

States of Jersey  
States Assembly



États de Jersey  
Assemblée des États

# Environment Scrutiny Panel

## Sustainable Transport Policy Review



Presented to the States on 12th November 2010

S.R. 13/2010



# Contents

Chairman's foreword .....	2
1. Introduction.....	4
2. Terms of Reference.....	6
3. Panel membership .....	6
4. Methodology.....	7
5. Summary of key findings .....	8
6. Recommendations .....	11
7. The need for a Sustainable Transport Policy.....	14
7.1 How are these points considered in the policy? .....	14
7.2 Vision and targets .....	15
7.3 Consultation and research .....	16
8. Improving public transport .....	19
8.1 Main bus service .....	19
8.2 Extended hours .....	19
8.3 Bus priority .....	21
8.4 The fleet .....	21
8.5 Fares .....	24
8.6 School buses.....	25
8.7 Town hopper service .....	27
8.8 Park and ride.....	27
8.9 The taxi service .....	28
9. Parking .....	30
9.1 Commuter versus shopper parking .....	30
9.2 Parking costs.....	30
10. The road network.....	35
10.1 Town centre pedestrian priority .....	35
10.2 Beaumont Hill / Route de la Haule junction .....	37
10.3 Cycling provision .....	38
10.4 Road safety .....	41
11. Smarter travel choices .....	43
11.1 Promoting cycling .....	43
11.2 Cycle rental .....	43
11.3 Travel plans for work place and school .....	43
11.4 Funding implications.....	43
11.5 Personal travel planning.....	44
12. Vehicle choices.....	45
12.1 Motorcycles .....	45
12.2 Electric bicycles.....	45
12.3 Vehicle emissions duty (VED) and commercial vehicles .....	45
12.4 Road worthiness and emissions testing .....	45
12.5 Commercial vehicle operator licences.....	46
12.6 Agricultural vehicles .....	46
13. Benefits, costs, timing and monitoring .....	48
13.1 Benefits .....	48
13.2 Costs .....	49
Appendices .....	51

## Chairman's foreword

Ideas for a Sustainable Transport Policy have been around in one form or another for over ten years. It was therefore a surprise when my Panel first became involved in early 2009, to discover that it was not – in the Panel's opinion at least – close to being a finished article. The Panel agreed to look at proposals from the department as they evolved, and I must thank Deputy Daniel Wimberley, my Vice Chairman, for volunteering as lead member on this issue. He has spent a lot of hours in meetings representing the Panel, sharing his experience and knowledge with both fellow Panel members and the department.

Additional consultation has improved the current STP over previous versions, but in the view of the Panel it remains very much a work in progress. There are various reasons for this.

Given the times we are in, it was always going to be difficult for the Minister to obtain generous funding for a new policy. However, the allocation of £500,000 per annum is seen as unrealistic for a policy that is expected to deliver measurable benefits and transform the way people think about travel, especially when the same sum is not even expected to be enough to complete the Eastern Cycle Route. The Panel believes that for the policy to be a success, the Minister will need to find ways to release further funding.

The department has tried to square the circle by producing a policy that promises progress in a lot of areas, without the resources needed to guarantee delivery. A substantial proportion of the budget (£200,000) is expected to be tied up in the first two years in interim improvements to the bus service, prior to the start of the next contract in 2013; which leaves little real money for other policy initiatives in the short term.

The Panel is also concerned that a lot of the policy content revolves around discussion of challenges and possible solutions at a high level, rather than getting down to the nitty-gritty of what the department will actually do. The Minister has explained his reluctance to go into detail in a policy document, but in the Panel's view this has led to a lack of transparency in many areas. For a policy that has been so long in coming, too many recommendations still involve proposals for more study.

In talks the Panel also emphasised the need for the policy to capture the public's imagination by adopting some headline measures that would highlight really positive changes. That has not happened; the policy remains (in members' eyes) overcautious in a number of key areas, and unclear in others.

It is therefore hard to know quite how to treat this policy. It presents many good ideas, but lacks concrete or really imaginative proposals, ultimately coming across as more of a wish-list than a definitive policy. Even where the Panel knows that a lot of background work has been done by the department or its consultants, there seems to be some reluctance to commit to specific measures. As things stand, even if it is adopted States Members and the public will not be 100% certain which aspects of the policy will be followed up and which won't.

A lack of specific targets in the policy in respect of many issues is also seen as a missed opportunity. The overall targets outlined (reduction in peak hour traffic, increase in bus passengers, etc.) are obviously broadly welcome, but the Panel would like to see much more emphasis on sustainable and environmental aspects such as air and noise pollution, pedestrian and cycling schemes, and how progress will be monitored. Bus improvements for commuters and changes to parking and charges are seen as being firmly in the department's comfort zone; the Panel believes more attention needs to be focused elsewhere for the policy to be seen as truly sustainable and gain maximum support from the public.

Overall, while supporting the department's aims the Panel lacks some confidence that what is proposed can actually be achieved within the framework set out in the policy, especially with limited resources. Members would like to see a rather different emphasis, giving more prominence to environmental targets and the development of sustainable networks to support a wide range of travel choices.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Phil Rondel". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke at the end.

Deputy P Rondel  
Chairman, Environment Panel

# 1. Introduction

The need for a coordinated transport policy for the Island has long been recognised. A former 'States Sustainable Travel and Transport Plan' was agreed as far back as 1999, but did not receive funding. The first draft of an 'Integrated Travel and Transport Plan' (ITTP) was subsequently submitted to the Council of Ministers in November 2006, before going out to consultation. The current Environment Scrutiny Panel first became involved with the policy in March 2009, when the Minister for Transport and Technical Services gave a presentation and then met with the Panel to discuss the ITTP. The Panel's conclusion was one of disappointment that the plan still appeared to need a lot of work.

The Transport and Technical Services Department engaged UK consultants for bus services and sustainable transport to advise on the policy. The Environment Panel attended briefings with consultants and met with the Minister in March 2010 to discuss the now renamed Sustainable Transport Policy (STP). Subsequently Vice Chairman Deputy Daniel Wimberley represented the Panel at a series of meetings in April 2010 at which proposals for the policy were discussed in more detail.

It was agreed that the Panel would review the new document and publish its comments prior to a States debate on the new policy. Given the extensive consultation already undertaken by the department and a relatively limited timescale the Panel decided not to engage an independent adviser for this review, so comments in the current report represent the views of the Panel based on information provided, rather than an in-depth technical analysis. Following its review of the draft policy the Panel held a public hearing with the Minister on 18<sup>th</sup> October 2010.

The STP promotes a vision of an Island where people think harder about their transport choices and consider the environmental and social costs attached to their decisions. It aims to persuade people to consider and use alternatives to the private car for their personal transport needs on a regular basis, in order to reduce congestion, pollution, consumption of fossil fuels and the number of accidents on our roads, as well as increasing the general health of the population through exercise gained walking and cycling as part of their regular journeys.

The Panel endorses the overall aims of the STP and sees it as a step forward from the earlier plan. While still aspirational, it places more emphasis on changes that will be needed if the department's vision of a less congested and car-dependent society is to have a realistic chance of success. However, the level of funding available for the policy raises real doubts about whether this will be sufficient to deliver the benefits intended.

In the current financial climate the Panel recognises that the department has a difficult job and needs to be realistic about the funding it can call on. However, members feel that there are opportunities for some 'big wins' in areas that the policy does not seem to be actively considering, which could be achieved at little or no cost. There are also concerns about whether some proposals which the policy does follow up actually go far enough to bring about the changes that are sought. Members see the policy as over-cautious in a number of areas.

As a 'high-level' policy document to the States it was not expected that the STP should go into minute detail about how specific aims would be implemented. Nevertheless, in the Panel's view there is some lack of essential detail. In numerous instances the document outlines the department's thought processes and attitudes, but gives no clear indication as to the way forward on a particular issue. In others it goes into greater detail about proposals for which there appears to be no immediate prospect of funding. As a result, much of the policy is hedged with uncertainties as to whether or how it will be followed through in practice; this makes it very difficult to judge how likely it is that specific aspects may succeed.

The Panel also senses reluctance on the part of the department to commit to potential 'headline' measures which members believe could gain wider public recognition and acceptance of the need for change.

This is a policy which needs to win hearts and minds. Doing too little risks failing to deliver on key objectives, without which public support may be lost; but going too far could alienate the travelling public. To succeed, the policy needs to strike a balance between 'easy-wins' and measures that may be less popular, but are needed to deliver the social, economic and environmental benefits which the Policy would achieve. The Panel considers that it is moving in the right direction, but in several areas a more explicit commitment to focus funds on what is most needed could help to give both the States and the Jersey public confidence that the long-awaited Sustainable Transport Policy can do what it says on the tin.

## 2. Terms of Reference

### Environment Scrutiny Panel Terms of Reference

#### Review of Sustainable Transport Policy

This review is being undertaken by the Environment Scrutiny Panel to consider the draft Sustainable Transport Policy, its overall aims and objectives, and the particular benefits and resource implications of implementing individual recommendations contained within it.

In so doing the Panel will examine the following issues.

1. Whether the recommendations can be expected to meet the policy aims, including:
  - reducing reliance on the private car by providing practical alternatives
  - reducing traffic congestion, particularly at peak hours
  - increasing bus use, cycling and walking at peak hours
  - increasing school bus use and the numbers of children cycling to school
  - reducing pollution
  - reducing injury rates caused by road accidents
2. Whether the recommendations are feasible, sufficiently challenging, meet the needs and aspirations of the general public and will lead beyond interim improvements to a genuinely sustainable public transport infrastructure.
3. Whether the policy:
  - will enable safe and convenient travel for all
  - offers equity of access across generations/physical abilities
  - is adequately funded

The Panel will report its findings to the States.

## 3. Panel membership



The Environment Scrutiny Panel is constituted as follows:

Deputy Phil Rondel, Chairman	(Member for St John)
Deputy Daniel Wimberley, Vice Chairman	(Member for St Mary)
Connétable John Refault	(St Peter)

Officer Support: M Haden and M Orbell



## 4. Methodology

The Panel was first invited to comment on the draft Integrated Travel and Transport Plan early in 2009. The Panel forwarded its conclusions in a letter to the Minister in May<sup>1</sup>. The letter gave reasons why members found the plan unsatisfactory:

- Much of its rationale was based on economic factors or assumptions that either no longer applied, or seemed increasingly uncertain. Fuel costs, increasing population, economic growth, rising demand for transport, continued housing development outside St Helier and the delivery of the Waterfront Development were cited as examples
- Assumptions were made within the plan about social factors which were not felt to be adequately supported by evidence. Widespread public support for 'green' initiatives was assumed, despite increasing financial hardship and rising unemployment
- Targets within the plan appeared to be inconsistent and unsupported by evidence as to how they could be met
- The draft plan did not contain any individual elements that could be expected to bring about major improvements, and numerous recommendations simply referred to a need for further studies

The Panel highlighted a need for changes to the existing bus service as a priority.

In September 2009 the Panel Chairman wrote again to the Minister following Panel consideration of the Sustainable Transport Policy 'vision' document<sup>2</sup>. This letter expressed disappointment that the vision did not appear to take account a number of the concerns highlighted in its previous correspondence about the ITTP.

In February 2010 Panel members were invited to a presentation given by consultants to the Transport and Technical Services Department, engaged to advise on possible improvements to the bus service. The Panel's observations were again reported to the Minister by letter<sup>3</sup>.

The Panel met with the Minister and his officers on 30<sup>th</sup> March 2010 to discuss the latest draft of the STP and the department's desired timetable for bringing the policy to the States. It was decided that further meetings to consider the policy in more detail would be beneficial and Deputy Wimberley met with the Assistant Minister and department officers on 12<sup>th</sup>, 13<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> April 2010.

It was agreed that the Panel would submit its comments to the States prior to any debate on the STP. Following its presentation to the Council of Ministers the Panel received a copy of the Minister's final policy document on 19<sup>th</sup> July 2010. This report is based on that document, although comparisons may be made with previous drafts where relevant.

The Minister was invited to a public hearing to discuss his policy in the light of the Panel's findings on 18th October 2010. The transcript of that meeting can be found on the Scrutiny website, [www.scrutiny.gov.je](http://www.scrutiny.gov.je)

---

<sup>1</sup> Appendix 1 - Letter to Minister for Transport and Technical Services, 5<sup>th</sup> May 2009

<sup>2</sup> Appendix 2 - Letter to Minister for Transport and Technical Services, 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2009

<sup>3</sup> Appendix 3 - Letter to Minister for Transport and Technical Services, 23<sup>rd</sup> February 2010

## **5. Summary of key findings**

- 1. Air pollution and associated health risks are not considered in detail in the policy**
- 2. Noise pollution is not addressed in the policy**
- 3. There is a lack of detailed targets in the policy relating to broader environmental issues and sustainability**
- 4. The department's action plans are not made sufficiently clear in many areas of the policy**
- 5. The policy appears to be partly based on an assumption that parking charges will need to be increased by more than the rate of inflation**
- 6. There is evidence that demand for car parking may be price sensitive**
- 7. Bus services after 6.00pm do not adequately meet the needs of employees working outside of normal office hours, or customers of businesses that are open for trade in the evening**
- 8. The bus service represents the only affordable means of transport for large numbers of residents who do not possess a car, yet evening services to most parts of the Island are inadequate**
- 9. Passengers departing Liberation Station on the limited late evening services are not able to use its facilities as the station closes early**
- 10. Practical and affordable opportunities for applying bus priority schemes in Jersey are limited by the size of existing roads; in most cases significant investment would be required to create additional bus lanes**
- 11. Passenger comfort is inadequate for many people on existing buses owing to insufficient space between seats**
- 12. Current arrangements for accommodating wheelchairs, child buggies and luggage on buses have been criticised and can vary between vehicles and services**
- 13. Bicycles cannot currently be carried on buses**
- 14. The current bus fleet is comprised of conventional diesel-powered vehicles which tend to be noisy and have relatively high levels of emissions**
- 15. The use of alternative fuels in commercial and other vehicles is not considered in any detail in the policy**
- 16. Current arrangements for discounted weekly and monthly bus tickets are date-limited and inflexible, so would not encourage occasional bus use**
- 17. The additional burden of school travel by car during term times is seen as tipping the balance between 'acceptable' and 'unacceptable' levels of congestion**
- 18. Just over half of parents responding to the 2006 Jersey Annual Social Survey indicated that they would make greater use of an improved school bus service**

- 19. The indicative budget for travel plans in the policy is just £40,000 to cover all States departments and schools; this is considered unlikely to be sufficient to deliver results in both areas**
- 20. Proposals to employ a part-time schools travel coordinator to ensure that all schools adopt a travel plan by 2015 are a step in the right direction but it is considered that additional resources will be required**
- 21. The Panel welcomes proposals for a new hopper bus service which could reduce the demand for on-street parking in town and improve access for shoppers and visitors**
- 22. The policy does not support large scale park and ride operations owing to constraints on land use and costs. Development of a 'bespoke' park and ride scheme is not considered appropriate by the department, although smaller informal solutions are encouraged**
- 23. There is evidence of public dissatisfaction with aspects of existing taxi and cab services; charges and availability feature amongst other concerns**
- 24. There is currently no integration of taxis with other public transport services**
- 25. There are disparities between regulated and unregulated taxi services which appear to cause difficulties within the industry and are potentially confusing to customers**
- 26. There is no evidence of majority public support for a reduction in availability of commuter parking, or for increased charges**
- 27. Existing bus services do not provide adequate alternatives to the use of the private car for most residents**
- 28. The majority of commuters are expected to continue to use the private car for some years to come**
- 29. The eco-friendly parking permit scheme does not take account of significant reductions in emissions for all new cars. It has limited environmental benefits but is exceptionally generous to a small number of owners, in direct conflict with the aim of the policy to reduce overall car use. If continued, States parking income will reduce substantially as the number of qualifying vehicles increases, leading to pressure to increase parking charges for others**
- 30. It is unclear from the policy whether proposals for the pedestrianisation of Halkett Place (south of Waterloo Street) will be progressed to completion**
- 31. There is no clarity concerning proposals in the policy for shared space schemes, traffic calming, cycle network routes and improved pedestrian facilities in the town area**
- 32. Studies of the Beaumont junction have not come up with a cost effective solution to congestion problems; remedies considered would necessitate construction of a new road for which land would have to be acquired, presumably by compulsory purchase**
- 33. An appropriate level of priority is given to cycling in the policy and there is a good understanding of strategic considerations and the practical steps required in promoting cycling**
- 34. The different elements of policy as they affect cycling are not brought together in the policy**
- 35. The benefits of increasing the numbers of people cycling are not clearly stated**

