

From:	Howard.Conkey@affa.gov.au
Sent: To:	Monday, 18 August 2003 11:16 AM Committee, NCET (REPS)
Subject:	pay parking in the Parliamentary Precinct - anti-family

To whom it may concern,

I wish to strongly object to the proposal to introduce pay parking in the Parliamentary Precinct. The group that will be most disadvantaged are families with young children in either school or child care. Pay parking for this group will be a further imposition on already tight budgets and the proposal is short sighted, discriminatory and, most definitely, anti-family.

While bus services to and from the precinct are excellent, they are not family friendly to support workers ebing able to drop kids off and pick them up again as well as balancing work commitments. In many instances, workers in the precinct with families have no option but to drive in order to meet their responsibilities and this group is less able to afford extra burdens on already tight budgets. Mooted costs of \$5 a day (\$50 a fortnight) will have a severe negative impact at a time when parents count and stretch every dollar.

This decision smacks of some brainless, childless SES officer who already has an assigned car spot in the area and so will be able to avoid any impact of this decision. It's little wonder people are avoiding having children these days when policies such as this can be entertained.

Howard Conkey Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

(Father of five)





From:	Medic, Linda [Linda.Medic@dcita.gov.au]
Sent:	Monday, 18 August 2003 2:22 PM
То:	Committee, NCET (REPS)
Subject:	Parking

#### Dear Sir/Madam

Before paid parking is given the go ahead, the ACT Government should at the very least commit to building enough car parking spaces in Barton. At the moment people are resorting to parking in the paddocks along Sydney Avenue as there isn't adequate parking to cover people working in the new buildings that have only recently been constructed along Sydney avenue. When it rains the paddocks are very slippery and therefore quite dangerous to walk on. The fact that the ACT Government allows people to park in the paddock also shows they are turning a blind eye to the lack of carparks in Barton. If people weren't allowed to park in the paddocks it would really make you wonder where then they could park as there really is nowhere else people can park. The carparks that have been established by the ACT Govt are also only temporary as I understand the land has been zoned for commercial development. It does make you wonder if all this land is zoned for commercial development what land has been retained for proper parking?

I live in Latham and the bus service I use is very good as I only need to take one bus - it does take an hour for me to travel by bus from Latham to Barton - by car it's about 25 minutes. However, with a young family you often need a car to drop and pick up your kids. Taking the bus is not particularly family friendly. The latest bus to leave Barton for Latham also leaves at about 5.30pm - for people wanting to work later there really is no choice but to bring your car.

There really is no great incentive to work in Barton, apart from the incentive of free parking at the moment (even though the carparks are mostly gravel and dirt paddocks) there are so very few services (apart from some Cafes). In Civic and Belconnen you do need to pay for parking but then again you can do a multitude of things and there are a range of services and shops and in most cases you don't need to use your car. Given the distance from services in Barton people have a higher need to use their cars at lunchtimes than do people in the City, Belconnen, Woden or Tuggeranong.

I understand parking fees are everywhere. However given the distance Barton is from any amenities and the poor availability of services I really think charging people for parking is unfair. I wonder if people need to pay for parking in Mitchell or Fyshwick?

#### Regards

Linda Medic Employee of the Department of Communications, Information Technology and the Arts.



From:	Charles.Hatcher@aqis.gov.au
Sent:	Monday, 18 August 2003 12:55 PM
To:	Committee, NCET (REPS)
Subject:	Pay parking in the Parliamentary Triangle

Dear Committee Member,

I can only speak on behalf of myself but I would assume many would have similar feelings in that the National Capital Authority's push for pay parking is a poor excuse for what seems like unnecessary revenue raising which will adversely affect many of the workers within the Parliamentary Triangle.

This move would affect our family household as well as that of many other working parents. No parent of very young children can consider catching the bus from outer suburbs, particularly when there are multiple bus changeovers involved and their children need be dropped off at a suitable care provider. With the family unit already stretched to the limit, three hrs travelling by bus per day is hardly a recipe for happiness on the home front.... Well, take a car and pay \$30 pw for parking. What a great idea, with childcare costs over \$27,000 pa for only two children there is not plenty of spare money for the luxury of parking with 10 minutes walking distance of your workplace.

