15 July 2008

East-West Transport Options Review
Department of Transport
GPO Box 2797
Melbourne VIC 3001
eastwestyoursay@transport.vic.gov.au

Dear Review Team,

PIA Submission EWLNAS

Please find attached the Planning Institute of Australia (PIA) Victorian Divisions submission the East West Link Needs Assessment Study (EWLNAS) lead by Sir Rod Eddington.

PIA welcomes the opportunity to provide a submission on this study. The high level of public and media interest and large number of submissions the review team appears likely to receive, is illustrative of how critically importantly the issues touched on by the study are perceived by the community at large.

Successfully addressing them will be take real leadership, but in the long run will lead to more sustainable communities and a better future for Melbourne and Victoria.

The PIA recognises that transport planning and land use planning are not two separate things but two facets of the same challenge (ie: transport is a part of land use planning). Fundamentally, PIA supports an integrated planning and decision making framework where land use planning processes fully account for the transport implications and requirements of our towns, cities and regions, and where transport planning fully considers land use implications and needs.

With this in mind, it is considered that EWLNAS, with it’s focus on major transport investment initiatives, under-plays the role of land use planning and the need to build liveable and sustainable communities.

Certainly the Government already has a solid land use metropolitan strategy in Melbourne 2030. Melbourne 2030 does respond to the transportation needs of Melbourne and PIA’s continued support for Melbourne 2030 is based on, in part, the successful delivery of the transport – particularly public transport – initiatives, as outlined in the strategy. PIA, as part of its submission to the Government’s audit of Melbourne 2030 conducted a member’s survey. Of the 67 questions put to members covering all aspects covered within the strategy four out of the top five issues in order of priority over next 5 years all related to the delivery of public transport. See Appendix two for more details of these results.

In 2006 and 2007 PIA surveyed Australia’s planning professionals for their expert opinions on how the country is performing in key areas critical to the health and well being of our cities and regions. In this questionnaire question 4 relates to Infrastructure and question 5 to Transport. The table below shows that Victoria has continually received a very poor ranking for both these questions and that it has continued to decline, particularly when compared to WA and Qld were major
infrastructure spending has commenced or been committed too. Appendix three contains a full copy of the Report Cards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Question 4: Infrastructure</th>
<th>Question 5: Transport</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Ranking</td>
<td>Approval Rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>C-</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is understood that the Government’s response to EWLNAS will include a broader response to the transport issues facing Melbourne and Victoria. This broader response is supported as it recognises the limitations of the relatively narrow focus of the EWLNAS. More importantly the broader response will provide the opportunity re-invigorate the delivery of *Melbourne 2030*, particularly with regards to upgrading the priority given to delivering improved public transport.

**In summary, PIA supports the EWLNAS recommendations on the requirement that the following four conditions are delivered:**

- The focus of the Government’s response to the East West Link Needs Assessment Study should be on delivering improved public transport outcomes,
- The implementation of the public transport initiatives should be integrated with land use planning initiatives specifically focus on delivering sustainable and liveable communities,
- The broader response to the study is supported and the opportunity to re-invigorate the delivery of *Melbourne 2030* should be embraced, and
- Proposals to further expand the freeway / tollway road network are not considered a priority at this time.

More detail comments on specific elements of the EWLNAS are provided in the attached Appendix One.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comment on the EWLNAS. PIA recognises that this study just scratches the surface on the transport issues facing Melbourne’s West, Melbourne and Victoria as a whole, and successfully addressing these issues presents many challenges to the Government and the community.

Yours sincerely

Jason Black, MPIA CPP
President, PIA Victoria
Appendix One:

PIA (Victoria) Submission to the East West Link Needs Assessment Study

1.0 Key Points

In summary, PIA supports the EWLNAS recommendations on the requirement that the following four conditions are delivered:

- The focus of the Government’s response to the East West Link Needs Assessment Study should be on delivering improved public transport outcomes,
- The implementation of the public transport initiatives should be integrated with land use planning initiatives specifically focus on delivering sustainable and liveable communities,
- The broader response to the study is supported and the opportunity to re-invigorate the delivery of Melbourne 2030 should be embraced, and
- Proposals to further expand the freeway / tollway road network are not considered a priority at this time.

2.0 Melbourne 2030

PIA is a strong advocate for the Melbourne 2030 Strategy. PIA strongly support its consolidation of development in sustainable activity centres with good public transport, walking and cycling access; attractive traffic calmed main streets and less driving. Melbourne 2030 plans for city to grow in a less car dependent form than Melbourne grew in the 20th century and therefore less need for new roads to accommodate the planned growth.

PIA, as part of its submission to the Government’s audit of Melbourne 2030 conducted a member’s survey. Of the 67 questions put to members covering all aspects covered within the strategy four out of the top five issues in order of priority over next 5 years all related to the delivery of public transport.

The Victorian Government has recently reviewed and reaffirmed the Melbourne 2030 as the basis for Melbourne’s urban development and transport planning.

The EWLNAS discussed Melbourne 2030 and support’s (recommendation 14), its goals for encouraging development of vibrant urban hubs and transit cities. However it misunderstands the strategy and its focus on a less car-dependent city and that attractive urban environments in these activity centres rely on reducing and slowing urban traffic in these areas. In particular, impacts negatively on Melbourne 2030 by:-

- Undermining its main goals for a sustainable less car-dependent urban form
- Building new roads which promote driving urban development in remote sprawl
- Promoting driving as the main transport in preference to public transport use – planning to miss Melbourne 2030’s 202020 mode share target even several decades late
- Undermining activity centres through encouraging with more cars and heavy traffic.
3.0 Integrated Land-use and Transport Planning

The Planning for all of Melbourne report July 08 which reaffirms the government’s commitment to Melbourne 2030 notes the connections between land-use and transport and the implications for livability stating;

“Land-use development and transport planning are inextricably linked. The form of our urban environment has a direct impact on the cost of providing transport services and infrastructure. Likewise, the public transport system and road network shapes our city, determining where and how we live, work, learn and play”.

In contrast the EWLNA study is very much a separate list of transport projects with little integration with land-use and does not follow from or strongly link with or support the Melbourne 2030 strategy.

The Planning for All of Melbourne report promises to develop an integrated, longer-term vision for Melbourne’s transport system beyond 2035 that helps Victoria meet its greenhouse gas emissions reduction target. We believe that the EWLNA study does not further that vision.

4.0 202020 mode shift to more sustainable transport

Through the Melbourne 2030 Strategy the Victorian Government committed to increase Melbourne’s public transport share of motorised trips to 20 percent by 2020. This would double the share of trips by public transport and is not overly ambitious because it would still allow for growth in car trips just at a slower rate. Since this target was established public transport patronage has grown at record rates with Department of Transport expecting to achieve the 202020 target. The higher range of DOT forecasts would achieve the target by 2016.

Does the EWLNA study agree, seek to achieve or even better the 202020 target? On the contrary the Government’s 202020 goal is not included in the plan’s recommendations and no significant increase in mode share by public transport sought over the next 40 years. The plan does note that rail capacity limitations could limit growth in train travel and recommends action. However, by not recognising the potential for a significant growth in the share of trips by public transport; the report’s recommendations over-invest in road based actions and under-invest in public transport.

5.0 A Road Plan versus a Public Transport Plan?

The EWLNAS proposes billions of dollars of investment in what is stated as an integrated package of major transport infrastructure projects – take away one component, and the plan collapses. It can be argued that the opposite is the case: the report is actually an amalgam of two quite different approaches to transport planning. One is ‘business as usual’ road planning; the other a visionary solution to Melbourne’s public transport crisis. It’s time for the government to choose one or the other, not both.
5.1 The Roads plan

The rationale of the study is to ‘first address current significant problems with the transport network’; then to move beyond the traditional predict and provide method and explore new connections needed to make the city more sustainable (p30). The ‘city shaping’ power of new, large scale projects is emphasised. In section 2.3 the report states that historical data together with the latest demographic forecasts were used to ‘predict future demand for each mode of travel’.