- 36. Although the policy identifies safety as a key issue if cycling is to be promoted effectively and in a responsible manner, there is little detail on how this issue should be addressed**
- 37. The benefits of liaising with cyclists are not explored in the policy**
- 38. Policy statements on road safety appear reassuring, but lack substance. A lack of specific proposals or targets other than to 're-establish a reducing trend' of accident injuries and move towards an aspirational 'vision zero' target is not considered to constitute a sufficiently robust approach to road safety issues**
- 39. There is no specific consideration of marketing incentives for people to change their travel habits in the policy, nor is there any indication where this might be possible within the indicative budget**
- 40. Comments in the policy concerning a possible need for additional incentives to compensate for the possible effects of VED on the replacement of commercial vehicles are considered to be premature**
- 41. VED is not considered to be an appropriate method of taxation for large commercial vehicles, which have substantially higher emissions than private cars or light vans**
- 42. Emissions and/or road worthiness testing would almost inevitably result in considerable additional costs to owners of private vehicles; the benefits have not been clearly established**
- 43. Evidence of an increasing number of defects in commercial vehicles tested following roadside checks suggests that there is a need for operators of commercial vehicles to be licensed**
- 44. Benefits of the policy are not identified as specific savings targets**
- 45. The policy does not clearly identify any means by which the public would be kept informed of progress towards achieving its aims**
- 46. The budget allocated to the policy is not considered adequate to achieve its intended purpose; some aspects may therefore have to be dropped or delayed**

## **6. Recommendations**

- 1. Both air and noise pollution should be followed up in detail to support the policy, with baseline levels, targets and success criteria defined**
- 2. Specific information should be provided to support policy targets for environmental sustainability**
- 3. The department should set out targets and a clear programme for action in respect of each individual policy aim**
- 4. The issue of raising parking charges needs to be handled with care, balancing the need to achieve the desired modal shift with the need for people's travel needs to be met in an affordable way. A range of affordable and practical alternative travel choices must be in place before any increases to parking charges are applied**
- 5. Later bus services should be made available on the majority of routes departing Liberation Station. More regular services should also be provided on all major routes to enable residents to spend an evening out in other parts of the Island and still return to St Helier by bus**
- 6. Liberation Station should remain open longer in the evenings to accommodate passengers using later services**
- 7. Consideration should be given to possibilities for extending the use of Liberation Station as a multi-purpose transport hub**
- 8. Bus priority schemes should only be pursued where significant costs would not be incurred, for example where sufficient lanes already exist to permit a bus lane to be created on a trial basis**
- 9. Passenger seating should be adequately spaced on all vehicles ordered or brought into service from now on to improve access and comfort for passengers of average or larger physique; wherever possible existing vehicles should be modified to address recognised problems with seat comfort**
- 10. All buses should have access for wheelchair users and children in buggies. They should also have facilities for passengers to carry a reasonable quantity of luggage**
- 11. The department should continue to investigate options for the carriage of a limited number of bicycles on all regular buses, whether on external racks or internally, with a view to offering this facility on all new buses (and retrofitting to older vehicles where appropriate)**
- 12. The department should take a pro-active stance on alternative, more environmentally friendly fuels such as L.P.G. and bio-diesel rather than postponing consideration of alternatives**
- 13. Possibilities for purchasing new gas-powered vehicles or converting existing buses should be investigated in depth and if technically and economically feasible, specified as part of the new bus contract**
- 14. More flexible ticketing options including Smart Cards should be progressed to encourage people to use buses as an occasional alternative to the car**

- 15. The needs-based review of school pupil travel patterns and potential for increased patronage of school buses is supported. The target of increasing school bus use by 20% by 2015 is considered potentially unambitious and should be revisited in the light of the review's findings**
- 16. The budget for travel plans should be reviewed and consideration given to seeking expert assistance from consultants with a track record of success in delivering travel plans to local authorities and schools to maximise the benefits**
- 17. The Panel would prefer to see the hopper bus introduced as a free service as it believes this would encourage maximum use and bring faster recognition of the benefits of leaving the car at home. Failing this, a flat low fee for unlimited use on a daily or other basis would be recommended**
- 18. Even greater benefits could be realised if the hopper service was coordinated with an overall plan to increase pedestrianisation and cycle priority schemes in St Helier**
- 19. The department should take an active role in identifying and developing small scale park and ride sites in suitable areas, in consultation with parishes. This would allow the development of a recognised network of approved parking and drop-off points which could be planned and integrated into the future bus network, rather than relying on ad hoc solutions**
- 20. The department's review of taxi services should be brought forward to ensure implementation of necessary changes within a shorter timescale than currently proposed, i.e. before 2015**
- 21. Car parking charges should not be used as a lever to 'persuade' people to change their mode of transport unless other positive measures have been tried and their results assessed**
- 22. If parking charges are increased above inflation at any point in the future, any increase in income which may result should be hypothecated for improvements to alternative sustainable transport provision**
- 23. Assuming that the STP is the model for the future and the department has confidence in it, the Panel considers that there would be merit in using an element of the Car Park Trading Fund to stimulate travel choice initiatives**
- 24. The eco-friendly parking permit scheme should be dropped, or reviewed taking into account emissions levels of new cars, the aims of the Sustainable Transport Policy, and likely costs and benefits to the States of continuing the scheme**
- 25. The department should review proposals for extending pedestrianisation contained in the EDAW strategy with the Parish of St Helier and the Planning Department, with a view to developing plans to trial more extensive pedestrian and cycling zones in the town centre, subject to appropriate consultation with residents and commercial interests**
- 26. Large scale redevelopment of the Beaumont junction should not be pursued at this time. However, any possibilities for incremental improvements to ease traffic flow through the area which do not involve major costs (such as conversion of the existing perquage car park crossing) should be followed up**
- 27. All policy elements relating to cycling, both strategic and practical, should be brought together in one document setting out a 'roadmap for cycling'**

- 28. A sustained commitment to cycling over the lifetime of the policy should be stated, with a budget, organisational structure, timescales and targets worked out no later than the end of 2011**
- 29. Issues around cyclists and road safety should be a specific focus of the road safety task group**
- 30. The policy statements on road safety and a 'reducing trend' for accident injuries should be treated as an interim position and replaced with more specific and robust targets to be developed by the road safety task group within an agreed timeframe**
- 31. All proposals for road improvements or alterations should include detailed consideration of safety implications for all road users, not just private cars or public transport**
- 32. Marketing incentives should be considered to promote the use of new or improved bus services, encourage greater uptake of under-used services and promote alternative transport choices**
- 33. The department should work with the Treasury to develop an appropriate mechanism to deal with the taxation of larger commercial vehicles based on their higher emissions levels, rather than seeking ways to incentivise owners to replace older vehicles**
- 34. Emissions and MOT style testing for privately owned vehicles should not be pursued at this time**
- 35. Commercial vehicle operator licensing is supported, and should include requirements for training and professional competence as well as vehicle maintenance and compliance with emissions standards**
- 36. The department should prioritise opportunities for maximum benefit at low or no cost, such as developing pedestrianisation and cycle network schemes**
- 37. Spending should be clearly prioritised and targeted on essential, rather than 'nice-to-have' items, structured as a rolling programme to ensure maximum benefits from money spent in each area rather than attempting to cover a whole range of policy objectives with limited funding**
- 38. To give the policy a greater chance of success, the Panel believes that the Minister will need to identify additional and innovative sources of funding**

## 7. The need for a Sustainable Transport Policy

The policy's executive summary refers to the States Strategic Plan and goes on to specify in bullet points<sup>1</sup> the reasons why we need to change the way we travel:

We need to change the way we travel about our island in order to:

- **reduce congestion;**
- **reduce local air and noise pollution;**
- **reduce our greenhouse gas emissions;**
- **increase our levels of physical activity;**
- **protect and improve the built environment;**
- **reduce the number of road injuries;**
- **provide access for everyone; and**
- **reduce oil dependency.**

### 7.1 How are these points considered in the policy?

The Panel believes that all of the points listed above are important. It was therefore somewhat surprised to discover that only four of the nine 'reasons for change' are given any detailed consideration in the policy. There are very limited references to air and noise pollution (noise is scarcely mentioned); protecting and improving the built environment; providing access for everyone; and reducing oil dependency. While it could be argued that some of these topics fall partly under other initiatives or policies (e.g. the draft Island Plan, draft Energy Policy, forthcoming Air Quality Strategy), the Panel believes for a number of reasons that rather more detailed information in all of these areas would benefit the policy.

Members are particularly concerned that the concept of access for all has not been specifically addressed, as it is considered that this is a fundamental premise that should underpin the entire policy. 12% of households in the Island (and 24% in St Helier) do not have access to a car; the Panel believes that the current bus network and timetable conspicuously fail to address their travel needs.

The absence of detail on air and noise pollution is also a key concern, as the Panel strongly believes that achieving cleaner air and quieter roads for residents should be considered as priorities in their own right, rather than as side-benefits of other aspects of the policy.

Many scientific studies have pointed to urban air pollution as a possible factor in a range of health problems, including asthma, cancers and premature mortality. A recent example from McGill University and the University of Montreal<sup>2</sup> indicates possible links between exposure to traffic pollution and increased risk of breast cancer.

Noise is also associated with various negative health effects. Exposure to road traffic noise can lead to annoyance, sleep-disturbance, stress and negative impacts on concentration and cognitive performance<sup>3</sup>.

There is only the briefest mention of health risks from transport-derived pollution in the policy, which focuses instead on the potential health benefits of increased exercise through travel.

---

<sup>1</sup> Sustainable Transport Policy p.8

<sup>2</sup> Published in Environmental Health Perspectives, 6<sup>th</sup> October 2010

<sup>3</sup> Source: ENHIS project (European Health Environment Information System)



In the Panel's view, if the policy does not include consideration of any baseline data for the pollution currently generated by road transport, its success or otherwise in reducing these hazards will be hard to assess. Members would like to see this information included, together with specific, measurable targets to be achieved during the life of the policy. It is felt that this would greatly strengthen the policy's environmental argument for people to leave their cars at home, which could be a significant motivating factor.

The Panel considers that the lack of measurable targets in a number of policy areas is a potential weakness which could militate against success. Other policy aims will be discussed further in the appropriate sections of this report.

### **Key findings**

1. Air pollution and associated health risks are not considered in detail in the policy
2. Noise pollution is not addressed in the policy

### **Recommendation**

1. Both air and noise pollution should be followed up in detail to support the policy, with baseline levels, targets and success criteria defined

## **7.2 Vision and targets**

The policy establishes a primary target of reducing peak hour traffic levels by 15% by 2015, with sub-targets identified as the means of achieving this<sup>1</sup>:

- 100% increase in travel to work by bus
- 100% increase in cycling to work
- 20% increase in walking to work
- 20% increase in school bus use
- 100% increase in cycling to school

When the Panel first looked at the draft ITTP it had concerns that the rationale for some targets was not clear. There are some big differences in the new policy, ie:

- Increase in bus use – UP from 50% to 100%
- Increase in cyclists – UP from 50% to 100%
- Increase in walking – DOWN from 50% to 20%

It is understood that these changes and others have arisen as a result of more detailed research since the earlier version. However, as noted above, the Panel believes that the policy would benefit from a broader range of targets, to enable progress in areas other than just traffic management to be assessed. Although this is essentially a transport policy, the concept of sustainability invokes much wider obligations, and success can only be measured against the 'big picture'.

---

<sup>1</sup> Sustainable Transport Policy p.10-11

The policy does acknowledge this in some areas – for example in establishing the hierarchy of transport modes, whereby public and sustainable forms of transport are prioritised over the private car. The Panel believes that this needs to be taken further, so that more of the ways in which individual transport choices can impact on the wider community are taken into account.

Members feel that it would be easier to motivate and incentivise members of the general public to change their travel habits if they were fully informed about the impact their choices have, and how change could benefit everyone. The policy does seek to achieve this, but much of its message is delivered at such a high level that the overall impression gained is that it is predominantly aspirational, rather than practical or achievable. The Panel believes that more concrete information about practicalities and planned measures is needed to get the message across in a positive and convincing way.

### **Key findings**

3. There is a lack of detailed targets in the policy relating to broader environmental issues and sustainability
4. The department's action plans are not made sufficiently clear in many areas of the policy

### **Recommendations**

2. Specific information should be provided to support policy targets for environmental sustainability
3. The department should set out targets and a clear programme for action in respect of each individual policy aim

## **7.3 Consultation and research**

### **7.3.1 Public consultation responses**

Appendices to the policy contain summaries of consultation and research carried out by the department. The Summary of Responses to the Green Paper on Sustainable Transport Policy (Appendix D)<sup>1</sup> gives an indication of the success of the consultation exercise in receiving a large volume of responses, the majority via the internet survey. Many of these were found to be supportive of policy aims, particularly those of reducing congestion and car use overall; there was also very strong support for improvements to the bus service and cycle routes.

The usual caveats in respect of self-selected public surveys apply. The Panel notes that some questions were slanted towards the expected answers (albeit very obviously); so for example respondents were asked if they found current levels of congestion unacceptable (66.5% agreed); and whether the suggested target of a 15% reduction in rush hour term time traffic was 'realistic' (59.5% thought it was 'about right').

Results were not always clear cut. For example, the Green Paper made it plain that a tram/light rail system could not work and would be prohibitively expensive, so it was perhaps a little alarming that 40.6% of respondents were still in favour of introducing one, compared to 39.9% against and 19.6% 'don't know'. Asked if they would consider alternative modes of travel, 46.6% said they would consider using the bus, 39.2% would consider cycling, and 35.8% walking.

---

<sup>1</sup> Sustainable Transport Policy p.103

Respondents were allowed to tick more than one box, and 58.8% already used alternative transport, so it is hard to know exactly how much additional encouragement to take from this, but the fact that only 8.9% indicated that they would not consider any alternative modes suggests there are real opportunities to bring about change.

While the department is rightly pleased at the response to its consultation and is quick to highlight public support where the figures stack up, there seems to have been a little 'cherry-picking' in how other public votes are reported or acted upon. For example, overall indications from the survey appear to show public support for 'soft' measures to positively encourage the use of alternative transport, but a majority opposed to 'hard' approaches such as increased parking charges. (53.4% were opposed to increased charges for commuter parking, compared with 42.1% in favour.)

There are various signals suggesting that increased parking charges are quite high on the department's agenda. In the table on p.11, the column for how policy targets would be encouraged finishes in every case with the phrase '**and parking charge increases**'. This seems to imply that parking charge increases are seen as an essential part of the sustainable transport package. The Panel considers that in the first instance the policy should focus more on positive incentives to encourage and promote modal change, and ensure that these are thoroughly explored and results monitored and assessed before harder measures are considered, although some combination of carrot and stick may eventually prove necessary.

While it is indicated in the text of the policy that it would be the department's intention to monitor the effect of other measures before determining whether parking charges would have to increase, Recommendation 3 on p.58 does not reflect this, simply stating: '**Increase the cost of off-street parking above inflation by 2015 to enhance pricing incentives for sustainable travel modes.**'

Resorting to arbitrary pricing measures to 'persuade' people out of their cars would clearly not be a popular move; the Panel is also concerned that if put into practice it would result in unavoidable hardship for many people who would find it extremely difficult to manage their travel needs without use of a car. To be truly sustainable and allow 'access for everyone'<sup>1</sup> the policy must first provide alternatives that are affordable to all, and in considering its own priorities the department must not lose sight of the fact that many people are already under financial pressure.

### **7.3.2 Advice from consultants**

Research commissioned from UK consultants is considerably more complex. Appendix C summarises a mode change study<sup>2</sup> carried out for the department, based on a combination of modelling studies, measured against the results of previous surveys and car park interviews to quantify the measures needed to meet policy targets and forecast the possible outcomes of different scenarios. The Panel has been assured that the analysis of car park interviews was adjusted using accepted techniques to compensate for inaccuracies arising from the methodology.

The table recording mode changes that could be expected to arise solely from increased parking charges<sup>3</sup> initially raised some questions in the Panel's mind, especially the indication that 16% of those using public car parks for commuting purposes would 'definitely' change to alternative modes of transport if charges were increased by 50p per day. However, it was explained that this was the 'raw' data from car park interviews only, and as such was subject to a substantial reduction once adjusted.

---

<sup>1</sup> Reasons why we need to change the way we travel, p.8

<sup>2</sup> Sustainable Transport Policy p.98

<sup>3</sup> Sustainable Transport Policy p.99

As the department applied an increase of 50p above inflation to car parking charges earlier this year, the Panel asked what effect this had had on actual numbers of cars seen in car parks<sup>1</sup>. The reply was that about 200 fewer cars appeared to be parked in public car parks following the price rise, which in fact was a somewhat larger fall than would have been predicted by the consultants' modelling. Although other factors such as the general economic situation may also have influenced these figures, this tends to confirm that car parking behaviour is price sensitive, and lends some weight to other conclusions about opportunities for modal change in the consultants' report.

