

**RAILWAY (METRONET) AMENDMENT BILL 2019**

*Committee*

Resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting. The Deputy Chair of Committees (Hon Dr Steve Thomas) in the chair; Hon Stephen Dawson (Minister for Environment) in charge of the bill.

**Clause 1: Short title —**

Committee was interrupted after the clause had been partly considered.

**Hon DONNA FARAGHER:** I seek some clarification. I was going to ask some questions at clause 8 on the Marshall Road land but I appreciate that Hon Tim Clifford raised questions about that just prior to question time. I am happy to ask my questions here or, if there is a preference to ask those questions at clause 8, I am happy to do so.

**Hon Stephen Dawson:** That would be my preference.

**Hon DONNA FARAGHER:** I am happy to do that.

**Hon MICHAEL MISCHIN:** I have just a couple of questions. Given the importance that has been attached to this particular project, as opposed to any other projects planned in the “Directions 2031” strategic plan in the transport projections, which projects are being deferred to give priority to the Ellenbrook–Morley railway line?

**Hon STEPHEN DAWSON:** I am told that none have been deferred. The department is doing them as quickly as it can.

**Hon MICHAEL MISCHIN:** If I understand it correctly, ample resources will be provided to meet the other projections for the projects that may be required in the metropolitan area under the transport plan, and they will not be affected by the fact that the Morley–Ellenbrook line will be put in place at an earlier stage than was originally anticipated.

**Hon STEPHEN DAWSON:** They will be done as soon as they can possibly be resourced. As I indicated, this is a priority for the government and it is being done now. The other projects will have to go through a budget process, just like this one has.

**Hon MICHAEL MISCHIN:** The minister keeps saying that this project is justified because the people of Ellenbrook want it. Of course, everyone wants things, but has the government turned its mind to whether this project is more important and should be given priority over any other projects in the transport plan?

**Hon STEPHEN DAWSON:** As I have previously indicated, it is not just the people of Ellenbrook who value this project. It is a 21-kilometre route. It is the people of Ellenbrook, Brabham, Dayton, Malaga, Noranda, Morley and Embleton who will all benefit from this project. As I have previously indicated, this is a priority project for the government and it is one that we are keen to deliver.

**Hon MICHAEL MISCHIN:** Is the minister able to say how many passengers will use this line on a daily basis when it is completed?

**Hon STEPHEN DAWSON:** I am advised it is anticipated that between 12 000 and 18 000 passengers will use it by 2031.

**Hon Michael Mischin:** Per day?

**Hon STEPHEN DAWSON:** Yes.

**Clause put and passed.**

**Clause 2: Commencement —**

**Hon SIMON O'BRIEN:** This is the commencement clause. I do not recall ever asking a question about a commencement clause.

**Hon Stephen Dawson:** You probably have but your memory is probably fading in your twilight years!

**Hon SIMON O'BRIEN:** It probably is, but this bill is a little different. A lot of work has been carried out and moneys expended on the project. That begs the question whether the government proposes to take the bill, when passed, to royal assent and therefore it will be on the statute book, or whether some other implications will see the government wish to delay it, perhaps due to waiting for federal funding or something.

**Hon STEPHEN DAWSON:** No, it is the government's intention to get royal assent immediately upon the bill's passage in this place.

**Clause put and passed.**

**Clause 3 put and passed.**

Hon Donna Faragher; Hon Michael Mischin; Hon Stephen Dawson; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Tjorn Sibma; Hon Robin Scott

---

**Clause 4: Long title amended —**

**Hon SIMON O'BRIEN:** I think this matter might have been touched on—it certainly has in the public debate—and I thought I would ask a question about it here. The long title is to be amended to include mentioning a railway from Bayswater to Ellenbrook, which it certainly is, but the line is to be known as the Morley–Ellenbrook line. I am puzzled why it will not be called either the Ellenbrook line or the Bayswater–Ellenbrook line. Why is the government calling it the Morley–Ellenbrook line, because that does not seem to me to be obvious?

**Hon STEPHEN DAWSON:** Quite simply, the government decided to call this the Morley–Ellenbrook line just like the previous government decided to call the Forrestfield–Airport Link the Forrestfield–Airport Link even though it will not go to Forrestfield; it will go to High Wycombe. This decision was made by the government. The train line does go through Morley. Morley is the next big suburb the train line goes through and that is part of the title given to the train line.