The road building cause is advanced with the argument that there is latent demand for a new east-west route crossing the Maribyrnong River (chapter 5). Latent, because the counts at the Eastern Freeway exit fail to justify such a link. Evidence of need has been inferred from screen counts as far afield as Brunswick and the CBD. Whether or not the ‘latent’ argument is accepted, this sounds suspiciously like a version of predict and provide. The ‘predict’ analysis takes little or no account of the impact of anticipated Federal climate change policy initiatives that will arise from the Garnaut process. Nor does it give weight to current State policies aimed at improving the sustainability of the metro urban form, like Melbourne 2030. The government aim of a twenty per cent share for public transport by 2020 is dismissed as impractical.

The roads authors provide a tortuous rebuttal (Appendix E) of the principle that building more roads increases the amount of traffic. This is another twist of the latent demand argument. The proposition seems to be that if people would use a new road but can’t because it hasn’t been built, then build it. The resulting increase in traffic is not really an increase because the demand was already there. There is no choice, say the road planners: latent demand must be responded to by building more road capacity. This is predict and provide in all but name.

5.2 The Public Transport Plan

The public transport authors appear to have a completely different perspective to their road engineer colleagues. Their chapter states: ‘…making forecasts and then shaping the system to meet them is self-fulfilling. If no system capacity or operational changes are made, patronage will inevitably plateau at capacity; making more system enhancements and improving the service will attract more people’.

In other words, predict and provide attracts more patronage. Providing additional capacity costs a lot of money. So choices need to be made about how much capacity to invest in.

In the public transport world, the ‘predict’ part of the equation is harder to argue than for the road planners.

The Eddington team’s transport model adopts a predicted growth in public transport equivalent to 2.1 per cent per annum, far lower than recent trends. In what seems like a circular argument, this low rate of growth is justified by the absence of major new infrastructure to increase rail capacity.

Fortunately the Government’s public transport division has stepped in and proposed in the report that a more realistic and up to date growth rate (6.6 per cent per year) be adopted. This becomes the basis for the rail tunnel and related proposals. The most pressing rail capacity need, according to the public transport planners, is in the Northern group of lines, largely as a result of rapid growth in the west, north west
and northern suburbs. On the basis of recent trends, peak patronage on these lines will more than double by 2021 to 45,000.

5.3 The ‘metro’ rail vision

The same planners drop hints that they are working on a long term vision for Melbourne’s rail network that will transform it into a modern metro system. At present, lines radiate outwards from the CBD like branches of a tree, through capacity-constraining junctions like North Melbourne. In the emerging vision, each line would become a self-contained, end-to-end route diving under the CBD, with a simplified, very much more frequent level of service, rather like the London tube or Paris metro. The so-called E-W rail tunnel would be a bold first step along that path. Add to this the inventive proposal to re-route V/Line trains from Geelong to join the Ballarat line near Rockbank, which in turn joins the Bendigo line at Sunshine. All three V/Line services would then feed into widened tracks at Sunshine-Footscray. This would remove further chronic capacity constraints in the metropolitan train system, and speed up the country services.

5.4 Poles apart

These imaginative proposals make sense as stage 1 of a radical plan to improve the whole of Melbourne’s rail infrastructure. The irony is that they are first seeing the light of day in a road study that focuses on east-west movement in inner Melbourne. Indeed, this limited brief is a fundamental flaw in the Eddington report, and no fault of its author, who has been at pains to point it out. Additional, expensive-to-resolve road network issues abound across the metropolitan area. Linking the Northern Ring Road to Eastlink is just the most recent example.

In effect, what has been delivered is a road plan that addresses a specific network issue in inner Melbourne, into which has been inserted the beginnings of a visionary plan to transform the capacity of the entire metropolitan rail system. The tunnel solution (one for road, one for rail) is the common denominator. In most other respects, the report’s road and public transport analyses are poles apart.

6.0 Public Transport

PIA strongly support the proposed improvements to public transport and agree that Melbourne’s public transport needs the large scale of investment recommended in the report to catch up with generations where the city grew without expanding our public transport services. We need public transport so that with walking and cycling the majority of all kinds of trips can be made without needing a car.

A complete public transport network across our city is needed to provide an attractive service for a significantly increasing proportion trips. The report whilst recognising the need to upgrade key public transport routes fails to fully consider the potential of public transport beyond a niche role for peak hour train commuters to the city. Convenient public transport options are needed for a wide range of non work trips in both peak hour and off-peak. The study ignores the scope for off-peak public transport which can readily be improved.

6.1 Rail Capacity

Melbourne’s growing need for more sustainable mode choices is gaining pace beyond Melbourne 2030 and further public transport improvements will be required if
the tunnel is abandoned (as it should be) according to the Eddington Supply and Demand Report on p180.

PIA welcomes the recommended increase in the capacity of Melbourne’s rail system with a new rail tunnel. Connecting rail to Parkville University/hospital precinct and the St Kilda Road/Alfred Hospital precinct for both work and other trips would be very worthwhile. Melbourne 2030 identifies these precincts as Specialised Activity Centres and aims to boost their role as attractive places for technology, science, health and economic activity with improved public transport.

Recent changes to the management and operations of the rail network have and will continue to result in increased services and capacity, which will in turn help to ease current pressure. However, even with further improvements to infrastructure use, the capacity of Melbourne’s inner rail network will need to be increased if it is to cope with continued rises in train patronage due to both mode shift and population growth. Planning for these extensions is carried out simultaneously with further assessment of the tunnel proposal to;

- Compare alternative rail alignments including linking northern group lines to Parkville and Caulfield line trains.
- Compare the benefits of alternative rail capacity improvements
- Include public information and consultation
- Identify the further upgrades in the public transport system needed to fully capitalise on the new rail capacity such as feeder buses and new bike and tram links in addition to the short term capacity measures identified in the report’s recommendation and the improvements to commence in November
- Assess ways of minimising disruption to Melbourne’s prized boulevards and tram services
- Progress the capacity improvements without delay whilst developing broader new transport plan for Melbourne.

6.2 Making better use of the existing network

PIA supports this Recommendation (3) Changes promised for November will further improve on the recent alterations to the rail timetable, rail use and reliability. Such improvements are a top priority in achieving a high quality public transport service and should be extended to include by 2010

- more trains in the shoulder either side of peak to reach near peak levels – to spread the peak burden and enable people to add leisure activities to commuter trips – a social and economic benefit.
- more trains at off-peak times where there is much potential for public transport growth
- Staffing all stations in the inner city and Melbourne 2030 Activity Centres to premium station levels to provide customer service, assist people with wheelchairs and emergencies so that drivers can keep trains moving rather than stopping to assist and to help with the introduction of the new ticketing system.

6.3 Create a better network with buses, bikes and walking

Better links between trains buses and bikes would improve the connectivity of the network and convenience for passengers. This is a missed opportunity in the report. Increasing daytime bus services to either meet every train or at least every 15 minutes like the Smart Bus services effectively extends the reach of the train network.
without the deterrent of long delays between connections. Improving bus services is necessary to both feed passengers to the new rail services and to provide more appealing non-train options. Likewise creating safer more convenient pedestrian and bicycle links to public transport stops with more useful signage will build a more connected network of sustainable transport modes.

6.4 Bus and tram priority and problems with clearways

PIA supports a greater priority for public transport on roads including:

- traffic light priority for trams and buses so that
  - they only need stop for passengers
  - they get a head start on traffic
  - turning cars don’t block their path
  - pedestrian lights change as trams and buses approach to facilitate passengers reaching them
- traffic metering
- modifying parallel parking spaces along the kerb to increase their length to allow forward parking – this would move cars more quickly off the road, reduce the total number of kerbside parking but still retain the buffer of parked cars so important to footpath activity
- setting a speed limit of 40 kilometres per hour for tram routes sharing road space particularly along strip shopping centres to
  - Recognise these as priority areas for activity centre destinations, pedestrians, and public transport and low priority for cars especially through traffic. A 40kmph limit is being extended to strip shopping centres and should include all those based along trams.
  - Improve the safety and amenity of pedestrians, cyclists, public transport passengers and appeal of the street environment in activity centres and residential areas.
- Considering potential for shared bus and bicycle lanes excluding other traffic, such as in Edinburgh

These measures are consistent with the report’s recommendation 8. Public Transport should have priority on all roads through these measures not just as recommended in the Report (recommendation 19) where new road space is to be added nearby. We support the re-allocation of road space to improve the public realm in activity centres, public transport, walking and cycling. Additional road space for driving is not warranted to achieve priority for sustainable transport modes on existing roads.