### **Key findings**

5. The policy appears to be partly based on an assumption that parking charges will need to be increased by more than the rate of inflation
6. There is evidence that demand for car parking may be price sensitive

### **Recommendation**

4. The issue of raising parking charges needs to be handled with care, balancing the need to achieve the desired modal shift with the need for people's travel needs to be met in an affordable way. A range of affordable and practical alternative travel choices must be in place before any increases to parking charges are applied

---

<sup>1</sup> Public hearing 18<sup>th</sup> October 2010

## **8. Improving public transport**

The Panel is fully in agreement with the policy aims to make substantial improvements to public transport. It was apparent that the earlier ITTP target of increasing bus ridership by 50% during peak hours was not going to make a significant dent in the number of car journeys to town during that period, so the Panel welcomed the move to a new target of a 100% increase under the STP. It is understood that proposals for a revised network were still being developed at the time of the public hearing in October 2010, but had not yet been seen by the Minister.

### **8.1 Main bus service**

In the medium term, negotiation of the new contract for bus services to commence in 2013 will provide the opportunity to achieve major improvements. Advice from the transport consultants AECOM/TAS suggests that enhancements can be made to the efficiency of the network to provide most of the desired increase in passenger numbers with no extra operational cost, which if correct would of course be a big step forward. The Panel considers that the cost of the new contract may also be influenced in a positive way for the States by the policy environment, if this is seen by the operator as being favourable to greater public take-up of bus services.

The policy also provides for a budget of £200,000 in 2011 and 2012 which is intended to be used to make interim improvements before the new contract comes into effect. While this is understood to be fairly flexible at this stage, the extent of improvements that can be made in the short term will to some extent depend on the existing operator's willingness to consider changes to arrangements under the existing contract. The department is hopeful that positive changes will be supported, and at the time of writing the Panel was interested to learn of proposals from Connex for a free bus initiative to transport supporters to and from matches at the Rugby Club. Members believe that this sort of event-led initiative is a good way to encourage greater use of buses generally; the success of the 'free bus day' earlier in the year and the more recent 'Green Travel day' show that many people are prepared to consider other means of transport than the car, especially when the alternatives are well publicised and easily accessible. However, depending on exactly how such events are arranged and whether any sponsorship can be achieved there may of course be costs to the department and/or the operator.

The Panel has few reservations about the proposed improvements to the service outlined on p.36 of the policy. However, details are sparse at this stage. It is assumed that a sizeable proportion of the increased ridership is expected to come from the much greater frequency of buses proposed for the 'southern' routes 1 and 15, between Gorey and the Airport. The Panel believes it will be important for similar emphasis to be placed on improving services to all areas, so that the policy delivers improved access to everyone. Members would hope to see minimum service levels to all areas stipulated under the new contract.

### **8.2 Extended hours**

A brief policy section on the night-time economy highlights the fact that no bus services run anywhere after midnight at present, and only routes 1 and 15 operate out of town 'at pub closing times'. The Panel believes that these comments cloak a much bigger problem; the major shortcomings of the current bus service outside normal working hours.

The online bus timetable at the time of writing showed that out of 23 regular routes, only nine leave Liberation Station after 6.00pm, and only five operate after 9pm; thus anyone going out in the evening who doesn't live on the Gorey or Airport routes must either use their own transport or rely on a taxi to get home. In the opinion of the Panel this has potentially:

1. negative implications for Jersey's economy
2. major impacts on people's ability to travel conveniently

3. reinforced unsustainable travel habits
4. contributed to a near-monopoly over public transport provision in the evenings by taxi services, which conflicts with the public interest.

It is understood that the Liberation Station information desk currently closes at 6.30pm and the concourse is closed to passengers at 7.15pm.

There is a multitude of reasons for people to travel during the evenings. Not just pubs and nightclubs but also restaurants, cafes, cinemas, theatres, sports clubs and centres and a whole range of other businesses are open after office hours, especially in summer. Many of these could benefit from a better bus service for their patrons and staff; this is seen as a potentially useful way of boosting the evening economy. Apart from leisure activities and shopping, people on shift work, (e.g. hospital staff), people working long hours in the finance, fulfilment and other industries, and cleaners working long into the night would all gain from a better late bus service.

While the lack of evening buses may not restrict the movements of car owners, with no affordable means of getting about in the evening the 12% of Jersey households (including 24% of households in St Helier) that don't own a car face a very different situation. Even car owners who might like to go out and enjoy a drink or a meal but worry about driving home afterwards may choose not to go owing to the lack of buses. The only beneficiaries of the present situation would appear to be taxi firms, who have until now been gifted a virtual monopoly.

The Panel believes that public transport, which includes taxis and cabs, should by definition service the transport needs of the whole community. In Jersey the bus is at present the only affordable means of public transport, yet currently the majority of buses are not available after working hours and the bus station closes early. 86.2% of respondents to the department's internet survey (over 1,000 people) were in favour of States investment in improved bus services. It is recommended that extending operating hours to improve public access to the bus service in the evenings should be a priority in negotiations for the next contract; the Panel suggests that this could be assisted by a further consultation exercise focusing on the potential demand for new or extended services.

Ideally the Panel would like to see continued efforts to improve existing services through negotiation with the current operators, rather than awaiting the new contract in 2013. Members are aware that there have been some positive changes already with additional buses on certain routes; they would like to see this go further if possible. The department has understandably not revealed too much detail of what it seeks to achieve under the next contract, but amongst other things the Panel would like to see consideration of greater use of Liberation Station in future as a multi-purpose transport hub which could perhaps accommodate taxi, hopper/minibus and cycle hire services in addition to regular buses, as well as staying open longer in the evenings.

### **Key findings**

- 7.** Bus services after 6.00pm do not adequately meet the needs of employees working outside of normal office hours, or customers of businesses that are open for trade in the evening
- 8.** The bus service represents the only affordable means of transport for large numbers of residents who do not possess a car, yet evening services to most parts of the Island are inadequate
- 9.** Passengers departing Liberation Station on the limited late evening services are not able to use its facilities as the station closes early

## **Recommendations**

5. Later bus services should be made available on the majority of routes departing Liberation Station. More regular services should also be provided on all major routes to enable residents to spend an evening out in other parts of the Island and still return to St Helier by bus
6. Liberation Station should remain open longer in the evenings to accommodate passengers using later services
7. Consideration should be given to possibilities for extending the use of Liberation Station as a multi-purpose transport hub

### **8.3 Bus priority**

Some study of possibilities for bus priority lanes has previously been carried out for the department, in particular with respect to possible solutions to the Beaumont junction. The Panel has always had reservations about the practicality of this approach in Jersey owing to the lack of existing road space and the cost of extending this to cater for bus lanes. During the public hearing on 18<sup>th</sup> October 2010 the Minister indicated that in view of our narrow roads and lack of additional space, bus priority was probably not achievable, although some thought was still being given to a short section of the Inner Road on the approach to West Park where there may be an opportunity for a bus lane to be created. The Panel notes that this appears slightly at odds with Recommendation 5 on p.47 of the policy, which seems to suggest that bus priority is still to be actively pursued.

Until the attractions of alternative transport are proven and the balance of numbers swings more towards public transport, improvements to bus scheduling seem to offer a more practical and equitable alternative to introducing dedicated bus lanes.

### **Key finding**

10. Practical and affordable opportunities for applying bus priority schemes in Jersey are limited by the size of existing roads; in most cases significant investment would be required to create additional bus lanes

### **Recommendation**

8. Bus priority schemes should only be pursued where significant costs would not be incurred, for example where sufficient lanes already exist to permit a bus lane to be created on a trial basis

### **8.4 The fleet**

#### **8.4.1 Seating comfort**

The Panel agrees that the quality of the bus fleet will be a key factor in attracting more people onto buses. One particular problem that was mentioned a number of times at meetings with the department was passenger comfort; it was generally acknowledged that the spacing of seats on the current fleet is too close to allow passengers of average height or above to sit comfortably, an irritating and unnecessary shortcoming which the Panel trusts will be addressed in the new fleet.

### **Key finding**

11. Passenger comfort is inadequate for many people on existing buses owing to insufficient space between seats

### **Recommendation**

9. Passenger seating should be adequately spaced on all vehicles ordered or brought into service from now on to improve access and comfort for passengers of average or larger physique; wherever possible existing vehicles should be modified to address recognised problems with seat comfort

## **8.4.2 Wheelchair and child buggy access**

Other fundamental issues around passenger comfort and convenience have been reflected in complaints reported in the media about inadequate provision for wheel-chair users, mothers with children in push chairs, etc. The Panel was pleased to have confirmation from the Minister<sup>1</sup> that all vehicles will in future be wheelchair and child buggy friendly.

## **8.4.3 Bicycles on buses**

The Panel believes that providing access for everyone to use public transport is a crucial issue. Beyond the essential duty of providing vehicles that are easily accessed by the elderly, disabled and families with young children, members feel that there is a real opportunity to boost alternative transport by including provision for cycles to be carried on buses, as happens in a number of other jurisdictions. For example in the USA in 2007 there were over 50,000 urban transit buses with provision for carrying bicycles<sup>2</sup>.

While experienced cyclists may not be deterred by occasional inclement weather and moderate gradients, less dedicated riders coming into St Helier from many parts of the Island face an uphill slog at some point on their way home. When faced with bad weather or after an especially tiring day, the ability to take the bicycle home on the bus could make all the difference to would-be cyclists. A practical solution to this problem could boost the numbers of people prepared to try cycling to work.

The Minister confirmed that a recent presentation from the operator had discussed the possibilities for bike racks on the back of buses, but that this appeared to present difficulties in terms of time taken and physical ability to load bicycles onto a rack. Based on experience from elsewhere, an alternative would be for all buses to have a sufficiently wide doorway and open interior space to enable easy entry not just for wheelchairs and buggies, but also for bikes and luggage to be loaded into the centre of the bus. This could tie in conveniently with the decision to re-configure buses used on the airport service to provide adequate storage for passenger luggage.

The Panel appreciates that this may require further thought, but recommends that forthcoming orders for new rolling stock (understood due to be placed in the New Year) should reflect the need to accommodate wheelchairs, child buggies, bicycles and luggage on all regular routes.

---

<sup>1</sup> Public hearing 18<sup>th</sup> October 2010

<sup>2</sup> Making Cycling Irresistible: Lessons from the Netherlands, Denmark and Germany. J Pucher and R Buehler, (2008) Transport Reviews, 28:4, 495 - 528



## Key findings

12. Current arrangements for accommodating wheelchairs, child buggies and luggage on buses have been criticised and can vary between vehicles and services

13. Bicycles cannot currently be carried on buses

## Recommendations

10. All buses should have access for wheelchair users and children in buggies. They should also have facilities for passengers to carry a reasonable quantity of luggage.

11. The department should continue to investigate options for the carriage of a limited number of bicycles on all regular buses, whether on external racks or internally, with a view to offering this facility on all new buses (and retrofitting to older vehicles where appropriate)

### 8.4.4 Alternative fuels

TTS will have the opportunity during negotiation of the next bus contract to obtain the best possible vehicles to suit Jersey's unique needs. The Panel suggests that the department should look closely into possibilities for running the next public transport fleet on alternative fuels. A brief comment about trials of hybrid diesel/electric buses in London is included in the policy, but it concludes that these would be unlikely to be viable for cost reasons in Jersey at present.

Jersey's current bus fleet is comprised of conventional diesel-powered vehicles. While modern diesel engines (and fuel) are much cleaner than previous generations, diesel exhaust is still a major source of air pollution, containing particulate matter, nitrogen oxides, hydrocarbons and other toxic substances. Diesel fumes are potentially carcinogenic and can contribute to serious health conditions, such as asthma and allergies, and can also worsen heart and lung disease, especially amongst vulnerable groups such as children and older individuals.<sup>1</sup>

The use of alternative fuels in public transport fleets is now well-established elsewhere. Fuels such as LPG<sup>2</sup>, CNG<sup>3</sup>, methane, biomethane, bio-diesel and ethanol all have environmental advantages over 'traditional' diesel vehicles. Both bio-diesel and LPG are available locally, and the Panel would like to see them given more encouragement.

Some of these fuels require existing vehicles to be converted to use them. The Panel has not done extensive research, but it is understood that this can generally be done at much lower cost than purchasing a new fleet. Compared with diesel-powered buses, advantages can include greatly reduced emissions and quieter running, as well as potentially lower maintenance and fuel costs. Positive spin-off benefits could include new commercial opportunities for conversion and maintenance of vehicles and alternative fuel distribution, which could help the Island's economy.

At the hearing with the Minister it was suggested by department officers that the overall cost and immature technology for alternative-fuelled vehicles could present obstacles to Jersey adopting these for some time to come. The Panel was surprised by this, as relatively 'low-tech' solutions – particularly LPG and other gas-powered technologies – are now in quite widespread use in the UK and Europe. Members feel that anything that could reduce air and noise pollution from the public transport fleet should be investigated, especially as more buses will be needed on our roads in

<sup>1</sup> Source: US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)

<sup>2</sup> Liquefied petroleum gas, sometimes known as Autogas

<sup>3</sup> Compressed natural gas

future if the policy succeeds. It is not known at this stage whether the States or the operator would be responsible for the purchase of the new fleet, but it would seem sensible to consider the full potential life-cycle and use of the vehicles over many years when deciding the preferred fuel for the next generation of Jersey buses.

### **Key findings**

**14.** The current bus fleet is comprised of conventional diesel-powered vehicles which tend to be noisy and have relatively high levels of emissions

**15.** The use of alternative fuels in commercial and other vehicles is not considered in any detail in the policy

### **Recommendations**

**12.** The department should take a pro-active stance on alternative, more environmentally friendly fuels such as L.P.G. and bio-diesel rather than postponing consideration of alternatives

**13.** Possibilities for purchasing new gas-powered vehicles or converting existing buses should be investigated in depth and if technically and economically feasible, specified as part of the new bus contract

## **8.5 Fares**

The policy states<sup>1</sup> that the balance between the cost of bus and car travel is influential in people's travel choices. The Panel agrees that this is true for some; however, many people do not have a choice. If you don't live near a bus stop, the bus doesn't run at convenient times, or you have to make stops on your journey (perhaps to drop off or pick up young children, or look in on relatives) taking the bus may not be an option.

Direct cost comparisons between bus use and commuter parking are thus potentially a red herring, and open up questions about access and equity. There will always be people who can afford, and will choose to use a car, whatever the cost of parking. However, there are others who have to use a car, even though they can ill afford it. Making car parking more expensive will not enable them to catch a bus, it will simply drive up their travel costs.

Providing better access for everyone is one of the key concepts behind the policy. If the proposals result in it becoming more expensive or inconvenient for people to use their cars, without ensuring that practical, affordable alternatives are available, then something is wrong. This is why the Panel is strongly in favour of promoting positive incentives for people to change their travel habits. Members are convinced that there are a lot of people who would like to use alternative transport but for whom existing options are simply not practical. Making buses more frequent, comfortable and flexible while still ensuring they offer good value will give many more people the opportunity to reduce their dependence on the car.

---

<sup>1</sup> Sustainable Transport Policy, p.40

### **8.5.1 Smart ticketing**

The Panel believes that smart ticketing would be a major asset in this respect. The thinking behind the policy is that people will use their cars less, not get rid of them altogether. For this to work, flexible payment options for both public transport and car parking will be essential. Weekly or monthly discounted travel passes (or parking tickets) will not deliver good value on the basis of occasional use.

Some form of Jersey travel card is therefore seen as an important step in promoting flexible travel habits. Additional benefits could be realised in reduced journey times (as a result of quicker boarding) and a simple card system could also help visitors. The Panel supports the introduction of such a system, and is somewhat dismayed to see Smart Cards listed only as 'desirable' in the budget outlined for the policy, suggesting that they may not be funded unless the new contract comes in under budget. Members believe that convenience plays a large role in travel decisions, and hope that a solution can be found to implement smart travel cards as a priority.

#### **Key finding**

**16.** Current arrangements for discounted weekly and monthly bus tickets are date-limited and inflexible, so would not encourage occasional bus use

#### **Recommendation**

**14.** More flexible ticketing options including Smart Cards should be progressed to encourage people to use buses as an occasional alternative to the car

### **8.6 School buses**

The policy clearly points to the school run as one of the main causes of Jersey's rush hour congestion, hence the 15% target for reduction in car journeys to replicate school holiday levels of traffic. The convenience of some existing school bus services leaves a lot to be desired, with some routes commencing as early as 7.10am and taking over an hour to arrive at their destination; this is unlikely to encourage students to want to use them. From the parental point of view, safety of younger children especially is always going to be a concern, so it is equally unsurprising that large numbers of primary school journeys are made by car.

