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1. Introduction

BusVic would like to thank the Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning for the opportunity to be part of the Plan Melbourne Refresh. Through the development of Plan Melbourne, and through this refresh process, BusVic has worked closely with the Ministerial Advisory Committee (MAC) to provide pertinent and timely data, as well as operational knowledge, to ensure that public transport was considered within an integrated planning framework that incorporated a strategic land use and transport lens.

BusVic was actively involved in the preparation of the original Plan Melbourne, providing a detailed submission to the MAC in 2013 on behalf of its members. During this refresh consultation period, BusVic has again been active in engaging in the process as well as seeking member and industry views on how the bus industry can work with the Victorian Government and other stakeholders to deliver the objectives of Plan Melbourne 2016.

In preparing this Submission, BusVic has taken into consideration the original Plan Melbourne strategy, its submission to that process, current government policy, and the scope of options for the Refresh. This Submission centres on factors associated with preparing a framework to develop integrated planning mechanisms to meet government growth forecasts for Melbourne at 2050. Specifically, this Submission addresses:

- Housing strategy opportunities;
- Connectivity through an integrated transport strategy;
- Melbourne as a city of resilience;
- Implementation of the strategy;

all in the context of the bus and coach industry.

This Submission also addresses some of the questions asked in the Government's Discussion Paper, but not all.

We hope the insights offered herein contributes to the narrative on how government policies and procedures in relation to procurement could be improved to realise greater Victorian economic activity and well-being.
2. Who is Bus Association Victoria Inc. (BusVic)?

BusVic (Bus Association Victoria, Inc.) is a member-owned, voluntary professional association for Victoria's private, accredited bus and coach operator's. Member operators offer bus and coach services across the route, mainstream school, special school, long-distance coach and charter and tour sectors throughout Victoria and other parts of Australia. Since 1944, BusVic has represented the best interests of members in a variety of ways, most importantly in respect of their relationship with Government and its Agencies, including contract negotiation and legislative and regulatory compliance.

BusVic invests in research and development on procurement, and social, economic, environmental, governance and safety factors on behalf of a ‘community of interest’, a collective of like-minded mainly family businesses that form the Victorian bus and coach industry. BusVic fosters, formulates, performs and evaluates society’s policies that are in the furtherance of the public good. Inherent in this relationship is the concept of BusVic acting as an agent of public policy. BusVic facilitates collective action for government by using its networks, norms, interactions, trust and reciprocity of its members. BusVic also promote State Government policy initiatives and regulatory reform by holding training seminars and information sessions at conferences and events. This ensures bus operators and the bus service network remains evolutionary and up to date with best practice from other national and international public transport networks.
3. Recommendations

BusVic supports the Plan Melbourne refresh process to better align the key strategic planning document with the government’s policy and investment agenda. In providing this support, BusVic makes the following recommendations to the refresh process:

- The refresh of Plan Melbourne 2016 offers an opportunity to rectify some of the glaring omissions on transport policy of the previous document. However, BusVic does not believe that the Refresh discussion paper incorporates the necessary inclusions to drive the broader strategic outcomes needed to support the forecast growth for Melbourne.
- BusVic reiterates its submission to the Plan Melbourne 2014 consultation process (Refer Addendum A). It advocates the need for a broad, city and state-wide planning strategy that supports transport equity, serving the needs of the commuter as well as social transit outcomes.
- To achieve this, the Plan Melbourne Refresh needs to be a truly integrated and comprehensive land use and transport plan. As a core element of its Plan Melbourne 2014 submission BusVic identified the following action plan that advocates the top transport priorities in the development of land use and transport policy needed to give effect to the planning principles that should underpin Plan Melbourne:
  a) Pillar 1 - Agreed and shared goals
  b) Pillar 2 - Local bus route minimum service levels (safety net)
  c) Pillar 3 - Arterial and Circumferential (Orbital) SmartBus Routes (A 20 minute city)
  d) Pillar 4 - Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) systems
  e) Pillar 5 - Infrastructure and on road priority measures
  f) Pillar 6 - Connectivity
  g) Pillar 7 - Embrace a continuously improving and evolving network (supply)
  h) Pillar 8 - Fix community transport
  i) Pillar 9 - Funding

