

26 October 2016

Perth Transport Plan for 3.5 million  
Department of Transport  
GPO Box C102  
Perth, WA 6839

Dear Sir/Madam,

*Transport @ 3.5 Million Submission*

The Committee for Perth is an influential, member based organisation driven by Perth's business and community leaders. As an advocate for a brighter, more liveable future for Perth, the Committee promotes and enables change that will improve the cultural diversity, economic prosperity, sustainability and world class amenity of Perth.

As the Department is aware, the Committee has played an active role in promoting a quality, multi-modal transport future for Perth and Peel and is currently in the process of finalising the *Get a Move On!* major project.

The *Get a Move On!* report, due for release on 30 November, makes a number of recommendations to 'get the region moving' towards an efficient, multi-modal, twenty-first century transport system supported by strategic employment destinations and a range of housing options.

*Get a Move On!* is the combined outcome of ten individual research projects undertaken over a 12 month period. This has included a survey of 2,000 commuters; interviews with 40 major businesses representing 100,000 commuters; the findings of on-the-ground study tours; and desktop research to examine the co-dependent relationship between land use, transport and economic development. The research, findings and recommendations of *Get a Move On!* provide the evidence base for this submission.

The Committee would like to commend the Department of Transport for the preparation of this document because we believe that a long-term strategy of this kind for transport in the region is essential for the delivery of a high quality, multi-modal future.

This submission has been prepared by the Committee for Perth with input from the Committee's Reshaping Working Group and *Get a Move On!* Steering Committee. This included a survey of Working Group and Steering Committee members to gain feedback on the individual proposals incorporated in *Transport @ 3.5 Million*.

Committee for Perth Limited

ACN 118 292 792

Ground Floor, 996 Hay Street, Perth WA 6000

t (08) 9481 5699

f (08) 9481 7738

e [enquiries@committeeforperth.com.au](mailto:enquiries@committeeforperth.com.au)

Our work is fully funded by our members & foundation partners. We acknowledge:



A complete list of current members is available at: [www.committeeforperth.com.au](http://www.committeeforperth.com.au)

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback on what is an important document to guide future transport initiatives. Should you require additional information or clarification on the Committee's submission, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'M Fulker', written in a cursive style.

Marion Fulker  
**CEO**

## Transport @ 3.5 Million – Committee for Perth Feedback

The Committee for Perth generally agrees with the vision outlined in *Transport @ 3.5 Million* (the Plan).

The plans that have been prepared to accommodate Perth's growth to a region of 3.5 million people - land use, environment and transport - should be the beginning of ongoing and genuine dialogue with all stakeholders over an extended period of time. Importantly, the region lacks an economic development strategy and this too should be prepared so that a comprehensive suite of documents work together to guide Perth's future.

### 1.0 Underlying Assumptions – Population and Employment

The Committee for Perth acknowledges that the Plan has been prepared to be consistent with Perth and Peel @ 3.5 Million and the Green Growth Plan and we commend the Department of Transport and others for working collaboratively to achieve an integrated document.

However, the Committee has identified key fundamental issues associated with the underlying population and employment assumptions on which the Plan is based.

In particular the Plan has been prepared on the basis that infill housing and employment targets presented in Directions 2031 and Perth and Peel @ 3.5 Million will be achieved. Additional detailed investigation is needed to determine whether these figures are likely to be a valid reflection of future growth because current evidence suggests that economic and population growth is unlikely to reflect these projections.

Our view is based on a review of strategic planning in Perth and Peel over the past 60 years, conducted by the Committee for Perth and published as FACTBase Bulletin 50. It found that targets for urban infill development and goals for employment decentralisation have not been achieved. In this context, *Get a Move On!* has identified a number of issues associated with the population and employment assumptions in the Plan, outlined below.