As you would be aware, medical, banking and commercial facilities are non-existent in the area and the introduction of long term parking meters would be another great funding initiative for the NCA. As workers go to the post office or bank in Manuka or similar nearby area, lose their space and have to pay another full day long term fee when they return to another separate car park.

I was interested to see that the ACT Government support the NCA's move and are prepared to offer increased resources to enforce these parking arrangements and consequently raise additional revenue through the outrageous parking fines. Has anyone been to Adelaide recently? The parking fines there are not equivalent to a traffic fine relating to a potentially dangerous infringement. Maybe the ACT government should first work out to handle its current \$100M surplus made at the expense of taxpayers, many of whom are first homebuyers, who have had to try and buy property in the current over inflated market.

This email is by no means a complaint about past decisions or current policy but rather a justification of why we do not need another pointless penalty imposed against us for choosing to live and work in Canberra.

I understand that the ACT Government and NCA suggest that the introduction of paid parking may attract developers to the area interested in building high rise car parking complexes. I would suggest that land within the Parliamentary Triangle is already at a premium and that no developer would consider high rise car parking when office or residential buildings would yield a much more significant return. If anything the attractiveness of the Parliamentary Triangle for those seeking office space would decrease.

I am also concerned about the area's tourism potential? With some of Australia's key agencies and important buildings such as Old Parliament House, the National Library, Art Gallery, High Court and Questacon. Domestic tourists will be thoroughly disgusted to be slugged to see these great Australian icons and historic monuments.

Kind Regards,

Charles Hatcher



196900-

From:	Davina.Yates@affa.gov.au
Sent:	Monday, 18 August 2003 2:18 PM
То:	Committee, NCET (REPS)
Cc:	vince_mcdevitt@cpsu.org
Subject:	Pay Parking

How can the ACT government suggest that the introduction of Pay Parking would trigger commercial investor interest when there hasn't been any? Since when was the Parliamentary circle classed as a Town Centre? With a whopping 66% increase in the office floor space in Barton, why were parking issues ignored during this boom time?

I would like it noted that I am one of the many that started to utilise the Bus service when I started working in the Barton area. I found it to be frustrating and time consuming and very quickly started to use my own transport to get to and from work so I could get to work on time and leave at a reasonable hour.

The Bus service must be held up to a higher standard if 'Pay Parking' comes into effect. And, will there be an increase in the amount of parking areas around the Parliamentary circle to accomodate all of those that are now illegally parked because there aren't enough parking spaces? Or is this going to be another revenue earner??

As an employee within the Parliamentary circle I object to the proposed pay for parking issue. Regards, Davina Yates Quota Administration Phone: (02) 6272 4484 Facsimile: (02) 6272 4585 davina.yates@affa.gov.au

This Email is intended for the use of the individual named above. If you are not the intended recipient, or the agent or employee reponsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any use, dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify us immediately by telephone and return the original message to us at the following address.



From:	Bettina Soder
Sent:	Thursday, 21
To:	Committee, N
Subject:	Pay parking

Bettina Soderbaum [Bettina.Soderbaum@ea.gov.au] Thursday, 21 August 2003 6:17 PM Committee, NCET (REPS) Pay parking

I work in the Parliamentary Triangle, and would like to convey to you my view of how a decision to bring in pay parking here will affect me.

I live in Yarralumla and have a five year-old at Telopea School in NSW Crescent, Barton. I have no objection to using buses, and in fact work for an organisation that spends a lot of time developing policies to encourage reduction in car use.

