

**RAILWAY (METRONET) BILL 2018**

*Second Reading*

Resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting.

**MRS L.M. HARVEY (Scarborough — Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** [2.56 pm]: I rise to add further to my earlier comments on the Railway (METRONET) Bill 2018. As I said earlier, some interesting maps were provided as part of the briefing. Looking through those maps, it looks as though there will need to be some grade separated intersections on the Yanchep line; that is the Public Transport Authority's preference for these rail projects. I would expect that they would be around Santorini Promenade and Romeo Road. The people in the northern suburbs would like to see the Mitchell Freeway extension to Romeo Road as well, but the state government has not funded that. It also looks like they might be needed at Pipidinny Road and at Yanchep Beach Road. But the really interesting section is the last few kilometres of this railway line, which ends up in sand dunes. The termination point of the proposed Yanchep rail extension is east 371222, north 6511677, so it will terminate in sand dunes 55.4 kilometres north of the Perth train station. It is hard to imagine, looking at all the land along this rail line. It is also interesting to note that where the rail line now finishes has moved away from the established suburbs, not beside them. We will need some explanation for that. It would be good to hear from the minister in her response to the second reading debate how long she expects it will take to get the environmental approvals through for the new corridor. My understanding is that the previous metropolitan region scheme corridor, which the rail line was to align with, had all the federal and state environmental approvals already in place. Now, with the land swap required and the new environmental approvals, I would be keen to know whether that will hold up the project. It goes back to the prioritisation of a project that still has environmental clearances to achieve, rather than a project like Byford where a rail corridor is already in place.

I have a few more questions about Yanchep. I know that the project definition plan is before cabinet; however, it would be good if the house could know some of the projections for patronage on the Yanchep line when it is due to start.

What is the projected patronage and revenue for this line? What will be the value capture component of this project? In the other place this week, during the estimates process, it was revealed that the government expects to achieve value capture for these rail projects over a period of 30 years, which indicates to me that, in the interim, for the state government to put forward its component of the funding, it will need to borrow. There will obviously be interest expenses associated with that addition to the Loan Bill. Depreciation expenses need to be added into these projects. Those expenses are obviously highest at the front end and diminish somewhat over time. Having the rail carriages available is a significant ongoing recurrent cost to the government in running these rail lines. It will be interesting to see what that cost will be for the Yanchep rail, given that we are starting from a population base of just over 22 000 people. Patronage numbers generally on public transport at the moment represent quite a small proportion of the community in metropolitan Perth using public transport on a daily basis. Indeed, that figure has been in freefall over the past couple of years, which means that patronage projections would have to be, one would suspect, on the conservative side. What percentage of the population of 22 000 is expected to be using this rail line on the day that it is opened for a daily commute? What, then, will citizens across the rest of the metropolitan area be paying to provide this \$520 million election commitment to the people of Yanchep and Two Rocks?

The Yanchep rail extension formed part of the previous government's transport plan, but not until the population of Perth and Peel reached 2.7 million, which was anticipated to be around 2031. Now that population growth is slowing in Western Australia, that may even have needed to be extended out further beyond 2031. The previous government took the approach of planning around a population growth pattern rather than just a time line. Some of these projects start to stack up in a cost-benefit ratio only once a certain population level has been reached. The Liberal government did not commit to the Yanchep rail extension during the election because we knew that if it were to be constructed, it would be constructed well ahead of time, given that it was anticipated that it would be needed around 2031. However, we acknowledge that it was the present government's election commitment, and I know that Hon Christian Porter and the federal government have supported this Yanchep rail line as one of the government's top priorities. That is why the federal government has put the funding towards it. These projects work by the state talking to the federal government, which will agree to a funding pool. The state then puts its priorities together and the feds say, "Yes, if that's your priority, that's what we'll fund." I have yet to hear from the minister about how we are going to pay for the ongoing cost of running these things. Perhaps she can outline in her second reading response whether the recurrent cost of running these rail projects is also built into the project definition plan provided to Infrastructure Australia to finalise the funding arrangements.

As I recall, when we were looking at potentially putting the Yanchep rail out there as an election commitment, which we then drew back from, it was anticipated that the line might have 2 600 or so daily trips by 2021, and around 13 500 by 2031. These are still very low patronage figures for an investment of \$520 million, but that is

what the government has chosen to do, and it will need to explain what the anticipated value capture will be over time. How will that work? Have arrangements been made, for example, with private owners of large tracts of land adjacent to the rail extension to have development occur there? Will there be a levy on those blocks as they are developed to help fund Metronet? At Alkimos, the government has a 50–50 arrangement between LandCorp and Lendlease, or one of the other private operators.

