

**SHOPPING CENTRES — PAID PARKING**

*Motion*

**MR P.C. TINLEY (Willagee)** [4.02 pm]: I move —

That this house —

- (1) calls on the Barnett government to rule out paid parking at metropolitan shopping centres and major retail centres; and
- (2) condemns the government for cost-of-living increases for Western Australian families, of which paid parking would be another impost.

My personal view is that this debate would ordinarily not need to have occurred, because it is based on a discussion paper released by government. Governments release discussion papers all the time, as do oppositions. As we will see going toward the next election, the number of discussion papers will subsequently —

**Dr A.D. Buti:** High quality.

**Mr P.C. TINLEY:** — be of extreme quality, particularly from the member for Armadale.

**Ms L.L. Baker** interjected.

**Mr P.C. TINLEY:** As will be the erudite contribution made by the member for Maylands!

Ordinarily the issue would have been dismissed, but the particular area of concern that causes some public interest in the matter was that this discussion paper, which was put together by the Department of Planning, discusses the development of a state planning policy addressing activity centres, and parking in particular. I quote from the paper —

Whilst the focus of this document is on major centres, the policy positions described can also be applied to smaller centres where appropriate.

That concerned a lot of people, and stakeholder and constituent groups went to a lot of members, really concerned that it would result in a similar situation to that which exists with retail trading hours, whereby one side of the street has an advantage with the trading hours and the other side of the street has a disadvantage because it does not have the same opportunity. We needed clarification about the potential situation in which one shopping centre would be required to have paid parking and another further down the road would not be required to have paid parking, hence the dilemma, and probably the necessity for the discussion paper and the statewide policy. The minister was quick to respond to it, noting the particular concerns that were raised in relation to the Murdoch activity centre, which principally comprises Fiona Stanley Hospital and Murdoch University, amongst other institutions. The parking policy that was to be applied there was of concern. That is slightly separate to what is being contended here, but the minister said —

“The State Government is not considering the mandated introduction of paid parking across the metropolitan area.

“The introduction of paid parking is, and will remain, the responsibility of local government in consultation with landowners.”

We would think that that would be the end of the matter; it is a discussion paper, no problems, let us move on with other substantive matters for the Parliament to deal with. But we started to delve into it and to ask: There was a discussion paper. Where did the discussion paper come from? Where is it going? What is the authorship and what is the direction for it? It is of particular concern, because when we reach back into the some of the history of paid parking since this government has come to power, we find a worrying pattern—a concern that actually belies the denial of the minister. To find a source of particular concern, we can start right back in May 2009. In the 2009–10 budget this government increased the parking levy by more than 200 per cent, creating a surplus in the parking fund for the City of Perth of approximately \$55 million. A further litany of evidence seems to be leaking out under the much maligned democratic process—it was maligned by the Premier today in question time—of freedom of information. These FOI documents are from the Department of Treasury and they discuss congestion taxes and those sorts of things. The important point to note is that this government is particularly wedded to the idea of opportunities to raise revenue other than from resources. It knows that it is bleeding money into royalties for regions. It knows it will lose money on forward projects such as the stadium and the waterfront. It knows those big projects bleed because it had the experience on the opposition side of the chamber of watching the former Labor government. From a Treasury point of view, the expansion of the Perth parking levy to include the whole metropolitan area, particularly major centres, would appear to be an equitable and reliable funding solution. The Department of Treasury is particularly keen on it and the minister’s own

Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Rita Saffioti; Acting Speaker; Mr Joe Francis; Mr John Day; Mr Bill Johnston; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Fran Logan; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Paul Miles

---

Department of Planning is active in the space. In fact, it is so active it has a senior bureaucrat who is solely dedicated to parking policy and who produced the paper. I will refrain from naming him, because it is not appropriate. The other point to make is that we are not talking about fees; we are not talking about a cost recovery; and as far as Treasury is concerned we are not simply talking about what it costs to provide the parking bay. This email from the Department of Treasury states —

Please consider that Perth Parking is a tax and not a fee enabling the fee revenue to exceed cost.

Therefore, as far as the Department of Treasury is concerned, this is a revenue-raising activity. This government needs to ensure that it is very clear about how much it will charge for paid parking and be very clear that it is a tax and not a fee.

Further on, in March 2010, the draft Murdoch activity centre plan was released. For those members who are unfamiliar with the Murdoch activity centre, it will be bounded by the new Fiona Stanley Hospital, Murdoch University and the expanded Challenger Institute of Technology. A main street and mixed-use precinct will be developed, St John of God Hospital will be expanded to 600-odd beds and, of course, there will be residential development in and around Murdoch on a 25-hectare site to the south of the university. According to the City of Melville's economic forecast, which is an independently verified economic forecast—I seek the minister's clarification, but I think forecasts have been verified by his department—it is believed that at its peak, there will be 37 000 jobs in and around the Murdoch activity centre, making it the second-largest employer of people outside the CBD. By 2031, in the order of 60 000 vehicles will be moving along the South Street boundary of the centre. It will be a significant place of employment, and a significant place of business and activity. A draft Murdoch activity centre access and parking policy has now been finalised. All this drove us towards the idea that this government has actually released for comment state planning policy 4.2, which states —

- require application of a regulatory and parking fee system that supports the efficient supply and use of parking and alternatives to private car use.

It will be enshrined in government policy unless the minister disavows that particular point. Paid parking will be a legitimate tool or lever used by this government over the people of Western Australia around particular activity centres.

Further on, in June of last year, the “Capital City Planning Framework” was released for public comment. The section under “Parking” on page 46 notes in part —

As a basic guide in what is a complex issue it is suggested that regulation of key aspects of parking supply and pricing need to be applied over the entire Central Perth area.

Again, another government document is outlining the requirement for paid parking across the metropolitan area. Of course, this idea is not quarantined. The Departments of Treasury, Finance, Planning and of course Transport have been involved in this matter. In “Public Transport for Perth in 2031”, released for public comment in July, the following comment was made —

The Department of Planning and the Department of Transport have been working on an over arching parking policy framework to ensure some consistency is given to how these measures are applied and to define the role of the State Government.

Again, the Departments of Treasury, Planning and Transport were all involved in the discussion about the application of a universal parking policy. Of course, in October there was the government discussion paper I mentioned, and then the City of Melville council meeting on 15 November last year accepted the Murdoch activity centre interim access and parking policy, which the Western Australian Planning Commission has adopted and endorsed. It causes some concern to us that the people of Western Australia potentially have to endure the application of a tax over them that I am sure they do not deserve. Why do they not deserve it? If we end up identifying an activity centre such as the shops at Innaloo or Booragoon, as an example, why would the universal policy not be applied to parking there? Why would that not then lead to people taking their car out to other areas? Why do they need to take their car? It is because it is a bit much to expect them to get on a bus—as described by this idea—to go to those shopping centres to do the usual bits and pieces of their weekly shopping.

There are two questions that need to be raised. First, does the minister categorically rule out paid parking across the city? I am talking about the metropolitan area. My concern is that the evidence I have outlined from the various government departments involved suggests to me that paid parking is a fait accompli and that this is the situation we will be saddled with. When we come to government, we will have to deal with a situation that will be worse than the retail trading hours situation, as there will be a hotchpotch application of parking policy across the city.

Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Rita Saffioti; Acting Speaker; Mr Joe Francis; Mr John Day; Mr Bill Johnston; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Fran Logan; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Paul Miles

---

In June last year the senior person responsible for parking policy within the Department of Planning, who sits as an adviser on the World Parking Symposium, was in Canada at the world symposium on parking and presented this to the world as our parking policy. I ask the minister to tell us in his response—if he intends to respond—whether he endorses the preparation of a statement on planning policy to address access, parking supply and management, and on strategic and specialised activity centres identified in “State Planning Policy 4.2: Activity Centres for Perth and Peel”. Did the minister authorise the attendance of the senior public servant at the World Parking Symposium in June last year in Canada where he outlined in this document our policy of paid parking universally applied?

**MS R. SAFFIOTI (West Swan)** [4.15 pm]: I rise to speak to this motion. I want to go over some of the points that the member for Willagee outlined. As he outlined, this issue of paid parking across metropolitan areas has been in the government pipeline over the past two or three years. A number of documents that he outlined shows that this was not just something that was produced by one department overnight. This is something that has been well thought out and planned by a number of agencies over the past two or three years. I must say I was shocked two or three weeks ago when I was watching television and saw the Minister for Planning out there in the community defending this idea of paid parking at shopping centres and saying, “Well, if there’s public transport, the public can catch public transport to shopping centres. Therefore there should be paid parking as a disincentive to bringing your car.” At the time I thought: what a ridiculous statement! It is a ridiculous statement for a number of reasons. First of all, as we know, a lot of people who go to shopping centres have young kids and they buy a lot of groceries and a lot of bags of things. The idea that a young mum can get on a bus with young kids and go and get 10 bags of groceries is not something, I think, many young mums out there would support. Secondly, the public transport system is inadequate. This government has shown again and again its failure to deliver on public transport in the suburbs. Today we again saw the Minister for Transport with those large—I think he described them as—A2 or A1 graphs.

**Mr J.E. McGrath:** A1.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** A1? I can assure members that the people of Ballajura are seeing less and less reliability from their bus services. The people of Ellenbrook have seen this government break a core election commitment and not deliver a rail line to Ellenbrook.

**Mr F.A. Alban:** There’s a big chance coming up at the next election for you, member!

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** The member for Swan Hills has more front than Myers! Has he apologised to the people of Ellenbrook yet for breaking a core election commitment? Has the member apologised to the people of Ellenbrook? Did he ever even lobby? Did he even go to the Premier and say anything? The member did not even confirm there was an election commitment. Honestly! He spent three and a half years running away from this election commitment.

**Mr F.A. Alban** interjected.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** I have been speaking to Ellenbrook people over the past few months, member for Swan Hills, and I tell him what—they do not like him very much. I have been surprised frankly about some of the responses I have received. I have been shocked —

**Mr F.A. Alban** interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr A.P. O’Gorman):** Member for Swan Hills, the member for West Swan is trying to make a speech. It is pretty difficult when you are continually interjecting on her. Can I urge you to desist? I call you to order for the first time.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** As I said, I was shocked to hear the minister on TV defending the concept of paid parking at shopping centres, saying people can catch public transport.

