED COMBINED TICKET & PARCELS FACILITIES	TOTAL NO. OF NEW, SEPARATE PARCELS FACILITIES	TOTAL NO. OF NEW TOILETS	COMMENTS
1930-1940	13 (6 stations on new Cronulla line, 4 new stations on existing lines)	3	2	1	Includes 1 relocated station, 1 rebuilt after fire & 1 replacement station building (Dulwich Hill)
1941-1950	16 (2 stations on new Ropes Creek line, 3 new stations on existing lines & 1 additional platform with building)	4	8	4	Includes 9 stations rebuilt between Westmead & St. Marys, excluding Blacktown – 1 replacement building (Bankstown OHBO)
1951-1960	4 (1 new station on new City Circle & 3 western quadruplication)	2 (Sydney Terminal & Mt. Colah)	3 Bankstown, Doonside & Blacktown)	1 (Mt. Colah)	Circular Quay, Clyde, Granville & Blacktown
1961-1970	5	2 (Central & Hurstville)	1 Hurstville	1 (Rose hill)	All 5 are replacements for existing stations
1971-1980	18 (4 new stations on new ESR line)	Nil	1 Blacktown	Nil	16 buildings replaced existing structures)

APPENDIX 6 – STRUCTURES PLANNED ON THE INTERCITY RAIL NETWORK IN CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER

YEAR PLAN APPROVED	STATION AND LINE	NATURE OF CONSTRUCTION	COMMENT
1933	Fassifern Main Northern line	New out-of shed on branch platform and new waiting shed on No. 2 platform	Station badly burnt in bush fire
1934	Cringilla Port Kembla branch	Addition of 48' to timber waiting shed	Original shed 10' long
1934	Broadmeadow Main Northern line	Centralized booking office on overhead road bridge	
1935	Wollongong Illawarra line	Porch added to entrance of General Waiting Room on No. 1 platform	
1935	Lysaghts Port Kembla branch	Central accounting office	Used for business with steelworks
1935	Wickham Newcastle branch	New brick buildings at new station	
1936	Lysaghts Port Kembla branch	Provision of timber male toilet	
1936	Coal Cliff Illawarra line	Provision of male and female toilets	
1936	Bundanoon Main Southern line	Larger General Waiting Room & Ladies' Waiting Room on No. 1 platform	
1937	Wombarra Illawarra line	Awning added to booking office	To give protection from rail and sun
1937	Lysaghts Port Kembla branch	Waiting shed provided for new station	Station designated "employee platform for Lysaghts

YEAR PLAN APPROVED	STATION AND LINE	NATURE OF CONSTRUCTION	COMMENT
			Newcastle Ltd"
1937	Port Kembla North Port Kembla branch	Timber shelter erected at newly opened station	
1937	Morisset Main Northern line	New, brick building on No. 2 platform	Replaced timber building
1937	Broadmeadow Main Northern line	Men's toilet on No. 1 platform	
1937	Civic Newcastle branch	New brick buildings at new station	
1937	Newcastle Newcastle branch	Cash desk & partitions in RRR	Awnings also extended on platform Nos. 2/3
1938	Wollongong Illawarra line	Bookstall provided on both platforms	
1938	Wollongong Illawarra line	Central overhead booking office	Not built
1938	Lysaghts Port Kembla branch	Timber ticket cabin built off-platform	
1938	Hamilton Newcastle branch	Porters' room added to building on No. 1 platform	
1938	Goulburn Main Southern line	Enlarged storage & change room for RRR	
1939	Lysaghts Port Kembla branch	Addition to Clerks' office	Not built
1939	Katoomba Main Western line	Parcels office expanded to engulf general waiting room	Cloak room to become new general waiting room
1940	Cringilla Port Kembla branch	Large brick building erected on island platform	Part of duplication to Port Kembla North
1940	Wollongong Illawarra line	Proposed, new larger parcels office	Not built until 1945

YEAR PLAN APPROVED	STATION AND LINE	NATURE OF CONSTRUCTION	COMMENT
1941	Wollongong Illawarra line	Dressing room provided on No. 1 platform for RRR staff	Separate room for females provided in 1956
1941	Coniston Illawarra line	New brick buildings on platform and off-platform booking office	Designed for duplication to Port Kembla North
1941	Newcastle Newcastle branch	Enquiry counter enlarged	
1941	Mount Victoria Main Western line	Enlarged bar provided in RRR	Footwarmer boiler capacity also extended
1942	Port Kembla Port Kembla branch	New waiting room and goods office added to existing timber building	
1942	Gerringong Illawarra line	Provision of brick station building	Previous timber building destroyed by fire
1942	Broadmeadow Main Northern line	New SM's office built on No. 2 platform	Original SM's office converted into staff meal & locker room
1943	Minnamurra Illawarra line	Provision of new 10' x 15' waiting shed	
1943	Hamilton Newcastle branch	Expanded Ladies' Waiting Room on platform No. 1	
1943	Mount Victoria Main Western line	Additional bedrooms for RRR staff	
1944	Wollongong Illawarra line	Office for Traffic Inspector built off-platform on No. 2 platform	
1944	Wyong Main Northern line	New, brick booking/parcels office on No. 2 platform	This was the 3 rd scheme to expand the parcels office
1944	Broadmeadow	Additional shelter	

