



**OFFICIAL REPORT**

**OF THE**

**STATES OF DELIBERATION**

**OF THE**

**ISLAND OF GUERNSEY**

**HANSARD**

**Royal Court House, Guernsey, Wednesday, 14th May 2014**

*All published Official Reports can be found on the  
official States of Guernsey website [www.gov.gg](http://www.gov.gg)*

**Volume 3, No. 12**

**ISSN 2049-8284**

**Present:**

**Richard J. Collas, Esq., Bailiff and Presiding Officer**

**Law Officers**

Miss M. M. E. Pullum, Q.C. (H.M. Comptroller)

**People's Deputies**

**St. Peter Port South**

Deputies P. A. Harwood, J. Kuttelwascher, B. L. Brehaut,  
R. Domaille, A. H. Langlois, R. A. Jones

**St. Peter Port North**

Deputies M. K. Le Clerc, J. A. B. Gollop, P. A. Sherbourne,  
R. Conder, M. J. Storey, E. G. Bebb, L. C. Queripel

**St. Sampson**

Deputies K. A. Stewart, P. L. Gillson,  
P. R. Le Pelley, S. J. Ogier, L. S. Trott

**The Vale**

Deputies M. J. Fallaize, D. B. Jones, L. B. Queripel, M. M. Lowe,  
A. R. Le Lièvre, A. Spruce, G. M. Collins

**The Castel**

Deputies D. J. Duquemin, M. H. Dorey,  
B. J. E. Paint, S. A. James, M. B. E., A. H. Adam

**The West**

Deputies R. A. Perrot, A. H. Brouard, A. M. Wilkie,  
D. de G. De Lisle, Y. Burford, D. A. Inglis

**The South-East**

Deputies H. J. R. Soulsby, R. W. Sillars, P. A. Luxon,  
M. G. O'Hara, F. W. Quin, M. P. J. Hadley

**Representatives of the Island of Alderney**

Alderney Representatives L. E. Jean and R. N. Harvey

**The Clerk to the States of Deliberation**

J. Torode, Esq. (H.M. Greffier)

**Absent at the Evocation**

H. E. Roberts Esq., Q.C. (H.M. Procureur); Deputy G. A. St Pier (*relevé à 10h 02*);  
Deputy C. J. Green (*relevé à 12h 34*); J. P. Le Tocq (*relevé à 17h 25*)

## Business transacted

Convocation.....	635
<b>Billet d'État IX.....</b>	<b>635</b>
VI. Guernsey Integrated on-Island Transport Strategy – Debate continued .....	635
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 12.35 p.m. and resumed its sitting at 2.30 p.m. ....</i>	<i>664</i>
VI. Guernsey Integrated on-Island Transport Strategy – Debate continued – Amended Propositions carried .....	664
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 6.04 p.m. ....</i>	<i>702</i>

*PAGE LEFT DELIBERATELY BLANK*

# States of Deliberation

*The States met at 9.30 a.m.*

[THE BAILIFF *in the Chair*]

## PRAYERS

*The Greffier*

## CONVOCATION

# Billet d'État IX

## ENVIRONMENT DEPARTMENT

### VI. Guernsey Integrated on-Island Transport Strategy – Debate continued

**The Greffier:** Billet d'État IX, Article VI. Guernsey Integrated on-Island Transport Strategy – continuation of debate.

**The Bailiff:** Well, Members, good morning to you all. Those who wish to do so may remove their  
5 jackets. I have been asked for that.

We had started general debate, you may remember, but since then I have received notice of two  
amendments: one proposed by Deputy Soulsby and seconded by Deputy Le Clerc; and the other proposed  
by Deputy Dorey and seconded by Deputy Brouard. Are there any other amendments that Members intend  
to lay at the moment? No? Well, we just have those two in play. I wonder if we take first Deputy Soulsby's  
10 amendment.

Deputy Soulsby.

*Amendment:*

*To add a new Proposition as follows:*

*'5A. To direct the Environment Department to publish annually on the States of Guernsey website,  
details of income and expenditure relating to the operation of paid parking.'*

**Deputy Soulsby:** Sir, this is a rather benign amendment. It is nothing to do with the merits or otherwise  
of paid parking. It is to do with accountability and transparency. It merely requires that – and I will quote  
this for those at home:

*'To direct the Environment Department to publish annually on the States of Guernsey website, details of income and expenditure  
relating to the operation of paid parking.'*

15 So the purpose is to ensure, should paid parking be approved, that everyone is able to see how it is  
working financially. Whether or not Members support paid parking is not relevant to this amendment and I  
therefore request that, in the interest of accountability and transparency, it is supported.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Le Clerc, do you formally second the amendment?  
20

**Deputy Le Clerc:** I do, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Does anybody wish to debate it? No?

Minister, Deputy Domaille, do you wish to say anything before...?

**Deputy Domaille:** No, sir.

**The Bailiff:** We go straight to the vote then. Those in favour; those against?

*Members voted Pour.*

**The Bailiff:** I declare it carried.

We move on now to Deputy Dorey's amendment. Deputy Dorey.

*Amendment:*

*To amend the Propositions as follows:*

*1) To delete Proposition 5b,*

*2) In the words following Proposition 5d, after 'Minority Report', insert a full stop and delete the remaining text,*

*3) To delete Proposition 7,*

*4) In Proposition 25(b), after the words 'paid parking' insert the words 'but not'.*

**Deputy Dorey:** Thank you, Mr Bailiff.

Firstly, I would like to make it clear that this amendment has nothing to do with paid parking and that is evidenced by the fact that I, as proposer, am a supporter of paid parking and the seconder – and I wish to thank Deputy Brouard for seconding this amendment – is against paid parking.

I would like to apologise for the lateness of this amendment. I originally thought that an amendment would not be necessary, and I would just ask Members to vote against Proposition 5(b), which is a chargeable annual disc-parking clock for short-stay parking in the disc zones of the rest of the Island – see paragraph... of the Minority Report – and also vote against Proposition 7, which is to agree a decrease of 1.2 pence per litre on the duty on petrol and gas oil, other than fuel used for air and marine navigation, with effect from April 2015, as described in paragraph 63 of the Minority Report.

Proposition 25(b) – again I will read it – talks about:

*'Income from paid parking including parking clocks as set out in paragraphs 46 to 55 and 57 to 63 of that Minority Report.'*

This also refers to parking clocks and it was considered that it would be better for an amendment to be placed to amend it.

So what does this amendment do? It removes the chargeable annual parking clocks and raises a similar amount of money by keeping the existing 1.2 pence fuel duty. This will remove the cost of bureaucracy for the annual charge.

It is also necessary to delete the amendment brought by Deputies Queripel and Ogier relating to reusing the chargeable annual parking clocks. As this amendment says, it will mean it will be no longer necessary.

I would like to give a very brief history of annual chargeable parking clocks. In 2009, the Environment Department proposed, instead of paid parking, introducing an annual parking disc at a cost of £26 per annum. This disc would not have been car specific – i.e. you could have moved it from car to car if you had more than one vehicle. The proposal was successfully amended by Deputies Brouard and Jones, replacing it with a 1.2 pence duty on fuel.

I would like to read an extract from the Minority Report preamble from page 714:

*'This Strategy is principally designed to achieve 'modal shift', in other words to reduce the number of miles travelled in private motor vehicles in favour of walking, cycling and buses by changing from one mode of transport to a better one, and also to make significant progress towards the outcomes encapsulated in the Transport Strategy Vision...'*

Introducing an annual chargeable parking clock will not achieve that modal shift. I do not believe that it would achieve any behavioural change. If you use a disc parking zone anywhere in the Island once a year – unlikely I know – or even every day, you would still pay the same amount. That cannot be fair; it is not related to usage.

Almost every car will require at some time during the year, if it is used normally, to park in a disc zone somewhere in the Island and therefore would require a parking clock which they would have to pay for annually. In comparison, the 1.2 pence per litre on fuel is related to usage of a motor vehicle and I would argue it is consistent with the principle of trying to reduce the number of miles travelled. I fully accept that 1.2 pence is not going to make any significant change but it will make it more expensive to use a vehicle rather than a parking clock, subsequent to the initial purchase.

The Policy Council's Policy and Research Unit concluded that there is a strong statistical evidence to support the hypothesis that increasing duty rates on petrol cause a decrease in demand for petrol – exactly what the Strategy is trying to achieve; exactly what this amendment will try and achieve.

Bureaucracy: whatever method is used to collect the annual charge for parking clocks, there will be administration costs, there will be system costs and there will also be commission if it is sold at various different outlets. Also, there will be the cost of producing the clock or, as Deputy Queripel said, in proposing a sticker or whatever else the Environment Department concludes on. This is just a waste of money and time. It is also very crude.

For example, on page 736, it says that the registration number will be required to be written on the clock in ink – not very sophisticated. A parking warden will not only have to check the time of the parking clock, they would also have to check the number plate against the handwritten number on the clock, a waste of time.

The States a number of years ago ended motor tax and increased the duty on fuel in order to save money spent on administration and make the tax directly related to vehicle usage. This is going in the opposite direction and is definitely a retrograde step. There has been criticism of other amendments that this is a carefully thought-out Integrated Strategy and it should not be amended. I would argue that this amendment is not tinkering with the Strategy. I would say that it actually strengthens the Strategy, because an annual charge for a parking clock would be just an expensive and inefficient way of collecting money to fund the Strategy. They will not cause any behaviour change. They are crude. They are not linked to usage and therefore they are unfair.

The 2009, the States disagreed with a very similar proposal. The public is paying the 1.2 pence fuel duty so the *status quo* would be maintained. There would be no negative public reaction. In comparison, the fuel duty costs nothing to collect and will contribute to the reduction of the number of miles travelled.

Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Brouard, do you formally second the amendment?

**Deputy Brouard:** Yes please sir, and may I reserve my right?

**The Bailiff:** Yes. Does anybody wish to speak on this amendment? Deputy Gollop.

**Deputy Gollop:** Sir, I support this amendment because I was considering putting forward a slightly different amendment, but I do not think that there is a particular urgency to debate it or to move it forward and it was more complicated than this.

But I could not see the logic, in what is otherwise a very useful and structured Strategy, of having these additional charges and eliminating for a while the 1.2 pence duty. The reason I say that is that the problem with getting rid of the 1.2 pence hypothecated, or semi-hypothecated, add-on on the fuel, is that it not only reduces public revenue but it probably facilitates two undesirable effects.

The first is that it is probable that some, if not all retail and wholesale outlets of fuel will keep their prices as they are or raise them anyway. So it will just effectively be a loss to the Government but not a boon to the consumer. In any case, do we particularly want to see a reduction in fuel because that goes against the theoretical arguments for this Strategy in the first place?

The second issue is, as we know, in the big wide world the price of fuel varies according to all kinds of political, international and economic resource circumstances. Deputy Ogier is really the expert on peak oil but I mean it is much bigger than Government intervention in that respect. And it is more than likely at some future occasion that the Treasury and Resources Department will propose a budget which will see some form of increase in fuel duty, if not this year maybe in future years.

As a consequence, that kind of micro-management of the fuel price in relation to this seems absurd and my desire is to keep it. My amendment – which I will not place, unless it is restructured – was very much to contain, initially at least, the cost of paid parking and share the costs of the Strategy with the overall motorist who, regardless of where they go and what they do, will pay the fuel duty, rather than just be a commuter parking in three or four specific car-parking areas.

So on those grounds, I think keeping the 1.2 pence is useful, but there is another even more particular reason to support this amendment and that is: the perception of the Transport Strategy amongst the public, which I think in some cases is misunderstood, is that it is in some sense anti-town, anti the retail sector, potentially reducing the life of St Peter Port. Now, the annual paid parking charge for the clock was a form of paid parking for customers – disabled and others – who were using car parks purely to have a coffee, have their hair done, buy things from the shops, walk around town, go to the town carnival events, whatever. Effectively, it was a quasi-form of paid parking, not for commuters and long stay, but for short stay because you could not utilise those car parking spaces without this annual charge and of course it would also have a little bit of an impact on the tourist sector as well.

I think we do not want to over confuse the picture. That would be a distraction. It would bring in the question of whether we really are having a continuation for the moment of free retail spaces and I think that

supporting this amendment actually makes the main line arguments of the Transport Strategy clearer cut, whilst at the same time I think simplifying the administration and protecting States revenue.

135 **The Bailiff:** Deputy David Jones.

**Deputy David Jones:** Thank you, Mr Bailiff.

We get ourselves in these situations when we continually try and deceive the public. The Brouard/Jones amendment for the 1.2 pence increase in fuel duty was in place of paid parking. The public thought they understood that. It also means that the more you use your car, the more you pay. It does not affect the elderly who do not use their cars that much and it was a fairer way of doing it, in my view.

Here we are: we have duped the public into believing that is what is going to happen. The next States comes in and decides to bring back paid parking and the Minority Report says, of course, they want to remove that duty increase. But anybody who knows anything about Government at all knows that that would soon be replaced by the Treasury. Once you remove it, they will go, 'Well you know, it used to be that price. Now it has gone down 1.5 pence. That gives us some wriggle room to put it back up.'

We are constantly duping the people of this Island. No wonder the public do not trust us! Can you blame them? We supported an amendment to put duty on fuel to avoid paid parking and here we are now trying through this wonderful ballet, this choreography, to try and get both! It is a con.

Now, I find myself in a funny position with this amendment because I agree that I would much rather see it remain on fuel, which is the thing that Deputy Brouard and I discussed at the time of the previous amendment, but at the same time I feel part of this con and it is putting us in a position where we are saying to the public, really what we want to do is we want the best of all worlds: 'We want to keep the duty. We want to charge you extra. We want to charge you for paid parking, even though it was not that many years ago that we increased the fuel surcharge to avoid paid parking – but there you are, that is the way Government is'. Well that is not the way Government should be. Our people should at least be able to trust this Assembly to stick to the things that it voted on, and that is what makes us dishonest.

160 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Fallaize and then Deputy Lester Queripel.

**Deputy Fallaize:** Thank you, sir.

Deputy Jones' rousing speech has one flaw in it, (**Deputy David Jones:** Only one?) which is that there has been an election in-between the decision. He refers to 'we' – he says, 'We're being dishonest', but actually, if you take for example school closures, the previous States decided against closing two primary schools. Deputy Jones on that occasion voted not to close them. This States decided to close two primary schools. Incidentally, Deputy Jones voted in favour on this later occasion. But the point is, it is a completely different States.

We know that no States can bind a future States and it is completely disingenuous for Deputy Jones to say the States are being dishonest with the public, if one States votes for a policy one way and the next States votes for a policy a different way, otherwise there would be no point in having elections.

So I think while it plays well no doubt on the radio, I do not think that Deputy Jones standing in front of the States and accusing the States of being dishonest, or disingenuous or whatever words he used, actually take the argument forward at all.

In 2009... and I agree with Deputy Jones more than I agree with Deputy Dorey in terms of the history of what was decided in 2009, because I think Deputy Dorey was not quite right when he referred to the decision of 2009. As I remember it, there were effectively four options before the States for funding a Transport Strategy. One was an annual parking charge – I think it was £26. I am not quite sure but it was something like that. One was paid parking. One was from general revenue and one was fuel, via the Brouard/Jones amendment. The States considered all of those four funding options at some length and voted out the first three and, as Deputy Jones says, voted in favour of Deputy Brouard's amendment, to put 1.2 pence additional duty on a litre of fuel.

So there is some link between this amendment and paid parking, in the sense that Deputy Jones is right when he says 1.2 pence was added to fuel duty in lieu of paid parking. But in a sense Deputy Jones then defeats his own argument because that is why the Minority Report tries to take the 1.2 pence off, because if we are going to introduce paid parking, then it is probably only right and proper that the 1.2 pence which in 2009 was introduced in lieu of paid parking should also be taken off. As I see it, either we have the 1.2 pence and no paid parking or we have paid parking and take off the 1.2 pence.

I give way to Deputy Jones.

190 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Jones.



**Deputy David Jones:** Sir, the point I was trying to make is in reality that is not what will happen, and that is the dishonesty of it, because that 1.2 pence in my view will be replaced by Treasury increasing fuel prices anyway. That is where the public are being misled: that they are going to get a trade-off between paid parking and reduction in fuel charges when everybody knows the end game is that is not going to happen.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Fallaize.

**Deputy Fallaize:** Sir, whatever the fuel duty is, it will be 1.2 pence less than it otherwise would be if the 1.2 pence is taken off. So clearly, if at some future point the States, on the advice of T&R, raises fuel duty and a whole load of Deputies go to the public and say, 'Well there you are, we told you that the States were being dishonest,' it is not surprising that the public will say, 'Ah well, the States have not been completely up front.' But if the States actually responsibly articulates properly what has happened, that 1.2 pence was taken off in lieu of paid parking, but subsequent to that there have been increases in fuel duty which otherwise would have happened anyway, then the public are less likely to have been misled.

So I think it largely depends on how we articulate the decisions the States make and in that respect, I disagree with Deputy Jones.

I do think, though, that if we have paid parking, we really need to take off the 1.2 pence. I accept that it is not integral to the success or otherwise of the Transport Strategy, but I do agree with the line in the Minority Report which says, or the paragraph which says:

'... the 2009 Brouard Amendment resulted in 1.2p being added to the cost of a litre of fuel in lieu of paid parking, to fund the island's Road Transport Strategy. Although this amendment has raised money, nominally towards the bus service, it has not driven any significant behaviour change. It is proposed that the duty on petrol and gas oil (...) is decreased by 1.2p as it would be unjust to keep this levy in place under the new parking system.'

I have no idea at all whether the paid parking Proposition is going to succeed. If it does not, I think we should keep the 1.2 pence in place and that is how I will vote at the end of the debate, but if paid parking is accepted, I think we ought to remove the 1.2 pence which was introduced in lieu of paid parking five years ago.

Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Lester Queripel.

**Deputy Lester Queripel:** Thank you, sir.

This whole debate has had more twists and turns than the Val des Terres and it feels to me as if we are taking part in a hill climb on the slowest run of the day, sir, because we do not seem to be able to reach the finishing line.

I am in need of clarification from Deputy Dorey please, sir, because I feel as though I am fighting with the wheel at the moment, trying to get through the S-bend – and I am not very good at driving sir, as Deputy St Pier will tell you, as we collided in the Deputies' Race on Liberation Day.

I am still not clear what is going to happen to the money sir and my questions to Deputy Dorey are these: is he saying that the 1.2 pence fuel duty will be used to part subsidise the buses and the user still pays, as happens now? Is he saying that the money will be used to fund a fare-less bus service? Is he saying that the money will be used to improve the bus service, provide more routes and more bus shelters etc.?

Because if the answer to my first two questions is yes, then presumably the Deputy Fallaize amendment, which directed an 18-month review of bus usage takes place, falls away. So I am in need of clarification on those points please, sir, and if the answer to my third question is yes, then presumably the Deputy Fallaize amendment stays in place. So I would like clarification on that point.

And my final point, sir, is my perception is that this amendment removes the need to pay for the clock itself, but still keeps the possibility of introducing paid parking very much alive. I just need clarification on whether or not that is the case and I apologise to the Minister, sir, for not asking these questions prior to debate but I really need to be clear what I am voting for before we come to vote.

Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Does anyone else wish to speak in the debate on this amendment? Deputy De Lisle.

**Deputy De Lisle:** I just wanted to say that this is an attempt to take away short-term paid parking, which is a stealth tax essentially on the motorist, which starts at £16 a year and if we note what has happened in other jurisdictions, sir, will be £20 the following year and then up from there until we have a stealth tax of £100 on the motorists in terms of short-term parking.

So I think this is something that I would support that we support this amendment, which essentially goes back to the 2006 *status quo* – the actual system that is in vogue at the current time. You wonder whether an amendment like this is necessary, but I think given the debate, it is probably worth supporting.

Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Anyone else wish to speak? Deputy Brouard.

**Deputy Brouard:** Thank you, sir.

When debate opened a couple of weeks ago, I mentioned the faff to Islanders of purchasing an annual parking clock, not to mention the expense. I cannot fathom out the reasons for it two weeks ago or today. The incentive of a £16 clock is to do what? It is fixing what problem?

The only thing I can think of is that it is a legacy from the 2009 Strategy which had a parking clock as the main revenue generator, instead of paid parking and was replaced, as Deputy Jones said, by the 1.2 pence on fuel. So it is purely a revenue raising item. It changes behaviour not one inch.

As I mentioned, 30,000 clocks going to landfill was a waste, so despite this Strategy being a wonderful whole and you cannot tinker with it, you have to take it as a package, I am pleased that there can be improvements and at least Deputy Ogier and Deputy Queripel think so, and if we were to be stuck with an annual £16 clock, then an annual revalidation is certainly called for.

But the problem goes far deeper. It is the whole bureaucracy and the time we will wish our citizens to engage with this. Even if it only takes the average person 15 minutes a year to buy or revalidate a clock, some will have to make a special journey to the Motor Tax Department because that is just what they do. My mother-in-law probably will be one of them. Others will simply have it revalidated by the new on-line app working through our new technology.

But bear with me. Say 15 minutes, 30,000 clocks – that is 7,500 hours. Take the normal office working year of 1,820 hours, we will waste the equivalent of four people's lives forever, just renewing and buying parking clocks. Four people's lives *forever*: that is the cost to our society. What an absolute waste of everybody's time for nothing and this is 'integrated'!

I have not even touched on the new Department of Clock Revalidation, but I am certain it will require two civil servants' posts at least, with pensions. Even to revalidate 30,000, even stamping a pile of them say on 24th December for the new year, at 2 mm thick for a parking clock, it will stand 60 metres high or nearly the height of the south coast cliffs. (*Laughter*) And even stamping, processing and posting them out at one every four minutes, it is 2,000 hours of work.

And of course we are hoping to support the Tourist Industry in our new Strategy. Still some come with their cars and their funny number plates, driving down High Street at midday. (*Laughter*) If they decide to bring their car across with a family of four, it is £16 if they want to park. So if they feel that is a little too expensive, they can always leave the car at the hotel and take the bus for £28. Please just think about what you are doing. (*Laughter*)

If we have to raise the £400,000 that parking clocks would bring in, rather than rescinding the 1.2 pence on fuel, we may as well keep the fuel burden which is simple to collect and certainly in terms of time, is not an extra faff in everyone's busy lives. This is a simple amendment and it will at least mitigate some of the damage to tourists, prevent the rise of the new Parking Clock Department and give Islanders some time to get on with their day and at the same time stop the equivalent of four lives being wasted every year.

Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Thank you.

Deputy St Pier, do you wish to be *relevé*?

**Deputy St Pier:** If I must, sir. (*Laughter*)

**The Bailiff:** You do not have to vote, Deputy St Pier – you do not need to be *relevé*! (*Laughter*)

Deputy Burford will speak on the amendment.

**Deputy Burford:** Yes, listening to Deputy Brouard, it does make you wonder how anybody manages to buy a parking clock at the moment.

But in the preamble to the Minority Report, it is stated that income and expenditure for the Strategy has been restricted primarily to those initiatives which will drive effective behaviour change. And the reason it says 'primarily' is because the parking clock is the one element that does not fall into that category.

In paragraph 57, the Report explains that the rationale behind the parking clock charge is that there is a significant minority of people who believe that if paid parking is introduced, it should be Island wide. Therefore, by introducing a chargeable clock, everyone who uses a disc zone anywhere on the Island is contributing.

Deputy Brouard's amendment in 2009 introduced the 1.2 pence fuel duty increase instead of a proposed parking clock and therefore Deputy Dorey's proposal to offset the income from the clock against the reduction in fuel duty was linked in the past and the difference in the income and expenditure can be managed within the net balance of the Strategy.

Therefore, if the majority of Members do wish to support this amendment, I have no great concerns that it will affect the integrity of the Strategy.

**The Bailiff:** Thank you.

Does anyone else wish to speak? No? Well, Deputy Domaille, do you wish to speak then, before Deputy Dorey replies?

**Deputy Domaille:** Yes, sir, I will be brief. I actually think that Deputy Brouard put it much better than I could actually. I thought that was a very good speech.

Clearly, I support the amendment. I am totally opposed to paid parking, I think that if the States go down that route then we will certainly regret it and rue the day.

The charge for the parking clock does absolutely nothing to reduce car usage or reduce congestion. It is just simply a revenue-raising matter.

I thought it was quite interesting to note that Deputy Dorey supports the 1.2 pence for fuel remaining in place as it were, because it affects everybody who uses the roads and will reduce car usage, and yet he supports paid parking which will only affect a minority. But we will come to that later, no doubt.

I remain opposed to paid parking. Please support this amendment.

Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Dorey.

**Deputy Dorey:** Thank you, Mr Bailiff.

I am glad to see that Deputy Domaille... and I thank him for his support and I thank Deputy Burford for saying she has no great concern it will affect the Strategy. She mentioned about paid parking, some people want it Island wide, I do not think this achieves paid parking Island wide. I think it just achieves a one-off charge for a parking clock and it will just annoy people and not create the idea that we have paid parking Island wide.

I think Deputy Gollop said about perception of the Strategy being anti-town. I think people will associate the parking clock with town and it will reinforce that perception which I think is wrong that it is anti-town.

Deputy Jones spoke about the choice. Well, it is not 'fuel duty or paid parking' – we have moved on from that. The choice is fuel duty or paid parking clocks for this amendment. So I think if you do not... It is not what your views are on paid parking. It is what your views are on paid parking clocks. If you want annual paid chargeable parking clocks, do not vote for the amendment, but I do not think that anybody wants that. I just think it is a waste of time and money, as Deputy Brouard has outlined and it will not be of benefit to our community. It will not benefit the tourist industry and it will not produce any incentive.

Deputy Fallaize spoke about the history. Well, I listened to the debate; I have listened to the tape of the debate in 2009. Yes, there was an outstanding resolution of the States for paid parking and the Environment Department came back with a proposal for parking clocks. He then proposed an amendment to fund it from general revenue. That was voted on first. That was rejected. Then the Deputies Brouard/Jones amendment on fuel duty was supported by the House.

So I think this is not in lieu of paid parking. It is in lieu of... What I am proposing is whether you have clocks or fuel duty, and it will fund the Strategy. There is no connection between this money going into the Strategy and what it funds, which is to answer Deputy Queripel's question.

You can look at the tables which are in the back of the Report which shows how the money is spent. You will see there is just annual income and expenditure. This is purely a means of raising money to fund the Strategy. It is not for any particular part of the Strategy and I thank Deputy De Lisle for his support.

I think there is a principle, 'polluter pays'. There is also a principle of using existing taxes and not introducing a new charge because we know every new charge you introduce – as Deputy Brouard has outlined – costs time and money. Parking clocks just stand out from the rest of this Integrated Strategy proposal. It will not cause any change in behaviour. It is just a very inefficient way of raising money and I urge the House to support this amendment and reject the charge for parking clocks.

Could I have a recorded vote, please, sir?

**The Bailiff:** Members, there is a request for a recorded vote on the amendment proposed by Deputy Dorey, seconded by Deputy Brouard. Greffier.

*There was a recorded vote.*

370 **The Bailiff:** Well, Members, we will have the result of the vote in a moment, but I believe it was carried.

In the meantime, we can continue with general debate because there are no other amendments pending. Deputy Langlois and then Deputy Laurie Queripel.

375 **Deputy Langlois:** Thank you, sir.

Two weeks ago, in case memories are short, the Assembly showed a clear wish to go with the Minority Report, when set against the Majority Board proposals. That was the debate we had then. Today is a new debate and can we please remember that, because there are some issues which were not covered two weeks ago and they desperately need covering?

380 Now, many of the proposed measures in the said Propositions before us today do have a value and they will make some contribution to policy rationalisation. However, the proposals for paid parking are the exception. There are times, sir, when this Assembly, faced with a significant or severe challenge or problem, should take a lead even if going against public opinion. That is what leadership in parliamentary affairs is all about. If we ever do that, sir, it should be with real confidence in three areas: firstly that the  
385 problem merits it, that it is big enough; secondly that we are acting as fairly as possible to the population; and thirdly, that it will have the desired effect or the predicted effects.

But, sir, the paid parking proposals fail on all three counts. One, such traffic issues that do exist in Guernsey are not primarily caused by the users of long-term town parking. It is a group of people who drive in at the beginning of the day and drive home at the end of the day and those are their two journeys of the  
390 day. Two, an instant annual tax of £1,300 on a very selected group of citizens, going about their legitimate business, is simply not fair. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) Thirdly, the potential consequences for the disruption of other parking, particularly for town residents and for those seeking to use short-term parking in St Peter Port, have simply not been given enough consideration in these proposals.

395 The debate two weeks ago has been blighted by exaggeration, the size of the problem has been blown up out of all proportion, and the predicted beneficial effects of the proposed solutions, I think, do not really bear close examination.

At some point two weeks ago, magically these proposals were dubbed as an experiment. I never saw the word experiment in the Minority Report – maybe I missed it. But they were dubbed as an experiment. I am simply not willing to experiment with people's lives and the future well-being of St Peter Port (**A Member:**  
400 Hear, hear.) in this way. The act of faith required to judge this widely varied bag of proposals and whether they will together produce a modal shift is simply too great. There are too many variables in here to say if we do all of that, this is what will happen. And incidentally, I do remind Members that actually 'modal shift' is not generally done in Guernsey. We do not do modal shift.

Let us give as much support as possible... No, sir, I will not give way. Let us give as much support as is possible and affordable to build a workable, viable and commercially attractive bus service. We seem to  
405 have forgotten in this debate that the contract for the bus service is about to be re-tendered. We need companies who are willing and able and attracted to run a proper bus service, financed correctly and appropriately and I do not believe that these proposals will help that process. When, and only when, that bus service is in place should we even consider changing or attempting to change the behaviour of a  
410 particular section of our people by imposing paid parking on them.

So, sir, to close, I thought it might be best to remind people that the perception of a St Peter Port parking problem is far from new. A little bit of local research has revealed to me, on good authority, that the 1964 GADOC pantomime – funny it is a pantomime, it seems vaguely familiar in this environment – scripted by the late Cecil Cook, included the following song – worry ye not, folks, I am not going to try and sing it!  
415 (*Laughter*) I am going to read it. (**A Member:** Oh, go on!) There is a little ditty here that says:

'There's Albert on his pedestal, you see him from afar.  
He's standing up and looking for a place to park his car.'

(*Laughter*) Now, despite that statue's proximity to the bus terminus, I feel sure that Albert would be against paid parking, so let us all join in and see off this affront to common sense.

420 **Several Members:** Hear, hear. (*Applause*)

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Laurie Queripel and then Deputy Gollop.

**Deputy Laurie Queripel:** Thank you, sir.

425 Sir, Mr Bailiff, Assembly colleagues, I feel there is a bias in this Report. It is not being used to provide solutions to the few genuine problems that need addressing, but the opportunity is being taken to propose

something – and I know Deputy Bebb, sir, does not like this term – ‘radical’, so perhaps I can use the term ‘far-reaching’, at least conceptual.

Sir, idealism does not make good policy and it is not something that policy decisions should be based on. It is not pragmatic. It does not properly consider or allow for the wider strategic and economic issues and needs of the community to be taken into consideration.

Now, sir, I do believe it is disingenuous to say, as some have said – I do not think anybody in this Chamber has said it, sir, but I have certainly heard this from members of the public, they have said – this Strategy is purely a revenue-raising exercise. Sir, I do not doubt that this is a genuine attempt on behalf of Deputy Burford and Deputy Brehaut to provide not just a way of making a few beneficial changes, but to provide a vision, sir. But for me, it is a view through a soft focus lens. It does not capture an entirely realistic picture.

Sir, I acknowledge the passion, the depth of research, the impressive presentation and I can understand, sir, why it has charged the imaginations of a goodly number of my Assembly colleagues. That is my fear, sir: that some Assembly Members are being carried away with the ambitious approach contained within this report and have allowed their judgement to be clouded. Sir, as the poet Samuel Taylor Coleridge once said, nothing is as contagious as enthusiasm.

