

Submission and Comments In Regards To Adelaide Rail Freight Movement Study

We wish to comment and provide feedback on the rail freight study from a residence view and experience from living in a suburb that is directly affected and impacted upon by freight trains.

We are a one-car family of five who choose to rely heavily on public transport thus the reason for choosing to live at Millswood. We wish to provide a submission and comments emphasising the social impact of the three main options being looked at.

Other features of the route that is important for the study to take into account.

As mentioned, there are safety issues with motor vehicle traffic, pedestrian safety and proximity and accessibility of the rail line to children. Other safety issues to be considered with the current alignment is the diesel emissions, dust creation and **extreme** noise pollution at all hours of the day and night.

Consideration should also be given to the damage being caused by the current alignment to private property through vibration and movement.

There is also the efficiency of passenger rail services and the potential growth of public transport usage if a change was made to the current alignment.

Economic growth and future forecasts

An important fact to be considered, keeping in mind predicted future assumptions and forecasts is that we endeavour to accommodate for any future growth. Planning for the future today will inevitably cost less economically, socially and environmentally.

Let us take for example the Adelaide southern expressway, which was built to accommodate short to medium term forecasts. This project will not be adequate enough into the future, as a dual road way is now required to cater for the

growing southern population. If this factor had been considered at the time of planning and implemented, the overall costing would have been significantly less than the inevitable future construction cost of the second road way.

Options identified

Option 1

The major concern with this option as a resident is the assumed improvement on social impacts, particularly with previously mentioned safety concerns. The noise, vibration and damage to properties would actually increase as the weight capacity and frequency of freights would increase into the future.

The efficiency of option one for the cost involved is not adequate, as it does not address many of the economic, social and environmental factors.

We wish to provide a first hand account of the social impact of a recent upgrade to the existing alignment. The South Australian state government had undertaken an upgrade of the Belair line with concrete sleepers and rail crossing upgrades. Since this upgrade earlier in 2009 the vibration and noise levels are actually more noticeable, leaving one to question whether an upgrade of the existing line would achieve any positive outcomes.

Option 3

This is by far the most favourable option. As mentioned in the report this option allows for a full resolution of community amenity issues, noise levels, safety and property damage.

Considering future forecasts and assumptions this option is ideal for Melbourne to Perth freight services. It allows for shorter transit times, larger capacity and far less operating costs.

For the Melbourne to Adelaide route although indirect it allows for a shorter transit time than is current and greater capacity with less operating costs.

This option also has the advantage of having a lesser capital cost whilst achieving the highest level of efficiency.

Option 4

This is not a favourable option. It is by far the most expensive while still not addressing all issues.

No consideration has been taken for the large number of residence located between Cross road and Islington. Option 4 suggests that the new southern bi-pass would connect with the current freight alignment just south of Cross road. This would infact have a negative impact on social aspects. Cross road traffic would suffer greatly. Residents between Cross road and Islington along the existing alignment would experience a much greater impact with large capacity and high frequency trains. Melbourne to Perth trains would still transit unnecessarily through Adelaide.

Once again for such an expensive option it seems to be inefficient. It appears logical that freight operators would be seeking an option that allows for efficiency and low cost for the most utilised future routes.

In summary an opportunity awaits for this project to be managed with long term and future considerations. A project with such significance must be correctly guided and directed for prosperity of our future generations and cities.

Mark and Maria Paneras