I was interested to look at some of the Urban Design Institute of Australia’s publications on strata reform. One of the areas of strata reform that the government is considering is a leasehold strata, which is a 99-year lease held by the government with a private operator, which can then progress development around significant sites. The train stations along the Yanchep line, including Alkimos, would be a good project to put forward as a new leasehold type of title, whereby individuals within the precinct would not necessarily own that property, but have it on a leasehold that eventually returns to the government. This gives the government in the future the opportunity to finalise those leases, which provides opportunities for big urban regeneration projects around significant sites such as train stations. I am not aware whether the minister and the government are considering a pilot project such as that around Alkimos, for example, but it would be good to hear the minister’s thoughts on these matters. None of these matters were articulated in the second reading speech to explain other aspects of the rail project.

My recollection is that generally four to five years are allowed for these projects, with the approvals and cleared metropolitan region scheme land in place, so the government’s commitment to complete this Yanchep rail extension by 2021 is certainly an ambitious target. With construction workers generally being in demand right across Australia, it will be very ambitious target to achieve that rail line and have it operating by 2021, with its 2 600 daily trips.

During the briefing, we were advised that a land swap was anticipated, but not a land acquisition. It would be good if the minister could clarify how that is anticipated to work, and also if there is an estimate, as I referred to earlier, of the value of the uplift for LandCorp once the station is constructed. Obviously, with LandCorp owning that property, if it is going to be sold, there will be some value uplift if the government seeks to make some significant income from that development. One would hope it can attract people to buy at Alkimos, presumably in a high-density arrangement around the train station.

Getting back to the anticipated operating costs, we raised this issue in estimates. The operating costs of the Forrestfield–Airport Link have blown out already, from what was anticipated in the first year of operation for the recurrent running costs. The running costs for the Forrestfield–Airport Link were articulated on page 631, under division 43 in the 2017–18 *Budget Statements*. Anticipated operating costs for 2018–19 were \$5 million or thereabouts; for 2019–20, around \$16 million; and for 2020–21, around \$41 million.

In the 2018–19 budget, which we saw through this place just over a month ago, there was an addition to those operating costs, with another \$1.5 million in 2018–19, another \$4 million in 2020–21, and another \$4 million in 2021–22. The Forrestfield–Airport Link is soon to be completed. The opposition would like to hear from the minister what the anticipated operating cost of the Yanchep line will be. The recurrent cost for the Forrestfield–Airport Link was for 12 kilometres of rail. The Yanchep extension is 14.5 kilometres of rail. Presumably, because fewer people live in Yanchep, there may not be the same train frequency as on the Forrestfield–Airport Link. One of the big concerns that taxpayers in Western Australia should have is how the government will fund the recurrent operating costs of these new rail projects if the patronage figures are not there, and what other levers the government is looking at pulling to try to get more people to use public transport. The government can advertise as much as it likes, but if public transport is not convenient, people will not use it.

The Thornlie–Cockburn line was initially a \$474 million commitment but is at \$536 million in this budget. The Thornlie–Cockburn line makes sense because it links the Mandurah and Armadale lines. There is a lot of development in that pocket and obviously some opportunities for higher density developments. I know this area very well. I grew up in Thornlie. Indeed, it was very good to see a grade-separated intersection between the existing freight corridor through Thornlie. Sadly, I remember as a child some terrible tragedies at that level crossing when over a period of time a couple of children who lived in Thornlie lost their lives by playing too close to the rail tracks. That is a terrible thing for a community to go through. The grade separation of rail and road is an integral safety component of all these types of projects.

The issue with the Thornlie–Cockburn line will be managing the infrastructure that currently sits in that corridor. Arc Infrastructure currently manages the freight line through that area. APA Group, BP Oil, Western Power and water and sewerage easements exist along that corridor. A lot of that infrastructure will need to be moved to enable an electrified passenger rail system to also use that corridor. The freight rail will need to be shifted in such a way that it does not disrupt freight movements and cause excessive costs for those businesses. Shifting the freight corridor will create noise and vibration issues for nearby residents. It would be good to hear from the minister how the noise and dust impacts of this project will be managed for people who live adjacent to the freight corridor, and also what the nearby residents can expect from the government. Will dilapidation surveys be done on their

properties, knowing that there will be vibration issues during construction, and also noise issues when the rail line moves closer to property boundaries? A noise wall will need to be constructed for the people who live nearby, because they will be closer to what is a very noisy industry.

There will also be some challenges with the alteration of the Armadale line at Beckenham and the Mandurah line at Cockburn. Obviously, a lot of commuters use those rail stations and a lot of businesses are located very close to those rail stations. The government will need to manage that very effectively to make sure that those businesses do not suffer undue disbenefit from interruption during the construction of the project.

