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ORGANISATION FOR STRATEGIC PLANNING

INTRODUCTION

In May, 1966, the Minister for Local Government wrote (*) to the Chairman of the Town and Country Planning Board stating that he was contemplating a review of the pattern of development established by the 1954 Melbourne and Metropolitan Master Plan and a reshaping of planning policy to meet future needs. The Minister stated that the necessity for an overall revision of urban planning policy was indicated by the overspill of growth beyond the limited Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works' Planning Scheme Area; by the narrow margin between present population and the population capacity of the zoning in the Board of Works' Scheme; by the work being done to arrive at a firm Transportation Plan for 1985, based on the recent Metropolitan Transportation Study, and by the need to relate this specialist component to an approved land-use plan.

The purpose of the review was to project the pattern of metropolitan growth for a further period into the future so that the Government could make appropriate decisions in good time for the required planning to proceed well ahead of actual development. The form of the review was to be a Statement of Urban Planning Policy.

The Minister's letter suggested that subjects for particular attention included the role of metropolitan Melbourne in State growth, the future shape and nature of urban growth and renewal and the relationship of the city to the surrounding countryside. As regards the future shape and nature of urban growth the letter envisaged a metropolitan complex within an area a good deal larger than the Board of Works' planning area possibly embracing new satellite towns or enlarged existing neighbouring towns.

The Minister instructed the Board to report to him on the form an Urban Planning Policy should take and in particular its views on Melbourne's future pattern of growth, methods of planning and regulating metropolitan expansion and the most suitable form of planning and administrative machinery.

The Minister's instructions to the Board received wide publicity at the time. It is understood also that the Minister forwarded copies of his letter to the Board, to the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works and the Town and Country Planning Association for their comments.

The Town and Country Planning Board, in its initial response to the Minister's request, in September, 1966, emphasised the primary importance of resolving which particular elements of urban growth are the strategic and essential concerns of metropolitan planning policy, and the most suitable authority or authorities to formulate and implement policy.

With the Minister's approval the Board subsequently commissioned " Urbsearch ", urban and regional research consultants, to assist in the study. The Board acknowledges the contribution made to this Report by the consultants particularly the principal Mr. George Clarke and also Mr. A. D. Winter, and is grateful for their energy, initiative and co-operation. Urbsearch in turn retained Mr. Alan Davies, Reader in Political Science at the University of Melbourne, to act as critic during the preparation of this Report.

The consultants have worked closely with the Chairman and officers of the Board, and have had a series of meetings with the Board itself. During the period of study, the Chairman met several bodies representative of private interests and the executives and principal officers of public authorities (†) concerned with metropolitan planning to acquaint them of the study.

The Chairman also visited and studied other existing State and regional planning authorities throughout Australia and also in New Zealand. In the meantime the consultants studied up-to-date advice and documentation from selected authorities and experts in nine countries including Australia (‡) on the structure, policies and practices of State, regional and/or metropolitan planning systems.

The following Report then, is based on intensive survey and analysis of the questions posed by the Minister. But it also derives from the long practical experience of Board members and staff and that of the consultants in metropolitan development analysis and forecasting for Melbourne and other Australian cities.

The Report represents a broad analysis of Melbourne's present and future growth problems, and a statement of the principles which the Board believes must underlie any successful attempt to meet these problems.

(*) The Minister's letter is reproduced in Appendix " A ".
(†) List contained in Appendix " B ".
(‡) List contained in Appendix " C ".
Acceptance of the principles outlined in the Report and of its recommendations is essential before details of their application can be worked out in consultation with all those concerned with shaping Melbourne's future.

Already, Victoria's planning system has achieved a great deal since the first Town and Country Planning Act, and the establishment of the Town and Country Planning Board in 1945. Over these 22 years the legislation has been improved and planning practice has extended over a wide area. Within a radius of about 50 miles from the heart of Melbourne there are very few municipalities which are not subject to an approved planning scheme or an interim development order.

The most notable of the planning schemes in the area is, of course, the Master Plan of the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works prepared in 1954. Pending approval by the Governor in Council this scheme is being implemented in the form of an interim development order and has been kept up to date since 1954 by a series of amendments.

Over the period since the introduction of planning legislation there has also emerged a wide recognition by every government authority concerned of the social and economic advantages to be derived from effective operation of the Town and Country Planning Act. At the same time long-term planning and programming has become the practice of many State and Federal bodies supplying public services throughout the State.

However, in spite of what has been achieved there is a pressing need, especially when the future large scale expansion of Melbourne is contemplated, for overall integration of the major components of urban growth. The Report's recommendations are therefore designed to serve as a positive guide to the co-ordination and direction of major planning and development activities, from which will emerge a coherent and economic pattern of urban growth for Melbourne and the areas likely to be influenced by its future expansion.

It cannot be too strongly emphasized that the primary component of urban growth is land use, and that land use must be planned as an expression of people's needs for places in which to live, to work, to carry out their business and enjoy their leisure. Other components of urban growth such as public utilities and transport are relatively incidental and within practical limits must be planned accordingly. The society of the future will be badly served by this generation unless the foreseeable problems of land use planning together with the incidental needs of services and transport are anticipated as far as practicable.
PART ONE

MELBOURNE'S GROWTH: ECONOMIC, ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL DETERMINANTS OF MAGNITUDE, STRUCTURE AND PATTERN.


As with people the world over, more and more Australians are living in big cities. These trends are well documented, and only too well known to those who, in their daily work, must face up to the implications of intensifying urban growth.

The trends evident for many years are again reflected in the preliminary results of the 1966 Commonwealth Census which have only recently been made available. It is now possible to examine some of the statistical evidence of population growth and shift in Australia and in Victoria over the five inter-censal years 1961 to 1966.

During this period, total Commonwealth population increased by 1,032,578, from approximately 10.5 million to 11.5 million. Of this total increase—

93.23 per cent. occurred in the ten largest cities. (*)
54.58 per cent. occurred in the two major urban complexes of Melbourne–Geelong, and Sydney–Newcastle–Wollongong.
25.86 per cent. occurred in the Melbourne metropolitan and Geelong urban areas.

Since 1961, there has been a further significant rise in the proportion of the Australian population living in our largest urban areas. In 1961, 59.5 per cent. of the national population lived in the ten largest cities. By 1966, this had increased to 62.5 per cent. Although these percentages could be stabilized by a massive programme of decentralization, it is unlikely that the trend could be reversed.

In Victoria the national and general world pattern is reflected. Between 1961 and 1966, the State's population increased from 2,930,113 to 3,217,832. This was an increase of 287,719, or of 9.8 per cent. over the 5-year period.

Of this increase—

96.3 per cent. occurred in the Melbourne metropolitan, Geelong, Latrobe Valley, Ballarat and Bendigo urban areas, leaving only 3.7 per cent. in the remainder of the State.
92.8 per cent. occurred in the Melbourne metropolitan and Geelong urban areas alone.

Between 1961 and 1966, the Melbourne and Geelong areas combined increased their share of the State population from 71 per cent. to 73 per cent.

Geelong, in spite of its proximity to Melbourne, owes its growth into a substantial city, largely to the development of its own local resources, particularly its port, and those of the area it serves. However a strong interaction between the two cities has inevitably grown up—each taking advantage of the other for employment, education, recreational and other opportunities through improved communications—so that today it can probably be said that Geelong as much as Dandenong, Frankston and Western Port with Melbourne as the core combine to form a large urban complex which must, from the point of view of future planning, be regarded as an integrated unit. The present interactions between Geelong and Melbourne have probably helped Geelong to maintain its healthy rate of population growth.

Although there are advantages to be gained from a more balanced distribution of the State's population, it seems unlikely that current trends can be significantly altered. This problem is at present being investigated by the Decentralization Advisory Committee appointed by the Government.

A policy of promoting growth of selected provincial centres through concentrated public investment has often been advocated as a boost to decentralization. However even exceptional success along these lines would not be likely to substantially alter the overall distribution of population. Although the drift to the metropolitan area could be slowed down the numbers involved would be relatively small. Further, increased productivity in rural areas is likely to increase the need for goods and services normally provided by the larger cities.

The Melbourne metropolitan area has been growing at the rate of about 50,000 persons every year—or at more than 2.5 per cent. per annum. If Australian immigration rates can be maintained at an average of 100,000 persons per annum, which has been consistent Government policy, and there is to be no marked fall in natural increase, estimates that the population of the area around Melbourne could exceed 3.5 million within the foreseeable future and 5 million within say 30 to 40 years seem realistic.

(*) Sydney, Newcastle, Wollongong; Melbourne, Geelong; Adelaide, Brisbane, Perth, Canberra, Hobart.
The demographers, Borrie and Spencer, in 1964, summarized the situation concisely. (*) They concluded that if national immigration continues at a long-term average of 100,000 persons per year, and if the Melbourne-Geelong-Yallourn complex could be held at its 1961 percentage of national population, it would contain—

- 2·3 million by 1966,
- 2·6 million by 1971,
- 3·0 million by 1976, and
- 4·9 million by 2000,

at which time, the national population projection is 24·6 million. This approximates a doubling, within 33 years, of the present population.

But this area seems already to have slightly increased its share of national population. In 1961 it contained 20·27 per cent. of the Australian total whereas the 1966 Census field counts indicate that this had increased to 20·74 per cent.

Borrie and Spencer concluded that if the percentage of the nation's population in the cities were to continue to increase, then by the year 2000, the Melbourne-Geelong-Yallourn complex could contain not 4·9 million, but 5·6 million people. They indicated that a substantial redistribution campaign could conceivably be successful in holding this area down to a population of 4·9 million by the year 2000, but that such a programme would demand joint Commonwealth and State initiative, direction and financing. They suggest that “the object should perhaps be another dozen Canberras”.

Borrie and Spencer thus give clear notice that it is now necessary to prepare for the contingency of between 4·9 and 5·6 million people in a greatly expanded central Victorian region. Among the world's major urban regions, this is a modest enough expectation. It is large enough, however, to indicate the magnitude of the growth that Melbourne and its environs are to experience and which will require to be channelled into a coherent pattern over a wide area.

The prospect has other significant policy implications. The planning process, and the State and local government institutions which it involves will require strengthening and re-shaping to meet unprecedented stresses and challenges and will in fact require greater participation at government level. But before such changes can be proposed, likely forms and directions of physical urban growth should be examined. This is needed in order to comprehend the extent of future urban expansion and the scale and nature of the planning and development tasks which State and local institutions will face.

2. The Existing Pattern of Urban Zonings in the Melbourne Metropolitan Area.

The areas zoned, and explicitly committed in planning schemes for urban land uses as at March, 1967, within a 50 to 60 mile radius of Melbourne have been compiled from the records of the Town and Country Planning Board and are shown on MAP 1 which follows this page.

This committed pattern broadly reflects environmental, economic and social determinants of growth over the past 132 years since the founding of Melbourne. It is from this given pattern that an enlarged concept must be evolved for accommodating approximately 5,000,000 people.

The total population of the zoning for urban use in this area at June, 1966, was 2,335,000. By relating unoccupied parts of the zoning to population densities and subdivision patterns of comparable occupied areas it has been estimated that the total capacity of the zoning, without allowance for possible increased population due to inner suburban redevelopment at high density, is approximately 3,245,000. Although in total there appears to be a comfortable margin for increase in population without further zoning it will be found on more detailed examination that wide margins are available where growth is slow and in some instances narrow margins where growth is rapid.

Generally speaking, overall estimates of zoning capacity for large areas are of little practical value. The zoning usually embraces quite large areas of which the owners do not contemplate development, at least for the time being. Then there are often areas in remote parts which have been zoned for the sole reason that they have been prematurely subdivided and contain a few scattered houses. Pressure for zoning extensions is not uncommonly based on the popularity of a locality reflecting a local shortage of zoned land rather than an overall scarcity.

On the whole it does seem apparent that significant new zonings will have to be contemplated at least in the more favoured areas, within the next five years.

It is important to note that forward planning on a broader basis for public works and utilities requires that future land use determinations be decided some years ahead of actual zoning. Developers maintain that the protracted period of land development and marketing requires that zonings be announced at least five years ahead of actual development. The nature and timing of these land use determinations need to be guided by a coherent long range policy for the future urban structure including the necessary provision for transport, both public and private.
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This Report now turns to outline the significant environmental, economic and social factors which have helped to shape the urban pattern as it is today, and which future development policies and plans should acknowledge.


Generally, Melbourne has expanded radially from the site of the first settlement along major transport routes, mainly those of fixed-line public transport. However, with the original centre growing into a major commercial and industrial complex and living areas spreading principally to the east and south the overall pattern of growth has been unevenly balanced.

The early establishment of the port and adjacent major railway yards encouraged industrial development to concentrate in the central and western areas of Melbourne. Some residential development took place in the eastern and bayside areas to the south of the City. These environmental factors have been reinforced by social preferences and in recent years by economic factors as industry and commerce have moved into outer suburban locations.

Population growth to the west of Melbourne represents only a small proportion of total growth and, during the last five years, there is evidence of some easing in the rate of growth to the north. These trends are evident in the figures of the Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics and those of the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works.

If these trends continue it can be expected that the great bulk of Melbourne's future growth will occur in the general eastern, south-eastern and southern directions.