**Hon SIMON O'BRIEN:** What it tends to show is that it is about delivering something to Morley, but, as I understand it, the major likely destination of Morley will be missed by quite some way—maybe even a couple of kilometres. What does the member for Morley think about this? Is the member happy with the route and the fact it is not really going to Morley at all?

**Hon STEPHEN DAWSON:** I am sure the member for Morley is very happy, as indeed are members in the other electorates this 21-kilometre train line will traverse. This train line will certainly go through the suburb of Morley. Consideration was given to whether it should go to Morley Galleria, for example, but obviously there are constraints associated with Morley Galleria. It was decided that this route was the best route for the train line because of the costs and efficiencies.

**Hon SIMON O'BRIEN:** I will conclude now, but I just wanted to thank the minister for his totally implausible and unlikely reason for why it is called the Morley–Ellenbrook line. It will go down as a footnote of history as one of the great incongruities. I will not move an amendment because that could be a protracted affair, and we would not want that, would we?

**Clause put and passed.**

**Clause 5 put and passed.**

**Clause 6: Schedule 1 amended —**

**Hon SIMON O'BRIEN:** I mentioned this in my contribution to the second reading: my understanding is that inserting “1994” in the places indicated will make the description in schedule 1 of the act more correct, or correct in view of the fact that there has been a change in another jurisdiction as to how these grid references are described. Could the minister indicate whether that is generally what it is about and what would be the consequences if this amendment were not made?

**Hon STEPHEN DAWSON:** I am going to give the honourable member a pre-prepared answer, which hopefully answers the question. It is confusing to me, but hopefully it answers the question. The reference in schedule 1, “Line of Thornlie–Cockburn Link”, in the Railway (METRONET) Act 2018 requires the insertion of “1994” after “Map Grid of Australia”. On and from 30 June 2020, the Geocentric Datum of Australia 2020 will come into use. Since the implementation of the previous Geocentric Datum of Australia 1994, the Australian continental plate has moved approximately 1.6 metres and Australia’s coordinates are no longer aligned with the global navigational satellite systems. To address this, in October 2017, the Australian government implemented a new datum known as the Geocentric Datum of Australia 2020—GDA2020. The Intergovernmental Committee on Surveying and Mapping has agreed on an adoption date of 30 June 2020 and a national initiative is currently underway to implement GDA2020 by this deadline. By inserting “1994” after “Map Grid of Australia”, it will be clear which Geocentric Datum of Australia is in use.

**Hon TJORN SIBMA:** I thank the minister very much for the overview of plate tectonics and its consequences on surveying and the delivery of the Metronet system! I want to refer to the last conversation: is the information the minister just provided the actual justification he was seeking for calling this line the Morley–Ellenbrook line rather than the Bayswater–Ellenbrook line, which it actually appears to be?

**Hon STEPHEN DAWSON:** No; it was totally independent of that, honourable member.

**Hon SIMON O'BRIEN:** I would hate to be seen in any way to remonstrate with my colleague here, but in fact he should have directed the question, as it relates to clause 6, not to the naming of the Morley–Ellenbrook line but in fact to the location of the Thornlie–Cockburn Link.

**Hon Michael Mischin:** It probably goes somewhere completely different anyway.

**Hon SIMON O'BRIEN:** Which probably goes somewhere completely different.

Hon Donna Faragher; Hon Michael Mischin; Hon Stephen Dawson; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Tjorn Sibma; Hon Robin Scott

---

**Hon Michael Mischin:** Perhaps Collie.

**Hon SIMON O'BRIEN:** Everything else is going to Collie, so it would not surprise me!

**The DEPUTY CHAIR:** Order, members! I do not think that Collie is anywhere near the purview of the bill before the chamber. I direct the honourable member back to clause 6, which is under debate today.

**Hon SIMON O'BRIEN:** Indeed. I will quickly conclude my examination of clause 6 because my colleague over here, Hon Martin Aldridge, has indicated that he has a proposed amendment brewing! We will look out for that with some wonderment.