**Mr J.H.D. Day:** I think you are verballing me actually. I made it very clear what is happening.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** I saw the Minister for Planning. I was shocked. I was very shocked. I talked to the shadow Minister for Transport and the shadow Minister for Planning about it. We were all shocked to hear what he said. As we said, this debate has a long history. As the member for Willagee said, in 2009–10 we saw a significant increase in the Perth parking levy—a 200 per cent increase. I think that levy collected a credit surplus of \$55 million. We have seen recently the Minister for Transport spend that money. Some was spent on a CAT bus and other funds were spent on other items that are not usually spent from that Perth parking fund—things such as road improvements. I understood that road improvements used to be funded from the Main Roads budget. But that does not seem to be occurring now. The government has had to increase the Perth parking fund to fund items that are usually funded in the normal course through the Main Roads budget.

Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Rita Saffioti; Acting Speaker; Mr Joe Francis; Mr John Day; Mr Bill Johnston; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Fran Logan; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Paul Miles

---

We saw the Murdoch activity centre access and parking policy. In June 2011 we saw in the capital city planning framework—a document released for public comment—that the regulation of parking supply and pricing is regarded as an effective means of managing travel patterns. As we heard in June 2011, there was a presentation on behalf of the Department of Planning to the World Parking Symposium titled “Towards a Metropolitan Parking Framework that supports Major Activities Centres in the Perth and Peel Region”. I was not aware it was in Canada; it is amazing that the Department of Planning funded someone to go to Canada.

Then in July 2011 we saw “Public Transport for Perth in 2031: Mapping out the Future for Perth’s Public Transport Network”, which stated things such as —

The Independent Panel makes the following recommendations for consideration in the short term funding plan:

...

2. Cash-in-lieu or parking levies in strategic centres with the net revenue dedicated to public transport to assist in reducing car travel and increasing public transport.

Then of course, last October we saw the discussion paper released to, as I understand it, selected key stakeholders, not the general public. Of course, part of that document states again that paid parking needs to be facilitated across the metropolitan area.

As I said, this is a tax-and-spend government. It cannot help but raid families with new parking levies and increased fees. We have seen significant increases in electricity, water and gas prices. As we have said time and time again, electricity is up 57 per cent and gas is up around 57 per cent.

**Mr J.H.D. Day:** And under you there would have been a zero increase in electricity prices, would there? Is that what you’re saying?

Several members interjected.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** No, we were honest with the people of Western Australia, minister.

**Mr J.H.D. Day** interjected.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** We were honest with the people of WA. The Liberal Party ran radio advertisements saying we were going to increase electricity charges—that is what the Liberal Party did.

**Mr W.J. Johnston:** Radio advertisements saying Labor was going to increase electricity charges.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** Labor was going to increase electricity charges, but the Liberal Party never told them what it was going to do.

**Mr J.H.D. Day:** We found out what it was like when we got in.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** We have seen significant increases in electricity, water and gas charges. We have seen significant increases in parking charges. We have seen the introduction of the landfill levy, which is another new charge—a new impost—on families. We have seen increases in fees across government services. We have seen money, such as the landfill levy funding taken away from agencies and used to fund some of the pet projects of this government such as the “Premier’s Palace”; it is wrong, and they are the wrong priorities. We have again seen, through this document and this process, the government busily working away behind the scenes developing the concept of paid parking across metropolitan centres. The key thing here is that it is facilitating local governments to impose these fees. Once the state government says, “These are the planning guidelines, this is the planning policy”, local government then has a guideline—a reference—to go about charging some of these fees. That is key. Today the minister has a chance to stand and rule out any new parking fees across the metropolitan area.

**Mr J.H.D. Day:** Anywhere in the metropolitan area?

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** Yes.

**Mr J.H.D. Day:** Anywhere?

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** Yes.

**Mr J.H.D. Day:** Including in relation to what local governments impose?

**Mr P. Abetz:** All car parks free—you’ve got to be joking!

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** So the member for Southern River believes there should be parking fees at car parks at shopping centres—at new hospitals?

Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Rita Saffioti; Acting Speaker; Mr Joe Francis; Mr John Day; Mr Bill Johnston; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Fran Logan; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Paul Miles

---

**Mr P. Abetz:** Not shopping centres, but you said the central business district. What about the convention centre? You don't want any fees for parking?

**Mrs L.M. Harvey:** So no fees at the airport?

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** Stand and tell me where the new fees are going to be.

**Mr F.M. Logan:** And how much!

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** And how much.

Several members interjected.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** No, come on; stand and tell me where the new fees are going to be and how much.

As I have said, we have continually seen this government imposing new fees and new charges on families. It is something that has been done in secret over the past number of years. It is only that this document came out in public that we are now able to debate it in this place.

If members opposite believe we should have more and more paid parking across the metropolitan area, fair enough; stand and tell me where. Tell me where there should be new fees and new paid parking for accessing things like shopping centres. If members believe in it, that is fine; stand and tell me which shopping centres should have paid parking. Personally, I would hate to see paid parking at shopping centres through Ballajura, Bennett Springs and Ellenbrook. As I said, public transport is not good enough, and families travelling to the shopping centres with young kids and having to carry loads of shopping away are not normally able to catch public transport; they prefer to use the car. If people want to stand and tell me where they believe new paid parking arrangements should be in places like shopping centres, fair enough; let them stand and tell me.

The member for Scarborough tried to interject on me before in relation to parking fees. Does the member for Scarborough support or oppose parking fees?

**Mrs L.M. Harvey:** I'm going to have something to say on this a little bit later, member for West Swan, thanks.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** Because I am reading from a media release from the member for Scarborough in relation to a City of Stirling proposal to introduce some paid parking. It states that —

**Mrs L.M. Harvey:** It is an imposition on working families in my electorate, member. I am surprised WA Labor is not out there, outraged at this impost on the workers in Herdsman Business Park.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** We are! We are outraged at the introduction of paid parking at strategic centres.

Several members interjected.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** The Liberal Party is defending paid parking at strategic centres! You guys were just defending paid parking at strategic centres, and now —

**Mr F.A. Alban:** You're telling the story!

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** Yes, we are.

**Mr P.C. Tinley:** Well, you're not! That's why we have to FOI everything! You're not telling anything!

**Mrs L.M. Harvey:** Is Herdsman Business Park an activity centre?

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** I want to quote the member for Scarborough. The media release states —

This is an unfair impost on local businesses and their employees and particularly damaging for local families ...

It's easy for the City of Stirling to say that people should catch public transport instead, but as a working mother, I know that it is not possible to pick up the kids from sports or swimming lessons or daycare in a bus!

So, selectively the government wants some paid parking, but in other situations, no paid parking. It depends on, again, whose electorate and where it is. As I said, if members opposite believe that there should be paid parking at strategic centres—fair enough; stand and let us know which ones. But as we have said —

**Mr P.C. Tinley:** What about the train station at Ellenbrook?

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** Oh, no; there is one!

**Mr F.A. Alban:** Why don't you tell us what you're going to do? It might be nice to hear your story!

Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Rita Saffioti; Acting Speaker; Mr Joe Francis; Mr John Day; Mr Bill Johnston; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Fran Logan; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Paul Miles

---

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** What is the member for Swan Hills going to do? The Liberal Party has been in government for three and a half years —

**Mr F.A. Alban:** It's your electorate now, member; you're going to have to speak up!

Several members interjected.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** How about the people of Aveley? Does the member for Swan Hills not worry about them?

**Mr F.A. Alban:** No more forums!

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** How about the people of Aveley? Does the member for Swan Hills not worry about them? Does the member worry about the people of Aveley? They are still in his new electorate.

**Mr F.A. Alban:** I have been out there 10 times more than you ever have, member —

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** Have they ever raised the rail line with the member?

**Mr F.A. Alban:** — maybe 100 times more than you have.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** Have they ever raised the rail line with the member?

*Point of Order*

**Mr J.M. FRANCIS:** I am actually honestly interested in the debate about the paid parking issue, and this is going nowhere.

**Mr P.C. Tinley:** Tell him to shut up! Give him one in the ribs!

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr A.P. O'Gorman):** Members, can I just remind you that it is unparliamentary to interject. Member for Jandakot, he is your colleague; I think you can restrain him; you are right beside him.

**Mr P.C. Tinley:** If you want a hand, I'll come over!

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Member for West Swan.

*Debate Resumed*

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** As I said, I do not want it to be the case that we have paid parking in our key local shopping centres. Families deserve to be able to shop, take their kids to the shopping centre and buy their groceries and their other goods, and not have to pay for parking. Basically, our public transport is not good enough. Despite the plans, the glossy documents and the big graphs this minister keeps producing, there is actually not much happening in the suburbs in respect of public transport. The member for Wanneroo finds that funny; he obviously believes that public transport in his suburb is excellent and believes that access to it for all his residents is fantastic—that is good, member for Wanneroo.

**Mr P.T. Miles** interjected.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** As I said, public transport in the suburbs is not up to scratch. Despite the glossy brochures and the big graphs, there have been very few new services throughout the suburbs. As I said, bus reliability in my suburb of Ballajura is actually decreasing. The Liberal Party has broken a core election promise by not building the Ellenbrook rail line, but it is going to build—what is it, a transit way? Member for Swan Hills, when is that transit way underway? Member for Swan Hills? Obviously he does not know when the transit way is underway either! The Liberal Party has broken a core promise. It is funny, I have been out to Ellenbrook and talked to a lot of people, and I heard the member for Swan Hills say that the rail line was never raised with him—is that right? Did nobody ever raise the issue of the rail line with the member for Swan Hills over the past three years?

**Mr F.A. Alban:** I was a candidate, member.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** Yes, but has anyone ever raised with the member the Ellenbrook rail line—the breaking of the election promise? Has anyone?

Several members interjected.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** What is the member doing for Ellenbrook?

Several members interjected.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** No, no—what is the Minister for Planning doing for Ellenbrook? The Minister for Planning has been here for three and a half years; what is he doing for Ellenbrook? What is he building?

**Mr J.H.D. Day:** A lot.

Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Rita Saffioti; Acting Speaker; Mr Joe Francis; Mr John Day; Mr Bill Johnston; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Fran Logan; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Paul Miles

---

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** What?

