1) The Todd Litman research can be found at: [http://www.vtpi.org/tdm/tdm26.htm](http://www.vtpi.org/tdm/tdm26.htm)


The CHAIR: Given the points of your submission that you are currently speaking to, I want to clarify one sentence which states:

Research indicates that shifting from a free to cost-recovery parking model typically reduces car commuting by 10-30% especially if it is implemented in conjunction with other transport demand strategies.

However, you have not told the Committee whose research it is.

Ms DUFFY: That has come out of the States, Tom Lipman.

The CHAIR: You say it is from the States but how recent is it? I have no sense of how reliable this information is because you have not said where it has come from.

Ms DUFFY: I can certainly send it all to you. That is obviously from a transport planner that is involved in this space very considerably. I am more than happy to send the whole research paper, if you like.

2) In reference to the questions by Ms McKay regarding: Do you support the Parking Space Levy – the response by Lorraine Duffy in context was “Yes if it solves congestion”. It should also be noted that the response straight after that is incorrect. It is referred to as a Congestion Living when it should be a Congestion Levy. see below:

Ms JODI McKay: Do you support the parking space levy?
Ms DUFFY: Yes.

Ms JODI McKay: Has it achieved what the Government set out to do?

Ms DUFFY: The parking space levy was initially a congestion living. That is what it was called. The goal of it was to reduce congestion. Obviously, that has not worked because we still have a lot of congestion. It is not about just saying, “Let’s build better roads or more roads.” It is about understanding how we plan and what we do as far as drivers and commuting are concerned. There is a lot of work. The congestion levy or parking space levy is imposed on only private operators. There is no levy for on-street parking. It is certainly not going to assist with the reducing congestion.

Additional questions on notice:

a). In your submission (p. 3), you note that the downside to building more commuter car parking is a financial cost to developers, businesses, and ultimately, the taxpayers, even those who are not using commuter car parking. a. What are the alternatives to building more commuter car parking that would address the growing demand for car parking?
Response:

Some of the points relating to these questions were addressed during the hearing, however additionally:

- There is a tension between our natural dislike for parking facilities and the desire to have them wherever and whenever needed and this in turn creates a conflict for drivers/commuters, businesses and the community.
- Effective parking management including policies and programs should result in the more efficient use of parking resources which can be done by:
  - Sharing and regulating pricing
  - Implementation of overflow parking plans
  - Improving commuter information about parking (in a more real and dynamic form)
  - Improve walking and cycling conditions/parking
  - Improve enforcement and control of parking regulations in/around commuter parking and address spillover issues
  - Review and improve parking facility design – wayfinding, real time data/occupancy
  - Source all of parking data – availability of parking spots in /around commuter hubs that are available during peak times. There could well be available parking around commuter hubs that are not being used during peak times however this data is not available. So, an investment in parking availability data.
  - Consider modular, temporary car parks for At Grade sites

b). What are the benefits and risks for reserving space in car parks for bicycle parking? a. Would you support more space being made available for bicycle parking around stations or in commuter car parks?

Response:

This could not be a one size fits all solution as each facility would have different requirements. Understanding the bike parking needs of bicyclists and identifying the factors that may influence them to use their bicycle to park at stations is necessary.

Understanding the full operating and administrative costs and customer service implications of current and planned bike parking facilities, including the type of bike parking requirements.

An important consideration in determining the potential market for bike parking is whether passengers’ trips could be served by bike parking if high quality bike parking facilities were provided at the commuter hub. Obviously, the benefits of cycle parking mean a lesser demand for car parking, although there would need to be significant evidence to support the increase in bicycle parking and, ideally the introduction of this form of parking noting that most bicycle users would expect the parking spots to be located in close proximity to the station which, could well be used for more vulnerable commuters.
Do you or your members have any data available on how many customers use commuter car parks, either in specific areas or across NSW? a. Do you have any data available on demographic breakdowns of people who use commuter car parks or other methods of accessing transport hubs?

Do you have any data available on the proportion of genuine commuters who use commuter car parks compared to, for example, local workers or shoppers?

Response:

Regarding the supply of data for use of commuter car parks, this is not information that Parking Australia has, however we would be prepared to see this data from our members given a suitable time frame and scope of information required.