

21/12

9/5/4

29th March, 1935.

The Secretary for Public Works,
Department of Public Works,
MELBOURNE, C.2.

Dear Sir,

I have to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 27th inst., informing the Board of the refusal of the Governor-in-Council to make an order for the purpose of carrying into effect the recommendation of the Board that certain portions of Sydney Road, between Flemington Road and Park Street, Parkville, be set apart as Tramway Reserves to be used exclusively for tramway purposes.

Yours faithfully,

Rat

Secretary.

is to be confined to the reduced width

Manage

trans: to Christyman

TRAMWAY RESERVES - PARKVILLE.

Letter, Secretary for Public Works, 27th March.

It was resolved that the tramway be constructed in the centre of the roadway in Parkville between Flemington Road and Park Street, and paved in.

Rat

Secretary.
29/3/35

27th March, 1935.

Sir, Representing the Melbourne City Council:-

With reference to the recommendation of the Melbourne and Metropolitan Tramways Board, dated the 2nd day of February 1935, that the Governor-in-Council give directions (pursuant to the provisions of Section 45 of the Melbourne and Metropolitan Tramways Act 1928) that the portions of Sydney Road, between Flemington Road and Park Street, Parkville, described on plans and drawings attached thereto, be set apart as Tramway Reserves to be used exclusively for tramway purposes, and with regard also to hearing by the Minister of the Melbourne City Council and the Melbourne and Metropolitan Tramways Board in the matter on the 6th inst., I am directed to inform you that at a meeting of the Executive Council yesterday the Governor-in-Council refused to make an order for the purpose of carrying into effect such recommendation.

Copies of publication in the Government Gazette of the decision of the Governor-in-Council will be forwarded to you when available.

Yours faithfully,

(Sgd) C.C. Gale,

Secretary.

The Secretary,

Bourke Street,

MELBOURNE.

9/1/1

NOTES OF HEARING BEFORE THE MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS
IN CONNECTION WITH THE BOARD'S RECOMMENDATION FOR CERTAIN
PORTIONS OF SYDNEY ROAD, PARKVILLE, TO BE SET ASIDE AS
TRAMWAY RESERVES.

6th March, 1935

PRESENT:-

Representing the Melbourne City Council:-

Cr. Campbell (Chairman, Public Works Committee).
Mr. Wootton (Deputy Town Clerk).

Representing the Board:-

Mr. Alex. Cameron (Chairman)
Sir Stephen Morell.
Hon. J. G. Membrey.
Cr. H.H. Bell.
Mr. J.V. O'Connor.
Mr. T.P. Strickland (Chief Engineer)
Mr. A.D. Murdoch (Manager).
Mr. R.A. Spencer (Secretary).

THE MINISTER invited the City Council representatives to express their views upon the Board's proposal.

CR. CAMPBELL said that the Council had written to the Minister in a letter dated 19th February, conveying the Council's views. The matter had been discussed by the Public Works Committee at great length, and also by the Council, and from the Council's point of view it is considered that if the tramway track is laid at the sides of the plantations as suggested in the Board's letter, it would be a calamity for the City and the citizens and traffic in every way. The Council wants St. Kilda Road, Flemington Road and Sydney Road, three main arterial roads, so that when the road is not being used for trams all traffic - motors and horse vehicles - will have the use of the full width of the roadway. It is not a question of maintenance. The existence of tramway tracks in the centre of the road as favored by the City Council provides an effective separation of heavy motor vehicles and slow moving horse-drawn traffic travelling in opposite directions, and tends to reduce the possibility of accident. If all such traffic is to be confined to the reduced width of 35 feet between the tram tracks, which would be the case if the Board's application is granted, the possibility of serious accidents will be considerably increased. The existence of tramway tracks in the centre of the roadway provides an effective line of demarkation that separates traffic travelling in opposite directions.

