

(An irregular publication for the Town Planning Research Group, not for publication or republication).

This issue:-

- 1. Objections and Alternatives to Transport Plan.
- 2. Two Slants on the Transport Plan
 - (a) Wot! no lobby !?
 - (b) The Myth of Transport "Neutrality".
- 3. Sir Bernard Evan's Influence on Planning.

(Two corrections fo "Irregular" No 38:-
Both on page 5, item 3)

(i) At the bottom of 4th para. read "three shall be quorum" instead of "there shall be a quorum"

(2) 7th para. insert the words "urban renewal" to read : "It is imperative that the public housing programmes be separated from any urban renewal program")

I/39/I Objections and Alternatives to Transport Plan.

The following are bald announcements for the information of readers, not necessarily complete.

The Metropolitan Transportation Plan has been in circulation for a year.

There have been three types of re-action:-

(a) Less Public Transport

The "Clark" school want to scrap the underground loop. They are backed by The Age newspaper which will publish very few letters critical of Clark or Dr. Jgy, who are concerned only for the big business functions of the C.B.D.

(b) Objections on Account of Amenity

The Yarra Valley Conservation League, the East Melbourne Group, the Carlton Association, the North Melbourne Association.

(c) Alternatives based on more public transport.

Two organisations have made representations to the two Ministers on the Metropolitan Transportation Committee. Wilcox and Hamer, with alternative proposals;+

(1) The Town and Country Planning Association .

(see Plan News Review" Vol I. No 6 Sept 1970. p 1..2 and No 7. Oct 1970. page 1. and No 8, Nov. p1 and page 4.)

(2) The Committee for Urban Action (II inner -area associations)

(See. "A Transport Policy for the Inner Areas.... an Evaluation and Submission " ... roned... Apply to Secretary "Committee for Urban Action" P.O. Box 102 North Melbourne 3051) (Box 102)

.....

2/39/I Two Slants on the Transport Plan

(a) Wot! No Lobby ?!

Pussyfooting on the transport issue is far too prevalent. There must be and there are powerful corporations whose all pervading influence could not fail to have a bearing on the formulation of major transport plans.

Two Slants on the Transport Plan. cont.

Absence of proof of any sinister corruption of authority is quite beside the point. It may exist, but it would not have to. So dominant is motor transport that all that any planner has to do is to "follow the trend" to find himself producing precisely the sort of plan that suits the powerful lobbies that the car industry represents.

The "Clark" school of thought (i.e. Colin Clark and Nick Clark and a few of their academic associates) are theoreticians of a kind which would maximise car utilisation. Within cities they advocate throughout and even residential densities (8,000 per square mile) which would maximise freeway networks capable of smooth functioning and, as between cities they advocate cities from 500,000 to 1 million which can be served entirely by road transport. (See item "Tewksbury Symposium... Overture by Colin Clark with missing notes... " in "Irregular No 35, p 35/0 for more on this)

Strangely enough the Clark school are highly conscious and highly aware of transport corruption in the past when we built too many railways.

Clark, Richards and Ogden for example in a paper on "Underground Railways" quote with approval from Michael Cannon's book "The Land Boomers"...

4,.... The Outer Circle.... was opened in 1890 and closed three years later. It meandered for 19 miles around Melbourne's northern suburbs from North Melbourne through to Brunswick, across empty paddocks to Fairfield, thence to Kew, then to Hartwell, finally joining the main Gippsland line near Oakleigh. The Land Boomers inside and outside of Parliament saw it as a speculators' paradise and invested heavily in broad acres along the route."

The trio of authors proceed. "The account given by Cannon of the history of the establishment of rail transport systems in Melbourne is sobering indeed. These systems grew in a chaotic and unplanned way mainly in response to pressures from land developers. It is to the credit of the responsible authorities the Victorian Railway Commissioners and the Melbourne Tramways Board that order has been created from this chaos" . (Tewksbury papers 4... 9I)

We are on the eve of a similar vast transport transformation: a freeway system. Could there be similar "pressures" worthy of "sober" thought ! Oh, No! NO! NO! Perish the thought".say Mr Nick Clark

"It is sometimes inferred" says Clark " that the Plan has been influenced by subtle pressures from vested interests. It is true that the Plan will affect different sections of the community in different ways. The implementation of the Plan will provide substantial benefits for outer suburban and central business district land owners and for motor vehicle and associated industries. It is sheer nonsense however, to state, even indirectly, that these or other groups have been able to influence the preparation of the Plan " .