- Plan Melbourne 2016 should be an integrated strategy that incorporates transport, land use planning, sustainability and housing strategies.
- A polycentric city and 20 minute neighbourhoods should be at the core of the strategy to deliver a connected city. The success of this concept relies on an integrated transport network advocating active transport, public transport and car use so as to provide the effective foundation to achieve the necessary economic, social and environmental outcomes of the government.
- There needs to be a coordinated infrastructure investment strategy that places an emphasis on active and public transport to meet the growth patterns of Melbourne moving to 2050.
BusVic supports the Plan Melbourne refresh housing development target of 70/30 (infill / growth areas), however it encourages the government to be bold and seek to exceed this target wherever practical.

The additional housing required to support the growth of Melbourne through to 2050 should be delivered predominantly by infill development within Melbourne's middle ring suburbs along existing public transport corridors to support transit orientated development outcomes.

The Refresh proposes to rely on the existing Principal Public Transport Network (PPTN) to provide the trunk transport services to support population growth to 2050. It focuses development solely along the existing PPTN and does not consider the impacts of growth on the capacity of this network, or identify alternative options to support this growth. It does not provide public transport alternatives to assess growth options nor does it offer appropriate planning guidance to developers with regard to the broader impact on the transport network of development. BusVic agrees with the MAC recommendation to secure broader transit corridors, including an expanded PPTN, across Melbourne for the period to 2050 and beyond.

Melbourne’s bus operators provide a flexible, low cost, public transport service that continues to respond to the ever expanding city’s population growth. In a capital constrained environment, bus services offer a low cost solution to sustainable outcomes across economic, social and environment factors. In growth areas, where population numbers do not justify the cost of a dedicated route service, demand responsive services can be tailored to meet the diverse need of the community at a reduced cost to government.

In existing growth corridors where long term rail infrastructure is proposed (i.e. Mernda, Whittlesea etc), Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) services can provide a low cost and flexible mass transit system that can be scaled quickly to demand along existing corridors with minimal capital expenditure. A trial of a BRT system can be trialled in a growth corridor with minimal financial risk to prove the concept and better understand operational and commercial issues.

The adoption and implementation of Plan Melbourne within the State Planning Policy Framework and at a local government level should be effectively coordinated across government to deliver an integrated approach, with the Metropolitan Planning Authority (MPA), and the proposed Victorian Planning Authority (VPA), providing that overarching governance function.

Implementation should be led at the local level by local government authorities and other regional authorities with the guidance and support of the MPA/VPA. It is at the local/regional interface that the greatest return on investment for social, economic and environmental outcomes are realised.

BusVic supports the use of a transparent and reliable monitoring framework to measure the success of Plan Melbourne 2016 over time.

An independent committee comprising government and a cross representation of industry stakeholders should be established to advise the MPA/VPA and VCAT.
BusVic recommends that infrastructure contribution plans are used to provide seed funding for the establishment of purpose designed public transport services in new communities from the commencement of development in new growth areas to support social outcomes as well as encourage early adoption of public transport as a viable transport journey option.

4. Plan Melbourne Refresh Strategic Direction

The Plan Melbourne Refresh seeks to address 3 key issues to align with current government policy and strategy:

1. Housing supply, diversity and affordability
2. Connectedness through urban built form and transport network connectivity
3. Resilience to climate change
4. Implementation

4.1 Housing

BusVic supports the affordable housing focus of the Plan Melbourne Refresh. In delivering actions to achieve more affordable housing BusVic advocates that infill development be the focus of additional capacity requirements to stop the growth in new Greenfield areas. The government has a 70/30 plan which will see infill development cater for 70% of the new housing growth and greenfield development support the remaining 30%. Infill development should be focussed within the 'middle ring' suburbs with an emphasis of higher densities along arterial transport routes. This approach will offer people locations with greater choice in terms of access and amenity. For housing policy in Melbourne’s growth corridors, development should be linked to transport outcomes that ultimately improve the level of access and amenity for new households and businesses.