So whether it is passion, idealism or enthusiasm, these things do not necessarily make good policy.

Sir, I am worried about the mind-set of government, not just this Government, sir, but any government when it believes the solutions lie in simply collecting money and spending it. It is so often not about proportionality, moderation or effectiveness. Sir, there is no spare money in the States’ coffers, and many Islanders are in the same position and yet some will be poorer for this Strategy.

I have nothing against visionary policy but it has to be the right policy at the right time.

Now, sir, I heard Deputy Lowe say on the radio recently that this is the most inactive States – I believe that is right – that she has ever known. Now firstly, sir, I say ‘good’ to that. (*Interjections*) Yes, and I will tell you why!

Secondly, sir, we know that is not strictly true because there is much work going on behind the scenes and many of us as individual Deputies are extremely busy. But I say ‘good’ for the reasons I have just given. We live in difficult economic times, for the States, for many Islanders and for a number of Island businesses and employers. It is not the time to introduce wide-sweeping and costly programmes. It is a time for restraint and discipline.

On top of that, sir, I think we have been getting mixed messages from the supporters of this Report – and Deputy Langlois alluded to that, sir. On the one hand I am hearing that this is an Integrated Strategy, every component has been dove-tailed and fused together – one might conclude almost an exact science. But then I have also heard, as Deputy Langlois heard, that it is an experiment that we should try and that was kind of confirmed by the successful amendment that Deputy Fallaize laid: a trial period in regard to one particular component of the Strategy, thus in a way placing that component in a different context making it distinct, setting it aside.

Then I heard from Deputy Burford, sir, when she felt at one time during debate that the Strategy might not succeed, that her dream was or might be over. Now, sir, I think we have heard a great deal this morning on the radio about dreams and nightmares. I am not going to say that if this Strategy succeeds, it will be a nightmare for everybody, but will certainly create a grim reality for a goodly number of Islanders, sir.

But the States, sir, this Chamber – it is not a laboratory. It is not a dream factory. It is not about making one person’s or a particular group of people’s dreams come true or become a reality. It is about, if there is a need to, putting policies in place that will be for the benefit of the whole of the community that are likely to yield significant results – and I agree with Deputy Langlois: I am not at all convinced about the modal shift that is predicted will take place – and provide true value for money for the taxpayer and the public.

I am not convinced that this Strategy ticks all those boxes and that is the acid test, sir. Actually, in principle, I like many of the themes in this Strategy, sir, but it is not about what I like. It is about what I think is best for the Island as a whole. This is not the time to be speculative or to experiment.

Now, sir, I know that Deputy Langlois said this is a new debate but it is actually a continuation of the debate that started two weeks ago and in what might be termed the first act of that debate, when the curtain rose on that debate, sir, during the episode entitled ‘The Sursis’, I felt that I had highlighted some short comings within this Report – some omissions, some lack of acknowledgement in regard to the consequences of some of the proposals. So I touched on paid parking and the evidence that counters or challenges the evidence presented in this Report.

I know it does not cancel it out, sir, because whatever subject you are looking at, there will be evidence for the argument and evidence against it. But there is evidence to say, sir, some regions in the UK have taken away paid parking. There was a feature on the ‘BBC News’ sir, recently, in the ‘South West News’, that some town areas in the region of the South West had taken away paid parking and it had revitalised their town centre, sir. That is a fact and there will be, of course, evidence that suggests in other areas, that

bringing in paid parking has make a beneficial difference, I understand that. There is no conclusive evidence either way, sir.

And, sir, I mentioned in that sursis debate, the cost implication for tradesmen who regularly work in town. I hope we have not forgotten that, sir. There are tradesmen, if they are working on substantial refurbishments in banks or retail outlets or offices, sir, they can spend over half their year – perhaps 30 weeks of a year – working in town, sir. That could add £800 or £900 a year to their costs. That will be inflationary, sir. They will have to pass those costs on to the customer.

This at a time, sir, when we want our businesses to be as competitive as possible. There are many challenges facing businesses, particularly tradesmen within the construction industry. They are faced with example with the white van man, sir, the tradesmen coming from overseas to work in the industry. They are faced with all sorts of challenges and this is the very last time we should be adding to their costs, because those costs will be passed on. And, sir, they need their vans at hand because there are materials and tools on those vans that they need to access so they will have no choice. They will have to park in long term parking, sir.

I mentioned how the user-pays principle has been completely discarded except for one group, sir, who will apparently pay for anything, even though the other groups would be on the receiving end of some greatly enhanced services and infrastructure and facilities.

I understand, I appreciate there will be some crossover. If people who motor to work in town, if they can see there has been improved bus service, if they can see there is better infrastructure in place for cycling and for walking, I think some of them will cross over. But I do not think it will be a modal shift. I do not think it will be significant, sir and yet it is the motorist who will pay for all of that, sir. That is why, sir, I voted for the amendment to put in place the 50-pence bus fare. I thought that was the best compromise. I thought that made the whole thing a bit fairer, sir. But the user-pays principle has been abandoned, sir, or discarded in order to fit the agenda of this Report.

There are other shortcomings and other omissions, sir. A modern society... I do not think there is any real acknowledgement in this Report, sir, of the type of society or community that we live in today. The moment this Island, as a deliberate policy, stepped from the backwater into the mainstream, became a home for corporate business, a financial centre, the moment we chose high economic growth as our policy, sir, the pressure was on. People's lives have speeded up. A multi-tasking day became the norm. For example, sir, both parents working, having to work, journeys to and from the child minder, journeys to and from school, after-school activities, perhaps the family shop along the way and all of that, sir, set against the clock. Sir, that is the reality for many Islanders today. It will be tomorrow, next week, next year and so on.

That is the context, sir, which *any* strategy – not just the Transport Strategy – that is the context that any Strategy has to be set against. It needs to be about what is doable, achievable within that context.

And yes, sir, it is beholden on Government to lead the way. Yes, a small stick might need to be created and applied, but I fear that what we are contemplating here is way more substantial than that. Whatever carrot there is, sir, it is only disguising a rather large stick, in my opinion, that will stun more than gently cajole.

Now, sir, the scenario I have described, the couple with children, I thought those were the kind of Islanders we were trying to encourage – encourage to make their homes here, their careers here, have their children here, to be economically active and for their children to be so in the future, also to be economically active, because of the demographic problem that we are seeking to address. We are about to possibly make their lives harder and more costly.

Sir, I think that represents a problem for those who believe in progressive social policy – and I *do* believe in progressive social policy.

I believe it is possible to support environmentally progressive ideas and actions, but if they go too far and too quickly, for that to have a detrimental affect socially. Some people, sir, particularly those who are modestly paid, who for whatever reason have little choice but to bring their car into town to work, will have to make some tough choices. They will have to find the money to pay to park from somewhere. That could be socially regressive, sir, and that could add to the States' welfare bill. What we need is a fine balance, sir. What we need are modest proposals, sir, that help to achieve both environmental and social progression.

Planning, sir: it was another deliberate States or Environment policy, sir, to centre or to concentrate the vast majority of economic, retail, commerce, business and social activity into one area of St Peter Port and the car parks, in a way, were created in acknowledgement of that fact. In a sense they are economic enablers. So when we talk about them as valuable real estate, yes they are. They facilitate economic activity, retail activity, commerce and business activity, social activity and employment and so on, sir.

But to deliberately concentrate all that activity into one area and to force people to converge upon it and then to wonder why there is some traffic congestion for short periods during the course of a day, sir, and then question why some areas have to be used for car parks, I suggest we give that a bit of thought, sir. Then to ask them to pay for the privilege, I think that is rather rich.

Now, sir, I know that Deputy Burford scolded me a couple of weeks ago and I do not wish to be subject to that again, (*Laughter*) but I will have to risk her wrath, sir! When I said two weeks ago that I believe that what was required was some intelligent, targeted tinkering containing some proportionate and achievable objective, I felt and still feel, sir, that would alleviate the obvious problems that I have just alluded to, without the need to resort to penalising people for a situation that has been created by this States, via Planning.

And then Deputy Burford mentioned, sir – and I appreciate it was probably a throwaway line, a lightweight line – but how about the North Beach Park, rather than the North Beach Car Park? Well, that actually appeals to me, sir. That actually appeals to the green me and that is the danger. We have to sort what is realistically achievable from the unlikely and unattainable.

Then we come to: the Report mentions enhancement of public amenity spaces and creating more public amenity spaces that could be used for recreational purposes if they were not being used for parking. Once again, sir, a laudable idea, but actually, there are public spaces, amenity spaces all over the Island and some very nice ones in St Peter Port and it would be an understatement to say that they are modestly used, sir.

I appreciate it is not only about the use of these spaces but also the appearance, sir, the aesthetics. But if these spaces are to be created, they will need on-going maintenance.

I was down by the bathing pools recently – it was actually on Liberation Day – where there are some lovely public spaces or amenity spaces, but they are certainly looking unkempt and untidy at the moment, because maintenance, sir, requires funding. The need for that will only increase if you create more public spaces, more amenity spaces, more recreation spaces.

So I suspect if you ask road users – I use that term advisedly, because road users are motorists, they are bus users, they are motorcyclists, they are cyclists – I suspect if you ask road users what they would prefer, more public amenity spaces or regular road maintenance and pot holes being filled etc., I believe they would choose the latter.

Now, sir, in the report there is this mention of this concept of travel plans, sir, and there is talk about providing showers and changing-room facilities for people who bicycle to work and perhaps walk. Sir, the idea of more places of work having showers and changing-room facilities to encourage or facilitate employees who wish to walk or cycle to work: once again, fine in principle but once again, the prospect of further adding cost of doing business in town where rents are already high, sir, and some businesses are just getting by, perhaps just ticking over.

So, sir, not only the capital cost if they do not have the facilities already, but the running costs, sir – water and energy on-going running costs – and the further prospects that these travel plans may become obligatory for some employers and that is what the Report says.

So would this result in – I do not know – would this result in further States' expenditure as an employee with premises in town? How many States buildings have these facilities, showers and changing rooms and stuff? And how does that fit in with the Energy Plan. I would imagine even though some people might choose to walk or cycle to work, they probably already take a shower before they leave home and they will do so again so when they reach work. Yes, they will they do so again when they reach work, so more energy, more water use.

On-road parking: the Report mentions the problems for residents who live in St Peter Port in and around town, parking problems for them. I am wondering if any thought has been given to on-road parking, sir, in other parishes. There are areas of the Vale and St Sampson and I am sure other parishes where residents have no choice. They have to park on the road. If Planning would allow perhaps they could create a parking space on their property, if they are allowed to knock a hole in their garden wall, but that does not seem to happen very often, so a lot of people outside of St Peter Port, sir, in the Vale and St Sampson in particular, have to park on the road.

What about if this Strategy is a raging success and many of the people who live in these areas decide not to use their cars so they bus or they cycle or they walk, sir? What happens to their cars?

On my side of the Bridge, sir, where I live there is a fairly typical mixture of some 23-hour, some 10-hour and some 2-hour parking zones. If people are going to leave their cars at home for perhaps a night and a day, they will be contravening those time limits. So what facility has been made or what allowance has been made for them, if they are going to abandon their cars or not use their cars and walk or cycle or bus, where are they going to leave their cars?

How are we going to pay for the people in these areas of the Island who will not be using their cars and they do not know where to leave them because they are parking in limited time zone spaces on the roads, sir?

In particular in the area around the Bridge, this is an area where there is a lot of industrial and retail activity. A lot of people work for example in and around the Bridge. Employees drive to work in these areas and there is only a limited amount of long-term spaces there as it is. If there are cars left in those spaces by residents who have chosen other modes of transport, there will be nowhere for those people to park.

Sir, I have to come back to the bus card, the £8 bus card. We have spoken, Deputy Brouard mentioned in his speech during the amendment, sir, about visitors having to pay for an £8 card. But my particular concern is what about the cruise-line passengers, sir? They come here for a few hours; they might want to take a bus trip round the Island. One trip round the Island would cost them £8 and if they are a couple, sir, one trip round the Island would cost £16 – £16! How would that look, sir –

Sir, I give way to... It feels a bit like Groundhog Day, but I will give way to Deputy Bebb. (*Laughter*)

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Bebb.

**Deputy Bebb:** Would Deputy Laurie Queripel like to suggest that £8, whether he thinks it is good value compared to other Island tours that he would actually see, or comparable bus journeys in other attractive locations?

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Queripel.

**Deputy Laurie Queripel:** I do not think that £8, sir, is good value for one journey and when people are here for just a few hours in one day, sir.

How would that look on Trip Advisor for example, if somebody said, 'I went to Guernsey and I paid £8 for one bus journey'? (*Interjections*) Or if they came with three of their family members and they said, 'We paid £32 for one bus trip for the family'? (*Interjections*)

I spoke to Deputy Rob Jones about this and he said he felt sure that something could be sorted out, that there could be some sort of concession, in regard to perhaps visitors or cruise line passengers. But if that is the case, where is the amendment? We have had two weeks! It will not be that easy to sort that one out.

So, sir, how would that look on Trip Advisor or in a tourist magazine when they say, 'Oh, by the way, if you go to Guernsey, you are going to pay £8 for one bus trip if you are a cruise passenger'?

Now, sir, I am sure that despite the fact that this Report allows for a drop in revenue or funding, allows a certain percentage and tells us that the Strategy will still be viable, how do you square the circle, sir, if the stick and the carrot are actually great successes and the revenue decreases beyond that tolerance level that Deputy Burford told us about, sir, and the service demands greatly increase? Do you hike all the charges, sir? Do you hike the charges of paid parking? How would that be fair?

And of course, we have an elephant in the room here. Vehicles are getting greener all the time. We are concerned about the environmental issues, sir, and the emissions. They are getting greener all the time. They have to. International standards are demanding it, sir.

As time goes on, that will have a beneficial impact in regard to the environment, sir, but it will also have an impact upon revenue. Revenues will decrease in regard to emission charges, sir, the greener that vehicles get. So how do we square that circle? Where will that be made up?

In 10 or 15 years' time, half the population could be driving around in electro- or hydro-powered cars, sir. There was a Japanese company that was founded in 2008 that is now producing hydro-powered cars, so that is not too far into the future. So cars are getting greener, sir, and will get greener.

I think it would be a mistake to approve these recommendations and then further down the line, and only then, having to face the true effect of the financial consequences on local business, on Islanders and to realise that a number of the objectives have simply not been attainable, or perhaps to realise that we have a Strategy in place that is neither practical or sustainable.

Sir, I understand that the Strategy, the vision is attractive, but I would ask Members, sir, to readjust their sights. I just do not believe that all the objectives are achievable. I think the benefits have been exaggerated and I know Deputy Bebb told us in part one of this debate, sir, a couple of weeks ago, that it might well save the HSSD millions and millions of pounds. I just do not believe that. (*Interjection by Deputy Bebb*) You did – you said millions, sorry, sir.

I will give way sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Bebb.

**Deputy Bebb:** I am sorry, but a point of order.

Deputy Laurie Queripel is misleading. I did not specify any amount of money. I simply said that it would be a very beneficial thing for the Island. Evidently that would come with financial benefits, but I did not specify any amount of money and definitely not millions and millions. That does not sound like me at all.

**Deputy Laurie Queripel:** Really? I apologise, sir! I thought I heard millions mentioned. But anyway Deputy Bebb felt there would be a significant beneficial effect, and I am not sure that there will be that type of modal shift, sir, to provide that kind of benefit, that kind of change.



I do not believe the behavioural changes will be significant enough. As a result a disproportionate cost will be borne by some Islanders. The choice that we hear so much about, sir, will actually be a Hobson's choice for some and I ask Members to consider those things as we go through this debate and when we come to the vote.

Thank you, sir.

*Amendment by Deputies Dorey and Brouard:*

*Carried – Pour 28, Contre 15, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 4*

**POUR**

Alderney Rep. Harvey  
Deputy Harwood  
Deputy Kuttelwascher  
Deputy Domaille  
Deputy Langlois  
Deputy Le Clerc  
Deputy Gollop  
Deputy Conder  
Deputy Lester Queripel  
Deputy Gillson  
Deputy Le Pelley  
Deputy Trott  
Deputy David Jones  
Deputy Laurie Queripel  
Deputy Lowe  
Deputy Spruce  
Deputy Collins  
Deputy Dorey  
Deputy Paint  
Deputy James  
Deputy Brouard  
Deputy Wilkie  
Deputy De Lisle  
Deputy Inglis  
Deputy Soulsby  
Deputy Sillars  
Deputy O'Hara  
Deputy Quin

**CONTRE**

Alderney Rep. Jean  
Deputy Brehaut  
Deputy Robert Jones  
Deputy Sherbourne  
Deputy Bebb  
Deputy St Pier  
Deputy Ogier  
Deputy Fallaize  
Deputy Le Lièvre  
Deputy Duquemin  
Deputy Adam  
Deputy Perrot  
Deputy Burford  
Deputy Luxon  
Deputy Hadley

**NE VOTE PAS**

None

**ABSENT**

Deputy Storey  
Deputy Stewart  
Deputy Green  
Deputy Le Tocq

**The Bailiff:** Just before I call Deputy Gollop, I must announce the result of the vote on the Deputy Dorey/Deputy Brouard amendment. There were 28 votes in favour, 15 against. I declare the amendment carried.

Deputy Lester Queripel, you have already spoken in general debate. Are you raising – ?

**Deputy Lester Queripel:** No sir, I have not spoken in general debate.

**The Bailiff:** Yes, you did.

**Deputy Lester Queripel:** I spoke on the amendment, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Yes and you said during the course of that, you were speaking in general debate. So I will call next Deputy Gollop.

**Deputy Lester Queripel:** You have got me there, sir. Yes I did, sir. *(Laughter)*

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Gollop.

**Deputy Gollop:** Thank you, sir.

One or two issues have already emerged about the activity or inactivity and desirability of that amongst the States. It reminds me of a situation comedy from America on environmental management. This very libertarian politician appointed somebody who was incapable of getting anything done and they said, 'Why would you waste the ratepayers' money on this person?' 'Precisely because he will not get anything done.' It is an argument for minimalist government.

But I do not think that we want to go there. In fact I support visions. I support dream factories, as long as they are manufacturing the right product. Indeed, I prefer to be a guinea pig than a lemming. *(Laughter)*

But yes, moving on, I do have sympathy with some of the points Deputy Laurie Queripel has made, because of course some of us who listened to the BBC phone-in last Sunday, heard from one of the Island's

more prominent hoteliers that there were issues with bus policy changes last year and over the last few years, and that they do affect tourism. Although I would personally say £8 is extremely good value for a cruise passenger, it is not good value for a casual visitor who may only want a trip initially to a hotel or from the airport to town or whatever. I think that will have to be looked at again, because it is more complicated than it looks, especially in terms of operational efficiency. In fact I may vote against the bus card provision.

I was accused again recently in a committee meeting of wanting to have it both ways and so on and so forth. Strangely enough, I am in the position of agreeing with virtually everything the Deputy Chief Minister, Deputy Langlois, has said because I think much of the strategic thinking we have heard in practice will not work quite as anticipated and that you will need over time much juicier carrots and much bigger sticks to achieve the change that is identified as being desirable.

However, I would chastise Deputy Langlois in one respect, because he made an argument which I have heard from a number of persons, both political and otherwise, that what we should be focusing on is the achievability of a commercially successful and popular bus service. But he, like many Members of the States, has sat on the Policy Council for Treasury and Resources that yanked the heart out of the previous bus operation (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) by cutbacks, by agreeing to a consultants' agenda, by shifting the nature of the operations, by making various decisions. There has been frustration.

Over the years I have written to Members of both Treasury and Resources and other Departments saying 'Put more money into the service' – no. 'Charge a more commercial fare to ensure that the service is better resourced' – no. 'Make alterations, put more resources' – no. Then we hear today that the alternative to the strategies is to effectively use general revenue to finance a more commercial bus service. Well if that was an option we have missed the boat or missed the bus on that one. So I think we have got to accept where we are is what has survived the last debate is most of Deputy Burford's proposals and we have to support them as the best way forward out of this particular jungle.

As regards bus sizes, I see on Google that I am down as saying we could have double-deckers in Guernsey. I am actually a big bus fan. Although I think there is a role for smaller buses, I think from time to time you do need bigger vehicles and if we are to see growth in numbers, we will need those bigger vehicles and contrary to popular belief, the 34-seaters we currently have are often full, especially in the summer months and at school times.

I would agree with Deputy Langlois in one respect that it is not just commuters that cause the problem but I do think you see significant tailbacks, especially when roads are closed in La Charroterie and the Grange, at the Halfway junction and many other areas. I think the case is proved that Guernsey would be better with 10% less traffic and that congestion would be better.

The other reason for supporting some decision today is the improvement of inclusivity, of accessibility, of social mobility for everybody on the disability spectrum and I think we must not forget that is an important part of both Strategies and a Strategy that is left from the amendments and to vote against everything, as some Members wish to do, would be a setback in that respect.

And so I think the best we can hope for is that we will come out with support for Deputy Burford's resolutions, minus perhaps one or two Propositions and we will then have to move forward to implementation with maybe a secondary debate next year.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy James, who was standing earlier.

**Deputy Fallaize:** Sir, a point of correction if I may.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Fallaize.

**Deputy Fallaize:** The last two speakers have referred to Propositions about the £8 bus card, but there are no Propositions about the £8 bus card. It was an idea floated in the Minority Report, so before that starts to become a big issue in the debate, there are no Propositions to vote against in that respect.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy James.

**Deputy James:** Thank you, sir.

My comments will indeed be brief. I think that many of the Members of the Assembly are becoming a little bit weary.

Yesterday morning around this time, I was in a taxi on my way to Malta Airport and all I heard from the driver were bitter complaints about traffic congestion, the roads were too small, the buses were too big. I very nearly suggested to him that Guernsey might have two Transport Strategies he might want to have a look at.

But seriously, sir, I came to this debate two weeks ago fairly opposed to paid parking. But listening to the debate, I am swinging very much towards that we have to make a brave decision.

I draw your attention to the table on page 678 which outlines the increase in registered vehicles since 1950. There has been over a tenfold increase in registered vehicles in Guernsey in that period of time. I do not have any faith or belief that the continued increase will not in fact continue, but to now seeing the figure of more than 85,000 vehicles registered in this Island is indeed for me an incredibly worrying statistic. There are a number of my friends that would accuse me of having contributed to that figure, but what I would say is I only ever drive one car at a time. (*Laughter*)

We have heard a number of misleading statements in the Assembly and I will address just a few. Quite a number of Members a couple weeks ago, and certainly Deputy Laurie Queripel reinforced it this morning... A number of towns and cities in the UK are ceasing paid parking because of the impact on the retail industry and that is the difference. Deputy Burford and Brehaut's Report is actually suggesting an extension of short-term parking to encourage shoppers in town, into St Peter Port, whereas in the UK they are looking to abolish parking charges because it is having an impact on the retail industry. So that is quite a misleading argument to make.

We heard about the impact on cruise passengers. I have been to many cities across Europe and personally I would think that if I could afford a cruise, I would not complain too much about paying £8 for a trip around the Island! (*Laughter and interjections*) But having gone to many cities across Europe and done tours, I can assure you that £8 is cheap indeed and I think these are just diversions to the real issue that we are here to talk about. Let us not worry at this point in time, let us not base our future life, quality of etc., on what a cruise passenger is going to have to pay to travel round the Island. Let us forget these inappropriate diversions to this debate.

My feeling having swung, my pendulum swinging very much to this Minority Report, is not based on what is convenient for me as an individual. I do not believe that I was elected to this Assembly to vote for what I want. I believe that I have been voted into this Assembly to ensure a good quality of life for future generations. I think it is absolutely imperative that we do care about the health and the wellbeing of the children in Guernsey. Wouldn't it be great to see children being able to walk to school? Many parents we have heard will not let their children walk to school because of the amount of cars on the road. People complain about buses being late. Why are they late? How many buses are on the road?

This is a complete package. It is a jigsaw. Let us not keep taking pieces out. Let us look at the whole for the benefit of Guernsey.

I really want to see a good, efficient, effective bus service for Guernsey. So I will throw my weight behind Deputy Burford and Brehaut's amendment.

And one final comment in terms of weight is that one comment that Deputy Laurie Queripel made in his speech was he referred to the elephant in the room. I was expecting him to look at me when he said it, but I am pleased he did not. (*Laughter*)

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Luxon.

**Deputy Luxon:** Thank you, Mr Bailiff.

Sir, on pages 709 to 712 in the Report, the Public Services Department constructed a letter of response to the Environment Department in terms of response to both the Majority and Minority Reports. I just wanted to make a few comments in that sense.

From the Department's point of view, we were concerned at seeing the impact on commercial vehicles, not just for the Public Service Department which operates an awful lot of commercial vehicles, but for the whole commercial sector and the inflationary impact that that would have within Guernsey. It is pleasing to see that some of the amendments have softened some of the Propositions.

I am not surprised that we are finding this difficult. Two weeks ago, the long debate, today and indeed previous States have struggled with the whole concept of trying to come to some resolution and forward Strategy on transport within Guernsey. Certainly from a personal point of view, I would like to be able to be able to see all of the benefits of all of the initiatives within the Minority Report that we are debating, implemented successfully and ideally without having to incur any charge or increased costs, to the people of Guernsey. That would be much, much easier but of course, if we did not apply the costs, it is highly unlikely, with all the initiatives, that it would affect the change that is inherent within the Report's Strategy.

Sir, two weeks ago, it did feel as though the free bus service and paid parking were the two key issues that the whole thrust of our direction through the debate were taking us. With paid parking, there is already paid parking in Guernsey. The States of Guernsey owns a piece of land at the airport and there is paid parking at the airport. What people have done, because of that charge for parking, they consider whether they accept that charge for convenience or whether they use a taxi or whether they use a bus or car share.

There is also paid parking I believe – some paid parking – at Beau Séjour but there is also paid parking in town, private parking spaces and in fact businesses that provide free parking for staff, that is paid

parking. There just is not a transaction for it. Some people who park their cars within St Peter Port also use incurring parking fines as a way of paid parking.

So there is paid parking in our Island and if we look at the areas that we are talking about that the proposals cover for long-term parking, it is fair to say that the Public Services Department, through the Ports Master Plan which this Assembly noted last year, we talked about the need to try and make sure that we found ways of generating additional revenue if we were going to be able to fund much of the maintenance and improvement works around the harbour area. So it would not surprise me if at some point the Harbours would have wanted to bring to the Assembly, the idea of paid parking to help with being able to invest and maintain that vital infrastructure. The Environment Department sadly is here earlier and there is history and precedent for those public car parking spaces in St Peter Port being aligned to paid parking to underpin and fund proposed Transport Strategies.

So I just wanted to share with Members that the reality of paid parking is not going to go away if we decide not to approve paid parking or indeed the Minority Report, I do not believe, because the Public Services Department is almost certainly going to have to bring back a range of options which would include that. I just make the point, there is paid parking already in Guernsey. These proposals do propose a very moderate degree of charging and I accept Deputy Dave Jones' viewpoint that once a charge is in place, there is a possibility for that charge to then be increased and increased. But at 60 pence per hour or just over £5 a day to be able to park your car in a prime piece of real estate, right in the heart of St Peter Port, with all of the demands for space that goes with that, is not a punitive charge.

I would much rather, and in a previous life I think I would have been supporting additional car parking being built and paid parking being implemented there, but I accept that more car parking probably will not impact on behavioural change which would then lead to many of the attributes that are listed in this Integrated Strategy.

So, sir, there is paid parking in the Island already. If paid parking is the single issue upon which Members want to either support or not support the Minority Report, I would just say the actual proposals are for moderate increases. I do accept for contractors, for business people that need vehicles, estate agents that have to come and go, that it is an implication for those businesses and for those people that choose to park there, there is a cost that they will have to bear, but the rest of the Strategy does give options that allow all car users to make some choices.

So reluctantly, in the sense that I would much rather see an Integrated Transport Strategy for Guernsey implemented and free, no additional cost to anybody, the reality is the free bit is impossible and I think the only way forward, if this Island wants to have a genuine approach to both the environmental and the practical issues of an Integrated Strategy on the Island, we have no choice other than to make that bold step and move in the direction that the Minority Report is suggesting.

Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Hadley.

**Deputy Hadley:** The Deputy Chief Minister mentioned the fact that this Island does not do modal shifts and somehow, I thought he was in a different debate, because I do think that these are very moderate proposals and there is a very limited degree of charges for parking.

Although there may have been a temporary drop in the population recently, I think in the future it is most likely we will see an increase in the population and with car ownership becoming ever more affordable for the less well-off in society, including the unemployed, the number of cars will almost certainly rise, seeing this will an increase in traffic movement and the increased need for more parking.

I got up – I was not going to speak – because of what Deputy Luxon just said: he considered in a previous life building more parking spaces. Well, we have heard that the parking space would probably cost about £50,000 to construct, and if you were a business doing that, you would want a 10% return on such an investment, which would mean a parking charge of around £20 an hour and yet we are providing these parking spaces free at the moment, and it does make you realise that creating more car-parking space is just not an option and indeed, building more roads is not much of an option either.

So it is essential that we – in moderation – reduce the number of car journeys. It is not about getting people out of their cars. It is about a reduction in the number of car journeys and to make the whole package attractive, it is essential to have a free, efficient bus service and I hope that will be implemented before we start.

So I think, also, people tend to misrepresent what the electorate are saying to us. My feeling is that there is probably a majority of the electorate in favour of a limited amount of parking and therefore I would urge Members to support the Strategy in its entirety.

**The Bailiff:** Yes, Deputy De Lisle and then Deputy Sherbourne.

**Deputy De Lisle:** Sir, paid parking in town is unfair and discriminatory against the town, both as a business location and our jewel in the crown. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) The Minority Report will charge long-stay paid parking at £1,300 a year to town workers – to begin with, that is. It will also charge designated disc zones, areas and spaces into long-stay parking around town, for example St Julian's Avenue, and taking away, for example, the three-hour parking in other areas. It will also tax employer-provided parking and subject more town streets to residential parking fees. Paid parking charges will not be introduced outside the town.

What concerns me very much is the unfairness, particularly in terms of the lower paid that work in town who need parking places. People working not on the minimum wage perhaps but on £8 to £12 an hour, that is something in the region of £16,000 and when you are taking from them £1,300 a year – I do not think Deputies on £32,000 have a right to subject those employees who are poorly paid, or lower paid employees, to paid parking in such a discriminatory fashion. I feel it is all very unfair and unjust. I think we have to remember that other towns where paid parking has been introduced have constantly raised charges. Guernsey's 60 pence an hour today will soon become £1 an hour for long-term parking tomorrow. These measures are all likely to shift businesses and their employees out of town.

Now the States Strategic Plan on the other hand, is to encourage revitalisation of town and the Bridge. Paid parking works against the Strategic Plan. It stops the growth of town and encourages growth out of town. The very things we are trying to work against in the Strategic Plan.

And here we come into a real fundamental in terms of an Integrated Strategy in reality. An Integrated Strategy has to be integrated across the States. Amendments like we have in front of us today should not work against other strategies of Government. This is not joined-up thinking. It is not joined-up Government. Strategies of the States ought to work in harmony (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) so we should be going in one direction, not all over the place with amendments such as this.

In the States Strategic Land Use Plan, town is to be maintained as the Island's primary retail centre and here we are doing something with paid parking to discriminate against the town and to force additional costs on the town and move town business into the country or into other areas of the Island.

The current focus is also of office accommodation in St Peter Port's main centre and a Strategic Objective of the States is to make Guernsey a globally competitive centre of economic growth and this is done internationally through growth centres. Our growth centre is town. So the Strategic Plan really is aiming at that growth centre providing the competitiveness for Guernsey with other economies and that is very important at the current time.

