

STATES OF JERSEY



TAKE NO ACTION ON THE DRAFT STATES OF JERSEY (MINISTERIAL OFFICES) AMENDMENT ORDER 202-.

**Lodged au Greffe on 8th July 2026
by Deputy T.A. Coles of St. Helier South
Earliest date for debate: 8th September 2026**

STATES GREFFE

PROPOSITION

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

to request the Chief Minister to take no action to make or enact the Draft States of Jersey (Ministerial Offices) Amendment Order 202- as appended to the [Notice under Article 29A\(3\) of the States of Jersey Law 2005: Changes to Ministerial Offices 2026 \(R.106/2026\)](#) until –

- (a) a report has been presented by the Chief Minister to the States which includes –
 - (i) details of any additional costs and staffing implications of establishing the role of Minister for Planning and Regulation;
 - (ii) clarification of the lines of officer accountability to the role of Minister for Planning and Regulation and whether any of these officers will also be accountable to other Ministers;
 - (iii) the reasoning behind the transfer of responsibilities for items listed in Schedules 1 and 2 of the Amendment Order and an explanation of the alternatives (if any) that were considered;
 - (iv) details of any consideration the Chief Minister gave to merging other ministerial roles before creating the position of Minister for Planning and Regulation; and
- (b) the States has debated and voted on the establishment of the role of Minister for Planning and Regulation, in light of the information provided within (a).

DEPUTY T.A. COLES OF ST. HELIER SOUTH

REPORT

Summary

This proposition seeks to ensure that all viable options have been properly evaluated, and that any decision to create a new ministerial role is made with full transparency, robust analysis, and a clear rationale that serves the best interests of the Island.

Report

Article 29A (1) of the [States of Jersey Law 2005](#) (the Law), allows the Chief Minister to establish and abolish a ministerial office by order. [R.106/2026](#) sets out the provision to be made by the Order: the establishment of a new ministerial role, Minister for Planning and Regulation, as is required under article 29A (3) of the law.

The Chief Minister, under article 29A (2) of the law, may include supplemental, incidental, consequential, transitional and saving provisions as he considers necessary. Unfortunately, the Chief Minister has opted, as is his right, not to provide any costs or assessments into the staffing requirements this new position will incur or reduce.

Article 29A (1)(c) of the law allows the Chief Minister to make provisions relating to a Minister's functions, including their transfer from one Minister to another. Given that the Chief Minister is transferring functions from the Minister for the Environment and Minister for Sustainable Economic Development to the Minister for Planning and Regulation, has consideration been given to combining the remaining functions of these two Ministerial offices?

Recommendation 1 of the [R.23/2022](#) Democratic Accountability and Governance Sub-committee Report (DAGs Report) states:

"Each department should have one minister who is ultimately accountable for the whole of the department. Where the scope of a department is such that it is felt additional Ministers are required, there should be a lead minister and non-CoM Ministers with responsibility for specific areas of the department." (p. 10)

The current structure of the department for Infrastructure and Environment is that there are two Ministers and one Chief Officer. The introduction of a third minister to this structure further blurs the lines of political accountability that the DAG Sub-Committee Report aimed at clearing up.

There are further issues arising around the lines of responsibility and accountability of minister and chief officer with the transfer of functions from the Minister for Sustainable Economic Development to both the Minister for the Environment and the new Minister for Planning and Regulation. Transferring those ministerial functions raises questions about whether the relevant Departments will be adequately staffed and line managed to deliver considering that the skills of Chief Officers and Departments are to be pulled from one section to another.

There is a strong argument that such a fundamental structural change like this should not happen without proper parliamentary scrutiny and debate, as there is the potential for unintended consequences from separating out the roles that have hitherto fallen under one department. The case for change, if it is justified, should be considered and voted by the Assembly.

Conclusion

While the creation of a new Minister for Planning and Regulation may be within the powers afforded to the Chief Minister by the Law, it is essential that this introduction is supported by thorough assessment and clear justification. At present, questions remain around the financial implications, staffing requirements, and operational impact.

Moreover, the redistribution of the functions from Environment and Sustainable Economic Development raises legitimate questions as to whether alternative arrangements – such as consolidating responsibilities within existing ministerial roles – have been fully explored. This is particularly important given that it appears to run contrary to the DAGs Report and recommendations.

Without clear evidence that these considerations have been addressed, there remains a risk that the proposed changes could complicate lines of responsibility and weaken, rather than strengthen, effective governance. Therefore, this proposition seeks to ensure that all viable options have been properly evaluated, and that any decision to create a new ministerial role is made with full transparency, robust analysis, and a clear rationale that serves the best interests of the Island.

Financial and staffing implications

Full assessment of financial and staffing implications should have been made before Chief ministerial order was issued. Presentation of these facts should be achievable with existing staffing levels of the Chief Minister's office.

Children's Rights Impact Assessment

I consider that this proposition 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.