

# STATES OF JERSEY



## GOVERNMENT PLAN 2020–2023 (P.71/2019): SECOND AMENDMENT

---

Lodged au Greffe on 1st November 2019  
by Deputy R. Labey of St. Helier

---

STATES GREFFE

**PAGE 3, PARAGRAPH (i) –**

After the words “Appendix 4 to the Report” insert the words –

“except that, on page 111 of Appendix 4, after the words “prior to the debate of the Government Plan.” there should be inserted the following words –

“Implementation of the Efficiencies Plan for 2020–23 will not, however, include any extension of standard car-parking charging hours from the current 8.00 a.m. to 5.00 p.m. to 7.00 a.m. to 6.00 p.m. (as was initially proposed in ‘Efficiencies Plan 2020–23’ (R.130/2019)).”.”.

DEPUTY R. LABEY OF ST. HELIER

**Note:** After this amendment, the proposition would read as follows –

**THE STATES are asked to decide whether they are of opinion –**

to receive the Government Plan 2020–2023 specified in Article 9(1) of the Public Finances (Jersey) Law 2019 (“the Law”) and specifically –

- (a) to approve the estimate of total States income to be paid into the Consolidated Fund in 2020 as set out in Appendix 2 – Summary Table 1 to the Report, which is inclusive of the proposed taxation and impôts duties changes outlined in the Government Plan, in line with Article 9(2)(a) of the Law; and
- (b) to approve each major project that is to be started or continued in 2020 and the total cost of each such project, in line with Article 9(2)(d), (e) and (f) of the Law and as set out in Appendix 2 – Summary Table 2 to the Report; and
- (c) to approve the proposed amount to be appropriated from the Consolidated Fund for 2020, for each head of expenditure, being gross expenditure less estimated income (if any), in line with Articles 9(2)(g), 10(1) and 10(2) of the Law and set out in Appendix 2 – Summary Tables 3(i) and (ii) of the Report; and
- (d) to approve the estimated income, being estimated gross income less expenditure, that each States trading operation will pay into its trading fund in 2020 in line with Article 9(2)(h) of the Law and set out in Appendix 2 – Summary Table 4 to the Report; and

- (e) to approve the proposed amount to be appropriated from each States trading operation’s trading fund for 2020 for each head of expenditure in line with Article 9(2)(i) of the Law and set out in Appendix 2 – Summary Table 5 to the Report; and
- (f) to approve –
  - (i) the establishment of a “Climate Emergency Fund”, in accordance with the provisions of Article 6 of the Law, as set out at Appendix 3 to the Report; and
  - (ii) the estimated income and expenditure proposals for the Climate Emergency Fund for 2020 as set out in Appendix 2 – Summary Table 6 to the Report; and
- (g) to approve the amounts to be transferred from one States fund to another for 2020 in line with Article 9(2)(b) as set out in Appendix 2 – Summary Table 7 to the Report; and
- (h) to approve the estimated income and expenditure of the Social Security, Health Insurance and Long-Term Care Funds for 2020 set out in Appendix 2 – Summary Tables 8(i), (ii) and (iii) to the Report, with –
  - (i) the estimated income to be raised from existing social security contributions defined in the Social Security Law and the proposed changes to contribution liability; and
  - (ii) the estimated expenditure to be paid to support the existing benefits and functions defined in the Social Security Law, the Health Insurance Law and the Long-Term Care Funds and new benefits, if any, to be paid from the Funds; and
- (i) to approve, in accordance with Article 9(1) of the Law, the Government Plan 2020–2023, as set out at Appendix 4 to the Report except that, on page 111 of Appendix 4, after the words “prior to the debate of the Government Plan.” there should be inserted the following words –
 

“Implementation of the Efficiencies Plan for 2020–23 will not, however, include any extension of standard car-parking charging hours from the current 8.00 a.m. to 5.00 p.m. to 7.00 a.m. to 6.00 p.m. (as was initially proposed in ‘Efficiencies Plan 2020–23’ (R.130/2019)).”.

## REPORT

The e-petition titled '[STOP the government extending car park charging hours from 8AM-5PM to 7AM-6PM](#)' (appended below) reached over 1,000 signatures in its first 24 hours.

At the time of writing, the petitioners have been waiting 6 days for a response from Ministers triggered by hitting the 1,000 target.

Currently the total number of signatories stands at 4,192.

Such a rapid rate of response indicates an inevitable achievement of 5,000 signatures within days, and the petition will, therefore, be considered for debate in the Assembly.

There is little point in having such a debate after the measures have been approved as part of the Government Plan. This proposition ensures meaningful debate of the proposed extension of charging hours as part of the Government Plan debate, and invites Members to reject it.

The changes to charging hours form part of the [Efficiencies Plan 2020–23](#). However, one has to question the rationale of describing as an 'efficiency' what is clearly a revenue-raising exercise.

Parking is an important element for both mobility and quality of life in urban areas. Parking policy is often an incendiary political issue, but this should not prevent policy debate, public consultation, or impact assessment. In the absence of any evidence to the contrary, it is not difficult to see why these measures are perceived as a pernicious assault on those who live in St. Helier.

Presuming it is still Government policy, how exactly do these proposed measures offer encouragement to live in St. Helier?

Very many do, but at least 50 local councils in the U.K. make no money whatsoever from parking – or even make a loss – to keep their town centres busy and to support high-street retailers (the retailer's credo: 'No parking, no business'). It can legitimately be argued that these measures take us in the wrong direction, and that innovative periods of grace or relaxation should be examined, especially around the environs of our cherished Central Market.

Dressing up this quick fix revenue-raiser as some kind of green initiative to reduce dependency on the car or to improve air quality is trite nonsense. Two additional, but critical, hours will simply inconvenience and aggravate those most undeserving of such interventions.

### **Financial and manpower implications**

The '[Efficiencies Plan 2020–23](#)' (R.130/2019) states that extending car-parking charging hours from the current 8.00 a.m. to 5.00 p.m. to 7.00 a.m. to 6.00 p.m. would raise additional income of £0.7 million. If this amendment were adopted, that additional income would not be realised, and the overall amount to be achieved through the Efficiencies Plan would be reduced by a similar sum.

E-PETITION

**“STOP the government extending car park charging hours from 8AM-5PM to 7AM-6PM.**

Parking is expensive enough as it is with the current hours of 8AM - 5PM. Now the government plan to extend these hours further by an extra 2 hours per day claiming that this is part of a major savings plan and will encourage people to use more sustainable modes of transport.

The government SHOULD implement free forms of transport, helping Jersey be more eco-friendly. The government WON'T do this because too much money is generated from parking fees and fines.

£1,672,725 was generated in parking fines from 2016-2018 and the price per unit of parking has gone up 51.79% from 2008 (£0.56-£0.85)

This is not savings, but rather punishing/stealing from the working class and people that want to shop locally.

People who work 12 hour shifts, starting at 7:30 will have to pay an additional 2 hours per day for parking. This is punishing essential workers such as nurses!”