

Submission form: Victoria's draft 30-year infrastructure strategy

Your details

Name:	Kathy Lazanas
Organisation (if applicable):	Urban Transit Solutions
Position (if applicable):	CEO
Email:	[REDACTED]
Phone:	[REDACTED]

About you

Please tell us which best describes you:

- Victorian resident
- Victorian business owner/operator
- Industry professional
- Community organisation representative
- Local government representative
- State government representative
- Researcher
- Other (please specify): Click or tap here to enter text.

Your focus areas

Select the topics or regions you are providing feedback on (select all that apply):

Topics	Regions
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Across sectors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Regional Victoria
<input type="checkbox"/> Circular economy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Urban growth areas
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Melbourne
<input type="checkbox"/> Climate change	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Community infrastructure	
<input type="checkbox"/> Education	
<input type="checkbox"/> Energy	
<input type="checkbox"/> Freight	
<input type="checkbox"/> Health	
<input type="checkbox"/> Housing	
<input type="checkbox"/> Infrastructure for Victoria's First Peoples	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transport	
<input type="checkbox"/> Water	

Your feedback

Add as many sections as you need to provide all your feedback in this submission.

Topic/area:	Victorians have good access to housing, jobs, services and opportunities
Recommendation name:	Make government infrastructure more accessible
Recommendation number:	6
Do you support this topic or recommendation?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> In part
Tell us why	Clearly overdue
Share any supporting evidence or examples	
Include proposed changes and improvements	<p>Accessible infrastructure is essential not only those with a disability but for everyone. An audit by VAGO revealed that only 15% of tram services offered a low-floor tram at a level-access stop in 2018–19, and projections indicated that, at the current rate of upgrades, full compliance might not be achieved until 2066, this is an indictment on our policies and legislation that this timeline keeps getting pushed out.</p> <p>Given that no penalties have been issued for missing the 2022 deadline, some enforcement mechanism should be created that will directly cause either compliance <i>and</i> appropriate penalties to whichever official or politician is responsible for non-compliance by 31 December 2032, as well as annual thresholds before that time.</p> <p>We note that the recommendation on page 30 states it will “cost around \$1.5 billion over 10 years”; this equates to \$150 million per annum for bus and tram stops which, considering the cost of tram stop upgrades, does not seem sufficient. Does this cost only consider stop upgrades, or also things like provision of footpaths to stops along roads which do not have foot access? For example, this stop – https://maps.app.goo.gl/YzvKNqvc8q6cCSHt6 – in Upper Ferntree Gully has tactiles so is at least partially compliant with accessibility standards, but it is unusable to wheelchair users because there is no approach pathway of any sort which is common practice across the bus network.</p>

Topic/area:	Victorians have good access to housing, jobs, services and opportunities
Recommendation name:	Rezone locations near existing infrastructure for more home choices
Recommendation number:	7
Do you support this topic or recommendation?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> In part
Tell us why	Providing more housing options near existing infrastructure will ultimately cost us less as a State. .
Share any supporting evidence or examples	
Include proposed changes and improvements	<p>This element should make reference to value capture.</p> <p>In addition to rezoning, it is worth considering altering the legislation centred around precinct structure plans and existing suburbs such that transit services, among other factors, are included in the list of prerequisites before houses can be occupied. This could be done in two ways:</p> <p>1) Ruling a maximum population density of an area tied to weekly services; such as 200 services per week = 15 residents per hectare, linear increase to 1000 services per week = 60 residents per hectare or higher, and even if additional properties exist and are available for occupation no additional residents would be permitted until service increases are granted. This would force development companies to advocate for Government service improvements; and/or</p> <p>2) At present, new build housing requires a certificate of safety before people are allowed to move in, looking at things like water and electricity supply. The same should be extended to other functions like internet, fire and medical services within a given time boundary, and transit services. We suggest a minimum threshold of 950-1000 services each way, each week, stopping within 800 metres' walking distance (not crow-flies) of the property entrance.</p> <p>Either or both of these proactive measures would help to ensure that public transport services are available at day one for new residents, reducing initial car ownership rates and thus encouraging development of healthy lifestyles, before bad habits can be formed.</p> <p>Lastly, we caution against the use of air-rights or development immediately adjacent to transport corridors, until such time as the ultimate transport corridor width is competently assessed. This will avoid the risk of developments taking place that later constrain options for service improvements. As examples, development of air-rights above Richmond station or between there and Federation Square may need to have its column placements constrained to avoid preventing future track layout alterations; and the development of East Village at North and East Boundary roads in Bentleigh East needs to be carefully tracked to avoid preventing future provision of bus rapid transit or light rail along either trunk corridor.</p>