We are responding to tectonic plate-shifting. Will this apply only to these railways that have been authorised or does the situation arise only in respect of those rail lines that have been authorised but are yet to be constructed? Does it make any difference to previous enabling legislation for other rail lines or is it just taken to be that they were authorised for wherever they were at the material time, and if plate tectonics have moved them four foot to the left or something, it does not really matter?

**Hon STEPHEN DAWSON:** I am told there is no requirement to change, say, the Forrestfield–Airport Link. The reason we are tidying it up is that there is an opportunity before us in this bill and because the Intergovernmental Committee on Surveying and Mapping agreed that the new datum will apply from 30 June 2020. There is no requirement to change other things, but we are doing it now because the opportunity is here.

**Clause put and passed.**

**Clause 7 put and passed.**

**Clause 8: Schedule 3 inserted —**

**Hon DONNA FARAGHER:** I have a few questions about the route. I appreciate some of those answers might not be able to be provided but I am going to ask the questions.

**Hon Stephen Dawson:** I will answer what I can.

**Hon DONNA FARAGHER:** The minister is very good.

My first question relates to the Marshall Road land. I appreciate that some questions have already been asked about that and the minister made mention of it in his reply to the second reading. Can I seek clarification about the actual land itself in terms of the requirements under the metropolitan region scheme? I understand that it is currently reserved parks and recreation because it forms part of Whiteman Park, albeit that is not what the government suggests. Will there be a requirement at all to amend the MRS to allow the line to go through; and, if so, can the minister provide me with some more detail?

**Hon STEPHEN DAWSON:** The honourable member is correct about its current zoning. The answer is no, though, in terms of needing to amend the MRS. The act we are amending gives us an exemption.

**Hon DONNA FARAGHER:** Does that exemption apply only to the line itself and/or the stations? I appreciate there is a proposed future station; does it include that as well?

**Hon STEPHEN DAWSON:** The Railway (METRONET) Act 2018 says, “Planning approval not required for certain Metronet works”, and that is Metronet works on non-railway land. However, development approvals and environmental approvals still need to be sought. It simply means that the MRS does not need to be amended, but those development approvals and environmental approvals processes need to be gone through.

**Hon DONNA FARAGHER:** Just so that I can confirm, should the government at any time in the future seek to urbanise parts of the land around those train stations, would it require an amendment to the metropolitan region scheme?

**Hon STEPHEN DAWSON:** Yes, it would, because it is urban development, not railway works.

**Hon DONNA FARAGHER:** The minister mentioned environmental approvals. If I heard correctly, in his summing up the minister indicated that from the government’s perspective, there were not enormous environmental values—I am putting words in the minister’s mouth, so I appreciate that he might want to make sure we are clear on that. I would have thought that there would be a requirement for an environmental assessment. If so, could the minister tell me whether that has been submitted to the Environmental Protection Authority; and, if so, what is its status? Can the minister tell me, if it is up to that point, what the level of assessment is?

**Hon STEPHEN DAWSON:** Regarding the environmental approvals, the public comment period recently closed for the level of assessment for the Malaga to Ellenbrook rail works. That was advertised on the EPA website recently as part of determining the level of assessment. The Bayswater to Malaga portion was referred to the EPA previously, and it decided that the level of environmental impact did not warrant formal assessment. A clearing permit application will be made to remove vegetation from the Noranda and Morley station sites, so it is in train. The first part, Bayswater to Malaga, has been done. The EPA said it did not warrant formal assessment. The second

Hon Donna Faragher; Hon Michael Mischin; Hon Stephen Dawson; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Tjorn Sibma; Hon Robin Scott

---

bit is in train at the moment, and the public comment period recently closed. It is before the EPA at the moment to determine a level of assessment for the project.

**Hon Donna Faragher:** Does that include the Marshall Road land precinct?

**Hon STEPHEN DAWSON:** Yes, it does, but only on the railway corridor.

**Hon DONNA FARAGHER:** Can the minister clarify that it is not the government's intention to seek to urbanise those parts of the Marshall Road land that are not required for the rail corridor?

