Integrated Transport Survey

**Community Engagement Report**
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# Executive summary

The City of Port Phillip is growing and becoming more densely populated. There are more people living, travelling through and visiting the municipality than ever before. Community consultation for the City of Port Phillip’s Council Plan 2017- 27 revealed that ratepayers and residents believe parking and transport issues are a high priority for the community.

A ‘business as usual’ approach to transport planning won’t help Port Phillip meet its challenges and Council is now developing a forward-looking Integrated Transport Strategy (ITS). The strategy, called *Future Streets*, will have three key aims:

**Complete Connections:** An integrated transport network that connects people and places

**Great Places**: Our streets and places are designed for people

**Smart Parking Management**: Demand for parking and car travel is moderated as our city grows

To help develop the ITS, the City of Port Phillip (Council) released a Position Paper, called *Setting the Direction.* The Position Paper identifies the transport problem and puts forward guiding principles, aims and objectives.

From 30 October to 4 December 2017, Council asked the community for feedback on the Position Paper. In addition, broader questions were asked about transport, parking, movement and accessibility across Port Phillip.

Community consultation broadly asked the question: *How do we fit more people into the same amount of space without impacting the things we value most?*

Council consulted with residents, business owners, workers, students and community groups. Visitors were also invited to share their views.

Three consultation tools were used:

* **Survey:** a 20-question survey, available online at haveyoursay.portphillip.vic.gov.au and in hard copy. People could also provide a general comment using the Brainstormer tool on our Have Your Say website
* **Focus groups:** three focus groups with residents, one focus group with small business owners and three in-depth telephone interviews with large businesses
* **Targeted discussions:** five targeted discussions with members of Council’s accessibility group, schools, older people, social housing tenants and the Multicultural Forum.

In total, 586 people participated in the consultation program. Council reached a good cross-section of the community through these voluntary and targeted activities.

Participants shared clear messages about growth and transport challenges. Locals told us the kinds of things the community highly values and the considerations that are most important to prepare Port Phillip for the streets of the future.

Feedback received during the consultation period will be considered as part of the development of the draft ITS. The ITS will provide an overarching framework to guide planning, investment and operations for movement and place within the municipality over the next 10 years. It will set the direction for all current and future use of Port Phillip’s streets, including transport, parking and great places.

The draft ITS will be presented to Council in March 2018 with an opportunity for the community to provide feedback prior to the plan being finalised for adoption in late June 2018**.**

## Key findings

### Complete Connections

* Across the community, participants recognise the need to adapt to the increased challenges of catering for growing demand for access and moving people and goods around the municipality.
* Participants told Council that they are making different choices about transport, travelling at different times or shopping online to avoid congestion.
* People think more needs to be done to encourage people to use active transport, like walking and cycling.
* Cycling is a realistic commuting option but participants don’t think cycling lanes are adequate or safe enough.
* Switching to active transport modes will take greater behaviour change due to it being less convenient or comfortable.
* Although not many participants use buses, they did indicate they would be interested in using an improved high-frequency bus service
* Public transport is considered a big part of the solution to transport challenges. Participants strongly support public transport improvements to reduce overcrowding and to make it safe and accessible for people of all ages and abilities.
* People with disability and older people highlighted challenges with moving around the area and accessing public transport.
* Participants want information about public transport services to be made more accessible to all members of the community. Information should be available in different languages and community and public transport information could be integrated so it’s easier to find out about all options
* The community bus is a highly valued local service.

### Smart Parking Management

* Locals are finding that driving around the area is getting more and more difficult, and many are using public transport, walking, or cycling on a daily basis.
* On-street parking is a challenge, especially in local streets. While participants believe in to reducing dependence on cars, they also think there are some steps that could be taken now. Council could do more to enforce parking and permit conditions, or to ensure residences with off-street parking are making use of those spaces before parking on the street.
* Access to on-street parking is seen as a benefit of rate-paying and living in the municipality. Participants told us that local residents, together with people with disabilities, should have priority for local parking over commuters and those who profit from using parking spaces, like car-sharing companies.
* Most survey participants believe residents who have access to off-street parking should retain their permits, but should have fewer than those who don’t have off-street parking.
* Small businesses and parents of young children are more reliant on their vehicles, and have greater concerns about impacts to parking.
* Locals have mixed views about the development of Council’s publicly accessible off-street car parks. A mixed-use development including residences and shops is seen as the best idea by just over half of those who responded to the survey.

Notable trends among different suburbs include:

* + More than half (56%) of South Melbourne residents said they were opposed to the ‘Redevelop off-street car parks into a multi-storey car park only’. In contrast, nearly three quarters (73%) of St Kilda Road residents were supportive.
  + The clear majority of St Kilda West residents (90%) believed ‘Residents – where no off-street parking is available’ should have the highest priority for on-street parking
  + St Kilda Road residents were most opposed (73%) to commuters having priority access to on-street parking and also believed commuters should pay the most to access on-street parking.
  + Balaclava residents (58%) most consistently believed ‘Residents – where no off-street parking is available’ should not pay the most for access on-street parking.
  + St Kilda West residents (73%) were more likely to be opposed to a reduction in permits than other residents. In contrast, all (100%) St Kilda Road residents said they were supportive of a reduction in permits (per residence).