I note also the Retail Strategy which the Commerce and Employment Department has signed up to, together with other agencies, the Chamber and so on, in Guernsey. That Retail Strategy contains proposals to enhance Guernsey's retail sector and makes the point that a sustained recession has impacted on consumer confidence and the advent of the internet, of course, has made life difficult and challenging for retailers and it calls for the Strategy to be used as a reference point by States and non-States entities, to understand the expected retail position – as I say, a position signed up to by Commerce and Employment, the Chamber of Commerce and the Town Partnership.

What is important is what they say in there really and this is where I have such difficulty with not having a joined-up Government Strategy, one that is so disparate and working in different ways. They say that as a means of bringing customers into St Peter Port, the car occupies a supreme position. Many retailers feel that additional centrally placed car parks have the potential to vastly improve the likelihood of shoppers visiting town, although they say that they feel that currently the amount of parking is probably about right.

The group does have concern about the future parking provision in St Peter Port, however, given that the car is the preferred mode of transport for most shoppers and that this Strategy document seeks to enhance and improve the town's retail offering. The group is keen to ensure that parking is not an inhibiting factor for a better, busier St Peter Port in the future and we have got to think of the future, from that point of view. They say that it is difficult to support the introduction of paid parking. The group is of the view that adding an extra cost to the Guernsey shopping experience would be detrimental to retail at a time when it faces many significant challenges.

They also say that paid parking is a matter being considered by the Environment Department, as it prepares a Traffic and Transport Strategy for the Island. Any introduction of paid parking in that document should be handled sensitively so as not to affect individuals' likelihood to go to Guernsey's retail centres. Paid parking for St Peter Port in existing parks is not supported by the Group for that reason. So here we have with a Strategy which is essentially the Retail Strategy, a lot of work has been put into it by not only outside bodies, not only by people providing their input, but also by the business community contributing, together with the Commerce and Employment Department contributing to that. Here on the other hand we have a Transport Strategy that is working diametrically opposed to that focus.

I think we have to work together and not through amendments to provide the type of unco-ordinated thinking that is being brought forward by this particular Strategy.

Sir, it is common knowledge that parking charges are killing high street shops in small towns across the country. In the UK town centre shops shut at an average of 18 a day during the first half of 2013, reflecting the continuing economic and evolving social pressures on the high street. And we are seeing that here, sir. This is no time to place a further burden on parking in town.

Eric Pickles, the UK Communities and Local Government Secretary, has warned that councils' anti-car dogma is contributing to the death of traditional high streets. He has called on local authorities to ban draconian parking policies that have led to motorists abandoning town centres. They must reduce parking charges that undermine the vitality of town centres, he says and Mr Pickles said current rules were simply driving motorists into the arms of internet retailers and out-of-town superstores. 'Trying to find somewhere to park is an obstacle course in too many of our towns, cities and seaside resorts', undermining the economic vitality of the high street and tourist destinations. 'Town halls need to ditch their anti-car dogma', making it easier to park, to help support local shops, local jobs and tourism.

As a result of that, and that being taken on by the UK Government, and the UK Government bringing in consultants to look at the problem, reduced parking fees and also the abandonment of parking fees is now the way that the UK is progressing.

In fact, in Northern Ireland, reduced parking fees have been introduced at 93 car parks in Northern Ireland and the Regional Development Minister there, Danny Kennedy, said that the initiative would help attract more shoppers to towns and cities in Northern Ireland. So there the local government, if you like, broadly is coming in to support initiatives that the towns themselves are not able to do themselves, because they are trapped into this revenue-building paid parking scenario.

So my call is for more of an integrated policy for Guernsey in terms of transportation and that we do not support paid parking in town as it is totally unfair and discriminatory, and I do not think we should be introducing discriminatory legislation in Guernsey.

It was always, in my opinion, better to tweak the current Strategy in place. There was no real need for this new Strategy or whatever. We had one. We have one. It is running at the moment. It is a matter of building on the earlier progress that we made. In fact, the objectives of this Strategy are essentially the same for the 2006 Strategy: to reduce the adverse impact of vehicle use and encourage the use of alternative forms of transport, including school bus services, park-and-ride services, residents' parking schemes. It was all in there. Motor cycling, cycle paths, walking, small compact car-parking schemes, car-sharing schemes, travel plans, it is all in there in the 2006 Strategy. And so, I must mention, was the 1.2 pence on petrol. That was part and parcel of the 2006 Strategy, which was amended towards paid parking and then of course we have heard about the further amendment to reverse that back to 1.2 pence fuel duty.

Another point I would like to mention is I do not understand why rescinding Resolution IX there of Billet d'État 2006 is necessary. It is the second Resolution before you:

'To approve the Environment Department's intention to acquire and develop suitable sites that might become available for construction of off-street residents' parking facilities.'

That would seem to me to be something that we should be bearing in mind constantly, because if there is an opportunity that Government can do this with perhaps limited funds, and it might be in co-operation with other associations and groups, it might be possible to improve the on-street parking situation in town, through suitable sites that might become available for construction of off-street residents' parking. I do not think we should throw that out, sir. I think that is something that we should bear in mind.

So altogether, please, do not support discriminatory policy, and please do not support policy that is not integrated through the States in general. Strategies we need are those that ought to work in harmony and this is not what I would call joined-up Government and that is what we should be working towards now.

Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Thank you.

I said I would call next Deputy Sherbourne.

**Deputy Sherbourne:** Not quite a mass exodus, but thank you, sir! *(Laughter)*

I only have a few words to say in support of the Minority Report, but I would like to state at the outset that I am really disappointed that Deputy Stewart is not here today to hear a brief speech without anecdotes. However, there will be a reference to dreams.

We are told by our Deputy Chief Minister that Guernsey does not do modal shifts. Guernsey does not do radical. We were told by Deputy Laurie Queripel that Government is not the place for dreams. How sad! **(Several Members:** Hear, hear.) How sad in both cases! **(A Member:** Hear, hear.) Government should be about the realisation of dreams.

I am glad as an individual that white Americans took very close note of a dream that a certain person had. **(Several Members:** Hear, hear.) Every single piece of social improvement in the British Isles has

come about as a result of dreams, people wishing to see better for their fellow beings. Those are the dreams that I like to see realised.

1005 On a much smaller scale, I believe that before us in this Minority Report is a small dream. It is the dream of two people who have got together and put together their perspective, their view on moving Guernsey on with regard transport. I disagree totally with Deputy De Lisle when he says that we have been offered less than an integrated policy. I do not see that. This *is* an integrated policy. The danger is that by the amendments that are being thrown at us, the integrity of that policy is at risk of being destroyed and I do  
1010 not think that we should be considering that at all.

We agreed at the last meeting that the free bus service would be an experiment for 18 months. We have a period where the whole of the Minority Report could be reviewed, assessed, monitored. I do not think that it is rocket science, the actual proposals before us, but I do believe it does include a vision of what transport in this Island could be in a fairly short time.

1015 So I would ask you to support the Minority Report for us to get on, get a vote and set people to work to make the necessary improvements that are needed.

Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Thank you. Does anyone else wish to speak? Deputy Bebb.

1020

**Deputy Bebb:** Thank you, *Monsieur le Bailli*.

I was very disappointed to hear Deputy Langlois' speech earlier on today as to the fact that Guernsey does not do modal shift. I sincerely hope that those words will not be used in a speech which is to do with our Tax and Benefit Review, because I am rather convinced that is in need of some further shift.

1025 The idea that this Assembly is incapable of taking bold decisions is simply not true and I think that once again, if we look at our tax position as to Zero-10, that was a bold move – a very necessary move in my opinion and one that we are still actually working through. But the idea that this Assembly is not able to take on bold decisions is quite simply erroneous and I think that it is time for us to deal with some of that.

I made reference in an earlier speech and I would like to expand on it, to the great benefits that were made in Public Health with regard to town planning. Back in 1848, there was a serious problem with cholera and with public communicable diseases. (**Deputy Sherbourne:** Not over here.) It was so severe that there was a need... The general way of dealing with those diseases at that point in time was simply to burn houses down if there was someone suffering from diseases – not exactly progressive. However, sanitation was introduced by town planners. That had a greater effect on public health than any medical  
1030 involvement in the 19th century. Sanitation was something that dealt with the greatest problems in our health community at the time.  
1035

Here today we have another public health issue. I realise that we will be debating the Medical Officer of Health's Report shortly and I think that it is fairly evident that diabetes is one of the greatest contributors towards some of the diseases – towards an awful lot of the diseases here. We have an increasing and dreadful rate of diabetes. We also have a very poor case of obesity and our Obesity Strategy is currently not being progressed because of a lack of funding. The idea that we can just simply sit back and do nothing in relation to these very real public health issues is simply folly. We will reap the costs in due course and I dare say that we are reaping an awful lot of them already.

I would like to ask if anybody in this Assembly is in the position that they no-one who is currently taking statins. I think that we would be hard pushed to find a single person in this Assembly who does not know of a single person today in Guernsey taking statins. That comes with a cost.

We seem to think that we can just medicate our way out of these problems and the truth is we cannot. As is evident in the MOH Report that we will be debating later, penicillin and antibiotics are coming to an end and we will face a very real large cost in dealing with these issues.

1050 Part of what we need to do is remove the need for the Health Service. What we need to do is change our behaviour. We need to become healthier. We need to cycle, we need to walk, we need to encourage people to do that and I believe that paid parking – which is, let's face it, the only real crux of this conversation by now – is one such disincentive to a very lazy form of transport and would encourage an awful lot more people onto an active means of transport.

1055 I have heard various people suggest that paid parking will be the doom of town. Well, I simply do not agree. First of all, I have to say that we obviously have support for the Minority Report from the Chamber of Commerce and also that we are introducing two and a half hours of free paid parking. Now that is considerably more than what is available at the moment.

I am aware that the Dean of Guernsey lives in Cornet Street and on a frequent basis he has meetings with people and I am aware that he has those meetings with people constantly looking at their watches. It is impossible to meet with someone in town, mid-day or part way through the day and have a decent parking space. In the same way, it is impossible for someone to spend a sufficient amount of time in town at the moment, in order to go shopping. Two and a half hours will make such a provision and will allow people to  
1060

do some shopping. If they wish to stay longer, that option of paying for parking in order to stay longer is one that is available to them. If you need three hours, it is perfectly reasonable to be paying £1.80 for three hours' worth of parking. Personally I am quite happy to pay £1.80 for three hours' worth of parking because it allows me that freedom. It allows me a choice, but more than that I would be more than likely to take a free bus or to take the bike into town. That is exactly what the Transport Strategy is looking to do: move people into a more sustainable means of transport.

I was the only one, I believe, that voted against the Soulsby amendment this morning. I ask Deputy Soulsby's forgiveness because I will now speak against this amendment and ask people not to vote for it, specifically because I do not know of a single other charge or tax that we levy and we specifically publicise how much we raise from it.

I have heard the argument that the charge... that this Transport Strategy is supposed to be hypothecated but I believe that there are many other parts of the Transport Strategy that will be revenue raising. I am unsure why we would therefore choose not to publicise specifically how much money we are raising from the wider vehicle registration or the CO<sub>2</sub> registration. I am unaware of why we choose one particular form of taxation to make very visible and therefore become a constant sore as opposed to all the other charges that we levy. I think that it is probably ill conceived and I will ask Members –

I will happily give way to Deputy Soulsby.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Soulsby.

**Deputy Soulsby:** There are other charges that are within the annual accounts and you will see them at Beau Séjour as an example.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Bebb.

**Deputy Bebb:** Thank you, Deputy Soulsby. I acknowledge that there are, I just feel that on this occasion it is one that will be a running sore and I do not think that it is fair for it to be highlighted in that respect. I think we should accept it as being introduced into general revenue, but I realise that the amendment has been accepted as a Proposition but I would ask Members to maybe consider once again whether to vote for it in the Propositions.

The question of... It is interesting that this morning, I found myself running a little late. I normally attend morning prayer in the Town Church at 7.30 on States' days, which means that I normally get into town well in advance of the worst forms of traffic. However, last night I was debating with another person, it got a little bit late and I therefore got up a little bit late this morning and I found myself trying to get into town for eight o'clock in the morning.

When people talk of the problem that we are trying to address and they are talking about the question of traffic alone, the difference in traffic between trying to get into town at half past seven and eight o'clock is phenomenal. Normally at half past seven I feel quite comfortable cycling, but I have to say that this morning, it was not particularly pleasant. I had someone trying to overtake me just before we got to a traffic light. I had a whole host of people who did not particularly like me for overtaking them whilst they were sitting at a traffic light and I realise that the question of traffic is fundamentally poor.

Part of the problem is that we do not have many motorists who are also cyclists and that lack of understanding as to how vulnerable that you feel as a cyclist is part of the problem we have on the Island. I have heard people suggest during debates on radio and so forth that we have some dreadful cyclists. Well there is one difference: if you have a bad cyclist and he has an accident, he is only likely to injure himself, whereas if you have a bad driver, he is likely to injure an awful lot more people. The idea that we can somehow equate cyclists with drivers is absolutely ludicrous, but when we are talking about the traffic that we are currently facing and the issues that we have, I fervently believe that we need to rethink the way that we construct and think of driving and transport.

I would like to talk about what they do in the Netherlands. In the Netherlands, they introduced legislation – and I see Deputy Langlois instantly despairing. However, this is something that is possible. They introduced legislation with a hierarchy of road users. At the top of the hierarchy was the pedestrian, then came the cyclist, then the scooter driver and so forth, with a burden of proof for any accident immediately falling on the person lower down the hierarchy.

Therefore, if I as a pedestrian am knocked into by a bike, the burden of proof to show that it is not the cyclist's fault, falls on the cyclist alone because they are lower down the hierarchy. Such form of thinking led to a fundamental different behaviour within society in the way that drivers dealt with cyclists and pedestrians. I think it is high time that we had that kind of legislation here, so that the burden of proof falls on those lower down who are more capable of causing great damage, because at the moment we recognise from the work done within the Transport Strategies, that people do not feel comfortable in either walking or



cycling and that is part of our problem. We are trying to debate encouraging people onto the roads at a time that they are not feeling comfortable and we need to address that.

I think that people have also talked of the Netherlands and I know that Deputy Langlois has actually never liked comparison with other jurisdictions, but it is fair to say that the more people who cycle, then the safer cyclists feel, the safer cyclists are, there are less accidents because people feel far more comfortable cycling in numbers. Therefore, if we do not encourage people to cycle, if we do not encourage people to get on to their bikes first thing in the morning to get to work, we simply will not see the change necessary in order to make people feel more comfortable and happier on the roads. This is simply not going to happen and that is why I think that the Department would do well in order to investigate that hierarchy type of proposal.

The other thing that is very difficult for Members to accept at the moment, and I do recognise this, is that the suggestion of a free bus service sounds fine until people talk about the current bus service. I think that it is fair to recognise that no-one feels that it is optimal – I think that is a nice way of putting it. But on the other hand, let us give some credit where credit is due. CT Plus has introduced a night bus service to certain parts of the Island and that has been very successful. I have seen a number of people, I have participated in the night service myself, trying to get from the Bridge back to Footes Lane and I found it to be an excellent service.

Those are the types of interventions, those are the types of development that we are talking about, and that I believe the Department is talking about when they are talking about developing the bus service further so that we have a far more comprehensive bus service that would allow people to make real choices. It is difficult to put that leap of faith into a free bus service at the moment, when we look at the current bus service, but we really have to accept that the Department make it explicit in their report that the bus service will be introduced and will be reformed, will be improved, before the introduction of the free bus service and I fully expect that the introduction to the free bus service will happen probably at the same time or if not, slightly before the introduction of paid parking.

We therefore have to accept that the payoff is not as the bus service is today and therefore I would ask people to put the faith in the Department with regard to the new bus contract that will be brought forward, that we are talking of a very different bus service to what we experience today.

Moving on from that, the other question with regard to paid parking and the comparisons that are being made with other jurisdictions, I am unaware of any other jurisdiction that is offering two and a half hours free parking and then pay for longer parking.

When I visit other places that make charges for parking, what I am aware of is that you pay 50 pence or a £1 for every hour, from the moment you park. Now, some people may prefer that here, but this is one of the reasons that some people can argue that paid parking has been detrimental towards some areas in the UK. Well it is perfectly feasible to think that if someone has to immediately pay 50 pence the moment they park, then of course it can have some detrimental effect and I would ask Members to once again revisit what is before us: two and a half hours free. It is fairly fundamentally different.

Now the next question is this £8 charge which as Deputy Collins rightly pointed out is not a Proposition, it is simply a suggestion. I think it is fair to say that given the amount of focus and debate on this £8 charge, the Department will have some fairly lengthy deliberations about the matter and will take into consideration what everybody has said. But let us also take a look at something comparators. In the Netherlands, it is a €7.50 charge for the OV-chipkaart. In London, it is I believe £3 for the Oyster Card. In Dublin, it is €5 for the Leap Card and in Hong it is 50 Hong Kong Dollars which equates to about £4.50 for the Octopus Card. It is fair to say that all of those fees are lower than the £8 that is being proposed, but by the same token, we should also remember that each one of those cards carries a fee on top of that for each and every journey that you travel. Eight pounds for no fee afterwards is not, I would suggest, particularly cumbersome.

Everybody that visits these places feels quite content that the first thing you do when you arrive at Schiphol Airport... Because I realise Deputy Langlois does not like the Netherlands, you might like to take Dublin: when you arrive you pay €5 for a Leap Card. That is the first thing you do: you pay €5 – it disappears immediately – and then you have to top up the card with additional money before you then pay for each and every journey. Once you have finished paying for each and every journey, you then return home with a card that still has money on it that you will not use probably for a number of years and the card may well expire.

Let us not imagine that people feel that this is a prohibitive charge: £8 is not prohibitive in any way, shape or form and I think that it is red herring.

The final thing that I would like to say this morning is that I did attend the Town Church, I did manage to make it in time for Mass and it was interesting that we are celebrating today the Feast of St Matthias. St Mathias was brought forward as an apostle in order to replace Judas. Interestingly enough, it was important that he was chosen by lot, rather than a democratic process. The reason he was chosen by lot and it was important is because God obviously had some involvement in choosing by lot as opposed to democratic process.

Now then, given the way that this debate is going, it may well be that choosing lots is actually a preferable way to the democratic process. But I would sincerely hope that democracy would prevail and that we see sense – that we support the whole of this Transport Strategy and that we do not seek to pull out straws here, there and everywhere and cause the whole thing to fall apart.

I believe that we have before us, a coherent set of principles, a coherent set of proposals that will provide us with a very real possibility of change. Change for the better of the Island. Change that has been agreed financially by the Chamber of Commerce. Change that would cause benefit for the health of people. Change that really provide options for people and let us face it, if we want to talk about the greatest expense for the people in Guernsey, it is running a car, not actually how much paid parking would be.

Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Ogier.

**Deputy Ogier:** Thank you, sir.

I welcome this Minority Report and it is not often you see a plan which fits together this well. I have been here 10 years and I have not seen many which deal with the issues which require solutions and dovetail into the overarching States' policies, as well as this policy does.

If you are looking for a coherent policy which fits into the States' metaplans, such as the Disability Strategy, by improving access and travel for the immobile, improving outcomes for the less well-off by providing an improved system of free transport, by improving environmental outcomes through better use of mass transit, meeting the aims of the Energy Resource Plan by using energy more wisely, furthering the aims of the Obesity Strategy, the Minority Report is the Strategy. It fulfils aims from most of the States' metaplans.

We have all those words in all the plans which sit on a shelf but it is not until you bring forward a policy which achieves those aims, that they are anything other than fine words on a page. This Report lifts so many beneficial aims from what the States have agreed are their priorities and puts them into practice.

Deputy De Lisle mentions closing shops and reduced hours, but of course he forgets that the Minority Report actually increases free parking for shoppers. Towns elsewhere have paid parking for shoppers and I agree that if you have paid parking for shoppers, it will have a detrimental effect. But if you increase the free shopping places for town shoppers, I think it is logical to expect you will have a benefit for shoppers, for town and for retail. This is a completely different approach to towns elsewhere that we see are suffering. We are increasing the amount of free shopping spaces.

The PSD Minister mentions the amount of harbour land given over to parking and if you want to talk about subsidies, the people of this Island hand across over £100 million of public land in prime harbour area to 1,400 people to park their cars on for eight hours. That is a heck of a subsidy!

What returns should the people of this Island expect to get for this land at commercial rates – £6 million to £7 million perhaps? But we use it to park cars on for eight hours. I think that is a tremendous waste of a public resource. Now if some of that area can be used to help a decent Transport Strategy work, and we get a modest financial return from that, that is something I can live with but currently it makes little sense to give away that amount of expensive land for free parking for the people of this Island.

The Transport Strategy is another one of those perennial divisive issues every States term has to wrestle with. The previous two terms have, and I recall before that too. Like the Waste Strategy, it drags on and on and this Assembly needs to come to a compromise to get through this impasse.

I suggest there are some elements of this Strategy which Members perhaps may not agree with and it will be easy for all the various factions in this Chamber to unite to throw out this Strategy as we have seen before, as we are seeing over this debate and as we saw with the waste, that those various factions cannot unite to accept the replacement when it comes along. It is easy to destroy and it is so much harder to build.

There is a risk of doing nothing, failing to support the major elements of this Strategy, wasting another few years of development and departmental time and leaving the Environment Department really with nowhere else to go. If we fail to support this Strategy, Environment will be left with little hope of finding anything else as most approaches have already been tried or debated.

There are things in this Strategy I do not particularly like but I have to respect the hours of work that its authors have put in, careful deliberation, study, research, weighing up behavioural change against social impact – and I will at least give this Strategy a chance to work. I believe in the dream, I believe in the vision, I believe this is a direction that we should be heading in. I feel the nudges, the sticks and the carrots are more likely to result in beneficial outcomes. I feel the Minority Report is more likely to achieve its desired outcomes than the Majority Report was, it hangs together, it is cohesive and it is integrated.

You can always find things to pick on if you are against something, but I have heard nothing which casts doubt on achieving the overall goals. Small niggles like £8 for a bus card, hardly big fish and easily put into context as a fine cost for an Island-wide tour. (A Member: Hear, hear.)

1245 Please Members, in the interests of progression, vote for this cohesive vision and give it a chance to work and we can finally tick off this perennial problem that the other previous 'worst States ever' have been able to solve.

**Several Members:** Hear, hear.

1250

**The Bailiff:** Yes, Alderney Representative Harvey.

**Alderney Representative Harvey:** I have listened, as everyone has, to this debate with great interest. It has been a debate full of passion and interest and it seems that we are gradually approaching the point at which we have to make our minds up.

1255

As a Representative of Alderney, it is very tempting, very seductive to say this is a Guernsey problem. However, you have been kind enough to pass amendments that remove the duty implications for Alderney and I think I would be failing in my duty as a Member of this Chamber if I did not participate in both the debate and the vote.

1260

I am particularly struck by comments from Deputies Langlois and James who talked, and sorry, I cannot remember the exact words, but it was about politicians being courageous and I think we do need to be courageous. We are here with a popular vote but we have to sometimes make hard decisions and I do not envy anybody in this Chamber who has to make such a hard decision on the nub of the matter, paid parking. So it would be easy to abstain but I think that would be incorrect.

1265

There has been talk of modal shift, which is a concept new to many of us. However, I think we get the drift and I think if there had been modal shift considered, or vision or dreams in Alderney 10 years ago, our economy would not be in the powerless state it is now, with depopulation and major problems which are much harder to address now.

1270

There have been a number of red herrings floating around today, most of which have been caught I think: the challenge to St Peter Port as a retail area I think has been demolished and I think the reason, as has been stated before, why most UK cities that have paid parking who are now looking to remove it, is because the foolishly imposed it from the first five minutes of arrival. So I do not think there is any threat to the town's retail strategy by the proposals in the Minority Report.

1275

Fairness also has been mentioned and fairness is a difficult concept. Unfortunately geography does not understand fairness. I would very much like to be able to drive to Paris from my home in Alderney but I cannot. (*Laughter*) There is a slight impediment in the way and in just the same way unfortunately, St Peter Port and Guernsey are victims and indeed in many respects, beneficiaries of their geography and that geography dictates that too many people wanting to be in the same place, parking for too long, is going to cause a problem.

1280

So it is a difficult situation, I sympathise with everybody here today, but I shall not take the easy way out and abstain because this is a Guernsey problem, but it is a problem that all of us are faced with and I will be supporting the Minority Report.

Thank you.

1285

**The Bailiff:** Alderney Representative Jean and then Deputy Trott.

**Alderney Representative Jean:** I cannot quite agree with my colleague. My view is different and I am not, sir, taking an easy route.

1290

Two weeks ago we received a lot of assistance from this House. Deputy Dave Jones and myself placed amendments and the States of Deliberation were very supportive to those amendments. I happen to feel that this is strictly a Guernsey matter and that is not abstaining. I will probably *Je ne vote pas*. I realise it is a difficult issue and I have listened to the problems and I know very well that you have parking problems here in Guernsey and you have congestion problems. Ways that you must look at to sort them out, I understand this, but from an Alderney point of view, our perspective on it is different and it is hardly right for me to come here on such a specific Guernsey matter, which is what this is, and foist my way of it all and say to you that I am going to vote for paid parking when I know that so many people and so much anxiety rests in this problem.

1295

The States of Guernsey must make that decision themselves, and I feel that it is only right that as an Alderney Representative *Je ne vote pas*.

1300

Thank you, sir. Thank you very much.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Trott.

**Deputy Trott:** Sir, more observations than anything else. Why are we debating this Minority Report? Well, we are debating it because it presented a better base for debate as the majority of this Assembly

1305

thought, not because we necessarily agreed with all, or in some cases, any of the Propositions of the Minority Report. I make that point because political commentators with some experience of this Assembly have, I think through their columns, sought to suggest otherwise. If this Report ends up significantly amended as it might, that is by no means a U-turn but simply an outcome of a process that this Assembly goes through.

Now, sir, I do not believe in demonising the car. It is much more of a benefit than a nuisance. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) Those words were contained in my very first election manifesto and my views have not changed.

Sir, the motorcar is undoubtedly the preferred transport choice and as a general rule, I believed 14 years ago as I do today that we have a congestion problem certainly, but only at peak times. Otherwise, travelling around this Island by motorcar does not pose much of a problem.

It is much more of a problem in Jersey. Quite recently, I had the opportunity to take the car over to Jersey. I was going to take my Smart car, sir, but because there were three of us and a perambulator and various other modes of transport, (*Interjections and laughter*) I had no choice but to take a slightly larger vehicle. I hear the former Chief Minister groaning. Did they have perambulators when you had young children, sir? (*Laughter*)

Anyway, I plugged in the GPS, sir, because I do not know Jersey very well, it is not a place I frequent regularly. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) I plugged in the GPS and it directed me to a car park, because they have paid parking as I am sure you know, sir. Anyway, when I got to this car park there was a big sign and it said it was full, so I thought oh well, I will try another one. So I went to the next one and that too was full. Anyway, I found myself sort of driving round and round in circles adding to the congestion, trying to find a place to park.

I know that some in this Assembly will say well I had alternatives: the bus service and this, that and the other. I think the bus service in Jersey is generally held in fairly high regard. They have buses that appear to be the right size and are well used. But the point is, they have paid parking and it clearly, in Jersey, has not done much for the congestion problems in St Helier because they remain a significant concern.

That leads me really to the whole point of displacement. I think that there is a very strong likelihood that the introduction of paid parking in places like the Odeon will have an effect to simply displace the problem elsewhere and time will tell whether that is correct or not.

People like Deputy Burford will tell us – and may I join the throngs of those who have complimented her and Deputy Brehaut on the production of this Report, it is a very well-constructed and interesting read – but there are those like the authors of this Report who will say, ‘Look at the evidence.’

Well, I am going to look at the evidence, let us have a look at page 599, those of us that have the Billet in hard copy at hand. On page 599 we are reminded – and I am sure these statistics are accurate, despite the fact they from the Department and not the Minority Report (*Laughter*) – that the St Sampson’s School Travel Habits Survey, said that back in 2001, 16% walked and in October 2013, 16% walked. Well why is that relevant? Well, it’s relevant because Living Streets would have you believe that the introduction of a walkway from Pitronnerie Road to St Sampson’s School would have seen a massive uplift in the numbers of people walking to school. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

They would also tell you, sir, that the introduction of a one-way system with very wide accommodating areas for pedestrians and cyclists would see a modal shift in behaviour. No such modal shift in behaviour has been forthcoming in this example.

So one has to be careful about what these statistics elsewhere show and I think I have given two examples, one local and one from our near neighbour, where the expectations have not been delivered in reality.

Let me tell you, sir, I am a little bit bothered about the States’ Members having to pay for their parking and that is page 776, Proposition 6. Again, if Members want to turn to that particular Proposition, they will see that it acts as a really quite significant disincentive because the way the Proposition is worded, is to suggest that... I will read it:

‘To agree that States’ Members who wish to avail themselves of parking on any or all States days at Lukis House shall pay £165 per year commencing on 1 November...’

So whether you use it once or however many times a year, it will cost you £165. Well that is the perfect disincentive to *use* your car, sir. It is not an incentive not to.

But it is you I am most bothered about, I have to tell you, sir. You, the Greffier, Her Majesty’s Comptroller and all those others who will not have the inconvenience of having to pay for your parking. (*Laughter*)

You see, Lukis House probably costs the taxpayer... I do not know, we have owned it an awful long time – a few thousand pounds. The Royal Court as you will know, sir – which came in on time and on budget, I was the project manager – (*Laughter*) cost, I think, £17 million or so. So you can see straight

away that in terms of the burden on the taxpayer, the provision of parking under the new Royal Court was much more expensive than Lukis House.

1365 Now the point is, and there is a serious point to this, the Minority Report guides us to the introduction of a tax on benefits, so eventually, sir, you will be taxed, I would imagine, for the use of that luxury and 5,500 States Employees will eventually be taxed for that benefit, should they choose to avail themselves of it and the overwhelming majority will. I doubt there are many in this Assembly who would disagree with that. That will filter through to wage demands and with it an impact on inflation and all of the other factors  
1370 associated with those sorts of issues. It will not be an easy thing to remedy and one that I have some concerns about.

The other issue that I think is worthy of mentioning, sir, is the length of time that strategies of this type take up and the demand on resources that results. Deputy Burford has said, and I do not doubt it for one moment, that she has spent many hundreds of hours on the preparation of this Report. I know when I was  
1375 the head of an important Strategy back in 2004 to 2006 – I refer of course to Zero-10 – I spent almost 300 hours in public presentations alone, let alone all of the other work responsible for formulating the proposals.

Now, I may be wrong but I believe there are numerous, maybe seven or eight additional reports that are needed should we approve these Propositions today, and that brings with it enormous resource consequences. May I politely recommend that Deputy Burford does not shoulder the burden of all of these  
1380 additional reports, because that is simply too much for one person to shoulder – but where are the resources within the Environment Department? One can only but guess.

Can I end, sir, saying that I really had a quite unpleasant moment at the last States meeting. You will recall that it rained continuously and foolishly, I drove in in my wife's Smart car. I say foolishly because I did find myself driving past four States' Members who were struggling in on foot sir, umbrellas aloft and  
1385 had I been in my Audi I would have stopped and given all four a lift, (*Laughter*) but because I was in my Smart car and only able to accommodate one, I decided to let all four down, sir. (*Laughter*)

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Dorey.

1390 **Deputy Dorey:** Thank you, Mr Bailiff.

I will be supporting all the Propositions except for one. Firstly, I would just like to say a correction about what I spoke about before, when I spoke about the debate in 2009: there was an amendment later in that debate about paid parking, which was also rejected.

So the Proposition that I would be voting against is 5d which says:

'the re-designation of Victoria and Albert Piers and the current 2 hour disc zone at North Beach into 2.5 hour disc zones (see paragraph 54 iii of that Minority Report).'