Topic/area:	Victorians have good access to housing, jobs, services and opportunities
Recommendation name:	Extend Melbourne's trams to encourage more new homes nearby
Recommendation number:	8
Do you support this topic or recommendation?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> In part
Tell us why	Extending tram lines is generally a good idea, but not all the selected extensions are practical given terrain constraints (trams are terrible at climbing steep hills (with high gradients) and have trouble with tight curves, especially when compared to buses); nor are these extensions necessarily the highest priorities.
Share any supporting evidence or examples	Australian Transport Assessment and Planning Guidelines O9 - https://www.atap.gov.au/sites/default/files/documents/atap-o9-brt-lrt-options-cba.pdf – section 4.9, page 40
Include proposed changes and improvements	<p>We agree that some tram routes need increased services, and other routes can and should be extended.</p> <p>Specifically:</p> <p>1. Swanston Street to Kensington</p> <p>It's worth noting that this route, if using existing track presently operated by Route 57, would run around the boundary of Arden rather than through or to the Metro One station. Beyond Arden, the line could branch to Macaulay station via Abbotsford-Canning, Arden-Macaulay or Arden-Langford, though the short portion of Arden Street between Abbotsford and Dryburgh-Macaulay is quite steep and thus may not be tram-compatible.</p> <p>The tram line <i>cannot</i> extend west of Macaulay until the railway under CityLink is grade-separated or otherwise rerouted, which will significantly increase the cost of this project. The railway could be elevated along the east of CityLink (nominally along the former goods sidings alignment) with a number of land acquisitions to make space; but this would result in a poor streetscape outcome. The only other option would be to reroute the whole of the Upfield line between the City and Royal Park or Jewell stations, including reclassifying the existing suburban train line as a Metro service, as understood internationally. This would directly counter Draft Recommendation 43's proposal to extend the railway from Upfield to Kalkallo, which has its own problems addressed below. Conversion of the line away from suburban rail is probably inevitable, but (notwithstanding the Macaulay level crossings) it is unlikely for at least half a century.</p> <p>Beyond Macaulay station and the Moonee Ponds Creek, Macaulay Road towards Kensington remains relatively flat for about 275 metres, then starts a steep westbound uphill climb which may not be compatible with a tram extension. Careful consideration would also need to be given to how the Kensington level crossing could be grade separated in the future, including the possible requirement for additional tracks; heritage concerns for the signal box and station</p>

Topic/area:

Victorians have good access to housing, jobs, services and opportunities

buildings; and the freight access requirements for the flour mill.

In summary, extending Route 3 as far as Arden and Macaulay is probably worthwhile, beyond would require serious thought and design work before confirming practicality.

2. Spencer Street to Flemington Bridge

Extending from the existing Spencer Street terminus north-west, then north along Abbotsford to join with existing Route 57, looks practical and useful. In this scenario we presume that Route 57 would link to Route 5, with Route 3 exclusively serving the present portion of 57 along Queensberry, Errol and Victoria Streets. The shared portion of Abbotsford Street may require short third tracks to minimise congestion and bunching, in the same vein as St Kilda Road at Southbank Boulevard and Toorak Road.

It is not entirely clear how the extended route is supposed to access Flemington Bridge, given that the map indicates a route other than the existing Flemington Road. However, an alternative to consider might be linking to Route 58 instead, with 57 and 59 both sharing the full length of Flemington Road from Racecourse Road to Haymarket.

3. Anzac station to Fishermans Bend North

We support this concept in principle, but caution that the apparently proposed tram link along Pickles Street from Mountain Street to Ingles/Dorcas may not be practical given the necessary curve radii. Turning north at Park Street then west at Dorcas Street, or use of Iffla Street and Lyell Street, may end up being necessary in lieu. Tram curves would also be worth providing at the intersection between Ingles Street and the Port Melbourne light rail, giving this new route access to Southbank depot.

Lastly, we note a non-zero change that the Turner Street alignment may be useful in restoring rail freight access to Webb Dock, based on passing under Footscray Road then uphill to cross the Yarra River at about the same height as the Bolte Bridge before curving west and following Turner Street to connect to the dock. Any development plans for Fishermans Bend North, including this tram extension, should at least be aware of this potential medium to long-term requirement.

