

**DRAFT ACTS ANNULING CERTAIN ROAD TRAFFIC
ORDERS RELATING TO PUBLIC PARKING PLACES**

**Lodged au Greffe on 24th February 1998
by Deputy A.S. Crowcroft of St. Helier**



STATES OF JERSEY

STATES GREFFE

175

1998

P.31

Price code: B

PROPOSITION

THE STATES are asked to decide whether they are of opinion -

to adopt Acts annulling the following Orders -

Road Traffic (Public Parking Places) (Amendment No. 35) (Jersey) Order 1998 (R & 0 9200);

Road Traffic (Saint Helier) (Amendment No. 2) (Jersey) Order 1998 (R & 0 9201);

Road Traffic (Saint Lawrence) (Amendment No. 10) (Jersey) Order 1998 (R & 0 9202).

DEPUTY A.S. CROWCROFT OF ST. HELIER

Report

There has been a great deal of public concern about the increased charges for car parking enacted on 17th February 1998 in R & O's 9200, 9201 and 9202.

The Public Services Committee has said that the Committee had no alternative but to increase dramatically parking charges because the responsibility for funding the school bus service has been transferred to it from the Education Committee.

It will be clear to anyone who travels in the United Kingdom that charges for parking in Jersey's public car parks are extremely low. A significant increase in parking charges is overdue, but if it is to be acceptable to the public it must be part of an integrated Island transport policy which the public have been consulted and informed about. The hypothecation of charges for motoring must be seen to be part of a strategy that delivers real benefits to the whole community, such as reduced congestion; ease of access to town for all travellers, whatever their mode of transport; improved air quality; less danger to pedestrians from the volume and speed of traffic; and so on. Therefore, while I broadly agree with the Public Services Committee's decision to increase parking charges, I do not believe that it should have been introduced as a single measure, or introduced without an informed debate.

The 'user pays' philosophy recently endorsed by the States will never work unless the user understands what he/she is paying for, and is in broad agreement with the payment being made. In this case, the users must not feel that they are being unfairly burdened with a levy which ought to be spread across all who drive into St. Helier and park their vehicle, whether in private or public parking spaces. If it is legitimate to hypothecate the revenue from charging for parking and to use it for making improvements in the transport system of the Island, then all who park in St. Helier - apart from residents - should share the burden. It is unfair to compel a minority of motorists (the users of public car parks) to pay for a minority of bus travellers (those school children who use the school bus service).

The lack of equity in the current proposals would have been clear if the Public Services Committee had informed or consulted with the 'user'.

The Committee might also have discovered that the public would endorse the need for a revamped school bus service, as an integrated part of the “comprehensive and Island-wide public transport service” required in ‘2000 and Beyond’, and that they would be prepared to pay for it through increases in the cost of motoring generally. Significantly, some objectors to the increased parking charges have claimed that they would use public transport instead of their cars if there were a reasonable level of bus service provided.

The R & O is an instrument which allows Committees to make routine changes to legislation such as the increasing of certain fees payable for services to keep pace with inflation. Neither the general public nor the States would be likely to object should the Public Services Committee seek to raise parking charges in line with inflation through subordinate legislation; equally, it would seem reasonable to use this means to extend parking charges to cover certain car parks which had previously offered free parking, as is proposed in a section of R & O 9200.

However, the R & O is not the proper instrument with which to introduce major policy changes in a piece-meal fashion. The Public Services Committee has indicated that the sustainable transport strategy requested by the States in the 1995 Strategic Policy Review and Action Plan ‘2000 and Beyond’ is in preparation, and I would suggest that this would be the appropriate time for the Committee’s parking policy together with their plans to hypothecate revenue from parking charges to be considered by the States.

In the event of the States’ adopting my proposition the position in relation to parking charges will revert to that which obtained prior to the making of the Order.

**Act annulling the Road Traffic (Public Parking Places)
(Amendment No. 35) (Jersey) Order 1998**

STATES OF JERSEY

The day of 199

THE STATES, in pursuance of the Subordinate Legislation (Jersey) Law 1960, as amended, annulled the Road Traffic (Public Parking Places) (Amendment No. 35) (Jersey) Order 1998.

**Act annulling the Road Traffic (Saint Helier) (Amendment No. 2)
(Jersey) Order 1998**

STATES OF JERSEY

The day of 199

THE STATES, in pursuance of the Subordinate Legislation (Jersey) Law 1960, as amended, annulled the Road Traffic (Saint Helier) (Amendment No. 2) (Jersey) Order 1998.

**Act annulling the Road Traffic (Saint Lawrence) (Amendment
No. 10) (Jersey) Order 1998**

STATES OF JERSEY

The day of 199

THE STATES, in pursuance of the Subordinate Legislation (Jersey) Law 1960, as amended, annulled the Road Traffic (Saint Lawrence) (Amendment No. 10) (Jersey) Order 1998.