

Updated Community Services
Transport – An Alternative
Urban Renewal

PART TWO

plan for melbourne



cro
papers

3/13

PLAN FOR MELBOURNE

PART II

("BLUEPRINTS FOR CHANGE")

COMPRISING:-

- ★ UPDATED COMMUNITY SERVICES**
- ★ TRANSPORT - AN ALTERNATIVE**
- ★ URBAN RENEWAL**

By

RUTH and MAURIE CROW

Published by the Modern Melbourne Committee of the Victorian State Committee of the Communist Party of Australia, which commissioned the authors to write this part of "Plan for Melbourne".

PRICE : \$2.00

INTRODUCTION

"Plan for Melbourne" has appeared thus far in two parts:

Part I. Facts and Principles (Published Feb. 1969)

Part 2. "Blueprints for Change" (This publication)

Part I was prepared by the Modern Melbourne Committee for the Victorian State Conference of the Communist Party of Australia in November 1968. It was pre-circulated to all delegates, pre-conference discussion resulted in a number of amendments, the final draft was carried by the Conference, and then it was published.

The procedure for Part 2 has been different. The more detailed proposals advanced for the most part, fall within the general framework of the general principles adopted for Part I. The Modern Melbourne Committee commissioned the husband and wife team of Maurie and Ruth Crow to write it, and the authors take responsibility for the ideas in this document, which are published for simultaneous discussion and action by members of the Communist Party and the public at large.

It is hoped that these blueprints for change will play some part in preparing for a worthwhile tomorrow by drawing attention to some of the immediate problems of our city and its citizens, and by advancing some ideas on how to tackle these challenges.

Authors' Note

So topical are all three of the "blueprint" subjects that major developments occurred in each field between the time of writing and publication.

For example, as if to illustrate the proposals on Domiciliary Care in Section I. "Updated Community Services", the historic First International Congress on Domiciliary Nursing was held in Melbourne from February 2nd 1970. The text could have been expanded to reflect the insight and brilliance of many of the ideas presented to this gathering; but Section I was already in the press.

Again, the Metropolitan Transportation Plan was suddenly released on December 17th, 1969, after Section II. "Transport ... an Alternative" was written, but just before it went to press; hence an Addendum dealing with the Transportation Plan was possible and this has been added.

The adjourned debate in the State Parliament on the "Urban Renewal Bills" had not yet commenced when these lines were being penned, so comment on the latest developments in administrative machinery cannot be made.

However, what we have presented here, we hope, depends not on the topical nor the transient for its value. Rather it is an attempt to present to people concepts which give them an opportunity to shape the future not merely to await the changes that chance, big corporations, irresponsible governments, or "the Establishment" may determine. Nowadays, so many of these changes merely mirror current trends and masquerade as plans based on "inevitable laws", or, as they are now often called "feasibility studies".

Many people have directly or indirectly contributed to framing this document. Some through spirited discussions, others through directing our attention to books, reports and articles; and a growing number, through the inspiration of the way they are pioneering new forms of organisation directed at improving the quality of life. We thank them all.

We hope that, by supplementing other surveys and plans, "Plan for Melbourne" helps to build a coalition of the left through which progressive tendencies of physical and social planning make contact with the political forces which are working for a general transformation of society.

Ruth Crow
Maurie Crow.

CONTENTS

PAGE

SECTION I. UPDATED COMMUNITY SERVICES

Blue Prints 	1
Preschool Centres	2
Three Historic Stages 	3
Four Challenges 	4
Dual-Function Centres 	11
School and Community	13
The Community and Recreation Centres	15
Peculiarities of Childhood 	16
Peculiarities of Youthhood 	18
Staffing and Financing 	19
Character and Design 	20
A Human Scale 	22
A Local Hub 	26
Domiciliary Services	27
How Service would Operate 	27
Staffing and Financing 	28
The Elderly 	29
The Lone Parent 	32
Humans with Problems 	33
The Cost 	34
Participation 	35

SECTION II. TRANSPORT ... AN ALTERNATIVE

The Transport of Goods 	38
The Transport of Man 	38
Cars for Recreation 	39
Cars for Commuting 	41
An Alternative Transport Policy	43
Wrong Direction 	43
Phased Encouragement - Discouragement	45
Future Rapid Transit	52
The Off-peak and Cross-suburban Problems	53
By-pass and Circumferential Freeways ..	59
The Exodus from the City	61
Dignity of the Traveller	64

Addendum: Critique of the Melbourne Transportation Plan	67
Method	67
A Radial Freeway System	72
Good Features	76

SECTION III. URBAN RENEWAL

Melbourne's Heart	77
City Interests want low density	78
What Should Remain Constant in the Flux	80
Community Fabric	82
The Future and the Past	84
Environment of Earlier Generations	89
The Changes Needed	92
Bulk Storage	92
Obsolete Land Uses	93
Freeways	94
Residential Densities	95
Industries	96
Community Services	100
Mixtures	101
Landscaping	105
New Planning Techniques	107
Structure Plan	107
Three Area-types	108
Other Techniques	112
The Housing Commission and the Future	116
Comprehensive Goals - A Great Heart	121

APPENDICES

1. Technical Teachers' Association list of non-teaching duties	123
1A. Figures on Pre-school Centres from 2 New Reports	123
2. Three objections to Abandoning Radial Freeway System	124
You Cannot Part a Man from his Car	124
You Cannot Separate Recreational and Commuter Uses	126
Public Transport Makes Too Big a Loss	126

	<u>PAGE</u>
3. Two Tables from Overseas	129
4. The Metro-Mobility System	131
5. The Eastern Freeway	131
6. Mr. Richards on Efficiency	132
Off-Peak Headways	133
Relocating Stations	133
Speed and Comfort Improvements ..	134
7. Mr. Hamer on High Density	135
8. Theories Against Redevelopment	136
9. Subsidies to Private Developers	142
10. Urban Renewal Bills	143
11. Public Participation in Planning	145

	<u>PAGE</u>
3. Two Tables from Overseas	129
4. The Metro-Mobility System	131
5. The Eastern Freeway	131
6. Mr. Richards on Efficiency	132
Off-Peak Headways	133
Relocating Stations	133
Speed and Comfort Improvements ..	134
7. Mr. Hamer on High Density	135
8. Theories Against Redevelopment	136
9. Subsidies to Private Developers	142
10. Urban Renewal Bills	143
11. Public Participation in Planning	145

SECTION I

UPDATED COMMUNITY SERVICES

THE HOME AND COMMUNITY FACILITIES

"To reach his full stature man needs a measure of privacy, a measure of casual informal association with relatives, work-mates, friends and neighbours, a measure of enjoyment where he is one of an audience, and, at the highest level, and on occasions, full participation in some type of social activity." (Plan for Melbourne Part I page 4).

BLUE PRINTS FOR CHANGE

Plan for Melbourne Part 2 has the sub-title "Blue Prints for Change." The intrinsic contradiction in this sub-title is perhaps most apparent when dealing with the home and the community facilities. The blue prints for change must be based on existing services... the kindergartens, health centres, schools, swimming pools, libraries, elderly citizens clubs and the hundreds of other organisations and institutions which play a part in providing recreation, culture, entertainment, sport, in maintaining health or in some other way improving the quality of life of the people.

The blue-print cannot be clear lines freshly drawn on a blank surface. Rather the starting point is a net of already existing facilities and the task in making the blue print is to examine this net, not in a static state, but in its living movement, with the community services developing, decaying, expanding, contracting, being modified or renewed. Here there is an area where a more rational use is changing the service, there a deterioration of what was once a thriving centre, in some other areas a complete lack of opportunities for social activity, somewhere else a lopsided provision, and in other places again high spots where inspired human efforts are being made, sometimes with insignificant impact on the community fabric as a whole, but always as the essential spark which spot-lights man's creative contribution to change.

Thus, not only is it necessary to visualise the net of existing community services in movement, with all the myriad of people using these services, but also the intertwining net of social groupings of

people who are evolving these facilities, and who bind these services into the every-day lives of the people.

The ever-increasing band of men and women who pioneer, maintain, modify and extend community facilities are unwittingly rewarded for their selfless hours of service because their activities lift them to finer human relationships.

This section of Plan for Melbourne Part 2 - namely, "Updated Community Services" aims more to indicate how existing services can be up-dated extended and co-ordinated, rather than envisaging quite different types of facilities being innovated, although innovations are proposed where older forms are inadaptable to new situations.

There are many community services which have served the family for many years and which seem to have inbuilt abilities to adapt to changing conditions. There is no reason to deal in detail with such facilities in a publication outlining a "blue-print for change".

Thus in the section on preschool education, the accepted form of half day kindergarten is given very little space, but the new challenges in the pre-school field are dealt with more fully.

Similarly a considerable amount of thought has been given to the new concept of domiciliary care as the provision of this type of service is in its pioneering stages and thus it warrants creative attention.

PRE-SCHOOL CENTRES

In Victoria, kindergartens and day nurseries were established over half a century ago. Each service has its own particular history and over the years many changes have been made to allow the kindergartens and day nurseries to more effectively meet the needs of the community.

There are three distinct types of pre-school child care.

1) Kindergartens, catering for children from about 3 years of age. The children usually attend the kindergarten for two or three hours a day on 3 or 4 days each week. Kindergartens are subsidised by the Government if building, equipment and staffing reach an approved standard. At most kindergartens a regular weekly donation of about a dollar a week is paid by the parents.

2) Day Nurseries, catering for children from a few months old to school age. The children can attend for a full day for five days a week. Attendance at Government-subsidised day nurseries is limited to those children whose mothers work because of economic necessity. Fees are charged on the basis of a means test. The Government sets a standard for building, equipment and staffing for those day nurseries which are subsidised.

3) Commercial child-minding. With the growth of employment opportunities for married women the need for centres where children can be left while mothers are working, has resulted in the mushrooming of minding centres. At these a profit is made from the fees charged. The State Government, through the Health Department does inspect these centres, but such inspection is mainly confined to the state of the premises.

A fourth type of pre-school centre is beginning to make its appearance. These are centres established by employers for the children of their workforce. Ericsson Pty. Ltd. in Broadmeadows and the Alfred Hospital in Prahran have established such a service. These really fall into the third category, but special mention is made of this development because it could well indicate a new trend in child care services.

It should be noted that the Government subsidised all-day pre-school centres in Victoria are now called "day nurseries". For many years they were known as "creches", a term still sometimes found in popular usage. The word "day nursery" will be used in this text, regardless of the historic period.

There are two distinct systems of pre-school centres which are subsidised by the Health Department, 1) the half-day kindergarten, and 2) the full-day nursery. Each system has its own history and traditions, and for most of the past fifty years there has been very limited co-ordination between the two services. However, for a brief time during the Second World War, some half-day kindergartens were extended to cater for children for a full day, and some new kindergartens were established which reserved some places for all-day care for children of working mothers.

Three Historic Stages

1. From the beginning of the twentieth century to the beginning of the Second World War kindergartens and day nurseries were established in the poorer suburbs by committees of wealthy patrons. For most of this period there was no Government assistance for these centres and at kindergartens there were no contributions expected from the parents (thus the name "Free Kindergarten"), while at the Day Nurseries a very nominal fee was charged.

2. At first the Government assistance to pre-school centres was made as a lump sum, but in the 1940s when the basis of this was changed to a grant for each child at a kindergarten which met an approved standard, it became more possible for kindergartens to be established, not only by committees of fairly wealthy patrons, but by committees of wage-earning parents. Coupled with this the much greater awareness of the value of kindergarten for pre-school children resulted in the extension of kindergartens to all suburbs.

In the period since 1940 there has been little increase in the number of day nurseries, subsidised by the Government, only one new centre having been established in the past 50 years, but the standard of care provided at these day nurseries improved out of all recognition. The twelve Melbourne day nurseries which are subsidised by the Government are in the inner suburbs. Thus the outer and middle suburbs are starved of such an essential service, and this has resulted in the third stage in pre-school centres.

3. The increase in opportunities for women to work and to study has resulted in far more women seeking minding centres for their young children. But State Governments have not provided for this new need. There has been no increase in the number of day nurseries despite the increase in the population and the increased proportion of women in the workforce. Instead of keeping pace Governments have permitted private enterprise to fill this gap.

The standard of care and the fees charged vary considerably at these minding centres, and it was not until the tragic Templestowe fire of 1964 that the Health Department began to take more effective steps to register these centres and to inspect the premises from the point of view of health and hygiene. As there are no Government-subsidised day nurseries in the outer suburbs, working mothers there have no choice other than to make some private arrangement or to use a commercial minding centre, where, although the premises may reach the required standard, the program of activity, the play equipment and the training of the staff, often leaves much to be desired.

Four Challenges

For the past thirty years two factors have determined where and what sort of pre-school child centre is established. On the one hand the area where parents have initiative and a high enough income a community kindergarten has been established; and, on the other hand child-minding centres have been established when an individual with money to invest finds suitable accommodation in an area where there are some clients who want the service his business can provide, his main object being to make a profit.

There are today four challenges in the field of pre-school child care.

1. An extension of kindergartens to ensure that each child, if parents so desire, can have one full year of pre-school education.
2. The provision of child care centres for working mothers and student mothers.
3. Experimentation with a new type of pre-school centre for families in high density estates.

4. Special measures to encourage kindergarten attendance by children from homes where English is not spoken.

Points 2, 3 and 4 will now be dealt with in more detail. It is not intended to deal fully with point one as its desirability is well accepted by the community.

However a yardstick for measuring the standard of provision of kindergartens in any locality is given by the example of Canberra. The Federal Department of Education and Science has stated that for Canberra it is "Departmental policy to ensure that each child, if his parents so desire, has one full year of pre-school education."

In Victoria, according to figures in Hansard in December 1968, there were 35,400 children receiving a "recognised pre-school education", in a population with 65,590 three year olds and 66,300 four year olds, a total of 131,890 children in the age group eligible for kindergarten education.

The other three challenges demand modification and experimentation as well as extension, and for this reason we will deal with them more fully.

Working and student mothers challenge

To cater for the pre-school children of working or student mothers, the following facts need to be considered

- 1) The most pressing problem is for some place where the child can be cared for during the hours of the mother's employment or education.
- 2) A proportion of women whose children are in the pre-school age group, are working because they are the sole bread winner of the family.
- 3) At present Government subsidies are only provided for those centres where mothers are working due to economic necessity.
- 4) There is no supervision of the commercial pre-school minding centres only inspection of health and hygiene.
- 5) An increasing number of women desire to use a centre for only a short period each week. Frequently the kindergarten or day nursery timetables are not suitable to provide for the short duration of care required.
- 6) While many employed women do travel some distance to work, and it is sometimes convenient for a nursery to be near the work place, if possible tedious journeys should be avoided for young children.

The time is now ripe for numerous bold experiments in the field of catering for the children of working mothers and student mothers. Some have already begun. The Melbourne University Family Club is pioneering a co-operative pre-school centre with parents buying shares. They recently received a small Government subsidy.

The Alfred Hospital, Prahran, has attracted trained staff with a Child Care Centre on the premises and Ericsson Pty. Ltd. manufacturers of telecommunication equipment set up a child care centre for their employees at their Broadmeadows factory.

Here are suggestions for other experiments

- (a) A new type of flexible "mother-child" centre (discussed later in this section)
- (b) Small home-like units where all the children of one family are cared for in the one centre, pre-school children all day (if necessary) and school age children after school and in the school holidays.
- (c) Centres which combine the function of day nursery and casual minding.

Whatever facilities are provided the present method of subsidising only those centres for working mothers who pass a means test should cease, and there should be no segregation of children and mothers according to income level.

As it has become profitable for commercial ventures to invest in child-minding centres, why cannot the Government and municipal Councils provide such centres and plough back the profits to subsidise the children of parents in lower income groups?

In 1966, 48 per cent of the female workforce was married. This emphasises the need for the Government to take more responsibility for the provision of child care centres for the working mothers. Therefore,

1. The present inspection of commercial child-care centres should be extended to supervision, the standard at such centre should be improved in every respect so that the building, equipment, and the staff are equal to that provided in Government-subsidised day nurseries and kindergartens.
2. Each Municipal Council should establish at least one Government-subsidised day nursery, and such centres should be used not only by those families where the mother works due to economic necessity.

3. The establishment of child-minding centres on a co-operative basis should be encouraged by an extension of Government subsidies to such centres.
4. Industrial enterprises should be assisted to establish child care centres on their premises through tax deductions and other ways.
5. The rigid separation between kindergartens and day nurseries should be reviewed. In some areas an existing kindergarten may more effectively serve the families of the area if some places were reserved for all day care for some children.
6. Experiments with a much more flexible type of all-day care should be carried out, especially in areas where there is high density population.
7. Day nurseries combined with casual minding centres to be established at selected railway stations (see "interchange complex" in Section II on Transport, below). In the 1930's a very popular centre of precisely this character operated above Flinders Street station.

High density estate challenge

New ways of housing families are presenting these new features:-

1. In new estates there has not yet developed the friendliness between neighbours which in established districts often results in mutual aid. The traditional "extended family" has not yet emerged.
2. Most high density estates so far constructed are predominantly vertical. Such high-rise buildings create communication barriers and "flat-bound" wives are particularly affected by the isolation that results.
3. Young children have little opportunity to play out-of-doors yet close to home on some estates.
4. On Housing Commission estates there is a concentration of families on low incomes and a very high proportion of single-parent families.

Such conditions call for bold experiments in the type of pre-school centre provided. One experiment could be a flexible type of centre with building and program allowing for much more coming and going and sitting around by the mothers. We will call this a "Mother-child centre".

In addition to the usual kindergarten room and kindergarten playground for three and four year old children, such centres should have facilities for babies and toddlers, up to three years of age, to

play safely indoors and outdoors directly overlooked from rooms used by mothers. A home-sized sitting room with kitchen annex could provide a social centre used daily by some mothers, and generally as a casual meeting place for families with young children.

Such a set-up would allow mothers to take turns to mind each others young children in surroundings which are familiar to the youngsters. At the same time mothers would not have to have their own flat privacy intruded upon when they baby-sat for a neighbour. In this way some mothers could be relieved of the babies or toddlers and could go shopping, or attend to some particularly arduous house-work without the little ones tagging on.

Such a "mother-child" centre could also cater for mothers in employment, but paid staff would be needed to directly care for the children of mothers who are regularly at the centre without their own mother. Even without specifically catering for the working or student mother, a child care centre would be a place that could be used by such mothers when they are looking for work or working for a short period of time, and in this way it would act as a bridge between the home and day nursery care for these families. (See example under "Working and Student mothers" above.)

At such a centre, children of the appropriate age, would attend the usual type of kindergarten. But while the child is at kindergarten and also at other times suitable to the mother, the sitting room and toddlers play corner and the kitchen annex would be an adjunct to the flat and a social focal point for mothers.

Thus any program to cater for the needs of pre-school children in high density estates has to consider three main functions:-

- 1) Providing educational activities for children of kindergarten age.
- 2) Providing a social centre for mothers of young children
- 3) Providing longer care for those children whose mothers are working or studying.

In some areas all three functions may be combined in the one building, in others it may be more suitable for several centres to co-operate together to provide the choice for the families.

The special needs for a different type of pre-school education in high density estates may result in consideration being given to a different type of staff-child ratio. In an experiment with a "mother-child centre" as outlined above it may be possible to establish a ratio between the number of families using the centre and the staff, rather than the number of children attending the kindergarten and the staff.

Plan for Melbourne Part 3, will give more detailed consideration of changes in building-design if families are to be housed in high density estates in the future. But, whatever happens in the future, there are at present in Melbourne a number of high density estates of high-rise buildings and many thousands of young children will be spending their childhood on these estates. The above ideas for experiments are to help overcome some of the worst effects of such vertical dwellings.

Migrant family challenge

Considering that mass migration has been proceeding for over 20 years it is disgraceful that the special pre-school needs of the children of migrants are so neglected. Here are some basic facts:-

- 1) Children brought up in homes where the parents do not speak English are at a cultural disadvantage and cannot make the best use of their education.
- 2) Some migrants are shy of mixing with Australians and thus seek companionship from men and women of their own nationality, thus helping to isolate their children.
- 3) In 1966, 15% of the Victorian population had been born in countries where English is not spoken. The proportion is much higher in the inner suburbs, for example in Fitzroy, over 50% of the population come from non-English-speaking countries.
- 4) Although the original kindergarten and day nurseries were established in the inner suburbs, today, it is precisely in these suburbs where there is no forward movement for the provision of these services, that there is a concentration of migrant children.
- 5) Attendance at a preschool centre would not only help the young migrant child to more quickly master English, but would also assist migrant women to mix with other than those in her own national group.
- 6) Although most migrant women know and use the Infant Welfare Centre, it appears that very many fewer realise that pre-school education is available for their child. Some migrants come from countries where no such facilities are available.

These facts call for a deliberate effort to encourage migrant families to send their young children to the pre-school centre. In areas where there is a concentration of migrant families the task of the centre should be seen to be in fostering of language development as well as providing stimulating activities and experiences that the home is unable to provide. The teachers who work in these centres should be strong in their competence to use English and in their power to encourage children to use language effectively. This may require a better staff ratio than at present in kindergartens.

When inner suburban kindergartens were first established, and even into the 1930's, it was a tradition for the kindergarten teacher to actually go around the homes and gather up the children for kindergarten. There was in some areas great missionary zeal to try to improve the cultural lives of the children in the crowded suburbs. While not advocating that this be re-introduced, nevertheless, there are many people in the community who could be inspired to assist with bringing migrant children to the pre-school centre.

A high proportion of young migrant women are in employment and there is a considerable amount of child-minding by neighbours and grandmothers. For many migrant children, relations and friends are much more part of their whole environment than is usual for Australian children. Also, because of the mutual child-minding, and the arduousness of household tasks which fall on the shoulders of the migrant women who are not in employment, some migrant women do not expect to organise their lives so that they have leisure hours.

Many primary schools are a meeting place for migrant women socially. They often meet on the pavement when they take the child to school or call for him when school is over. Kindergartens, with their long tradition of parent-teacher groups are in a good position to find out how to make the kindergarten just such an informal meeting place for migrant mothers, but of course a much more comfortable meeting place can be provided at the kindergarten because at most such centres it is usual to encourage mothers to come right into the building.

It would be very revealing to know how many migrant girls, especially from southern European countries, have completed the three-year kindergarten course. Yet, an effective person to encourage migrant women to use a kindergarten would be a kindergarten teacher of migrant origin. It is unlikely that many migrant girls will graduate from the College in the near future. Their own cultural disadvantages militates against them receiving a tertiary education, and the depressed bursaries for students and the low salaries for kindergarten teachers are not attractive to girls from low income homes. We suggest there is a place for a new type of trained person which we shall call "Pre-school Aides".

In the meantime a training scheme for mature-age migrant women and for migrant girls to become "pre-school aides" would be one way of immediately helping to bridge the gap between migrant families and pre-school centres. Such aides should be paid salaries, both when in training and when working, which would attract capable and intelligent people to undertake this work.

Thus in areas where there is a concentration of non-English speaking migrants:-

- 1) Pre-school centres need staff with special skills in English.

- 2) A flexible program to encourage parents to gather at the pre-school centre on as many occasions as possible.
- 3) More zeal in popularising kindergarten facilities amongst migrants.
- 4) Migrant girls and mature age women to be trained to work in pre-school centres.
- 5) No centres should be specifically for migrant children.
- 6) The intake should always have a proportion of Australian children, but in areas where there is a high proportion of migrant families there needs to be more staff for the pre-school centre.

Dual-Function Pre-school Centres

Creche, kindergarten, day nursery, pre-school centre, pre-school play group, nursery school, family club, all aptly describe a particular type of facility to those people who are initiated into the ways of providing for pre-school children in Australia. But, for the vast majority of Australian parents the words are interchangeable and have no precise meaning. They don't care what the centre is called so long as it provides the type of care they want for their child.

The new challenges facing the pre-school field can best be answered by a more flexible and better integrated pre-school service along the lines suggested. Thus the distinction between day nursery, kindergarten and minding centre should be less rigid. Perhaps an all embracing name, such as "Preschool Centre" is appropriate.

The traditional type half-day kindergarten may continue to be the most popular form of pre-school service, but as well as an extension of these centres, other facilities need to be planned; some providing exclusively for day nursery care, others casual minding, some a combination of casual care and day nursery care; and where appropriate some offering special social opportunities for parents.

Such centres could be located in residential areas, at work places, at railway stations or shopping centres. The size of these centres would vary, bearing always in mind the principle of human pedestrian scale later mentioned.

An all embracing name such as Preschool Centre could serve as a token of a changed Health Department policy. At present the pre-school centres are artificially cast into three segregated types, as explained earlier. The rapidity with which community needs are changing, necessitates that there should be a continual reappraisal and adjustment of each pre-school centre to ensure that the type of facility is serving the particular needs of the families of that district. Unless this is done, the very people who could most benefit from such facilities may not be served by them.

A pre-school centre is much more concerned with both the child and his parents, particularly the mother, than is either the school or the Infant Welfare Centre.

At the Infant Welfare Centre the mother and child are so close that they are almost inseparable, and at school the child is already becoming a separate individual. But, at a pre-school centre, both the mother and child are catered for both as separate individuals and jointly. This duality of pre-school education demands a great variety of types of services.

The child needs creative play, companionship, opportunities to begin to learn to be self reliant and independent and all the other wonderful opening-out of experiences which only a well run pre-school program can achieve.

The mother's needs may be much more complicated. Some may primarily want companionship, others may seek ways to increase their knowledge about children and the management of the home; some may have pressing economic problems which can only be solved by full time employment; whereas others may have an overwhelming desire to complete their own education; some may work to pay for a trip abroad, others may work to buy bread and butter for the children. For some, being the mother of a pre-school child is a wonderful new experience, for others there is no novelty in taking the youngest of the family to the centre. Many Australian-born parents take kindergarten facilities for granted, but a large number of migrant women have never had any experience with such opportunities for pre-school education.

Thus it is relatively much more straightforward to provide for the pre-school child than to provide for the needs of the pre-school child's mother. But both are equally important.

A few decades ago, when "motherhood" was synonymous with "housewife", when few families lived in flats and there were very few migrants, the needs of the pre-schooler's mother were much more uniform.

The half-century of creative, pioneering work which has resulted in our Government-subsidised kindergartens and day nurseries is a rich heritage. The standards of staffing, program, equipment and buildings at these centres must be safeguarded and extended to every pre-school centre, whether it be a commercial profit-making venture, a co-operative club of parents, or a minding centre at an industrial enterprise.

A high standard of equipment and building are relatively easy to provide, the bottleneck however, is in the limited facilities for training staff for pre-school centres.

A greatly expanded training scheme for pre-school staff for both kindergarten teachers and staff for day nurseries is urgent. To meet the pressing requirements for trained people in these spheres of work,

training opportunities should be offered to mature age students as well as to younger girls.

Thus the blueprint for change in the field of pre-school education envisages not only a greater diversity in the types of centres, but a greater universality in the basic standards of care provided.

SCHOOLS AND THE COMMUNITY

At nearly every school there is some type of organisation of parents of the school children. The School Committee, the Mothers' Club or the Parents' Association are valuable connecting links between the school and the community.

New types of community involvement around the schools are now beginning to take place. There are a number of reasons why this is so:-

1. The shorter working week and therefore more time for leisure time pursuits.
2. The increased interest in educational opportunities, both for a continuation of formal education and also for informal education.
3. Some of the modern facilities which should now be provided at schools can be used by youth and adults as well as by the school pupils.
4. The increasing number of non-teaching duties which are at present the responsibility of teachers (see Appendix No. 1 "T.T.A.V. List of non-teaching duties".)
5. Cars enable teachers to live some distance from the school district.

These are some of the factors which result in the need for two new types of community involvement around the school:-

1. The use of the school premises after school hours by adults, youth and children.
2. The employment of school aides to relieve teachers of non-teaching duties.

1. After-school hours

There is nothing new in schools being used after school hours. There are plenty of examples where this has been done. What is new, however, is that some new schools are being planned to particularly encourage the use of the premises by the public, and that the plans for these schools are being presented to the people for democratic consultation.

For example, the Education Department is planning to build a new Education Centre at Collingwood. This will combine a primary and secondary school and the building is designed to make it easy for some rooms to be used after school.

The Collingwood Education Centre is not only to be a new type of building, but in planning the centre, a new way of planning with people has been initiated teachers, parents, councillors, Education Department officials, and other public citizens have been brought together into discussions on planning at the blue-print stage. Such a method of planning new schools and school alterations and additions will help to more fully integrate the school with the community, and life itself will more directly help the educative process.

To meet the needs of modern education, schools need craft-rooms, libraries, film rooms, laboratories, language machines, assembly halls, lunch rooms, gymnasiums and sports grounds. Such amenities need not lie idle after school hours and during the holidays; but to enable them to be used effectively necessitates buildings and grounds particularly adapted for such extra use.

But, the school library cannot be opened at night without a trained librarian, the craft-room would soon be chaotic without a craft teacher, and the sports equipment would rapidly deteriorate without a physical education instructor. Thus an expanded program of training of specialist teachers and leaders of leisure time activities is the key to greater use of schools when lessons are over.

"Many schools could successfully be adapted for lively after-school community activities for all age groups, but not without teachers and leaders". (Plan for Melbourne Part I, page 4)

Proposals for use of schools after school hours are also being made in Britain. In a report published by the Ministry of Housing and Local Government entitled "The Needs of New Communities" it is stated in paragraph 155 "Much more (use) would be possible if schools were designed from the outset for the joint use of both school children and the adult community. Development along these lines has been commended to local authorities in a joint circular of the Department of Education and Science and the Minister of Housing and Local Government" ... the report also states (paragraph 156) "There is of course a financial problem here. Yet, though it is clearly more expensive to provide a school with facilities which can be used by the community as a whole, it is even more expensive in total to provide completely separate facilities."

2. The employment of schools aides

Before cars enabled teachers to commute to school each day, teachers usually lived within walking distance of the school where they taught. Therefore they had a greater opportunity of knowing the

families and the district.

At some schools today the only local citizens associated with the school are the caretaker and the parents who help in the school canteen. Such people often become vital connecting links between the teachers and the community of the district.

A new field of employment must be developed as part of our education system. This is employment of school aides, to work as laboratory assistants, clerks, library assistants, sports coaches, book-sellers, organisers of excursions, film projectionists and so on. Such employment would be very suitable for women who could work part time. Although for some of the tasks listed some training would be necessary, others would be relatively unskilled work and in any case there is an increasing number of women who have qualifications which would fit them for such work. If such part-time employment was offering near at home, they could combine a job with the tasks of bringing up their own children.

School Aides, recruited from local housewives, could be a new force which could generate a new enthusiasm for the participation of local people in school activities.

Similarly the staffing of the schools for after-school activities opens up a new field of employment. This type of employment could also attract local people who wish to have part time employment.

Special courses to train school aides and leisure time leaders could well open up a field of work for the mature-age women, although of course not exclusively for them.

The main purpose of schools is education. This is enhanced when the school and the community are integrated. There is a variety of ways that this can be done and in the future many experiments will take place, and new relationships will be established between the school and the community. One factor, should however remain constant. That is, the democratic organisations of parents, teachers and public citizens as part of the school.

COMMUNITY AND RECREATION

"The peculiarity of any high-class social life is not only that it is based on a group of people voluntarily co-operating with the same interests or aims, but to operate at its highest level, or even to operate at all, each such group requires skilled persons to give instruction, guidance, inspiration and organisation." (Plan for Melbourne Part I, page 4.)

The school (out-of-school-hours), the library, the swimming pool, sports grounds and community centres are only some of the existing

facilities which provide leisure time recreation.

The best of these provide a variety of activities at four different levels. Some may come as casual individuals, (to change a book, to have swim, to practise a craft and so on). Others may be seeking companionship outside the family circle. Some come to be entertained, others to participate in a team (a sports team, an acting group, a hobbies group and many, many others including the democratic organisation of the centre itself).

There is of course, no hard and fast boundaries between these four levels of activities, but when these four types of participation are planned, recreation can be used to break down artificial privacy and thus enrich the lives of those participating.

New designs for swimming pools (for example at Malvern), sports complexes (for example at Clayton) - and libraries (for example at Essendon) make it more possible for these facilities to be used not only for recreation for individual enjoyment, but also by community groups. Thus, those who desire to do so, can become part of a collective of people, rather than an alienated member of a crowd.

For the purpose of discussing the leisure time activities of young people it is necessary to make a rough division between childhood and youthhood. Naturally there is no hard and fast division, but for this analysis, up to the age of twelve years (end of primary school years) is childhood, whereas teenage youth are from twelve years to about seventeen years (from the beginning of secondary school to car driving age). The term young people is used here to cover both childhood and youth.

Three Peculiarities of Childhood

When organising activities for children, three peculiarities of this age group need to be taken into consideration. These are:-

- 1) They need the guardianship of adults
- 2) They are at the task of learning
- 3) They are on the threshold of youth

The guardianship

Although children need opportunities to choose activities, and companionship to their own taste and in their own time, they cannot exercise this choice unless there is adequate guardianship at the centre they wish to attend. Thus leadership at any children's recreation centre must have the two-fold responsibility of providing both activities and guardianship. Part of this guardianship is the physical care of the children and of the premises, part is the

acceptance of responsibility for financing the activities. Another aspect of this dependence of children on adults is that they cannot decide on the type of recreation facilities that are needed. Thus, children depend on a band of adults closely associated with the recreation centre. Parents may form part of this band, but such social service is not exclusively for parents.

Learning

Although many continue education all through life, nevertheless it is only in child-hood that there is a chance to learn and experiment in many different directions, and to spend nearly every waking hour on the pursuit of knowledge (either through lessons or through play). Children want to try a hundred different activities. Provision must be made for this.

Later in this plan it will be advocated that recreation centres for children should be within easy safe walking distance of the home. The problem to solve is, how can a wide variety of activities of a high, challenging level be provided at such a local centre, particularly in the areas of low density housing?

How can mediocrity be avoided and a wide choice given? One solution to this problem is for each centre to have a twofold function. A wide canvass of activities being provided for those youngsters who want to "give many things a go" and at least one activity being organised at a very high challenging level. For example at one local recreation centre the special activity would be drama, at another art, or ballet, or gymnastics, and so on. Thus younger children would be attracted to the nearest centre because they would mainly still be at the experimenting stage, whereas those who are beginning to want to specialise could travel to the centre which provided the activity of their choice.

On the threshold of youth

Children need guardianship by adults, but in the first step into the community through a recreation centre they are often much more inspired by youth who are only a few years older than themselves. Thus many of the general activities at a recreation centre become much more lively and interesting if they are lead by young people in their teens. But it should not be expected that such young leaders provide the guardianship, nor are many of them able to give consistent leadership in the fields of specialist activities.

This particular contribution that some youth can make to assist children in their leisure activities, needs to be heeded by all who are concerned with recreation for both children and youth. The mass media encourages teenagers to congregate in their own age group, such segregation can stultify the development of young people, whereas involvement with other age groups often brings out their true altruistic

yearnings for activities, not only for their own self-centred development, but for the good of others.

Three Peculiarities of Youth-hood

These three peculiarities of childhood extend, but to a lesser extent to teen-age youth, who as they grow older seek greater opportunities for specialisation, are able to travel farther, and are beginning to have economic independence.

Thus the three peculiarities listed for children apply to teenage youth when they are modified.

- 1) Self discipline begins to replace guardianship.
- 2) They are beginning to specialise in their education.
- 3) They are on the threshold of adult life.