4. Southern Cross station to Fishermans Bend South

We see the value in extending a tram route from the city and Southbank along Williamstown Road, but we argue against this being an extension of Route 11 via Spencer Street specifically. While it would be a lot cheaper than constructing a new bridge from Collins Street West to Lorimer Street, it would also entrench congestion at the Collins / Spencer Streets intersection that was supposed to have been solved by rerouting 12 via LaTrobe (as briefly occurred during the pandemic). As such, we maintain that the route from Collins Street West is preferable, though we recommend this be done with a steeply-graded arch bridge that should give at least ten metres of clearance between the high water mark and underside of the bridge deck, rather than a flat but mechanical bridge (e.g. swing or lift) which would subject the tram system to random delays.

5. East Malvern to Hughesdale via Chadstone

Topic/area:

Victorians have good access to housing, jobs, services and opportunities

This proposal is well-intentioned, but not practical. Extending the current Route 3 to East Malvern on Waverley Road is fine, though diverting to link to East Malvern station would sacrifice service to the local shops. Beyond East Malvern there is no easy way to get to Chadstone. Use of the former Outer Circle alignment would put the tram about 700 metres away from the shopping centre and eliminate a strip of well-maintained urban forest. The alternate route from Waverley Road to Chadstone Road is impossible because of the tight curve that would be needed at that intersection, and the steep gradient of Chadstone Road between Fenwick Street and Bellevue Avenue may not be tram-compatible either.

As such, our alternative proposal is for the tram to extend to Waverley Road, then follow along to Batesford Road and terminate at Warrigal Road, serving the railway station, local shopping strip, and Holmesglen TAFE. We note that there are other ways to get trams to Chadstone and that this has been the long-standing position of organisations such as Yarra Trams.

6. East Brighton to Moorabbin

We wholly support the proposal to link existing routes 16-north and 64-south into a combined Route 68 from Kew to East Brighton, and to extend this route further south to Moorabbin and potentially beyond. Whether that second extension is best made along South Road towards Warrigal Road, or further along Nepean Highway to Southland with SRL interchange, is open for debate.

However, this does leave the existing portion of Route 64 along Dandenong Road from Wattletree Road to Hawthorn Road abandoned. We would prefer to see this extended approximately 100 metres in the short term to provide a proper terminus for the truncated Route 64, which would give a better interchange to Malvern station and provide a launching point for a light rail (distinct from mixed-traffic trams) extension from Malvern. This would run along Dandenong Road, extending in stages through Caulfield to Chadstone and Monash University to Rowville in lieu of the “trackless tram” proposal for the same section.

7. Melville Road to Batman train station

This is somewhat confusing, because Route 58 was supposed to extend to Glenroy station (via Turner Road to Derby Street, Boundary Road, Rhodes Parade, Plumpton Avenue and W heatsheaf Road) rather than Batman station. It isn't clear that there is room at Derby and Gaffney streets for the necessary curve, nor that the implied redeveloping the land north of Gaffney Street as residential would be desirable. This proposal may only be sensible if connected to a truncated Route 11, forming a circle via Batman rather than the latter route terminating slightly further north without a significant trip generator. But that would be contingent on the Batman station level crossing being grade-separated.

8. Wattle Park to Burwood East

We support this extension.

9. Other

There are a number of proposed tram extensions in Melbourne that IV has not flagged as priorities; it would be good to see some

Topic/area:

Victorians have good access to housing, jobs, services and opportunities

discussion on the reasoning for each. For example, the above suggestion of a rerouted 64 from Malvern to Caulfield, Chadstone, Monash and Rowville, or the extension of Route 48 to Doncaster Park and Ride then (noting potential gradient issues) to Doncaster Shoppingtown; route 67 to Carnegie (with curve radii issues), or Murrumbeena and Chadstone via Neerim Road, and many others. We also note that IV's map on page 39 of the draft report shows Route 5 splitting at St Kilda Junction, with some services running along the present route to East Malvern, and the rest taking up the present Route 16 segment that is lost when 16+64 combine to 68. This section was previously covered by Route 3 on weekends, and that function could be restored. Alternatively, the two sections of this loop – Fitzroy Street between St Kilda Junction and Canterbury Road, and Carlisle Street between Acland Street and St Kilda Road – could be served by extensions of Route 12, the former via restored tramlines on Wellington Street.

