

COMMITTEE OF ENQUIRY INTO THE NATIONAL ESTATESubmission by Ruth Crow and Maurie Crow

12/9/1973

The government is invited to subscribe to a set of basic value-judgements in relation to the "national estate" in terms similar to those set out below, and known as "Ecoso Guidelines" ("Eco" for ecological, and "so" for sociological).

What is needed, it is submitted, are guidelines for a policy that are thoroughgoing, consistent and principled. These are :

ECOSO GUIDELINES" Preamble: Outrageous Modern Trends

Today we are living in a world increasingly manipulated by advertisements and propaganda for a culture of consuming rather than using, of receiving or following rather than participating.

We who live in western advanced countries have little choice other than to buy goods designed with built-in obsolescence. Thus a large proportion of hard work goes to fashioning materials which are misused or not fully used, so that the more that is produced, the more there is wasted. These same superior industrial powers force this same pattern of consumerism on the people of the Third World. Under these conditions, the limited natural and human resources are not only inequitably distributed but are also recklessly squandered with outrageous pollutions and destructions of the natural environment. As for the social environment, life and thinking become dominated by material possessions and this creates a barrier making it increasingly difficult for neighbours, work mates and even members of the same family to relate to each other.

There is a more efficient way of living which does more for the dignity of man, using less energy and preserving the world as a pleasant and habitable place.

Guidelines to Reverse Trends

1. A value-judgement in favour of regeneration and promotion of community participation meaning that it is humanising and enriching for people to relate to each other through one form or another of voluntary participatory activity both on the job and off the job, exercising a measure of control in the course of such activity.
2. A consequent recognition of necessity for change in life-style and behaviour patterns that sees the quality of life as an alternative to consumerism understood as mass production and consumption of wasteful and unsatisfying consumer goods and services based on compulsion or manipulation.
3. Accordingly a policy of restricting the use of energy and non-renewable resources per head and hence a planned design of community, including population size, where man can better relate to man and nature in order to reduce wasteful goods and services ~~at~~ at the same time guaranteeing an adequate minimum subsistence to all, and using modern technology to this end.
4. The recognition that such objectives cannot be achieved either on the basis of partial linear one-level ecological remedies or with authoritarian or manipulative control of production or affairs, but require a comprehensive, multi-directional, all-level and participating effort to achieve global ecological equilibrium"

\*\*\*\*\*

The difficulties associated with so moderating economic growth as to be ecologically acceptable and a

The difficulties associated with so moderating economic growth as to be ecologically acceptable, and at the same time lead to a state of stabilisation of resource-use are so formidable that a concerted attack at all levels is going to be needed to solve them. But if governments set themselves perspectives less than those contained in the above guidelines, the piece-meal or partial results will surely prove quite ineffective in reversing the trend of current pressures on the ecology and on non-renewable resources.

Of all the problems to be solved within the context of the "Ecoso Guidelines" or some similar set of principles, the most difficult, it is submitted, is the problem of fossil fuels.

The consumption of energy based on fossil fuels is the cornerstone of our continuation as a relatively advanced industrial country. Not only that, it will prove to be the cornerstone of our relations with all the less developed countries in the Pacific region, for, if we are to share our "national estate" in the form of a share of energy resources (as we do other minerals), with the countries of Asia, a new dimension enters the picture. On the basis of the energy levels per head that we expend in Australia, and on which our standard of living is based, there is literally insufficient fossil fuel energy in the whole world (let alone Australia) to enable the population of Asia to live at the same standards of living measured in terms of energy, as we do.

So many have testified recently to this proposition, that we do not propose to cite an array of experts to prove this statement.

The implications of the proposition that Australians are consuming per head many times more than our sensible share of energy, whether measured in terms of our Asiatic neighbours, or our own future generations, however, imposes on Australian governments a transcending urgency to undertake the complicated task of drastically paring down our energy consumption per head.

Such a task is undeniably complicated, because it must be effected in such a style as to improve the real quality of life, and so that no one is deprived (as there are still too many deprived) of elementary commodities and services of shelter, education, health and culture.

Within the scope of this problem of paring down energy per head, where are we to start?

It is submitted that the cornerstone of the problem of reducing energy per head is elimination of "consumerism" as defined in the "Ecoso Guidelines" namely, eliminating the "production and consumption of wasteful and unsatisfying consumer goods and services based on compulsion or manipulation".