YEAR PLAN APPROVED	STATION AND LINE	NATURE OF CONSTRUCTION	COMMENT
	Main Northern line	provided on No. 2/3 platform	
1944	Warrimoo Main Western line	Booking office added to existing brick building	
1944	Springwood Main Western line	Parcels office expanded to engulf the general waiting room	New general waiting room added to the Sydney end of the building
1944	Katoomba Main Western line	Timber meal room added to separate Traffic Inspector's office	
1944	Lithgow Main Western line	Extension of parcels office	Not done until 1949
1945	Wollongong Illawarra line	Additional space provided in RRR on No. 2 platform	Not built until 1946
1945	Towradgi Illawarra line	Temporary booking office erected at new station	Large buildings on platforms not built
1945	Nowra Illawarra line	New brick station building	Previous timber building destroyed by fire
1945	Gosford Main Northern line	New fish store on platform No. 1	
1945	Newcastle Newcastle branch	Ticket office remodelled to reduce ticket windows from 6 to 3	
1946	Minnamurra Illawarra line	Provision of ladies toilet	Removed in 1974
1946	Newcastle Newcastle branch	Additional space in outwards parcels office	
1946	Moss Vale Main Southern line	Separate bar in RRR eliminated & dining area enlarged	
1947	Woy Woy Main Northern	New brick parcels office	

YEAR PLAN APPROVED	STATION AND LINE	NATURE OF CONSTRUCTION	COMMENT
	line		
1947	Bullaburra Main Western line	Brick male/female toilet block	Not built until 1956
1948	Woy Woy Main Northern line	New barrier shelter at bottom of stairs	
1948	Thirroul Illawarra line	External "wind shield" fitted to western side window of booking office	This took the form of a fixed awning
1948	Teralba Main Northern line	Expansion of parcels office into S.M.'s office	Also, conversion of general waiting room into S.M.'s
1948	Cockle Creek Main Northern line	New brick buildings at new site	Required to align with new rail bridge over Cockle Creek
1949	Towradgi Illawarra line	New timber platform buildings on both platforms	Not built
1950	Towradgi Illawarra line	Temporary waiting sheds erected on both platforms	Sheeted externally with corrugated iron
1950	Oak Flats Illawarra line	Off-platform toilets provided for men and women	Externally clad with corrugated iron sheets
1950	Gosford Main Northern line	New ticket window requiring elimination of seating in waiting room on No. 1 platform	
1950	Newcastle Newcastle branch	New parcels awning on No. 4 platform	
1952	Oak Flats Illawarra line	Timber booking office	
1952	Adamstown Main Northern line	Timber building extended to provide new parcels & booking offices	
1952	Springwood	Additional counter	

YEAR PLAN APPROVED	STATION AND LINE	NATURE OF CONSTRUCTION	COMMENT
	Main Western line	placed in parcels office	
1952	Lithgow Main Western line	Toilet for parcels/booking office staff on footbridge	
1953	Wollongong Illawarra line	Additional space in RRR on No. 1 platform	Not constructed until 1956
1953	Newcastle Newcastle branch	Additional “:crush” counters provided in RRR	
1954	Dora Creek Main Northern line	Timber buildings erected on each platform at new site of station	New site required to align with new rail bridge over Dora Creek
1954	Broadmeadow Main Northern line	Milk & snack bar on No. 2 platform	
1954	Newcastle Newcastle branch	New inwards parcels office & cloak room	
1956	Newcastle Newcastle branch	New inwards & outwards parcels offices	
1956	Warrimoo Main Western line	New brick building	Previous platform buildings destroyed in bush fire
1958	Woonona Illawarra line	Timber station building relocated from Roslyn & erected on No. 2 platform	Additional to timber waiting shed
1959	Gosford Min Northern line	Re-arrangement of RRR on platform 2/3 to accommodate more customers	In connection with electrification opened in 1960
1961	Lapstone Main Western line	New brick buildings at new station	Station paid for by land developer, Lapstone