Self discipline

Guardianship for youth needs to be much less obtrusive. Part of this guardianship can be provided by the youth themselves setting a code of conduct. Here, to the extent that young people take responsibilities for the conduct of others, either of their peers or of a younger age group, it is more likely that a high standard will prevail. Thus when youth are assisting with activities for children they are likely to become more self reliant and socially responsible individuals.

Specialisation

Whether teenage youth are attending school or not, many are still acquiring knowledge and have already chosen to perfect a special skill, some as a vocation, others as a hobby. Whereas for children a recreation centre needs to offer opportunities "to try a hundred different things" coupled with a chance to pursue one interest more intensely, youth who have already chosen to specialise, need to be offered complementary activities which will introduce them into a more varied social life.

Thus for teenagers the conversation pit at the swimming pool, or the canteen at the Community Centre, have much greater importance than such amenities have for children.

Threshold of adult life

For a number of reasons youth of today tend to mix more in their own age group. For example, the increased number of young people continuing with education, the high proportion of youth in the community, and the mass media's emphasis on youth as a stage in life which has its own separate interests, fashions and so on. Congregating with people

of the same age has some very positive value for young people, but it is also important for them to be integrated with the other age groups in the community both older and younger.

The type of recreation facilities that are provided can either emphasise the segregation of teen-age youth or give them an opportunity to gear into some form of social life with older age groups. As pointed out in the section on children's recreation, youth who have almost crossed the threshold into adult life can make an intrinsic inspiration to younger people who are just stepping up to this threshold. The teenager who only has a chance to mix with his peers is denied his full social development in two directions.

Staffing and Financing

"Private enterprise can make a profit out of sport and health when it provides proper coaches, trainers and instructors, as a number of city and suburban centres demonstrate. What can be done privately for profit, should be done publicly, for a full range of activities on a vast scale." (Plan for Melbourne Part I page 5.)

Today, for many who are seeking recreation, there is little choice between an efficiently-run profit-making recreation complex, and a poorly equipped and inadequately staffed youth club or community centre.

The field is wide open for the Municipal Council to provide new facilities or to extend already existing facilities, for example, sports pavilions, pools, libraries, or to assist schools to be open after school hours. Such centres could provide similar amenities to those provided by the commercial centres, but a more varied program of activities, and because these services would be on a non-profit basis, they would be cheaper and the control more democratic.

The cost of providing activities could be the responsibility of those participating, but the actual physical maintenance of the building and equipment would be shouldered by the responsible authority. The present conditions of hiring municipal sports fields provides a basis for this type of sharing of cost of maintenance.

A number of recreation organisations receive subsidies from the State Government, but these are completely inadequate for any worthwhile expansion of recreation centres.

But, even more than inadequate finance, the lack of trained leaders for leisure time activities is holding back the development of such services.

It augurs well for the future that a two year youth leadership course (with bursaries of a thousand dollars a year) has now been

established by the Institute of Social Welfare. This is a step in the right direction, however, the next step, has yet to be taken. That is, these trained recreation officers to be guaranteed conditions of employment commensurate with their training and with the responsibilities they will be taking. Some of the Committees at present responsible for recreation centres are not in a secure enough position to accept such a responsibility.

The establishment of Community Centres with area officers (with reasonably good salaries) by the Melbourne City Council, at North Melbourne, Flemington and Carlton sets an example to be followed in other areas.

Voluntary helpers have an essential role to play at all recreation centres, but they can only play an effective role if the centre is adequately staffed with leaders who have been trained especially for this type of work. A quote from "Plan for Melbourne Part I, page 4" describes this partnership in the following way -

"In a word, services of people with special skills and in great numbers are needed to raise the quality of life, not to replace the efforts of the participants, but to complement them. And this applies at all levels, from umpires for junior cricket up to, say, choreographers. With the increase in productivity, and the possibility of increased leisure all this will become even more important."

Character and Design

From what has been said about the nature of childhood, the nature of youth, the need of both groups for a certain degree of separation from but also integration with adults, and with each other, and further the necessity to co-ordinate the efforts of voluntary leaders of different community activities with the paid trained leaders and instructors, it follows that there is no one straight-forward way to provide for leisure time activities. There is no prototype for a universal recreation centre.

Thus when planning for the provision of recreational activities the following need to be considered

1. A wide variety of activities, especially at centres where children predominate.
2. At least one activity at a high, challenging standard at every centre.
3. Opportunities for informal social groupings, especially at centres where youth predominate.
4. Opportunities for highly organised group activities.

5. Provision of separate activities for various age groups.
6. Provision of combined activities for mixed age groups.

Whether such opportunities are offering at a new, specially built centre or an improvised one in an old adapted building, the design needs to take all of these principles into account.

Sometimes a barn-like hall or obsolete factory is purchased or handed over by some authority and is supposed to serve as a centre. Without tremendous adaption such a structure is simply unsuitable except for very specialised purposes as can be readily understood by reference to the above principles.

For example, if any attempt is made to use it for functions involving mixed age groups, the youth having no way of separating themselves, both from children and adults, as they badly need to do for part of the time for their own social purposes, are hardly likely to attend. Or, for example, such undifferentiated space makes it difficult to supply for children a variety of different activities for them to experiment.

At the same time, any idea of designing a standard recreation centre good for all purposes would also need to be rejected. In the example suggested above that each recreation centre, under low-density Australian conditions, can specialise in only one or two activities at a really high standard, means that one centre may well be constructed around, say, a gymnasium, another around a theatre, still another have a workshop as its main speciality and so on.

On the other hand certain principles of design seem to suggest themselves, irrespective of size, location or function or main specialised purposes, namely

1. Small private rooms or spaces are needed in which both formal and informal gatherings of various age groups and activities can take place uninterrupted. This does not necessarily mean permanent rooms of unchangeable size. The flexibility of partitions now made possible by modern technology and architecture should certainly be explored and would tend to be very useful indeed in enabling convenient spaces for different purposes to be created at will. By whatever means small spaces are created however, they need to have a feeling of privacy.
2. Refreshment facilities are needed. These need not be expensively equipped and elaborate kitchens or canteens, but a corner with a bench, sink, stove etc. where those who wish may provide themselves some refreshments.

Understandably these are either often lacking altogether at such centres, or there is one over-large, expensive, unsociable kitchen. Eating and drinking and the preparation of food and drink can be very

companionable, and quite inducive in themselves to social activities. In bigger centres several such relatively cheap corners are suggested so that youth or mothers or others, can if desired, have refreshments in their own private groupings within the centre.

3. Outdoor design is important for any recreation centre. Too often a centre is found in conjunction with a playing field, or perhaps a children's playground, and that is thought to be sufficient.

The undifferentiated space of a field has very few social uses, short of organised sport of some description. But outdoors should be capable of supplying as many activities in fine weather as indoors, and the above principles should be applied to them too.

For example, protected conversation corners, practice places for various sports, such as cricket nets, basket ball rings, small landscaped amphitheatres, "wendy houses", spaces for adventure playgrounds.

A HUMAN SCALE

"The fashionable theory of planners and administrators is to accept the impact of the car on suburban life as inevitable and unimportant. Mobility, they say, has made obsolete all local facilities and services, except perhaps the service stations and a small park or so and a milk shop. The neighbourhood as a unit of community activity is, according to this view, an anachronism."

....." some apologists for the break down of local community activities on a neighbourhood basis argue that with car mobility these activities appear or should appear on a district basis ..." (Plan for Melbourne Part I at pp.12, 13)

Such a theory and such an apology we cannot accept. The basis of our value judgment on this matter is put in Part I and we will repeat it and then proceed with detailed reasons why homely, pedestrian human scale facilities continue to be extremely important.

After observing that local centres tend to give place to district super-markets Plan for Melbourne Part I states:

"That is the point at which the family is trapped. A generation ago "Junior" could walk to the Scout Hall, teenagers could tram to the tennis club, and there were many adult activities within walking distance or close in terms of public transport. The future outer-suburban-car-dependent parents, however, will be compelled to chauffeur every member of the family to most activities until they are old enough to drive a car themselves."

Every day life needs to be brought back to the pedestrian scale. Particularly is this necessary for the house-bound women, children and youth.

"The greatest punishment on earth is solitary confinement, yet many wives are suffering from it all the time" Rev. Father Frank Richards, Director of the Melbourne Catholic Family Planning Bureau and author of "How to be married..... AND happy." ("Herald" 20.9.69)

"Plan for Melbourne" Part I expressed the same sentiment in these words:-

"Especially severe is the effect of this home-centred self sufficiency on the housewife and youth of the outer suburbs. The commuter has at least his work mates. Many wives, however, feel desperately lonely." (at p.10)

The birth of a child usually results in fundamental changes in the pattern of life of the parents. The woman is particularly affected by this, especially if her previous circle of friends has mainly been composed of those who have not yet the responsibility of motherhood.

In addition, the increased tendency for women to be employed, not only results in the young mother losing the friendship of her own work mates; but it is quite possible that some of the homes near where she lives are empty because many of those who were formerly housewives are now in employment.

However, the birth of the baby presents the possibility of new connections with the community. The home visit by the infant Welfare Sister and the regular Health Centre visits can open up new prospects to the mother.

In the fifty years since their inception most Infant Welfare Centres have been located so that they are easily accessible to the pram-pushing mother. Thus in the older suburbs most mothers can walk to the Health Centre. This pleasure is denied many mothers who live in the outer newer suburbs where many must make their Health Centre visits by car, thus lessening the opportunity of casually meeting neighbours on the way.

A small Infant Welfare Centre, open two or three days a week, scattered at frequent intervals throughout the suburbs has been the pattern for the development of this service. This has much to recommend it and a similar pattern should continue as new areas are developed.

For both mother and child a walk to the kindergarten is not only companionable, but such a walk is often an opportunity for meeting other mothers and young children on the way.

The Dr. Vera Scantlebury Browne Report, published by the Victorian Department of Health in 1944, recognised the importance of distance between the home and the pre-school centre, and it recommended that no child should have to walk more than a quarter of a mile to such a centre. Dr. Browne was Director of Maternal and Infant Welfare in the Department of Health in the 1930's and 1940's.

Such a recommendation has yet to be implemented in many parts of Melbourne. The low density housing in some areas militates against the achievement of such a standard, particularly in the outer suburbs. In deciding the location of a pre-school centre, consideration needs to be given to maximising the number of children who could walk to the Centre.

A pre-school centre within walking distance of most homes is a realisable aim in the immediate future, and any tendency to construct bigger centres more widely spaced for reasons of economy should be resisted.

Similarly, while appreciating that there may well be a minimum size below which a primary school cannot provide a balanced education, it is nevertheless obvious that the size of some Melbourne schools does not reflect any principled decision, nor is their location related to their size in any significant way.

When Melbourne was more densely settled the schools were all large schools reaching well beyond an enrolment of five hundred, but, then, all schools together formed a net with only about one mile or at most a mile and half between each school.

Regardless of the fact that density of housing is decreasing, particularly in the outer suburbs, many very large primary schools have been established and their full complement of pupils depends on a proportion of children, either being driven to school by parents, or travelling on public transport.

Any metropolitan area where families live more than 3/4 of a mile from a primary school is suffering a loss of amenity.

In N.S.W. Mr. L. A. Whiteman, Acting Chief of the Division of Research and Planning, Department of Education states "In fully developed residential areas of normal type primary schools should be about one mile apart so that most of the pupils attending will be not more than one half mile walking distance from the school."

In the Australian Capital Territory it has also been stated that "Departmental primary schools serving new neighbourhoods are located so as to eliminate the need for special transport all homes are within half a mile walking distance of a school."

In some of the newer estates such as Tullamarine, Elliston or Fountain Gate, consideration has been given to minimising through traffic in the residential area, but in less fortunate older areas the heritage of grid-iron streets is not so easily overcome. Nevertheless, much more could be done to turn some streets into quiet access streets with most of the traffic directed away from the school and from residential areas.

Too often, the main way of dealing with dangerous traffic spots is to install expensive traffic lights or an overpass rather than considering a new street pattern.

Better siting of schools, fewer grid iron road patterns, in some districts smaller schools, thus bringing schools closer to homes, would all contribute to the elimination of road hazards for school children, and the more ready development of community contacts both between children and adults.

Paul Ritter in his book "City Planning Perth" describes how grid-iron streets were changed into a walk-way scheme in the Perth suburb of Carlisle. Ritter writes ... "Lion st. turned into "Lion Walk". This and its parallel cycle track serve particularly children and old people; the Walk connects homes with two schools, a playground, the proposed new hall, the old people's centre, shops, railway station and bus stop, and a large block of old people's flats" and then he states ... "This minor Town Planning scheme was passed in May 1968. This is probably the first Australian urban renewal scheme which has turned a grid-iron area into a neighbourhood unit, a good precedent to a pressing problem frequently found."

For the first few years of school life most children find enough social life at school and at casual play with children in the neighbourhood. The provision of safe places to play near their own homes for children in this age group is essential.

In the last few years of primary school however the school and the home neighbours need to be supplemented with richer opportunities. The Cubs, Brownies, Junior Sports Teams, dancing classes, Church Clubs, swimming pools, libraries, gym classes and many other group activities beckon the children from the immediate vicinity of their home.

Spare time social activities for children of this age should be within walking distance. As children enter their teen years they are much more consciously seeking independence from the family and many already travel further afield for formal education.

Recreation for them does not have to be so close to home. Indeed part of the adventure of growing up is to be old enough to be responsible to travel on public transport and to select recreation from a wider choice.

But for many car-less youth the availability of public transport is the key for them to become more independent.

A LOCAL HUB

Although throughout this entire section of "Updated Community Services" various age groups have been selected and some of their characteristics emphasised, life is not separated into such compartments. Neither, as a rule, does one facility serve only one age group, or where this does exist, it is the very aspect which should be overcome. Thus, as mentioned, the Infant Welfare Centre serves both mother and child, and junior sports teams are not only sports organisations for school children, but also a social organisation for older people associated with them.

Community services if they are to be effective for the family and the people using them, whatever their age, need to be closely integrated. The family as a whole can be enriched when any one of its members becomes associated with an activity. It follows that a neighbourhood which includes a grouped complex of such services is more likely to make participation possible for more members of the family.

The example of the new mother and the importance of her meeting new neighbours at the Infant Welfare Centre has been given. If in the course of her visit to this centre, however, the mother can do other errands such as shopping, or changing library books, she is more likely to consolidate her acquaintances, and from this primitive beginning she may find answers for acceptance into some form of social life commensurate with her different status in society.

Still more is this likely if there are other community type activities actually in progress nearby. In the sections on Transport and Urban Renewal to follow, as throughout this Section and Part I of "Plan for Melbourne" we have consistently advocated group social complexes and tried to propose measures, for transport, urban renewal and updated community services which would facilitate the deliberate creation or resurrection of mixed concentrations of various social activities.

Those trends in modern society which tend to disrupt and scatter community activities instead of consolidating and enriching them are bad trends. Many people are beginning to feel and express this in different ways, but they are often disheartened, thinking it impossible to find solutions to correct bad but seemingly overwhelming trends.

In this section, we have reaffirmed in some detail, a few aspects of what we believe should be the positive aspirations of a civilised individual as part of his local community in a modern Melbourne.

DOMICILIARY SERVICES

A new concept on how to best care for those who are in ill health is beginning to be understood. This is the concept of developing a network of domiciliary services. That is, services supplied to the home not only for those in ill health but also for those suffering some social disability. In its most perfect development the main emphasis of such a scheme would be to prevent ill health and to create a milieu conducive to the well being of the people.

A valuable document on this subject has been prepared entitled "Submission on The Development of Domiciliary Services" by the Joint Committee on Domiciliary Services and Health Insurance of the Victorian Council of Social Service and The Australian Association of Social Workers (Victorian Branch) published in March 1969 available from the V.C.S.S. 107 Russell St. Melbourne.

The type of services

Meals on wheels, emergency housekeepers, visiting nurses, visits by Infant Welfare Sister are some of the already existing services to the home. It is now being recommended that these be extended to include visiting physio-therapy, chiropody, occupational therapy, library and other such services as well as more home visits by doctors, baby-sitting and maintenance on wheels for elderly people. The clients served by the Service to be extended to include meals on wheels for all lone people when they are ill, no matter what age they are or what income they may have, and emergency housekeeping not only for those who are ill but also for those who are caring for the sick person.

One of the main aims of the domiciliary scheme is to prevent unnecessary institutionalisation. Thus it is recommended that some of the existing services be more comprehensive. For example, in most suburbs, meals on wheels are only available five days a week, and most emergency housekeeping only provide help between meal times, and the housekeeper is specifically allowed only to attend to daily cleaning of the home, the clients being requested not to ask them to do any special cleaning (for example windows, sweeping down walls, washing curtains etc.) Such restrictions will have to be lifted if the scheme is to fulfil its object.

How the services would operate

Eligibility for the present meagre domiciliary service mainly rests on the recommendation of a doctor, but social workers and other professional welfare workers should be able to vouch for those who need the help.

If the network of domiciliary service is to be really effective it must be human and personalised and must not be some anonymous,

faceless official or charitable organisation. Therefore, although many arrangements could be quickly and easily made over a telephone, nevertheless it is necessary that there be some easily accessible centre for domiciliary care in every locality.

Although many of the services will mainly be used by elderly people, they will not be the only clients and the centre for domiciliary care could be situated in some building other than that used as a centre for elderly citizens. For example, in the Melbourne City Council area there are already several complexes which include a kindergarten, health centre and pre-school dental clinic, and the local administration of the domiciliary services could be on these premises. Some of the services that would be provided would, of course, need other premises, for example, the kitchen for meals on wheels, and storeroom for maintenance on wheels.

Staffing and Financing

The whole idea will be doomed to failure unless there is a greatly expanded program for the training of social workers and other welfare personnel. If a truly effective network of domiciliary services can be evolved, then the provision of large institutions, especially for the elderly and chronically ill, will be greatly diminished. But, until there is adequate trained staff, and public money has been allocated for a realistic expansion of domiciliary services, it is very important that the traditional institutions be kept open to serve the people.

In "The Australian," 30/11/69 an article has the title "Nursing at home soon for the old," and the then Federal Minister for Health, Dr. Forbes is reported as saying "A programme of home-nursing service for the aged and infirm is to be introduced soon." Commenting on the Minister's statement, the following statement is made in the same article by Mr. Jago, the New South Wales Minister for Health "The home nursing scheme would take care of them in more suitable surroundings at a very much lower cost."

The cheese-paring attitude expressed by such a prominent public person as Mr. Jago renews the warning that to some people the criteria used for judging the value of a service may be whether it is cheap, not whether it effectively serves the people who need it.

Any such unscrupulous attitude by officialdom could result in people in need being forced to hide their troubles behind the shutters of their homes.

Any approach by Governments with mean motives would be unacceptable and likely to set-back the flowering of a full program of domiciliary care instead of liberalising an expansion of community concern which could improve the quality of life by providing a sense of security for

those no longer in the full bloom of health or who have fallen on hard times.

On the other hand an approach by Governments genuinely concerned to raise the quality of life and prepared to expend more, not less money to do so would enlist support from three sources, namely from some of the beneficiaries themselves, from Councils and from people offering voluntary community services.

Though doubtless in a minority some of the beneficiaries would be in a position to pay, and would gladly pay reasonable charges for services otherwise unobtainable. For example a lone person normally in good employment, who becomes sick would gladly pay for meals on wheels or housekeeping services.

Secondly, local Councils who have for long been associated with some domiciliary services such as meals on wheels and emergency housekeeping services, would be heavily involved in any expansion of such services, but any such expansion could only be properly achieved on the basis of employment of an adequate staff of social workers to administer it.

For some thirty years the only Victorian Municipal Council to employ social workers was the South Melbourne Council and although the situation is already changing in other Councils it must be appreciated that an upgrading in the importance and number of social workers would be necessary to establish the scale of services envisaged in the report by the Victorian Council of Social Services.

Thirdly, while emphasising that the basic finances for domiciliary services must come from public moneys, and that the main services would be provided by staff who would be adequately remunerated for their work, nevertheless in such a scheme there is room for people of all ages and of many different skills to be voluntary helpers in the community services.

In the past the social service minded citizens have too often had to shoulder the main financial responsibility of providing social assistance. The acceptance by the Government and by the municipal Councils of financing such services releases these people for more creative work. The main role of voluntary helpers would not be to make the scheme cheaper, but to closely tie the service to the community.

The Elderly

The aged population will always include many who are dependent, helpless and in need of community support, but there is an increasing number of elderly people who are in good health and who can be independent. Community facilities can assist them to remain independent and healthy. There are two trends in contemporary Australian life which make it essential that such community facilities be extended as rapidly as possible.

1. The increase in the number of married women in the work force. The re-entry into employment of the 35 to 45 age group of women affects their capacity to care for ageing parents and even to give them company.
2. The one-family dwellings, the city sprawl with flats and homes limited to one family accommodation, has resulted in many old people being left behind in the older inner suburbs.

In both North Melbourne and in Fitzroy 11% of the population is of pensionable age (i.e. 60 years and over for women, and 65 years and over for men) whereas for Victoria as a whole the percentage is 10%.

Many elderly people are in the areas where redevelopment schemes have been taking place, and some of them are re-housed in small flat units, which allow them very little opportunity for social life around their own hearth. Thus the one-family dwellings, plus the individual flats for elderly tend to segregate the generations not only into housing types, but also into separate suburban areas, the elderly in the inner suburbs, and those with young families in the outer suburbs.

Domiciliary service, particularly for the elderly, cannot be limited to an extension of health services to the home, (e.g. doctors, physiotherapists, nurses, hairdressers and so on) but must also include assistance with maintaining the actual shelter of the elderly person. There are at least two ways Municipal Council could help in this. One way is by "maintenance on wheels" and the other is the provision of pre-fabricated "granny units".

Maintenance on wheels

Because of physical frailty, the homes of some elderly or ill people may quickly fall into disrepair. A home maintenance service for such everyday things as changing globes, fixing washers, mending fuses and other similar household jobs will help them remain in their own homes.

Such a service would not do extensive repairs; but, for those physically disabled who needed the home to be modified, home alterations could also be included in this service. It is not envisaged that such services should be free, although it may be necessary to provide them more cheaply than other tradesmen. The main appeal of "maintenance on wheels" would be that it was easily available, cheaply priced, and that a variety of repairs could be effected from the one centre by reliable tradesmen.

Housing

A scheme for the housing of elderly relatives is being considered in one municipality of Melbourne. It is investigating the possibility of pre-fabricated "granny units" being leased to residents for the erection in the back garden for the duration of the elderly relation's

need. Such units could be dismantled and re-assembled as required.

There are also moves to encourage the erection of extra rooms or to make alterations to homes to accommodate elderly relations, by taxation deductions for such expenses. But more flexible building regulations are required, so that, when desired, the elderly need not be relegated to a "bungalow" in the backyard as one choice, or live as fully part of the family as another choice, but could have various forms of "flatettes", permitting a degree of dignified privacy, whilst having help at hand.

Nevertheless, the waiting list of elderly people seeking accommodation in institutions for the aged, or in elderly citizens' villages, continues to increase.

Through the Federal Government, grants are now available for homes for elderly people, and churches, welfare organisations and Municipal Councils are availing themselves of this finance.

Many of the homes built under the Commonwealth scheme are partly subsidised by the elderly person paying up to \$4000 for a flat or cottage. The elderly person then pays a small weekly maintenance fee.

For a growing number of people such accommodation is proving to be very satisfactory. In the best of these places the elderly person can enjoy the companionship of others if they so desire, but when it is needed they can have privacy. Most of the flats or cottages have a kitchenette, but meals can also be obtained from a central dining room. Daily visit from a nurse and an emergency button in the flat eliminates the fear of accident happening while the elderly person is on her own.

As most of these estates have only recently been built, they incorporate the most recent thinking in design for the elderly. It is unfortunate that in the Housing Commission flats for lone people, in which there is a high proportion of elderly women, there has not been the same attention to detail.

There are many different ways of coping with the specific problems of those who are no longer young. Elderly people need to be given as wide a choice as possible and domiciliary services will make such a choice more possible.

The Australian Commonwealth Pensioners Federation include a section on Housing in their publication "A Charter of Pensioners Claims." Some of the points of this program are ... An adequate pension rate so that suitable accommodation can be afforded ... Commonwealth Housing grants to be made available to State and Local Governments and Trade Unions, for aged persons' homes.

The Lone Parent

Today three new factors affect the lives of those who are left as a parent without a partner.

1. The mobility of our society. As a result of the thousands of migrants, the drift from the country to the city, and other similar causes of mobility, many married couples have no close relations near where they are living. Thus in times of adversity, they have no relations to turn to for moral or financial support.

2. The increase in employment opportunities for women affects the older age groups as well as the younger. Because of employment or other interests outside the domestic circle, many in the older generation have less time to be concerned about the problems of their married offsprings. This self-sufficiency of the older generation has some positive advantages for all age groups, but for those in adversity there is not the same opportunity to "run home to mother."

3. Housing in two or three bedroom flats or houses makes it less possible for families to "double bunk" with relations. Indeed, in the Housing Commission flats it is impossible, and in suburban homes the building of extra accommodation (by a "lean-to" or a closed in verandah, sleep-out, or a bungalow in the yard) is next to impossible.

On the other hand, increased employment opportunities for women, particularly if there were equal pay and tax rebates for child minding, could help some lone parents to greater economic independence, but to be able to take advantage of the labour market she needs much more effective help from community services.

The 1966 survey on poverty by Professor Henderson highlighted that the most economically-deprived people in Melbourne are the lone parents and their children.

The term "lone parent" means a man or a woman who has at least one dependent child, and who is the sole bread winner. At the time of the survey there were over 15,000 lone parents and the estimated number of children dependent on them was 25,000.

Much needs to be done to overcome this deprivation, and a campaign against poverty is urgent because by far the greater proportion are women with unequal wages. But, whether their poverty is overcome or not, such lone persons have certain special human needs which are not remedied by income only.

A small, but typical example of the human problems of lone parents was reported at the Nunawading Widows Consultation in August 1967. (page 30 of the report of this conference) - "young couples have little difficulty in finding baby sitters as they arrange with other couples

to take it in turns to help each other out. However couples were loathe to encourage baby sitting arrangements with a widow for in this case there was no quid-pro-quo."

Many of the needs of the lone parent - particularly the lone mother - could be met through the extension of community facilities as suggested in Plan for Melbourne. However, paradoxically, although the widow with children is the person in greatest need of being integrated into community activity, she is less likely to be able to take advantage of them. The quotation from the Widows Consultation indicates that the pressures to isolate her in the home, are even greater than they are on other mothers.

It is in spheres, such as this, that domiciliary services are a connecting link between the home and the community. A social worker, as part of domiciliary services, could counsel and encourage a lone parent to use community facilities as an adjunct to the home and could arrange practical assistance with help such as a baby sitting service.

Similarly, with other special human problems of lone parents, the most effective help is through human relationships.

"But men cannot live in isolation. Even more important is the improvement of recreation, culture, entertainment, education, holidays and sport, in a word, improvement of "social life" in one form or another" (Plan for Melbourne Part I. Page 4).

Humans with Problems

Thus humans with problems need a human community, even more than those people who are fortunate to have good health, economic security and whose family relationships conform more closely to what is regarded as normal.

In the past the tradition has been to provide large institutions, many hidden in country towns, for the people who do not fit into this accepted pattern. The orphans, the cripples, the mentally ill, the law breakers, the widows and the elderly have been segregated and it is these very groups of people who need a rich community life.

In Plan for Melbourne Part 3 more detailed consideration will be given to housing, and some of the needs of special groups will be dealt with more fully. Here it is only possible to make a brief mention and to deplore the frequent outbursts against suburban scatterisation of accommodation for some of the people with special problems. For example when a suburban home is being converted as a small hostel for the rehabilitation of delinquent youth, or a day centre is established as a psychiatric clinic in a quiet neighbourhood.

In areas where there are large scale development or redevelopment of dwellings, the opportunity exists for providing a small percentage of accommodation for people with special needs. Just as at present 5% of land in a housing estate is set aside for public open space, so also a percentage of subdivisions should be reserved for some of the following purposes, cottages or flats for elderly, or lone parents, hostels for youth, both from the country and those who need special care, cottages for orphans and so on. There could be wide experimentation in how such land is used, some for small scattered homes, some for blocks of flats.

If some such scheme as this is adopted, then those people who are suffering from adversity can more easily help themselves to the community services. This will give them an opportunity for independence and self reliance and this dignity will help to make rehabilitation more possible.

Thus it is not only a matter of visualising and planning for a network of community services, it is also a matter of ensuring that those who will most benefit from such facilities are in a position to choose to use them.

But, of course, community facilities are not only for those with special problems, indeed unless they serve an integrated community, then they cease to have any real community significance and the community as a whole is robbed of their right for a rich social life.

THE COST

These ideas are doomed to remain a dream unless it can be proved that it is economically feasible to provide such facilities.

It is pertinent to quote Mr. Bruce McFarlane, lecturer in Department of Political Science at the National University, in his book "Economic Policy, the Case for Reform."

"The human costs of misplaced physical environment ... whether they be in increased incidence of physical or mental illness, time and energy sacrificed to tension and psychosomatic symptoms or simple wasted effort and discomfort ... deserves to be considered in computing the total expense to the community. If this were done the economic criteria by which the planner operates would be revised substantially."

In some sections of this plan recommendations have been made for financial assistance from the Governments or from the Municipal Council. There are two conditions on which such proposals are based.

1. In some instances (for example pre-school centres) there are already precedents for public money to be spent on these services.

2. Recommendations for public finance for some of the newer types of services (for example domiciliary services), are being made by authoritative organisations, (for example the Victorian Council of Social Services) and this Plan supports their efforts.

Some of the recommendations in this section of Plan for Melbourne would require very little public finance for their maintenance. For example, most of the running expenses of an all-day-care centre or of a recreation centre could be met by fees charged for the services.

Other recommendations would result in more rational use of community facilities. For example, the use of schools for recreation; the better co-ordination of already existing services such as "meals on wheels" so that a larger number of people are served from one well equipped centre and the experimentation with more flexible types of programs at pre-school centres.

Over all these practical considerations of economic feasibility there is a barely tapped source of wealth ... the dynamic enthusiasm of human beings when "They themselves provide the final link to lift their own activities to more and more human satisfying forms" (Plan for Melbourne Part I page 5)

PARTICIPATION

Many community facilities had their origin in charity ... the rich helping the poor. This period has ended, but the question now unsolved is ... how can the community participate in planning facilities? A feature of the past few years has been that numerous individuals and groups of people are formulating practical plans for involving the citizens in planning.

For example, the Victorian Council of Social Services publication "The Community and Welfare Facilities in Fitzroy" (June 1969) has a section dealing with "An outline of proposals for establishment of a Fitzroy Community Association." This association has been formed.

Another example is the mushrooming of new types of associations, for example the Carlton Association and others similar to it.

In England the Ministry of Housing and Local Government has published a book "People and Planning" and this deals with how to involve the public in planning. (See Appendix No. 11 "Public Participation in Planning").

In Perth, Paul Ritter's "City Planning Perth" deals with some aspects of the same problem.

Many other examples could be given, all are attempts to find new ways of involving people with planning and not leaving the decisions solely to authorities.

Because of the past charity origin it is still assumed by many, that community facilities are needed in the older, poorer suburbs, but that in more affluent areas the people do not need such services. Many of the services discussed already exist in all parts of Melbourne, (for example kindergartens and health centres, elderly citizens' clubs) and other services exist in embryo in some of our suburbs (schools as recreation centres, community centres, some domiciliary services.)

The ideas presented in this Plan can only be implemented through public participation in planning. New organisations of people will be evolved, some initiated by planning authorities, some by municipal councils, and some by groups of local organisations. Thus in the future there will be many forums which present various plans to the public, through exhibitions, films, T.V., visits to show facilities, seminars, and in numerous other ways the people will become more informed about the role of these services in our modern society and will be more able to play a part to establish them.

All those who were on kindergarten committees in the 1940's when the whole structure for the provision of kindergartens was changed from being a charity to be a community service will remember the impact that the popularisation of kindergarten education had on the community. The leaflets, the visits to such places as the Lady Gowrie Centre, the exhibitions on child care, the petitions for kindergartens, involved hundreds of people. The public can only participate in planning if they can be inspired with a perspective of what the new planning can mean for the enrichment of community living.

These blue-prints for community facilities have been written to give this perspective. The key word is that they are "blue-prints for change" and that they therefore do not pose a rigid way forward, rather the whole emphasis is on flexibility, the one steady feature being that "Man is a social animal and a rich life can only be one in which his real nature is taken into account." Plan for Melbourne Part I page 4.

SECTION II

TRANSPORT - AN ALTERNATIVE

Stop-Press Foreword

This section was completed and ready for the press before the sudden publication on December 17th 1969 of the three volumes of the \$1 million "Melbourne Transportation Study" released by the Metropolitan Transportation Committee.

Had it been the case that "The Study" and "Transportation Plan" were based, or even partly based, on the social goals which are in the forefront of the system proposed in this Section, the authors would undoubtedly have had to re-write what you are about to read.

It was not to be. The first two volumes turned out to be the full "Study" presented by Wilbur Smith & Associates to the Metropolitan Transportation Committee, a "Summary" of which appeared in 1966. The third Volume, containing the actual Transportation Plan did not depart in any way whatsoever from the methods used by Wilbur Smith & Associates, and these methods are based on a radically different scale of human values to ours.

As the authors had examined the 1966 "Summary", therefore, the essential features of the December 1969 Study and Plan were successfully anticipated in the text, which needed no alteration.

However "A Critique of the Melbourne Transportation Plan" has been added to the end of the original text, contrasting in detail the methods and value judgments of the full official "Study" and "Transportation Plan" against this "Plan for Melbourne" Parts I & II and contrasting the consequent radically different features.

THE TRANSPORT OF GOODS

The modern transport system is one of the miracles which makes possible for the first time in history that man is able to live in a super-sized city of millions called now a "megapolis" or a "conurbation", which is what Melbourne is fast becoming.

Heavy haulages over long distances interstate or overseas of the raw materials upon which other industries are based at one extreme, is matched at the other extreme by the sub-distributive reticulation of consumer goods into all the separate kitchens which, in Melbourne, are as thinly scattered as in any other comparable city in the world.

The first requirement is that the wharves, the airports, the railway networks and the roads which carry the giant freighters, concrete-mixers and delivery vans be kept open and adequate to cope with this amazing intricate daily interchange of commodities at all levels.

Surprisingly, however, the perplexing problems of modern transport are not concerned so much with this complex movement of goods, as with the transport of man himself. Moreover the main inefficiencies of transport for industries relate to the congestion on the roads due far more to cars carrying men than to vehicles carrying goods.

The transport of man himself, therefore, is the problem dealt with here.

Nevertheless, the bearing that the solution of the problem of human transport has on industrial efficiency should be remembered. The more efficient modern industry is, the greater the demand upon it can be for better working conditions, less boring work and for leisure, amenities and services for the people who work in it and depend on it.