Travel habits are hard to break once established. Research from elsewhere<sup>1</sup> suggests that children themselves prefer walking or cycling to school from an early age; we need to find safe and convenient ways to tap into this and enable our young people to get into the habit of using healthy and sustainable ways of travelling that they will continue to use as they grow older.

#### **8.6.1 School travel plans**

With this in mind the Panel is surprised that the policy does not focus more closely on reducing the volume of school travel by private car during term time. Because of its scale Jersey seems particularly well situated to benefit from community-based initiatives such as 'walking buses' and 'bike buddies' to break dependence on the car for school travel, especially if safe routes can be identified and clearly signed.

---

<sup>1</sup> E.g. Cycling England – survey carried out for Bike to School Week, April 2009

Proposals in the policy include a detailed review of travel demand data for schools. Members would like to see broad terms of reference for this study, to encourage community involvement in developing sustainable travel plans for the Island's school population. Eco-Active published a guide to school travel plans, incorporating examples of best practice from different schemes around the UK in July 2010. However, in the Panel's view it will be very important for travel plans to be 'championed' by an individual or organisation with real expertise in such matters. It would not be seen as practical either for the Education Department to carry out this task, or for a 'part-timer' from another department to do so without appropriate training, and members recommend that the Transport and Technical Services Department considers using outside consultants with a successful track record to deliver or help to deliver this important initiative.

Advice obtained from Sustrans suggests that the proposed annual budget of £40,000 for the development of travel plans for the entire States organisation (including schools) might only be sufficient to develop travel plans for schools. As a comparison on a similar scale, the Panel understands that the 'Bike It' programme for Lancaster covered approximately 30 schools in 4 to 5 years, with funding of £65,000 per annum from Cycle England.

Changing the school travel habits of today's young children could bring great benefits in terms of health and quality of life for future generations of adults, as well as helping to reduce traffic problems and pollution. The Panel considers that if social costs and benefits are factored in, an appropriate level of investment now would generate huge savings in the long run.

### **Key findings**

- 17.** The additional burden of school travel by car during term times is seen as tipping the balance between 'acceptable' and 'unacceptable' levels of congestion
- 18.** Just over half of parents responding to the 2006 Jersey Annual Social Survey indicated that they would make greater use of an improved school bus service
- 19.** The indicative budget for travel plans in the policy is just £40,000 to cover all States departments and schools; this is considered unlikely to be sufficient to deliver results in both areas
- 20.** Proposals to employ a part-time schools travel coordinator to ensure that all schools adopt a travel plan by 2015 are a step in the right direction but it is considered that additional resources will be required

### **Recommendations**

- 15.** The needs-based review of school pupil travel patterns and potential for increased patronage of school buses is supported. The target of increasing school bus use by 20% by 2015 is considered potentially unambitious and should be revisited in the light of the review's findings
- 16.** The budget for travel plans should be reviewed and consideration given to seeking expert assistance from consultants with a track record of success in delivering travel plans to local authorities and schools to maximise the benefits

## **8.7 Town hopper service**

The Panel strongly supports proposals for a town hopper bus service, and in discussions with the department made clear its preference for this to be free if possible. This is seen as a potential 'headline' strategy which could boost public support for alternative transport in general, if marketed effectively. At the hearing on 18<sup>th</sup> October the Minister was unable to confirm whether the service would be free or if charges would apply. Whatever the final arrangement, it would need to permit rapid boarding to ensure the efficiency of the service. If payment was required a Smart Card mechanism may be one option, alternatively daily or weekly tickets could be considered giving unlimited travel on the hopper service for a fixed low price.

Present thinking is that the hopper bus service would be integrated with the main bus service, albeit probably using different vehicles. Consideration would be given to links with outlying areas and schools in St Saviour in particular. The Panel agrees that careful examination of routes and existing traffic patterns will be required to gain the maximum benefit from hopper bus links, which it is hoped would perform a much wider service than merely connecting Liberation Station to the rest of town. The Panel is pleased to see that thought is being given to using the service as an informal park and ride solution from car parks on the town periphery, thus potentially reducing the pressure for on-street parking. The service could also considerably reduce the time currently spent by main buses negotiating the Broad Street 'loop', if passengers were able to transfer directly onto the hopper at Liberation Station or another convenient stop.

## **8.8 Park and ride**

The Panel was not convinced that plans under the previous policy to trial a park and ride scheme from Goose Green were the best idea, owing to difficulty of access to that site at peak hours when the service would have been most needed. However, members are pleased to see that the concept of small-scale park and ride is still supported. If appropriate consideration is given to the location of bus stops near convenient sites and proposals regarding the use of hopper buses to service town edge car parks are followed up, it is felt that this could help to reduce the overall number of cars needing to access the town centre.

It is understood that there is some concern amongst Connétables that parking on busy roads and estates on the way into town could become more of a problem if the hopper bus service is used as an informal park and ride solution. Park and ride facilities may need to be given formal approval at specific sites, where parking would not present problems for local residents or the free movement of traffic. At the hearing one suggestion was made by the Panel concerning the possible use of the La Fontaine car park in St John, which is frequently empty except at weekends. This site is understood to be owned by the States; the Panel is aware that there are many 'pockets' of land in States ownership all over the Island which could be looked at to see if they have potential as small-scale park and ride sites. The Minister suggested that parishes may also be able to assist in identifying suitable parking places, and confirmed that his department would try anything that could encourage more people onto buses.

In the Panel's view the policy would benefit from more attention to park and ride possibilities. Clearly the Island does not have the space for the large permanent car parks that characterise park and ride operations outside many UK cities, but with suitable encouragement, even relatively small sites could make a big difference to the numbers of cars travelling into town each day, as well as building bus ridership and making the whole transport network more efficient.

The Panel recommends a more pro-active approach from the department to take this matter up with parish authorities. There is a need to identify suitable sites and compare these with feedback from residents to see what level of demand could be expected and where. This is seen as a golden opportunity to design the future bus network so that residents of outlying areas without immediate access to a convenient bus stop can still make use of the service. It could also generate additional passengers by creating 'kiss and ride' drop-off points, and encouraging

bicycle access for those who live too far from town to cycle comfortably, but might be prepared to meet the bus part-way.

### **Key findings**

**21.** The Panel welcomes proposals for a new hopper bus service which could reduce the demand for on-street parking in town and improve access for shoppers and visitors

**22.** The policy does not support large scale park and ride operations owing to constraints on land use and costs. Development of a 'bespoke' park and ride scheme is not considered appropriate by the department, although smaller informal solutions are encouraged

### **Recommendations**

**17.** The Panel would prefer to see the hopper bus introduced as a free service as it believes this would encourage maximum use and bring faster recognition of the benefits of leaving the car at home. Failing this, a flat low fee for unlimited use on a daily or other basis would be recommended

**18.** Even greater benefits could be realised if the hopper service was coordinated with an overall plan to increase pedestrianisation and cycle priority schemes in St Helier

**19.** The department should take an active role in identifying and developing small scale park and ride sites in suitable areas, in consultation with parishes. This would allow the development of a recognised network of approved parking and drop-off points which could be planned and integrated into the future bus network, rather than relying on ad hoc solutions

## **8.9 The taxi service**

During the public hearing on 18<sup>th</sup> October the Minister stated that the taxi service was one of the challenges that he was keen to deal with during his term in office. In discussion the Panel was told that differences between regulated rank taxis and largely unregulated private hire services were not necessarily understood by the public. Complaints about pricing tended to relate to private hire services, whose fares are not controlled and can sometimes be 25% or more higher than rank taxi fares; 71% of written comments to the consultation about taxis complained of excessive fares.<sup>1</sup> Other potential problems revolved around difficulties in obtaining taxi services in the country areas, especially at night, a lack of 24 hour cover, and services to the airport.

The Minister indicated that his department had engaged in extensive consultation with stakeholders involved with taxi services, and despite encountering a wide range of conflicting views he was determined to press ahead with moves to improve provision. Responses to the department's consultation suggest strong public support for a more coherent and less costly taxi service.

The Panel notes that the department appears to have a clear idea of a range of improvements that are needed to rationalise the Island's taxi service; certainly many of the problems identified within the system are historic and well-recognised. Difficulties meeting the demands of the night-time economy in St Helier are exacerbated by the lack of late buses, and it has been suggested that some failings of the overall transport network could be addressed by a degree of integration between taxi and bus services, as happens elsewhere.

---

<sup>1</sup> Sustainable Transport Policy, p.43

Members believe that taxis should be an integral part of the public transport network, providing comprehensive, affordable and convenient services accessible to all. It is clearly in the public interest that this matter be dealt with as soon as possible, and the Panel therefore recommends that the Minister should expedite improvements within a much shorter timescale than currently proposed within the policy, which suggests further evidence-gathering and development of proposals until 2012, with changes only implemented by 2015. This is considered to be an unacceptably slow timetable for change.

### **Key findings**

**23.** There is evidence of public dissatisfaction with aspects of existing taxi and cab services; charges and availability feature amongst other concerns

**24.** There is currently no integration of taxis with other public transport services

**25.** There are disparities between regulated and unregulated taxi services which appear to cause difficulties within the industry and are potentially confusing to customers

### **Recommendation**

**20.** The department's review of taxi services should be brought forward to ensure implementation of necessary changes within a shorter timescale than currently proposed, i.e. before 2015

## 9. Parking

This part of the policy raises the possibility of reducing public car parking provision based on the policy aim to reduce commuting by car. However, to avoid simply exacerbating current parking problems, any significant reduction in parking provision must go hand in hand with a real reduction in car commuting. Then the benefits of releasing parking land for redevelopment can be realised.

### 9.1 *Commuter versus shopper parking*

One difficulty faced by the department is therefore that of balancing supply and demand. This is complicated by the fact that private non-residential parking spaces in St Helier significantly outnumber public provision, as well as the need to retain adequate public parking spaces to permit convenient parking for shoppers.

The policy states that 57% of respondents to the department's consultation agreed that the number of commuter parking spaces (public and private) in St Helier should not be increased. However, the Panel notes that this is not the same as voting for a decrease, and from the evidence it would be reasonable to assume that over half of those surveyed were content with no change; while over a third (37%) who disagreed presumably wanted an increase in commuter parking. This does not indicate public support for a reduction in public commuter parking. There was also a majority in favour of increased shopper parking.

Predicting future parking needs is not helped by uncertainties over major projects such as the Waterfront Development and the North of Town Master-plan. This may explain why the policy is noncommittal about likely numbers of public spaces that could be saved, and even warns that planning restrictions on private parking in future could create a demand for more public spaces. Realistically, it would appear that those who would like to see more parking made available are likely to be disappointed, but it may not be clear for some time where any savings could be made.

### 9.2 *Parking costs*

#### 9.2.1 **The case for increased charges**

Returning to the cost of parking the policy is easier to follow. Attention is drawn once again to a comparison between bus fares and parking charges. The following statement regarding parking cost increases appears on p.51:

**As discussed in section 3.1.10 the cost of bus fares will need to be increased by the cost of living and in order to protect and improve the differential cost between private car use and other modes it is proposed that the cost of parking is increased above the rate of inflation. Our research suggests that a second increase above inflation would need to be applied by 2015, though this would not be done until proposed improvements to bus frequency and capacity have been implemented. The effectiveness of other measures within this policy will be monitored before the need to increase parking costs or the appropriate increase is determined. Advance notice would be given of proposed increases above inflation.**

A majority of respondents to the department's survey were opposed to both increased prices for public commuter parking and a tax or levy on private commuter spaces, although 70.7% felt that commuters should be 'encouraged' to leave their cars at home once a week.

The Panel believes that the cost of parking should not be increased above inflation to 'protect and improve' a notional differential between parking and bus fares unless a broad range of alternatives is already in place. In the UK the choice may include bus, coach, underground and train services,



park and ride arrangements, cycle and walking networks, affordable taxi services, or car sharing schemes. The Panel believes Jersey has a very long way to go to improve its travel infrastructure before making parking less affordable can be justified.

### 9.2.2 Use of parking income

Members would be more prepared to accept reasonable increases to parking charges over time if the income was used directly to fund sustainable transport initiatives. A special case was made for the Car Park Trading Fund (CPTF) to be 'dipped into' to provide £500,000 for the first stage of development of the Eastern Cycle Route; the Panel notes that this amount is equal to the entire annual budget for the Sustainable Transport Policy. At its hearing with the Minister the Panel queried whether a similar approach could be used to give the policy a more realistic budget. The response was that this was something about which the department would be extremely cautious, as the CPTF was designed to take into account the costs of maintaining and eventually rebuilding current car parks when they reach the end of their design life.

The Panel challenges the Minister to take a leap of faith in respect of his policy. If he is confident that its aims will be delivered in the long term, unlocking additional funding from the CPTF to make up the shortfall in the budget for the STP would result in greater benefits in a shorter period. What is more, the success of the policy is intended to result in reduced demand for public parking, releasing land currently devoted to car parks for redevelopment; this should more than repay any sums 'borrowed'.

In the hearing, the department emphasised that parking in Jersey is now relatively inexpensive compared with many parts of the UK. While the policy may reduce parking demand (and thus income) over time, it would seem reasonable for this to be partly offset by increased charges if a portion of that income was hypothecated to support practical alternatives to the private car. The Panel also considers that possibilities for eventual refurbishment of existing multi-storey car parks (rather than completely rebuilding at much higher cost) should be considered as part of the overall funding package, to enable the release of funds to support more sustainable transport measures.

### 9.2.3 Other options

Study of the consultants' summary report suggests that some of the policy's objectives could be achieved by means other than increased parking charges. The following statement (from p.1 of the report summary) shows that many interviewees put a high value on bus improvements:

**For public car parks 12% of interviewees said they would probably use the bus if there were improvements and 29% said they would definitely use the bus. A more frequent service was the most important factor linked to a change of mode followed by a quicker service and less crowded buses.**

Despite the encouragement offered by such findings, it should be recognised that for many people the private car will remain the most practical solution for their personal transport needs for some time to come. No amount of improvements to the bus service, cycle routes, or travel plans will make it possible for everyone (for example elderly people, people with disabilities, mothers with young children) to access alternative transport equally; yet they will still need to travel every day.

Future changes to parking charges must therefore take into account the extent to which increases would hit people in some of these groups much harder than others. Increasing parking charges to force modal change is a very blunt instrument, which raises real questions about equity. In the Panel's view price increases over inflation can only be justified if they are balanced by improvements to affordable alternative provision.

## 9.2.4 Eco-parking benefits

It is noted that the comparison of car parking charges with bus fares included on p.40 fails to mention the 'eco-friendly parking permit' option described elsewhere in the policy. The eco-permit scheme started in 2008 and currently allows owners of qualifying cars with low emissions (including electric-powered vehicles) to purchase parking at half the normal price, which according to the policy represents a potential annual saving of over £700 for a commuter regularly parking in St Helier. When this is taken into account, the cost of parking an eco-car falls roughly into line with that of a monthly commuter pass for the bus.

## 9.2.5 Carbon footprint of new cars

The Panel sees a number of potential flaws in this scheme. When considered in the light of other policy efforts to persuade people out of their cars it seems counter-productive; it also introduces a somewhat perverse incentive for people to buy more new cars. Research suggests that the environmental impacts of manufacturing a new vehicle can typically equal its emissions from a lifetime in operation<sup>1</sup>. For this reason some sources<sup>2</sup> now recommend keeping older cars as being more environmentally friendly than purchasing new; so while Jersey might seek to improve its own emissions record with this scheme, the global outcome may not be beneficial.

## 9.2.6 Emissions and costs

The emission limits under the scheme allow a petrol or diesel-powered vehicle covering annual Jersey mileage of approximately 6,000 miles to generate around a tonne of CO<sup>2</sup> per annum and still qualify for the discount. The Vehicle Certification Agency website,<sup>3</sup> official UK source for car fuel consumption and exhaust emissions figures, listed just 25 vehicles that would qualify at the time of writing (excluding hybrids). This compared with some hundreds, including full-sized family cars, falling just outside the guidelines, but which would still emit less than a tonne and a half of CO<sup>2</sup> under the same conditions.

While the number of vehicles qualifying for these permits is still extremely low, it is clearly rising quickly as technology improves; this would appear likely to further undermine the aim of the policy to encourage the use of alternative transport. The policy also states that charges for other cars will have to be reviewed as the number of eligible vehicles rises, which would discriminate against the less well-off, while rewarding those who can afford a new, lower emitting car.

The Panel therefore questions whether the environmental gain offered by the eco-cars is really sufficient to justify the States losing an increasing amount of income every year (up to £34,000 at present, based on only 49 permits so far issued). It is noted that the current arrangements potentially value half a tonne or less of CO<sup>2</sup> saved at up to £700, compared with recent average market prices for offset carbon dioxide equivalent (CO<sup>2</sup> e) of around €15 per tonne.