This approach aligns with the polycentric city and 20 minute neighbourhoods strategy, whereby social capital and inclusion is improved through improved community connectedness. As has been shown by VAGO (2013), BusVic (2014) and McCloskey et al (2009), higher density residential areas supported by strong public and active transport networks result in increased economic, social and environmental spillovers. These benefits accompany modal shift away from the car as people within the community have a reduced dependence on cars, participating more in active forms of transport modality (walking, cycling and public transport).

The concept of the polycentric city, supported by 20 minute neighbourhoods is a great opportunity to reduce car demand; however the opportunity to incorporate cycling and public transport as a core element of the 20 minute city is critical to achieving desired sustainable outcomes. The Plan Melbourne Refresh discussion paper attempts to redefine the concept of a 20 minute neighbourhood to one that
enables the community to "meet your everyday (non work) needs locally, primarily within a 20 minute walk". The literature that developed and has espoused the 20 minute neighbourhood concept focuses on walking, cycling and public transport as key active transport modes that underpin the 20 minute neighbourhood (Stanley et al 2015). As has been argued by the MAC in response to the 20 minute walking neighbourhood, the way Melbourne has developed, and will continue to develop, it is highly unlikely that the concept can ever have widespread adoption due to the distance between residential and community areas in many parts of Melbourne's outer suburbs. To ensure long term success in the adoption of the 20 minute neighbourhood, BusVic supports rewording the discussion paper definition of the 20 minute neighbourhood to incorporate walking, cycling and public transport.

As has been previously mentioned, Plan Melbourne 2016 needs to be supported by a housing strategy and integrated transport strategy that seeks to facilitate social and commuter links to deliver more affordable and prosperous community outcomes. The conversation on housing affordability needs to be expanded beyond the current definition and include externalities into the cost of purchasing and maintaining a house. At present current economic factors: additional car, environmental impact, and social impact are not deemed measures in determining housing affordability.

VAGO (2013) identified that inadequate public transport in growth area communities is creating barriers to mobility, including access to critical services, education and employment opportunities. In turn, these deficiencies are increasing car dependence, pollution and exacerbating traffic congestion at significant community cost. This both limits state productivity and the time that people can spend with their families. Integrated public and active transport services will improve journey times for commuters and offer transport options for social activities.

Melbourne's growth corridors reflect the relatively greater transport disadvantage faced by people living in outer suburbs (Stanley et al, 2015). People living in outer suburbs make about the same number of trips as those living in inner suburbs but travel almost twice as far in so doing (a function of relatively low accessibility in outer areas). The corresponding public transport service availability in outer Melbourne is less than one-third that in inner Melbourne. VAGO (2013) also found that growth areas have substantially fewer, less frequent and less direct public transport services compared to the metropolitan Melbourne average with almost one-quarter of growth area households fail to meet the state’s target of 95 per cent of households being within 400 metres of public transport.

Efficient public transport links can improve housing affordability by significantly reducing household expenditure on transport. By integrating public transport services into growth areas at start of a development rather than near end, it provides people with transport journey options, and the opportunity to reduce the need for two car households.
4.2 Connectedness

Public transport provides people with the opportunity to connect with friends, their community and to build social capital. The provision of a “minimum service level” creates the foundation of a “social transit role” performed by public transport (Stanley et al, 2015). Appropriate minimum service levels will vary by location and the intent needs to be balanced with due consideration of value for money from taxpayer funded services. The early provision of public transport in growth areas is important in offering the community alternative transport journey options at the time they move into an area. Inadequate public transport options may impede mobility and accessibility, and directly impact the environment through supporting greater car dependency.