THE TRANSPORT OF MAN

The value-judgments we make for transport of man are of two types: The main ones given in Part I of "Plan for Melbourne" relate to the over-all metropolitan scene and can be summarised as follows:-

1. To help conserve and develop social activities of all types associated with the city "heart", and for the same purpose to deliberately create district and suburban "hearts" and to avert the spiritual poverty of orientating the family around "keeping up with the Joneses" to which the scatteration of the car-dependent sprawl tends to give rise, plans for radial freeways which clog up

and rob of diversity the centres they serve and further encourage sprawl should be abandoned in favour of public rapid transit for commuters connecting high-density suburban centres with higher-density district centres and both with a higher-density city heart (See part I pp 9-15)

2. There should be an extension of camping holidays, week-end outings and other recreational trips by car for all who want it. (p.19)

Objections can no doubt be made to the feasibility of adopting the transport aspects of such value-judgments. One is that car-owners have become so attached to their cars that it is psychologically impossible, whatever the inducements to use public transport, to part with them. Another objection is that once a person has a car, he cannot be expected to use it for the purpose of recreation only but must be expected to use it also for commuting to work. A third objection is that public transport cannot be made to pay because the more the patronage the greater the losses (These objections are dealt with in Appendix No. 2 "Three Objections to Abandoning a Radial Freeway System")

A fourth objection that freeways will be inevitable to enable cars to get out of Melbourne for recreation purposes raises such important transport and sociological problems that they are dealt with below under the heading "The Exodus from the City".

However if the proper distinctions are drawn and policies based on them, it would seem that the following corollary value-judgments, despite the objections, are quite tenable and not inconsistent with real possibilities whether psychological, social, economic or technical:-

3. Everyone who wants to should have the use of a car for the purpose of recreation, and the use of cars for holidays and outings in circumstances which add to the enjoyment of the venture should be encouraged.

4. Use of cars for commuting to work should be discouraged in favour of public transport, and vigorously so whenever public transport can be provided under conditions that are comparable in travelling time, price, frequency, convenience and comfort.

Cars for Recreation

A few aspects of this are dealt with first, but the main body of policy will be concerned with the problem of freeways and cars for commuting because this is the most difficult problem to solve.

Motor mechanics, both qualified and amateur, may derive special satisfaction from keeping old cars on the road. The majority of people, however, who want a car for recreation, want a car capable of instant use. A desirable standard to be attained for a minimum wage for Melbourne's citizens in the 1970's, it is suggested therefor, should be one that is sufficient to buy and run a "good" car.

Not everyone however, desires to spend a big part of his income in this particular way, and yet most would like the use of a car at times. The hire-a-car services developed for the convenience of businessmen arriving at airports maybe provides the germ of potential future car-hire services that could be far more generally obtainable, and within the pocket of the ordinary citizen whose wages had been lifted to the standard suggested.

Small hire-car pools in major holiday resorts could possibly also be popular.

From a community point of view the patronage of well-distributed fleets of cheaply-rented hire-cars would be economically desirable. It would tend to encourage more people to use public transport more often, both for holidays as well as for commuting, it would economise on road investments, and obtain greater value from the cars so used.

At the same time it would enable the citizen to spend more of his money on other interests than transport instead of the present system where very many, faced with deteriorating public transport, have the continuous expense of keeping a car, often for only occasional use, or use for only part of the day.

Transport experts overseas have already reached the stage of seriously considering, for the future, a midget city run-about car, not privately-owned, but available in great quantities to be simply picked up by the driver, driven to his destination and left there for the next driver.

Without making judgment on the merits of such a proposition, it can be seen that a cheap widely-available hire-a-car service would not be nearly so radical, and might well serve as a transitional stage.

Special current problems relating to recreational car-ownership are dealt with below in the Section "Parking and Transport for the Inner Areas" and "The Exodus from the City". A few aspects of the need for a changed character of holiday resorts are dealt with in the later section, because this can have some bearing on metropolitan transport.

But there are many other aspects of great importance to the recreational motorist. For example the provision of ample and adequate picnic spots, car look-out spots, fishing access points, and private camping areas, not to mention the conservation of the landscape, and the development of more varied recreational pursuits for the whole family at seaside and country resorts.

These aspects will be developed further in a section on the role of the proposed "Conservation and Holiday Resort Authority" in part III of "Plan for Melbourne". Though connected, they are not expanded here because they are not specifically transport problems.

Cars for Commuting

The official radial freeway policy

The report of the Metropolitan Transportation Committee had not, at the time of writing, been released by the Government. There have been reportedly numerous postponements in the publication.

We would like to think that the postponements were due to re-thinking about the wisdom of a radial freeway system, but it is already sufficiently clear that this Government has no intention of departing from the basic concepts contained in the Metropolitan Transportation Study, "Travel in Melbourne" prepared by the Consultants, Wilbur Smith & Associates in 1966 of which a 'Summary' was released to the public. The methodology of the "Consultant's Report (if the 'Summary' is any guide) must be searchingly questioned.

It is becoming a commonplace nowadays amongst planners to recognise that one facet of the planner's job should be to present "options" to the public. That is to say, they should produce different feasible alternative solutions, but disclose, too, the differential "value-judgments" upon which each scheme is based. If a freeway system is advanced, for example, the full sociological impact on the "quality of life" which would ultimately result should be openly described. If, on the other hand, public transport is to be revived and up-dated on altogether different type of "quality of life" could result. If a third alternative arises (such as the midget city run-about mentioned), the impact of this, too, should be disclosed.

Then the public and the politicians should debate democratically, not so much the technical qualities of the different schemes (which most of them, even the politicians, have no training to judge anyhow) but which type of value-judgment or "quality of life" they prefer, for this, after all, is the issue on which people really are entitled to a democratic voice! The choice having been democratically determined, it is then for the experts and their computers, to bring it to life.

Not only does the Wilbur Smith "Summary" make no attempt to uncover the value-judgments implicit in its analysis or recommendations, on the contrary, it appears to go out of its way to cover them up! It makes alternatives seem impossible by writing its predictions of the future in a statistical "this will be" pontifical style.

It apparently assumes that you can study the present "facts", feed them into a computer, and get out a quite certain projection of future facts 20 years ahead! All it has done, alas, without knowing it, or without saying so, is to adopt the hidden value-judgments inherent in present trends. But these trends are good, bad and indifferent.

It is simply "non-planning" to project into the future bad trends as well as good ones. The very purpose of planning is to try to alter the course of events so that bad trends are eliminated. And it is bad

planning for the planner to impose upon the public what is "good" or "bad" for these concepts, by their very nature, are standards for the public to formulate.

For example, the "Summary" tells us: "Trips by private transport are expected to increase from 2,000,000 in 1964 to about 6,000,000 trips per day in 1985. Trips by train will rise by 50% to nearly 600,000 per day by 1985" (p.15) But surely, whether or not ten times as many people will be using cars than use trains is going to depend on policy decisions, including the quantity of investment in public transport, and whether it is strengthened by a combination of other controls including urban growth patterns, land use, housing densities and where sited, and, we could add, deliberately-fostered community activities in particular places?

Recommendations in the "Summary" include "express bus services on freeways, together with an express rail service from the Doncaster area" and "the new freeway systems to vary between 250 and 350 miles in length.---" (p.14)

To the casual reader, the Wilbur Smith Report could give the impression that it is producing a balanced plan as between public and private transport. It advocates, for example, the undergrounding of both trains and trams in the city, the express Doncaster rail, and faster speeds and more frequent trips for public transport generally.

Despite some lip-service since the "Summary" to "balanced transport" by various authoritative spokesmen, however, it is our estimate that the Government is not going to present a genuine alternative for debate by the public and is not going to disclose the social consequences of adopting a radial freeway system or a strengthened public transport system respectively.

Even the Underground, forty years overdue, seems to be conceived by Wilbur Smith & Associates as a measure to prevent the demise of the rail system, rather than a measure for its overall revitalisation and expansion. The rail reservation in the median strip of the Eastern Freeway, is simply at this stage a land reservation with no promises or prospects of development, with the eternal temptation that it could be turned at any time into special freeway lanes for express buses, or "bus-trains" according to the system of "Metro-Mobility" advertised by General Motors Corporation U.S.A. (See also Appendix No. 4 "The Metro-Mobility System")

Incidentally, apologists seem to be saying that the freeway system will not be "radial". Naturally, by "radial" is not meant that all freeways meet at the G.P.O.! But if they converge on the city from different directions (the South Eastern Freeway to Batman Avenue, the Tullamarine Freeway to Flemington Bridge, the proposed Eastern Freeway so far, to Wellington Street) then that is "radial" in our definition of the term, meaning freeways that quite definitely serve the needs of car-commuters to the city.

What will be presented to the public, therefore, in our judgment, will be a one-sided transport future based on the augmentation of all present trends in transport, housing, growth patterns and social activities, helping to extend the material basis for the whole system of values, in fact, that Plan for Melbourne Part I (pp. 9-15) rejects.

We therefore offer an alternative future transport system. We are not transport engineers or traffic experts. We have no computers. We cannot hope to predict with any degree of accuracy what it nowadays takes experts with the aid of computers many months to achieve.

We can only say we have done our best to study some of the experts and to formulate in very general terms an alternative set of feasible propositions based on an alternative set of values. We are not immodest enough to pretend that what follows is going to be the last word. We would only hope that, given the value-judgments we have adopted as a basis, a suitable team of experts could modify and improve the technical details without throwing out the principles on which they are based.

AN ALTERNATIVE TRANSPORT POLICY

This problem is dealt with in only five aspects: (1) Commuting to work in the City, (2) The off-peak and cross-suburban Problem, (3) Bypass & Circumferential Freeways, (4) The exodus from the City and (5) the dignity of the Traveller.

1. COMMUTING TO THE CITY

Value Judgment: The city and near-city areas are places where very valuable human activities should take place; they should not be used for storage of bulky commodities, and commuter's cars come into this category very much more than bales of wool, timber or other merchandise, because they have to be shifted twice a day, not only making the city difficult of access by non-commuting cars on business or pleasure, but resulting, in the end, with both a car-blighted city-centre and a car-blighted core of inner suburbs.

First Step: Stop Going in the Wrong Direction:

(i) New radial freeways for commuters should be stopped!

One can never go in the right direction by taking further steps in the wrong direction. True, it may be necessary to beat tactical retreats at times, in order the better to advance later! But a radial freeway is not a tactical manoeuvre in the transport field, it is a strategic one.

Since Part I of "Plan for Melbourne" was written, the combined decisions of the Federal and State Governments, by the operation of the Commonwealth Aid Roads Agreement in March 1969 have committed Melbourne not only to spending over the following 5 years \$107.5 million extra

money released to Victoria by the Federal Government "mainly for urban expressways and freeways (Mr. Gorton "Age" 14/3/1969), but "the extra money would be spent on roads around Melbourne, particularly freeways in and out of the city" (Mr. Bolte "Australian" 14/3/1969). Plans for the new Eastern (Doncaster) Freeway were released already by May 1969 (Mr. Hamer "The Herald" 26/5/1969) - See Appendix No. 5 "The Eastern Freeway".

To beat a tactical retreat in relation to radial freeways already under construction, we do not propose these works be arrested. We put forward, below, instead certain tentative suggestions for modification to the plans, the object of which is to convert their commuter serving functions primarily into the other dual function they have, namely, that of by-pass freeways (See section below: "(3) By-pass and Circumferential Freeways")

The Eastern Freeway should not be built at all.

To beat a further tactical retreat it is also proposed that Federal freeway-earmarked moneys be spent on certain circumferential or tangential freeways which would not do the damage of increasing car-parking demands in and around the city; and, provided the Government's "green-wedge" policy is firmly adhered to, would not have quite the same effect of encouraging an indiscriminate car-based far-flung sprawl (See: "By-pass & Circumferential Freeways")

Lest it be thought that all this is heartless neglect of today's harassed city car-commuters and would be unacceptable to them, it should be recalled that in Part I of "Plan for Melbourne" it was proposed that systematic improvement to the existing main road net work should be undertaken both by overcoming "bottle-necks" and closing off one end of many access side streets, not only for the amenity of these residential streets but to allow a more uninterrupted flow of traffic on the main road.

(ii) Indiscriminate car-parking provisions should be controlled now.

Just as it is wrong for radial freeways to pour cars into the city and near-city areas without consideration of the question of where they are to be parked when they get there or the effect of that parking, so it is equally wrong to create parking in excess of the capacity of the road system to cope with it. The flow of cars in city streets is already beginning to be affected at times by the pressure of cars queueing to gain entry to off-street parking. Carried to an extreme too much parking can create pressure for road-widening and/or freeways, just as freeways create a demand for parking.

There is a mathematical relationship between the size of roads, the traffic-generating capacity of different buildings and the quantity of parking as Prof. Buchanan ("Traffic in Towns") has demonstrated.

However the traffic-generating capacity of a city building has surely considerable variability if different transport systems are to be contemplated. As far as the commuter-traffic element in the total traffic generated by a building is concerned, it could range from 100% car-commuting at one extreme to 100% public-transport commuting at the other. The bed-rock flow of traffic generated by the building which cannot be changed is the traffic for delivery of goods and services and for customers or those coming and going in connection with the business.

If the transport objectives proposed here result in reducing the traffic-generating capacity of city buildings (because of increased commuting by public transport) an immediate stop should be put to any proposals for new car-parking facilities, until experts give scientific advice on just how many are needed for the present road system, and where they should be distributed in order to prevent congestion in particular streets.

Second Step: Phased Encouragement-Discouragement Period

More attractive public transport in itself insufficient

Having decided to immediately cease measures (radial freeways and over-supplied city parking) which can only make the situation worse, and the solution more painful, the next problem is to commence a phased period where every added encouragement to travel by public transport would be met by a matching discouragement of car-commuting to the city.

Some strong advocates of public transport believe that the only thing that has to be done to win people from car-driving back to public transport, is to lower fares and improve the present service in every possible way. We do not believe this is sufficient in Melbourne. Such measures would, of course, win back a percentage of patrons, but, by themselves, not a significant percentage; not a sufficient percentage, for example, to take the peak-hour pressure off the road system to such an extent that freeways would not be required.

We do say that public transport should be more attractive in every way and fares cheaper (see below), and we say it quite strongly, and even at the expense of considerable public subsidy if necessary. But something more radical than this is going to be required.

We have to face the fact that there will inevitably be, for a long transitional period of time, tens of thousands of city commuters, whose homes are so inaccessible to convenient public transport networks, or whose habits have become so ingrained, that they will feel impelled at least to commence their journey to the city by car.

All-day car-parking: where should it be?

The big and difficult question is: how far should city-commuters be permitted to go towards the city-centre before being virtually forced, for economic reasons, or because of exasperation with time-

wasting, to abandon their car and resort to the space-economising public transport? What techniques can best induce them to do this?

Some advocate big car-parks on the fringes of the central business district and associated with new rail stations located on some form of underground loop, coupled with the banning of all city all-day street parking whatsoever within the area of the loop.

Others advocate the interchange between private car and railways somewhat further out, proposing, for example, multi-storey car parks at Richmond, Albert Park and North Melbourne stations, presumably coupled with banning or discouragement of all-day street parking within the area of a mile or two from the G.P.O.

Although both of these concepts would be better than trying to do the impossible by parking the increasing volume of cars within the central business district, and although the second proposition would be more effective than the first, neither of them are really adequate to the real situation.

Both of them would remove the blight of an impossible degree of car-parking and the resultants of either peak-hour road congestion or extravagantly wide roads for such socially-valuable land from the central business district either to its immediate fringes or a little further out.

The object should be to avoid not only a car-blighted "Golden Mile", but to avoid also a car-blighted core of inner suburbs around the Golden Mile containing so many valuable all-Melbourne facilities.

Thus the object should be to entice those who cannot avoid starting their city-commuting by car not onto the main roads headed towards the city, but to entice them to leave their cars at a railway station on the way to the city, the nearer their home and the more remote from the city the better.

The "park-fare"

There could be a pricing policy designed for this purpose. A ticket could be sold which would entitle the holder to an all-day railway car-parking berth plus his railway fare (called here a "park-fare" for short).

The park-fare could be the same for all stations, that is, the parking-fee element of the park-fare would decrease the further the station from the city to the exact amount that the fare element increased. Thus the further you drove your car towards the city, the more it would cost you because the more your car expenses although the park-fare would be constant.

At the same time such a system would make it cheaper still to use a bus, and in some cases even a taxi, to get to the station, especially if, as we advocate later, these modes of travel were subsidised.

The introduction of the park-fare system would have to be carefully contrived so that those who now enjoy free parking at stations would not pay more. This would mean, in effect, a reduction in rail fares which is another necessary element in attracting more patronage for public transport.

There would need to be special parking prohibitions or charges for all-day parking in all streets surrounding such suburban stations. All-day city parking charges should then be gradually increased.

There would need to be also specially-constructed parking arrangements at stations, including, where necessary, double or treble-tier parking structures over the station and over railway property to prevent the undesirable deadening effects of spread-out parking lots surrounding the socially-valuable land around each station.

"The box"

More about parking structures later. Now, however to restate the problem: Within what distance of the city should a potential car-commuter be permitted to leave his car all day?

It is our view that Balaclava, Caulfield, Camberwell, Clifton Hill, Moreland, Essendon and Footscray should form roughly a "box" within which all-day commuter-parking would be actively discouraged and systematically eliminated.

This "box" would vary from 9 to 12 miles across with the central city area being situated nearer to the western and northern boundaries than the eastern or southern. This takes account of the lop-sided residential shape of Melbourne, and provides for a greater "car catchment" area on the south-eastern side of the city, where, in order to prevent congestion, cars must be "caught" further from the city than on the west or north.

The campaign against commuter-parking would start in the city and gradually work outwards towards the perimeter of the "box", in the first instance along tram or bus routes or near rail stations within the "box". The reason for this is that for some time it would be more difficult for workers employed in the inner-suburban workplaces to go by public transport than workers employed in city offices.

This would have to be taken into account, but by gradually improving the on-street public transport network within the "box" area, the penalties for all-day parking would be step by step increased wherever the public transport became really efficient.

It should be observed, however, that the stations mentioned are already served by trams or buses as well as trains, and new on-street services could be developed from these points as patronage increased. It may be advantageous, later, to connect these stations around the perimeter of the "box" if practical by a "ring-road" or "box-road" so

that motorists coming as far as the "box" could go with ease around the edge of it, or catch a fast public transport vehicle, to the particular parking area or interchange that connects most conveniently with his inner suburban destination.

"Interchange complexes"

First steps would be to select those stations on the perimeter of the "box" through which an almost continuous rail service could be reasonably organised. Above these stations, and on the immediately-surrounding railway property should be erected really big several-tier structures, with basements if suitable. These would house a complex of social purposes.

They should be so designed that they act as stations or rather "interchanges" where buses, taxis and kiss-n-ride car drivers can let down their passengers under shelter and either alongside or immediately above or below the station platforms.

Modern shopping arcades on platform level could be part of such structures for the convenience of passengers as well as for earning income. Indoor sports and health complexes with showers, pools, gymnasium, squash, bowls etc. could be considered as an integral part of such projects. Balance of accommodation would be for car parks, either on platform level or above or below it.

The structure should be so designed as to permit of later expansion, both along the track in either direction, or by adding tiers, or, if necessary, by later expansion onto non-Railway property near the station.

Immediately surrounding such stations there should be zones for the highest residential densities, not just permitting, but compelling mixed residential with retail, commercial and social uses, so that on the lower floors of such buildings, lively centres of commerce and social activity can flourish. At night time and in weekends, the interchange carparks could be used for parking for cars of visitors to the high-density dwellings. Some of the centres which we have called "a grouped complex of community services" could with advantage be sited within such environs (See above, "A Local Hub")

Grading and location of interchange complexes

For purposes of definition, we shall call such interchange-social-purpose centres "Interchange Complex Grade I". Such could be located for example, at the following stations where Mr. I. D. Richards has recommended there should be a 5-minutes off-peak maximum rail service headway:- Caulfield, Clifton Hill, Footscray and Burnley. (See Appendix No. 6 "Mr. Richard's Proposals for Efficiency": Table 1)

We suggest the following stations recommended for 10 minute off-peak headways by Mr. Richards could be considered for subsequent conversion to 5-minute headways and also equipped with Interchange Complexes Grade I,

namely: Camberwell, Moreland, Essendon (and if the St. Kilda line is ever extended to Balaclava station, as recommended by Mr. Richards) Balaclava.

On the south-eastern side of Melbourne, Burnley could thus provide a second-tier catchment for those not using Caulfield or Camberwell.

Similar structures, not so big nor with such ambitious commercial or sports complexes, but on the same principle, classified as "Inter-change Complexes Grade 2" should be erected on a series of other selected stations with a maximum off-peak of no more than 10 minute headways, so designed that later, should the need arise, they could be expanded to Grade I Complex standard. Such could be considered from amongst the following stations, for example: Brighton Beach, Moorabbin, Oakleigh, Box Hill, Heidelberg, Preston, Sunshine, Newport.

Of other stations, some should be eliminated for quicker running times and some should be relocated (See Appendix No. 6 Table 2(a) and (c)) and the balance retained equipped with improved access to the platforms for bus, taxis and kiss-n-ride chauffeurs, and with big, though less elaborate car parks.

Such a parking and pricing system, coupled with inner-area discouragement of all-day commuter parking (dealt with next), and with express services from Interchange complexes Grades 1 and 2, with improved feeder services, off-peak services, comfort and speed is quite deliberately designed to "catch" the city-bound car-commuter as far out from the inner areas as possible. At the same time, to the extent this policy can be made successful, more road-space and parking can be made available for the motorist travelling to the city on business or for pleasure for some period of the day.

Parking and transport for the inner areas

Actually, the "inner areas" as understood here cannot be described by putting one leg of a compass on the G.P.O. on a map and drawing a circle. The older housing stock is to be found within several miles of the G.P.O. to be sure. But it also tends to creep close to the railway lines for several more miles, so that the narrow-fronted inner area properties tend to take on a "hand-and-finger" configuration.

The "box" we have suggested as a "commuter-discouragement" box, namely, Balaclava, Caulfield, Camberwell, Clifton Hill, Moreland, Essendon, Footscray represents, very roughly, the end of the finger-tips of the old housing stock of single houses on narrow frontages. Residential development much beyond this circle was on the present Uniform Building Regulations pattern of 45, 50 or 60 feet frontages.

This is mentioned at this point, not only to indicate that what we define as the "inner areas" are not confined to a small circle around the city, but because of the implications on parking and hence traffic potential.

Compulsory off-street parking for residences beyond the perimeter of this box becomes a possibility. With the narrow frontages of the older housing areas, however, it is impossible.

Within the "inner areas" so defined therefore, as distinct from areas way beyond the box, there is a treble traffic difficulty as compared with middle and outer suburbs with 50 ft. frontages:-

1. There tends to be, in weekdays, more traffic and more congestion and more need to clear some streets for through traffic.
2. The residents of these areas have to park in these streets.
3. The commuters to the city or inner suburban workplaces use the same streets for all-day parking.

Whilst one value judgment is that the storage of cars is not a desirable feature for the city or inner areas, another, and conflicting value-judgment is that anyone who wants the use of a car for recreation should have the right to one.

Three factors combined, however, should begin to operate which would attract inner-area residents voluntarily to abandon, not necessarily the driving of cars and enjoyment of car outings, but the ownership and permanent storage of cars in the inner areas, namely:

1. The gradually-improving net-work of on-street inner-area transport connecting to interchanges with frequent off-peak services.
2. A changed character of holiday resorts and the mode of travel to them (see below) and
3. The extension of subsidised U-drive hire-car systems (see above).

Nevertheless, this trend would be only a long-term one. Short-term, the demands of inner-area residents for a long transitional period would be for the right to stable their own cars near their home, so that the immediate problem is to make room for them.

Main basis for tackling this problem is three fold. First, to gradually make available for residents more street-parking space as all-day commuter parking is eliminated. Secondly devise extra street and off-street parking for residents only. Thirdly gradually build-up efficient street public transport throughout "the box".

We deal with the subject of extra parking earmarked for residents more fully under the section on "Renewal Policies". To indicate here the main techniques suggested:

1. All new Housing Commission estates, or Master Builder estates to have a basement under the entire area of the estate, largely devoted to carparking.
2. Wherever there is "spot development" whether by a single owner or a co-operative group of owners, underground or off-street parking should be provided.
3. Some streets can conveniently be made one-way streets, freeing some of the road surface for angle-parking; other streets can with advantage be completely blocked off at one end enabling them to be turned over to parking lots.
4. In "co-operative areas" or even in "preservation areas", opportunities may be found or made for amalgamating the little-used ends of long back-yards with the back lanes, turning them into tastefully-landscaped utility yards including parking.
5. Other selected sites in such zones, could be used for carefully designed and landscaped two-tier parking for the surrounding residents.

However, within the scope of these limited objectives, the street parking of resident's cars should be regarded only as a stop-gap solution while the various off-street provisions are being made. This is especially so in those streets which should be made "clearways" for the greater convenience of general car traffic in these areas, although street parking for visitors must be provided in compensation for those living on such clearways by still other nearby streets or off-street parking lots.

It should be emphasised, however, that although we have devoted some space to the problem of parking in the inner areas, this alone cannot achieve a turning point in the otherwise insoluble problem of increasing commuter-parking, unless accompanied by a quite rapid, marked and continuing improvement in public transport in-and-around the inner areas.

A universal 5-minutes off-peak headway for buses and trams, improved cross-suburban networks in the inner areas, using mini-buses if necessary, short shuttle-services to overcome "blind spots", and so on. Specialised transport for special problems may be indicated. For example, for the big Fishermens Bend factories or wharf areas, a monorail, or spur-line from the rail underground could possibly bear investigation.

Subsidised "feeder" transport

Success in assisting city and inner-suburban car commuters to switch to public transport depends in no small measure on what happens in the middle and outer suburbs.

Not only should the main train or tram journey be frequent, comfortable, fast and cheap but an equally frequent, comfortable, fast and cheap journey should be provided between the home and the nearest tram-stop or nearest station.

Unless an increasing percentage can be convinced to leave their car at home altogether and travel to the city entirely by public transport, the interchange complexes themselves, and the roads leading to them would rapidly become congested, which would begin to deaden the very local social centres it is aimed to enliven.

The transport bottleneck in this regard is the privately-owned public bus system which, on many routes, manages to run at a profit only by reducing all off-peak and even peak-time journeys and, like the publicly-owned transport systems, raising fares.

All private bus-routes should be absorbed into a newly-constituted Melbourne Transportation Department amalgamating all suburban rail-tram and bus operations and with responsibility also for traffic, taxis and overall suburban road policy matters. We will call it "Melbourne Transport", for short.

Buses and mini-buses, running inevitably at a loss, should then be organised to honeycomb the residential hinterland beyond reasonable walking distance from any bus stop or train station. If there were sufficient demand, hire-cars or taxis also could be subsidised for a similar function at peak hours, with a higher fare, of course, than the buses.

Summarising the second step in solving the city-commuter problem then: There should be a complicated comprehensive encouragement-discouragement system to entice-constrain car commuters from all-day parking in the "box" area, simultaneously making street and off-street parking possible throughout this area for cars of residents or those whose business or pleasure takes them part-time to the city. The end result aimed for would be a public transport network that could convey a worker from his home to his workplace in the city or anywhere in the inner area in a comparable time and equal comfort and cheaper than he could convey himself in his own car.

The Third Step: Future Rapid Transit --- Rail and Car

Having substantially achieved such a task, which would take many years to complete, consideration might then be given to a near-total prohibition of all-day parking of car-commuters throughout the "box." Immediate consideration should be given and early implementation to a further general up-lift in speed of public transport until it is converted to a genuine modern rapid-transit system.

Then and only then, when travel patterns of the overwhelming majority of city commuters had been confirmed as patrons of public transport should the merits of radial-type freeways be contemplated

for the service of the non-commuters. This would include conversion of any by-pass freeways, proposed above, to a dual purpose giving them also access to the city and inner areas.

In Part I of "Plan of Melbourne", incidentally, it was suggested that the first conversion to rapid-transit be the Geelong-Dandenong line which could give the most advantage being the longest run, both ends of which could be sensibly extended outwards for new suburban development, and maybe this could be given quite early consideration.

The next main topic dealt with is:-

2. The Off-Peak and Cross-Suburban Problem

Value-judgment: Vital social activities of the car-deprived section of the population --- children, teenagers, housewives, the elderly and non-drivers --- require active local and district centres, and a cheap frequent public transport system linking them, which can raise the quality of suburban life, not only for the car-deprived but for the car-owner as well.

The Melbourne public transport system has been allowed by post-war Governments to decay to the point that it repels instead of attracting patrons, who pay higher and higher fares for progressively less service and convenience as the years go on.

This situation not only forces many a male breadwinner to use the family car for work journeys, but effectively leaves stranded the car-deprived members of the family. In turn, this often pressurises the family at great sacrifice to purchase a second car by expenditures on what could otherwise be a higher quality of life. As sons and daughters begin to go to work, even a third car makes its appearance.

All this accelerates the decline of public transport and off-peak more markedly than peak, because housewives and youth with cars no longer use it, causing a shut down in bus services to a degree that further discourages those who remain car-deprived, driving them into patterns of reliance on family chauffeurs.

In 1966, of 139 privately-operated bus routes " --- in the off-peak period 8 routes do not operate, services on 64 routes are infrequent without regular headways, and half the routes have headways of 30 minutes or more" (A Summary of the Consultant's Report at p.6). As most of these routes feed railway stations and tram lines, the off-peak patronage of the whole public transport system suffers.

Yet, from an economic standpoint, the volume of off-peak traffic is the decisive factor in determining whether a transport system runs at a loss or makes a profit. The theory has actually been advanced that the more peak-hour travellers that can be won back to travel by public transport the bigger the loss it will make! Whether this is true or not surely no-one would dispute the proposition that a sharp increase

in off-peak travel would decrease losses. (See Appendix No. 2 "Three Objections", Objection 3 "Public Transport Makes Too Big a Loss")

However, it is not only for these economic reasons, although they are important, but even more for social reasons that the suburban housewife and teenage youth need to be provided with cheap convenient off-peak transport services to local points of social activity, which otherwise cannot thrive being inaccessible by some and by-passed by others. (See "Updated Community Service" Sub-section: "A Human Scale" above).

Although not identical with the off-peak problem the question of commuting to suburban factories and offices should also be considered, because from a transport point of view the problems of peak-time "cross-country" or rather "cross-suburban" transport overlap with the problems of off-peak transport of a cross-suburban character. The strengthening of public transport to these factories is also important to avoid in miniature, at some future date, the same sort of car-choked district centres as is now becoming the problem with the city itself.

The new Transportation Department should organise a far more effective net-work of "cross-town" buses, running, if necessary, at a loss, with special attention to connections to the bigger industrial concerns at peak hours, to the car-based super-markets at off-peak, and to the car-based sportsgrounds and recreation centres in the weekend and holidays.

Off-peak and social centres

The inter-relation between transport and other aspects of life, apart from the journey to work, should never be forgotten. It is useful, therefore, at this point, to recall some aspects of principles proposed in "Plan for Melbourne Part I". These could serve as our basic value-judgments for this aspect of the problem.

"First that faster mobility is required to overcome increasing distances, second that a much higher density of housing is required in selected areas to limit the sprawl and help invigorate local and district activities and thirdly that the siting of all facilities, industrial, commercial, leisure-time alike, should be on the basis of reducing the need for transport wherever possible, or where unavoidable that the type of transport available be the cheapest and fastest for the purpose". (pp. 13-14)

"Siting of all future major facilities --- supermarkets, commercial centres, factories, educational institutions, recreational centres, high density housing estates, should be planned to be erected near the rail lines so that, having travelled from home to the station, a variety of facilities are within convenient reach".

"Siting of local facilities, kindergartens, day nurseries, primary school, food shops, playgrounds, sport and other recreational facilities

should be within pedestrian distance and in many cases could form a close-knit central complex, including, where possible, small factories and offices." (pp. 15-16)

Cheap frequent continuous off-peak transport is thus badly needed both to connect local centres via suburban railway stations to district centres to break down the geographic isolation of the car-deprived suburban housewife during the week and also youth after school and work is finished. Such thriving local and district centres, fed by public transport, would also provide more meaningful human contact for those who travel by car.

Since Part I of "Plan for Melbourne" was written, Minister for Local Government, Mr. Hamer, has written to all Local Councils proposing that they introduce different density zones ranging from low density where flats would be prohibited at one extreme, to high density at the other. (See Appendix No. 7: "Hamer on High Density") We agree with the Minister's suggestions that appropriate sites for high-density zoning are those adjacent to transport or shopping facilities.

However, so important is the deliberate creation of high-density and vital social centres at local and district level to Melbourne as a whole that we consider it was inappropriate to hand to local Councils which are subject to heavy pressure from local property-owners, the decision-making in such matters. The State Government itself should be responsible for the regenerative processes required to constitute (in new areas) or re-constitute (in old areas) the high-density vital social centres together with the necessary connecting transport to make these places really "come alive".

Stations that are more than "comfort stations"

Bus and tram shelters are either non-existent or very primitive. "Comfort stations" provided for the motorist are little more than toilets. The traditional railway station was much more. In addition to toilets and shelter for boarding and alighting, it provided, typically, a "waiting room", telephones, letter-box and newspaper stall.

Real consideration needs to be given to the up-grading of all these facilities: bus and tram shelters being at least wind and sun proof and station waiting rooms air-conditioned, and equipped with armchairs, curtains and warm floor coverings to the standard of airport waiting rooms.

The concept of commercial sporting and social facilities incorporated along with carparking and improved sheltered access by bus and car to the platforms is proposed in the Interchange complexes. However, the same principles applied at least to some extent should be considered in relation to all stations, where railway property to one degree or another, depending on local circumstances, could be used for multi-purposes, and not just as a place where people wait for trains.

Just as the Education Department should co-operate with other Departments, the Local Council and local citizens' organisations, so the Government should invest the new Transportation Department with the same attitude to railway station properties, parts of which, of course, have to be set aside for railway purposes, but other parts of which should be regarded as an integrated whole with the surrounding higher-density development or re-development providing built-in social-purpose amenities on ground floor levels.

At the very least railway waiting rooms could have annexes for children with indoor play equipment and toys. There should be a free telephone service to the nearest taxi depot, so that elderly people or parents with children could order a taxi to call to the station. Public rooms for hire to various local organisations could be considered: something like the Railways Institute rooms at Flinders Street in miniature but modernised.

Such facilities would be directly opposite to present trends; stations which once had telephones or letter boxes or newstands lose even such primitive facilities. Of course, not only should properly-paid attendants for railway purposes be on hand, but properly-paid extra employees for supervision of extended services would be required, in line with the idea advanced in Part I of "Plan for Melbourne" that people, as distinct from industry or commerce, are entitled to an increasing share of the predicted growth of the tertiary "service industry" (pp. 5-6)

Fast, comfortable, frequent travel

The transport experts should be invited to formulate recommended speeds and standards of comfort in the light of the latest overseas technological advances in the field of bus tram or rapid-transit rail and feasible improved frequencies worked out. High standards should apply of course at all times, not just at peak periods.

Some novel recommendations have recently been produced by a Melbourne transport expert Mr. I. D. Richards, and these should be examined to see if they can or should be improved upon.

A brief precis of some of the main ideas is contained in Appendix No. 6 (Sub-Section 3). Tentatively, until some better ideas are forthcoming, we consider that there is contained in Mr. Richard's views a set of standards that could be taken over as part of an immediate transport target. No one would regret the passing of the old "red" trains.

On the matter of trams, we cannot offer any firm ideas. They slow down car traffic on an average of 10 m.p.h. and, just as seriously, car traffic slows down tram speeds too. Yet trams carry more passengers than do the railways. On balance, it would seem inevitable that the tram system be retained for some considerable time, but, if so there needs to be considerable minor improvements, especially as regards frequency, including off-peak frequency which should nowhere exceed $7\frac{1}{2}$ minutes.

Lines should be re-routed in some parts to ease "bottleneck" conditions, tracks should be given special median strips separated from cars in other parts, and there should be general improvement of passenger off-loading zones.