## 9.2.7 Incentives for smaller / electric vehicles

The costs of providing public parking relate directly to the amount of space required, so if anything there would seem to be a good argument for charging according to vehicle size. The Panel could also see the value of retaining some form of subsidy to encourage the take-up of all-electric vehicles, which have much clearer green credentials, but are likely to be prohibitively expensive until the technology becomes more mainstream.

However, there seems to be little justification in continuing to offer eco-permit parking subsidies for

---

<sup>1</sup> What's the carbon footprint of ... a new car? Guardian.co.uk, 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2010

<sup>2</sup> Eg the Greener car guide produced by Start, a collaboration between the Prince's Charities, leading businesses, other charitable and not-for-profit organisations and the UK national and local government

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.vcacarfueldata.org.uk/>

conventional vehicles, which reward owners for one purchasing decision many times over, and in time will lose the States substantial sums of income. The scheme appears to be at odds with many aspects of the sustainable transport policy, and improvements in engine technology mean that its benefits to the States are already questionable.

### **9.2.8 Vehicle Emissions Duty**

The Panel is also conscious that new arrangements for Vehicle Emissions Duty (VED) have just come into effect which are designed to influence and reward environmentally friendly purchasing decisions and make car buyers think about emissions when making their choice of a new vehicle. VED income is to be used to support environmental initiatives (including the STP) and members consider that as a genuine environmental tax, this is a more appropriate mechanism for encouraging behavioural change than the eco-friendly parking permit.

### **9.2.9 Payment mechanisms**

The Panel is also slightly bemused by the discussion of parking payment solutions in the policy. There seems to be some reluctance to break with scratch-cards as a payment mechanism for on-street parking, but the Panel finds references to narrow Jersey streets as an argument against the introduction of 'on-street machinery' rather unconvincing. Payment stations now come in all shapes and sizes and have the ability to accept payment by cash, debit, credit or Smart Card, which would be a great improvement over the inflexibility of the scratch-card. The Panel agrees that old-fashioned parking meters every few yards would be intrusive, but these are no longer necessary.

### **9.2.10 Number plate recognition**

The department's proposal to trial 'high-tech' number plate recognition and/or in-car electronic metering systems for off-street parking also came as a surprise. The Panel feels that in budgetary terms this may be a nice-to-have item, rather than a necessity, although it has not been discussed in detail as investigations were still ongoing by the department.

One quoted advantage is the ability to promote differential pricing to encourage people to park at their nearest car park. The Panel has some concerns about how this could work in practice; for example there may be many reasons why people could come into town from different directions on different days or at different times. There may also be implications for privacy and data protection linked to such initiatives. Members would query whether Jersey needs to go down such a 'big brother' route just to facilitate parking payments. However, if there were ways to integrate this into an over-arching Smart Card system which could also cover payment for public transport it may be worth taking further, provided sufficient funds are available.

### **9.2.11 Bicycle and motorcycle parking**

Proposals to increase the availability and range of cycle and motorcycle/scooter parking are seen as essential to the success of the policy and are supported.

#### **Key findings**

**26.** There is no evidence of majority public support for a reduction in availability of commuter parking, or for increased charges

**27.** Existing bus services do not provide adequate alternatives to the use of the private car for most residents

**Key findings cont'd**

**28.** The majority of commuters are expected to continue to use the private car for some years to come

**29.** The eco-friendly parking permit scheme does not take account of significant reductions in emissions for all new cars. It has limited environmental benefits but is exceptionally generous to a small number of owners, in direct conflict with the aim of the policy to reduce overall car use. If continued, States parking income will reduce substantially as the number of qualifying vehicles increases, leading to pressure to increase parking charges for others

**Recommendations**

**21.** Car parking charges should not be used as a lever to 'persuade' people to change their mode of transport unless other positive measures have been tried and their results assessed

**22.** If parking charges are increased above inflation at any point in the future, any increase in income which may result should be hypothecated for improvements to alternative sustainable transport provision

**23.** Assuming that the STP is the model for the future and the department has confidence in it, the Panel considers that there would be merit in using an element of the Car Park Trading Fund to stimulate travel choice initiatives

**24.** The eco-friendly parking permit scheme should be dropped, or reviewed taking into account emissions levels of new cars, the aims of the Sustainable Transport Policy, and likely costs and benefits to the States of continuing the scheme

## 10. The road network

In general terms the policy argues that increasing road capacity tends to generate more vehicular traffic, which is contrary to what is intended. It therefore advocates network improvements aimed at improving pedestrian, cycle and public transport access where possible.

### 10.1 *Town centre pedestrian priority*

Panel members would strongly support measures to provide improved facilities for walking and cycling as well as public transport. However, this is a key area in which the Panel believes the STP does not go nearly far enough. Despite support from the Medical Officer of Health, recommending ambitious targets for people to take more exercise through daily travel, the policy takes what the Panel believes to be an excessively cautious approach to various schemes for extending pedestrianisation proposed in the EDAW regeneration strategy for St Helier. It concludes that only one proposal, for Halkett Place south of Waterloo Street, has potential benefits that outweigh possible downsides; but even then the policy does not commit to a trial, and moves on swiftly to discuss opportunities for 'shared space'.

The Panel firmly believes that extending pedestrian zones within the town centre could greatly enhance the impact of the policy and bring added benefits in terms of reducing air and noise pollution, decreasing demand for on-street parking and providing an enhanced experience for residents, shoppers and visitors. This could also include consideration of dedicated cycle routes, improved pedestrian space on one-way routes, as well as 'shared space' initiatives which could transform the attractiveness of some parts of St Helier, encouraging more footfall and commercial opportunities in areas currently dominated by the car. It is hoped that such measures could significantly reduce the volume of traffic circulating in the town both at peak times and during the day, although due consideration would have to be given to the needs of residents and commercial delivery vehicles.

The Panel recognises the department's concerns about the possible impact of altered traffic flows on adjacent areas and the ring road, but considers that if the policy is to have any real chance of transforming people's travel habits and improving the quality of life for town residents, a bold approach is required. Experience suggests that Jersey's traffic problems revolve primarily around peak hour access and egress from commuter parking in town, drop-off and (to a lesser extent) pick from schools, and daytime circulation, congestion, pollution and car accommodation in St Helier itself. There are also other areas outside St Helier where periodic congestion causes problems, on certain major routes and around parish centres.

The Panel has had to consider whether the policy addresses these problems in a coherent and balanced way. From the evidence seen in the policy there appears to be limited focus and funding to deal with vital areas such as school traffic and congestion in St Helier; the policy's real aim seems to be targeting commuter traffic via improvements to the main bus service, and action to reduce parking. While the policy does refer to quality of life, it does so more in the general context of improving health through exercise; it has very little to say about the quality of life for people living and working in town, breathing traffic fumes, dodging cars and trying to hear themselves talk over traffic noise all day, then having no means to get out of town at night.

This report has already commented (in section 6.1) on the absence of any information or detailed consideration of the risks posed to health by traffic-related air and noise pollution.

The following exchange took place during the hearing with the Minister for Transport and Technical Services on 18<sup>th</sup> October:

**The Deputy of St. John:**

*Pedestrian zones and cycling priority and shared zones; the policy talks about it but why does the policy not do more to restrict vehicle movements through St. Helier during the daytime?*

**The Minister for Transport and Technical Services:**

*There is, once again, a balance to be struck in St. Helier. There are the needs of the residents and the needs of commerce and they are not always compatible, it has to be said. I think it is important that if the vibrancy of St. Helier is to remain, people have to be allowed to get in. Now, how do they do that? There are suggestions and we are obviously aware of the EDAW Report with regards St. Helier and the present philosophy of the Connétable. There are aspirations to close Halkett Place to through traffic. Those are objected to by a lot of the traders. So I think there is a fairly delicate balance to be struck. We also have the issue of the move towards the Waterfront and the old abattoir site and what effect will that have on town centre trading. So I think there is probably more work to be done. That is my feeling so far and I know the Chamber of Commerce is in considerable opposition to certainly closing off Halkett Place, which is a big issue.*

**The Deputy of St. John:**

*There is a lot of air pollution in those areas on very warm days and I can recall in the 1960s and the early 1970s when we were putting the precinct in town, et cetera, being a Centenier at that time, and the traders and the like and Chamber of Commerce used to complain about taking away the business from the town. In fact it was the best thing that happened in St. Helier because we now have a vibrant King Street, Queen Street and other areas. Surely, because of people who live and work in that area, we should be looking seriously at increasing that and yet we do not seem to want to take that on board.*

**The Minister for Transport and Technical Services:**

*I think the drive for that has to come from the parish and it is my philosophy throughout the Island that the Connétables need to be in concert with our policy and we need to be in concert with theirs. If there is not the enthusiasm, there is little point in us fighting the battle.*

The Panel believes that the era of 'car accommodation' in town needs to end, in favour of a more sustainable vision that would see people's health and quality of life greatly enhanced. Arguably there would be no loss to the trade or vibrancy of the town centre if changes were carefully managed to ensure that deliveries were not unreasonably restricted, and regular hopper bus links enabled easy access to and from town centre shops and businesses for those who did not wish, or were not able to walk or cycle.

On p.20 of the policy the following statement appears:

**The potential to embrace a more sustainable approach to our travel habits is excellent, and being self governing, we have an opportunity not just to follow international best practice, but to lead it.**

Without some willingness on the part of the department to take risks, members consider that any claim to lead international best practice in sustainable travel is sadly misplaced. However, a more courageous and pro-active approach could still transform the policy and create a town centre of which the Island could be truly proud.

Members' feelings in this respect appear to be shared by the Connétable of St Helier, who made the following comments in an email to the Panel about the STP on 26<sup>th</sup> October 2010:

***There is a reluctance to 'bite the bullet' in respect of policy implementation such as greater pedestrian priority in the town centre ("TTS has studied the impact of (EDAW's) proposals and concluded that with current volumes of traffic the disadvantages of pollution and congestion on the remaining network would be too great should all the proposals be adopted." pp.11 and 63. Thus an extremely expensive but professional and 'world class'***

*review of the town centre which found ample evidence of the need for more pedestrian-priority areas is dismissed because there is 'too much traffic' (!), and the only section of new pedestrian-priority which the STP might support is southwards along the section of Halkett Place from its junction with Waterloo Street. But even this scheme, we are told on p.64, might be replaced by 'shared space', which clearly could not work at the junction of Halkett Place and King Street, and which would not have worked as the STP claims it does, at Charing Cross, had not the Parish of St Helier insisted on the installation of the two 'Jersey crossings' there. In any case, there is no timetable for the delivery of what has been adopted in successive Island Plans, and recommended by every significant traffic study in the past 30 years. The speed and volume of traffic along such town centre streets as Halkett Place, Mulcaster Street and Broad Street has been shown to make walking difficult for all, and especially dangerous for the mobility-impaired, the young and the elderly, but the STP offers no radical solution to the problems.*

The Panel fully agrees with the Connétable's comments. Members would therefore recommend that the department consults with parish authorities to bring forward proposals to trial more extensive pedestrianisation and other network improvements in St Helier, while monitoring the impact on adjacent roads as well as public opinion to see if more permanent arrangements would find favour. In the Panel's view this is preferable to an approach which appears to preclude changes based on traffic studies and modelling without putting them to the test.

### **Key findings**

**30.** It is unclear from the policy whether proposals for the pedestrianisation of Halkett Place (south of Waterloo Street) will be progressed to completion

**31.** There is no clarity concerning proposals in the policy for shared space schemes, traffic calming, cycle network routes and improved pedestrian facilities in the town area

### **Recommendation**

**25.** The department should review proposals for extending pedestrianisation contained in the EDAAW strategy with the Parish of St Helier and the Planning Department, with a view to developing plans to trial more extensive pedestrian and cycling zones in the town centre, subject to appropriate consultation with residents and commercial interests

## **10.2 Beaumont Hill / Route de la Haule junction**

The policy indicates that problems with congestion in this area relate to the lack of spare capacity of the roads on either side of the junction, so improvements to the junction itself would not provide a solution. Even if new roads were to be constructed through Goose Green Marsh or along the sea front there would still be a limit to the volume of traffic that could pass readily through the junctions on Victoria Avenue.

For these reasons the policy does not currently propose any road improvements at Beaumont; it must therefore be hoped that if it succeeds in reducing overall traffic volumes, there will be a beneficial impact at Beaumont as well.

Although not mentioned in the policy, there was an indication at the hearing with the Minister that traffic flow after Beaumont could be slightly improved if the present lit pedestrian crossing at the

perquage car park was replaced with a pedestrian refuge arrangement. If this is the case, the Panel hopes that work will be progressed as soon as possible.

### **Key finding**

**32.** Studies of the Beaumont junction have not come up with a cost effective solution to congestion problems; remedies considered would necessitate construction of a new road for which land would have to be acquired, presumably by compulsory purchase

### **Recommendation**

**26.** Large scale redevelopment of the Beaumont junction should not be pursued at this time. However, any possibilities for incremental improvements to ease traffic flow through the area which do not involve major costs (such as conversion of the existing perquage car park crossing) should be followed up

## **10.3 Cycling provision**

Cycling is seen as a key component of the STP and the following key strategic building blocks are present in the policy:

1. A high place in the transport hierarchy (p.61)
2. The setting of ambitious but justified targets of 100% increase in commuter cycling (p.26) and 100% increase in cycling to school (p.10)
3. The monitoring of cycling rates and trends (performance indicators, pp.89-90)
4. The recognition of the importance of safety as it affects cyclists and the take-up of cycling (pp.15, 72)
5. The need to raise awareness of the benefits of cycling and remove misconceptions about perceived difficulties (p.72)
6. The recognition of the benefits of cycling (health benefits mentioned in a number of places, financial benefits p.83)

The policy also contains many specific ideas for improving provision. However, from the page numbers above it will be seen that key references to cycling are somewhat scattered throughout the document. This gives the impression of a somewhat uncoordinated approach, particularly as the benefits of cycling for society are not spelt out in one place either. The Panel suggests that these could be summarised as below:

- A healthier population making fewer demands on the health system
- A better environment, with reduced noise, stress and anxiety for all
- More children (walking and) cycling to school creating better fitness levels and promoting greater independence
- Less demand for States expenditure on major road or parking improvements to increase capacity
- Land previously given over to car parking made available for other uses
- Lower use of resources, especially fossil fuels
- A more attractive Island for tourists

The Panel has identified four main areas of concern in respect of cycling in the policy.



### **10.3.1 Safety**

The policy rightly identifies this as a key issue when it says on p.72: '**Cyclists have to be made safer and feel safer on all roads.**' This laudable and essential aim has to be matched by ongoing commitment and investment in the necessary education, awareness raising and enforcement amongst motorists and cyclists alike.

As an example, moves to incorporate new cycle lanes and other road design features into Jersey's narrow roads will require great care to ensure that they do not inadvertently create any additional hazards for cyclists or other road users, and can be adequately monitored (and policed) in use to ensure that they operate safely. They will also bring a requirement for comprehensive awareness raising and education for all road users. Cyclists are part of the mix, and all road users - cyclists, motorists, pedestrians and even horse riders - must interact safely.

In 1995 the Jersey Cycling Group published a document in which it spelt out precisely what is needed to ensure safety for cyclists. Its conclusions are even more relevant in a time when there is a policy being proposed to substantially increase the number of cyclists on our roads. Part of this document is reproduced at Appendix 5.

### **10.3.2 Children**

The Panel's observations on the importance of ensuring that children cycle to school in greater numbers as targeted in the strategy, and on what investment is necessary for this to happen, may be found in section 8.6.1 above.

### **10.3.3 Liaising with cyclists**

Regular cyclists are a well-defined group and it would be relatively easy to encourage effective liaison. This is not mentioned in the policy but it would have many benefits. Cyclists could save the department time and money by acting as:

- A source of feedback on existing facilities and future proposals
- A source of ideas for improvements
- Extra 'eyes and ears' for the department, for example helping to flag up dangers such as pot-holes

### **10.3.4. Funding and commitment**

The policy risks seeming 'fuzzy' because the various elements relating to cycling are not brought together. It suggests that increased levels of cycling will constitute the second biggest modal change after increased bus use, and if specific areas mentioned for improvement are acted upon these will have significant budgetary implications:

- Improvements to the western route
- Development of an eastern route
- Provision in the harbour area
- On-road cycle lanes and advanced stop-lines
- Cycle parking improvements
- Provision of more shared space solutions
- Carrying bikes on buses
- Future road improvements to focus on walking, cycling, public transport and safety

Yet it is not clear from the policy document how it is intended to fund this programme going forward, and how such funding would be justified in the absence of a clear and coherent statement of the benefits. Nor is it clear whether the requisite across-the-board commitment to cycling exists. Lack of clarity on these two key aspects of the policy is a matter of concern to the Panel.