"Specifically, the Plan is not the work of a group of engineers and planners irrevocably committed to the virtues of the motor car and low density suburban living. Such criticism is demonstrably inaccurate, If anything the plan is biased towards public transport system and high density inner suburban living."

(N. Clark, in "An Assessment of the Transportation Plan ." p 3 . papers from the %Symposium on Balanced Urban Transportation in Melbourne" Institute of Engineers April 1970)

Fortunately there are those in the community who do not agree with Mr; Clark.

"The motor car must be sensibly brought under control, but that means doing battle with the vast lobby of motor manufactureres, oil companies

Two Slants on Transport . contd.

cement and rubber suppliers, highway contractors and sometimes even the traffic "experts" themselves...."

(Denis Winston. Prof. Town and Country Planning at the University of Sydney quoted by Prof. Rolf Jensen Dean of the Faculty of Architecture and Town Planning the University of Adelaide at p.43 of papers of Conference in Nov 1968 on the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study (M.A.T.S.) more of this later)

Precisely !

And Prof. Jensen adds, on his own behalf "It is indeed obvious that, in attempting to counter development and transport for Adelaide, a powerful vested interest exists which appears to see in the urban freeway the furtherance of the interests of business, commerce and industry. Whereas if persisted in and the proposals go ahead, they will undoubtedly result in the effective strangulation of the life of the city. as has occurred in a number of other instances."

In fact even Mr. Wilcox, Minister of Transport, at the "Symposium on Balanced Urban Transportation" last April reminded his audience that there had been, over the years, quite a few powerful lobbies to the Federal Government for road funds but none for public transport. As a result there are massive Federal funds available to the State for roads to such an extent that the authoritative estimate is that already, under existing formulas, no less than 2/3 of the immense sum of \$2616 million that the Plan provides for freeways are vouchsafed whereas what is worrying the Government is where to get the comparatively microscopic amount of \$355 million for trams, trains and buses.

The Minister almost gave the appearance of inviting public agitation for Federal money for public transport. Now don't read that last sentence wrongly. That is not to say that the Minister puts himself in the camp of Prof. Winston, Prof Jensen or the writer. If he had, he would not have presided over the Transportation Committee basing itself so slavishly on the Wilbur Smith study concepts. He wants a strong enough lobby to get himself the best part of the \$355 millions. That is all,

No lobby by the oil, car, rubber interests? What rubbish! "Nonsense" to state "even indirectly" that these groups are unable to influence the preparation of the plan? Come, Come Mr. Nick Clark !

As the Crowspoint out : Mr. Marshall M. Rich the Wilbur Smith "Study Manager" in Melbourne, in delivering a paper to the 1964 R.A.C.V. Symposium stated that the data used in his paper was "drawn from survey reports of various cities and from the book "Future Highways and Urban Growth" prepared by Wilbur Smith and Associates under commission from the Automobile Manufacturer's Association of the U.S. A. "

(see Appendix No 4. "Plan for Melbourne Part 2, p. 131, by R. and M. Crow

.....

3/39/I.

The Myth of Transport "Neutrality"

The "study director" of the Metropolitan Transportation Committee, J. M. Bayley has made it clear that "public demand" is the only basis on which he, as a transport planner, can plan. He says he is not justified in deciding what are "good" trends or "bad" trends, but can only observe what the public actually do, and judge that what they do is good for them, and should be so planned for accordingly.

That is what the Melbourne Transportation Plan means when it says of itself it is a "demand" plan. This demand tends to boil down to the demand of the citizen sitting behind the driving wheel, irritated with congestion on the road or difficulty in parking. It ignores his demand as a civilised citizen entitled to pedestrian dignity and social amenity, when he slams his car door, and it ignores the social "demand" of his young children, his teenage children, his wife, his aged parents for a

The Myth of Transport "Neutrality" contd.

for transport that facilitates communication with their friends instead of hindering it.

The following extensive quotation from Hugh Stretton (Ideas for Australian Cities) penetratingly characterises the school of thought which is "right wing". We reckon the Clark and the Bayley schools qualify....

"... No planning information is more political, ~~and~~ and moral or immoral ~~than~~ than the traffic planner's choice of what is fed into his computer."