YEAR PLAN APPROVED	STATION AND LINE	NATURE OF CONSTRUCTION	COMMENT
			Estate Pty Ltd
1963	Hamilton Newcastle branch	Brick men's toilet on No. 2 platform	
1964	Blaxland Main Western line	Parcels office added end of building	
1965	Kembla Grange Illawarra line	Provision of blockwork male/female toilets	
1965	Picton Main Southern line	Cantilevered awning replaces posted verandah on No. 1 platform	
1967	Coal Cliff Illawarra line	Provision of new concrete blockwork building to replace timber building	
1970	North Wollongong Illawarra line	New brick platform buildings to replace timber structures	Check 190 – 49 as 1970 drawing is cancelled
1972	Bulli Illawarra line	Conversion of the Ladies Waiting Room into male/female toilets	Part of the timber structure containing male/female toilets demolished
1972	Broadmeadow Main Northern line	New brick building on No. 1 platform	
1974	Minnamurra Illawarra line	Blockwork waiting shed replaced timber waiting shed	
1975	Towradgi Illawarra line	New buildings on both platforms	Not done
1975	Fairy Meadow Illawarra line	New platform buildings	Paid for by Commonwealth Government
1975	Port Kembla North Port Kembla branch	Metal-sided waiting shed to replace timber building	Paid for by Commonwealth Government
1975	Adamstown	New brick waiting	Paid for by

YEAR PLAN APPROVED	STATION AND LINE	NATURE OF CONSTRUCTION	COMMENT
	Main Northern line	room on No. 1 platform	Commonwealth Government
1976	Corrimal Illawarra line	New overhead booking office	Planned as part of quadruplication – not built
1976	Fairy Meadow Illawarra line	New overhead booking office	Planned as part of quadruplication – not built
1977	Wollongong Illawarra line	Upgrading of booking office and waiting room on No. 1 platform	
1977	Woonona Illawarra line	New building of external metal siding constructed on No. 1 platform	Replaced timber structure – paid for by Commonwealth Government
1977	Lysaghts Port Kembla branch	New long platform shelter sheeted externally with metal siding	Paid for by Commonwealth Government
1978	Unanderra Illawarra line	New blockwork toilet block	Replaced timber toilets
1978	Gosford Main Northern line	New, brick booking office & waiting room on No. 1 platform	
1978	Picton Main Southern line	Brick out-of shed on No. 1 platform	The last out-of shed built on the NSW system
1978	Bargo Main Southern line	New temporary buildings on both platforms	Fire destroyed main structure
1979	Towradgi Illawarra line	New brick waiting sheds and off-platform booking office	Paid for by Commonwealth Government
1979	Albion Park Illawarra line	New brick male/female toilet block	Replaced timber structures
1979	Woy Woy	Off-platform, brick booking & parcels	On eastern side of line

YEAR PLAN APPROVED	STATION AND LINE	NATURE OF CONSTRUCTION	COMMENT
		office	
1980	Thirroul Illawarra line	Conversion of the Ladies Waiting Room into male/female toilets	Detached men's toilet demolished
1980	Teralba Main Northern line	Removal of No. 1 platform waiting room	Conversion of No. 2 platform into island platform

SOURCES: Plans in PTC,SRA, RIC and RailCorp Plan Room

APPENDIX 7 – PASSENGER STRUCTURES PLANNED ON THE RURAL RAIL NETWORK BETWEEN GOULBURN & ALBURY IN CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER 1930-1980

YEAR PLAN APPROVED	LINE AND STATION	NATURE OF CONSTRUCTION	COMMENT
1934	Wagga Wagga	Store provided for RRR	
1938	Junee	Re-arrangement of clerical space	For the establishment of Telephone Train Control
1941	Cootamundra	Extension of counter in RRR	
1942	Cootamundra	Extension of parcels office & porters' room	
1942	Kapooka	Timber booking office 12' x 6' added to signal box	To cater for nearby Army base
1942	Marina	Timber booking office & waiting room on No. 2 platform	Related to duplication of Cootamundra-Junee section
1942	Illabo	New timber buildings provided on main loop lines	Related to duplication of Cootamundra-Junee section
1943	Cootamundra	Provision of a store for the RRR	Ladies' toilet suites also renewed
1943	Harden	Additional counter space provided in RRR	
1944	Wagga Wagga	Change room for RRR staff & office for RRR Sub-manager	Not done
1947	Albury	Provision of a smaller light refreshment room in RRR	Parcels office also extended
1949	Albury	Convert Gents' Waiting Room into General Waiting Room	