For example, the need to improve the surface of the railway track is referred to, as is the need to address safety issues along the promenade cycle track, but ongoing maintenance of this kind implies commitment and an ongoing budget. It also seems to the Panel that the ability to take bikes on buses, which is a potential winning marketing tool for the bus operator, is seen more as a problem than an opportunity.

A suitable budget and commitment could support the effective overall promotion of cycling in different contexts and the provision of necessary improvements in infrastructure, whilst ensuring that the safety of cyclists was not compromised. However, the Panel has some doubt as to whether the levels of commitment and funding demonstrated in the policy will be sufficient to deliver the desired results.

The Connétable of St Helier also commented in his email to the Panel on the absence of a coherent cycling strategy in the policy:

***The STP is far from ambitious in its treatment of cycling. Given the very low take up of commuter cycling quoted in the report (based on 2009 data) and the fact that much of the Island is particularly well suited to cycling, and given its place in the transport hierarchy, one would have expected a much fuller and more comprehensive treatment of cycling. The St Helier Roads Committee formulated its own draft cycling strategy for the Parish several years ago and submitted it to the previous Minister for consideration as part of his transport policy but there is no evidence that it has influenced the current policy.***

### **Key findings**

- 33.** An appropriate level of priority is given to cycling in the policy and there is a good understanding of strategic considerations and the practical steps required in promoting cycling.
- 34.** The different elements of policy as they affect cycling are not brought together in the policy
- 35.** The benefits of increasing the numbers of people cycling are not clearly stated
- 36.** Although the policy identifies safety as a key issue if cycling is to be promoted effectively and in a responsible manner, there is little detail on how this issue should be addressed
- 37.** The benefits of liaising with cyclists are not explored in the policy

### **Recommendations**

- 27.** All policy elements relating to cycling, both strategic and practical, should be brought together in one document setting out a 'roadmap for cycling'
- 28.** A sustained commitment to cycling over the lifetime of the policy should be stated, with a budget, organisational structure, timescales and targets worked out no later than the end of 2011
- 29.** Issues around cyclists and road safety should be a specific focus of the road safety task group

## **10.4 Road safety**

The Panel has serious reservations about the policy stance on road safety. It is understood that a commitment in the previous draft to reduce road injuries by 20% was dropped owing to a lack of confidence about how it could be delivered in practice. The move to a 'reducing trend' is therefore seen as a compromise, one which members feel needs to be fleshed out with more information. The Panel notes that in terms of community costs, reducing accident rates has a huge rate of return.

### **10.4.1 Lack of analysis**

Members were surprised to discover that until now there has been little analysis of road accident records to inform new safety measures; it was admitted in the hearing that in the past there had not been a properly coordinated approach to road safety between the various departments involved. It was suggested that they need to come together more regularly to look at the causes of accidents in Jersey to see where investment could bring about reductions, and this would be the function of a new task group.

The policy itself offers little detail about practical measures that could realistically support moves towards a 'vision zero' target of no deaths or serious injuries on our roads, which is a matter of some concern, especially in the light of recent tragic events. There is also a feeling amongst the Panel that not having a specific target for reducing accidents in the policy could lead to a loss of focus on accident prevention, whereas a recognised target - even if it might not always be achieved - could place more emphasis on results. Panel members considered that while broad promises of better engineering, enforcement and education to improve road safety may sound reassuring, some recent projects left room for doubt as to whether those promises could be delivered successfully in practice. In view of the increased numbers of cyclists, motorcyclists and pedestrians expected to result from adoption of the policy, road safety will require a more systematic and coordinated approach in future.

### **10.4.2 Cycle and motorcycle safety**

The Panel believes that particular attention will need to be focused on safety for cyclists and motorcyclists. The STP partly relies on increasing levels of two-wheeled transport for success, yet there appears to be little recognition locally that cycles and motorcycles not only use road space differently from other vehicles, but have completely different dynamics and safety issues.

The condition of our roads is of particular importance to two-wheeled transport. A pothole or damaged surface that may be a minor annoyance to car drivers can cause a serious accident to cyclists or motorcyclists. Unfortunately many of Jersey's roads are now in appalling condition, and service covers on corners, slippery road markings, leaf-strewn lanes and muddy field exits add to the dangers for those using two-wheeled transport. Proper consideration at the design stage of all new or altered road layouts should help to ensure that the needs of cyclists and motorcyclists as well as other traffic are taken into account, but there are also repair and maintenance issues to be addressed if we want to keep the number of accidents down while increasing the numbers of cyclists and motorcyclists on our roads.

#### **Key finding**

**38.** Policy statements on road safety appear reassuring, but lack substance. A lack of specific proposals or targets other than to 're-establish a reducing trend' of accident injuries and move towards an aspirational 'vision zero' target is not considered to constitute a sufficiently robust approach to road safety issues

## **Recommendations**

**30.** The policy statements on road safety and a 'reducing trend' for accident injuries should be treated as an interim position and replaced with more specific and robust targets to be developed by the road safety task group within an agreed timeframe

**31.** All proposals for road improvements or alterations should include detailed consideration of safety implications for all road users, not just private cars or public transport

## **11. Smarter travel choices**

The policy proposes that people should be encouraged to make better travel choices that will lead to a reduced congestion, environmental benefits and a healthier lifestyle. These are of course worthwhile aims; but bringing them about is complicated. More people could probably be persuaded to try an alternative to the car on nice sunny days in summer than in the depths of winter, which suggests that traffic improvements may be a seasonal phenomenon. There is nothing wrong with this, although it highlights the importance of ensuring a comprehensive and comfortable year-round bus service to the success of the policy.

### ***11.1 Promoting cycling***

Increasing the numbers of people cycling will be heavily dependent on making this activity as attractive as possible to people who have not previously used a bicycle to commute to work. The Panel considers that while awareness campaigns and marketing definitely have their place, the most meaningful improvements are likely to come from giving people confidence that roads will be made physically safer for cyclists. This could be assisted by the widespread adoption of cycle priority marking on roads, and by actively reducing the amount of vehicle traffic where cycling could reasonably be prioritised, for example by creating a network of cycling and pedestrian priority roads in St Helier during the daytime.

The Panel believes it will be important not to over-emphasise the creation of off-road cycle routes in the policy as an alternative to cycling on-road. While some off-road routes may be practical, as indicated in the policy they are not an option in many areas, and in terms of both sustainability and safety it would be more beneficial to foster a culture where cycling on roads is accepted, rather than 'segregating' cyclists from other traffic.

### ***11.2 Cycle rental***

The Panel agrees with the STP that possibilities for cycle rental schemes are worth exploring, particularly in connection with the bus service. Although distances in St Helier may be shorter than in European cities, the ability to get off a bus and straight onto a bike could take five or even ten minutes off some people's commuting time. This could prove an attractive alternative to queuing up for a space in a car park, especially if the perceived safety and network issues are addressed. There might also be attractions in such a scheme for some visitors.

### ***11.3 Travel plans for work place and school***

The Panel supports the concept of travel plans and their introduction as a sensible way forward for all large developments, States departments and schools as well as businesses. However, it is clear that such plans may have an uphill struggle if there is no dedicated funding available to support them. In the case of existing businesses and States departments where there is limited availability of showers, changing facilities, bicycle storage and lockers it is inevitably going to be harder to convert staff to walking and cycling to work; motorcyclists will also need somewhere to change and store protective and wet-weather gear, as well as parking facilities reasonably close to their place of employment.

### ***11.4 Funding implications***

For most travel plans there will therefore be funding implications involved in providing or extending necessary facilities. On p.73 of the policy it states:

**It is important that travel plans are resourced in the long term, to ensure that measures in the plan survive changes in personnel, circumstances, tenants or ownership of businesses.**

Funding for travel plans should be considered as an 'invest to save' initiative. Measurable benefits to the employer over time can include reduced sickness, lower absenteeism, and a more alert workforce. Similar benefits apply to travel plans for schools. Individuals concerned gain from the health benefits and time saved, and the Island as a whole in terms of reduced congestion, environmental gains and (eventually) reduced pressure on the health service.

The annual budget allocated under the policy for all States travel plans including schools and departments is only £40,000. The Panel believes that a more realistic allocation of funds is required to cover the costs of developing travel plans for States departments as well as schools.

### **11.5 Personal travel planning**

In early discussions with the department the Panel was informed of plans to promote personal travel planning (PTP) with the assistance of Sustrans, a British charity which promotes sustainable transport. Members were taken aback to discover that the option preferred by the charity was to deliver a large-scale campaign including home visits, awareness-raising and support for residents to change their travel habits at a cost of some £300,000; the Panel was therefore reassured by the decision to postpone implementation of a PTP project, pending assessment of the success of other measures.

In view of Jersey's small size and the relatively limited travel options available at present it is felt that the majority of people will already be aware of the bus and cycle routes available. However, the Panel believes that in order to encourage more people to try alternative travel, there may be a need to offer more substantial incentives than the 'free bus ticket' mentioned in the PTP section. This is supported by the findings of the AECOM/TAS consultants' review of the bus service, which concluded that while the service was well marketed to tourists, **the economic and environmental benefits of using public transport need to be marketed and made more attractive to the resident population.**<sup>1</sup> Adopting new habits takes time; if marketing incentives were available these could be targeted at routes which were not generally well-used, for example where buses were already running but not at full capacity, so there would effectively be no cost to providing such an incentive.

#### **Key finding**

**39.** There is no specific consideration of marketing incentives for people to change their travel habits in the policy, nor is there any indication where this might be possible within the indicative budget

#### **Recommendation**

**32.** Marketing incentives should be considered to promote the use of new or improved bus services, encourage greater uptake of under-used services and promote alternative transport choices

---

<sup>1</sup> STP, p.35

## **12. Vehicle choices**

In its opening paragraph this section makes an important statement: that the private car can be expected to remain the preferred option for many people who live outside walking distance of their destination, at least in the foreseeable future. The choice of vehicle and how it will be powered are therefore important issues. Incentives for low emission vehicles have been discussed previously in the parking section of this report.

### **12.1 Motorcycles**

The Panel is supportive of policy aims to encourage more take-up of motor-cycles and other powered two-wheelers; relatively low emissions and reduced demand for road and parking space are in their favour. There is however no escaping the fact that riders are more at risk of injury in accidents than other road users, and campaigns encouraging more awareness of motorcyclists as well as cyclists would be of benefit.

In respect of motorcycle training, the Panel believes that while some review may be appropriate if specific safety issues arise from analysis of road accidents, it will be important to ensure that any proposals for change are assessed by experts, and full consultation with stakeholders and appropriate organisations takes place before implementation is considered.

### **12.2 Electric bicycles**

The Panel considers that the policy is right to support the growing interest in electrically-assisted bicycles and other low or zero emission vehicles by ensuring that legislation encourages their use. As electric bikes appear to have developed more quickly than electric cars the Panel would recommend that the department looks into possibilities for installing charging points for them at convenient locations, as this could widen their appeal as an alternative to normal bicycles to people who might otherwise not consider cycling as an option.

### **12.3 Vehicle emissions duty (VED) and commercial vehicles**

This section includes comments about the potential for VED arrangements to impact on the purchase of commercial vehicles, and mentions incentives such as scrappage schemes as a possible option to encourage the replacement of older commercial vehicles. The Panel does not agree that this should be necessary. The VED regulations were not drawn up with commercial vehicles in mind; in the Panel's view, the best approach to ensure a level playing field for all commercial operators would be to develop suitable legislation based on up-to-date emission regulations specifically for commercial vehicles, rather than risk creating a demand for additional incentive schemes.

### **12.4 Road worthiness and emissions testing**

While it would be hard to oppose the principle of either emissions testing or 'road worthiness' MOT style testing, the practicalities are another matter. Under current arrangements approximately 1,000 vehicles (mostly larger or commercial types) are checked each year at DVS, and the Panel is informed that approximately 12,000 more are subjected to roadside checks. Of these, over 300 were found to be defective last year; however, the number of defects found in private cars has been reducing steadily since 2006. The policy draws attention to costs that would have to be borne by motorists if testing were to become compulsory, suggesting that emissions testing would be a less onerous requirement than full MOT style testing in a time of recession.

The Panel has not been informed of the likely cost implications of gearing up to carry out individual emissions tests on the 113,000 vehicles registered in the Island (according to Jersey in Figures) at the end of 2009. However, it is expected that these would be considerable.

Clearly any move to oblige all vehicles to be tested on an annual basis, whether for emissions or road worthiness, would have massive implications both for individual owners and the department. Garages would presumably have to be assessed, licensed and subsequently monitored for their ability to carry out tests accurately and fairly. Certificates would have to be issued and renewed, and there would need to be a mechanism for taking non-compliant vehicles off the road. Some local garages now charge over £70 per hour for work carried out, so a requirement for annual servicing or emissions checks could potentially result in car owners having to pay hundreds of pounds per vehicle owned.

In the absence of clear evidence to prove that defective vehicles are involved in a significantly larger number of accidents than other vehicles, such measures are considered to be not only unaffordable, but also potentially unnecessary at present. The Panel was therefore pleased to hear from the Assistant Minister at the hearing on 18<sup>th</sup> October that there was no likelihood of any move towards MOT style testing for private cars in the near future.

### **12.5 Commercial vehicle operator licences**

The Panel considers that the introduction of commercial vehicle operator licences is long overdue in Jersey. This appears to be supported by the increasing number of faults noted in the policy as being found with larger vehicles, and by reports in the media (following recent road checks by DVS) suggesting that many existing operators are neglecting basic maintenance.

Although not referred to in the policy, such a system could also help to address matters such as training in vehicle operation, driver hours and loading as well as maintenance issues; this could follow the lines of UK certification, where issue of an operator's licence requires the operator to possess a Certificate of Professional Competence in Road Haulage (CPC) qualification. The requirement for operator licenses has existed for many years in other jurisdictions and the Panel believes that this opportunity to enhance overall standards of competence should not be overlooked.

However, members remain to be convinced that a system of 'self-certification' by commercial operators (even backed up by departmental audit of records) would be sufficiently robust in practice. It is suggested that department resources for this initiative should in the first instance be focused on active monitoring and testing to ensure compliance, although it may be appropriate over time to move towards a more 'hands-off' approach once individual operators have been able to prove that their maintenance and training programmes are consistent and effective.

### **12.6 Agricultural vehicles**

The Panel notes that the policy is silent on the use of agricultural vehicles on roads.

#### **Key findings**

**40.** Comments in the policy concerning a possible need for additional incentives to compensate for the possible effects of VED on the replacement of commercial vehicles are considered to be premature

**41.** VED is not considered to be an appropriate method of taxation for large commercial vehicles, which have substantially higher emissions than private cars or light vans



**Key findings cont'd**

**42.** Emissions and/or road worthiness testing would almost inevitably result in considerable additional costs to owners of private vehicles; the benefits have not been clearly established

**43.** Evidence of an increasing number of defects in commercial vehicles tested following roadside checks suggests that there is a need for operators of commercial vehicles to be licensed

**Recommendations**

**33.** The department should work with the Treasury to develop an appropriate mechanism to deal with the taxation of larger commercial vehicles based on their higher emissions levels, rather than seeking ways to incentivise owners to replace older vehicles

**34.** Emissions and MOT style testing for privately owned vehicles should not be pursued at this time

**35.** Commercial vehicle operator licensing is supported, and should include requirements for training and professional competence as well as vehicle maintenance and compliance with emissions standards

## 13. Benefits, costs, timing and monitoring

### 13.1 Benefits

It is clear that if the policy is successful in achieving its targets, significant benefits should ensue. However, the extent of these will only become apparent over time. The way that the possible benefits have been described in the policy could be misunderstood. Essentially it has identified a 'headline' monetary figure approximating to the largest estimate of current environmental costs which could be attributed in some way to transport issues; but it has not attempted to identify specific savings targets in relation to these figures. The Panel believes that the lack of specific targets in many areas of the policy could lead to weaknesses in monitoring performance and affect public confidence, as suggested in the following exchange during the hearing on 18<sup>th</sup> October:

**The Deputy of St. Mary:**

*I know others will want to pick up on the bus issue. But if I step back a bit, when we are talking about the cost of what this policy is, which you say is £500,000, can we have a look at the benefits side, and on page 8 you list the way that travel impacts on the Island and the benefits of having this policy. I just wonder if you would like to talk to those a little bit and say how you are going to make sure the public know about the progress that has been made in these areas.*

**The Minister for Transport and Technical Services:**

*In practice the translation will be towards reduced congestion, reduced air and noise pollution and down the list from that point of view, of course, improving the environment, particularly if you go back to schools; improving the environment in the St. Saviour area. I think the public will be able to judge that fairly well by the performance of the actions that we take. It will be obvious. I think what we need to look at is also the hidden benefits which are not there in writing, if you like - as you have referred to in the past - the environmental benefits which are not always immediately apparent will become apparent in the fullness of time and, of course, that has to link in with the Medical Officer of Health's requirements in terms of health improvements in the children. She is quite targeted on linking with us on that and we sincerely hope that we can work together in achieving additional health benefits.*

**The Deputy of St. Mary:**

*I just wonder, given the need to, in a sense, sell this policy - by sell I mean you have to sell it to the States, which is going to be quite difficult maybe, and sell it to the public - whether there should not be more emphasis on ... you say the public will be able to judge this, I am not sure and it would be nice if you had measures, existing measures of air and noise pollution and you could show 2 years down the line, 4 years down the line, this is the progress we have made in Bath Street, this is the progress we have made on St. Saviour's Road, this is the progress we have made in St. Mary's village. Would that not be a real motivator for the public and for your own department?*

The Panel considers that it would be a great asset to the policy if its progress could be monitored and demonstrated in a way that could capture the public imagination and be more relevant to individuals. In particular members believe that more specific and measurable targets could encourage greater benefits by enabling a closer focus on individual aspects of the policy. This could motivate more people to participate and change their own travel habits.

