

17 June 2026

To:

Hon John Carey MLA
Minister for Planning and Lands; Housing and Works; Health Infrastructure

Hon Meredith Hammat MLA
Minister for Health; Mental Health

Hon Simone McGurk MLA
Minister for Heritage

Hon Matthew Swinbourn MLC
Minister for the Environment

Hon Sabine Winton MLA
Minister for Education

Hon Paul Papalia MLA
Minister for Corrective Services

CC:

Hon Roger Cook MLA, Premier
Hon Dr Tony Buti MLA, Attorney General

Dear Ministers,

We write as concerned residents and community members regarding the Cook Government's Graylands Campus Project and the proposed expansion of forensic mental health services at the Graylands site in Mount Claremont.

We address this letter principally to Minister Carey, given his portfolio responsibilities for planning, lands, housing, works and health infrastructure, and to Minister Hammat, given her responsibilities for health and mental health. We have copied the other Ministers whose portfolios are directly engaged by the project, including heritage, environment, education and corrective services.

For many years, the publicly stated direction for Graylands was one of decommissioning, divestment and replacement of an outdated institutional facility. Former Premier Mark McGowan publicly described Graylands as no longer fit for purpose and indicated that services would be moved to modern facilities rather than expanded on the existing campus.

The current proposal appears to represent a substantial reversal of that direction, transforming a site long expected to be wound down into a significantly expanded forensic mental health campus.

Despite the significance of this policy shift, there has been no clear public explanation of when or why the Government's direction changed, what alternatives were considered, or why

the community, nearby schools and other local stakeholders were not consulted before the project progressed to concept design and contractor engagement.

Current State Government material describes Stage 1 as delivering 32 new sub-acute male forensic mental health beds, an eight-bed child and adolescent forensic mental health unit, and an Integrated Patient Services and Rehabilitation Centre. It also confirms that ADCO has been engaged through an Early Contractor Involvement process to commence design.

Earlier public material referred to Stage 1 as involving 53 new forensic mental health beds, including five beds for a child and adolescent unit. Infrastructure WA material also referred to a broader proposal involving 136 forensic mental health beds at Graylands.

The relationship between the current 40-bed project, the earlier 53-bed announcement and the broader 136-bed proposal has not been clearly explained to the local community. It is also unclear whether the proposed beds are additional to, or replacements for, the existing Frankland Centre forensic beds.

This is not a minor hospital refurbishment. It represents a significant change in the future use, scale, character and risk profile of the Graylands site. It affects Mount Claremont residents, local roads, heritage buildings, environmental values, community uses and four nearby schools: John XXIII College, Mount Claremont Primary School, Moerlina School and Quintilian School.

These four schools, with approximately 2,075 students combined, are located within approximately one kilometre of the Graylands campus, with some school boundaries and student routes situated considerably closer to the northern project area.

Available information indicates that the broader proposal may ultimately involve 136 acute and sub-acute forensic mental health beds, an Integrated Patient Services and Rehabilitation Centre, and community-based forensic mental health programs.

The relevant community interface therefore extends beyond perimeter security and the risk of escape. A substantially larger forensic facility, potentially accommodating patients at different stages of rehabilitation and transition, raises important questions about the level of security required, patient movement within and beyond the campus, supervised community access programs, the routes that may be used, and how these activities will interact with nearby schools, residential streets and community facilities.

These matters are central to any proper assessment of the project's impact on the surrounding area.

The scale and nature of the proposal may also have material economic consequences for surrounding homeowners, including potential impacts on residential property values, marketability and buyer demand. We are unaware of any independent assessment commissioned by the Government to determine whether the project may adversely affect nearby property owners.

This potential impact should be independently assessed before irreversible works proceed. If a material reduction in surrounding property values is established, the Government should also explain whether it will provide compensation, property acquisition or another form of

financial redress, rather than requiring individual homeowners to bear a substantial private financial loss arising from a State-initiated project.

Residents are only now becoming aware of the scale and nature of the proposal. There is no record of meaningful consultation with the Mount Claremont community, the four nearby schools, school boards, P&Cs or parents before the project progressed to contractor engagement.

