



**INTERFACE**  
COUNCILS

Submission in response to  
Infrastructure Victoria's  
*All things considered* paper

17 June 2016

# Contents

Introduction .....	2
Context.....	3
Feedback .....	4
<b>1. OVERALL APPROACH.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>a. The framework.....</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>b. Integration with other strategies and plans .....</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>c. Roles and responsibilities .....</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>d. Funding .....</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>e. Planning and delivery.....</i>	<i>6</i>
<i>f. Consultation .....</i>	<i>7</i>
<b>2. PRIORITIES AND CONCERNS FOR INTERFACE COUNCILS .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<i>a. Key priorities .....</i>	<i>8</i>
<i>b. Additional considerations recommended .....</i>	<i>13</i>
<i>c. Specific concerns .....</i>	<i>15</i>
Conclusion.....	16

# Introduction

Interface Councils welcome the opportunity to make a submission in response to Infrastructure Victoria's *All things considered* paper.

Interface Councils would like to commend infrastructure Victoria on producing a thorough and transparent document that captures a wide array of options, both conservative and controversial, as possible solutions to a number of challenges that Victoria is currently facing, or will likely encounter in the coming years. We acknowledge and appreciate the magnitude of this task and the variables Infrastructure Victoria must consider when delivering its recommendations at the end of the year.

This submission intends to assist with this task by tabling a collective position on behalf of the ten Interface municipalities comprising Cardinia Shire Council, City of Casey, Hume City Council, Melton City Council, Mitchell Shire Council, Mornington Peninsula Shire Council, Nillumbik Shire Council, City of Whittlesea, Wyndham City Council and Yarra Ranges Council.

It does this by providing considered feedback in two key areas:

1. Overall approach
2. Priorities/concerns for Interface Councils

Each Council may also submit an individual response notwithstanding the collective submission.

## Context

The Interface region is home to more than 1.3 million people and is continuing to grow significantly. The Interface region includes six growth area councils and the 10 councils collectively, are responsible for the management of 90 per cent of green wedges, some of Melbourne's most important assets in terms of biodiversity, sustainability and economic development.

During the last ten years, population growth in Interface areas has significantly exceeded the State average, accounting for over half of the growth occurring in Melbourne and nearly half of the State's population growth. Between 2010 and 2015, Interface Councils recorded an average growth rate of 3.1 per cent, almost four times that of regional Victoria and more than double the growth of non-Interface metro areas.

In understanding our position in response to *All things considered*, it is important to note the historical under-investment and lack of timely infrastructure delivery in interface areas, despite the additional burdens we carry. Expenditure to provide essential infrastructure has not kept pace with population growth, leaving residents in Interface areas living without access to adequate levels of infrastructure. This is an issue that has resulted in severely disadvantaged and isolated communities in Melbourne's outer suburbs, demonstrating the undeniable link between the timely delivery of appropriate infrastructure and social outcomes.

Looking to the future, where in just 15 years interface areas will account for approximately 65 per cent of Melbourne's growth, the challenge of providing essential infrastructure to support liveable and vibrant communities whilst also bridging the existing gap, is a significant one.

Furthermore, the complexities and pressures of maintaining and developing green wedges are immense. Issues facing Interface Councils include the loss of productive agricultural land, protection of biodiversity and green wedge amenity and support for appropriate tourism and economic development activities in green wedge areas. Issues which require both physical and social infrastructure, to be addressed.

Interface Councils acknowledge that other areas and regions in Victoria face other challenges that are also of great significance and also need to be addressed to fulfil Infrastructure Victoria's vision. However, Interface Councils stress that unless there are some fundamental changes to the way the State plans and delivers infrastructure, the communities in interface municipalities - who already struggle to access transport, education, health services, social support and employment- will be left behind.

# Feedback

## 1. OVERALL APPROACH

### *a. The framework*

*All things considered* has tabled 236 options which are intended to achieve the vision and objectives set by Infrastructure Victoria in *Laying the foundations*. Interface Councils strongly support the emphasis on social outcomes in this framework and are pleased to see comprehensive set of options to help achieve these outcomes.