1395 As I currently understand, there is already a problem with commuters using two-hour parking. (**A Member:** Yes.) So we currently have a problem with just two hours. As we are going to be introducing charges for three -hour and greater time parking, I think that we will make those two and a half hours more attractive to commuters. There are various businesses that are quite happy for their staff to leave for five minutes to just move their cars, and that is what happens, as I have been reliably informed.

1400 So I actually think that making those parking spaces two and a half hours rather than two hours, will make them more attractive to commuters. They might be able to cut two and a half hours off their paid parking time, even if they then move into a paid parking area and I think that would not be beneficial to St Peter Port as a shopping area. So I will vote against 5d. I do not believe that will undermine the Strategy. We are talking about half an hour but I just think it would be better to have those areas at two hours rather  
1405 than two and a half hours.

Just linked to parking, I would also encourage the Environment Department to replace the half-hour parking at the Lower Pollet and Church Square which is proposed to be removed. I think those very short parking areas are beneficial to town. It allows people to pop in and do some particular banking or shopping where they know precisely what they want to buy or do, and I think they are useful. I think it is useful  
1410 having it on the land side of the town as opposed to the sea side of town to make the journey shorter and I would encourage them, where the waiting area for the Police Station is, in the lower part below Hospital Lane, that would be a good area to have as a half hour area rather than the current two hours as that is very close to town.

Deputy Gillson spoke a couple of weeks ago about one way systems, and I completely agree with him. I  
1415 think that we need to... I think we do have a problem with cars driving on pavements. I think the system of one way for cars and two ways for cycles which started in the Castel were wrong many years ago and it is now round the Baubigny Schools. I think it needs to be ruled out on a significant number of roads in the Island where there is not room for two cars, or a car and a commercial vehicle, to pass without mounting the pavement – particularly as the States is not willing to financially encourage commercial vehicles to be

narrower by having the width tax on those vehicles. I think we need to encourage pedestrians and one way of doing that is to stop vehicles using the pavements and also have the advantage of cycles going two-way.

Sometimes I drive frequently along the Bailiff's Cross and there are corners along there where if there is a commercial vehicle and car, you cannot pass without mounting the pavement. I really do, I am concerned when I see some people mounting the pavement on a corner and I wonder why we have any pedestrians in this Island when I see things like that happening, because it must be frightening if you are a pedestrian, you are in a corner and there are two vehicles that cannot pass without mounting the pavement.

So I think it is really important, if we are serious about encouraging cyclists, and pavements where two cars cannot pass, we have to have the roads one way for vehicles. It would be an inconvenience but I think it would considerably improve safety and it would also encourage the health aspect which has already been spoken about, which I am not going to repeat, but encouraging walking and cycling is of benefit but people have got to feel safe doing that and that is one of the most important ways I think, of making people feel safe.

I am very pleased to see Proposition 18 which is about presumed liability and they are going to investigate that. I think that is excellent. Again, that will encourage cyclists. *(A horn sounded) (Laughter)* Traffic noises to go with it!

**Deputy David Jones:** You can put that horn away now. *(Laughter)*

**Deputy Dorey:** The other thing I think I would encourage them to look at is advance stop lines, or cycle boxes at traffic lights, which allows cyclists to gather at the front of a queue for traffic lights and therefore it is considered far safer for them to be at the front where they can be clearly seen and there is an area for them there.

Deputy Trott mentioned about Proposition 6. I support it but one thing I would say is that in 54i, it talks about the 50% discount for vehicles which emit less than 100 grammes of CO<sub>2</sub> per kilometre. I think that those encouragements for people to use vehicles which produce less pollution should also be there for States' Members. I think it should be equal and I think that would be good. Also mentioning that, a lot of people have mentioned about the cost of paid parking, but there is a simple way of halving that cost which is to have a vehicle which emits less 100 grammes of CO<sub>2</sub> per kilometre, so that you get 50% discount.

The whole idea of this policy is to discourage large vehicles, discourage usage of vehicles, discourage wide vehicles and I think this again is part of the Strategy and if people really are concerned about the cost of parking, there are a number of cars, some of the hybrid cars, which are well below 100 grammes of CO<sub>2</sub> per kilometre which can take a family of five. They are not large but they have five seats, so there is the opportunity for people to use the long stay parking and get a discount and do what this whole Strategy is trying to do: encourage more efficient vehicles as well as using vehicles less.

Deputy Luxon referred to existing paid parking at the airport. There is also some at the harbour and people who are going to Sark, I believe can purchase parking permits, as I believe they do that, so there is an existing public paid parking scheme in town for people who want to go to Sark. So we have a system already. Those are all the points to cover.

Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Conder.

**Deputy Conder:** Thank you, sir.

Sir, colleagues, I have listened to this debate with great interest and felt quite humble listening to some of the excellent speeches and have learnt a lot. I stand by where I started really, which is that I am a strong and passionate supporter of the Minority Report as now amended. I was grateful to my colleague Deputy Burford, in her speech in response to Deputy Dorey's amendment, for allowing her supporters to vote in favour of the change in petrol and the petrol duty and the removal of the charges for parking car size – pleased to be able to vote for that.

I think that to respond to Deputy Laurie Queripel's excellent speech and indeed, to allude to my friend, Deputy Sherbourne's speech, I think it is appropriate that politicians should dream – in fact I think it is almost essential – and to try and turn their dreams into reality by standing for office and bringing forward policies. Whilst not wishing to put words into Deputy Burford's mouth, I think she has had a dream and I think that is embodied in this Minority Report and I congratulate her for it.

Deputy Sherbourne referred to somebody else who had a dream, of course Martin Luther King who delivered probably one of the two or three greatest speeches of the 20th century on the steps of the Capitol Building. It would be an insult to his memory for me to pretend that this debate and my views share any of the importance of emancipating a whole race from prejudice.

But I do have a dream. I have a dream that young children can actually walk to school in safety. **(Severall Members:** Hear, hear.) I actually have a dream that elderly people can walk the streets without

having to push themselves into hedges to get out of the way of commercial vehicles and lorries on the pavement surface. And I have a dream that I can actually cycle here and cycle back in safety.

As I said two weeks ago, I will not get on a cycle in this Island. It is not safe and I take my hat off and respect those who are brave enough to do so, Deputy Bebb, but I fear for you and Deputies like you cycling in this Island.

This is an Integrated Strategy. It has the vision, it has the dream of actually producing a healthier, cleaner environment where people can move around this Island in safety and where the whole quality of life of all people is improved. It is an Integrated Strategy that aims for smaller vehicles. It aims to achieve less pollution. It aims for greater use of buses, more walking and more cycling. By bringing all those together, it integrates the whole way of life, about how we move around this Island and how we actually get to work or get to wherever we want to be. It is unashamedly trying to change behaviours and it should be not be castigated and we should not be embarrassed about that. It is trying to change the way that we live. We should feel that we can walk more easily around this Island and that we can cycle.

Just yesterday, I read a report – I think by the UK’s Health Officer – to say that 20 minutes’ vigorous walking a day for those over 65 years old – and I have to declare an interest! (*Laughter*) – actually does more to prolong life than most medical interventions, taking statins, changing diet and my friend Deputy Harwood will be pleased to know that I will be vigorously walking back from the States to my home at the end of today, (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) as he told me to at the start of this morning. Although I will be to an extent, taking my life in my hands as I walk down the Fosse André trying to avoid the two-way traffic.

Other colleagues have referred to the dangers of experimenting. No, this is not an experiment. It is the desire to change the way we live, as we have already said. There is actually an element of experiment now simply because of the successful amendment that Deputy Fallaize brought in terms of free bus provision for 18 months. But actually any policy, any resolution, any legislation that a Government brings in is an experiment, for the simple reason that no States can bind another.

We are not actually changing something irrevocably, though in truth I hope we are, but simply by virtue of the fact that if another States in two and a half years’ time does not like it, it can change it. If the experiment, if that is what it is, is deemed to have failed, it can be changed. Nothing is irrevocable. Again by virtue of Deputy Soulsby’s successful amendment earlier on, we will certainly have information about the cost and the benefits and efficacy of any paid parking.

So we should not be afraid of knocking ourselves into something which will change this Island for ever. I hope it does. But if the price is so high, it is absolutely in the hands of the next States to change it.

And so finally, sir, in terms of the oft-quoted cost of £1,300, that is a £1,300 cost which of course one does not want impose on those who are going to really struggle to pay that, but actually this is an Integrated Strategy. One hopes that nobody, or very few people, will actually have to take on £1,300 because they would use the buses. This is about trying to persuade people to use the free buses! So whilst there is a disincentive to park long term, there is actually a massive incentive never or very infrequently to park long term, by using the now free buses.

Absolutely finally, sir, I would just refer to the Minister of Local Government, Mr Pickles, who I think Deputy De Lisle referred to. He was railing against, to an extent, the paid parking in UK towns and cities and the impact it has on local environment, but actually what he was saying, much more, was about the inability of cars to get into towns – the road furniture, over-zealous traffic wardens, but most importantly, about CCTV. I might struggle if we had actually introduced CCTVs into our car parks to make sure that people are not parking, but that is actually what he was railing about. It was about allowing local Governments to be much freer and making it much easier for cars to get into town at defined car-parking spaces. Perversely, I believe this Minority Report, by discouraging people from parking will actually free up car parking spaces and in many cases, make it much easier for people to find a space when they want to come into town, whether for two and a half hours or long term.

So colleagues, I urge you to support the Minority Report as amended this morning. It is I think the two cases, two particular Deputies’ dream, I applaud them for it as so many people have and I think it is a dream worth realising.

Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Fallaize.

**Deputy Fallaize:** Thank you, sir.

I just want to raise, first of all, a small matter regarding a particular class of motorist in the commercial field in particular and that is hire cars. This is a concern that has been raised with me and which I share, that of course we have made exemptions in the Propositions as amended, as a result of Deputy Soulsby’s amendment, for commercial vehicles. We have not made any exemptions for hire cars and I am not suggesting that we ought to by amendment or anything like that, but I think the circumstances in which

people use hire cars are materially different from the circumstances in which people who are based in the Island are using motor vehicles.

We are trying, those of us who believe in the Minority Report, to have some influence on transport behaviour and in respect of the width duties and the emissions duties on the behaviour of people when they purchase cars. But these are long-term purchases in the main. These are families who may get several years' use out of cars, but for a person who comes to the Island on holiday, they are only perhaps using a car for a few days or a couple of weeks maximum, and hire companies are bringing in cars perhaps for a periods of three months or six months and having to register those cars every time they bring them in, and they would attract duties under the proposals as they stand.

There is clearly some flexibility in the Minority Report that Deputy Burford has proposed and I know that there is a lot of detail that is still to be worked out, so I do not suggest that this is any sort of problem which is insurmountable, but I am asking if the Propositions as amended are successful, if the Department would be prepared, please, to consider the I think quite special circumstances which are attached to hire car companies when they are bringing cars in and to at least consider the case of hire car companies when framing the detailed legislation that will need to come back to the States in due course. I would be pleased if the Department would be prepared to do that.

More generally, this debate has been not unlike previous debates about Transport Strategy and about paid parking and it is essentially a debate about paid parking, I think. I was in the States in 2009 when a proposal for paid parking was defeated, I think by 24 votes to 22. There was a vote on paid parking about three years before that which was successful I think by two votes, and that is the way it always is in the States when paid parking is debated. I think that broadly reflects public opinion.

Both sides in this debate have claimed to be representing public opinion. We have heard that public opinion is violently opposed to paid parking and we have heard that public opinion is in favour of paid parking and usually, public opinion is in favour of whichever side of the argument we favour.

Actually I think usually when there has been any sort of reliable polls carried out, opinion is very split and that has been reflected certainly in my in-box and mailbag over the last few weeks. I think there are people who are vehemently opposed. There are people who are very strongly in favour. I think public opinion is broadly divided in the same way that the States are divided, almost right down the middle.

There has been criticism, not from inside the Assembly perhaps but certainly from outside from some columnists and from some members of the public, about the nature of this debate. 'Look, it's going to take four days to determine a Transport Strategy', but actually I am going to defend the States in this respect. This kind of debate, where there is division and when there is sometimes prevarication and where there are U-turns, goes on in every jurisdiction. The only difference in Guernsey is that it happens in public. If we were in a different jurisdiction in a different system of Government, all this would happen in private. We would have somebody laying a motion to do something in the morning, someone trying to take it out in the afternoon, we would have prevarication, we would have U-turns but it would all happen in private and then at the end of that debate, the people who had participated as part of Government would come out and say, 'We are all united, this is our policy position,' (*Laughter*) even though half of them would have fought against it in private.

Now our way of doing it in public does sometimes inevitably lead to questions about governance. People say this looks like it is a mess, it looks maverick and it looks as if the States do not know what they are doing. On the other hand, one could argue that it is an open and transparent way of doing business and that actually the alternative, where people disagree in private and then pretend that they agree with things in public, is disingenuous. So I would defend the States going through these sorts of issues in an admittedly slightly laborious way, because that is our system and I do not think that it is any worse than doing all of this in private and then being disingenuous in public.

Deputy Trott talked us through his experience in Jersey, but I think when Deputy Burford opened debate on her amendment, she cited Jersey, or she has at least in one speech I have heard, as an example of a disintegrated Transport Strategy. So I do not think that what has been done in Jersey or necessarily what has been done elsewhere is evidence of what would happen or might happen if the Transport Strategy Propositions as amended are approved today.

He also said that travelling around this Island by motor car is not a great problem, except in periods of congestion, and I agree with him actually. I think that for the motorist, there is no traffic problem in Guernsey at all. There is a bit of congestion in the mornings and in the evenings, but when I am driving my car, I never feel that there is a traffic problem in Guernsey.

But that is to see the Transport Strategy purely from the perspective of the motorist (**A Member:** Yes.) because as well as being ... We talk about motorists – well, some Members have – as if they are some kind of sub-species and all they do all day is drive their cars around. They do not do anything else. They are just 'motorists' and we can put them in that kind of pigeon hole.

I am a motorist but I am also a cyclist. I am also a pedestrian. I used to be a bus user until the CT Plus and the Environment Department totally messed up that service. Now I will not use it at all until it is sorted



out, but I am still a pedestrian and a cyclist. Now when I am a pedestrian and a cyclist, there is a traffic problem. There is definitely a traffic problem if you are a child trying to walk to school or the parent of a child who would like your children to walk to school. There is definitely a traffic problem if you are one of the 8,000 adults who do not drive in Guernsey. There is definitely a traffic problem if you live on a very, very busy road which has got traffic going along it all the time. It is absolutely saturated with traffic and I have those people in mind when debating the proposals in this Minority Report.

I think what has been interesting in debate from those people who oppose the Transport Strategy and that really means they oppose paid parking, because there has been very, very little opposition to any of the measures, other than paid parking. I am amazed actually that there has not been more opposition to width duties and emissions duties, and Deputy Dorey raised the presumption of liability and those sorts of Propositions, there has been hardly any debate on those and yet in many ways, they are really quite radical measures. All of the opposition, more or less, has been about paid parking. But the opponents of paid parking have not in any way put forward any kind of alternative Transport Strategy. We have just had opposition.

The Environment Department, the majority of the Environment – well, we think it was the majority, but certainly the Minister and the Deputy Minister in fairness to them – have put forward their alternative Transport Strategy but the States has very clearly voted against it. Two thirds of Members did not want to debate it. It is clear now that the Minority Report is the only game in town. I do not just mean in the context of the vote today, but I mean in the context of having a Transport Strategy. Either we vote in favour of the Propositions as amended or we are not going to have a Transport Strategy at all. That is very clear because the opponents of paid parking, the opponents of this Strategy cannot come up with anything else. They have had an opportunity. They cannot come up with anything which is sufficiently visionary and they clearly cannot unite a majority of the States.

Now, we would be about the only place around in the Western hemisphere which would not have a Transport Strategy, because that is where we are at the moment, the 2009 Transport Strategy is not a Transport Strategy at all. Well, it certainly is not one that can work.

Deputy De Lisle and other Members, Deputy Laurie Queripel as well, talk about an attack on town but among the measures that have been proposed here are a free bus service, where currently there is a charge, including a free bus service in and out of town, and an extension of free parking up to two and a half hours. That is not an attack on town. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) That is not an attack on retail in town.

Deputy De Lisle talked about these proposals being contrary to the vision for town and the importance of free parking underpinning that vision in town, but I think that if he looks through the vision in town to which he is referring, he will see the emphasis placed on free parking for short-term shoppers. That was the emphasis placed on the Strategy to which he is referring – that is essential to retain free short term parking – and that is retained in the Minority Report. So I do not think the proposals can represent an attack on town.

I was once opposed to paid parking and I was persuaded, actually as much by the former Treasury Minister as by the authors of the Minority Report –

**Deputy Trott:** Sir, which former Treasury Minister?

**Deputy Fallaize:** The immediate past Treasury Minister, who was a very strong proponent of paid parking and it was his amendment that was only just defeated in 2009. He made not so much the environmental case but the economic case for paid parking and after doubting it for a while, he persuaded me.

I think the idea seems to me, that the principle that is important, is that Government collects tax revenue and provides services and facilities free at the point of use where there is a significant benefit for the whole community, from an individual consuming that service or facility. When a child goes to school, there is a significant benefit for the whole community. When a person obtains health care, there is a significant benefit for the whole community. Now, that is a good reason for the States to collect tax revenue and then provide services and facilities free at the point of use.

But we make a charge for people who want to use Beau Séjour. We make a charge for people who want to hire sports facilities from Culture and Leisure. We make a charge for people who want to hire school halls from schools which are controlled by the States. We even run a dairy but we charge for people to consume milk. Now, I cannot put parking, free parking, in the same category as schools and hospitals. I think that parking falls more into the category of sports facilities, Beau Séjour and other sorts of services and facilities. We even charge for blood tests. So the argument that we must, it is some sort of moral imperative that we must retain free parking in prime areas of town, I think falls down economically as much as it does environmentally.

But in the end, this will come down I think, to a division between people who are optimistic and people who are pessimistic. The speeches we have heard from people who oppose this Strategy, by and large, are

pessimists. I think they believe that if it could work, it probably is worth it, but they do not think it will work. ‘Well, you are never going to get the Guernseyman out of his car.’ ‘What will happen if wage claims go up as a result of paid parking?’ and niggling doubts about all sorts of peripheral issues around the edge of this Strategy. If we take a sceptical and pessimistic view of human nature, we would vote against this Strategy.

But I am going to take an optimistic view and I think actually the Propositions as amended will succeed, because I think that a majority of States’ Members in this Assembly are sufficiently optimistic to believe that the proposals can work and that they can, in time, present a better way of dealing with transport and traffic policy in Guernsey. It is a choice, for me, between being optimistic and being pessimistic. I am not 100% certain that it will work. I cannot be. We very rarely can be 100% certain that things will work, but if one takes an optimistic view of human nature, it is worth backing these proposals and I think that is what the States will do and I hope the States will be optimistic and vote for the proposals.

Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Dorey.

**Deputy Dorey:** A point of correction.

We do not charge for blood tests unless you are a private patient. Primary Care Practices charge for taking your blood, but the States does not charge for the blood test.

**The Bailiff:** Just before we rise, Deputy Green, do you wish to be *relevé*?

**Deputy Green:** Yes please, sir. Thank you very much.

**The Bailiff:** We will rise now and resume at 2.30 p.m.

*The Assembly adjourned at 12.35 p.m.  
and resumed its sitting at 2.30 p.m.*

## **VI. Guernsey Integrated on-Island Transport Strategy – Debate continued – Amended Propositions carried**

**The Bailiff:** Members, we continue the debate on the Guernsey Integrated on-Island Transport Strategy. Who else wishes to speak?

Yes, Deputy Kuttelwascher.

**Deputy Kuttelwascher:** You sort of feel obliged to have a bit, don’t you? (*Laughter*)

I am standing here in part because of what Deputy Fallaize said, which I found rather offensive in a way – and I know he is not here. He was intimating that those who opposed it were pessimists (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) and those who supported it were optimists. What a load of nonsense! (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) I suppose I could describe myself as a dreaming optimistic pessimist, (*Laughter*) which to me means I am a realist. But, anyhow, I think emotions have gone a bit too far in that respect and I certainly would not describe anybody who opposed my views as a natural pessimist.

So I am going to start by referring to something my colleague on my left said on the radio in the weekend after the debate. He expressed some surprise that, two-thirds of the Members having voted for the amendment to debate the Minority Report, why there seemed to be such a problem with continuing with the debate. But Deputy Fallaize actually explained what we were doing. We were choosing which Report to debate – warts and all, amendments and all. If you voted in that Report, or in that vote, to debate that Report, that did not mean to say you naturally supported it. Now, it was clear to me, but it was not clear to everybody.

Now, Deputy Harwood also said later on, on the radio, we have to make a decision. Well, he is dead right, but I think he was assuming there were only two decisions – which there are not; there are three. Because if we vote out this strategy we are left with a 2006 Tax Strategy with 31 Resolutions. This Report only seeks to negate one of them, so there will be 30 left. Actually there is another one because there was a 14 and a 14(a). It was really two. Add that to the 29 and we have got a lot of Resolutions that we are going to deal with if this particular strategy is accepted.

Which brings me on to another position which was put forward by the Minister of the Department. He said, ‘I do not want to be left with nothing’. Well, you will not be left with nothing. If this is voted out you

will be left with the 2006 Tax Strategy and in fact the Resolution relating to paid parking and the 1.2p on the fuel from 2009. So you will not be left with nothing.

That brings me to a point: what has happened to this tax strategy in eight years? (*Interjections*)

**A Member:** We are talking about transport.

**Deputy Kuttelwascher:** Sorry. Tax begins with a 'T' – this traffic strategy? Well, not a lot. I did not do too much research, but I pulled out the accounts for 2012, purely because, for four months of that year, this current Environment Board were in position. And although they did not set their budget – it was set by the previous T&R Board, of which Deputy Domaille was a Member – when you look at it – 'Road Transport Strategy'. The original budget was minus £4,000.

Now, that is an odd number but I presume there was so much in the kitty that the T&R Board at that time thought, 'Oh, they have not spent it. We are not giving them anymore. We will take four back.'

The authorised budget actually went up to £69,000, which is a very modest sum considering £300,000 a year was supposed to be put towards this strategy from the 1.2p extra tax on petrol per litre.

What did they actually spend? The actual outcome? *Minus £126,000* – which is almost bizarre. When you look at these figures it is almost the only figure with a minus in any of the budgets as regards the actual spend. So, God, what a nirvana for Treasury resources! You give someone a £69,000 budget at the beginning of the year and at the end of the year you get double your money back. All that shows to me is they have not actually progressed what is in the 2006 Tax Strategy. (**A Member:** Transport.) Sorry. Well, this is so much a tax raising measure, I am not really sure there is a lot of difference. (*Interjection*) If I just look at the 2006 –

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Trott. A point of order.

**Deputy Trott:** It is actually a matter of correction because the 2006 figures are one thing, the fact that the 1.2p was not introduced until 2009 is another.

**Deputy Kuttelwascher:** Sir, I did not mention the 2006 figures, I mentioned the 2012 figures. I am looking at the 2012 budget States' accounts. (*Interjection*) I mentioned that.

I will just look at the first Resolution now of the 2006 *Transport Strategy* – come Tax Strategy:

'To approve that the main object of the Island's Road Transport Strategy shall be to reduce the adverse environmental, economic and social impacts of vehicle use in the Island, in particular, by: encouraging the use of alternative forms of transport; discouraging unnecessary motor vehicle usage; promoting more responsible use of vehicles; and, promoting the more efficient use of the Island's transport infrastructure.'

The problem we have is we seem to think because one strategy has not delivered – because it has not – we will just produce another one. But why on earth was this not delivered? I really do not know the answer to that.

Regarding this particular Minority Report, I am going to focus on something else. Deputy Fallaize again said it is all hinging around paid parking. Well, it is not. There is another issue I have with this, from a fiscal point of view, and that is: one of the Propositions requires that the bus depot project be included in the current skip process as a pipeline project.

But it is not funded and I will say why. They are proposing a funding of £1.15 million per year over 20 years or so. In the Majority Report they estimated the cost of building the depot at £15 million to £20 million. Now, this current capital project delivery programme is running only until 2017 so if they want to deliver this depot in that period and only put in about £4 million, where is the rest coming from? I do not have a clue. This is a major piece of expenditure which has already not made the cut during our capital prioritisation process. And, although this looks a suitable way of funding it, it does not actually fund it, it funds a bit of it.

So where is this money coming from? When I spoke on the sursis I mentioned that, if Members remember, at the time of the capital prioritisation process we were originally underfunded by £70 million, then another £20 million because of HSSD's requirements to improve the wards. This is adding another £20 million to it.

Now, these numbers change and I know roughly what the latest numbers are, but I can tell you now that the money is not in the pot. So someone tell me where it is coming from, if they want this project to be funded during the current process. Because I do not think it can be without either raiding our savings, our Contingency Reserve Tax Strategy, or raising some more taxes over the next couple of years, or whatever. But this is the big cost. The other costs are minor compared to this. So I cannot support that. I do not think there is an immediate requirement for this particular depot and as such I cannot support it. So it is not just the paid parking issue. This is another issue.

There is also a requirement in here for Treasury and Resources to give possibly, if required, up to £835,000 from the taxpayer, if you like from general revenue, from the Budget Reserve. Now, that is under extreme pressure now and we are only five months into the year. That money may not be there. So, again, if that money goes it will have to come out of the Contingency Reserve. This is even before we consider all the other items I talked about – the personal tax and the sort of taxes we may have to raise for next year. This is a first big step towards rather a large spending exercise and I do not personally think it is justified.

I think I am going to leave it at that because I wanted to point out that it is not just parking, it is also the issue of the capital costs of this bus depot. And I have spoken to Alderney Member Jean. He said there were not really involved with paid parking, but one of these Propositions does relate to a £835,000 possible withdrawal from the Budget Reserve. And Alderney Members do pay tax and you do fund that Budget Reserve as you do everything else. (*Interjection*) So I would not use that necessarily as a reason not to vote.

Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Anybody else or shall we go to Deputy Domaille?

No. Deputy Spruce.

**Deputy Spruce:** Thank you, sir. I thought I must have the final say.

Well, Members, here we are after nearly four days of debate with a transport strategy which is certainly no longer integrated and no longer fully-funded. Various amendments have weakened the long-term effectiveness of the Minority Report proposals. In fact it is no longer cohesive in any way.

Now, given that a free bus service was a central plank of the strategy – the central plank that was expected to get people back on the buses – how can we now have any confidence of success? The Assembly have only agreed to provide a free bus service for 18 months and thereafter charge 50p per bus ride unless ridership has increased significantly. Trust me, 18 months is not long enough to secure the improvement in a service provision that would significantly increase ridership, or the information you would require in order to make a considered decision on bus fares.

Given where we are now, how can we possibly propose the introduction of paid parking in St Peter Port? Paid parking was the biggest stick in the Minority Report's proposals, but the Assembly has now decided to withhold any guarantee that the biggest carrot will be available on a long-term basis.

The Minority Report's plan was that paid parking would not only act as the biggest disincentive but that it would pay for the free and vastly improved bus service, thereby giving people a real choice of transport options. A choice which it was hoped would get people back on the buses. This carrot can no longer be delivered in the long term.

Deputy Langlois was entirely correct: there is no evidence that paid parking will be a success. But what we do know is there is a risk to St Peter Port's viability and attractiveness as a place to do work. How can this Assembly have any credibility when all it proposes are measures to beat the Town worker into submission, whilst offering no credible long-term guaranteed transport alternative? Why should someone unfortunate enough to work in St Peter Port be expected to pay £1,300 per year for long-term parking, especially when there is no guarantee that they will be provided with an improved and effective alternative?

Now, think about this: there are Members in this Assembly who actually believe that the extension of free parking for shoppers will help the Town. If you worked in Town wouldn't you use the free 2.5 hours, then move your car? Let us say 8.30 a.m. until 11 a.m. then you move your car to a paid parking area and then when all the shoppers go home at lunch you take a 1.30 p.m. to 4 p.m. place. That will have a serious impact on St Peter Port, but what it will also do is save that Town worker £750 a year – by using the free places.

There are those that actually think paid parking will provide them with a parking place. But it will not. We have got no more spaces. In fact we are likely to have less because the 2.5 hours is going to be extended. So those that have sort of suggested, 'Finally, you will be able to have a space because you will be paying for it,' ... it is a total illusion.

So why would you pay when all the free parking spaces are close to your work and, as I say, you can save some £750 per year? Admittedly, everyone could not secure a free place, but shoppers would be impacted and thereby trade in Town. So I should think carefully about what might be done to St Peter Port's trading.

We have heard from some Members who have a dream. The problem with dreams is that when you wake up you have to deal with the reality of the impact your decision has had on the average person. Dreams are all well and good but the reality is always different. (**A Member:** Hear, hear). There is no doubt that the Department can provide an improved bus service with the revenue which will be raised from width and emission duties, because these width and emission duties are quite significant. If in the final event a minimal 50p fare is introduced this can also be used to fund improved measures.

I ask you therefore to consider carefully how you vote upon each of the recommendations. We are in danger, in my opinion, of voting through only revenue raising measures, without offering the public any

discernible gain for the price they will pay. Please reject Proposition 5, thereby removing paid parking from the strategy. The risk to St Peter Port is just too great. Remember the width and emission duties alone will raise more than enough revenue to improve the travelling public's options and introduce many of the transport strategy's proposed initiatives. We really do not need paid parking to improve the public transport system.

Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Perrot.

**Deputy Perrot:** Thank you, sir.

To use the time honoured phrase, 'I was not going to speak' ... (*Laughter*) but I have listened to so many really long speeches and long prepared speeches, which have delivered slight repetition and all the rest of it, and I just thought I would get my own back. (*Laughter*) No, that is not the real reason. (*Laughter*) The real reason is I am the third Member of the Treasury Board to speak and I just wanted to show you what a smooth harmonised body of people we are.

This debate has been extraordinarily long and it has been criticised for that. I would just like to defend what has happened, irrespective of the fact that there has been repetition and that people have been determined to come out with pre-arranged speeches no matter what else is said. That is democracy (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) and I take heart at what has happened over the last few days and long may that remain.

But I echo to the rafters... I wish he were here but I echo to the rafters what Deputy Fallaize had to say about that. And I think it is disobliging but expected of the media to say the sorts of things that they were saying and to be critical of what has happened, whereas actually what goes on in the States of Guernsey is more democratic than very many other places and certainly any other places where they have party politics. Indeed the infantilism of some of the *Press* comment would beggar belief if we were not so used to it. (*Laughter*)

As to the substantive Propositions, I do draw distinction between taxes and charges. I think charges are perfectly appropriate for debate. I think taxes, impôts, duties – that sort of thing – have to be considered much more carefully and they have to be considered either at Budget time or when there is a special committee looking at them – as the Personal Tax Review joint boards are a special Committee for that purpose – and I do not think that one ought to be on the hoof bringing in taxes and impôts and duties.

I think it is fair enough to raise charges. We have them for everything. We had a whole list of charges read out this morning by Deputy Fallaize, who could also have said, of course, that the Environment Department makes a number of charges now, in respect of any application for planning permission and... [*Inaudible*]

I have gone on record as saying I am in favour of paid parking. I was in favour of it in the 80's when we voted in the budget for the QEII Marina, because that was going to be one of the ways in which we were going to repay the capital spent, and I support it now. I think that paying for parking is paying for the provision of that car park.

Porridge... I do not know why I want to speak about – Oh, it is my writing. It is park and ride! (*Laughter*) I do not believe that the park and ride is a particularly good system. It works in a sort of desultory way, but I really do not think that if we are going to have a proper bus service – which is exactly what we ought to have – that we need to bother to do much about park and ride.