**Mr J.H.D. Day:** There is a very frequent bus service now.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** Is that it?

**Mr J.H.D. Day:** And, as you have said, there are plans for a transit way.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** When will that happen?

**Mr J.H.D. Day:** Is it Labor policy to commit to a train service for the people of Ellenbrook?

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** The minister has been in government for three and a half years. What is his government's policy? When will this transit way be built? It is fair enough if the minister wants to ask me questions, but I can ask him questions as well. He has been in government for three and a half year and he has his hands on the purse strings. The government broke a core election promise to build a rail line to Ellenbrook. It said that there was going to be a transit way. When will that transit way be built?

**Mr J.H.D. Day:** You should direct that question to the Minister for Transport.

**Mr W.J. Johnston:** Don't ask me the tough questions; I'm only a minister!

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** Yes. As I said, the idea of paid parking at shopping centres and major activity centres is just wrong. The government has been conducting this process in secret. It has finally come out.

**Mr J.H.D. Day:** What is your view about some paid parking in the Murdoch activity centre? Do you have a view on that?

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** Is that the government's proposal?

**Mr J.H.D. Day:** What is your view?

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** What is the government's policy?

**Mr P.C. Tinley:** You should ask the member for Bateman what he wants.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** I should ask the member for Jandakot or the member for Bateman; it is more relevant to them. Honestly! The minister is refusing to answer any questions and is throwing them to an opposition backbencher. He is the minister; he should tell us what the government is doing with paid parking in key activity centres such as Murdoch.

**MR J.M. FRANCIS (Jandakot) [4.31 pm]:** I have followed this debate fairly closely.

**Mr P.C. Tinley:** You couldn't have; he was talking in your ear the whole time!

**Mr J.M. FRANCIS:** I know what happened.

The issue of paid parking in Perth came to my attention through the Joint Standing Committee on Delegated Legislation when the government increased the parking levy for the City of Perth. The committee exercised its right to ask why the government did that and to investigate where the money that the government collects from the City of Perth parking levy goes. Without going into the details of the committee, it is obviously a fairly contentious issue. At the end of the day, what I learnt from this whole process is that all the money that the government collects from the City of Perth parking levy must be spent on transport solutions for the City of Perth. Whether that money is spent in the year it is collected or in the following year, or whenever, it must be spent on transport solutions. There is a bit of a philosophical argument about this. If people are charged to park their cars in the city, will that provide a disincentive for them to do so? If people are on the edge of deciding whether to catch a train or drive their car into the city, will increasing the parking levy tip them over into deciding to catch a train or will they just pay the levy to park their car and add to the congestion in the city? That is one way of looking at it. Another way of looking at it is that all the money raised from the parking levy has to be spent on transport infrastructure. CAT buses are big consumers of that budget, which is a positive thing. I would like to think that all members, including Labor members and members of the Greens (WA) in the other house, would support a policy of increasing bus services, cycleways or whatever. But the government must spend the money on that particular issue.

Interestingly, the previous government—I know the member for Riverton has the figures on this—increased the City of Perth parking levy 150 per cent in its first year alone. No-one comes to this particular debate on the City of Perth issue as a Trappist monk. It is a little hypocritical for Labor members to criticise the government for increasing the fee. When they were in government, they also increased the fee. Besides all that, it is a glass-half-full argument to say that it may push some people who are on the edge of deciding whether to catch the train or bus to work or whether to drive to work into catching public transport. There are merits on both sides of the argument. It applies to the City of Perth now. Someone has to pay for public transport infrastructure.

Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Rita Saffioti; Acting Speaker; Mr Joe Francis; Mr John Day; Mr Bill Johnston; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Fran Logan; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Paul Miles

---

Governments do not have money; taxpayers have money. I am sure there are people who now catch public transport to Perth because of the increase in the cost of parking.

I want to concentrate my comments on the issue of paid parking in shopping centres. I do not want to be confrontational, but I honestly believe it was a bit mischievous of the shadow Minister for Transport to say that the Barnett government is going to bring in paid parking in shopping centres.

**Mr W.J. Johnston** interjected.

**Mr J.M. FRANCIS:** Let me finish. I have not discussed this with the Minister for Transport. As a Liberal member of Parliament, I will never support a government telling a private shopping centre owner that he will charge people to use his privately owned car park. I will never support a government forcing Frank Lowy, who owns the Westfield shopping centres, or Stan Perron —

**Mr P.C. Tinley:** You force developers to do all sorts of other things, so what's the difference?

**Mr J.M. FRANCIS:** Can I finish? I will never support a government telling private shopping centre owners what they will and will not do with their parking. If the Stan Perrons and the Frank Lowys of the world want to charge people to park at their shopping centres, that will be their problem. I cannot imagine them bringing in a paid parking scheme. As I said, it would be a commercial decision for them; it should have nothing to do with the government. It would drive consumers away from their retail tenants. If they had an issue with all-day parkers who were not shopping in their centres, I could understand them bringing in a scheme whereby people park free for the first three hours and then pay a small rate per hour after that to discourage people from parking there all day. I have seen examples of that in the state transport car parking system because people have abused the privilege, and I will go into that in a moment. That is a decision for private shopping centre owners and their tenants; it is not a decision that the government should ever dictate.

The member for Willagee rightly touched on this issue. If, hypothetically, the government forced Cockburn Gateway to charge people to park at the shopping centre—I can never imagine that happening—it would force retail customers away from Cockburn Gateway to Garden City Booragoon. That would be one of the dumbest things it could ever do. It would stifle competition and un-level the playing field in the retail sector. Rightly or wrongly, both sides of this Parliament—the Labor Party now has a new leader—have been trying to help level the playing field of shopping centre trading hours. Why on earth would the government say to one part of the retail centre on a geographical boundary that it will charge its customers to park there? It would be madness. As I said, my position is crystal clear. I will never support a government telling —

**Mr P.C. Tinley:** What about charging nurses to park at a hospital where they have to work?

**Mr J.M. FRANCIS:** How about we tell MPs to pay for parking at Parliament House? Would the member be happy to do that? I would be happy to pay for parking.

**Mr P.C. Tinley:** That's not what this is about. It's not just about shopping centres. Is it okay for nurses to pay?

**Mr J.M. FRANCIS:** I know. Let me make it crystal clear that I do not support a government telling shopping centre owners what they can do with their privately owned car parks. If they want to bring in a fee to drive customers away from their tenants, they will be the ones who lose money and damage the little economies around their suburbs.

I said I would touch on this, member for West Swan. We went to the last election—I will not harp on—promising to build more car parking along the train line. As the government unveils more and more parking, we have little ribbon-cutting sessions to say, “Here's another 100-odd parking bays at this train station”. We are about to finish another 480 parking bays in Knock Place at Cockburn Central train station. A couple of years ago when Hon Simon O'Brien was the transport minister, we went to Murdoch train station to cut a ribbon and unveil the 100-odd, or whatever it was, car parking bays that we had committed to and done. Early in the morning the Public Transport Authority put a couple of cones in front of two bays so that we would have somewhere to take the photo. As members know, these things are part of the run in politics. As we cut that ribbon, two cars came and filled those bays. I jumped in and said, “Welcome to the new car parking. Where are you catching the train to?” One of the drivers replied, “I'm not catching the train. I'm a painter. I just leave my car here all day; my boss is coming to pick me up and we're going somewhere else.” We build car parking bays at train stations for people who catch the train, yet someone at the train station who was never going to catch the train was using a publicly funded car parking bay just because it was convenient for him to get out of one car and into his boss's car and leave it for the day.

**Mr W.J. Johnston** interjected.

Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Rita Saffioti; Acting Speaker; Mr Joe Francis; Mr John Day; Mr Bill Johnston; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Fran Logan; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Paul Miles

---

**Mr J.M. FRANCIS:** Maybe the tools were in the van—whatever it was. The point is that we build car parking bays at train stations and I would expect them to be used 100 per cent by people catching the train; that is what they are there for.

Two ladies—I think it was a mother and her daughter—pulled up to the second bay and one of them was leaving her car parked there all day while she went and shopped at Booragoon Garden City. They were also using the Murdoch train station car parking facilities to —

**Mr W.J. Johnston:** How were they going from Murdoch?

**Mr J.M. FRANCIS:** Driving in the second car. They pulled up in two cars, parked one car at the train station and drove off in the other to go to Booragoon Garden City.

**Mr W.J. Johnston:** So they're saving petrol with one car.

**Mr J.M. FRANCIS:** There are a lot of other places in the area where they can park. I look at my own electorate office. I do not want everyone to feel sorry for me, but I probably have the smallest and oldest electorate office. I have a tiny electorate office on South Street.

Several members interjected.

**Mr J.M. FRANCIS:** I have not seen everyone's electorate office, but mine is on the corner of Calley Drive and South Street, opposite the shopping centre at Leeming. Most days I cannot get a car park at my own office because it is filled at eight o'clock in the morning by people who have parked their cars and walked to the train station. I know this is an issue and it is one reason—love me or hate me—that people cannot knock me for continually advocating for more parking at train stations!

**Mr W.J. Johnston:** The minister says there's no point. The minister says you can't keep building car parks. That's what he said.

**Mr J.M. FRANCIS:** We are still building more car parking bays. The point is that we have car parking at transport hubs, such as train stations, and a lot of that car parking is not being used by people who are using the public transport for which it is provided. We have to question whether there is a way to limit access to that parking only to people who are catching public transport. I do not remember the details exactly, but I think a few years ago—it may well still be there, and if the member for Fremantle was in the chamber, she might have been able to remind me—the train station at Fremantle had a trial limit whereby people had to swipe a Park 'n' Ride card. If they did not use their Park 'n' Ride card for public transport within an hour of going in there, they would be docked \$10 from it or something like that, but if they caught public transport, they did not pay for the parking. I think that is something the government would be well advised to look at. I seriously have a problem —

**Mr F.M. Logan:** Do you think they should pay for it at train stations?

**Mr J.M. FRANCIS:** No. When people pay for security car parking at the train station, they are paying for —  
Several members interjected.