The reality for me however, is that I have to drop off and pick up my child on the way to and from work, and it is so impractical for me to do this by bus as to make it a non-option. The nearest bus past my home does not go close enough to Telopea School for a five year old to reasonably be able to walk the remaining distance - I would have to catch a bus from Yarralumla to Woden and then Woden to Barton to get anywhere near the school. By the time I got my son to school I would have spent around an hour on buses and then I would be faced with a 30 min walk to my office in St George's Terrace. I would have to leave home at around seven am to get to work by nine-thirty, a situation which you would surely agree would be ridiculous given that Yarralumla is an adjacent suburb to Parkes!

Cycling is out - I would be too frightened to cycle in peak hour traffic with a 24 kg child plus school bag on the back.

In addition, as I manage a family of four on top of my paid employment, and have a number of outside work interests, I frequently need to use my lunch hour to access commercial and professional services, of which there are none in Parkes or Barton. I have actually tried doing this by bus, and have found that the scarcity of services and meandering of routes make the journey time to and from the nearest commercial centres more than I can afford out of the total time available to me during the working day for this kind of activity. It is always far quicker by car.

So, pay parking or not, I will have no option but to continue to travel to work by car. Although an exact parking fee has not yet been announced, a figure of \$5 per day is being mooted. Using this for argument's sake, I would effectively be facing a \$200 per month pretax pay cut. Pay parking at that price would therefore have the same effect for me as demotion by a couple of levels.

My situation would not, I think, be at all unusual. Many many people have to drop young children at school or day care on their way to and from work and very few would be able to do it any way other than by car.

I would fervently hope that you will give genuine consideration in your decisionmaking to the unfair penalties that the introduction of pay parking will impose on people like me.





From: Sent: To: Subject:	John Bastin [John.Bastin@ea.gov.au] Thursday, 21 August 2003 3:46 PM Committee, NCET (REPS) Pay Parking	
Dear Committee		
I am a public servant who works in the Parliamentary Triangle and drives a car to work. I wish to point out a number of issues why it is necessary to use a car to travel to work rather than use public transport.		
Facilities The Parliamentary Triangle is not a town centres such as Woden and Belconnen. Shopping facilities are non-existent and food services facilities are minimal. The nearest centre is Kingston, 25 minutes walk from my office and 25 minutes to walk back. I drive.		
Bus Service Contrary to the claim of the CEO of Action that the bus service is adequate, many workers in the Triangle would have to catch two buses, swopping a 15 minute drive for a 45 minute bus trip.		
Working hours Flexible working hours provide significant benefits to both employer and employee. Reliance on public transport reduces employee travel options to narrow 'windows of opportunity' dictated by Action timetables, regardless of the inconvenience to both employer and employee.		
Executive Level Staff EL staff currently work "reasonable hours", usually in excess of the contracted time of 7.21 per day. The additional hours are rarely compensated; reliance on using buses will remove the flexibility of EL staff to work the unpaid overtime reducing the "free" labour currently enjoyed by the employer, predominantly the Government.		
Parenting Workers with children at childcare or school rely on their car to get to and from work via childcare and/or school. Public transport is not a real option for many such people.		
Safety Use of public transport at night presents a safety issue for some employees arriving a darkened bus interchanges and at bus stops in the suburbs.		
Revenue NCA will benefit from a large unspecified revenue windfall for which it apparently has no determined purpose.		
Use of own car to attend meetings Staff often rely on their own car to attend to departmental business away from the Department. This provides benefits in terms of staff time and reduced call on taxi fares.		
Thank you for your	attention.	
John Bastin	CAPTUL AND COMMITTEE	

From: Sent: To: Subject: kim brown [justin\_morgan69@hotmail.com] Monday, 25 August 2003 10:49 AM Committee, NCET (REPS) pay parking in the Zone

I wish to voice my objection to implementing pay parking in the Zone (aka the parliamentary triangle). The following points apply.

\* I live 40 km from where I work. Taking a bus to and from work would take me around two hours one way. Public transport is not an option for me, realistically.

