

**Submission
No 13**

**A FRAMEWORK FOR PERFORMANCE REPORTING AND DRIVING
WELLBEING OUTCOMES IN NSW**

Organisation: WalkSydney

Date Received: 26 July 2024



Daniel Mookhey and Courtenay Moussos
Treasurer and Minister for Finance
NSW Government
Macquarie Street,
Sydney 2000

Via: [REDACTED]

WalkSydney Incorporated
www.walksydney.org
Level 4, 68 Wentworth Ave,
Sydney 2000

25 July 2024

Wellbeing Framework, WALKSYDNEY SUBMISSION

WalkSydney is the peak body advocating for walking in the Greater Sydney Region. We are working to make it easier, safer and more pleasant to walk in Sydney. With a growing population we need to ensure people can easily walk to public transport, local shops and services, and shared transport options.

WalkSydney's vision is for walking to be the first choice for short trips around Sydney.

WalkSydney has three key asks:

- ❖ *30 km/hr urban default speed*
- ❖ *streets that are safe and easy to cross*
- ❖ *pedestrian priority over cars*

*WalkSydney is a member of the **Better Streets** coalition, an collection of hundreds of community organisations advocating for better streets in Australia*

WalkSydney welcomes the opportunity to provide input to the proposed NSW Performance and Wellbeing Framework. The introduction of the framework is welcomed as an overarching means of guiding decision making. We recommend the framework is pared down to key wellbeing metrics, and 'Connected' is aligned to SDG 11.2 and relevant NUP metrics, focusing on reducing the need to travel through local provision of services, and achieving equitable and sustainable travel when required.



1. Less themes, more focus on sustainability and equity.

Generally, there are too many themes (and thus indicators). Themes appear single agency (thus road safety is not in Secure, but Connected). A ‘mission-driven’ government, like Keir Starmer’s, would help distill the government’s goal. For example, an overarching multi-agency mission like a “Child-Friendly City” touches on road safety, public and active transport, school attendance and mental health. The UK Labour publication [Getting Britain Moving](#), shows clarity of mission, people-centred goals, leading to the [Children's Wellbeing Bill](#) focusing more clearly on school attendance, private school inspection standards and *better place planning around schools*.

Aligning to the Sustainable Development Goals and National Urban Policy would also help. Relevant to your indicators, we have suggested alignment could be better achieved under the NUP by adopting the same aims as the SDG goals, and similar metrics - see the **Appendix**.

2. Align Indicators to International and National Frameworks

The WHO publication “[Achieving Wellbeing](#)” warns against focusing in traditional metrics like GDP growth, and instead on disparities of distribution / inequities. In many ways the framework is aligned - for example in measuring mental health and children's development. However, metrics like *journey time reliability* are meaningless or even harmful to wellbeing.

In this vein, as with the SDGs and *Getting Britain Moving*, a people-focused wellbeing approach would replace the vague themes like ‘Connected’ with active and SMART statements like ‘Connect residents to centres using affordable, sustainable transport modes’

3. Use this to make decisions, and iterate on this first version

While the framework will be used to track performance over time as a lag indicator (using the indicators proposed) it must also be adapted into criteria that can be used as lead indicators for government investment. For example all transport projects should be asked to demonstrate **how** they will increase public and active transport mode share. If they show they will induce traffic demand or reduce sustainable mode share, they should not be approved by cabinet. A retrospective audit of recent decisions, like Elizabeth Drive, should also be undertaken, as these appear to us to be poorly aligned to the framework.

We recognise that any new framework will not be perfect at the first go. Wellbeing itself is also by its nature community-focused. Make this a model for building the trust you seek through multi-step consultation. Publish a “what we heard”, refine, and re-consult as you go.



4. If not, focus on public and active transport share, distribution and priority

However, recognising that you may not be looking at an extended process or rewrite, the following comments are specifically focused on the current theme of “Connected” which covers our general remit of transport, walkable planning and safety.

The theme of Connected could be better defined as sustainable access to everyday needs (rather than just government services). People's core daily needs are access to **education, work, open space and fresh food**. These can be achieved sustainably online, through walking and cycling access for short trips, and public transport for longer trips.

11 indicators are proposed for Connected. Of these:

1. **Road fatalities and serious injuries should be measured by reference to inequality** - see Transport for London's “Inequalities in Road Danger 2017-2021” report, and their live Road Danger Inequalities Dashboard for example. They should also separate out vulnerable road users from other victims of collisions, and data should be collected on victim age. This would replace the proposed two indicators (fatalities, all users; serious injury, all users) with three (**FSI by SEIFA band, FSI by victim mode, FSI by age**), with ‘direction’ being to flatten the SEIFA gradient or lowest two bands, reduce walk/cycle casualties as a proportion of all trips, and reduce FSI of under 18 and over 55.
2. **Service reliability of public transport is inadequate** as a measure (and the current metrics are too forgiving of what counts as ‘on time’). Availability (both frequency and reliability) is a better measure, and is already measured in NSW through PTAL (which can also be improved upon).
3. **Public and active transport mode share is welcomed** as a measure. This is key for achieving net zero as well as giving those who cannot drive like the young and old access to services.
4. Proportion of housing with 30 minute access to metropolitan centres is a good metric but could be complemented by local (10 minute) active transport **access to a local centres**, to target the bulk of trips, or segmented as proposed in the NUP to recognise modes and level of service (ie walk, or segregated cycle, or frequent public transport).
5. **Journey time reliability by road is a poor metric** for measuring wellbeing and should be removed. Not only does it favour only one mode, but it leads to enormous investment to solve for the forecast “peak of peaks”, costing NSW billions more than other countries who are addressing motonormativity. We suggest this is deleted altogether, or replaced with “journey time comparison, peak period” by public or