-2-

The Board has pointed out that the construction of the track in open ballast in the manner desired by it would enable the Board to effect a saving of £18,000 in constructional costs. In view of the fact that the life of the tracks will extend over a period of a great number of years, the Council submits that that saving is not commensurate with the loss of road space and added risk of accident that the Board's proposal would entail, neither of which disabilities would apply if the tracks are constructed to permanent levels in the centre of the roadway as advocated by the Council. The question of saving £18,000 must be taken into consideration; but it is the future of that beautiful roadway we have to consider. Traffic is constantly increasing. Having a ballast track means that it is given up for all time.

THE MINISTER:- The Board says that there would be a saving in maintenance of £2,000 a year.

CR. CAMPBELL:- The beauty of our roadways is shown in Flemington Road where the trees are now commencing to mature. In another three to five years Flemington Road will begin to take shape.

Cr. Campbell quoted further from the letter to the traffic Minister (copy attached).

THE MINISTER:- What is the width of Flemington Road compared with Sydney Road?

THE CHAIRMAN:- Flemington Road and Dandenong Road are the same - 3 chains wide. Sydney Road is a little wider.

THE MINISTER:- Those side roads are not paved now.

CR. CAMPBELL:- With penetration macadam.

THE MINISTER:- Have you any recent census of the traffic of those two side roads?

CR. CAMPBELL:- Not of the side roads.

THE CHAIRMAN:- We can supply the information (hands to Minister). The number of vehicles travelling on one direction in the central portion of Sydney Road in 17½ hours is less than the number crossing Princes Bridge in the same direction in one hour.

THE MINISTER:- Well, Mr. Cameron, you have had a copy of the letter of the City Council, and I shall be pleased to hear what the Board's views are.

THE MINISTERS(to Cr. Campbell):- The Board say that the annual extra cost if it has a paved tramway will be £2,000 in maintenance. Have you figured out the extra maintenance cost to you if you included the centre of the roadway? The taxpayer would have to find it.

CR. CAMPBELL:- I am not too sure that the Board has definitely stated yet which scheme they really consider is the best scheme.

THE MINISTER:- I think they ask for their track in a parked area alongside the reserves on each side of the central roadway.

THE CHAIRMAN:- That is our recommendation.

THE MINISTER:- What would it leave in the centre for other traffic?

THE CHAIRMAN:- 35 feet.

THE MINISTER (to CR. Campbell):- If the ordinary traffic is excluded from 35 feet of the centre it would increase the use of the other roads, and therefore it would cost the Council something extra in maintenance cost for the greater use of the other roads.

CR. CAMPBELL:- It certainly would concentrate the traffic to a narrower portion of the roadway. At the present time the traffic balances itself that roadway.

THE MINISTER:- The Board says that it will cost them £2,000 a year extra. Would there be any extra cost to the City Council if we agreed to let them have a parked tramway?

CR. CAMPBELL:- (Could not give the figures).- We want the tramway constructed similar to St.Kilda Road and Flemington Road.

THE CHAIRMAN asked Cr. Campbell through the Minister, if the Council had obtained any expert reports by the City Engineer.

MR. CAMPBELL replied that the City Engineer reported to the Public Works Committee, but it was then only a matter of various suggestions of getting over the traffic difficulties. He may have expressed a personal opinion.- I am putting the Council's view.

THE MINISTER:- Well, Mr. Cameron, you have had a copy of the letter of the City Council, and I shall be pleased to hear what the Board's views are.

THE CHAIRMAN:- We have not received a copy of the Council's memorandum. This is the first time we have heard any reasons, or arguments against the Board's proposal. (Mr. Wootton handed the Chairman a copy of the memorandum).

In the first place, under the Board's proposal there will be 34 feet between the outer margin of each parked area, in the centre of the roadway, which will be available for other vehicles.