\* lack of services in the area. There are no convenient banks, shops, medical centres, post offices, mechanics, service stations, or other services in the area. In order to pay a bill, see a doctor or post a letter, we need to get in a car and drive to Kingston, Fyshwick or the city centre. I don't believe the bus service from here covers areas like Fyshwick effectively. Some of this business needs to be done in Queanbeyan, where the bus service is even less efficient from here.

\* the "dirt" carpark should not be a paid parking zone, because of its low quality surface. I have driven out of that carpark after a wet day, and had no steering or brakes from when I backed out to when I reached the gravel surface at the kerb. The car effectively skidded the entire distance, and could have easily damaged another car. This carpark is often full to capacity and difficult to negotiate, with cars parked illegally. I have also known of cars being stolen from this carpark - it is out of the way and less visible than other carparks in the area.

justin\_morgan69@hotmail.com "Saddle up a dream and ride" James Blundell

Hot chart ringtones and polyphonics. Go to http://ninemsn.com.au/mobilemania/default.asp



/ena Jameson [rjameson@nla.gov.au]
day, 25 August 2003 2:55 PM
nmittee, NCET (REPS)
parking
ŗ

It is with concern that I have followed the debate about pay parking in the Parliamentary triangle.

I live in the Belconnen town centre, so to catch the bus I have either a twenty minute walk to the Belconnen interchange or a 10 minute walk to the nearest bus stop, where there are infrequent services. In peak hour it then takes around 45 minutes to reach the Albert Hall stop on Commonwealth avenue, followed by another 7 minute walk to the National Library where I work. There are bus services that are slightly closer to the Library but it is generally not worth changing in Civic/ waiting for the connection. In contrast, it takes approximately 30 minutes in peak hours and as little as 15 minutes in other times for me to drive to work.

I used to catch the bus every day, but eventually decided to buy a car for the following reasons: In winter I often leave work in the dark, and did not feel safe \* walking by myself. I often have medical or other appointments in work times - it is \* impossible to attend these by bus in a reasonable amount of time. I am a member of a volunteer based professional group (AICCM) - we \* have meetings in or immediately after work hours. Again, it will disrupt work times to attend these meetings using public transport. It is difficult to carry everything needed for work and classes or \* activities after work, when walking and on the bus. Pay parking will cause me financial inconvenience. I am a single person with a mortgage and car payments as well as ordinary living expenses, and this will be an added burden to a tightly structured budget. However I do not want to have to catch the bus for the reasons outlined above.

There are no services within walking distance in the Parliamentary Triangle, we certainly don't have the advantages of working in the city or Woden. I would imagine that it will also be off putting for tourists visiting the attractions in the area. Many of these are currently free, so pay parking will have a major impact on them.

Regards, Rowena Jameson

Exhibition Conservator National Library of Australia 6262 1597



From: Sent: To: Subject: Liz.StClairLong@affa.gov.au Monday, 18 August 2003 5:49 PM Committee, NCET (REPS) NCA Pay Parking Proposal

As an employee in Barton, I wish to protest at the NCA's request for the introduction of paid parking to the parliamentary triangle.

I am supported in this protest by verbal representations to the Committee by both my employer (Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry) and my union (Community and Public Sector Union) pointing out the disadvantages such a proposal, if adopted, would present to Commonwealth public service organisations and their staff.

There have been no additions to the services provided to this area, in terms of increased public transport, retail facilities or business outlets for at least 10 years. There is no plan to increase bus or retail/business services within the area, despite increased tourist numbers to the ACT and the explosion of office floor space available in the area immediately outside the Triangle. However there has been a relentless doing away with parking facilities across the Triangle and on its edges.

The NCA and the ACT Governments persist in pressing (as they have done a number of times in the past 30 years) for pay parking. This is clearly for revenue raising. Neither body has put forward short-term options for traffic management, apart from the 'silver bullet' of pay parking, decreased availability of parking having already been tried unsuccessfully.

