

City of Hobsons Bay: social needs, gaps in transit

Dr James Reynolds


2024-11-04

This note is part of a series examining transit social needs-gaps in Greater Melbourne¹. In Victoria, public transport is the responsibility of state government, although Local Government Authorities (LGAs) may have some influence through planning processes and advocacy. However, it is unclear how much transit is supplied or how well social needs for transport are met for each LGA. This note explores social needs for transport, and transit provision in 2021 and 2023, in the City of Hobson Bay using the Currie and Sendbergs (2007) methodology².

METHODS:

Scores for transit supply and transport needs were calculated based on the Victorian GTFS feed³ and Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) data using the *gtfssupplyindex* R package⁴ as per Reynolds, Currie and Qu (in drafting)⁵. Results are shown for the ABS' Statistical Area 1s (SA1s), categorized based on averages across the Melbourne Greater Capital City Statistical Area (GCCSA).

RESULTS: Social needs for transport Figure 1 compares social needs for LGAs similarly located in the middle suburbs⁶ and the outer parts of Greater Melbourne, beyond the inner and middle suburbs, with those for the City of Hobsons Bay.



Needs were higher than the Melbourne average for 58.5% of the City of Hobsons Bay's population, and appear similar to other middle LGAs and the outer parts of Melbourne⁷.

Figure 2 shows the distribution of transit service in 2021 and 2023. Transit service levels were below the Melbourne average for 72.9%

¹ See <https://tinyurl.com/4rctaxfc>



² Graham Currie and Zed Senbergs, "Identifying Spatial Gaps in Public Transport Provision for Socially Disadvantaged Australians: The Melbourne 'Needs Gap' Study," 2007; Graham Currie, "Quantifying Spatial Gaps in Public Transport Supply Based on Social Needs," *Journal of Transport Geography* 18, no. 1 (2010): 31-41.

³ Results are based on GTFS feeds for August 2021 and 2023, so may not match services run.

⁴ See <https://github.com/James-Reynolds/gtfssupplyindex>

⁵ James Reynolds, Graham Currie, and Yanda Qu, "Social Needs for Transport and Gaps in Transit Service: New GTFS Tools," *In Drafting*, 2024.

⁶ LGAs: Brimbank, Maribyrnong, Moonee Valley, Merri-Bek, Darebin, Boroondara, Stonnington, Glen Eira and Bayside.

⁷ Differences between Hobsons Bay and either group were not statistically significant ($\chi^2(5) = 5.06$, $p = .409$)($\chi^2(5) = 4.19$, $p = .523$).




Figure 2: Transport Supply 2021 (left, by population) and 2023 (right, by SA1)

of City of Hobsons Bay residents in 2021, which is more than for the other middle suburb LGAs (53.7%)⁸, but less than for outer parts of Melbourne (90.6%)⁹. Distribution of transit supply, categorised with respect to Melbourne's average, appears similar in 2023 (Figure 2, right). Figure 3 directly compares 2021 and 2023 service levels.

⁸ Differences were statistically significant ($\chi^2(6) = 62.10, p < .001$).

⁹ Differences were statistically significant ($\chi^2(6) = 122.84, p < .001$).




Figure 3: Transit service change 2021 to 2023. SA1s with needs above, but supply below, average highlighted in black.

Transit levels increased by 1% or more by 2023 in SA1s that were home to 41.0% of City of Hobsons Bay residents in 2021, which is a higher proportion than for those in the similar middle suburb LGAs (28.1%)¹⁰ or the or more outer parts of Greater Melbourne (35.9%)¹¹. 42.0% of the City of Hobsons Bay population lived in SA1s with *needs above, but supply below* the Melbourne averages in 2021¹². However, for 38.1% of this cohort service levels increased 1% or more, a higher proportion than for the similar cohorts in the rest of the middle suburban LGAs (13.1%)¹³ or (24.8%)¹⁴.

Overall, City of Hobsons Bay residents appear more likely than similarly located, middle suburban, LGAs to have had transit service levels lower than the Melbourne average, but also more likely to have seen transit increase by 2023.

¹⁰ Differences were statistically significant ($\chi^2(9) = 220.01, p < .001$).

¹¹ Differences were statistically significant ($\chi^2(9) = 98.18, p < .001$).

¹² Shown with black in Figure 3. This compares to 31.3% of residents in the rest of the middle suburban LGAs and 50.0% of those in more outer parts of Melbourne.

¹³ Differences were statistically significant (Fisher test $p = 5e-04$).

¹⁴ Differences with the outer parts of Greater Melbourne were also statistically significant (Fisher test $p = 5e-04$).