We have also become aware that an EPBC referral occurred in 2025. The referral material states that the City of Nedlands was advised of the project and invited to provide feedback, with no specific commentary received to date.

Notification to the City of Nedlands, without any specific response being received, should not be treated as a substitute for meaningful community consultation. Nor is there evidence that local residents or nearby school communities were directly alerted to the EPBC public comment opportunity.

Infrastructure WA's March 2023 assessment noted that the business case proposed 136 forensic mental health beds at Graylands but found that further work was required in relation to scope, cost, timing, procurement, benefits and program management.

It concluded that the business case contained insufficient information to support an investment decision and noted potential undefined heritage refurbishment costs. In that context, progressing the project without publicly releasing the further work undertaken, and without meaningful community consultation, raises serious concerns about the quality of decision-making, transparency and the responsible use of taxpayer funds.

There is also a specific public safety and notification precedent. In 2014, following the escape of David Charles Batty from the Frankland Centre, the then Opposition spokesperson for mental health, Stephen Dawson, publicly criticised the failure to inform the community. The issue was not only the escape itself, but also the absence of timely community notification.

That incident raises a question the community has never had the opportunity to ask: whether there have been other incidents since 2014 involving forensic patients absconding or being absent without leave from Graylands that were not publicly disclosed, and whether any such incidents have informed the risk assessment for the proposed expansion.

This information is relevant to any proper assessment of community safety and should be publicly disclosed.

The first physical step associated with the project appears to include the relocation of the Claremont Therapeutic Riding Centre to 9 John XXIII Avenue. That relocation is directly connected to the broader Graylands project and should not proceed in a manner that pre-empts proper public consultation on the project as a whole.

The community has not been provided with the full business case, site-selection analysis, alternative-sites analysis, current masterplan, safety and security model, traffic assessment, emergency management plan, school-interface assessment, heritage impact statement, environmental assessment, community access model, property-market impact assessment, or modelling of how the Criminal Law (Mental Impairment) reforms may affect patient

numbers, patient profiles, leave arrangements, supervision requirements and the community interface at this site.

The central issue is whether the decision to concentrate a major forensic mental health campus at Graylands has been transparently explained, properly justified and supported by adequate safety, planning, heritage, environmental, economic and community-impact assessments.

This is particularly important given the longstanding public understanding that Graylands was to be decommissioned, divested and replaced rather than expanded in this form.

We call on the Government to take the following steps immediately:

1. Pause all vegetation clearing, demolition, site preparation and associated works at the Graylands site and 9 John XXIII Avenue until formal public information sessions have been held and the relevant documents have been released for public scrutiny.
2. Publish the current masterplan and clarify the full intended future forensic bed capacity at Graylands, rather than limiting public information to the Stage 1 scope.
3. Publish the full business case, Graylands Taskforce recommendations, Infrastructure WA assessment, the Government's response to that assessment, the site-selection analysis and the alternative-sites assessment, including any assessment of sites adjacent to existing corrective services infrastructure.
4. Publish the Government's assessment of the project's impact on the surrounding community, including specifically the four nearby schools, together with the proposed mitigation measures.
5. Commission an independent assessment by a suitably qualified property valuation or property economics firm of the project's potential impact on the value, marketability and buyer demand for surrounding residential properties, and publicly release the assessment, methodology and findings.
6. If that independent assessment establishes that the project is likely to cause a material reduction in surrounding property values, state whether the Government will establish a compensation, property-acquisition or other financial-redress mechanism for affected homeowners. If it will not, explain the basis on which the Government considers it reasonable for individual residents to bear a substantial private financial loss arising directly from a State-initiated project.
7. Disclose whether there have been incidents since 2014 involving patients absconding or being absent without leave from Graylands forensic services, whether the

community was notified of those incidents, and how any such incidents have informed the risk assessment for the expanded facility.