The locational pattern of recent manufacturing growth has generally followed residential development and, in terms of workforce employed, Melbourne's consumer industries seem likely to continue to follow this pattern. The post-war dispersal of manufacturing throughout the metropolis has no doubt had its influence on labour and distribution problems but such dispersal requires to be carefully organized in future to ensure that locations will allow optimum plant sizes and the free flow of materials between firms. A high proportion of Melbourne's industries need to locate close to the population centre of the metropolis to achieve distribution and marketing economies, or to secure large labour inputs. Very large areas are zoned for industry in the western and northern areas, but much land remains undeveloped or is held apparently for future plant expansion. Future industrial growth in these areas seems likely to depend mainly on the needs of heavy industries requiring large sites and also proximity to interstate and overseas transport terminals. Competition for labour, distance from executive and white-collar residential areas and the costs of basic services will probably limit the rate of industrial growth in the north and west. Because manufacturers have become reconciled to intra-urban trucking and transportation, a high proportion of industry will probably continue to follow labour, services and other linked industries to the eastern and south-eastern areas. The development at Western Port, and the availability of natural gas, are influences which could reinforce this trend and break down the traditional location advantages of the western and central areas.

Melbourne's growth is becoming increasingly lopsided while the inner areas continue to lose population. Having regard to the relatively small scale of present redevelopment projects, the alienation of residential land for other uses, and the increasing space standards of traffic and other facilities, it seems unlikely that increased densities achieved by redevelopment will significantly change the overall pattern of population distribution. This is not to say that urban renewal (rehabilitation and redevelopment) is not a vital necessity for social, economic and environmental reasons. In the middle-ring suburbs higher densities may well be achieved in the future arising out of an increased demand for housing locations close to the City, places of employment and particular leisure pursuits. Here again the increasing proportion of land for new or extended schools, business centres, roads, institutions and open space must be allowed for and even though the nett result is a population increase it is not likely to affect significantly, at least for some time, the magnitude of outward expansion.

The prospect of a greatly increased population in Melbourne and its environs, continuation of outward urban expansion on a large scale and of the great bulk of this being to the east and south-east, brings future planning face to face with the problem of how to maintain the dominant position which the central area of Melbourne has enjoyed up to the present time.
The central areas of most big cities like Melbourne and Sydney, and particularly those of the United States, have for some years been undergoing a marked transition. This has been brought about largely by increasing mobility which has broken down the earlier dependence on transport systems, including fixed rail transport, radiating from central areas, and resulted in widely diffused metropolitan travel patterns. This reorientation of the pattern of communications together with growing congestion in central areas and the latter's increasing remoteness from outer suburbs has led to the development of large suburban shopping centres (Chadstone and Northland being Melbourne examples). In some instances large commercial centres have grown up around major suburban passenger interchanges (e.g., Box Hill, Footscray) or have boosted an old market town (e.g., Dandenong) engulfed by urban expansion. The reaction to these trends has been for central areas to become more specialized in both retail, office and professional functions.

In Melbourne these trends have been experienced in substantial measure but because of the unevenly distributed growth of the metropolis which, it is apparent, is likely to continue, the position of the central area is particularly vulnerable.

If, as seems likely, outer urban expansion continues to accommodate the expected additional 2½ million people the growth of commercial activity in the outer suburbs might logically and with advantage take the form of a major business centre related to each of the eastern, south-eastern and southern extensions. These centres would not be unlike the parent central area in the range of activities they covered and would thus accommodate decentralized Government offices and other district administrative, commercial and cultural functions which would otherwise not be readily accessible, located as they are at present, mainly within the central area. The selection and promotion of a limited number of major centres would probably be preferable as a means of attracting major commercial interest and providing adequate focal and interchange points in the transport system. A similar principle was observed in the preparation of the Board of Works' Master Plan of 1954.

While this pattern of growth evolves, Melbourne's central area must not be allowed to languish. It has always been and should remain the State's economic and social hub, the cynosure of State-wide cultural, political and administrative influences and at the same time retain a continuing supremacy over the social and economic life of the Melbourne community. However the City's position is too vulnerable for this to happen of its own accord. Its stability in the future will depend greatly on improved accessibility and internal traffic circulation, including the long-delayed City underground, and an informed and bold approach to redevelopment problems both in the City itself and inner suburbs. Unquestionably it must take a prominent place in any future strategic plan for urban expansion beyond the present metropolis.

4. Influences and Determinants on the Future Pattern for Urban Expansion Beyond the Present Metropolis.

The areas around Melbourne which can be developed most economically from the point of view of works and services are also areas of high natural amenity. Climatically and topographically, the areas to the east are more pleasant, and are more closely linked with the major natural recreation resorts. The pattern of future urban growth beyond the present metropolitan limits will be largely influenced and shaped by:

(a) Land Already Committed to Other Uses.—Large areas are already committed for major water supply catchments and reservoirs, protected state forests, reserves for major public utility installations such as sewage farm and treatment works, national parks and sanctuaries, reserves for national defence purposes (e.g., Avalon, Point Cook and Laverton airfields, areas for the storage of explosives, naval establishments), major transport installations (e.g., Tullamarine), special purposes reserves (e.g., Portsea Quarantine Station), and major areas used for extractive industry. The general extent of these is indicated on MAP 1.

(b) Land Unsuitable for Urban Development Due to Physical Characteristics.—Although there is little land around the metropolitan area which could not be developed using modern engineering and building technology, in many places the costs by present methods would be excessive or even prohibitive. Physical restraints are imposed by swamplands (e.g., Carrum marshes), areas with steep slopes (e.g., Dandenong Ranges) and flat rocky areas (e.g., some portions of the basalt plains).

(c) Economics of Works and Services.—A fundamental influence on the pattern of urban growth is the relative costs, having regard to location, topographical and engineering considerations, of providing works and services, the major items of which are water supply, drainage, sewerage and transport. However the technique of cost-benefit analysis in this field is being more and more applied in the selection of areas for urban development. Obviously as cities grow larger the principle of maximising the use of available public utility installations and
minimizing operation and maintenance costs becomes increasingly important. Thus the following long-term considerations must be regarded as growth determinants:

(i) **Water Supply.**—The future water supply needs of the Melbourne area have been investigated in broad outline and it has been established that future supplies will be drawn from the Yarra River Valley and other streams to the east. Thus from the water supply point of view alone, development in the western and north-western areas of the metropolis would be more costly than elsewhere. Further, having regard to the lower rainfall in the west, consumption per capita is likely to be greater while there is evidence of higher reticulation costs due to the extensive occurrence of basalt close to the surface in the area.

At present most major reservoirs have a water level at around 600 feet above sea level and thus large urban areas at higher altitudes would require a pumped supply. Although this is accepted as a basic cost in many other cities most of Melbourne is gravity fed and therefore it seems logical that preference would be given to those areas where pumping is not necessary.

(ii) **Sewerage.**—It is understood that the Metropolitan Board of Works has adequate plans for headworks for meeting anticipated demands for many years. Although questions regarding the location of treatment works and the disposal of effluent may have to be determined it does not appear that any major restraint other than cost will need to be recognized. However reticulation costs would probably be higher in the western sector.

(iii) **Drainage.**—There are a number of areas, such as the Carrum marshes, the low-lying area north of Western Port, the flat basalt plain north from Epping and in the west which would be costly to drain. Drainage is, of course, another important factor to be taken into consideration in cost-benefit studies for urban expansion. It can often become a ruling factor and it might well be decided that future urban development should avoid these areas leaving them to serve as part of the major open space system.

(iv) **Transport.**—As is evident from a study of MAP 1 transport plays a major part in the shaping of the pattern of urban growth. In Melbourne the growth to the east and south-east has been strongly influenced by the system of railways radiating from the City. The big gap in the system is the absence of a rail circuit in the City itself, a defect which, if allowed to remain, seems likely to make the City's position even more vulnerable in the future. Railway land reservations in suburban and fringe areas provide scope for amplification, a fact which is likely to influence the future growth pattern. The modern freeway has also become a major influence on urban growth as can be seen in many cities in the United States. Planning for freeways in Melbourne and its environs and for improvements in the existing roadway system is well advanced. With the present and planned transport network as a base the Metropolitan Transportation Study is designing a comprehensive system for the metropolitan area based on 1985 requirements. However, the expected continued strong growth to the east and south-east poses a major transport problem for broad strategic planning particularly in providing for axial communications between major centres of commerce and industry and appropriate cross connections.

Transcending all of these considerations, but not necessarily in conflict with them is the established preference, influenced by attractive environmental features, for living areas in the east and south. The undulating topography, pleasant climate, natural tree vegetation, and close proximity to natural recreation areas have all combined to make these the favoured residential areas. The eastern side of Port Phillip Bay is the more picturesque with the advantage of clean sandy beaches and shelter for water sports while the Yarra and Latrobe Valleys, and the Dandenong Ranges, offer a wide variety of scenery. Consequently, there are strong social pressures for continued growth on the eastern side. Furthermore this now has the prospect of achieving substantial economic strength from the construction of the natural gas pipeline from Gippsland to Dandenong and the projected industrial development at Western Port.

It seems more desirable for Government policy to permit development to proceed naturally according to economic and social trends rather than to promote and possibly subsidize, to meet the costs of works and services, a more apparently balanced pattern of growth to the north-west and west.
The first four sections of this Part of the Report have been concerned with summarizing the strategic determinants of current and future growth in the central urban concentration of Victoria. These determinants have been examined in terms of—

the magnitude of national, State and Melbourne-Geelong population growth, and also of population distribution within the Melbourne-Geelong area;

existing urban zone capacities; and

the major economic, social and environmental trends—past, present and future—which should positively shape, and in some cases restrain, the structure and pattern of future urban growth.

The already committed major land use pattern together with the major physical restraints on growth, is shown on MAP 1. It is now possible to use this map as a base on which to consider desirable patterns of future growth.

5. A Concept for Continuous Growth.

There are no doubt many different ways in which Melbourne could continue to grow. These would vary markedly according to the degree of control, promotion and co-ordination capable of being achieved in planning and development. For example to envisage much slower growth than has been indicated by the population studies already referred to, accompanied by rapid expansion of one or more of the provincial cities outside Melbourne’s immediate influence, would require Government intervention in the restraint of urban growth on the one hand and redirection on the other. This has so far not been attempted in this country nor has it been very successful in others. At the same time a laissez-faire attitude to metropolitan growth, allowing it to creep aimlessly over the countryside in a form which lacks any semblance of comprehensive community planning and local civic design is an alternative which even the most complacent would deplore. Somewhere between these two extremes there are a number of popularly discussed concepts, three of which are now to be outlined. These are as follows:—

(a) Concentrically balanced periphery growth around the present metropolitan area;

(b) The establishment of a green belt around the present metropolitan area and further urban growth taking the form of large substantially independent satellite cities; and

(c) The linear extensions of organized pre-planned communities along corridors leading away from the present metropolitan area, with wide secure wedges of countryside between the corridors.

(a) Balanced Periphery Growth.

The imbalance of metropolitan growth in relation to Melbourne’s central area is well recognized and has been discussed in some detail in this Report. It is conceivable that this phenomenon which, it is said, has a weakening effect on the central area as well as many other unsatisfactory features, could be overcome by promoting a concentric balance in one form or another. This would mean accelerated growth in the western and also the northern areas and perhaps restraining growth in the others.

Without overlooking the likelihood of further limited growth to the west and north, any large scale development in these directions could not reasonably be recommended on the economic, environmental or social grounds which have already been broadly discussed. The encouragement of major urban growth to the west would significantly increase the overall costs of public utilities. It seems certain that the potentialities of the west and north for growth will continue to depend on certain limited categories of industrial development. Further, the belief that the central area would benefit from accelerated growth in the western and northern areas must be qualified by the probability that the residents of these areas would be mainly industrial workers and would therefore have little affinity with the City at least for employment or business reasons. Relatively few executive or white-collar workers now reside in these areas. Further, in the longer term, the north-western portion of the area may suffer extreme noise nuisance from the Tullamarine Jetport, which, at least until the problem of modern airports has been overcome, could further reduce its amenity for large scale residential use.

The northern outlet, through Broadmeadows and beyond, has an appeal as a direction of potential economic growth, for it lies along the direct Melbourne–Canberra–Sydney axis. This area will need careful study in the investigation and planning that will be necessary to determine the future growth pattern for Melbourne. However, at this stage it would be difficult to substantiate because it appears to suffer somewhat similar climatic and environmental disabilities as the areas to the west. It also suffers the economic liability of being expensive to service with water and sewerage. It is relatively unattractive and could not be readily recommended for residential extension, although it may provide sites for certain kinds of land transport break-of-bulk terminals and facilities.

The natural growth pattern of cities is a guide which must always be kept in the forefront in planning for the future. Concentric growth around a central area is the most logical and natural form. Departures from it, though some of them may be obscure, can usually be explained. The
explanation is obvious where a not easily surmountable natural barrier such as a wide waterway exists. In Melbourne the explanation is not so simple but the evidence that barriers inhibiting concentric growth do exist is inescapable when it is recognized that the nature of metropolitan expansion has resulted in the principal focal point, the central area, becoming very much "out of centre ".

Nothing in the foreseeable future seems likely to remove these inhibitions to concentric growth. Indeed, there are strong economic and social reasons for seeking a new balance in a planned pattern of development in the environmentally more pleasant eastern areas.

(b) A Green Belt with Large-scale Satellites beyond.

The satellite town, separated from the parent metropolis by a green belt, is a widely discussed form of metropolitan growth. It has been strongly advocated and in some instances applied where continuous metropolitan expansion has reached seemingly endless dimensions.