Population Targets	Jobs Targets
While the proportion of urban infill has increased in recent decades, urban infill targets have not been achieved.	The jobs targets presented in the Plan and in Perth and Peel @ 3.5 Million are not underpinned by a regional plan for economic development. As a result, there is little information available regarding the evidence/assumptions underpinning these targets, the likelihood that they will be achieved in practice and whether the proposed spatial allocation of employment is consistent with the delivery of a productive and resilient economic future for the region.
The Plan states that current planning strategy aims to 'increase in higher density living in the central area and around activity centres and provide access to new employment opportunities' however evidence collated as part of <i>Get a Move On!</i> indicates that a substantial proportion of urban infill development is occurring outside the central sub-region and in dispersed, suburban, car dependent locations.	The job targets presented in the Plan assume very substantial employment decentralisation over the period from 2011 to 2050. In particular, the proportion of jobs in the Central sub-region are projected to decrease from 64% to 48% and employment in outer activity centres is projected to increase substantially. Research undertaken as part of <i>Get a Move On!</i> indicates that this will be difficult to achieve. Despite long-term strategies for employment decentralisation in all major Australian cities, a very substantial proportion of employment

Population Targets	Jobs Targets
<p>There are very significant barriers associated with the delivery of urban infill in the central sub-region (such as community and local authority resistance). There is therefore a need for state planning policy to be more specific regarding the activity centres that are appropriate to accommodate higher density residential development and the processes that will ensure infill targets for specific activity centres are delivered.</p>	<p>remains centralised and there is limited evidence of outer activity centres that have successfully attracted white collar or knowledge based employment. CBDs and central locations are particularly attractive to knowledge sector employers. Research indicates that central, accessible locations are critical for these businesses and therefore economic productivity planning should focus on providing high quality, connected, central knowledge sector destinations.</p>
<p>Evidence indicates that developing nodes of high density residential development is important to support public transport commuting. <i>Get a Move On!</i> has revealed that people in Perth and Peel indicate a willingness to trade off access to a single residential home in order to live in central locations.</p>	<p><i>Get a Move On!</i> has established that the existing activity centres hierarchy (SPP 4.2 – Activity Centres for Perth and Peel) does not reflect the performance of metropolitan activity centres in practice, either as employment centres or public transport destinations. Evidence also indicates that the number and dispersal of strategic metropolitan and secondary activity centres is too great to deliver transport efficiencies. A review of this policy and other relevant planning policy is needed to ensure the hierarchy provides a realistic reflection of the role of activity centres and their future development potential as employment and public transport destinations and promotes a spatial pattern of employment that will provide capacity for future public transport efficiencies.</p>

It is therefore recommended that the Department of Transport work with necessary arms of Government to review the proposed employment targets to ensure these are achievable and facilitate efficient movement.

## 2.0 Prioritise Public Transport Investment

The *Get a Move On!* Commuter Survey revealed that:

- 90% of all commuters support investment in new public transport.
- 85% support making better use of existing public transport infrastructure.
- 83% support incentives for non-car commuting as a key transport strategy for the region.
- By contrast, 60% of commuters support road investment.

Responses to the Committee for Perth *Transport @ 3.5 Million* feedback survey also indicate that people and organisations in Perth and Peel believe that investment in public transport projects should be prioritised over investment in roads. Considerable concern was expressed regarding the potential for some road proposals to generate more trips by car than facilitate mode shift.

It is therefore recommended that the Plan prioritises the delivery of key public and active transport projects, rather than road projects for movement through and to knowledge destinations.

### **3.0 Focus on Investment in Central Locations in Short to Medium Term**

The Perth CBD and inner/central destinations are the heart of accessibility, economic activity and productivity in Perth and Peel. Evidence collated as part of *Get a Move On!* also shows that CBD and inner destinations are preferred locations for business; for higher density living; and for public transport and active commuting. The region has few locations where people can feasibly achieve a non-car dependent lifestyle.