**Mr J.M. FRANCIS:** Yes, they do. On the member's side there is a small section that is fenced off.

**Mr F.M. Logan:** I'm talking about the PTA parking. There is PTA parking at Cockburn Central.

**Mr J.M. FRANCIS:** At the moment there is a tiny bit of PTA parking at Cockburn Central that people pay for, but they are paying for a premium car parking spot and certain extra security for their vehicle. I think the answer is a fair mix of that. Some people will not mind paying a little for —

**Mr F.M. Logan** interjected.

**Mr J.M. FRANCIS:** If there is no security, then, no; if it is just the same service, they should not pay for it. If as part of the overall mix at Cockburn Central there was some parking that was better serviced and secure, a bit of a premium could be expected. That is the mix that the PTA had under the previous government and this government. Therefore, the issue is not really that contentious. When we look at it, I have a problem with people using public transport car parking bays at stations when they are not catching public transport. We need a way to ensure that only people who catch the train park at the station. I am not saying that they have to pay—I am thinking on my feet. Let us have a boom gate and people can swipe their Park 'n' Ride card, and if they do not catch the train, they will have to pay.

Several members interjected.

**Mr J.M. FRANCIS:** It is not fair to people who are looking for a car parking bay at a train station to get there and find that the car park is filled with the cars of people who are not catching public transport that day. I do not know the percentage mix of people who do that, but it struck me a number of times that a lot of people do that. I

Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Rita Saffioti; Acting Speaker; Mr Joe Francis; Mr John Day; Mr Bill Johnston; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Fran Logan; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Paul Miles

---

would like to think that both sides of this house would say that there is something not quite right with that situation. If we can look at that, that would be a great thing.

In closing, as I said, it is not the job of government to tell private shopping centre owners that they have to charge people to park at their shopping centres.

**MR J.H.D. DAY (Kalamunda — Minister for Planning)** [4.48 pm]: The opposition has asked me to rule out paid parking across the metropolitan area and I do that. I said that two or three weeks ago and I do that again today. Certainly, nothing is being done by this government that will require paid parking across the metropolitan area, and in particular at metropolitan shopping centres and major retail centres, as indicated in the motion moved by the member for Willagee. The member called on me, on behalf of the government, to rule out paid parking across the metropolitan area, and I do that.

A discussion paper has been developed within the Department of Planning about parking issues in major activity centres. It is entirely appropriate that the department did that and distributed it. This discussion paper was developed from a consideration of the parking issues in the Murdoch activity centre, which of course will be an area of major activity—it already is, in fact, to a large extent—particularly once Fiona Stanley Hospital is open and operating. With all the consequent activities that will flow from that, there certainly will be a need to manage parking, traffic issues and congestion in that centre, and as a result of that the “Access and Parking Strategy for Health Campuses in the Perth Metropolitan Area” has been developed by the Department of Health. That, in part, covers the activities at Murdoch activity centre and other major activity centres for which the health department has responsibility. Obviously, the Queen Elizabeth II Medical Centre is another key example. However, that does not mean that any action has been taken by this government, nor will there be, to require paid parking at shopping centres across the Perth metropolitan area. I agree that that would not be a reasonable thing to do. It would be completely counterproductive. It would not be necessary and it will not happen as far as this government is concerned.

I also make it clear that the government has no intention to extend the Perth parking levy to other geographical areas. There has never been any suggestion of that, that I have been aware of, since we have been in government. The only suggestion I have heard is what came from the opposition three or so weeks ago, which has only been a scaremongering campaign.

The Perth parking levy operates in the City of Perth area and the funds that are collected, and have been for a long time, are put towards providing a higher level of public transport in the Perth CBD than would otherwise be the case. The Minister for Transport provided information a couple of weeks ago about decisions of the government to use part of the Perth parking levy for traffic management in the Perth CBD in other respects, including the introduction of a new CAT bus service between Leederville and the Perth CBD. As I said, the Perth parking levy is not being extended across the Perth metropolitan area as implied, if not overtly suggested, by the opposition spokesperson for transport three or so weeks ago.

As I indicated, the responses to the discussion paper prepared by the Department of Planning are being considered in the preparation of a draft state planning policy for parking at major activity centres. If that draft policy is acted on further by the Planning Commission, it will be put out for public comment and consultation, as is always the case. Certainly there will be nothing in that as far as the government is concerned that will require paid parking at suburban shopping centres across the metropolitan area.

If I am being asked to rule out the extension of paid parking by local governments in areas they control, I obviously cannot do that. The reality is that paid parking in the metropolitan area is the responsibility of local governments and local governments will make decisions as they consider appropriate. They need to be accountable for the decisions that they make. Paid parking applies in quite a number of local government areas in the Perth metropolitan area. Paid parking has applied in the City of Perth area for as long as I can remember. It applies in Fremantle, Leederville, Claremont—I think I am right in saying—Subiaco, Joondalup, Victoria Park and a number of other locations. Obviously, fees are imposed for parking in kerbside parking and parking areas operated by local governments or by the private sector specifically as public parking areas. That has been the case for many years and, presumably, local governments will extend their operations in that respect to some extent. However, requiring paid parking to be implemented on private land on which shopping centres are located is certainly not the policy of this government. As I said, I think it would be counterproductive and it is not something that we are considering at all. I hope that makes the position of the government very clear.

**Mr P.C. Tinley:** Major activity centres or activity centres as in the SPP are not necessarily defined in 4.2. Will the government define those that will be major activity centres or activity centres?

**Mr J.H.D. DAY:** The Murdoch activity centre is an example of such a situation. The Queen Elizabeth II Medical Centre is another example. I note that in the member’s motion he has asked us to rule out paid parking at metropolitan shopping centres and major retail centres. I presume the member has been quite careful in the

Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Rita Saffioti; Acting Speaker; Mr Joe Francis; Mr John Day; Mr Bill Johnston; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Fran Logan; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Paul Miles

---

wording of his motion in that respect. The member is not calling on us to rule out paid parking in major activity centres such as Murdoch or the Queen Elizabeth II Medical Centre site.

**Mr P.C. Tinley:** When will you prescribe an area a major activity centre?

**Mr J.H.D. DAY:** I think it would be looked at on a case-by-case basis. I am not sure whether a precise definition will be developed to define a major activity centre. I may be wrong on that, but I am not aware of that.

**Mr P.C. Tinley:** In the event that you prescribe an activity centre at Murdoch or wherever—it does not matter—they are required to have paid parking under this planning proposal.

**Mr J.H.D. DAY:** They are not necessarily required to, as I understand it. They are certainly required to have parking management plans. The operators of the facilities, whether hospitals, TAFE facilities or other major facilities within those centres, need parking management plans and paid parking may be part of that.

**Mr P.C. Tinley:** My point is that if an area is an activity centre, it has to have approval if SPP 4.2 gets up in whatever form, and it has to have a parking management plan. It will never be mandated as a condition of the development that it must have paid parking.

**Mr J.H.D. DAY:** That is my understanding, but the natural consequence may well be that paid parking is one way of managing parking in those centres. Paid parking has been the situation at the Queen Elizabeth II Medical Centre site for as long as I can remember. At locations such as that—Murdoch is obviously an equivalent site—people would expect paid parking to be needed to manage the situation and to pay for the facilities that are being provided at high cost in a lot of cases.

**Mr P.C. Tinley:** That is up to the proponents and the developers, and the WAPC will not mandate as a condition of a development that it must have paid parking.

**Mr J.H.D. DAY:** That is my understanding.

**Mr P.C. Tinley:** The reason I say that is that if the WAPC describes an area as an activity centre or a major activity centre, it could be the Herdsman Business Park or Westfield Innaloo Shopping Centre and environs. You could apply these things to any geographical area. We want to rule out—which includes in there a private development and public land—the requirement for paid parking.

**Mr J.H.D. DAY:** As the member has said, that is certainly the case in major shopping centres and major retail centres. We as a state government certainly do not require paid parking. What local governments decide to put in place in facilities they operate or by agreement with shopping centre operators and so on is a different matter. I have made it clear that we are not requiring paid parking across the metropolitan area, as the member for Willagee asked me to rule out. Secondly, the Perth parking levy is not being extended more widely.

**MR W.J. JOHNSTON (Cannington) [4.58 pm]:** I would like to contribute to the debate on the motion moved by the member for Willagee, which reads —

That this house —

- (1) calls on the Barnett government to rule out paid parking in metropolitan shopping centres and major retail centres; and
- (2) condemns the government for cost-of-living increases for Western Australian families, of which paid parking would be another impost.

In doing so, I draw the attention of the house to the fact that when this document was released by the government, it was not the minister who went on radio to discuss it; it was a public servant. I do not understand why the government was not prepared to stand up and explain itself to the people of Western Australia but, instead, sent out a public servant to do so. It is not fair that the people of Western Australia did not get to hear directly from the minister defending his discussion paper. Instead, it was a public servant. With all due respect, I am sure that the public servant has many good qualities and is an expert in his field, but he is unable to enter a political debate on an important issue such as this because that is not his job. His job is to serve all Western Australians. It is the minister's job to explain why this proposal is being put out by government.

This government proposal includes the idea that paid parking would be a contributor to the development of public transport in the suburbs. That is quite easily seen if we read the document. It also includes the idea that pricing should be used to manage demand. That is a very clear statement in this proposal from the government. It also says that parking is a funding source to support sustainable access options. These are the ideas that the government has included in its discussion paper. But the minister hid and would not be held accountable to the public of Western Australia for the ideas that are included in this government proposal. I do not understand why that has occurred.

Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Rita Saffioti; Acting Speaker; Mr Joe Francis; Mr John Day; Mr Bill Johnston; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Fran Logan; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Paul Miles

---

This also reminds me, when we are talking about cost-of-living pressures, of the fact that this government, after nearly four years in office, still will not outline its plan for further electricity price increases. It is outrageous that after four years in office, the government says that it has no plan on this issue. It is extraordinary. For how long does the government have to be in office before it works out what it wants to do with electricity pricing? The government told the electorate that it would not increase prices over the four years of the current electoral cycle. Before the last election, the Labor Party said that it would increase electricity prices by 40 per cent over four years. The Liberal Party's clear position going into the last election was that that was too much. Therefore, the only inference that we could take from the Liberal Party's position at the last election was that its electricity price increase would be less than the glide path published by the Labor Party. However, the people of Western Australia have now found that the Liberal government has put up electricity prices by 57 per cent in three years. By how much is the government going to put up electricity prices over the next four years?

