



**VICTORIA UNIVERSITY**  
MELBOURNE AUSTRALIA

*Irregular no. 3; Sep. 1967*

This is the Unpublished version of the following publication

UNSPECIFIED (1967) Irregular no. 3; Sep. 1967. Irregular (3). pp. 1-8.  
(Unpublished)

The publisher's official version can be found at

Note that access to this version may require subscription.

Downloaded from VU Research Repository <https://vuir.vu.edu.au/16321/>

September, 1967.

Irregular publication for members of the Town Planning Research Group (Not for normal publication or re-publication).

Here we start:

Note sequence of next two meetings -

September: Growth patterns of Melbourne.

October: High-density housing - what form and where located in relation to city, industry and transport?

This issue is intended to supply a few ideas to whet the appetite for the discussion on growth patterns and, therefore, contains:

Section 1. Some suggested reading.

Section 2. Two fashions in satellites.

Section 3. Notes on "Melbourne Sprawl" Seminar.

#### SECTION 1

#### Some suggested Reading

1. Town and Country Planning Association's recommendations to Hamer (Plan News Review Oct-Dec. 1966).
2. M.M.B.W. Report to Hamer (if you can get it).
3. Town and Country Board's report to Hamer (if it is published by then and if you can get it).
4. The Role of Town Planning (A.L.P. Booklet).
5. "Australian Cities: Chaos or Planned Growth?" (consisting of papers read at the 32nd Summer School of the Australian Institute of Political Science held at Canberra C.S. A.C.T. 29 to 31 January 1966 by Denis Winston, Martin Meyerson, Peter Harrison, H.W. Herbert and Ruth Atkins - Angus & Robertson \$1.95).

#### SECTION 2

#### Two Fashions in Satellites

Amongst town planners there seem to be two competing ideas for satellite "new towns" required to contain the growth of cities that have reached several million.

- A. 50,000 baby satellites 25 miles away.
- B. 1/4 million giant satellites 50 miles and more away:-

Examples:-

#### A. Baby Satellite Advocates

1. Werribee-Melton-Sunbury-Whittlesea-Hurstbridge-East Lilydale, Somerville (i.e., 25-30 miles away (Plan News Review October-December on cover) (BUT see Point 3 below).
2. Finger-like corridors plus satellite bulges not-very-far from Melbourne (MMBW report to Hamer).
3. "The first Victorian new town should be built about 25-30 miles from Melbourne...an eventual population of 100,000..." (The Role of Town Planning, p. 13 BUT see point 4 below)

#### B. Giant Satellite Advocates

1. "...250,000 is acknowledged as a minimum target by those who have thought about it" (Peter Harrison, Director of Town Planning National Capital Development Commission Canberra, see Australian Cities: Chaos or Planned Growth at p. 69).
2. "...The optimum is in the range between 250,000 and 300,000...not less than 40 to 60 miles from the city..." (Peter Hall, The World's Cities pp. 180-181 on Soviet Townplanners).
3. "...Spaced centralised communities to cater for populations of between 100,000 and 250,000 (Plan News Review p. 5).
4. "...Many industrialists believe 500,000 is the smallest size of city...



which they can find the facilities and market they need"...  
(The Role of Townplanning p. 12.)

### Some Conflicting Reasons:-

#### 4/3/7 A. For Near-at hand Babies

1...25-30 miles from Melbourne - a distance far enough to discourage daily travel to the city yet close enough for travel to be possible as a "safety valve" should either industry or population grow too fast for the other in the new town. This distance would also mean that new industries would be reasonably close to the suppliers, market and Port of Melbourne" (Role of Town Planning p.13)

#### 5/3/7 B For Farther-away Giants

"...economic size of urban units...at the same time... Soviet planners recognise the advantage of the very big" (satellite) "city: better education and training, better cultural facilities, linkages between industry and services... should not be less than 40-60 miles from the city itself but not much further, or they will lose their economic and cultural ties with the city..." (Peter Hall "The World's Cities" p. 180-181)

#### 6/3/7 Some Comments on A versus B

1. Peter Hall points out that Soviet figures being much higher than that of English new towns may arise from high average Soviet densities which make it possible to service a much bigger population within a given radius.