### Great Places

* Participants recognise that Port Phillip is growing and changing, and mostly see this as a positive.
* Locals enjoy the liveliness of the local area and welcome visitors and new residents, however they also value the sense of community and want this to be maintained.
* Wide footpaths that are accessible to all, trees and plants and improved cycling lanes are top priorities for street space.
* Loading and delivery zones and car share parking bays are considered the least important uses of street space.

Notable trends among different suburbs include:

* + St Kilda Road residents said wide footpaths that are accessible and trees and plants were most important for local streets (half ranked these a top priority), as did Balaclava residents (48%).
  + More than any others, St Kilda East residents (34%) opposed loading and delivery zones on local streets.

More broadly:

* Just as there is non-uniform population growth and density across the municipality, participants have different views about what’s important based on their daily experiences and transport challenges.
* Participants believe Council has an important role to play in leading the community through the changes and ensuring initiatives are well managed, with impacts to locals minimised as much as possible.
* Participants have a degree of trust in Council to find solutions to parking and transport challenges, but aren’t sure if it has the right level of authority to deliver the necessary improvements to things like public transport.
* Participants are broadly supportive of the aims and objectives set out in the Position Paper.
* Participants aren’t sure how the ‘guiding principles’ outlined in the Position Paper will translate into action and would like some clarification.

# Engagement overview

## Consultation approach

Council used three consultation tools for community engagement:

* **Survey:** a 20-question survey, available online at haveyoursay.portphillip.vic.gov.au and in hard copy. People could also provide a general comment using the Brainstormer tool on Council’s HaveYourSay website
* **Focus groups:** three focus groups with residents, one focus group with small business owners and three in-depth telephone interviews with large businesses
* **Targeted discussions:** five targeted discussions with members of our accessibility group, schools, older people, social housing tenants and the Multicultural Forum

Council promoted the ITS engagement and encouraged people to fill out the survey via:

* Social Media (Facebook, Twitter, Linked In, Instagram)
* Diversity (Council's official magazine)
* Advertisements in the Leader newspaper
* Postcard distribution
* Email campaign

Informative materials were made available and accessible to ensure everyone in the community could make a meaningful contribution.

### Position paper

Council released a Position Paper on 30 October 2017 called ‘Setting the Direction’. The paper identifies the transport problem and sets out guiding principles, aims and objectives for the strategy. It was designed to generate discussion and forms the basis of the elements that were tested through engagement.

### Video

To help people understand the challenges the municipality faces, an animated video was produced and is available online at [haveyoursay.portphillip.vic.gov.au/futurestreets](http://haveyoursay.portphillip.vic.gov.au/futurestreets). This video was shown to focus group and targeted group discussion participants prior to their sessions.

## Participation and consultation methodology

In total, 586 people participated in the engagement:

* 502 people completed a survey
* 30 people participated in the focus groups
* 54 people participated in targeted discussions.
* 1,425 people visited Council’s engagement portal
* 222 people downloaded documents from Council’s engagement portal
* 18 contributions were recorded on Council’s engagement portal

### Survey

#### Methodology

Questions asked in the survey were based on some of the key initiatives to be delivered through the strategy. The survey was broken into four sections:

* **Section 1 - On-street and off-street parking, streetscape function and uses**
* How best to allocate space on streets in local residential areas, key destinations and main streets
* **Section 2 – Fairness and equity of access to parking**
  + How best to prioritise and control parking space in local residential areas and key destinations and main streets
* **Section 3 – Public transport access and frequency**
  + How the community uses public transport and what specific improvements Council could support
* **Section 4 – Demographic questions** 
  + About respondents’ relationship to the area, age, gender and household status

The survey was available in hardcopy and via Council’s engagement portal haveyoursay.portphillip.vic.gov.au from 30 October to 4 December. Hard copy responses were manually entered into the online system by a Council staff member.

#### Participation

The survey reached a cross-section of the community.

The typical survey respondent was aged between 35 and 49, lives in St Kilda with a partner and no children at home.

Analysis of the participants’ demographic information found that:

* 73% of respondents live in the municipality and 16% are people who work or study in the municipality
* 21% of respondents live in St Kilda, 17% are from Port Melbourne and 12% are from Elwood. The remainder reside in St Kilda East (9%), Albert Park (8%), South Melbourne (8%), St Kilda West (6%), Middle Park (5%), Balaclava (5%), Other suburbs (outside the City of Port Phillip) (5%) St Kilda Road (2%) and Ripponlea (1%).
* 51% are female, 46% are male and 3% selected ‘Prefer not to say’
* 33% are 35-49 year olds and 29% are aged 60 and above
* 35% live as a couple and do not have children at home
* 32% have children at home – who are mostly school-aged (60%).

### Focus groups

#### Participation

Participants were selected from each of Council’s three wards: Canal, Lake and Gateway. To participate, residents had to meet the following criteria:

* must have lived in the City of Port Phillip for at least five years
* mix of demographic factors such as gender, household income and location
* mix of people who own and rent their house
* mix of people who travel via car, public transport, bike or walking.