Because of the major economic, social and financial problems that the solution poses it is not one that can be recommended without considerable investigation particularly having regard to the prevailing Australian attitude to urban growth—the overwhelming preference of the population for a metropolitan environment with its many shortcomings, the unwillingness of industry to forsake the economic security of the parent metropolis and governmental reluctance or inability due to limitations of financial resources to invest public capital in comprehensive urban development.

It is questionable whether a satellite town would represent a satisfactory panacea for the large number of people, industries and businesses who, it is well known, want to be located in big cities, even though the satellite is identified as an appendage to a big city located perhaps no more than 30 to 40 miles from its centre and separated only by an attractive belt of open country. Even in the United Kingdom where the establishment of satellite towns is a reality their occupation has been achieved only by means of substantial promotion and inducements. The housing component in these towns has been provided mainly by public authorities while industry and business development has been achieved by displacement and even prohibition on redevelopment in the parent metropolis on the one hand, and on the other hand attractive concessions as an inducement to settlement in the new town. All of this means considerable investment of public funds, undertaken in the United Kingdom as a national policy, but so far in this country not yet apparently envisaged by the Commonwealth Government nor attempted by State Governments except for isolated instances of public housing projects.

Large initial investment of public funds would be required in most instances, for entirely new major utility installations and transport connections to establish the satellite towns and enable them to grow quickly enough to absorb their allotted share of population growth. Again this is part of British government policy. In Australia big cities have grown by accretion by which means the inadequacies and diseconomies of public utilities and transport have been concealed or at least accepted, particularly on the urban fringe. Though this is not to be commended, it is believed that a switch from what is almost traditional to a concept of ready made towns would require lengthy preparation and substantial government intervention in directing and promoting urban growth.

The initial costs of establishing satellite towns together with the costs of crossing the undeveloped or lightly developed separation strip between the satellite and the parent metropolis would need strong justification, and there are no doubt circumstances in some Australian cities where this type of urban pattern would be warranted. The rural background is unquestionably an integral part of a metropolis. Putting aside the value of rural landscape as a mental relief for the town dweller, something incapable of telling assessment, and also the value of the close proximity of primary production, there are many metropolitan activities in the form of welfare, educational, research and other types of institutions which need to be in rural surroundings and yet close to the metropolis. Therefore where a metropolis is capable of sprawling outwards in all directions with nothing in the shape of natural barriers to stop it, the preservation of the rural background in the form of a continuous green belt has come to be regarded as a necessity.

In the light of the foregoing it cannot be said that the satellite form as a general solution could be or even needs to be adopted for Melbourne's future growth. Apart from the initial heavy investment of public funds involved which at this stage would seem to be insuperable, there are also large areas of countryside close to the metropolis which, for physiographic and other reasons, are capable of being held against urban expansion.

A practical alternative to the satellite form, which has been adopted elsewhere, is to select a large well-established town in the vicinity of the metropolis, as an outlet for metropolitan growth. In this connection Geelong merits consideration. As noted previously in this Report, Geelong is now, and will continue to be closely linked with Melbourne, but is separated from it by large areas of committed non-urban land uses and a relatively inhospitable physical environment. With a population exceeding 105,000, and an average annual growth rate above 3 per cent., Geelong can be expected to retain and perhaps even to increase its share of State growth. This will depend largely upon the establishment of new industries, for which ample land is available to the north.
between Geelong and Lara, and to the east beyond Point Henry. The high land of the nearer Bellarine Peninsula and the country to the south toward Torquay have climatic and scenic attractions for residential development similar to the south-eastern environs of Melbourne and are well suited for residential expansion.

Balanced economic development may well demand the optimum use of Geelong's port facilities as well as development of the potentialities of Western Port. Both of these objectives will depend on the accelerated growth of local industry, which could well be a matter of planning and development policy. Further, the Latrobe Valley urban/industrial complex, Ballarat and possibly Seymour may be found in the future to have a potentiality for growth into much larger cities well insulated from the ordinary daily life of the Melbourne metropolis.

(c) Linear Growth by Corridors of Metropolitan Towns.

Any satisfactory growth concept should respect certain principles derived from the foregoing sections of this Report. These principles demand a concept which—

(i) can accommodate continuous growth to a population up to five millions within a broadly defined area and yet still be capable of further extension;

(ii) stops formless and characterless suburban growth on the periphery of the existing metropolitan area;

(iii) can serve increasing levels of activity while minimizing transport bottlenecks, i.e., can provide high density transport corridors capable of economically supporting efficient mass public transit facilities;

(iv) supplements the Melbourne central area by providing major regional, commercial, civic and cultural centres as focal points for the main urban extensions;

(v) in the short term, grows in physically and socially distinct manageable stages or units, so that the pattern is relatively contained and complete at each stage, and yet in the long term, achieves a coherent overall structure by the gradual addition of such units;

(vi) makes use of existing basic infrastructure in public utility headworks and highway and railway reservations;

(vii) harnesses and guides spontaneous economic and social pressures for growth in the eastern part of the Melbourne area and at Geelong;

(viii) accommodates essential large-scale natural reserves for conservation, catchment, forest, recreation, vacation, tourist and agricultural purposes in neighbouring areas such as the Dandenong Ranges and the southern portion of the Mornington Peninsula;

(ix) recognizes the higher costs of utility services in the northern and western areas around Melbourne, the costs of pumping and water supply over the 600 feet contour, and the costs of draining low-lying land.

These principles can be satisfied by the concept illustrated by MAP 2 (follows this page). This concept envisages a gradually regulated growth of communities, either breaking new ground, or where coincidence occurs, expanding existing settlements, forming clusters or corridors dictated by physical and other restraints and located according to social, economic and environmental considerations and, of course, public utilities and transport facilities.

These communities would have a population capacity of up to 100,000 and could thus be identified as town units. They would not be satellite towns as they would lack the degree of physical separation and self-sufficiency which is aimed at in that concept. Rather they might well be termed "metro-towns", indicating that each is part of a group dependent on one major centre of commercial, social and cultural interest and a limited number of major industrial concentrations. In the illustration on MAP 2 each group of metro-towns is linked along a major transport route extending from the established metropolitan area. However, each group has a distinct identity of its own defined by protected wedges of natural reserves for conservation, forest, recreation, tourist and/or agricultural purposes.

It is also an important feature of this concept that each group of metro-towns, whether in clusters or corridors, would form its own regional unit for detailed physical planning, design and development control. This means that for detailed physical planning and all that it entails there would be a number of regions located and defined to conform to the overall strategic pattern of expected growth. It is, of course, too early at this stage to attempt to define these regions but obviously the parent metropolis represented by the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works' planning area would form the major central unit. The Geelong area and the Bellarine Peninsula would form another obvious region while the Mornington Peninsula including the proposed Western Port development also suggests itself. Others are not so obvious but it is possible to envisage five or six regions. A diagrammatic representation of the system is shown on the map attached as Appendix "D".
The term region in this context needs qualification as it has become widely used to identify large areas for different public purposes. For example the Central Planning Authority has 13 regions as units for the promotion of development. The Country Fire Authority on the other hand has 25 regions, while the Hospitals and Charities Commission has 10 not including Melbourne for hospital administration and 16 including Melbourne for ambulance services. It is obvious from these examples that the systems of regions defined by different authorities for their own particular purposes do not correspond. This Report is concerned with areas suitable as units for physical planning, the definition of which would have regard to social and economic affinities and geographical and administrative factors. They would be large enough, as the examples already given indicate, to be identified and become known as planning regions.

Taking the concept illustrated on MAP 2 as a logical pattern of future growth in the Melbourne–Geelong–Western Port area it seems feasible that a completely new and major “ring” transport connection would be required as a direct link from northern transport outlets to the predicted strong growth to the east and south-east. This transport link is also indicated on MAP 2. If its apparent need can be justified by investigation it could take the form of a major services channel ultimately containing not only a high speed motorway, but also a standard gauge railway, and the necessary pipe and transmission lines. It would link the Hume Highway and the Melbourne–Sydney railway, either at Craigieburn or Wallan, to the Gippsland routes and Western Port, passing close to existing major administrative and commercial centres at Ringwood, Dandenong and Frankston.

This major transport link would not be designed to serve or permit continuous land development along its length, but only to connect the major radial transport routes which it intersects. Therefore expressway, railway and bus interchanges should be restricted to a limited number of points. Such a route would, of course, have to be determined by detailed transport and civil engineering studies, but the land required would need to be reserved and protected at an early date. In addition, there may well be a need for a further airport located on the south-eastern margin as indicated on MAP 2. In time a direct road transport link between the Geelong region and the Mornington Peninsula region may well be justified, firstly by vehicular ferry and eventually perhaps by road tunnel.

Some of the regional groups indicated on MAP 2 are less restrained than others in their growth capacities. The eastern extension towards Warragul and the Latrobe Valley could for example, be extended, while the north-eastern clusters cannot, because they are ultimately limited by topography and by committed non-urban land uses.

This concept, although based on a limited amount of investigation, satisfies the principles outlined on page 14. It substantiates the statement in the Minister’s letter that:—

“... The concept of an expanded Melbourne ... envisages what may be termed a metropolitan complex within a broadly defined metropolitan region. Such a region would necessarily require to be a good deal larger than the present planning area of the Board of Works, and possibly large enough to embrace neighbouring towns which might be included in the metropolitan complex as satisfactory outlets for population growth from the parent urban area.”

Further, it appears to the Board in the light of present knowledge, the most practical framework within which short-term physical planning and programming can operate in staged and manageable steps guided by a flexible but disciplined long-termed structural concept. This does not mean however, that other concepts should be dismissed at this stage. A considerable amount of study will be necessary before it can be stated confidently which is likely in the long run to prove the most feasible. Even then long-range concepts must be regarded only as a broad aim capable of adjustment to meet changing circumstances and up to date assessments of the requirements of society.


So far in this Report different broad concepts of the form that Melbourne’s future growth might take have been discussed. The object of this has been not to attempt to discover the most acceptable form, but rather, to range over a variety of possibilities in order to define a broad geographical area of study as a guide to the organization which will be necessary to carry out detailed investigations and be responsible for what may be regarded as strategic planning.

While it is not considered necessary or even desirable to attempt to precisely define anything in the nature of a strategic planning area there is a practical need for agreement on the broad geographical limits for the functional co-ordination of many matters of research, investigation, planning, programming, budgetting and policy-making.

Such an area does not mean a planning area in the normal sense as the limit of operations of an authority charged with the responsibilities of physical land use planning and development control. It is required as a broad limit for major investigations for strategic planning, one of the responsibilities of which will be the delineation of appropriate physical planning areas already referred to as planning regions.
Therefore the area of study for strategic planning must embrace, not merely land likely to be absorbed for urban needs in the foreseeable future, but also those surrounding areas whose conservation, reservation or change-of-use is, or is likely to be, required for the well-being of the urban population. These areas include—

- national parks, beaches, and other recreation areas and places of scenic beauty likely to be extensively used by the urban population and special conservation areas requiring protection because of the proximity of urban population;
- areas of rural or non-urban zones unsuitable or undesirable for urban development, and which must be subject to strategic policy and controls to prevent indiscriminate exploitation;
- catchment areas, forests, and other reserves of land for potential special uses such as a further airport;
- neighbouring towns and villages whose future growth and expansion must be co-ordinated as an essential part of strategic policy, planning and programming.

All of these elements can be seen on MAP 2. Without defining a boundary it can be said that the area of study must include Geelong and the Bellarine Peninsula, extend north to Kilmore, east to Warragul and include the whole of Western Port and the Mornington Peninsula. It covers some 7,000 square miles, which is approximately ten times the present Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works' planning area and is obviously in the nature of the "broadly defined metropolitan region . . . . . . . a good deal larger than the present planning area of the Board of Works" that the Minister had in mind. However, having already adopted the term region for physical planning, the area of study will be referred to in the rest of the Report as the Port Phillip District and be treated as a complex of planning regions requiring overall co-ordination in the form of a strategic plan of the major components of urban growth.
1. **Personal Concern of Present Generation.**

Almost 70 per cent. of Victorians of today can expect to live to see the population of the Port Phillip District reach 5 million. All men today under 38 years of age, and all women under 44, have life expectancies of more than 33 years (*). Children born today will only be 32 by the year 2000. Those voting for the first time will only be 54.

The magnitude and rapidity of expected growth expressed in these terms becomes even more dramatic when contemplated in relation to the many technological changes that have been forecast. It has already become palpably obvious that cities, in the way they have been allowed to grow and in the way they have been managed, have not succeeded in taking advantage of what science and technology is capable of achieving. The twentieth century has seen amazing accomplishments in the application of human ingenuity which somehow has substantially neglected human beings living in communities.

It is therefore of real personal concern to the present generation that effective management and planning organisation be established now to ensure a satisfactory urban environment for a future in which they will participate.

2. **Demands on Public Sector Management.**

It has been shown that the word “metropolitan” will come to be outdated as a true description of the future urban complex of which Melbourne will be the focus. Melbourne is now experiencing the pains of transformation from a single-centred metropolis to something quite different—a many-centred urban complex ranging over some 7,000 square miles. Gradually, new enlarged commercial and industrial centres, such as at Dandenong, Ringwood and Frankston are relieving the older central area of Melbourne of some of its less important functions, while Geelong and the proposed development at Western Port can be seen to be entering the inter-urban complex. Growth from these centres will in future create, in effect, further metropolises linked together by strong local and economic interactions.