General cross-suburban travel

The Wilbur Smith "Summary" would have it understood that "central area trips which made up nearly 18% of survey area travel in 1964 are expected to account for 10% of all travel in 1985" (p.15)

This is only another way of saying that by 1985, given the Wilbur Smith value judgments on which the predictions are based, 90% of all travel will not be to the central area, and therefore the overwhelming transport requirements will be cross-suburban.

It seems to be necessary to make three qualifications to this picture.

Firstly, the 90% must include a tremendous amount of night-time, week-end and holiday recreational travel, as well as mid-week off-peak shopping and commercial trips. However, the critical times, when all forms of transport tend to be overtaxed, are the morning and evening peak-hour commuting to work. The proportion as between cross-suburban as to central city area commuting at these critical times which largely dictate transport capacity requirements could be very different from 90% as to 10%. It is the peak-hour, not total weekly traffic, that counts.

Secondly, once adopt a radial freeway system, as Wilbur Smith certainly does, then whatever the short-term effects, the long-term effects will be to severely restrict the growth of central areas due to the space-consuming deadening and repelling effects of mass-parking. With investment directed to public transport however, and denied for any radial freeways, there would surely be a very much larger proportion of travel to the central areas and a correspondingly smaller cross-suburban pattern than that predicted by Wilbur Smith.

Thirdly, whether the 90% of predicted suburban travel is going to be by road and the extent to which freeways are going to be necessary to carry much of this depends partly on the proportion of private transport, a factor which is influenced by the feasibility of public transport, which, in its turn, is largely affected by growth patterns and location of different facilities.

In Part I of "Plan for Melbourne" it was pointed out that "the early high-class radial rail system has not been extended to meet the problem of cross-suburban transport." --- the slow infrequent" (bus) "services to the rail heads therefore have become more and more frustrating as residential sub-divisions have opened up further and further from rail stations. The car thus becomes a necessity for many even to get to the station, and, recently, with the development of big

factories on the outer fringes, to get direct from home to work. More recently still the car becomes a necessity to get to the super-market and to take the youngsters to school" (p.9)

Naturally, the low-density residential areas tend to make public transport for cross-suburban travel more expensive than radial central-city public travel. Couple all this up with the necessary increasing cross-suburban transport of goods between industries increasingly located in the outer suburbs, and, quite predictably, Wilbur Smith's solution to the cross-suburban transport problem is based on private transport.

The "Summary" predicts "250 to 350 miles" of freeway, and a great proportion of that, of course, would have to be cross-suburban: there could not possibly be so much length of freeway taken up only with radial freeways. Incidentally, apologists for Wilbur-Smith type freeway systems may think that this fact justifies them in stating that they are not radial, simply because there will also be cross-suburban freeways. This is like saying a man has not got legs because he also has arms, as if all limbs have the same function!

Now, at the time the Wilbur Smith "Summary" was released, the Government had not then decided on a "corridor" policy of outward growth along the radial transport "spines" with "green wedges" in between, nor envisaged the growth, within these corridors of "metro-towns" or district centres as proposed by the Town and Country Planning Board. (See "Hansard" 24/2/1968 p. 3248 Ministerial Statement on New Townplanning Organisation for Victoria).

Such deliberately-forced growth patterns are to encourage the future siting of major centres of industry, commerce and recreation on the radial spines. This whole policy, if carried out, could reduce the random scattering of major facilities between the rail spines that give rise to much unnecessary cross-suburban private car commuting. We would go further, as indicated above, and aim at the reconstruction of high-density centres in the built-up areas as we have explained with the concept of "interchange centres" and their environs.

Thus selective cross-suburban transport between the major district centres, and even between the minor local suburban centres could definitely be based on very much stronger public transport communications, linking deliberately-created centres of higher concentration of activities, and still further reduce the Wilbur Smith prescription for private transport. By minimising unnecessary suburban travel caused by random scattering, it would also reduce the total volume of suburban as distinct from central city travel.

Quite possibly, a few of these cross-suburban connections could be achieved by rail. For example, along the same new trunk-rail route as contemplated by the Town and Country Planning Board (i.e. joining the Sydney line to the Gippsland and Westernport lines via Ringwood and Dandenong or thereabouts), a commuter rail service as well could possibly

bear consideration. Especially might this be feasible if coupled with the concept advanced above of efficient feeder bus services to the rail stations, and from the rail stations to the factories.

However, even if one or a few such cross-suburban rail connections were feasible, there would certainly need to be efficient cross-suburban roads, so that public transport by bus and hire-car, as well as private cars and goods traffic could be better accommodated. Quite certainly, more and rationalised cross-suburban arterial roads are needed.

In this connection, cross-suburban freeways may be justified in some places, although, wherever rail connections seemed really feasible, freeways should not precede them or they would "kill" the potential rail customers before they became established. We have called such freeways "circumferential" freeways, because, in the main, we suggest their general direction should be on the circumference of circles that have the central city areas as their centre, rather than in the direction which might induce the commuter by car to head towards the city.

Whilst bearing in mind that traffic flowing at 30 m.p.h. permits a maximum number of cars and is therefore the most economic (see Plan for Melbourne Part I p.14), it should be clearly understood that the propositions we advance are not against freeways as such. They are against freeways designed to enable the city car-commuter to clog the city; and thinking further ahead still, against freeways tending to have the same clogging effect on the contemplated district centres.

The tricky question then arises: how to cater efficiently for private non-commuter transport that wants to proceed right through the central city area to another suburb the other side? The answer has already been constructed, in embryo namely: freeways which can be converted to by-passing the whole of the "box" area. We deal with this in the next transport topic.

3. By-Pass & Circumferential Freeways

Value-Judgment: Refer to value-judgment for the first topic above, namely, "Commuting to the City" i.e. prevention of radial freeways converting inner areas into bulk storage functions for car-bodies. Refer also to value-judgment for the next topic, namely "The Exodus to the Country": the need for adequate "holiday highways".

Geelong Road should be linked with Dandenong Road via the South Eastern Freeway and the Lower Yarra Crossing as now designed, but with emphasis on access to the port and denying access to the central business district, or to its fringes except for buses and commercial vehicles. There should be provision, however, for private cars to let down passengers at passenger unloading zones to connect with city public transport.

The Tullamarine Freeway similarly, instead of terminating at Flemington Bridge, should be continued down Moonee Ponds Creek to be

connected with the port and the Lower-Yarra Crossing-South Eastern Freeway, thus connecting traffic from Sydney or Bendigo with a by-pass loop around Melbourne with the Geelong-Dandenong-Westernport by-pass system.

Once again, airport and other buses and taxis would be permitted access to the central areas, and private cars unloading to connect with city transport. This raises the question, though: just where?

The Premier has announced his support for a big and comprehensive redevelopment of the Flinders Street station area. One planner's concept showed the South Eastern Freeway continued along Batman Avenue and running through this new rail station complex. This would be a ridiculous arrangement, no matter what form the freeways took.

The Flinders Street railway tracks should be roofed over and publicly-owned buildings set aside for public purposes erected above them. These buildings, incidentally, should not be in the form of a cliff shutting off the city from the Yarra as occurs now both with the old Railways Institute building and with the new "Eastern Gate" slabs over Princes Bridge station, but with the buildings running north and south to open up the city to the river, both visually, and for pedestrian access.

We suggest a bold concept for development of the southern bank of the Yarra opposite to the Flinders Street railway, and conceived as an integrated transport interchange with the city underground and tram system. The entire Yarra Bank Road area between Swanston St. bridge and Queen St. bridge could be re-developed as an adjunct to the by-pass freeway which could pass very close at this point, tunnelling, as planned now, under Alexander Avenue. It could consist of a major loading and unloading area for passengers from buses taxis or private cars, connected across the river with pedestrian bridges equipped with moving pavements.

Incidentally, a project designed to carry these moving pedestrian pavements from the main Yarra-Bank-Flinders-Street passenger terminals, through into the heart of the Bourke Street shopping centre, possibly elevated to overpass cross traffic in Flinders Lane, Collins Street and Little Collins Street could be examined.

Such a scheme could constitute a challenge to planners, excite the public imagination, and lift the problem of localised city passenger-distribution to embrace not only the primary badly-needed city underground but also the sophistication of secondary passenger-distribution in a style which should be expected of the technological age.

Taxis, buses and commercial vehicles only would be allowed access from this by-pass freeway loading adjunct onto the arterial road system. So too, as the object is to prevent the existing freeways under construction from pouring cars into the city for the purpose of parking (which the central areas can only accommodate at the expense of losing their primary function) naturally the by-pass freeways should not connect with the city

ring road. This project should also be proceeded with, but for the purpose of distributing more localised arterial road through-traffic without the temptation of short-cutting through the "golden mile" city squares.

It is suggested, tentatively, that Federal finances already earmarked for freeways, should be used, following completion of the above-mentioned works on a circumferential freeway connecting Sydney Road through Ringwood to Dandenong with provision for a two-pronged future extension beyond Dandenong, on to Westernport and Frankston, and another to Warragul, with a railway reservation in the same strip.

However, as Ringwood, Dandenong, Frankston and Westernport could well be future district centres any freeways would need to be kept well away from the commercial-social heart of these places lest they later act to deaden them, in the same way as they will surely deaden Melbourne city itself if the present radial freeway program is not modified in some such style as proposed here.

The general direction of such a route was proposed in broad outline by the Town and Country Board in 1967 for a trunk railway connecting the Sydney line with the Gippsland line and with Westernport (see "Organisation for Strategic Planning" map p.17). Maybe, speaking tactically again, it would be better to construct a rail line first, or at least simultaneously with the freeway to encourage railway-orientation of major industries linked, not only with Westernport, but with possibly new decentralised industrial complexes at Albury-Wodonga and in the Latrobe Valley.

Similarly, on the west of Melbourne, a circumferential freeway could eventually be useful to connect the Hume Highway (Sydney), intercepting the Calder Highway (Bendigo), Ballarat Road and Geelong Road in an arc that, say, takes in Sunbury, Melton and Werribee, although it should be noted that the Tullamarine Freeway to some degree and for some time will serve this purpose, especially if it is joined, as is suggested above, to Geelong Road via the Lower Yarra Crossing Freeway.

4. The Exodus from the City

Value judgment: There should be an extension of camping holidays, week-end outings and other recreational trips by car for all who want it.

Radial freeway apologists sometimes invert the usual argument to reinforce their claims and in addition to stating that freeways are necessary to get people into the city for work, they claim that identical freeways are also necessary for the reverse purpose of getting people out of the city for recreation.

For Melbourne, the holiday and weekend exodus and return is indeed already becoming a real problem.

There are a number of angles to this problem, however, which are of

an entirely different order to the arguments relating for or against radial freeways or public transport for city commuting.

Perhaps it should be said, at the outset, that holiday "peak-times" have not the same sharp short duration as the city-commuter "peak-hour", nor do they have quite the same degree of seriousness, because to be undeservedly late for work is more exasperating than the extension of the recreation-time drive.

(i) "Holiday highways" different function to "commuter freeways"

The purpose of a "holiday freeway" or "holiday highway" is not the same as and cannot be used to justify a city-commuter freeway.

The by-pass freeway already mentioned, for example, would cater quite adequately for someone in Footscray travelling to Wilson's Promontory or the Dandenongs, or someone in Burwood travelling to Lorne or Macedon, although deliberately made useless as a commuter freeway.

At nights weekends and holiday times there is no particular congestion around the inner suburban streets, comparable to the week-day commuter congestion.

What seems to be needed is many more divided highways leading out from the outer fringes of the suburbs because it is on the "open road" beyond the metropolitan area that the most unexpected and irritating delays due to congestion are beginning to occur.

We suggest, however, that these added and improved highways be carried no further inwards towards the city centre than the circumferential freeways suggested in the last section, so that they do not begin to act as a temptation to city-commuters.

The circumferential freeways suggested would also bring some relief to the touring motorist.

(ii) Remove "escapism" on grounds of boredom

The more and more dreary the suburbs become, the less and less vital the city and local activity, the more in sheer desperation and for lack of a more sophisticated and creative an alternative people turn for escape from the city.

This is not to say that for most city dwellers it is not occasionally very necessary indeed to relax in some natural setting and get a change of atmosphere. But it is not necessary every week-end to do this. The very emphasis on the quality of urban life advocated by Plan for Melbourne indeed would set the trend in the other direction. The more attractive the city becomes, the less need for people to rush out of it at every opportunity.

In fact, a proportion of weekend escapism has its origin in some or all members of the family feeling "at a loose end" in the city, and the

purchase of a week-end shack in the hills or seaside sometimes results, thus, for many, consolidating the habit of deserting the city once a week.

Where this is connected with some abiding interest in sporting or recreational activities, such as fishing surfing horseriding boating or walking, well and good. But where it is not, it should not be encouraged because, apart from the weekend and holiday pressure on the road system it leads to dangerous pressures for subdivisional sprawls across the choicest beauty spots in the bush and around the coast.

(iii) A change in the character of holiday resorts

Foreshadowed in Part I of Plan for Melbourne is the urgency of changing the character of holiday resorts in the choicest holiday areas by forbidding suburban-type sprawl and by concentrating into villages well-sited caravan parks, holiday cabins, flats, motels and guest houses leaving unspoiled conservation areas of countryside or seaside between for all to enjoy.

The provision of good, plentiful but reasonably-priced holiday accommodation of different types (a proportion, if necessary, publicly-owned) would not only maintain the original choiceness of the environment, but it would be more convenient and cheaper than suburban-type holiday shacks.

It would obviate much of the tedious carting of supplies and provisions, it would be more flexible, removing the feeling of obligation that having built a cottage, it was necessary to use it regularly, and it would be more economic from the community point of view because, apart from the saving on reticulation of services, a big proportion of private holiday accommodation remains unnecessarily unused.

From a transport point of view, too, such a policy would bring changes, making public transport to holiday resorts more attractive because no longer would the private car be needed, as at present, either to travel across the spread-out suburban-type holiday subdivision to reach natural surroundings, nor for the carrying of provisions.

Areas would still need to be set aside for those campers, fishermen and bush-walkers who prefer to get right away from everybody into the heart of the bush. Other areas would need to be set aside for suburban-type subdivisions for those who, despite the new holiday opportunities find in the ownership of a second home a form of relaxation, but they should not be in the beauty spots, because by their very nature holiday subdivisions destroy the very beauty that attracted people there in the first place.

More will be said about holiday resorts in Part III of Plan for Melbourne, expanding on the role of the Conservation and Holiday Resort Authority proposed in Part I (at p.19). More will be said too about transport of a tourist character: the need for cheaper and higher quality tours with more content. Some need to be far more intensively organised

along educational, cultural or sporting lines; or different combinations of the three aspects and where appropriate of a "package deal" nature integrating different modes of transport, air, rail, coach, river and sea.

The extension of U-drive car pools or boat pools and chartered coaches and boats located in the bigger holiday resorts would also enable the holiday-maker to explore the surrounding territory without having the expense of owning the means of conveyance to do so.

Here, however, what is emphasised is the transport impact of such a changed direction of holiday policies on the metropolitan transport system, because it would mean less compulsion to rely on the private car as the preponderant mode of transport for holiday purposes, substituting holiday and transport arrangements which combined could provide cheaper, richer and more varied recreational experiences.

To summarise: the operation of three new factors: new and improved "holiday highways", the removal of the cause of compulsive weekend escapism and the prevention of suburbanising beauty spots, and a changed character for holiday resorts and tourism removing reliance on the private car should sufficiently cope with weekend and holiday exodus, and without demanding, at all, radial freeways of the type planned for city commuting.

5. The Dignity of the Traveller

The framework of transport proposals set out above is concerned with setting the correct direction to solve some of the most vexed problems, which are more sociological and political problems rather than economic or technical ones.

On the purely technical side, nothing is surer than that new and radical transportation solutions will be found as technological advances are made. So, we do not aim to predict very far into the future on this side of the problem.

We have carefully refrained, for example, in relation to Melbourne's city underground, from indicating whether we support "the loop" beneath Spring St. and Latrobe St. or the rival idea of a Queens Street - University underground. Study might possibly lead to some even better solution, but a decision in principle should be made immediately.

Neither have we examined the technically-feasible but rather more remote prospect, say, of a system of midget runabout electric cars which could operate within the "box" area. These would require less city space than cars, not only because of their size, but because, being publicly-owned, a proportion of them would be taken out during the day, leaving space for those coming in.

Such a system could supplement and hasten the objectives which we have proposed above, rather than be in conflict with them, although the impact of such a system might require re-thinking and modification of parking policy, building design and even use of freeways.

But whatever technological advances are made, the really important thing is for Melbourne citizens to be prepared, sociologically and politically to meet the new situation, because this is the direction that has brought failure, hitherto.

The car is a most wonderful machine. The fact that industry is now sufficiently productive to enable even the lowest paid breadwinner were he to be paid wages which, by rights he should be paid to own a car, is potentially, a tremendous advance in standards.

In a big city, the use of the car for any type of function which involves a series of calls at different places is unequalled, whether it be travelling from place to place on business, or for calling on friends and relatives. It is unsurpassed for camping or fishing holidays enabling access by ordinary citizens to country otherwise inaccessible for practical purposes, and it is providing a new-found pleasure of "tourism" as well as bringing picnics and country outings within the range of many previously unable to enjoy them.

However, as a machine to convey tens of thousands of people in the one direction to arrive at the same destination at the same time, it is a failure. As a machine that has enticed families to set up home further and further from public transport it is also a failure, because it has compelled those who cannot drive to depend on those who can. For the elderly, the young, the housewives and those who do not wish to own such a machine, as well as for the unpaid and often resentful chauffeur, this has created more social problems for the family than it has solved as well as assisting by dispersal to break down the fabric of community associations and activities.

Yet it is not the machine that is at fault. It is man's failure to confine the use of the machine for the purposes for which it is suited in any civilised community.

For too long the car has been the universal answer to the transport problems of all members of the family for all purposes. There has been no steady improvement in the distribution, quality or price of public transport to keep pace with the steady perfection of the car.

Pathetically, the inability to control the whole situation is often blamed onto the size of the city itself, instead of on the planning and political shortcomings of the authorities and the interests who stand to gain by maximising car sales. This false theory about the badness of bigness in cities only serves to divert public political attention from the real nature of the urban problem.

One aspect of the result has been an increasing loss of human dignity by the citizen considered as a traveller, and this is equally true of motorist as well as non-motorist. The motorist's exasperation with congestion or with parking difficulties is matched by the non-motorist's undignified herding into insufficient, infrequent and out-moded public transport vehicles.

When the traveller, whether motorist or non-motorist, reaches his destination, he is often confronted not, as he should be, with dignified buildings set in dignified landscaped sites, or with a reposeful or exciting view of nature, but with a bare and treeless car-park and a sea of cars.

Man can learn to live in a civilised way in super-cities but one of the conditions is that he must learn to restore dignity to motorist and public transport traveller alike by the skilled integration of the car and public transport, carefully confining each to the task for which it is best fitted.

There are big corporations and governments whose basic interests run counter to this. As a consequence of this, solutions advanced by various authorities to the "problem" of transport (which is seen as a transport problem and never a social problem) typically present themselves as schemes to increase the accommodation for the car, either on the road or on a parking lot.

Lip-service given to "balanced transport" coming from such quarters conceives as "balance" for public transport, the maintenance of just sufficient to convey typists and junior clerks to the central business district, or low-income migrants to the big factories. Never is the problem approached as a modern manufacturer approaches the problem of conveyance of material within his factory, namely on the basis of efficiency, choosing the most appropriate material-handling equipment for the different purposes involved. Still less, is it approached from a sociological point of view.

To justify the loss of real human dignity and the quality of a finer civilised life which is contributed to by a radial freeway system, the best that can be produced by its apologists is the concept that the consumer demand for cars is a hard fact of life that has to be met and the radial freeway is the only answer to this consumer demand.

History, however is full of examples where the untrammelled play of "the market" have been so obviously opposed to over-all community interests, that the community has re-acted and forced controls; and it is only a matter of time before control of the unsocial use of the car in cities of more than several million will provide another example.

Big corporations and governments which do not accept this will have to go, rather than we succumb to the forlorn hope that we can give away as a bad job the tremendous super-cities which create the material possibility of a greater further flowering of civilisation.

Restoring the dignity of the traveller, which means choosing the appropriate mode of travel adapted to a civilised environment and way of life is an integral part of advancing the dignity of man.

ADDENDUM

CRITIQUE OF THE MELBOURNE TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Methods

Transport surveys

According to the 1929 Townplanning Commission Report on Melbourne, the Commission conducted the first scientific traffic survey in the world, a claim based on the fact that the Commission sent all over the world for information on techniques and could not find any.

However that may be, the Melbourne Transportation Committee by 1963, could make no such boast. It employed Wilbur Smith and Associates, the American Transportation consultants to produce a survey on Melbourne in conjunction with the Melbourne firm of Len T. Frazer & Associates, and, as Volume I of the full study, called "Survey" says: "--- the techniques used to develop these traffic models have been applied previously in other major transportation studies" (I p.142)

Nevertheless, the Wilbur Smith Transportation Study, consisting of two volumes (Vol. I "Survey" and Vol. II "Parking") is a tribute to the advancing ability of experts to scientifically measure travel patterns. Furthermore, by studying certain social factors not directly concerned with transport, such as location of employment, retail and education centres, levels of car ownership in different areas, distribution of population as between bluecollar and whitecollar, different income groups and family composition etc. they were able to evolve mathematical formulas from which to erect "models", which, in turn, estimate the actual quantity type and direction of travel on the existing transport network.

This estimate of transport, theoretically calculated, they then checked against actual current transport flows on the present network, painstakingly counted. There is no doubt that such computer-assisted exercises, even though they cost some \$850,000 could save millions if properly used, by removing guesswork which, though sometimes inspired can also make blunders of costly proportion.

It does not detract from the recognition of the brilliance of this expertise, and its potential usefulness to say that the experts associated with the study were given entirely the wrong assumptions to work on from this point.

Follow the logic of the Wilbur Smith experts. Having evolved transport formulae deduced from certain other non-transport social factors, which, they find, can describe fairly accurately the actual transport state of affairs, they argue that, given social factors of a different magnitude either in earlier years or in the years ahead, they should be able to theoretically calculate the number of trips and mode of travel of the past, or to eventuate in the future, and construct transport "models" to cope with these trips.

They tested the soundness of their formulae by predicting with a fair degree of accuracy the number of trips actually made in 1951, 1954 and 1961, being years when transport counts were available. (I p.125)

2. Forecasting techniques

Quite confident now, the Wilbur Smith team decide they have a "powerful tool which can be used to test alternative solutions to many major problems of transportation planning", because, we are told, "statistical evaluations of the comparison uniformly confirm the ability of the models to successfully re-create present travel, thus demonstrating their suitability for use in forecasting" (I p.142)

And so, as we observed under the heading "The Official Radial Freeway Policy" in the main text: "Not only does the Wilbur Smith 'Summary' make no attempt to uncover the value-judgments implicit in its analysis or recommendations; on the contrary, it appears to go out of its way to cover them up. It makes alternatives seem impossible by writing its predictions of the future in a statistical 'this will be' pontifical style. It apparently assumes you can study the present 'facts', feed them into a computer, and get a quite certain projection of future facts 20 years ahead! All it has done, alas, without knowing it, or without saying so, is to adopt the hidden value-judgments inherent in present trends."

"But these trends are good, bad and indifferent. It is simply 'non-planning' to project into the future bad trends as well as good ones. The very purpose of planning is to try to alter the course of events so that bad trends are eliminated---"

Having read the full study, we judge that our words justly characterise this as well as the 1966 Summary, and we stick by our opinions which we consider confirmed by the study.

It might be objected: how then could the Wilbur Smith survey accurately predict the past from their formulae?

The reason is that, since 1951, Victoria, and Melbourne, has had "laissez-faire" Governments, which have left to private enterprise the maximum degree of latitude, so that the "consumer demand" of the Joneses and their rivals has prevailed: the "trend" has become the law. The only major planning change was the 1954 "Master Plan", but this was essentially a zoning plan which, by stabilising land-uses, removed one of the most unpredictable elements of a growing city, thus making the trend-predictions of the Wilbur Smith exercise surer still.

By the same token, turning from the past to the future, the only condition which could make Wilbur Smith-type forecasting feasible would be a continuation of laissez-faire government and "trend-planning".

3. Community goals

We have tried hard to find in any of the two volumes of the Wilbur Smith Study or the third volume which is the Melbourne Transportation

Committee's Plan, any indication, even by implication, that the Committee have had any other approach than trend-planning.

For example we thought we might have proved ourselves wrong when we read: "The purpose of the study which is reported here has been to measure present travel, to provide an understanding of its complex relationship to other aspects of life in Melbourne---" (I p.18).

But "other aspects of life" turned out to be the statistics of "population, employment, car-ownership, family income, retail activity and school attendance" (I p.110).

Then we read that a transport plan or a land development plan or both should be revised to improve the balance between the two "as many times as necessary to evolve a general plan that is consistent with community goals and resources" (I p.23)

That really sounded good! "Community goals" were to be used to re-adjust transport and zoning to each other! But there is not a single word more, in the whole three volumes, to indicate what the authors meant by the phrase, still less how they had taken such "goals" into account.

In Volume II which is a study of parking requirements in the central business district and fringes until 1975 (not 1985, the target year for the "plan") a most astounding example of trend planning based on consumer demand presents itself. We learn that the object is to balance supply of and demand for parking for each city block!

"These forecasts are based on the anticipated increases in floor area, population, motor vehicle registration, and other variables which affect travel and parking activities in the urban area ---- the most critical area needing provision of new parking facilities is the 16-block portion of the city bounded by Lonsdale, Swanston, Flinders and King Streets" (II p.66)

This is "demand planning" with a vengeance! The "community goal" by 1975 apparently is to have 10,000 extra parking spaces in our Golden Mile! Whilst London and Paris are struggling desperately to discourage cars crowding into and ruining their central city areas, which finish up driving people and capital away from them, Melbourne starts "planning" deliberately in the opposite direction!

Volume III, the Transportation Plan (which we call for short throughout here simply the "Plan") is what the Melbourne Transportation Committee have made of the Wilbur Smith studies presented in 1966, after the Committee spent another three years of study and deliberation upon it. It is instructive to see if they departed from Wilbur Smith thinking.

4. Trend-planning by consumer demand of individuals

What can be gathered by implication from Volumes I and II is openly stated in Volume III. "The plan should be a 'demand' plan--" we are told.

"To provide a transportation service matched to the expected demand throughout the design area" is listed as one of the "main objectives" (III p.3)

Now if this meant broadly that the task was to supply a "community demand" for transporting workers to work, their wives to the shops and their children to school, there could be no quibble. If, further, the transport services developed in response to the "community demand" were to be so organised together with land-use that genuine "community goals" which served to enrich the quality of social life emerged, one could even applaud.

But this is not what is meant! By "demand" the Transportation Committee quite literally means "individual consumer demand", uncontrolled and untrammelled by what we might term "community consumer demand".

To the Committee, the question of the accumulation of all the individual consumer demands of all the car owners added up, quite inescapably, not only to a freeway system of several hundred miles, but one which funnelled traffic right into the centre of the city's heart. It is as simple as that. The question of the most efficient way of conveying people to the city without cluttering it up, which also would create a "demand" but based on community considerations simply does not come into the Committee's field of thought.

To prove the point in the sharpest way: take the question, already mentioned, of all-day carparking in the central city area. Now most planners would say that all-day parking should be kept right out of the Golden Mile. As we have seen, Wilbur Smith not only "forecast" the necessity of all-day parking in this area, but even "balancing" the supply to the demand, block by block!

The "Plan" completely succumbs to this idea. To make it workable they have to provide a ring-freeway in a tight loop around the central business district, and the reason given for this stems back precisely to the consumer demand of the city all-day parker!

"Without this by-passing function" (of the ring freeway) "it would not be possible to increase the central area parking predicted for 1985 except at the risk of overtaking the city streets and creating permanent peak-hour traffic chaos" (III p.54)

We completely reject the basic methodology of the predictive aspects of the Wilbur Smith report, as being trend-planning of the most antiquated and narrow kind, and we completely reject the basic tenets of the Transportation "Plan" based upon it. In a very real sense, it is a "Non-Plan" a product of laissez-faire policies which in the context of the 1970's mean that the real interests of the biggest corporations have the biggest influence.

Whether it has understood the implications of its "Plan" or not, that is precisely what the Transportation Committee has presented to

Melbourne. The car industry, the steel industry, the oil industry and rubber industry will look forward to accelerating returns for an "easy thing" instead of trying to adapt their industries to new uses for man in the age of technology. And the hapless citizen will spend more and more of his allegedly increasing affluence on transport costs.

If the plan is ever carried out, millions of cars will run millions of socially unnecessary miles on commuting before Melbourne "proves", as plenty of cities a little bigger have already proved, that this "system" is unworkable anyway.

It is absolute humbug for the Transportation Committee to produce, as another one of its "main objectives", the pious words: "To provide a transport network which could be implemented with as little interference to the commercial and community structure as possible" (III p.3).

The comprehensive radial freeway system which they have produced is the very transport measure which will interfere to a maximum degree with the "commercial and community structure."

5. Alternatives

One last matter in connection with methodology before we come to the detailed recommendations of the Plan.

The Wilbur Smith report promised that its study "establishes the basis for considering alternatives, so that agreement on a final plan may be reached with full appreciation of how its costs and services compare with other proposals" (I p.18), and asked about the rail underground in the Legislative Council, the Minister for Local Government said: "The Committee was free to consider alternative schemes and the report will indicate those which were considered" (Hansard 6/12/'69 p.2296).

As this Minister, together with the Minister for Transport, was a Cabinet Minister sitting on the Transportation Committee, one would have expected the Plan to disclose at least what underground alternatives were considered, and, hopefully, what alternative general transport systems were considered. Despite the Minister's words, the Plan reveals neither. It only indicates that alternatives to the underground were considered, but not, as promised, what those alternatives were.

So too the "Plan" says of its own procedure:-

"The Plan development process for the Melbourne Transportation Plan started with two preliminary plans -- one providing for a maximum development of roads and freeways, together with a relatively smaller expansion of the existing public transport services, and the other for considerably less development of roads and freeways but greater expansion of public transport. Seven possible plans were developed and tested before the final plan, now recommended, was evolved" (III p.32)

Once again, we are not vouchsafed the actual alternatives, only the knowledge that the Committee discussed them. There is no indication whether the recommended plan was the one which had the most emphasis on roads, or on public transport, or somewhere between.

As will be apparent from our Appendix No. 11 "Public Participation in Planning" this, in our view is just not good enough nor is it good enough to advance the spectre of "speculation" as a reason for secrecy. Not only were transport choices not presented to the public in the formative stages of planning, but even in the completed report the choices are not disclosed. So we can be forgiven for guessing, fortified by circumstantial evidence.

Our guess is that the sort of alternatives the Committee discussed were relatively minor alternatives all safely within the framework of some sort of "consumer-demand" trend plan radial freeway concept. Alternative undergrounds, just where the ring freeway should be located, whether there should be a rail line in the median strip of the Eastern freeway, or express buses instead: questions of that order.

All of these questions, however, are of minor significance compared to a question of quite different dimensions, namely, whether a radial freeway system is adopted or not. Planning alternatives presented to the public should above all be radically different alternatives which give a genuine choice of values, as well as minor choices of design alternatives.

A Radial Freeway System

1. An open-ended grid?

We say categorically that the "Plan" is, in its essence, a radial freeway system, that for this reason it is a bad plan and should be withdrawn.

It can be objected that it does not recommend a "radial freeway system". The words are nowhere used. And it can be argued that, on the contrary, the sort of system the diagrams show can be described as an "open-ended grid system."

Now if all freeways were to be given equal value, and all drawn on a map with the same pen, maybe both descriptions could be fairly applied.

All freeways, as recommended, however, are not of equal value. Figure 7-2 (III between pp 48 and 49) show that some are to be 4-lane, some 6-lane and some 8-lane freeways. More significant still, Figure 7-4 (III opposite p.50) shows the traffic volumes in vehicles per day anticipated on the freeways in 1985. This enables us to isolate the heavy-duty freeways from the light-duty ones.

Freeways that are to carry 100,000 or more vehicles per day (coloured yellow and green on the map) are precisely those sections of the freeway system which converge on the central "ring freeway" within which is contained the central business district. Just to glance at the map makes it quite clear that these heavy-duty freeways are radial. Those to carry less than 100,000 per day (coloured blue and grey on the map) are mainly cross-suburban or (obviously) the outer and quieter sections of the radial freeways.

We defined as "radial" a system that is designed to serve the car-commuters to the central business district. The system on the "plan" is designed, insofar as its primary heavy-duty purposes are concerned, precisely for this.

Incidentally, it is hard to imagine that the cross-suburban freeways where the "demand" of our unseen hero, the individual consumer, is the least, are going to be built first by our "demand planners", who will undoubtedly be confronted with shortage of funds in any case! In fact, Figure 7-4 graphically confirms our contention that it is the peak commuter traffic that dictates road capacity rather than total weekly traffic: hence the heavy-duty radial freeways are very much more than 10% as against 90% for suburban, and on Wilbur Smith's own argument, therefore the community would pay an extravagant price to get commuters to the city by freeways.

2. "Balanced transport"

In the main text we wrote: "Despite some lip-service since the 'Summary' to 'balanced transport' by various authoritative spokesmen, however, it is our estimate that the Government is not going to present a genuine alternative for debate by the public, and is not going to disclose the social consequences of adopting a radial freeway system or a strengthened public transport system respectively" (See section: "The Official Radial Freeway Policy").

Our estimate has been proved correct. Even our phrase "lip-service --to balanced transport" has been officially vindicated by the "Plan".

We are solemnly assured that one of the main objectives of the Plan is "to maintain a proper balance between public and private transport" (III p.3)

Within the ranks of those who, basically are consumer demand trend planners, and who therefore basically submit to the inevitability of radial freeway systems, there are differences.

Some, like Mr. N. F. Clark, mentioned in Part I of "Plan for Melbourne", now joined by his father Dr. Colin Clark, are such fanatical freeway advocates that they openly oppose the city rail underground, openly advocate measures that amount to a conscious policy of railway deterioration. Colin Clark now, typically, calls for "high speed buses using segregated tracks" ("Age" 5/1/'70) and see our Appendix No. 4 on the "Metro-Mobility System").

At the other extreme within the radial freeway demand camp, is a planner such as John Loder, a consulting transport engineer just returned from installing a freeway system for the city of Sao Paulo (population 6.5 million) in Brazil. Of the Melbourne "Plan" he says:

"While the freeway system has been adequately studied and the plan presented is basically good, not enough attention has been given to the

development of adequate public transport. No attempt has been made to develop or anticipate improved means of public transport. All that has been done is to make some extensions to systems founded on 19th century technology" ("Herald" 18/12/'69).

In between these views which are at either extreme within the radial freeway school of thought, lies the Transportation Committee's "Plan". It proposes, indeed, the underground which is now required as a railways operational requirement, also the Doncaster railway, two other modest extensions of existing lines and a moderate improvement in travel standards but not, as Loder correctly says, anything better than 19th century technology.

Only in this sense can the Plan be described as striking a "balance" between public and private transport, "Compromise" indeed would be a better word than "balance": it is a political compromise one suspects rather than a technical compromise, succeeding at best in appeasing the followers of either extreme by saying: "Well at least we haven't gone to the other extreme!"

But in no sense of the word is it a "balance" between a radial freeway system, on the one hand (represented either by the Clarks, or by J. Loder, or by the Transport Committee) and some genuine system aimed at restoring public transport to a dominant position for mass commuting, such as we have suggested, on the other.