PIA opposes the Government’s current clearway plans as these would locate high volumes of fast moving traffic so close to the footpath that it undermines the safety and appeal of walking, cycling and activity centre destinations which are essential to public transport and achieving a sustainable city under Melbourne 2030. Extending clearways to create more space for driving in peak hour promotes more driving, congestion, pollution, noise and greenhouse gas emissions and reduces both the speed and attractiveness of public transport.

6.5 Park and Ride poor urban design, wasting prime land and against Melbourne 2030

PIA is opposed to reports recommendation (9) to expand car-parks at stations. Park and Ride encourages car use for travel to the station, creates large swathes of bitumen covered land around stations, leading to a loss of local and station amenity, and unsafe station environments. With high quality and regular feeder bus services and good walking and cycling access, commuters do not need to drive to the station.
Pouring more money into Park and Ride facilities is an admission of a failure to run quality bus services. Car-parks at stations are incompatible with Transit Oriented Design under Melbourne 2030 which seeks to locate attractive public spaces and high intensity development in the most accessible locations. Station car-parks promote short trips which are the dirtiest driving whilst engine pollution control equipment has yet to warm up. This undermines the aim of promoting public transport travel as the green and healthy alternative to driving.

Instead the government should;

- Upgrade feeder buses to meet each train
- Each year audit and improve the safety and convenience of walking and cycling to stations and bus and tram stops to target every stop within 5 years. This would form an expansion of the new Victoria government DOT program.
- Introduce green travel plans (as proposed in Melbourne 2030 for developments that attract many visitors) for stations to encourage use of non-car access
- Provide free bike parking lockers and enclosures at stations.

6.6 Rail extensions also needed

PIA supports the report recommendations (2 & 3) to extend the suburban rail network to Sunbury and Tarneit as this would provide a better public transport service to more city and country Victorians.

The Tarneit Line would provide for both this growth area and country trains. This new line should provide a suburban service at the outset and should be located to serve the widest possible catchment by going through the centre of urban development (and not just skirting its edges) and connecting all possible activity centres. Werribee Station must be the connection point for the new link, not to its west, so that passenger interchanges are easier and to support the activity centre/Transit City role of Werribee. New stations at the heart of activity centres, new routes and development at existing stations should be follow transit oriented design principles outlined in Melbourne 2030. Bus services should be planned along with the new line to meet every daytime train or at least a 15 minute service like Smart-Buses to connect the rail service to its community and other modes. Car-parks at stations should be avoided as they are not compatible with transit oriented design or Melbourne2030.

Providing suburban trains to Sunbury is welcome and would catch up with the development of this area as a growth suburb of the 1970’s under the Melbourne 2030 of 40 years ago. Other parts of Melbourne that need a similar catch up. The Melbourne 2030’s Urban Growth Boundary gives us a new opportunity to plan and provide good public transport services to the known future extent of Melbourne.

The plan should be much more ambitious as these limited expansions do not go anywhere far enough to meet the needs of our generation, let alone catch up for several generations where the city grew without corresponding growth in rail and then to provide for our children’s generation. Rail should be extended to all corridors in Melbourne and all Principal Activity Centres identified in Melbourne 2030 and as many other activity centres as possible. These extensions can be planned at the same time as planning for rail capacity upgrades and the Tarneit and Sunbury extensions to include

- Melton – why did the report leave it out when its needs are very similar to Sunbury which was favoured with an electric train proposal
- South Morang – then Mernda
- Doncaster
- Cranbourne East
- North Epping
- With new stations at Caroline Springs, and Southland.
- Rowville/Monash University.
- And stations at Caroline Springs and Southland

6.7 Bikes

PIA supports the reports attention to bicycles as a healthy and sustainable transport mode that should be further expanded. PIA agrees with the reports call “for the Victorian Government to establish a long-term strategic program for walking and cycling, supported by significant and reliable recurrent funding and located within one central department”. (Overview report p80). This should be considered as an important 21st recommendation of the report.

Further cycling improvements should be developed in consultation with local communities, cycling groups and local councils and include completion and updating of the parks trails, Principal Bicycle Network and local council bike strategies.

While recommending improving several key routes for cycling the report fails to acknowledge that its plans to increase driving and road freight would seriously detract from a safe cycling environment overall.

6.8 Walking

Walking is the healthiest and more environmentally friendly transport mode and accounts for a sizable proportion of trips including to work (does PIA have good figures? Surprisingly walking is not considered in the report.

There is considerable scope to improve walking facilities that involve both state and local government, including:
- More pedestrian crossings
- Adjusting traffic lights to reduce waiting times for pedestrians and allowing crossing in 1 stage
- Reducing traffic speeds to 40 kmph in activity centres and tram streets and a maximum urban road speed of 60kmph – slower speeds have been showed in Victoria to significant reduce pedestrian injuries and deaths
- Slowing and reducing heavy traffic especially against the kerb – an argument against clearways
- Wider footpaths to accommodate 2 prams or wheelchairs – called for by PIA following the state conference in Yarra Junction where participants assessed its walkability
- Smooth ramps the full width of street crossings and removing steps at kerbs.

Increased State Government attention to walking and funding would be required to achieve these improvements and a review of pedestrian design standards.

The report also fails to consider the importance of a safe and attractive environment for walking especially to public transport. The recommendations to increase driving would more heavy traffic reducing the attractiveness of our city for walking. Perhaps a pedestrian tunnel or 2 would attract more serious consideration to walking?
7.0 Climate Risk and Green House Emissions

The study team and SKM Maunsells are to be commended for considering climate change in The Environment and Heritage background report even though it was not included in the study’s terms of reference.

The Eddington Study Environment and Heritage report notes “Government recognizes the need to dramatically reduce greenhouse gas emissions in the coming decades, and has set targets to do so. Any realistic approach to such reductions would require significant contribution through reductions of emissions in the transport sector. The community expects the transport system to reduce its current impact on the natural environment and on climate change”.

We strongly endorse the Eddington Environment and Heritage Report statement that “A key environmental criterion for the assessment of strategy options will be greenhouse gas emissions associated with each option” and the reports stated aim to rank proposals against the Governments target to reduce transport emissions by 60% by 2050 and progressive interim targets.

The report discussed climate change bus does it reflect the urgency of the climate risk and all necessary and possible transport solutions in the report recommendations.

Table 2 in Eddington Environment and Heritage Report compares transport emissions in Australia, UK and USA. Transport emissions per person are much higher in countries with the most car-based transport systems. Australian transport emissions per person are about double those in the UK and about half the Americans; indicating the importance of making our cities and transport systems more like the European cities with consolidated urban form based on public transport, walking and cycling and less like the Americans car-dependent sprawling cities.

From Table 2: Comparison of greenhouse gases emissions per person

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AUSTRALIA</th>
<th>UK</th>
<th>USA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tonnes per year per person</td>
<td>tonnes per year per person</td>
<td>tonnes per year per person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Transport</td>
<td>3.8 (100%)</td>
<td>2.1 (55%)</td>
<td>6.75 (178%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from Cars</td>
<td>2.07 (100%)</td>
<td>1.04 (50%)</td>
<td>3.95 (191%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eddington Environment and Heritage Report

Transport emissions are growing rapidly with the Eddington Environment and Heritage Report noting with concern “the National Greenhouse Strategy Module 5 – Efficient Transport and Sustainable Urban Planning highlights that, under business as usual assumptions, domestic transport emissions would increase by 42%, on 1994 levels, by 2015.

The EWLNAS Environment and Heritage Report summarises the Government commitments to reduce greenhouse emissions from transport, listed below.

**Victorian Government Commitments**

**Victorian Greenhouse Strategy 2002** according to the Eddington Environment and Heritage Report “recognised transport as a significant contributor to Victoria’s greenhouse gas emissions and that greenhouse gas emissions from the road sector
are projected to grow significantly over the next decade. Key areas for action were identified as:

- Promotion of integrated cross-modal transport solutions
- A reduction in the need for motorised travel through integrated land use/transport planning strategies
- Promotion of modal shift through delivery of a high quality public transport system
- Improving the fuel economy and emissions performance of motor vehicles
- Influencing travel choices and driver behaviour
- Improving the efficiency and effectiveness of the freight sector.”

