

**5.3: SUPPORT ALBANY PORT AUTHORITY PROPOSAL FOR DETOUR FOR BRIDGE OVER RAIL PROJECT**

<b>Land Description</b>	:	Princess Royal Drive
<b>Proponent</b>	:	Albany Port Authority
<b>Attachments</b>	:	Nil
<b>Responsible Officer(s)</b>	:	Chief Executive Officer (F James)

**IN BRIEF**

- Albany Port Authority seeks support from the City of Albany to detour traffic to enable the construction on Princess Royal Drive over the woodchip railway line.

**ITEM 5.3 RESPONSIBLE OFFICER RECOMMENDATION**

**MOVED: COUNCILLOR WOLFE**  
**SECONDED: MAYOR EVANS**

That Council **SUPPORT** the Albany Port Authority's Option 1 by requesting the Minister for Transport and the Minister for Regional Development and Lands to work with WestNet Rail to evaluate the real costs and planning requirements of the required temporary rail crossing to facilitate a detour.

**CARRIED 10-0**

**BACKGROUND**

1. The Albany Port Authority seeks support from the City of Albany for the adoption of planning measures required to create a detour for traffic to enable the construction of a bridge on Princess Royal Drive over the woodchip railway line at the eastern end of the Port area.

**DISCUSSION**

2. This report provides the concept outline of a proposal in order to achieve a decision on the matter.
3. The Albany Port Authority's proposal is as follows:

**Proposal.** Albany Port Authority seeks support from the City of Albany for the adoption of planning measures required to create a detour for traffic to enable the construction of a bridge on Princess Royal Drive over the woodchip railway line at the eastern end of the Port area.

**Issue.** The project to deliver the bridge on Princess Royal Drive within Albany Port, to take road vehicles over the woodchip rail siding is being progressed to provide uninterrupted access to berth 7 for Southdown Joint Venture (the "Grange" Project).

There would be benefits for all other users of the road (apart from berth 7 users) including users of the boardwalk who are trying to access the eastern port area at times when woodchip trains are arriving at or departing from the port i.e. with a bridge there would be no blocking of Princess Royal Drive by trains.

The proposed timing of the start of the construction of the bridge is early 2012 and last for between 3 and 6 months. A detour around the site would be required to enable port traffic to continue to access the eastern area of the port while construction is proceeding.

Planning undertaken by the Port for the project has identified two viable options for a detour.

**Options for detours:**

- Option 1: A new temporary road alignment around the north of the site which would cross the railway line immediately east of CBH; and
- Option 2: Access via Brunswick Road east (which would require re-opening of Brunswick Road where it is currently blocked at the port boundary).

**Advantages and Disadvantages**

**Option 1**

*Advantages*

- Only changes to traffic flow paths are in the immediate vicinity of the site;
- No requirement for heavy articulated vehicles to “break down” before accessing the port area;

*Disadvantages*

- Significant costs would be charged by WestNet Rail for design and installation of a temporary rail crossing (including boom gates and flashing lights);
- Likely that costs of improvements to the CBH private rail crossing would be charged to the Port although technically the Port has no responsibility for private rail crossings;
- Port would not have control of a major expenditure item thus raising the risks of cost overrun for the project;
- Project may become unviable for reasons of cost;
- Possible interruptions to train traffic during construction;
- Dust nuisance during summer months;

**Option 2**

*Advantages*

- costs correspond to budget and the Port would have a larger degree of control over the outcomes;
- traffic volumes using the detour would be low (approximately 100 Vehicles per day according to City traffic counts);
- carting of spoil from the decommissioned reservoir on Mt Clarence to the waste disposal site by contractors on behalf of the Water Corporation in 2009, which involved far higher numbers of vehicles than this proposal, is a good example of how a similar issue was managed and that project was carried out successfully;

*Disadvantages*

- traffic would use City road network between Residency Road (or Bolt Terrace) and the port area;
- heavy vehicles would drive along residential and city centre roads;
- heavy vehicles with more than one trailer would have to “break down” on Hanrahan Road before accessing the Port – this would result in the requirement for two or three vehicle movements by some vehicles;

**\*\*REFER DISCLAIMER\*\***

In the case of **Option 1**, there are safety concerns raised by WestNet Rail and CBH relating to a second rail crossing located close to the existing CBH private rail crossing and any new rail crossing would involve considerable expense in the form of barriers and/or flashing lights (including significant electrical controls).

In the case of **Option 2** there would be community concern about heavy (or any) vehicles using Brunswick Road East since it has effectively operated as a cul-de-sac since being physically (not formally) closed in the early 1980's.

The expected construction time would be 3 to 6 months depending on final design details and weather, therefore the proposal would be to re-open the road for between 3 and 6 months for all traffic that requires access to the port's eastern-area; thereafter there is a strong case that the road should remain open for the purposes of access of emergency vehicles only.

Since the Option 2 detour has considerable technical and commercial advantages for the Port compared to the Option 1 detour, the Port would prefer to adopt Option 2.

### **Significance of Bridge to Port Development**

The importance of the Bridge Over Rail project to the Port cannot be overstated.

The drivers for the project are the Southdown Magnetite Project, the Woodchip industry that uses rail transport, the requirement to develop infrastructure to increase rail transport capacity within the port and to facilitate infrastructure that would enable future developments to proceed such as a new rail alignment around the northern side of CBH (for future bauxite, kaolin and or magnetite exports) and a rail loop to allow all trains entering the port area to unload and depart the port without having to shunt and turn around.

### **GOVERNMENT CONSULTATION**

4. No government consultation has been conducted at present.

### **PUBLIC CONSULTATION / ENGAGEMENT**

5. Adoption of Option 2 will require thorough consultation with affected residents.

### **STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS**

6. Nil.

### **STRATEGIC IMPLICATIONS**

7. This item directly relates to the following elements of the City of Albany Strategic Plan 2011-2021:

#### **Key Focus Area**

Sustainability and Development

#### **Community Priority**

Regional local government partnerships

#### **Proposed Strategies**

Hold consultations with regional local governments as to their needs regarding services and infrastructure within the City of Albany.

**POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

8. There are no policy implications relevant to this item.

**RISK IDENTIFICATION & MITIGATION**

9. The risk identification and categorisation relies on the City's Risk Management Framework.

<b>Risk</b>	<b>Likelihood</b>	<b>Consequence</b>	<b>Risk Analysis</b>	<b>Mitigation</b>
If detour proposal one is not supported by WestNet, negative effect on residents and CBD business owners.	Unlikely	Medium	Medium	Support the Port Authorities request to request the Minister for Transport and the Minister for Regional Development and Lands to work with WestNet Rail.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

10. Beyond staff time involved in organising the land matters, there are no financial implications relevant to this item.

**LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

11. There are no legal implications related to this item.

**ALTERNATE OPTIONS**

Council can chose to either support or decline the Albany Port Authority's proposal in total or in part as detailed in the Responsible Officer's Recommendation.

**SUMMARY CONCLUSION**

Option One is the preferred as it has minimum impact on residents and business owners.

<b>File Number (Name of Ward)</b>	:	GR.LRL.1
<b>Previous Reference</b>	:	Nil