With that in mind, the Panel would recommend that the department considers the possibility for regularly publishing statistics relevant to the policy, such as traffic levels on different routes around the Island. This information could become a useful motivational tool for people to try new travel modes. Statistical data arising from automatic monitoring currently carried out and more detailed surveys performed annually could also be used pro-actively to identify marketing opportunities, for example by highlighting particular bus routes which could be targeted with incentives to increase ridership. If data collected by the proposed road safety task group was also made public a similar approach could be taken to focus public attention on the causes and consequences of road

accidents. Engaging with the public in this way could assist the work of the group by enhancing public awareness of current road safety issues.

In the slightly longer term, publicising progress against existing levels of air and possibly noise pollution at specific sites, levels of fuel use and greenhouse gas emissions would also be seen as a way not just of marking the success of the policy, but also showing people that their actions really can make a difference, which could be a major motivating factor leading to even greater benefits. It is understood that air quality monitoring is currently performed by the Health Department, but the Panel believes that the importance of traffic-related air pollution in terms of potential health issues as well as greenhouse gas emissions is such that targets should be set and progress monitored and reported on as part of the Sustainable Transport Policy.

## **13.2 Costs**

At the hearing on 18<sup>th</sup> October the Panel challenged the Minister on the restricted budget available for the policy, asking if he really felt that his aims could be achieved with such constraints on investment. Despite assurances that the policy was aiming at what was achievable, the Panel's view is that the overall budget allocation is unrealistic to reach the intended targets. To put things in perspective, the entire annual budget for the Sustainable Transport Policy is only £500,000, which compares with the same amount voted for just the first stage of the Eastern Cycle Route.

The Panel has some sympathy with the Minister, whose department's delivery of the policy is partly dictated by the requirements of the States Strategic Plan, but has come at a time when States funding is arguably more tightly constrained than at any time in recent decades. That said, members believe that unless the Minister can persuade States members and the Treasury to consider investing more in the STP, different approaches may need to be considered.

As it currently stands there are concerns that the limited budget for the policy will be spread very thinly over a broad range of projects, inevitably leading to concerns that delivery may be patchy or inadequate in some areas. For example the possible expenditure scenario on p.88 identifies the sum of £20,000 for public awareness campaigns, which in itself seems extremely tight; but there is no mention of any budget for marketing or incentivisation. The suggested allocation of £40,000 for travel plans for schools and States departments has already been identified by the Panel as likely to be inadequate to cover both areas to a good standard. Members are slightly puzzled by the department's recent public announcement that it intends to trial a number plate recognition system at Sand Street car park next year, which seems to risk raising public expectations before the policy has been agreed or funding identified.

Clearly the funding scenario has been drawn with a very broad brush and there is little detail in it at this stage. However, the Panel would draw attention to the requirement for the policy to have a real impact if it is to engage the public. This would point to a need to maximise low or no cost solutions. Chief amongst these would be possibilities for trialling extended pedestrianisation and cycle networks in St Helier.

Members would also recommend prioritising necessary spending on areas where the investment could be expected to make the biggest difference, which might in the first instance be in improvements to the bus service, developing travel plans for schools, extending cycle networks, and providing additional facilities for cycle and motorcycle parking. As successive years' funding became available the department could then address lower priority or 'nice-to-have' measures such as number plate recognition systems with more confidence that the basic framework for the policy was securely in place. In the Panel's view a better targeted rolling programme such as this would be a more effective use of the very limited funding available than directing smaller sums to a large number of different policy initiatives at once.

### **Key findings**

**44.** Benefits of the policy are not identified as specific savings targets

**45.** The policy does not clearly identify any means by which the public would be kept informed of progress towards achieving its aims

**46.** The budget allocated to the policy is not considered adequate to achieve its intended purpose; some aspects may therefore have to be dropped or delayed

### **Recommendations**

**36.** The department should prioritise opportunities for maximum benefit at low or no cost, such as developing pedestrianisation and cycle network schemes

**37.** Spending should be clearly prioritised and targeted on essential, rather than 'nice-to-have' items, structured as a rolling programme to ensure maximum benefits from money spent in each area rather than attempting to cover a whole range of policy objectives with limited funding

**38.** To give the policy a greater chance of success, the Panel believes that the Minister will need to identify additional and innovative sources of funding

## ***Appendices***

### **Appendix 1 - Letter to Minister for Transport and Technical Services, 5<sup>th</sup> May 2009**

#### Scrutiny Office

Connétable Michael Jackson  
Minister for Transport and Technical Services  
P.O. Box 412  
South Hill Offices  
St Helier  
Jersey JE4 8UY

Our Ref: 514/1(3)

5<sup>th</sup> May 2009

#### **Integrated Travel and Transport Plan**

Dear Minister

Further to your e-mail of 7<sup>th</sup> April 2009 concerning taxis and cabs, this matter has now been discussed by the Panel as a possible subject for future review. The Panel noted your remarks concerning a report to be prepared by the Director of Driver and Vehicle Services, and would be grateful for a copy of this document when it is completed. However, members came to the conclusion that this matter should properly be dealt with as part of a comprehensive review of the Integrated Travel and Transport Plan. This poses some problems for the Panel, which I will explain.

As you know, Panel members attended your offices on 12<sup>th</sup> March for a discussion of the draft Integrated Travel and Transport Plan with yourself and your officers. Following this a number of questions from Deputy Wimberley on behalf of the Panel were forwarded to your Department, to which replies have since been received. The opportunity for a full and frank discussion was much appreciated, as are the efforts of your officers to reply to our enquiries.

Unfortunately, the unanimous reaction of Panel members in respect of the Integrated Travel and Transport Plan in its draft form was one of considerable disappointment. Given the extended period during which this plan has been in preparation, the Panel had high hopes that when it finally emerged it would contain clear, practical and detailed proposals which could be expected to bring about substantial improvements to travel and transport in Jersey.

In our opinion this expectation has not been met in the present document. In particular, the Panel is concerned that:

- Much of the rationale for the plan is based on economic factors or assumptions that either no longer apply, or are at best very uncertain: high fuel costs, increasing population, economic growth, rising demand for transport, continued housing development outside St Helier and the delivery of the Waterfront Development come to mind as obvious examples

- Various assumptions have been made within the plan about social factors which are not easily quantifiable, often unsupported by hard evidence. It is felt that widespread public support for 'green' initiatives and willingness to embrace behavioural change cannot safely be assumed in circumstances of increasing financial hardship and rising unemployment, especially where the individual would be expected to bear additional costs
- Some of the plan's stated targets seem unambitious, others unrealistic. For example, increasing bus use by 50% during peak hours might appear to be major step forward, until the 350 extra passengers this would represent is compared with the 11,000 who come to town by car during the same period. There is no satisfactory explanation as to how 50% increases in walking and cycling could be achieved, or specific details of measures which could reduce road injuries by 20%
- The draft Travel and Transport Plan does not seem to contain any individual initiatives that could be expected to bring about major improvements, while a number of its recommendations simply refer to further surveys or studies yet to be undertaken. Overall the document gives the appearance of a work in progress rather than a completed policy statement.

**The Panel therefore considers that in its present form the Integrated Travel and Transport Plan is ill-conceived and not fit for purpose.**

One issue which causes members particular concern is the bus service. The Panel believes that there is widespread dissatisfaction amongst the general public about the level of service provided by Connex at present, especially from those who live in the rural parishes. Without radical improvements to the public transport system, members believe that any attempt to bring about significant changes to behaviour involving a reduction in car journeys is essentially bound to fail, as for many people there is no realistic alternative to the private car for their day-to-day travel needs. Proposals for changes to the bus service contained within the draft plan are far from clear but as noted above, targets for improvement seem wholly inadequate.

With this in mind the Panel is extremely concerned that the process for renewing the bus contract should not proceed independently. It is understood that a review of the law and consideration of the route network are scheduled for this year, in preparation for the tendering process to take place in late 2010 or early 2011. In our view this preparatory work will be premature unless it is fully incorporated into an agreed overall travel and transport policy, albeit not the one which is currently on the table.

From the comments above you will realise that the Panel has serious misgivings about the draft Integrated Travel and Transport Plan and suggests that considerably more work is required on this before it is formally submitted for scrutiny. Despite the length of time it has spent in development it is felt that a major reappraisal would be a positive step. I would be grateful to hear your views on this and if you agree, would be happy to discuss a possible timeline so that the Panel can schedule work on an amended plan within its work programme.

Yours sincerely



Deputy P Rondel  
Chairman, Environment Scrutiny Panel

## **Appendix 2 - Letter to Minister for Transport and Technical Services, 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2009**

Scrutiny Office

Connétable Michael Jackson  
Minister for Transport and Technical Services  
P.O. Box 412  
South Hill Offices  
St Helier  
Jersey JE4 8UY

Our Ref: 514/1(3)

23<sup>rd</sup> September 2009

### **Sustainable Transport Plan**

Dear Minister

Members of the Environment Scrutiny Panel have now had the opportunity to discuss the draft Sustainable Transport Policy - 'Vision' Consultation Document. Our initial reaction is unfortunately one of disappointment, in that the document appears to take no account of the concerns noted in my previous letter regarding the Integrated Travel and Transport Plan (5<sup>th</sup> May 2009), in which the Panel remarked upon the lack of 'clear, practical and detailed proposals which could be expected to bring about substantial improvements to travel and transport in Jersey'. It is therefore not surprising that members view the new STP 'Vision' document with some frustration, as it appears to simply reiterate a number of the basic ideas from the previous Integrated Travel and Transport Plan in even less detailed terms, without adding anything new.

It may well be argued that this is by nature a 'high level' policy document, rather than a plan of action. However, even at the higher policy level the Panel would expect a public consultation document to show some rational and evidence-based justification for ideas which appear to be central to departmental planning. Regrettably the 'Vision' document does not provide this; indeed in its present form the Panel feels that it amounts to little more than wishful thinking, dressed up as public consultation. It paints an optimistic picture of a substantial shift in behaviour in favour of sustainable transport choices, but offers little or no information as to how this could be achieved in practice. While the goals of reduced pollution and congestion may be admirable, meaningful estimates of costs are not supplied, and there is no coherent rationale outlining how the desired changes in personal behaviour would be achieved in reality. For example, the specific target of reducing peak hour traffic levels in term time by 15% appears to be rely heavily on the premise that the 'many alternatives to private car use ... need to be made more attractive to encourage people to choose them more often'. The accompanying chart showing 'potential mode changes' gives an indication of the substantial numbers of people who the department thinks would need to radically alter their current behaviour and adopt alternative means of transport to achieve this target. However, the Panel is concerned that this may considerably over-estimate people's willingness or ability to embrace such lifestyle changes. A particular worry (which was previously expressed in the letter referred to above) is that while there appears to be some commitment to make improvements to the bus service, the kind of capacity increases which are mentioned in the document seem to be completely inadequate to bring about any major change in people's transport choices.

Members are concerned that in the absence of the necessary supporting evidence the consultation as it stands may be premature and potentially misleading. Some of the Panel's problems with the consultation document are covered below:

1. The only options seemingly considered for raising funds involve additional taxes on motorists and higher costs for parking. Both of these will tend to be inflationary and regressive in nature; it is obviously less than ideal that it is also proposed to put up bus fares at the same time. Little consideration appears to have been given to the public's ability to sustain such increased charges, or whether in the absence of real alternatives it is fair to single out the motorist as a source of extra income (especially bearing in mind the main thrust of the proposals is to reduce car use, which would seem to represent something of a 'double whammy' for those who rely on their cars).
2. While there is an indication that more investment is needed in the bus service, areas for improvement are only discussed in very general terms. It is noted that the draft policy envisages an increase in bus usage at peak hours of only some 350 passengers, amounting to roughly 3% of the number who currently travel into St Helier by car. Members consider that in the absence of practical alternatives, improvements in capacity significantly in excess of this level may need to be investigated, and would recommend that the terms of reference for the department's consultants are amended to cover this possibility.
3. The Panel believes that that any meaningful consultation should provide members of the public with a range of ideas upon which to comment, and the stimulus to contribute their own. The Panel is particularly concerned that the consultation questions included in this draft document are both inadequate in scope and leading in nature, with many seemingly heavily biased towards the department's desired outcomes. Two such examples in respect of the bus service are: 'Do you agree the bus service should continue to be subsidised by the tax payer?' 'Do you think the States should invest in improved bus services?' Members question what direction the policy could take if (hypothetically) the public answered either of these questions in the negative. The over-use of essentially rhetorical 'Do you agree?' questions in the draft (especially when no realistic alternatives are included) risks undermining the credibility of the consultation.
4. Very little information is supplied regarding the costs or practicality of achieving the department's aims. The Panel wonders how much credibility will attach to any preferences which may be expressed by respondents to the consultation if they are not given the full picture, including how much the policy objectives will cost them and what chance they have of success. The draft more than once mentions that £1 million per annum could be raised by putting an extra 2p on fuel duty. However, it makes only a cursory reference to proposals for 'environmental' taxes which are known to be well advanced; and it fails to mention that much higher levels of tax and fuel duty are being considered to raise additional funding if necessary. Members believe that the public deserves a more candid appraisal of the full extent of both likely costs and realistic outcomes of the policy.
5. It is noted that in the section 'Improving Public Transport' the figure of £80m is quoted in respect of the likely cost of a mass-transit light rail or tram system, as part of an explicit argument why this would not be viable; this rather negative stance is carried over from the previous draft Integrated Travel and Transport Plan. There may be good reasons why a light rail/tram solution might be considered uneconomic, but the Panel considers that including this comment only to follow it with the question "Do you think a tram system would be value for money?" reflects poorly on the consultation as a whole and may even appear patronising to the public. (Members are also concerned that it may demonstrate a resistance within the department to considering other mass transit possibilities, should they arise.)
6. Decisions have clearly been made concerning the department's intention to charge significantly more for parking. There are also strong hints within the document that there may be a departmental agenda to actively inconvenience private motorists<sup>1</sup> to further reduce the attractiveness of car use. However, the proposals fail to demonstrate any practical alternatives to the car for people living in country parishes who cannot consider buses or cycling as a realistic option, owing to limitations on services, inconvenient timing and/or distances involved in their journey to work. Moves to deter people from using their cars thus seem likely to have a disproportionate impact both on people living in certain areas and on certain sectors of the population; for example research indicates that mothers with young children are often particularly car dependent.
7. The claim that 'there are many alternatives to private car use' is overstated. If one assumes that taxis are excluded on grounds of cost, and accepts the department's argument (see 5. above) that any alternative form of mass transport system would be prohibitively expensive, the only



remaining choices are the bus (if a regular service exists in your area); walking; cycling; and (some form of) motorcycling. Of these, walking is limited to short distances and depends heavily on the weather; cycling is restrictive in terms of carrying bags and is weather dependant; motorcycling has similar limitations and requires specialist training and tests. Compared with using a car, all of the non-bus alternatives bring significant additional risk and/or inconvenience.