Our Environment Our Future Sustainability Action Statement 2006 committed the government to reducing greenhouse emissions by 60% by 2050 compared to 2000 levels and identified the need to reduce greenhouse emissions from transport by

- More transport choice and expanding the TravelSmart Program
- Promoting Alternative fuels in government vehicles and a Biofuels Action Plan
- A Hybrid bus trial in Melbourne
- Greening the Victorian automotive industry.

The Melbourne Principles on Sustainable Cities adopted at the World Summit on Sustainable Development Johannesburg in 2002 agreed to by the Victorian Government.

Australian Government Commitments
The National Greenhouse Strategy 1998 which links the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change and the Kyoto Protocol. The Eddington Study Environment and Heritage notes that the strategy proposes the following measures to reduce transport greenhouse emissions:

- Integrating land use and transport planning
- Travel demand and traffic management
- Encouraging greater use of public transport, walking and cycling
- Improving fuel efficiency and fuel technologies
- Freight and logistics systems
- Specific transport actions included TravelSmart, a program designed to get people to change the way they travel, and car sharing programs.

The EWLNAS recommendations choose surprisingly few of these transport commitments to pursue mainly focussing on vehicle technology to continue to increasing driving. This would undermine the commitments to integrate land-use and transport and integrate transport modes and reduce the need to and amount of motor travel. This is surprising given the urgency of climate change recognised in the government strategies and the Eddington Environment and Heritage report.

The proposal for a new freeway and resultant increase in driving and emissions in this plan would take Melbourne further from a being a sustainable city and from achieving the Melbourne principles bearing our city’s own name.

The EWLNA report assumptions on greenhouse emissions in the Eddington report do not provide a sound basis for transport investment decisions; because they

- Deny that a new freeway will induce more driving and more emissions even if the rail and cycling actions achieve some reductions.
- It is unrealistic to assume a new road can reduce emissions by keeping traffic flowing when this ignores the reality that building new roads attracts more traffic and a return to congestion.
- Rely on the Nous report which downplays the potential for a significant mode shift to public transport and assumes a “business as usual” road based transport system. This exaggerates relative benefit of more efficient cars compared to public transport and masks the greenhouse problem with more roads and more driving.
- Assume no carbon price for its preferred model and an unrealistically low carbon price for its most expensive scenario - a maximum carbon price $10 compared to the current European carbon price $45 per tonne. The European carbon price rose 40% over the last 4 months rising with the price of oil. A price on carbon including petrol is very likely by 2010 under the Federal Carbon Trading Scheme. A more realistic carbon price would be at least $35 per tonne and is likely to dampen the demand for driving and increase pressure for alternatives.
- Overlook the potential for public transport to use renewable electricity. This inflates the value of discounts the value of more fuel efficient cars compared to investing in public transport especially off-peak services.
- Ignore the need to make harder cuts to other sectors if increase transport emissions remain high and even grow. With growing scientific consensus that we may need to cut overall emissions by some 80-90% to maintain a relatively safe climate it is untenable and tragic for our children to allow transport emissions to remain high.

8.0 Oil Vulnerability

The EWLNAS notes that if oil prices continue to rise “more and more people will use public transport, and action needs to be taken to ensure that public transport options exist with sufficient capacity to meet this increased demand” p211. Victoria’s recent record growth in public transport passenger numbers support this trend.

The study area contains some of areas of Melbourne that are amongst its most oil-dependent, least well served by public transport and cycling links and most socially and economically disadvantaged – using the Brotherhood of St Lawrence’s VAMPIRE index.

The report states that “it is clear that the demand for oil is unsustainable and must be reduced” p 210.

The report’s oil price estimates appear seriously out-of-date. It assumes oil will continue at 2006 prices in real terms or that is a petrol price of $66 per barrel or less than half its current price. (Veitch Lister Consulting Background Modelling Assumptions report page 6). This is potentially a very dangerous underestimation to underpin such major long term transport investment decisions.

In the 3 months since the report was released, oil has increased by US$26 per barrel to $144 and in Melbourne petrol has increased by 27 cents per litres. This 20 percent increase in 3 months is close to that noted in the report over the previous 3 years. The pace of petrol price rises is increasing even though the high Australian dollar has limited the impact on Australian petrol prices, as noted in the report. Melbourne 2030 in 2002 set out a vision for a less oil dependent Melbourne, but the subsequent transport plans were prepared when oil was far cheaper than now - Metropolitan
Transport Plan 2004 oil was around US$30 per barrel and Meeting Our Transport Challenges in 2004 oil around US$70. Realistic predictions for oil are that it could double in price over the next 3 years and continue beyond that with increasing dependence on very insure parts of the world. Transport decisions need to be based on realistic estimates for oil prices and security and also factor in more extreme scenarios.

The report appears out-dated in assuming people will want to continue driving at 2006 levels. This error means the report recommendations overestimate the value of new roads and underestimates the scale of investment needed in public transport, cycling and walking.

9.0 An East West Road Tunnel – Not a Priority

PIA consider that additional freeway/ tollways are not a priority at this time. They will promote more driving at a time when we must rapidly reduce greenhouse emissions and oil use.

The $9 billion freeway is a poor investment that it would costs twice as much as its potential benefits and would have an even lower return if environmental, social and petrol and climate costs were fully accounted for. Such a large investment should instead be used to provide adequate public transport alternatives and cycling and walking options for all Melbournians.

The road is not needed as there are already alternatives in:
- The Westgate/Monash freeway currently being at great expense *(what’s the amount up to now - a huge blow out?)*
- Ballarat/Geelong,
- Dynon
- and Footscray Roads,
- and a variety of non-road based solutions.
- Instead population growth projected for the west in the next 17 years could be accommodated without new roads if
  - public transport trips to inner city are increased to 60% of trips
  - truck freight efficiency is increased to 1 container per truck and
  - rail freight is increased to 30 per cent of freight as per the Government target.

10.0 Do Melbournians really want to drive more?

The report’s focuses mainly on driving as the preferred transport mode for the overwhelming majority of trips and targets investment accordingly. Public transport is relegated to a niche role for central city train commuters and not even planned to reach the 202020 target decades late. The report predicts what car transport will look like for the next 30 years based on past transport growth. This fails to take into account the serious effect that climate change and rising petrol prices will have upon people’s ability and desire to drive. The report assumes people will still want to drive at ever increasing rates for the next 42 years and recommends investment to achieve that outcome.

The reports objectives for improving the employment prospects for the west are laudable. However, the report does not fully appreciate the opportunities presented in the Melbourne 2030 strategy for new local jobs in activity centres in the knowledge
and service economy where travel is minimised by sustainable modes and traffic impacts are reduced. Developing a transport system that necessitates driving long distances to work harms family and community life rather than improving the standard of living.

Melburnians have in the past voted against such cross town driving to work. When Coles-Myer moved from the city to Tooronga in the early 1990’s one third of workers from the western suburbs left the company. This was even with the new South-Eastern Freeway passing Coles-Myers door and relatively un-congested. Public transport use by workers declined from 63 % to 10 % after the move. Workers also tended to start work earlier after the move apparently to avoid morning traffic congestion (PTD Coles Myer Study).

11.0  Induced traffic

The report was commissioned to cut congestion. However, by downplaying the problem of induced traffic it does not solve congestion but would make it worse. The new freeway by increasing road capacity will induce more driving and more fuel use and greenhouse emissions -the experience with most freeways in history.

The Victorian Competition and Efficiency Commission found in its 2006 report Making the Right Choices; Options for Managing Transport Congestion that “it is important that induced demand effects be included in project appraisals. Failure to account for induced demand could lead to estimation errors in the benefit and costs of new road infrastructure.”

The Eddington Transport Supply and Demand Report also acknowledges that the road tunnel options will attract more driving and less public transport, walking and cycling (p 180).

By inducing more driving and more greenhouse emissions this proposal is totally incongruous with government objectives to reduce greenhouse emissions and increase public transport share of travel.

If the tunnel were to proceed PIA would agree with the study that absolutely no city or city fringe interchanges should be allowed because this would promote even more driving and further undermine public transport to the inner city. The tunnel should be abandoned in preference for better public transport and more freight on rails.