**Hon STEPHEN DAWSON:** I am advised that there is no plan to change it.

**Hon DONNA FARAGHER:** One area in the Marshall Road land had long been identified by the City of Swan for a sporting precinct, and I recall at the time of the minister's announcement about the route that there would need to be some further discussions with the city about identifying an alternative location. I am not sure whether the minister can provide this advice to me, but is he aware whether an alternative location has been identified? I have heard there might be, but I would like some clarification.

**Hon STEPHEN DAWSON:** I am not aware that an alternative location has been found. I am advised that those conversations between the state and the City of Swan are ongoing.

**Hon DONNA FARAGHER:** Just so I am clear, at this time an alternative location has not been confirmed.

**Hon STEPHEN DAWSON:** Not that we are aware of, bearing in mind that this is the Metronet team. I am not being obtuse, but we are only aware of the discussions about the train line. The conversations about sporting fields may well be had by other people. We are certainly aware that the negotiations and conversations between the state and the City of Swan are ongoing.

**Hon DONNA FARAGHER:** I turn to the requirements of the land, and I suppose this goes back to the MRS and the ability to deal with it in that manner. What is being considered for Park 'n' Ride options?

**Hon STEPHEN DAWSON:** I am advised that there will be Park 'n' Ride at all stations, but the number of parking bays is still to be decided.

**Hon DONNA FARAGHER:** I am sorry; I am asking a lot of questions, but it is helpful. I understand that Ellenbrook Christian College will be impacted partly as a result of the route. I understand that the college was aware at the time of purchase of the land that there was a pre-existing corridor, and that was obviously some time ago. Notwithstanding that, can the minister advise what design solutions are being considered for that area?

**Hon STEPHEN DAWSON:** The honourable member is correct. The train line and the Ellenbrook station will be built within the existing transit corridor that was reserved as part of the development plan for Ellenbrook in the early 1990s. The transit corridor sits between the college buildings and the oval. The Swan Christian Education Association was aware of the corridor when it purchased the land for the school. I am further advised that the Metronet office has been working very closely with the school as part of the planning process, and will continue to work with it together with the PTA and the construction contractor to minimise impacts as much as possible. We are not at a stage yet at which there will be an impact, but we are certainly working closely with the school and those who will be involved in the project to mitigate any implication in order to ensure the school could continue to operate and have access to the fields.

**Hon Donna Faragher:** I think there are obviously concerns about noise impacts and the like.

**Hon STEPHEN DAWSON:** Certainly; that is why the Metronet office is working closely with the school at the moment.

**Hon DONNA FARAGHER:** This is a question about Whiteman Park, and perhaps the minister's advisers may be able to assist. I understand that there are at least three other exit points currently. There are two main entry and exit points to the park at this time, but there are other points that can be used in case of emergency. I understand that those exit points could be impacted by the train line; that is, they might not be able to be accessed. The reason I raise this is in case there is an emergency, which no-one ever wants to see. Whiteman Park obviously has high environmental value and has a bushfire risk. I am seeking some clarification. If that is not the case, I am happy to be provided with that information, but I am keen to hear the Metronet team's understanding of those access and exit points.

**Hon STEPHEN DAWSON:** I am told we are working with the Department of Fire and Emergency Services quite closely to work out the requirements to enable people to leave the park in the event of a significant fire, and that work is happening at the moment.

**Hon DONNA FARAGHER:** Can the minister confirm for me whether exit points are identified in the planning at this time that would need to be looked at; and, if so, how many?

**Hon STEPHEN DAWSON:** I am advised that at least one is being looked at, but, again, we are working closely with fire and emergency services on that.

Hon Donna Faragher; Hon Michael Mischin; Hon Stephen Dawson; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Tjorn Sibma; Hon Robin Scott

---

**Hon DONNA FARAGHER:** I am sure the minister would appreciate and agree that this is a key issue that needs to be resolved for the protection of that park. It is a very, very popular park. If there is any reduction of exit points—no-one wants to have to use them—and there is an impact, alternative options need to be identified to ensure that there are appropriate points for people to exit.

**Hon STEPHEN DAWSON:** I draw the member's attention to the fact that we are not cutting off public access points.

**Hon Donna Faragher:** I appreciate that; it is the other points.

**Hon STEPHEN DAWSON:** Sure, but just so everybody is clear, it is not the public access points. We are working with fire and emergency services on those other potential points. The member is a former environment minister, so we share this bond that Whiteman Park is a special place, and the EPA has a role to play in the environmental approvals for this project.