*But what does success look like?*

There is currently no clear measure or target for what success looks like within the framework. While the identification of needs does provide some guidance as to the purpose of options, there is a lack of clarification around what success looks like in addressing each need.

Without this, there is significant risk in options being selected based on a perception of relative contribution to a need rather than an accurate and somewhat objective assessment of whether the option is assisting with a specific and measurable outcome or outcomes associated with the need. For example, one measure of success for the need '*Address infrastructure demands in areas with high population growth*' could be a 7 day a week, high frequency and high capacity integrated transport network.

By developing a clear set of outcomes under each need, Infrastructure Victoria could work backwards from the desired outcome to identify the appropriate options to achieve this outcome. Moreover, if these measures of success can be defined, this 30-year strategy has a much greater chance of realising its independence, authority and withstanding political influence.

In addition to identifying what success looks like, as options are further developed and implementation plans are prepared, KPIs should be incorporated, e.g. time for delivery and budget, to ensure there are some performance measurement and accountability systems embedded in the strategy.

### *b. Integration with other strategies and plans*

It is clear Infrastructure Victoria has consulted a number of state government documents in its preparation of this paper, however it appears there is some disconnect with regards state policy documents. For example, a number of options tabled do not appear to reference existing requirements of the Victorian Planning Provisions. Interface Councils would strongly encourage Infrastructure Victoria to place great emphasis on ensuring there is consistency between existing state planning policy, the Plan Melbourne refresh paper (once released) and the 30- Year infrastructure strategy.

There have been a number of strategies and discussions papers out for comment from other agencies including the Department of Environment Land Water and Planning, the Port Phillip and Western Port Catchment Management Authority, the Metropolitan Waste and Resource Recovery Group which also explore infrastructure solutions such as water pricing, delivery of recycled water schemes, floodplain and waste management for Victoria.

Moreover, there is significant work that has been undertaken by councils as part of Regional Development Australia Committees, Regional Managers Forums, and the metropolitan sub-regional groups to explore and develop long-term infrastructure strategies both in general and relating to specific infrastructure

categories at a local or regional level. For example, the northern regional councils developed *Northern Horizons*, a 50 year infrastructure plan for Melbourne's north to meet current and future infrastructure requirements and capitalise on the region's considerable social, economic and environment potential.

Interface Councils acknowledge there is an insurmountable number of plans, reports and strategies that could be considered in the development of infrastructure options. However, to ensure there is alignment across the board, both between state departments and agencies, and regional and local priorities, Interface Councils support a more extensive examination of some of the documents outlined above. A section demonstrating how an option relates to state, regional and local strategies, should be included in the options book that sits behind *All things considered*.

### *c. Roles and responsibilities*

Local government plays a crucial role in the delivery and maintenance of infrastructure and will be impacted by the recommendations made in the final strategy.

As such, the intended roles and responsibilities of all three levels of government and the private sector in planning for, delivering, operating and maintaining an infrastructure asset should be identified as part of the development of each option.

Council resources are already tight and even more so in the current rate capping environment. Interface Councils are concerned about the increase in responsibility and financial burden the draft options may incur on already scarce resources. For example, there are a number of options which may not fall within the State's traditional position description which will likely result in the responsibility resting with councils. In addition, there are options where the State Government would be the lead agent, yet the responsibility of implementing a program, will fall to local government.

Unless there is careful consideration about the roles of all stakeholders in the funding and delivery of the draft options, the final strategy is at risk of operating beyond the means of those that can implement it. By incorporating this analysis into the strategy, it will allow for a healthy assessment of whether in fact a project can be implemented in the appropriate timeframes. This may in turn, impact the merit and prioritisation of some options.

### *d. Funding*

As stated in *All things considered*:

*'...How we pay for and finance infrastructure can significantly affect which community needs are met, who can access infrastructure, how we use it, and when we pay for it.'*

While the price of delivering comes at a cost, often it is the hidden recurrent costs that become a liability. This is an issue all levels of government struggle with. There is some discussion of possible funding mechanisms in *All things considered* and the *Funding and Financing* paper. However, a more inclusive and prominent debate about the way options would be funded and maintained is required before considered recommendations- that take into account the implications for all stakeholders- can be made.