12.0  Trucks and Residential Amenity

PIA agree with the report that heavy traffic in residential areas and particularly truck traffic in the inner west must be stopped. We support much more freight going by rail and truck bans in residential areas. Trucks accessing the port should be directed to use the Westgate Freeway and City Link and a short section of new road to be built between the Westgate Bridge and Whitehall Street to Footscray and Dynon Roads. We also support the realigning Paramount Rd between Sunshine Road and Geelong Road and creating a new route along Cemetery Road to the West Gate Freeway but strongly oppose any extension north along Ashley Street because it’s unnecessary and creates new problems with trucks in residential areas with some of Australia’s most disadvantaged communities.
PIA oppose new roads connecting to and widening Smithfield/Ballarat Roads because it’s unnecessary and creates new problems with trucks in residential areas and parkland.

13.0 Project management

PIA is concerned that planning of new transport infrastructure is not isolated in a new standalone agency (recommendation 20) but allows for the integration of both land-use and transport planning. A transport project is not a corridor where people are removed but a community. A new separate agency would be a move away from the recent positive changes made by the Victorian Government in the new Department of Transport with the stated objective to:

"Deliver a stronger focus on the delivery of public transport improvements, as new projects come on line to increase network capacity and meet record growth in patronage"

It is essential that planning for transport project involves extensive community consultation to ensure both community support and best value investments.
Appendix Two:

PIA M2030 Implementation Survey Results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Progress of this initiative to date</th>
<th>Effectiveness of this initiative</th>
<th>Is this a priority for the next 5 years</th>
<th>Order Ranking</th>
<th>Priority Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direction 1: A more compact city</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build up activity centres as a focus for high-quality development, activity and living for the whole community</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broaden the base of activity in centres that are currently dominated by shopping to include a wider range of services over longer hours, and restrict out-of-centre development</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locate a substantial proportion of new housing in or close to activity centres and other strategic redevelopment sites that offer good access to services and transport</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direction 2: Better management of metropolitan growth</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish an urban growth boundary to set clear limits to metropolitan Melbourne’s outward development</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concentrate urban expansion into growth areas that are served by high-capacity public transport</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage the sequence of development in growth areas so that services are available from early in the life of new communities</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect the green wedges of metropolitan Melbourne from inappropriate development</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direction 3: Networks with the regional cities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote the growth of regional cities and key towns on regional transport corridors as part of a networked cities model</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control development in rural areas to protect agriculture and avoid inappropriate rural residential development</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction 4: A more prosperous city</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain access to productive natural resources and an adequate supply</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of well-located land for energy generation, infrastructure and industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction 5: A great place to be</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote good urban design to make the environment more liveable and</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attractive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognise and protect cultural identity, neighbourhood character and</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sense of place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve community safety and encourage neighbourhood design that makes</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>people feel safe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect heritage places and values</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote excellent neighbourhood design to create attractive, walkable</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and diverse communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the quality and distribution of local open space and ensure</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>long-term protection of public open space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rectify gaps in the network of metropolitan open space by creating new</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parks and ensure major open-space corridors are protected and enhanced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the environmental health of the bays and their catchments</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect coastal and foreshore environments, and improve public access</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and recreational facilities around Port Phillip Bay and Western Port</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain and develop metropolitan Melbourne as a desirable tourist</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>destination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction 6: A fairer city</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase the supply of well-located affordable housing</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan for a more equitable distribution of social infrastructure</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the coordination and timing of the installation of services</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and infrastructure in new development areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direction 7: A greener city</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a strong cultural environment and increase access to arts, recreation and other cultural facilities</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td><strong>3.23</strong></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure that water resources are managed in a sustainable way</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td><strong>4.24</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce the amount of waste generated and encourage increased reuse and recycling of waste materials</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td><strong>3.88</strong></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribute to national and international efforts to reduce energy usage and greenhouse gas emissions</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td><strong>4.11</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce the impact of stormwater on bays and catchments</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td><strong>3.89</strong></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect ground water and land resources</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td><strong>3.80</strong></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure that land-use and transport planning and infrastructure provision contribute to improved air quality</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td><strong>3.99</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect native habitat and areas of important biodiversity through appropriate land-use planning</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td><strong>3.77</strong></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote the concept of sustainability and develop benchmarks to measure progress</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td><strong>3.87</strong></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead by example in environmental management</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td><strong>3.84</strong></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direction 8: Better transport links</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrade and develop the Principal Public Transport Network and local public transport services to connect activity centres and link Melbourne to the regional cities</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td><strong>4.41</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the operation of the existing public transport network with faster, more reliable and efficient on-road and rail public transport</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td><strong>4.41</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan urban development to make jobs and community services more accessible</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td><strong>4.03</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinate development of all transport modes to provide a comprehensive transport system</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td><strong>4.32</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage the road system to achieve integration, choice and balance by developing an efficient and safe network and making the most of existing infrastructure</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review transport practices, including design, construction and management, to reduce environmental impacts</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give more priority to cycling and walking in planning urban development and in managing our road system and neighbourhoods</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote the use of sustainable personal transport options</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direction 9: Better planning decisions, careful management</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieve better planning decisions</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed up resolution of appeals</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep Melbourne 2030 up to date</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a strong partnership with local government</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement Melbourne 2030 in an integrated way that involves the community</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Score</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>Finish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>4.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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2006 Planning Report Card
Voice of the Planning Profession

The Planning Institute of Australia (PIA) is the national body representing planning professionals. PIA is the voice of the planning profession. PIA is an advocate for improved planning performance and better planning systems, actively promoting economically, socially and environmentally sustainable communities.

Report Card—Telling it like it is!

In April 2006, PIA announced it would develop a planning opinion poll which would allow the profession to peer review the performance of our planning systems and current planning outcomes across the nation.
Voice of the Planning Profession

The Planning Institute of Australia (PIA) is the national body representing planning professionals. PIA is the voice of the planning profession. PIA is an advocate for improved planning performance and better planning systems, actively promoting economically, socially and environmentally sustainable communities.

Report Card—Telling it like it is!

In April 2006, PIA announced it would develop a planning opinion poll which would allow the profession to peer review the performance of our planning systems and current planning outcomes across the nation.

In addition to planners many people influence outcomes in the built environment—politicians, councillors, a wide range of professional advice and service providers, developers and others. They impact outcomes through funding, regulatory, development and other decisions.

In September 2006 PIA invited the planning profession to ‘tell it like it is’, conducting its first ‘state of the nation’ opinion poll. The results, outlined here, are honest, clear and revealing.

The Planning Report Card survey will be conducted annually with the results being announced on World Town Planning Day. This will allow us, each year, to see if planning outcomes are getting better or worse.

10 Critical Planning Factors

In each state, the profession was asked to assess how Australia is performing against 10 key areas identified by PIA as critical to creating effective, functional and sustainable cities, towns, neighbourhoods and regions.

The 10 critical factors are:
- Growth Management
- Sustainability Indicators
- Governance
- Infrastructure
- Transport
- Demographic Change
- Housing
- Community Engagement
- Planning Profession
- Streamlining Approvals

The Results

This assessment is intended to be constructive and help inform state agencies, local governments, the built environment professionals and the community of interests in planning.

Over 650 qualified planning practitioners with a high level of expertise and professional capability responded to the survey. Respondents simply scored their state A, B, C or D, against each criterion.

Aggregated, these results tell us how the Australian planning system is performing.

The results indicate that some States are taking positive steps to get it right but there is still a lot of work to be done.

The survey results are summarised in the table below.

Australia is performing reasonably well (with some caveats) against three of the ten criteria:
- Growth Management
- Public Participation
- Streamlining Approvals

Australia is doing less well against the other 7 criteria. No more than 65% of respondents rated their state A or B against any criterion. Some States received no A or B scores against some criteria. Given the low response rate for Tasmania and the Northern Territory those results are not statistically reliable.

The graphs below illustrate what percentage of respondents rated their jurisdiction A or B, against each criterion. These graphs provide an important indication of who has performed best and worst.

Conclusion

PIA has identified the 10 most important criteria for a strong, healthy planning system.

Based on the results of this survey, Australia is doing reasonably well in 2 or 3 areas, but a substantial improvement is needed in others.

PIA will strongly advocate for decision makers to better fund, design and build communities that meet Australia’s future economic, social and environmental needs and that are governed well.

We want to see straight A’s!