Melbourne has successively been a village (1835–1840), a town (1840–1850), a city (1850–1880), a metropolis (1880–1960) and is now in the throes of its fourth structural transformation. Each transformation has involved a basic structural shift in Melbourne’s size, scale, area and urban form. This can be likened to the growth of human beings who go through similar successive transformations from babyhood to childhood, to adolescence, to adulthood.

Each stage of human growth demands different codes of behaviour, increasing self-control, and different demands on the management of personal behaviour. There is a brief critical period of especial stress at the beginning of each transformation while adjustment takes place.

Similarly, there have been critical periods of especial stress in Melbourne’s growth and management. These have been in the 1840’s (village to town), the 1850’s when the gold rushes began (town to city), the 1880’s (city to metropolis) and now in the 1960’s (metropolis to conurbation). The next doubling of population from 2½ to 5 million has begun to present public sector management problems of a completely different degree of magnitude, complexity and difficulty, from those of the last such doubling between the 1930’s and the 1960’s. Within the next same period of about 30 years, provision has to be made for over 12 million additional people, not the mere 1 million of the last such period. Within 12 years from now annual growth could be at the rate of 75,000 per year, by 1990 it could be 100,000, and by the year 2000 the rate could be about 135,000 persons per annum.

Higher standards of living, increasing leisure and extending economic horizons bring greater per capita demands than ever before for public services and utilities. People increasingly demand greater power generation, road space and water storage capacities per capita, more school and university places and hospital beds per thousand population (*). This means that demands for public investment are growing faster than population growth alone would indicate. Increasingly efficient planning and programming of available public finance will therefore be required.

Yet at the same time, the costs of providing roads, public transport, water, sewage, drainage and other services, are growing at a still faster rate—water has to be brought from longer distances, while drainage and sewerage mains need to be carried for longer distances, and some urban expansion will go into areas previously by-passed because of higher development costs per acre.


(†) Several years ago the “Municipal News of the United States of America” calculated that for every additional million people in a metropolis, there would need to be 4,800 new elementary schools, 1,600 new high school rooms, 100,000,000 gallons of water daily, 1,800 policemen and 1,500 firemen, without calculating housing, factories, hospitals, national parks, transport facilities, &c. The compounding effect of these necessities needs no emphasis.
The increasing numbers and use of motor vehicles provides a further instance of demand outstripping planning growth. The Melbourne Transportation Study consultants predicted that between 1964 and 1985, when the number of households in the Melbourne metropolitan area is expected nearly to double, the car ownership ratio will increase from 0.8 to 1.2 cars per household, and the number of private cars treble from about 460,000 to approximately 1,320,000.

Demands on management systems also multiply faster than population growth. The larger the urban mass, the greater is the need for both formal and informal interactions and communications between men and organisations, and the more complex the management organisation—the marshalling of land, men and money to prepare plans and carry out projects. Information-processing and decision-making reach new levels of complexity.

As a City grows larger, there is a multiplication of the number of people—particularly specialist technicians, managers and co-ordinators—required to keep it functioning reasonably smoothly and expanding rationally. It becomes correspondingly more difficult to bring these people together to formulate co-ordinated plans and joint action. Communication, co-ordination and decision-making systems need constantly to be revised and brought up to date.

In 1839, public sector development in the Port Phillip District was managed and co-ordinated by one man, C. J. La Trobe, Superintendent and Head of the Civil Service. By 1954, the total staff of State, semi and local government authorities in Victoria was 125,600. Over the next twelve years from 1954 to 1966, these grew by 35 per cent. to 169,200, while State population grew by only 31 per cent.

From 1865 to 1890, State development and conservation was managed and co-ordinated by one body—the Board of Land and Works, comprising representatives of the then three major specialist development authorities, Crown Lands and Survey, Public Works and Railways and Roads. This body was the "first attempt to cohere" (*) separate parts of public sector development. It had entire State-wide jurisdiction over all roads (except those of any local road district, shire or borough), railways, sewerage, water supply, and the "taking of land" for public works. But the multiplication of specialist problems has since meant that the same range of activities, in the Melbourne area alone, today engages the separate attentions of a large number of statutory authorities (e.g., Victorian Railways, Country Roads Board, Melbourne Harbour Trust, Gas and Fuel Corporation, State Electricity Commission, Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works, &c.), several quasi-departmental bodies (e.g., National Parks Authority) and a number of boards and committees for research, advice and partial co-ordination (e.g., Town and Country Planning Board, Metropolitan Transportation Committee, &c.).

Thanks to these bodies, the specialist technical functions they each serve can be understood and operated efficiently, each within their own limit. The unsolved problems of today lie in balancing, inter-relating and co-ordinating these to produce a comprehensively satisfactory environment for the 5 million people to be prepared for in the relatively near future.

3. The Present Fragmentation of Specialist Planning.

Already in Melbourne major problems are arising because of the absence of a comprehensive recognized system for co-ordinating the individual policies, plans and demands of federal, state and local government bodies within the public sector, leaving aside the further problems of co-ordination between the public and private sectors. The proposed City underground, the development of Western Port and the future water, sewerage, gas and electricity supply of Melbourne, all illustrate the difficulties. In all Australian States large statutory bodies have been created to control and maintain the essential services and facilities—water supply, sewerage, main roads, public transport, electricity, gas—and each has built up great responsibilities, resources and technical competence in its own field.

However, because of the size of their individual responsibilities it is practically impossible for any single one of them to have a synoptic view of the total problems of future development. Now that the metropolis has exceeded the boundaries of the metropolitan planning area their efforts are not being guided and inspired by a common vision of the Port Phillip District as an urban complex, so that bodies such as the State Electricity Commission, Post Master General's Department, Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works and State Rivers and Water Supply Commission, each must have their own concepts of growth. Some are planning separately for 20, 30 or 40 years ahead, or for a population of 5 million. This is not to say that these bodies do not co-operate over specific issues or projects, but rather that a good deal of human effort and money is not effectively used, and opportunities are lost, because this co-ordination is not comprehensive nor organised and channelled in an effective manner.

One example is that of the special long range problems of electricity supply. The present plans of the State Electricity Commission are summarized in the 1967 Victorian Year Book:—

"The increasing difficulty of obtaining easements for transmission lines, particularly in the Melbourne Metropolitan Area, has caused the State Electricity Commission of Victoria to examine its long-term proposals for the transmission of power to, and around, the Melbourne Metropolitan Area . . . . . . . . . . . . (*)."

The long-term forecast of load growth indicates that the present system maximum demand of some 2,000 megawatts will rise to about 25,000 megawatts by 1995. Since approximately 80 per cent of the State load is centred in the Melbourne Metropolitan Area, there will be considerable problems in the transmission of power between the Latrobe Valley and Melbourne. If 220,000 volt transmission were to be used, then a total of 34 double circuit tower lines would be required, which apart from being uneconomic, would present great difficulties in the provision of the necessary easements. Investigation has shown that it is necessary to go to a higher transmission voltage, and 500,000 volts has been selected as the optimum requiring a total of only ten additional lines for the transmission of the additional power from the Latrobe Valley by 1995."

The State Electricity Commission has already formulated broad plans for the location of these easements, which in some areas at least will require careful detailed investigation to avoid conflict with other land use requirements.

The State Rivers and Water Supply Commission reported in 1963 on proposals for Melbourne's future water supply prepared by the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works:—

"The Board's estimates of population growth, and a progressive increase of water requirements, appear quite realistic, and in accordance with past experience.

There is no certainty of course that a population of 5,000,000 will be reached just before the end of the century, but the argument for forward planning is just as valid if this figure were to be anticipated 10 to 15 years later.

By the year 2000, it is evident that, whatever view one takes of future population movements, there will almost inevitably be between two and three times as many people looking to the Board for water than there are today.

It can be argued that the period for forward planning for water resources development and use should be more like 50 to 60 years instead of 30 to 40...

It seems that forward planning for water supply in U.S.A. anticipates future consumption rates somewhat higher than envisaged by the Board. This is not a criticism of the Board's figures, but serves to emphasize the point that the time has arrived for forward planning for the use of the water resources of south-eastern Victoria.

... an outline plan could be prepared to guide the co-ordinated development in stages of all streams in south-eastern Victoria from the Maribyrnong on the west to the Tambo on the east, with preliminary consideration to utilizing waters of the lower Snowy.

(*)

Other specialist reports related to Melbourne's future growth and planning are at present being prepared on limited briefs, for a limited area or for a limited period ahead, by such bodies, among others, as the Metropolitan Transportation Committee.

The socio-economic data gathered and analysed in the Metropolitan Transportation Study has important implications beyond transport for the land-use planning of the Port Phillip District and it should be utilized for the production of a strategic plan for future urban development over the next 30 to 50 years, not merely for advice on the planning of only one of the major components of urban growth for such a short period as the eighteen years remaining to 1985.

These transport and utility bodies, under present circumstances, are forced to plan their own future systems, based on their own concepts of future urban growth. These concepts are likely to be in conflict with each other. Statutory bodies need to have the opportunity to participate in formulating an agreed concept for the future magnitude, structure and pattern of urban growth resulting from a reconciliation and integration of their individual development plans and programmes.


However unrelated these specialized plans for public utilities and transport may be, they are at least being pursued by individually well-equipped and well-staffed bodies. These statutory bodies have large resources, wide powers and extensive jurisdictions (mostly State-wide) within their limited fields. They command intensive public interest and attention.

The same cannot be said for the primary component of metropolitan growth—urban land use—nor for that vital component conservation, a broad term applied in this Report to the protection of land for regional open space, recreational, scenic, agricultural, scientific and ecological needs.

Looked at in the light of long-range planning by specialist authorities for public utilities and even transport, planning for the vital components of land-use and conservation in the Port Phillip District as a whole is fragmentary and extremely lacking in long-range co-ordinated concepts.

Conservation within the Port Phillip District depends on the separate efforts of such bodies as the National Parks Authority, the Port Phillip Authority, the Fisheries and Wildlife Department, the Forests Commission, the Soil Conservation Authority, the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works and the Department of Crown Lands and Survey. The Town and Country Planning Board has contributed in a limited way to co-ordination in the conservation field through the preparation of planning schemes for relatively small sections, as at French Island, Phillip Island and the Ocean Road area. In addition to this the Board of Works' scheme and some planning schemes for metropolitan fringe municipalities have prevented the indiscriminate exploitation of large areas valuable for scenic or recreational purposes. Nevertheless, especially in view of the expected greatly increased urban growth, it is obvious that strengthening and co-ordination of these individual efforts is needed.

One has only to be reminded that the population of the Port Phillip District has taken over 130 years to reach its present proportions and of the denudation that this has caused to the natural environment, to realize what effect the doubling of the population in something like the next 30 or 40 years could have on what is left of such priceless conservation areas as the Dandenongs and the Mornington Peninsula.

Unquestionably the pressures of rapid urban growth will require strong and effective measures to adequately preserve areas of natural amenity. The Minister for Local Government summarized these pressures in a speech last year to the Ninth Australian Planning Congress. He instanced the increased mobility and leisure of Australians, as the generators of multiplying pressures on recreation and scenic areas. While population grows rapidly, at around 2·5 per cent. per annum, reaching 3 per cent. in urban areas, car registrations are growing at 5 per cent. per annum. The Minister pointed out that the "reduction in Saturday work has already released thousands for the golf course, the ski run or the surf beach. And the recent general increase in annual leave to three weeks increased by 50 per cent. at one stroke, the time which people might spend in local recreation or holiday resorts".

The lack of a coherent plan outside the Board of Works' planning area has already allowed suburban development to encroach on the foothills of the renowned Dandenong Ranges and has resulted in the depollution of large areas by unnecessary subdivision in the Mornington Peninsula. It is certainly true that subsequent action under local interim development orders and local planning schemes has confined the damage in the Dandenongs and the Peninsula. But in the absence of a strategic regional concept for encouraging growth in specified future urban communities, and an agreed planning strategy for the prevention of urban development in particular green wedges between these communities, similar inroads on other vital conservation areas are bound to occur.

As regards land-use planning which of course must be based on some concept of future urban growth patterns, the Board of Works' scheme, first published in 1954, represents the only attempt made so far to implement broad metropolitan planning measures. By now, as has already been pointed out, metropolitan growth has greatly exceeded the Board of Works' planning area boundary in the general eastern and south-eastern sectors. Outside the planning area and within the broader area which is expected to accommodate future urban growth, land-use planning is the responsibility of a large number of councils operating more or less individually within the confines of their municipal boundaries.

Broadly therefore urban land-use planning and development control for the Port Phillip District at present depends on individual contributions by the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works, the 39 local councils wholly within the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works' planning area, and the many local councils wholly or partly outside of it. These are the land-use authorities, but there are other significant State bodies responsible for special activities involving land-use such as public housing, primary and high schools, technical colleges, universities, hospitals and penal institutions and also Commonwealth bodies responsible for land needs for telecommunications, airports and defence establishments.

No single authority presently involved in land-use planning is in a position to co-ordinate all of these requirements for land development and land conservation into an agreed overall concept for growth—a concept which can be related to public utility and transport needs and unite, guide and reconcile the efforts of all the bodies active in the Port Phillip District.

The function of the Town and Country Planning Board at present is to examine planning schemes "handed up" to the Minister for Local Government by the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works and the councils within and outside the Board's planning area. The Town and Country Planning Board has not had the specific task and has not been staffed to carry out the responsibility of overall strategic planning and to "hand down" the guidelines and directives within which regional and local planning authorities should work. Neither would it be appropriate for the Board to attempt such a task without the active participation of the State Departments and statutory authorities who are the largest and most active developers in the area.