We were advised during the briefing that a Bush Forever site adjacent to Jandakot Airport will need to be managed during construction. Some environmental surveys may need to be done on that land. I do not know whether those surveys have commenced. We were advised that the contractors would need access through that Bush Forever site. One would anticipate that as part of that \$536 million allocation there will be an allocation for some rehabilitation of that Bush Forever site should it be damaged during construction. Once again, a lot needs to be managed to deliver this project by 2021. It is a very ambitious target. With all the issues that will need to be sorted out with this project, a 2021 target will definitely be an achievement if the government manages to open it on time.

It would be interesting to hear from the minister what the project development plan anticipates for the ongoing subsidisation cost of running the Thornlie–Cockburn link, the revenue projections for the commuters who will use that line, and the expected patronage of that line. It would also be interesting to hear whether there will be a value-capture component in any regeneration projects that will be constructed as part of this rail project. We were advised during the briefing that two new stations will be constructed as part of the Thornlie–Cockburn link and there will be alterations to Beckenham and Cockburn stations. It would be good if the minister would articulate the anticipated revenue over the next 30 years or so from any value-capture opportunities at those sites. It would also be good to hear whether there will be some kind of proximity levy for people who live near those transit-oriented development sites. Is it anticipated, for example, that when those titles are transferred, they will carry with them a charge of \$5 000 or \$10 000, or something like that, to be put into funding the improved value, one would presume, of those properties once a train station is constructed nearby?

I say once again, in concluding my remarks, that the former Liberal–National government had a very strong commitment to planning and commencing road and rail projects to make our city work. We were in government for eight years. That was during a time of, firstly, a global financial crisis, and, secondly, higher than anticipated—in fact, extraordinary—migration to the state, when 500 000 people moved to Western Australia over those eight years. All those people needed to be provided with schools, hospitals, infrastructure access and a range of other things. That is why our government commenced the “Perth and Peel transport plan: For 3.5 Million People and Beyond”, which sits within the planning framework for the metropolitan area of Perth and Peel going forward to 2031, and indeed beyond. I have mentioned this particular work before. There is nothing in the government’s Metronet election commitments and Metronet projects that was not previously in the Perth and Peel transport plan. Every single one of those election commitments and every single one of those projects can be found at page 10 of our document, under the heading “The Public Transport Rail Network @ 3.5 Million and Beyond”, and now forms part of the government’s renamed Metronet transport plan. The Yanchep extension is in there. There was an extension on the east Wanneroo rail link, stage 1, from the city to Marshall Road by 2.7 million people, and Marshall Road to the Joondalup line by 3.5 million people, and a spur line to Ellenbrook once we hit a population of 3.5 million. That was when it was anticipated, through the good work of these people within the government agencies, that those rail lines would be needed. Once again, those rail projects are a way to link existing rail services, to try to prevent urban sprawl and to create opportunities for intensified development, urban regeneration projects and higher density living around train stations to try to contain development into a framework that is environmentally acceptable in a modern Western Australia.

There was a Perth orbital link. Stage 1 was to go from Stirling to Murdoch for a population of 3.5 million; stage 2 was to go from Murdoch to Bayswater for a population of 3.5 million; and stage 3 was to connect Bayswater to Stirling for a population mass beyond 3.5 million. The radial extensions included the Joondalup line extension to Yanchep, which the legislation before the house will enable. That was anticipated in this plan to be needed for a population of 2.7 million, but it was part of this transport strategy. There is also the Midland line extension to Bellevue for a population of 2.7 million. Once again, the government has brought that project forward as part of an election commitment and is now doing the planning for that, but it did form part of this planning framework. The Armadale line extension to Byford was anticipated in this strategy document for a population of 3.5 million. The government committed to that at the election but is yet to allocate any funding towards that project other than the \$2.1 million worth of planning funding. The 40 000 or so residents living in that catchment area will go wanting in lieu of other projects that the government has prioritised ahead of it.

There were other rail links. The line from Cockburn Central to Thornlie has commenced as part of this plan. There was also the inner-city subway system connecting Perth, East Perth, West Perth, Northbridge, Leederville and

other city centres. That is the sort of project that we would need to look at once our population hits 3.5 million in the future.

I encourage members to look at the “Perth & Peel Transport Plan”. A lot of that planning work was very good and it will be relevant for many years into the future. I commend Hon Ken Travers for picking up the elements of that plan as part of his Metronet campaign in 2013, and the Labor Party took that campaign platform to the 2017 election. I am very pleased that the government has decided to continue with the rail projects that were substantially started under the Liberal–National government. It does not matter what they are named; commuters just want a railway station near where they live so they can hop on a train and get to work and spend the time that they would otherwise have spent navigating a vehicle relaxing in a rail carriage and reading a book, listening to music or doing some other form of meditative activity.