Planning Report Card—National Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Growth Management</th>
<th>Sustainability Indicators</th>
<th>Governance Structure</th>
<th>Infrastructure</th>
<th>Transport</th>
<th>Demographic Change</th>
<th>Housing</th>
<th>Public Participation</th>
<th>Professional Planning Workforce</th>
<th>Planning Assessment</th>
<th>Average State Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C–</td>
<td>C–</td>
<td>C–</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>B–</td>
<td>C+</td>
<td>C+</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C+</td>
<td>B–</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QLD</td>
<td>B–</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C+</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C+</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>B–</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C+</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B–</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>C+</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C–</td>
<td>D+</td>
<td>C–</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C–</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAS</td>
<td>D+</td>
<td>C–</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C–</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>C+</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B–</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B–</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>C+</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KEY
A = Performing well against this criteria
B = Doing well against this criterion with some initiatives underway
C = Evidence of some initiatives with improvement required to achieve this criterion
D = Inadequate progress and no action underway in this criterion
How are we doing?

1. Growth Management

Question — How is your state performing in developing and approving growth management plans for regions that integrate social, economic, environmental and transport issues?

Response — The ACT and Queensland were the top performers closely followed by Victoria. Over 50% of respondents in these three States gave their jurisdictions an A or B. WA and SA are still doing quite well with over 40% and 30% respectively responding with an A or B. NSW is lagging behind with around 20% of respondents rating the state A or B.

2. Sustainability Indicators

Question — How is your state/territory performing in developing sustainability indicators that can be used to measure the performance of plans?

Response — The ACT, WA, SA and Victoria are on track and developing sustainability indicators. Around 30% to 40% of respondents indicated that these States were performing well. Queensland is next in line, and can improve its performance with 20% rating the state A or B and for NSW only 15% of respondents give the state a high score.

3. Governance

Question — How is your state/territory performing in having governance structures in place that can support the development and implementation of effective growth management plans?

Response — Each state has its own unique governance structures in planning. This can be confusing and costly for the development industry and community. While systems are complex and varied, overall planners see the ACT and Victoria as our best performers. Middle ranking States are Qld, SA and WA. NSW is again lagging behind, but 20% of respondents still score it well, with an A or B.

6. Demographic Change

Question — How is your state/territory performing in developing a sea change/tree change strategy to address impacts of population shifts?

Response — Australia’s ageing population and the demographic shift to coastal cities and regional towns by the graying population and those seeking a change in lifestyle has significant planning and infrastructure implications. Victoria and the ACT are addressing this in coastal and regional planning strategies. SA and Queensland are going some way to tackling the issues with pressure greatest in Queensland where growth continues at a rapid rate. A and B scores are negligible in other States and territories.

7. Housing

Question — How is your state/territory performing in developing a housing strategy that addresses affordability, housing choice and sustainable design?

Response — South Australia which has historically been a reasonable housing performer ranks highest with most A’s and B’s, followed by Victoria and then NSW (35%, 30% and 20% respectively). All other States performed poorly with only 13% of Queensland respondents rating the state well on this criterion. This score covers a wide range of issues that must be addressed in a strong housing policy framework — affordability, choice and design.

8. Public Participation

Question — How is your state/territory performing in having effective mechanisms for public participation in developing planning strategies?

Response — Effective planning must actively engage with and reflect the needs and expectations of the community. WA is again an exemplar with a high and visible approach to community engagement and consultation being taken at the highest level in that state, championed by the Planning Minister herself. Victoria also ranks very highly in this area. Both high performing States saw over 60% of respondents ranking their efforts A or B. Across the board, this is an area in which most jurisdictions appear to be on the right track with even the worst performers securing high scores from 30% of respondents.
4. Infrastructure

Question — How is your state/territory performing in having a timetable and funding commitment for major social and physical infrastructure in accordance with a growth management plan?

Funding Commitments for Major Social and Physical Infrastructure to Support Growth Management Plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>A or B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QLD</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAS</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response — Queensland and WA top the chart in terms of funding commitments for infrastructure. This seems to reflect the infrastructure plans accompanying the South East Queensland plan, and rail and development infrastructure investment in WA. No state scored very highly on this front with the top scoring States giving only 23% and 30% in A’s and B’s. Most of the other States performed poorly. Clearly we need stronger investment in development infrastructure, better coordination across all three tiers of government, long term commitment and a stronger link to strategic planning.

5. Transport

Question — How is your state/territory performing in having a commitment to fund improvement and expansion of public transport integrated with a growth management plan?

Expansion of Public Transport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>A or B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QLD</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAS</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response — Infrastructure spending is also lined to investment in public transport as part of an integrated transport and planning system. Western Australia clearly outranks all other jurisdictions with 64% of respondents ranking the state A or B. Strong investment in rail and public transport infrastructure both within and beyond metropolitan Perth makes WA an outstanding performer and places it well above its peers. Queensland ranks well below WA, but is the next best performer. All other States need to significantly lift their game. Congestion and air quality are major issues for Australian cities.

9. Planning Workforce

Question — How is your state/territory performing in having a well resourced and skilled professional planning workforce to provide expertise to the planning process?

Maintenance of a Well Resourced and Skilled Professional Planning Workforce

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>A or B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QLD</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAS</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response — The chronic shortage of planners has been a problem for the profession and quality planning outcomes for some 3-5 years. PIA has conducted a national inquiry into this issue and has taken steps to address it. Attraction, retention and churn of planners, particularly within local government affects quality outcomes. SA and Victoria are ranked highest against this criterion. All other States have achieved pretty average scores, with NSW being the lowest ranked. Tasmanian however has all the same problems as a region in attracting and retaining professionals given its scale.

10. Streamlined Assessment

Question — How is your state/territory performing in having a streamlined planning assessment process in place?

Streamlined Planning Assessment Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>A or B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QLD</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response — SA and ACT are performing well. These respondents back up what we are seeing taking place — SA putting in place development assessment panels and the ACT implementing the nationally devised ‘leading practice model’ for development assessment. NSW and WA are the poor performers, with average performances by the other States. The NT appears to shine, and is by all accounts improving, but the number of respondents makes this result statistically unreliable.
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Voice of the Planning Profession

Liveable, sustainable communities are critical to national prosperity and to securing Australia’s future economically, socially and environmentally.

The Planning Institute of Australia (PIA) is the voice of the planning profession. It represents planners nationally and advocates for better planning systems and performance across Australia.

Telling it like it is!
Are we doing what is needed in the critical areas for creating effective, functional and sustainable cities, towns, neighbourhoods and regions? Every year Australian planning professionals are asked by PIA for their expert opinions on how we are performing in key areas critical to the health and wellbeing of our cities.

The first poll was conducted in 2006. The results, released on World Town Planning Day, 8 November, attracted considerable media, political and community interest. The results of the second report card are outlined here.

This year over 740 planners responded to the survey ‘telling it like it is’!

Many people influence the built environment—state and federal politicians, local government councilors, professionals, community, public servants, developers and many others. They impact on our cities, towns and regions through their decisions in terms of funding, regulation, development proposals and design.

This opinion poll gives the profession an opportunity to reflect on the current state of our planning systems and outcomes. Planners are qualified and well placed to tell us how well we are doing.

The frustrations of the planning community with the speed of progress, the impediments to change and the lack of investment in planning shows through again this year in the comments provided by respondents.

Now 12 critical planning factors

The 2007 Report Card includes two new criteria—climate change and urban design as well as the 10 criteria used last year. The 12 critical factors are:

» Growth Management
» Sustainability Indicators
» Governance
» Infrastructure
» Transport
» Demographic Change
» Housing
» Public Participation
» Planning Workforce
» Streamlined Assessment
» Urban Design
» Climate Change

The scores—A word of caution!

Be careful how you use these results! This year’s results are not directly comparable with last year’s. As a result of feedback from the 2006 Report Card, PIA has made some changes.

Planners requested a change to the scoring scale. An A–D scoring scale was used last year. In 2007, we have used scores from A–E. This greater range of possible scores allows us to better assess performance and will be used in 2008 and beyond, allowing year to year comparisons to be made from next year.

The 2007 Report Card scores are:

A Performing well against this criterion (80–100%)
B Doing well against this criterion with some initiatives underway (70–79%)
C Evidence of some initiatives with improvement required to reach this criterion (60–69%)
D Inadequate progress in this criterion (50–59%)
E No progress (<49%)
Governments have their say!

PIA has been advocating for the Commonwealth government to play a leadership role in making our cities more sustainable and liveable. We need all three spheres of government working together with a shared vision, clear objectives and a strategic approach to investment and private sector partnerships to achieve this.

