[ASSEMBLY - Thursday, 26 November 2009] p9983c-9987a

Mr Murray Cowper; Mr Colin Barnett; Speaker; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Rob Johnson; Acting Speaker

RAILWAY (BUTLER TO BRIGHTON) BILL 2009

Introduction and First Reading

Bill introduced, on motion by Mr M.J. Cowper (Parliamentary Secretary), and read a first time.

Explanatory memorandum presented by the parliamentary secretary.

Second Reading

MR M.J. COWPER (Murray-Wellington — Parliamentary Secretary) [12.04 pm]: I move —

That the bill be now read a second time.

Before I commence the second reading of this bill, I am required under the provisions of section 18A of the Transport Co-ordination Act 1966 to table a report by the Acting Director General of Transport relating to the planned construction of the new railway from Butler to Brighton. I table the report.

[See paper 1682.]

Ms A.J.G. MacTiernan: When did the Liberal Party last build a piece of railway?

The SPEAKER: Member for Armadale!

Mr M.J. COWPER: I know the member for Armadale is having some difficulty here but this is a historic moment.

Ms A.J.G. MacTiernan: It is absolutely entertaining. The government is not building any rail!

Mr M.J. COWPER: The member should perhaps draw her attention to what is going on in the Supreme Court in relation to a private matter, that has made mention of the member.

The purpose of the bill is to implement the legislative authority for the construction of the extension of the Joondalup line from Butler to Brighton. It will supplement the Railway (Northern and Southern Urban Extensions) Act 1999.

Mr P. Papalia: That is a fairly bullying way to behave.

Ms A.J.G. MacTiernan: Is this the same matter —

Point of Order

Mr C.J. BARNETT: Mr Speaker, this is a second reading speech. It is convention in this house that second reading speeches not be interrupted. There will be plenty of opportunity later to debate issues.

The SPEAKER: I take the point of order. Member for Armadale.

Ms A.J.G. MacTIERNAN: An allegation of a personal nature was made by the member. I seek that I be given some sort of opportunity to respond to this, or the member withdraws.

The SPEAKER: Member for Armadale, I am not going to take your point of order. I did not hear an allegation made. I am going to urge the member to come back to what is currently before this place.

Debate Resumed

Ms A.J.G. MacTiernan: We'll start talking about what you're doing at the Shire of Murray; the way you're threatening the officers there!

The SPEAKER: Member for Armadale, I formally call you for the second time today.

Mr C.J. Barnett: Throw her out—unbelievable!

Mr M.J. COWPER: Her true colours have been shown, Mr Speaker.

Point of Order

Mr M. McGOWAN: A second reading speech is meant to be a read speech because it can be used consequently in legal proceedings. On two occasions the member for Murray-Wellington has inserted other material into his second reading speech. I am seeking the Speaker's ruling as to whether or not that is appropriate and whether or not the material that the member for Murray-Wellington has inserted into his second reading speech will remain as part of the *Hansard* record. That is a matter that now will be potentially used in legal proceedings.

The SPEAKER: Before you start your second reading speech, member for Murray-Wellington, your second reading speech is your second reading speech. Whether it is all written or whether you are delivering it off the top of your head, that is what the second reading speech is. I also accept, member for Rockingham, that there is

[ASSEMBLY - Thursday, 26 November 2009] p9983c-9987a

Mr Murray Cowper; Mr Colin Barnett; Speaker; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Rob Johnson; Acting Speaker

some wise guidance in the words that you have said. I hope that the member for Murray-Wellington takes that on board when he presents the second reading speech.

Debate Resumed

Mr M.J. COWPER: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I will recommence my second reading speech.

Before I commence the second reading of this bill, I am required under section 18A of the Transport Coordination Act 1966 to table a report by the Acting Director General of Transport on the planned construction of the new railway line from Butler to Brighton. I have tabled this report.