In its submission to the Plan Melbourne 2014 consultation process BusVic advocated the need for a broad, city and state-wide planning strategy that supports transport equity, serving the needs of the commuter as well as social transit outcomes. An integrated transport network should include active transport modes, public transport, as well as road and freight transport tasks. There needs to be a concerted infrastructure investment strategy in transport that places an emphasis on active and public transport to meet the growth patterns of Melbourne moving to 2050.

Plan Melbourne, and the proposed Refresh are focused on land use planning outcomes as the main driver to delivering the capacity to support the forecast growth expectations through to 2050. The MAC advised that it is essential to have an integrated approach that covered strategic land use planning and transport. BusVic supports the concept that the Plan Melbourne Refresh should be an integrated planning document covering land use planning, transport and housing.

VAGO (2013) found that Victorians wanted an integrated transport system that contributes to an inclusive, prosperous and environmentally responsible state. It found that the system should:

- Promote social and economic inclusion
- Facilitate economic prosperity
- Actively contribute to environmental sustainability
- Provide for the effective integration of transport and land use
- Facilitate efficient, coordinated and reliable movement, and
- Be safe and support health and wellbeing
4.2.1 Transport Corridors

BusVic supports the government commitment to protect transport corridors in Plan Melbourne 2016, in particular public transport corridors. These corridors should inform planning decision making at the state and local levels, and be used to deliver the Transit Orientated Development (TOD), housing and activity centre outcomes identified by the government. The identification of public transport corridors should provide the flexibility to consider BRT systems as well as rail and other mass transit options. The identification and subsequent protection of corridors should form part of a broader integrated transport strategy that links with Plan Melbourne 2016. This will ensure appropriate protection is applied through the planning system, corridor encroachment is managed, and medium to long term development is not stymied by insufficient transit corridors.

The discussion paper identifies that the Principal Public Transport Network (PPTN) should form the nexus of the strategic transport corridor along which to focus development and funnel transport funding so as to maximise return on investment. While this should be the current minimum starting point, the Plan Melbourne document should not be structured in such a manner that potential future corridors are omitted or not considered. BusVic supports the inclusion of the PPTN in Plan Melbourne 2016 along with the identification of long term strategic transit corridors, which include public transport networks, along with appropriate development can be facilitated. The PPTN should be seen as a current and future network, continually reviewed and updated within Plan Melbourne 2016 to reflect growth patterns in Melbourne.

BusVic does not support the implementation of a planning strategy that advocates long term development based on "current network priorities". This approach does not support the pursuit of innovation to address the constraints that will evolve as the growth of Melbourne's population exceeds 6 million people by 2050. With approximately 90% of all current personal journeys made by car, moving to a population of 6 million people within the current city boundary drawing on existing transport networks will deliver choking congestion driving adverse social, economic and health impacts.

Melbourne has a planning history that is littered with transport corridors lost to encroachment, rezoning, and short term political expediency that has had long term impacts on the city including significant capital costs to develop alternative infrastructure solutions (some examples include - Western Ring Road - Northern East Link Corridor reservation removed in the 1970s, building of the Melbourne Aquarium blocking additional above ground rail capacity within the CBD, and residential development encroachment along urban train lines limiting the ability to lay additional tracks in the corridor).
4.2.2 Transit Orientated Development

BusVic supports the inclusion of MAC Recommendation 10 to *Designate a set of strategic public transport corridors for Transit Orientated Development* (TOD) be included in Plan Melbourne 2016. Significant investigation and planning in this space already exists and provides guidance for LGAs and developers in their planning and investment frameworks. Securing these corridors early protects them from encroachment and conversely protects residents through notification on title. It is important that these corridors are included in an integrated transport strategy that supports the government's approach to a better connected Melbourne.