To really achieve "balance", a massive and proportionately very much greater investment would have to be made in public transport than in private transport, because so many dominating pressures are in the direction of supporting freeways. Yet the "Plan" does the very reverse, proposing $6\frac{1}{2}$ times more investment on highways than on public transport: \$2261 million against \$355 million!

A mind capable of generalising such proportions as "balance", would seem to be somewhat imbalanced itself, unless its real purpose is an exercise in cynical political bluff.

3. The consequences

Those who have read Part I of "Plan for Melbourne" and followed the argument carefully in the section on Transport to which this is an addendum will not need an expansion of our views on the social consequences of the radial freeway system proposed by the "Plan".

To give a summarised critique of the "Plan" measured against some of the principles and standards we have proposed:-

1. No analysis of "community goals" or the quality of Melbourne's "heart", and linking this by rapid rail with district "hearts" and thence to local suburban "hearts" deliberately planned and created.

2. No suggestion of changing land-use zoning to minimise transport and

improve the quality of life e.g. no discussion of closer proximity of employment, and residence, or of possible greater flexibility for some "mixed" land uses, or the anachronism of "storage", including cars, in the central business district.

3. No discussion on the ultimate impossibility of ever wider freeways, and ever-expanding city parking way beyond the target year of 1985.

4. Although it is admitted that "levels of service influence public transport to a great extent. It is for this reason that study must be devoted to a headway analysis and service frequency" (1 p.43) and although the "Plan" proposes 5-min. headways on "high traffic routes" and 10-min. on others (III p.3), there are no proposals whatsoever, as with Mr. I. D. Richards as to the equally vital off-peak headways.

5. No concepts at all of "interchange complexes" with a social function, as well as a parking function, only a mild proposal for providing more bus bays at certain rail stations (III p.41), and, typically, proposals to allow private enterprise to "develop" railway land with car parks (III p.39).

6. No mention of the importance to public transport of higher-density zoning near stations and other public transport, although the Minister of Local Government has already indicated the importance of this to local Councils.

7. No parking policy for the inner areas as a whole, only city parkers problems in the "fringe" area extending no further than the University, Hoddle St. and St. Kilda Rd. areas, no thought for inner areas resident's parking problems, and no attempt to work towards gradual elimination of inner area all-day street parking, or even in the city itself.

8. No "box" attempt, as in London, to encourage motorists not to bring their cars right into the city, and no policy, such as we suggest to "catch" them as far from the city as possible.

9. No proposal for feeder-buses to be taken over and operated by one Melbourne transport authority with trains and trams, and subsidised.

10. No radical new-type rapid transit to be under consideration.

11. Other transport proposals such as the trunk rail line connecting the Sydney line to Gippsland via Ringwood and Dandenong or thereabouts with a Westernport branch line proposed by the Town and Country Planning Board (See "Organisation for Strategic Planning" 1967) or Mr. I.D. Richards' one-carriage "trains", not recommended by "plan" and apparently not even considered.

12. No surveys made either to try to determine the relative efficiency of freeways or public rail transport for mass commuting, or their relative costs.

13. And to add another consequence: no concern for or even explanation of the enormously disruptive effect of full freeway interchanges with curves allowing 50 mph which could consume upwards of 100 acres of land (about the size of the Melbourne cemetery).

Good Features

It is not inconsistent with all we have said in strong criticism of the "Plan" to say that there are, nevertheless, many acceptable, even praiseworthy, features.

The situation could be likened to that of a man sitting down to a meal of which the roast beef, being the main course, was poisoned, but the oysters and soup, the nuts and raisins are very good.

The radial freeway system, if partaken, will along with other social factors, eventually poison Melbourne. This does not prevent many of the comparatively less critical features of the "Plan" being quite digestible. In fact some even parallel, at least in principle, some of the features advocated by us in the main text. For example:-

1. The city underground rail loop.
2. A Doncaster line (but not we say down the Yarra Valley)
3. A new Carrum Downs (i.e. Dandenong to Frankston) and a new Mulgrave (i.e. Huntingdale to Ferntree Gully) lines (See our Appendix No. 6 "Mr. Richards on Efficiency")
4. Extension of electrification and duplication of tracks and of automatic signalling.
5. Grade separation of rail and road at 80 places.
6. Increased peak frequencies (but these not nearly good enough and no off-peak frequencies mentioned).
7. 97 out-of-date trains to be replaced by trains of the "most modern design", with improved passenger seat ratios.
8. Reserve right-of-ways wherever possible for trams.
9. Modernisation of tram and bus fleets.
10. The "standards of service": average express rail speeds 40-45 m.p.h. and non express 30 m.p.h.; 15 m.p.h. trams and buses, with off-peak frequencies of 10 minutes; maximum of 20% standing for train, tram or bus.
11. Continuing transport study (but starting from scratch please with the object of producing a plan along the lines of "Plan for Melbourne Part II" but far better).

SECTION III

URBAN RENEWAL

MELBOURNE'S HEART

"Any great metropolis is more than the sum of its parts. Its central city area provides the highest form of all social endeavour --- Melbourne is endowed with some magnificent central facilities that rank in world class. The Botanic Gardens, the Melbourne Cup at Flemington Race Course, the football finals at the Melbourne Cricket Ground, the Meyer Music Bowl, the new Cultural Centre, the Showgrounds, the Olympic Pool ---"

"--- the city's 'heart' is far bigger than the 'golden mile' of the city's commercial centre or C.B.D. (central business district) of planners' terminology" --- "With a doubled population a much bigger 'heart' with more facilities will be needed. The renewal of the inner areas must be planned to take this into account and not be confined to residential and factory buildings only" (Plan for Melbourne Part I pp. 6-7)

The above quotations stem from value judgments which regard the inner areas as having an importance to Melbourne's citizens as a whole which transcends the importance of the local activities carried on in the inner areas:-

"The higher the class of such central activity the more vigor and quality it generates, the more inspiration it creates for local suburban or district activities" (p.6).

The "vigor and quality" of the activities in the central city and inner areas, are not created by buildings and facilities, however necessary these may be. They are created by people. And a really civilised city does not consist of only the highest forms of specialist activity in certain buildings or places at certain times, which are then often "dead" most other times, but in a lively interested community-spirited coming-and-going of people of very many types who live or work in the area, with those who come into the area from the middle and outer suburbs.

Living and working in the inner areas are the most diverse types and strata of the population. There are Australian-born industrial workers. There are Italian, Greek, Chinese, Jewish and other minority communities. There are many pensioners, students, and more recently young married people. There are increasing numbers of whitecollar workers and professionals. There is room in the inner areas for all of these many different types of people to live in many different styles according to taste.

This diversity can be valuable, and there is need in the inner areas to take advantage of the rich and varied talents on every hand, creating opportunities to release their expression for the enrichment of all who

live and work there or in the city itself so that a pervading atmosphere of citizen participation and intelligent interest complements the rarer selective "top" performances of the "stars" in the various fields of academic, cultural, entertainment and sporting endeavour.

How to do this is what we understand by "urban renewal". How to enable whitecollar and bluecollar workers who are not so well-to-do to shift to the inner areas, if they so desire, to participate in such a regenerative process, as some of the well-to-do are now doing, we embrace in the concept of "urban renewal". How to update the community services and adapt the environment to induce many more people to bring up their families in the inner areas which would in time supplement the floating student population with a more permanent and bigger percentage of young people who are that section with more time and energy to sustain community efforts is also what we mean by "urban renewal". How to integrate the social planning with the physical to achieve all these aims is what we understand by "urban renewal".

It is necessary to say this, because the word "urban-renewal" in some places has become a "dirty word" associated with insensitive destruction of communities along with the buildings they are housed in. What we mean by the words has nothing whatsoever in common with such an approach.

To add a more technical note: we will be thinking, mainly, in what follows of the suburbs in the "central sector" as defined by the 1954 "Survey and Analysis" of the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works, namely: Flemington, Kensington, North Melbourne, West Melbourne, Port Melbourne, South Melbourne, Jolimont, East Melbourne, Richmond, Collingwood, Fitzroy, Carlton and Parkville, although much of what we have to say may apply, with modifications within the "box" as defined in our Section on Transport, particularly along the public transport routes within this area.

We should mention also, that although the "central business district" has an insoluble link with the inner areas, this will be dealt with in Part III of Plan for Melbourne, and only mentioned here to the extent that it impacts the problems of the inner areas surrounding it.

From what has been said it is obvious that our value-judgments for the inner areas derive from the inextricably integrated interests of Melbourne's citizens as a whole, and those who live and work in the inner areas.

Big City Interests want Low Density

Value judgments deriving from sectional interests should not be permitted to hinder the further flowering of the various centralised activities which help sustain and rejuvenate the whole metropolis.

For example, the sectional interests of the commercial concerns in the 'golden mile' are popularly believed to exert strong pressure on the shaping of official policies for the inner areas. Such a generalisation is correct.

But the popular image of the form of this pressure is that it lies behind the Government policy of using the Housing Commission's "slum-clearance" acquisition powers as an opportunity for creating higher densities and also for "bringing the middle class back into the inner areas", both aims being to supply a better market for the 'golden mile'.

Ten years ago this image was fully applicable, and indeed, even to this day such pressures still exist. Actually, however, a policy of re-development at low densities in the inner suburban areas is rapidly gaining ground, and as it corresponds with the interests of the very biggest corporations, both in the city and outside it, stands a good chance of changing official attitudes.

This is due to a powerful combination of forces. The very biggest retailers pioneered the exodus from Bourke Street to the district supermarkets, the banks and head offices are more concerned with ease of access by car for their important customers than they are with throngs of people in the city, whilst the oil, steel, rubber and motor industries, as mentioned stand to gain easy returns from a radial freeway system.

The ring freeway connecting with the radial freeways is necessary to make practical any massive increase in parking in the Golden Mile, but densities that are too high in the inner areas would endanger the planned freeway system by overtaxing its capacity. So it is not surprising that the Transportation Plan "predicts" a modest 30% increase in population by 1985 for the central sector suburbs against an average 56.9% increase. Only 3 of the 14 sectors adopted by the Transportation Study show a lower predicted increase than 30% (III Table 3-2 at p.8)

This makes sense when read along with a publication of the Melbourne Chamber of Commerce produced in early 1969: --a booklet entitled "Outline of proposal for the establishment of a Civic Affairs Division within the Chamber to deal with the problems of Inner Area Redevelopment". Among the "initial supporters" of this move are listed: I.C.I., Ansett, Dunlop, Jennings, Mobil Oil, Hooker, McEwans, Waltons, Australia Hotel, National Bank and A.N.Z. Bank.

This body especially set up to tackle the problems of redevelopment of the "half a dozen suburbs largely in a state of decay" around the city, advocates increased parking in the city, an inner ring road, and an "extension of residential development schemes based on private enterprises and government acquisition and clearing of land" no doubt conceived in the main as Jennings-type residential redevelopment which only marginally increases existing population densities. Such a policy actually is against the basic interests of the thousands of smaller and middle-sized central city enterprises, the very ones which give variety and attract the public to the city and which need throngs of people to flourish.

The Chamber's only apparent claim to a concern for an all-city interest as distinct from an interest representing the biggest concerns is its advocacy of a city rail underground. This, however, is deceptive because it is an unavoidable measure to deliver to the city the increasing

crowds of clerks, typists and shop-assistants too numerous for any freeway system to handle, and which Flinders Street station will be unable to cater for, although the long-term reality of radial freeway systems is to restrict the fullest potential growth of central city areas.

So, there are two distinct and opposite lines of policy for the inner areas emanating from the central business district.

The newer policy backed by the very biggest corporations supports freeways right into the city, jumbo-jet loads of rich tourists, parking in the 'Golden Mile' and redevelopment at low densities in the inner areas. It finds expression in the Transportation Plan and the Civic Affairs Division of the Melbourne Chamber of Commerce.

The older policy, formerly supported by the bigger city interests but now being abandoned by them was for redevelopment of the inner areas with much high-density, including high-rise towers and found expression in Housing Commission policy, and in the pioneer "Hotham Gardens" North Melbourne project in the initial stages when there were 14 master builders co-operating and before Jennings took over and when there were ideas of a tower-block set in gardens for the central development.

The clash of these two policies underlies and is partly responsible for the rivalry between Cabinet Ministers responsible for the Housing Commission and the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works respectively, which extends into the Victorian Government and which emerged in 1969 in the form of two separate bills for establishing "urban renewal agencies" which were presented to Parliament.

However, neither in their new form, nor in their old form, should such sectional interests be permitted to dictate a policy for the inner areas.

Both, insofar as they had a thought at all for the welfare of Melbourne as a whole and the importance of a vital "heart" for its people, thought only in commercial terms. Both, insofar as they thought at all of the people living in the inner areas, must have thought of most of them as being "decayed" along with the buildings because the "redevelopment" is never expressed in any other terms than sweeping away the buildings and scattering the communities that live in them.

What Should Remain Constant in the Flux?

Both policies deriving from the central business district have managed at length, between them, to create a sharp and growing protest movement from the people living in the inner areas, which tends to reject all change whatsoever, because all the changes so far made or contemplated either by the Housing Commission, the freeway system or the master builders have been so unacceptable, that, in sheer primitive self-defence a "hands-off" movement is gathering strength.

Yet widespread and rapid changes are inevitable: even without government intervention in the form of freeway decisions, Housing Commission

operations, and possible "urban renewal agencies", changing industrial and commercial requirements, the pressure of those who can afford it seeking homes as a "drift" back to the inner areas becomes popular and successive waves of migrants buying out the older homes of the older Australians make big changes certain.

A negative battle-cry of "hands-off!" may be suitable for an immediate tactical battle with bull-dozing authorities, but untenable for a long-term policy. It is natural therefore that the "hands-off" movement has begun to generate theories to prove that it is sociologically and economically desirable to "leave everything just as it is". Some aspects of these theories are dealt with in Appendix No. 8: "Theories Against Redevelopment".

Any overstatement of the case for preservation by such theories tends to weaken the chance of this movement to have a significant impact on the course of events, because it sacrifices the support of those who are looking for an improved quality of life as far as residents are concerned, which requires planned changes as well as planned preservation. By needlessly attacking high-density as a matter of principle and for everybody, it also tends to sacrifice the potential identity of interests between the inner area residents and the smaller city enterprises (See Appendix No. 8 for more on this).

The "hands-off" movement, however, is beginning to come of age, and by joining forces with the humanitarian and dedicated section of the Churches, welfare organisations, and people with a sensitive political conscience, is beginning to carry out the important historic task of focusing public attention on basic value judgments as to what is really worth preserving, and how to preserve it in the flux of desirable changes.

In the flux of possible physical changes there are two features which should remain constant: two precious features which are so easy to sweep away and yet impossible to replace.

The first of these features, a universal element over the whole of the area concerned, is the existing community fabric, a complex tapestry of human relationships.

The second feature, not universal, but far more widespread than is commonly understood, are residential areas of varying sizes which retain a certain environmental character of an earlier period and which impart whatever of historical distinction our relatively young metropolis has managed thus far to gather to itself.

The blindness of big investors, the one eyedness of authorities each thinking of its own compartmental problems, and the indifference or ignorance of Government, present a frightening menace to these two frail features; community fabric and environmental preservation. Neither of these has obviously to do either with profit or efficiency, and yet very much to do with the "quality of life."

Destroy these two features and Melbourne will never be quite the place it could have been.

Before planning changes therefore, it is necessary to plan, and urgently, for preservation.

Preservation of the community fabric

Value Judgment: The top priority of any renewal or redevelopment of the inner areas or central city must be preservation of the fabric of the existing community life.

The first concern must be to so phase and organise any changes that existing residential communities can continue with a minimum of disturbance.

In the inner areas are a high proportion of elderly citizens with strong attachments to the neighbours, institutions, habits and environment known for a life time. For example, familiar doctors, neighbours who can be relied on for help in times of sickness or distress, a local shopping centre where you are known to shop-keepers and shoppers and feel you "belong" and elderly citizens' centres.

Parallel factors apply in the case of strong established communities based on national minorities such as Italians, Greeks, Maltese, Chinese and Jewish people. Some of these are not long in Australia and rely heavily on the proximity not only of neighbours of the same nationality, but on local shops and clubs. But, even where language is not a barrier, shops, clubs, doctors, and picture theatres catering for their own culture have become part of their lives.

When the Housing Commission moves in to acquire big areas, however, all such associations are thrown into jeopardy.

Enforced exile into houses on Housing Commission estates in the far outer suburbs or to high rise flats in other inner suburbs, breaking up in the process strong personal and institutional contacts, is a form of inhuman and intolerant bureaucracy which has gone on far too long. It is this policy which has caused so much resentment and bitterness against the Housing Commission in recent years, so that instead of its operations being welcomed as an opportunity to improve housing standards and community life they are dreaded by the very people whom they are supposed to assist.

This situation is bad enough but there is recently a feature of it which makes the Housing Commission policy not only unacceptable to those dispossessed of their homes, but more generally unacceptable to the public. Resale by tender of about half of the acquired land to private enterprise, most of it to one particular private developer, gives the nasty impression that the Housing Commission, rather than concentrating on its historical mission of "slum clearance" and provision of a higher standard of housing for the low income families, has now increasingly become an instrument for the Government to provide bountiful gifts of choice real estate to private enterprise.

Along with this goes an apparent Government policy of using the Commission powers of acquisition and resale to deliberately create exclusive areas in such suburbs. Thus parts of North Melbourne, Carlton, and South

Melbourne are to have areas of own-your-own flats built by private enterprise and likely to be bought in the main by clerical and business people, whilst Fitzroy, Collingwood and Richmond are to be redeveloped with Commission flats for those they seem to regard as "second class" citizens whose housing position is so desperate that they are near the top of the long Housing Commission waiting list.

Government policy is thus set on a course calculated to make the Housing Commission's operation impossibly unpopular, and could lead to a mischievous and entirely unnecessary antagonism between the older or migrant industrial worker, and the younger white collar clerks, junior executives, teachers, nurses, secretaries, professionals, and the like who are increasingly attracted by the advantages of living near the city.

The whole situation tends to generate amongst industrial workers and the preservationist-minded professionals a negative, anti-Housing Commission attitude, which blindly hits out not only at the Commission, but at everything the Commission does. Hence identifying the Commission with high-rise flats the tendency is for an emotional attack on high density living as such, instead of constructive demands for overcoming obvious shortcomings. Similarly there is an emotional attack on the Commission itself instead of constructive demands that updated policies and renewal machinery be created to give guide lines to the Commission as a construction authority ensuring that it accord fully with the public purposes of improving the standard of housing and environment of the working people for which it was created.

Reshaping of Government policy to remove the original main source of recent accumulating resentment against the Housing Commission therefore is top priority. Breaking up of the particular local community life to which people have grown accustomed and which they rightly prize is a barbarous and totally unnecessary exercise of power which runs counter to the whole purpose of raising living standards for which the Commission was created.

Instead of uprooting and scattering local communities, thus making its task progressively more politically impossible the greater the scale of its operation, renewal policy must be to preserve and foster all existing community life.

First and foremost, the highest-density new development should take place at least initially, on land that is not now residential at all.

Yet, in time, it will be inevitable and desirable to demolish the houses and re-house those whose conditions are worst. Moreover, for reasons advanced in Part I of Plan for Melbourne much higher residential densities near the city are desirable in the interests of Melbourne people as a whole. Fortunately if such a task is tackled on a large enough scale and in a planned human style, the solutions to the considerable problems of rehousing communities without disrupting the pattern of their life and associations can be found, along the following lines...

1. Before any move is made to acquire any residential properties the Commission should build nearby a selection of many different types of

higher density housing - town houses, row-houses, courtyard-houses, terrace-houses as well as walk-up flats and tower blocks.

2. Opportunity should be given to every person living in the area next to be acquired to choose the nearby type of home-unit preferred at low cost or at low rental, provision being made wherever desired and possible for neighbours to relocate in groups.

3. Wherever community facilities are also affected by acquisition care should be taken to re-establish the same facilities served by the same personell in any rebuilding. Thus the same shop-keeper should have new shops built - near to the new housing and completed before the old ones are demolished so that enforced lack of continuity does not drive them from the neighbourhood. The same principle should be applied to doctor's surgeries, clubrooms or hall, children's playgrounds, picture theatres and so on.

4. Land required by the Housing Commission or any renewal agency to get "one jump ahead" so that they do not need to acquire homes, shops, clubs and other vital community properties before completion of the new units, could, if carefully considered, come from a variety of other land uses. For example....

(i) Purchase or acquisition of unsuitable and/or low-employment industries such as junk yards, car sales yards, or obnoxious industries, that should not be located in inner areas at all.

(ii) Conversion of obsolete utilities e.g. Council depots and yards could be profitably amalgamated and shifted out to less valuable land; (this should be done whether Councils amalgamate or not) gas-meter grounds after the introduction of natural gas, Newmarket sale yards etc.

(iii) The initial use of badly-located parkland to be substituted as soon as clearance takes place by equal areas of more favourably sited parklands.

2. Fostering the future a bigger task than preserving the past

Before dealing with the second problem of preserving the environment of earlier generations it is necessary to get the size of the problem into proportion.

Amongst certain academic, professional, artistic and executive circles as well as students and others there is a growing trend to regard as fashionable and highly desirable the purchase and restoration of 19th century town houses including terrace houses close to the city. Thus the buildings sought are in the main the houses of the well-to-do upper classes or the middle classes of last century, and their internal modernisation to meet modern standards of convenience and style requires often quite a costly outlay, that can be afforded only by the circles mentioned.

The small cottages built to house families of industrial workers of last century are often very small and have poor access to light and sun

and poor privacy. However these are often convertible at small expense to reasonable "diggings" for dormitory and study purposes, for students, nurses, teachers and others without children, although they are hardly regarded as adequate for a family home, even by these same groups when they later marry and have children.

Some groups in the inner areas, comprising in the main the above class of persons, have sprung up basically around the preservation of certain selected areas against the encroachment of any changes and this awakening awareness of the distinctive taste of an earlier period and the desire to retain the environmental character of whole areas rather than individual homes deserves support from all whether they live in such areas or not.

Because these groups are often vocal and usually justly so, there tends to be created a public impression that the correct and popular policy over the whole of the inner areas is exclusively this type of individual restoration of homes, and that this process can replace almost entirely the need for newly built Government-subsidised low-income housing in the inner areas. Indeed as explained in Appendix No. 8, there is a whole philosophy of planning concepts which expand this into an exclusive technique supposed to be good for all areas irrespective of their condition.

In our assessment of the situation, a "restoration remedy" expressed in such sweeping terms is quite out of perspective applied to Melbourne's inner suburban housing needs.

What is right about the theory is that any condemnation of older buildings, simply on account of their age is quite wrong. And any condemnation of buildings on the grounds that they do not comply with modern standards, if by "modern" is meant that they must have a street frontage and a set-back from each side boundary as well as the street is simply laughable. Such siting provisions enshrined in the Uniform Building Regulations originally adopted with the best of intentions to enforce a standard of privacy and access to light and sun, unintentionally helped to create the familiar sprawling uniformity in our outer suburbs and urgently need overhauling even as regard the outer suburbs, to permit experiment with more flexible forms of housing, for example landscaped group housing, and other forms.

As regards the inner suburbs, however, such provisions should never have been applicable: they seriously hindered or prevented the rebuilding of terrace-housing and row-housing, which are very appropriate forms of housing for the inner areas. Perhaps, on reflection, we should thank the Uniform Building Regulations because by having prevented rebuilding on small inner-area sites, they have by happy accident had the effect of preserving whole big areas from random rebuilding of individual modern dwellings until a point in history has arrived when there are sufficient people living in some of these areas with a regard for the taste and charm of the 19th century at its best, that, given support, there is a good chance of these areas being preserved, and along with them something distinctively "Melbourne".

How different has been official attitudes to this problem can be gauged by the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works survey published in 1954 as a basis for the "Master Plan" which is our present planning scheme.

The report contained in "Surveys and Analysis" which is a companion Volume to the 1954 "Report" correctly detected the beginning of a trend which has since increased: "There is a natural resistance growing to residence in the most distant outer suburbs, chiefly because of distance and inconvenience which, when related to the prime objection to the inner areas -- poor housing conditions -- suggests that there will be increasing pressure to redevelop the older inner suburbs to make them more attractive for living purposes" (p.53). It then proceeds to classify all houses in Melbourne into 3 classes (1) modern and structurally sound and conforming to present day standards (2) older buildings structurally sound and not built to modern standards and (3) old buildings not suited for modern requirements. (p.54).

There follows on p.57 a map which, on our calculations shows some 9,000 to 10,000 acres, virtually the whole of the residential "central sector" inner suburbs, plus Williamstown, Footscray, Brunswick, Northcote, Prahran and other older areas classified as "Class 3".. " -- it is reasonable to assume," the Survey then states, "that the existing third-class dwellings involving some 105,000 households should be replaced within the next 30 years" (p.16). As the survey was made in 1951, the expectation was that virtually the whole of the old housing stock in the areas mentioned would be replaced by 1981! Some expectation, considering the Housing Commission began clearing at the rate of some 20 acres per year!

Note that the word is "replaced" and there is no mention anywhere in the text of rehabilitating or renovating "structurally sound" buildings to make them "suitable for modern requirements". So it seems apparent that what the authors meant by "modern standards" were precisely those very standards of site-size, frontage and set-back contained in the Uniform Building Regulations, which should not have been regarded in any sensible approach to the inner areas at all. How planners of twenty years ago could come to such conclusions can only be explained historically: it was not long after the war, and not only were there slums still which were really slums, but most of the housing was still landlord-owned and run-down and the effects of migration, home-ownership, the shorter working week and full employment had not yet begun to accumulate.

Measured against the radical 1954 Board of Works replacement rate, which spared East Melbourne, South Yarra and St. Kilda Road but swept nearly everything else away, the now much-maligned Shaw-Davey report of the Victorian Housing Commission which appeared in 1960 and recommended some 1000 acres for demolition is a mild and harmless document, contemplating only 1/10th the amount of replacement being housing "so substandard in nature that economic repair was out of the question." ("The Enemy Within the Gates", Housing Commission p.1); and this figure was automatically adopted as an immediate target by the then Minister of Housing L.H.S.Thompson in 1965 in his work "Victorian Housing Today and Tomorrow" (at pp. 25-26).

"The Future Growth of Melbourne", the 1967 report of the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works for the first time in an official publication that we can trace mentions the "need to preserve buildings of historic or architectural quality", although there is no indication either of a concept of preserving whole areas of an earlier environment, nor of the idea of applying finance to renovation of structurally-sound old buildings instead of replacing them. The figures produced by this report of 8000 acres in the central sector redeveloped at densities of 130 to 160 persons per acre (about 3 times the present densities) involving clearance of 240 acres per year was not a "recommendation", but, like so much of that report, a "possibility", in this case a possible maximum density figure for the inner areas, without the authors attaching preferences to their figures.

Official surveys, then, based on criteria that adopt the present Uniform Building Regulations on siting as their standard, or which fail to face up to the fact that with skilled advice many structurally-sound buildings can be converted into very comfortable modern living quarters more economically than rebuilding, are useless when we come to assess the extent of the areas which should be preserved.

The authors, therefore, can be forgiven for some guesswork in trying to assess the proportion of land within the 8000 acres of central sector inner suburbs which might be reasonably set aside for preservation of the environmental character of whole areas. In order to get our proportions in order, we hazard a figure from 500 to 800 acres to be preserved. This would be, say, 1/10th of the total residential areas.

This is not to say that there would not be tens of thousands of other houses outside these preservation areas that would be better rehabilitated than demolished, but in the majority of cases the decision would be left as a matter of choice or agreement by owners, and we have special suggestions on these problems which are dealt with below.

In the preservation areas, however, the owner would have no choice: he would not be permitted to pull down, or structurally alter the facade of his house, except under strict controls which we will mention later.

Having dealt with what is right about the theory of rehabilitation of individual houses, we come to what is wrong about it, namely its claim to be the one-and-only or even the dominant form of remedy for inner area suburbs.

Living in both types of areas so far identified i.e. preservation areas and what we shall call for the moment "non-preservation areas" (further distinctions will be made soon) are tens of thousands of people who are the least well-to-do, and whose living standards come nowhere near what can be considered as modern, either as regards light, sun, privacy, amenity or design.

Yet for special reasons many of such people, for example, migrants and elderly Australians, do not want to shift from the area.

Their opposition to redevelopment springs not from their desire to preserve, but partly because they fear a shabby deal, either inadequate compensation or a lack of reasonable choice of alternative accommodation offered; but in addition to these factors, and above all, because the whole process as now practised disrupts the community with which they are associated.

The overwhelming majority of these people at present resident in the inner areas deserve much higher housing standards than they have. But they cannot afford them, and many could not afford even interest and repayments on loans if finance for restoration were to be the only form of assistance. Moreover, despite titanic efforts in some cases, and even not a little cash, many amateur renovators do not really succeed in attaining for their families standards of internal design and amenity although many of them, proud of their workmanship, would not own to this, often, however, because they would not be really aware anyway of "how the other half lives". This is not surprising, since such a task of conversion, apart from the more elementary measures of a new kitchen sink, an internal toilet, and a coat of paint throughout, is a highly skilled job for an architect or a builder with special skills and taste.

As well as all these considerations, there is a very big percentage of dwellings, especially timber dwellings, which it is quite uneconomic to rehabilitate, and on which the owners spend money, not because they regard it as an investment, but because they have no alternative if they have any pride in their home and wish to "make the best of things", and have a little money to do it with.

It is harmful to advance theories that hinder the effort to enable people living in such conditions to obtain modern new homes. It is bad enough that many low-income earners are obliged to spend what to them is precious money to make their living quarters barely tolerable, without spending public money on the same eventually hopeless task.

Now, for reasons we have advanced elsewhere, to do with creating the potential for enlivening the "deadness" of Melbourne's "heart", outside of office hours, or a major sporting event, it is desirable to have much higher densities wherever rebuilding does occur in the inner areas.

We think ultimate average densities of 40 to 50 living units per acre for the non-preservation areas as distinct from the present average of 20 units per acre or less for the inner residential areas is desirable, although, as we develop later, the main concentration of highest densities should be on land that is now non-residential, so that the degree of disturbance to existing home-owners would be minimised.

In other words, we are suggesting a figure that would amount to at least doubling the present densities of areas outside the proposed 800 acres of preservation areas, which would seem reasonably attainable, when it is recalled that the Board of Works 1967 report, quoted above, contemplated a possible trebling of densities. By way of comparison, the independent survey on housing carried out by the Housing Industry

Association "Land Usage Committee" in 1966 which was mainly preoccupied with showing that more flats could be expected in the middle suburbs and less flats in the inner suburbs than the Board of Works, proposes 30 persons per acre as against 16.05 average now.

This survey, incidentally, shows lower densities than ours because its figures relate density to the whole municipal area, whereas the densities we speak of are not residential areas; on the other hand the survey includes St. Kilda which has high densities (See "A Study in Land Usage". Table at p.8) However the concept of doubling populations is common to both this survey and our own proposition and demonstrates that our figures for higher density are certainly not unrealistic, and may err on the conservative side.

Assuming, then, that our proposed average density targets were to be attained, the size of the problem of areas to be preserved against non-preservation areas in terms of population can now be calculated.

Approximately, the non-preservation areas (8000 acres) would be ten times the acreage of the preservation areas (800 acres). But, as the density of the non-preservation areas would double, whilst that of the preservation areas would remain constant, the ultimate proportions would be twenty times as many people living in the non-preservation areas as would be living in the preservation areas.

Thus the relative size of these two problems, preserving the past and fostering the future are of a different order. Even if our figures need radical correction, and the proportion measured in terms of people is not 20 to 1 but some lesser proportion, it is certain that quite serious attention has to be paid to new buildings with their complement of social facilities in the inner areas.

Keeping the problem in perspective, the whole of the inner areas just cannot be dismissed with the type of treatment that is adequate for preservation areas only.

3. Preservation of the environment of earlier generations

Although this problem may be the smaller-size problem, it is not for that reason less urgent. The speculative, insensitive private developer can ruin very rapidly the particular unique character of the last century environment that imparts its charm and historic significance and which serves to connect Melbourne with its past.

Some parts owe their charm to the town planning efforts of early Government surveyors of 100 years ago, such as St. Vincents Place South Melbourne and small Carlton squares such as Macarthur Place, Murchison Sq. and Argyle Place.

There are parts consisting of solid, pleasant, spacious terrace houses built by the wealthy of a century ago, some architect designed and tasteful examples of living environs in another era, for example in Parkville, Jolimont, East Melbourne and parts of Drummond St. Carlton.

Such areas should forthwith be declared "preservation area" and all demolition or major external structural alterations or new buildings forbidden without a special permit.

The object in such preservation areas would then be to retain the original external architecture of the buildings. This would involve, in some cases the restoration of some buildings to their former state. In other cases, of course, there would be individual buildings so much beyond restoration or so much out-of-character that demolition was inevitable. Here rebuilding in a modern style would be permitted, but only if it were in keeping with the general character of the environment.

Whatever administrative machinery was devised to control such an area, local preservation advisory committees consisting of architects, dedicated to such ideas, National Trust nominees and representatives of local citizens associations would need to play a big part in the process of decision making.

It is sometimes objected that to declare such a preservation area would put a "blight" over an area preventing property owners from obtaining expected increases in the value of their property because they would be prevented from selling to developers. All planning has economic effects, favouring some sectors at the expense of others, but to hesitate on this ground would be to put an end to planning entirely and cannot be entertained.

However such is the popularity of the trend of sections of academics, professionals and others towards this type of living that if such restrictions did not immediately increase the value of present owners it would be only a question of time before they did. This is so because the reverse side of the process is a guarantee that the environment, which is always an element in the marketable commodity which is residential land, becomes here not only a bigger element by its very nature, but begins to expand unfettered by fears that unwanted redevelopment will rob it of its unique and irreplaceable character.

A more intractable difficulty is, how to assist lower income families now living in such preservation areas to remain there, if they so desire, or to frame the problem in reverse, how to prevent such preservation areas becoming exclusive societies of academics, professionals and executive personnel which is no more desirable than to have special "ghettoes" of impoverished deserted wives, widows and elderly as is created in some areas by the Housing Commission.

A scheme of special financial assistance to restore the exteriors to the standards expected by the local preservation advisory committee and to modernise the interior and decorate it to their own taste from "a preservation fund" available at low interest rates, and repayable on sale of the property or death of the owner is needed.

In the case of those who would be eligible for housing assistance and who live in such preservation areas, if they were owners, such loans

would be interest free, or if they were tenants they could receive proportion of what would otherwise be a Government subsidy for rehousing in the form of a scheme of rent assistance.

Another practical difficulty is to develop a consciousness of the need for preservation capable of thinking in terms of sufficiently intimate areas. The case for the bigger and choicer obvious selections such as those mentioned by way of illustration ... Parkville, East Melbourne, St. Vincents Place and so on, is clear enough.

It was fashionable, in the early days for the well-to-do to build on the higher land for the sake of drainage and to obtain a view, leaving the lower land for the factories and workers cottages. So on the higher land, especially, but in other parts too, there are very many less well known areas fully deserving of preservation. Some areas are quite small. The National Trust was originally concerned only with retaining individual buildings of historic or architectural merit. The thinking of the Trust today however tends towards the realisation that, although it may be possible to win a victory for a small number of buildings to which they have allotted the highest classification as worthy of retention at all costs, the best way of retaining the great number of buildings with lower classifications is to retain the whole area, even if it be a small area, of which these buildings form a part.