In February, the Premier said that electricity prices needed to rise by 30 per cent to reach the cost of production at that time. Of course we now know that is not true, because the Economic Regulation Authority report demonstrates that electricity prices are nowhere near 30 per cent below production costs. The only conclusion we can draw from that is that the Premier wants to go back to the bad old days and use the electricity system as a source of revenue. Rather than deliver a service to the community, the Premier wants to use electricity prices as a cash cow to subsidise his grand plans. The Premier will not tell anyone in this state, after four years in government, what his plan is for future increases in electricity prices. The only conclusion we can draw from that is that the Premier is doing exactly what he did in 2008, when he refused to be honest with the people of this state and he refused to set out what his price path would be for electricity.

There is only one choice for the Premier in respect of electricity charges when we think about cost-of-living increases for Western Australian families. In this year's budget, the Premier must clearly and specifically set out the price path that he will take if he is re-elected. That is the only choice that the Premier has. If the Premier does not do that, he is not being honest with the people of Western Australia. If the Premier does not set out in this year's budget a clear choice over the next four years, he is not being honest. The Premier has had four years to do this, with public service support and with access to every piece of advice that he needs. If after four years in government the Premier cannot explain himself, he stands condemned for those cost-of-living pressures.

Electricity prices have a major impact on ordinary families in this state. Families in this state have already had a 57 per cent increase. The Minister for Energy said on radio the other day that the increase this year will not be 15 per cent. But the minister would not say what it will be. Every time the Premier is held to account for the amounts that are in the forward estimates, he says they are the forward estimates and they do not count. The Premier pockets the benefit from those price increases in the forward estimates in the surplus prediction for the future of this state. Let us make that clear. The Premier will go to the election and spend on election promises the increased money that is in the budget from ordinary families. But up until now he has not been prepared—this is his opportunity—to look the people of this state in the eye and tell them, honestly and frankly, “This is what I am going to do with electricity prices”.

**Mr F.M. Logan:** Coward!

**Mr W.J. JOHNSTON:** The member for Cockburn interjects. If the Premier is to do something that is respected by the people of Western Australia, he needs to do that. It is not hard. He knows. He has all the information available to him to set out what the price path is. It is in the budget papers. I got back answers to questions on notice just today from the Minister for Energy, which make it clear that all the earnings benefit from the price path in the budget is currently included in the future revenue from each of the energy corporations. So that has made that clear. The budget estimates for the out years are accurate only if the price path in the budget is true. If the price path in the budget is not true, the Premier needs to explain why the books have been cooked. The Premier needs to explain why he is not being honest with the people of this state on the future of electricity prices, and also about the budget. The Premier cannot come into this place and say we have this strong budget position if the very foundation for what he says in those budget estimates is false and is made up. So this is a real challenge for the Premier in this year's budget. After all the Premier's time in government, and with all the resources that are available to him, there are no excuses not to be honest. The Premier was not honest last time, because in 2008 the Liberal Party ran radio advertisements attacking the Labor Party for having set out a clear price path for electricity prices in this state. This is now the opportunity for the government to be honest as well; and, if it is not, it will stand condemned.

The cost-of-living pressures in Western Australia are acute. The Treasurer once came into question time and said, “If you're going to be a poor person, it's best to be a poor person in Western Australia.” It was the most extraordinary performance I have ever seen. The facts are that Western Australia is an expensive place in which to live. I do not drink coffee, but even a coffee costs a dollar more in Perth than it does in east coast cities. Groceries are more expensive. Fresh fruit and vegetables are often more expensive. Western Australia is an

Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Rita Saffioti; Acting Speaker; Mr Joe Francis; Mr John Day; Mr Bill Johnston; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Fran Logan; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Paul Miles

---

expensive place in which to live. Rental accommodation is often more expensive in Perth, and there are effectively no private rentals available; and the wait time for a Homeswest house is seven years. Every one of us has people coming into our electorate offices with a housing crisis—such as people in private rentals who are told by their landlords that for whatever reason their lease is not going to be renewed—and we all have to struggle to find alternative accommodation for these people, and we know how hard that is getting to be. That is part of that cost-of-living pressure. It is interesting that when the government was in opposition, it said that one of the reasons that house prices in this state were increasing was the land supply restrictions. Of course the land supply is now lower than it was when we were in government. So if that was the cause of the cost pressures in the housing sector, again the government stands absolutely condemned for that because of its failure to properly manage the housing supply system in this state.

It is interesting to look at the government's proposal in this framework for major activity centres. One of the arguments put by the government to explain this proposal is that major activity centres can have different transport options. In my electorate the major activity location is the Carousel Shopping Centre, which is the second-busiest shopping centre in the state. There is virtually no option for people who live in any of the surrounding suburbs to catch public transport to the Carousel Shopping Centre. If the government decided to use the parking levies to fund public transport options, I bet \$100 that there would be a long lag between the introduction of the parking costs and the delivery of any potential public transport options. That is just the reality. This levy is a serious attack on top of all the other attacks on the cost of living for Western Australians that this government has delivered.

Another challenge we have is the fact that the Minister for Energy does not like to work. In 2009, the Minister for Energy explained in the other chamber how he had personally involved himself in the Synergy billing system. It is interesting that we now find out from the Economic Regulation Authority that the number of complaints to Synergy has increased by 630 per cent since this government came to power.

**Mr F.M. Logan:** Since the minister got involved.

**Mr W.J. JOHNSTON:** Indeed. We have seen in the north west of the state the collapse of the underground power project in the Pilbara because the minister has not been able to properly manage that proposal. Not only has there been a cost blow-out, but also the contractors have walked away from the contract.

**Mr P. Papalia:** Shocking! Is that right? How can he hold onto his job?

**Mr W.J. JOHNSTON:** Indeed. Every time the government is under pressure over electricity costs, what is its answer? Its answer is to re-merge Verve and Synergy. I got another answer back from the Minister for Energy today to question on notice 7554 that I put to him. I will read it only in part —

I refer to the Minister's repeated statement that the re-merger of Verve Energy and Synergy remains a real option for the Government, and I ask —

(a) does the Minister have any up-dated advice on the potential savings from the re-merger since he received the Verve Energy Review of August 2009, and if yes:

I asked a series of questions and then asked —

(b) has the Minister sought any advice from any agency on the costs of merging Verve Energy and Synergy, and if yes:

I then asked another series of questions. What was the minister's answer? The minister's solution to the cost-of-living pressures in the energy sector is, "No." The government has neither sought nor received any advice since the Verve Energy review of August 2009 regarding the re-merging of Verve and Synergy—none at all. When the minister and the Premier tell the media that that is an option because it will enable the government to save money, they are not telling the truth. They know the answer because it was included in the Verve Energy review of 2009. Members can read it on the website. It is also called the Oates review. The review said that there would be \$5 million in savings. That is 47c per bill per customer. It also explained the risk of the government having to borrow an additional \$10 billion over the next eight years to pay for generation in this state or, alternatively, to enter into take-or-pay contracts with private sector providers, which is exactly the same as borrowing the money; it makes no difference at all. That is on top of the prediction in the budget that the borrowings of this state will reach a record \$24 billion. That \$10 billion is on top of that \$24 billion. There is no plan. Every time the Minister for Energy and the Premier publicly say that their plan to keep down the cost-of-living pressures is to re-merge Verve and Synergy, they are not telling the truth. They have the advice. When the government says those things in the media, it is acting against the decision of cabinet. The cabinet of Western Australia, of which the Premier and Minister for Energy are members, decided in August 2009 not to merge Verve and Synergy. This is an extraordinary position whereby the government's policy is not to merge Verve and Synergy but the political position is to say that that is the way to keep down cost pressures. The government knows that that will not work

Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Rita Saffioti; Acting Speaker; Mr Joe Francis; Mr John Day; Mr Bill Johnston; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Fran Logan; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Paul Miles

---

because it paid \$200 000 or \$236 000—I cannot remember the exact figure—to Mr Oates to do the review in 2009. The government has got the review and has accepted it. It is about time that we saw a little bit of honesty from the Premier and the Minister for Energy in respect of the cost-of-living pressures and the energy sector. It is appropriate that they stand condemned because of their behaviour on this issue, because it is critical to the future of Western Australians.

**DR M.D. NAHAN (Riverton)** [5.15 pm]: I would like to make a few comments on this motion. I am glad that the Minister for Planning made it quite clear that we are dealing with two issues and that members opposite are getting confused. The first issue is the ability of property owners, whether they are private or public, to charge for the parking that they provide—that is, the usual parking. The second issue, which is of the most concern, is whether there will be a levy or tax on top of the parking fee to be earmarked for public transport of some sort; that is, the parking levy that applies to Perth will be applied more widely. That is the central issue. I understand that a group of people in the Department of Planning got their impetus for this type of idea under the previous Labor regime and continue to work on it. This is something that Hon Alannah MacTiernan pushed for quite strongly and people in the department are still working away at it. I express my support for the statements made by the minister and the member for Jandakot on this matter. As a member of the Liberal–National government, I would strongly resist the imposition of a tax, particularly on privately owned parking bays, and/or the forced regulation of private parking area owners at shopping centres or otherwise to levy parking fees. That is not how a Liberal government operates.

I would like to say a few words about the Murdoch precinct, which is a major issue. That is not in my electorate; it is in the member for Jandakot's electorate. There is a major hospital there and we have some real problems. Once the levy is placed on the City of Perth, which is where the train goes, that will cause a price differential up and down the line. One of the biggest issues of concern for people in my electorate who use that line is that people are coming from a large catchment area to park at Bull Creek and Murdoch because they can drive there and avoid paid parking in the city. It is free to park at those places and there is only one charge for the train, whereas there is a fee to park in the city. That has resulted in the free parking areas in those places being clogged up and is something that we have to deal with and that the member for Jandakot has tried to address. All sorts of people who do not use public transport are parking there, but they have to get there very early in the morning to do that.