Left without the guidance of a co-operatively prepared and approved overall land-use concept, developers, public and private, are forced to operate on their own calculations concerning the possible magnitude, structure and pattern of future land-use development or merely on speculation and guesswork. For example, the Metropolitan Transportation Study for 1985 has had to project future land-use patterns well beyond the Board of Works' planning area.

In short, all of the conflicting demands, needs and pressures for housing, commercial, industrial, recreational, scenic and agricultural land development and conservation, together with the essential transport and utility reservations, need to be broadly integrated in a strategic plan for the Port Phillip District. The statutory bodies concerned have a great deal to contribute to such a strategic plan. But their contributions need to be embodied in wider land-use and conservation concepts, to provide an efficient and socially acceptable quality of physical environment.

Co-ordination of regional development on the scale envisaged cannot be achieved by the existing technique of the statutory planning scheme laid down by the Town and Country Planning Act. Public authorities responsible for various activities related to land-use planning are, of course, required to be individually approached as the need arises but there is no machinery for automatic comprehensive co-ordination.

The statutory planning scheme is a tool for detailed planning at the level of local government. It demands the statutory fixing of precise boundaries, at a relatively large scale, for local zones within which permissible uses are regulated and other uses prohibited. It is in fact only a part of the comprehensive planning process, an instrument of development control, not capable of being nor intended for strategic planning and co-ordination.

Strategic planning implies longer-range, more flexible, broader policies, plans and programmes to integrate the key components of development. These components are land-use, conservation and the infrastructure works and public services of the State Departments and statutory authorities. Development policies can then be implemented through the detailed programmes of these public sector authorities, and through the land-use zoning of statutory planning schemes.

Melbourne's structural transformation as envisaged in this Report demands a rearrangement in the system for development, management and planning.

Matters of strategic significance must be given careful attention at the appropriate level. Strategic policies, plans and programmes must provide a framework within which individual State Government agencies and statutory planning authorities can implement matters of detail. Such a system would operate from the general to the particular, thus reversing the present procedure, whereby planning ideas are conceived at the local level, some in fairly comprehensive form but many in individual fragments. They are then handed upwards, ultimately coming piecemeal, as it were, to the level of the State Cabinet.

The Minister for Local Government in his letter to the Board of 3rd May, 1966, envisaged a new upper level of planning and co-ordination in stating that he required his intended review of metropolitan planning to take the form of a Statement of Urban Planning Policy. This introduced a new element of leadership into the situation outlined in this part of the Report—a form of leadership which requires the "handing down" of major policies as a pre-requisite to the "handing up" of detailed plans for review and approval. It has been estimated that major new releases of land zoned for urban purposes will be needed within the next five years. Therefore the need for determination of the future pattern of growth for the Port Phillip District is urgent.
PART THREE

THE PRINCIPLES OF STRATEGIC PLANNING ORGANISATION.

1. The Significance of Strategic Planning as a Direct Responsibility of State Government.

The environmental, economic and social studies outlined in Part One of this Report led to the appreciation of an area (see MAPS 1 and 2) over which strategic planning for Melbourne's future growth will necessarily have to operate. This area is large enough to encompass not only land likely to be occupied for urban use in the future, but also those surrounding lands the use or conservation of which is inseparably related to urban growth in the Port Phillip District and therefore must be considered in broad scale planning for the well-being of the population as a whole. These surrounding areas include—

- national parks, beaches, coastlines, Port Phillip Bay and Western Port, other recreation areas and places of scenic beauty likely to be extensively used by the urban population;
- areas of rural or non-urban land unsuitable or undesirable for urban development, and which must be subject to strategic policy controls;
- catchment areas, forests, and other reserves of land for special uses such as a further airport.

They also embrace neighbouring towns and villages whose future growth and expansion must be co-ordinated in the formulation of policy, planning and programming for the whole urban complex.

In defining the physical scope of strategic planning, it has not been necessary nor does it seem desirable to delineate a geographical boundary. It is sufficient to nominate the key places or geographical features such as Geelong and Western Port which clearly identify the area of study.

The area designated in this way has been called the Port Phillip District. It is approximately 100 miles from east to west, and 80 miles from north to south, comprising approximately 7,000 square miles. Although this is about ten times the present metropolitan planning area, it is only 8 per cent. of the area of the State. For physical and statutory planning it will be made up of several regions but it is not likely for the purposes of broad concepts to suffer the disability which has up till now hampered metropolitan planning.

Within this part of the State lives about 75 per cent. of the State's population. It contains about one-third of the State's 210 local government areas, nearly three-quarters of the electorates for the Legislative Assembly and more than half of the Legislative Council provinces. It includes over three-quarters of all voters enrolled in Victoria. This concentration of population and voting strength is not peculiar to Victoria. Roughly the same distribution will be found in comparable areas in New South Wales (the Newcastle-Sydney-Wollongong area) and around Adelaide while the rapid relative outward growth and agglomerating of big cities throughout the world, particularly in the United States, has already been noted. The facts simply indicate that management and development in such a vital area are major State Government responsibilities.

Key policy decisions affecting the Port Phillip District both as regards its day to day management and future development must ultimately be made by the Government. The State Cabinet itself, under existing circumstances must act as the co-ordinating body for planning and development decisions affecting the area as a whole as it does also for the State. The Treasurer each year in his task of Budget preparation, implicitly ranks priorities among many different sorts of developmental activities through annual revenue and loan allocations. In between these annual distributions of resources over the public sector, the Cabinet resolves conflicts between the interests of different authorities which are serious or persistent.

At State level are most of the departments, boards and other statutory authorities to which Parliament has delegated substantial powers with respect to services and controls. These are powerful influences in shaping large scale urban development. State Cabinet traditionally serves as the arbiter of the overlapping activities and projects of the statutory authorities though some of them have substantial freedom to operate independently within their respective fields.

In the light of such circumstances it is inconceivable that the Government could or should yield these responsibilities, directly affecting more than three-quarters of Victorian voters, to any separately elected body. Any such directly or indirectly elected authority would be competing with State Parliament itself.

Pre-determination of the broad pattern of urban growth within the Port Phillip District must therefore remain, and increase in significance as a State function. This needs to be recognized by the strengthening of administrative arrangements, within the existing governmental system, for the co-ordination, planning and programming of development at the scale envisaged.
2. The Strategic Components of Development Co-ordination.

These can be grouped in four broad categories which must together be integrated into coherent policies, plans and programmes. The four broad components of strategic planning and programming are those of—

- the pattern of urban land-use for future growth;
- the pattern of non-urban land conservation;
- the transport system; and
- the utilities system.

Private as well as public sector activities need to be borne in mind but it is the latter which are the key elements once economic and social trends have been established. The public sector activities consolidate the pattern of urban growth through the supply of basic public works and services and the development consents, which are necessary pre-requisites to private action. Private housing and industrial development cannot be implemented satisfactorily until the basic infrastructure of railway lines, highways, gas, electricity, telecommunications, water, sewerage, main drainage, schools, technical colleges, hospitals, and so on, have been provided, or at least precisely programmed for early provision.

Major new industrial development, having in many cases been attracted to Victoria by Government initiative, often requires special facilitating action by Cabinet, the Premier and the appropriate Ministers to ensure the provision of land and other essential facilities. In other parts of the State private industrial development often depends upon special assistance both in the nature of advice and finance by the Division of State Development.

New shopping centres depend upon appropriate action in the public sector such as prior zoning and development of housing and employment areas, adequate transport arrangements as well as upon consents under town planning administration.

Private housing estate development similarly can only follow the decisions of public authorities as regards the provision of public services, zoning and town planning consents. Although private enterprise can economically and relatively independently develop new office buildings in parts of the City which are suitably located and well served by public transport, the social and economic problems of urban redevelopment throughout the inner ring of suburbs have so far proved to be intractable without leadership and promotion by the Housing Commission.

The major new growth of industry, having in many cases been attracted to Victoria by Government initiative, often requires special facilitating action by the Cabinet, the Premier and the appropriate Ministers to ensure the provision of land and other essential facilities. In other parts of the State private industrial development often depends upon special assistance both in the nature of advice and finance by the Division of State Development.

Private housing estate development similarly can only follow the decisions of public authorities as regards the provision of public services, zoning and town planning consents. Although private enterprise can economically and relatively independently develop new office buildings in parts of the City which are suitably located and well served by public transport, the social and economic problems of urban redevelopment throughout the inner ring of suburbs have so far proved to be intractable without leadership and promotion by the Housing Commission.

The private sector activities can be most effectively helped by co-ordinated long-term strategic planning and integration of the key components of urban growth and by orderly designation of land for urban development. The chief complaint of private developers is that their own forward planning is hampered by the absence of co-ordinated government direction of the pattern of urban growth. Private bodies are therefore forced to speculate on where and when urban land will next be opened for development. If many of the present uncertainties could be removed, investment risks would be reduced and these savings could be passed to the community as a whole, or to the individual house or lot buyer. Such longer term planning and works co-ordination would enable a more effective employment of the State’s capital resources.

Economic growth through private enterprise can, therefore, now be most materially assisted by co-ordinated planning and programming at State level, by State agencies responsible to Ministers of the Cabinet, themselves constituting the prime co-ordinating body.

3. Integration of the Components of Development.

From the foregoing it can be seen that machinery is needed to co-ordinate the four components, to produce and keep continually under review a broad strategic plan and programme for the Port Phillip District.

There must be a central office adequately equipped with expert staff, to carry out the necessary social, economic and physiographic investigations and for recording the plans and programmes of the separate authorities, and comparing them—giving rise to a strategic plan and development programme. At the same time, there must be a channel through which conflicting demands for land between specialist bodies of the public sector can be foreseen and resolved.

The steps and procedures needed are:

- To continually assess on the basis of social, economic, demographic and physiographic studies the future land-use requirements for living areas, industry and commerce and ancillary uses.
- To establish a central clearing house for the major proposals of separate authorities. This will be of prime importance during the initial establishment period after which a comprehensive strategic plan should begin to emerge.
- To reveal conflicts between different components and assist to resolve as many of these as possible before they demand attention at a high level.
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To formulate a strategic plan for the Port Phillip District comprising the urban pattern, the conservation areas, and the easements, reservations and sites for the major services, communications and special uses. This should be done for periods of up to 30 or more years ahead where circumstances so require.

To formulate programmes on a shorter term basis and related to cost-benefit studies, for the staging of major public works in conjunction with designation of land for urban development, and in conjunction with predicted private sector activity. At this stage also it should be possible to ensure greater harmony than has yet been achieved between the requirements of major development works dictated by economic and engineering considerations, and their environmental and social effects in both urban and rural areas.

To submit for Ministerial and/or Cabinet approval, and subsequently hand down to physical planning authorities, skeletal framework plans, schedules and directives within which they may carry out detailed planning and administration. This, too, would be done on a shorter term basis (1 to 6 years ahead).

To lay down principles for the guidance of the authorities responsible for statutory planning on the desirable environmental character to be achieved in detail planning and development; to advise on the broad principles of environmental design.

The foregoing steps and procedures represent the preparation and implementing of strategic planning proposals. As previously stated this would need to be primarily the responsibility of a central office equipped with expert staff. Since however, the whole process is one of integration of major components of development for which, in the public sector, a large number of authorities are individually responsible, and since it has been established that the success of strategic planning depends largely on participation by the appropriate authorities the central office would also need to be in a position to carry out much of its investigation through the assistance of these authorities or by working parties composed of staff provided by them.

Following the establishment of the Transportation Committee in 1963, official recognition was given to the need for such working parties. The model it provides should now, where this method is appropriate, be extended to other components of growth, such as urban land-use and conservation. As it stands, the usefulness of the Transportation Committee is severely limited by the lack of authoritative land-use development planning over the whole area of influence and of relationship to conservation and utilities' planning.

It is necessary that a pattern of major transport routes be envisaged even beyond 1985, and that the location of these be broadly determined. The location of future major transport terminals should be investigated, and further appropriate reservations made for such installations and their ancillary services. The need for major new transport connections and extensions has been outlined in Part One of this Report. The transport requirements inherent in a concept of future growth for a population of 5 million need early investigation, so that appropriate land reservations can be incorporated in local or regional planning schemes.

There is similarly a need to bring together, again by means of working parties where appropriate, the forward plans of public utility organisations, to relate each proposal to the planning of other components, and to understand their implications, in the widest sense, for the area as a whole. Major easements and reservations are required for public utilities such as fuel and power, major drainage works, sewerage treatment plants and outfall services, water supply aqueducts and pipelines and also telephone and telecommunications. Harnessing the available resources of knowledge for strategic planning should not, of course, be confined to public authorities. For advice on research and planning techniques and in order to have access to certain kinds of research itself, there should be a close link with the universities and other tertiary educational institutions. Again there must be a close association with professional bodies and representative organisations of private enterprise. As regards conservation the assistance and co-operation of the many dedicated organisations such as the National Resources Conservation League would be invaluable.


It is now possible to enunciate the principles on which the organisation for strategic planning and co-ordination of development should be based. These may be summarized as follows:—

(i) Expansion of Melbourne metropolis to accommodate 5 million people is likely to create new and strengthen existing economic and social interactions in the Melbourne–Geelong–Western Port area referred to in this Report as the Port Phillip District. This area needs to be identified for the purpose of strategic planning.