"It may be up to the planners, especially if the links are technical to point out to the politicians and public the wider social implications of alternative methods of calculating transport economies. The more computerized his education and the more he loves machinery, the less likely the expert maybe to perform this last duty willingly or well. If he does not perform it at all, the refusal is moral. It should not be allowed any technical disguises, or even the modesty that says sincerely enough: "I'm only a public servant, I'm only an engineer". If a traffic planner quietly leaves pedestrians, school journeys, residential noise, and adjacent property values and amenities out of his test program, and if he includes direct compensation but not true replacement and relocation costs, or if he leaves out everything that can't be quantified, and announces his results as 'an optimum transport system' then no political redeemer can wash away his sins for him. He has deliberately chosen to plan for some classes and individuals against others, and probably for a general increase in his city's inequalities."

"Some urban planners nevertheless insist on posing as neutral, technical, unbiassed servants of the people. Some American planning schools (and a few Australian imitators) actively urge them to do so. These contrast themselves with the British tradition which they belittle as "utopian" "directive" or "paternal" and generally undemocratic--- though the Governments in charge of British planning are more democratic than most. The critics confess instead a philosophy of "adaptive" or "non-directive" planning, with strictly objective science as its basis: find out what the citizens want to pay for, and plan it for them."

"In practice there is usually a contradiction within this abstinent philosophy. Planners may think of themselves as obedient servants of government, but they also advise it and are one arm of its power. So the abstinent philosophy tends to issue advice to government to treat its citizens in a certain way: to plan what the buyers are offering to pay for, and to avoid "directive" "Ideological" planning---that is, to avoid using town planning as a method of social reform. Whether it is urged on governments, voters, or students in planning school, this right-wing ideology should be allowed no false pretences of "neutrality"."

(extract from "Ideas for Australian Cities" by Hugh Stretton, pp. 273... 274)

Exactly! Come off it Nick Clark! No lobby at all, no influence not even "indirect"? If that is what you say your whole "science" is suspect.

(Editor's note: we have not space to conclude the relevant portion of Stretton's quotation on the scientific nature of what is advanced as "scientific objectivity" More next time. In the meantime read "Ideas for Australian Cities".

.....

4/ 3/ I.

Sir Bernard Evans' Influence on Planning.

The sensational actions of public figures such as Evans often get wide publicity leaving much more serious and more damaging actions undisclosed by the mass media and hidden from public scrutiny.

We are not concerned here with any allegations as to whether Evans used planning information for personal gain. We are concerned with quite

Sir Bernard Evans ' Influence on Planning. cont.

and legitimate policies advanced and fought for by Evans. But, what we ask is, are they good planning policies ?

The M.M.B.W. "Survey and Analysis" in 1954 carefully listed the reasons why the country east and south east of Melbourne was more suitable for development: higher rainfall, better soil, cheaper foundations and excavations, gently rolling country instead of flat windy plains, closer to beach and bush recreation, closer to water and electricity services etc. (pp. 98 general, p 125 cost of services, p 18 rainfall ... e.g. 20 inches at Footscray and 30 inches at Cmbewell... e)

The 1954 Master Plan took account of these reasons and to minimise the long distance commuting which this was beginning to give rise , created industrial zones in Moorabbin, Oakleigh, Clayton, Muna wading- Ringwood, Dandenong, Frankston etc. (15 years later the Nick Clark school of transport engineers in a series of papers at Tweksbury Symposium after ' much research' discovered these new centres of more rapid growth as if they resulted from unplanned natural growth, not one of the papers even mentioning the 1954 M.M.B.W. planning !!

In addition to the verbal explanation (at pp. 46. 47) the 1954 M.M.B.W. Report actually gave estimates of the shift of industry to the east & south resulting from its zoning. We give it here.

Table 2.
Percentage of Total Industrial
Employment in Statistical Districts.

District	1947	Estimated Future
Central	60	37.0
Western	15	15.5
Northern	13	14.5
Eastern	4	7.0
Southern	10	26.0
Metropolitan	100	100.0

On May 1966 the Minister for Local Government . R. J. Hamer asked the M.M.B.W. to furnish its considerations on the future growth of Melbourne. The Highways and Town Planning Committee of the M.M.B.W. of which Bernard Evans was the Deputy Chairman (the Chairman of the M. M. B. W. is the nominal chairman) was the Committee responsible to the M.M.B.W. for such a report.