In particular, Interface Councils are facing increasing strain on what are already limited revenue streams. Interface Councils do not have access to the same revenue streams as many other Councils across Victoria. For example, a large portion of revenue for non-Interface Metropolitan Melbourne Councils is parking revenue, income that Interface Councils cannot access. In a rapidly changing environment including the rate cap as well as amendments to developer contributions legislation, the ability for Interface Councils to

deliver adequate infrastructure and services that keeps pace with rapidly growing population is becoming increasingly restricted. Unless, these conditions are considered, there is a danger the intended purpose and potential of options is undermined.

### **Growth Area Infrastructure Charge (GAIC)**

In 2008, the Growth Area Infrastructure Contribution was introduced to incur a levy for land bought within the Urban Growth Boundary, to provide state infrastructure needed to support the development of new suburbs. As stated by the Metropolitan Planning Authority “All funds raised by the GAIC will be used to provide vital State infrastructure and to assist development in the growth areas of Melbourne”. The GAIC has been estimated to contribute approximately 15 percent of the cost of providing State infrastructure and services in the growth areas.” However, despite millions of dollars being collected, growth area councils have seen minimal tangible outcomes nor given any indication of a forward program for the expenditure of these contributions.

Interface Councils assert that GAIC directly relates to the need *Addressing infrastructure demands in areas of high growth*. In relation to the discussion of possible funding mechanisms, the group strongly encourages Infrastructure Victoria to recommend a more effective and transparent governance of this funding stream is required to assist with the funding of options that qualify for it. This should include collections currently sitting in the hands of the State Revenue Office, as well as those that will be obtained in the future.

### **Asset management and maintenance**

Interface Councils commend Infrastructure Victoria on the attention given to asset management and maintenance in *All things considered*.

The paper identifies the relationship between the level of service provided by infrastructure and the standard the asset is maintained at. While Interface Councils supports the focus on “the need for more costly, frequent and earlier maintenance efforts.” it would like to highlight the inequity that currently exists in terms of the standards and regulations local government must adhere to and the lack there of for state government.

For example, the current arterial road network is maintained at a standard far from what it should be. There is a significant need for increased investment in the renewal of road pavements across the existing network, state-wide.

It seems only fair and responsible that if there are standards and regulations that require local government to maintain assets to a certain level, the same should apply for other levels of government, before exploring to options that require us to expand or build new assets. As such Interface Councils emphasise the need for a broader, state-wide conversation about these standards, in particular for roads, and a commitment to adhering to these by all parties responsible for managing and maintaining infrastructure assets.

#### *e. Planning and delivery*

A common conundrum in Interface areas is the desire by councils and developers to deliver innovative, cost-effective and sustainable solutions, yet being unable to implement it due to a lack of long-term planning and funding certainty from the State Government. As a result, councils and developers are often forced to proceed with the delivery of less innovative, less cost-effective and less sustainable solutions to ensure communities have access to basic infrastructure in a timely manner. For example,

in many cases Interface Councils have been prepared for the implementation of a shared use, collocated or integrated facility. However, due to a lack of guaranteed funding at a state level, councils have been forced to proceed with building urgently required community facilities to address over-demand. Consequently, council forgo opportunities to build infrastructure to serve more than one purpose and address more than one need.

While Interface Councils appreciate the 30-year infrastructure strategy lays the foundations for long-term planning, there are some fundamental changes to the approach to planning for, funding and delivering infrastructure that are required at a state level. Governance changes, Interface Councils strongly believe should be incorporated into the strategy for it to fulfil its vision and objectives, include:

1. *Long-term planning cycles and funding certainty* – four to eight year planning cycles and a commitment from governments to longer-term funding certainty would enable significant forward planning for councils and the private sector. In particular, it would allow councils to incorporate the required funds into their budget process. This would enable more successful partnerships, new service delivery models and a greater leverage of each dollar invested for all parties involved.
2. *Early delivery* –The above approach would dramatically assist with the early delivery of enabling infrastructure. This is imperative in Interface areas, as for too long, infrastructure has been delivered after communities have been developed rather than before or as the communities are being developed.