The purpose of this bill is to implement the legislative authority for the construction of the extension of the Joondalup line from Butler to Brighton. It will supplement the Railway (Northern and Southern Urban Extensions) Act 1999. The Northern Suburbs Transit System—Perth to Joondalup Railway: Master Plan was issued in November 1989. Construction of the Joondalup line commenced in July 1991, and services to Currambine began in March 1993. The case to extend the Joondalup line from Currambine to the present terminus at Clarkson was detailed in the Northern Suburbs Railway—Currambine to Butler Railway Extension: Interim Master Plan (March 2000) in which it was predicted that between 2 850 and 3 250 people would catch a train at the station each weekday in 2006—section 3.3.2. Clarkson railway station opened in October 2004. In March 2009, over 3 600 people caught the train there each weekday. The Interim Master Plan (March 2000) also found that as the corridor developed towards its ultimate potential, the road and public transport system serving it would not function without the continued expansion of the Joondalup Line—section 3.3.3. There are already signs of capacity issues on the Mitchell Freeway and West Coast Highway closer to the city at peak times, especially during the morning peak, which may well be related to the increasing patronage being carried by the Joondalup line.

The population of the corridor from Clarkson to the north is expected to increase from around 41 000 in 2008 to about 84 000 in 2014. This population growth indicates that there will be the need for one additional station north of Clarkson by 2014, given that experience on Joondalup and Mandurah lines shows that a rail station requires a captive population of at least 30 000 to sustain it. To satisfy the need for an extra station, the public transport and town planning objectives will best be served if a major car-bus interchange transit station is built near Butler Boulevard at Brighton, 7.5 kilometres north of the Clarkson station. Empirically derived patronage estimates show that if this station is commissioned in December 2014, in excess of 3 000 people would catch the train each working day at Brighton, in addition to another 2 500 daily boarders at Clarkson. By 2031, the population of the corridor from Clarkson northwards is expected to reach 188 000.

This proposal to extend the railway from Clarkson to a station at Brighton differs from a finding made in the Public Transport Authority's Butler master plan of August 2008, which recommended terminating the extension to a large park-and-ride station just north of Lukin Drive at Butler. I shall therefore now give an explanation of the difference in findings.

The drivers to extend the Joondalup line are the anticipated population growth in the corridor north of Clarkson, extending ultimately to Yanchep; how that growth will occur; the extent and timing of the growth; the prevailing economic conditions; inter-regional travel demand; sustainability; the availability of road and rail capacity to meet demand; and the extent to which timely provision of public transport services can positively influence planning and land use outcomes.

To address the public transport requirements of the then proposed Brighton Estate, an inquiry-by-design workshop, known as the Brighton charette, was held in 2001, with participation by the then Department for Planning and Infrastructure, the City of Wanneroo and the Brighton Joint Venture developer. The charrette proposed a rail extension of about 7.5 kilometres from Clarkson to the Brighton town centre by 2003, and construction by around 2006-07. However, there was no follow-up action taken to develop a proper case for government funding support. The charrette assumed a major park-and-ride station at Butler, approximately five kilometres north of Clarkson, and a station a further two and a half kilometres north in the business precinct of the proposed Brighton town centre. The Brighton town centre was to be located approximately one kilometre to the west of the station, at the intersection of Marmion Avenue and Butler Boulevard. It was envisaged that an activity corridor would extend from the town centre, along Butler Boulevard to the station, and further east to service the commercial area at the future Mitchell Freeway.

Under the charette, it was decided that there would not be any major parking facility at Brighton as it was considered that this would be an obstacle to intensified land use and transit-orientated development—TOD—immediately around the station. To accommodate parking needs, therefore, the charrette proposed that a station be built between Brighton and Clarkson at Butler.

[ASSEMBLY - Thursday, 26 November 2009] p9983c-9987a

Mr Murray Cowper; Mr Colin Barnett; Speaker; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Rob Johnson; Acting Speaker

In 2006, the Department for Planning and Infrastructure conducted a preliminary patronage analysis of the emerging development, with allowance for minimal parking at Brighton. This showed that it would be difficult to make a case to extend the railway from Clarkson beyond Butler.