And I do not think, frankly, that we need a bus depot. I do not think buses need little houses. What we might have is some sort of garage for the maintenance of buses, but after that they ought to be out on their own and perfectly happy.

Look, actually, I admit it now, the one real reason why I am on my feet is this presumed liability as between motorists and bicyclists. As far as I am concerned, that is a legal outrage. If we start going down that road Lord knows when we are going to stop. We have had far too many cases where, because it is actually quite difficult to prosecute something criminally, that we have in fact seen in effect the reversal of the burden of proof and I loathe that. If something is an offence, it is up to the prosecutors to prove it. And I am glad to see that my colleague, Deputy Green, is nodding in agreement. (**Deputy Green:** Yes.)

Even if you think that I am one of the suspects because I was a lawyer – and that is a perfectly fair enough thought to have about me – that nothing that I say should be taken at face value because of that, (*Laughter*) just think about the way which the system could be abused. Just think about that. We already know that sometimes there is a bit of a strop between cyclists and drivers. Personally I hate cyclists when I am driving a car, (*Laughter*) but actually I hate car drivers when I am cycling. One is always conscious that there is a sort of tension between the two. I could quite see that in one these strops indignation goes to manufacture assertions about what the other person was doing.

So this bit of the Minority Report I really do think that we ought to remove and I shall be voting against that. I will also be voting against any further, in my view, unnecessary messing about with the speed limits. And I certainly will not be supporting first registration.

**The Bailiff:** Anyone else?

Yes, Deputy Lowe and then Deputy Soulsby.

**Deputy Lowe:** Thank you, sir. (*Interjections*)

**A Member:** He did that on purpose.

**Deputy Lowe:** I do not think Deputy Le Lièvre wanted me to speak, so he just sent all my notes flying on the floor. Thank you.

There are just a couple of points I want to make really, from some of the speeches that have taken place already. Especially the point where we are being told this happens in such and such a place – whether it is in England, whether it is in Jersey, whether it is in Wales, whether it is in Timbuktu. Let us be honest, I do not really care what happens elsewhere, I just really care about here. We are talking about an Island, 9 by 5 miles. We are not talking about a Town that actually has a city that you do actually go into the city. What is the definition of ‘town’? Where does our Town start and finish?

I know it sort of states in this Minority Report that they are going to be looking at the Town line. Well, Town has always been classed as St Peter Port, so I would expect the whole of St Peter Port to fall into this category for paid parking under the Minority Report.

That is something that maybe Deputy Burford can expand on when she sums up afterwards. Because it does concern me because years ago obviously, St Peter Port and indeed most of the Island... there were so many corner shops. I was doing a count the other day. There were two in Gibauderie, there were three in Brock Road/Dalgairns Road. They were everywhere: two around by the Arsenal, another down by Amherst. They were literally in stone throws. That is how Guernsey operated – you had your shops very close to your houses so therefore you did not need a car as such, you could actually get whatever you wanted. These days you have to walk quite a considerable way to get to a shop to get the daily bits and pieces that you might want. Therefore the car definitely is part of our lifestyle. I know some feel uncomfortable about that: we are supposed to all walk.

Well, actually if I came to the States today and I decided to catch the bus, it would take me an hour and a half instead of half an hour coming in my car and going home again. Now, that is a big difference. I do not have an hour and a half every day to walk to catch the bus and wait for the bus to come the other way. And I think that is the crux of it. Our lifestyles do not allow for the time to be able to use the buses on a daily basis.

Now, I use the buses a lot but only usually at weekends – occasionally in the week, depending on what I am doing – because I have the time. But I do not have the time during the week to get from A to B. It is only going in that direction and sometimes you have got a long area that you have got to do. It would take me an hour and a half now to go to the airport. It used to take me 22 minutes on the bus but they changed the route. And I accept that they are looking to expand on that. But I do not know where all these buses and all these drivers and all these busy schedules are going to come from, because you are going to need an awful lot of bus drivers and an awful lot of buses if you are going to try and get to this Report as sort of the best of everything that is being looked at.

It has also been mentioned as well about the prime piece of real estate down on North Beach. Many in this Assembly will be aware that for the last 10 years plus they have been looking for that piece of land to put hotels and shops on there. That was always the dream and the far end was going to be for PSD, because it was: why have all these cars on North Beach when you could put development on there which would be of great benefit to the Island for those coming in on cruise ships? They would have shops nearby, they would have a hotel nearby and therefore that was the outcome of what they really wanted to do with North Beach about 10 or 12 years ago.

I would suggest there might be a little bit of this here too. If people actually wake up to the fact that, if they are trying to get you out of the car, that is really the ultimate goal – to try and get that piece of land back. I think Deputy Ogier mentioned before about the real estate piece of land there on North Beach which is just having cars sit on it. Well, if you support paid parking you are still wanting to get the cars there, because you are saying – not you personally Deputy Ogier, I am just sort of saying the States, those that support paid parking – that you will be able to go and park on there because paid parking is going to actually increase an awful lot of parking spaces. I do not know where they are coming from, but you are suddenly going to be able to find parking spaces.

Certainly, I am aware of different people who are in the workplace currently who have already spoken to their employers and said, ‘If this goes through we are going to have to change our hours. We are going to

have to have more flexi hours because we cannot afford £1,300 to be paid for paid parking. We are going to have to go and move our car,' and they are going to be going for the 2.5 hour car parks, and they have made that very clear to me.

You have also got – and I think it is quite relevant at the moment really because the data was actually released about the sales and how sales have been affected on the market for local market and open market sales, and the statistics have been released. Indeed, I quote from my colleague and friend here across the way, Deputy Green. He posted, 'It was not great for ordinary families trying to get on to the housing ladder.'

Well, one particular couple have already spoken to me and they both bring their car into Town. They both struggle with a mortgage. Now, one comes for 7 o'clock because he has to be in for 7 o'clock and his wife comes for half past eight because she has to do the child care and school run.

Now, they both need their cars for those reasons. That will mean just under £3,000. They are struggling now and they have made it very clear – and it is not very nice to hear somebody upset about that – that they will have to sell that very property that they have been pleased to get on to the housing ladder with their young family, because they do not have nearly £3,000 spare sitting in the kitty. They cannot use the bus to be able to go to the child care and to the school, and he has to get in earlier and there is not a bus for him.

They have made it very clear not only are they deeply upset as a local family – they go back generations – but they will have to look to leave the Island. It is as simple as that. That is the way that they are actually telling me on the phone about that.

Am I comfortable with that? No, I am not because I actually like people to be able to get onto the housing market and not pay these extortionate rents. If you have got a family we all know it is very difficult to get in rented accommodation if you do have a family. So they are both working for that very reason, that they can get a mortgage to have a house, but they do not have nearly £3,000 spare cash to pay the States as a fine for bringing their car into Town. And bearing in mind the average house price now is £453,398, we are not talking low money here.

Sir, there are other bits here but I really have not got any more that I am going to add because it has been said already. Apart from the fact my other real concern is about the States' employees and us as an employer because I know that T&R have been directed to pick this up. Well, good luck T&R because I do not know how you are going to do that because you have got, according to this Minority Report... how do you define who has got the parking space?

Some of those are fine. If you have got Frossard House, fine. They all go to Frossard House. They have all got their parking. I can remember getting told off by one civil servant because I had parked there. I said, 'Excuse me, did you pay for that? Are you paying so much for this annually?' 'No, but that is where I park.' Okay, fair enough, park there. But they have not got a right to that, but these are the ones that are guaranteed their parking spaces. And that is fine. I have not got a problem with that because I am totally for free parking – I do not actually agree with paid parking.

But if you are going to go down the route of paid parking – and T&R now have to try and unravel this for looking at some form of benefit in kind or indeed looking at this – you have, I suggest, a huge headache because there are some who are paid to use their own cars as well and they are actually parking in public car parks at the moment.

One of those has actually said to me, 'Well, I will not be doing that. They are going to have to start giving me a proper car park because I am not going to be paying to park in paid parking long term when that is going to cost me some money.'

How you define who is full time, who is part time, how you are going to do it – I take my hat off to you if you can come up with an answer to that. Yes, making faces, quite rightly Deputy St Pier, because it is a nightmare and I do not think there is an easy answer to it. But that is what you are faced with because it is wrong that you are penalising 1,700 people who need to come into Town to work and many of those need their car for various reasons.

And yet, as I said the other day, the congestion is after they have parked at 8 o'clock in the morning, which would indicate that most of those have their own parking in a work space – which, again, they are going to be penalised under T&R's proposals when they come back, because that is what the Minority Report is asking them to do, even though they are already taxed.

Interestingly enough, again when you look at the Report, when they are asking T&R, it is suddenly a tax; if it is the people parking on the Pier, it is paid parking. It is a tax. It has been said so many times by many people in this Assembly. You are talking about taxing people for parking on the Pier. End of, really, and I hope Members will reject that.

I still have had far more say to me that they are against paid parking and if it does not work out this infrastructure that it is going to cost as well – we are going to be left with an enormous amount of bill to pay for, for all the equipment that may be put in when it is not going to be that successful.

So there are huge concerns about that and I would probably say one in every 15 – probably higher than that – have actually said they support paid parking. A huge majority are totally against and I ask the States to reject it.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Soulsby.

**Deputy Soulsby:** Sir, a few months ago my husband and I celebrated our 25th wedding anniversary. (*Applause*) I did not say it for the clap. (*Interjection*) In the last few weeks, because of paid parking, I have seriously wondered whether we would make it to 26. (*Laughter*) It has certainly become undoubtedly clear to me, if I did not know it before, that many people have strong views on this issue.

As I stated a couple of weeks ago, I have always had an open mind about the merits, or otherwise, of paid parking. I have no particular idealistic or philosophical view on it. I spent the last couple of months listening to the arguments on both sides. I have researched the matter and read various academic papers on the subject. Research papers tend to support it, citing it as a mean to combat wasted time, money, congestion and pollution – basically saying we are actually paying a high price for so called free parking.

I get that. But I also get that it means that some people will be affected – those that have to park, who have no private space or other alternatives. I also know that there are no guarantees that implementing it in some areas will not cause problems elsewhere.

But Deputy Kuttelwascher says, ‘We already have a transport strategy so I do not need to vote for it. That is okay then.’ Well, yes, there is the remnants of a transport strategy that goes back to 2006 – a strategy that would bring in travel plans for Sir Charles Frossard House and the PEH, a Strategy that would take account of cycling needs for new developments.

So eight years later where are we? Well, the parking problems at Sir Charles Frossard House indicate that there is no successful travel plan. We have a car park at the PEH that has probably doubled in size since 2006 and the last time I looked there was no cycle path anywhere near.

At the time it was written, the bus service was so popular according to the 2006 report that people were being turned away from the bus stops because they were so full. Average occupancy was 18. Now it is less than nine. Well, that has worked out well then. (*Interjections*)

This was a strategy that was committed to compulsory emissions and noise testing. Where is that? A strategy that proposed paid parking, approved, then thrown out and here we are today. A strategy more disintegrated than integrated.

So we come on to the question, do we really need one? Isn’t everything fine apart from some rush hour traffic?

Well, Deputy Burford got me thinking when she talked two weeks ago about going on the bus with her son. She made me think about how my children get around now and how I travelled around before I came to Guernsey. My mum never drove and when I was a young child we went everywhere by foot and bus. I went to school by bus, I went to town by bus and I went to my friends’ houses by bus. Why? Well, it was cheap. It was not free, but it was cheap. But the real reason was the service was brilliant. And in the summer there were additional scheduled open top buses, named after the famous Devonians such as Sir Francis Drake and Sir Walter Raleigh, that were incredibly popular and a real draw for the tourist. So I grew up used to a great bus service, but never really thought about it. I then lived in London and got around by bus most of time for those six years that I was there.

Then I came to Guernsey and for the first time in my life I realised I needed a car, which actually meant I needed to learn to drive. I just had not had to before. I did try using public transport for the first year, but the last bus I could get was at 5.30 p.m. at night. Great if you are someone who works 9 a.m. to 5 p.m., but not if deadlines have to be met and overtime is required and expected.

Cycling was out of the question as there was nowhere to put a bike and nowhere to change at the office, and frankly back then I did not have the confidence to cycle amongst the traffic. So that was another driver on Guernsey roads because there was no viable alternative. And things have not got better in the last 20 odd years.

I spoke about two weeks ago about how I was concerned that paid parking would make us more like Little England. Well, I have now come to the conclusion – having seen road rage, selfish and intolerant driving and having had a journey that took half an hour to travel a couple of miles in the last two weeks – that our roads are like that already. So, no, we do not have an integrated transport strategy and, yes, I want one.

I want an integrated transport strategy because my daughter should be able to get a bus or walk the two miles to college without endangering her life every time she has to cross a main arterial road on a blind corner because the pavement just disappears. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) I want an integrated transport strategy because there is something wrong somewhere when my son cannot get a bus in the morning to the grammar school, but he can get one on the way back.



I want an integrated transport strategy for the sake of our visitor economy because I want Guernsey to be a place that tourists want to come to, even come back to, and not comment on how busy the roads are. I want an integrated transport strategy as I do not want Guernsey to continue to have unacceptable pollution levels because of vehicle congestion. I want an integrated transport strategy as I do not want to see the Health Services bill continue to grow to pay for the literally growing obesity problem on this Island.

I want an integrated transport strategy as I am fed up being made to feel that, as a cyclist, I do not belong on the road. When I am not the one creating the potholes, but have to endanger my life swerving into the middle of the road to avoid them and have to pay for PSD to fill them in from the taxes I pay.

I want an integrated transport strategy as without one we are sending all the wrong messages to the people of Guernsey now and in the future. We say we really do not care about all the implications of continuing as we are. A properly funded integrated transport strategy has been long overdue.

So whilst I am no fan of paid parking and really and truly struggle accepting it, for me, the need for an integrated transport strategy is indisputable and paid parking is the least worst option to pay for it.

I question the comments I have heard here about needing to be brave and courageous. For me, bravery is when someone risks their life to rescue someone else from a burning building, and any way being brave does not necessarily mean being right. Anyone who knows anything about the Charge of the Light Brigade could tell you that. *(Laughter)*

For me, it is about getting something done. Doing nothing is not an option and, on that basis, I will support Proposition 5 and I would urge all other Members to do likewise. **(Several Members: Hear, hear.)** *(Applause)*

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Brouard.

**Deputy Brouard:** Thank you, sir.

There were complaints at the last States' sitting that all this was taking too much time – the time of the Environment in preparation, the time us Deputies are talking in debate. Well, maybe it might be because of a split in the Board, bringing two different Reports – both unacceptable, one a pile of compromises on top of another pile of compromises, the other a dream or a nightmare. Then you leave this smorgasbord on the steps of the States and say, 'Sort it out'. So, yes, it will take a bit of time and then somehow it is my fault. I welcome – as Deputy Perrot said – the openness our system brings and we have no whip.

I just want to touch on a couple of things while I am talking about Deputies and some things that people have said. Deputy Ogier mentioned the harbour land. Yes, the harbour can use it but, of course, the main two long-stay parking areas were of course funded by general revenue – by the people, by us – because we realised that we needed a place for people to park, to drive our economy, which was then the office workers and the shop workers and the banking industry and the finance and the trust and the lawyers, and the little gofers who go in between and all those people who do not park in the corporate garages. That is why we built the large car parks there. It was to drive our economy – a job it still does today.

Now, Alderney Reps as well... of course they can vote. That is no trouble at all, because one of the key elements of this which comes in the strategy is, of course, the £1,300 which those people who will be parking in the corporate garages will be paying as part of their benefit in kind. So, of course, all the shop workers who now park at the back of the garage in Victoria Street will all be having the £1,300 annual income tax assessment and, as Alderney is part of our Income Tax area, they will be caught by this just as much as everybody else.

Deputy Conder had a dream about people walking to school and I do not want to be critical but it just struck a chord. What about those parents of the school children at St Andrews? They had a dream. Your dream was of bigger class sizes and three-form entry, but they had a dream of walking and attending the local parish school in the centre of their community. If you want to bring back walking let us do it across the board and integrate it. **(A Member: Hear, hear.)**

Deputy Fallaize, you said the opponents of paid parking cannot come up with an alternative. I have an alternative: there are some pieces I can put in here – we have got the Strategy from 2006 and there are few elements in the strategy we are debating now which, if carried forward, I think would be very beneficial.

We have some 29 individual Propositions and I will be asking the Presiding Officer if they could all be taken separately at the vote. I wish Members to vote in a certain way just as the proponents of the Propositions do. So I would ask your colleagues to mark your Propositions sheet carefully one how you wish to vote on each line.

I personally do not think they are a package but I am happy, if after all the debate and all the thoughts, you still feel they really are. Now, there are some good initiatives but they are around the edges. The main issues are unfair, unacceptable and fundamentally flawed.

Now, if I understand it correctly, the Environment Department has allowed £300,000 of FTP savings to be banked by taking the funds out of the bus contract. Then we took 1.2p for every litre of fuel because Environment wanted the money to improve the bus service. But instead left that money – now totalling

some £2.5 million of Islanders' funds – with T&R. And now want paid parking again – this time to replace the £300,000 they put into the pot as their FTP savings, no doubt to a fanfare of, 'Oh, what good corporate players are we.'

I do not understand the accountancy that goes with that. I think we can do better than that and I believe we owe our Islanders better than that. And I will be disappointed if Treasury, as our present guardian, allow that kind of accountancy. I would rather walk on hot coals than spoil our Island with paid parking. And I will sob gently when the means to avoid it have been allowed to slip through our Environment hands like grains of sand.

Now, these proposals are a seismic shift in funding. Spreading the burden to the motorist. Now, to me buses are a public service. It is not for the motorist to fund Mrs Le Page's trips to Town. It needs to be remembered that the motorist is also the general revenue provider, but will now also carry the CO<sub>2</sub>, the width tax, first registration *et al* and in effect will pay twice or at least twice as much.

And there is a puzzle: why are both reports basically silent on the existing funding of the core bus services, which have already cost the tax payer some £2.5 million and is not picked up in the comments? Yet to me when one is evaluating and forming a transport strategy, there needs to be some appreciation of its effectiveness, performance, costing – so, not to mention the funds we have already put in, seems to be an accountancy void.

Both strategies take this public donation of some £2.5 million as a given, rather than making a case and evaluating what we already spend. And of course before collecting a further £4.5 million first registrations, £1 million in paid parking, and of course we had the clock this morning which has been replaced. That is some £6 million extra off the motorist – making free buses costing a subsidy of £8.5 million and making the real subsidy more like £8 per journey. Why is that? Why is there no basic accountancy?

While I am asking questions, on Proposition 6 – parking at Lukis House on States' meeting days – why do you single this group out? Not the Deputies who live in Town, because they are already here. Not the professional court workers or the lawyers who park there the other 330 days. What is that? Gesture politics, gender politics? What is the rationale?

Now, I have a dream and it still not too late: sort out the road and the potholes so cycling has a chance. (A Member: Hear, hear.) Clean the pavements and the weeds and the overgrowing plants and make walking a reality. (A Member: Absolutely) Put the extra school buses that we have already paid for, before you beat me up for the problem left by your choice in leaving the money with Treasury which the motorist has already paid for with 1.2p. (Several Members: Hear, hear.)

Encourage smaller cars. Pick up the good bits – the taxi bus idea, the car sharing, better information on public transport, cycling clubs at school. Number 6 – no paid parking, no paid clocks or additional CO<sub>2</sub> tax or fuel tax. It is just not needed. The funds are already there.

So there is my dream and I am sure most of you would agree with much of what I have said. And remember the three Rs of running a public bus service: routes, reliability and a reasonable fare.

On to the Propositions. Number 1 – that is a 'no'. Number 2 – I am happy to go along with looking for further land. That is no problem there. Number 3 – okay with that. Number 4 – 'no' to the CO<sub>2</sub>. Okay. Sorry, I did not realise I had a fan club but – (Laughter) It is looking good.

So it is 'no' to 1, 'okay' for number 2, 'okay' for number 3. Number 4, first registration – 'no'. Number 5 is the paid parking – 'no'. (Interjections) Number 6 – Lukis House – 'no', that is just gesturing. Number 7 – (interjections) 'no'. Well, I might as well have it out as well. (Laughter) Number 8 – 'no', but number 9 – 'yes, fine'. Number 10 – 'fine'. Number 11 – 'fine'. 'No' to 12. 'No' to 13.

Now, Deputy Bebb said, 'It makes light of the £8 fare for the buses'. He says, 'It is not in the Proposition.' Oh, yes, it is, because if you read Proposition 13, it says:

'To approve for a period of 18 months the policies in respect of the cost of bus travel as set out in paragraph 85 and 87.'

So, of course, as all good minded people do, you go to 85 and 87 and there you read of the £8 charge:

'... in order to use the buses, a swipe card at a cost of £8, is purchased which [will]... allow unlimited free travel.'

So –

**Deputy Fallaize:** Point of order, sir.

If Deputy Brouard reads on it says:

'The fine detail of how this will be managed will be finalised by the Department if the proposal for a free service is agreed...'

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Brouard.

2190 **Deputy Brouard:** Deputy Fallaize is absolutely correct but both he and I have been around the block enough times to realise exactly what that means. There is a real link to the two. So thank you, Deputy Fallaize, for that. You have just really confirmed my fears.

Number 14 – taxi licences – ‘fine’. Number 15 – ‘fine’. Motorcycling – ‘great’, number 16. Number 17 – ‘fine’. Number 18 – ‘okay’. Number 19 – ‘okay’. Number 20 – ‘okay’. Number 21 – ‘okay’. Number 22 –  
2195 ‘okay’. Number 23 – ‘okay’. Number 24 – ‘okay’. Number 25 – ‘no’.

Sorry, just – through the Chair – for Deputy Green, those were all okay up to 25 and then it is ‘no’.  
(*Laughter*) And 26 – ‘no’. Number 27 – ‘no’. Number 28 – ‘okay’ and 29 – ‘okay’. (*Interjections*)

But to be fair, this is what we have to do. We have to go through each of the Propositions in turn and vote on them. You have got to have some guidance. But anyway, rather than take on board the amendments  
2200 and advice offered to improve the Minority vision, you choose and have chosen to reject them.

So I ask you this: hold on to your vision, do not buckle, give no quarter, keep your £8 charge, keep that barrier high to prevent public access to the buses, keep moving fresh air around the Island, give our tourists that hit, commiserate over the loss of your paid parking clocks, keep your package integrated, keep all the precious parts like some old master painting where each brush stroke cannot be replicated or replaced, keep  
2205 your vision whole, punish the ordinary Guernsey worker who happens to have a job in Town and bring in paid parking as other places realise its costs, introduce that personal charge of £1,300 for parking in the corporate garage and turn my Island into your vision of Little Britain as you row us ever closer to Hampshire. (*Laughter*)

I will only ask two things of you in return today, if I lose. Two things. As you have argued, it is an integrated package – and it must be this package – then commit to me that, if you need to change any of the integrated parts or if one part fails, it all fails. So a year down the road when the green confetti has all be swept away do not be tempted to change the £8 annual charge to £2 or change the first registration when there is a real slump in car sales. If you are forced to change just one tiny hair, I ask: bring it all back to the States, because if any of those are adjusted so also must paid parking and a reasonable bus fare. You cannot  
2215 have it both ways. So that is my first request. And I ask of you your commitment that if you change it at all, it comes back to the States. I cannot be clearer than that.

My second is more personal. Please do not be coy or shy at the next election. Paid parking, £8 bus card, will bring the States to a new position. So at election time do not come down all fuzzy with a bout of that saviour of political careers, the EAS or ‘Election Amnesia Syndrome’. (*Laughter*) So nail your colours bright, bold in font on to your manifesto. Do not let me have to fight your battles in public. You be brave, be open, make sure you clearly state how you voted today. Do not let me have to remind our electors of your position at hustings night. You tell them. You tell them because be in no doubt this will be an important decision, it will really bite and it will be remembered for the wrong reasons.

Thank you, sir. (*Applause*)

2225 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Le Pelley.

**Deputy Le Pelley:** Thank you, sir.

I voted to debate the Minority Report, not because I wished to support every section and subsection within it, but because I wanted to see it debated and I think that, okay, four days of debate has passed, but this is no bad thing – better than something being nodded through without questioning and testing, of statements and figures.

Investigations and the collection of data will be useful tools to make further recommendations and decisions to do with transport in the future.

2235 Most of what I had noted to say has already been said. Most clearly by Deputy Langlois in his speech early this morning, and also by Deputy Brouard who was very good entertainment this morning and was pretty good this afternoon as well. In fact as he went through his 29 points I was pleased that you concurred with everything that I had ticked and crossed. So there may be one or two gasps around the hall.

We mentioned, or someone mentioned earlier the elephant in the room, I think more relevant today is the Guernsey donkey in his or her car. Because I do not really think that my constituents or the average Guernsey person who has approached me wants paid parking in any shape or form. (**Several Members:** Hear hear.) I think what has been said to me once or twice is, ‘Face reality, the car is king,’ and I do not really want to have a car as a king, but it is here and it is here big time and it is here to stay.

2245 There are many reasons why people need large cars. They may have large families, may have to transport goods this way and that across the Island and there may be some others who have reason for long distance travel abroad.

Some of the money that is raised by whatever measures we vote through today, I hope will be sequestered to help pay for a better road system – a road system not riddled with potholes. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) I have been engaged in radio phone-ins and on radio chat shows where I have  
2250 actually been at logger-heads with Deputy Green, because Deputy Green has stated that he does not believe

we should be a suing society, and that if people have accidents and the like, because of potholes and whatever, that they should not be able to sue the States. I think they should. (*Interjections*)

I think really where a reasonable enough amount of time has been given, a warning has been given about dangerous potholes etc. and nothing has been done, there is a degree of negligence there and suing should be possible. And with this attitude about potholes, in fact we might get a better road sense and a better road usage either by public transport or by people on bicycles, motor bicycles and cars.

Another aspect that I think we really do need to address is we need to do a lot more for the disabled members of our society, in getting around the Island. Recent surveys suggest there are over 4,000 people with some form of disability. They certainly deserve much better than they are getting at the moment. And I am very pleased to be a part of the team – together with Deputies Gollop and Wilkie – to actually be pushing through some of those changes on behalf of the Disability Group.

Let's look at some of the unintended consequences or knock on effects that some of these proposals may have. People have only so much money to spend. £1,300 per annum for car parking is £1,300 less to spend elsewhere – (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) in the shops, perhaps, which in turn will affect shopkeepers and shop workers who will either have lower turnovers and face closure or loss of employment.

A clampdown on abandoned or semi-abandoned cars in the Crocq and for sale vehicles on South Side in St Sampson's has resulted in many more cars being parked or abandoned – semi abandoned, some would argue – in the roads leading off the approaches to the Bridge and into Delancey Park in particular. What will happen in the areas surrounding Victoria Road, the Odeon car park, and St Julian's Avenue etc. if people are sort of shunted elsewhere to look for free parking? What is going to happen to the residents in those areas?

Affordability – what we do need is a reliable, reasonably priced and sensibly routed bus service. Some bus routes appear figuratively to go round Sark to get to Herm. Many hours can be spent in a week getting on what used to be quite a simple short journey in my youth.

Taking away the... I thought it was £247,000 but I hear other people saying it is nearer £300,000, from the former bus service providers was always going to lead to a poorer bus service. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) Moving forward, things cost more. Taking money away I cannot see how you were ever hoping to get any improvement.

So what happens if we approve paid parking and the free bus service becomes a fantastic success? More people on the buses and far fewer cars in the paid car parks, less revenue. This will equal less money coming in to support or pay for the free bus service. What happens then? Where is the balance?

Paid parking will affect the lower paid. It will unfairly only affect those who work in Town rather than in other parts of the Island. We need to find another way of funding the strategy other than by paid parking. I will be voting against Proposition 5.

As one after thought, I think you will find that many people are already paying taxes for the benefit in kind value of their car parking spaces. I know that certain members of my family have to have a value of their car park taken as a payment in kind and they are taxed on it. I thought that was the current position in law. So why are we arguing about it?

Thank you for listening.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Adam.

**Deputy Adam:** Thank you, sir.

I feel, to a certain extent, obliged to make a comment after Deputy Perrot said he is the third... Obviously, I am the fourth Member of Treasury and Resources Department.

Deputy Brouard went through a list of Propositions and I think he stopped at number 25, which is in relation to the Minority Report – first registration and income from paid parking. What concerns me, sir, is he did not mention 27, 'To authorise the T&R Department if required to approve a transfer from the Budget Reserve of up to £835,000, in the year... not 2015 but in the year '2014' – £835,000.

to approve a transfer from the Budget Reserve of up to £835,000... to fund implementation of the strategy.'

Deputy Kuttelwascher has already mentioned, to you the fact, that the Budget Reserve is not a bottomless pit of money. There is a certain amount put in with assessments being made at the beginning of years, where we – or our officers – consider along with us – 'what are the risk areas?' We know what some of the risk areas were last time – HSSD, Education, SSD. So we know what some of them might be, but there are other areas in the offing and we know, as a Board, that one has to be careful about these things.

Also on page 76 and 77 it gives a summary of estimated annual income and expenditure. It gives a summary of 'estimated'. I was always taught, sir, that you do not spend the money in your wallet unless it is there to be spent. A terribly bad habit Scottish people have, but it is a safe way and I prefer to start seeing

and having an idea of what revenue income is from what I think are very valid ideas – very fair ideas, considerable ideas to try and spread the burden. But it would be nice to know how accurate the estimates are for 2014 or should we not start things like a free bus service which the Minister, Deputy Domaille, said he would like to introduce as soon as possible. That means that you are starting to build up a negative sum of money straight away.

The other thing that Deputy Brouard said was North Beach – I am not too sure if he meant North Beach – car park came out of general revenue funding. No, it did not. It came out of the Port Holding account, which was functional at that time – according to what I have been told – and therefore came out of people who owned boats. And people who own boats actually have to pay for parking. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) But they do not call it parking, they call it mooring.

Now, I have always been voted against –

**Deputy Domaille:** A point of clarification, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Domaille.

**Deputy Domaille:** I am sorry I do not like... No, it definitely came from general revenue.

**Deputy Adam:** Sorry, someone else informed me, sir, that it came from port holding. Fair enough.

But anyway, I have always voting in favour of paid parking for the last eight or nine times it has come forward. I hear all the arguments about it. I listen to all the arguments about it. I see no proof of all arguments about it. People tell me about the problems of the retail shops in St Peter Port. That has been ongoing.

Those may remember that Deputy Mary Lowe used to go round the shops to find out how many were empty. And that was not last week, it was not last year. I think it might have been three or four years ago. So they have been having problems for that length of time. They cannot blame it on the fact that you might bring in paid parking. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) It is a problem that has been there and it has to be assessed and it has to be looked at and you have got the Retail Strategy, which is by Commerce and Employment, not that long ago to suggest ways forward.

So I will be voting in favour of 5, although I am not too happy about Deputy Dorey's amendment getting through – concerning the parking clock. I think the burden should have been spread across the board. In other words, why should I be able to go down and park for 2.5 hours completely free as many times as I want and someone else has to pay for their parking? Or why should I be able to go down St Sampson's and park in a space there without contributing something to the overall traffic strategy?

Lastly, I would just mention Deputy Jones. He has been critical of the Treasury and Resources – it must have been some time this morning, I think it was – when he said about the 1.2p on petrol. He said if you take it off, T&R will come along and put it back on again. No, they will not. The money that comes off 1.2p will come off but at the time of assessing what extra income is required to pay extra salaries for public sector workers and other increases which are fairly routine year on year we need a little bit more money in the coffers to pay this. Now, it is recognised by most people that consumer aspects, such as TRP, alcohol, petrol and other things, are almost a routine – has been for the last 20 years I think almost – of a small increase. So that actually may go up at that time, but that will be dependent on the situation, financially speaking, at that time. (*Interjections*) I did not hear that, sir, fortunately. (**The Bailiff:** Good.) (*Laughter*) So I think that is a bit of a red herring.