**Mr J.M. Francis:** A lot of university students park at the car park because Murdoch University charges a fee.

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** Not only does the university charge a fee, but also it enforces penalties for parking in the wrong spot. The problems in that area will only be accentuated because, in my view, the area was designed with too few parking bays. The university and TAFE will expand, along with St John of God Hospital Murdoch. There is a huge amount of expansion going on there and we have underbuilt the number of parking spaces, which has placed a huge demand on the current parking spaces. It is my view that the government must look at those precincts and ensure that there is adequate parking in those areas. We have to look at how people will use those areas if we impose a tax—let us say the levy on Perth—that will impact up and down the line. I believe we have to encourage people to use public transport and we have to fund it somehow, but I want to put on record that most people get to that train and to the hospital by car and will continue to do so, and we have to facilitate them getting to that area. Part of that is to have adequate parking accessible to the hospital and related services; otherwise we will lock them out. There is also, of course, another issue that I will not go into in great length but that is just as important to the Murdoch precinct, and that is southern access. Unless we continue to build the Roe Highway stage 8 extension through to Murdoch Drive, there will be huge congestion, particularly from the western suburbs, of people trying to access this beautiful new hospital. I know that there is great resistance to that on the opposition side. In fact, the other place has had a debate and it has been made quite clear that the Labor Party not only is deadset against building it, but also plans to excise the land set aside for Roe 8 for alternative uses. It wants to stop the government from continuing to look at whether it can build Roe 8 through to Stock Road in an environmentally sensitive manner; the Labor Party has put up the barrier. Without Roe 8, without the extension to Murdoch Drive, there will be no southern access to the Murdoch precinct and the northern access at South Street will just be chockers.

**Mr P.C. Tinley:** Hang on a moment; just be clear. There is nothing stopping this government doing Roe 8. You do not need an act of Parliament to do Roe 8, so why haven't you done it?

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** We are; just listen.

**Mr P.C. Tinley:** No, you're not.

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** We have —

Several members interjected.

Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Rita Saffioti; Acting Speaker; Mr Joe Francis; Mr John Day; Mr Bill Johnston; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Fran Logan; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Paul Miles

---

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** We have spent \$20 million —

**Mr P.C. Tinley:** That is what I am talking about. You talk a good fight; go and build it.

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** We have spent \$20 million planning Roe.

Several members interjected.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Members!

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** It is now with the Environmental Protection Authority. The EPA will make a decision on whether it can be built in an environmentally sustainable manner, the route and the structure. Maybe the opposition should have done this. It did not do it with the arena, Fiona Stanley Hospital and a number of other developments.

**Mr W.J. Johnston:** Where are the bulldozers? Are they still warming up?

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Cannington!

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** We do the planning —

Several members interjected.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Riverton, take a seat. This is now degenerating again.

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** We have done exactly what we said we were going to do. We have spent the \$20 million planning —

**Mr P. Papalia:** You have spent three and half years and \$20 million doing nothing.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Warnbro!

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** Doing nothing?

**Mr W.J. Johnston:** Yes, doing nothing.

**Mr P.C. Tinley:** Why isn't the \$770 million in the forward estimates?

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** Because we have —

**Mr P.C. Tinley:** In the next four years you're not going to do anything, because there is nothing in the forward estimates.

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** We have spent \$20 million planning the process.

Several members interjected.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** We have someone interjecting and posing a question and another two members shouting over the member who has asked the question. I do not really want to start calling people, but please show a bit of decorum and tolerance.

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** I support what we have done on Roe Highway very much. We are doing what we said we were going to do. We are going to plan it and ensure that we can build it in an environmentally sustainable manner. We are on track to do that. With the EPA process, there are, I think, 500 questions that Main Roads is looking at. Towards the end of this year the EPA will give its tick; I presume it will be a tick of approval to build in a certain way. Then we can go to the next stage of committing the money and designing and determining the route and construction. One of the biggest problems, of course, with Roe 8 is that when the previous mob was in government, it built —

**Mr W.J. Johnston** interjected.

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** That is what the EPA is looking at—the route. That is the task.

**Mr W.J. Johnston:** So you don't have the engineering?

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** We have done the preliminary —

**Mr W.J. Johnston:** How can you if you don't know where it's going?

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Members!

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** We have different routes and the EPA looks at those, as it is supposed to do, and sees whether those alternatives can be built in an environmentally sustainable manner; that is what it does. The real task—one of the biggest problems and cost—is due to the Labor mob, when in it was in government, turning the

Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Rita Saffioti; Acting Speaker; Mr Joe Francis; Mr John Day; Mr Bill Johnston; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Fran Logan; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Paul Miles

---

intersection of Roe Highway and Kwinana Freeway into a spaghetti junction specifically to stop Roe from being extended further west. That will add another \$100 million to the task, but we have to do it.

**Mr W.J. Johnston:** We built it to the end of Roe Highway.

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** Yes; that is what the former Labor government made sure. It used it as a barrier against continued building. Nonetheless, we will overcome that. It is another part of the task.

**Mr P.C. Tinley:** Guarantee us that you'll build it.

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** The government cannot guarantee it until the EPA gives it approval.

**Mr P. Papalia:** Will you resign if it is not done?

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** No. If the EPA says that we cannot do it in a sustainable manner, we will have to cop it. But what happens to the opposition if the EPA says that we can do it? What will the opposition do? The Labor Party has said it is dead against it no matter what; it does not want it no matter what.

**Mr P.C. Tinley:** We're really clear about what we're doing.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** You are starting again, members.

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** That is what I want on record for the people in Bateman, Jandakot, Riverton and Southern River.

**Mr W.J. Johnston:** Come on, member for Jandakot, interject, quick!

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** He wants it.

**Mr P. Papalia:** Does he? Hang on; I didn't hear that. Did Hansard hear the member for Jandakot?

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** The Labor Party will be held accountable for purposely stopping the building of that road that would actually largely service its constituents.

**Mr F.M. Logan:** A road to nowhere.

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** Yes; a road to nowhere.

**Mr W.J. Johnston:** Where are the bulldozers? Are they still warming up?

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** They are ready to go as soon as we get the approval.

**Mr W.J. Johnston** interjected.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Cannington!

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** The issues of parking and access around the Murdoch precinct are vital. I think we need not only a substantial increase in parking facilities in that precinct, but also substantial north and south access. The data shows that around 350 000 people will visit the hospital within five, six or seven years; that is on top of those using the university, the retirement village in the area, the TAFE and St John of God Hospital. That is not just —

**Mr P.C. Tinley:** Privatised prisons.

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** Yes. It is not privatised; it is a prison. Does the member not want people to visit people in prisons?

**Mr P.C. Tinley:** It is outsourced.

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** Does the member not want people to visit people in prisons, especially youth remand centres?

Several members interjected.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Members!

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** Yes. The people who live west of the Fiona Stanley complex just want to keep it in isolation and not have access to it and for it to have inadequate parking. Obviously, the member for Willagee does not want people, especially family members, to visit their children in remand prison.

My position is that we should not expand the Perth parking levy, which in my view has been expanded too much.

**Mr J.M. Francis:** Geographically.

Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Rita Saffioti; Acting Speaker; Mr Joe Francis; Mr John Day; Mr Bill Johnston; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Fran Logan; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Paul Miles

---

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** We should not expand it geographically to other precincts or, most importantly, privately run centres such as shopping centres; nor, as the member for Jandakot said, should we regulate how those centres charge for parking, whether it is through forcing them to charge for parking or stopping them from allowing to provide so many hours of free parking, as many shopping centres—a commercial venture—do. A lot of that is already regulated by local government; that is fair enough and that is the way it exists. We should not put a special parking tax on businesses, and nor should we regulate how they are run. That is my view.

**MR F.M. LOGAN (Cockburn)** [5.30 pm]: It is interesting why this issue has come up. I put this issue down to sustainability fundamentalists, because, as the Minister for Planning knows, that is why this whole issue has come up.

**Mr J.H.D. Day:** Did you discuss this with your former colleague, the former member for Armadale?

**Mr F.M. LOGAN:** I do not have to discuss anything with the former member for Armadale, and the less I discuss with her, the better!

**Mr J.M. Francis:** No love lost there!

**Mr F.M. LOGAN:** No.

A government member: That says a lot!

**Mr F.M. LOGAN:** That is right; we get on very well, but it is a bit like some family members of mine: the further away we are from each other, the better.

It is the fundamentalist sustainability advocates. The minister knows what this comes down to. That paper was written by people in his department who want to get every single person out of a car and onto public transport. That is what it is all about. The problem is, as the minister knows, that Perth has been designed as a city for cars since the Stephenson report and plan. That is the problem. We have reached the situation in the twenty-first century in which there is a clash between the old 1950s designs of the city—some of those designs are still in place; the member for Riverton referred to Roe Highway, which is a hangover, a dinosaur, from the Stephenson plan—and the modern approach to sustainability. The debate we are having today is the apogee of the clash between those two cultures.

**Mr J.H.D. Day:** We need to move towards less overall reliance on cars, but cars will always be important.

**Mr F.M. LOGAN:** I agree, minister. We need to move to less reliance on cars, and of course we need to expand and increase not only public transport but patronage on public transport, but we are still dealing with the problem that Perth has been and is being designed for car usage. The outer metropolitan suburbs of Perth, which are a lot of the areas that we in this chamber represent, are only truly accessible by car. I will give an example of the issues faced by constituents in my electorate who try to get parking at Cockburn Central. I pointed out to the former member for Armadale the issue of parking at railway stations. It seemed to have gone in one ear and out the other. I met her representatives from the department as well, who were quite one-eyed about the whole issue of car parking at railway stations. If a working mother with a young family who lives in Hammond Park, which is two suburbs away from the railway station at Cockburn Central, goes to work in the city—this is a real example, minister—she will drop the first child off at primary school and the second child off at kindergarten or day care, and then she will try to get to the railway station. By the time she gets to the railway station, all the car parks are gone. She ends up literally parking on the side of the road. When she comes back, she has a \$100 fine.

**Mr J.M. Francis:** Thank you, City of Cockburn.

**Mr F.M. LOGAN:** Thank you, City of Cockburn or the Public Transport Authority, because they both fine people. That is the reality for a lot of people in the outer suburbs of Perth. The member for Jandakot gave other examples of people in other areas parking their cars. I actually do not blame those people. The member for Jandakot got quite upset about it. I will give some real examples—I have talked about two—of people parking at Cockburn. People who live south of Armadale—in fact, many who live in the minister's electorate—drive all the way over to Cockburn and Murdoch to park because it is quicker to do so and jump on the train and get to Perth than taking the train from Armadale. The train takes only 12 minutes or 16 minutes into Perth from Murdoch, rather than a train from Armadale, which takes an awful lot longer because there are far more stops on the railway line. That is why people drive and park at Cockburn or Murdoch. Nevertheless, these people still use public transport. They have a right to park at the car parks. They will park somewhere, whether it is Armadale, Bull Creek, Murdoch or Cockburn. Unfortunately, they park in the area of Cockburn. There is not very much that can be done about that. We encourage people to use Park 'n' Ride, and they are parking and riding, but they are parking and riding at another railway line.

