



**KEN TRAVERS MLC**

2/129 GRAND BOULEVARD (BEHIND ANZ BANK)  
JOONDALUP WA 6027

Phone: (08) 9300 3422

Fax: (08) 9300 3424

Hon Simon O'Brien MLC  
Chairman  
Standing Committee on Environment and Public Affairs  
Parliament House  
PERTH WA 6000

*Simon*  
Dear Chairman,

Thank you for your invitation to provide a written submission regarding the issues raised in Petition No 11 – New Rail Yards at Claisebrook.

I was initially contacted by a group of residents, now known as the 'Tully Road Action Group' in May 2013 regarding a letter they received from the Public Transport Authority (PTA), notifying them of works to expand the Claisebrook rail stowage yards, located behind their properties.

I believe there are a range of issues that the Committee should inquire into that go beyond the planning decisions of the Metropolitan Redevelopment Authority (MRA) and focus on the process by which the PTA arrived at their decisions to (a) expand the rail depot; and (b) the choice of the Claisebrook location.

I question whether the Claisebrook rail depot is the best place for an expansion, considering the associated expense involved, when the State Government will need to build a new rail depot as part of the rail line to Perth Airport. The existing Claisebrook depot can handle all the trains that will need to be stored there until this time.

Further extending these rail yards conflicts with the Premier's vision for an eastern entry statement to Perth City. The Premier is quoted on the Perth Stadium website that ".....together with the Riverside Development, the Perth Waterfront, the Perth Cultural Centre, the City Link and the Perth Arena, the new Perth Stadium and an eastern precinct will enhance Perth's reputation as a world class city with a range of entertainment options". The development of the depot will detract from this vision.

Has the PTA completed a business case to justify this expenditure, especially in light of recent expenditure to replace timber sleepers with concrete at this location which will now be removed and replaced.

The PTA's proposal is currently lodged with the MRA, seeking approval to develop Lot 500 located next to the eastern boundary of the Claisebrook East Perth Rail Depot for the future expansion of its stowage yard, depot operations and infrastructure.

The initial concern of residents was that works had commenced without consultation leading to subsequent concerns about increased rail traffic, visual and noise pollution and a reduction in the overall amenity and value of their homes.

Once residents pointed out their concerns, the PTA met with residents to provide a briefing on the scope of works. It was during this process that the PTA, admitted that they had overlooked the requirement of a planning application for works under the MRA regulations.

The PTA has advised residents by way of a powerpoint presentation, that the Claisebrook Depot is at capacity and currently stows 40 x 'A'Series rail cars. However, in a response from the Minister to a parliamentary question (Council QON 262), the Parliamentary Secretary stated that 44 'A'series trains are currently stored at the Claisebrook depot which can store a maximum of 48.

It is my understanding that all 48 'A'series trains were previously stored at the Claisebrook depot, prior to the construction of the Mandurah Rail Line. It is further my understanding that the intention is to only store 'A'series rail cars at this depot, so why is the expansion necessary in light of the damage it will do to the amenity and visual impact of the area.

I am concerned that the PTA has provided misinformation to the residents of the Tully Road Action Group in order to support their case for an expansion of the rail yards.

I would urge the committee to inquire into the following issues;

- 1) Why did the PTA provide misleading information to residents;
- 2) Did the PTA complete a business case for this project;
- 3) Is the expansion of this rail yard really necessary considering it can already house all existing 'A'series carriages;
- 4) Does the expansion of this rail yard conflict with the Premiers vision for an 'eastern entry statement' for Perth City?

These issues are not about the planning process but highlight the poor processes to arrive at the decision to seek planning permission. This case reminds me of a similar case when the Constitutional Affairs Committee in 1997 lead a successful investigation into the decision processes for a rail freight facility in Canning Vale which was eventually stopped.

It is my understanding that the Member for Perth has been in contact with local residents and wrote to the Minister for Transport outlining her concerns ( copy attached). I am sure she would be supportive of the Committee investigating the matters raised.

Please feel free to contact me if you require any further information on this matter.

Yours sincerely



**KEN TRAVERS MLC**  
**MEMBER FOR NORTH METROPOLITAN**





# Eleni Evangel MLA

Your State Member for Perth



Representing: Highgate, East Perth, Leederville, Mt Hawthorn, North Perth, Northbridge, Perth, West Perth and parts of Cockburn and the City of

4 July 2013

The Hon Troy Buswell MLA  
Minister for Transport  
13<sup>th</sup> Floor, Dumas House  
2 Havelock Street  
WEST PERTH WA 6005

Dear Minister *Troy,*

RE: TULLY ROAD ACTION GROUP – INCREASED RAIL TRACKS

I recently met with a group of constituents from the Tully Road Action Group, in regard to their concerns with the planned increase in the number of rail tracks near their homes and the inevitable increased noise pollution. The group presented a petition signed by over 30 local residents, which outlined their concerns and suggested solutions.

Minister, I am sure you are aware, that currently there are only two tracks in use and the planned increase will see up to five operational tracks. The spokesperson for the group, Mr Peter Kroll, stated that residents are constantly exposed to loud, screeching noises, coming from the tracks until as late as 3.00am. In addition, Mr Kroll explained that residents are concerned about the impact these conditions will have on their property values.

It is feared that the increased number of rail tracks will impact seriously on the residents existing lifestyle. I understand the PTA had some communication with residents, albeit at a very late stage, regarding the details of the increased rail tracks. My understanding is there was a green wall of shrub that was used to buffer the noise omissions from the two existing tracks. This has now been taken down and a brick wall is proposed to replace this green noise barrier.

Minister, I wish to take this opportunity to highlight the importance of this wall as a noise buffer and ask it is built with all circumstances considered for its purpose. This includes; increased height and width to provide a sufficient and effective sound barrier, extending the length of the wall to reach East Parade where new housing is

planned for development and thick green shrub to cover the wall on the residents side for extra noise proofing and visual appeal.

I have enclosed for your reference a copy of the correspondence received from the Tully Road Action Group, which outline some additional items for your urgent consideration.

I look forward to and would appreciate your comments on this matter.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Eleni Evangel".

**ELENI EVANGEL MLA  
MEMBER FOR PERTH**

---