YEAR PLAN APPROVED	LINE AND STATION	NATURE OF CONSTRUCTION	COMMENT
1966	Albury	Booking office enlarged	
1968	Harefield	New station constructed of external metal siding erected to replace timber building	Structure built around new interlocking panel for planned introduction of CTC

SOURCES: Plans in PTC,SRA, RIC and RailCorp Plan Room

APPENDIX 8

NEW STATION BUILDINGS IN RURAL NSW (EXCEPT GOULBURN-ALBURY) 1930-1980

DATE	LOCATION
1931	Warren
1934	Caragabal
1935	Condobolin
1935	Griffith
1936	Archville
1937	Burringbar
1938	Billinudgel
1938	Kankool
1938	Mendooran
1938	Mingaletta
1939	Captains Flat
1940	Hopefield
1940	Kempsey
1940	Mullumbimby
1941	Corobimila
1941	Dalys
1943	Nambucca Heads
1944	Dungog (partly built)
1955	Broken Hill
1965	Edgeroi
1967	Bourke
1967	Mungindi

SOURCE: S.A. Sharp, *The Railway Stations of NSW*, unpublished M.Ec. (Hons) thesis, University of Sydney, 1982, Vol. 2, Appendix A4, pp. 271 & 291-295

APPENDIX 9

FREIGHT INFRASTRUCTURE BETWEEN GOULBURN AND ALBURY 1930-1980

YEAR	LOCATION	NATURE OF WORK
1931	Henty	New stockyard
1934	Junee	New loading bank
1935	Yass Junction	Additional stock loading bank
1935	Murrumburrah	Wool loading bank
1942	Albury	25 ton travelling crane
1945	Cootamundra	New clerical office for goods shed
1945	Harden	Shelter over transhipment stage
1968	Goulburn	Extension of goods shed
1970	Goulburn	Replacement of timber deck on goods shed stage with concrete
1977	Goulburn	Amenities building for wool dump staff
1977	Cootamundra	Wool dump in association with freight centre
1978	Cootamundra	Siding for wool dump
1980	Goulburn	Air-conditioning of goods shed office

SOURCE: Plans from PTC, SRA, RIC and RailCorp Plan Room

APPENDIX 10

NEW OR REPLACEMENT FREIGHT INFRASTRUCTURE IN NSW (EXCLUDING THE MAIN SOUTHERN LINE BETWEEN GOULBURN & ALBURY) 1930-1980

YEAR	LOCATION	DESCRIPTION
1936	Nowra	New office for clerical staff
1937	Caragabal	New goods shed relocated from Forest Hill
1937	Belgamba	New goods shed at new station
1937	Honeysuckle	New office for clerical staff
1939	Captains Flat	New goods shed at newly opened line
1941	Port Kembla	New office for goods yard
1943	Honeysuckle	New wool shed
1943	Lismore	New office for goods shed
1947	Menindee	New goods shed
1948	Ivanhoe	New goods shed
1963	Cobar	New goods shed
1963	Moree	New combined goods shed and parcels office
1963	Gunnedah	New office for clerical staff
1967	Leeton	New goods shed
1966	Forbes	New goods shed
1968	Griffith	New goods shed
1969	Broken Hill	New goods shed in connection with gauge standardisation
1969	Narrabri	New office for clerical staff in connection with extension of goods shed

SOURCE: Plans in PTC, SRA, RIC and RailCorp Plan Room

APPENDIX 11

CONSTRUCTION OF BULK WHEAT SILOS IN NSW 1930-1980

YEAR OF CONSTRUCTION	LOCATION
1930	Curban
1930	Alectown West
1930	Goonumbla
1930	Tomingley West
1930	Gidginbung
1930	Nelungaloo
1930	Gunningbland
1930	Tichborne
1930	Erigolia
1930	Weethalle
1931	Cunningar
1931	Quandary
1931	Woodstock
1931	Ladysmith
1931	Belfrayden
1932	Pleasant Hills
1932	Brundah
1932	Gooloogong
1932	Mangoplah +
1932	Sheperds
1932	Rand +
1932	Urangeline East +
1932	Ootha
1932	Yarrabandai
1933	Mickibri
1933	Tomingley West +
1933	Alectown West +
1933	Gobondery
1933	Tullamore
1933	Derriwong
1933	Condobolin
1933	Kadungle
1933	The Troffs
1933	Quirindi
1934	Biniguy
1934	Gravesend
1934	Warialda
1934	Breeza