The *Get a Move On!* Commuter Survey revealed that:

- 70% of commuters identified public transport investment in inner and middle locations as the top priority for the region.
- 70% of commuters and a majority of businesses also support strategies to locate higher density housing close to employment and public transport infrastructure.
- By contrast, 24% of commuters support prioritising public transport investment in heavy rail for the outer suburbs.

Similarly, responses to the Committee for Perth *Transport @ 3.5 Million* feedback survey indicate that there is little support for investment in public transport to new fringe suburban locations. A majority of respondents believe that investment in public transport to outer suburban locations will act to facilitate urban sprawl rather than facilitating urban infill development.

There is also a view that investment in low density, outer suburban locations will not contribute to the delivery of a more interconnected, high frequency public transport system or substantially improve access to employment for people in the region as a whole. It is therefore recommended that priority is given to investment in public transport to serve the CBD and major inner destinations rather than fringe residential locations, particularly in the short to medium-term (20 year period). However it is critical that proposals for new public transport infrastructure are accompanied by land use planning strategies that will ensure that residential and employment populations around major transport hubs are increased in order to deliver sufficient patronage levels needed to support 'turn up and go' multimodal movement.

### **4.0 Prioritise Access to Knowledge Destinations**

The *Get a Move On!* Commuter Survey results and ABS statistics indicate that people in white collar professions such as managers, professionals, or clerical administration workers are most likely to be public transport commuters. Very low income commuters (i.e. students with an income of less than \$20,000 per annum) and young people (aged under 35 years) are also less likely to commute by car.

It is recommended that the Plan prioritises investment in public transport to major knowledge destinations such as universities and professional, science and technical service hubs.

### **5.0 Optimise the Existing Public Transport System**

A key finding of the *Get a Move On!* Commuter Survey and Business Interviews is that people in Perth and Peel are frustrated by overcrowding on the public transport system and businesses do not believe that the capacity of the system is adequate to accommodate further mode shift.

While the Plan identifies strategies to optimise the performance of existing road infrastructure, it does not identify strategies to maximise the current and future performance of existing public transport infrastructure.

It is recommended that considerable attention is given to strategies to optimise the capacity and performance of the existing public transport system. This includes finalising, publishing and funding the Public Transport Authority's Route Utilisation Strategy with priority given to optimising the capacity of routes that currently suffer from overcrowding.

## **6.0 Address Funding Up Front**

It is evident that the ability of the State Government to commit to funding transport infrastructure will ultimately determine transport outcomes in Perth and Peel and that budget constraints have recently directly inhibited the delivery of new promised public transport projects for the metropolitan region.

Research undertaken regarding transport infrastructure funding as part of *Get a Move On!* has identified a need for:

- A consistent pipeline of high-quality public infrastructure projects initiated by Government.
- Project evaluation and prioritisation to be supported by transparent and rigorous cost benefit analysis.
- Avoiding a 'one size fits all' approach to infrastructure funding and financing by designing, funding and financing models to suit individual infrastructure projects.

It is recommended that a rigorous and transparent assessment of all projects proposed within the Plan is undertaken. It is also recommended that the State Government identifies a diverse pool of funding mechanisms that will be drawn upon to fund the transport infrastructure projects identified within the final strategy document. This should be undertaken in conjunction with the finalisation of the Plan to ensure that the final document provides a definitive and implementable strategy for the future.

## **7.0 Other General Comments**

Respondents to the Committee for Perth *Transport @ 3.5 Million* feedback survey also provided the following general feedback:

- Additional evidence is required in the Plan to support the proposals: respondents expressed uncertainty regarding a number of proposals and proposed prioritisation and would like evidence regarding the need for specific proposals to be incorporated in the Plan.
- Further reference is needed to land use strategies that will support proposed public transport: respondents believe that the Plan could be significantly strengthened by identifying within the Plan land use strategies that will specifically support public transport investment in the Plan. This includes investigation to retain heritage line stations and increasing residential density in order to ensure their long-term viability.
- Additional detail is required regarding timing for proposals and criteria for initiating key proposals.
- Increased detail and attention is needed regarding future investment in infrastructure for walking.

