

# STATES OF JERSEY



## IMPORTATION OF WASTE FOR TREATMENT IN THE JERSEY ENERGY FROM WASTE PLANT (P.104/2018): COMMENTS

---

Presented to the States on 6th November 2018  
by the Environment, Housing and Infrastructure Scrutiny Panel

---

STATES GREFFE

## COMMENTS

1. An Act of the States dated 29th June 2004 approved the ‘States Strategic Plan 2005 to 2010’ ([P.81/2004](#)) and agreed, *inter alia*, that the States would introduce a comprehensive liquid and solid waste policy; which included in paragraph (a)(vi) that the Committee be charged to keep under review the option of a joint Channel Islands waste facility located in Jersey, in conjunction with the States of Guernsey, subject to the approval by the States of any such proposals.
2. This was followed on 17th February 2010 by ‘Importation of Waste: approval by the States Assembly’ ([P.17/2010](#)) from the then Environment Scrutiny Panel, which asked the States “to agree that the importation of waste into Jersey for treatment in the Island’s Energy from Waste plant shall not proceed, and that no discussions or negotiations on this matter shall take place, until the principle of waste importation has been discussed and approved by the States Assembly”.
3. The report within P.17/2010 highlights 2 particular areas of concern to the Panel of the day, and [P.104/2018](#) satisfactorily answers them in that they have, to all intents and purposes, been surpassed.
4. The Minister for Transport and Technical Services of the day successfully amended P.17/2010 by proposing an alteration of the proposition wording to permit discussions and negotiations to take place (see [P.17/2010 Amd.](#)).
5. The accompanying report suggested, in its opening paragraph, that the purpose of the amendment was to enable the Minister and other Ministers to discuss, and if in the interests of the States of Jersey, negotiate with their counterparts in Guernsey, Alderney and other Channel Islands, regarding potential opportunities that those jurisdictions may wish to consider for disposal of waste within Jersey’s new Energy from Waste facility.
6. In addition, the report alludes to the States of Alderney having written to the Minister on 14th September 2009, asking whether consideration could be given to accepting waste from that island.
7. P.104/2018 indicates that, some 8½ years later on 26th March 2018, the same point was emphasised during a visit by the President of Alderney, effectively making the same request.
8. It could be suggested that offering capacity in our Energy from Waste plant to neighbouring Channel Islands has mutually beneficial advantages of supporting those islands in optimising their sustainable waste management arrangements, and would enable investment locally without detriment to our own waste disposal service. The La Collette facility is sized for Jersey’s future needs; there has always been a window of opportunity for other Channel Islands to use spare capacity if we have it.
9. P.104/2018 is silent on the revenue which it is anticipated would be gained by the Ports of Jersey and any hauliers involved locally.

10. It may be acceptable that the quantities of refuse accepted from Alderney could be received at New North Quay and be hauled to La Collette, but the importation of larger quantities may necessitate vessels berthing on the Victoria Pier and a consequent reduction in pressure on the harbour road network.
11. There seems little reason for Members not to support what is both a community-minded and commercial decision, which all indications suggest will be of benefit to residents of Jersey and Alderney alike.

---

**Statement under Standing Order 37A [Presentation of comment relating to a proposition]**

The Panel wishes to apologise for submitting late comments. Due to a high volume workload in recent weeks, including review work and public hearings, the Panel only met within the last week to discuss submitting a Comments paper relating to P.104/2018. Furthermore, as the Panel had no major concerns with the Proposition, it deliberated as to the necessity to submit a Comments paper, but ultimately felt that it might be beneficial for the Assembly if it did.