Of course, such a definition has its difficulties. What one person may regard as wasteful or unsatisfying, another may regard as satisfying and essential. However, real satisfaction, in terms of the value judgements advanced by "Ecoso Exchange", and to which we subscribe, consists of people relating better to other people in a re-birth of community participation in one form or another of activity which requires, typically, very little energy or material, as distinct from expenditure of energy in manufacturing or distributing consumer goods, or unnecessarily moving people around.

In this brief submission, we therefore advance the following three propositions, which we have called "cornerstone" propositions to indicate that we regard them at once as the most difficult and the most vital to tackle. But the cornerstone is not the whole edifice of our heritage, and, of course, we are not suggesting that; only that if an edifice of "heritage"-protection is to be erected, and the cornerstone omitted (thus permitting unlimited escalating growth in every direction), then much of the structure of ecological and cultural heritage can collapse under the pressure of present trends.

### THE THREE "CORNERSTONES"

#### 1. A Cornerstone Value Judgement :

The pressures for growth that can exhaust vital elements of the "national estate" can only be contained by the flourishing of participatory satisfactions in place of consumerism (i.e. the "Ecoso Guidelines" mentioned above).

#### 2. A Cornerstone Policy : (in accordance with the above value judgments, but not exhausting them) :

Reduction of the expenditure of fossil-fuel energy per head, but with

a greater proportion of the total energy<sup>then</sup> is now used, expended on facilitating participatory contact between people.

3. A Cornerstone Action-Plan (in order to make a start on the reduction of fossil fuel consumption per head) :

Minimising the consumption of oil and petrol used in transport by minimising the need to use cars and trucks, at the same time as creating more people-intensive and attractive centres, or areas,

(a) in urban areas

by initiating such patterns of urban growth, decentralisation, and transport modes that both use minimal energy for freight distribution and commuting to work, and permit maximum opportunity for human and viable social centres.

(b) in rural and seaside recreational areas

by initiating development of holiday and picnic resorts that maximise relaxation and recreation both physical and cultural with a minimum use of travel and minimum impact on the surrounding countryside.

The third of these three cornerstone propositions, namely, the "cornerstone action-plan" is the one to which we now turn. This is entirely our own personal contribution to this enquiry, although elements of it do have support by different organisations and groupings in the community.

Before describing, briefly, the concepts of the detailed action-plans, a comment is needed to explain why, of all the ways of cutting down on fossil fuel energy, we choose transport as the particular cornerstone.

Why not, (it might be objected), ration fossil fuel energy for industry? Or why not rely on a straight-out campaign for people to abandon consumerism as a way of life?

Now there is a case---and no doubt a strong case---that could be developed along the lines that an industry that uses disproportionately heavy quantities of energy, such as the aluminium industry, should be controlled. Control could take the form of confining aluminium products to such uses for which this material is uniquely suitable, and not permit its use where substitute materials are as good or nearly as good. We would certainly not oppose such a supplementary approach to the one we suggest.

There is unquestionably, also, a big place for campaigning for a non-consumerism way of life at all times, and in many different ways, against the massive and overwhelming stream of advertising which is all in the other direction.

But these forms of tackling the problem are, in different ways, negative rather than positive, and their effects are likely to be marginal rather than ~~decisive~~. *Decisive*

What we advance is a constructive and yet more far-reaching assault on the problem, and that is why we designate it a "cornerstone" action-plan.

It is within the power, now, of all public authorities combined, to pre-plan future urban growth and transport. It is not asking a very extensive enlargement of existing powers and controls to suggest that future recreational resorts and the transport serving them be equally matters of State and national concern, and not left at the mercy either of private investment or of local governments bent on increasing visitors and tourists to increase commerce and rate revenues.

The effect of deliberately turning the direction of all future urban and recreational growth along lines of maximum social and minimal energy development, would be a cumulative one. Once people began to discover, or re-discover that participatory efforts were more satisfying than acquiring the latest fashion of the latest consumer gadget, and more satisfying than travel-for-travel's-sake to places where they were never significantly involved around any activity at all that gave them satisfaction, then the demand for this sort of consumer goods and this sort of travel would begin to abate.