Under Section 45 (1) of the Board's Act, the Governor in Council, on the recommendation of the Board and the Municipality, may by order direct that any portion of a street or road which is at least two chains wide shall be set apart as a tramway reserve and used exclusively for tramway purposes. In the Board's proposals there would be no interference with the tree reserves or their beauty, or anything else. There is no question of restoring any portion of the reserve as provided under Section 45 (3) (b) (1). Under Section 99, it is provided that the Board shall take every precaution to secure the safety of passengers and persons passing along or across the streets or roads upon the route of any tramway. We say that by placing the tramway in an exclusive right-of-way alongside the plantations provides a continuous safety zone. There are something like 16 million passengers per annum who use the Sydney Road and Flemington Road tramways - many thousands per day over this section. It is the Board's firm conviction that it would not be discharging its obligations under the Act if it did not provide the greatest safety possible.

In 1923 the Board's Act was amended to provide for tramways set apart in reserves where roads were two chains wide. It was for roads like Sydney Road that the provision was made by Parliament, and if these arguments put forward by the City Council prevailed it would frustrate the whole meaning and intention of the Act. It would be just and equitable to use the area exclusively

for tramway purposes to guarantee the safety of passengers to a greater degree. A count taken in Sydney Road shows that taking bicycles and other vehicles into account, the number using the centre roadway within the area proposed for parked tramways is less ^{in a day} than the number crossing Princes Bridge in an hour. Hardly any of the vehicles go within the area which is desired for the reserves - that area is practically unused today. They all keep to the centre of the road, and the wear and tear is accentuated on that portion where the tramway is laid. I can conceive of no case where the purposes of the Tramways Act to provide for parked trams could be given effect to if it could not be given effect to in Sydney Road. In view of the intention of Parliament there is no reason why Sydney Road should be excluded from parked tramways any more than any other road of similar width. Reference was made by Cr. Campbell to Flemington Road. When we negotiated with the City Council in the first place, it was agreed that the tramway should be parked in the centre, the same as Dandenong Road. That was approved until it came to the allowance the Board would make towards the paving of the side roads. In the opinion of the Board the City Council asked an exorbitant figure. Because we would not agree the City Engineer and City Surveyor entirely altered the plans. They had no objection to the question of parking - it was merely a question of money. The Council made a complete volte face. If uniformity has to be observed, what about Victoria Parade? If parking cannot be permitted in Sydney Road it cannot be permitted anywhere. The purposes of the Act would be entirely frustrated. The proposed area for parked tramways extends from the Haymarket to Park Street, a little short of the Melbourne boundary. There is a park on one side; there are no cross streets at all; and there is ample room for all other traffic. It seems to me that there is no place within the tramway area where parked tramways would be less objectionable than there.

We have sent to you a statement showing the advantages of parking in Sydney Road - greater safety, greater speed, quieter and smoother riding, and the saving in capital and

maintenance costs. The question of Capital Cost is one which might come back on the Council's ratepayers - the City Council's rateability is 25% of the total of the Metropolitan area -, and I think the ratepayers have as much claim upon the protection of the City Council as private motors. Motor Cars carry one fifty-second of the number carried by Tramcars. The part asked to be set aside is practically unused for traffic - they hug the centre of the road.

I think the facts as set out by the Board outweigh the fanciful objections put forward about the beauty of the road. Nothing that the Board will do will impair the beauty of the road. We will not put down a ballast track like a railway track; it will be more like a gravel path alongside the reserve - the same as in Peel Street and Dandenong Road. Nothing there can be said to impair the beauty of the road or detract from its appearance.

THE CHAIRMAN also quoted Section 59 (d) of the Act - "the Board may maintain alter remove replace or relay in any portion or situation the rails of any tramway under its management or any part thereof."

THE MINISTER:- You propose to make crossing places ?

THE CHAIRMAN:- Yes - laid to road level and paved. You are free and untrammelled to make such Order as you may deem equitable. You have plenary powers to say what should be done in the best interests of the Public if you set aside portion of the road.

