

PERTH PARKING MANAGEMENT BILL 2023

Consideration in Detail

Clause 1 put and passed.

Clause 2: Commencement —

Mr R.S. LOVE: The commencement provisions for the bill are in three parts. Clause 2(c) states —
the rest of the Act — on a day fixed by proclamation.

Discussion in the briefing indicated that fresh regulations were to be drafted due to the nature of this being completely new legislation rather than a rewrite of the 1999 act. What is the state of development of those regulations? What consultation has been undertaken? When is the likely proclamation?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The drafting of regulations will commence once the bill has been passed. Some background policy work has been done to allow consultation to shortly commence with a range of stakeholders, including local councils, peak bodies, such as the Property Council, and other government agencies. There have been wideranging discussions since 2017, but consultation will start and drafting will commence once the bill has been passed.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 3: Objects of Act —

Mr R.S. LOVE: This is a new insertion—obviously, it is a completely new act—but a difference from the 1999 act is the inclusion of the “Objects of Act” clause. Proposed section 3, “Objects of Act”, states —

The objects of this Act are —

- (a) to provide for licensing and authorising of parking spaces in the PM area in the metropolitan region to manage parking including for 1 or more of the following —

It goes through those areas that have been well-identified in the previous act. It continues —

- (i) to mitigate traffic congestion;
- (ii) to promote a sustainable balance between different modes of transport;
- (iii) to improve accessibility, economic activity or urban amenity;

And, interestingly —

- (b) to provide that licence fees and other revenue may be used for the benefit of the PM area to improve transport, accessibility, economic activity or urban amenity.

We had the discussion in the second reading, but I am wondering whether the minister could work through what she sees as the role of the licence fees and revenue collected from the parking management area. What level of expenditure does she see moving into areas of economic activity and urban amenity as opposed to traditional areas of transport connectivity?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: We undertake a lot of initiatives that support accessibility and transport into the Perth parking management area. We could argue that Metronet’s new rail lines and new ways of getting to the city support the objective of this act. That is not and will not be funded by the Perth parking levy. The cap on fares, which makes it more affordable to move into the city, is not funded by this levy, nor will it be. The Matagarup Bridge, which created a new connection into the city, was not funded by the levy. There are a lot of things we have done, and will continue to do, which are not funded by the levy. It will depend on the priority as to how things are funded.

When the member was in government, his government allowed funds to accumulate over time, then spent it on the new busport on Wellington Street. That was a wise decision. It did not build a busport every year. It did not spend everything it collected every year, because that is nonsensical. We accumulate the funds then identify the priority. The priority, part of the City Link project, was to fund the new underground busport. That is what the Liberal–National government did with that money. As a government, we identify emerging priorities and then find sources of funding. An example is the Perth Concert Hall. The car park is unsafe. We have had to close parts of it. We are injecting—I cannot remember. Member for Perth? There is a lot of money in the budget to improve the concert hall. There was a car park under the concert hall. Who collected the revenue? Was it the state government? It collected some of it through the Perth parking levy. Some of the money currently in that fund was collected by people going to the concert hall. What do they get in return from the cultural institution? They get nothing. There are things that may be on the horizon. The concert hall is one, but that has already been funded from other sources.

Mr J.N. Carey: Actually, we are spending \$134 million.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: We are spending \$134 million on the concert hall. The concert hall had money collected by the city of Perth plus the Perth parking levy. So when the member is talking about the funds in the bank account,

some of that was collected by people going to the Perth Concert Hall. Should some of that money be used to support the Perth Concert Hall? Probably, if we are looking at it from a need and nexus point of view. We would suggest it was, from an economic point of view. Tens of millions of dollars were collected through the Perth parking levy from the Perth Concert Hall car park and by the City of Perth and they did not invest in it. Should we fund massive upgrades to cultural institutions with some Perth parking levy funds in the future? Maybe. That is not the plan currently, because we have already funded upgrades to the Perth Concert Hall through the consolidated fund.

We talk about urban amenity and economic activity. Those things help support business. There was another busport in the city—the one that is part of the convention centre. We could potentially use funds from this to support a new busport as part of the convention centre rebuild. But if we were to spend—according to the economic geniuses from the opposition—everything we collect from this fund every year, then we would have no money to fund major infrastructure projects, like the Barnett government did. It increased the levy by 440 per cent. It accumulated funds. It did not spend everything that came through the door. It accumulated funds and then, as part of the City Link project, it built the new underground busport. That was a sensible thing to do. We will look at priorities after the bill is passed; they will be things that improve economic activity. John, do you want to hear from me?

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Perth.

Mr J.N. CAREY: Keep going. My apologies. You are amazing.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: That was seamless—Austin Powers seamless!

The ACTING SPEAKER: It is all under control!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: They may be things that we will fund. All I am saying is that we are going to try to support major transport and other infrastructure, economic activity and people coming into the city. The best thing we can do to support businesses in the city is getting customers into the city, especially for the retail stores and cafes. Cafe districts are massive in other cities. There is a lot of activity. We need to continue to support this.

Mr R.S. LOVE: The objects of the act, again, describe that we can expend money in the manners that are prescribed. The bill's name is the Perth Parking Management Bill 2023. The objects of the act refer to the parking management area in the metropolitan region. It does not specify Perth and I understand it is expanded into Subiaco and into the City of Vincent as a parking management area. Is there scope for a review for expansion, given the definition or description of the parking management area as being in the metropolitan region? Is that something the minister is considering as part of what may be allowed under the new act?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: No, the aim is to allow for expenditure outside the Perth parking management area.

Debate interrupted, pursuant to standing orders.

[Continued on page 4685.]