(ii) Strategic planning of the scale envisaged must be regarded as a joint undertaking by the authorities responsible for land-use planning and development control, public utilities, transport and conservation and one which is capable of being implemented within the existing systems of State administration.
(iii) Because the State Government is the body responsible for final decisions on all major development matters, strategic planning should be carried out at a level closely linked to the Minister concerned. The creation of an additional elected body or extension of an existing one to assume such responsibility would be inappropriate and an unnecessary duplication.

(iv) Because a body is needed to act as a filter for demands and conflicts affecting land before they require Cabinet attention, the importance of the decisions to be made necessitates a most highly responsible membership.

(v) The body responsible for strategic planning and co-ordination should be independent of all or any of the authorities represented as regards their routine operations and management.

(vi) There should be a two-tier system of planning, strategic planning at State level, and physical planning at the local government level. The latter could, as in the past, be carried out at a regional level or municipal level, as appropriate in the particular circumstances.

These principles may be compared with conclusions reached after six years by the Perth Metropolitan Region Planning Authority. The following is taken from the Authority's Annual Report for 1964–65.

"The Authority believes that there are four fundamental requirements which must be fulfilled and applied over a long period of years if success is to be achieved in shaping Metropolitan Perth in a form which is socially and economically satisfactory:—

(a) Major regional planning decisions must reflect State Government policies and be endorsed and supported by the Government.

(b) State Government instrumentalities and other public authorities whose development works represent the realization of co-ordinated regional development must participate effectively in regional planning decisions.

(c) A wide range of specialist professional skills must be applied in support of decision-making on the major elements of regional planning.

(d) An effective process of regional planning goes beyond the statutory jurisdiction of the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority in administering the Region Scheme: there must be a focus of organised co-ordination which embraces the agencies referred to in (b) above."

Having stressed the importance of Government endorsement of strategic planning and participation by Government authorities it is appropriate to conclude this Part of the Report by referring again to the Minister's letter and its reference to "the ever-present need to relate metropolitan population growth to that of provincial cities and towns to ensure that no opportunity is lost to promote better distribution of the State's population."

Initially this Report was concerned with the Minister's intention to have reviewed the planning arrangements for the Melbourne metropolitan area. As a result of the study described in Part One of the Report it has become apparent that the proposed review should cover the much wider area embracing Melbourne, Geelong and Western Port. Although the growth problems of this area command immediate attention it will be recognized in the light of the principles that have been enunciated so far that there are other parts of the State, with sufficient growth or potentiality for growth to justify a strategic planning approach. Accordingly, having regard in particular to the quoted section of the Minister's letter, consideration of the organisation for strategic planning takes on a wide significance.
THE RECOMMENDED ORGANISATION FOR STRATEGIC AND PHYSICAL PLANNING.

1. The Nature of the Organisation Required.

This Report began with the Minister's request in his letter of 3rd May, 1966, for a definition of the term "Statement of Urban Planning Policy", for the Board's view on Melbourne's future pattern of growth, and its recommendations on metropolitan planning method including a suitable authority or authorities for carrying it out.

Implicit in the Minister's request was his concern that much of Melbourne's growth, in already exceeding the boundaries of the Board of Works' planning area, lacked metropolitan planning guidance.

After making a preliminary study of the present position, the Board was able to assure itself that Melbourne's growth, even though it had assumed many unsatisfactory characteristics, was in fact now almost entirely contained, if not by the Board of Works' Master Plan, at least by planning control exercised by local authorities. Thus the Board felt justified in turning its immediate attention to what it considered to be the first fundamental need—an effective organisation for a greatly enlarged area for broad planning.

The major and readily apparent weakness in the present system, in the Board's view, was that much of the responsibility for providing the sinaus of metropolitan development and re-development, both in the established parts of the metropolis and particularly in areas into which it was likely to expand, was in the hands of government authorities which so far had had the opportunity to participate directly in metropolitan planning. Furthermore, there was no satisfactory machinery for integrating the specialized planning which each of these authorities must of necessity undertake individually in their own particular fields, and for reconciling their proposals with land-use and conservation needs.

Organisation stood out sharply as a question to be resolved urgently, together with the related need to define the nature and limits of metropolitan planning. As regards the latter, the Board was aware from its examination of the Board of Works' Planning Scheme now awaiting approval of the Governor in Council, that there is no clear distinction in that scheme between matters of metropolitan significance and of local detail.

The Minister accepted the Board's interpretation of the two principal aims of its Report.

The first step was to define an area of study to which the intended organisation would apply itself in carrying out the review and formulating a Statement of Urban Planning Policy which it was understood were the Minister's ultimate aims. The Minister's letter had referred to the possibility of further metropolitan growth taking the form of satellite towns and to a metropolitan complex involving neighbouring towns envisaging a region which "would necessarily require to be a good deal larger than the present planning area of the Board of Works". Even within this much broader compass it seemed possible, early in the Board's investigation, to contemplate an organisation solely and objectively concerned with metropolitan planning and constituted in such a way as to enable the participation of the appropriate government authorities. This it seemed, could have been achieved by an extension of the Board of Works' planning area and, to satisfy the principle of participation, by either a redefinition of the Board of Works' function as a planning authority or the establishment of an entirely new authority.

In order to define the area of study it became necessary to consider the likely size and shape of the future metropolis with some bias towards generously proportioned environs having in mind the difficulties that already had arisen from a too-restricted metropolitan planning area defined not much more than fifteen years ago. However, it was found, in considering likely metropolitan patterns based on an authoritative estimate of a 5 million population within 30 to 40 years, that there could be major extensions in the east and south-east reaching beyond and on both sides of the Dandenongs and into the Mornington Peninsula, and that in the west an enlarged Geelong might well provide a balancing influence.

Thus the concept of an enlarged metropolis began to be superseded by one embracing Melbourne, Geelong and Western Port as an urban complex, the broad planning for which could no longer be regarded as a metropolitan responsibility.

The threat to the Dandenongs and Mornington Peninsula, both of them highly prized conservation areas, together with the Board's recognition of conservation as a major component of metropolitan growth gave even greater dimension to the area of study.

On this point it was concluded that the organisation which was to be responsible for the preparation of a Statement of Urban Planning Policy should have an area of study about ten times as large as, but including the present metropolitan planning area, in extent about 7,000 square miles.
Further investigation added even greater emphasis to the need for co-ordination by revealing that specialized planning by some major authorities was being advanced well into the future without the guidance of an authoritative concept of a pattern of future urban growth.

Thus it became evident that the responsibility for broad planning of the major constituents of land-use and the integration of this component with those of public utilities, transport and conservation for such a large, complex and vital area must become vested in a planning body having the status of a government authority.

Such a conclusion pointed either to the setting up of a new state planning authority responsible only for strategic planning or to a reconstituted Town and Country Planning Board having two distinct responsibilities, its present one of general supervision of statutory town and country planning and the new one of strategic planning and all that it entailed. In either case strategic planning could well be applied to any area of State economic importance, either existing or potential, such as the Latrobe Valley, or, say, the Shepparton district as well as the area of immediate concern, the Port Phillip District.

The reconstitution of the Board, renamed the State Planning Board of Victoria, is considered to be the most practical course to adopt.

2. The Proposed Organisation for a Strategic Planning Body.

The term strategic planning has already been used a good deal in this Report. Although its use may be transgressing military terminology it fittingly describes the fairly new concept of broad planning for the modern phenomenon of the conurbation. Town and country planning, even that carried out in the preparation of the Melbourne Master Plan and other similar metropolitan plans has been primarily physical in character. It has been concerned mainly with the disposition, and definition by finite lines related to property boundaries, of the land to be used for housing, industry, commerce and the like and of the reservation of land for parks, transport facilities and other public purposes. These physical plans have eventually culminated as planning schemes approved, as far as this State is concerned, under the Town and Country Planning Act.

No doubt many planning schemes are based on carefully reasoned out functional plans outling, without detailed concern for finite boundaries, a broad disposition or pattern of land-use related to public utility system capacities and integrated by a system of transport communications. On the whole, however, this functional planning stage seems to have been neglected even for large and important urban areas where the need for a synoptic appreciation of the growth form of the whole is an essential pre-requisite to the detailed planning of localities.

In an area as large and complex as the Melbourne-Geelong-Western Port area the need for the synoptic appreciation afforded by strategic planning is inescapable. The possibility of the growth of a strong urban corridor east beyond Dandenong has significant implications for the Melbourne central area more than twenty miles to the west. Likewise a pioneer movement of urban expansion to the south-east and east has strong implications for the Dandenongs as a conservation area. These are but two examples why the whole area likely to be affected by the urban settlement of 5 million people needs to be examined synoptically. Only in this way can the processes of disposition of land-use, the provision of public utilities and transport and the protection or conservation areas be adequately blended.

As has been stated broad functional planning may have preceded some of the present planning schemes and it is important that it should. But in an area under a single local government administration this stage of the planning operation is largely a matter of domestic concern. In the large and vital area with which this Report is primarily concerned, with its wide range of social, economic and cultural differences and its divisions of administrative responsibility, it is essential not only that strategic planning be carried out but also that it have the authority of Government endorsement.

Strategic planning has not hitherto been recognized as a responsibility of the Town and Country Planning Board. The Board up till now has had the established responsibility of reviewing planning schemes of which there have been a considerable number, submitted to the Minister for Local Government under the Town and Country Planning Act and advising the Minister on their suitability for approval. The most important of these was the Board of Works’ scheme on which the Board has made two major reports. A second responsibility has been to advise the Minister on general matters relating to town and country planning. Advice of this kind has often been given at the Minister’s request but frequently the Board has itself initiated action either as the circumstances demanded or through recommendations in its annual reports. A third responsibility which has also absorbed a good deal of the Board’s resources has been to prepare planning schemes for special areas of State rather than local concern such as the Latrobe Valley and the environs of reservoirs and of the coastline.

Having regard to this third responsibility it would be in keeping with the Board’s charter as laid down in the Act that it should assume the responsibility of strategic planning.
However, the responsibility of strategic planning, particularly having regard to the principles expounded in this Report, would entail extensive re-organisation. In the first place the operations of the Board itself would have to be arranged in such a way that its present reviewing and advisory responsibilities were clearly separated from that of strategic planning. This division would also apply to the planning staff and to a lesser extent to the administrative staff.

While re-organisation of the Board would be designed to enable it to take care of the operational and administrative responsibilities of strategic planning, participation by public authorities in the processes of planning and integration of the major components of urban growth would be achieved through a co-ordinating council, comprising the heads of the authorities directly concerned. This body might appropriately be named the Council for the Co-ordination of Regional Planning and should have the responsibility of reviewing and endorsing (and if felt necessary, initiating) strategic planning proposals formulated by the Board. The proposed composition of the Council is shown on the chart attached as Appendix "E". All strategic planning proposals submitted by the Board to the Minister would require the Council's endorsement.

Once these proposals had received approval at Cabinet level the Board would again be responsible for handing down the proposals in the form of directives to the appropriate planning authorities, preferably regional planning bodies, but in their absence, the municipal planning authorities, for the areas affected. These directives would act as guidelines for physical planning, representing government decisions on policy, major works and ruling principles and standards.

Reverting to the organisation of the Board, a review of its membership appears to be justified. At present the Board consists of one full-time member who is the Chairman, and two part-time members. The Bill to amend the Act which was presented to the last session of Parliament provided for an additional full-time member the intention being, it is understood, to free the Chairman from direct day-to-day responsibility for the Board's statutory planning and related administrative activities. The additional responsibility of strategic planning envisaged in this Report together with the formation of the proposed Council would, it is believed, justify the addition of a third full-time member. This member would be directly responsible for the strategic planning division of the Board and would assist the Chairman in his responsibilities connected with the proposed Council.


A brief outline of a procedure for strategic planning by the Town and Country Planning Board will illustrate the significant features of the proposed organisation.

The nature of the organisation has already been broadly outlined—the strategic planning division of the Town and Country Planning Board (renamed) and the Council for the Co-ordination of Regional Planning. The immediate task is the strategic planning for the Port Phillip District.

The Board's strategic planning division would begin with the preparation of an outline of a proposed urban growth pattern based in simple terms on studies of demographic, social and economic trends and on physiographic studies of the ability of the land concerned to sustain a proposed urban growth pattern based in simple terms on studies of demographic, social and economic trends and on physiographic studies of the ability of the land concerned to sustain an urban growth pattern. This work would be carried out by the Board's own staff and where circumstances warranted, by consultants retained for specific studies. Concurrently there would be close collaboration with the authorities responsible for the public utilities and transport components to ensure feasibility of the emerging outline. As regards conservation the appropriate authorities, university faculties and representative organisations would be consulted to ensure satisfactory reconciliation of the urban growth pattern with conservation needs. This collaboration would be done, according to the circumstances, either by working parties made up of representatives of the appropriate bodies, by the secondment of staff from authorities or by referring to authorities for specialized investigation.

As the work progressed the Board's staff would make submissions on principles, policies and planning proposals to the Board who in turn would refer them to the Council. At this point members of the Council would be in a position to be briefed by officers of their respective authorities who had been consulted or engaged in the preparatory stages.

For submission to the Minister and ultimately for approval by the Governor in Council, the strategic planning proposals would take the form of a Statement of Planning Policy. At the stage where this document was to be considered by Cabinet, Ministers would be in a position to obtain information direct from their representatives on the Council (see Appendix "E"). Should the Board's submission not have been supported by any member or members of the Council, either generally or more particularly, respecting the interests of any authority, the Board would be obliged to report such conflict to the Minister for determination.