In turn, this would begin to effect a slowing of the growth of industry producing such goods and services, leading to a decline in the otherwise escalating demand for energy, and a consequent slackening in the rate of

utilisation, not only of oil and petrol, but of other forms of fossil fuel, such as coal and natural gas.

There never is any way of making very big social changes that are painless for absolutely everyone. But we submit that what we propose is the least painful for most people. In effect, for all new growth, an entirely different way---a more ecologically and sociologically correct way---is proposed.

The expanding influence of practical examples of new and better ways on a mass scale (as distinct from the splendid efforts of a committed but minority segment of the younger generation) could then be used to restructure the presently built-up big urban areas in a manner to be referred to below.

It might be objected that alternative modes of urban living or recreational pursuits, however devised, would all require fossil fuel energy, and changing from one form of energy (e.g. private transport based on oil) to another (e.g. public transport based on electricity) would merely be switching from one form of fossil fuel to another.

This is true, but the amount of energy required to convey a given tonnage of goods or a given number of people by private transport is many times greater than that required for the same job performed by public transport.

We do not pretend to be experts, and have to rely on experts (as no doubt this Committee of Enquiry does too), as a basis of judgement; but since this is, admittedly, an important part of our argument, we introduce two assessments of the energy respectively expended on private and on public transport: one from the United Kingdom, the other from Melbourne.

The example from the United Kingdom is taken from the book "A Blueprint for Survival", published 1972 by Tom Stacey of "The Ecologist" printed by Compton Press. The book is introduced with a "Statement of Support" signed by 36 distinguished U.K. scientists (and also, incidentally, by Sir Macfarlane Burnet of Melbourne) which endorsed the basic principles of the book without endorsing every detail.

"No one can contemplate with equanimity the doubling of roads within this decade necessary to maintain the status quo, and we must therefore seek sensible transportation alternatives. It is clear that broadly-speaking the only alternative is public transport---a mix of rapid mass-transit by road and rail. Rail especially should never have been allowed to run down to the extent that it has. The power requirements for transporting freight by road are five to six times greater than by rail and the pollution is correspondingly higher. The energy outlay for the cement and steel to build a motorway is three to four times greater than that required to build a railway, and the land area necessary for the former is estimated to be four times more than for the latter. Public transport whether by road or rail is much more efficient in terms of per capita use of materials and energy than any private alternative. It can also be as flexible, provided it is encouraged at the expense of private transport." (pp. 67-68).

The second example is from a paper on "Some Systems Concepts for Urban Planning" by Mr J.F. Brotchie, published by the C.S.I.R.O. Division of Building Research in Melbourne. In a table cited in this paper and prepared by Mr R. Schmidt of the same organisation, tentative comparative figures based on "very rough estimates", which are to be refined at a later stage are given. They relate to metropolitan passenger transport, and assess the "energy use ratio" as 2.5 for private transport as against 1.0 for public transport. (at p.10). We do not know what the equivalent energy use ratio for freight would be for Melbourne.

It is clear that the advantages of public over private transport in terms of energy are of a different order. A layman could surely be permitted from evidence such as this, to draw the conclusion that at least double the energy is used up by private as against public transport.

We submit, therefore, that what we have to say from here on is not to do with a mere ~~trifling~~ trifling and fanciful alternative style of living having a marginal effect on the national estate: it is to do with whether we halve our transport energy requirements as a first mighty step, aimed at, say, halving all other energy requirements.

We turn now to the constructive proposals for tackling the twin problems of urban design and holiday patterns which form, together, the "cornerstone action plan" for immediate governmental attention.

Urban Areas---Patterns of Growth,Decentralisation and Transportation Modes to Minimise Cars and Trucks and Create more People-Intensive Centres.

The Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works (MMBW) has proposed certain patterns of urban growth for the future Melbourne region that, if adopted,would set the direction and pattern of urban growth for decades ahead thus dictating the predominate modes of transport for even longer periods.

The MMBW proposals contemplate a multi-corridor development radiating out in eight different directions from the present Melbourne built-up area and separated by seven "green wedges" between the eight corridors.

This is an urban design that quite inevitably will maximise car and truck use,because of the residential low densities,attenuated still further by the increasing cross-wedge travel required which make public transport near to impossible;and in turn,the increasing proportion of car and truck use will lead to even more scattering than at present of people-intensive activities.