## 8.0 Comments on Specific Proposals identified within Transport @ 3.5 Million

The Committee for Perth invited members of the Reshaping Working Group and *Get a Move On!* Steering Committee to provide feedback on the individual proposals identified within the Plan. A summary of the feedback is provided below. For ease of review, the level of support indicated for each proposal has been categorised and colour coded based on the categories in Table 1 below.

**Table 1: Definition of Support Categories**

	Supported by 75% or more respondents either as currently proposed, or with timeframe amendments.
	Support between 40% and 75% with respondents expressing uncertainty/identifying need for additional investigation.
	Fewer than 40% of respondents support proposal.

**Table 2: Summary of Feedback – Section 3.1 Public Transport Network**

Proposal	% Degree of Support	Feedback and Comments
East Wanneroo Rail Link Stage 2 Marshall Road to the Joondalup Line - by 3.5 million.	30% support.  50% do not support and identify a preference for inner public transport solutions to be prioritised rather than outer investment.	It is suggested that the route is amended to be more direct and travel via Mt Lawley, with priority given to inner link between Perth and ECU/Mt Lawley followed by a future direct link to Joondalup beyond 3.5 million.
East Wanneroo Rail Link Stage 3 Ellenbrook spur - beyond 3.5 million.	50% support.  40% do not support (not perceived to be a transport priority).	Further investigation is needed to identify whether population densities along this route are adequate to support future public transport investment (residential densities and development capacity along this route are not considered adequate to support public transport given the area of land sterilised by Whiteman Park and low density residential nature of Ellenbrook).
Stirling - Murdoch Orbital Rail Service Stage 1 Stirling to UWA-QEII - by 3.5 million.	56% support.	Additional investigation and information is needed regarding proposed route.  Need to examine overall demand for travel between Booragoon and Stirling.  Alignment between Stirling and Subiaco also requires review (preference expressed for more direct connection to Subiaco rather than connection at Shenton Park).
Stirling - Murdoch Orbital Rail Service Stage 2 UWA-QEII to Murdoch - by 3.5 million.	63% support.	Additional information is needed regarding the proposed timing and the land use strategies that will be implemented to support this link.

Proposal	% Degree of Support	Feedback and Comments
Stirling - Murdoch Orbital Rail Service Stage 3 Murdoch to Thornlie line - beyond 3.5 million.	63% support.	Additional information is needed regarding the proposed timing and the land use strategies that will be implemented to support rail infrastructure.
Radial Extension Joondalup line to Yanchep - by 2.7 million.	10% support. 80% do not support.	There is perception that this link is not a priority and will facilitate additional urban sprawl.
Radial Extension Midland line to Bellevue - by 2.7 million.	75% support.	Timeframe/priority should be downgraded to 'beyond 3.5 million' and additional information is needed regarding land use strategies proposed to support this infrastructure (i.e. strategies for transit oriented development along the proposed route).
Radial Extension Thornlie line to Cockburn Central - by 2.7 million.	56% support. 40% uncertain regarding need for this link.	There is considerable uncertainty regarding the need for this route and the priority that it should be given. Additional investigation and information is needed to examine demand for public transport travel from Cockburn Central to Thornlie.
Radial Extension Armadale line to Byford - by 3.5 million.	38% support. 60% do not support.	Timeframe/priority should be downgraded to 'beyond 3.5 million'.
Radial Extension Forrestfield Airport Link to connect to Thornlie line - beyond 3.5 million.	87% support.	Timeframe/priority should be upgraded to 'by 2.7 million'.
Perth Light Rail Stage 1 UWA-QEII to Curtin-Bentley - by 2.7 million.	89% support.	Timeframe/priority should be upgraded to 'by 2.7 million'.
Perth Light Rail Stage 2 Curtin-Bentley to Canning Bridge - by 3.5 million.	86% support.	Timeframe/priority should be upgraded to 'by 2.7 million'
Inner-City Subway System between central Perth, East Perth, West Perth, Northbridge, Leederville and other inner city centres - beyond 3.5 million.	60% support. 40% general support however uncertain whether this link should be a subway.	Strongly support investment in new public transport infrastructure to link between central Perth, East Perth, West Perth, Northbridge, Leederville and inner urban villages however additional investigation should be undertaken to determine whether this should be a subway and the routes that should be taken. Feedback and evidence indicates that this should be a series of interconnected links rather than a circle route.

