

# **STATES OF JERSEY**



## **STRATEGIC TRAVEL AND TRANSPORT PLAN (P.174/2005): AMENDMENT**

---

**Lodged au Greffe on 13th September 2005  
by Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier of St. Saviour**

---

**STATES GREFFE**

STRATEGIC TRAVEL AND TRANSPORT PLAN (P.174/2005): AMENDMENT

---

- 1 *In paragraph (b)(i), for subparagraphs (1) and (2) substitute the following sub-paragraph –*
  - “(1) the presentation to the States within one year of a revised bus strategy capable of being fully implemented within one year after approval, which, inter alia, addresses all public transport issues contained in the Plan and which also contains recommendations on the manner in which the revised bus strategy, once implemented, can be rapidly modified in case of changed circumstances”,

*and renumber remaining sub-paragraphs accordingly.*
  
- 2 *At the end of both paragraphs (b)(ii) and (b)(iii) insert the words “with the exception of those matters that will be included in the revised bus strategy referred to in paragraph (b)(i)(1) above.”.*

DEPUTY R.G. LE HÉRISSIER OF ST. SAVIOUR

# REPORT

## Introduction

There have been several false dawns in respect of public transport.

Most recently, there was a belief that, after the Bus Strategy had been adopted by the States, and Connex had been appointed as the successful tenderer, a fresh start would be made and that gradual improvements would come about.

Ironically, many of the sought-after improvements are contained in the Sustainable “Travel and Transport Plan draft framework – July 2005”. Some have come about, e.g. a new largely disabled friendly fleet, incentive fare in the evening, wider publicity.

This raises the inevitable question of why changes, about which there is a strong consensus, are taking so long to materialise.

Members are only too aware of the factors which have delayed progression of the Bus Strategy. Many of these are dealt with in the recent report of the Committee of Inquiry.

Indeed, the then forthcoming publication of the Report was cited as the major reason as to why reform of the Bus Service could not be progressed.

It is now 3 years since Connex took over and there have only been minor changes in respect of routes and fare structures.

## Proposal

It became apparent sometime ago that there is little flexibility in the terms of the contract. It appears that every addition requires extra payments to Connex.

Further, by inheriting a route structure the Committee largely froze into place a structure which is no longer relevant in some respects but which is inordinately difficult to change.

Some changes (initially seen as innovative and desirable) such as the extension of Route 19 to Elizabeth Terminal are not working yet just seem to carry on and on at great expense to the taxpayer.

The proposer is very disappointed that, after all the expectation which surrounded Connex's arrival, after all the turbulence which has surrounded the contract, the public are yet again being asked to wait for improvements against a background of escalating costs.

There is a crying need for a revised strategy and for a mechanism that allows minor or incremental changes to be swiftly made and implemented.

It is preposterous that 1 – 5 years is set as the timescale for these long overdue and incessantly discussed changes.

Hence the proposal that the Committee (and the Minister that will of course take over these functions) reports back to the Assembly in one year with a revised bus strategy.

There are no direct financial and manpower implications arising out of this amendment other than the resource implications of preparing the revised bus strategy. The actual resource implications of the new strategy itself will have to be assessed when it has been prepared.