I would like an assurance from the minister that he and his department have no intention of introducing paid parking at railway stations over and above the current mix.

Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Rita Saffioti; Acting Speaker; Mr Joe Francis; Mr John Day; Mr Bill Johnston; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Fran Logan; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Paul Miles

---

**Mr J.H.D. Day:** Certainly the Department of Planning does not. I do not know what the thinking is at the PTA. The Minister for Transport has responsibility for that portfolio.

**Mr F.M. LOGAN:** If there is an intention to do that, minister, I know that there will be howls of protests from both sides of the chamber.

**Mr J.H.D. Day:** I would certainly think there is no intention of that as a general policy. There is some paid parking at rail stations at the moment.

**Mr F.M. LOGAN:** Yes; a very small amount. The member for Jandakot indicated there was some sort of—

**Mr J.M. Francis:** Premium for security.

**Mr F.M. LOGAN:** Yes; he said that there was some sort of mix in parking; I am not too sure.

**Mr J.H.D. Day:** I would think that if multilevel car parks were going to be provided at rail stations, obviously that would have to be paid for somehow, so that may well need to be paid for.

**Mr F.M. LOGAN:** I would not disagree with that. I am sure nobody would disagree with that, including commuters themselves and drivers. If multistorey car parks were built at railway stations or adjacent to railway stations, people would have to pay, because of the costs involved in building and securing those car parks. I think that would be more than acceptable, certainly to everybody in the house. I have raised that matter with people who park at Cockburn Central, and they said that they are more than happy to pay for parking if it is at a multistorey car park.

One concern which has been raised and which lies at the heart of this is the approach by the department to encourage people to get out of their cars by forcing them out of their cars financially—that is, to introduce a fee structure across all parking in metropolitan Perth to force people from their cars and onto public transport. That has to be fought because the city is not designed for that change. Until we expand dramatically our public transport in a similar way that other cities around the world have done, we literally cannot do that. The onus is on the minister to go back to the department and tell those fundamentalists who exist within the department to get back in their box. They need to get a dose of reality that we are living in Perth. We are not living in London, Paris or New York.

**Mr J.H.D. Day:** Did things go awry, in your view, under your government?

**Mr F.M. LOGAN:** No, no; I think both sides of Parliament are committed to the whole concept of sustainability, but it has to be introduced in a way that is appropriate to the city in which we live, and the fact that this city has been designed to accommodate cars. Although moves can be made to change that, dramatic moves should not be made—as those fundamentalists are trying to make—in order to financially penalise people to force them out of their cars. People will not be forced out of their cars. All people will do is pay and they will grizzle, and the government will pay at the ballot box. The minister knows that that is exactly what will happen. For his own political longevity, I would suggest that the minister tell these fundamentalists to get back in their box and give them a dose of reality about the way in which Perth has been designed and structured.

**Mr J.H.D. Day:** Can I just ask a question, which is perhaps a bit cheeky? We were discussing your former colleague in Armadale. Is she now planning adviser to the Leader of the Opposition?

**Mr F.M. LOGAN:** Not as far as I am aware—certainly not.

**Mr J.H.D. Day:** I think I recall reading something about that at one stage.

**Mr F.M. LOGAN:** I know that. I think that was attached to a by-line under a picture of the both of them having a cup of coffee. As far as I am aware, she is very busy in her new-found role as the Mayor of Vincent.

I return to the issue of parking at shopping centres. The member for Riverton touched on this matter, and the expression of outrage of trying to direct privately owned shopping centres in the way in which they charge or do not charge for parking in their car parks. The reality is that most big shopping centres have their parking regulated and controlled, and parking fines enforced, by local government. This paper was suggesting that the state government direct councils to be required to charge for parking in areas under their control. That means in large shopping centres like Cockburn Gateway, which, although owned by the parent group, is controlled and governed by the City of Cockburn which enforces fines. So should this —

**Mr J.M. Francis** interjected.

**Mr F.M. LOGAN:** No, no, that is how it is done.

Should the concept of this paper be endorsed by the minister and find its way into reality—sometimes these things happen, regardless of assurances given by the minister—we will see directions from government to local

Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Rita Saffioti; Acting Speaker; Mr Joe Francis; Mr John Day; Mr Bill Johnston; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Fran Logan; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Paul Miles

---

councils that parking will have to be paid for in major activity centres, including shopping centres, because that parking is regulated and controlled by local councils. It will happen, unless the minister is very firm with his department about this paper by asking it to drop it completely and ignore its recommendations, or at least come up with an alternative proposal. The fear I have is that when the member for Willagee asked the minister what he considered to be activity centres and what could be defined as activity centres, that definition was not very clear at all. Murdoch was used as an example of an activity centre. The member for Jandakot touched on it, but anybody who has tried to get parking at Murdoch knows that currently it is a nightmare—currently it is a nightmare! It is proposed that by 2021, South Street will carry 49 000 vehicles a day, and 60 000 vehicles a day by 2031. With the development currently underway around the St John of God Murdoch Hospital, in the vicinity of 37 000 people will be working in the Murdoch precinct, which will include the university, both hospitals, and the associated offices and research departments that are being built right now.

Parking, currently, is a major problem. The member for Riverton pointed out that parking has been completely undercooked in that area—it certainly has. The minister is in government, and he needs to address that issue. Fiona Stanley Hospital will clearly have to put in a significant number of parking bays, St John of God hospital is just about to embark on an expansion—how many parking bays are they going to build? The building envelope that flows down from both hospitals to the railway stations will also include tower blocks for offices and apartments. How many parking bays are they going to be required to build not only for people who work and live there, but also that might be made available to other people? I do not think that has been made very clear at all, minister. Taking the hospital's example that has been put in the paper, should parking be charged for it will be \$7 a day.

As the minister knows, the Department of Health is proposing to charge \$7 a day to park at Fiona Stanley Hospital, which is \$35 a week. On a 48-week year—a full year with four weeks' holiday—workers will have to pay \$1 650 a year. Some of those workers, such as ward orderlies or gardeners or cleaners in a privatised hospital—particularly if they are working for Serco—will be on low incomes.

**Mr J.M. Francis:** You get more money working for Serco!

**Mr F.M. LOGAN:** If they get more working for Serco, I will eat my socks.

**Mr J.M. Francis:** I hope you wash them every day!

Several members interjected.

**Mr F.M. LOGAN:** If those workers are charged that amount, it is a huge amount out of their pay packet every year simply for the pleasure of parking at work. Then of course that will set the standard, as the minister knows. Once that \$7 is in place at Fiona Stanley, it will be the same for St John of God and it will flow on to the other publicly available parking bays, if they are available at Murdoch. I put to the minister that the small number of parking bays currently available at Murdoch in the Public Transport Authority precinct—because of the disparity, as pointed out by the member for Riverton, between those who pay and those who do not pay—will be charged for. The PTA will come back and say, “We have to charge because everybody else in the entire Murdoch precinct is charging \$7 a day and our car park is completely overloaded with cars.”

**Mr J.M. Francis:** Are you talking about the train station?

**Mr F.M. LOGAN:** Yes, I am talking about the train station. I know the minister did not give a clear answer at all in terms of the PTA charging for parking at railway stations, but he can see from that example of the Murdoch precinct how the pressure for parking at Murdoch will flow back, forcing the PTA to charge an equivalent rate to everybody on the other side of the freeway.

**Mr J.M. Francis:** Can I ask you a question, member?

**Mr F.M. LOGAN:** Yes.

**Mr J.M. Francis:** What do you think of my suggestion to put a boom gate up at the entrance of the train station car park, swipe it with your Park 'n' Ride card, and if you do not catch the train within an hour, you get charged \$10 off your Park 'n' Ride. If you do catch the train, you do not pay for the parking. That way, the only people who get free parking at the train station will be catching the train.

**Mr F.M. LOGAN:** The only problem with that, member for Jandakot, is that I cannot see how who is catching the train is going to be defined. Once they are in there, whether they are catching the train or not —

**Mr J.M. Francis:** If they do not use the Park 'n' Ride to tag on at the train station —

**Mr F.M. LOGAN:** I see.

Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Rita Saffioti; Acting Speaker; Mr Joe Francis; Mr John Day; Mr Bill Johnston; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Fran Logan; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Paul Miles

---

**Mr J.M. Francis:** Does the member know what I mean?

**Mr F.M. LOGAN:** Yes.

**Mr J.M. Francis:** I'm not saying it is the perfect solution; it is just an idea.

**Mr F.M. LOGAN:** That is a possibility that could be looked at, and I am sure the PTA would probably look at something like that, particularly in an area that is a pinch point like Murdoch precinct.

The point I am making, minister, is that we know where this whole philosophy came from. It is a philosophy that is a major problem for commuters in Perth; it is a philosophy that needs to be extinguished—not sustainability, but this issue. This philosophy of charging for parking in metropolitan car parks needs to be extinguished quickly by the minister, because the cat is already out of the bag with the Department of Health. Workers who are on low incomes and struggling to pay horrendous utility costs will be slugged for \$1 680 a year for the privilege of going to work.

**MRS L.M. HARVEY (Scarborough — Parliamentary Secretary)** [5.49 pm]: I am standing to speak against this motion. Paid parking is a very big issue at the moment in the electorate of Scarborough, not because of a discussion paper put out by the planning idealists, but because of moves by the local government to introduce a \$1 200 per annum impost on employees and small businesses in Herdsman Business Park in Osborne Park.

It is worth noting at the outset that Herdsman Business Park is not identified as an activity centre in “Directions 2031”; indeed, people would probably be pretty lucky to find any activity at all in Herdsman outside of working hours. It is turning into more of an administration hub for a number of sectors of the economy, including a few government departments that have recently moved into the Optima Centre on Parkland Road.