The greater distances to traverse across the no-man's land of green wedges as the corridors grow outwards,coupled with the dispersal effect typical of industrial,commercial and residential areas predominately based on the car and truck would mean increasing distances would have to be traversed for a given purpose.The amount of wasted energy therefore with such a design is not merely to be counted as a simple mile to mile comparison as between private and public transport. Even if this whole 8-corridor system could be served entirely by public transport,and the dispersal of people-intensive centres one from the other could therefore be minimised,it would still be a design of such a nature that it would waste unnecessary energy by enforcing longer trips,the greater the metropolis grew.

We made an official objection to the MMBW regional plan proposals,and our objection was heard in December 1972. The decision is not yet known. Clearly the decision involves,or should involve,both State and Federal planning agencies because it is of national importance.

Our objection took the form of proposing a positive alternative,namely the "Gippsland corridor". We wrote a book entitled "Plan for Melbourne Part 3" published by the Communist Party of Australia,not as the policy of that body,but in the public interest,and we have submitted a copy of this book for background material for this Committee. In addition,we made a personal verbal submission in support of our case at the hearing of the objections to the MMBW proposals,and one photostat copy of this submission has also been tendered.

There are many aspects of an alternative growth pattern as radical as that proposed by us,and we do not expect this Committee of Enquiry to have the time to explore every aspect;but we will refer here quite briefly to the essential features that have to do with energy used in transport,and in the complementary function of clustering together people-intensive activities around the transport interchanges to cut down the need for transport.This latter aspect,(which we call "structuring" the corridor),at the same time provides optimum conditions for social participatory activities that tend to reduce the desire to travel..

It is proposed that the Gippsland corridor take up all future growth that would otherwise have taken place in one or another of the 8 corridors proposed by the MMBW. The corridor would be served by rapid-transit rail of 150 to 200 m.p.h. connecting to Flinders Street,alongside an efficient but conventional type electric suburban rail service. Rapid transit stations would be 8 to 10 miles apart with 4 or 5 suburban stations between. Each station would be surrounded by a pedestrian scale but very compact,car-free centre containing a mixture of light industry,secondary and tertiary education,indoor recreational facilities,shopping centre and high density residences for those who chose so to live. An essential feature of each such centre would be the compulsory provision of spaces which could be hired for nominal charges and used for participatory activities of any description (a mild proposal when it is considered that these days it is often compulsory to provide off-street parking for cars). These indoor public spaces for participatory activities would not be thrust to left-over and unwanted sites,but interspersed at the most convenient and busiest places with other uses.

Residential densities would become lower as the distance from the centre increased,with conventional type villas on the edge of the corridor.As the corridor would be only 4 to 5 miles wide,no-one would be more than 2 miles or so from both the station and the local community hub of life.

Each community would thus be a human-scale community. To deter random and pointless dispersal and strengthen local identity all on-street public transport serving the area of each community would converge on the interchange and community centre (more sophisticated modes of modern transport than buses could be used later if proved to be of superior convenience and ~~freedom of movement~~ not inferior from the point of view of energy-use.)

Just as no-one would be more than a few miles from the centre, conversely, no-one would live or work more than a few miles from the bush.

Yet everyone would be connected, time-wise, very closely with other centres of employment and culture along the corridor by way of rapid transit; so that a great diversity of employment and cultural opportunities could thus be made available for those who could not find them locally.

It is pointed out that this proposed arrangement provides the potential achievement of major objectives of a dual character mentioned above, namely :

### 1. Less energy for transport.

Although private cars would still be used mainly for recreational purposes:

- (a) the rapid transit, being double the speed of the private car would be able to out-class it for long distances.
- (b) the forbidding of car-space in the compact social-industrial-commercial-recreational centre, except for hire-cars, taxis and deliveries of goods, and the provision of a frequent shuttle bus service would out-convenience the car for very short distances for any local purpose.
- (c) the more industries became strung along the corridor as it grew outwards, the better the chance of rail services out-classing the road hauliers for shifting freight.

### 2. More opportunities for human satisfaction.

The daytime workforce and study-force (i.e. industrial workers, office workers, professional workers, secondary school students and any tertiary students) would be in easy walk of the shops and organised recreational and potential participatory activities; and the housewives, children and elderly people would have ready public bus transport access to the same centre---thus making feasible full multi-purpose use of all social facilities. Commuters to work or student commuters who went daily to other centres, would also pass through their local centre on the way, thus facilitating social contact between them and others whose business was in the local centre, during the day.