In conclusion, I have put forward a lot of questions that I would like the minister to turn her mind to when she gives her reply. The opposition will certainly ask a range of questions during the consideration in detail stage of the bill to try to get some estimates from the government about value capture, patronage forecasts, revenue forecasts, and the scheduled timing of the stations that will be constructed—all those sorts of things that an opposition would be expected to ask a minister about during the passage of a bill to enable passenger rail into Western Australian metropolitan areas. With that, I conclude my remarks.

**MR T.J. HEALY (Southern River)** [3.23 pm]: I commend the words of the member for Scarborough. I always love hearing about the imaginary world of unicorns and dragons that is the Liberal Party public transport policy. I think it is absolutely fantastic to hear. I am really excited about the Railway (METRONET) Bill 2018. This is the Metronet bill. This bill will continue the incredible track record of Labor governments in building incredibly important infrastructure in Western Australia.

**Mr V.A. Catania** interjected.

**Mr T.J. HEALY:** In response to that interjection, the cost of this part is \$536 million. The member will find it in the budget.

The purpose of this bill is to authorise as part of the Metronet plan the construction of a railway from Beckenham junction to Cockburn, known as the Thornlie–Cockburn Link, and from Butler to Yanchep and for related purposes. The Thornlie–Cockburn Link railway will branch off the Armadale line at Beckenham and at Cockburn Central station on the Mandurah line, with two new stations at Ranford Road and Nicholson Road in Canning Vale and a bus interchange and Park ‘n’ Ride facilities, to my electorate of Southern River as promised. We will deliver. Those playing at home will be very excited about clause 3 of the bill. It authorises the construction of the proposed Thornlie–Cockburn Link railway and extends to the construction and maintenance of the proposed railway with all the proper and usual works and facilities, and schedule 1 sets out that line.

I would like to commend the “Minister for Metronet”. It is fantastic to have as another incredible advocate a Labor government minister who believes in public transport. I would like to read from her second reading speech, with which I concur —

This link is also the first stage of the future circle route, which will see not only our rail system head into and out of the city, but also across the suburbs. It is about creating an integrated and coordinated public transport network for our future.

It continues —

The Thornlie–Cockburn Link will provide people living in our suburbs greater access to employment, health and education facilities in key centres such as Cockburn Central, Murdoch and Canning city centre. It will also link more commuters to strategic commercial and industrial jobs in Jandakot, Canning Vale and Welshpool, and other major employment centres.

This is key —

Not to build these projects would be to ignore the families, pensioners, and young people in our suburbs wanting access to our hospitals, our TAFEs, our universities and jobs. These projects are not only projects for today, but projects for generations to come.

I also thank the minister for the several site visits that the member for Thornlie and I have had to the Nicholson Road and Ranford Road station sites and for the incredible support that we have had in holding consultation sessions and forums in the community to take this to our constituents. As the member for Scarborough said, I admit to making balloon dogs at the Metronet stalls in my shopping centres to advertise the awesome project.

Metronet is not just about trains and stations. It is about creating jobs and connecting people. It is about equity in access, training, commerce and trying to affect congestion. For the first time, it is an integrated transport plan. Labor has an incredible track record in public transport in this state. Labor built the Joondalup line, the Mandurah

line and the Thornlie line. Labor reopened the Fremantle line many years ago after it was shut down. I will refer to a big historical document. The clerks have told me that this is appropriate to read from. This is our *Hansard*. I would like to read from the second reading speech of our previous Metronet minister, Alannah MacTiernan, on the Railway (Jandakot–Perth) Bill 2002 given on 14 August 2002. It states —

The purpose of this Bill is to implement the legislative authority for the construction of the Jandakot to Perth section of the ... railway ... When the Government came into office in February 2001 it reviewed the previous Government's decision to take the south west metropolitan rail line via Kenwick. It was evident that the route proposed did not provide the best public transport outcome to service the south west metropolitan area, or an attractive and viable alternative to the motor vehicle.

The Kenwick deviation had a number of problems and unresolved issues. It added approximately 11 kilometres to the journey and at least 12 minutes each way in travel time from Thomsons Lake ...

The second reading speech for the 2002 bill for what we now know as the very popular Mandurah line continues —

The journey from Perth to Mandurah will take 48 minutes, compared with 60 minutes under the Kenwick route ...

... There will be 3 500 additional weekday boardings from the station at Spencer Road, Thornlie ...

...

Features of the Jandakot to Perth section of the south west metropolitan railway are 23 kilometres of railway track and associated infrastructure with stations at South Street, Leach Highway and Canning Bridge, an underground station at the Esplanade, and new underground platforms for Perth station to the eastern side ...

I note that the member for Bateman has often said—I will refer to his contribution later—that the Mandurah line was a waste of infrastructure.