Over the past 10 years, the City of Stirling has progressively approved many developments. Development after development in Herdsman Business Park has been approved with large discounts in parking requirements. This has led largely to the problem that occurs in Herdsman at the moment because there is a significant lack of parking availability in the area. The council's solution to this is demonstrated in its paid parking business case, which is currently out for comment, and basically advertises that it wants to start charging for parking in the area. The City of Stirling's main reason to start charging those who work in Herdsman for parking is that according to its study, 67 per cent of motorists who use the public street parking facilities in Herdsman Business Park live outside the City of Stirling. Therefore, its argument is that it is an unfair impost on City of Stirling ratepayers to pay for parking for these outsiders. Interestingly, though, the council's business case also includes Glendalough where it also intends to charge for street parking, even though the same survey indicated that more than 85 per cent of people who park in that area are City of Stirling ratepayers.

Ignoring that hypocrisy for the moment and addressing the user-pays principle, it is worth noting a few points. Businesses pay rates too. As a property is developed and the gross rental value improves, so too the rate at which local government rates revenue changes. The reality is that businesses pay rates to the City of Stirling through the outgoings in their lease or if they own the property freehold. The strategy is not user-pays as the user will pay far more than the costs. The capital outlay for the business plan that the City of Stirling has put forward has a very quick rate of return for what has been proposed. A user-pays system based on a useful life of 10 to 15 years would lead to a significantly lower parking fee.

I also note with some concern that City of Stirling employees, not all of whom live in the City of Stirling, have had their parking station on Cedric Street excluded from the management strategy. There is quite a significant issue of insufficient parking within the vicinity of the City of Stirling building, and I believe that its employees are causing a problem for neighbouring businesses by taking up the parking provided by businesses in that area.

I find this issue really frustrating because some downright misleading statements have been made in this paid parking business case. For example, it states that a well-managed parking service will support business viability and attract businesses. I do not know how charging for parking equates to a well-managed parking service and I know for certain that having paid parking will not attract business. In fact, businesses have been attracted to Herdsman Business Park because of the availability of free parking. Free parking is often used as a selling point to entice employees to work in the area. In the real world, if employees are expected to pay for their parking, it has a twofold effect on the surrounding small businesses: employees seek other employment because the costs of getting to work are too great, and employers need to pay higher wages to cover their employees' parking costs. To increase wages to match the parking fee, based on a \$1 200 after-tax requirement, small businesses are looking at a cost of around \$2 000 per employee. Therefore, a small business with 10 staff is looking at about \$20 000 for a local government parking tax that would give no benefit whatsoever to the business.

The most incredibly frustrating part of this paid parking argument in Herdsman is that the city created the problem, yet it will now benefit financially to the tune of \$2 million or more a year to implement this ridiculous

Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Rita Saffioti; Acting Speaker; Mr Joe Francis; Mr John Day; Mr Bill Johnston; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Fran Logan; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Paul Miles

---

solution. Let us take, for example, a development on Walters Drive. Using the City of Stirling's local planning scheme, this development required 171 bays. The development was given a discount of 15 per cent of the required bays and ended up including 147 bays. That same development has since proposed a change of use that will require even more bays to comply with the local planning scheme. The city's planning committee recommended to council that it waives any cash-in-lieu requirement for these additional bays; therefore, this development will provide only 147 bays despite the fact that to comply with the council's own scheme without discount would normally require 186 bays. That is a 39-bay shortfall; 39 cars with nowhere to park in an area where the City of Stirling now proposes to have paid parking. There are similar stories right across the business park.

To add further insult to local businesses, some of the existing parking areas between Jon Sanders Drive and Hasler Road were contributed directly by businesses. That was not just through their rates, but a direct contribution to the construction of public parking that the city now intends to charge the employees and customers of these businesses for the use of. It is outrageous!

I watched with interest as an honourable member from the upper house from Labor attacked the government over this discussion paper and defended the City of Stirling's actions saying that it complies with government policy. Herdsman and Glendalough are where the City of Stirling plans to implement paid parking. Neither one of these areas is included in the discussion paper. In phase 2 of this parking plan, Main Street and other areas of the City of Stirling will be hit with paid parking, yet I have not heard from members opposite one skerrick of opposition about this impost on small businesses and employees within Herdsman Business Park and the other areas that will be included in the rollout of this scheme. I have not heard from the Labor member for Balcatta or the Labor member for Nollamara on their thoughts about the City of Stirling's introduction of paid parking. The members for the North Metropolitan Region and the East Metropolitan Region have been silent and absent from the debate on paid parking in the City of Stirling. We do not know where they stand. Perhaps the member for Willagee could consult with his friend Councillor David Michael, Deputy Mayor of the City of Stirling, and ask what he thinks about paid parking. For the information of members, the councillors unanimously voted in favour of this decision to send the business case out for public comment. Therefore, I think it really is time that members opposite stopped this mock indignation about the discussion paper and did their bit to support my local community in opposing this outrageous imposition on employees and small businesses—that is, the City of Stirling's paid parking proposal for Herdsman Business Park.

In conclusion, I stand against this motion and support the comments made earlier by the Minister for Planning who has come out very strongly to say that the government in no way, shape or form would look at imposing a paid-parking requirement on metropolitan shopping centres and retail centres. I thank members for listening to my contribution.

**MR P.T. MILES (Wanneroo)** [5.58 pm]: I too rise to support the Minister for Planning's comments made earlier in the debate this afternoon. The debate has been quite good on both sides of the house and I have enjoyed some of the comments from Labor members as well as from my own colleagues.

I guess I am lucky in some respects that the City of Wanneroo has not introduced paid parking in any of its areas. That is not to say that it might not cotton on to the fact that it can gain many multiple millions of dollars to add to its bank balance to build its cherished administration blocks and stuff like that. Parking is a problem in the City of Wanneroo and even in the townsite of Wanneroo. It is simply because we are a growing city and a growing state. People are moving in and there is more traffic and more parking on the street. That is not to say that I think we should take the easy option and just charge for parking. As the member for Jandakot said, other methods can be put in place that do not simply take the easy option of taxing something for the sake of taxing it.

One of those methods, which I heard a member earlier say and which I know the Lakeside shopping centre uses, is to give people three to four hours parking and if someone's vehicle is parked for more than that time limit, they are issued with an infringement. That is designed to prevent people parking in the shopping centre and walking across to the train station or the bus depot and using the area as an all-day parking bay. That was more of an issue around Joondalup when the City of Joondalup decided to put in paid parking in all its local streets. That caused quite a lot of agitation in the whole of the northern corridor. It was not just the City of Joondalup that received a barrage of petitions on that. As the member for Wanneroo, I was barraged, and I know other members would have been as well. Local governments like that easy option. It is a good tax for them. I do not know what they do with that revenue. When the City of Joondalup first applied it, it said it was just a low cost of 20c or something like that. It has gradually gone up and up. I have actually received a fine for parking illegally near the hospital in that area.

**Extract from *Hansard***  
[ASSEMBLY — Wednesday, 2 May 2012]  
p2169b-2190a

Mr Peter Tinley; Ms Rita Saffioti; Acting Speaker; Mr Joe Francis; Mr John Day; Mr Bill Johnston; Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Fran Logan; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Paul Miles

---

I agree with the members for Southern River, Jandakot and Riverton—sorry, not the member for Southern River; he has not stood up yet. I will not support paid parking being imposed on any private company at all. That is not something that this government, or this minister, would even contemplate. That is not to say that people in the public service will not put that suggestion forward. Such suggestions, quite rightly, should be thought through and presented to ministers from time to time, but it is up to the minister of the day to say, “No way, José; we’re not going to do it.” Local councils need to be a bit more imaginative about the way they do their parking and fee structures.

On the comments the member for Scarborough made about the Herdsman area, my wife works in Herdsman, and has done for five years, for a fairly large organisation. Yes, she, too, will have to start paying fees that the local council wants to start ripping off from people who have been parking there without any fee for five years. It is not as though the City of Stirling will put anything in place to explain why it will charge that fee. If the city was to put in more parking bays or multistorey car parking, I could understand it wanting to recoup the fees to pay for that facility, but this is just a blatant grab for funds. It needs to be raised as an issue. If it was not for the member for Scarborough, that issue clearly would not have made the newspaper at the time.

I support the government wholeheartedly in its decision on this matter, and to rule out compulsory paid parking for retailers. The motion is a little dubious. Car park issues around activity centres will always come up from time to time, but, fortunately, this government will not enforce any paid parking in any private landholding.

Question put and a division taken with the following result —

Ayes (20)

Ms J.M. Freeman  
Mr J.N. Hyde  
Mr W.J. Johnston  
Mr J.C. Kobelke  
Mr F.M. Logan

Mrs C.A. Martin  
Mr M. McGowan  
Mr M.P. Murray  
Mr A.P. O’Gorman  
Mr P. Papalia

Mr J.R. Quigley  
Ms M.M. Quirk  
Mr E.S. Ripper  
Mrs M.H. Roberts  
Ms R. Saffioti

Mr T.G. Stephens  
Mr P.C. Tinley  
Mr P.B. Watson  
Mr M.P. Whitely  
Mr D.A. Templeman (*Teller*)

Noes (24)

Mr F.A. Alban  
Mr C.J. Barnett  
Mr I.C. Blayney  
Mr J.J.M. Bowler  
Mr G.M. Castrilli  
Mr V.A. Catania

Dr E. Constable  
Mr M.J. Cowper  
Mr J.H.D. Day  
Mr J.M. Francis  
Mr B.J. Grylls  
Dr K.D. Hames

Mrs L.M. Harvey  
Mr A.P. Jacob  
Dr G.G. Jacobs  
Mr R.F. Johnson  
Mr A. Krsticevic  
Mr W.R. Marmion

Mr P.T. Miles  
Ms A.R. Mitchell  
Dr M.D. Nahan  
Mr M.W. Sutherland  
Mr T.K. Waldron  
Mr A.J. Simpson (*Teller*)

Pairs

Mr B.S. Wyatt  
Mr R.H. Cook  
Mr C.J. Tallentire  
Dr A.D. Buti  
Ms L.L. Baker  
Mr A.J. Waddell

Mr D.T. Redman  
Mr J.E. McGrath  
Mr I.M. Britza  
Mr C.C. Porter  
Mr T.R. Buswell  
Mr P. Abetz

Question thus negatived.