Proposal	% Degree of Support	Feedback and Comments
		<p>Additional information should also be provided regarding the land use strategies that will be implemented to increase population densities and support public transport use in these locations.</p> <p>Priority for public transport investment to connect the CBD and inner urban villages should be upgraded to 'by 2.7 million'.</p>
Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) or Light Rail route to connect Ellenbrook to Bassendean Station, Midland and the new East Wanneroo Rail Link - by 2.7 million.	56% support.	General support for strategies to increase access to existing rail infrastructure in outer areas, however there is uncertainty regarding the appropriate mode for these links and it is suggested that additional investigation is undertaken to determine appropriate routes.
Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) or Light Rail to connect Glendalough Station to Scarborough Beach - by 2.7 million.	75% support.	Potential has been identified for this route to link to Perth via Newcastle and Oxford Street.
Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) or Light Rail to connect Canning Bridge to Booragoon - beyond 3.5 million.	88% support.	Support for this route to be served by light rail.
Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) or Light Rail to connect Murdoch Station to the Cockburn Coast via Fremantle.	88% support.	Timeframe/priority should be upgraded to 'by 2.7 million'.
Planning for higher volume ferry services to sites including East Perth, Claisebrook Cove, new Perth Stadium, Coode Street, Canning Bridge, Point Walter and UWA.	100% support.	However there is a strong perception that this needs to be accompanied by land use planning to deliver adequate density at ferry nodes.

**Table 3: Summary of Feedback – Section 3.2 Road Network**

Proposal	% Support	Feedback and Comments
Perth Freight Link from the Great Northern Highway to Fremantle Port - NorthLink, Gateway, Roe 8, Fremantle Tunnel, and Fremantle Port Connect (Canning Highway to the Inner Harbour) - by 2.7	43% support.	The alignment of this route cannot be supported until a decision is made regarding the future of North Quay/Fremantle Port.

million.		
East-West City Link Riverside Bridge (or tunnel) and East-West Tunnel - by 3.5 million.	33% support.	There is a perception that this proposal reflects an outdated, car based approach to transport planning that will encourage and induce additional traffic movements along with a view that congestion cannot be significantly reduced by building more roads.
Stock Road Tunnel (from Leach Highway linking with Stephenson Avenue at Jon Sanders Drive) - by 3.5 million.	38% support.	Additional study and evaluation of this route is needed because uncertainty was expressed regarding the need for this route and whether it will encourage more car based travel.
Fremantle - Rockingham Highway, to be completed in stages - by 3.5 million.	63% support.	Supported with priority downgraded to 'beyond 3.5 million'. There is a perception that this is not a transport priority and that public transport solutions for Fremantle should be prioritised.
Tonkin Highway Freeway standard between the Perth Darwin National Highway and Mundijong Road - by 3.5 million.	50% support.	Supported with priority downgraded to 'beyond 3.5 million'.
Mitchell Freeway Extension to Yanchep – by 3.5 million.	44% support.	Strong perception that this is not a transport priority and extension will facilitate urban sprawl. It is requested that priority is extended to 'beyond 3.5 million'.
Mitchell Freeway extension between Yanchep and Indian Ocean Drive - beyond 3.5 million.	38% support.	Strong perception that this extension will facilitate urban sprawl.
Perth - Adelaide National Highway - by 3.5 million.	63% support.	Additional investigation undertaken in regards to priority (there is a perception that this is not a major priority).
Roe Highway extension to link to Stock Road (Roe 8) - by 2.7 million.	67% support.	Supported based on retention of current port operations (i.e. if North Quay remains primary container terminal).
"All Lane Running" on parts of the Mitchell and Kwinana Freeways - by 2.7 million.	75% support.	Respondents expressed a view that it is essential that use of existing assets is maximised, however there is a risk of increasing attractiveness of driving and it is suggested that strategies to upgrade roads are accompanied by consideration of strategies to limit the attractiveness of driving to knowledge destinations served by effective high frequency public transport.
"All Lane Running" implemented on parts of the Tonkin, Reid and Roe Highways as required by demand - by 3.5 million.	50% support.	Additional investigation and information is requested – concern has been expressed that this will facilitate car travel and reduce the potential for mode shift.