The following applied to businesses:

* have operated as a business in the council area for at least two years
* mix of business size and type (within Small and Medium Enterprise (SME) business group)
* large businesses must have 250 or more employees
* geographical spread across the municipality.

Focus groups were split according to council ward areas and a separate group was dedicated to hearing from small business owners. Three in-depth interviews were conducted via telephone with large businesses.

#### Methodology

The objectives of the focus groups were to:

* understand current attitudes, values and behaviours around transport, parking and land usage in the City
* identify key perceived challenges for the community and priority areas of the ITS
* gauge community reaction to key elements of the ITS strategy, including strengths, weaknesses and suggested improvements
* test key communication messages around the ITS.

Each focus group session lasted approximately two hours and involved seven to eight research participants. Each telephone interview lasted 60 minutes and involved one large business participant.

The group discussions were run by market research firm EY Sweeney. Participants in the research were recruited through EY Sweeney’s recruitment processes. Large business participants were recruited from businesses in the area nominated by the Council.

Participants were provided with the Setting the Direction position paper and asked to read it prior to the session. They were also shown the overview video.

### Targeted discussions

#### Participation

The following groups participated in the targeted discussions,

* City of Port Phillip’s Multicultural Forum – eight participants
* Albert Park Primary School – 20 students from Grade 6
* Albert Park College students – nine students from Years 7 to 9
* Accessibility Group – two participants
* 15 senior community members.
* Social Housing Tenants – six participants

#### Methodology

These discussions covered a range of topics, mostly focused on what people like about their local streets, what makes it easy or difficult to get around and which modes of transport they use to go about their daily activities.

Discussions were facilitated by both independent discussion hosts from Capire Consulting Group and Council staff members.

### Note on participation and representation

Engagement successfully captured a cross section of views and feedback from residents, rate payers, business owners and visitors to Port Phillip. With 586 engagement participants from a total estimated population of 108,558 people, these responses cannot be seen as representative of the whole municipality.

While engagement should not be read as representative, participation rates in the survey strongly reflect the population of Port Phillip (see table below).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Suburb** | **Participation in survey** | **Percentage of City of Port Phillip population (2016 ERP)** |
| St Kilda | 21% of respondents | 20% of population |
| Elwood | 12% of respondents | 15% of population |
| Port Melbourne | 17% of respondents | 16% of population |
| St Kilda East | 9% of respondents | 9% of population |
| Albert Park | 8% of respondents | 6% of population |
| South Melbourne | 8% of respondents | 11% of population |
| St Kilda West | 6% of respondents | 3% of population |
| Middle Park | 5% of respondents | 4% of population |
| Balaclava | 5% of respondents | 5% of population |
| St Kilda Road | 2% of respondents | 8% of population |
| Ripponlea | 1% of respondents | 2% of population |

Efforts have been made to hear from a diversity of voices, including community members who are considered by Council to be ‘harder to reach’.

The survey, made publicly available online and in hard copy, enabled Council to seek as many responses as possible.

Interviews with focus groups (residents, rate payers and business owners) provided Council with an opportunity to explore issues in greater depth. Council sought a mix of participants; genders, household income and location as well as a mix of people who own and rent their house and travel via car, public transport, bike or walking.

Council targeted those who are considered harder to reach by inviting them to participate in facilitated discussions and aimed to remove barriers, such as language or accessibility, by hosting discussions in convenient locations, providing interpreters or translators and providing materials in accessible formats.

Finally, it should also be noted:

* Results are based on feedback from the community and, therefore, some information provided may be factually incorrect.
* Online engagement can be difficult for people with vision impairment and those who cannot access or use online platforms. In response, Council provided hard copy surveys in print.
* Survey respondents did not have to answer all questions in the survey, or provide a response to each part of a survey question. As such, response rates per question will vary.

## Analysis methodology

This report provides a summary of all results.

Council engaged Nation Partners to complete an independent analysis of the survey’s results and to prepare this overarching engagement report.

Using the demographic information provided by respondents, the report identifies how different demographic groups responded to the survey questions.

Due to the low number of respondents aged 18-24 (10 out of 502) their responses have been combined with those of the 25-34 cohort for demographic analysis purposes.

Qualitative results have been analysed by determining the key themes in participants’ comments. These results have not been quantified.

# Engagement findings

## Discussions with targeted groups

Targeted discussions with groups of locals from particular demographics focused on what people value about their local streets, what makes it easy or difficult to get around and how they move around the city.

**Social housing tenants**

Discussion focused primarily on the accessibility of public transport, particularly trams and buses, including the community bus, as well as the accessibility and clarity of information required to use them.

Participants told Council about the importance and value of community buses. They rely on them to access health appointments, activities and volunteering when other transport options are inaccessible or too expensive.

Participants suggested that tram upgrades need to occur to improve accessibility for older people, people with disability and parents with prams. Improvements should include better shelter at stops, buses with lowering floors, increased tram services, wheelchair access and wider access points.

Council also heard the need for greater accessibility of information about public transport and community buses, particularly for the elderly, those with disabilities, and those without access to smart phones or the internet.