Given this, in 2007 we invited national and state governments to have their say and respond to the survey by providing details of initiatives underway in the 12 criteria. Local government decision makers also play a critical role in outcomes, so we invited local government associations to distribute the survey and respond.

More detail on PIA’s policy and advocacy as well as government responses to the survey questions can be found on the PIA website www.planning.org.au.

Employment of respondents

To assist with understanding the results, PIA wanted to know who was responding to the survey. A snapshot of responding planners by key employment group is outlined below.

The results

The survey tool is intended to illustrate how Australia, state by state, is performing in planning terms. This assessment is intended to be constructive, highlighting our successes as well as identifying where we can do better.

PIA has no objective other than to help inform Commonwealth, state, territory and local government agencies, built environment professionals, the development industry and the wider community.

The survey results are summarised in the table on the inside spread.

The results indicate that overall Australia has scored a C. This means there is evidence of some initiatives being taken in the 12 key areas nationally, but that improvement is needed to meet the levels of commitment, activity and funding needed to produce effective outcomes.

Australia-wide we are performing reasonably well (with some caveats) in three of the twelve criteria:

- Growth Management
- Public Participation
- Streamlined Assessment

Australia is also doing moderately well in terms of Urban Design and Governance. We are doing less well, however, against the remaining seven criteria.

Some states and territories are continuing to take positive steps to get it right. The strong performances which rated C+ on the national table include:

- WA—Transport Planning and Public Participation
- SA—Streamlined Development Assessment
- Victoria—Public Participation
- Queensland and ACT—Growth Management
- ACT—Public Participation

In terms of the positives, no more than 60% of respondents rated their state A or B against any criterion and some states/territories received no A scores at all against any criteria. So, there is still a lot more to be done.

The graphs that are provided overleaf illustrate what percentage of respondents rated their jurisdiction A or B, against each criterion. These graphs provide an important indication of who has performed best in the opinion of survey respondents.

Northern Territory had a low respondent rate and have therefore not been included.

Conclusion

PIA has identified the 12 most important criteria for a strong, healthy planning system. Based on the results of this survey, as a nation, we have scored a C.

PIA will continue to advocate strongly for decision makers to better design, fund and build communities that meet Australia’s future economic, social and environmental needs and that are governed well.

Given the pressure our communities are under to accommodate growth, deal with the decline in housing affordability and to address the impacts of climate change, next year we expect to see governments and industry making greater strides to prepare Australia for the future.

We expect a big improvement in 2008!
1. Growth Management

**Question**—How is your state/territory performing in developing and approving growth management plans for regions that integrate social, economic, environmental and transport issues?

‘Queensland is developing a strong regional planning regime which seems to be heading in the right direction.’

**Response**—Queensland and the ACT had the best results, which was a similar outcome to 2006 with over 40% of respondents in these two jurisdictions rating this criterion as an A or B score. In all other states/territories respondents returned A or B scores over 25% with the exception of Tasmania, reflecting the various initiatives underway for managing growth in most states/territories.

Input from Queensland Government—‘The Queensland Government aims to deliver a consistent framework for regional planning across Queensland. At present the Department of Infrastructure and Planning is accelerating implementation of the State’s seven existing regional plans and by the end of 2008, five new Queensland regional plans will be delivered.’

2. Sustainability Indicators

**Question**—How is your state/territory performing in developing sustainability indicators that can be used to measure the performance of plans?

‘Pleased to know that the (ACT) Government is requiring five star rated building development...’

**Response**—Sustainability indicators are a relatively new concept and are still being developed or implemented across the country which perhaps accounts for the low level of A or B scores in this category compared to others. Similar to 2006, ACT returned the highest A or B score closely followed by SA. The remainder of the state/territories scores were close together, returning A or B scores at around 15%. More work is needed here.

Input from ACT Government—‘In 2003 the ACT Government established a statutory planning and land authority, which in part achieves the Governance structure recommended by the Development Assessment Forum Leading Practice Model.’

3. Governance

**Question**—How is your state/territory performing in having governance structures in place that can support the development and implementation of effective growth management plans?

‘Planning legislation passed last week (in the ACT) gives effect to DAF Leading Practice Model.’

**Response**—Different governance structures exist around the country but the ACT, as with the 2006 Report Card, was the best performer in A or B scores, closely followed by Queensland and Victoria. In most jurisdictions over 25% of respondents returned A’s or B’s, with the exception of NSW and Tasmania.

Input from ACT Government—‘In 2003 the ACT Government established a statutory planning and land authority, which in part achieves the Governance structure recommended by the Development Assessment Forum Leading Practice Model.’

4. Infrastructure

**Question**—How is your state/territory performing in having a timetable and funding commitment for major social and physical infrastructure in accordance with a growth management plan?

‘South East Queensland has had a strong commitment to infrastructure funding to support the implementation of the South East Queensland Regional Plan.’
Response—Maintaining appropriate levels of infrastructure and servicing new growth areas remains a concern in many of our major cities and towns. Queensland, as in 2006, was the leading performer with just under 35% of respondents returning A’s or B’s for this criterion reflecting the established link between infrastructure plans and growth management plans, especially for South East Queensland. The middle ranking states/territories were WA, ACT and Victoria with around 25% of respondents returning an A or B, and followed by SA, Tasmania and NSW.

Input from Queensland Government—‘Regionally, the South East Queensland Infrastructure Plan and Program 2007–2026 provides an ideal example of the long term infrastructure prioritisation required to complement the South East Queensland Regional Plan in managing significant population growth. Significant infrastructure projects are listed with associated timeframes and budgets, linked to the annual State Budget process.’

5. Transport

Question—How is your state/territory performing in having a commitment to fund improvement and expansion of public transport integrated with a growth management plan?

‘Western Australia is progressing very well at present. There is always more that can be done however our population levels and low densities make providing a high level of service difficult.’

Response—Private and public sector investment in public transport remains a critical issue to address increasing congestion and fuel prices. Western Australia is the stand out performer for this criterion with close to 60% of respondents scoring A or B. That puts WA some 25% ahead of the next closest state, reflecting the greatest disparity between A or B scores for any of the 12 criteria. This was also the case in 2006. Queensland is the next best A or B score performer followed closely by Victoria, SA, ACT, NSW and Tasmania ranked below 10% for the A and B score. Western Australia’s score reflects the huge amount of co-ordinated investment in public transport in that state, especially in the Perth region.

Input from WA Government—‘Western Australia has a significant number of public transport initiatives underway and has a long established commitment to public transport. Initiatives include the new Southern Suburbs Railway, a twenty year plan for public transport, developer pre-funding transit infrastructure, application of Transit Oriented Developments, Central and Transit programs.’

6. Demographic Change

Question—How is your state/territory performing in developing a sea change/tree change strategy to address the impacts of population shifts?

‘There is sufficient scope through the broader metropolitan planning strategy, Melbourne 2030, as well as other strategies, such as the Great Ocean Road Strategy, to address the impacts of population shifts in Victoria.’

Response—Population shifts caused by lifestyle and economic drivers, such as the resource boom, are impacting on many smaller coastal and inland settlements. Victoria scored the highest of A’s or B’s for this criterion which assesses progress on addressing population shifts to coastal and regional centres. It also performed best in 2006 indicating success with its strategies. Next in terms of A or B scores were SA, Queensland, WA and ACT. NSW and Tasmania returned only 10% of respondents for A or B scores.

Input from Victorian Government—‘Significant regional strategic planning has occurred involving detailed settlement planning for coastal and other regional settlements including structure planning and urban design frameworks. The role of coastal and regional centres as the backbone of regional economies is being strengthened through targeted investment in public transport, infrastructure and improved regional communications.’

Planning Report Card—National results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Growth Management</th>
<th>Sustainability Indicators</th>
<th>Governance</th>
<th>Infrastructure</th>
<th>Transport</th>
<th>Demographic Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C -</td>
<td>C -</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>C +</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D +</td>
<td>C -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QLD</td>
<td>C +</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C -</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D +</td>
<td>D +</td>
<td>C -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAS</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D +</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D -</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATIONAL</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C -</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D +</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 7. Housing

**Question**—How is your state/territory performing in developing a housing strategy that addresses affordability, housing choice and sustainable design?