It is further pointed out that although the Gippsland corridor is part of "Melbourne" (looked at in one way); it is also decentralisation (looked at in another way). It is, in fact a new form of urban organisation based on the most modern technology, and yet aimed to preserve both human associations and natural resources.

It would cut right across the conventional and interminable controversies about decentralisation. It would end the doubt about whether and where to decentralise, and the puzzle about the rate at which it should be ~~effected~~ attempted.

This is because the Gippsland corridor would automatically absorb all of Melbourne's growth, and could absorb also what would otherwise become energy-expensive growth in other potential candidates for separated decentralised cities.

In fact, the Gippsland corridor, seen as a decentralisation measure, would constitute decentralisation in the strongest possible form. If structured in the manner already proposed, each local community, conceived as a small decentralised country town, would nevertheless have a highly urban local centre, and be connected most effectively, and with the least possible expenditure of energy with Melbourne itself as well as all other high-intensity human centres between.

We will not describe in greater detail the corridor, but suggest for supplementary reference the following :

Plan for Melbourne Part 3 pp 18-23, pp 25-29.

Submission to MMBW 7/12/'72 pp 4-9.

In the book, we also tackle the more difficult and longer-duration problem of re-structuring the present Melbourne built-up area, proposing to reconstitute centres of people-intensive activity in relation to selected transport interchanges, with the same principles in mind as are

proposed for the Gippsland corridor. That is to say: the interlocking objectives of concentrating human-intensive activities to minimise the need for private transport and hence the use of unnecessary energy; and heightening participatory enjoyment with the same end in view are adapted to the circumstances of the present metropolitan area. We will not elaborate here on how such a transition can be ~~staged~~ staged, but refer to Plan for Melbourne Part 3 pp 106-121.

We appreciate that our propositions have been cast in the terms of the regional plan of one capital city only: and as far as they affect decentralisation for one State only. We venture the opinion, however, that similar principles could and should be worked out and adapted to every major urban growth centre in Australia.

#### Urban Areas---Proposals for Immediate Positive Action

We therefore ask that this Committee of Enquiry recommend:

1. that as a matter of urgency, the total transport energy-expenditure of the two alternative designs for Melbourne: that is, the MMBW design (with conventional and escalating increases in car and truck usage) as against the Gippsland corridor design (based on an ever-increasing proportion of the future population using public transport and desiring less transport generally) be investigated by an appropriate team of scientists, and also that the opportunities for participatory satisfaction and the chance of enhancing it as between the two systems be investigated.
2. that decisions on major regional planning schemes for future growth, for Melbourne or for any other capital city be delayed until the findings of these scientific investigations are known and appraised by all governments and authorities concerned.

The next page, which should be considered as part of the text of this submission, consists, for convenience, of a photostat of pp 72-73 of Plan for Melbourne Part 3. This sets out request number 1. above, in its original form and in more detail.

We believe the metro-hearted, rapid transit, Gippsland-corridor as structured and described would constitute a long-term immense saving of fossil-fuel and energy and an immense enhancement of social consciousness with a consequent potential saving of still more energy by the new generations as against the Evans-MMBW radial corridor plan coupled, as it must be, with the MTC freeway network.

We cannot prove it. But it could be proved. We propose that a multi-disciplinary team of appropriately qualified scientists who are acknowledged as outstanding in the matter of their attitudes of social responsibility in their own field be given this task. They may need to draw on economists, engineers, planners, sociologists, geographers and many other disciplines but it is for scientists, we suggest to be given the primary task of evaluating the "ecology benefit" and "ecology cost" of planning decisions of the dimensions of a regional plan for several million people.

We propose the examination might concentrate on total energy-expenditure of alternative designs for Melbourne: . . .

- |   |    |   |
|---|----|---|
| (A) Gippsland Corridor                          | v. | Seven Radial Corridors                              |
| + (rapid transit)                               |    | + (car for cross transport)                         |
| + ("structure" less commuting)                  |    | + ("unstructured" by car)                           |
| (B) Gippsland Corridor form of decentralisation | v. | Five Separated Decentralised Cities 100 miles apart |
| + (rail supplemented by trucks)                 |    | + (trucks and rail)                                 |

We are not suggesting that this is the only issue the scientists would need to weigh ecologically. We know there would be others. For example respective pollution levels as affecting Port Phillip Bay and Westernport Bay as mentioned; or for example, respective air pollution generated by the number of automobiles required for each alternative.