2. Mr. Fraser, Chairman of Town and Country Planning Board at the annual meeting of the T. & C. Planning Association Dec. 1956 pointed out that Australian conditions different to English new towns.
  - (a) Workers in England used to living in Council houses where Council builds them but in Australia families to suburb-of-choice tends to limit uprooting and resettling.
  - (b) In Australia greater car-mobility of workers means less compulsion to go to live near industry.

3. Writer's Comment: "Satellite" seems to be an ambiguous term. Thus, if "babies" of 50,000 only 25 miles from Melbourne it would be difficult to develop industries sufficiently big and diversified to prevent commuting with Melbourne, hence they would become mainly "dormitory satellites", therefore not really satellites but rather an outer suburb with more greenery around it.

On the other hand, if a satellite has a sufficiently diversified industry and is far enough away to make commuting impossible it is really decentralisation.

#### 9/3/7 Which to you prefer, A or B, or have you a C or D?

Incidentally, to complicate matters further: The French Government aero-train (the silent air-cushioned train running on a pre-cast concrete centre track...propelled by rockets, propeller or linear induction electric motor) plans to transport people 70 miles from Orleans to Paris in 15 minutes at 300 m.p.h.

Mobility on such a time-distance scale could well make present concepts of commuting and satellites outdated.



"THE MELBOURNE SPRAWL"One-Day Seminar3/6/1967Some Impressions

Note: Writer's comments ~~throughout~~ in brackets throughout

(Attended by ~~xxx~~ 300 planners, architects, councillors, citizens)

(Actual speeches of Shaw and Yunker roneod, excerpts from Bayly's speech roneod, and can be borrowed. Full proceedings to be published later but not available for 6 months.)

10/3/7 Hamer (Minister for Local Government) The Pan Pacific Urban Conference attended by 17 nations. World Health Organisation ~~that~~ <sup>estimated</sup> by 2000 A.D. 80% of human race would live in towns.

11/3/7 Suggested a "workshop seminar" later in year when all plans on Melbourne's future be discussed, Town & Country Planning Board, Town & Country Planning Association, UCB, etc.

12/3/7 (Query: Should not the Labour movement or some section of it present a plan and expect it, too, to be considered?)

13/3/7 Spread of great cities threaten many things... natural beauty... (couldn't hear "other things" than natural beauty... loss of amenity, disruption of social ~~xxxxxx~~ traditions not mentioned?)

14/3/7 Raised the query "Sprawl" as such not a bad thing? "Expanded city" as such not a bad thing?  
(Agree. Trouble is not sprawl but low density, low amenity, unplanned sprawl.)

15/3/7 (Comment: When plans are in "melting pot stage" Hamer good at showing a grasp of significance of some of the issues. Query: is he in a position to stand up to vested interests that must be restricted if best plans are to be implemented?)

REVIEW OF ADDRESSES

<u>Zelman Cowen</u>	City and inner Melbourne
<u>Graham Shaw</u>	Suburbs
<u>John Bayly</u>	The Rural-being-urbanised.
<u>John Clement</u>	A Plan of Action.

Zelman Cowen

16/3/7 Scope of Problem: President Johnston "In the next 40 years must rebuild entire urban America..."

17/3/7 M.C.C. Plan Won't Work. Criticised M.C.C. plan for the city ("Report on planning scheme for Central Business Area of the City of Melbourne - R.F. Borrie 1/10/1964). No car parks for shoppers; we need separation of pedestrian from vehicular traffic, when there are 400 cars to 1000 population plan will not work despite underground. Quoted Prof. Buchanan radically new urban form, "not slightest awareness of this in Australia". Cars underground better than multi-storey car parks.

18/3/7 Federal Government Aid. Problem of national dimensions



3/7 220

Federal structure of Government a hindrance. Yet in America Federal authorities head a vast complex of activities. Quoted Director of U.S. Urban Renewal Programme as to inability of private enterprise to rebuild without Government aid. Commonwealth Government has power. Must have Federal finance. Urban renewal should have high priority.

19/3/7 Radical Re-design and Grade Separation for Inner City.

New ~~big~~ buildings of odd shapes and sizes on space insufficient to cater for traffic they generate wrong. Should be a adequate acquisition of inner city areas to have buildings properly sited with sufficient space and multi-level planning with grade separation and cars underground. It should be made burdensome for owners of ~~small~~ small ramshackle buildings to retain them for it is waste of land space.

20/3/7 Responsibility to Lead. Such big changes cannot be made without "community awareness" but community has to be led into such awareness.