8. Given the global recession, it seems reasonable that any initiative which could be expected to put a disproportionate burden on the lower paid should be avoided at all costs. It therefore seems unfortunate that a policy intended to be sustainable should seemingly rely for its success on applying additional financial pressure on members of the public.
9. The section of the consultation devoted to 'vehicle choices' seems to be sending mixed messages. Current proposals for new 'environmental' taxes in the shape of Vehicle Emissions Duty (VED) are played down, but an agenda is set out to introduce a regular emissions testing régime to enable it to pursue the owners of older vehicles, which in many cases will not be able to comply with modern standards. This would inevitably be costly and time consuming; assertions that it may be in our interests to avoid future difficulties with the EU also seem inconsistent when considered alongside other many other areas in which the Island does not follow EU imperatives.
10. Offering cut-price parking to the minority of people who can aspire to purchase a new 'eco-friendly' car in the current financial climate also jars with efforts throughout the rest of the consultation to encourage people to move away from their reliance on private cars. There are obvious problems with encouraging the use of one particular type of car while trying to reduce car use overall. While the Panel can see the importance of establishing some incentives for behaviour change, it would seem sensible to avoid later conflicts by getting it right from the outset.
11. The declaration that the department would be unable to fund any new initiatives or improvements out of its existing budget pre-supposes that alternative prioritisation is unthinkable, even in the interests of promoting desired behavioural changes. This would seem to risk missing real opportunities to bring about a new way of thinking.
12. It is noted in passing (under Sustainable Travel Choices) that the consultation emphasises that all States departments and new developments should be required to put in place travel plans for staff and residents; yet TTS is understood to have invoked regulations regarding floor area to exclude consideration of a travel plan for its own new Energy from Waste Plant. If true, this would seem to be an unfortunate example of don't do what I do, do what I say.

The Panel considers that this consultation is flawed. While it attempts to give a positive message on the prospects for behavioural change and sustainable transport, it provides insufficient evidence as to how the department expects to deliver on its objectives, or what the cost of this may be. On the other hand there are strong indications that it will (deliberately) drive up the cost of motoring and make car use less convenient. Members are particularly concerned that the content and format of the questions included in the document represent a very poor example of consultation. The Panel believes it would be better to complete such background studies as are necessary to furnish evidence in support of the department's plans, before pressing for their adoption. While this would not hinder the department's launch of its proposals it would allow for a much more satisfactory and meaningful consultation to take place at a more appropriate time.

The Panel is concerned that the department seems to be attempting to deliver its agenda for change without having completed adequate groundwork. Whatever the pressures, it is felt that more effort is still urgently needed to ensure that the policy eventually adopted will be fit for purpose and acceptable to the ordinary people of Jersey.

Yours sincerely



Deputy P Rondel  
Chairman, Environment Scrutiny Panel

## **Appendix 3 - Letter to Minister for Transport and Technical Services, 23<sup>rd</sup> February 2010**

### Scrutiny Office

Connétable Michael Jackson  
Minister for Transport and Technical Services  
P.O. Box 412  
South Hill Offices  
St Helier  
Jersey JE4 8UY

Our Ref: 514/1(3)

23<sup>rd</sup> February 2010

#### **Meeting with Bus Consultants 1<sup>st</sup> February 2010**

Dear Minister

Further to Panel members' attendance at the meeting with the department's consultants on 1<sup>st</sup> February 2010 concerning their report on the bus service, I write to give the Panel's views in respect of the report, presentation and discussion.

Members consider that that the latest position represents a step forward from last year, in particular the expectation that significantly greater numbers of passengers may be able to access buses during peak hours than was previously proposed. However, the Panel believes that there is still considerable room for improvement to services to northern and country parishes and some coastal locations.

There was some discussion at the meeting of the opportunity to fine-tune proposed routes. As it stands the report appears to emphasise certain easy wins such as increased capacity to the Airport via Red Houses. The Panel considers that the more frequent services proposed need to be extended into other areas to give a greater number of residents the opportunity to take the bus instead of the car.

The Panel welcomes discussion of possibilities for a new town hopper bus service. Members feel consideration should be given to whether the service as a whole, or key parts of it, could be provided free of charge. However, the Panel has strong reservations about plans to reduce the number of regular bus services stopping in Broad Street. It is felt that Broad Street is currently a key access point to the bus service for shoppers, especially the elderly and mothers with young children.

Members await with interest the forthcoming trial of a double-decker bus on suitable routes. However, whilst approving moves to increase the number of available seats, there was unanimous condemnation at the meeting of the cramped and uncomfortable seating provided on many existing Connex buses. It is hoped that this problem will not be overlooked in any future contract.

A number of matters not discussed in detail at the meeting are also of interest to the Panel. In respect of a premium-priced Airport express service, members believe that depending on the proposed route and timings this may offer a way forward to those who object to paying taxi fares, but query whether potential passengers will be prepared to pay £5 per journey unless the service and vehicles provided are significantly more convenient and luxurious than regular buses.

While on the subject of fares, it is believed that there was a brief mention of the possibility that prices for period tickets used by visitors may not need to reflect the same value as regular bus fares. The Panel would urge caution in respect of this advice given the need to boost tourism to the Island and encourage repeat visits.

Moving on to other issues, the Panel was ultimately somewhat disappointed at a lack of innovation in the AECOM report, which seemed to revisit old ideas rather than come up with anything new. For example, members believe that there is scope for synergy between bus services and other forms of public transport, including taxis and smaller minibuses. Such systems appear to work extremely well elsewhere. The report concludes that the high set-up costs for Demand Responsive Transport could not be justified, although presumably this is based on the possible cost of Connex operating such services. The Panel trusts that it is intended to investigate such ideas in more depth in the wider context of the Sustainable Transport Policy.

Bus priority measures as outlined in the report do not contain sufficient detail to allow a meaningful assessment. However, from what is presented the practicality of such measures seems questionable. Lack of space to create dedicated bus lanes implies that any schemes will be very restricted; relatively short sections of existing roads that could theoretically accommodate extra lanes soon feed back into busy junctions, so at peak times any brief advantage gained over other traffic would soon be compromised. More ambitious elements involving construction of new sections of road would involve substantial costs, which the Panel is not convinced have been accurately represented in the report. Members are not persuaded by efforts to justify such schemes through theoretical values attributed to time gained, as peak hour travel for most people occurs either before or after working time, and thus arguably has no wider implications for the economy.

The Panel was somewhat surprised to learn at the meeting that serious consideration of 'park and ride' facilities appears to have been dropped from the Sustainable Transport Plan. While not convinced that Goose Green would have been a practical location to trial such a service, members consider that there may well be scope for more modest schemes within the Parishes. However, for any scheme to succeed it would presumably need to be planned into the new bus network, rather than added on as an afterthought.

Finally, as indicated at the meeting, members are very aware of the importance of ensuring the safety of those walking to or waiting at bus stops. However, the concept of 'bus-boarders' as outlined in the report gives rise to concerns. It is suggested that the design would prevent other vehicles from passing buses when they stop to pick up passengers. However, given the lack of passing opportunities on Jersey roads, this could result in queues of vehicles following slow-moving buses for long distances, which is not considered practical or desirable. Further, the creation of physical chicanes on narrow country roads where cars travel in both directions would seem to add to safety concerns, especially at night. The Panel has reservations as to how this could operate in practice.

Overall, the Panel welcomes recommendations in the report for streamlining and improving the bus service, and hopes that these will lead to substantial improvements over earlier proposals. However, members feel that much additional detail work remains to be done before the package could be considered complete. Some aspects of the proposals (particularly bus priority measures) appear overly ambitious and of questionable benefit. The Panel believes that targeting scarce resources on the core task of providing more frequent and comprehensive bus services would represent a more cost-effective solution to the provision of sustainable transport in the Island.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Phil Rondel', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Deputy P Rondel  
Chairman, Environment Scrutiny Panel

## Appendix 4 - Comments on P.104/2010 received from the Constable of St Helier, 26<sup>th</sup> October 2010.

(The Constable subsequently lodged an amendment to the proposition.)

### Comments on P.104 by the Constable of St Helier

While there is little to disagree with in the high level aim of the STP (reducing traffic levels at peak times by 15%), there is an absence of practical measures that could achieve the level of traffic reduction aspired to - especially in the light of competing States' policies, which will lead to more vehicles on our roads, such as growing and diversifying the economy, population growth to maintain the proportion of economically active residents, and focusing new development in St Helier (although achieving the last item reduces the need to commute in and out of the town).

A proper (and world-leading) 'transport hierarchy' places the transport needs of those least able to travel independently at the top of its list of priorities; however, the STP appears to devote just one paragraph to 'disabled parking' (p.57). It is suggested that disabled parking should be charged for, and that there is some abuse of the current system, but consultation is all that is proposed. There is no recognition of the appreciable role played by the Shopmobility scheme, and the potential for increasing provision for it in other car parks than Sand Street, nor of the importance of safe pedestrian routes for those who find walking difficult.

Pedestrians come next in the commonly accepted transport hierarchy, but the STP also places their needs well down the priority list, below bus travel and parking pp 60/61. There is no identification of key walking routes contained in just over a page of the policy, nor of the many junctions (the pedestrian route out of Green Street car park is just one glaring example) where there are no pedestrian facilities; there appears to have been no effort to list or prioritise the provision of the improved facilities even though the Medical Officer of Health includes walking with cycling as "key to addressing the growing problem of obesity and other fitness related diseases." Nor does the STP appear to be influenced by the MOH's recommendation that "Jersey sets *ambitious* (my italics) targets for walking and cycling."

The STP is far from ambitious in its treatment of cycling. Given the very low take up of commuter cycling quoted in the report (based on 2009 data) and the fact that much of the Island is particularly well suited to cycling, and given its place in the transport hierarchy, one would have expected a much fuller and more comprehensive treatment of cycling. The St Helier Roads Committee formulated its own draft cycling strategy for the Parish several years ago and submitted it to the previous Minister for consideration as part of his transport policy but there is no evidence that it has influenced the current policy.

There is a reluctance to 'bite the bullet' in respect of policy implementation such as greater pedestrian priority in the town centre ("TTS has studied the impact of (EDAW's) proposals and concluded that with current volumes of traffic the disadvantages of pollution and congestion on the remaining network would be too great should all the proposals be adopted." pp.11 and 63. Thus an extremely expensive but professional and 'world class' review of the town centre which found ample evidence of the need for more pedestrian-priority areas is dismissed because there is 'too much traffic' (!), and the only section of new pedestrian-priority which the STP might support is southwards along the section of Halkett Place from its junction with Waterloo Street. But even this scheme, we are told on p.64, might be replaced by 'shared space', which clearly could not work at the junction of Halkett Place and King Street, and which would not have worked as the STP claims it does, at Charing Cross, had not the Parish of St Helier insisted on the installation of the two 'Jersey crossings' there. In any case, there is no timetable for the delivery of what has been adopted in successive Island Plans, and recommended by every significant traffic study in the past 30 years. The speed and volume of traffic along such town centre streets as Halkett Place, Mulcaster Street and Broad Street has been shown to make walking difficult for all, and especially

dangerous for the mobility-impaired, the young and the elderly, but the STP offers no radical solution to the problems.

The STP is equally perplexing on the key issue of road safety - TTS's aspires to 'Vision Zero' ie no serious road injuries but instead of proposing the adoption of specific measures that have been shown to reduce speed related collisions, or measures proven to remove defective vehicles from circulation (although an MOT for commercial vehicles is talked about) TTS recommends the creation of (another) task force (p.31).

There is a marked over-reliance on an improved bus service to achieve road traffic reduction, with a corresponding pledge to earmark the lion's share of any funding that can be found for such improvements - £350,000 of a notional £500,000. Improvements to make walking and cycling easier and safer are allocated a paltry £140,000 in 2011, and barely half that sum in 2013, which would be eaten up by a single scheme (pp.88/89). The targets should be adjusted to persuade a much higher proportion of school pupils and commuters to switch to walking or cycling, and the funding adjusted accordingly so that infrastructure can be quickly improved. A town hopper service from 2013 is to be welcomed, but the urgent need to provide transport out of town late at night, is left as something to be investigated. Late-night services could and should be provided next year, in conjunction with keeping the bus station open much later to provide warm and secure shelter for waiting passengers.

This is a key point as for TTS to seek to persuade more people to adopt modes of travel which makes them more vulnerable to serious injury (walking up and down the narrow pavements of Midvale Road, for example, a highly congested pedestrian route with inadequate pavement widths to avoid pedestrians being struck by passing vehicles) is irresponsible, and could lead to a rise in the number of serious injuries on our roads rather than a 'Vision Zero'. The funding for the Eastern cycle route is unclear beyond the current agreed tranche of £500,000, besides which the £500,000 annual spending on the STP "may be required to reduce in line with the comprehensive spending review (CSR)."

Raising the cost of parking is wrongly seen as a panacea for our transport ills - on p.11, it is the only measure which is proposed as a mechanism to achieve all of the targets given - even though TTS has the data at its disposal which clearly shows that a significant proportion of motorists are accessing private non-residential (PNR) parking, and will, therefore, be untouched by raising parking charges above inflation. It is highly probable that the minority of drivers who are forced to use the public long-stay car parks, and who are not given privileged parking at work, are the less well paid staff or the part-time workers, including single parents. However, tackling the attractiveness of PNR parking which might level the playing field, is placed in the 'too difficult box' as one of the 'radical solutions' dismissed in para 4 of the Report and again on pp 51/52.

The danger that raising parking charges above inflation will affect the retail sector is accepted (p.48) but the only comfort the policy offers is that a reduction in traffic levels will free up some parking spaces in the short-stay car parks. Increasing the capacity of Snow Hill car park, which could not be better placed in terms of access to the road network and proximity to the Town Centre, remains, once again, just a possibility (pp 54/55).

Given the stated lack of 'radical solutions', the lack of detail, the absence of a CSR-proof timetable, the unwillingness to follow through policies adopted by successive Island Plans, the evidence that Jersey lags behind many comparable jurisdictions in its implementation of sustainable transport policies, it seems a vain boast for the STP to state that "we have an opportunity not just to follow international best practice, but to lead it." Jersey's Green Lane Network probably was something to boast about when it was first introduced thanks to the foresight of the then Constable of St Peter, but it was never completed - nor does the STP provide a mechanism for its completion; instead a 'review' by the Constables is proposed. In the area of transport planning we have a lot of catching up to do before we can aspire to lead the world.

## **Appendix 5 – Extract from “Cycling Safety Campaign” Report**

(Published by the Jersey Cycling Group 1995.)

.....

### **2. EDUCATION FOR CYCLISTS**

A coherent, persistent and well-funded campaign needs to be implemented to promote the message of SAFE CYCLING IN SOCIETY. The following elements are suggested:

i) basic market research to ensure that a campaign is effective:

- to establish which groups misbehave the most
- to establish their reasons for misbehaving

NB Major misbehaviours in this context are riding on pavements and riding without lights

ii) a campaign aimed initially at these groups, but moving on later to include all groups: children, teenagers, young adults, new riders, old riders, etc.

iii) campaign must cover the areas of basic riding skills; riding in traffic and the rules; ensuring cycle is roadworthy, and lighting

iv) methods might include:

- a) 2 stage cycling proficiency in the schools
- b) basic skills classes for new riders and advanced skills classes, leading to an advanced cycling proficiency
- c) PR in all media to make SAFE CYCLING "cool", trendy, or whatever the appropriate term may be,
- d) well-produced, clear material publicising new cycle facilities as they are implemented and explaining the correct way to use them
- e) enforcement and well-publicised enforcement at that

### **3. EDUCATION FOR OTHER ROAD-USERS**

#### **A. Information campaign**

Most of the dangers to cyclists come from motorised road traffic so any campaign must aim to make car/lorry/bus/coach drivers more aware of cyclists. These could be reached by advertising in the media and on posters, and through schools via children to their parents. Inform drivers of the various common faults, including:

- overtaking without leaving the cyclist enough room - cutting in after overtaking
- overtaking on left-hand bend and cutting in
- overtaking then stopping due to slow or stationary traffic ahead - overtaking just before a junction
- failing to keep to the left of the carriageway in very slow traffic thus preventing the cyclist from overtaking on the "correct" side
- pulling out in front of cyclists
- failing to give extra space/consideration in wet or windy or icy weather

#### **B. Cyclists' hot-line**

There could be a telephone number with answerphone on which cyclists could report minor incidents caused by motorists which are serious enough to make you very cross, but not serious enough to inform the police. (This could be the same line as used for pothole reporting.) The car

number together with other details time/place/nature of incident could be recorded. This would serve a three-fold purpose:

- i) cyclists could release their frustration at such incidents
- ii) some data concerning motorists' bad habits would be obtained
- iii) any motorist who appeared to be regularly offending could be given some positive advice on how to drive in a safer and more cycle-friendly way.

The same hotline would serve in similar circumstances for motorists as well.

.....

## 5. CONCLUSION

We believe that for the message of cycle safety to reach everyone concerned, from the motorist to the "mature" cyclist riding on the wrong side on the cycle track to the youngster on the precinct, it is essential to have a global approach.

There is a massive deficit in awareness in Jersey: awareness that the bicycle, in the settings we are looking at, is simply one means of transport among others and not a toy; awareness of the benefits it can bring; awareness of just what measures can easily be put in place to encourage cycling; awareness of the need to include cyclists when thinking about the "rules of the road".

In the long run, this deficit can only be overcome when cycling takes its proper place in our culture. Only then will it be possible to instil the right attitudes in all concerned.

Jersey Cycling Group

September 1995.