I refer to the comments of one of my predecessors, Paul Andrews, a former member for Southern River, when he spoke on the Railway (Jandakot to Perth) Bill 2002.

**Mr V.A. Catania:** Good man.

**Mr T.J. HEALY:** He was a very good man. He said the following on 12 September 2002 —

I happily support this Bill because the project offers a high quality public transport system to the people of my electorate. My electorate consists of some of the fastest growing residential areas in the metropolitan region.

I can say that the same applies 16 years later. We are one of the fastest growing regions. We have often been promised this by the Liberals but they have never delivered. The former member for Southern River goes on —

On Wednesday morning when I came to Parliament, the freeway was absolutely chock-a-block. Traffic was backed up to Berrigan Drive. Traffic is supposedly gathering force in Perth each year by about seven to eight per cent. One of the reasons it has reached this critical point is the growth in the southern part of my electorate ... It takes me at least one day a week to go through the letters from the new constituents in my electorate so that I can service these people. This direct service to the CBD will provide a fast and frequent service; an excellent service to the suburbs ...

The people in those suburbs are satisfied with this plan. I know that because I doorknock in those areas and speak to my constituents. I can categorically say that the vast majority of people in those suburbs support this plan.

The Liberal record in the Court and Barnett years is one of always promising and never delivering. That is what has happened, and it is humbling for me to be part of a Labor government that will build the next part of our public transport infrastructure. The airport line was promised, but it took five years for even the first dig. There was the Metro Area Express light rail and the closing of the Fremantle line. Liberal governments do not build rail. They do not care about public transport. I will quote from an article in *The Weekend West* of 14 April, which states —

The Public Transport Authority has delivered a Perth land developer an extraordinary cash windfall, buying a southern suburbs property for \$4.56 million just three years after it sold it to the developer for less than \$1 million.

*The Weekend West* can reveal that the previous State government's plan for a rail freight facility meant the PTA had to offer to buy back Lot 501 in Edward Street, Kenwick, ... The PTA had sold it to him in 2013 for \$946,000 when it —

The previous government —

thought it was not needed, then paid \$4.56 million to get it back in November 2016.

Transport and Planning Minister Rita Saffioti has described the transactions as “a waste of taxpayers’ money”.

“This situation sums up the previous government’s chaos among ministers and poor management of the finances,” ...

“It demonstrates a complete lack of co-ordination and foresight between the former transport minister and former planning minister.”

Liberal governments just do not get it. We have had 20 years of promises in my electorate to build this rail line. Yes, there was an original plan—again, never delivered—to divert the Mandurah line through Kenwick and Canning Vale. It is proven that that was a poor choice. The Gallop—Carpenter Labor government built that line straight up the Kwinana Freeway. As promised, we delivered the Thornlie spur line. I admit that we lost government in 2008. However, I am sure this project would have been well and truly built had the government not changed in 2008. Unfortunately, due to the majority of Liberal and National Party members in this chamber, my community missed out because Liberals do not build rail. I would like to briefly quote Hon Alannah MacTiernan in *Hansard* and I certainly commend the views of the former Minister for Planning and Infrastructure during the second reading debate on 12 September 2002. I think this summarises the Liberals’ attitude to public transport. Hon Alannah MacTiernan as the former Minister for Planning and Infrastructure, said —

You really are a mob of troglodytes.

**Mr D.A. Templeman:** There are none of them here!

**Mr T.J. HEALY:** I say to all remaining Liberals, “ca-ca, ca-ca”, come down to the chamber, because they really are a mob of troglodytes as stated in *Hansard* by the former minister in 2002.

I would like to talk about the detail around my Canning Vale train line. As mentioned earlier, there is \$536 million in the budget for my Canning Vale train line. There will be two incredible train stations at Nicholson Road and Ranford Road, which will connect my community through bus services and interchanges and brilliant planning. I will quote a few facts and figures. We will duplicate three kilometres of railway between the Beckenham and Thornlie stations. We will build a 17.5 kilometre extension to connect that Thornlie and Cockburn link. We will have to relocate about 11 kilometres of freight line because the existing freight line is in the middle. One side will have to be moved to the side to allow for the sleeve there. The two new stations will be more than just simple stations. They will be precincts that will connect and service my community. Thornlie station will be modified to allow it to be a push-through station. Minister, I think the member for Thornlie and I would love to select a bunch of Thornlie and Southern River children so that when we finally bash through that wall at Thornlie station, we can give them toy sledgehammers. It would be a great opportunity for our community to really embrace that.

**Ms R. Saffioti:** Bring down that wall!

**Mr T.J. HEALY:** Yes. I was at the 2005 opening of the Thornlie station.

Minister MacTiernan was there. Choirs of schoolchildren were singing; it was a true community event. I would love us to complete that story arc and get children back into that community to help us move part of that wall.