On the whole, I feel that the Minority Report is a bit more balanced. I, sir, would like if we could ask Deputy Brouard, instead of having every Proposition – a vote – that he might like to group them together as he did and simply say, number 4, 5, 25... split it up. It takes two or three minutes to do each one... (*Interjections*) 27 of them. Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Anyone else?  
Yes, Deputy Gillson.

**Deputy Gillson:** Sir, thank you.

Deputy Perrot will be pleased this is not a pre-typed speech. Unfortunately, the quality will probably reflect that. (*Laughter*)

There is a lot of good in this strategy, as indeed in the Majority Report. There are a couple in here – apart from paid parking – which I am dubious of. Like Deputy Perrot, the 18 – I am dubious about actually having presumed liability in case of accidents. That concerns me. I am not too sure if I will support 12, which is construction of a bus depot, because of the way it bypasses the capital priority.

But there is a lot in it. I am not wedded to the car. I agree with encouraging alternative modes of transport. The funding of CO<sub>2</sub>, width taxes – I am happy to support that. I am dubious about how the width

tax will actually affect people's behaviour, but it is a source of funding for the strategy so I am happy with it. As indeed Deputy Dorey mentioned this morning, last week in my speech I made some positive suggestions as to how we could change the road infrastructure to be able to encourage cyclists and make it safer for cycling.

So I think there is a lot in this and I will support pretty much of it. But I will not support paid parking. I am not going to repeat a lot of my speech from last week. I think fundamentally paid parking is not fair. It focuses on a group who will, by their nature, be the less well-paid employees in town. I accept the free buses will be an option for people and the free bus service is essential.

But I do question what about people who start work early. The Home Department employs a number of people in Town who start earlier than 7 o'clock. They need to be in Town about half six, quarter to seven.

So a question for Deputy Burford or Deputy Brehaut: in the cost estimates you have got in your funding models, do those costings specifically include a bus network which will deliver people into St Peter Port from all round the Island to be in for about half past six, for people who have to start work at seven? Because I would hope that you have addressed that and that that funding for a service at that level is included, because if not then these people will have to pay the parking. They will not have an option because they will have to use their cars.

I think the effect on Town is a worry – how it will affect Town, how it will affect shops. Deputy Adams said, 'Well, it is okay, the shops have always been a problem so why worry about it.' Actually that is a very good reason for not having paid parking because there have been problems. Why make it worse? (**A Member:** Yes, exactly) What you have said Deputy Adam is precisely a reason for not having paid parking.

Now, I also want to contradict something that Deputy Ogier said. There is actually under this – what has been proposed – less short-term spaces in Town.

**Deputy Ogier:** Do you mean fewer?

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Ogier. (*Laughter*)

**Deputy Gillson:** Well, that was an interruption worth getting up for. (*Laughter and interjections*) Yes, there will be less or fewer short-term spaces.

It says that a lot of three-hour ones will be converted to 10-hour or removed completely to make way for other uses of that area for harbour usage. So, to encourage people into Town, we are going to have less short term parking.

It is interesting, the idea of raising the period from two to two and a half hours. I am not quite sure how that will stop people who work in Town nipping out to move their cars, because people have not been nipping out moving their cars since it has been three hours. I can remember the days when A&F was at the older former States' offices, where people used to go out to move their cars on the Crown Pier every two hours. So actually increasing it to three hours, or to two and a half hours, just makes it easier for office workers to move their cars. It is not a disincentive. There is a history of people doing it at two hours so people will do at three hours. But I think it is important, if you have not read the fine print of the Report, there is a reduction in parking spaces.

In fact, increasing the length of a space – that someone can stay in a space – also effectively reduces the effective number of spaces, because you are reducing the turnover of cars. So it is not really going to encourage people.

Deputy Luxon – airport having paid parking. Gosh, that is a good one. Significantly different though. You have to compare apples with pears. The aim of airport parking... It is not a disc zone and it cannot really be, but you do not want people parking there days on end. If you did not have some form of paid parking at the airport you could end up with people leaving their cars there for two weeks or a week while they go on holiday. You need it there because you do not have people coming in day in, day out on the same regular basis.

**Deputy Luxon:** A point of correction, sir.

The airport does have a disc zone, because it has multiple charging mechanisms based on the amount of hours that you do park there. So, in real terms, it does.

**Deputy Gillson:** Not the free disc zone, like the harbour's and everywhere else. It is a different system. It is a paid parking system and you know that well, Deputy Luxon.

But the key point there is you are comparing apples and pears. The whole reasoning behind having paid parking at the airport is a different reason. There are different drivers behind it. Basically, you do not want people to park for two weeks when they go on holiday.

Some people have mentioned benefit in kind and taxation and I think, if paid parking comes in, then that does need to come in, because it equalises... it makes the unfair less unfair because if everybody who is coming in to Town – and most of those people are going to be the better paid people – will be paying.

2435 But I have a real issue as to how it can work, because you have got to decide which roads and which buildings you are going to apply to, and so where will the threshold be in Town. I would guess that you have got to have Frossard House involved with it. And a very specific question: what do you do about people who need their cars? Okay, the Department has to come back with a report, but I would hope that some thought has been put into this already, and what do you do with people who have to use their cars? I  
2440 am going to use – because this an Environment Department report – Environment's example: planning staff, building control staff. They have to use their cars. Are they going to be told you have got to use your car because you have got to go out and about, but we are going to try and make it taxable for you to come in to work with your car, you do not have a choice? There are real problems with that.

Deputy Soulsby made a comment about paid parking being the lesser of evils because she wants the strategy. Well, I think I want the strategy. I like the idea of making the roads safer for pedestrians, safer for  
2445 cyclists. Like Deputy Fallaize, I agree, when I am in the car there is not a problem but when I am a pedestrian there is a traffic problem. In some ways this report should not be entitled a traffic strategy, it should be a road user's strategy. That would be a more appropriate title because we actually want the roads safer for all users.

2450 So I agree with her there, but I did check with the Minister of the Environment Department, and the strategy, apart from the bus depot, is pretty well fundable without paid parking. So we can have this strategy without paid parking.

At the end of the last States' meeting I was passed an interesting note from a Member – it was a private note so I will not mention who it came from – saying to me – because I had made a bit of a speech about  
2455 not wanting stick and preferring carrots – to the effect that, as Home Minister, how do I condone prison if I do not agree with the stick? Well, basically, people who are in prison have committed a crime and as far as I am aware nobody is suggesting long-term parking is actually a criminal offence. But that did get me –

I will give way.

2460 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Bebb.

**Deputy Bebb:** Given as the note came from me, actually I think the note was, 'If you do not believe in carrots and sticks, how can you not agree with the criminal justice system?' which is slightly different to what you have implied.

2465 **Deputy Gillson:** It has been two weeks – my memory. I am going to get old, just as I look it.

It got me thinking about the prison. A lot of what the prison does is positive rehabilitation. It is about encouraging people's behaviour and they are doing that through positive offender management. Carrots – it is encouraging, it is all positive action.

2470 I started to think about different thinks and I know that, apart from one person, the majority of Education support paid parking. Now, just think if we have got a student who is not working to their best ability, who is going to get a C but you think they could get a B or an A, you do not punish them to encourage a shift of behaviour – well, I hope not – you encourage them, you nurture them, you encourage them that the benefits of changing their behaviour and how that can help them. Again, it is a carrot. It is a  
2475 positive role model.

Last time we debated, Deputy Ogier commented on solid waste. In fact I thought it was quite interesting that he commented, saying something about compromising – how he compromised supporting Suez – which he did until the vote when he voted against it! Solid waste and kerbside collection is another example of where we are doing something in terms of a positive encouragement. It is free. It is free for the moment.  
2480 In two years' time there will probably be some charge for it, but the logic behind it is let's bring it in free, let's encourage people to use it, let's do a positive encouragement. When people are used to using it then you can evaluate what sort of costs. So there are lots of examples of where, as a society and as a Government, we are moving towards a society of encouragement, of positive actions, of positive encouragement.

2485 So I find it is very strange that there are so many Deputies here who, in other Departmental work and other views on life, I think we have got to encourage people. 'We do not use the stick.' Yet when it comes to paid parking, 'We have got to use it. We want to discourage.' I find it really quite sad that we have got so many negative attitudes towards... we have got to force people. I want to encourage people to use different forms of transport, changing the infrastructure, putting a good bus service in. All of those, they may work.  
2490 Great, why bring in paid parking right now?

It has been mentioned about public opinion being divided. Well, it is. It is pretty well 50/50. So why, given that public opinion is 50/50, are we jumping to the stick? Why not accept... say, okay, half the

population do not like paid parking, half the population do, but at this moment... and acknowledge there is a risk to Town? It may be big, it may be small but there is a risk. So why not at this stage say, 'Actually, we do not have to alienate the population, we do not have to take a risk in Town, because we can implement by far the majority of the strategy without the stick of paid parking.'

Finally, I would like to refer to Deputy Fallaize who suggested that those of us who are against paid parking are pessimistic. I disagree. He is pessimistic, I am the optimist because I believe we can introduce this strategy and it will work without paid parking. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) So I am suggesting please be positive, send a positive message to the public that we throw out paid parking and let's have a positive attitude towards what would be a road users' strategy.

Thank you. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.)

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Ogier.

**Deputy Ogier:** A point of correction, sir. I believe Deputy Gillson is conflating events across a year – I did compromise and support Suez. This Assembly threw it out a year later – a movement I had no connection with.

**Deputy Gillson:** Yes, but when you voted, you voted to throw it out. You supported the Requête throwing it out.

**The Bailiff:** Does anyone else wish to speak in general debate, before...?  
Deputy Green.

**Deputy Green:** Sir, thank you. I will be relatively brief.

I too, like a number of other speakers this afternoon, defend the length of the debate we have had on this transport strategy. As Deputy Fallaize said, we do at least some of our Government business in public and there really is nowhere to hide in terms of that. I do not think, therefore, that we should denigrate ourselves too much about the length and the nature of this debate because, after all, public transport and the problems that the bus service has had, and all the rest of it, are perennial issues in Guernsey politics. And it is, therefore, no surprise that we are taking the proper amount of time to do the job properly, whatever side of the debate you are on to make the case and to make amendments if you see fit. We are a debating Chamber and that is what we are here principally to do. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

I will be supporting all of the Propositions, as amended, in the Minority Report. I do have one slight misgiving about the presumed liability matter that Deputy Perrot and indeed Deputy Gillson mentioned before. I will come on to that in a moment.

But I do think what we have here is an opportunity, an opportunity to support and to vote for a properly integrated system, and to give ourselves a fighting chance of achieving the modal shift that could make our Island an even better place to live, and I do not think we should lose sight of that.

I think many people have congratulated Deputy Burford on the initial speech she made. It was a very good speech, but it was a good speech because it had imagination in it. I think in politics in general, and perhaps in Guernsey politics in particular, we do sometimes lack imagination. But I think this Minority Report is one that is not lacking in imagination. Some people have talked in terms of dreams and unrealistic visions and nightmares even (*Laughter*) but it is not any of those things, it is about imagination and it is about the power of imagining how the world, how the Island, could be actually better than what it is already.

Of course, paid parking and all the rest of it, is not necessarily going to be popular but we are a Government. The point of the Government is not necessarily to be popular. It is not a popularity contest. We are here to govern and we should never, ever lose sight of that.

I do just want to touch upon a point I made briefly in my speech the other week, which was that historically I did not support and have not supported paid parking. But you do have to revisit some of your long-held views now and again, and you do have to put yourself under scrutiny. You cannot just go through life never ever changing your view on anything.

So I came to this Minority Report and I tried to look at it with a fresh mind, with an open mind, and I think that is what has actually driven me to being in a position to support this.

Paid parking is always going to be a divisive issue but we have to get away from this kind of *de facto* view that some people have – and I remember Deputy De Lisle, I think, made reference to this a couple of weeks ago – in terms of almost having a human right to free parking in the Island. An absolute nonsense. Absolute rubbish. (*Interjections*) Anybody here who has looked at the Convention on Human Rights, as applied by the Human Rights (Bailiwick of Guernsey) Law, will see no right to free parking in there. (*Laughter*) I am sure Madame Comptroller can confirm that.



In my opinion paid parking, together with a proper package – as envisaged now in this Minority Report as amended – with a decent bus service, go hand in hand, and with that I genuinely think there is a fighting chance that you may well see behavioural change if you do pass this Minority Report in its totality today. Not behavioural change for its own sake, because that is pointless, but behavioural change in order to achieve real mitigation and dilution of the problems that we have talked about. To dilute the car dependency culture, to make the Island nicer for road users, cyclists and pedestrians. To make the Island nicer for tourists and to use the public realm of this Island in a better way.

Now, I want to deal briefly with the point that often gets made about paid parking which is that it is an extra burden on low income workers – and of course it is – that has to be accepted and there is some superficial validity to that argument. But it conveniently ignores the more general point, which is that poor public transport disadvantages lower income Guernsey in particular more than any other group. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) Therefore a better, more co-ordinated, well-funded bus service can actually be an engine for achieving a much better way of life for those lower income people. And I think we forget that.

Deputy Fallaize mentioned the 8,000 or so people in this Island who do not or cannot drive. In those circumstances, we have to remember that there are those particular groups. It is not just the particularly vocal people who may happen to park their cars in North Beach car park. We have to represent everybody in this community, and that must include those 8,000 or so people.

So the point I am trying to make is that there is an important social policy aspect to public transport policy, and this strategy in particular, and there is an obvious advantage to lower income Guernsey in having a free bus service and perhaps being able to escape from the tyranny of having to own a car.

I want to touch upon the presumed liability point because this is possibly where I, not exactly disagree with Deputy Burford and Deputy Brehaut, but I do have some scepticism about the presumed liability aspect. And, as I say, I certainly agreed with Deputy Perrot's comments earlier.

I think the nature of the Proposition is such that I probably will support it, but it is certainly with a heavy heart because I think we have to carefully look at what the evidence is. Because I am not personally persuaded, at this stage, that having presumed liability would necessarily lead to safer roads, and that is ultimately what this is about. I want to see a much more detailed analysis on this before we go down that road.

I know we are out of step with many of the European nations but I understand, and am given to understand, that the introduction of strict or presumed liability in Ontario in Canada has certainly not resulted in any real breakthrough for safety on the roads – quite the reverse. So I am rather dubious about that and, as I say, the actual wording of Proposition 18 is such that it is to investigate the feasibility. So I think I have to accept that that should go ahead and I can support that, but not with any particular enthusiasm.

In general terms, I will vote for all of these Propositions in the hope of achieving the modal shift that we need to see.

Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** No-one else is rising. I will call on –  
Somebody is rising. Oh, sorry, Deputy Inglis – I had said I would call.  
Sorry, Deputy Inglis.

**Deputy Inglis:** Thank you, sir.

A lot has been said today and I want to say from the offset that I will not support paid parking.

That is not to say I do not support the vision that Deputy Burford has, although it is a vision. There are a lot of principles in there that I feel are very relevant but the method of asking people who either work, live or support St Peter Port. St Peter Port is the heart of our Island. It is a vibrant heart in our Island and we seem to want to really have a rupture to that which is very unfair. There are a lot of good ideas floating around today that if, blended properly, will create a good solution. But it is not going to happen overnight. It is not going to happen in the next 10 years.

Deputy Langlois highlighted that Albert was looking for a parking space in 1964. That was 50 years ago. So it is going to be very difficult to develop the vision as we hear it.

What really concerns me is the vibrant heart of St Peter Port – and Deputy Laurie Queripel highlighted that this morning – in what really goes on here. How do we support the service industry that supports everybody in this area of the Island? It is something that has not even been considered and is something that we need to focus on.

Retail is going to be highly damaged if we bring in paid parking. Have no bones about it, they will really suffer. They are already suffering with the internet traffic. Anyone who goes down to one of the freight hauliers will see. We are not talking about CDs, we are not talking about small items. We are talking big and this is seriously affecting our economy. I certainly do not wish to see or damage that integral part.

Members, I just want you to think, when you are making your decision, we are going to be debating something even bigger in three months' time and I do not want to be putting two nails in the coffin of this heart of our Island and therefore will not be supporting it.

Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Duquemin.

**Deputy Duquemin:** Thank you, Mr Bailiff.

Deputy Al Brouard's speech tried hard to create a 'mood-al' shift but, sir, I am in a good mood this afternoon because as I walked up the High Street at lunchtime there was a busker singing and playing his guitar. A better singer than a guitarist in my humble opinion but he did share a chord with me today with his song, and I will explain why later.

I know I might have to suffer the wrath of Deputy Kuttelwascher but I would like to start by echoing the words of Deputies Sherbourne and Conder this morning and this afternoon, when they said that they thought we, as a Government, should have dreams. They were spot on. We should have ambition, we should have drive – no pun intended – and we should want to make Guernsey a better place – a better place for all Islanders to live.

I often think of the *BBC Guernsey* trailer that featured some of the individuals behind the new Dandelion Project – those who want to make Guernsey the best place in the world. When Jim Cathcart interviewed them on his *BBC* programme he gave them an air horn and when they felt his questions were negative, defeatist or the like, they could blow the horn – and they did on several occasions. As the trailer was repeated I often thought how good it would be to have one of those horns in this Assembly (*Interjection*) to blast when Deputies are negative, defeatist, glass half empty and the like. And this morning and this afternoon, sadly, we would have got good use out of the horn.

But enough of dreams. I want to refer to the vision and remind ourselves exactly what the Minority Report set out as its aim and why two weeks ago a large majority of us considered it to be the best option to debate.

Sir, page 718, paragraph 5, says:

'Our vision for travel in Guernsey is:

To facilitate safe, convenient, accessible and affordable travel options for all the community....'

I am going to repeat that because it is crucial,

'all the community, which are time and energy efficient, enhance health and the environment and minimise pollution.'

Paragraph 6 – the next paragraph – says:

'This integrated Transport Strategy and Action Plan is designed to set in train changes to move positively towards these goals and to provide a roadmap to continue them into the future.'

The Minority Report, the presentation, Deputy Burford's speech two weeks ago, has more than delivered against this premise and promise. And there is an action plan, with the bus service improved and made free before the paid parking kicks in. It is carrot before stick.

Sir, I will be devastated if we end up disintegrating what is a well-conceived, well-constructed, and well-budgeted integrated transport strategy for this Island.

Deputy Fallaize was right this morning when he said, just before lunch, like all similar debates this has turned in to a debate on paid parking. It is unfortunate that this is the main topic focus, but I will cover other things too, later, but I would like to bust a few myths on the topic.

As my PSD Minister said this morning, paid parking already exists in Guernsey, at the airport. It is free for an hour but there are charges thereafter. In response to Deputy Gillson – as my Castel colleague, Deputy Green, said – it is not like comparing apples and pears, but perhaps green apples and red apples. But the reality is at the airport nobody bats an eyelid about paid parking – it is the norm.

That is the airport. So why at the seaport, when the PSD Board deliberates about the future, does the mind-set exist, even in a small way, that we give even the slightest concern to perhaps the loss of 10 or a dozen free spaces, when we are trying to create a fit-for-purpose 21st century harbour that sees 30% of our passenger arrivals and 98% of our goods arrivals coming through it. It is madness. We cannot and we must not compromise because of a Corsa or a Clio.

Some say it is the Guernseyman's or Guernseywoman's right to park for free on the North Beach and the Piers. That is the fact. They have no value in pounds, shillings and pence but bizarrely, sir, those Piers, the North Beach, those car park spaces do have a monetary value when an event is being held on them – even a non-profit or charity event. Sir, it is a big bugbear of mine that they have no value when a car is

parked there but as soon as there is, for example, a marquee on it with say the Taste of Guernsey Festival on it selling Guernsey, it is suddenly worth many hundreds of pounds each day. Free for cars but many hundreds of pounds if it is for an event that is good for Guernsey. Madness, but it puts things in perspective.

2670 As well as looking at it from PSD's perspective, I would also like to look at it from a Culture and Leisure perspective. A North Beach park rather than a North Beach car park would be a fantastic long term aim and a better welcome to the oft-mentioned cruise passenger than a sea of cars. But this morning Deputy Laurie Queripel spoke about economic enablers. Well, I would argue with my C&L hat on that it is an economic dis-enabler that commuters park for the whole day on Castle Pier, when those spaces would be  
2675 best used by our visitors to visit our top attraction, the Jewel in our Crown – Castle Cornet. What would be best for Guernsey plc? We do not make it easy for people to visit Castle Cornet.

Sir, Deputy De Lisle spoke this morning, and others to, about the discriminatory legislation – that was the phrase that Deputy De Lisle used – of paid parking, and others have spoken about a tax of £1,300 a year on the lowest paid.

2680 But I think the real problem, the big problem, is that we currently have a discriminatory society where we force our lowest paid to have a car to take part in society. This is the car dependency, that Deputy Soulsby so ably demonstrated, that exists in Guernsey more than other places. We force our lowest paid to spend a disproportionate percentage of their income on a car that they cannot afford and that is not fair. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.)

2685 Deputy De Lisle spoke about a shop worker earning say £16,000 having to spend £1,300 each year – roughly 10% of their wages – on parking. 'Regressive' was Deputy De Lisle's verdict. Well, I say – and this, Mr Bailiff, is the key point we need to create an enhanced, improved, public transport service, free buses that means that shop worker does not need a car, and is encouraged to change from being a two-car family to a one-car family, or a three-car family to a two-car family, and has the opportunity to save £3,000  
2690 per year – the costs and running costs of a car.

On wages of £16,000, rather than lose 10% of their salary, the £3,000 saving would effectively be a 20% *increase* in wages and perhaps – as Deputy Lowe's example – that family would be better investing the £3,000 saving in a property and a mortgage rather than on a bit of metal they would no longer need if we gave them the proper public transport alternatives that they deserve. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) Quality  
2695 of life is one of our SSP guiding principles.

Rather than being regressive my verdict is that that would be truly progressive. Instead of costing Islanders £1,300, we will be giving them the opportunity to have an extra £3,000 in their back pocket.

Deputy Laurie Queripel also asked: 'what if it is a raging success?' What happens? Where will they leave their car at home on street parking when they get the free bus? The answer is they will not that car.  
2700 They will sell it. They will not replace it and they will save £3,000 a year. (*Laughter and interjections*) They will change from a three-car family to a two-car family, or a two-car family to a one-car family. And remember there are 8,000 adults who do not drive. They should be as much our priority as the aforementioned and oft mentioned motorists.

2705 So enough of the sticks, let's focus on the carrots – and the biggest, juiciest carrot of them all. In my manifesto I said:

'There is too much traffic on our roads, but unless we are able to cut the umbilical cord that ties all of us to our cars, there is no easy solution. Whilst it is hard to envisage what a thriving bus service would be like, encouraging people to make more use of public transport remains as the most likely way to make a real difference.'

That is what I wrote two years ago and nothing has changed. The bus service *is* a game changer.

2710 I will refer Members back to what I said on the amendments. If we can double the number of people travelling on the buses, even if it is free, we will dramatically increase the value for money to taxpayers.

I remember standing at Gatwick Airport on the platform recently waiting for the Gatwick express to Victoria and I thought about the size of the public transport offering in the UK – trains, undergrounds, coaches, buses, trams and the like – all compared to our little Island. The infrastructure we need for 60,000 people should be 1,000 times smaller than the UK's 60 million. In truth, it must be much smaller yet, but  
2715 we still make a big mess of the small public transport offering that we need to create and manage for Islanders. We must and we need to do better.

The Minority Report, just as the Majority Report, said we would not only have a free bus service but we would have a better one – and we need it.

2720 Much has been said about modal shift – change of habits – and there is a correlation for me, and I am sure it will not be lost on Deputy Burford who sits on both PSD and Environment between the waste hierarchy and the transport hierarchy. Those upside down triangles – if a triangle can be upside down. Just in the same way that we want Islanders to feel good about recycling and feel a tad guilty if they throw a tin or a yoghurt pot in the wrong bin, we want in time to create a real feel good factor about doing the right thing when it comes to transport – and know that we are all in this together.

2725 To this end – and this is the elephant in the room, or the donkey on the bus – we need to remove the stigma attached to getting on a bus in Guernsey. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) Why do we see anyone and everyone on buses and the underground in London and we all use it ourselves, but often we do not want to be seen on the bus in Guernsey?

2730 When I worked in Town I caught the bus from right outside my clos. I jumped off right by my office and I even took my daughter to the nursery. When I did this people would stop and ask if my car was broken – (*Laughter*) did I need a lift? Later they might ask me why they had seen me standing at the bus stop. They thought it was strange that I was getting a bus but it should not be the exception, it should be the rule. Sir, back then we were a one-car family and the buses worked for me.

2735 Let me return to the busker in town this lunchtime. Why did I mention him? He was singing a song that had the lyrics, ‘Waiting for the world to change.’ Well, Mr Bailiff, I am glad that Deputies Burford and Brehaut did not wait for the Island to change. They want to help the Island change, make the Island change. And, yes, just like recycling and other things that are good for Island life, we need to give people a little nudge, a bit of encouragement. Sir, let’s vote today to make Guernsey a better place – a better place for all Islanders to live. Referring once again to the busker’s lyrics, ‘This is a no waiting zone’.

2740 It is not about hard decisions, it is not about brave decisions, it is not about difficult or even as Deputy Soulsby said, difficult decisions, it is not about making the easy, populist decision that will get me or Deputy Al Brouard elected. I have never and will never vote because of what I believe will get me re-elected. It is, Mr Bailiff, about the right decision for Guernsey, not for the next two years but for the next 20 years and beyond. And I am confident that this Assembly *will* make the right decision and we *will* make a difference.

2745 Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Brehaut.

2750 **Deputy Collins:** Sir, can I –

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Collins.

2755 **Deputy Collins:** – propose 14(1) please, sir.

**The Bailiff:** You want to guillotine the debate, do you? (*Interjections*) That means we will have to have a recorded vote, because we have to see if we have a two-thirds majority.

2760 **Deputy Trott:** Sir, just one matter. You had actually called Deputy Brehaut’s name before Deputy Collins stood. And you set a precedent with me.

**The Bailiff:** I had actually. I had, so if I am being consistent with the ruling I gave the other day, Deputy Brehaut can speak and then we will deal with Rule 14(1).

2765 **Deputy Brehaut:** The highs and lows of democracy. (*Interjections*) Thank you for that intervention, Deputy Trott.

2770 We started the debate this morning, sir, with Deputy Allister Langlois saying that the size of the problem has been blown out of all proportion. Deputy Burford and myself did not invent the problem. We went out to consultation and members of the public told us what was wrong, and they were very clear – they said: there are too many cars, they are too wide and other road users feel vulnerable, families do not feel safe when walking or cycling, St Peter Port and many other areas are blighted by the use of the car, not just by parked cars, but by cars circulating high volume.

2775 Speak to charities such as Longevity about pollution, speak to the Chest and Heart Clinic about cardiac failure, speak to nurses about the prevalence of Type 2 diabetes, speak to clinicians about obesity. These are all lifestyle issues, lifestyle diseases. There is a cause. You – we, as an Assembly – have an obligation to act. That is of course unless you are going to ignore budgetary restraints and simply give HSSD many more millions of pounds over the years ahead. Unlikely, I will assume.

2780 As I walked into the Assembly today, I walked down Queen’s Road and then along The Grange with a very long line of cars to my left – bumper to bumper, end to end; the vast majority single occupancy – the vast majority of those cars single occupancy. Why is that considered the new norm and why, as a Government, would we not be seeking to improve the environment for those who live within St Peter Port, and have several thousand cars each morning literally at the end of their path or garden or doorstep?

2785 Think about that for a moment perhaps if you are a Deputy from another parish or in the north of the Island. You may well think, ‘I will leave home at 9.15 a.m. avoiding the worst of the congestion. So that is a 10-minute journey into Town. What is the problem? But, again, I urge you, spare a thought for those

whose properties can be found at the very core of the traffic turmoil each and every day, each and every morning and evening. And the next time you are stuck in traffic – in a traffic jam – just remember you are the traffic. Could you, should you have sought an alternative?

2790 This is not about taking everyone out of their car for every trip. This is about progressively, over time, moving away and becoming less dependent on the car. Other communities have done that and seen a real benefit of transforming dead car parking spaces into *alfresco* eating spaces. People stay, they sit and, importantly, they spend. And no better example in the local context than the new facility at the top of Smith Street.

2795 Traffic is a quality of life issue to the point, remember, where residents and their families feel unsafe. Parents do not consider it safe for their children to walk or cycle to school. Why does that fact not send shivers down our spine? How on earth have we got to that point and why are we not doing anything about it?

2800 During the last debate, I stood whilst the Home Minister was speaking and he did not give way to me but I just wanted to make the point then and make this point now. The question is: what is the cost of dealing – this is for the Home Department in particular and the Home Minister in his new role – with growing car numbers? What do the accident stats look like? How much Police time is taken up on RTAs – road traffic accidents? What resources do the Fire Service need and use? What is the cost to HSSD – that is A&E and the community broadly? St John Ambulance and Rescue need financial support. They are experiencing difficulties at the moment. What percentage of their resource is RTA-related? What training do they give to their staff with regard to paramedics that is directly related to RTAs and the movement of traffic around the Island?

2805 Let's just reflect for a moment what Guernsey can look like when the traffic flow is lessened. When schools are out, when students are out and their parents are on holiday too. We should just take that little window, take that beam of light and make it an absolute aspirational life style. The Minority Report strives to deliver that lifestyle for you.

2810 Some in this Assembly appear to have been anti-paid parking since their very conception. 'It is not the Guernsey way,' they say. 'We are becoming more like Little England,' they say. 'Tourists like free parking,' they say. Well, 60,000 vehicles on 24 square miles – is that really the Guernsey way? We are after all still driving up on what started life as old cart tracks. Cars sat end to end, making journeys of less than two or three miles, isn't that the real Little England that Deputy Soulsby was referring to?

2815 And please somebody find me the tourist who can hand on heart say, 'Well, we have never visited Guernsey before but the real clincher was the fact that you have free parking,' then express some regret that the cruise company did not allow them to pack their cars in their hand luggage. And, of course, those same cruise passengers will be paying not £8 – which is a gift to tour round the Island – but £59 or \$99... they are sold before they get on Guernsey. \$99 for an Island tour, not an £8 ticket. Tourists like our vibrant Town and the Minority Report again strives to keep it that way with extended pier parking – an approach favoured by Town traders.

2820 And can I say there have been a number of references to Town, St Peter Port, and its demise and we should not talk St Peter Port down, (*Interjections*) because it is changing. The nature of St Peter Port is changing. People buy certain things online, but you cannot get a coffee online. Many more people work in St Peter Port in offices that once worked in retail. And the nature of Town is changing. So living through a period of change is difficult, but stop this self-fulfilling prophecy of talking down a Town that is still very vibrant. And of course the Town traders supported the approach of extending the parking on the piers.

2830 Deputy De Lisle spoke rather generally of subjecting our Islanders to charging regimes – particularly paid parking – but, let's face it, you can avoid the width charge, you can avoid the emission charge, you will be rewarded for buying your fuel-efficient, energy-efficient vehicles and if you feel paid parking impinges then jump on a free reliable bus service and the point to stress is: not this bus service, a new bus service.

2835 When we talk about the retail strategy in isolation, it is interesting to note that the starting point for some contributors to that were working on the assumption that States' Members would never approve paid parking. So some people working on these strategies take it as a given that this Assembly would never approve paid parking and that misinforms their policy development moving forward. I have actually said it.

2840 It is important to note that parking in the UK – as I said in the last speech – is operated generally, not exclusively by private contractors or councils who get a lot less from Central Government. Also in the UK they have VAT, Council Tax and other consumption taxes, so there is no direct comparison to UK towns and our St Peter Port.