**Hon DONNA FARAGHER:** I am certainly not raising this to be difficult; I think it is a fair point and one that needs to be addressed, and I appreciate that the minister, as Minister for Environment, will be taking a keen interest in that as well.

With regard to the bridge at Broun Avenue, can the minister confirm that there will be a need to lift the bridge, or will there be a new bridge?

**Hon STEPHEN DAWSON:** We will have to actually replace the bridge; the bridge will be demolished and replaced to accommodate the new Morley station and bus interchange.

**Hon DONNA FARAGHER:** Can the minister provide me with an expected time frame for that to occur, and how much time the government expects will be required for construction? Given that that is a very important bridge and route, can the minister provide me with some more detail? I presume the current bridge will be retained while the new bridge is built alongside. If the minister could provide me with more detail, I would appreciate it.

**Hon STEPHEN DAWSON:** I can clarify that there will always be a bridge there. The likelihood is that we will probably build the new one and, once that is built, remove the old one. It is part of the Tonkin gap work that will commence mid-2020. When it will happen is yet to be worked out, but certainly there will be a bridge there.

**Hon DONNA FARAGHER:** That is helpful. I understand there will be some requirement for resumptions of land. Could the minister detail for me what those resumptions are? I know of at least one, but I presume there may well also be some requirements around the Bayswater area.

**Hon STEPHEN DAWSON:** I am told that there will be a requirement to acquire some land in the Bayswater industrial area; that detail is being worked through at the moment. There is also some semirural land at Bennett Springs that we will need to acquire, but that work has not yet commenced. We are still finalising what might be needed.

**Hon DONNA FARAGHER:** Have landowners been informed of likely resumptions, either whole or in part?

**Hon STEPHEN DAWSON:** We have written to them advising that we may need their land, so they are aware of that, but, obviously, it will depend on the detail and we will not know until further down the track what lands will need to be acquired. But it is certainly our view that we will work with landowners to come to a resolution on the acquisition of land.

**Hon DONNA FARAGHER:** There have obviously been discussions about the alignment. Can the minister explain to me the number of options that were considered? I have heard a figure of more than 100. What was the process of discounting or otherwise those routes, and how did we come to the final selection?

**Hon STEPHEN DAWSON:** The member is correct that more than 100 options were considered before they were narrowed down to the final preferred option that is before us. I am advised that each option was assessed against project objectives and key criteria such as community benefits and opportunities, community and environmental impacts, development opportunities, rail operations, value for money and operating costs. A significant amount of work was done to get down to the preferred option that is before us now. I mentioned earlier that it took 62 000 project hours to get us to where we are now, so a significant amount of analysis was done to arrive at the route we have.

**Hon DONNA FARAGHER:** Can I just clarify the various options that were put forward: obviously, there is the Malaga point, but was consideration given to having the route go into Ballajura?

**Hon STEPHEN DAWSON:** No, it was not. My further advice is that it was not part of the problem area of the north east corridor.

**Hon DONNA FARAGHER:** I just wanted some clarity on that; thank you.

**Hon MICHAEL MISCHIN:** I have a few questions about the route of the Morley–Ellenbrook rail line. Schedule 3, inserted by clause 8, specifies the route to be taken, from around Bayswater station through to Ellenbrook. How long is that? I think there was mention in the second reading speech of approximately 21 kilometres. Can the minister be more precise about that? I calculate 21.4 kilometres from the figures that are in the schedule. Is that the best that can be done?

Hon Donna Faragher; Hon Michael Mischin; Hon Stephen Dawson; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Tjorn Sibma; Hon Robin Scott

---

**Hon STEPHEN DAWSON:** My notes indicate that it is approximately 21 kilometres; I am advised, though, that it is somewhere between 21 and 22 kilometres.

**Hon Michael Mischin:** That's probably the tectonic plates moving!

**Hon STEPHEN DAWSON:** Perhaps a 1.6-metre tectonic movement! The member has just done a quick figure, I have just done a quick figure, but it is between 21 and 22 kilometres.