The consequences of an ‘on demand’ approach are explicit. Schools are overcrowded, footpaths are missing meaning children cannot ride or walk to school, roads are congested and perhaps the overarching product of the latter, access to adequate education, employment and social support services is significantly diminished. Mandating an early delivery approach to infrastructure, not only prevents the increased social welfare and economic costs associated with disadvantage, but reaps significant social and economic benefits for the area and the State.

#### *f. Consultation*

Interface Councils acknowledge that Infrastructure Victoria are operating within tight timeframes. Nevertheless, the consultation time frames for a document of such significance to the strategic direction of Victoria, were insufficient.

Local government as a major provider of infrastructure across Victoria and responsible for \$79 billion of assets and infrastructure, and the bearer of crucial local knowledge should be considered a key stakeholder, and thus be given adequate time to provide the input and evidence it can contribute to this process.



## 2. PRIORITIES AND CONCERNS FOR INTERFACE COUNCILS

Interface Councils are extremely supportive of the diverse types of infrastructure explored. Furthermore, it is great to see the options tabled are not restricted to traditional tangible infrastructure such as public transport, but also include non-traditional infrastructure-related options such as justice, education and employment. Many of the traditional and non-traditional items identified, would directly benefit the social and economic well-being of interface communities.

In this section, we attempt to identify key priorities in the options canvassed, additional options or changes that Interface Councils believe should be considered and the options it has concerns about.

### a. Key priorities

Interface Councils considers all 19 Needs as high priorities, and support the majority of options detailed in *All things considered*. Below are Interface Councils' key priorities amongst the existing options.

Key priority	Comments (Further information can be provided on request)	Need/s: (Incl. all needs it contributes to)
<i>Growth area bus service expansion (LBS)</i>	<p>As increased frequency of priority bus routes and extension of existing routes is a key priority, there strong support for a 'Whole of Government' and cross stakeholder approach to the coordination and delivery of bus services.</p> <p>Interface Councils in partnership with PTV and local bus operators have prepared the <i>PTV Interface Bus Service Improvement Report</i>. This report identifies a number of improvements that would assist in bringing bus services up to minimum service levels. <b>A copy of this report can be provided on request.</b></p>	1, 10,11
<i>Greenfield development sequencing (GFS)</i>	<p>This option requires elevation- currently in 'concepts requiring further development' however is strongly supported by Interface Councils.</p> <p>GFS would improve coordination and sequencing of infrastructure through greater direction and emphasis on planning for sequencing of infrastructure and staged land release in PSPs. It would also increase councils' ability to manage sequencing and alignment of new development with infrastructure in the planning process.</p>	1
<i>Sub-regional infrastructure planning (SIP)</i>	<p>Fully support the need to establish a collaborative partnership across all levels of government to align the roll out of infrastructure with all land use and other initiatives.</p> <p>Must ensure that it <i>is</i> focused on infrastructure delivery or priority setting and not planning.</p>	1

<b>Key priority</b>	<b>Comments</b> (Further information can be provided on request)	<b>Need/s:</b> (Incl. all needs it contributes to)
<i>Growth area train station upgrade and provision (GAT)</i>	Strongly supported and requires elevation as it is currently in 'concepts requiring further development.'  In addition, the list of identified projects should be reviewed in close consultation with Interface Councils to ensure alignment with priorities.	1,10
<i>Urban development in established areas (UDC)</i>	Support intensification of development along transport corridors especially public transport corridors. However, more clarity is required as to the level of local government involvement in determining what is appropriate.	1
<i>Arterial road network employment enhancements (ARN)</i>	Further analysis is needed for the ARN to determine how land use and economic development can be initiated by the State so that road infrastructure can be provided.  Moreover, this option should also refer to the Australian Infrastructure Plan priority list which prioritises outer suburban capacity improvements.	1,10,11
<i>Cultural and sports major infrastructure investment framework (CSM)</i>	This option requires elevation as it is currently in 'concepts requiring further development'  Funding for higher order facilities must be considered as part of growth area planning. The current investment is not sufficient.  A framework should incorporate processes to ensure benefits of infrastructure investments are equitably distributed (i.e. gender, social and cultural inclusion lens at planning stage)	1,4, 5
<i>Community space refurbishment or rationalisation (CSR)</i>	This option requires elevation, as it is currently in 'concepts requiring further development'  The 2015 ALGA State of the Assets reports that councils' self-reported 40 per cent of community infrastructure is not fit-for-purpose and require significant maintenance or renewal works to bring it up to standard.	1,5
<i>Sport and recreational facility investment framework (SRF)</i>	It is recommended this option is further explored, However, it needs to take into account gender and cultural needs with changing demographics and trends in sport participation.	1,4
<i>Preventative health care awareness (PHC)</i>		3