An example of this approach has been in NSW where the state has adopted an integrated transport and land use planning approach that aims to build and strengthen the physical and social environment to encourage communities to engage in active living through TOD. This is delivered by co-locating trip-generating activities near one another and by supporting a network of mixed-use centres to accommodate these activities, people can avoid unnecessary motorised travel. This general strategy was proposed by BusVic in its Moving People Victoria (2014) document where it advocated for land use policies and programs to provide greater emphasis to more compact settlement patterns. This should facilitate even higher modal shares for walking and cycling reducing road congestion, transport GHG emissions and increasing personal activity levels.
4.2.3 Social Benefits

Community Prosperity

From a governance perspective, local bus operators are facilitators of increased social capital and community prosperity. Operators' community interactions such as providing discounted and complimentary bus-services enables more opportunities for access to individual and group travel. This can reduce the likelihood of users being socially excluded, which in turn improves personal and community capacity building. Bus operators who contribute their time for no fee to local organisations keep the organisation’s costs low, which increases the likelihood of the organisation achieving their objectives, and in turn strengthens the resilience and viability of the community. Bus operators sharing their resources with other operators fosters inter-operator good will, reciprocity and peace of mind that they have the ability to continue to provide their contracted bus-service in times of adversity, such as when drivers are sick or vehicles are unserviceable. Community interactions which see operators incur costs for the sake of their community, such as financial donations, non-financial donations and sponsorships, benefit the recipients as they are more likely to achieve their intended objectives, which contributes towards community health and well-being. Sponsoring the education and living expenses of children from war-torn countries improves those recipients' personal capacity to contribute to society, their well-being and from a societal perspective, fosters social cohesion. Operator purchasing behaviour that sees some bus operators consciously reinvest their income on local product and service providers, as far as practicable, to an extent keeps their money in their community. This contributes to the retention of local jobs, local economic activity and community prosperity.

Safety and security interactions benefit the recipient by virtue of their well-being being sustained. The community and society as a whole benefit from operators’ safety and security interactions as they capitalise on the societal contribution the recipient of the safety interaction is able to make, because they are safe, and also by there being less of a likelihood of a burden on emergency services and hospital visits and the like.

Bus operators that combine their resources with other operators are essentially using bridging social capital (individuals and organisations with common values, trust and reciprocity) to deliver a social service as if it were one operator contracted to the client. This facilitates a commercial outcome for each operators' business. This inter-operator trust and cooperation is self-perpetuating and increases their businesses viability. From a user perspective, passengers gain a greater sense of confidence that the bus-service will operate as scheduled. From a government perspective, the authority (or contractor) gains a greater sense of confidence that the degree of inter-operator reciprocity will act as a safety net of sorts and ensure the contracted task is
delivered, which in turn will prevent customer satisfaction from declining in the event of emergency or potential service disruption (Lowe, 2015.)

**Social Exclusion**

These scenarios illustrate the importance of mobility on people’s ability to participate in society. This is reinforced by Stanley and Barrett (2011). Social exclusion looks at the barriers to full participation in society. Stanley et al. (2010) examined the connection between trip making and the risk of social exclusion in Melbourne (and later included regional Victoria) and found that the average value of an additional trip at the average household income was approximately $20 to a person of risk of social exclusion. In other words, for a person at risk of social exclusion who has average income, enabling another trip is equivalent to giving that person $20. That research confirmed a significant link between increased mobility (trip making) and reduced risk of social exclusion in both metropolitan and regional studies. That work also showed social inclusion is closely associated with well-being. Thus, the reduction of social exclusion is considered a social determinant that bus-services can contribute towards alleviating. Similarly, Ahern and Hine (2015, p.394) find that present transport is not meeting the needs of older people and that they experience significant transport disadvantage when they can no longer drive. In addition to increasing funding for more conventional public transport services, so as to offer more regular and frequent services to hospitals and medical appointments, the authors suggest greater links between government health and transport departments and agencies; that there be a more ‘whole of government’ approach to coordination of government services and achieve more synergies.