We have read "Limits to Growth" too recently to have forgotten that the inter-connection between the main growth factors are such that an all-sided simultaneous understanding and decision must be made involving a re-appraisal of industrial processes, agricultural techniques and family planning.

Still surely deliberate dispersal as a consciously adopted design principle is bound to use, in total, far more energy and non-renewable resources, and a design that aims in the opposite direction cannot be wrong? Certainly, the *rate* of resource-use in Gippsland corridor would still have to be examined, and might indeed be far too high per head. But, at least it would be lower per head than either radial corridor development, or decentralised 100-mile apart separate cities?

Similarly, we suggest that another multi-disciplinary team simultaneously explore the relative sociological merits of the two pairs of alternatives, taking specifically as its criteria which is the most calculated to facilitate, rapidly, the formation of creative "social mix" and "age-sex mix" to advance ecological-sociological performance standards for the whole community.

Of course this cannot be a form of accounting with the precision of scientists "costing" consumption of energy used by alternative schemes, yet these sort of social factors are now beginning to enter economists cost/benefit theory and practice, and if it is possible for the M.M.B.W. to "cost" relative conservation values as it has in the 1971 "Regional Policies" report, it should be possible for sociologists to grade the merits of different schemes according to the *opportunity* each affords for the formation of collectives.

The personnel of such investigating teams would not need to have, of course, the class of economists who embrace the concept that what people really need can only be measured by the "consumer's dollar" (because it is the *voluntary* non-consumer-based socio-ecological objectives that are called for) nor those who are their equivalent in the field of sociology who base themselves on surveys of what people say they want (because it is a *new* dimension of social responsibility and mutual respect and enjoyment of other people breaking with consumer-constricting habits that are needed).

Some of the issues to which such a committee should address itself, we suggest are:

- |   |    |   |
|---|----|---|
| (A) Concourses in concentrated public transport served mini-metro hearts in Gippsland corridor.   | v. | Random car-facilitated locations in low density suburban radial corridors.  |
| (B) Structured social mix area favoured by all in south east with special measures to overcome existing deprivation in other areas.                   | v. | Extension of "deprived west" and "exclusive" parts of south and east.   |
| (C) A range of employment, education and culture (either local or by transit) enabling an all age mix in Gippsland corridor type of decentralisation. | v. | An acute shortage of youth who have to migrate to Melbourne for jobs, education, culture in formation stage of all separate decentralised cities. |

So, for those who object to the Gippsland corridor on the grounds of "cost" of rapid transit, our first answer is: the ecological and sociological cost is the crucial factor from here on. We believe that our proposals meet these criteria and that either a radial corridor Melbourne, or separate decentralised cities policy would not meet it.

We turn now to the second of the twin constructive proposals of the "cornerstone" action plan :

Rural and Seaside Recreational Areas---Holiday and Picnic Resorts That Maximise Relaxation and Recreation with a Minimum of Travel and Impact on Surrounding Countryside.

About three quarters of Victoria's wealth is concentrated in the Port Phillip district, as economists count wealth. As a picnicker or holidaymaker counts value, however, the balance is the other way. The three quarters of the Victorian population who live in the Melbourne region or Geelong are thinking of somewhere to go in the bush, or beside the sea or a lake or a river. The consequent flood of picnickers and holidaymakers have given rise to two problems.

Firstly, there is not enough room for them all at "pick" spots, and this problem becomes aggravated the more subdivisions for holiday shacks are permitted along the beach fronts, the mountain ridges, the river valleys, and other choice places. Secondly there is the matter of the sheer conservation of our bush and shores in their natural state, not only to avoid the erosion of our natural resources, but because the bushes and trees, the birds and animals are, after all, the very reason that people are attracted back to nature.