The process of initiation and formulation (by the Board) collaboration (through the working parties, &c.), endorsement (by the Council), submission (by the Board to the Minister) and information (between members of the Council and their respective Ministers) appears to satisfy the principles of comprehensive planning, integration and participation.
4. Procedure for Physical Planning within the Strategic Planning Framework.

Practical considerations, requiring early determinations in areas expected to experience rapid or new growth, would probably preclude the preparation as a single operation of a complete and comprehensive strategic plan and Statement of Planning Policy in turn to be approved and handed down as a framework for physical planning for the whole group of regions. It is more likely that the strategic plan would be gradually built up and consolidated by a series of decisions on major issues made as they arise, each related to an overall plan in course of preparation even though in the early stages the latter may only be in an elementary form.

In these circumstances it would be necessary, concurrently with the setting up of an organisation for strategic planning, to begin to establish the organisation for carrying out detailed physical planning in accordance with the Policy directives handed down.

Reference has already been made to the proposed system for physical planning—the Port Phillip District comprising a number of regions of which the area entrusted to the Board of Works would be the central key region with others encompassing such areas as Geelong and the Bellarine Peninsula or Mornington Peninsula. It has also been stated that the determination of the boundaries of regions would require careful investigation having regard in particular to such important factors as social and economic community of interest, and what is most important, initial strength in resources of leadership, expert staff and finance.

In envisaging such a system the political implications have not been overlooked. Indeed these may well be so complex that it would be prudent, rather than attempt to establish the system precipitately by an overall determination of boundaries, to establish the principle in the first place and then proceed to institute regional authorities according to a priority determined by needs. The procedure for the establishment of a regional authority would be the same as that outlined in the Bill amending the Town and Country Planning Act presented to Parliament earlier this year. Until regional authorities had been established, existing planning controls or new controls where necessary would provide a safeguard with the Board exercising overall supervision.

Planning at the local government level or physical planning as it has been referred to in this Report has always been handicapped by the lack of an adequate system of liaison through which the planning authority should be able to get a clear appreciation of the policies and intentions regarding development of public authorities. Such an appreciation is essential if a council or a regional planning authority is to be expected to formulate a planning scheme which purports to guide future development and assist the private developer in drawing up his own plans.

A Statement of Planning Policy approved by the Governor in Council would be expected to meet this pressing need. It would be translated into directives by the State Planning Board and conveyed and explained by consultation, to the authorities responsible for physical planning whether they be regional planning authorities or local councils. From this stage onwards the planning process would be as laid down in the Town and Country Planning Act culminating in due course in a planning scheme. After submission to the Minister the scheme would be referred to the State Planning Board for examination by its statutory planning division.

The concept of a Statement of Planning Policy and the associated directives is a new one in this country at least as far as official recognition and application are concerned. This is one reason why its realization will require a great deal of careful preparation and organisation. It would be utterly impractical to expect the system to be introduced quickly and without many initial difficulties. Many public authorities, hampered by a system of budgeting and by lack of finance, which force them to confine the bulk of their activities to very short term projects, have been unable to extend their advanced planning beyond sketchy outlines. More than this will be necessary if vital sites and routes for future public undertakings are to be protected from urban invasion.

Thus the form that the Statement of Planning Policy and the directives should take, will require careful, detailed consideration and be kept in mind throughout the strategic planning stage. Strategic planning is structural in character not unlike the framework of a building of steel members which determines the outline of the structure, the number of stories and the main service channels for lifts, stairways, air-conditioning and plumbing. The enlightened builder or authority from which he must obtain a permit to build, may also have regard to the external environment by reserving a portion of the site as open space. At any rate, at this framework stage the internal layout of the building is not apparent and very often is left to individual tenants to determine to their own satisfaction. Likewise a structural or strategic plan would lay down the outer limits of urban growth and the main service channels for communications and public utilities. It might also define the locations of major establishments and installations of greater than local or regional influence such as air, sea and land transport terminals, universities and the like. Defined conservation features outside the urban limits would represent external environment and thus the analogy with the structural components of a building is complete. As regards internal layout, that is, the land-use composition and lesser ancillary requirements of urban areas, the strategic plan would be unlikely to go further than to make estimates of population capacities of regions, the nature and extent of expected industrial development and possibly also the general location of major centres of economic, administrative and social activity.
Nevertheless physical planning would be expected to achieve high standards not only in the
disposition and rational relationship of the constituents of land-use and public purpose
reservations but also in development carried out in conformity with the planning. To this end
development standards and ruling principles would either form part of the directives handed down
to the planning authorities or be required to be formulated by the authorities to the satisfaction of
the Board.

Finally the responsibilities of public utility and transport authorities in the physical planning
process must not be overlooked. Whatever the strategic plan indicated a framework of public
utility or transport features these would be expected to be defined precisely at the physical planning
stage and adequate provision made for the acquisition of any land reserved for such features.

5. Financial Implications.

The term town planning whether applied to localities or to large regions often implies in the
public and even the official mind, costly undertakings which the community simply cannot afford.
This conception of the financial implications of planning as an insuperable barrier seems to envisage
a drastic purging of all that is unpleasant or inconvenient in towns and cities. It is a pity, it is so
often said, that this was not done or the mistakes avoided, 50 or 100 years ago but now, obviously,
it is too late. And so planning in its entirety is subordinated or discarded as impractical by many
people as they face what has grown up and become established in the past, and turn their backs on
new urban growth often woefully inadequate as to ordinary amenities such as sewerage, transport,
schools, shops and decent environment.

Planning can achieve and has already achieved a great deal, not by costly purges but simply
by better husbandry, by co-ordination of the spending of both public and private funds, in the
building of the new parts of our cities (and even the rehabilitation of the old) and by the insistence
on high standards. Indeed it can be shown as would be expected that good husbandry in town
building is sound economy. This is not to say that planning has no financial implications at all,
but rather that the money expended on planning is an insurance against a repetition of much of what
is found unsatisfactory in established areas unable to cope with the requirements of modern
society.

The financial requirements for forward planning of the Port Phillip District are not
formidable when it is viewed as an undertaking to provide acceptable living, working and
recreational standards for a population which in 30 years will be double the present numbers. As
already pointed out the period is so short that the undertaking cannot be put aside for posterity
to look after. In any case, such are the permanence of buildings and the inviolability of property
rights, that those who are responsible for today's urban development owe a considerable obligation
to posterity. Much of Melbourne as it is today, its transport dilemmas, its traffic bottlenecks
and its blemished environment, is the legacy of responsibility shelved or ignored by past
generations—not the early pioneers who gave the City its generously proportioned parks and
handsome boulevards, but those of the later and so called prosperous periods of rapid expansion
when attempts to further dignify the City for the contemporary and future community were
overwhelmed by waves of greed.

The investment of public money in planning and forming the structure for the development
entailed in accommodating 2½ million more people cannot be regarded as a luxury or as something,
in times of public finance stringency, that can be done without. In private enterprise this stage
in the growth and expansion of an organisation or even in the continuous reappraisal of its activities,
is a commonplace feature of management to which funds and other resources are regularly allocated.
Efficient growing organisations are constantly reaching out ahead of their day-to-day operations
exploring and assessing future sources of raw materials, market potentialities, locations for
expansion, developments in technology and the like, all of which require financial investment in
research, planning and land acquisition.

Some government authorities, particularly those concerned with public utilities like water
supply and power, function in the same way and the price of the commodities they retail to
consumers covers the planning and preparation stage of the management of their affairs. The
same cannot be said of transport, but this is largely because of the quandaries and uncertainties which
seem to inhibit the determination of clear cut policies defining the roles of the different arms of
transport at present generally being allowed to compete on uneven terms. On the other hand most
public authorities including those concerned with transport, are deprived of the benefits of proper
management by a budgeting system which requires tangible results and short term programmes
as justification for expenditure.

What is needed in the public sector is the machinery to integrate the specialized planning
of the many public utility and transport authorities and co-ordinate them with land-use and
conservation needs. This is strategic planning, which not only must be faced up to and paid for
as a pressing need but in fact be regarded as a phase of regional management and a sound
investment. With planning must be coupled preparation, which simply means protection by the
acquisition of the land seen to be required for long range public purposes such as transport and
public utility routes and installations and conservation areas.
This, of course, is not a new conception. The Board of Works' Master Plan of 1954, was an attempt to recognize the phase of planning and preparation in metropolitan management. Its notable achievements were weakened by the inability of the Board of Works to fully involve the entire system of public utility and transport undertakings in direct participation in planning and preparation. Now that the scale of future growth has transcended the limits of metropolitan management by local government the opportunity to strengthen the organisation presents itself.

The financial implications of strategic planning are represented firstly in the cost of re-organising the Town and Country Planning Board and of the administration involved in convening the proposed Council for the Co-ordination of Regional Planning. This should not be substantial considering that existing planning and administrative machinery is being harnessed to provide the required organisation.

Secondly there are the financial implications of what has been referred to as preparation, that is, acquisition of land for public purposes for long range needs. These would undoubtedly be of much greater proportions and although it is not possible at this stage to give even a broad estimate of the amounts involved it may be appropriate to discuss possible sources of finance for this purpose.

Many searching enquiries have been made into the influences of land-use, either determined by planning controls or resulting from natural trends, on land values. Some enquiries have also revealed the influences that speculation by private interests can have on the direction and nature of urban growth. Long before such enquiries were made, and since the beginning of the modern town planning movement, it has been widely held that the ownership of land does not include the right to the entire benefit, expressed in the increase in the value of land, which accrues as the result of actions taken in the public interest in the nature of public works (e.g., public utility and transport improvements) or of decisions on the use of land in accordance with town planning schemes. The effect of benefits of this kind reflected in increased land values is called betterment and there have been isolated attempts by public authorities to recover it, going back over many years, even prior to town planning legislation which now, in several countries, has recognized the principle. In Australia, the Victorian and New South Wales legislation generally follow the British example set in the thirties. In the United Kingdom there have been several attempts to improve on the crude beginnings of the earlier town planning legislation.

The question has been dealt with in a Study of Property Rights and Compensation by Mr. Justice Else-Mitchell of the New South Wales Supreme Court.(*)

"Given a determination to revitalize our cities and urban areas, to ensure proper standards and improve the amenities of future cities and towns, as well as an acknowledgement of the need to control development in rural areas, the only question remaining to be answered is whether we can devise a means by which all necessary steps to these ends can be taken without the financial burden assuming crippling proportions. No one doubts that the cost of planning and replanning must be met by the community, that is, by its present and future citizens who will share the benefits which are certain to ensue from the implementation of sound planning proposals. Is it not more equitable, therefore, to cast the financial burden upon the land-owner whose efforts did not create and seldom have added much to the value of the asset in his hands rather than to expect the productive processes of the community and the income and wage earners to bear another impost which will have to be passed on and added to all other community costs?"

He goes on to pose "for consideration, enquiry and research" the question of reforming our property laws according to principles which he clearly outlines.

However, setting aside for appropriate investigation in due course, the broad question of betterment, as applied to the whole process of town planning and the latter's effects on property values, with all the attendant difficulties and complexities which have so far stifled even serious thought, let alone action on the subject in this country, there remains one clear field in which an equitable division of land value benefits from planning would provide a source of revenue for public improvements. This is in the zoning of rural land for urban occupation.

There was a time when the owner of land in the path of urban expansion could reap the full benefit which this change in the status of his land conferred on him. His sole obligation was to subdivide his land into lots suitable for the apparent need (and usually very much in excess of it). The community, as tax and ratepayers, bore the entire obligation, when it was ultimately to be met, of street and footpath construction, drainage, water supply and providing the land for open space and many other amenities necessary to permit adequate occupation standards. These circumstances have given land ownership wherever a potentiality for growth could be seen or invented, an irresistible charm, dulled only temporarily by the economic collapses that have inevitably followed or every large Australian city as it expanded. By degrees these deplorable conditions under which large numbers of people had to live in outer suburbs forced

governments to impose obligations on subdividers. The first of these was street construction, while recent legislation in this State enables a council to require the subdivider to provide land for public open space. Some authorities also require a contribution to the provision of water supply and sewerage and in the main metropolitan areas of New South Wales this is now compelled by law.

However, in spite of this gradual imposition of responsibility on the land subdivider he still has much to gain from favourable zoning. Rural lands on the fringe of metropolitan areas, even while they remain under rural zoning in planning schemes still provide what is apparently a fruitful field for speculation. One objectionable feature of this is that the speculator having acquired an interest in rural fringe land will exert pressure for rezoning which, if successful, can not only cause an uneconomic surplus of zoned urban land but may even be the beginning of misdirected urban expansion.

The whole question of land values is extremely pertinent to strategic planning. The latter will make known well in advance of development the general shape and location of future urban growth and the structure of major works and improvements. While this kind of declaration will greatly limit the field for speculation, which at present covers almost the entire urban periphery, and may thus help to stabilize rural land values in some quarters, it will at the same time focus attention on the selected quarters. The resultant effect on land values, in the absence of dampening measures, is not difficult to imagine and, if it were, examples near at hand and of recent times could be cited. This is one side of the question. The other is that the declaration and the subsequent physical planning and development would confer on the land designated for urban expansion substantial increases in value which would be due entirely to demographic, social and economic trends recognized and expressed by planning measures and consolidated by public works. In other words the individual owners of the land would have contributed nothing to the change in the status of the land. Thus they would not be entitled to the entire increase in value, a substantial proportion of which should be applied to making the land suitable and ready, in the widest sense, for urban occupation. Some at least of the money derived from this source should be channelled into a fund which it will be necessary to establish to finance the acquisition of land earmarked for major public purposes in strategic planning proposals.

