

# **STATES OF JERSEY**

**r**

## **RESIDENTIAL AND BUSINESS PARKING SCHEME, STOPFORD ROAD AREA, ST. HELIER: FEES**

---

Lodged au Greffe on 14th October 2003  
by Deputy G.P. Southern of St. Helier

---

**STATES GREFFE**

## **PROPOSITION**

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

to request the Environment and Public Services Committee to fix the annual fee payable for a residential parking permit under the residential and business parking scheme in St. Helier at no more than £260 per year with effect from the date of expiry of the trial scheme on 4th November 2003.

DEPUTY G.P. SOUTHERN OF ST. HELIER

## REPORT

On Tuesday 7th October 2003, Members learned, through answers from the President of the Environment and Public Services Committee, that the annual fee for residential parking in St. Helier No. 2 was to rise from £150 to £600. The affected residents learned of the rise either through the media or by letter from the Committee that evening. In the letter to residents, the Committee states in justification for the scale of this rise –

*The Environment and Public Services Committee has given careful consideration to the cost of the new permits. It is essential that the parking scheme becomes self-financing, to cover all initial costs, running costs plus the loss of season ticket sales. In order to do this the annual fee for a permit must rise to £600.*

*The Committee is mindful that this is a very substantial increase on the present cost, and for this reason, is prepared to continue to discount the true cost of a permit for a further 6 months. The cost of a permit which will be valid from 5th November 2003 to 5th May 2004, will therefore be set at £240. In May 2004 the cost of a permit will rise to £300, payable at 6-month intervals.*

In a paper discussed at a meeting of the Committee to which St. Helier representatives were invited on 23rd September 2003, the following costs were revealed –

### Start-up costs in first year

Consultants' fees	£18,000
Permit creation and admin systems	£ 5,000
Street signs and poles	<u>£ 6,000</u>
	£29,000

### Annual running costs

Administration	£ 2,200
Patrols on streets	£27,200
Consumables	£ 1,000
Estimated loss of PSD season tickets	£72,000
Less income from new scratchcard areas	<u>£ 4,000</u>
	£98,400

At the foot of the page the following conclusions are reached –

The annual charge (to cover costs) after the first year would be £550 (assuming start-up costs are “written off”).

If start-up costs are spread over a 5-year period, the cost of a permit would be £585 per year.

Members will notice that by far the largest element of these “costs” is the figure of £72,000 for estimated loss of car parking revenue elsewhere. I believe that the addition of this sum to the costs is both inappropriate and unreasonable. In response to demand from residents over more than a decade, the Committee finally responded with a new service, on-street residential parking. This is inevitably a cheaper system than what was in place. There is no requirement to build and maintain expensive multi-storey car parks for this small group of car-users. All that has happened is that a small amount of the pressure on car parks has been eased slightly. Is Gas Place now empty? I believe not. Have any car parks been emptied? They have not.

What we see here is not user-pays, but a new principle, non-user pays.

I find the inclusion of this “lost revenue” sum in the running costs manifestly absurd. I am fully aware that the Environment and Public Services is desperate to raise its income, but I believe there can be no justification for using the scheme as a milch-cow.

The true annual running costs shown by the figures above are £30,400. If we were to include recovery of start-up

costs over a 2-year period, then the annual fee would be £260.

This is a realistic fee that I believe would be acceptable to residents. It also covers the true costs and could enable similar schemes to be started in other areas following full recovery of start-up costs.

### **Financial and manpower implications**

This proposition would increase income from the residential parking scheme from £27,000 to over £46,000. There are no manpower implications.