It was agreed that a variety of improvements could be made, including expanding the Metlink (Public Transport Victoria) phone service to include community bus services, availability of Council staff to help members understand and get the most out of the community bus service, and clear, user-friendly timetables at public transport stops and online.

**Community members with disability**

Public transport accessibility was a key focus of discussion.

Participants told Council that improvements need to be made to ensure those with visual and physical impairments using wheelchairs, walkers or prams can safely navigate footpaths, ramps and curbs, particularly to access trams. In addition, wide footpaths are preferable, as they provide space for shared use by pedestrians, prams and bikes.

Participants also highlighted the importance of audible and tactile signals for crossing roads and navigating footpaths. Guidance from construction workers would assist in navigating uneven and inconsistent paths around construction zones.

One participant noted that the number and time allowance of disabled parking spaces is not sufficient for those who are working, and many parking spaces are not designed with enough room for wheelchair users to access their cars.

**Multicultural Forum**

Participants discussed the importance of the community bus, expressing that it works well and benefits the community. One participant indicated that it does not drop people off where they want.

Lack of parking was raised as an issue, with a suggestion that the number of permits per residence should be reduced to ensure every house in the street can access parking, not just those with multiple cars.

Participants enjoy the proximity to green spaces and parks, but also raised an issue trees being too tall and causing blockages in the gutters. In addition, it was suggested that footpaths need to be cleaner and should be flat to make it easier to navigate for those with mobility aids.

There is a lack of accessibility of information about transport for those who do not speak English and it was suggested that translated documentation and presentations to cultural clubs could assist in making information more accessible.

**Albert Park Primary School**

Walking is a major form of transportation for kids getting to and from school, with some riding bikes and scooters as an alternative. As such, safety while crossing roads was regarded as a key issue. Safer bike and walking paths were raised as a hope for the future.

**Albert Park College**

Students use a combination of walking, biking, public transport and cars to get to and from school, but suggest that public transport should be promoted over car use, with the future of the environment as a key consideration. Improving road crossings to cater for older and younger people was also suggested.

Students expressed a belief that greater investment to improve public transport (particularly trams) and a reduction in the number of car parks on the road would reduce the number of cars used. In addition, they suggested that improved public transport would lead to improved access to services and jobs, and result in a reduction in poverty.

Students also indicated that tourists would benefit if public transport was more accessible and easier to use.

**Seniors**

Participants discussed the importance of trees, nature strips, seating and footpaths in the City, as well as the people and a sense of community.

Safety was raised as an issue, with key concerns regarding racism and racial abuse, cyclists travelling in packs making walking unsafe for pedestrians, and people getting impatient and crossing roads without waiting for the pedestrian lights.

One of the challenges raised was a lack of coordination between trains, trams and buses. In addition, people using walking aids have difficulty access trams without access ramps.

Participants told Council that there is not enough parking available, and too many people use the street for parking instead of their garages.

## Focus groups

The objectives of the residents and business focus groups were to:

* understand current attitudes, values and behaviours around transport, parking and land usage in the City
* identify key perceived challenges for the community and priority areas of the ITS
* gauge community reaction to key elements of the ITS strategy, including strengths, weaknesses and suggested improvements
* test key communication messages around the ITS.

### Key findings

#### The impact of population growth is being felt, but people are changing their travel habits

* Overall, residents make a lifestyle choice to live in Port Phillip and are committed to the community.
* Residents value the liveliness, diversity and quality of life they get in Port Phillip.
* Many already make adjustments to live in the area, such as:
  + giving up their car and increasing public transport use
  + travelling in off-peak times
  + shopping online.
* Some residents cycle and others want to but feel safety measures and bike lanes need to be improved.
* Residents who do feel dissatisfied with the change occurring in the area tend to be those who have lived in the neighbourhood the longest and may feel they ‘bought in’ to a different ideal.

|  |
| --- |
| Regardless of how long they have been there, residents and businesses have a strong sense of attachment to the community and care about how it changes and grows. |

#### Population growth is thought to be a benefit to the community, if managed well

* Our community sees a range of benefits of population growth, such as: increased diversity, more shops and cafes, longer opening hours for local shops and better transport options.
* The downsides of population growth are seen to be: crowded public transport, difficulty accessing local services like schools and shops, traffic congestion, decreased safety and difficulty for local businesses to remain competitive against big brands.
* The effects of population growth are felt differently across Port Phillip – the St Kilda area feels the most stretched and other areas, such as Albert Park, don’t yet feel the full impact.

|  |
| --- |
| The community feels that Council has an important role to play in making sure population growth is well managed and that current residents’ lifestyles aren’t impacted too greatly. |

#### The challenges that have an impact on everyday lives are more meaningful

* Challenges residents are facing include:
  + crowded trams in peak times
  + long lines at the supermarket
  + difficulties finding parking, or finding it too expensive.
* Residents expected and tended to value references to specific, concrete solutions rather than principles and ideals.
* Broader community challenges, such as changes to jobs or climate change, are seen as less relevant because they don’t feel these things necessarily affect them or day-to-day.
* Some of the language in the position paper was confusing or doesn’t mean much to people.

|  |
| --- |
| The community accept that transport and population growth in the community is a complex issue and that it may mean trade-offs or changing the way they move around the area in the future. |