The local railcar procurement policy is a fantastic way to link this to jobs and to building things in our community. A media release of 22 April headed “Local workers to help build new METRONET railcars” states, in part —

... 246 new METRONET railcars for Perth over the next decade.

The pre-qualification tender for the \$1.6 billion project will include a local content target of 50 per cent for the manufacturing of new rail cars, honouring a key election commitment ...

My learned colleagues who have been here for longer than I have may recall the former Liberal member for Morley often suggesting that these railcars should be built in India or elsewhere offshore. When we build these things in Western Australia, we get the jobs and that is fantastic. Five years ago, no-one lived in parts of my electorate. In North Bletchley, as I call it, existing bus routes do not connect to homes. Even those bus services were linked to only the Thornlie and Murdoch stations. Families in Huntingdale cannot access a regular bus stop. Theoretically, Gosnells is very close to our Thornlie station but is completely segregated from it. The Canning Vale suburb needs better bus services. As part of this, we will create a fantastic integrated bus network, because each train station will have beautiful busports in addition to cycle facilities. The precincts will be fantastic facilities. These will link to jobs and to TAFEs. Local apprentices will be employed on these projects as well as being able to train at our local TAFEs. They will even be able to access those TAFEs. We have done an incredible amount of youth and community consultation, for which I commend the minister.

At our Metronet forum in August last year there was standing room only—well over 100 people. People flowed through the door to join our consultation for that session. One of the issues raised was noise mitigation and how disruptive the existing freight line and our new public transport railcars are. I understand that the minister has confirmed—very different from the situation with the Butler rail line, because Butler was built by a government that is not really interested in these matters—that the Thornlie line will have noise mitigation. Very complex mats will allow the community in that precinct along the rail lines not to be disturbed in the same way as other communities are. The new stations along this new line will allow my community to get to Perth Stadium. It is a great stadium; I still have not been there. My community cannot get to the new stadium. Due to the poor planning of the stadium, there is no adequate public transport. People can catch a train there, but the Thornlie line has to close every time there is an event at the stadium. My community has to catch several buses from Cannington station to get home. My community will finally be able to access services after we build this line.

I want to talk about a large part of the Metronet project—the Morley–Ellenbrook line that was promised by the Liberals in 2008, and again in 2013. It is the same as my Canning Vale station. The former member for Southern River and former government promised in 2008 and 2013 to build a Canning Vale line; they did not. It was very similar to Ellenbrook, and I commend this government for doing it. It is the same for the Byford line. We will finish the Forrestfield–Airport Link. The former government promised it in 2013; when we came to government four years later, the former government had not even begun digging. There is also the Midland rail extension and Karnup station. Stage 1 of the Metronet project will involve 72 kilometres of rail line and up to 18 new stations—an incredible investment. Those projects will link to stage 2 of the project and continue the freight line. Stage 1 will build the Thornlie–Cockburn line. Extending the freight line all the way to Fremantle and, when the Forrestfield–Airport Link is available, linking up Roe Highway is an important part of stage 2 that my community is very, very excited about.

**Mr V.A. Catania:** How much is that?

**Mr T.J. HEALY:** We have not announced the cost of stage 2 because those parts are in the future.

The 2002 bill was opposed by a former member for South Perth, Phillip Pental. It was great to hear that the current member for South Perth supports these projects. Again, this is about connecting communities and bringing people together, and restoring and delivering on a promise that this government made to the people of my electorate. I thank these people for their advocacy: Minister Saffioti; local members Hon Sue Ellery and Hon Kate Doust; the member for Thornlie; a former member for Riverton, Tony McRae; Paul Andrews; Sheila McHale; Judyth Watson; Monica Holmes; and Peter Abetz.

I close on a quote from the former member for Southern River in the *Comment News* of 10 May 2011. Under the heading “MPs push for transport”, it reads —

Southern River MLA Peter Abetz also called for a rail extension, yet he feared that the only hope in extending the Thornlie line would lie with a future Labor Government.

Promised and delivered. Members, Acting Speaker, thank you.

**MS L.L. BAKER (Maylands — Deputy Speaker)** [3.42 pm]: It is a great day because I, member for Maylands, stand to contribute to the debate on the Railway (METRONET) Bill 2018. I am very, very proud to stand in front of this house on behalf of the residents of the electorate of Maylands. I like to refer to Bayswater as the “heart and the centre of the universe” in my electorate. It is because of the Metronet project that I can now make these claims. I think my community is well and truly with me on this.