21/3/7 Functions of Central City Area should be Retained. Not against decentralisation of functions to suburbs but still central city functions should be retained.

22/3/7 (Note: In all of this no discussion of public transport whatever. Assumption that car has to be catered for. Based himself on Buchanan. Also ~~existent~~ consistent with R.A.C.V. grade-separation plan which he didn't mention. Cf. Buchanan's assumption that we have to accommodate the car until it reaches "saturation point". But, to give him his due, Buchanan also advocated improved public transport and pointed out that extravagant capital cost of rebuilding city could lead to public revolting against cost and opting for only partial solutions, i.e. less use of car and more of public transport. Note, in any case, London has a developed underground.)

23/3/7 (Comment: Agree with points 18/3/7, 20/3/7 and 21/3/7. But for the rest impression is that Cowen is either shallow or deliberately adopting an out-dated conservatism disguised with a bold radical-seeming facade. Asked "are we justified in assuming the car as the main form of computer transport" he simply said, Yes, he didn't believe helicopters provided a challenge...not even then mentioning rapid transit rail solutions at all.

Thus, Cowen, planning for a Melbourne of 5,000,000, thoughtlessly applying Buchanan's ideas to a Melbourne with a population of 2 1/4 million proposes, in effect, solutions already found impractical by American cities of 5,000,000 except with staggering outlays of public funds.)

24/3/7 (Query: Nevertheless, what should policy for city be? Sir Bernard Evans, Chairman of City Council Building and Town Planning Committee, attacked Cowen in Herald 5/6/67 - because Council had no control over anything beyond boundaries of Spring, Flinders, Spencer and Victoria Streets and its plan only part of master plan. But Borrie, pp 31-35 and diagram p 36 assumes fringe car parks connected both with ring road and underground over Spencer Street station (1,000) Victoria Market (1,200) Latrobe Street between Elizabeth, Swanston and A'Beckett (600) Wellington Parade (1,000) over Flinders Street station (700) and corner of Flinders & Spencer (figures equal capacity at each level). Also at p 61 proposes 1/12th of floor space for car parks in new buildings. Reimann Basch, President of Council of Progress Associations proposes - Herald 27/9/66 - bigger-circle underground around MacCauley station, university, Jolimont, with car parks over station and with parking fee covering cost of fare to city. One City Councillor suggest car park at Richmond station.

25/3/7 (Query: Apart from underground parking issue should there be large-area redevelopment, for example, National Mutual Building, new St. James' Building, etc., with dignified buildings set in proper open space and, if so, where and who to acquire land and



and who to develop?)

26/3/7 query: If cars and trams are at street level should there be special elevated pedestrian concourses or subways or collonaded walks?)

GRAHAM SIA? on Sub-urban Development.

27/3/7 "The neighbourhood, not the individual building block is now the unit of urban design, and all fresh schemes for both open spaces and for traffic, to be worthy of approval, must separate the pedestrian completely from the motor car...first decisively achieved at Radburn, New Jersey..." (eliminates) "wastage in excessive roads...As for daily use, the same requirements for open space now apply to both the most congested cities and the most sprawling suburbs; for the first must be loosened up for the sake of health and pleasure, while the second must become more concentrated and many-sided, for the sake of a balanced social life..." Lewis Mumford.

28/3/7 Tend to think of suburbs in terms of residential use only, single unit house on their own sites, the shape and arrangement of our cities has been the decisions of land developers, land surveyors and Municipal engineers. Disadvantages: Playgrounds too far from supervision by mothers, backyards unsuitable for children over six, not everyone a gardener, 40% of the population single, elderly or childless couples, parents and children waste time and energy in travel.

29/3/7 Contrast Stockholm. "Beads-on-a-string" served by rapid transit rail to central Stockholm, each bead with central core of shopping and community facilities on top of railway station, surrounded by high-density for single people, etc., then ring of medium density for small families and then low-density for large families.

30/3/7 "A new transportation medium as technically advanced as the space age may well give the structure to the Melbourne of the future".

31/3/7 "The form which Melbourne will take in the future is not very important. The matter which is, in my opinion, critical, is that a growth pattern be established as quickly as possible. Whether Melbourne will be a linear city from Kilmore to Warrigal or a radial city with arms reaching to the ocean coast beyond Geelong and into the hills towards Gisborne and Healesville or a compact central core with a galaxy of satellites matters little."