#### The community supports the draft strategies aims, but wonder how much is within Council’s control

* The strategy needs to consider:
  + who else needs to be involved in shaping Port Phillip’s future, like other government agencies
  + everyone who lives, works, runs a business or visits the local area
  + the many forms of transport that people will need to use to move around the area – shifting away from cars
* Residents and businesses think that Council could be more ‘forward looking’ with its vision for the strategy. They feel the current position paper might only plan for things to stay the same, rather than planning for how people will move around in the future. Examples of changes residents and businesses are seeing include:
  + less people owning cars
  + work becoming more flexible and people not necessarily working standard business hours.
* Community members support the aim of the ITS, but question if Council can really deliver on the principles and objectives. For example:
  + public transport is a key theme, but working with Public Transport Victoria will be necessary to deliver the changes that are needed
  + Federal Government is considered to have a stronger role in addressing climate change and the community isn’t sure how Council can change this.
* The community don’t necessarily see any funding challenges in delivering on the strategy, believing that Council raises enough revenue to fund these kinds of strategies.

|  |
| --- |
| People accept that there are big challenges, that the issues are complex and that the answers might not be easy. |

#### Small businesses are more cautious of change, whereas big businesses are open to it

* While residents and large businesses are largely positive about the position paper, small businesses are more cautious about aspects that might lead to change.
* Small businesses tend to rely more on vehicles for transporting their products.
* Small businesses are concerned that the strategy might make it more difficult for customers to get to their stores, which could affect their business.
* Large businesses are looking for ways they can support Council to manage congestion and are already making changes.

|  |
| --- |
| Council needs to consider businesses of all sizes through the ITS. |

### Specific feedback on the draft guiding principles

| **Guiding principle** | **Feedback** |
| --- | --- |
| We support a transition towards a zero emissions and renewable energy future | While the aim is supported, people questioned how much influence council has over public transport planning and delivery |
| We prioritise people over vehicles | Residents mostly agreed with this principle  Some business owners think this principle may be unfair and symbolise an anti-car agenda |
| We enable enjoyable and seamless journeys | Many don’t think this is achievable and that the system is currently quite disorganised  Participants didn’t see walking and cycling as part of a ‘seamless’ journey |
| We support shared and effective use of vehicles, lanes, footpaths and land | People see limitations in this principle, believing the neighbourhood has a lack of space to work with |
| We harness partnerships to leverage outcomes | People agree that this is important to influence change but aren’t sure which partnerships Council is referring to |
| We promote social equity and fair use of fees | Some were confused by the language in this principle, unsure what ‘promoting social equity’ really means |
| We plan our City and its transport together | People don’t feel this principle supports their current experience, having significant challenges moving around the area on a daily basis |
| We embrace mobility technology and innovation | Participants felt this was important to managing population growth, with schemes like car sharing or parking sensors |
| We adapt to change by testing, monitoring and learning | These three principles didn’t raise any particular positive or negative issues for participants |
| We invest wisely to benefit our community now and tomorrow |
| We support greener freight and eco-logistics for moving goods |

### Feedback on the draft objectives

| **Objective area** | **Feedback** |
| --- | --- |
| We are a City of Complete Connections: an integrated network that connects people and places | People agree that public transport and walking should be encouraged, but it must be made safe to do so and other options need to remain  Cycling and walking aren’t practical for people of all ages  There is a need to shift perceptions about the role of active transport. Some acknowledge that they will choose another option due to weather or convenience |
| We are a City of Smart Parking Management: demand for parking and car travel is moderated as our city grows | Residents are concerned about their ability to park near their homes during peak times, like the Grand Prix and St Kilda Festival  Residents feel that paying rates gives them a right to access parking, either through permits or lower on-street costs  Most believe, however, that some abuse this privilege, for example in houses with five cars  While overall car use needs to decline, residents also want Council to enforce today’s rules – like houses with too many cars or people not using their private parking  Businesses are concerned about the impact to their businesses if parking is further restricted |
| We are a City of Great Places: Our streets and places are designed for people | People want to know that changes to infrastructure will be well managed, will have an overall benefit and that impacts will be minimised as much as possible  The Acland Street redevelopment was raised as an issue for businesses during construction; however, residents are positive about the effect the changes have had, finding it easier to visit the area than before  There is a general concern that the community is becoming fractured, and participants support the aims of this objective. They want to promote connections within the community and the community hub is popular |

## Survey

The survey was focused on how local and main road space should be used, on-street parking priorities and public transport. 502 people responded to the survey.