It is urgent that these two problems should be tackled simultaneously through the establishment of a Conservation and Holiday Resort Authority. Such an authority should have power to declare hundreds of thousands of acres of suitable bush and seacoast as conservation areas and be empowered to control land-use in these areas. These powers should include the following :-

1. Compact Resorts

The power should be given to buy up all vacant lots in places where private holiday cottages are not desirable, and provide accommodation instead ranging from camping grounds, holiday flats, guest houses and motels so that it is concentrated in one area. The compactness resulting from such planning would leave much larger areas of unspoiled countryside which could be used for general enjoyment.

2. Control Access

Power is needed to control access to areas that can be ecologically damaged by too great a concentration of people. This can be achieved in several different ways: one obvious one is to limit car parking space to the number of people the area can safely accommodate, as is already being done in many British parks.

3. Access to Former Public Reserves

Power is needed to re-open access to all areas of scenic beauty, or of interest to anglers, bushwalkers, gem collectors, field naturalists, campers, and explorers which were formerly open to the public, but which are now privately controlled. In particular (in Victoria), land that has recently been acquired for private use by the Land (Unused Roads and Waterfrontages) Act 1961, should be made accessible to the public; although made conditional on point 2 above, where necessary.

4. Reclaiming Areas from Private Sector.

In the long term, governments should make it possible for the Conservation and Holiday Resort Authority to acquire from private property holders a strip of land along all water frontages of sea, lakes or rivers. The width of the strip should depend on the nature of the terrain, one of the main criterias being that there is enough public land to enable those enjoying the area to feel that they are "away from it all" (By way of example: there is 40 miles of glorious coastline between Port Fairy and Portland that is fenced off and treated a private preserves.)

Access to such newly-opened up areas should not be by roads that hug the river or beach, but by side roads that branch off the main road many miles away, and end at suitable areas for picnicing, camping or holiday resorts (as the case may be). One would thus "arrive" into a compact place, but at least with a feeling of wilderness all around.

5. Multi-use National Parks near Cities.

Areas where there is already considerable overdevelopment, and which

are close to big urban concentrations should, although continuing to permit multi-use of currently existing uses, have tight constraints against further urban or holiday-shack type of development. Over a long period, but according to a plan, there could be gradual resumption of land in what should be choice areas, and restoration of the bush effected. The ~~Marketing~~ Conservation and Holiday Resort Authority, by careful siting in compact hamlets, and sensitive landscaping with native flora could, over a period, provide greatly increased accommodation so that many more people could enjoy sojourns in such places, and yet the overall original "bush" ~~marketing~~ atmosphere could become much more all-pervading, even from the scenic road for day-trippers. Obvious examples near Melbourne are the Dandenongs, the Yarra Valley and the Mornington Peninsula.

The first two problems mentioned were the pressure of people at "pick" spots, and the need to conserve the bush and seashore from suburbanisation. A third problem, linked with these two problems, has to do with the mobility of modern society. The very title chosen, for example, by the Victorian State Government for the department administering in this area of affairs is the "Ministry of Tourism".

The word "tourism" has a twofold implication: First, that the association with one place is only for a brief time, during a "tour"; and secondly that the tourist comes from another State or country. The word conjures up for most people the overtone of an "overseas tourist".

In line with just such concepts, much of the government subsidy, to date, has gone into developing tourist attractions of a fleeting character—festivals and similar "events", and accommodation for people "on the move".

But to renew himself through recreation, man also needs holiday resorts where the main attractions encourage him to stay in one place. This is not only necessary socially for the benefit of the person, but could have ecological advantages as well. Holiday places where the main attractions are accessible through the self-locomotion of man as a pedestrian could make a considerable contribution to saving fossil fuel resources.

Therefore, in addition to the points listed above the Conservation and Holiday Authority needs to develop policies aimed at making the compact holiday resorts places that are really worth staying in, both environmentally and socially, and should take these further steps:

#### 6. Pedestrian Trails

Guidelines should be drafted for the development in all holiday resort areas of carefully sited pedestrian footways or trails, to encourage travel by foot rather than car, once having arrived at a holiday resort or picnic spot. Wilson's Promontory is an example of how access by car has been limited, and bridle tracks provide the access to the coast and mountain country.

#### 7. Scientific Education Centres

Field stations which provide educational material about the area surrounding particular resorts should be developed. This practice has been commenced through the National Parks Authority for those areas, but the process should be extended to all areas, combined with careful explanation of the sort of care that has to be taken to protect the bush and how to do it.