This qualitative data illustrates several realities. First, it suggests that the bus can be more than just a vehicle to convey passengers from A to B; the bus can be a mechanism that can help to reduce social exclusion, increase social cohesion, contribute towards improving community and personal connectedness, viability and resilience, all of which can be positively associated with community prosperity, particularly in a rural setting. Some rural areas are adjusting to declining employment in agriculture, the out-migration of youth, and populations that are both ageing and declining. Transport is central to the response to all of these challenges (OECD, 2009, p. 4) as it enables people to participate in some things society has to offer. This underscores the second point; the importance of the role of the local bus operator, as the person charged with the responsibility of being the provider of the transport service (perhaps as an agent of government) that contributes to reducing social exclusion, increasing social cohesion and community connectedness, improving the viability of the town and enabling community prosperity. Most importantly, keeping community members safe is a core responsibility of a bus operator.
Kamruzzaman et al. (2014) also find that individuals living in transit oriented developments had a significantly higher level of trust and reciprocity and connections with neighbours compared with residents of transit adjacent developments. Transit oriented development is characterised by moderate to high residential and/or employment density, diverse land use patterns, well-connected street networks and centred on fast, frequent and well connected public transport. Transit adjacent developments possess suburban street patterns, low densities and segregated land uses (Kamruzzaman et al. 2014, p. 145). Further, Utsunomiya (2015, p. 10) finds that the introduction of a new light rail line has changed the activities of residents along the line and has tended to promote more opportunities to come into contact with others than before. These studies shed light on the role of public transport from a social capital perspective.

### 4.2.4 Low Cost Public Transport Connections

BusVic continues to advocate the government's Plan For Victoria’s Bus Network, its commitment in the Plan Melbourne Refresh to expand the network, as well as incorporate greater on road priority measures to provide a more efficient and cost effective bus network for passengers.

BusVic supports the government plan to transform the public transport network. As stated in our 2013 submission, buses provide a flexible low cost system, both in terms of capital and operational expenditure, that can move passengers very efficiently. Buses are extremely efficient and effective in providing public transport services in growth areas where minimal additional investment is needed as the existing road corridors provide suitable base infrastructure.

VAGO (2013) found that the time taken to fund rail services to growth areas from first identifying the need is usually excessive, in most cases it exceeds 30 years. The provision of new or additional bus services to support government policy can be delivered with short procurement lead times (up to 6 months) and has high local manufacturing content that supports employment in Victoria. As buses use existing infrastructure, and with minor network upgrades that support bus prioritisation, they can deliver an efficient service performance even on congested road networks (refer to the Hoddle St and Victoria Pde bus network priority upgrades).

The proposal to extend the South Morang rail line to Mernda provides a great opportunity for the Victorian government to trial a BRT system linking Mernda with the existing train network whilst current economic conditions do not support the significant capital investment required for a rail extension. The BRT can operate along the existing road corridor until the rail link is constructed, offering residents an alternative interim public transport option. The trial can be used as a demonstration in Victoria of how government can procure high frequency and high volume
passenger services at a significantly lower capital and operating cost to traditional fixed rail services. This trial will provide an opportunity for government agencies to work together to deliver a service across modes (i.e. VicRoads, PTV, DEDJTR, DELWP).

4.3 Resilience

BusVic supports the approach of Plan Melbourne Refresh to support the sustainability of Melbourne through a range of strategies to create a city that is responsive to internal and external changes that influence the social wellbeing, economic capacity and environmental performance of the city. The term ‘Resilience’ as adopted in the Plan Melbourne Refresh can be misleading in the intended outcomes of the strategy. Typically resilience refers to the ability to respond to, return to a normal state, or recover from an external force, trauma, event. The language in Plan Melbourne Refresh is focused on establishing resilience as an environmental pillar, the ability of Melbourne to respond to change and adapt to environmental factors. BusVic is of the view that the intent of the Plan Melbourne Refresh is the concept of sustainability and community wellbeing, existing constructs of which the community is widely understanding and accepting.