YEAR OF CONSTRUCTION	LOCATION
1934	Duri
1934	Narrabri
1934	West Tamworth
1934	Appleby
1934	Gidley
1934	Attunga
1934	Westdale
1934	Manilla
1934	Kikoiria
1934	Belfrayden +
1934	Berendebba
1934	Weedallion
1934	Quandialla +
1934	Wirrinya +
1934	Wyanga +
1934	Wargin
1934	Weeja
1934	Burgooney
1934	Lake Cargelligo
1934	Warral
1934	Nemingha
1934	Baan Baa
1934	Nea
1934	Emerald Hill
1934	Boggabri
1934	Curlewis
1934	Gunnedah
1934	Tullibigeal +
1934	Binya +
1934	Arthurville +
1934	Yeoval +
1934	Cumnock +
1935	Armatree
1935	Talbragar
1934	Wallendbeen +
1934	Delungra
1934	Mount Russell
1934	Inverell
1935	Bendick Murrell
1935	Noonbinna +
1935	Holmwood
1935	Glen Logan
1935	Minore
1935	Mungeriba

YEAR OF CONSTRUCTION	LOCATION
1935	Walmer
1935	Yuluma
1935	Muronbung
1935	Ulamambri
1935	Dunedoo
1935	Mendooran
1935	Merrygoen
1935	Binnaway
1935	Grawlin Plains
1935	Baradine
1936	Arajoel
1936	Burcher
1936	Buralyang
1936	Garoolgan
1936	Naradhan
1936	Kywong
1936	Corobimila
1936	Yenda
1937	Bogan Gate +
1937	Parkes +
1938	Forbes +
1938	Eumungerie +
1938	Geurie +
1938	Manildra +
1938	Molong +
1939	Henty +
1941	Billimari +
1941	Gooloogong +
1941	Holmwood +
1941	Noonbinna +
1941	Birriwa
1941	Nyrang Creek
1941	Trajere
1941	Premier
1941	Wirega
1950s	Werris Creek sub-terminal
1950s	Junee sub-terminal
1950s	Temora sub-terminal
1950s	Moree sub-terminal
1950s	Parkes sub-terminal
1950	Gilgandra +
1950	Narromine +
1950	Peak Hill +
1951	Tootool +

YEAR OF CONSTRUCTION	LOCATION
1953	Brushwood +
1955	Holbrook +
1959	Breeza +
1960	Armatree +
1960	Curban +
1960	Quirindi +
1960	Warialda +
1961	Condobolin +
1961	Yeoval +
1961	Burcher +
1961	Muronbung +
1961	Grenfell +
1961	Trajere +
1962	Erigolia +
1962	Kikoiria +
1962	Tullibigeal +
1964	Willow Tree
1965	Willow Tree +
1967	Cunningar +
1968	Inverell +
1969	Minore +
1969	Culcairn +
1972	Ungarie +
1973	Uranquinty +
1977	Buralyang +

SOURCE: K. Ryan, "Storing the Golden Grain", *Australian Model Railway Magazine*, Vol. 14 No. 11 issue 164, October 1990, pp. 17-24 - + denotes additional silos to existing facility



APPENDIX 12

FREIGHT CENTRES CONSTRUCTED IN NSW 1970-1980

YEAR	LOCATION	COMMENT
1975	Tamworth	Largest one built – only one built with overhead cranes for unloading containers
1976	Armidale	
1976	Glenn Innes	
1976	Gunnedah	
1976	Coonamble	
1977	Cowra	
1977	Wyalong Central	
1977	Cootamundra	
1978	Old Casino	
1980	Wagga Wagga	
1980	Narrabri	Restricted to addition of office to existing goods shed
No date	Lee Street, Sydney	Not built
No date	Wyong	Not built
No date	Katoomba	Not built
No date	Bathurst	Not built

SOURCES: Plans in PTC,SRA, RIC and RailCorp Plan Room

APPENDIX 13

ACQUISITION OF FREIGHT ROLLINGSTOCK 1930-1980

YEAR/S OF INTRODUCTION TO SERVICE	TYPE OF WAGON	CODE OF WAGON	NUMBER OF VEHICLES
1931-1938	Ballast hoppers (for departmental work)	MH	105
1933-1950	Refrigerator cars	MRC	249
1937-1953	Guards vans	PHG	135
1938-1947	Open wagons	U	2,000
1939-1950	Coal hoppers	LCH	2,990
1940	Guards vans with drover accommodation (conversions)	SHG	14
1940s	Motor car carriers	BKR	7
1941/42	Well wagons (for large loads)	LFW	4
1942-1946	Wheat hoppers	RU	650
1943-1959	Flat cars	MLE	500
1947	Louvre vans	MLV	22
1948-1953	Louvre vans (reframed)	LV	165
1948-1953	Covered vans	CV	34
1951	Open wagons	G	500
1951-1953	Guards vans	MHG	200
1951-1954	Refrigerator cars	TRC	260
1951-57	Gun powder vans	PV	52
1951-1960	Coal hoppers	BCH	1,635
1953	Well wagons (for large loads)	LLW	3
1957 & 1958	Louvre vans	MLV	111
1958	Louvre vans	LLV	295
1958	Covered vans	MBC	149
1958	Motor car carriers	BKC	15
1958-1968	Livestock vans (cattle)	BCW	550
1959/1960	Livestock vans (cattle)	BCW	100
1959-1963	Gun powder vans		