In 2007, the PTA initiated the preparation of a master plan to extend the railway north of Clarkson, accepting the charrette principle of minimal parking at Brighton and a large park-and-ride facility at Butler. The patronage analysis confirmed the earlier DPI findings. The master plan was completed in August 2008, with recommendations that the railway should be extended only to Butler and the option to build a station at Brighton should be revisited when planning the next extension, which was assumed to be to Alkimos.

In the latter stages of 2008, following completion of the master plan to Butler, there was a reappraisal of what would be required to make a station at Brighton viable. There was added motivation to all stakeholders to find a solution as the DPI had already purchased land through the metropolitan region improvement fund—MRIF—for the railway through the Brighton Estate for \$10.62 million. It had also provided just over \$5 million to construct the major part of the bulk earthworks through that estate over a distance of about 2.5 kilometres, under the project management of the Public Transport Authority. Construction of those earthworks, retaining walls and fencing commenced in January 2008 and is now practically completed.

The August 2008 master plan had found against extension of the railway to a station at Brighton, because the transit-oriented development objectives of the Brighton charrette had assumed that a station could be justified purely on unquantified town planning benefits and an unrealistic expectation that the patronage generated by people walking to the station would be sufficient to make the case. As part of the reappraisal, it was accepted that patronage generated from the catchment within walking distance of the station was much less than required and that the majority of the patronage required for viability could be derived only from a much greater population living beyond walking distance. This highlighted the need for a major park-and-ride facility with capacity to serve an area many times that within the walkable catchment, and merely confirmed the experience and principles that had been adopted in planning the Joondalup and Mandurah lines.

Stations such as Warwick on the Joondalup line and Murdoch on the Mandurah line derive over 90 per cent of their patronage from commuters who access the stations by motorised means from catchment areas greater than 30 square kilometres. Although the amount of land required to accommodate motorised feeder services—buses and cars—is up to three hectares, it is insignificant in relation to the area served.

In summary, reappraisal of what would be required to make a station at Brighton viable identified two major deficiencies for attention. The first was the lack of population density within walking distance of the station, as what was being planned would generate less that 500 daily users of the train service. The second deficiency was a lack of parking. The PTA and the land developer agreed that, to be effective, the density of development within walking distance of the station had to be doubled. The developer agreed to amend the plans to double the density within the walkable catchment area from about 6 000 to 12 000 residents—about 6 800 dwellings on just over 200 gross hectares—which could provide almost 1 000 daily users of the train but which would take almost a decade to achieve. The issue of parking was addressed and agreement was reached that parking would be provided for approximately 1 000 cars at Brighton.

Consulting firm Syme Marmion was commissioned to examine the business case and three railway extension options—namely, the extension to Butler; the extension to Brighton with a station at Brighton only; and the extension to Brighton with stations at Brighton and Butler. In preparing the business case, Syme Marmion used current best estimates of population projections for the growth area from Clarkson north to Yanchep-Two Rocks to put the rail extension into a longer-term planning context. These estimates are derived from the Australian Bureau of Statistics; from the Department of Planning—WA Tomorrow population projections; the City of Wanneroo—id. consultants suburb level population projections; and planning at structure plan level for major developments at Brighton, Alkimos-Eglinton and Yanchep-Two Rocks—St Andrews. The population projections showed that the population of the rapidly expanding corridor, including Clarkson, would grow from about 41 000 in 2008 to about 188 000 in 2031 when there would be a need for three new stations in addition to Clarkson.

Based on the planning and practical experience at Clarkson and other parts of the rapid transit network built over the past 18 years, Syme Marmion confirmed that a captive population of around 30 000 people living within the total catchment area of a station was a benchmark in making the case for a new station that would yield about 2 000 daily users of the train. Accepting this, and having shown that the population from Clarkson northwards would have reached about reached about 84 000 by 2014, Syme Marmion concluded that there was justification to build one station north of Clarkson by 2014, provided the facilities included a major park-and-ride area to provide a large percentage of the necessary patronage, especially in earlier years of the station's history.