It may also be worth considering gradual quadruplication of the tramlines along St Kilda Road, starting from Anzac station to Toorak Road and proceeding further south as necessary, to assist in separating slower generally-on-street routes from the faster generally-light-rail routes.

Topic/area:	Victorians have good access to housing, jobs, services and opportunities
Topic/area:	Victorians have good access to housing, jobs, services and opportunities
Recommendation name:	Run faster bus services, more often, in Victoria's largest cities
Recommendation number:	9
Do you support this topic or recommendation?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> In part
Tell us why	Bus services need to drastically, and quickly, improve.
Share any supporting evidence or examples	
Include proposed changes and improvements	<p>Most of Melbourne's bus network needs a significant overhaul, with resources poured in to significantly improve services, as IV has previously recognised. New and refreshed routes often have no more than two or three services per hour, which cannot provide a competitive and attractive service to anyone who has alternative options.</p> <p>Melbourne's bus services drastically need improvement and there are a number of plans that exist including DTP's Bus Reform Plan (which has not and will not be released by the Government) as well as countless Council plans which have sought to increase and streamline bus services as well as Dr John Stone's West Bus plan that seeks to streamline Melbourne's bus services in the West.</p> <p>It is unconscionable that as a State we continue to lag behind other cities including Sydney, Brisbane and Auckland when it comes to bus services.</p> <p>Public release of DTP's Bus Reform Plan should be paramount and consultation on the development of a new blueprint for Melbourne's bus network should be delivered as a priority. A minimum level service requirements such as Auckland's approach of 7am – 7pm high frequency services 7 days per week should be baseline. This helps commuters understand minimum service availability but also is the building block for services to commence earlier and run later (e.g. 6am – 9pm or 10pm to support shift workers and Fri or Sat evenings).</p>

Topic/area:	Victorians have good access to housing, jobs, services and opportunities
Topic/area:	Victorians have good access to housing, jobs, services and opportunities
Recommendation name:	Build a new bus rapid transit network
Recommendation number:	10
Do you support this topic or recommendation?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> In part
Tell us why	No definition of “bus rapid transit” is provided.
Share any supporting evidence or examples	Australian Transport Assessment and Planning Guidelines O9 - https://www.atap.gov.au/sites/default/files/documents/atap-o9-brt-lrt-options-cba.pdf – Chapter 3, pages 5–21. Note this references the 2016 BRT Standard, not the more recent 2024 version.
Include proposed changes and improvements	<p>It is difficult to support a purported “bus rapid transit” network without knowing exactly what that means in practice. The Federal Government guidelines lay out what the term should be used to indicate, and that does not match up well to the examples provided. Adelaide’s O-Bahn and Brisbane’s Metro services do not meet the Medium Capacity Transit definitions above, and the Eastern Freeway busway currently being built in conjunction with North East Link is a poor excuse for a BRT corridor; under the 2016 standards it lifts the rank of the City to Doncaster corridor from about 23 points out of 100, to about 32 points out of 100. This is because the corridor does provide for quick trips between the stops along the freeway, but that’s all it does. Extending the busway from Hoddle Street into the CBD should significantly improve that score.</p> <p>For the other proposed routes that IV has recommended, it is not clear why the Tarneit-Highpoint and Keilor East-Broadmeadows-Donnybrook routes are separate when they could easily be connected. We have discussed above our views regarding Monash and Rowville, but that is not necessarily mutually exclusive to the proposed BRT from Huntingdale to Upper Ferntree Gully. Indeed, there is a reasonable argument for this route to be extended west along North Road to Ormond (interchange with Frankston line for Southland), and perhaps to Elsternwick where it could connect to a BRT-upgraded Route 246. We note below a dislike of the Upfield to Kalkallo rail extension, instead preferring Lalor – Wollert – Donnybrook, which would use the land corridor shown here as BRT. For that reason, we think the BRT from Epping to Wollert would be a mistake.</p> <p>Separate from the BRT routes, it may be worth developing a network of express buses making use of more of the freeway/tollway network. For example, an express bus from Northland to Bulleen then via the North East Link to either or both of the City and Doncaster, or express buses using the West Gate Bridge and Tunnel.</p>