I will take members on a bit of a journey. We have many new members in the house, so I wanted to take them on a bit of a *Thomas the Tank Engine* journey covering the beginning of these discussions. It was with some amazement that the now Minister for Transport and I listened to the debates in this house on the Railway (Forrestfield–Airport Link) Bill 2015 when it was brought into this house by the former government several years ago. As we sat listening to the debate, we looked at each other. We were a bit puzzled about how a Forrestfield–Airport Link could be built while completely ignoring Bayswater, which was the culmination point. It is where everything happens. It is where the airport link hits the Midland line. I can just imagine a completely overwhelmed tourism population, having jumped off an aeroplane, disappeared underground for a few kilometres and popped up in the current Bayswater train station. Anybody who has been there knows it pretty much resembles one of those quaint country rail sidings where grain or whatever was loaded in the 1960s. It is barely functional and very sad. It could in no way carry the weight of expectation my community had about what Bayswater can be in future.

The now minister and I contributed to that debate. We wondered why the only thing the former short-sighted Liberal government had factored into its costings for Bayswater was a disability ramp. I am not saying a disability ramp is not an important part of a train station; it certainly is. But it was a little bit underwhelming considering the

impact of the future Forrestfield line. There would have been a 100 per cent increase in the number of trains travelling up and down that line with no change to the train station.

It was with great pleasure that I watched our now Minister for Transport argue her way through pre-election discussions with the now Premier, cabinet colleagues and backbenchers. A decision was made that, indeed, Bayswater needed to be an important transport hub. In fact, it will be one of the biggest and most impressive transport hubs after completion. Along that line, we realised that a funding commitment was needed. The then shadow minister bashed down doors and did a lot of work to make sure that we have the funding for this project. I thank her on behalf of the Maylands community, because it is a very successful outcome.

For me, this journey started six years ago. I started talking with the Bayswater community about what was required to restructure Bayswater to activate it and bring some life into the community. Bayswater is just outside the Perth metropolitan area; it is the next stop along the railway line from Maylands. Maylands had a bit of work done to redevelop the town precinct some years ago. Admittedly, it could probably do with a little more attention now, but it really benefited from the work done to it then. When Labor was last in government, we also built a new train station at Maylands—an impressive building—but Bayswater was always the poor cousin. Retailers, shop owners and the residents around Bayswater had spoken to me on many occasions about the lack of community activism to support major development in Bayswater, and the need to bring the community together. For me, one of the magic things about this project has been that it has been the skeleton—the framework—for activating my remarkable community of Bayswater in a way that I could never, ever have anticipated. For that, I am extremely grateful. We do not have one or two community groups activated and fighting for the future; we have about four, which keeps me busy. Members with strong community activism in their electorates know how demanding that can be. I am extremely happy that we have these strong groups that all want a place at the table to represent the community of Bayswater.

One of the great things about this project is that in December 2016, I was very, very proud to host the very first Metronet consultation in Western Australia. I was in a position to do that because it was off the back of four years of discussion with my community. I was absolutely confident that people would come in their droves, with passion, motivation and patience about the future. As long as they had a government that was prepared to listen to them and commit to helping them achieve what they saw as the future—the vision for this area redevelopment—the people would support us. The results of the last election were testament to how correct that is. Over 200 people came to The RISE in Maylands and contributed their views to the vision for Bayswater’s redevelopment, including the train station. It laid the groundwork for ongoing community consultation when these groups started to emerge and the community started to become cohesive and committed and all facing in the same direction. That was absolute gold for a member of Parliament to have that happen in their community. It would not have happened without that Metronet idea and vision.

I am very grateful that the Metronet team has been consultative. I have watched it form, norm and storm, as you say, and get its mojo together about how it will do its work. It is fantastic to see that being rolled out. I am very impressed with the people who are involved in the Metronet team. They are committed and they are very professional. They also actually understand community consultation, which is a rare thing. They have been very adept at pulling together my community to engage with them and keep them involved in what Bayswater might look like.

The Metronet team has run two drop-in sessions, in Maylands and in Bayswater, with my support. More than 300 people attended, and 972 surveys were completed online. We have reviewed all that feedback. The Metronet team has produced some information about what those who attended this forum think are important issues around the redevelopment of what will be the biggest urban transport hub in the state, how it should look, how it should fit with the city’s precinct plan, as well as heights, density, retail opportunities, lines of sight, green space, open space and, above all, no more trucks stuck under the bridge—hallelujah! I suspect I might put in a bid for public art at the station that depicts a very large truck stuck under a bridge. One of the most amusing things about my very gorgeous community is that they keep posting pictures every time some truck driver gets stuck under the bridge. It is about one a month, if not one a week. It is one of those strange quirks of nature that people driving trucks do not understand how high their truck is and how low the bridge is. It does not matter how many signs are put up, how many flashing lights there are and how many people are jumping up and down waving flags, they just go on under there! But not all the way—they crunch to a halt. I have been stuck behind many of them.