The report issued in June 1967 did not take the same attitude as the 1954 report as to the desirability of eastern and south-eastern expansion. On the contrary.

It made a new type of analysis of residential location. The secondary work-force predominated in the west and north. There is a belt of higher income tertiary work-force in the east " from Doncaster to Beaumaris and takes in most of the intermediate suburbs in the Southern and Eastern Sectors" (p 5) Beyond this belt from Moorabbin -Oakleigh down south-east and south stretching beyond Dandenong and Frankston the secondary work force again predominates "in closer proximity to the (newer) industrial zones , in which most find employment/"

"This clearly indicates that the concentration of particular segments of populations " (i.e. industrial workers) "in the Southern and Eastern Sectors in areas of higher amenity value, is attracting populations of a similar type "(i.e. industrial) "resulting in the inbalance of growth around the central area"

Sir Bernard Evans Influence on Town Planning . cont.

"This unbalanced growth is likely to continue unless planning measures, probably with some incentives, are taken to build up the settlement rate in the Northern and Western Sectors...." p 5.

The report then advances 6 possible growth patterns (Plans 2...7) all of which show new growth in the west and north as well as east south-east and south.

Oh dear! Oh dear! Fancy industrial workers living in areas of "high amenity value"! They should be made to live in the west and north at the cost of public subsidy for higher cost of services!

What was consciously planned by the 1954 M.M.B.W. Plan was in effect, described by the 1967 M.M.B.W. Report as "imbalance"!

The Town and Country Planning Board's solution to Melbourne's future growth however indicates a great growth corridor with new metro-towns beyond Dandenong on the way to Warragul, with a branch to Hastings and no growth on the north and west. ("Organisation for Strategic Planning" July 1967, at p 16)

There was discussion at Hamer's "Workshop Forum" at Latrobe University on 7.10. '67 which followed the launching of the T.C.P.B. Report delivered by its Chairman M.R. D. L. Fraser. Bernard Evans led the attack on the report.

He said that "we" (the M.M.B.W.) "are by no means convinced that no encouragement should be given to the north or west whatsoever".....these areas.."are not developed for the simple reason no services have been provided". He pointed out that the Lower Yarra Crossing would bring the Western Suburbs within "15 minutes of Melbourne" and produced the idea of "balance" around the C.B.D.

On these issues Evans had a win over the T. and C.P.B.. On 21. 2. 1968 Mr. Hamer in a "Ministerial Statement" to the Legislative Council announced :-

"The third important" (Government) "policy decision involves the encouragement of renewed growth in the northern and western suburbs of Melbourne. Many have remarked on the lop-sided pattern of growth of the metropolis over the past three decades, but the Government believes that the balance may be restored in part by such measures as it can itself control, and by a deliberate policy in the provision of transport, water, power, and other services required in developing areas. The growth of industry in these sectors needs to be balanced by the growth of residential and commercial areas. The Government also believes that the greatly improved access which will be afforded by the Lower Yarra Crossing and the new Tullamarine Freeway and new bridges on the Dynon Rd. will assist the growth of these suburbs to the great benefit of the whole metropolis. In order to assist further in this growth, the metropolitan planning authority will be asked to study the practicability of establishing satellite towns in the areas of Melton, Sunbury and Whittlesea" (Hansard 24. 2. 68 at p 3248.. 9)

The writer considers that the T and C.P.B.'s concept of corridor growth towards Warragul and Hastings is superior. That is provided there were strong metro-towns in the corridor (or even a new second city at the gateway to Gippsland as advocated by Hugh Stretton) and provided a really rapid transit link to the C.B.D. was made on this line. The writer does not hold with the idea that a big proportion of industrial workers should have to live on the worst land in Melbourne.

Those who do hold these views, however, must understand they have a quite serious obstacle in the shape of the political influence of Sir Bernard Evans.

.....

A quote from the Australian 13. I. 70.

Belconnen ; a City With Accent on Humans.

".... Its architect, John Andrews, defines urban as what takes place at street level, and not what happens above it... it is at street level that the mingling, the activity and pulsing occur...

".... What has been designed now is a series of three story walk-up wings with a pedestrian mall running at right angles to them half way up... a sidewalk in the sky".