A study of the question with a view to positive steps to enforce practical measures, should be one of the first tasks of the organisation proposed for strategic planning.

Finally, as regards the financial considerations of strategic planning, reference should be made to the role played by Commonwealth Government instrumentalities in the growth and development of the Port Phillip District. It has been substantial in the past, both with respect to metropolitan Melbourne and to Geelong. It is likely to be even more substantial in the future.

The functions for which the Commonwealth Government has accepted full or partial responsibility—defence, air transport, postal, telegraphic and wireless communications, national research, tertiary education are perhaps the major examples—become at some stage or other inextricably involved in the different levels of urban management. All of the installations and establishments involved in these functions, even though the Commonwealth may determine their locations, have wide reactions which influence the planning and development of the major components of urban growth to a marked degree. A modern jet airport may well set up a formidable barrier to urban expansion in the direction in which it is located. On the other hand a new university, to the establishment of which the Commonwealth contributes a great deal, would most certainly be an accelerating influence on urban growth.

It will be the responsibility of the Board and the Council for the Co-ordination of Regional Planning to ensure that the planning and operations of the appropriate Commonwealth instrumentalities are adequately integrated in strategic planning. On the other hand the Commonwealth Government must be made to recognize that it has a vested interest in the future growth of the Port Phillip District and that sound strategic planning will not only enhance the value of its investment but provide an assurance of more efficient functioning of the numerous establishments owned by the Commonwealth or in which it has an interest.

6. Conclusion—Recommendations.

It would hardly be necessary to conclude this Report with a list or a summary of its recommendations. The Report has been composed in such a way that the Board's answers to the questions posed by the Minister in his letter of 3rd May, 1966, began to emerge in Part One of the Report each answer leading to and being consolidated to provide the next and so on. This has resulted, for the sake of emphasis and clarification, in a good deal of reiteration of such terms and phrases as area of study, strategic planning, integration of major components of urban growth, participation by authorities engaged in major urban development, statement of planning policy and directives, handing down of directives and financial implications of strategic planning. These are, in effect, the recommendations of the Report and the Report needs to be read carefully and thoroughly to appreciate their full significance.
It would be more fitting, in the Board’s view, to conclude its Report by referring to and quoting from the experience of others who have in widely separated locations and at times much earlier than the present, considered the problems of metropolitan growth and evolution.

Lewis Mumford in “The Culture of Cities” first published in 1938 discusses the “Regional Framework of Civilization”. He shows how man’s conscious relationship to the earth changed at about the 15th century through the opening up of a new world by exploration and colonization. This began what he terms a “period of terrestrial neglect”.

“...In the act of seizing all the habitable parts of the earth the colonists systematically misused and neglected their possession out of ignorance and of greed.

Later where industries developed, where towns spread, land values rose and the land lost most of its value.”

Now he says the period of exploration has come to an end and our attitude towards the earth is undergoing another profound change. The era of the pioneer is over—there is no place left to move. We have reached the end of our journey and we must retrace our steps and, region by region, learn to do intelligently and co-operatively what we hitherto did in such disregard of the elementary decencies of life. “The grasp of the region as a dynamic social reality is a first step toward a constructive policy of planning, housing and urban renewal.”

He sees the region as a geographic unit and the city as a geographic fact—an expression of regional individuality, and a means of preserving resources—minerals, forests, scenery, etc.

Dealing with the “Politics of Regional Development” he demonstrates how the old arbitrary political boundaries have become outdated and that there is emerging into the cold glare of scrutiny a concept of putting things in order—that the various human activities are better dealt with at differing levels in accordance with reality. The idea of regionalism emerges as the articulation of the various regions comprising the whole.

Mumford, though no lover of the metropolis, where “bigness takes the place of form: voluminousness takes the place of significance” and “nature, except in a surviving landscape park, is scarcely to be found”, has advanced principles which are logical for and applicable to the planning of the irrepressible urban growth which now, all over the world, in spite of his strictures, is causing big cities almost to merge together.

Some ten years earlier than Mumford, in a foreword to its Report on its Plan of General Development—Melbourne (1929), the Metropolitan Town Planning Commission stated—

“The unmistakable tendency of cities to increase rapidly in population and expansiveness should forcibly impress upon all legislators and administrators the desirability of taking steps in due time to provide for the necessities of the future. The lessons to be learnt from the absence of such a policy may be found in the extensive and costly reconstruction schemes which have taken place in many cities. It is now generally realized that if a city is to serve best its true functions it must have guidance and control in development according to a well-considered plan.”

Their warning was in due course heeded by the legislators by the passing of the Town and Country Planning Act in 1944 and their actions culminated eventually in the Master Plan of 1954, prepared by the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works.

In this Report the Board has stressed that the growth problems of Melbourne can no longer be resolved on a metropolitan scale—that a new concept, embracing a much wider area and resulting from much greater participation, is needed for a population which in a relatively short time will be twice what it is today. The principles which were advocated in Melbourne in 1929 and by Mumford in 1938, have not altered—only the scale and the degree of complexity have changed.

R. D. L. FRASER, Chairman.
A. N. KEMSLEY, Member.
A. C. COLLINS, Member.

4th September, 1967.
DEAR MR. FRASER,

FUTURE GROWTH OF MELBOURNE

The growth of the Melbourne and Metropolitan area has reached a stage when the pattern of development established by the Master Plan since 1954, must be reviewed and planning policy reshaped to meet the needs of the future.

I have in mind a comprehensive review as distinct from that which has been necessary from time to time during the Interim Development period of the scheme to keep the Plan flexible and to provide for changes as they occurred.

The necessity for such an overall review is indicated by—

(a) the tendency for metropolitan growth in some areas to overspill beyond that covered by the Board of Works' present scheme.

(b) The increase in metropolitan population to a figure which leaves only a fairly narrow margin for further growth up to the planned capacity of the scheme of 2½ millions.

(c) The work now being done to arrive at a firm Transportation Plan based on the recent Metropolitan Transportation Study, and the need to relate it to an approved land-use plan.

In addition to these urgent considerations, there is the ever-present need to relate metropolitan population growth to that of provincial cities and towns to ensure that no opportunity is lost to promote better distribution of the State's population.

The purpose of the review is to project the pattern of metropolitan growth for a further period into the future, so that the Government can make appropriate decisions in good time and resultant planning can proceed well ahead of actual development.

I intend that the review should take the form of a Statement of Urban Planning Policy, based on consideration of the major social, economic and environmental factors involved, and of the views of the public authorities and representatives of private enterprise who would have to be consulted.

The Statement of Urban Planning Policy should comprise basically an outline of the expected shape and nature of metropolitan growth over, say, the next twenty years, which is the planning period chosen for the Transportation Study. It should also indicate the powers and measures which would need to be introduced to achieve its purposes, both in the inner areas through urban renewal, and on the growing fringes, particularly where departures from traditional forms of urban development are envisaged.

Up-to-date, Melbourne has tended to grow primarily by extension along the main railway and road approaches to the central area as the main place of employment, and along the eastern bayside, with wedges of open space, principally along the river valleys. This growth was inevitable because of the manner in which these natural and artificial features radiate from the centre, but even this pattern is now changing.

Natural streams such as the Dandenong Creek in the east and the Werribee River in the west flow generally from north to south, and hence transversely across the previous line of expansion. The Dandenongs, which it is vital to preserve, also lie generally in a north-south direction, and as the Westport area develops as a port in due course, it will automatically provide a new hub for future growth.

Such a widely dispersed metropolis unless carefully planned at once raises a threat to the surrounding countryside. This will require special attention. In addition, nobody could happily contemplate a future metropolis of seemingly endless suburbia spreading outwards indefinitely. It must be strongly emphasised that future planning should take full account of the surrounding countryside as a vital part of the metropolitan environment.

Accordingly, I would urge the Board to give particular attention to the possibility of urban decentralisation with provision for "satellite" towns of, say, 100,000 or even greater population each based on a sizeable industrial and commercial area and separated from the existing metropolis, and from each other, by broad tracts of open country, natural parkland and recreation space.

The concept of an expanded Melbourne metropolis either in the satellite form, or in some other form which investigation may prove to be acceptable, envisages what may be termed a metropolitan complex within a broadly defined metropolitan region. Such a region would necessarily require to be a good deal larger than the present planning area of the Board of Works, and possibly large enough to embrace neighbouring towns which might be included in the metropolitan complex as satisfactory outlets for population growth from the parent urban area.

I would appreciate the Board's consideration of the whole question, and should like to have its opinion as to the nature of the Urban Planning Policy to meet the needs of the future, and the method of formulation, and in particular its views on—

1. The most desirable shape and nature of the urban community of Melbourne in the future.
2. The most suitable method of planning and regulating the future growth of the metropolis.
3. The most suitable authority or authorities to carry out such planning and supervision.

Yours sincerely,

R. J. HAMER,
Minister for Local Government.
APPENDIX "B"

(To the Report by the Town and Country Planning Board to the Minister for Local Government on the Future Growth of Melbourne—July, 1967 (see page 5)).

AUTHORITIES AND PRIVATE ORGANISATIONS CONSULTED BY THE CHAIRMAN THROUGH APPROPRIATE EXECUTIVES AND PRINCIPAL OFFICERS

Public Authorities—

Premier’s Department
State Treasury
Country Roads Board
Housing Commission, Victoria
Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works
State Electricity Commission of Victoria
Gas and Fuel Corporation of Victoria
Victorian Pipelines Commission
Victorian Railways
Traffic Commission
Melbourne and Metropolitan Tramways Board
Department of Crown Lands and Survey
State Rivers and Water Supply Commission
Melbourne City Council.

Private Organisations—

Australian Planning Institute—Melbourne Division
Commonwealth Institute of Valuers (Inc.) Victorian Division
Institution of Surveyors (Aust.) Victorian Division
Melbourne Chamber of Commerce
Municipal Association of Victoria
National Trust of Australia (Victoria)
Real Estate and Stock Institute of Victoria
Royal Automobile Club of Victoria
Royal Victorian Institute of Architects
Town and Country Planning Association of Victoria
Urban Land Institute (Melbourne)
Victorian Chamber of Manufactures
Victorian Employers Federation

Interstate and Overseas Planning Authorities—

New South Wales .... State Planning Authority
Queensland .... Co-ordinator General’s Department
South Australia .... State Planning Office
Western Australia .... Town Planning Department
Metropolitan Region Planning Authority
New Zealand .... Wellington Regional Planning Authority
Auckland Regional Authority
APPENDIX “C”
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AUTHORITIES WHO PROVIDED INFORMATION TO THE BOARD’S CONSULTANTS

The Head,
Commissariat General de Plan, d’Equipment, et de Productivite,
PARIS, 7. France.

The Secretary,
Ministry of Housing and Local Government,
LONDON. S.W.I. England.

Mr. Kinnunen,
Regional Planning Officer,
STOCKHOLM. Sweden.

The Deputy Minister,
Department of Municipal Affairs,
TORONTO. Ontario.

Mr. C. A. Van Gorcum,
Rijksdienst Voor Het Nationale Plan Bureau,
THE HAGUE. Netherlands.

Director of State Planning,
Department of Planning and Economic Development,
HONOLULU. Hawaii.

The Secretary,
Boligministeriet,
COPENHAGEN. Denmark.

The Director,
Ministry of Works,
WELLINGTON. C.1. New Zealand.

Professor William A. Robson,
London School of Economics and Political Science,
University of London,

The Honorary Secretary,
Regional Studies Association,
LONDON. S.W.1 England.

The Secretary,
International Institute of Local Authorities,
THE HAGUE. Netherlands.

Miss Joan Rydon,
Latrobe University,
MELBOURNE. Victoria.

Mr. A. A. Morrison,
Senior Lecturer in History,
University of Queensland,
BRISBANE. Queensland.

The Secretary,
The Town Planning Institute,
LONDON. W.I. United Kingdom.

By Authority: C. H. Rixon, Government Printer, Melbourne
Diagram showing possible regional units for physical planning in the Port Phillip District.
### STRATEGIC PLANNING—PARTICIPATION BY PUBLIC AUTHORITIES

#### RESPONSIBLE MINISTERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Premier and Treasurer (including the Minister of State Development)</th>
<th>Chief Secretary</th>
<th>Minister of Public Works</th>
<th>Minister of Housing and of Forests</th>
<th>Minister for Local Government</th>
<th>Minister for Fuel and Power, and of Mines</th>
<th>Minister of Transport</th>
<th>Minister of Lands, of Soldier Settlement and for Conservation</th>
<th>Minister of Water Supply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### COUNCIL FOR THE CO-ORDINATION OF REGIONAL PLANNING

| Secretary, Premier's Department | Director of Finance | Director, Fisheries and Wildlife Department | Chairman, Country Roads Board | Chairman, Housing Commission | Chairman, Town and Country Planning Board (renamed the State Planning Board) | Secretary, Municipal Association of Victoria | Chairman, State Electricity Commission | Chairman, Victorian Railways Commissioners | Chairman, Soil Conservation Authority | Chairman, State Rivers and Water Supply Commission |