Topic/area:	Victorians have good access to housing, jobs, services and opportunities
Topic/area:	Victorians have good access to housing, jobs, services and opportunities
Recommendation name:	Extend metropolitan trains and run more services in Melbourne's west
Recommendation number:	11
Do you support this topic or recommendation?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> In part
Tell us why	Altona North appears to be on the former site of Paisley station. This needs to be carefully considered, because a bad design in conjunction with the existing Millers Road bridge could have severe consequences for a future Melbourne Metro 2 design, and/or returning express Geelong trains to the via-Werribee corridor.
Share any supporting evidence or examples	
Include proposed changes and improvements	<p>Other than Altona North, other station sites worth considering are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maddox Road (as part of the level crossing removal for that site), which will be a crucial interchange with Melbourne Metro 2. • Skeleton Creek, unlikely to have sufficient patronage to justify construction but worth checking just in case. • Derrimut Road, which should be built to support the East Werribee precinct if that proceeds. • Werribee Racecourse, unlikely to have sufficient patronage to justify construction; reconsider if the Racecourse is redeveloped. • Browns Road / Ison Road, likely to draw upwards of 1,200 passengers per day in the early stages, and 3,500 per day as more precinct structure plans in the area are filled in. <p>Additional crucial rail infrastructure for the south-western suburbs includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A third and fourth track is provided between Werribee and Millers Road, Paisley / Altona North. Ideally these tracks would extend further into the city, but that length built for speeds of 160 km/h should allow express V/Line services to run faster than present from Geelong to the City, even after accounting for the slow running from Paisley to Southern Cross between suburban services. • A flying junction somewhere between Altona Junction and Newport South (either side of Maddox Road), to solve the conflict between citybound Altona and outbound Werribee express services; designed with the Melbourne Metro 2 portal location in mind. • Reconfiguring platforms 13-14-15-16 at Southern Cross so

Topic/area:

Victorians have good access to housing, jobs, services and opportunities

that V/Line services can terminate in the middle two, and suburban services run through the outer two.

Topic/area:	Victorians have good access to housing, jobs, services and opportunities
Topic/area:	Victorians have good access to housing, jobs, services and opportunities
Recommendation name:	Extend metropolitan trains and run more services in Melbourne's west
Recommendation number:	11
Do you support this topic or recommendation?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> In part
Tell us why	The recommendation is a good start but could go further.
Share any supporting evidence or examples	<p>Page 44 of IV's draft report has two logic flaws.</p> <p>1) "The metropolitan train network does not reach many of these communities. They have few bus services ... As a result, many residents must drive ... In Melbourne's outer suburbs and new growth areas, 63% of residents drive to work compared to 32% in inner Melbourne."</p> <p>This does <i>not</i> establish that extending metropolitan rail to the west will significantly decrease driving commuter mode share. The change is a slightly faster and much higher capacity service, but with the same origin and destination nodes.</p> <p>2) "Melton residents could access 18,000 more jobs within 60 minutes travel time."</p> <p>The reference link does not work (it may be secured against public access?), but it is worth noting that a 60-minute commute is not a reasonable metric by which to assess the potential value of a transit project. As of 2012, 41% of all commutes (trips from home to paid employment) were 15 minutes or less, and 70% of commutes were 30 minutes or less.</p> <p>(https://www.bitre.gov.au/publications/2016/rr_144) These values may have shifted post-pandemic, as more people work from home some days each week and therefore accept longer commutes on the days when they do commute, but sixty minutes still seems an excessive metric. Consider that only a fraction of total employment opportunities are in the CBD, or along rail corridors.</p>

Topic/area:

Victorians have good access to housing, jobs, services and opportunities

Include proposed changes and improvements

We fully agree that electrified services to Melton are warranted and overdue. We support provision of new stations at Thornhill Park and Mount Atkinson. However, we don't know whether Melton or Wyndham (excluding Ballarat and Geelong, respectively) has higher existing or potential rail patronage, and it seems likely that both corridors will eventually need quadruplication and electrification. This will become more apparent as new station/s are opened along the Regional Rail Link. Alternatively, additional tracks along the Werribee to Newport corridor could divert some Geelong and Warrnambool trains, making way for future service increases to Wyndham.

Quadruplication only from Sunshine to Caroline Springs is a risky move, because it means that V/Line and metropolitan services will still have to share track between Caroline Springs and Melton. A third express line may be sufficient to support Ballarat services, though of course full quadruplication would be preferred.

