

Via email to: sarailfreight@infrastructure.gov.au
For the attention of:

19th November 2009

The Manager
Adelaide Rail Freight Movements Study
Department of Infrastructure, Transport,
Regional Development and Local Government
GPO Box 594
CANBERRA ACT 2601

Dear Sir/Madam

Submission – Adelaide Rail Freight Movement Study Discussion Paper – October 2009

I am responding to your Discussion Paper as a private individual. I am also a current Councillor (and former Deputy Mayor) with the City of Onkaparinga and chair and/or coordinate a broad number of volunteer groups and activities within my general area. The City of Onkaparinga has considered the Discussion Paper and is making its own submission.

My submission specifically addresses the Review Team's request for feedback on *'other features of the route that are important for the Study to take into account'*.

It is my view that the study should be broadened to incorporate not only rail freight movement but also the movement of passengers between Murray Bridge and Adelaide and the many locations in the eastern part of the Fleurieu Peninsula in between which are currently very badly serviced by convenient and timely public transport.

It is because of this [of the five options being considered] I particularly like Option 4 (the Southern route) as it will provide an opportunity to expand the freight service into this much needed passenger service to advantage travellers located between Murray Bridge and Adelaide like Meadows, Kangarilla, Clarendon, Happy Valley, Chandlers Hill, Aberfoyle Park, Flagstaff Hill and Coromandel Valley. Those who live in these locations and in the hills nearby have no fast public transport service to the Adelaide city and therefore have to rely on slow moving buses that have little or no priority over the rest of the traffic travelling in their vicinity and times to therefore travel to Adelaide plains are significant.

It also seems to me that option 1 (essentially do nothing) is not an option; option 2 is surpassed by option 3 which in turn provides little benefit for the southern community; option 5 does very little for the hills dwellers and is at

comparable cost to option 4. Option 4 with the inclusion of a passenger services [with the freight] is in my view the most desirable and overall cost effective option. This is with the absolute proviso that any noise or pollutant generation is at an absolute minimum so as not to detrimentally affect residents who travel or live in the vicinity of the option 4 route.

As background: Part of the old decommissioned Willunga railway line which is further south on the Fleurieu Peninsula did provide a passenger facility some 30 years ago but it turned towards the coast at Reynella and connected with the Brighton line at Hallett Cove thus denying the northern part of the City of Onkaparinga with an effective rail service. The existing Brighton to Noarlunga rail service is also in the process of being extended to Seaford and will eventually be extended to Aldinga Beach (and maybe beyond to Victor Harbor).

For many decades now, there has been community pressure to provide a second major public transport corridor from the Adelaide plains to the south which would run east of and complement the current Brighton to Noarlunga railway corridor. A possible solution which has had some minor consideration is to extend the Adelaide to Tonsley passenger/freight line to Bedford Park and up through Flagstaff Hill and proceed south to meet up with the old Willunga railway line alignment at Reynella. I understand that the extension to Bedford Park from Tonsley (approximately 1 km) is in the planning stage by SA State Government but any further extension to the south is not under consideration.

Option 4 of the Study shows a proposal for a tunnel from about the Adelaide suburb of Hawthorne to near Clarendon, then above ground and a tunnel again near Kangarilla to Meadows and above ground again for a total of 22 km of tunnel. To me this indicates that there may be real opportunities to provide passenger access points (railway stations) at a number of locations along this route like Meadows, Kangarilla, Clarendon, Happy Valley, Chandlers Hill, Aberfoyle Park and Coromandel Valley.

The Study shows that the cost of option 4 is in the vicinity of \$2.4 billion which is the highest of all the options and would for that reason be harder to justify despite the significant savings in travel times, etc. But by including the provision for passenger traffic as well could in my opinion tip the balance in favour of this option.

I would see the line as being electrified to minimise pollutants and may need to be gauged to complement the freight line else it may require dual lines as currently exist on the Blackwood to Adelaide line. Ideally the line should be duplicated or be provided with a number of sidings to allow trains to pass one another in opposite directions. This should not add significantly to the overall cost.

Although there is no discussion within the Study concerning passenger possibilities, I think the Study Objectives with regard to impact on community amenity (economic, social and environmental impacts) provides for a broadening of considerations. This is insofar as provision of benefits to the community is concerned by way of including passenger transport as well.

Option 4 is obviously the shortest route from Murray Bridge to the City of Adelaide and has significant travel time savings compared to the other options although it is the most expensive. However this has to be contrasted to the fact that a future public transport corridor will be required to service the eastern part of southern Adelaide and this may more than justify the \$2.4 billion cost.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comment.

For consideration

(WECoomans JP)

Bill Coomans JP

*Bcc: Mr Jeff Tate - CEO City of Onkaparinga
Dr Bob Such MP - Member for Fisher
Amanda Rishworth MP - Federal Member for Kingston*