

STATES OF JERSEY



COMMON STRATEGIC POLICY 2026 – 2030 (P.75/2026): NINETEENTH AMENDMENT

PROPORTIONATE REGULATION

Lodged au Greffe on 27th October 2026
by the Environment, Housing and Infrastructure Scrutiny Panel
Earliest date for debate: 10th November 2026

STATES GREFFE

COMMON STRATEGIC POLICY 2026 – 2030 (P.75/2026):) NINETEENTH
AMENDMENT

1 PAGE 2

After the words “report accompanying this Proposition” insert the words –

“, except that, on page 10 of the report, in Action 4.1 after “Revise the Island Plan” there should be inserted the words “, where necessary and evidenced,””.

2 PAGE 2 –

After the words “report accompanying this Proposition” insert the words –

“, except that, on page 10 of the report, in Action 4.3 after “Reduce the burden of regulation to businesses” there should be inserted the words “whilst maintaining existing environmental, heritage and consumer protection””.

3 PAGE 2 –

After the words “report accompanying this Proposition” insert the words –

“, except that, on page 10 of the report, for the words “The test should be simple: regulation should exist where it is necessary and proportionate, not because that is how Government has always done things” there should be substituted the following –

“The test should be simple: regulation should exist where it is necessary and proportionate, with priority given to areas of regulation that disproportionately impact small and micro-businesses and organisations””.

ENVIRONMENT, HOUSING AND INFRASTRUCTURE SCRUTINY
PANEL

Note: After this amendment, the proposition would read as follows –

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

in accordance with Article 18(2)(e) of the States of Jersey Law 2005, to approve the statement of the Common Strategic Policy of the Council of Ministers as set out in the report accompanying this Proposition, **except that –**

On page 10 of the report, in action 4.1 after the words “Revise the Island Plan” there should be inserted the words “,where necessary and evidenced,”.

On page 10 of the report, in action 4.3 after the words “Reduce the burden of regulation to businesses” there should be inserted the words “whilst maintaining existing environmental, heritage and consumer protection”.

On page 10 of the report for the words “The test should be simple: regulation should exist where it is necessary and proportionate, not because that is how Government has always done things” there should be substituted the following –

“The test should be simple: regulation should exist where it is necessary and proportionate, with priority given to areas of regulation that disproportionately impact small and micro-businesses and organisations.”.

REPORT

Introduction

The [Common Strategic Policy P.75/2026](#) (hereafter 'the CSP') was lodged by the Council of Ministers on 29th September 2026 and is due for debate on 10th November 2026. The CSP, if adopted by the States Assembly, will replace the Common Strategic Policy for 2023-2026 and approve the Government's proposed eleven priorities for delivery in the next four years.

Collectively, the amendments seek to ensure that economic growth, regulatory reform and planning policy are delivered in a balanced and evidence-based manner, whilst maintaining regard for the Island's longer-term strategic commitments.

Part 1

In March 2026, the States Assembly adopted the [Planning and Building \(Jersey\) Amendment Law 202-](#), which introduced a new power for the Minister to bring forward revisions to an Island Plan while it is in force. The first part of the Panel's amendment seeks to ensure that any such revisions are undertaken only where necessary and supported by appropriate evidence.

The proposed amendment would insert the words: "*where necessary and evidenced*" after the words "Revise the Island Plan" in Action 4.1. If approved, Action 4.1 would read: "Revise the Island Plan, where necessary and evidenced, to facilitate economic growth and sustainable development."

The amendment does not prevent revisions to the Island Plan. Rather, it seeks to ensure that revisions are proportionate, evidence based and made in response to clearly identified needs.

The Panel considers that this approach is consistent with the intention of the recent planning reforms, which were designed to provide greater flexibility whilst maintaining confidence in the planning system. By requiring revisions to be both necessary and evidenced, the amendment helps ensure that future changes are supported by a clear justification and remain aligned with the long-term interests of Islanders.

Part 2

The second amendment seeks to ensure that efforts to reduce regulation and administrative burdens on businesses are pursued in a balanced manner and do not inadvertently weaken important protections.