[ASSEMBLY - Thursday, 26 November 2009] p9983c-9987a

Mr Murray Cowper; Mr Colin Barnett; Speaker; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Rob Johnson; Acting Speaker

In making the significant changes to produce a viable case to extend the railway to Brighton and build a station there, not only are the transport-land use fundamentals of the original Brighton charrette overturned, but so too is the viability of the case to build a station at Butler, which will no longer be required immediately, although the land that was purchased by the DPI to build a station there will be retained, enabling a station to be built in the future if the need arises.

The scope of works to extend the railway to Brighton includes the cost of land for the railway reserve; civil works, including earthworks and drainage and structures, including three road-over-rail bridges; the specific railway engineering works including track, overhead traction systems, power supply, signalling and communications; a station at Brighton with initial parking for approximately 1 000 cars with the understanding that the area of car parking may reduce over time to no less than 700 bays; additional stowage roads and associated facilities at the Nowergup and Mandurah depots; the new main communications backbone system between the East Perth control centre and Joondalup; and all other system and integration costs to commission the new railway extension.

Eleven new buses will be purchased to provide the required bus feeder services, and that cost is included in the estimates. In 2007 an order was placed for 15 additional three-car train sets. This included four trains and the required funding for the proposed extension. The first of three three-car sets entered service in June 2009.

The total estimated capital cost of the extension of the Joondalup line to Brighton is \$240.7 million. The time frame for construction, from the commencement of bulk earthworks to the commissioning of passenger services from Brighton station, is 42 months. Construction will have to commence by the end of June 2011 to achieve commencement of services by the end of 2014.

Extending the Joondalup rail line to Brighton is an important and logical step in expanding our integrated public transport system. The extended line will enhance the communities it will serve and it will contribute to the sustainability of the wider metropolitan area. Most importantly, the ability for commuters to use public transport for journeys to and from the Perth central area will make space on the already crowded arterial road and freeway system linking the north-west corridor and the city for commercial business trips and those trips that cannot be served by public transport.

The Railway (Butler to Brighton) Bill 2009 will implement the legislative authority to construct the extension to Brighton and I commend the bill to the house.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Ms R. Saffioti.

Point of Order

Mr M. McGOWAN: Madam Acting Speaker, I seek your ruling on whether the exchange during the second reading speech between the member for Murray-Wellington and the member for Armadale will form part of the *Hansard* record; that is, when we read the *Hansard*, will that exchange be there or not be there? It was certainly an interesting exchange, albeit it was not relevant to the bill, and I would like to know the outcome given that the member for Murray-Wellington recommenced his speech. I know that the Hansard reporters recorded that exchange and I am interested to know what the outcome will be.

Mr C.J. BARNETT: The Speaker previously ruled that a person presenting a second reading speech can say whatever he or she wants to say. Normally, the second reading speech is read as a set text. The exchange between the parliamentary secretary and the member for Armadale—they happen in this place; we should not be unrealistic about that—in no way impacts on the stature of the second reading speech. If the member for Armadale feels aggrieved, she can use the mechanisms in the standing orders of this Parliament. I did not hear the member for Murray-Wellington make any direct accusation; however, that is the member for Armadale's problem. The second reading speech has not been compromised in any way whatsoever.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I have a further point of order. If I may, I will make a very short contribution. I was aware from the TV what was being said and that is why I came back to the chamber. The second reading speech will be in the *Hansard* record. If the member for Rockingham or the member for Armadale decide that they want to listen to the tape of the second reading speech, they have the capacity to do so.

Ms R. Saffioti interjected.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Please be quiet; this is serious.

If there is any discrepancy between what the parliamentary secretary said and what is approved by him for correction in *Hansard*, the member for Rockingham has the ability to check that against the tape and the *Hansard* record.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mrs L.M. Harvey): The *Hansard* will record what was spoken in the house.

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY - Thursday, 26 November 2009]

p9983c-9987a

Mr Murray Cowper; Mr Colin Barnett; Speaker; Ms Alannah MacTiernan; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Rob Johnson; Acting Speaker

Mr M. McGowan: Understood.

Mr R.F. Johnson: Okay.