

STATES OF JERSEY



COMMON STRATEGIC POLICY 2026 – 2030 (P.75/2026): TWENTY-FOURTH AMENDMENT

REMOVE THE PROVISION FOR MORE HOMES

Lodged au Greffe on 27th October 2026
by Deputy A.F. Curtis of St. Clement
Earliest date for debate: 10th November 2026

STATES GREFFE

COMMON STRATEGIC POLICY 2026 - 2030 (P.75/2026): TWENTY-
FOURTH AMENDMENT

1 PAGE 2 –

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

“, except that on pages 5 and 13 of the report the words “Provide more homes and” should be deleted from Priority 6. and the word “upgrade” capitalized, and on page 13 –

- (a) 6.1 should be deleted and the subsequent paragraphs redesignated accordingly;
- (b) after the words “accelerate investment in the infrastructure” the word “, homes” should be deleted; and
- (c) the bullet point “Deliver more homes” should be deleted”.

DEPUTY A.F. CURTIS OF ST. CLEMENT

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 pages 5 and 13 of the report the words “Provide more homes and” should be deleted from Priority 6. and the word “upgrade” capitalized, and on page 13 –

- (a) 6.1 should be deleted and the subsequent paragraphs redesignated accordingly;
- (b) after the words “accelerate investment in the infrastructure” the word “, homes” should be deleted; and
- (c) the bullet point “Deliver more homes” should be deleted”.

REPORT

Summary

The [Common Strategic Policy 2026 – 2030](#) (the CSP) proposes Priority 6 as –

“Provide more homes and upgrade core infrastructure that Islanders rely on”

This amendment removes from the CSP the priority that Government (taken to include SoJDC and Andium Homes) should “Provide more homes”. It also deletes Action 6.1’

–

“Enable housing development to provide more homes for Islanders and assisted purchase schemes”

The narrative of Priority 6 goes further and states –

“We will accelerate investment in the infrastructure, homes and public assets”

No information is presented with the CSP on why Government should provide more homes or whether Jersey needs more homes at all, let alone accelerate investment in homes.

The priority to ‘Provide new homes’, Action 6.1 and the commitment to ‘accelerate investment in homes’ should therefore be removed, giving Government more capacity to focus on its other priorities.

Further, the decision to extend or provide assisted-purchase schemes funded by Government (in some way) should be considered as a standalone item by the States Assembly, as part of a wider review into affordability.

Background and Context

Housing affordability is one of, if not the largest, contribution to the cost of living for most islanders. It is entirely reasonable to want to see the cost of housing (whether purchasing or renting) decrease.

That said, there is nothing to say that increasing housing delivery will improve housing costs for islanders, and further, that Government should see it as their own priority. To consider this, four questions should first be considered;

Do we need more homes?

First, before the Government decides that it should deliver more homes, it should ask – does the Island have enough homes to meet housing need?

Fortunately, we have good data from Statistics Jersey on both near term and long-term housing need, including the ‘Future Housing Needs 2026 to 2028’¹ (FHN 2026) report and the ‘Households and Future Housing Needs Projections 2025 – 2040’² (HNP 2025)

¹ [Future Housing Needs 2026 to 2028 | Statistics Jersey](#)

² [R-Household-Projections-2025-2040-20260225.pdf](#)

The FHN 2026 shows that, as current, Jersey has an overall shortfall of 310 units in 2026, and that

- With a net-nil migration, we will have a housing surplus by 2035
- With a +325 net migration, we will require 140 homes on average per year up to 2040

Total additional projected qualified / entitled units required under different net migration scenarios					
Migration scenario	2025	2030	2035	2040	Average additional units required per year
+1,000	220	1,440	3,100	4,730	280
+700	160	1,050	2,170	3,190	190
+325	80	570	1,010	1,250	70
Net nil	10	150	0	-420	-20
-100	-10	20	-320	-940	-60

Total projected registered units required under different net migration scenarios					
Migration scenario	2025	2030	2035	2040	Average additional units required per year
+1,000	940	2,400	3,150	3,790	220
+700	680	1,690	2,200	2,640	160
+325	360	800	1,010	1,190	70
Net nil	80	20	-20	-70	0
-100	0	-210	-340	-450	-30