2845 On the subject of Town workers, the real expense for families on low incomes is the car, or rather the necessity to own one if the options are not open to them. We do hear complaints from the tourists about the bus service and they are valid complaints. But I want a bus service – a social bus service – that is tailored for those who live and work here each and every day. The Minority Report can give you that as well, if you support it.

Today we were hearing that families will sell their houses, leave Guernsey, relocate, pay for the move, seek employment in the UK. Yes, all of that, instead of buying a bike or picking up a free bike from Longue Hougue, or buying a motor scooter or getting on a free bus. That people will leave the Island to avoid paid parking.

Deputy Langlois also, when he kicked off earlier today... When he kicked off! When he opened debate rather. *(Laughter)* When he opened much earlier he was saying that Guernsey does not do modal shift. Sorry, in this Assembly we frequently talk about poverty and social policy, but the Deputy Chief Minister's remarks demonstrated a different type of poverty to me today and that is the poverty of expectation: a lack of ambition, a lack of vision. What could your children or grandchildren's tomorrow look like? We care about that, don't we?

Deputy Ogier asked: "will we unite to throw out a strategy?" Then what? During the week we were hearing from Deputy Lowe on how, decision-wise, this was the worst Assembly. Why? Because the new Members are all learning. Well, actually new Members such as Deputy Burford are pretty fast learners, I have to say. **(A Member: Hear, hear.)** And ironically there is a risk that this progressive, well thought through policy strategy could be stymied – not by the newbies but by the longer serving Members of this Assembly. **(Several Members: Hear, hear.)**

Generally, our inboxes are a good indicator of the strength of feeling within the community and actually my inbox – post-literal post box – has been light, and I do believe that this Assembly, or those who are opposed to paid parking, are actually out of step with the community generally.

Think mortgage interest tax relief. Think school closure. Think incinerator. Think right to life. Now, that is political engagement and that is lobbying and we have not seen very much of it lately.

Members, some of you today are saying, 'I support the strategy but not the element, or at least the one element, that seeks to fund it.' We cannot even, on reputational grounds alone, debate a strategy over a two sitting period, only then to pull the plug on funding. Why would you want to do that? Why would you leave us with... or what would you see as an outcome? What would you want as an outcome and what do you really want to happen? You can only achieve a true modal shift if you have both the incentives and disincentives. And for those of you who say, 'You have your width charges and you have your emission charges, that is your bus funding.' That, fundamentally, is a misunderstanding of the nature of the Minority Report and the mechanisms that can and will deliver. When we discussed the Minority Report the last time around people acknowledged the – as I referred to before – integrated nature of this strategy and how this policy Jenga or pulling blocks out would mean that it then puts the whole policy direction at risk.

Members, this Minority Report gives you an opportunity to move forward, to embrace change, to give a strong message to the community. And we acknowledge that there are challenges out there and we will meet them. And move away from the anecdotes in Douzaine rooms, comments on social media, anonymous comments on forums that appear in the letters page, targeted one-sided opinion columns – move away from all of that. Set those aside. You are elected to govern, to take decisions, at times, that are not universally popular. Please do that, make a decision today, and send out a positive message to the community from this Assembly and vote for the Minority Report.

And, finally, sir, on pessimism, Oscar Wilde said, 'the optimist sees the doughnut, the pessimist sees the hole.' Well, today, you can actually have your cake and eat it. Please support the Minority Report. *(Laughter)*

**The Bailiff:** Before we go to the vote on the Rule 14(1) Proposition, could I just have an indication of how many other people wish to speak?

Right, so Deputy St Pier would be able to speak in any event on any financial implications. So then we have two other Members who wish to speak who would be deprived of the opportunity to do so if Rule 14(1) goes ahead. Do you wish me to put it to the ...?

**Deputy Collins:** No, sir, I withdraw the request.

**The Bailiff:** Thank you.  
Deputy Harwood then.

**Deputy Harwood:** Thank you, sir, fellow Members.

In response to Deputy Brehaut, he should have read the leaflet that I handed him on Saturday on behalf of Living Streets. It gave him an alternative route to have walked down to this Assembly today to avoid the congestion of The Grange. The pleasure of going down Mount Hermon, the pleasure of going down the Petite Fontaine is a joy to behold.

**Deputy Brehaut:** Sorry, sir, I enjoy the discomfort of drivers. *(Laughter)*

**Deputy Harwood:** Sir, fellow Members.

I am not ashamed to say that I share a dream, I share a vision, that this Island will reduce the dependency upon the motor vehicle by reducing the miles of travel undertaken in private motor vehicles.

I also share a vision that is stated in the Majority Report – and I am conscious of the fact there is a supporter of the Majority Report sitting in front of me – which said the clear focus is on an integrated package of measures that will deliver a change in peoples travel habits, so that the private motor vehicle is not always the primary choice of travel but rather walking, cycling, public transport, motorcycling and car sharing are given high priority.

Sir, to achieve that dream and that vision we need to incentivise people to leave the car at home. And the Minority Report – the Minority strategy – envisages that that will be achieved by a free and improved bus service and also by a modest hourly charge for long-term parking. And that, sir, is the essence of the Strategy that we have the opportunity to adopt today.

In an earlier speech, sir, I encouraged Members to act decisively and I also endorse Deputy Brehaut's comments. Members should not procrastinate, Members should not be feint hearted, Members should not shilly-shally, but Members should endorse a transport strategy that is right for this Island and for our community.

And, sir, like others, I was somewhat concerned that Deputy Langlois, and one or two others, and Deputy Laurie Queripel, suggested Guernsey does not do modal shifts, Guernsey does not do radical change. Sir, fellow members, I submit that as parliamentarians we have a duty to introduce such changes for future generations (**Several Members:** Hear, hear) and we should not be ashamed to do so.

Sir, many Members have spoken about the fact that we have an existing 2006 Strategy. They have viewed that as we can rely upon the 2006 Strategy, but I submit clearly that strategy has not worked. We still have congestion, we still have full car parks, from as early as 7.30 a.m. in the morning.

Now, sir, Deputy Langlois also referred to a 1964 pantomime and he endorsed that by saying this is not a new problem – that Albert was looking around for car parking space in 1964, he is still looking around for car parking space in 2014. That also endorses the fact that clearly there has not been a transport strategy that has delivered anything at all, (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) and that notwithstanding the fact that since 1964 we have had a considerable amount of additional free parking space at the North Beach and other areas.

I would also mention in passing, I think it was about 1964 pantomime or it might have been 1962 pantomime where the villains of the piece were a certain Mrs Rush and Miss Tomkins. That was in the context of the scandal at the time when the States was being accused of selling off Fort George on the cheap for private development. That shows how short people's memories are, because I think people would now say Fort George has actually been a success for the Island. (*Interjections*)

Sir, we have also been questioned as to leadership. And this is in the context of saying, 'Well, there is not public support for paid parking.' But if you ask people who enjoy the benefits of free parking is it any surprise they would be less than enthusiastic to support the introduction of paid parking?

Reference has also been made to the interests of St Peter Port and the importance of revitalisation of retail offering and that I full endorse. But I would submit, sir, that the revitalisation of St Peter Port is not helped by continuing free long-term parking, but what is more important is free short-term parking. That there is footfall, that people can come in to shop, to do business in St Peter Port – not necessarily people who are going to be parked for eight hours to 10 hours a day.

To Deputy Laurie Queripel, who also can make me express concern about the position of the local tradesmen – the white van man, I am surprised he does not actually support the idea of paid parking because that is a means also of spreading the load, spreading the burden, of paid parking to those who come into this Island from off the Island and who currently enjoy the benefits of free paid parking. This is an opportunity to get them on to a level playing field with our local traders.

Sir, I am flattered that Deputy Kuttelwascher...Kuttelwascher... (*Laughter*) my colleague on my right, (*Laughter*) on a Saturday morning was listening to my interview on *Radio Guernsey*. What a sad life. He must really try and get out a bit more. (*Laughter*) Deputy Kuttel... My colleague on my right (*Laughter*) has, however, highlighted and identified one particularly important reason why people should support this strategy in the Minority Report which we are looking at today, and that is again that he has identified that the 2006 Strategy has not worked, it has not delivered. There is no fall-back position to fall... You cannot fall back on assuming the 2006 Strategy is working. Okay.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Kuttelwascher.

**Deputy Kuttelwascher:** I did not say that. I said the reason it has not worked is that there has been no real attempt to implement it for eight years, in spite of funding being available. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) And I said we replace one strategy with another strategy, but they are all a waste of time if you do not try and implement them. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.)

**Deputy Harwood:** I thank you for that intervention and that additional speech, (**Deputy Kuttelwascher:** Thank you.) but it just merely goes to show that the 2006 Strategy has not worked and has not delivered.

Sir, one point I do agree, however, with my friend on my right (*Laughter*) is in relation to Proposition 12 because I think it is wrong as part of these Propositions that the proposal for a bus depot... that we should be directing Treasury and Resources to classify the bus depot as a pipeline project. I do not believe that is an essential part of the strategy and I certainly will not be supporting that. (*Interjection*)

Sir, Deputy Spruce and others have focussed on funding issues. I might suggest with due respect that Deputy Spruce and others are missing the point. It is not about funding, it is about achieving behavioural change and the paid parking is an essential part of that. It is not necessarily essential to funding, but it is essential to achieve that modal change we have talked about.

Deputy Perrot, again, referred to the Proposition set out in paragraph 18. As the transport hierarchy... as one who uses my feet probably more than a car, I am delighted to be at the top of that particular pyramid. But I do also encourage him to note that the Proposition set out in paragraph 18 merely requires an investigation into the possibility of that liability programme. It is not committing the States to do so. I suggest and I encourage him to endorse and to support Proposition 18 because it does at least enable the issue to be considered.

To Deputy Adam, who referred to Proposition 27 of the Minority Report, it is perhaps helpful to note that in the original Majority Report the amount that has been requested from Treasury and Resources is almost exactly double the amount that is required by the Minority. So the Minority has already achieved a reduction in the demands on the States' coffers.

Sir, in previous discussions there were suggestions as to how we measure the success of the transport strategy. I suggest, and I offer as a suggestion, that the following could be used as a measure of success after two years.

Firstly, the bus occupancy should be a minimum of 80% between the hours of 7.30 a.m. and 9 a.m. and between 5 p.m. and 7 p.m. There should be a reduction in the usage of long-term parking by a factor of 10%. And further there should be a reduction in the number of cars travelling into St Peter Port at peak commuting hours with one person alone. We should aim to reduce that by a factor of 20%.

Sir, I urge this Assembly to support the Propositions contained in the Minority Report and as set out in the amended version, except that I will be voting against Proposition 12.

Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Deputy Burford.

**Deputy Burford:** Thank you, sir.

I will start off with the matter of the bus depot, seeing several people have actually raised it. Those Members who took the time to read the compelling submission of the Environment Department to the Capital Prioritisation that was available in the Members' room may find it somewhat odd to hear protests that we actually now do not need one.

The previous States' Resolution that Deputy Brouard referred to, to purchase 19 school buses, was scuppered by the lack of anywhere to put them. The current facilities are rented and creaking at the seams. In order to have a first class public transport system a bus depot is essential, it is not just a nice to have. And when we talk of public transport we have to remember that with the exception of the niche role played by taxis, and perhaps taxi variants in the form of dial a ride, buses are the public transport system. We do not have trains and trams and subways, and therefore we have to get the buses right and, unsurprisingly, that includes somewhere to keep them.

In terms of the funding, various figures have been bandied round on social media, in the *Press*, and even in this Assembly. I think we had a policy of not sort of divulging capital prioritisation figures generally, but I can certainly tell you that it is not £20 million. I had numerous discussions with Treasury who advised that a suitable method of funding a bus depot could be by an amortised loan over a loan period of 15 to 20 years.

When I came to writing the Propositions – or recommendations as they were at that stage – I was advised by Treasury and the Law Officers that it needed to be written in the way it was, in order to put it through the skip process, even though it would be funded by an amortised loan. So that is why the reason the Proposition is before you in the format it is in today.

On the £835,000 transfer from Budget Reserve, this is fully funded from the first registration duty. It is just simply that it is in the current year, so again that was the advice from Treasury and Resources on how that Proposition should be written. So hopefully that clears up those two items.

Coming now to some of the things that Deputy Spruce mentioned. The Minority Report is still fully funded and it is still integrated. None of the amendments that have gone through have affected that, in my view. The amendments have been minor to say the least, but it is the case that paid parking is absolutely essential and Deputy Spruce's contention that we can vote out paid parking and be left with a workable



3030 strategy, I believe, is completely wrong. So much so that, if paid parking were to be unsuccessful, I would struggle myself to support many of the Propositions in my own Report, which should give you some understanding of how strongly I feel about that.

Deputy Perrot – just to say that the reason we have gone in to a first registration duty is that Rule 15(2) obliges Departments to identify the source of funding. But it is also quite interesting that, both in other  
3035 places and in our consultations that we had here in Guernsey, it is always shown that people are markedly more happy to actually support measures like paid parking or like first registration duties, if they know the money is actually going to be ploughed back into alternative transport measures. So although some people might say the motorist is paying for it all, the motorist is not always the motorist but we do have evidence that actually that is the sort of things that the motorists want their money to go towards.

3040 Deputy Lowe brought up the subject of the benefit in kind and saying that it may be difficult to define the areas. That is a task, if that Proposition is passed, for Treasury and Resources as part of the investigation into benefit in kind, and it is probably not going to be as tricky a job as Island wide voting, but it will be a detailed piece of work, I am sure.

Also anyone coming in to Town at 8.30 a.m. who currently relies on parking in long stay – I am not  
3045 quite sure how they do when it is all generally full by then.

Deputy Brouard suggested the benefit in kind will affect Alderney residents. Again, I do not see how that can be claimed until the Report is brought back by Treasury and Resources.

I think there was also a mention that up to £8 million will be spent on the buses, but that certainly is not the annual figure that is in the Report.

3050 I was fascinated, though, to hear the individual Propositions that Deputy Brouard is going to vote for, and what I noticed most about them is that he wants all of the good bits and none of the bad bits – so none of funding but all of the benefits. I really think that is probably where we have gone wrong in the past and I implore you not to let us go wrong that way today.

To Deputy Gillson, already there are some buses that are quite early in the morning and the extended  
3055 commuter period is obviously a really important time to address. But although the buses will provide an excellent alternative, let's not rule out the fact that people may choose to car share, cycle or walk. So it is not the only option.

I pick up your point as well about longer stays in short-stay parking meaning that it is a shorter turn over, but actually if you refer back to the Report – as the Proposition does – it does actually say a maximum  
3060 of 2.5 hours. So there is scope for the Department, if they so wish, for smaller areas with the periods to be shorter if that is generally felt what the actual need is. But I think it is quite important to have some spaces for people who want to stay longer in Town to shop and to go for lunch, and obviously we will be looking at enforcing that. I think we are all aware that, although we say people come out of their officers to move their cars, often those cars do not move very far.

3065 On the point of encouragement, the 2006 Strategy was all about encouragement and it failed. And I will come to something on the subject of encouragement later.

Deputy Inglis – 'Retail is far more likely to benefit than suffer from this transport strategy.' That is precisely what has happened to places that have got to grips with the car culture.

Deputy Brehaut mentions the cost of accidents. I tried to research the cost of accidents for the strategy  
3070 and I spent some considerable time with the Police talking about it. They had a concern that their figures were not sound enough to actually be published in a States' Report, I think it is fair to say, because it is obviously quite difficult to work those things out accurately. But, interestingly, in Jersey they do publish a figure, which is £18 million a year as a result of the direct and indirect cost of road traffic accidents. So I suppose *pro rata* for Guernsey we are looking at round about £10 million.

3075 And like other Members, I rather despair at Deputy Langlois' assertion that we do not do modal shift and I am sure that people would rather that we were a 'can do' Assembly rather than a 'can't do' one. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

Similarly, Deputy Laurie Queripel feels that we are being carried away by ambition. Well, heaven forbid that, when we can sit here comfortably with the *status quo*. Anyone listening to some of this debate  
3080 would imagine that this strategy is some kind of Armageddon scenario, rather than numerous proposals to make life better, funded by a one-off duty on larger and more polluting vehicles and some modest proposals for long-stay paid parking.

Travel plans do not require showers to be built, so you can rest assured. I mean it is just an example of what can be done, it is not a requirement or a Proposition.

3085 Deputy Queripel also worries that some people in St Sampson's, who stop using their cars because the alternatives become so successful, will have nowhere to put the cars that they do not use anymore. (*Laughter*) He asks how we square the circle with this policy that is not going to achieve any change, when it is so successful that it no longer collects enough money. Well, the strategy provides for adjustments. As cars get more efficient, other jurisdictions adjust their bands to recognise that.

3090 On the subject of more lovely open spaces and the cost of their maintenance, of course, car parks and access roads need maintenance as well.

I think that Deputy Ogier responded quite clearly to the many points about how this strategy fits in with other States' strategies, and indeed I outlined them all in my speech last time and I will not repeat them here, you will pleased.

3095 Deputy De Lisle wants Environment to continue seeking off-street parking for residents but, with private Town spaces going at about £2,400 a year, this is just not viable. And, although many others have picked up on this point, it obviously bears repeating, we are not charging for shopper parking.

I thank Deputy Dorey for his numerous constructive comments. I will not address them all but I would be very pleased to take them forward. On the subject of increasing 2 hour stays to 2.5, he is correct that it is finely balanced. And I have pointed out about the point of it being a maximum.

3100 Deputy Trott is concerned that the investigations that this Report calls for might take 500 hours each. That is certainly not the case and they are not all States' reports, but there will be resource implications and the strategy allows for that in its funding.

It is impossible to know why the figures for walking to St Sampson's School are unchanged, but I would hazard two educated guesses. Firstly, the initiative was not part of an integrated travel plan, which the strategy proposes to address. And, secondly, there has been a significant shift to bus use, with better school bus provision.

3105 Deputy Fallaize raised the issue of hire cars. The most important thing to note is that the majority of hire cars are Ford Fiestas and Ford Kas, which would be below the charging thresholds anyway and therefore not pay anything. So the strategy will encourage hire car companies to use smaller, narrower, cleaner fleets, more suited to our Island roads. I do not think it is unreasonable for the hire cost of large cars to carry an extra cost, reflecting their impact. However, at detailed level we will of course look at the situation to ensure that any charge is proportional and to ensure that any alleviation cannot be exploited as a loophole.

3115 Deputy Fallaize rightly pointed out that the reason paid parking has not been effective in Jersey is that there is a lack of sufficiently attractive alternatives. In fact, I can elaborate on that point by way of a short story.

When it comes to transport choices, economic factors influence people's decision-making, but not necessarily in the ways you might assume. To demonstrate how behavioural economics affects decision-making I would like to take you through a few imaginary scenarios.

3120 Scenario one is played out under the *status quo*. Michael lives in St Sampson's and works in Town. He owns his own car and he usually fills it up with petrol every Saturday when he does the weekly shop. One of his colleagues, Suzy, has recently been extolling the virtues of getting the bus to work – this is an imaginary scenario after all. So one morning he contemplates following her example. The money he has already invested in his car to buy it, insure it, maintain it and refuel it, is a retrospective or sunk cost – in other words, a cost that cannot be recouped. By contrast, taking the bus is a future avoidable cost – in other words, money that has not yet been spent and does not necessarily need to be spent, to the tune of £2 for the return fare for the day – provided of course he can show he is local.

3125 He has already paid for his car and anyway it is more convenient than the bus. So he decides Suzy is slightly batty and drives to work as usual, parking in a 10-hour bay at North Beach.

3130 Scenario two. The States of Guernsey have voted in fare-less buses but not user pays long-stay parking, which remains free at the point of use. Michael's colleague Suzy is banging on about the virtues of commuting by bus more than ever, now they are free and more frequent and reliable, with improved coverage and free Wi-Fi thrown in to the bargain.

3135 Michael secretly quite fancies Suzy so one morning (*Laughter*) he again considers catching the bus to work instead of driving. The buses are certainly more convenient than they used to be – possibly, if he is honest, even more convenient than driving, as he would not have to leave for Town so early and then walk the five minutes from North Beach, and now there is no associated cost to put him off. Yet he still chooses to drive to work. Why? If he were a truly rational creature the money that Michael had already spent on his car would have no bearing on his decision on how to get to work. He would make the decision based purely on the merits of each of the two options he is considering. The problem is he is not a truly rational creature, he is a human and therefore the idea of wasting money he has already spent carries much more weight in his decision-making process than the idea of what he could potentially gain.

3145 It is like the time he spent £100 on a ticket to see One Direction on that memorable but fictional occasion they gave an open air concert in Guernsey. (*Laughter*) The day of the concert arrived it was cold, wet and miserable. Michael was not really in the mood and, to top it all, he had just come to the realisation that he did not even like One Direction. He had only bought the ticket because Suzy told him she was going (*Laughter*) and now she had just texted to say she was not going after all. But, because loss aversion is such a powerful human instinct, the thought of effectively wasting his £100 meant that he went to the concert anyway. The prospect of spending his time more enjoyably, having a warm, cosy and contented evening in the pub with Suzy did not even stand a chance when weighed against the £100-already-spent factor. So he

stood in the rain, watching a band he did not like, having a miserable time, but at least he had not wasted that £100. (*Laughter*)

Anyway, I digress. There is one more scenario, which I have given the creative title of scenario three. Imagine, if you, will that the States has voted in an integrated transport strategy – hurrah! – complete with fare-less buses and user-pays long-stay parking. Suzy has, of course, been singing the praises of the new bus service and Michael is once again considering his travel options over breakfast – quite possibly in his car.

On the one hand, the fact that he has already invested a lot of money in his car is a very compelling reason to use it. He would not want to waste that money, after all. On the other hand, there is now a cost associated with driving to Town, to the tune of about £5 to park at North Beach while he is at work. This is a future avoidable cost. It is a cost that he has not yet spent and he can easily avoid spending it. So on this occasion that is exactly what he decides to do. Instead of jumping into his car at 7.30 a.m. he catches the 8.15 a.m. bus – and, by happy coincidence, the very same bus that Suzy is on. I will leave the story there, except to mention that Michael was very glad that he got the bus that day.

Now, Michael, of course, is a fictional character but his decision making process is entirely real, as evidenced by a huge body of science that falls under the title of behavioural economics. We may like to think of ourselves as rational beings when it comes to making decisions, but all the studies and research show that, in fact, we make decisions under the influence of a variety of different biases that we are probably not even aware of.

What my three scenarios demonstrate is that we cannot for a moment underestimate the bias in our society towards using the car. No matter how many carrots we dangle in front of someone, we are very unlikely to be able to simply encourage them into using alternative forms of transport, because the bias towards their car generally carries far more weight than any benefit they stand to gain from the alternatives.

The most effective way to overcome the bias is to use that same human instinct – the instinct to avoid loss – on the other side of the equation. People are far more likely to use alternative transport, if by doing so, they can avoid spending a fiver. Suddenly it is a different proposition they can avoid spending £100 a month. Under a fully integrated and balanced transport strategy many people will choose to avoid this cost, people's behaviour will change. But that modal shift will only happen with a fully integrated and balanced transport strategy.

Many people have underlined the point that a better bus service needs to be in place before paid parking comes in. I agree that this is crucial – the Report emphasises it. I believe that we can work with the current operator straight away to start putting right some of the things that are clearly wrong with the service at the moment. We will not introduce paid parking until there is a high quality, frequent and reliable bus service. Passing this strategy in its entirety today will enable us to rectify the underfunding of the bus service for the benefit of those who currently use it and those who want to use it – visitors to the Island and even those who continue to drive, as there will be fewer cars on the road as a result.

The Town residents parking issue is also an important one and a substantial report is on its way but, as with many issues in this debate, there is a tendency to look at it through the lens of where we are now and not where we are trying to go.

One of the reasons behind the resident's parking scheme is to stop the unnecessary circulation of vehicles which happens now, with some people who live within walking distance of their work having to move their cars first thing in the morning. Another reason is to stop commuters driving through the back streets of Town, looking for a parking space – and the scheme will introduce measures to achieve this.

We know that – especially where there are old houses that have been subdivided into flats – on street parking does not meet current needs but, as with long stay commuter parking, the aim is to address the demand side of the equation rather than just the supply side. Because all the evidence shows that facilitating the private car has only ever led to increased congestion, pollution, accidents, health problems and more.

So what the strategy will do is to provide much better alternatives to the car so that for some people – for those that choose to – it will be possible to decide to forego the cost of having to run a car at all or to become a one-car family instead of a two-car family. And those who choose to make that change will be alleviating the pressure for those for whom a car is essential due to their particular circumstances. It is a win-win solution. If there is a comprehensive bus service, safer and more attractive walking and cycling and car clubs or car-pooling, some people will find that it no longer makes sense to run a car.

Turning now to the main thrust of what I want to say. As usual, this Assembly has divided into a number of camps that are difficult to unite and that, once again, risk deferring effective policymaking. No wonder the people of this Island despair of us at times like this. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.)

Firstly, we have the camp that believes that there is no need for a transport strategy either because they do not perceive there to be a problem or because, for some largely unspecified reason, they just do not want another strategy. Then we have the camp that recognises there is need for a transport strategy and, indeed, is keen to implement one, but just cannot stomach the inclusion of paid parking.

There is also a third camp that has approached this report with commendable objectivity. I thank them for taking the time to analyse and understand the complexity of the bigger picture and for recognising the need for a fully integrated approach to achieve this strategy's aims – particularly those who kept an open mind enough to change what was sometimes long held views during the process of researching the Report or listening to the last debate.

Let's start with the first camp – those who question the need for a transport strategy at all. Personally, I find it difficult to understand how anyone – especially anyone in Government – would think that, as a modern western jurisdiction, we do not need something as basic and fundamental as transport policy. We have policies and strategies for things far less universal than transport. So it is beyond belief that we do not have a strategy that manages something that affects everyone every day. 'Ah, but,' I hear some mutter, 'we have the 2006 Strategy.' Technically speaking, this is correct and, indeed, it is the extant version and the one that we are still working under today.

So I ask you this: how many have actually read it cover to cover? Those that were here in the Assembly before last will have done, of course, but anyone thinking of voting out this strategy today needs to know what we will be left with. The 2011 report – the one that was not debated – raised many criticisms of the 2006 Strategy, which can be summarised like this.

The existing Transport Strategy is perceived by the States to be ineffective. However, the States has never clearly identified the problem or fully committed to clearly defined goals, together with supported policies and work streams to deliver those goals. The initial 2003 Strategy was clearly aimed at reducing commuter traffic impacts but, while the States approved many of the incentives associated with the Strategy, the penalties and disincentives were never resolved. The current 2006 Transport Strategy, which includes the phrase 'freedom of transport choice', clearly attempted to deliver all things to all people rather than driving policy and actions in a clearly-defined direction.

So, to summarise the not very subtle nuances of that analysis, our extant Transport Strategy is ineffective and therefore not fit for purpose.

When I was working on the Minority Report I took those criticisms into account, to avoid repeating the errors. Of course everyone wants the incentives without the disincentives – that is just human nature and, as politicians, we often feel it is our job to give people what they want. But it is no good having or voting in a strategy that simply does not work. In fact 'no good' is understating it. An ineffective strategy is actively counterproductive. It is a waste of time. It is a waste of resources. It is a waste of taxpayers' money. And it is the waste of the opportunity to do our job properly and drive policy in a clearly defined direction.

Every time we waste that opportunity, we erode a little more of the public's faith in us. We have been voted into the Assembly to make decisions that will deliver positive impacts for the whole Island. Sometimes – and, in the case of transport, all too often – those decisions take us outside our comfort zone and we lapse into poor policy cobbled together on the floor of the Assembly or, on occasion, no policy at all.

Those decisions are not necessarily easy, they might not be comfortable and often they will not even be intuitive, but if we want an effective viable transport strategy we need to make those decisions with an objective attitude and a clear aim in mind. Please do not dodge this decision and let us leave here today with a hamstrung strategy or an essential policy vacuum.

If we leave this Assembly today after four days of debate without a strategy, I do not consider that we have done our job or carried out our responsibility to the electorate. I also suspect that in no time at all we would find ourselves back at square one, being directed to come back to the States with a transport strategy.

Now, any transport strategy is going to seek to do, in essence, all the things that this one does. There is no case for a strategy that facilitates ever increasing car use with the ever increasing public and private expenditure, congestion, land planning problems, pollution, social isolation, environmental degradation and long-term health issues that inevitably follow.

Moving on to the second camp – those that are fundamentally opposed to paid parking. As I said last time, I understand why Members might feel that paid parking is unnecessary or unfair or somehow un-Guernsey. I know that your opinion will have been informed by a number of different factors. I appreciate the strength of feeling involved, as many of you have expressed it eloquently during debate.

Well, I will let you into a little secret; I used to be firmly against paid parking myself. While I was anything but a States watcher the last time this was proposed, I do recall the media publicity around the issue and my strong gut reaction then was that it was un-Guernsey and it would make life less convenient. Like most busy people, I did not know any more about the proposals than what I had read in the *Press*, but I knew I did not like them.

But what I know now is that without addressing the issue of parking we cannot have an effective transport strategy. Fact. Just as you have not arrived at your conclusions lightly, neither have I.

I am the first to admit that a few years ago I knew little of the subject. I had had plenty of conversations about it of course, but since then I have studied the subject of transport at university level and, in the last two years since being on the working group, I have read around the matter from every conceivable angle. I

have listened at length to the views of the widest possible cross-section of the Guernsey community. I have read countless transport strategies from countless jurisdictions and not just obvious places like Copenhagen and Amsterdam, but from many small towns and Island communities around the world with parallels to Guernsey. I found strategies that worked brilliantly and I found strategies that were a disaster, and strategies all along the spectrum between those two points.

Everything I have heard and read and analysed has pointed to one key fact: no set of incentives for alternative transport, no matter how compelling, can compete with the ultimate incentive for car use – free parking.

We have heard plenty of sincere and heart felt arguments against paid parking during this debate, but not once – *not once* – has anyone produced any evidence that free long-stay parking can work as part of an effective transport strategy. And that is quite simply because it cannot.

Now, there was something I heard mentioned by a couple of people in this Assembly last time we were here, and it was this: they commented that, because we are in the second half of this term, some Members will be thinking of their re-election prospects and that may deter them from supporting anything perceived to be controversial. I am not sure I do believe that people would do that and I certainly do not want to believe it, if for no other reason than that it rather underestimates the electorate.

I put support for paid parking in my manifesto and, not surprisingly, when I went door knocking people brought the subject up. But what became clear to me is that people assess candidates in the round and not on one issue. But a far better example than me is Deputy Perrot. His manifesto contained only about 17 words and two of them were paid parking. (*Laughter*) Indeed, I heard tell that the only two people in the entire west who did not vote for Deputy Perrot were an elderly couple waiting to catch a bus to the polling station from Fort Grey when it drove past them full of cruise ship passengers, (*Laughter*) apparently.

It is convenient to assume that, by defending free parking, one is representing the voice of the people, but even this is not borne out by the evidence. We know from our consultation that many of those who work and currently park in Town actually support paid parking for a variety of reasons, when placed in the context of an integrated strategy with attractive alternatives.

Clearly, if one simply asked whether people wished to pay for something that is presently free, most are likely to say ‘no’. But, when set in the context of reduced congestion, safer streets for cycling and walking and a first class public transport system, the support is there.

What is also evident is that long-stay paid parking will change behaviour. Many more people than at present will choose to walk, cycle, catch the bus and car share, especially once they are properly incentivised, and the very fact that some people do not like the idea of paid parking is evidence that it is an effective disincentive.

By now I am sure there is no need to reiterate why meaningful disincentives are an essential part of the balance when it comes to affecting behaviour change. So, remember, free parking comes at a cost and today the most important cost to consider is the very existence of an integrated transport strategy and all the beneficial changes that such a policy can bring with it.

