

Dear Senators

My name is Justin O'Malley. I am writing in relation to the proposed "Perth Freight Link" (PFL) and the impacts it is likely to have on our home and suburb.

1) I object to PFL in principle because it is a short term proposition that won't effectively resolve transport problems in and around Perth/Fremantle. The current proposal will be redundant within 10 – 15 years once Fremantle Port reaches capacity. The current PFL proposal is literally, a "road to nowhere" in its current form; the state government has not fully thought through the planned route, and as such, the expected final cost of PFL is not known.

Given that this proposed "road to nowhere" would then require even more funds to finalise the route, I submit to your Committee that the state government needs to consider better options, and better routes.

2) The Roe 8 component of PFL will destroy, or alternatively, have significant, negative impacts on the nationally and internationally recognised Beeliar Wetlands.

3) This proposed "road to nowhere" will have huge, negative impacts on the heritage value of North Fremantle if the project proceeds.

4) The funds the Commonwealth is allocating to this project will be wasted, given that within 10 – 15 years, Fremantle Port will reach its capacity, and a new harbour facility will be required for Fremantle/Perth/WA. I would propose that the Commonwealth funds would be better spent if put towards the development of the "Outer Harbour" project – a project that has a much better longer term "vision" for Perth/Fremantle and traffic issues.

5) PFL will not solve the existing transport problems for Perth – it is expected that many trucks will continue to utilise existing highways/roads in order to access Fremantle Port, and that in order to avoid paying the expected tolls on the new highway, there will be 'leakage' back on to existing highways.

6) I object to PFL because the state government has not adequately consulted the suburbs PFL is likely to affect. We have simply been told to expect (and accept) Option 1 or Option 2.

7) I object to PFL because the state government has not adequately considered the reasonable, viable, better options available to it. It seems to me that PFL is the 'quick fix' to a problem – except that the quick fix won't fix the problems.

8) I object to PFL because once a decision about “Option 1” or “Option 2” is made, numerous residences will be demolished in order for PFL to be completed.

9) The proposed “Option 2” (also known as “Roe 9”) will have a more obvious impact on our home and suburb than Option 1. Option 2 proposes to cut a tunnel through bushland near our home (Clontarf Hill). Clontarf Hill is one of the last standing remnants of bushland in Hamilton Hill and provides local residents with a great recreational venue as well as providing birds and reptiles with a ‘green corridor’.

10) Should Option 2 go ahead, there will be significant, negative health impacts for residents in Hamilton Hill. The proposed highway will be approximately 500m from our house, and a proposed ‘on ramp’/interchange will be even closer to our home – approximately 300 metres away. The new highway will create a significant impediment to ingress/egress to our adjacent streets, as well as creating an internal boundary that will divide Hamilton Hill.

Additionally, Option 2 will create significant noise pollution, as well as diesel particulate pollution that is not a problem currently. Diesel particulate pollution is now recognised as a health hazard.

Finally, I would encourage your Committee to advise the Commonwealth to withdraw funding for PFL – if the funds allocated for PFL were instead allocated to the “Outer Harbour” concept, the funds would be used in much better ways, with much less opposition to the current proposal, in a manner that will effectively address transport issues for many years to come.

Regards

Justin O’Malley