32/3/7 Nationalisation of urban land would be unpopular but control of development at point of time when it changes from rural to urban use feasible. Cp. Canberra, State Housing authorities. Victorian Housing Commission can provide fully roaded and serviced lots for £18,000 in north-western suburbs and £13,000 in south-eastern sand belt, which would cost £4,000 from private sources. "The difference is made up from the inflated prices paid by developers for land, his development costs including the high rates of interest and high pressure sales programme, his "holding" costs (real or imagined) his profit and the profit of subsequent small speculators." Planning authorities should be constructing ~~authorities~~ authorities with power to buy, plan ~~the~~ future use, develop and sell.

33/3/7 The addition of quite small amounts to cost of each lot could finance community facility, e.g., £20 X 500-lot sub-division would finance small hall or infant welfare centre.



24/3/7 Growing field of thought that housing types and density are not synonymous. 222

Old concepts:-

"High Density" ... tall blocks of flats.  
"Medium Density" ... walk-up flats, maisonettes and row houses.  
"Low Density" ... single storey terraces, courtyard houses and single houses.

25/3/7 New concepts:- (especially in .K.)

~~High Density Low Rise~~

"High-density low-rise"

Examples of unusual but more versatile forms...

- (a) R.W. houses fronting Gatehouse and Park Streets Parkville backing onto linear park where children can play.
- (b) St. Vincents Gardens (South Melb.) , Murchison and McArthur Squares (Carlton)
- (c) Burley Griffin sub-divisions at Maglemont and Ivanhoe 49 years ago .
- (d) Fountaingate development on Princes Highway beyond Hailam.
- (e) "Disappointing that my own scheme for the new town of Churchill and several other Housing Commission estates will not be built."

26/3/7 49 ft instead of 50 ft frontages with better design of house and site would help, saving 20% costs.

27/3/7 Need to build experimentally to demonstrate to Australians there are other forms of housing. Research programmes by Commonwealth Housing Commission in its report 25/8/2944 never carried out. Suggest 1% of each State Housing Authorities' finance to build 150 experimental dwellings a year. Maybe newly-created Federal Dept. of Housing could co-ordinate research programmes to obviate State duplication.

28/3/7 In answer to question: Melbourne is in fact being rebuilt. Some 30-40,000 walk-up flats on some 900 acres. But this is rebuilding wrongly. Chapter 3 of the Uniform Building Regulations "Site Requirements" should be separated from these regulations and controlled by planning authorities.

Note: Bayly said he didn't quite agree with Shaw that the growth pattern didn't matter. (See 31/3/7)

Note: Asked a question later as to whether <sup>he</sup> agreed with 40 ft frontages (see 36/3/7) Bayly had a different approach (see 50/3/7 below).

29/3/7 (Comment: Apart from growth patterns, 31/3/7, and doubts about 40 ft frontages, 50/3/7, the rest seems very sound, especially interesting being the control of rural sub-divisions and community facilities to be paid from savings (32/3/7 and 33/3/7)

30/3/7 (Query: What new transport medium "as technically advanced as the space age" did he mean? (30/3/7). The nearest "space age" transport is vacuum tube undergrounds planned by the U.S. aero-space industry.)

31/3/7 (Query: What were Shaw's plans for Churchill?)



42/3/7 (query: Should planning authorities become constructing authorities only for the purpose of services and selling lots, etc., (32/3/7), or go further and construct or supervise dwelling construction implicit in Bayly's ideas (59/3/7)?

JOHN BAYLY

The Rural Development

( i.e., Those parts that are once rural but are becoming urban)

43/3/7 Agrees with Cowen that problem a national one, also living without a city not worth living. The city needs head, a central city area. "Only the lowest forms of life multiply by dividing." In favour of big cities. The trouble with our city is not its size but bungling its development. Allow them to "dribble all over the countryside".

44/3/7 Without MGBV plan development within its area would have been much worse, but plan fails because it doesn't conserve surrounding countryside. For example, Mornington Peninsular, beautiful now, and beautiful for the first few thousand, but when several tens of thousands more go there it will not be worth going to.

45/3/7 Urgent that those parts of the countryside that will be given over to major urban development up to 2,000 A.D. and those which will be conserved for recreational purposes be designated. Distinction never drawn.