**Hon MICHAEL MISCHIN:** How wide is the corridor that will be occupied by the railway reserve?

**Hon STEPHEN DAWSON:** The corridor will be approximately 40 metres wide for the vast majority of the line, but, of course, at the train stations, the corridor will obviously be broader, depending on such things as how many parking bays there are. But, certainly, the main corridor is approximately 40 metres wide.

**Hon MICHAEL MISCHIN:** Which brings me to my next question. I confess that I do not know the status of this document, but it is under the Metronet letterhead, addressed to the Minister for Transport, headed "Report on the Planned Construction of the Morley–Ellenbrook Line Railway". It is signed by Acting Director General Mark Burgess and dated 24 September 2019. I do not know whether it has been tabled or is part of the materials. Is the minister familiar with that document? I do not suppose he can tell me what its status is; has it been tabled as part of the explanatory memorandum or anything of that nature?

**Hon STEPHEN DAWSON:** I am not aware whether it has been tabled; I have a copy here of the report from the acting director general to the minister. I am not aware of the status of it, but the member has a copy of it, so if he has a question in relation to it, he should ask away. Some of my advisers are aware of the document and others have never seen it.

**Hon MICHAEL MISCHIN:** Perhaps for the sake of clarity I will seek leave to table a copy of that, because it may be of some relevance to future reference. I do not have a spare copy, but I understand there are some at the back.

**Hon STEPHEN DAWSON:** I have been drawn to the second reading speech, in which the minister tabled a report by the acting director general of the Department of Transport, "Report on the Planned Construction of the Morley–Ellenbrook Line Railway", so it has been tabled previously.

**Hon MICHAEL MISCHIN:** The document makes mention of the need for five new stations to be constructed at Morley, Noranda, Malaga, Whiteman Park and Ellenbrook. Have the sites for those stations been identified; and, if so, can the minister point out on the map that came with the report where they are intended to be? It seems to me that all that map shows is the route to be taken. The Ellenbrook station presumably will be at the end of it, but where are the other four stations going to be located?

**Hon STEPHEN DAWSON:** I am advised that the Morley station will be at Broun Avenue, the Noranda station will be at Benara Road, the Malaga station will be between Tonkin Highway and Beechboro Road, the Whiteman Park station will be at the eastern entry to Whiteman Park, and the Ellenbrook station will be in the town centre, south of The Parkway.

**Hon MICHAEL MISCHIN:** I know they will not be precise spots, but would the minister be good enough to put crosses on the plan indicating these stations for my reference and perhaps the future reference of the Parliament?

**The DEPUTY CHAIR (Hon Dr Steve Thomas):** I am not entirely certain of the parliamentary protocol on this, but we will have a little slack today. Are you going to draw first, minister?

**Hon STEPHEN DAWSON:** I am going to give some further information, Mr Deputy Chair. A publicly available document—the Metronet newsletter from August 2019—already has the stations marked on it. I am going to table that document and Hon Michael Mischin will get a copy of that. It has the approximate areas for the train stations. That is probably more helpful than my terrible drawing on the maps.

[See paper [3619](#).]

**Hon MICHAEL MISCHIN:** I am obliged to the minister for that. This document points out five stations, but it also has provision for a future station at a place called Bennett Springs East. Essentially, provision is made for six stations.

**Hon Stephen Dawson:** That is correct.

**Hon MICHAEL MISCHIN:** Can the minister give us a rough idea of how much land is required for each of those stations?

**Hon STEPHEN DAWSON:** I cannot, honourable member. There is no hard and fast rule as to how big they might be. As I have previously indicated, we are now doing the work on how many parking bays will be needed at each station. Once that is done, we will have a sense of how big each station will need to be. We do not have that information because we have not yet done the work.

**Hon MICHAEL MISCHIN:** Some of the stations along the freeway are accommodated within the railway corridor in the middle of the freeway. I do not use them, so I am not sure how the parking is accommodated in these places. Is that the plan here or are these going to extend some significant distance out from the 40-metre railway corridor?

Hon Donna Faragher; Hon Michael Mischin; Hon Stephen Dawson; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Tjorn Sibma; Hon Robin Scott

---

**Hon STEPHEN DAWSON:** The parking will be around the proposed stations. For example, the train stations on the freeway have parking bays on each side of the freeway. That will not be the case here, because the parking will encapsulate the train stations.

