

STATES OF JERSEY



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

BRING THE INVESTING IN JERSEY PLAN TO THE ASSEMBLY FOR DEBATE

**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): SIXTEENTH
AMENDMENT

1 PAGE 2 –

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

“, except that on page 13 of the report Action 6.2 should be substituted with the following –

“6.2 Bring the ‘Investing in Jersey’ plan, as published or as revised by the Council of Ministers, to the Assembly for debate by June 2027 and deliver on this plan using the new Capital Investment Fund subject to its approval””.

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 page 13 of the report Action 6.2 should be substituted with the following –

“6.2 Bring the ‘Investing in Jersey’ plan, as published or as revised by the Council of Ministers, to the Assembly for debate by June 2027 and deliver on this plan using the new Capital Investment Fund subject to its approval”.

REPORT

Summary

This amendment seeks to ensure that the [Investing in Jersey 2026 - 2050](#) (IIJ) plan, or a revised version, is debated by the States Assembly, and if approval is given, it can then be delivered upon.

This is to ensure the Assembly has a fair say in the programme of works planned to be delivered, and that implicit approval is not given to the whole scope of works included in the current IIJ without debate.

Context and Background

In August 2025, the former Council of Minister announced and published their ‘Investing in Jersey 2026 – 2050’ Plan (IIJ).¹

The programme is described on Page 3 –

“Investing in Jersey: 2026-2050 sets out a long-term, coordinated plan for renewing and maintaining the Island’s infrastructure and public assets. It provides a clear framework for investment in key areas such as housing, education, roads, utilities, coastal resilience, public buildings, and shared community spaces”

IIJ has several facets including the formation of the Jersey Capital Investment Fund (JCIF) to enable better delivery of capital projects and investment. IIJ also documents specific projects to be delivered and proposes some broad timeframes.

Some of these projects, such as maintenance of public infrastructure like roads and drains – can be considered evergreen responsibilities of the Government. Others, such as –

- Increase the supply of affordable housing (p. 4)
- Relocate Highlands College to a more central location (p. 5)
- Deliver a new public car park in St Helier (p. 19)

can be considered policy choices – where there are legitimate policy debates to be had.

It should be noted that IIJ was not lodged for debate or approved by the States Assembly. It featured in the Budget 2026 – 2029, where the focus was on the establishment of the JCIF.

The 2026 – 2030 Common Strategic Policy (the CSP)

The CSP Action 6.2 states –

“Begin implementing the Investing in Jersey plan using the new Capital Investment Fund” (p. 13)

¹ [Government launches Investing In Jersey programme](#)

Given the breadth and significance of many areas covered in the IJJ Plan, it would appear reasonable that this document, or a newer version, be debated as a standalone proposition by the Assembly.

It is not clear whether supporting the CSP (and thus IJJ by virtue of Priority 6) lends Assembly support to some, or all, of the areas included in IJJ.

For example, would its approval provide an endorsement for a new public car park, investment to host the Island Games, or a priority to deliver new homes? Or does support for IJJ more broadly mean the development of a capital programme based on this current Assembly's aims, which may be different to those published within the original document?

So what does Action 6.2 add to the CSP?

IJJ itself states on page 23 that both the individual projects and the amounts transferred to the JCIF will be agreed and scrutinised by the States Assembly through the annual Budget. If so, the question becomes –

What does Action 6.2 – ‘*Begin implementing the Investing in Jersey plan*’ – actually add?

The risk is that it will be read as Assembly endorsement of the plan's overall priorities and direction some of which the Budget does not ask Members to approve.

It may also be read as endorsing elements of IJJ which are not capital projects at all, and so may never come before the Assembly through the Budget. Examples include expanding eligibility for registered workers to rent qualified property (p. 7) and extending shared equity support to up to 40% (p. 8).

Before the Assembly agrees to support [Investing in Jersey](#) – it should be clear what the plan does and doesn't do, which elements are hypothetical, which are agreed, and whether the Assembly is happy with direction of travel.

Conclusion

[Investing in Jersey](#) as a policy document to set the business case for the establishment of the JCIF has succeeded, and we are now in the better position of having a dedicated Capital Fund.

We should not confuse the delivery of the JCIF with a plan of mixed detail, without explicit Assembly approval.

Before approval, we should know what ‘agreeing to deliver Investing In Jersey’ means, and of the projects that are to be delivered, which elements have the support of the Assembly.

The solution to this is for the Council of Ministers to bring Investing in Jersey (whether the published version or one revised to meet the aims of this Government), to the Assembly to debate, amend if necessary and vote upon.

Financial and staffing implications

There is no financial or staffing implications, beyond the regular time of States sittings and the preparation of IJJ for lodging.

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.