46/3/7 In order to preserve beautiful landscapes strong case for living closer together in the countryside than people now live in the outer suburbs so that more people can enjoy it.

47/3/7 Different forms of living must be provided so people have an opportunity to choose, which they do not now have. It is not enough for Governments to give people only what they demand but to offer choices.

48/3/7 Four land-use demands competing in near countryside, all essential, all will intensify...urban expansion, energy-producing and extractive industries, network of communications and recreation. This last quite important. The more leisure the more demand for recreation, for boating, fishing, swimming, camping, etc..

49/3/7 Independent ad hoc planning for these developments in administrative isolation bound to result in failure to resolve competition between them. Four needs:

1. Land resources survey of metropolitan region.
2. Interdisciplinary research...we need specialists who will jump over their boundaries. For example, planners need to "stick their necks out" on social-logical subjects and vice versa.
3. Experimental environmental design, centered upon housing, to ensure maximum freedom of informed choice between practicable alternatives.
4. A pattern of regional planning scheme for economic and physical development.

50/3/7 question: Does Bayly favour the 40 ft frontage idea?

Answer: We have developed the habit of cutting up land to uniform sizes suitable for the type of uniform buildings intended for the area. We cut it up into little bits and then design buildings for the little bits. The process should be reversed. We should seek the most appropriate siting for buildings, then arrange the buildings in relation to the open space and each other, and then, and only then, and only if necessary, sub-divide so that each may control a little piece of land so that we know who is responsible for what.



51/3/7 Question: How far should the MIBS region extend?

Answer: As far as necessary. For example, Bellerine Peninsular suitable for residential, especially if Hovercraft which can negotiate 5 ft waves could ply between Bellerine and Flinders St. Station with 130 passengers taking 30 minutes for the trip and with 120 minute service. Also Latrobe Valley, Ballarat, wherever needed.

52/3/7 (Comment: The idea of preserving bigger slabs of countryside and having higher-density housing to make it possible good. (45/3/7, 46/3/7). Bayly, although thinking in the same direction as Shaw, seems to go further on the question of house siting and design in relation to sub-division. Shaw, although advocating experimental houses (35/3/7, 37/3/7) and public controlled sub-division (32/3/7, 38/3/7) seems also to be largely preoccupied with traditional right-to-build-on-your-own-site (36/3/7, 32/3/7) even while agreeing that in Mumford's words "the neighbourhood, not the individual building block is now the unit of urban design".

Bayly, on other hand, seems to want experimental groups of buildings properly sited in relation to open space and to each other as basis for neighbourhood unit (49/3/7, 50/3/7).

(Query: Is Bayly's proposition too radical for popular acceptance? But why not? For example, Commission flats, some Carlton apartment row houses, Jennings' Hotham Gardens, all of which have a degree of visual unity...even if lacking in social facilities...are not designed on individual lots, but people, given the choice, will buy or rent them. If the ideas of Laryl Jackson, "AGE" 5/6/67, of urgency of sensible large area re-design to permit proper relation between high-rise, medium-rise and low dwellings is to be carried out, it would be almost impossible to achieve by zoning regulations, but requires positive, concrete, architectural design and sociological design to provide what people really need other than a place to sleep and so that, as in the London County Council's Alton Housing Estate at Roehampton "towers, slab blocks, medium height rows and terraces are provided in separate groups without compromising the amenities and advantages of each". Maybe it is necessary to have varying policies for inner areas, "middle" suburbs, outer suburbs, entirely new developments into "rural land"?).

YOUNG, J.P. on Planning of Latrobe University.

53/3/7 Novel features: Care to fit in with landscape; traffic on suburban principle; grade separation by pedestrian concourses over service traffic roads in central very-busy core of Uni. life; affinity of design between all buildings.

54/3/7 "It will be seen that the Latrobe plans are compounded from the same practical necessities that make cities and suburbs - buildings for living, working recreation and commerce; roads and municipal services; gardens and playing fields. Here is the suburban planning problem in microcosm..."

(Comment: Yes, splendid plans. Worth showing people over as it nears completion to show elements of gracious living conditions which suburbs should have.)

JOHN GIBBART "A Plan of Action"

(Note: Writer couldn't hear out of it.. amplification very poor at this stage. Have to wait for publication of proceedings.)

Next issue of Irregular. Summary of ideas generated by August discussion on inner suburban redevelopment for further thought pending October discussion.