THE MINISTER:- You say there are 1,032 cycles pass along this centre roadway. Is there no risk of cycles running into the open ballast track?

THE CHAIRMAN:- No - it would be separated from the roadway by a 9" kerb.

THE MINISTER:- Would there be any danger of motor cars getting on to the ballast track?

THE CHAIRMAN:- No more than on to the footpath.

THE MINISTER:- You say that the tram would carry the equivalent of 50 motor cars ?

THE CHAIRMAN:- That fact has been checked at frequent intervals. In Great Britain the average is 1.7 for 43 square feet

would be delayed and inconvenience caused to passengers.
of space. The space occupied by motor cars is enormous. In

Australia the average carried in motor cars is less than two.
Flemington Road and at Park Street create further dangers, inasmuch

THE MINISTER:- You say that the extra cost involved
in putting in a tramway like that in Flemington Road would be
£18,000. Later on you speak of the extra cost of rails as £7,000.
Does the £18,000 include the rails?

THE CHAIRMAN:- Yes. £18,000 is the cost inclusive of
the rails.

THE MINISTER:- What is the length?

THE CHAIRMAN:- One and a half miles approximately.

THE MINISTER:- You say it would cost £2,000 extra per
annum for maintenance. What is the average per mile over the
system?

THE CHAIRMAN:- About £150 per annum for minor
maintenance per mile of single track; but for reconstruction it
may run into thousands.

THE MINISTER:- What does it cost to lay down a
double track tramway?

THE CHIEF ENGINEER:- Roughly £40,000 a mile wood-paved.

MR. WOOTTON:- From a traffic point of view the Council's
objection is not a passive one; it is a considered opinion. The
great point is that it is the general tendency today to increase
rather than decrease roads. The Board's proposal would reduce
Sydney Road by 34%.

THE MINISTER:- I will look at the statements you have
submitted and the plans. The kick, I suppose,
view is that there would be grave risk of accident by the means
proposed to separate the ballast track from the 35 feet of
roadway left for vehicles; it would cause a death trap. Take
St. Kilda Road plantations with rockeries 2 feet to 2 feet 6 inches
high, yet motor cars mount these frequently.

THE MINISTER:- When?

MR. WOOTTON:- At night time. With a 9 inch kerb in
Sydney Road the likelihood of vehicles being driven over the kerb
on to the ballast track, with the possibility of overturning,
would be considerably increased. In such cases tramway traffic

9/1/4
Melbourne and Metropolitan Tramways Board
would be delayed and inconvenience caused to passengers.

The points of convergence of the tramway tracks at Flemington Road and at Park Street create further dangers, inasmuch as at such points the trams will cut across other traffic. The Board's plans provide for a beacon and plantations right in the line of oncoming traffic. The Council considers that these erections will constitute a definite obstruction and a danger point, and that even if well illuminated, accidents will result. The experience in Wellington Parade with well-lighted safety zone standards, which were hit by motorists on many occasions, shows definitely the inadvisability of placing any obstruction in the centre of the roadway in the direct path of vehicular traffic.

Then there is the fact that we are charged as a Council with a lack of uniformity. One of our greatest points in order to obtain uniformity is to get Sydney Road, a three chain road, the same as St. Kilda Road and Flemington Road.

Although the Chairman says that the plantations will not be interfered with, the Board's plans provide for the removal of the plantation from the North of Elizabeth Street to Grattan Street on the West side of Sydney Road, and for cutting back of plantations at other points.

THE CHIEF ENGINEER mentioned that the removal of the plantation referred to was merely a suggestion on the plan.

THE MINISTER:- I will look at the statements you have submitted and the plans, and see the place. The kick, I suppose, will be on me.

HON. J. G. MEMBREY:- The longer we are coming to a decision the longer the work will be held up. We want to call for tenders as soon as possible.

THE MINISTER:- I appreciate that.

OR. CAMPBELL and THE CHAIRMAN thanked the Minister for his courteous hearing.