Whiteman Yanchep Highway - by 3.5 million.	63% support.	Additional investigation and information is requested – there is a perception that this proposal is not a priority and should be downgraded to ‘beyond 3.5 million’.
--	--------------	--

**Table 4: Summary of Feedback – Section 3.3 Active Transport Network**

Proposal	% Support	Feedback and Comments
An additional 185km of off-road cycleways - by 2.7 million.	100% support.	Cycling component of the Plan is perceived to provide a great opportunity to better connect communities and destinations through creating safe, direct and (mostly) separated cycling infrastructure.
500km additional off-road cycleways added - by 3.5 million.	90% support.	Respondents perceive that this should be achieved prior to 3.5 million.
Green Bridge - Three Points Bridge, connecting Chidley Point, Point Walter and Point Resolution.	78% support.	Timeframe/priority should be upgraded to ‘by 2.7 million’.
Herisson Island Bridge - by 3.5 million.	80% support.	Timeframe/priority should be upgraded to ‘by 2.7 million’.
Racecourse Bridge - by 3.5 million.	100% support.	
Maylands Bus Bridge - by 3.5 million.	89% support.	Action needed to ensure this does not become a traffic bridge.
Summers Street Bridge.	75% support.	Additional investigation required.
Salter Point Bridge - by 3.5 million.	88% support.	
Pipeline River Crossing - by 3.5 million.	88% support.	
Canning River Elevated Boardwalk - by 3.5 million.	88% support.	
Lake Joondalup Green Bridge - by 3.5 million.	87% support.	Upgrade to high priority (by 2.7 million).
Lake Goollalal Bridge - by 3.5 million.	50% support. 40% unsure regarding need for this bridge.	Additional investigation needed (not perceived to be a priority by 3.5 million).

**Table 5: Summary of Feedback – Section 3.4 Freight Network**

Proposal	% Support	Feedback and Comments
Freight Rail Upgrades at Forrestfield/Kewdale - by 2.7 million.	71% support.	
Freight Rail Upgrades at Cockburn and Kwinana Triangles - by 3.5 million.	83% support.	
Dedicated freight rail link over Swan River - by 3.5 million.	57% support.	Additional investigation needed taking into account future role of Fremantle Port.
Southern Link Road - connecting Mundijong Road with Brookton and Albany Highways - beyond 3.5 million.	67% support.	
Construction of Rowley Road, Anketell Road and Mundijong Road as 4 lane divided standard - by 3.5 million.	67% support.	
Intermodal Terminals at Kewdale Terminal 2, Latitude 32 and South Bullsbrook - by 3.5 million.	71% support.	Additional investigation should be undertaken to consider alternative locations.
Removal of level crossings in Canning Vale, Bibra Lake, Middle Swan and Midvale.	86% support.	Request that criteria for level crossing removal is specified within the Plan.

**Table 6: Summary of Feedback – Section 4 Optimising the System**

Introduction of differential public transport fares for the peak period and non-peak times.	80% support.	Requires considerable investigation. Need to avoid increasing fares during peak periods as there is strong potential to discourage peak public transport use.
---	--------------	---