Incidentally, although the object of Part 2, Plan for Melbourne is not to deal with the central business district, since the question of preservation often is a "now or never" issue, it is as well to mention here that it is urgent that principles of retaining the choicest of the city's historic and aesthetic buildings be adopted without delay.

A suggestion of the architect-planner Cr. Paul Ritter of Perth, seems to be highly reasonable. He points out that it is the facade architecture of many such buildings that are the important feature and that it might well be structurally feasible to leave a portion of the front section of the old building replacing the older rear section with a new tower slab.

This has the dual advantage of the preservation of history and of keeping the buildings on the street frontage more in human scale, thus avoiding the inhuman feeling of walking at the bottom of a canyon built of glass walls, which is so typical of skyscraper cities.

Perhaps, before it is too late, this technique could be considered for enforcement for other purposes than saving individual historic buildings, for example to preserve the "Paris end of Collins St." already beginning to be eroded. And, in any case, even where new buildings reach right into the street frontage, the device of set-back of the towers from the building line and erecting them on a low three or four storey base can prevent the "shut-in" feeling.

THE CHANGES NEEDED

Having dealt with the two features that must be carefully preserved in the process of change, namely the community fabric and suitable areas of an environmental character, which must receive the first priority, the next task is to examine what changes are needed in the inner areas.

Here are some generalised value judgments as a basis of the propositions to follow.

The inner areas should form, together with the central business district, the "heart" of the metropolis which should contain many of the centralised community facilities and therefore socially valuable land.

- (i) Bulk storage is an unsuitable land use.
- (ii) Certain industries formerly tolerated should now be regarded as obnoxious or otherwise obsolete being inconsistent to siting close to high density areas.
- (iii) Such freeways as penetrate the inner areas should deny access for the all-day car commuter.
- (iv) Higher densities are desirable.
- (v) An increase in unobnoxious high-labour-content industries is desirable.
- (vi) A more varied and extensive network of local community services and facilities should be provided.
- (vii) To the extent that the residential population is increased, the object should be to so design the housing and other facilities to cater for a mixed population, mixed age groups, mixed occupations and mixed income levels.
- (viii) Landscaping should be an integral part of all rebuilding design.

1. Bulk storage is an unsuitable land use

Melbourne is a seaport and its industries and commerce depend upon the expansion of goods handled through the port.

In the early days it was inevitable that the storage of timber, wool, and heavy crates of merchandise drawn by oxen or horse, should be warehoused close to the wharves.

It is now commonplace to regard the west end of Flinders Lane in the city proper consisting of old warehouses as inappropriate land use ripe for redevelopment.

This has long become so because heavy bulk commodities whether for

import or export no longer need to be dumped near the wharves, but can be on loaded or off-loaded from trains or road freighters, which, once they are loaded, can convey them economically to or from factories or warehouses in the suburbs or even in country towns.

What now has to be realised is that there are quite extensive land uses around some of the inner suburbs that historically speaking are equally obsolete to Flinders Lane, such as timber yards, junk yards, wool stores and general warehousing facilities which should be relocated on main trunk transport routes some distance from the city.

This would release hundreds of acres for more suitable residential or industrial use.

On the same principle of the unsuitability of bulk storage in the city or inner areas come the parking of cars. This is a more perplexing problem. Whereas the natural economic pressures are towards the gradual elimination of warehousing on valuable land, unfortunately the natural economic pressures favour the parking of more cars even in the central business district, and, as an overflow, in the surrounding inner areas.

The Melbourne Transportation Committee report, slavishly basing itself on the dominance of the car for private commuting, and on a laissez-faire "demand" plan, even applied to parking in the central business district (Vol. 2, page 9) abandons all criteria except car convenience and even justifies the inner ring freeway on the basis of clearing the city streets to make possible the augmented city parking (Vol. 3, p. 54). The basic criteria underlying the Transportation Study have to be rejected, or any valuable land won from warehousing or other obsolete land uses is likely to be immediately lost to car-parking.

This subject has been dealt with already in the section above on transport as has the technique to overcome the difficulties associated with non-commuter parking facilities for inner suburban residents living moreover at a higher density.

Obnoxious and obsolete land use

Apart from warehousing and car-parking and other storage purposes, there are other land uses equally obsolete for a variety of reasons.

Some are obsolete, because although at one time, they would not have been regarded as obnoxious in an urban context, with more advanced scientific knowledge and higher standards of acceptable amenities they have come to be so regarded.

Into this category come, for example, smog-producing, noise-producing and smell-producing industries such as foundries, panel beating or tanning factories.

Some of these could possibly be relocated in the centre of industrial zones in the inner areas especially if their noise-producing or smog-

producing effects could be highly controlled to acceptable scientific standards.

Another example is the cattle and sheep sale-yards and abbatoirs at Newmarket. Over forty years ago and as late as 1954 expert town planning reports have recommended removal of these facilities to Derrimut, but the Government has refused to make this decision, although increasing use of road freighter has made the refusal more and more obstinate.

A legacy of the days of the horse and cart is the system of municipal Council "yards" in the inner areas. With modern expensive road making equipment all highly-mobile, there should be a rationalised amalgamation of these "yarding" facilities into one or two big, highly mechanised depots on less expensive land located well outside the inner areas. Arrangements could be made for this quite irrespective of the vexed problem of the merits or demerits of amalgamation of Councils.

Gasometers containing town gas soon to be made obsolete by conversion to natural gas is another obvious example of obsolescence of land use. However, there are probably many more. Enterprises which have a low labor content and a high land use content, especially, should come under review, for example, used car sale yards or unnecessary duplication and triplication of service stations.

3. Such freeways as penetrate to the inner areas should deny access for the all-day car commuter

This subject has already been dealt with in connection with transport.

We reiterate here that, since they are already completed or in the process of construction, The Tullamarine, Lower Yarra Crossing and the South Eastern freeways should be converted into by-pass freeways, providing no all-day commuter access to the city or inner areas whatever.

From the standpoint of the inner areas this would have the least harmful effects because these freeways would not be carving through residential areas.

The ring freeway, the Eastern freeway and the two southern freeways carving through the centre of Collingwood, Richmond, Prahran, East Melbourne, Carlton, North Melbourne and South Melbourne however, should be abandoned.

Apart from the deleterious "severance" effect which is easily understandable the sheer amount of land required for six and eight lane freeways and their interchanges independent of the existing road network at that, would be an extravagant expenditure of valuable inner area land.

As if this were not enough, there are even suggestions afoot for a novel form of "redevelopment" in connection with the freeway network. It is proposed that, if wider land reservations than the freeways were taken, they could be made into "park-way" drives, landscaped on either side, and

and high rise residential buildings could be set within the new landscaped park strips, with adequate parking sited right on the freeway.

Such extravagant proposals, feasible or even desirable for a new town, or on the greenacre outskirts, cannot be superimposed on Melbourne unless the community at large is prepared to pay for the ruination of the quality of its inner suburban areas and ultimately, the city centre itself.

4. Higher residential densities

A rate of high density new residential building many times that of the slow Housing Commission rate should be undertaken.

It is very poor that hundreds of migrants start their life in Australia in low standard housing in Melbourne's inner suburbs, sometimes in severely over-crowded conditions. It is still worse that thousands of Australians are so desperate for housing that the annual receipt of applications for Housing Commission tenancies run at the rate of 10,000, well over 5,000 of these for accommodation in the metropolitan area.

To demolish any considerable part of the existing stock of houses in such circumstances is a wickedly misguided policy, driving up higher still the prices of some of the lowest priced houses in Melbourne, thus making the housing prospects still worse for the most desperate by reducing the supply, and lengthening the Commission's waiting lists.

Not a single house should be demolished until the stock of new housing has satisfied all of those who are eligible on the waiting list, and begun the task of offering migrants housing worthy of modern Australian standards. Some of this new housing will be in outer suburbs and in country towns and some in the inner suburbs.

Key to the situation is massive resumption of land for housing in inner areas from various sources of non-residential land already mentioned and a vastly accelerated program of high density building begun upon it.

Only when the waiting list of the desperate have been satisfied should the Commission begin demolition of areas of housing judged impossible to usefully convert to modern standards. And when this process does begin it should proceed by the technique already mentioned, namely of pre-building, nearby a variety of high density housing, giving a free choice to those in the area being acquired to move in groups and to the particular accommodation that suits them. (See section above "Preservation of the Community Fabric.")

The reason that high density is proposed for all of this new building in the inner areas have been set out in Part I of "Plan for Melbourne" and also in the section on Transport above, and do not need repeating. It is not appropriate here to deal with the various experimental modern high density projects which should be undertaken and which it is hoped to deal with as part of a section on Housing in Part III of "Plan for Melbourne".

It should be made clear however that the term "high density" is not confined to multi storey elevator flats, or "high rise" as they are called, and is not even confined to "flats" at all, still less to the type of Housing Commission blocks which typically lack space for community facilities except the barest essentials and what few facilities there are, mainly an exercise in "after thought" planning and poorly staffed at that.

There are many alternative forms of high density housing ... town houses, courtyard houses, terrace houses, walk-up flats, hostels, (for nurses students and others) boarding houses (particularly for seasonal workers) as well as various-sized elevator flats; combinations of which should be offered for sale, rental or full boarding fee.

In the Board of Works "Residential Planning Standards" published in May 1969 for discussion, there is a proposed zone for redevelopment areas, like the other zones proposed, that does not lay down any minimum dwelling density standards. So far as this zone applies to the inner areas, we propose that it should lay down high minimum density, except for preservation areas, and set no maximum, leaving room for the occasional experiment in this regard, remembering that even the highest present densities in Australian cities are low in comparison with some overseas cities with comparable living standards.

The Melbourne Transport Study has recommended given freeway networks with given capacities. Strong supporter of such a network, oppose high densities in the inner suburbs, because with poor public transport alternatives the problem of car parking in the inner areas could become impossible and ultimately overtax the freeway system.

In our judgment, high density in the inner areas strengthen the public transport system, and the stronger this system becomes the higher the near-city densities it encourages, and this is a desirable goal to hold.

It is undesirable to artificially tailor not only the public transport system but also the near-city residential densities not for the human needs of revitalising the city "heart" and district centres, but to accommodate solely the "demand" of the city car-commuter who would cease to demand such a system surely, if he was fairly presented with all the sociological consequences which ultimately would affect him too as a citizen.

5. An increase in unobnoxious high labour-content industries is desirable

A certain amount of "commuting in reverse" is inevitable by people living in inner areas who go to work in other areas. The older tradition of the son entering the trade, occupation, industry or profession of his father, and the family home therefore being selected if possible, near to the place of employment of the male breadwinners, has been disrupted for three reasons ... partly it is the gradual rise in the percentage of women in employment, partly to the effect of immigration coupled with increased secondary education opening opportunities for up-grading of children of

Australian parents with more skilled jobs or white collar jobs, and partly the exodus of big industries to the outer suburbs. These trends apply anywhere in Melbourne.

It would therefore be as unrealistic to expect all members of families living in inner areas to find their employment in the city or inner areas as it would be to have the same expectations for any other part of the metropolis. Those who argue that there should not be high densities of industrial workers in the inner areas which should be converted to residential areas for white collar city workers, miss the point. For a father of a family to travel say from Richmond to an industry at Sunshine or Dandenong could make better sense for the family than if it shifted to Sunshine or Dandenong only to find that the daughter had to travel to her white collar job, in the city, the son to an educational centre near the city and the mother had no suitable employment at all.

Nevertheless the diversification of employment opportunities in the inner areas as elsewhere is obviously a desirable goal. That aspect of the zoning approach of the Board of Works in its 1954 master plan to so zone as to try to even-up industrial and commercial zones, with residential zones to minimise commuting was correct.

For a renewal policy for industry in the inner areas, however, there is more scope, more flexibility and more sophistication required. It is extraordinary that there has been little discussion of the renewing of the older industrial areas. Almost all discussion has centred around where people live and not where they work.

The one single operative idea is to liken the inner areas to a rotten core of decaying residentials which should be cut out and room made in the remodelling for own-your-own flats for what is called the "middle class" to live near to their city employment. The so called "middle class" turn out to be mainly salaried and white collar workers. Consideration for them is quite justified. But, quite intolerable is lack of equal consideration for the industrial workers, many of them migrants.

As has already been described their choice of suburbs is not respected by Government policy which sells 50% or so of acquired land to private developers to build own-your-own flats, scattering the industrial workers to do so.

There is little talk of any rotten core of decaying factories in the inner areas nor the importance of renewing them and modernising them for the benefit of the existing workforce and expanding them to meet an expanding population of industrial workers living in the inner area, so that many of them too can live near their employment.

As a start to discussion of such problems we advance the following principles and concepts for consideration

a) Obsolete uses. Obsolete space-consuming and low-labour content industries or obnoxious industries should be shifted out of inner areas,

aspects of which have been mentioned.

b) Slum factories. Apart from inappropriate land-use, worn out slum factories should be declared unfit for human labour and demolished; in some cases it may be possible to renovate them and bring them up to standards instead of demolishing them.

"Standard" in this context should mean not simply complying with health and safety regulations, but measuring up to the best in modern welfare and town planning norms including really good day lighting, sun-lighting, air conditioning, canteens recreation facilities and rest rooms as well as modern working conditions.

c) High density factories New factories built on part of the land made available from items a) and b) above should not be single-storey sprawling buildings, but high density factories. Many of the bigger factories of an earlier period in the inner suburbs were of this character, for example in the printing, newspaper, textile, match-making and food industries.

With the inevitable relative reduction in the number of industrial workers due to increasing technological innovations, it is necessary that factory accommodation density in the inner areas be set at a very much higher level for factories than for residential accommodation. It should be feasible to adapt the semi-automated production "line" to multi-storey factories especially for products that are not bulky or heavy.

However, as the object is not only to avoid waste of valuable land, but to provide maximum employment opportunities for industrial workers, it is important that industries be encouraged which not only have a high labour-content now, but which are likely to retain a relatively high labour-content despite technological improvement.

That section of light industry, for example, which caters for consumer durables of a more personal nature where changing fashion trends dictate a constantly changing design, style, or material, such as clothing, footwear, personal accoutrements or ornamental household furniture would seem to come into this category.

Many small industries too are not squeezed out or absorbed by the big manufacturing giants despite all the take-overs, most of these are light industrial undertakings that are not of an obnoxious character, and less likely to be radically affected by automatic processes, if only because one of the factors tending to keep them in business is their flexibility to produce commodities that are not destined for mass production, because they are required in small quantities only or for short periods.

Amongst the class of industry so far mentioned also there tends to be plenty of jobs for women and youth which is also an advantage because it would all help to make the inner areas suitable for families, as well as students, pensioners and lone persons, because married women especially need to reside not too far from their job.

So called "service" industries of a personal character are dealt with in the next section, but it should be noted that there are thousands of occupations which it is hard to classify as either "industrial" on the one hand, or "white collar" on the other; such as hospital employees, catering employees, employees of race courses, cleaners, laundry workers, motor mechanics, which should expand as the associated services on which they are based, expand.

d) Flatted Factories. The problem of applying the principle of high density accommodation for small factories could be economically, sensibly and satisfactorily overcome by a combination of two modern concepts; "the industrial park" and "flatted factories".

The concept of the "industrial park" or "industrial estate", examples of which are beginning in Australia, include the rental instead of the ownership of factory space by small or medium-sized manufacturers. The rent includes the rights of the factory owner to use common facilities such as a computer service, and of his employees to use a commonly-used health centre, canteen, shops, bank, gymnasium, shower rooms and recreation facilities and so on.

The concept of "flatted factories" is to reject the age old practice of each small factory being built independently in a row on the street frontage, its size limited by the restricted funds of the owner. Instead, an architect-designed big building, or complex of buildings, of high density would enable each manufacturer renting a "flat" or "flats" of factory space to suit his requirements.

By the device of combining the "industrial park" with the "flatted factory" smaller employers could be given the flexibility they require, their employees could enjoy, as they should, first class conditions for health, welfare and amenity as good as that which should be mandatory for all bigger factories.

A variation of the above tenancy-based arrangements could be an own-your-own factory scheme based on an expansion of the strata title idea, with the common welfare and recreation facilities controlled, as they are with residential flats, by a "service company" or "body corporate" on which each small factory owner was represented as well as union shop committees, or stewards, and this could be combined with a co-operative development effort similar to shops or residential accommodation described below.

e) Standardised minimum factory amenities. From what has been said about standards against which to measure a "slum factory" or standards that would be required for any big factories or an "industrial park of smaller flatted factories" it is clear that the trade union movement needs to enlist the assistance of the appropriate professions to formulate more modern and all-sided minimum requirements in this respect, and unions and professionals jointly campaign to have them enforced.

6. Extensive network of local and central community services

That section of the so-called "service" industries that provide health, culture, entertainment and recreation are already established in the city and inner areas. They should be expanded.

Part I of Plan for Melbourne calling for a higher "quality of life" observed ... "building and equipment, however necessary, are barren without participants; and participation has to be encouraged, organised and inspired by those who know how."

"Private enterprise can make profit out of sport and health when it provided proper coaches, trainers, or instructors, as a number of city and suburban centres demonstrate. What can be done privately, for profit, should be done publicly, for a full range of activities and on a vast scale."

These remarks apply with force to the inner areas because these areas concentrate a relatively high proportion of facilities mentioned. This is to be expected and welcomed because ready access to Melbourne's "heart" from the rest of the metropolis has made the whole inner areas a logical focus for the highest form of such activities.

The direction in which the expansion of services is required for Melbourne as a whole has been dealt with in the first part of this publication and applies also to the inner areas.

If there are to be uniform higher average densities throughout the inner areas, however, as we propose, it is easier to organise a bigger range of services on a pedestrian scale. This combined with a process of comprehensive renewal assisted by increasing awareness as exemplified by the Fitzroy Report on Community Facilities of the Victorian Council of Social Services and some of the inner suburban citizens associations offer a magnificent opportunity to create in the inner suburbs a pioneer model.

More intensive use of some of our generous open spaces would also be worthwhile. The Myer Music Bowl, in one aspect, is an encroachment of a building onto a public park, but the overall advantages are tremendous leading to a far more extensive enjoyment of Kings Domain by thousands who would otherwise scarcely be aware of its existence and charm. The proposals for an Australian native garden in Royal Park near Gatehouse St. could with imaginative facilities for picnickers and children, provide a different kind of enjoyment.

Sporting and cultural organisations should be consulted now to pre-plan new major extensions thought likely to be required, and the plans should be displayed publicly ... Should the Richmond ground be expanded later to a second Melbourne Cricket Ground? Will the Showgrounds be big enough? Will there be sufficient accommodation for basketball, athletics, soccer, open air concerts? Are more or more satisfactory concert halls needed? Should marinas take up beach space close to Melbourne? Do central library services need expansion?

A system of subsidised restaurants and kiosks, some licensed some not, should be started now so that all public places are well serviced by eating houses supplying meals which a worker out with his wife and children can afford. A conscious attempt should also be made to cater for the preferences of migrants at such eating places.

This should displace policies of leasing restaurants to entrepreneurs who charge high prices and try to attract an exclusive clientele. Such a trend is already apparent in new restaurants in the new Cultural Centre and Fitzroy Gardens and could have happened in the Botanic Gardens.

It should be observed that in addition to all-Melbourne type sporting and cultural arenas and halls, which are booked out for the finest performers, land also needs to be set aside for children, youth, and adults who live in the inner areas, for their participation. Much ingenuity for organising multiple-use land will be needed for this purpose, because space set aside for such purposes cannot be as generous as in the outer suburbs.

For example, school grounds cannot be expected to be so big, but should be bigger than they are, properly graded upkept carefully by paid curators and gardeners and used by youth and adults after school hours and in the weekends. Very high standards of gardening care for the numerous sports grounds in Royal Park, Albert Park, Fawcner Park and Studley Park are required to enable maximum multi-use without deterioration.

Too often community facilities are closed during weekends, holidays and at night, at the very time when people have more leisure and are more likely to be encouraged to start using them. This arises partly from an acute shortage of trained instructors, coaches, welfare officers, youth leaders, music teachers, dance instructors, club leaders and other such.

Obviously for the army of such workers required in hospitals, theatres, cafes, studios, clubs, sports centres and the like, much of their work is or should be shift work, odd time work, holiday time work and weekend work. Not only should special consideration be given to such personnel by finding suitable accommodation for them and their families in the inner areas, but they also need to be sufficient of them for rostering where required; and many, now amongst the poorly paid, should be very well paid, not only in compensation for the awkward hours worked but to raise the whole status and dignity of their work. Perhaps subsidised special-housing such as Churches supply to clergy and country state schools used to supply to teachers, but grouped together in higher density could be one way of doing this.

7. Mixed population, mixed nationalities, mixed age groups, mixed occupations and mixed income levels

It is socially undesirable to allow "ghettoes" to develop. In the original meaning a "ghetto" was a quarter of the city to which Jews were compulsorily confined. Then the notion was extended to quarters almost exclusively of any national minority ... Jews, Negroes, or others and the undesirability of this was widely understood.

Sociologists have now extended the concept beyond national minorities to embrace "income ghettos" or isolation into residential communities of any particular grouping.

There are incipient ghetto tendencies in the inner areas of Melbourne. Traditionally, Jewish people for example in North Carlton and St. Kilda, but more recently strong Greek and Italian settlements in most of the inner areas. To this add other tendencies. As already mentioned the original Australian residents tend to be elderly, their married children having long ago set up home in outer suburbs. In some inner suburbs there is a strong "hostel" or "rooming" demand, for young people, students, teachers and nurses. There are in parts many lone bachelors wanting cheap rooms or boarding house accommodation, some seasonal workers, some with no families to live with, some sick.

Into this situation of "natural" growth has recently intruded Housing Commission operations. These have resulted in some suburbs, in big estates of low income groupings. Although the original hindrances on migrant applications have been removed, the main migrant groups obtaining accommodation seem to be British, and other northern European migrants. Sometimes within the big Housing Commission estates there is a high proportion of deserted wives and widows, and therefore many children from "one parent" homes.

Where the Commission has sold to private developers, they have done so in large parcels of land, thus creating estates of own-your-own flats where salaried professional, clerical and administrative white collar workers predominate.

If there is any overall plan by the Commission at all, apart from the original intention of demolishing the very worst slum pockets, it appears now to be to develop some suburbs Fitzroy, Collingwood, Richmond and Port Melbourne, for example, exclusively for Commission estates for industrial workers and parts of other suburbs such as North Melbourne, Carlton, South Melbourne and Windsor whether there are bad slums to be reclaimed or not, into what the master builders conceive as a "better class" environment, for own-your-own flat owners.

This approach which might be called an "estate agent's approach" to the problem of urban renewal must be ended in favour of a sociological approach.

Old people do not want to be segregated in big estates exclusively for the old. "Age is catching" is a saying they have. They need continuing associations with all age groups including the young. Young people in their first flush of independence from their parents and the adult world may feel for a time they need only the exclusive company of their own age group. This finds its extreme expression in hippy colonies. But this feeling, typically, is one that lasts only a year or two and is aggravated by the failure of society to provide associations with the adult world into which the young need and want normally to find acceptance as soon as they can.

As the children of industrial workers attain higher levels of education, and as the white collar workers and employed professional workers become increasingly unionised the two groups, blue collar and white collar begin to shed their mutual suspicion and misunderstanding of each other. Social segregation into separate suburbs or very big areas tends to hinder this process. Better that their children go to the same schools, their parents drink together at the same hotel and use the same shops and social centres. And what goes as between two major social groups, goes as well between the less skilled and more skilled and different income levels within each group.

Similarly, and more obviously, the process of integration of migrant communities into the Australian community is hindered not assisted by their segregation into tight knit exclusive communities over big areas.

The real problem in the case of integration of migrants (and aborigines too for that matter) however, serves to emphasise similar though less easily understood problems in the other cases of young and old, white collar and industrial workers, that have been mentioned.

Migrant minorities have to feel free to associate closely, to live beside each other, even to have their own newspaper, shops and theatres. Any misguided ideas of forcing them to assimilate are doomed, not only to failure, but to produce the opposite effect to that intended, favouring the rebirth of a fierce national pride that was not present when they felt their national identity was not threatened.

So too, old people though they often enjoy or even crave a certain amount of acceptance by youth and children, cannot be bothered with them at all times. They need their periods of peace and quiet, and other occasions to associate with their peers. It would not help to develop good relationships between the old and the young, or vice versa, to have an elderly person's home unit sandwiched between a flat where wild teenage parties are wont to be held on the one side and a child minding centre on the other. To try to force associations by a too-close proximity would certainly produce the opposite to the desired effect.

In like manner, a truck driver, wharf labourer, or slaughterman would not feel as comfortable living in a block of flats surrounded by lecturers, accountants and clerks or vice versa; lone persons and big families may neither relish living next door to each other.

Thus the problem is not a simple one, it is complex. Whilst it is right in principle that there should be a mixing of all ages, occupations and nationalities, it is also wrong in principle to try to achieve this compulsorily by an enforced too-close proximity.

The solution would seem to be not at the extreme of whole suburbs or even big estates exclusively a ghetto for one type or another nor at the other extreme of everyone conforming to and sharing identical environmental and social conditions ... anyone next door to anyone irrespective of race, age, marital or income status.

Instead the solution appears to be somewhere between the two extremes although it should be remembered that designs for residential and community living are only one factor, politics, education, the mass media, employment patterns and all sorts of social factors also play a part.

We are indebted to Chermayeff and Alexander's book "Community and Privacy" for a germ of a general principle which seems important.

Dealing with the problem of design within the family home, they come to one set of conclusions amongst others. They say that children need at times privacy, both indoor and outdoor; that the adults need at times privacy, both indoor and outdoor; and at other times the whole family or some members of it need community, both indoor and outdoor. And so the house is designed, with a certain "buffer zone" such as utility rooms, kitchen, T.V. rooms, laundries, bathrooms etc. separating the different "quarters" within the house, the courtyards which provide the various different outdoor privacy, as well as community outdoor courtyard being each separated from the others.

The principles behind this concept could be transferred to the problem of design for inner-suburban renewal policies, to the extent that there is residential building other than "spot" development.

Thus the groupings could be big enough to give each nationality, income group, age group, or marital group the feeling of privacy and identity within their own group. At the same time it could be small enough to enable a natural sharing of certain community features, such as child minding centres, primary schools, local convenience shopping centre, playgrounds, local halls and the like.

Admittedly, the combinations and permutations would be much more complex than those within a typical urban family. For example a Southern European migrant man, wife and children often live and choose to live with parents, grandparents, uncles and aunts, in the same house. Youth in hostels or bachelors in boarding houses would have less cause for local shopping than others, and no cause to use school premises, unless the schools were open for after school adult activities.

Working on such principles however, quite careful attention could be paid to designing the precise type of interior accommodation tailored to the personal needs of different classes of people, ranging from small "studio flats" for single persons, to units for extended large groups of an extended family, or full boarding house facilities.

It may be possible too to make use of the "buffer" idea, with some of the landscaping of roads or of community facilities serving to avoid too-close proximity of one major group with another. With imagination also it is possible to incorporate within high density, medium rise buildings a range of different types of accommodation, some on the ground floor for example having small private yards, inside which families could do as they pleased, others with generous private balconies, other with small penthouse or studio type apartments more suitable for single people.

Much experiment is needed, with combinations of groupings, building types, and community services. Above all physical design of combining different groups and services must be a conscious principled approach, based on the above concepts, or better ones, if they can be formulated in the process of experiment. They must, in a word, be based on sociological factors, and supplemented as we have tried to suggest consistently in our approach throughout Part II of Plan for Melbourne with principled and massive efforts to vitalise community services and activities of all descriptions.

8. Landscaping an integral part of renewal

The subject is not as trivial as it may sound. If there is one thing that distinguishes an industrial working class suburb from one of the more recent suburbs of the well-to-do it is the lack of trees, rather than the size of the house or sites.

Melbourne, one of the most "suburban" cities in the world, despite its pride in its suburban gardens has little to pride itself this century by way of landscaping.

A distinction needs to be drawn between suburban gardening and landscape gardening. In theory perhaps, the 25 ft. set back of the house from the road frontage, creating 100 foot unbuilt on space between a house and the house over the road, should automatically provide a landscaping effect down the street. In practice, however, it does this only accidentally, partly because, unlike parts of Perth, the side paling fences are carried down right to the footpath with a front fence as well, and partly because many householders prefer shrubs and flowers to trees.

Individual suburban front yards may each contain pleasant intimate garden and yet the total street effect be a dreary one, although, even at worst, with low rise buildings an open "plenty of room" feeling at least has resulted. If Melbourne citizens are to be enticed in greater numbers to live at higher densities it will not be helped by the sort of bare private flats set out in a site covered with concrete inducing a "shut in" overbuilt feeling unaesthetic and somehow less human.

Somehow, also, the bigger Housing Commission estates, leaving as much as 80% of the site as open space, seem inhuman and they create great uninviting stretches of open grass that almost seem to be a waste of space because they are unuseable for playing or recreation space and they are almost as unsightly as car parks.

This provides a challenge. Fortunately, recent years have produced a rise in Australia of landscape architecture as a serious study and a professional practice, and if sufficient of such architects are trained and given the scope and authority to integrate their skills with builders on the one hand and Council street planting programs on the other, very pleasant environments, in our judgment, could be created, even for quite high densities.

As this is an entirely new way of tackling what is for Melbourne a new problem we offer a few ideas for possible application in the inner areas.

(a) Comprehensive Treatment

All open space whatsoever within a renewal area should be comprehensively subjected to landscape architecture, not as an after thought exercise, but in the formative design stages when architects and planners are developing their over-all plans.

(b) The Bare Car Park

Elsewhere we advocate that all big estates or developments should be compelled to create an underground car basement over the entire site.

This does not mean that trees cannot be planted on soil replaced over the top of such basements.

Wherever there are to be surface car parks, there is no reason at all why everyone of them, including on-street car parking facilities should not have trees carefully placed between car spaces.

The same applies to possible utility car parks and children's play space created from the deep back-yards and back lanes within a block to be preserved.

(c) A combination of factors could give the landscape architect the possibility of creating, in time, magnificent street landscaping. First even in the areas of highest density there needs to be a modest set back from the building line, if only a few feet. Next space can often be borrowed from footpaths that are wider than they really need to be. Finally the treatment of the "nature strip" and the median strip, if any, should be at the disposal of the landscape architect for the full length of the street, irrespective of the owners or authorities concerned.

This could give, in time, pleasing avenues and shrubberies, If in addition the building architects, when they wanted to erect a high rise building, did not face the street with a precipice-wall, but kept low 3 or 4 storey bases to the street, it would tend to give human proportions and overcome the unnecessary "canyon feeling."

(d) Factories and shops

The above remarks on set back and comprehensive landscaping should apply to industrial areas and shopping centres, as well as residential areas. The "flatted factory" for smaller employers already mentioned would facilities such landscaping which could be carried into whatever other common open spaces that were designed.

(e) Roof Gardens

On the roofs of suitable factories, the podium of larger buildings,

the roofs of car parks or of certain medium and higher density residential housing, it is possible to have roof gardens, and even treeplanting of smaller trees can be successful and economic as proved by certain American techniques.

Problems such as those confronting a landscape architect who has to consider technical problems of architecture of the buildings, the situation of underground pipes and overhead wires, the requirements of traffic access and day-lighting, and withall produce an aesthetic result are considerable.

It should readily be understood that this is really a new profession, and although most Melbourne citizens probably regard themselves as competent gardeners and many Council engineers regard themselves as competent designers of parks, the skills for the quality of landscaping required are really of a higher and different order entirely.

Even those parts of inner areas which are not to be renewed, or where renewal is hardly likely to take place for years, the landscape architect should be consulted. Albert Park is an obvious case in point. But renewal of street planting, landscaping of Moonee Ponds Creek and Maribyrnong River, landscaping in connection with Tullamarine and South Eastern Freeways are all problems well worth examination. Consideration could usefully be given to a subsidised consulting service by landscape architects for the benefit of factories, churches, and home owners, (whether flats or houses) on aesthetic problems from the view-point of a passer-by in connection with planting on their properties.

NEW PLANNING TECHNIQUES NEEDED

It is one thing to formulate what seems to be some of Melbourne's planning goals for the inner areas; it is another thing to devise machinery designed to achieve these goals.

In appendix No. 10 "Urban Renewal Bills", there are some analytical and critical comments on two urban renewal bills before the Victorian Parliament at the time of writing, but whose passage was blocked temporarily, at least, by the Upper House. Irrespective of the fate of these bills, or other legislation we advance for consideration a set of planning techniques which we suggest should be adopted irrespective of what administrative machinery is adopted, or, if the administrative machinery if so cast to make the carrying out of these principles impossible, then it should be urgently recast.

1. Comprehensive Inner Area Structure Plan

No redevelopment authority or renewal agency should proceed without a principled plan, and that plan, by the very nature of some of the problems outlined needs to be a comprehensive plan, not just for a few score acres here and there but for the whole of the inner areas.

The principles already mentioned according to which surveys in connection with such a plan should have regard are: (i) reclaiming bulk-storage land uses (ii) obnoxious industries, (iii) saving land, otherwise

to be carpark by redesigning freeways and converting them into a by-pass system (iv) reclaiming slum factories and determining the highest acceptable minimum industrial densities, including flatted factories, (v) determining the highest acceptable minimum residential densities on non-residential land to be resumed, (vi) determining the location of a network of local and central community facilities giving a full range of services (vii) designing new residential patterns in relation to community services and in relation to each other to avoid "ghetto" suburbs or estates (viii) comprehensive architectural landscaping.

Other functions of such a plan are dealt with now

2. Three Area Types

The inner area structure plan should designate three area-types, and the whole of the inner areas would be classified one or another of these three types:-

- (a) A preservation area
- (b) A redevelopment area
- (c) A co-operative area

(a) Preservation area has already been dealt with, together with suggested aesthetic controls, advisory machinery and finance to help restore and maintain the standard of restoration.

(b) Redevelopment area would cover all those areas, initially reclaimed from non-residential land uses, mentioned above.

It would also include all areas of present housing judged to be so sub-standard that any attempt to rehabilitate them to reasonably modern standards would either be impossible or extravagantly costly.

The techniques of rehousing all people in areas so affected and the techniques of compensation for all property owners so affected have been proposed above in the section "Preservation of the Community Fabric".

To this should be added that except where quite early acquisition is determined, the system of valuation and compensation should be switched to that in operation for Board of Works highway reservations. This would provide that the difference between the value of the property so affected by the new area-type order and its unaffected value can be claimed, either on re-sale by the owner or ultimately by the owner on acquisition.

If the owner could show that the total unaffected value so offered was less than sufficient to purchase a comparable house in a comparable suburb, he would be entitled to extra compensation. This would tend to avoid the "blight" caused by a slump in value as for example in areas over which the Housing Commission orders have been in operation for a long period.

However, the main object should be to actually acquire these houses as soon as possible. In the section above called "Higher Residential Densities" it will be remembered that it is proposed that not a single house be demolished until the Housing Commission waiting lists have been satisfied, and to enable this to be done a vastly accelerated program of building is called for, based on an immediate massive resumption of non-residential land from all sources listed.

(c) Co-operative area

All parts of the inner areas not classified either for preservation or redevelopment, should be classified as a "co-operative area", subdivided into residential and industrial sub-zones.

These would be areas where, although there may be plentiful cases of individual sub-standard factories or houses, they would be in the minority, the buildings for the most part being sound, and if not in good condition, reasonably able to be renovated.

"Spot Development" by owners or developers, big and small, would be permitted in such areas and either renovations or rebuildings. There would be no attempt as in the preservation area to apply design or aesthetic control to the exterior of the buildings.