YEAR/S OF INTRODUCTION TO SERVICE	TYPE OF WAGON	CODE OF WAGON	NUMBER OF VEHICLES
	(conversions)	PV	28
1960s	Guards vans (conversions)	GHG	120
1961-1964	Open wagons	BD	200
1962	Flat cars	BME	50
1962-1970	Flat cars for "Flexivans" (i.e. semi-trailer bodies)	TVF	59
1963	Louvre vans	HLX	72
1963	Motor car carriers	BKF	15
1963	Open wagons (conversions)	UT	244
1963-1969	Container flats	BC	104
1963-1970	Open wagons	BDL	580
1963-1967	Covered vans (conversions)	ABV	55
1963-1970	Motor car carriers	BKX	76
1965	Refrigerator cars	GRC	1
1965	Open wagons	CCX	18
1965	Coal hopper	CH	350
1965	Cement hopper	ARX	50
1965-1967	Guards vans	FHG	100
1965-1970	Wheat hoppers	WH	619
1967	Sugar cane flat cars	CF	21
1968	Container flats (conversions)	SCE	40
1968	Coal hopper	PCH	1
1968	Steel rod flat cars	SRF	2
1968	Flat car for wheel sets (for departmental use)	BWF	2
1968	Flat car for metal products (conversions)	RDF	2
1968/69	Open wagons	GC	85
1968-1970	Open wagons	NOB	280
1969	Container flats	CCX	30
1969	Guards vans	JHG	2
1969/70	Louvre vans	JLX	135

YEAR/S OF INTRODUCTION TO SERVICE	TYPE OF WAGON	CODE OF WAGON	NUMBER OF VEHICLES
1969/70	Louvre vans	NLJ	135
1970	Flat wagons (for coil steel)	NFM	40
1970	Motor car carriers	NMK	18
1970/71	Cement hoppers	NPT	5
1970-1972	Container flats	NQO	30
1971	Livestock vans (cattle)	NSCF	50
1971/72	Open wagons (conversions)	NOS	2
1971/72	Container flats	NQB	50
1971-1975	Container flats	NQO	400
1971-1981	Container flats	NQI	125
1972-1977	Guards vans	NVJ	98
1972-1978	Louvre vans	NLC	13
1973	Cement hoppers	NPC	10
1973-1976	Louvre vans	NLK	200
1973/74	Refrigerator vans	NRN	30
1973/74	Covered vans	NZP	8
1973-1976	Refrigerator vans (conversions)	NRW	10
1973-1976	“RACE” containers (owned by the department)	Various	1,782
1973-1981	Container flats	NQJ	132
1974	Covered vans (conversion)	NBB	1
1974/75	Livestock vans (cattle) (conversions)	NSCF	100
1974/75	Coil steel wagons (conversions)	NCN	50
1974/75	Motor car carriers	NMN	98
1975/76	Open wagons	NOC	200
1975/76	Flat wagons	NFP	20
1975/76	Container flats	NQF	160
1975-1979	Container flats	NQS	124
1976/77	Wheat hoppers	NGT	530
1976/77	Coal hoppers	NHC, NHV & NHG	500
1976-1979	Coil steel wagons	NCL, NCM, NCR	120

YEAR/S OF INTRODUCTION TO SERVICE	TYPE OF WAGON	CODE OF WAGON	NUMBER OF VEHICLES
	(conversions)	& NCH	
1977-1979	Coal hoppers	NHT	300
1977-1981	Open wagons	NOD	600
1977-1981	Refrigerated containers (owned by the department)	LRC, IC, SRC & QRC	261
1978/1981	Cement hoppers	NPR	125
TOTALS			18,331 wagons 2,043 containers

SOURCES: J. Beckhaus, *Railway Freight Wagons of NSW*, Sydney, ARHS, 1982 and J. Beckhaus, *Railway Freight Wagons of NSW*, Kings Cross, S.C.R. Publications, 1970