8. Publish all documents provided to or received from the City of Nedlands, the WAPC and the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage regarding the project. The Government should also explain what consultation occurred with the City, including when it occurred, what information was provided, who received it, whether elected members were briefed, and whether any formal response was recorded.
9. Explain what direct consultation has occurred with the principals, school boards, P&Cs and parents of John XXIII College, Mount Claremont Primary School, Moerlina School and Quintilian School.
10. Explain when EPBC referral 2025/10271 was lodged and publicly advertised, and what steps were taken to directly alert Mount Claremont residents, nearby schools, school boards, P&Cs and affected local users to the public comment opportunity.
11. Explain whether the Government considers a publicly listed EPBC referral, without direct local notification, to constitute adequate community consultation for a major forensic mental health expansion in a residential and school-adjacent precinct.
12. Publish the safety, security, patient movement, transport, traffic, emergency management, incident notification and school-interface assessments.
13. Publish the heritage impact assessment, proposed demolition and tree-removal schedules, and Heritage Council advice before any works affecting heritage values proceed.
14. Publish the environmental assessment, tree-clearing plans, black cockatoo habitat assessment and all documents relied upon in the EPBC referral.
15. Explain how the Criminal Law (Mental Impairment) reforms have been modelled in relation to demand, patient profiles, leave arrangements, supervision, security classifications, transition pathways and the community interface.
16. Conduct an independent review of alternative sites, including justice-adjacent and other government-owned sites that may be cheaper, faster, safer and less constrained by heritage considerations, school proximity and residential amenity.
17. Hold properly advertised public meetings in Mount Claremont, including direct engagement with nearby school communities, before the project progresses further.

We also request that the written response address the following portfolio-specific questions.

For Minister Carey:

What planning approval pathway is being used? Has a Significant Development Application been, or will one be, lodged with the WAPC? Is the Government relying on any public works exemption and, if so, on what legislative basis? Will any public advertising include direct notification to Mount Claremont residents and the four nearby school communities?

Has an independent property-market impact assessment been commissioned through the Minister's planning, housing, works or health infrastructure portfolios? If not, will one be commissioned before irreversible works proceed?

If a material adverse impact on surrounding residential property values is independently established, will the Government provide compensation, voluntary acquisition or another form of financial redress to affected homeowners?

For Minister Hammat:

How does the current proposal reconcile with the previous public direction to decommission Graylands? What is the total intended forensic bed capacity across all stages? What is the proposed patient movement and community access model? How have the Criminal Law (Mental Impairment) reforms been modelled in relation to this site?

For Minister McGurk:

Has a Heritage Impact Statement been prepared for State Registered Heritage Place No. 13630? Has any approval been sought, or is any approval anticipated, for demolition, alteration or works affecting heritage fabric? Will there be an opportunity for public comment?

For Minister Swinbourn:

What is the status and effect of EPBC referral 2025/10271? Does the Government consider that the referral adequately described the cumulative scope of the Graylands Campus Project, including the main campus works? Given the apparent absence of meaningful community consultation to date, does the Government consider that a further public referral or consultation process is warranted?

For Minister Winton:

Has the Department of Education been formally consulted about the project's proximity to John XXIII College, Mount Claremont Primary School, Moerlina School and Quintilian School? Has any school-interface assessment been prepared and shared with the affected school communities?

For Minister Papalia:

What assessment has been undertaken of government-owned sites adjacent to existing corrective services infrastructure as alternative locations for the expanded forensic mental health campus?

The community should not be asked to accept a major forensic expansion without disclosure of the documents and assessments relied upon to justify the site selection, scale, cost, safety model and community impacts.

Given their direct portfolio responsibilities for health infrastructure, planning, works delivery, health and mental health, we request a written response from the Hon John Carey MLA and the Hon Meredith Hammat MLA, prepared in consultation with the other Ministers copied to this letter where relevant to their portfolios.

We ask that this correspondence be acknowledged in writing within 14 calendar days and that a substantive written response be provided within 28 calendar days, addressing each of the matters raised above.

We have also written to the City of Nedlands and the local Member for Cottesloe, Ms Sandra Brewer MLA, given the local planning, consultation and community-impact issues raised by the project.

Yours sincerely,

XXX

Mount Claremont Community Network Group
On behalf of concerned residents of Mount Claremont