An integrated transport system can help the government deliver a more resilient and environmentally sustainable Melbourne by:

- Encouraging active transport options
- Reducing CO2 emissions and other pollutants associated with congestion and car travel
- Supporting active transport which contributes to broader community health benefits through increased exercise resulting in reduced obesity, reduced health costs, and lower incidents of heart disease
- Reducing congestion through the provision of alternative transport journey options
- Delivering a 20 minute city and polycentric city which reduces reliance on cars, journey length and congestion cycle on Melbourne's road network
- Improving the economic productivity of the state by reducing congestion, reducing road network maintenance costs, and increasing the life of infrastructure
- Modal shift from private to public transport can increase social capital, community participation and social cohesion.

Encouraging mode shift from car journeys to public transport will reduce greenhouse bases by 2/3 for the equivalent journey during peak hour periods, and over 90% during off peak. There is an increased dependence that has developed on the motor vehicle for personal travel. A case study of school journeys in Sydney shows that from 1971 - 2003, active transport (walking/cycling and public transport) decreased from over 80% in 1971 to approximately 40% by 2000–03. Conversely car use increased from 15% to 57% (BusVic, 2014).
However policy makers should remain cognisant that in seeking to deliver an integrated transport network to support the growth of Melbourne to 2050, that less than 20% of jobs in Melbourne are in the CBD (McCloskey et al, 2009). More than 80% of jobs are dispersed across hundreds of square kilometres. Accordingly, the majority of people in Melbourne still rely on car use to access employment in the most time efficient manner as the public transport network is designed to link with connections that funnel people through to the CBD. Until Melbourne develops a fully integrated network that supports journeys throughout Melbourne, car use will still be the preferred choice of transport for the clear majority of workers in the city.

4.4 Implementation

Plan Melbourne should be effectively coordinated across government to deliver an integrated approach, with the MPA, and the proposed VPA, providing that overarching governance function. Implementation should be led at the local level by LGAs and other regional authorities with the guidance and support of the MPA/VPA. It is at the local/regional interface that the greatest return on investment for social, economic and environmental outcomes are realised.

BusVic supports the use of a transparent and reliable monitoring framework to measure the success of Plan Melbourne 2016 over time. Transparent reporting on clear and measurable targets will underpin the success of the strategy and provide strong community and industry support for ongoing implementation. Inconsistent, or low transparency in decision making will discourage investment and create a culture of opposition by both community and developers.

VAGO (2013) identified that growth corridor plans and Precinct Structure Plans provide a sound framework for identifying infrastructure needs in growth areas, however the absence of a supporting funding and implementation strategy limits their effectiveness. BusVic recommends that infrastructure contribution plans are used to seed fund the establishment of purpose designed public transport services in new communities from the commencement of development in new growth areas. This arrangement will persist until there is sufficient development along the corridor for the catchment to be deemed self sustaining. As discussed earlier, establishing a public transport service early, provides the hook needed to encourage public transport passenger usage.
5. Conclusion

This submission suggests that:

- The Victorian Government adopts an integrated planning approach to support Melbourne’s growth through to 2050. Plan Melbourne needs to be supported by, and linked to a transport strategy and housing strategy;
- Plan Melbourne 2016 should identify and seek to secure key transit corridors that will form the framework for development through to 2050. This network should include the Principal Public Transport Network;
- 20 minute neighbourhoods are critical in creating a connected Melbourne, where active and public transport form the basis of most journeys. Plan Melbourne 2016 should define a 20 minute neighbourhood so as amenities and services can be accessed by walking, cycling and/or public transport;
- The Victorian Government pursue infill development along existing transport corridors in Melbourne’s middle ring suburbs;
- The Victorian Government accepts the opportunity to trial a Bus Rapid Transit system between South Morang train station and Mernda as an interim low cost solution to extending the train line; and
- The implementation of Plan Melbourne 2016 be a whole of government approach, led by the Metropolitan Planning Authority and supported by a fully funded infrastructure program for the first stage.
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