

Miletic, Daniel (REPS)

From:
Sent: Monday, 18 August 2003 10:43 AM
To: Committee, NCET (REPS)
Subject: Pay Parking proposal

Dear Committee member

I would like to voice my opposition to the pay parking proposal put forward for the Parliamentary Precinct.

Like many others that work in this area I have young school age children (I am also a single parent). I work part-time hours and live in a semi-rural area on the outskirts of Canberra. My take home (after tax salary) is \$30,000 pa. I have no option other than to drive my car to work (there is no bus service where I live). Also, I take my 6 and 8 year old children to school.

I cannot understand why imposing pay parking in this area would provide an advantage to the local community. There are no shopping centres (unlike the major town centres) and the public transport system is inadequate.

I understand that if pay parking were imposed, it would cost approximately \$5 or \$6 per day to come to work. That means that most employees would need to find an additional \$50 to \$60 per fortnight from their take-home salary or approximately \$1500 per year (This sum is equivalent to my annual residential rates bill and I for one would find this extra cost difficult to afford). Please do not agree to impose pay parking on us - you will be taxing the working poor.

Kind Regards,



Miletic, Daniel (REPS)

From: Patrick.Bennett@affa.gov.au
Sent: Monday, 18 August 2003 10:42 AM
To: Committee, NCET (REPS)
Subject: Objection to paid parking in Parliamentary Triangle

I object to the introduction of paid parking within the Parliamentary triangle based on the previous reasons for its non-inclusion. Those reasons are:

that the Parliamentary Triangle is a non-commercial area;
that parking is predominantly for the use of Public Servants working in the Parliamentary Triangle; and that the introduction of paid parking would obviously only show that the ACT Government is revenue raising with no logic behind it's introduction.

The ACT Government has lost millions of dollars in the past through the blow-out of the Bruce Stadium, costly court proceedings defending the Chief Minister of their liability in the demolition of the original Canberra Hospital and has also shown that it is not willing to listen to residents and car lovers by the closure of the Drag Strip.

There is no logic behind the decision to introduce paid parking except for revenue raising. This is a poor excuse for the ACT Government and we will soon be another Victoria.

Do not introduce paid parking into the Parliamentary Triangle!

Patrick Bennett
AFFA
18 August 2003



Miletic, Daniel (REPS)

From: Peter.Hancock@affa.gov.au
Sent: Monday, 18 August 2003 10:44 AM
To: Committee, NCET (REPS)
Subject: Submission

I strongly oppose the proposal for the introduction of pay parking around Barton. The proposal and how it is being managed reflects poorly on the NCA and the ACT Government.

This is clearly a grubby attempt at revenue raising at the expense of people who use cars. It discriminates against those people who need to use cars for delivering children to and from school, those who study and need to attend classes during the day, and those who use their cars for essential errands at lunchtime.

Despite assertions to the contrary, the public transport (bus) system is not a substitute. It will not adequately meet my or most other people's transport needs.

The ACT Government should be condemned for its support for the pay parking push. I understand the ACT government lent their full support to the National Capital Authority's pay parking proposal on Wednesday night when they appeared before the Parliamentary Joint Committee currently inquiring into the issue. In giving their evidence the ACT government completely ignored the unique circumstances that prevail throughout the parliamentary precinct and single-mindedly sought to justify a commercialised town centre approach.

The ACT government confirmed their belief that the introduction of pay parking on the streets of the precinct via parking meters or voucher machines should trigger commercial investor interest in the construction of multi level pay car parks. Under questioning they conceded they had no evidence of this, but suggested it worked in other town centres.

The CEO of Action buses testified that there was an effective bus service in operation and that employees in the area just needed to be educated about how to use the buses. This is self-serving rubbish.

According to the property Council of Australia, during the period 1993 - 2003 office floor space in Civic has decreased by 1.7%. Over the same period office floor space in Barton has increased by a whopping 66%. How could so much development be approved without any thought for the provision of appropriate commercial and professional services or public transport, and where has all the proceeds from the development gone?

Whilst giving evidence to the committee on Wednesday night the NCA conceded their planning policy only required the proliferation of new developments in the area to provide 1 on-site car space for every 100sqm of floor space, when they knew around 3 spaces would be required. Is it any wonder we have a parking problem in this area? The NCA is clearly incompetent.

The NCA have now lodged a further supplementary submission with the committee and requested that they give their evidence around the submission "in camera" (not open to public scrutiny) because the contents are confidential. This is unacceptable and demonstrates again how this body needs to be reformed.

Peter Hancock



Miletic, Daniel (REPS)

From: Peter.Slattery@affa.gov.au
Sent: Monday, 18 August 2003 10:57 AM
To: Committee, NCET (REPS)
Subject: Proposed introduction of paid parking in Barton

To the Committee responsible for this issue,

I am what you might consider a member of the silent majority. However, I have recently been made aware of the concerns of a colleague and this has inspired me to take a little time out from my busy schedule to write to you.

This person mentioned that if paid parking is introduced in the Barton area she will be placed in a position where it will no longer be economically viable for her to continue working. Parking costs will blow out her already tight budget. She is a single parent with school age children, and is unable to utilise the public transport system. Her options are limited and she may have to consider resigning her position and returning to a supporting parents benefit.

This concerns me greatly. I know that the need to raise revenue is important for the state and federal governments. However, I believe that the battlers are being forsaken in the interests of filling the ACT Government's coffers.

Please do not forget those who struggle on limited incomes.

Thankyou

Peter Slattery
peter.slattery@affa.gov.au
ph 02 6272 5259
fax 02 6272 4857



Miletic, Daniel (REPS)

From: Melissa.Stroud@affa.gov.au
Sent: Monday, 18 August 2003 11:01 AM
To: Committee, NCET (REPS)
Subject: Parliamentary Triangle

SUBMISSION105.....

Importance: High

Good morning,

I wish to raise my opposition to the possible introduction of pay parking in the Parliamentary Triangle. I understand that this is currently before a Parliamentary Joint Committee inquiry.

I understand the introduction of pay parking in town centre areas where the impact of workers parking is quite significant. However, in these areas you have a large number of shopping areas and general needs sectors, such as shop fronts.

In the Parliamentary Triangle the majority of buildings are just for work purposes especially government departments where there is little to no public contact. There is no shopping areas, no banks, no post office, no shop fronts or other general access requirements.

I realise that in this area there are large scale tourism buildings, Questacon, old and new Parliament Houses, the art gallery etc, and some argument has been that to introduce pay parking would stop office workers parking in the triangle taking up tourist spaces. The argument does not hold water as these tourist buildings have parking of their own which if there is a problem of non-visitors using the spaces the issue could be dealt with by securing the parking at the building for visitors only and not introducing a blanket pay parking over the entire area.

There is a good bus service in the area and from my understanding it is used well especially by people I have talked with in my building, but for many they do not have the option of bus usage for a variety of reasons, most of which revolves around their family life. I don't believe it is fair to introduce a further financial burden to those in an area where they do not have the luxury of access to town centre facilities and also due to their location can not rely on public transport to meet their needs to family issues.

Please consider in this enquiry that those working in the Parliamentary Triangle already have to pay to go to do things such as their banking and payment of general living expenses. There is already in many areas a pressure on car spaces to the employees trying to make an honest living. Don't increase the pressure to hard working tax paying persons working in the triangle by adding a parking expense.

Regards

Melissa Stroud
Industry Development and Trade
Forest Industries
Dept Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry - Australia
Tel: + 61 (0) 2 6272 5847
Fax: + 61 (0) 2 6272 4875
Visit our website at: www.affa.gov.au/forestry

