



25th February 2026

Deputy Tom Coles
Vice-Chair, Environment, Housing and Infrastructure Panel
Scrutiny Office, States Greffe
Morier House
St Helier
JE1 1DD

Dear Deputy Coles

Animal Welfare & Control Review – Straying Livestock

Thank you for your letter of 19th February 2026 regarding Part 4 of the Draft Animal Welfare (Jersey) Law 2026-.

We have consulted with some of our members who keep animals and would like to advise that we are of the opinion that all the original concerns remain. We have not seen evidence from the SVO that this is an issue and we cannot envisage a keeper refusing to deal with straying animals. This issue has long been dealt with by farmers and the police and is an inevitable part of island life.

We set out some specific points as follows:

i) Redundancy

This provision is an example of additional unnecessary regulation (in contrast to the [COM policy or reducing red tape](#)). If an Inspector believes the animals' welfare is at risk, Articles 11 (Duty to Protect Animal Welfare) and 12 (Improvement Notices) already provide the powers necessary to regulate this issue. Applying this provision to all roads on the Island without any link to a reasonable expectation of harm imposes an unfair liability on the farming community, and breaches the principle of regulation by least restrictive means.

ii) Who decides what is 'safe'?

In the current draft law, if the inspector decides that returning them to the field is not 'safe' (regardless of training/evidence) then the keeper would commit an offence by putting them back in the field (i.e. an area deemed un-safe by an inspector). The threshold for 'safe' is very subjective and therefore this ambiguity creates possible conflict between professional keepers and inspectors. Criminal liability should never rest on subjective criteria without statutory guidance.

iii) Public Place

The definition is currently defined as a 'public road'. This definition therefore supposes that all public roads poses the same welfare risk to animals. Yet quite clearly, Rue de Fliquet and Victoria Avenue pose very different risks. Rather than a broad and unfair blanket definition

like this, more reasonable legislation would ensure that a reasonable risk to animal welfare was evidenced before an offence could be triggered, otherwise this provision creates far too much (and unfair, unjust and unbalanced) liability for keepers.

iv) Widening 'Public Place' by Order:

The Minister can, by order, widen the area in question (on which animals are deemed to have strayed) to 'any other place open to the public'. As Jersey has no trespass law, this would arguably allow the Environment Department to create a blanket straying provision on 'any land' in Jersey. This extension should be limited only to areas where there is an evidenced risk to welfare.

v) Dogs

If the Veterinary Team believe this to be a welfare risk to animals, then the provision needs to be widened to include straying dogs.

vi) Cattle Grids

Depending on how the term 'stray' is interpreted, this article will forever prohibit the use of cattle grids in Jersey, and whilst we are not aware of any in use at the moment, they are used across the rest of the British Isles.

If the States Vet feels there is a risk to animal welfare, they already have the powers under Article 11 (Duty to protect Animal Welfare) and 12 (Improvement Notices) to achieve what this straying provision is trying to do without burdening everyone with extra regulation.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to be 'Douglas Richardson', with a stylized, cursive script.

Douglas Richardson
President