### Key findings

* Respondents prioritise wide footpaths and trees and plants on local and main streets.
* Loading and delivery zones and car share parking bays are least important on local and main streets.
* Respondents believe that residents who have no available off-street parking and people with disabilities should have priority access to on-street parking.
* Cars parked by commuters and car-share companies are seen as the lowest priority users for access to on-street parking. They are also regarded as the users that should pay the most for parking.
* Respondents believe commuters, who are often not from the area, shouldn’t have priority access to parking. There is also a more general view that the local area is heavily congested and that more must be done to discourage car use.
* There are mixed views about the idea of developing Council’s publicly accessible off-street car parks. There was the most support for redeveloping car parks for a mixed-use (residential and retail) development.
* The community is divided on the matter of how many household parking permits are issued. Most believe that residents who have access to off-street parking should retain their permits but should have fewer than those who don’t have off-street parking.
* Two thirds of survey respondents catch public transport every day or at least once a week.
* Trams are the most commonly caught mode of public transport, followed by trains. Buses are not a popular choice.
* Respondents who don’t catch buses regularly, choose not to because:
  + there is preference for other modes of transport, which are seen as more comfortable and convenient
  + buses are considered slow, likely to be caught in traffic and unreliable
  + respondents are not aware of bus services, service times and routes.
* There are mixed views about introducing changes to buses services. The slight majority would prefer that some improvements are made, and that a high frequency service is introduced.

### About the survey respondents

Survey respondents represented a fair cross-section of the City of Port Phillip community.

* 73% of respondents live in the City of Port Phillip.
* 21% of respondents live in St Kilda, 17% from Port Melbourne and 12% from Elwood. Only 4 Ripponlea residents responded.
* 51% of respondents are females.
* 33% of respondents are 35-49 year olds and 29% are aged 60 and above.
* 35% of respondents live in a couple and do not have children at home.
* 32% of respondent do have children at home, who are most likely school-age (60%).

#### Relationship to the area

Respondents were asked to identify their relationship to the municipality. Six options were given, and respondents could select as many as relevant. The vast majority of respondents identified as living in the City of Port Phillip (73% or 463 people).

* People who work or study in the City of Port Phillip accounted for 101, or 16%, of respondents.
* 42 people were business owners or operators. Of these 42 people:
  + only 1 does not live in the area
  + 26 also live and work in the area
  + 15 live in the area, but did not identify that they also work there.

As such, it is important to recognise that business owner and resident groups are not necessarily distinct and findings comparing these two groups’ views should be treated with caution.

#### Residential suburb

St Kilda residents accounted for one-fifth of respondents (106), followed by those living in Port Melbourne (87), Elwood (58), St Kilda East (43) and South Melbourne (41).

Other suburbs were:

Hampton (two); Toorak (two); Brunswick (two); Brighton East; Mooroolbark; Bacchus Marsh; Preston; 3054; Windsor; Maidstone; Thornbury; Footscray; Melbourne 3004; Preston; Yarraville; Blackburn; Kelior Downs; South Yarra; Docklands; Bentleigh East (one each).

#### Gender

There were slightly more female respondents (254) than male (231).

#### Age group

Respondents’ ages were evenly balanced between under 50 and over 50. The 35-49 age group accounted for 167 people, a third of respondents, and the 18-24 age group the lowest at just 10 respondents.

### Priorities for how space is used on local streets, main streets and at key destinations

Council asked for feedback on how best to allocate space in the municipality’s streets balancing transport, parking and great places.

Respondents were asked to rank nine elements for local street space and 11 elements for main street and key destination space in order of importance, with **one** being the **most** important.

Results for these ‘order of preference’ questions are represented as an average ranking score.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Local streets** | **Main streets and key destinations** |
| Wide footpaths accessible to all abilities | Wide footpaths accessible to all abilities |
| Trees and plants | Trees and plants |
| Protected or improved bike lanes | Protected or improved bike lanes |
| Recreation spaces | Recreation spaces |
| Street furniture | Street furniture |
| On-street parking bays | On-street parking bays |
| Dedicated public transport only lanes | Dedicated public transport only lanes |
| Car share parking bays | Car share parking bays |
| Loading and delivery zones | Loading and delivery zones |
|  | Paved space for events and gatherings |
|  | Commercial space for café seating, goods and signage |

|  |
| --- |
| **Key findings** |
| * Wide footpaths and trees and plants are the highest priorities for local and main streets. |
| * Car share parking bays and loading and delivery zones are the lowest priorities for local and main streets. |

**Local streets – highest priorities**

* **Wide footpaths** was the highest priority and received an overall average score of 3.25. Residents in Middle Park and those who live outside the municipality were more likely to highly prioritise this feature.
* **Trees and plants** received an overall average score of 3.30.
* **Wide footpaths and trees and plants** together received 42% of all priority 1 and 2 rankings. Those aged 60 and over were also more likely to rate wide footpaths and trees and plants highly.
* **Protected or improved bike lanes** were prioritised more by 18-34 year olds than other age groups, which this group gave the highest number of priority 1 rankings (20).

**Local streets – lowest priorities**

Loading and delivery zones and space for car share parking received the lowest ranking scores for local streets.

Loading and delivery zones received the greatest number of priority 8 and 9 votes (27%) for local streets, with an average score of 6.70. South Melbourne residents are less likely than residents in other suburbs to see loading and deliver zones as a low priority, with 18% of priority 8 or 9 votes from this suburb.

**Main streets – highest priorities**

The top three priorities were:

* wide footpaths accessible to all abilities (average score: 3.39)
* trees and plants (average score: 4.07)
* protected or improved bike lanes (average score (4.72).

