

# STATES OF JERSEY



## **PROVISION OF STATES MEMBERS' LUNCHES AT CERTAIN MEETINGS AND CAR PARKING (P.171/2009): AMENDMENT**

---

Lodged au Greffe on 24th November 2009  
by Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré of St. Lawrence

---

**STATES GREFFE**



PROVISION OF STATES MEMBERS' LUNCHEAS AT CERTAIN MEETINGS  
AND CAR PARKING (P.171/2009): AMENDMENT

---

**PAGE 2, PARAGRAPH (b) –**

After the words “any member” insert the words “(except those not receiving any of the salary element of the remuneration package)”.

DEPUTY J.A.N. LE FONDRÉ OF ST. LAWRENCE

## **REPORT**

I support the principles behind Senator Ferguson's proposition, as the provision of free parking to States members has been a bone of contention from the Public perspective for quite some time, particularly since the remuneration package was significantly increased a few years ago.

Originally, parking was provided as a 'perk' in front of the States building before the Royal Square was extended, at a time when States members were given a form of expense allowance. Thus it was a benefit, at the time that States members were still acting in a quasi-honorary role.

The present position is that the remuneration package has significantly increased since those days, but the provision of free parking has never been re-addressed.

My amendment seeks to ensure that, where any members choose not to take any part of the salary element of the remuneration package (as opposed to the expense element), such members would still have the benefit of a free parking space.

Given that this relates to individual circumstances I am not aware (quite rightly) of whether any members are presently in this position. However, an extract from the States Annual Accounts (for 2008) states the following –

### **Members Remuneration**

- Net spend of £2,343,685, an underspend of £46,515 (2%) against Final Approved Budget

Actual spend was less than approved budget due to not all members taking up the remuneration.

Therefore it would seem reasonable to assume that a very few members do not take the remuneration package, and in my view it would be unfair to penalise them in respect of the parking provision when they continue to act in the best traditions of the States.

### **Financial and manpower implications**

There are no manpower implications arising from this proposition.

It is difficult to assess the financial consequences, as I am not privy to the private circumstances of individual members. However, based upon the information contained in the States accounts, if one were to assume that 2 members would continue to be provided with free parking, this would reduce the revenue potentially raised by part (b) of P.171/2009 by the price of 2 season tickets, being a total of approximately £2,274.