However there would be one control; a high minimum-density requirement, not as we have already mentioned, just a maximum density limit as proposed by the Board of Works "Residential Planning Standards".

The effect of this would be that all buildings that already had higher densities than the minimum set, could be altered or renovated without difficulty, provided they did not lower the density. It would not be permitted however to make any structural additions or replacements of buildings with densities lower than the minimum, unless such additions or replacements could raise them to the minimum.

There could develop a strong demand by factory owners, home owners or developers for land in such areas, because they would know from the classification that they could have a guarantee against being disturbed.

A difficulty, however, could be a tendency, just because of this, to squeeze out the small home owner or small factory owner and yet they would be as entitled to stay in the inner areas, if they so desired, as anyone who happened to live in a preservation area or a redevelopment area

If their site was too small to erect a suitable building to the minimum density requirements, they could sell but even if the buyer had capital he too would be confronted with the same difficulties of the constriction of the land title. This obstacle of antiquated land-title shapes and sizes therefore could clamp a position of deadlock over big areas thus defeating the object of quickly raising densities. Either that, or it could artificially drive up land prices because a neighbour learning of development plans after the adjacent property had been bought, could

force up the price to extortionate levels knowing he had a monopoly position.

The answer to these problems lies in organised efforts by such neighbours, whether home owners or factory owners, to form co-operatives and raise a loan on the security of their land to build new flatted factories, a shopping centre, or some form of high density housing, as the case may be, to an agreed design. They would thus supply themselves with modern accommodation considerably raising the value of their share in the new building, and using the extra accommodation either for themselves, or let to tenants so that the rent could help meet the loan repayment charges.

Special "co-operative funds" available at low interest rates should be made available by the Government for this purpose. A branch of the renewal agency could provide specialised valuation and architectural service which for a reasonable charge would produce for such "spot development", flexible schemes and sketches of possible designs.

Such a co-operative scheme would serve a dual purpose, enabling each small and medium sized owner to remain in the inner areas helping themselves to improve their properties, and overcome the archaic title-size restrictions without the over-use of the weapon of public acquisition which, if used to re-organise areas predominantly of sound buildings could be widely resented as an arbitrary use of public power.

That is why the proposed area has been called a "co-operative area", to lay the emphasis on that particular feature of renewal technique which, in such areas would be to the advantage of all concerned to facilitate.

Any co-operative scheme for flatted flats, a shopping centre, or residential accommodation should be able to incorporate within it, if feasible and mutually desired, the retention of any existing building or buildings or parts of them. There would be no need in many cases to raze everything to the ground before starting. That is why specialist advisory teams should be made readily available.

Techniques would need to be developed also to base such co-operative efforts over as big an area as possible, because this could well give sufficient flexibility to enable minimum of disturbance, portion of the higher density building being available before other portions were demolished or remodelled.

The present Strata Titles Act would provide the basic machinery for the reconstituted buildings, each owner finishing up with an own-your-own area. The Act also provides the machinery for a "Body Corporate" service company on which each owner acts as a director and which controls the common property, or common services, such as gardening, window cleaning etc.

In any co-operative scheme there would advisably be some common property at the least the few feet set-back frontage, which it has been suggested could be subjected along with the nature strip into street landscaping

which would lift the whole quality of the environment, in addition to the new or reconstructed and renovated buildings. Also there could well be, as with most own-your-own flats, rules against individual decoration of the exterior of the new building or building complexes; the exteriors would become a matter of unified treatment by the body corporate.

In other cases, however, the body corporate would control more extensive common property. For example, in a reconstructed shopping centre, any pedestrian arcade, malls, or precincts, or any special delivery bays, or car parks for customers. In flatted factories, as has been proposed, the common property could include computer facilities, canteens, first aid rooms, showers, recreational facilities, roof gardens and so on.

The Strata Title Act would need to be amended to become more flexible permitting the strata plan of sub-division to include old buildings as well as new, factories and shops as well as flats, and detached buildings as well as attached.

Density controls would need to be made sufficiently flexible so that in any co-operative scheme the average density only would be the figure to be counted, not the density of each individual building, or building complex. This would enable very flexible building designs to emerge and the bigger the area the greater the flexibility made possible.

Also for example, if there happened to be a low density building of historic merit in a co-operative area, it would then be possible to organise the surrounding area, if it were big enough, to allow for its retention, the other new or reconstructed buildings providing higher densities to raise the average density to required minimum density levels.

3. Mixed Land Uses

Historically many parts of the inner areas were a close mixture of factories shops and houses. In some case this lead to a bad amenity, for example, a few houses sandwiched in between noisy factories or taller buildings, shutting out the light.

In revulsion against these inhuman incompatibilities an early generation of planners drew up a set of land-use zones which we now have and which were far too simplistic and tended to "throw out the baby with the bath water." They painted colours on the map of Melbourne which provided for residential, commercial and industrial zones, geographically separated from each other into big areas, which incidentally made our commuting longer and our housewives and children more isolated from every day aspects of life.

The attempt to carry this idea to extremes in the inner areas is quite unnecessary.

Already professional opinion has begun to swing back to the realisation that a close combination of shops, or offices and high density residential accommodation can be a distinct advantage, if only because it

permits dual use at different times of the day of common facilities, for example car parking space. If obnoxious industries are removed, as we propose, then there is no reason why selected inoffensive workshops amongst those left which are relatively noiseless and nuisance-free should not be located near residential buildings, e.g. clothing, advertising and printing shops to mention a few.

In many cases of "non-conforming user", therefore, it should not always prove necessary to reject a permit for the establishment in a co-operative scheme of an office, shop, or inoffensive very small workshop into a complex also containing residential accommodation.

Air conditioning, changing production techniques, sound-proofing devices and air pollution filtering and the exact location of different land uses in relation to each other can enable, in favourable cases, sophisticated, close combinations of mixed land uses which would in fact be quite compatible.

Indeed a case can be made out for many sociological advantages of having a livelier, busier atmosphere with different people coming and going throughout the day and evening where there are "mixed primary uses" of land as Jane Jacobs describes them. This is better than "dead" residential areas during the day and "dead" office areas or factory areas after working hours.

The specialised consultative valuation and architectural services mentioned could have on its staff the engineers and experts with the appropriate skills to advise wherever a discretion to issue a permit becomes necessary to provide a flexibility which cannot be enshrined in regulations, which however should be liberalised as much as possible to permit the more obvious combinations such as shops or offices with residences.

Other Techniques

Basement car parks & environmental areas

Under the heading "Parking policy for inner areas" in the section above on Transport, certain proposals for off-street and on-street parking in the inner areas were advanced which dealt with the parking aspects only.

Here we deal with the associated aspects of the same proposals

i) Basements In all new estates in the redevelopment area, a basement under the entire area of the site would be compulsory. The main purpose and the main space-consuming use for such a basement would be for car parking.

The intensity of land-use above-ground would be heightened because surface off-street parking would be eliminated.

But the existence of such basements opens up other advantages, because

it could be made relatively noise-proof. Work-shop and car repair shops, would supply a long-felt need for men who miss the suburban backyard shed or garage.

On the bigger estates also, comfortable air conditioned, basement rooms could be set aside for the older youth of the estate, where they could organise social activities of their own choice, but including noise-producing activities, such as singing and record playing and dancing, where they would not be disturbing others.

"Spot Development" in the Co-operative area would be required to provide off-street parking. Perhaps advantages of height or site coverage could be extended where basements were supplied for the bigger co-operative schemes. Alternatively part of the re-subdivided land might have to be set aside for multi storey car parks serving others nearby for a charge.

ii) Environmental areas The making of some streets one-way streets, and blocking other streets off at one end for augmenting on-street parking capacity should be combined with the systematic creation throughout the inner areas of "environmental areas."

This is the term used by Professor Buchanan in his book "Traffic in Towns" to denote residential areas primarily for pedestrian use which should be created. Cars would have to have access to such areas, but, in the best possible style cars should have a different access to buildings from the pedestrian ways, according to "Radburn" type principles.

These principles should be observed fully in any development in redevelopment areas.

In built-up areas there are seldom the opportunities to provide complete Radburn-style separation of car-ways and pedestrian ways. By preventing selected streets from being used for through-traffic however, it may sometimes be possible to create streets that are relatively safe, and hence raise the quality of the environment of the selected area for children and the pedestrian adults from the view point of safety and noise.

Another opportunity to create a partial "environmental area" occurs where there is a whole block of houses in a preservation area. Often such blocks have a small right-of-way or lane through the centre. The backyards facing this right-of-way are often very deep, and little used. Agreement between all owners could result in them setting a portion of their yards aside for conversion into one large common internal yard. Part of this could be turned over to a car park, and another portion for a safe children's playground. If this were combined with high class landscaping, a very pleasant park-like aspect could be created, adding convenience and value to all concerned.

Similar ideas might suitably be carried out in some co-operative areas, though here it would not be desirable to set aside too big an area for such purposes as it could; by restricting the depth of land, add unnecessary limiting restrictions to the size and shape of consolidated land titles and

therefore limit the potential for imaginative architectural design and also reduce the resulting densities obtained.

Exchanging land uses and decanting

With the object of retaining the community fabric extremely flexible techniques are required at the point of time that actual physical demolition and rebuilding are simultaneously proceeding.

The exchange of land uses is one which is inevitable in any case, if land use is to be better organised. For example as already mentioned the technique for using badly-sited parkland for buildings, the new buildings being used as houses, shops or factories to accommodate people from a nearby area, clearing the area from which they came and then turning it into parkland.

There is no point in converting all gasometers immediately to parkland when they become obsolete. The particular park may not be well sited for a park to start with. But also an opportunity could be lost for this vacant land to be built on so that people nearby could be shifted to this site and then the site they had previously occupied could, if suitably sited, be used for a park, or used for some other redevelopment purposes and extra park planned for as the scheme develops.

Decanting, in the sense of shifting residents, shopkeepers or even small workshops to temporary accommodation while new accommodation is built is another technique. Within the total site of a co-operation scheme, for example, it may be necessary for some owners or tenants to be decanted temporarily to another part of the site already rebuilt, or even given Housing Commission accommodation pending renovations or rebuilding of what will eventually become their new accommodation.

A renewal agency and public participation

By proposing three area-types (a) preservation (b) redevelopment and (c) co-operation it is not intended to convey that the planning of these would be separated. Each certainly would have separate features and methods of control, but there must be overall plans. The concept of a "renewal area" contained in the Urban Renewal Bills, for example, (see appendix No. 10) is not incorrect, and might well include parts or even a few segments of each of the three areas.

This becomes obvious as soon as over-all requirements such as transport needs, and the location of shopping centres and other community facilities are considered. Indeed, in a certain sense the whole of the inner areas should be regarded as one "renewal area".

Those who say no public authority controls are necessary other than improved uniform building regulations, and no special organisation is needed, are, in our view closing their eyes to the very considerable changes going on in these areas already, and the greater changes to come.

The days of the feasibility of laissez-faire policy are finished. To allow the present situation to develop without policies and without a guiding highly skilled administrative hand, does not mean that nothing will change, or that all changes will be for the best. On the contrary, if unplanned, many changes will be for the worse. In any case existing authorities, such as the various Municipal Councils, the Housing Commission, and the various State Government Departments, will intervene under their existing powers as they are now. None of these authorities, however, will have that particular degree of skilled planning and sociological expertise to tackle the complexities and problems of co-ordination involved. Big capital is also involved as it is now, but in the absence of coherent policies and a body to see that they are carried out, the short term interests, say, of the bigger master builders, or the big retailers in the golden mile, or the car and oil industries are likely to be those that decide trends irrespective of merit.

We propose that a renewal authority should be constituted for the whole of the inner areas and that its top administration should comprise a team headed by a highly qualified planner and a sociologist, these being the key skills for the particular task, but including also a competent economist and landscape architect.

They need a big staff of planners, architects, social workers and valuers not only to guide the more significant changes but to carry on a continuing survey of the effects of the operations, to assist in further experiments and correct any obvious imbalance of priorities, or one-sided decisions.

The tasks of such a team, so staffed, would be the major one of evolving structure or frame-work plans incorporating the principles we have proposed, and to oversee the carrying into effect of any major developments or redevelopments. The authority would involve the public in planning in the formative stages, publicly releasing survey information and publicly advancing planning alternatives where these are feasible before final recommendations are formulated. All possible steps should be taken to involve, in the decision making, not only all authorities and organisations, but the people living and working in the areas (see appendix No. 11 "Public Participation in Planning").

The renewal authority should be a division of the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works, although established with its own special financial grants and not a burden on metropolitan rates. For the Melbourne scene the Board is the one organisation with a responsibility for the Town Planning of the whole Melbourne region, and such region-wide planning is inextricably connected with any inner-urban planning. Moreover all local Councils are represented on it.

Any renewal authority would need to work very closely with local Councils which should also be compelled to engage planners and sociologists who should be accorded as much authority in their own field as the Health Officer is for health and the building inspector for safety. Councils would assist in carrying out much of the details of planning, including development of the community facilities, but with three tremendous

advantages .. they would have an assured framework overall plan within which to work; from above they would have consultative advice of the highest order to guide them; and from below they would have an increasingly aware public, awakened and held interested by the whole process of deliberate involvement in decision making.

The Housing Commission's Future

We deal, lastly, with a set of controversial issues mainly centring around Housing Commission policy. Seldom has a public institution become as controversial as has the Victorian Housing Commission over recent years. This is due to two main causes:

(a) To some extent it has been providing the positive role of supplying public housing for those on low incomes, but it has been doing this, in the inner areas especially in an unacceptably rigid form, unsuitable for families and with an unacceptably heartless technique of depriving low income groups of houses they do not want to part with.

(b) To some extent it has been the instrument of helping salaried workers to buy own-your-own flats in the inner areas, but has given the appearance in the process of favouring one particular master builder. This one builder has developed two-thirds of the land which has been reclaimed with public money (see appendix No. 9 "Subsidies to Private Developers")

The Housing Commission as a constructing authority is a public asset. The Commission's Prefabricated Concrete factory at Holmesglen, the only war-time munitions factory in Victoria that has been converted to peace time use, is also a public asset. So also is the whole function of subsidising people desperately in need of housing, so is the function of ensuring the repair of houses unfit for human habitation.

Unfortunately the Commission like almost all other Victorian public services, such as the railways, health, and even education has been the victim of long-standing Government policies of diverting to private enterprise as much as possible of what was formerly the public sector of the economy. What is left of the public sector therefore becomes unprofitable, deprived of adequate funds, run-down, unpopular and too often fastened with the blame for a state of affairs forced on it by Government policy. To add insult to injury it is then widely held up by the Government supporters as an example that public enterprise is by its very nature inefficient.

This has to be said because it would be quite wrong to sacrifice the Housing Commission on account of unpopular policies for which the Government is responsible.

It is of first rate importance that the four functions mentioned (i) construction, (ii) building materials manufacture, (iii) housing subsidies for low income groups (iv) policing of minimum housing standards, are not only retained but greatly expanded.

There is a fifth function, that the Commission should no doubt retain, namely, estate management, meaning rent collection and maintenance.

However a sixth function, that of social planning for the residents

and workers in the inner areas, and the physical planning of the environment, which should flow from this social planning, is a function which should be stripped from the Commission entirely.

It is not a question of the personnel of the Commission, but simply that the Commission is not and never has been a planning authority, and it is going to be hard enough for the traditional physical-environment planners to integrate their plans with the sociological planner which is today's crying need. It would be disastrous to hand major planning responsibilities, which have region-wide impact, to an organisation that has never had responsibilities for planning, but whose major historical function has been slum abolition and housing for the needy.

The Commission, forced into existence towards the end of the depression years by a combination of missionary zeal and militant struggles, began with this laudable object, but imperceptibly "slum abolition" in the post-war years became "slum clearance" and this became in the 1960's "block demolition" and included pulling down of perfectly sound hotels, shops, factories and houses and even new flats, to clear a whole block for choice real estate sales.

Whether justified or not in particular cases, neither these operations, nor those of the Commission's own estates were properly planned even from the point of view of physical co-ordination of other elementary services such as roads, schools, kindergartens, community centres and shops, which is not to be wondered at, considering the Commission has never been orientated as a planning body.

Indeed it is precisely the Commission's lack of sociological and planning finesse that has at length aroused a groundswell of bitter public opposition to its policies which unfortunately tend, in desperation, to reject all the changes instead of only the bad features of changes which the Commission is making.

Some of the problems which the Commission has created and our proposals to overcome them:-

Flats

The Commission's high-rise flats are good buildings and the home-unit interiors are not bad. They are unsuitable, though, for families with young children. They are very suitable and quite popular with other groups, as the spate of luxury private high-rise flats around Melbourne testifies.

Such flats should be built for workers who prefer to live in this style as well as for the wealthy.

Commission walk-up flats, not bad inside, but built on stilts and sited in great, open undifferentiated open spaces are unpopular with mothers because they provide no facilities for her to control the children. But well-designed walk-up flats set in pleasant landscaping is quite popular for other groups as own-your-own flats testify.

High-rise and walk-up flats should be built for workers who prefer to live in this style as well as for the more well-to-do. Melbourne has yet to see a full range of built-in social facilities and services in any range flats, high-rise or walk up and it would be a tragedy for experiment to be abandoned in the face of a rising tide of resentment against the Commission's sociological and environmental planning mistakes.

Big Estates

The misguided policy of big Commission or master-builders "ghetto" type estates, another planning mistake, which we considered above, tend to give rise to a theory in reaction, that the development of any big tract of land is undesirable. As we have outlined above we consider "mixed" development quite possible and desirable, and indeed, unless this is planned, the unfettered free play of the market tends in any case in most parts to create communities that are not mixed.

Only in small pockets is there a "natural" trend towards a cosmopolitan mixed-income, mixed age-group population. Big estates should not be planned as a matter of principle, when many small estates amongst sounder-type older buildings are desirable. Neither should big estates be avoided as a matter of principle where large tracts of land are available and where the economies of prefabricated and modular building construction methods can be applied, tempered by the sociologist, the architect, the landscaper and the planner.

Subsidies

The Commission has made the word "subsidy" a dirty word in the context of urban redevelopment because its practice of selling acquired land by offering tenders of three acre allotments has resulted in the near-monopoly of one big firm with considerable capital outlay to develop such big projects. This is coupled with bitter complaints of inadequate compensation by those whose properties have been acquired to make such practices possible.

So it is not surprising that the accusation has been made that the Commission is subsidising the rich developer at the expense of the poor property owner. And it is no defence to say that the better-paid salaried purchaser of the new own-your-own flats are a possible secondary beneficiary in the deal, especially as they enjoy the attractive financial terms of Government Home Finance Trust Funds, making it easier for the developer to sell on a low deposit.

One has to make the difficult mental effort to dissociate one's mind from all the nasty habits of the Commission, which lack even elementary political sense, if the question of subsidy for urban redevelopment is to be considered dispassionately.

Assuming that the Commission had never made the mistake of forcibly acquiring property from people under conditions made so unattractive that they did not want to go, assuming that it has not befallen that mainly one big firm, but many smaller firms and many individual property owners co-

operatively as well had participated in the comprehensively planned redevelopment scheme, would Government subsidy be justified for the sake of redevelopment in such circumstances?

The answer clearly is "yes" if the people's need is considered. Especially if it is further assumed that the task be tackled along the lines we suggest. Australians live in a whole system of subsidies. The planned reshaping of the quality of life in the cities, rather than its unplanned deterioration is in everybody's interest and money for the improvement of cities along with education, public transport and culture should rank for public subsidy along with primary produce or protected secondary industry.

But subsidy should be a uniformly operating one. The same rate of assistance should apply whether the object is to renovate houses in the preservation area, to build new houses, shops, or factories in the redevelopment area, or to build, rebuild, or renovate houses, shops or factories in the co-operative area. It should be available at the same rate of assistance and with the same ease, whether the recipient is a master builder, a mixed co-operative group of small owners or individual owners or shopkeepers, on low income, and should be equally available for community effort to improve community facilities.

What is wrong with the scheme for own-your-own flats for salaried workers, is not that it has been supported by subsidy, but that this has been the only subsidy.

Concrete and quantity, quality and equality

Just as the Housing Commission has made "subsidy" a dirty word it has helped to make "concrete" a dirty material. A world-wide coloured anti-city emotionalism has grown up over largely unanalysed epithets such as "little concrete boxes", "concrete jungles", "concrete monstrosities" and the like.

On a more serious level we are invited to condemn the Holmesglen prefabricated building materials factory because, by its steady stream of concrete panels, it is said, it compels the Commission, even against its will, to continue erecting high-rise and walk-up flats in order to keep the factory going and to assist the finance of the Commission, because concrete villa houses have become unpopular.

The Commission has lent colour to both these objections, first, by creating low income "ghettoes", by unnecessarily erecting many buildings on great concrete stilts in open paddocks and by surrounding them with extensive concrete car parks; and, in general, both inside and out, failing to create a human scale. These weaknesses have nothing essentially to do with concrete, but with design, both aesthetic design and sociological design.

Secondly prefabricated concrete does not compel the erection of high-rise flats, or even flats at all. There are very many other types and

styles of residential accommodation for which concrete could be used, not necessarily exclusively.

The development of prefabricated building panels and units combined with modular techniques are very important so that costs of housing can be cheapened and more spent on high-class design to raise the general environment.

The Holmesglen factory should definitely be retained, even extended to facilitate an accelerated rate of public housing. Consideration should also be given to the possibility of extending part of the subsidy to co-operative efforts in the co-operative area in the form of modular-units, at cost, of concrete parts to assist in their rebuilding and renovation projects.

Turning from the problems of concrete and quantity and cost, the question of quality is equally important. We have already advanced the proposition that the Commission should provide a great diversity of housing forms. Already, actually it has, to a limited degree begun to experiment with row-housing, but there are many other forms of higher density other than the traditional walk-up and high-rise flats.

Moreover the different forms do not need to be segregated, each to its own estate. As previously mentioned "mixed" estates, in every sense of the word, are desirable, and the designers of high-quality environment would have far more scope were this the case.

We now go further and propose that the standard of quality of Commission residential accommodation should not be inferior internally or externally, nor in the quality of materials, nor even seem, because of their appearance, to be inferior to the own-your-owns of comparable size built by private enterprise.

Moreover, the Commission should enter the field of building such own-your-own flats in competition with master builders, which could come nearer to making a profit on the deal rather than the present big loss.

This would obliterate the stigma that is beginning to attach to residence in Commission estates even amongst industrial workers ... Under such conditions, higher paid industrial workers and salaried white-collar workers would pay either full economic rents or buy the flats and would then be living in the same estates as those lower income groups whose plight entitles them to housing assistance.

What has been proposed above about "mixed estates" indeed would offer very odious contrasts if marked differences, or even apparent differences in quality as between accommodation for different income groups were permitted. The issue of a more universal high quality therefore becomes one of equality as well.

Summary on the Commission's future and related issues

The Housing Commission should no longer say what is to be built or where. But it should have a tremendously expanded building program with enormously bigger finances.

Under direction from the Renewal Authority -

- (a) It would greatly accelerate the rate of building for low income families until there was no waiting list
- (b) It would build for all low-income groups amongst industrial and white-collar workers, charging an economic rent or selling own-your-own units at average market prices to those not eligible for housing assistance, making no distinction whatever between any income groups.
- (c) It would use the Holmesglen prefabricated concrete factory products much more widely, but far more sensitively and imaginatively, also selling at cost some of the factory's products designed to help subsidise co-operative projects in the co-operative area.
- (d) It would, under direction build a great variety of high density housing in "mixed estates" which would be of varying sizes and not on principle, big or small.
- (e) The policy of subsidy to master builders who bought Commission land, would be made a general one, applying at the same rate to individuals or co-operative groups.

COMPREHENSIVE GOALS: A GREAT HEART

Certain aspects peculiar to urban renewal problems have of necessity been isolated for the purpose of treatment. But, it needs to be added that all plans concerned need to fully and comprehensively apply all modern town planning and sociological principles not already mentioned. This requires comprehension of the parts in relation to the whole and in relation to each other on the part of the planning authority, and comprehension behind that again of the ultimate goals for the inner areas.

Elementary, for example, is the creation of "environmental areas" for pedestrians, where cars would have access, separated wherever possible from pedestrian access, but would not have through-way. Within such areas should be grouped all of the most common community services on a pedestrian scale, for example, a local "convenience" shopping centre, primary school, playground, pre-school centre and coin laundry, a hotel, tavern or restaurant and a small park.

Equally elementary is the integration of educational, recreational and cultural services, all really well staffed, and with the above mentioned "common" services. The object is to raise the popularity and degree of participation of activities now enjoyed by only a select few into activities

that are as "common" as shopping and washing. The ideas advanced in the first section of Plan for Melbourne Part 2 ... "Updated Community Services" would form part of such a comprehensive approach where there should be an indistinguishable co-planning of sociological and environmental needs.

The goal of local suburban "hearts", district "hearts" as well as one central Melbourne "heart" propounded in Part I of Plan for Melbourne applies in the inner localities. However, higher densities, and what should be ease of rapid transport within the inner areas, mean that many of the "local" facilities and services should be able to approximate "district" centre standards rather than local ones.

Physical "Renewal" of the inner areas is not an end in itself. Renewal of man himself by renewal of his social activities in a richer, more varied, more civilised form is the goal, of which renewal in the sense of preservation, or in the sense of remodelling or complete redevelopment and the design of facilities should be the physical expression.

If the people who live and work in the inner areas participate in this task of uplifting the quality of their own lives, they will help revitalise the "heart" of Melbourne as a whole.

Appendices

Appendix 1.

123.

Appendix No. 1.

TECHNICAL TEACHERS' ASSOCIATION LIST OF NON-TEACHING DUTIES

In February 1969 the Technical Teachers' Association of Victoria published a "Report on Additional Duties Performed in Technical Schools". These listed 27 different duties and fourteen of these are listed as being "undertaken only until such time as non-teaching personnel available". Non-teaching duties included ... bus supervision, teacher in charge of bicycles, canteen duty, yard duty, tool maintenance, first aid, lockers etc.

Appendix No. 1A

FIGURES ON PRE-SCHOOL CENTRES FROM TWO NEW REPORTS

This appendix is related to page 5. It is not numbered in the text because Section 1 was already at the printery when two new reports became available to the public, namely:-

1. "Caring for Children of One-Parent Families and Working Wives" by the Victorian Council of Social Services, 107 Russell St. Melbourne.
2. A Survey by the Federal Department of Labour and National Service on Child Care, facts from which were released to the press on February 21st 1970.

This appendix is based on figures from these two sources -

For the Whole of Victoria

<u>Data</u>	<u>Commercial Minding</u>	<u>Subsidised Day Centre</u>	<u>Kindergartens</u>
Number	251	15	736
Attendance	4,333	700	35,400 *
Fees per week	\$10 ... \$14	Sliding Scale	About \$1
Age	Babies to 5 years	Babies to 5 years	3, 4, years
Duration	All Day	All Day	Half Day

* This figure from Hansard not from reports.

At least 18 Councils have discussed the establishment of day nurseries with officers of the Victorian Department of Health during recent times; but so far plans have only been submitted for two new centres, Collingwood and Coburg.

For the Whole of Australia

555 registered minding centres cater for 14,000 children, 40 of these are subsidised by Government or Municipal Council and cater for 2000 children.

There are 200,000 mothers in the work force with 250,000 children under six years of age.

Appendix No. 2THREE OBJECTIONS TO ABANDONING A RADIAL FREEWAY SYSTEM

1. You cannot part a man from his car
2. You cannot separate recreational and commuting uses of the car
3. Public Transport makes too big a loss.

There is something to be said for the substance of each of these objections. They do in fact present certain obstacles which reinforce the mounting demand for freeways. We believe, however, for reasons we give below, that they are obstacles which can be overcome and should be overcome.

First Objection: You cannot part a man from his car

Psychologists tell us that modern men or women who have become heavily car-dependent, come to regard their own car as an extension of their personality, just as are their clothes or their home.

Without his own car a person can feel "not quite himself", as if he were not wearing his own clothes. In a word, it helps to give him "identity", his "status".

The attachment of a person to his car is therefore a factor not to be taken lightly. Especially is this so when, whatever the cost, his car appears to be the most personally convenient mode of travel, requiring neither timetables, physical exertion nor mixing with strangers and can travel the shortest route between any two given points.

No wonder the transport engineers who comprise the Metropolitan Transportation Study have quickly succumbed to the view that popular demand for cars must inevitably mean more cars per family, and given the present built-up areas, freeways would be the only way to cope with this demand! Being trained neither as sociologists nor economists nor even as townplanners it seemed conclusive to them that if only 10% of motorists asked, said that they would switch to public transport even if it were twice as fast and fares half the price, then that was proof of the inevitability of freeways into and out of the city.

Even more psychologically tendentious is the reported questionnaire being conducted by Mr. N. F. Clark of the Civil Engineering Department of the Melbourne University ("Herald" 4/7/1969). City workers in Melbourne, Sydney and Adelaide are being asked if they would travel by car to work if the congestion and parking problems were solved. Two thirds, naturally, reply they would!

It must be said of both these surveys and others like them that it is hopeless to expect a meaningful result unless a complete set of options are put and the full resulting social consequences of each option is objectively presented not only as to the superficial physical effects on the individual, but also as to the underlying social value judgments.

If we can state here a minor value-judgment in relation to these "psychological" and superficial "opinion polls" questionnaires:-

"A car should not be regarded as a status symbol"

Unfortunately it is, partly in the sense that a person without a car, especially a young person, feels deprived compared to a car owner, partly in the sense that a man with a "smarter" car is regarded as a "smarter man". The status-symbol idea owes much of its strength to the massive over-advertising of the car as a "way of life" in itself, ranging all the way from keeping the family together to attracting a soul-mate who will "fall for" the happy owner because of his fortunate choice of make.

In either sense such a value-judgment is a poor one and should be openly stated so people can be assisted to reject it. The car industry allied with the oil and rubber industries are among the mightiest corporations in the world and the standpoint of their public relations experts are naturally absorbed by many owners or would-be owners of cars when they ascribe to the car fictitious values to the real utilitarian values of these machines. This hinders the problem of clarification of genuine transport alternatives.

This task is sufficiently difficult and involves clear exposition to the public of the real essence of the "quality of life" implicit in alternative proposals.

Complicating the problem by proceeding on the basis of questionnaires which make no attempt to uncover the unstated assumptions of a so-called immutable "consumer demand" which is a false or at least undisclosed basis the experts then proceed to erect their "transport models". This only makes confusion worse confounded.

To the concept that a man cannot be parted from his car for psychological reasons, we can only suggest, that if these sort of reasons were the dominant ones, man in an earlier age, would never have been parted from his horse, which in many ways aroused keener emotions of affection surely than can be claimed for the car.

Yet the suburbs have exiled the horse just as surely as the central business and cultural hearts of great cities will find the need to exile the car. Yet this is really not such a radical prospect for the owner who will still have his vehicle for recreation.

Second Objection: You Cannot Separate Recreational and Commuter Uses

The argument here is also somewhat psychological, but of a different character. It is claimed that it is a fact of life that once a person owns a car at all, he is impelled to use it for all possible purposes: he cannot be expected, for example, to use it for recreation and not use it to commute to work.

This may be true of some persons, and this sort of factor has been taken into account, above, when it has been presumed that for a long transitional period many car-owners will start the journey to work in their car.

But it is not universal even now. "Kiss-'n-ride" housewife chauffeurs who drop their husbands at the railway station, for example, prove this. The cars left parked at the rail stations, or left at home in the car ports also prove it.

Gradually improving conditions of public transport and deteriorating conditions for central-city parking would surely operate to enable the majority to overcome the psychological inertia of habit and come to regard his car as his leisure-time friend.

Many men regard their wife also as an inseparable friend, but they never dream of taking her to work!

Third Objection: Public Transport Makes Too Big a Loss

There have grown up several peculiar myths about transport finance which obstruct clear thinking on the subject.

To start with, in Australia, there are very few aspects of the economy that are not subsidised in one form or another. Many primary products are subsidised, as are much of our health services, our education system, some sports facilities and cultural efforts. Housing is subsidised and assisted in various ways. Tax concessions and other forms of protection such as tariffs abound, in the case of industry.

When it comes to transport, the road system is also subsidised by the State and Federal Governments. The road lobby argues that all this comes from car registration fees and petrol taxes and therefore the motorists themselves pay for their own roads. This is only partly true.

In the first place, petrol tax and registration fees are partly paid by industrial users, and is a cost passed on ultimately in the price of consumer goods purchased by non-motorist as well as motorist. In the second place, the access road network and its maintenance has been paid by home-owners whether motorist or not.

But, in any case, the road network is paid for by rates and taxes of

various kinds. It is not a toll system which might liken it to an industry which "pays for itself". The slogan "Your Taxes At Work" flamboyantly announce the billboards on Melbourne's highway improvement works.

Never so on any public transport project. If your taxes are at work here, it is a matter apparently of shame, to be hushed up. But the Tramways Board have to make the trams pay for themselves: they receive no subsidy. The Railways Department deficits, small in comparison to the total turnover, are met by the State Government, but the eternal complaint is that trains should pay for themselves. Many private bus lines only make a profit by reducing or cancelling all off-peak journeys to the point where they almost cease, in effect, to be a "service" at all.

Symptomatic of the double-standard to road and railway finance is the fact that the Bolte Government has been complaining for years about Victoria's poor share of Federal finance for roads. In relation to railways however Mr. Bolte is reported to have said "The Victorian Government has never asked Canberra for a grant for any rail project, other than the underground railway" ("Herald" 23/9/1969)

The efficiency of the railways for mass transport is indisputable (See table Appendix No. 3 "Two Tables from Overseas"). But the total cost passenger-plus-community per passenger-mile of the railway system against the road system, or of an improved public transport system against a road-plus-freeway system has not been scientifically estimated, at least for Melbourne or Australia.

Railway finances are exactly calculable to the last cent, the exact deficit per passenger-mile can be given because the exact trip by every passenger is recorded, along with the finances of the entire industry. No such figures are available for roads or freeways, and the costs and expenses of the cars that run upon them, in such a way that the costs of commuter's cars, and the roads and facilities they use can be singled out.

Even if this were possible other "cost/benefit" factors would have to be brought into account such as comfort, accident-rate, travel-time, walking-time, parking-time etc. (See Australian Planning Institute Journal Oct. 1968. R.P.Wilson at p.121 and H.M.Kolsen & P.J.Forsyth at pp. 128-129).

In this state of affairs, no one is entitled to demand of advocates of better public transport that "it has to pay", when the (unproved) possibilities are that the combined cost of the motorist and the community for a car-commuter-mile (especially on a freeway) is far higher anyway than the combined cost of the passenger (fare) and the community (the deficit) for a train-commuter-mile.

However, without conceding that their case has to rest on being a profitable economic investment, because of the overriding social considerations involved (just as in the case, say, of education) advocates for

better public transport will strengthen their hand if they show regard to the cost element.

In this regard it is interesting to note the theory of R.P. Wilson (see above) that public transport losses are getting bigger because more and more patrons are travelling in the peak hour as compared to non-peak. What makes a profitable investment possible is a situation where rolling stock and staff are used to capacity continuously throughout the day. From this it follows, so runs the argument, that the more success in winning back peak-hour car-commuters to travel on the railways, the bigger the losses would be!

Mr. I. D. Richards (A.P.I. Journal at pp. 111-119) while not advancing such a theory, produces basic facts about Melbourne's suburban railways which would seem to re-inforce the above argument. Off-peak travel is falling, yet, the railways are carrying about the same number of passengers, but from further and further out, which demands express running, and therefore more frequent trains, and the greater frequency demands closer signal spacing which increases the cost.

