

is the writer's responsibility to draw attention to what is necessary to carry out this scheme properly and effectively.

If the work which has been done in drawing up the scheme is not to be wasted there must be effective enforcement, adequate finance and continuity of research and planning.

It is most desirable that the enforcement and interpretation of the provisions of the planning scheme should be uniform throughout the whole metropolitan area, and that the problems which will inevitably arise should be viewed from a metropolitan rather than a local standpoint.

The means by which the scheme should be financed is a matter of great importance which should have the careful consideration of the Government before the scheme is adopted. Some public body must have the authority and the means to pay such equitable compensation as is required to be paid to any person interested in land which is injuriously affected by the scheme. As the law now stands, this responsibility will fall on the individual councils, which for purposes of the enforcement of the planning scheme are the responsible authorities. Few, if any, of the existing municipal councils would be able to carry this financial burden, and it would not be equitable for them to have to do so in such cases as reservations for roads and major parklands which are for the benefit of the city as a whole and not only for that of the particular municipality in which they may be located. This is a planning scheme for the whole metropolitan area and the cost should be distributed equitably among all who benefit from it.

The question of benefit, however, extends even beyond metropolitan boundaries. As the capital city of Victoria, Melbourne serves the whole State and anything which makes Melbourne more efficient and able to perform its functions more effectively will be of benefit to all the people of Victoria. It would seem equitable therefore that some of the cost should come from State funds.

If the scheme is to be implemented effectively and if the cost is to be distributed in relation to the benefit received, then legislation is necessary to provide that the cost should be shared by the general body of taxpayers, by the people of the metropolitan area, by the users of road transport for whose benefit substantial reservations are provided, and by the public authorities on whose behalf land has been reserved.

Planning is not static and the planning scheme will have to be amended from time to time as circumstances and conditions change. If it is to be developed and amended to best serve the community at all times, there must be constant research and analysis of the metropolitan area and its activities, on the lines of the surveys which formed the basis of the planning scheme, so that the changes which continually occur in a growing city can be determined and correctly interpreted. One of the great benefits of planning is the assistance and advice which a planning authority can give to government, semi-government and civic authorities,

and to private enterprise. Just how valuable this assistance and advice can be has already been proved many times since work began on the planning scheme three years ago. Public authorities and private firms have availed themselves on numerous occasions of the vast amount of vital information obtained from the detailed surveys of the metropolis. If this worthwhile assistance is to be continued, then the valuable information already obtained must be kept up-to-date, and this can be done only on a metropolitan basis.

Finally, before the proper effect can be given to the intentions underlying the provisions of the planning scheme relating to such things as District Business Centres, the Civic Centre, and the Re-development Zones associated with road widenings and road deviations, detailed planning will be necessary. As these are essential metropolitan problems this planning should be the responsibility of a metropolitan authority.

Thus it will be seen that a metropolitan planning authority is essential if this planning scheme is to be carried out effectively, and if it is not to become merely a paper dream or nullified by piecemeal and unco-ordinated effort. To attempt to implement the scheme in any other way would be only a token attack on the problems confronting Melbourne and could be disastrous for our city and its citizens.

CONCLUSION

Prominent people in all walks of life have frequently stated that Australia is on the threshold of an era of great development. Great though the country's strides have been in the past, huge power and irrigation undertakings and big industrial projects, coupled with notable scientific advances, are sufficient to indicate that Australia in the future will far outstrip what it has achieved so far. And, hand in hand with this vast national expansion and progress, Melbourne will continue to grow and to develop. Thus it is imperative that this city should no longer be without a plan to guide its growth, for if nothing is done to check and correct Melbourne's deficiencies they will grow as the city grows, and will become even worse and more complex than they are today. The city will become less and less efficient, and will become more costly to administer, to live in, to work in, and to conduct business in.

This planning scheme now submitted to the Board and to the people of Melbourne is, we confidently believe, the means of ensuring a finer city by guiding and regulating its growth in the best interests of the community as a whole and with equity to all sections. Throughout its preparation one guiding principle was always to the forefront — it must be practical. All those associated with the scheme realised that although ideals were desirable they often exceeded what was physically or financially possible, and must be modified where necessary to fit Melbourne's present development and its ability to pay for them.

The plan has involved three years of painstaking and careful study of Melbourne and its people. Almost every phase of city and community life was thoroughly examined and analysed to ascertain Melbourne's present and future needs, and to determine the most suitable course for sound and progressive development. As town planning concerns mainly people, a vast amount of information was obtained by inquiry from and consultation with the citizens of Melbourne themselves, to ascertain their desires and ambitions, their habits and needs so that this scheme would take into account the community's viewpoint. The result is a sound, workable blueprint for a better city of the future. At the same time, the things which this scheme provides for cannot be easily and quickly achieved without endeavour or even without sacrifice. But like most hard-earned achievements they will repay many-fold the cost and effort of attaining them. Their worth will not be measureable merely in terms of money, but also in better health, increased happiness and contentment, greater civic pride and the general well-being of the people.

Some people might claim that Melbourne cannot afford to plan. To such people there is but one reply: "Can Melbourne afford not to plan?" Can Melbourne longer afford

to be inefficient, with its traffic congestion and bottlenecks, its transport difficulties, its costly sprawl, its lack of schools, its ill-planned and often wrongly-situated shopping centres, its lack of balance between residential and industrial areas, and other defects that together make Melbourne costly to operate and often difficult to live in? While it is not presumed that this plan will remedy all these defects, at least it will alleviate many of them, and, more important, it will ensure that the same mistakes will not be repeated in future development of the metropolitan area. These are the real purposes of this scheme.

To the many people of Melbourne who appreciate the need and value of planning, the scheme is a redoubtable challenge. It is the means of achieving a better city for ourselves and for our children, but we cannot afford to delay. Melbourne has missed previous opportunities to plan, taking instead the easier path of neglect and complacency. If the citizens of today reject this challenge and let pass this new opportunity, they will make the solution of the problems of Melbourne more difficult and more costly and will impose an unnecessary and unjustified burden on future generations.