‘Affordable Housing strategy underway (in ACT).’

**Response**—Housing affordability is at a crisis point across the country and related issues around housing choice, location and design are also critical factors for social and environmental sustainability. The Australian Capital Territory respondents returned the highest number of A and B scores, improving on its performance last year, and along with SA was significantly ahead of the other states. Victoria and Queensland were around 20% and WA, NSW and Tasmania rated below 15% in terms of A or B scores.

**Input from ACT Government**—‘The ACT Government has recently released its Affordable Housing Action Plan, comprising a number of initiatives, some of which reflect the approaches contained within the National Action Framework for Affordable Housing.’

### 8. Public Participation

**Question**—How is your state/territory performing in having effective mechanisms for public participation in developing planning strategies?

‘(WA) Minister has introduced a wide array of public consultation mechanisms from citizen juries to deliberative democracy programs.’

**Response**—Effective engagement with communities is important to ensure plans remain robust and have community ownership. Western Australia continues to be the leader with 55% of respondents returning A or B scores for public participation. This was also the case in 2006, which supports the many public participation initiatives underway in WA. Victoria also scored well in terms of A’s and B’s with 45% from respondents. Tasmania markedly improved its position from 2006 (from last to third).

**Input from WA Government**—‘The Department of Planning and Infrastructure has been at the forefront of developing innovative ways in which to consult with the people who are affected by its decisions and policies. It has taken a leading role in exploring innovations in community engagement, with 21st Century Town Meetings (Dialogues), Deliberative Surveys, Citizen’s Juries, Multi Criteria Analysis Conferences and Consensus Forums.’

### 9. Planning Workforce

**Question**—How is your state/territory performing in having a well-resourced and skilled professional workforce to provide expertise to the planning process?

‘Always a shortage of planners (in ACT) but there is support for training and development’

**Response**—The planning system cannot perform effectively without a skilled and resourced planning profession. The chronic shortage of planners still remains a problem though many initiatives are now underway to address the problem. The ACT showed a marked improvement in its A or B responses compared with last year achieving the highest A or B score, followed by Victoria and then SA. In the remainder of the states less than 15% of respondents responded with A’s or B’s.

**Input from ACT Government**—‘The ACT Planning and Land Authority has sought to introduce more flexible and responsive workplace arrangements attractive to those who do not want to work full time, but that also promotes a greater range of experiences for those engaged in its workforce. The Authority also practices a strong philosophy of a multi-disciplinary approach to its work, making effective engagement of all design professions and para-professionals.’

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Housing</th>
<th>Public Participation</th>
<th>Planning Workforce</th>
<th>Streamlined Assessment</th>
<th>Urban Design</th>
<th>Climate Change</th>
<th>AVERAGE GRADE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D+</td>
<td>C -</td>
<td>D -</td>
<td>D +</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D +</td>
<td></td>
<td>D +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>C +</td>
<td>C -</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D +</td>
<td>C -</td>
<td>C -</td>
<td>D +</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>C +</td>
<td>C -</td>
<td>C -</td>
<td>C -</td>
<td>C -</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C -</td>
<td>C -</td>
<td>C -</td>
<td>C -</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D+</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C -</td>
<td>C -</td>
<td>D -</td>
<td></td>
<td>D +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D+</td>
<td>B -</td>
<td>D +</td>
<td>C -</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D +</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C -</td>
<td>C -</td>
<td>C -</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. Streamlined Assessment

**Question**—How is your state/territory performing in having a streamlined planning assessment in place?

‘The system (in SA) is simpler and more usable versus other states. Red tape reduction is underway with some potential to do more without undermining Triple Bottom Line. Delegations and Development Assessment Panels (generally) are worthwhile improvements.’

**Response**—Planning reform is underway in many jurisdictions with many initiatives aimed at streamlining the process, such as Development Assessment Panels which have been established in SA. ACT and SA continue, from 2006, to perform well and returned the highest number of A or B scores for streamlining assessment processes with both jurisdictions now implementing many of the reforms recommended through the Development Assessment Forum.

**Input from SA Government**—‘South Australia is leading the nation in reforms streamlining the assessment system. Since February 2007 councils must, by law, delegate their powers and functions with respect to determining development plan (‘planning’) consent to either council staff or to a development panel (council or regional). Such panels are required to have a majority of independent members.’

11. Urban Design

**Question**—How is your state/territory performing in having clear policies that promote quality buildings and urban spaces?

‘Good standard (in Victoria)—upheld fairly consistently—needs to link more effectively with tangible sustainability requirements. Urban design should not be divorced from urban quality.’

**Response**—This is a new criterion for 2007 and reflects a growing interest and desire for quality urban design in our cities and towns. Victoria was strongest with over 40% of respondents awarding an A or B score, being placed well ahead of the middle ranking performers, with Tasmania having a very low score on this criterion. New South Wales had its best A or B performance in this criteria. Victoria has undertaken many initiatives to improve the design of cities and towns.

**Input from Victorian Government**—‘The Department of Sustainability and Environment has prepared a suite of design guidelines to assist in design negotiation consisting of Design Guidelines for Higher Density Residential Development, Activity Centre Design Guidelines and Safer Design Guidelines. Other initiatives include: demonstration projects, establishment of the Office of the Victorian Government Architect and development of an urban improvement grant scheme.’

12. Climate Change

**Question**—How is your state/territory performing in having a strategy to mitigate and adapt to climate change?

‘The ACT (Government) has recently released a strategy. The effectiveness of this and the political commitment to implementation is yet to be tested.’

**Response**—This is another new criteria for 2007 which assesses performance in implementing strategies to adapt to and mitigate against the impacts of climate change. This is likely to gain greater prominence in the planning arena in the years to come as the built environment is highly vulnerable to the effects of climate change, including severe weather events. ACT and SA were both strong A or B score performers in this criterion. Queensland which scored high A or B’s against a number of other criterion, performed least well.

**Input from ACT Government**—‘By the release of the survey, the Government will have released its Climate Change Strategy comprising three sequential Action Plans that contain measures aimed at addressing areas in the ACT that contribute most heavily to greenhouse gas emissions.’
Planers continue to express concern about the shortage of qualified professionals, blame shifting between spheres of government, complexity of planning regulation and the lack of strategic outlook and regional planning activity.

‘There are many new initiatives identified, however the ability to deliver is unclear from a resourcing and skilled professional staff perspective. ... Need to ensure practitioners are involved in the formulation of the policy direction not comment after the fact.’

‘Too much blame shifting is happening between the State and Local Government. The State needs to be more prescriptive in establishing fair and reasonable performance targets and look at how this can best be achieved within the context of an acute skill shortage of experienced planners.’

‘I think there needs to be a greater appreciation for the local authorities who are placed under a lot of stress to get things done in such short timeframes, particularly by the private sector.’

‘The survey is a step in the right direction however it is very metro centric and there is no real distinction about the affect the planning system is having on rural and regional areas.’

‘Accommodating parties who wield substantial political influence is done reasonably well. Looking after the public interest and involving the public in decision making is done poorly, if at all.’

‘The state is in a reactive planning phase. This can only be changed with big (likely unpopular) political commitments to appropriate urban growth strategies that take into account the triple bottom line, and ensure that the environmental and social aspects of that triple bottom line are weighted appropriately. Current development is disgraceful, and sees us developing our city in increasing sprawl with little regard for water shortages, energy efficiency, the environment and society.’

‘The planning system has deteriorated over time ... It has become generally unmanageable for “everyday” activities and is overly time consuming. It appears that every step that is made to improve/simplify the system there ends up being more complications/delays/abilities to achieve an appropriate outcome.’

‘We are struggling to deal with the day to day workload let alone deal with strategic planning issues. We are dealing with a development boom inspired by the resource sector. Also I believe the centralised planning authorities struggle to address the regional issues and often fail to heed our advice.’

‘I think planning has now become a more important issue amongst the public generally and in the press. This is now reflected in government action.’

‘The move to regional planning, embracing numerous Councils, is a good strategic move and the only way to manage urban growth. However the regional plans must also address social and environmental issues and develop integrated forward looking plans with the political will to enforce them.’

‘The development assessment system is totally dysfunctional, planning adds little or no value to the process, and public confidence in the system is diminishing.’

‘Regional strategies linked to local urban structure plans and, in some cases, local infrastructure service plans should produce some positive planning results.’