We can not accept aspects of Mr. Wilson's calculations. He has mixed up tram and bus figures, for one thing. For another, if deficit per head is worked out from Mr. Wilson's figures, and Adelaide's figures brought in, it is clear the bigger capitals Sydney, Melbourne, Brisbane and Adelaide, have smaller deficits than Newcastle, Hobart, Launceston or Perth: so, on his own figures Mr. Wilson's argument seems to collapse.

However, it is clear that the more the off-peak patronage can be won back the better. Neither Mr. Wilson nor Mr. Richards discuss any possibilities of this.

The proposals we make (i) for strong and high-density social centres around rail stations, including a number of district centres, and (2) for subsidised feeder-bus services to these stations, are deliberately calculated, not only to solve the city-commuter problem, but to promote housewife and youth patronage of the rail-based services, which would be off-peak. And the losses on the buses would be off-set, at least to some extent, by the gains on the railways. We should imagine too, that the restoration of patronage to middle-distance stations would help economically.

If freeways are established, there may develop strong pressure for a system of "buses-on-freeways" in competition with the railways. From Mr. Wilson's figures (although he did not draw these conclusions), the return per head in Melbourne and Adelaide where there are trams was much higher than in other capital cities where there are buses. It would seem to follow that if trams are more economic than buses well-patronised trains would be even more economic.

To the objection that "public transport makes too big a loss" therefore, in summary we suggest three main answers:-

1. It is not proved that public transport costs the community more than private transport, and it may cost much less.
2. Irrespective of cost, as with education or health, there are certain overriding community considerations which favour public transport for certain purposes.
3. The particular plans advanced should improve off-peak traffic and restore patronage to middle-distance stations thus helping off-set general railway deficits which would be augmented by possible feeder-bus deficits.

Appendix No. 3

TWO TABLES FROM OVERSEAS

Illustrating Mass Transport Efficiency & Costs

(Note: These figures are typical figures only. Furthermore they are from America and not directly applicable to Australian conditions, more especially the figures of capital cost in Table 2. However, the figures should give a reasonable idea of the order of the magnitudes involved.)

Table No. 1

Table of Practical Lane Capacities for Transit Vehicle Types -- With Equivalent Numbers of Cars and of Expressway Traffic Lanes

(Abbreviated from Table quoted by Mr. I. D. Richards in "Desirable Public Transport Criteria Planned for Future Melbourne" 21/5/'69, taken by Mr. Richards from "Recommended Standards, Warrants and Objectives for Transit Services and Facilities" Public Administration Service, Chicago, 1958" --- we have omitted "trolley-buses" which are same figures as "buses" and omitted 2-car and 3-car trams)

Type of Transit Vehicle	Peak-hr. Passengers per Vehicle (Ø)	<u>Practical Capacity Express Service:</u>			<u>Equivalent No. of:-</u>	
		Pract- ical Express Headway (sec)	Veh. per hour one-way	Pass. per hour one-way	Cars for Same no. of transit pass	Traffic Lanes One-way.
Bus	56	30	120	6720	4480	3
Tram	80	30	120	9600	6400	4.3
Rapid - Transit - Train	1200	90	40	48000	32000	21.3

Ø Peak-hour capacity is taken as 80% of "carrying value" of each vehicle, which is the combined seated and standee capacity i.e. respectively 70 (bus) 100 (tram) and 1500 (train).

Table No. 2

Table Showing Comparison of Typical Features of Urban Transportation

(Abbreviated and adapted from Table quoted by Mr. Paul Ritter "Planning for Man and Motor" Pergamon Press 1964 at p.100, taken by Mr. Ritter from H.D.Quiney "New Concept in Transit Facilities" Traffic Quarterly April 1952).

Type of Transit	No. of Lanes or Tracks	Typical Frequency of Access or Stops (in feet)	Peak-hour Direction Person-Trip Capacity	Peak-Speed mph	Typical Full Capital Cost, ¹ Urban Mile	Cost Capacity Ratio (f)/(d) (1)
(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)
<u>Automobiles</u>						
Freeway	8	6000	9000	32	\$15m	\$1670
Expressway (at grade)	8	2000	6000	b 25	\$ 3m	\$ 500
Arterial (2)	6	600	3000	20	-	-
<u>Railways</u>						
Underground (express)	2	9000	50000	33	\$22m	\$ 440
Underground (local)	2	3200	50000	20	\$22m	\$ 440
Above ground (express) (3)	2	9000	50000	33	\$ 7m	\$ 140
Above ground (local)	2	3200	50000	20	\$ 7m	\$ 140
<u>Trams</u>						
Right-of-way (4)	2	2000	34000	25	\$ 2m.	\$ 60
In arterials	2	1200	34000	17	\$ 1m.	\$ 30
<u>Buses</u>						
Freeway express bus (5)	2	4000	8000	22	-	-
Arterial limited bus	2	2000	7000	14	-	-
Local surface bus	2	600	7000	10	-	-

Notes (1) i.e. cost/capacity ratio is capital cost per mile for number of persons carried per hour. (2) footnote to table says "travelled way assumed already available", therefore, presumably reason why no costs, or cost/capacity ratio given (3) the division in table is into "subway" and "elevated". We take it that "elevated" here means "above ground", not necessarily built on elevated bridges. (4) Full text here reads "in available private rights-of-way" (5) No cost or cost/capacity given here -- presume same order as "freeway" above.

Appendix No. 4THE METRO-MOBILITY SYSTEM

A film entitled "Metro-Mobility" produced by the General Motors Corporation, Michigan, U.S.A. was shown to the "Traffic Symposium" organised by the Royal Automobile Club of Victoria in 1964. The basic idea is that buses handle the whole trip including collection of passengers around suburban "loops" honeycombing the residential areas for this purpose, then trunkline rapid transit along freeways and "interchange" of passengers to the bus which distributes them to their "downtown" destination.

The "interchange" stations proposed are erected above freeways, the buses mounting along ramps into the "station" where passengers go to the particular platform and board the particular bus for their destination. From this point buses could be linked together, if necessary, into "bus-trains" which continue along the freeway with automatic control of speeds steering and spacing.

Idea to increase freeway capacity is to have special lanes for buses only, either single (to the city in the morning, reversible to the suburbs in the evening); or two single lanes; or even three of which one would be reversible. (See pp. 107-109 "Living with the Motor Car", published by the R.A.C.V.)

The implications for Melbourne are that the Wilbur Smith "Summary of the Consultant's Report" released in 1966 by the Melbourne Transportation Committee states that "express bus services on freeways are proposed, together with an express rail service from the Doncaster area -- the new freeway systems vary between 250 and 350 miles in length" (p. 14).

Mr. Marshall M. Rich, the Wilbur Smith "Study-Manager" in Melbourne, in delivering a paper to the 1964 R.A.C.V. Symposium stated that the data used in his paper was "drawn from survey reports of various cities and from the book 'Future Highways and Urban Growth' prepared by Wilbur Smith and Associates under commission from the Automobile Manufacturer's Association."

It is hard to escape the conclusion that Wilbur Smith and Associates transport concepts are heavily orientated on the U.S. car industry, and on freeways, and therefore buses-on-freeways.

Appendix No. 5THE EASTERN FREEWAY

"The Herald" 26/5/1969 carried a main front-page story: "Eight-lane Freeway Starts in 1970" -- "Work on Melbourne's \$24 million Eastern Freeway will start next year the Minister for Local Government, Mr. Hamer, said today. It will be 5½ miles long and, when completed, will have four lanes each side of a double-track railway---"

"The Board of Works Chairman Mr. A. H. Croxford said -- the Board had provided for the rail line in its plans but construction would be up to the Railways -- the State Government will give \$18 million towards the cost of the freeway -- the Board of Works will provide the other \$6 million from the metropolitan improvement rate."

Apart from the addition of a railway reservation, this meant a doubling of the formerly-planned four-lane capacity. At the hearing by the Board of objections to the consequential amendments to the planning scheme in October 1969, an argument advanced by several inner suburban citizen's associations that the route should not be considered at all until the Metropolitan Transportation Report had been released, and transport alternatives including public transport considered by the public, was rejected by Mr. Croxford as out of order on the ground that the Eastern Freeway was already part of the planning scheme approved by the Government in principle. Just so! We have started on the crazy "freeway logic": 4 is the same as 8, if that is insufficient then 10, 12, even 16 or another new freeway! Instead of this approach, the Government should have produced options of a fundamental character between a transport system weighted towards public or towards private transport.

Interestingly, a big group of property-owners whose amenity was affected combined to pay a firm of townplanners to produce amendments to the freeway route. Planning options of this sort should be produced at public expense by the planning authority (See Appendix No. 11)

Appendix No. 6

MR. RICHARDS ON EFFICIENCY

Proposals by Mr. I. D. Richards for a More Efficient Melbourne Suburban Railway System

(Note: The tables and excerpts or precis set out below are taken from or adapted from a public lecture delivered by Mr. I. D. Richards at the University of Melbourne on 21/5/1969 entitled: "Desirable Public Transport Criteria -- Planned System for Future Melbourne." The author, formerly the engineer assigned by the Victorian Railways to the Melbourne and Metropolitan Transportation Study, was, at the date of the lecture, a project engineer attached to the transport section of the Dept. of Civil Engineering which published the lecture in roneod form).

We have selected from Mr. Richard's material three sets of proposals:

1. Suggested Off-Peak Maximum Headways.
2. Suggested Elimination or Re-location of Stations.
3. Suggested Speed and Comfort Improvements.

1. Suggested Off-Peak Maximum Headways

<u>Item</u>	<u>Headway in Minutes</u> (Stopping-all-stations service except item (iv))	<u>Stations</u> (Terminal or Junction Stations)
(i)	60	Sunbury, Craigieburn, Coldstream, Hastings
(ii)	30	Williamstown, Altona, Werribee, Deer Park West, Somerton, Hurstbridge, Berwick.
(iii)	20	Upfield, Epping, Lilydale, Belgrave, Morningside, Port Melbourne.
(iv)	20-min. express to Richmond	Ringwood, Mordialloc
(v)	10	Newport, St. Albans, Broadmeadows, Fawkner, Reservoir, Eltham, Doncaster East, Ringwood, Alamein, Glen Waverley, Ferntree Gully, Dandenong, Frankston, Mordialloc, Sandringham.
(vi)	5	Footscray, Clifton Hill, Burnley, Caulfield.

2. Suggested Elimination or Re-Location of Stations

Mr. Richards proposes three guides for the positioning of railway stations, both to improve the integration of trains with buses, trams or cars, and to speed-up the trains to serve the longer-distance passengers. Stations, he says, are best located:-

- "(i) As near as possible to the centre of the area (residential, shopping, commercial, industrial or recreational) ---
- (ii) Close to the main street containing feeder services, and
- (iii) With at least one mile between neighbouring stations" (p.6)

In line with these guides, he proposes:-

(a) Elimination of stations

Group 1 within $\frac{1}{2}$ mile of more-importantly located stations and which themselves have little or no feeder service

Bonbeach, Chatham, Croxton, Darebin, Dennis, Eaglemont, East Camberwell, Fawkner, Glenbervie, McKinnon, Merri, Middle Footscray, North Port, Parkdale, Ripponlea, Rushall, Sandown Park (except for sports specials), Seddon, Tecoma, Willison.

Group 2. Stations made redundant by recommended re-location
(See (b) below)

Hartwell, Jolimont, Moonee Ponds.

Group 3. Stations within 6 miles of the City and made redundant by full co-ordination of all public transport services

(Note: Except for Northcote and Newmarket, the other stations mentioned below are eliminated to make way for a re-organisation of approach by some lines to Flinders Street, coupled with express-running techniques advanced by Mr. Richards to provide a more effective and cheaper alternative to the Latrobe St.-Spring St. underground loop. Instead Mr. Richards suggests an underground under Queens Street, the centre of the city's employment connected to a re-routed Upfield line and the new Doncaster line; coupled with the extension of the St. Kilda line to Balaclava, Caulfield and East Malvern. This would enable a "balancing" of trains from east and west into Flinders St. station which is at near-capacity; thus removing the time-consuming need to reverse trains, and at the same time providing express running from Glen Waverley, Dandenong, Frankston or Sandringham lines, and new city stations at Spring-Flinders St.; Queensbridge; Bourke-Queen, Franklin St. etc. We pass no value judgments on these proposals against the Latrobe-Spring St. loop scheme, other than to say that they would appear to have so many attractive features that very serious re-consideration should be given to the problem.)

South Melbourne, Albert Park, Middle Park, St. Kilda.
Pahran, Windsor.
Newmarket, Northcote.

Group 4. Stations in semi-rural areas likely to remain undeveloped for considerable time

Hurstbridge, Wattleglen.

(b) Re-Location of stations

Where locations could be improved to give better access to feeder services in cross streets.

(Note: Distances range from .1 to .3 of a mile. The roads to which the stations would be shifted not shown here, but would be obvious to users).

Ascot Vale, Boronia, Burwood, Clifton Hill, Coburg, Collingwood, East Ringwood, Gowrie, Hawksburn, Laburnum, Macleod, Surrey Hills, Thornbury, Tooronga, Victoria Park, West Richmond, Yarraville.

3. Suggested Speed and Comfort Improvements

Three of the methods of reducing overall travel times (greater frequency due to reduced headways; a quicker journey due to elimination of stations, re-location of stations to reduce passenger's walking times suggested by Mr. Richards) have already been listed above.

Mr. Richards explains that in the past 40 years there have been few significant improvements to Melbourne's public transport services. He

explains, for example, that in relation to railways the advantages of higher speeds and acceleration made possible by the "blue" Harris trains were lost because they still operated on mixed schedules with the slower "red" trains. Instead of the 25 mph average speeds, he estimates that 30 mph (stopping) and 45 mph (express) averages are possible.

After examining the many theoretical methods (some contradictory) for decreasing over-all travel time, and the impact of modern electronic control equipment, he accuses the "operators" (Mr. Richards' polite euphemism for the Victorian Railways Department!) as having outmoded concepts. He says:-

"The concept of the railway 'train' apparently is accepted by the operators as the sole basic unit of transport service. It should not be so. --- The first of the positive steps should be the introduction of single vehicle trains operated preferably automatically (therefore crewless) or by one man. The vehicle should be capable of multi-unit operation so that the seating can be increased or reduced as the demand varies along the route."

Mr. Richards says a considerable fleet of single-carriage trains capable of multiple unit operation would be required to service the recommended off-peak frequencies, and should replace rolling stock 50 years of age or older.

Improvements apart from travel-time suggested by Mr. Richards include weather-proofing of interchanges between street transport and stations; parking fees that cover rail fares; new Mulgrave (which would service new football ground) and Carrum Downs lines; automatic fare collection, self-closing doors, smooth-riding springing, and adoption of techniques to minimise noise, vehicles designed for a maximum of seated and a minimum of standing passengers (e.g. with double-deck vehicles), and integrated timetables for all public transport.

Appendix No. 7

HAMER ON HIGH-DENSITY

Mr. R. J. Hamer's Suggestions Regarding Appropriate Places for High-Density Residential Zones

On November 28th 1968, the Minister for Local Government, Mr. R. J. Hamer wrote to all Metropolitan Municipal Councils:-

"----It is envisaged that control of flat development under the Town and Country Planning Act will be achieved primarily through a range of residential zones in which maximum density limits will be fixed, from zones where flats will be entirely prohibited, at one extreme, to high density zones at the other. The latter would generally be located in

areas close to railway stations or other transport, or adjacent to shopping areas, or where a natural amenity such as views over the Bay, or public gardens or attractive natural features make high density desirable" (our emphasis).

So too, the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works "Residential Planning Standards" circulated in May 1969, to Councils for comment, propose high density zones "in close proximity to the Central Business Zone, major growth centres, major public transport facilities, or adjoining major open space areas (including bayside areas)---" (Our emphasis).

Appendix No. 8

THEORIES AGAINST REDEVELOPMENT

Ideas are beginning to appear which attack not merely the tactical blunders of the Housing Commission for what they build and what they destroy in order to build and how they do it, but the more fundamental issue of whether the Housing Commission operations as a building authority in the inner areas are justified at all.

One such idea is expressed in a challenge to define a "slum". The argument is that, whilst there may at one time have been pockets of slum hovels, these have long since been cleared out by the Commission. It is not denied that there are still many dwellings that are not up to the "standard of human habitation". As the Commission has power to order demolition or repair of such individual buildings, however, this technique, coupled with readily available loan funds to enable owners to repair, is said to be sufficient.

Complementary to this idea, is the idea that the Commission's inner suburban operations are highly uneconomical. The latest high-rise tower block of thirty stories Commission flats at South Melbourne are estimated to cost as high as \$19,000 for a three bedroom unit when total costs of acquisition, demolition and construction are taken into account; for this sum, the argument runs, the families concerned could have a spacious suburban house and garden, and without any reduction of the housing stock.

Admitting that there are still thousands of people with desperate housing needs, the claim is that the most economic and satisfactory answer is for the Commission to confine its building to the outer suburbs. The Commission says it can build a suburban house for \$8,000, so that it could house nearly two and a half times as many people for the same money in the outer suburbs.

Many of those living in the inner suburban Housing Commission estates, it is claimed, travel to outer suburbs to employment, so there is no advantage in living near the city. Others claim that housing in the inner areas has the environmental characteristics of last century and should be

preserved as part of our history. Others, not so sweeping in their approach, say there should be normal "spot development".

Others argue that old housing, especially terrace housing suitable for families, has developed a natural mixture of income groups, nationalities and age groups, which is sociologically quite desirable and that in the big estates there is a homogeneity of social types that creates many social problems.

This set of ideas has many observations which are correct, and which have to be answered and taken into account. It can readily be seen that the whole concept of "redevelopment" is under challenge, or even the concept of "renewal" if, by renewal is meant anything more than renovation by each owner.

A systematised theory into which such a set of ideas falls quite naturally has been developed by Jane Jacobs in her book "The Death and Life of Great American Cities", sub-titled "The failure of town planning", published in 1961. Mrs. Jacobs makes a forthright attack on the fundamental assumptions of big-name town planners. She attacks Ebenezer Howard's English-village type "garden-city" with factories to one side behind a neat screen of trees and the city conceived as a spread-out collection of self-centred townships. She attacks Lewis Mumford, who, like Howard, she classified as a "decentrist", that is, an advocate of regional planning with the aim of decentralising great cities, dispersing their enterprises and populations into smaller separated cities. She attacks Le Corbusier's "Radiant city" conceived in the 1920s as a car-based city of huge towers set in parkland, a "vertical garden city", an attempt to combine the idea of gardens with high density. She contends that none of these ideas take into account how a big city really works.

Mrs. Jacobs contends that these eminent thinkers led a whole generation of planners into producing a climate of ideas which has influenced authorities to sort out man's activities into neat homogeneous "zones", and re-order the city according to the "zoner's" ideas. These include low density suburbs or big high-density project estates, but with plenty of open space, which is supposed to cure in some magic way the evils supposed to be generated by high density living in the big, bad, city with its great diversity of functions all mixed up.

As against this Mrs. Jacobs argues strongly for diversity, by means of what she calls "mixed primary uses" of land (which include residential use) in big cities as being natural and advantageous because along with enough density and "mixed secondary uses" they provide a vital coming-and-going of all different sorts of persons for different purposes all through the day and much of the night. This creates a vitality that permits the flourishing of a myriad of smaller enterprises which simply could not survive in the suburbs and conversely which make a great city the point of attraction.

Mrs. Jacobs regards the suburbs as the centre of the big corporations,

both in the sense that here are to be found the big mass production industries manufacturing the standardised products, and here also are to be found the standardised super-markets retailing these standardised products. In this sense the central city areas have now become the protectors of the small man, the protectors of initiative, of creativeness.

It is the older buildings, however, in the city and the inner suburbs which house the "small man" whether residential or otherwise. It is these buildings which fall victim to the block clearance "redevelopment" upon which the "open space" project estates, sorted out into income groups, are built, thus driving out the small man and with him the diversity and hence the attractiveness which is the basis on which the city centres are founded. Even enterprises that are too big, housed in buildings that are too big, can blight a street of smaller enterprises.

Thus far we agree substantially with the analysis and value judgments made by Mrs. Jacobs on these matters we have outlined and have tried to adapt them to Melbourne conditions.

In doing so, we have not, however, followed Jacobs for the most part in her proposed remedies for reasons we will deal with shortly.

Amongst those who, in Melbourne, consider themselves avowed followers of Jane Jacob's ideas or amongst those who, without seeing themselves in that position, have adopted a set of remedies similar to Jacobs, there seems to be two points of sharp difference in value judgments with Jacobs regarding the inner areas...

1. They are opposed to high density living.
2. They fail to see the city proper in its function as a centre for small diversified enterprises.

Actually, as a point of argument, point 2 usually stems from point 1. "The only reason why there is a demand for high-density in the inner areas is because it suits the big commercial and financial interests in the central business district" is a familiar formulation; true several decades ago, becoming less and less true the more the big city commercial interests establish branches in the suburbs, and now not true.

But, true or not, this is not an approach Jacobs makes at all. She regards high-density in the big cities as a virtue in itself, as a way of life that makes city life tolerable. She has her own density standards below which "city vitality" cannot exist.

To illustrate the difference. Dwelling density in old type inner areas of Melbourne range between 15 and 20 per acre. Typical densities of new walk-up flats are 30 to 45 per acre. The Housing Commission flats with high-rise towers aim at 130 to 150 per acre.

Mrs. Jacobs says .. "Very low densities, six dwellings or fewer to the net acre make out well in the suburbs between 10 and 15 dwellings to the acre yield a kind of semi-suburb they will not generate city liveliness or public life densities of this kind ringing a city are a bad long-term bet, destined to become 'grey areas' ... There is a justification for densities averaging twenty dwellings or less to the acre, and there may be good reasons for these densities, so long as their dwellings and neighbourhood are not everyday part and parcel of a big city,"....

"....between the point where semi-suburban character and function are lost and the point at which lively diversity and public life can arise, lies a range of big city densities that I call 'in-between densities' they are fit generally for nothing but trouble."

"I can find only one city district with vitality that has well under 100 dwellings per acre the escape from in-between densities lies somewhere around the figure of 100 dwellings to an acre under circumstances most congenial in all other respects to produce diversity. As a general rule, I think 100 dwellings to the acre will be found to be too low."
(pp.222...225)

Thus the Housing Commission high-rise estates are the only ones which might qualify in Mrs. Jacobs' eyes for city vitality densities, as they are above 100 to the acre, but they fail anyway, on other grounds, namely that they do not permit diversity.

All of Melbourne's other inner area densities, old and new, apart from areas where there are elevator flats, fall hopelessly short of the Jacobs standards of "vitality". The old housing is semi-suburban "grey" and thus part of the in-between city densities "fit for nothing but trouble."

In fact in the following words, in which she attacks Lewis Mumford, Mrs. Jacobs would be attacking also those in Melbourne who believe they are her supporters, but who in our view are trying to apply remedies without understanding the conditions for which they were proposed by Mrs. Jacobs.

"Some planning theorists call for urban variety and liveliness and simultaneously prescribe 'in-between densities.' For example, Lewis Mumford writes 'Now the great function of the city is to permit, indeed to encourage and incite the greatest potential number of meetings, encounters, challenges, between all persons, classes and groups, providing, as it were, a stage upon which the drama of social life may be enacted, with the actors taking their turn as spectators and the spectators as actors.'"

"In the next paragraph, however, he castigates city areas occupied at densities of 200 to 500 persons (*italics ours*) per acre and recommends 'housing that will permit parks and gardens as an integral part of the

design, at densities not higher than 100, or at most in quarters for childless people, of 125 persons per acre.' Densities of 100 persons per acre means dwelling unit density in the range of 25 to 50 per acre. Urbanity and 'in-between' densities like this can only be combined theoretically. They are incompatible because of the economics of generating city diversity" (footnote pp.223, 224).

To understand the basis of Miss Jacobs' remedies it is necessary to understand her approach to "unslumming the slums" as she calls it.

She regards the saviours of the slums as what she calls "the middle class" who arise naturally within the slums. If only they can be persuaded to stay where they are instead of escaping their environment, they are the successful ones who can spend money on improvements which gradually lift up the environment without any one being displaced. She views this economically. She is not snobbish towards those who would otherwise be permanent slum dwellers. She says they are successful personalities in their own slum streets, but are lost if they are uprooted and transplanted.

She opposes her views to the authorities who prate, (as some do in Melbourne) about "bringing back the middle class" as if they had to leave the city, acquire a ranch style house and barbeque before they can qualify to "come back" and rescue the city. She opposes those who want to root out a whole big segment of slum on a scale large enough to create a sufficiently extensive new environment to be fit to attract the middle-class.

She quite deliberately bases her remedies on her view that "the processes that occur in "unslumming" depend on the fact that a metropolitan economy, if it is working well is constantly transforming many into skilled (or even educated) people, many green-horns into competent citizens."

And it is on this basis of theory and value judgment that Jane Jacobs advances the remedy that public money to improve housing should not go to public housing authorities, who acquire, demolish and build estates which are then publicly owned and administered publicly. Instead private financial funds should go to people living in the area who are prepared to employ private enterprise to renovate or rebuild particular buildings, the public money going in the form of rent subsidy to tenants who cannot afford the higher rents of the renovated or new buildings which result.

She is opposed to public housing being owned and run by the Government, which in her view is an exception. The Government she says does not take over farms or airlines simply because it subsidises them.

Whilst sympathising with Jacobs in her opposition to the wrong public housing policies in her country and to the wrong motives on which they are based, and which Melbourne has followed to some extent, we reject her judgment that all "unslumming" initiative must come from the middle-class, we are opposed to her views that there is no place for public housing combined with adequate planning, and whilst we agree that there is a big place for private funds and public subsidies for renovation and rebuilding.

we cannot agree that this technique has to be universalised into the sole method for revitalising the city and near city areas.

On the other hand, for reasons set out elsewhere, we support Jacobs' view on high densities for the inner areas, large parts of which are obviously destined to be "engulfed" by the expanding city. Although the extremely high densities traditional, say, for New York (Greenwich Village where Mrs. Jacobs lives ranges from a minimum of 125 dwellings to a maximum of 200 dwellings per acre) are unlikely ever to become attained near Melbourne, we believe that, in the inner areas, it is correct to have a deliberate policy of increasing densities.

We cannot accept the simplistic comparison of housing costs of a high density unit, say in South Melbourne or other inner suburbs as against a house in the outer suburbs. This is because on the one hand there are so many hidden costs in expansion in a new suburb in the form of heavy and continuing transport costs and the gradual establishment of a full set of community facilities, let alone social costs, and on the other hand there are so many alternative forms of higher density buildings.

For example, there is a research paper by Mr. M. A. Jones delivered to the Urban Research Unit of the Australian National University on December 6, 1969. It is a study in contrast between "Slum Clearance and Urban Renewal Activities of the N.S.W. and the Victorian Housing Commissions," and is an extremely useful collection of statistics and facts on two radically different policies.

Only 55% of persons displaced in Melbourne wanted to relocate in public housing, as against 79% in Sydney, due, according to Jones, to the "relatively high range of rehousing offered" in N.S.W. The block clearance and high-rise flats typical of Melbourne has not been applied in Sydney which has cleared mainly individual houses and offered choices of walk up flats in middle suburbs, or villa houses in outer suburbs.

Most of Mr. Jones' criticisms of the Victorian Housing Commission seem justified. Mr. Jones says "The N.S.W. Housing Commission has found that the majority of its metropolitan area applicants desire cottages, even though most cottages available for allocation are at Mt. Druitt, 31 miles from Sydney." However, he makes no attempt to examine whether, having chosen to live in such a distant utopia, the inhabitants and their children become satisfied with their lot after they have lived there some time.

In fact in a report published in 1968 by the Faculty of Architecture, Sydney University, "Life and Metropolitan Location", Miss Barbara Finch examines 3 Housing Commission Estates in three different parts of Sydney, at different distances from the city's centre. In her conclusion she writes.... "It is known to be cheaper for the Housing Commission to develop large tracts of land on the fringes of the urban area, than to build smaller developments in existing suburbs or redevelopment projects in the inner areas. But the savings enjoyed by the Commission (which no

doubt result in more housing units being built) result in higher living costs for the tenants of the outer areas. In this study it has been found that the tenants of Green Valley have to travel outside the area to get their groceries at a price they can afford; their journeys to work are long and expensive, as are all their journeys, and they have very little choice of entertainment facilities. It is also assumed that wives who wish to go to work are prevented from doing so by the lack of suitable employment near to their homes."

Green Valley is only 19 miles from the centre of Sydney as compared to Mt. Druitt's 31 miles.

Indeed if one could generalise, it would seem that most theories in opposition to redevelopment seem to have the weakness that they exhibit interest only in the inner areas and not in the metropolis as a whole; Jane Jacobs specifically excludes the suburbs from the scope of her book; Mr. Jones does not follow the fate of the Mt. Druitt or Green Valley Commission estates.

Of all the questions asked by admirers of Mrs. Jacobs in Melbourne, one never hears the question "if the well-to-do are finding it attractive now to come into the inner suburbs and live at higher densities, why should not the industrial and white collar workers have the same opportunity?"

It is this question we have set out to answer amongst others.

Appendix No. 9

SUBSIDIES TO PRIVATE DEVELOPERS

Housing Commission Sale of Reclaimed Land in the Inner Area to Private Developers Showing Prices and Rates of Subsidies.

Area	Acres	Cost of Reclamation	Selling Price	Subsidy	% of subsidy to price	Developer
O'Shanassy St. North Melb.	2.51	\$164,134	\$95,000	\$69,134	73%	Original Co-op of 14 builders
Harris St. North Melb.	5.04	\$576,216	\$264,000	\$312,216	119%	Some Co-op Some Jennings See Note 2.
Hanover St. Fitzroy	2.70	\$346,561	\$184,650	\$161,911	88%	Co-operative purchasers
De Murska St. Windsor	2.07	\$245,514	\$95,000	\$130,514	137%	Jennings

Cont.

Area	Acres	Cost of Reclamation	Selling Price	Subsidy	% of subsidy price	Developer
Lee St. Carlton	3.38	\$444,376	\$213,100	231,276	109%	Jennings
Woods St. North Melb.	2.75	\$605,090	\$208,800	396,200	185%	Jennings
Cross St. Carlton	2.78	\$480,268	\$199,000	281,268	131%	University Co-operative Purchasers

Note: The first three columns are based on figures taken from Hansard Sept. 30th 1969 at pp. 450-451. The following columns are calculations based on these figures.

Note 2. The original non-profit company known as Master Builders (Associated) Redevelopment Ltd. was taken over by one of the 14 master-builders, namely Jennings, after about half of the Harris St. development was complete.

Appendix No. 10

URBAN RENEWAL BILLS

On 29th October 1969 two Bills on Urban Renewal were introduced in the Victorian Legislative Assembly by Mr. Meagher, Minister of Housing.

The first Bill aimed to establish the Victorian Housing Commission as a "renewal agency" empowered, subject to certain conditions, and provided it "consulted" with various other bodies, to draw up an "urban renewal proposal" for a particular area. The second Bill, gave similar powers to a municipal council or to any other "renewal agency" that might be constituted in the future, by Parliament.

It was widely recognised publicly, that although the two bills were legally complementary, they were a result of a rivalry in Cabinet between the Minister of Housing, Mr. Meagher and the Minister for Local Government, Mr. Hamer, reflecting also differences in approach by the Housing Commission, on the one hand, and the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works, the regional planning authority on the other.

"It must be a novel doctrine of constitutional responsibilities" said Mr. Holding, the Opposition Leader, "that there can be two Bills with two philosophies and two concepts tossed into Parliament and then left to the Opposition and the Country Party to sort out." So these two parties (The Labour Party opposition and the Country Party) in the Legislative Council forced the adjournment of the debate for two months.

For reasons set out in the text (See "The Housing Commission Future"), we have made it clear that we regard the Housing Commission as entirely unacceptable as a planning body, which is above all, what a renewal agency would have to be.

We will deal therefore with the second Bill, which does not provide for the Housing Commission as a renewal agency, and which, in any case, is somewhat better in some aspects than the first Bill.

A number of features are acceptable, for example....

(i) The Government has to approve a "statement of reason" as to why it is necessary to prepare a "renewal proposal" for an area and has to approve the final "renewal proposals" when complete. This makes the Government and Parliament politically responsible, as they should be, for such major decisions affecting people's lives.

(ii) The "renewal proposals" must set out existing land use of area, the general nature of the proposed renewal, which parts are to be reconstructed, and areas where the preservation of particular environment is considered desirable.

This contains the concept, not only of "reconstructing" parts of an area which corresponds to the older powers of the Housing Commission, but the concept of preserving other parts.

(iii) Feasibility of "social" factors must be set out in the renewal proposal which must list recreation grounds, ornamental gardens, parks, children's playgrounds and in addition, wherever there is to be an increase in population additional hospital, medical, social welfare, educational and transport facilities.

(iv) The idea of "consultation" planning is incorporated e.g. a renewal agency has to "consult" local councils, other planning authorities, Government instrumentalities affected, the National Trust, and advisory committees can be set up which include not only representatives of authorities but "interested persons."

However, the Bill falls very much short of providing machinery for measures we have proposed. For example to list a few...

(v) "Consultation" is not public participation and the legislation or regulations under it should contain procedures similar to those set out in Appendix No. 11, because there is nothing in the Bill whatsoever that provides that the surveys on which the renewal proposals are based, nor even the details of the proposals themselves have to be made available even to the bodies that have to be consulted, still less the public. Only after the proposal is "completed" is it to be put on public exhibition.

(vi) The Bill does not provide any concept whatever of "preserving communities" as distinct from "preserving environments".

(vii) The Bill when listing community facilities has a heavy emphasis on facilities such as hospitals, medical, social welfare and educational which are quite elementary and have to do (apart from schools) with assistance to the sick and needy rather than a full life for the healthy and average citizen who needs libraries, swimming pools, children's centres, sports centres, kindergartens. Local-convenience shopping is not even listed.

(viii) The Bill does not provide what qualifications the personnel of the renewal agency is to have, which should be headed, as we suggest by a planner and sociologist and assisted by an architect and landscape architect.

Appendix No. 11

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION IN PLANNING

The principal of participatory democracy in relation to urban affairs finds an interesting exposition in the United Kingdom publication "People and Planning" issued by the Ministry of Housing and Local Government (H.M.S.O. 1969). This is a report of a committee appointed in March 1968 "to consider and report on the best methods, including publicity, of securing the participation of the public at the formative stage in the making of development plans for their area".

The Committee was under the chairmanship of A.M. Skeffington M.P. and is therefore sometimes called the "Skeffington report".

Note the key word "participation ... at the formative stage". This is at the other pole to the older planning technique of permitting "objections" after the planning is finalised and resolving itself mainly into contests between property owners.

The procedures recommended are quite radically different, both from "objection" planning and even from the "consultative" planning techniques of Melbourne's proposed "Urban Renewal" legislation, which are akin to the theme of Prince Phillip's last Commonwealth Study Conference in Australia; this was an exhortation to all people in authority to ask questions first before making decisions, instead of making instant decisions followed by enquiries as to what went wrong.

The Skeffington report on the contrary established planning as a two-way process. In other words the planning authority has to systematically divulge all information at all stages of the planning process. It must actively endeavour to elicit the public reaction, and to consider and reply to these reactions.

Four stages are identified when efforts to impart information to the public are especially desirable. The Skeffington Report lists