The proposed amendment would insert the words "whilst maintaining existing environmental, heritage and consumer protection" after the words "Reduce the burden of regulation to businesses" in Action 4.3. If approved, Action 4.3 would read: "Reduce the burden of regulation to businesses whilst maintaining existing environmental, heritage and consumer protection."

The Panel's amendment reflects principles established in [Future Jersey 2017 - 2037](#) , which emphasises that economic, environmental and community objectives should be pursued together rather than in isolation. [Future Jersey](#) states:

"We cannot afford to put community, the economy or the environment in separate boxes. They all contribute to our quality of life and impact on each other."

The document also identifies a number of long-term outcomes, including:

- "We will value and enjoy our built and historic environment."
- "We will protect our unique natural environment for future generations."
- "We will use and manage our natural resources responsibly."

The amendment is also aligned with [Jersey's Island Outcomes Framework](#), which recognises that sustainable wellbeing is achieved through the interconnected themes of economic, environmental and community wellbeing. The Framework includes outcomes relating to the protection of Jersey's natural environment, the management of natural resources and the preservation of the built and historic environment.

The Panel considers that reducing unnecessary regulation can support economic activity and improve the business environment. However, it also considers that regulatory reform should not be interpreted as reducing protections that support the environment, heritage conservation and consumer confidence.

The Panel further notes that Article 9 of the [Public Finances \(Jersey\) Law 2019](#) requires the Council of Ministers, when preparing the Government Plan, to take account of the sustainable wellbeing of Islanders over successive generations, including economic, social, environmental and cultural wellbeing. The Panel considers that the proposed amendment is consistent with this principle by seeking to balance economic objectives with environmental, heritage and consumer protections.

Accordingly, the amendment seeks to provide a balanced framework for regulatory reform by ensuring that the objective of reducing burdens on businesses is pursued alongside Jersey's longstanding commitments to environmental, heritage and consumer protection and in a manner consistent with the principle of sustainable wellbeing.

Part 3

The third part of the Panel's amendment seeks to ensure that the impact of regulation on small and micro-businesses is given appropriate consideration when reviewing regulatory requirements.

The proposed amendment would insert the words "with priority given to areas of regulation that disproportionately impact small and micro-businesses and organisations" after the words "The test should be simple: regulation should exist where it is necessary and proportionate". If approved, the text would read:

"The test should be simple: regulation should exist where it is necessary and proportionate, with priority given to areas of regulation that disproportionately impact small and micro-businesses and organisations."

The Panel notes that the existing wording is primarily concerned with the principle that regulation should not be retained solely because it has historically been in place. The Panel considers that this principle is already reflected in the requirement for regulation to be necessary and proportionate. The proposed amendment therefore replaces this

wording with a more targeted objective, focusing on areas of regulation that may place a disproportionate burden on small and micro-businesses and organisations.

The Panel considers that the principle of proportionality should recognise that the impact of regulatory requirements may vary depending on the size and resources of a business or organisation.

The Panel believes that this amendment is consistent with the objective identified in Future Jersey 2017-2037 of maintaining an attractive business environment and supporting local enterprise.

Future Jersey recognises the importance of business growth, entrepreneurship and job creation, while also noting concerns expressed by Islanders about bureaucracy acting as a barrier to business activity. Under the Attractive Business Environment outcome in Future Jersey, Islanders expressed concern that: *"bureaucracy, recruitment issues and commercial rents hindered business enterprise."*

The amendment does not propose the removal of regulatory safeguards. Rather, it seeks to ensure that efforts to simplify regulation are targeted towards those areas where the burden is greatest and where reform may have the most beneficial effect for smaller businesses and organisations.

The Panel therefore considers that prioritising the review of regulations that disproportionately affect small and micro-businesses represents a practical and proportionate approach to supporting enterprise whilst maintaining appropriate protections.

Financial and staffing implications

As a principal agreement it is not possible to identify financial and manpower implications at this stage as this would be dependent on the Government's approach to implementation.

Children's Rights Impact Assessment

The Panel considers that this amendment has no direct or indirect impact on children and that the duty to have due regard to the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child does not arise. Accordingly, a Children's Rights Impact Assessment is not required under the Children (Convention Rights) (Jersey) Law 2022.