Although not highlighted in IV's report, redistributing the VLocity fleet currently used on Melton services could allow withdrawal of the small, outdated fleet of Sprinters presently operating on the Seymour and Stony Point corridors. It may also enable gradual withdrawal of older VLocity sets to be converted to a format better suited for longer-distance trips, e.g. with more comfortable seating and buffet facilities in line with those provided on the Albury standard gauge sets.

Topic/area:	Victorians have good access to housing, jobs, services and opportunities
Topic/area:	Victorians have good access to housing, jobs, services and opportunities
Recommendation name:	Run more bus and coach services in regional Victoria
Recommendation number:	12
Do you support this topic or recommendation?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> In part
Tell us why	As with Melbourne, an increase in bus services can only be a good thing.
Share any supporting evidence or examples	
Include proposed changes and improvements	As with Melbourne, a flat application of minimum service standards (e.g. 7/7/7) to all regional cities is crucial and must be enacted at the earliest possible opportunity. We agree that Wodonga and (to a lesser extent) Shepparton drastically need a fresh approach to their bus networks.

Topic/area:	Victorians have good access to housing, jobs, services and opportunities
Recommendation name:	Make off-peak public transport cheaper and simplify regional fare zones
Recommendation number:	13
Do you support this topic or recommendation?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> In part
Tell us why	<p>We support most of the proposed remedies, but we <i>do not</i> support splitting up the existing multi-modal zone-based fare structure into distinct modes (p.50). This element is directly counter to the statement that “To reduce complexity and make public transport fairer, the government should replace Early Bird train-only fares with off-peak discounts that apply to all public transport modes. Passengers should be able to switch between trains, trams and buses at the same fare” (p.49).</p>
Share any supporting evidence or examples	
Include proposed changes and improvements	<p>Generally speaking, we feel that service improvements above particular thresholds (e.g. Turn Up and Go service levels) will do far more to boost patronage than any sort of fare adjustment policy.</p> <p>With that said, to make a better ‘fairness’ argument for off-peak fare reduction, it may be worth considering the correlation between who is travelling in peak/off-peak, and income brackets. For example, a higher peak fare may not be as much of a problem for low-income people if they don’t need to commute or otherwise travel during peak hour/s anyway. This is not quite the same statistic as the cited 45% of off-peak trips being made by low-income earners.</p> <p>We also note the comment that “The cost range includes detailed modelling of public transport fares, tracking the impact of fare changes to the public transport network, and refining fares” (p.50); it seems unlikely that any previous fare changes, like the early bird, free tram zone or fare caps, had any modelling done in advance of announcement or implementation. So why start now?</p> <p>A key element which is missing in the report is the fact that fares cover less than 30% of operational costs of the public transport network, and any further net reductions in fares will make net service increases harder to achieve, particularly under the present operating cost-neutral paradigm with a disinclination towards ongoing investment.</p>

Topic/area:	Victorians are healthy and safe
Recommendation name:	Make local streets safer for children and communities
Recommendation number:	14
Do you support this topic or recommendation?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> In part
Tell us why	The recommendation is a good start, but could go further.
Share any supporting evidence or examples	
Include proposed changes and improvements	<p>We agree that areas like schools should be prioritised, but there should also be a long-term goal to convert ALL local streets to the lower speed limit, reinforced by new standards based on places like the Netherlands which require new and rebuilt streets to be redesigned to encourage active travel, and discourage car travel. It may be simpler to cordon off entire blocks of streets at a time and declare them to all be 30 km/h, rather than using a street-by-street approach.</p> <p>The Victorian and the other states should advocate for AustRoads and/or ATAP to generate, and make accessible to the public, a street design guide in the same vein as the Netherlands' Red Book.</p> <p>Page 55 of the IV draft plan says "We estimate that making local streets safer for children and communities will cost \$35 million to \$45 million. This includes the cost of changing speed limit policy and working with local governments to install speed limit signs." Does this cost element include the rolling costs associated with streetscape rebuilds to bring them in line with international best practice, or only the provision of lower speed limit signs without active or passive enforcement? Experience in Perth and other cities has proven that redesigning streets to induce lower speeds is far more effective than merely providing speed signs.</p>