APPENDIX 14

ACQUISITION OF ELECTRIC PASSENGER ROLLINGSTOCK FOR USE IN THE SYDNEY METROPOLITAN AREA 1930-1980

YEAR INTRODUCED INTO SERVICE	TYPE OF CARRIAGES	NUMBER OF CARRIAGES
1937	1927 Modified Clyde powers cars	12
1940	1940 Tulloch powers cars	24
1940	1940 Tulloch trailer cars	24
1950	1950 Tulloch trailer cars	15
1951	1950 Tulloch powers cars	3
1951	1950 Tulloch trailer cars	9
1952	1950 Tulloch powers cars	8
1953	1950 Tulloch powers cars	6
1953	1950 Tulloch trailer cars	12
1954	1950 Tulloch powers cars	17
1954	1950 Tulloch trailer cars	18
1955	1950 Tulloch powers cars	11
1955	1950 Tulloch trailer cars	14
1956	1955 Sputnik trailer cars	13
1956	1950 Tulloch powers cars	5
1956	1950 Tulloch trailer cars	19
1957	1955 Sputnik powers cars	2
1957	1955 Sputnik trailer cars	9
1958	1955 Sputnik trailer cars	16
1959	1950 Tulloch trailer cars	18
1958	1955 Sputnik powers cars	23
1959	1955 Sputnik powers	11

YEAR INTRODUCED INTO SERVICE	TYPE OF CARRIAGES	NUMBER OF CARRIAGES
	cars	
1959	1955 Sputnik trailer cars	10
1960	1955 Sputnik powers cars	5
1960	1955 Sputnik trailer cars	8
1964-1968	1964 Tulloch double deck trailers	120
1968	Prototype double deck power cars	4
1972/73	Production double deck power cars	53
1973-1976	2 nd contract for double deck power and trailer cars	96
1977/78	3 rd contract for double deck power and trailer cars	50
1978-1981	4 th contract for double deck power and trailer cars	150
TOTAL		795

SOURCES: D. Keenan & H. Clark, *First Stop Central*, Sydney, AETA, 1963, S. Dornan & R. Henderson, *The Electric Railways of NSW*, Sydney, AETA, 1976 & G. Churchman, *Railway Electrification in Australia and New Zealand*, Sydney, IPL Books, 1995

APPENDIX 15

ELECTRIFICATION OF EXISTING LINES

YEAR LINE ELECTRIFIED	YEAR LINE OPENED	DESCRIPTION OF LINE	COMMENT
1936	1888	Clyde-Rosehill	Restricted to horse racing meetings
1939	1931	Kingsgrove-East Hills	For general passenger use
1955	1860	Parramatta-Penrith	For export coal traffic
1957	1869	Penrith-Lithgow	For export coal traffic
1957	1942	St.Marys-Ropes Creek	For workers only at factories
1957-1960	Various	Small section of freight-only lines in Sydney	Flemington-Canterbury: Chullora Workshops: Pippita
1958	1887	Hornsby-Cowan	To eliminate use of steam locomotive on Cowan bank
1959	1901	Rosehill-Carlingford	For general passenger use
1959	1888	Rosehill-Sandown	Restricted service for industrial workers
1960	1889	Cowan-Gosford	To eliminate use of steam locomotive on Cowan bank
1967	1916	Canterbury-Rozelle	For export coal traffic
1968	1863	Liverpool-Campbelltown	For export coal traffic
1968	1958	Cambelltown-Glenlee	For export coal traffic
1975	1864	Blacktown-Riverstone	For general passenger use

SOURCE: S.E. Dornan & R.G. Henderson, *The Electric Railways of NSW*, Sydney, AETA, 1976

APPENDIX 16

DELIVERY OF ELECTRIC PARCELS VANS 1930-1980

YEAR INTO SERVICE	CARRIAGE NUMBER	COMMENT
1930	C3100	Conversion of former timber power car
1935	D4001	Conversion of timber trailer car requiring a passenger power car for haulage
1955	C3027	Conversion of former timber power car
1955	D4006	Converted from former timber trailer car
1960	C3070	Conversion of former timber power car
1965	C3087	Conversion of former timber power car
1969	C3020	Conversion of former timber power car
1973	5 carriages – numbers unknown	Converted from former steel passenger carriages and replaced 5 of the existing timber carriages

SOURCE: M. Kerry, *Sydney's Wooden Electrics*, Sydney, Transit Australia Publishing, 2001

