

## Adelaide Rail Freight Movement Study

To the Review Team:

As concerned citizens, we write in favour of the northern bypass route (option 3) for the interstate rail corridor.

We are opposed to the other options outlined in the report. Option one throws good money after bad. Living as we do close to the railway line, in Kings Park, we are concerned that longer, heavier and two storey trains would pose significant additional health risks from the increased production of diesel particulates.

WE are also concerned that the general amenity of the inner city suburbs near the railway track will suffer, at a time when urban planning policy in Adelaide calls for higher density residential living. Already, the trains cause traffic congestion, and the loud screeching noise of the trains disrupts the night's sleep for people who must wake in time for a productive day's work. Traffic congestion at Cross Road is mentioned in several places in the report: this includes potentially life-threatening delays to the progress of emergency vehicles.

Improving the route, as the report states, will still not eliminate the issues completely, and not at all in the inner south-west suburbs. It is perhaps these suburbs the report refers to when it points to "amenity issues and potential safety risks" for this option.

We also oppose the southern bypass, option 4. This expensive option does not resolve the health and social issues raised above. The longer, heavier and double storey freight trains would still run through the inner suburbs, disrupting further these pleasant neighbourhoods, and posing health risks for their growing population. In particular, Kings Park, a settled suburb with many established gardens and trees, would be disrupted should the tunnel entry start north, or even south, of Cross Road. It is likely, in my view, that land acquisition would be strongly resisted, and from a project perspective this could lead to long delays in the timeline.

We can envisage a bike path, rather than the interstate freight trains, sharing the corridor with the suburban trains that run from Adelaide to Belair. A bike path would be a welcome initiative and encourage cycle commuting from the south-western suburbs into the city centre.

On the other hand, a northern route would take the freight trains

through relatively unpopulated areas, where such negative factors as diesel particulates, noise and vibration would not matter. Indeed, as the report states, the emission of pollutants would be relatively low, because of relatively low fuel consumption. This option also performs very well against social criteria, and creates few heritage issues or traffic congestion problems, according to the report. This option is also cheaper than the southern bypass option.

For these reasons we strongly support the northern bypass route.

Yours sincerely,

Ms Margaret-Ann Williams and Professor Don DeBats