#### 8. Cultural Entertainment

Facilities for cultural entertainment of a high standard should be arranged for all major holiday resorts. During vacation, many people have time to go to a concert, a film, or a play, but drive-in theatre entertainment is often the only choice even in places where there are thousands of holiday-makers. Consideration should be given to the possibility of holiday circuits by top performers.

#### 9. People to Serve Others

Provision is needed for many more officers at all major holiday resorts such as caretakers, park rangers, lifesavers, bushwalk organisers, excursion leaders, and any other sort of organiser that seems wanted: not to impose or urge people to do something they are not inclined to do, but to be on hand to assist if a need for some particular type of participation by the holidaymakers ~~emerges~~ becomes apparent.

The alternative to such a positive program is continuation of :  
 (a) the present weekend or holiday exodus of more and more people trying to go further and further afield to escape the urban suburbia only to find themselves in a bush suburbia or a seaside suburbia with the consequent ruination of many of the finest areas of bush and seaside.

(b) the emphasis on "tour" type of holidays where people are expected to derive all their relaxation from being constantly on the move, instead of intensely enjoying the relaxation of a more intimate association with nature combined (if they so desire) with more active and enjoyable relaxation with other people in the provision of sport, culture and other forms of participatory activities appropriate to holidaying.

Both recreation trends depend almost exclusively on car, bus, or plane; and in both the destinations tend to become further and further apart, and of less importance than the movement to them.

Two further powers and responsibilities for the Conservation and Holiday Resort Authorities are therefore called for :

#### 10. Arrangement of Public Transport Access.

All public transport departments and agencies should be charged with the responsibility of working out feasible public transport access to major holiday resorts, subsidised, if necessary, to provide serious competition with the private vehicle for such uses.

Such services would need to cover day-picnic excursions, as well as holiday-excursions. Express running of such trains with buses or cars connecting with railheads direct to the resort concerned could be considered.

#### 11. Supply of Holiday Equipment formerly Brought by Car

To make public transport to resorts a workable alternative, supplies are required at such places for very cheap hire of all bulky or heavy holiday or picnic equipment which now tempts or even compels the picnickers or holidaymakers to use cars.

These hireable items should include caravans, tents, boats, barbeques, picnic tables, and chairs, beach umbrellas, baby's pushers and cots and so on. Food and drinks at city prices should be readily available at all reasonable times as well as hampers to carry them in. A plentiful supply of cheap hire of rowboats, surfboards, skis, yachts, and, where appropriate, horses should be available to break the dependency on the speedboat, beach buggy and "fun-wheels" to the point where prohibition could be considered.

The effect of providing conditions for enhanced relaxation, combined, where desired, with exhilarating outdoor, or cultural or fun-type indoor recreational activities at fixed places, coupled with the greatly increased use of convenient public transport made feasible precisely because the destinations are fixed, could, on the face of it, save great quantities of fossil fuel energy, now used in weekend and holiday touring, and in motor boats and airplanes.

It is submitted that this general policy outlined for recreation beyond the city and suburbs is self-evidently superior to current trends from the point of view of protecting the ~~national estate~~ national estate; and applies equally to all States without the need for elaborate investigations while the bad trends are allowed to continue.

#### Recreational Areas---Proposals for Immediate Positive Action.

We therefore ask that this Committee of Enquiry recommend :

1. The establishment of ~~Health~~ Conservation and Holiday Resort Authorities empowered with interim development orders to prevent all further recreational resorts or facilities in the bush or on the seacoast unless they comply with the type of standards and policies as set out above, such Authorities to have acknowledged conservationists as their key personnel, and to absorb all ministries or agencies of tourism under their control.
2. The changing of all Transport Authorities to plan closely in

conjunction with the Conservation and Holiday Resort Authorities the  
the gradual replacement of private transport by the competition of  
all ~~main~~ the main existing resorts, with the provision of access only  
by public transport to any big selected new holiday or picnic resorts.

\*\*\*\*\*

That concludes this brief submission. We realised less than a week ago that the opportunity was available to us to present this material. We ask therefore that defects of expression or of typing be overlooked.

We welcome the Committee of Enquiry and consider that what this ~~is~~ committee is concerned with can have great national and historic significance, if the correct conclusions are reached and actually implemented at all levels of government. We hope, naturally, that our views can play some useful part in the Committee's conclusions.