APPENDIX 17

INTRODUCTION OF NEW PASSENGER ROLLINGSTOCK TO COUNTRY RAIL SERVICES 1930- 1980

YEAR	NATURE OF IMPROVEMENT	COMMENT
1934	BPH 38 rail motor & CT 81 trailer for branch line service	
1934-40	Hale & Kelburn tip-over seats replaced fixed seats in 37 CPH rail motors used on branch lines	These seats ere similar to those in Sydney suburban carriages
1935	37 CPH rail motors used on branch lines repowered with larger engines	
1937	4 Silver City Comet diesel train sets (total of 20 carriages) introduced to Parkes-Broken Hill service	First air-conditioned train in Australia
1937	6 FP class rail buses introduced for branch line service	
1937/38	2 HT parcel trailers built for use on Silver City Comets	
1938	Four 400 class diesel trains with 8 trailers entered branch line service	These were non air-conditioned versions of the Silver City Comet carriages
1939	4 GT parcels trailers built to operate with CPH rail motors on branch line services	
1940,43 &44	3 FT trailers introduced for branch line services to operate with 400 class diesel trains	
1941	Carriage HT 76 converted to passenger trailer to operate with CPH rail motors on branch line services	
1945-56	37 CPH rail motors relowered with diesel engines for use on branch lines	
1949/50	10 two-car diesel trains class 600/700 introduced for branch line services	
1951	36 900 class power cars and 18 trailer cars enter service on main lines in country areas	
1957/58	3 TP class parcels trailers for use on Far west Express diesel train	

YEAR	NATURE OF IMPROVEMENT	COMMENT
1959-68	12 ETP and EPT cars converted for use as parcels/guards vans for use behind main and branch line diesel-trains	
1959-61	8 IHO vans converted for use as parcels/guards vans for use behind branch line diesel trains	
1961	5 Budd 1100 class diesel cars enter service for the South Coast Daylight express	
1968	18 additional two-car diesel trains introduced on branch line services	These were initially used on suburban services in Sydney, Newcastle and Wollongong from 1961
1968-70	6 FP rail buses for use on branch line services	
1969	1 rail/road bus code AXT895 for use on branch line services	
1970	Ten 1200 class Tulloch diesel rail cars enter service for use on the Riverina Express for main line and branch line service	
1975	Replacement of all rail services with buses radiating from Dubbo	In previous line closures, no replacement road service provided
1979	Announced introduction of XPT trains for use on country main line services (10 power cars and 20 trailer cars)	

SOURCES: D. Cooke, *Railmotors and XPTs*, Sydney, ARHS, 1984; The *Tin Hare Gazette*, No. 43 November 2005;

APPENDIX 18

NEW LINES OPENED IN NSW BETWEEN 1930-1980

YEAR LINE OPENED	NAME OF LINE	PURPOSE OF LINE	COMMENT
1930	Casino- Queensland Border	General freight	Funded by Commonwealth Government under national rail standardisation project
1930	Booyong-Ballina	General freight	Closed in 1948
1931	Tempe-East Hills	Urban passenger	Politically motivated to serve land developers
1931	Hillston-Roto	Operational	To provide additional connection between Southern & Western lines
1932	Robinvale- koorakee	Freight – operated by VR	Closed in 1943
1932	Unanderra-Moss Vale	Conveyance of limestone to BHP steel works	BHP under contract to ship set tonnage on line
1932	Camurra- Bogabilla	General freight	To attempt to stop Queensland Rail taking trade from NSW
1932	Central-Waverton	Urban passenger	
1937	Pelaw Main- Weston	Coal	Private railway
1937	Aberdare Junction - Stanford Methyr	Coal	Private railway
1939	Sutherland- Cronulla	Urban passenger	Politically motivated to provide unemployment relief

YEAR LINE OPENED	NAME OF LINE	PURPOSE OF LINE	COMMENT
1942	St.Marys-Ropes Creek	Military	Funded by USA Army to serve military store
1954	Awaba-Wangi Power station	Coal	
1958	Glenlee Junction-Glenlee	Coal	
1963	Coniston-port Kembla Inner Harbour	Coal	
1966	Newdell Junction-Antienne	General traffic	Deviation of Main Northern line required by flooding of valley for power station
1968	Kooragang South junction-Kooragang Island	coal	To serve new coal loader
1970	Broken Hill-SA border	General freight	Part of trans-Australia standard gauge project
1978	Whittingham-Mount Thorley	Coal	First coal mine served by balloon loop
1979	Liddell Junction-Newdell/Liddell Balloon Loop	coal	
1979	Botany-ANL Terminal	ISO freight containers	
1980	Vales Point Junction- Vales Point power station	Coal	1 st power station served by balloon loop
1980	Newness Junction-Clarence Balloon Loop	coal	

SOURCE: H. Quinlan & J.R. Newland, *Australian Railway Routes 1854-2000*, Sydney, ARHS, 2000