<b>Key priority</b>	<b>Comments</b> (Further information can be provided on request)	<b>Need/s:</b> (Incl. all needs it contributes to)
<i>Community infrastructure accessibility (CIM)</i>	There is significant need to embed universal design principles to new and upgraded community infrastructure to make accessible and inclusive for all people irrespective of mobility, gender or age.	1,4,5
<i>Integrated shared use community and recreation facilities (RFC)</i>	Interface Councils have seen major benefits for communities through integrated shared use facilities that have been delivered. However, often a lack of funding certainty and planning at a state level prohibits councils from maximising these opportunities.  There is a need for state-wide, whole of government policy about shared community space and how it should occur.	1,4,5
<i>Bicycle and walking path expansion and improvement (BWP2)</i>	The importance of recognising major trail networks and other walking/bike paths in promoting active transport and physical activity for all ages. Particular consideration should be given to missing links that prohibit or discourage active lifestyles.	1, 4
<i>Justice delivery in growth areas (JDG)</i>	There is limited access to justice systems in Interface areas. As such this option requires elevation as it currently sits in 'concepts requiring further development'	1,8
<i>Justice and human services join planning (JHS)</i>	There is limited access to justice systems in Interface areas. As such this option requires elevation as it currently sits in 'concepts requiring further development'	1,8
<i>School shortages (SSS)</i>	Interface Councils strongly support this option. However emphasise often the delay in delivery of schools due to misalignment with the release of land for development. As a result inadequate education infrastructure has led to significantly overcrowded schools that are not conducive to a quality learning environment, evident in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Relatively low educational outcomes</li> <li>• High youth disengagement particularly in regards to higher education and workforce participation</li> </ul>	1,9
<i>TAFE recapitalisation (TAF)</i>	Limited opportunities for face-to-face tertiary education, locally, and significantly limited access to public transport. Consequences as above.	1,9
<i>Lifelong learning hubs (LLH)</i>		1,9

<b>Key priority</b>	<b>Comments</b> (Further information can be provided on request)	<b>Need/s:</b> (Incl. all needs it contributes to)
<i>School infrastructure funding certainty (SIF)</i>	This is crucial for education facilities to be delivered in a timely manner so access to quality learning environments is not compromised.	1,9
<i>Employment outside central city incentivisation (EOC)</i>	It is strongly recommended Metropolitan Activity Centres are included in the list of places where incentives should be provided.	10
<i>Public transport train timetabling (PTV)</i>		1,10,11
<i>Road space allocation changes (RSF)</i>		10
<i>Train station car parking improvements (TSC)</i>	Many residents in Interface areas are often discouraged from using public transport due to limited car parking space and very restricted PT connectivity between their home and trains. There is currently huge, and inappropriate overflow at many interface train stations.  Interface Councils should be consulted in the development of the detail of this option.	1,10,11
<i>New Port (NCP)</i>	Interface Councils are concerned that delays in this decision will place greater pressure on the Port of Melbourne to be Melbourne's only port and would require significant dredging and deepening of the heads and bay. It is vital that the location of an alternative port be determined as soon as possible. Failure to resolve this issue will have significant economic impact to the region and Victoria. In a report undertaken by global infrastructure consultancy GHD, it is estimated that for the Victorian state economy, in 2035-36, the negative impact of insufficient container port capacity would be around \$2.2 billion in Gross State Product (GSP) and would mean a loss of 4,800 jobs (Port of Hastings Economic Impact Analysis, GHD and Econsearch, 2013). Preferred options for a port may be outlined in individual council submissions.	13
<i>Recycled treated wastewater for non-potable agricultural use (TWR)</i>	In particular, the Bunyip food belt project which is based on major use of recycled water.	14
<i>Recycled treated wastewater for non-potable household use (RTH)</i>	Purple pipelines schemes are being implemented in some interface areas. Interface Councils strongly encourage these types of options to be considered for all areas in Melbourne to achieve the environmental outcomes laid out. This option requires elevation	14