With that simple thought in mind and with a clear personal commitment from me to work tirelessly on its delivery, I urge you to support this Report in its integrated entirety.

Thank you. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) (*Applause*)

**The Bailiff:** Deputy St Pier.

**Deputy St Pier:** Sir, as the fifth and final Member of the Treasury and Resources Department, I have very little to add on the resources implications of the strategy that has not been said by other Members of the Department and indeed in the Treasury and Resources Department’s letter of comment, which is in the Billet.

As we draw to the end of four days of debate and we approach what is clearly the crunch vote on paid parking, the moment is shortly upon us. Sir, I would certainly echo Deputy Burford’s comments in relation to Proposition 5 as being perhaps the key Proposition and I would certainly like to suggest that perhaps that – if it is possible – is taken as the first Proposition so that Members (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) could then decide where to go after that.

Clearly this is a divisive issue, as Deputy Gillson said. The population certainly seems to be divided very much along the lines of 50/50. The emails that we have all received seem to be pretty evenly balanced between those two camps and that is obviously very much reflected in the Assembly this afternoon.

On just a personal note in relation to presumed liability, as a cyclist, the idea that anybody who happens to knock me over is presumed to be liable seems attractive. However, as a driver – particularly a driver at night following many children without lights and any high visibility gear – it does concern me that drivers may end up being presumed liable in those sort of circumstances. So I think it is attractive, but some further consideration would need to be given to that issue.

Deputy Fallaize referred to my immediate predecessor – that former Deputy Parkinson had laid out the economic rationale for paid parking which had persuaded Deputy Fallaize. Particularly, Deputy Fallaize made some comments around the relationship between taxes and free at the point of delivery services. I do not know if Deputy Fallaize was aware, but he was actually perfectly describing Policy Council’s guidance on fees and charges, which has been issued to all Departments, which seeks to give Departments guidance on how to charge for services and, in particular, the assessment of what is a private benefit and what is a public benefit. So he was very much describing the policy which exists for all other services which Departments provide.

I think Deputy Soulsby very much summed up, for me, the comments in relation to the strategy as a whole and actually expressed it far better than I can myself, so I will not seek to repeat that. But I do want to make two comments in relation to Propositions, in which Treasury and Resources do have a particular interest.

One is Proposition 12 which is the construction of the bus depot. I did make some comments when we met a couple of weeks ago about how that would be accounted for through the Capital Reserve. One Member did, sir, refer to this Proposition as ‘bypassing the capital prioritisation process’. I do not agree with that. I think what it is doing is forcing this project into the States’ capital investment portfolio process and it is, in that sense, no different from the amendment that was moved to the capital prioritisation report at the end of last year to put the hospital re-profiling into the programme. This is effectively doing the same thing.

Deputy Burford did refer to the advice in relation to the funding of the development by way of some form of amortised loan. Of course, we do have a policy – a Resolution – of this Assembly which of course requires loans to have a discrete revenue stream to enable their repayment. And I think some care and consideration would need to be given as to whether that does or does not apply in this case. And that would certainly have to be an issue which Treasury would need to give careful consideration to if this project were to be moved forward as part of the capital programme as one of the pipeline projects.

The other Resolution that I wanted to pick up was in relation to the benefits in kind, Proposition 8, and again a number of Members have referred to this, and particularly Deputies Gillson and Lowe. Sir, technically, legally, it will be very easy to introduce a benefit in kind charge, simply by rescinding the exemption which exists in the Income Tax Law for parking provision. However, practically, as Deputy Gillson has indicated, there are a number of deeply difficult practical issues that will need to be considered. The geographic area – will it apply Island-wide or to a narrower area? What will the rates be? How will we deal with part-timers? How will we deal with spaces which are shared? And how will we deal – as a number of people have said – with those for whom spaces are required for work?

However, for me, it is a little bit of a disappointment – and this comes as no surprise to Deputy Burford – that this Proposition merely comes forward as a requirement to bring a further report rather than an integrated part of this proposal because – as, I think, Deputy Gillson and others have said – I think there is a very real equity issue with the imposition of paid parking without an equal charge on those for whom the employer-provided spaces are free, (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) and therefore it is for me an integral part of this strategy that a benefit in kind charge should be accepted by this Assembly when a further report is brought.

Indeed, the disincentive effect or rationale behind paid parking of course has no impact whatsoever on those for whom free places are provided. And it is an irony that the policy of social inclusion is one which will, in many ways, benefit the socially exclusive. So it is something that does require... It is not an easy nut to crack. It can be done. It will require imagination and it will require clearly a further report, which is accepted by this Assembly of course, if it is to be a fully integrated package with the paid parking provisions.

However, I would say that – perhaps contrary to Deputy Laurie Queripel – I could envisage a situation where actually it could reduce business costs, because businesses would not necessarily be required to have the same number of parking spaces available that they rent or pay for, for their staff.

Sir, when I worked in Town I had the benefit of an employer-provided parking space. Nine times out of 10 I cycled to work but the space was kept empty for me for the one day in 10 that I decided to drive. Clearly, had I had a benefit-in-kind charge, I certainly would have let that space go at a saving to my employer. So I think that it is possible to envisage that actually businesses could benefit with a reduction in the number of spaces that need to be provided.

Sir, I have nothing further to add. Thank you.

**The Bailiff:** Unless anyone else wishes to speak – I see no-one rising – Deputy Domaille will reply to the debate.

**Deputy Domaille:** Thank you, sir.

I will be brief. I think we have probably exhausted this topic. I think everything that needs to be said has been said and I think probably several things that did not need to be said have been said several times. (Laughter) So I will try not to fall into that trap for myself. Actually it seems like it was only two weeks ago we were talking about transport and traffic, (Laughter) and today has been illuminating and there has been nothing new.

I was going to do a longer speech but I think it is important that we move to the vote. But there are a couple of things I do need to highlight.

A couple of points have been raised. Deputy Fallaize raised a matter of the hire cars. As Deputy Burford said, yes, we will look at that but I suspect the devil will actually be in the detail. There are all sorts of problems in that.

Deputy Dorey raised 30-minute zones. I think that is a good suggestion – perhaps have a 30-minute zone by the Old Town Hospital/new Police Station.

Comments have been made about the previous strategies and the funding. If only we could get at the funding. The problem is that it has been pigeonholed for various initiatives, primarily buses, which we have not been able to action – not least because we do not have a depot, which Deputy Burford referred to, and not least because actually getting the drivers is not easy.

There have been many good speeches and I think it has been illuminating to hear the different views. It is also very clear to see that, yes, there is a split in the Environment Department over this issue, but actually it seems to be mirrored within this Assembly. So I do not think there is any surprise there and actually I think some of the discussions we have had around the board table have been as frank and as honest and as different in views as we have had here, not only today but the last few days as well.

I would like to remind Members actually many of the proposals in the Minority Report are similar to the those of the Majority Report and I will be supporting those measures – improvements to the bus services, improvements to taxis, improvements for pedestrians, cyclists, motorcyclists, measures for disabled etc. All of that – please do.

I also stress that, regardless of my own personal view, whatever is decided today – *whatever* is decided today – the Environment Board will implement in full as quickly as possible, subject only to resources being available. This is not to be taken as a negative comment, rather an acceptance there is a lot of work to be done and the sooner we start, the better. So can we park that? Pardon the pun.

My concerns about paid parking, I am afraid, still remain. I could go through all the reasons – the operational, the unfairness all of that – but I think Members have aired that fully. I could repeat it but then why repeat it?

I thought it was quite interesting to see that Deputy Queripel talked about parking being an economic enabler and I thought it was also interesting that the argument that the land was a valuable resource... Well, if you follow that logic, it applies to all other car parks in public ownership, including the hospital and maybe even the schools and whatever.

Just one other thing: Deputy St Pier has alluded to the benefits in kind as actually being an integral part of the paid parking. If Members – and I accept and I acknowledge Deputy Burford's point about paid parking being an integral part, in her view, of her strategy... but I would just ask you very briefly to turn to page 774. It is always good to finish with a few figures. It just livens the day up. If you look on the left hand side of that chart, you will see there that the income from the new charges will be £3,150,000 – that is the £4,150,000 less the £1 million because they reduced loss of fuel duty with less car usage – and then of course the £400,000 for the fuel duty is back in. If you look on the right-hand side, you will see that having the free buses, expanding the bus network, replacing previous cuts to the bus contract, bus infrastructure, cycle infrastructure, pedestrian infrastructure, public realm improvements, disability transport measures and, if you want them, the vehicle subsidies come to £3.25 million.

In other words, what I am saying is that without paid parking at this time, you can fund all of the improvements – which were all agreed on, I believe. And taking in view particular Deputy St Pier's points about the paid parking and the benefits in kind, you could actually do this, start it now, do not introduce the paid parking at the moment. Wait, get the bus figures in, improve the bus service, get these other things in place and then if it is not working come back with what I regard to be draconian proposals. But I will say here and now that if that does not work I will very happily... Well, 'happily' is the wrong word – I will strongly support paid parking.

Thank you, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Chief Minister, do you wish to be *relevé*?

**The Chief Minister (Deputy Le Tocq):** Yes, please, sir. (Laughter)

**The Bailiff:** Well, Members –

**Deputy Domaille:** Do we have to say it all again, sir? (*Laughter*)

3455 **The Bailiff:** – we now come to the vote on the Propositions. You have the amended Propositions before you –

3460 **Deputy Domaille:** Sorry, sir, could I just ask just one thing I did forget? Deputy St Pier suggested we take the paid parking first. Deputy Burford has made it very clear how fundamental it is. I believe it is fundamental as well –

**The Bailiff:** I was just going to say that I will take Proposition 5 first. Deputy Lowe, I think, just wants to declare an interest –

3465 **Deputy Lowe:** Just to reiterate my interest in this matter, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Yes. Right, well, Proposition 5, you have before you. I remind – Yes, Deputy Dorey?

3470 **Deputy Dorey:** I would ask for 5(d) to be voted separately.

3475 **The Bailiff:** Yes, right. I was going to remind you that 5(b) has already been deleted, by the successful Deputy Dorey/Deputy Brouard amendment and that the last five lines or so of Proposition 5 have been deleted, so it now finishes with the words ‘...and as described in paragraphs 46 to 63 of that Minority Report’. Those words following on immediately after 5(d).

I wonder if we are to take... Does anybody wish either 5(a) or 5(c) to be taken separately? No. Well, probably the best think is to take 5(d) separately and then, if that is rejected, to effectively delete it and take the remainder of 5 with that deleted.

3480 That would be the only way to do it. It is slightly odd. It is just a single Proposition. I am not sure that it really – I am looking to Her Majesty’s Comptroller.

**Deputy Fallaize:** Sir, can’t we just vote on 5(a) and (c) first? 5(d) stands. I mean I know it is (d) of 5 but it stands on its own doesn’t it? It is not necessarily integral to the –

3485 **The Bailiff:** Well, 5(a) and (c) are not wholly self-contained because they all end with, ‘... and as described in paragraphs 46 to 63 of that Minority Report.’ (*Interjection*)

**Deputy Fallaize:** No, that bit does not because that bit has been deleted by Deputy Dorey’s amendment.

3490 **The Bailiff:** No, the words, ‘...and as described in paragraphs 46 to 63 of that Minority Report’ remain.

**Deputy Le Pelley:** Sir, the words ‘Minority Report’ occur twice. Can you decide which ones are the ones that have the full stop after it?

3495 **The Bailiff:** Right. As I understand it, the effect of the Deputy Dorey/Brouard amendment – Proposition 5 now begins with the words ‘...to agree that paid parking shall be introduced through’ and we have got (a), (b) has gone, (c) remains, (d) reads ‘...the re-designation of Victoria and Albert Piers and the current disc zone at North Beach into 2.5 hour disc zones, see paragraph 54.3 of that Minority Report,’ – semi colon – ‘and as described in paragraphs 46 to 63 of that Minority Report.’ – full stop. And the remainder of that has been deleted.

3500 **The Comptroller:** Sir, there is also another 5A

3505 **The Bailiff:** Well, there is 5A. I assume we are taking that separately because it is a separate Proposition, but that is how I understand –

**Deputy Fallaize:** Sorry, sir, so the paragraph which starts ‘...and as described in paragraphs 46 to 63’ remain? Is that what..?

3510 **The Bailiff:** Those words remain and there is a full stop after Minority Report.

**Deputy Fallaize:** But they cannot, because it says –



**The Bailiff:** Well, that is what you voted for this morning.

**Deputy Fallaize:** No, number 2 of Deputy Dorey's amendments says, 'in the words following Proposition 5(d) after Minority Report,' – comma, instead of full stop, but there is already a full stop after the 'Minority Report' that you are referring to, sir. Where there is not a full stop is in the 'Minority Report' that appears in the line above.

**The Bailiff:** Yes, but that is in 5(d). The reference is to the words that follow 5(d).  
Madam Comptroller?

**The Comptroller:** Sir, that is correct. It might be worth remembering that amendment is just what resulted from the Queripel/Ogier amendment and that makes it perfectly clear that it was just following that second 'Minority Report' at the time that it was drafted. That is correct, sir.

**The Bailiff:** I mean really it is a single paragraph. It is very difficult, I think, to take 5(d) separately. It could be done. Effectively, we are voting on an amendment to delete 5(d), in effect.

**The Comptroller:** It is a little bit odd, sir. If the States wishes to do that, it can be done. It does look a little odd.

**The Bailiff:** Yes. Deputy Burford?

**Deputy Burford:** Sir, can I ask Deputy Dorey just to mention that the word 'maximum' is included in the text that this refers back to, so I think in some degree what he is trying to achieve is already provided for under the Report?

**The Bailiff:** Well, we cannot have any more speeches. You are wanting 5(d) taken separately? *(Interjection by Deputy Dorey)* You will leave it? So we will vote on 5 as an integral whole in its now amended form and I suspect there will be a request for a recorded vote on Proposition 5. *(Interjections)*

**Deputy Lester Queripel:** I will request that please, sir.

**The Bailiff:** Sorry?

**Deputy Lester Queripel:** I will request a recorded vote, please, sir.

**The Bailiff:** You will request that?

So it is a recorded vote on Proposition 5, which is concerned with paid parking, for the benefit of those at home.

*There was a recorded vote.*

*Proposition 5:*

*Carried – Pour 25, Contre 19, Ne vote pas 1, Absent 2*

POUR	CONTRE	NE VOTE PAS	ABSENT
Alderney Rep. Harvey	Deputy Kuttelwascher	Alderney Rep. Jean	Deputy Storey
Deputy Harwood	Deputy Domaille		Deputy Stewart
Deputy Brehaut	Deputy Langlois		
Deputy Robert Jones	Deputy Lester Queripel		
Deputy Le Clerc	Deputy Gillson		
Deputy Gollop	Deputy Le Pelley		
Deputy Sherbourne	Deputy Trott		
Deputy Conder	Deputy David Jones		
Deputy Bebb	Deputy Laurie Queripel		
Deputy St Pier	Deputy Lowe		
Deputy Ogier	Deputy Spruce		
Deputy Fallaize	Deputy Collins		
Deputy Le Lièvre	Deputy Paint		
Deputy Duquemin	Deputy Brouard		
Deputy Green	Deputy Wilkie		
Deputy Dorey	Deputy De Lisle		
Deputy Le Tocq	Deputy Inglis		
Deputy James	Deputy Sillars		
Deputy Adam	Deputy O'Hara		

Deputy Perrot  
Deputy Burford  
Deputy Soulsby  
Deputy Luxon  
Deputy Quin  
Deputy Hadley

3560 **The Bailiff:** Well, Members, the result of the vote on Proposition 5 was 25 votes in favour, with 19 against and one abstention. I declare it carried.

I suggest we go back to the beginning. I know there was a request that each Proposition be taken separately but is there any objection to taking Propositions 1 to 4 all together as a block? Does anybody wish to...?

3565 Yes, Deputy Brouard?

**Deputy Brouard:** I am quite happy to have number 2 taken separately, sir, if it is no bother.

3570 **The Bailiff:** Perhaps it is easier then just to take them all separately.  
Proposition 1. Those in favour; those against.

*Members voted Pour.*

3575 **The Bailiff:** I declare it carried.  
Proposition 2. Those in favour; those against.

*Members voted Pour.*

3580 **The Bailiff:** I declare that carried.  
Proposition 3. Those in favour; those against.

*Members voted Pour.*

3585 **The Bailiff:** I declare it carried.  
Proposition 4 – First Registration Duty. Those in favour; those against.

*Some Members voted Pour, some Members voted Contre.*

**The Bailiff:** I think we need a recorded vote on that one.

3590 *There was a recorded vote.*

*Proposition 4:*

*Carried – Pour 23, Contre 22, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 2*

**POUR**

Alderney Rep. Harvey  
Deputy Harwood  
Deputy Brehaut  
Deputy Robert Jones  
Deputy Le Clerc  
Deputy Gollop  
Deputy Sherbourne  
Deputy Conder  
Deputy Bebb  
Deputy St Pier  
Deputy Ogier  
Deputy Fallaize  
Deputy Le Lièvre  
Deputy Duquemin  
Deputy Green  
Deputy Dorey  
Deputy Le Tocq  
Deputy James  
Deputy Adam  
Deputy Burford  
Deputy Soulsby  
Deputy Luxon  
Deputy Hadley

**CONTRE**

Alderney Rep. Jean  
Deputy Kuttelwascher  
Deputy Domaille  
Deputy Langlois  
Deputy Lester Queripel  
Deputy Gillson  
Deputy Le Pelley  
Deputy Trott  
Deputy David Jones  
Deputy Laurie Queripel  
Deputy Lowe  
Deputy Spruce  
Deputy Collins  
Deputy Paint  
Deputy Perrot  
Deputy Brouard  
Deputy Wilkie  
Deputy De Lisle  
Deputy Inglis  
Deputy Sillars  
Deputy O'Hara  
Deputy Quin

**NE VOTE PAS**

None

**ABSENT**

Deputy Storey  
Deputy Stewart

3595 **The Bailiff:** Well, Members, the result of the vote of Proposition 4 was 23 votes in favour, with 22 against. I declare it carried.

We move on then to Proposition 5A which was inserted by the successful Deputy Soulsby/Deputy Le Clerc amendment this morning. I just remind you of the wording:

‘5A To direct the Environment Department to publish annually on the States of Guernsey website, details of income and expenditure relating to the operation of paid parking’

3600 I put it to you. Those in favour; those against.

*Members voted Pour.*

3605 **The Bailiff:** I declare it carried.

Proposition 6. This is about States’ Members who wish to avail themselves of parking on States days at Lukis House to be £165 per year, starting on 1st November. Those in favour; those against.

*Members voted Pour.*

3610 **The Bailiff:** I declare it carried.

Proposition 7 has been deleted by the successful Deputy Dorey/Deputy Brouard amendment.

We then get to 8. Do we need to continue going through with these individually or can we take a number of them together? Can anybody indicate which is the next one that they would want to have taken separately? (**Several Members:** 12.) Well, let’s take 8 to 11 as a block. Anybody object to that?

3615 **Deputy Lester Queripel:** Sir, can we take 8 individually, please?

**The Bailiff:** Take 8 individually, right.

3620 **Deputy Queripel:** Yes, please.

**The Bailiff:** Proposition 8. Those in favour; those against.

*Some Members voted Pour, some Members voted Contre.*

3625 **The Bailiff:** Sounds to me as if that was carried. But did I hear somebody saying they wanted a recorded vote on that? Deputy Queripel?

3630 **Deputy Lester Queripel:** I would request a recorded vote please, sir, yes.

**The Bailiff:** Recorded vote. This is then on taxing the benefit to employees of employer-provided parking.

*There was a recorded vote.*

3635

*Proposition 8:*

*Carried – Pour 29, Contre 16, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 2*

**POUR**

Alderney Rep. Harvey  
Deputy Harwood  
Deputy Brehaut  
Deputy Robert Jones  
Deputy Le Clerc  
Deputy Gollop  
Deputy Sherbourne  
Deputy Conder  
Deputy Bebb  
Deputy St Pier  
Deputy Gillson  
Deputy Le Pelley  
Deputy Ogier  
Deputy Trott  
Deputy Fallaize  
Deputy Le Lièvre

**CONTRE**

Alderney Rep. Jean  
Deputy Kuttelwascher  
Deputy Domaille  
Deputy Langlois  
Deputy Lester Queripel  
Deputy David Jones  
Deputy Laurie Queripel  
Deputy Lowe  
Deputy Spruce  
Deputy Paint  
Deputy James  
Deputy Brouard  
Deputy De Lisle  
Deputy Inglis  
Deputy O’Hara  
Deputy Quin

**NE VOTE PAS**

None

**ABSENT**

Deputy Storey  
Deputy Stewart

Deputy Collins  
Deputy Duquemin  
Deputy Green  
Deputy Dorey  
Deputy Le Tocq  
Deputy Adam  
Deputy Perrot  
Deputy Wilkie  
Deputy Burford  
Deputy Soulsby  
Deputy Sillars  
Deputy Luxon  
Deputy Hadley

3640 **The Bailiff:** Members the result of the vote on Proposition 8 was 29 votes in favour, 16 against. So I declare it carried.

We then take 9, 10 and 11 together. They deal respectively with park –  
Sorry?

3645 **Deputy Perrot:** I ask that 9 be taken separately.

**The Bailiff:** Right. Proposition 9 – concerned with park and ride. Those in favour; those against.

*Members voted Pour.*

3650 **The Bailiff:** I declare it carried.  
Let's carry on with individual Propositions. Proposition 10 – car sharing. Those in favour; those against.

*Members voted Pour.*

3655 **The Bailiff:** I declare it carried.  
Proposition 11 – learner drivers. Those in favour; those against.

*Members voted Pour.*

3660 **The Bailiff:** I declare it carried.  
Proposition 12, concerned with the bus depot. Those in favour; those against.

*Some Members voted Pour, some Members voted Contre.*

3665 **The Bailiff:** Some people shouted very loudly so it is difficult for me to say how many... I am not going to call that one. I think we need to go to a recorded vote.

*Proposition 12:*

*Carried – Pour 24, Contre 21, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 2*

**POUR**

Alderney Rep. Jean  
Alderney Rep. Harvey  
Deputy Brehaut  
Deputy Robert Jones  
Deputy Gollop  
Deputy Sherbourne  
Deputy Conder  
Deputy Bebb  
Deputy St Pier  
Deputy Le Pelley  
Deputy Ogier  
Deputy Trott  
Deputy Fallaize  
Deputy Le Lièvre  
Deputy Duquemin  
Deputy Green  
Deputy Dorey  
Deputy Le Tocq  
Deputy James  
Deputy Wilkie  
Deputy Burford

**CONTRE**

Deputy Harwood  
Deputy Kuttelwascher  
Deputy Domaille  
Deputy Langlois  
Deputy Le Clerc  
Deputy Lester Queripel  
Deputy Gillson  
Deputy David Jones  
Deputy Laurie Queripel  
Deputy Lowe  
Deputy Spruce  
Deputy Collins  
Deputy Paint  
Deputy Adam  
Deputy Perrot  
Deputy Brouard  
Deputy De Lisle  
Deputy Inglis  
Deputy Sillars  
Deputy O'Hara  
Deputy Quin

**NE VOTE PAS**

None

**ABSENT**

Deputy Storey  
Deputy Stewart

Deputy Soulsby  
Deputy Luxon  
Deputy Hadley

3670

**Deputy Trott:** Sir, while that vote is being counted can I seek your guidance on Proposition 13 and what the consequence(s) of voting down Proposition 13 is/are?

3675

**The Bailiff:** If I can remind Members, Proposition 13 was amended by the Deputy St Pier/Deputy Luxon amendment and then further amended. I think, if it is voted down, the whole Proposition 13 must fall. I suppose your question is: does the Deputy St Pier/Deputy Luxon amendment now revive? I do not think it does.

3680

**Deputy Trott:** It was and it was not. There is no other mechanism but to direct this through you. What I was unclear about was what the *status quo* would become with regard to bus fares? Because we discussed so much about this that I cannot remember what the current situation is.

3685

**The Bailiff:** While Her Majesty's Comptroller reflects on that, (*Laughter*) the vote on Proposition 12 was 24 in favour, 21 against. Proposition 12 was carried.

The Proposition 13, as it now stands:

'13. To approve for a period of 18 months the policies in respect of the costs of bus travel as set out in paragraphs 85 and 87 of that Minority Report, including the policy that bus travel will be free at the point of use, provided [there is] a presumption that at the [end] of that period of 18 months a fare structure shall be introduced along the lines [recommended] by G A Deputy St Pier and Deputy P A Luxon... unless [the States resolves otherwise before then].'

So I think the status is that it will be free bus fares for 18 months unless the States resolve to continue the free bus fares beyond that. If they do not so resolve then the charge will kick in after 18 months.

3690

**Deputy Trott:** What I am saying is if 13 is voted down and we return to the current situation – the *status quo* – can someone remind me precisely what that is?

3695

**The Bailiff:** But I am not sure that... The present *status quo* is not subject to a States' Resolution, I do not believe, so I do not think there would be a States' Resolution governing the bus fares. It would be a matter, I would assume, for the Environment Department to set. I think that must be right.

**Deputy Trott:** That was precisely my understanding. Thank you, sir. (*Laughter*)

3700

**The Bailiff:** Thank you, Deputy Trott.  
So we vote on Proposition 13. Those in favour; those against.

*Members voted Pour.*

3705

**The Bailiff:** Despite some loud voices against, I believe that was carried by a fairly hefty majority. I declare 13 carried.

Do we need to carry on taking them individually or can we take a block of Propositions together? Proposition 17, you want to have taken separately? (*Interjections*) Propositions 14 to 17, it is suggested we can take together. Proposition 14 concerns taxi licences, 15 is also about taxi provision, 16 relates to motorcycling and 17 the cycling infrastructure. Is everybody happy that those four are taken together? Yes.

3710

So I put to you Propositions 14 to 17. Those in favour, those against.

*Members voted Pour.*

3715

**The Bailiff:** I declare them all carried.  
Proposition 18 – the Proposition relating to presumed liability for greater protection of cyclists and pedestrians. Those in favour; those against.

*Some Members voted Pour, some Members voted Contre.*

3720

**The Bailiff:** I think it was carried but to be safe I think we should go to a recorded vote.

*Proposition 18:*

*Carried – Pour 23, Contre 22, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 2*

POUR	CONTRE	NE VOTE PAS	ABSENT
Alderney Rep. Jean	Alderney Rep. Harvey	None	Deputy Storey
Deputy Harwood	Deputy Kuttelwascher		Deputy Stewart
Deputy Brehaut	Deputy Langlois		
Deputy Domaille	Deputy Robert Jones		
Deputy Gollop	Deputy Le Clerc		
Deputy Sherbourne	Deputy Lester Queripel		
Deputy Conder	Deputy Gillson		
Deputy Bebb	Deputy Le Pelley		
Deputy St Pier	Deputy David Jones		
Deputy Ogier	Deputy Laurie Queripel		
Deputy Trott	Deputy Lowe		
Deputy Fallaize	Deputy Le Lièvre		
Deputy Duquemin	Deputy Spruce		
Deputy Green	Deputy Collins		
Deputy Dorey	Deputy Paint		
Deputy Le Tocq	Deputy James		
Deputy Adam	Deputy Perrot		
Deputy Burford	Deputy Brouard		
Deputy Inglis	Deputy Wilkie		
Deputy Soulsby	Deputy De Lisle		
Deputy Luxon	Deputy Sillars		
Deputy O'Hara	Deputy Quin		
Deputy Hadley			

**The Bailiff:** Closer than I thought.

3725 Well, Members, the result of the vote on Proposition 18 was 23 in favour, 22 against. I declare it carried.

Can we take the next block of Propositions together, starting at Proposition 19 – walking and pedestrian infrastructure, Proposition 20 – travel plans for businesses, schools and States' departments, 21 – the proposed review of commercial vehicle activity...? Stop me anybody, if you want to.

Proposition 22 –

3730

**Deputy Perrot:** I would like to be the sole voice voting against the Proposition.

**The Bailiff:** Which one? 22. Right.

We will take 19, 20 and 21 together. Those in favour; those against.

3735

*Members voted Pour.*

**The Bailiff:** I declare 19, 20 and 21 all carried.

Proposition 22. Those in favour; those against.

3740

*Members voted Pour.*

**The Bailiff:** I think you won on volume but not on numbers, Deputy Perrot. (*Laughter*) Proposition 22 is carried.

3745 Proposition 23 is concerned with disabled people, 24 concerns the vision and recommendations in paragraph 154 of the Minority – (*Interjection*) Proposition 23 – separately? Right.

Those in favour of 23; those against.

*Members voted Pour.*

3750

**The Bailiff:** I declare 23 carried.

Let's take 24 separately. Those in favour; those against.

*Members voted Pour.*

3755

**The Bailiff:** Proposition 25 we will take separately. I remind you that 25 has been amended by the Deputy Dorey/Deputy Brouard amendment, so that 25(b) now reads,

'Income from paid parking but not including parking clocks as set out in paragraphs 46 to 55 and 57 to 63 of that Minority Report.'

3760 The words 'but not' have been inserted.  
So Proposition 25. Those in favour; those against.

*Members voted Pour.*

3765 **The Bailiff:** I declare it carried.  
Let's take the next one separately. Proposition 26. Those in favour; those against.

*Members voted Pour.*

3770 **The Bailiff:** I declare it carried.  
Proposition 27:

'... to approve a transfer from the Budget Reserve of up to £835,000... to fund implementation of the strategy.'

Those in favour; those against.

3775 *Some Members voted Pour, some Members voted Contre.*

**The Bailiff:** Close again. I think it is carried. Does anybody wish that to be – ?

3780 **A Member:** Yes, please, sir. I will have a recorded vote.

**The Bailiff:** Yes. A recorded vote on 27.

*Proposition 27:*

*Carried – Pour 34, Contre 10, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 3*

**POUR**

Alderney Rep. Jean  
Alderney Rep. Harvey  
Deputy Harwood  
Deputy Brehaut  
Deputy Domaille  
Deputy Langlois  
Deputy Robert Jones  
Deputy Le Clerc  
Deputy Gollop  
Deputy Sherbourne  
Deputy Conder  
Deputy Bebb  
Deputy St Pier  
Deputy Gillson  
Deputy Ogier  
Deputy Trott  
Deputy Fallaize  
Deputy Le Lièvre  
Deputy Spruce  
Deputy Collins  
Deputy Duquemin  
Deputy Green  
Deputy Dorey  
Deputy Le Tocq  
Deputy James  
Deputy Perrot  
Deputy Wilkie  
Deputy Burford  
Deputy Inglis  
Deputy Soulsby  
Deputy Luxon  
Deputy O'Hara  
Deputy Quin  
Deputy Hadley

**CONTRE**

Deputy Kuttelwascher  
Deputy Lester Queripel  
Deputy Le Pelley  
Deputy David Jones  
Deputy Laurie Queripel  
Deputy Lowe  
Deputy Paint  
Deputy Adam  
Deputy Brouard  
Deputy De Lisle

**NE VOTE PAS**

None

**ABSENT**

Deputy Storey  
Deputy Stewart  
Deputy Sillars

3785 **The Bailiff:** Members of the States, the record of those votes passed on Proposition 27 was 34 in favour, 10 against. I declare it carried.  
Next we have Proposition 28. Those in favour; those against.

3790 *Members voted Pour.*

**The Bailiff:** I declare it carried.

And, finally, Proposition 29. Those in favour; those against.

3795 *Members voted Pour.*

**The Bailiff:** I declare it carried.

That brings us to the close of today's business. We will resume at 9.30 a.m. tomorrow with Volume 2 of Billet IX.

*The Assembly adjourned at 6.04 p.m.*