Topic/area:	Victorians are healthy and safe
Recommendation name:	Build safe cycling networks in Melbourne and Regional Cities
Recommendation number:	15
Do you support this topic or recommendation?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> In part
Tell us why	The recommendation is a good start, but could go further.
Share any supporting evidence or examples	<p>The recently opened “shared use” bike path built in conjunction with the West Gate Tunnel project has long, sweeping curves with limited visibility, so it is unlikely to be safe for pedestrians. Thus, a piece of infrastructure marketed as being for both cyclists and pedestrians is not ideal for either. Ref: https://www.linkedin.com/feed/update/urn:li:ugcPost:7318239622856073216/</p>
Include proposed changes and improvements	<p>The idea of an integrated, wide-ranging bike path network around Melbourne and the regional cities is to be lauded; but there is a risk that such a network could a) prioritise commuter cyclists and forget to cater for recreational cyclists, and/or b) depend on provision of shared pedestrian and cycle paths, rather than providing distinct (parallel) routes for each mode. It will be necessary to explicitly design and market these new routes as cycling corridors, rather than as shared paths which must be managed separately.</p> <p>We also believe that all public bus routes that intersect with the existing and proposed cycle corridors should have the vehicles fitted with bike racks. Until this is standardised across a route’s fleet, timetables and user-end apps like the PTV Journey Planner should allow passengers to know which services on a route are bike-compatible (similar to how Yarra Trams advises whether a particular service will be high- or low-floor).</p> <p>Alternatively, or in parallel, there may be value in a wider roll-out of Parkiteer secure bike cages at places where the bike corridors meet other transit modes (not just at railway stations), and also at nodes along the paths.</p>

Topic/area:	Victoria has a high productivity and circular economy
Recommendation name:	Prepare and publish infrastructure sector plans to shape Victoria's cities
Recommendation number:	35
Do you support this topic or recommendation?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> In part
Tell us why	This is an obvious requirement for any competent forward planning
Share any supporting evidence or examples	
Include proposed changes and improvements	While it makes sense that plans be published with 15-to-20-year periods in mind, revision of plans at more frequent intervals is important to keep in mind.

Topic/area:	Victoria has a high productivity and circular economy
Recommendation name:	Improve asset management of all government infrastructure
Recommendation number:	37
Do you support this topic or recommendation?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> In part
Tell us why	This is an obvious requirement for any competent forward planning
Share any supporting evidence or examples	
Include proposed changes and improvements	<p>Having publicly accessible asset registers (in non-secure fields) can assist the public in reporting issues with infrastructure that may need to be addressed, e.g. via apps like Snap-Send-Solve.</p> <p>It is recommended that the State investigates best-practice systems and procedures as utilised by other States, Territories and/or the Federal Government rather than creating new systems whole-cloth, which would be prohibitively costly.</p>

Topic/area:	Victoria has a high productivity and circular economy
Recommendation name:	City Loop reconfiguration
Recommendation number:	43
Do you support this topic or recommendation?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> In part
Tell us why	The 'Split Loop' proposal is critical, and it is only a shame that it is not ready to start digging immediately on the day that Melbourne Metro One will open.
Share any supporting evidence or examples	
Include proposed changes and improvements	<p>If Split Loop could have started on Day Two of Metro One operation, that would have avoided Frankston line passengers having to adapt to their services being diverted into the City Loop, only to then be pulled out again for the second construction period.</p> <p>It is not clear whether linking the Upfield line to the Caulfield corridor (as implied in the diagram on page 148) is ideal, particularly given the cost of an additional flyover in the North Melbourne area. It may be more appropriate to run towards Glen Waverley. Redrawing this diagram with the yellow lines to Richmond and then a generic arrow beyond may be a better way to indicate these options.</p>

Topic/area:	Victoria has a high productivity and circular economy
Recommendation name:	Extend metropolitan trains to growth areas in Melbourne's south-east
Recommendation number:	43
Do you support this topic or recommendation?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> In part
Tell us why	Extending the Cranbourne line to Clyde is a good idea, particularly now that the prerequisite duplication and grade separation jobs are completed (barring Webster Street, to be done in the next few years).
Share any supporting evidence or examples	
Include proposed changes and improvements	<p>Along with the proposed Dandenong South station, it is worth considering provision of a flyover at Dandenong East junction both to remove a conflict point, and to resolve the existing 70 km/h (citybound) and 65 km/h (outbound) speed restrictions applied to Cranbourne line services.</p> <p>Additionally, Dandenong station is overdue for a rebuild. While it had a new structure provided in the early 1990s, its platforms are narrow and the gap between them does not meet modern standards. Construction of a new station with at least two, wide and fully sheltered island platforms, should be started in the former goods yard site, with tracks transitioning across as works proceed until the present island platform can be demolished, resolving its clearance problems.</p> <p>Clyde station should be designed with potential for future extension, although this is very unlikely to be justified in anything but the longest term unless Tooradin airport becomes Melbourne's third major international connection.</p>