### Options for redeveloping public off-street car parks

Respondents were asked to indicate their support for three options relating to Council’s public, off-street car parks:

* **A.** redevelop off-street car parks into a multi-storey carpark only
* **B.** redevelop off-street car parks to provide a mix of affordable apartments, commercial premises, ground level retain and public car parking
* **C.** keep as is.

|  |
| --- |
| **Key findings** |
| * 54% of respondents **support** **redeveloping car-parks for mixed use** and 35% oppose it. |
| * **Multi-storey car parks** received the **strongest opposition**, with 43% either strongly or somewhat opposed. |

There are mixed views about the idea of redeveloping council’s off-street car parks. There is a slight preference for converting car parks into mixed-use hubs (Option B), with 263 respondents supporting this option. This option was most strongly supported by Balaclava (71%) and St Kilda Road (73%) respondents.

35% of all respondents were opposed to Option B. Those who showed a higher level of opposition, either somewhat or strongly, were Elwood (45%) and Middle Park respondents (42%), and those who own or operate a business in the area (52%).

Over a third of people remained neutral about keeping things as they are, suggesting people aren’t moved by proposals for change.

### How best to prioritise and control parking space on local and main streets

Council asked for people’s opinions on who should have priority for parking spaces. This section asked people to think about the wide range of people who might need to park on local and main streets and factors like paid parking and residential parking permits.

#### Priority for on-street parking and who should pay the most

The survey gave eight options for ranking, from highest to lowest, those who should have priority access to on-street parking, and who should pay the most.

The options were:

* cars parked by commuters
* car-share companies
* business – customers, deliveries, employees
* tradespeople and service providers
* visitors – for people visiting family / friends / attractions / businesses
* carers for school / childcare drop-off/pickup
* people with disabilities
* residents – where no off-street parking is available.

|  |
| --- |
| **Key findings** |
| * Residents with no off-street parking should have greatest priority for on-street parking. |
| * 44% believe residents with no off-street parking should pay the least for on-street parking. |
| * Cars parked by commuters were given lowest priority for access to on-street parking. |
| * 54% of people think commuters should pay the most for on-street parking. |

**Access to on-street parking**

67% of respondents believe **residents** who do not have any off-street parking should be given the **highest** priority for on-street car parking with an average ranking of 1.78.

People with disabilities (2.85) and visitors (3.75) were also considered to be high priorities for access to on-street parking.

Respondents also see **cars parked by commuters** as the **lowest** priority for on-street car parking (6.78). Car-share companies were also given a low ranking of 5.45.

**Paying for on-street parking**

Who should have to pay the least

**Residents with no off-street parking** were seen as the group that should have to pay the least, with an average ranking of 6.28. 44% of respondents gave residents a priority 8 ranking.

**People with disabilities** also ranked low, with an average of 5.97.

St Kilda Road respondents were less likely than others to believe residents should pay the least for parking, with 36% of respondents giving residents a priority 8 ranking.

Who should have to pay the most

**Cars parked by commuters** were ranked as those who should pay the most for on-street parking with a ranking of 6.21.

Respondents felt strongly that commuters should be using public transport rather than adding more cars to the streets and roads in City of Port Phillip. 50% of priority 1 votes went to this group.

Many commented that commuters are often not from the municipality and should not have access to on-street parking at the disadvantage of locals.

People also think **car-share companies** (5.97) should have to pay more for on-street bays. Respondents explained that this is because they are a commercial company earning a profit from providing this service. Some commented that these cars are parked for long periods of time and should have to pay the most for occupying space that could otherwise be used by residents.

**Residential parking permits**

The survey asked respondents about the number of parking permits each household can have, and whether or not houses that have off-street parking should be allowed to have parking permits.

|  |
| --- |
| **Key findings** |
| * Most respondents think residences with off-street parking should be able to have parking permits, but less than those who don’t have off-street parking. |
| * A slight majority of people think the number of permits per household should not change. |

**Should property owners with off-street car parking have access to on-street parking permits (residential and visitor)?**

The survey asked respondents to select one of the following three options:

1. Yes
2. Yes, but less permits than residences with no off-street parking (i.e. less than 3)
3. No

82% of respondents selected one of the ‘Yes’ options and think houses that have off-street parking should be able to get a parking permit.

Overall, just over half of respondents think houses that have off-street parking should be able to get a parking permit but should have less permits than houses with no off-street parking.

**Should there be a reduction in the number of on-street parking permits a house can have?**

Currently, a house can have a combination of up to three residential and visitor permits. The survey asked if this number should be reduced.

The community was divided on this issue. 51% of respondents don’t think there should be a reduction in permit numbers and 49% do.

* St Kilda West respondents (73%) were more likely than others to oppose a reduction in permits, as were those who own or operate a business in the City of Port Phillip (64%).
* Reduction in permits was supported by all St Kilda Road respondents, 75% of visitors and 67% of respondents aged 70 years and above.

### Public transport use, preferences and views about bus improvements

This section asked people about their public transport use and some of the specific improvements Council could support.

|  |
| --- |
| **Key findings** |
| * Nearly all respondents catch public transport, and around half use it daily. |
| * Trams are the most frequently used mode of public transport. |
| * Most respondents don’t ever use buses, but a majority would be interested in catching buses if a high-frequency service was introduced. |
| * 10 minutes is the longest respondents are willing to walk for a high-frequency bus. |

#### Public transport use

Public transport use in the City of Port Phillip is strong.