<b>Key priority</b>	<b>Comments</b> (Further information can be provided on request)	<b>Need/s:</b> (Incl. all needs it contributes to)
<b>Priorities for specific interface areas</b>		
<i>International airport in the south east of Melbourne (IAS)</i>	Further development is required to consider the impact on environment (including on the Western Port RAMSAR area) and existing communities. Consideration should be given for the airport to complement existing and future infrastructure projects to maximise economic opportunities across the whole of the south east region.	1
<i>Northern metropolitan corridor health service expansion (NHE)</i>		1,3
<i>Clyde Rail extension (CRE)</i>	Required to service the forecast 100 000 residents expected to move into Clyde and Clyde South as well as surrounding communities, in the next 10-15 years.	1,10,11
<i>Melton rail electrification (MRE1)</i>	Indirect benefits for surrounding municipalities too.	1,10, 11
<i>Wyndham Vale to Werribee rail extension (WWW)</i>	Requires a review of the scope in consultation with relevant councils, in particular Wyndham City Council.	1,10, 11
<i>Wallan rail electrification (WRE1)</i>	Should include New Beveridge and Lockerbie rail stations and station upgrades.	1,10,11
<i>Wollert rail extension (WRE2)</i>	A rapid bus service with its own right of way is a viable short-term solution to promote use of public transport.	1,10,11
<i>Outer Metropolitan Ring Road (OME)</i>	Could be considered as two discrete projects being the sections – Hume FWY to Western FWY and The Western FWY to the Princes FWY due to benefits associate with each section independently	1,10,11
<i>Western Intermodal Freight Terminal (WIF)</i>	This option should be elevated as it currently a 'concept for further development.' It is understood the business case is well advanced for this project.	13

*b. Additional considerations recommended*

The below table identifies high priority options that Interface Councils warrant significant consideration for inclusion in the final strategy.

<b>Recommendation for additional option/change</b>	<b>Comment</b> (Further information can be provided on request)	<b>Need/s:</b> (Incl. all needs it contributes to)
<i>An option relating to population triggers for new infrastructure in Growth Areas, should be included</i>	<p>The development of state government infrastructure should be linked to population growth, e.g. For every increase of population x 000 people, the State Government should be required to purchase land for a Primary School. This would have a twofold benefit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased certainty on the provision of State Government infrastructure needed to service local communities.</li> <li>• Makes it easier for Government Departments to request funding for the provision of infrastructure to service fast growing communities.</li> </ul>	1,4,5,10,11
<i>An option that relates to the condition and capacity of arterial roads in all areas not only in proximity to major employment centres, is critical</i>	<p>The state of the arterial road system is critical to the whole of Victoria and needs to be considered across the network.</p> <p>Interface Councils has prepared a priority arterial roads project list in consultation with VicRoads. <b>This can be provided on request.</b></p>	1,2,10,11
<i>An option for the renewal of road pavements across the existing arterial road network is required</i>	Investment in renewal of the state road network is imperative. It relates directly to 'better use of existing infrastructure'. In many cases the renewal of arterial roads through pavement works could significantly increase its capacity, rather than building a new solution to decrease load.	1,10,11
<i>An option that focus on enabling infrastructure protect, maintain and develop green wedge areas, is required</i>	Interface Councils manage 90 per cent of Melbourne's green wedges. Green Wedges contain some of the most iconic destinations, businesses and landscapes which contribute significantly to Melbourne's famed liveability. They are productive landscapes, providing recreational opportunities for Melbourne's residents, economic and lifestyle benefits to its inhabitants, and is the repository of landscape and biodiversity values of State and national significance. There is a significant need for enabling infrastructure for green wedges to maintain, protect and develop the enormous, latent value that they provide to the State. There has been little acknowledgement of this crucial need across the government.	4,5,16