active transport vs car (which, at least, would recognise that ‘reliability’ projects for cars often make comparable PT trips less attractive.

6. **Passenger satisfaction (4 metrics) are unreliable subjective measures**, a high weighting compared to the other themes. NSW already measures overall subjective well-being.

Consider whether scores in subjective categories will actually lead to more equitable or distributed outcomes - particularly “*satisfaction - roads*”, or whether they will lead to spurious additional billions spent on asphalt, re-grading and so on, to increase ‘connected’ scores, but with no actual change in equity or wellbeing (or connectivity).

7. **Trust and access to government services are not well suited to this category** and could be replaced with a more meaningful measure of local access to services such as **proportion of homes within walking access of a local centre, or fresh food (supermarket/grocery), or walkable access to primary education.**

We look forward to seeing the revised framework and subsequent rounds of consultation.

Tegan Mitchell
Board Member

Marc Lane
President

Appendix - WalkSydney Submission on the National Urban Policy (extract) - Goals and Targets

Deliver safe and affordable housing for all [SDG 11.1]

Policy Statement: To create equitable urban areas where everyone feels safe and secure, access to housing, infrastructure, education and jobs is essential. Zone sufficient diverse, well-located housing. Require walkable access to social services and transport for new homes, Increase social housing supply, mandate a minimum percentage of housing that is affordable, and invest in transport and social infrastructure, densification and infill development.

NUP Dashboard 1

Indicator	Key Metric	Target
1.1 Housing Availability	Current approved housing* and housing under construction, state-wide as a ratio of population change	>1:1
1.2 Housing Affordability	Ratio of ISRAD 1 - 3 adults, to current affordable (30:40) housing under construction or available in the state	<1:1
1.3 Homelessness and overcrowding	Number of homeless people on census day. Ratio of number of people to number of bedrooms, in each SAL.	Zero, <3:1
1.4 Access to social services and transport	Percentage of people within (total of): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 800m of a train or metro station, or - 400m of a bus or light rail stop, with a frequency of 4 or more services an hour (7a - 10p, 7d), or - 5km of a centre, along a segregated cycle path for 90% of the journey, or - 800m of a centre, otherwise. 	>90%
1.5 Urban Development Pattern	Significant Urban Area (ABS), and urban density within the SUA.	No change, >10 per sqkm

**This is a better measure than monthly approvals as this recognises there may be an industry bottleneck if there are historic approved, valid but abandoned approvals.*

Required Actions for State and Local Government

—Develop housing targets that align to projected growth (adjusted for undersupply) to 2030.

- Develop a shared data platform that tracks housing and infrastructure supply and demand across all states and territories, by 2026.
- Each state is to zone a minimum of [20%] of cities as additional medium density or higher, and ensure these are close to frequent transport, parks, schools and jobs, by 2025.
- Set a minimum number of social and affordable (30:40) houses to be delivered each year
- Each state to set urban growth boundaries around each metropolitan and regional city, and tests for expansion of regional towns, by 2025.

Deliver affordable and sustainable transport systems [SDG 11.2]

Policy statement: Support urban areas to improve sustainability and achieve net zero emissions by 2050 in transport systems by locating new housing around stations and transit corridors, or within a walk or cycle distance of centres. This will include ensuring strategic planning, land use and infrastructure frameworks are co-ordinated around transport nodes, new transport is delivered in ‘transit deserts’ and new local centres within walk and cycle distance of all existing houses

NUP Dashboard 2

Indicator	Key Metric	Target
2.1 New Housing around Sustainable Transport	Percentage of new housing* within (total of): - 800m of a train or metro station, or - 400m of a bus or light rail stop, with a frequency of 4 or more services an hour (7a - 10p, 7d), or - 5km of a centre, along a segregated cycle path for 90% of the journey, or - 800m of a centre, otherwise.	100%
2.2 Total sustainable transport	Percentage of all non-freight trips made by non-car modes	On track to reach 64% by 2030**

* This is aligned to Target 1.4, the lag indicator for the total population

** This would highlight the need for rapid and meaningful action, year-on-year.

Required Actions for State and Local Government

- Reform urban planning and zoning rules to support emissions reduction outcomes, including prioritising mixed-use neighbourhoods that are close to amenities and employment and encouraging lower emissions active travel, such as walking and cycling
- Support the development of a national approach to developing urban areas which addresses current and projected climate risks and prioritises preparation and mitigation over rebuilding.