I urge the Committee to take a longer-term view of the Parliamentary Triangle's continued accessibility, amenity and dignity and to reject the "hack through or be damned" approach being adopted (jointly, it would seem) by the NCA and the ACT Government. I also urge committee members to ask what impact the introduction of pay parking will have on public servants, whose agencies are situated so as to be within close call of the House for good reason, not a specious whim.

Yours sincerely

Liz St Clair Long Senior Policy Officer Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry GPO Box 858 CANBERRA ACT 2600



From: Sent: To: Subject: Bernadette.Oakes@aqis.gov.au Monday, 18 August 2003 10:30 AM Committee, NCET (REPS) objection to paid parking in Barton

As an employee who works in the Barton area, I would like to strongly object to the introduction of paid parking. I have two small children who go to child care in Barton and I do not wish to have to contend with traffic, busses and crossing very busy roads on daily basis.

Thank you Bernadette Oakes



From: Sent: To: Subject: Barbara.VanDerLinden@brs.gov.au Monday, 18 August 2003 10:40 AM Committee, NCET (REPS) Barton Pay parking

Well there goes all my certified agreement pay rise plus some, straight into the hands of the Government, it was nice while the thought lasted.

The people of Canberra are not so stupid that they don't realise this is another way to pull money out of our already empty wallets, htere is no compassion and reason left in the way the government ruthlessly sucks us all dry, with unrealistic parking fines and speeding fines it has nothing to do with saving lives it has to do with making money and it is the biggest rort yet discovered by local Government as the rewards to them are huge and the community anger and frustration is rising steadily. One day the lid is going to burst off and no-one will be surprised at all.

#### Barbara





From:
Sent:
To:
Subject:

Alyssa.Hicks@affa.gov.au Tuesday, 26 August 2003 2:42 PM Committee, NCET (REPS) Pay Parking

To the Committee

I wish to oppose the idea of pay parking in Barton. I am a single mother with three children. I live in Conder, however one of my

children is in Family Day Care in Gordon during the day, the other two attend school in Gowrie. I would find it impossible to

catch public transport to work or "car pool". I work part time, 99% of people I know working part time have children also and find themselves in the same predicament. I am outraged at the thought of having to "pay to work", if it's not hard enough with the price of petrol and living, I think it is totally unfair.

Alyssa Hicks



From:	Control Room [Security@nga.gov.au]
Sent:	Wednesday, 20 August 2003 8:50 AM
To: Subject:	Committee, NCET (REPS) pay parking

Typical, what else would one expect from the ACT Government? This is yet another example where the government completely ignores the people of Canberra. The government has only one thing in mind, and that is, ripping the public (employees) of Canberra off once again. I strongly object to this unfair proposal being imposed on workers in the area. There is only one reason to come to this place, and that's work. If the government insists on it's workers paying for parking in this area, than it should be classed as a work related expense, and therefore, tax deductable.

Z Stefek. Security Control Room National Gallery of Australia GPO Box 1150 CANBERRA ACT 2601 Phone: 02 62406446; Fax: 02 62406445 Email: security@nga.gov.au

"Warning - this email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and are only for the use of the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient you have received this email in error. Any use, dissemination, forwarding, printing, copying or dealing in any way whatsoever with this email is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please reply immediately by way of advice to us and delete/destroy the documents."

National Gallery of Australia Winner 2002-03 Australian Tourism Award.

'Sari To Sarong' opens 11 July 2003.

Over 250 works, dating from the 14th century.

Free entry. See http://nga.gov.au/SariToSarong for details.

The National Gallery of Australia is a Federal Government Agency.



1

From: Sent: To: Subject: Catherine.Potter@affa.gov.au Monday, 18 August 2003 10:31 AM Committee, NCET (REPS) paid parking enquiry

Good morning

I would like to register my concern about possible introduction of paid parking in the Parliamentary Triangle. I have to drive to work rather than catch public transport as I drop off and pick up my child from school. I cannot afford an additional cost of possibly \$50 - \$80 per fortnight to park my car near my work place. I am very against this proposal, think it is discriminatory and trust that you will not advise its introduction.

With thanks

Catherine Potter