Topic/area:	Victoria has a high productivity and circular economy
Recommendation name:	Extend metropolitan trains to growth areas in Melbourne's north
Recommendation number:	43
Do you support this topic or recommendation?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> In part
Tell us why	<p>The Upfield line, with its closely spaced stations, high frequency of level crossings, and lack of significant midway activity centres, is a poor choice for extension northbound.</p> <p>The only appealing element is the short connection from Upfield to Roxburgh Park, but that disguises other expensive challenges like the need to cross the standard gauge mainline without affecting the freight yard there or the Somerton Road bridge; and it is not clear whether Broadmeadows station has capacity to turn around additional services on top of the through Craigieburn, V/Line and freight trips.</p> <p>There is a better way to provide suburban services to the north.</p>
Share any supporting evidence or examples	The proposed budget (page 152) makes no reference to the complexities of crossing the standard gauge interstate line specifically at Roxburgh Park, nor does it address the existing constraints already applicable to the Essendon and Coburg corridors.
Include proposed changes and improvements	<p>We acknowledge that the Upfield line presently provides a poor service (constrained by the single track between Gowrie and Upfield, and the placement of the emergency/maintenance crossover between Coburg and Batman). These issues are worth addressing, but not as part of an extension.</p> <p>We also acknowledge that the Craigieburn line is approaching and soon will be at capacity, even discounting the demands of future suburbs north of the current end of the line, and after accounting for the additional capacity afforded by removing Sunbury trains from the City Loop.</p> <p>In the short term, repairing the broad gauge Albion – Broadmeadows line could assist in diverting regional trains from the via-Essendon corridor to the Regional Rail Link. This is likely to be made easier by the upcoming redevelopment of the Sunshine and Albion station precincts in line with Airport Rail, but capacity will be constrained by interstate freight and passenger traffic.</p> <p>In the short to medium term, V/Line trains could run more frequently along the Craigieburn line with a relatively minor alteration to the track layout at Broadmeadows (allowing citybound overtaking as well as outbound, with citybound electric trips rerouted via Platform 2), and regularly scheduled overtaking both there and at Essendon. Combined with a high degree of operational discipline, this should permit trains every 10 minutes to and from Craigieburn plus three additional timetable slots each way, each hour, for Wallan, Seymour, Shepparton and freight services.</p>

Topic/area:

Victoria has a high productivity and circular economy

In the long term, rather than extending the railway from Upfield back to Roxburgh Park and beyond, an overall better solution would be to take the proposed branch line from Lalor to Wollert (in lieu of the alternate BRT or similar proposals) and extend across to Donnybrook. This would be a mostly greenfields extension, mitigating some of the cost, but would provide an alternate route from Wallan and Kalkallo via the Epping activity centre directly into the City (with a faster connection than via Coburg), as well as connecting the new Northern suburbs to LaTrobe University via Reservoir station. This would eclipse any business case for the Wollert extension on its own merits and support the business case for Melbourne Metro 2 which may be otherwise lacking.

(As a side benefit, if it ever becomes necessary, quadruplication of the rail line from Lalor to Northcote is much easier than adding additional tracks along either the Essendon or Coburg corridors.)

In the very long term (post-regional electrification, or use of bimodal train sets), this would enable use of the Metro 2 tunnel from Kalkallo and Wallan through to Geelong.

More feedback (optional)

Page 54 of the Draft strategy notes that the Victorian Government has a “target of 25% of trips by active travel by 2030.” It is also absolutely critical that this active transport mode share target is achieved by taking share away from private motorised modes, rather than by cannibalising from public transport mode share.

When the Free Tram Zone (FTZ) was introduced in 2015 patronage increased, but most of this came from people who would otherwise have walked. IV has previously called for the FTZ to be scrapped, and we agree with this, but if/when that happens the resultant increase in active travel mode share should **not** count towards the 25% target.

Ref: <https://www.theguardian.com/australia-news/2025/jan/12/melbourne-free-trams-experiment-decade-critics>