Source: [Future housing needs | Statistics Jersey](#)

The data shows we are in a very different place to previous estimates such as the 2018 [Objective Assessment of Housing Need](#) (OAHN) that informed the Bridging Island Plan – which, when combined with a then forecast shortfall of homes, led to a policy position of believing that “a net target of at least 7,900 homes is required up to 2030 “³

So, whilst historically data suggested the delivery of new homes was essential, more recent data shows it is not (unless we want to carry a large surplus of homes).

Indeed, this re-assessment is accepted by the Head of Strategic Housing and Regeneration, who in the Q3 2026 Quarterly hearing with the Housing Minister stated in response to a question on whether we need more homes;

Head of Strategic Housing and Regeneration

*" You are totally right. In terms of the population change and the number of homes that we have built, we are in a really good place, and that is a good thing for Jersey. ”*⁴

The CSP should respond to the key priorities of the political term (and reasonably prepare for the future beyond). As such it is not clear why new homes is a priority.

Who should deliver new homes?

³ [Bridging Island Plan 2022 to 2025](#) Page 196

⁴ [2026-10-22-Transcript-Quarterly-Hearing-and-Budget-Minister-for-Housing.pdf](#) Page 55

Secondly, removing “Deliver new homes” from the CSP does not mean we should see all new housing development stop – but it does mean we should ask if Government needs to be a large part of the provision.

The private sector has a significant role to play in the provision of homes. Private developers and homeowners routinely bring forward plans, large and small, to deliver a new housing.

Anecdotally, there is a feeling by some that the public sector (i.e. Andium Homes) has played an outsized role in the new housing market recently, delivering a large volume of new homes for sale and rent across St. Helier, and now more widely through the development of the rezoned housing sites. Now may be a good time to revisit the rate at which Government provides homes.

Will new homes be affordable?

Thirdly, if the Government does deliver new homes, there is nothing to say this is the best way to create ‘affordable homes.’

The cost of construction in Jersey is widely known to be reaching a point where ‘cost to build’ meets ‘market value’ – with the response to [Written Question 464/2025](#) stating “the basic cost of constructing an apartment is around £4,600 per sqm”. This would make the delivery of a 70m² property £322,000 before land acquisition and other non-construction development costs.

Further to this, there is little evidence the Government has been able to purchase sites for new housing at ‘affordable’ rates – instead competing with the private market.

Therefore, whether a new-build home, or an existing one, it is highly likely it now ‘costs’ Government in some form to provide an affordable home to purchase. As such, if delivering ‘affordable homes’ is the ambition, the various options (including support for purchasing existing homes) should be presented to the Assembly.

Should Government deliver open market homes?

Lastly, it is worth considering the role that the States of Jersey Development Company (SoJDC) have in the provision of homes. Given the forecasts and data show we are roughly ‘right-sized’ in our current housing provision – with the small shortfall able to be delivered by the private sector, it may need to think carefully about the quantum of housing it seeks to provide.

It should not simply assume it has a mandate to deliver the greatest number of homes possible, because as stated, there is not a clear need for these.

Conclusion

The Government’s priority to ‘Provide more homes’ is not grounded in data or the knowledge that we need ‘more homes.’ As a priority, it should be separated from the provision of infrastructure to enable new homes (that may be provided by the private sector), and the priority to make homes affordable.

Nor should Government commit to ‘accelerate investment in homes’ (Page 13 Paragraph 1).

The Assembly should instead consider during this term the Government’s role within housing provision and housing affordability more closely – including what interventions if any it should have. This should include a fuller debate on assisted-purchase schemes.

This amendment enables the Assembly the space to do so, without presupposing that building new homes delivers this.

Financial and staffing implications

There are no staffing impacts within Government. A de-prioritising of new home delivery by Government (Andium Homes, SoJDC) may result in less house building, but this would in turn result in less exposure to debt from borrowing to fund these.

Children’s Rights Impact Assessment

I consider 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.