Let me talk a little about what came out of the drop-in sessions. I will talk about some of the feedback we have had from my community so far. These sessions were run on 21 April and 5 May at Bayswater Primary School by the Metronet and Forrestfield–Airport Link teams. People from the City of Bayswater also came forward and talked to people about the projects happening in Bayswater. One of the themes that the team took away to think about were issues related to connectivity, which was interesting; that is, the police station, which is at the north-eastern end of the Bayswater town centre, down to the pub—the Baysie hotel—down to the other side, the cheese shop and the car parking on the other side of the bridge too. They were really concerned about making sure

we have a good crossing so that people can get from the east to the west of the train station. They want people to be able to move about the precinct more freely, and are encouraged to. At the moment there are two halves to Bayswater—this side of the railway line and the other side of the railway line. The only way I can get between the two is to cross the railway line on foot or go along the cyclepath, or drive under the tunnel—when I can get past the trucks!—and connect that way. When we build this train station, one vision is to lift it so that there are clear lines of sight underneath it, trees, lots of greenery, and some retail provision as well.

There were also issues around making sure we have good bus services. When I say this will be a big urban transport hub, buses will have to be part of the capability of this. We need to reduce the number of pedestrians crossing the road. Better bus services will help with that. Cycle routes need to be maintained all through the design and construction, if we can. We want to make sure that pedestrians and cyclists are kept a little separate, if at all possible. There are inherent dangers in having both on the same pathway, as I am sure members know. Historically, if we had had a conversation 10 years ago about car parking at train stations, we would have all been up in arms. I remember campaigning, “More parking at train stations. What is the government doing?” The community has caught up with the fact that parking at train stations does not necessarily mean a good transport hub or a good design for the future. It is great that my community is down with that. I am really proud of that.

I now refer to the look and feel of the station. The majority of people agreed that the design of the new station should reference the history of Bayswater. It is kind of a little Fitzroy, a little funky and a little heritage. Interestingly enough, double the number of people who talked about heritage wanted a modern station. I think that shows some of the adaptive re-use we have going on with heritage around our community. Admittedly, Western Australia has been a bit slow with that but we are seeing some good examples of how to do that—Guildford Hotel is one. Fremantle has some good examples of how to bring heritage into modern construction. Of course safety is paramount. We have heard a lot of discussion in this house about public safety over the last sitting week. We need to make sure that safety and amenity are built into this new development.

I think members might be interested to know about a little rose garden that is at the front of the station at the moment. I suspect that if the Metronet team had not been so cautious in its planning and consultation, it would have been tempted to have not even thought about the little garden and what it might mean to people.

**Mr D.T. Redman:** They missed it; they did not hit it!

**Ms L.L. BAKER:** Good point. No—they did see it. The rose garden means a lot to members of my electorate. Relatives’ ashes have been scattered there and ceremonies have been held there for longstanding residents who have wanted to tie themselves forever to that train station. It is with caution and with a great deal of respect that we talked about how to move the rose garden to a place where it could retain heritage and retain that sense of loss and history—that sense of commitment to Bayswater.

There was a bit of concern about the increase in noise from more trains. We are trying to make sure that future noise-mitigating facilities are in place and that they are not an eyesore; that they are well managed and look great. One of the things that we still need to do in progressing the Bayswater redevelopment is to ensure the community has a broad range of options to comment on possible designs. We have given them some inspirations for designs. If they were more aware of what was available and the scope of what we can do within the resources we have, they might be tempted to be a little more creative and innovative. But after all, it is a train station. It will have big trains running through it, so at the end of the day there are some limitations to how incredibly funky a train station can be. The community wants to have something practical, modern and architecturally clever. It wants a good space that is functional, has lots of green and lines of sight, and open air. The community is very attracted towards the use of public space, increasing that use of public space, and most of all the community wants to grow. It wants to grow with good design. Obviously that links into what the City of Bayswater plans to do with the structure plan around the train station. It is probably no secret that I am, as is the Minister for Transport, a supporter of the need to have good infill around train stations because that is the obvious place to place a little bit more density and perhaps a bit more height to do what we can to make them the centre of urban transport in that area.

I look forward to seeing the City of Bayswater progress with a strong structure plan that encourages clever use and really good styles of architecture for developers in that area. Since I have been doing this job, over the last 10 years, one of the things I have been really critical of are some of the really poor and very average apartment developments and uses of infill that we see. Developers need to be mindful of the fact that Bayswater is a real gem. It is close to the city and prices in the area are going to go up with this development. People will want to move into the area, but they will not want to move into shabby, poorly thought-out designs. They are looking for upmarket, modern, twenty-first century living in the area that does more than just tip its hat to heritage, but that also keeps heritage central.

Debate adjourned, pursuant to standing orders.