

PERTH PARKING MANAGEMENT ACT — REFORM

19. Mr R.S. LOVE to the Minister for Transport:

I have a supplementary question. Will the minister table the proposed new boundaries for the Perth parking levy and will the minister also table the expected criteria that eligible projects will need to meet?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI replied:

I will make two points about that. The first point is that we do not have the criteria yet because we are out for consultation. That is the point.

Mr R.S. Love interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: No, we do not have the criteria because we are out to consult. That is what I have said. I wrote that in the letter to the mayor. I said that we are really keen to work together to establish those criteria. I think he wants more lighting. Great. I would expect that feedback.

The second point concerns the area. The Causeway was one example, and another is the purple CAT to UWA. Everyone loves the purple CAT and claimed credit for it. But do members know what the problem with the purple CAT was? It was that the boundary could not facilitate the purple CAT going to Nedlands, so we had to adjust the boundary enough to allow the vehicle to go along the road but not enough to capture the commercial businesses because otherwise they would be subject to the levy. We did not want new people being subject to the levy, just as we did not want to happen in Victoria Park. We had to construct boundaries that followed the footpath and be careful not to change the boundaries to capture other areas because then the businesses would be subject to the levy. We do not think it is sensible to keep doing that. The member for Nedlands has raised with me the expansion of the CAT bus into Subiaco. As we continue to develop Subiaco East, the people of Subiaco might want to expand the CAT bus into Subiaco. I think that is a good thing. Does the Leader of the Opposition support that? I think the Leader of the Opposition is after a densely populated area.

Mr R.S. Love: Put on the table what you are actually proposing.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: A lot of density and a lot of development is coming to Subiaco, for example. The member for Nedlands has already raised this with me. She has asked whether under these new changes we could support a new CAT bus extension into Subiaco. That is a valid comment, but if we were to do it now, we would have to make all the businesses liable for the levy. As a result, one of the things I am saying is that we have put out the policy and then we want to consult about the detail of the boundaries and the interconnected inner-city governments. All those things are within scope. We want to consult. I am sure that the Minister for Culture and the Arts is very keen for more things to be supported. I am sure a lot of members have things they want supported. Subiaco is an example. We could extend a new CAT bus service into Subiaco, but we cannot do that currently unless we make the entirety of Rokeby Road and Roberts Road subject to the levy. They are the issues that we are trying to deal with. I think that is a sensible thing to do. I will say again that I wrote to the mayor yesterday saying, “This is the announcement and this is the policy. We welcome your feedback. We want to sit down and work with you on this.” That is what we want to do. We wanted to announce the policy and then work through the detail with people about what should be included within the scope. I think that is entirely reasonable to do. As I said, if people do not want to be involved and want to throw stones, that is fine. This is part of being in government. There are the people who want to participate in getting great outcomes and those who do not. I am into getting great outcomes. I have the door open. I welcome comments. The member for Nedlands has already taken the opportunity to grab me about what a CAT bus could do for Subiaco, and I think that is a great initiative that we could try to incorporate. They are the great ideas that we can incorporate. Like I said, my door is open. I welcome the discussion. But if people want to start attacking things that do not exist, I am sorry; that is their issue not mine. If members want to attack something that I have not said or things that are not happening, that to me does not sound like a reasonable approach to policymaking in this state.