**Hon MICHAEL MISCHIN:** That brings me to the next point: how much private property needs to be purchased or, in the event that no-one is willing to sell, compulsorily acquired by the government to complete this project? Has that been calculated?

**Hon STEPHEN DAWSON:** The amount has not yet been calculated. Hon Donna Faragher asked a similar question. There is a bit of land in the Bayswater industrial estate that we may need to acquire and also at Bennett Springs. That would be down the track; provision is made for the train station that we do not propose to build yet. In saying that, there will need to be a corridor available in Bennett Springs, but we do not yet know how big or broad that will be. That work has not been done.

**Hon MICHAEL MISCHIN:** The minister mentioned some industrial estate needing to be acquired in one fashion or another. What about private housing? Is there a need for any homes to be demolished to be able to put this line through on the route that has been identified?

**Hon STEPHEN DAWSON:** Only potentially at Bennett Springs. For the rest of the route, there is no requirement to demolish houses.

**Hon MICHAEL MISCHIN:** Has any acquisition of land occurred to date in anticipation of this?

**Hon STEPHEN DAWSON:** One block of land has been acquired in the Bayswater industrial estate, and that was from somebody who wanted to sell the land.

**Hon MICHAEL MISCHIN:** How much is it expected to cost to acquire the land that is necessary, and can the minister give an idea of how much the acquisition of that particular parcel of land came to?

**Hon STEPHEN DAWSON:** We do not have the Bayswater information with us; it may well be commercial-in-confidence. If the member is okay, I do not propose to hold up the bill on that. I will ask the question. If I can provide that information to the chamber at a later stage, I will provide it. With Bennett Springs, we do not know what we need at this stage, so we do not know what it will cost.

**Hon MICHAEL MISCHIN:** When the line is put through, will it run close to residential properties; and, if so, roughly how far away from the rail line will these residential properties be?

**Hon STEPHEN DAWSON:** I am advised that properties will back onto the corridor, certainly in Ellenbrook, but the department is quite adept at putting in noise mitigation such as noise walls. All that work is to be done. There are certainly houses in Ellenbrook that are close to the corridor.

**Hon MICHAEL MISCHIN:** Lastly, is it expected that the rail line will increase, decrease or make no difference to the property value of those residential properties contiguous to the rail line?

**Hon STEPHEN DAWSON:** I cannot speculate on that, but I think a real estate agent might tell the member that having a train line or a train station nearby is a positive in terms of house prices. We have not done that work.

**Hon ROBIN SCOTT:** I would like to ask a simple question about the Mt Lawley subway. What is the main reason for a new bridge? Is it because of more trains or heavier trains?

**Hon STEPHEN DAWSON:** We are not doing anything to the Mt Lawley subway. Does the member mean the Bayswater subway?

**Hon Robin Scott:** Sorry; the Bayswater subway.

**Hon STEPHEN DAWSON:** I am advised that the current bridge is the lowest bridge on the Midland line. It keeps getting hit by trucks and is then out of action for a time. We are taking the opportunity now to raise it and hopefully mitigate those events in the future.

*Sitting suspended from 6.00 to 7.30 pm*

**Hon ROBIN SCOTT:** I apologise to the minister for getting the name of the subway wrong before the dinner break. The minister mentioned that the subway bridge at Bayswater was too low. It must be a really good and substantial bridge because there have been many attempts by various trucks and buses to knock it down. I was just wondering whether lowering the road rather than putting in a new bridge was ever considered.

**Hon STEPHEN DAWSON:** It was considered, honourable member, but I am told that the road is already very close to groundwater, and so it made more sense to go up.

**Clause put and passed.**

**Title put and passed.**

*Report*

**Extract from *Hansard***

[COUNCIL — Tuesday, 18 February 2020]

p627d-634a

Hon Donna Faragher; Hon Michael Mischin; Hon Stephen Dawson; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Tjorn Sibma; Hon Robin Scott

---

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

*Third Reading*

Bill read a third time, on motion by **Hon Stephen Dawson (Minister for Environment)**, and passed.