* 92% of respondents do catch public transport and 44% of respondents catch public transport every day or most days.
* 70% of respondents catch trams most regularly.

Balaclava residents are least likely to catch the tram, where 71% of respondents catch the train.

Elwood and Port Melbourne respondents are the strongest bus users, with 16% of respondents from these suburbs selecting this option.

#### Bus use

The survey asked specifically about bus use. Most respondents said they don’t catch buses at all (58%).

* St Kilda West respondents (87%) are less likely to catch buses.
* Those who live in Elwood are more likely to catch buses (62%).
* 60% of 18-34 year olds do not catch buses, the lowest of any age group.

Council asked respondents to give us three main reasons why they don’t catch buses. The main themes were:

* **Other modes of transport preferred**

Most respondents are satisfied with the convenience and access of their main mode of transport. Comments included:

*“Good access to trams and trains”*

*“Tram is easier and better and more predictable”*

*“Trams take me to the destinations I need”*

* **Bus routes aren’t unsuitable or are inconvenient**

Many respondents felt bus routes do not meet their needs in providing a direct and convenient route to their usual destinations. Comments included:

*“Inconvenient destinations”*

*“There are no buses (as far as I am aware) that conveniently go to where I want go”*

*“Do not go in the desired direction”*

* **Proximity to home or work**

In addition to perception that bus routes are inconvenient, respondents identified that other modes of transport were closer to their home or work. Comments included:

*“Tram transport system is easy to access to/from residence”*

*“There are no buses near my house”*

*“Stops not convenient”*

* **Lack of awareness of services**

There appeared to be a lack of awareness of the bus services in the area and that respondents find it confusing to understand where a bus will take them. Some respondents commented that they don’t know when or where buses stop and travel to. Comments included:

*“It’s not easy to work out where the buses go and where the stops are”*

*“No idea where buses go to where to get them from”*

*“It's difficult to determine where buses go and don't go”*

* **Perceived issues with comfort, safety and reliability**

A number of comments related to the service provided by buses compared with other modes of transport. Some people indicated they don’t feel as safe on buses or that buses aren’t comfortable to travel on.

Respondents also raised service reliability as an issue some attributed this to the fact buses need to share congested roads with other traffic, unlike other public transport modes.

Comments included:

*“Timetable not reliable”*

*“Do not like them too much, do not feel too comfortable, too much movement”*

*“Buses are just as impacted by congestion as cars”*

*“I did not like using them when my children were in a pram so have not used them since”*

#### Views about possible bus improvements

Council asked people about what kind of bus service improvements they would be interested in. Three options were given:

* A high frequency bus service (every 5-10 minutes) but a further walk from home
* Same bus service as now but a closer walk from home
* I’m not interested in catching buses.

58% (271) of respondents are interested in bus improvements. Of these 271 people, most (69%) would prefer a high frequency bus service that is further from home.

* Middle Park and Port Melbourne respondents (46%) are most interested in the high frequency option.
* 55% of 18-34 year olds, the lowest bus users of any age group, are interested in this high frequency option.

Respondents were asked how long they would be willing to walk for a high frequency bus service. They could select five, 10, 15, 20 or over 20 minutes.

The majority of respondents (52%) nominated 10 minutes. Around a third of respondents have a preference for a five-minute walk, and no one would be willing to walk more than 20 minutes for the service.

### Have we missed anything?

As a part of the online engagement process on **haveyoursay.portphillip.vic.gov.au**, Council asked a question on the Brainstormer tool (a comment board): *Have we missed anything?*

Twelve responses were received and analysed.

Responses mostly related to suggested improvements and investments in transport options, providing infrastructure that focuses on safety and speed limits in certain areas of the municipality.

**Cycling and alternative transport**

Improvements to and general support for a focus on cycling, including suggestions to local roads which promote cycling and thus cycling as a commuting option. Alternative transport ideas such as better facilities to accommodate motorcycles were also received.

**Trams and trains**

General improvements to services through increasing frequency of trams and trains during high demand, as well as efficiency measures such as traffic signaling that assists to clear traffic. Suggestions for future needs for trams and trains and potential connections to other existing services were mentioned.

**Pedestrians and safety**

A number of responses highlight that pedestrian safety is important, including new infrastructure such as pedestrian bridges will help to reduce dangerous crossings.

**High density and car parking provisions**

High density developments and the provision of off-street car parking as a mandatory component of future developments was raised.

## Appendix – survey questions

**Question 1: Thinking of your local streets, please rank the following uses of street space in order of priority (with 1 being the highest priority)?**

**Question 2: Thinking of your key destinations and main streets, please rank the following uses of street space in order of priority (with 1 being the highest priority)?**

**Question 8: Should there be a reduction in the number of on-street parking permits per residence (currently a single residence can have a combination of up to 3 residential/visitor permits)?**

**Question 9: Do you catch public transport?**

**Question 11: How often do you catch public transport?**

**Question 12 (a): Do you catch buses?**