<b>Recommendation for additional option/change</b>	<b>Comment</b> (Further information can be provided on request)	<b>Need/s:</b> (Incl. all needs it contributes to)
<i>Consider incorporating two more concepts into the options tabled in Need 7- Provide better access to housing for the most vulnerable Victorians.</i>	No changes requested to the set of options tabled. However, consider including the following to assist with increasing the supply of affordable housing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Affordable and social housing development incentives and fund</li> <li>Social housing private provision to increase stock in current options.</li> </ul>	7
<i>Expand Need 11: Improve access to middle and outer metropolitan major employment centres</i>	This need should include access to Metropolitan Activity Centres.	11
<i>Include an option for the acquisition and development of new regional parks</i>	Parks Victoria and DELWP have proposed regional parks in metro Melbourne which present opportunities to address several needs.	1,4,16
<i>Include an option relating to community education programs about reducing energy usage</i>	Directly related to 'changing behaviour and managing demand'.	18
<i>Include Environmentally Sensitive Design Framework in planning process</i>	A more holistic approach is required early in the development process. As such, it seems pertinent to include regulations regarding environmentally sustainable development in the planning process.	18
<b>Specific</b>		
<i>Western metropolitan corridor health service expansion</i>	The City's west has comparable requirements to the city's north. Similar to the <i>Northern metropolitan corridor health service expansion</i> , the West require further expansion of health services to ease increasing strain on access to such services.	1,3
<i>Beveridge Interstate Freight Terminal</i>		13

c. *Specific concerns*

The below table outlines the key concerns Interface Councils have with options tabled thus far. The ramifications of these options for all stakeholders need to be carefully investigated if Infrastructure Victoria wishes to pursue them.

<b>Key concern</b>	<b>Comment</b> (Further information can be provided on request)	<b>Need/s:</b> (Incl. all needs it contributes to)
<i>Centralised Planning Scheme (CSP1)</i>	<p>Interface Councils are significantly concerned about this option and the idea of administration by one central body. It would not be in the interests of communities to have decisions made by a body that does not understand the local infrastructure needs and priorities or provide any mechanism for the community to participate in decision making.</p> <p>If a central planning authority was created it would likely be swamped with planning applications and its officers would not be well placed to understand the intricacies across a diverse range of municipalities across Victoria. Even if a range of 'regional' offices were created to assess planning permits it would be difficult for planning officers to conduct site inspections or be across the wide array of planning issues that are particular to each different location in the State.</p> <p>It is imperative local knowledge is not eroded from the system. Interface Councils strongly support the deletion of this option as there are already mechanisms to provide some centralised function:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State Planning Policy Framework, standard zones, overlays, and particular provisions</li> <li>• The Minister for Planning can be made the Responsible Authority for projects of State Significance</li> <li>• Current model of 'centralised' MPA but decentralised PI Schemes is the right balance</li> </ul>	1



## Conclusion

Interface Councils support the development of a 30-year Infrastructure plan, and are pleased with the comprehensive approach to exploring options that may assist in achieving the defined vision and objectives.

In concluding remarks, Interface Councils stress the importance of defining what success would look like in 30 years. That is, what infrastructure we need to be in place so that by 2046, *“...we see a Victoria where everyone can access good jobs, education and services regardless of where they live, where communities are held together by strong bonds, where industries and businesses thrive and where the environment is valued and protected.”*

It is absolutely imperative that this occurs through extensive consultation with all stakeholders, and in particular local government, who will bear the significant social and economic impact if these definitions of success are not reflective of local needs and priorities. Alignment is absolutely key to the success of this strategy.