



PCLem/MAR/01.

15 May 2017

Deputy David Johnson
Chairman
Environment, Housing & Infrastructure Scrutiny Panel
Scrutiny Office
Morier House
St. Helier
JERSEY JE1 1DD

Dear David

Re: Review of solid and liquid waste charges for non-householders

Thank you for your letter dated 28 April 2017 in relation to the above and I would comment as follows :-

Agricultural Industry concerns :

- **Liquid waste:** Large user, mostly water for crops or drinking water for animals. I have raised this at a Consultation Meeting because this is water used but returned to the land and so does not use any waste infrastructure. The only significant use is at the potato packing stations and Jersey Dairy where any rise in costs will be of concern.
- **Solid Waste - 5 main items :-**
 - **Potato Polythene**
 - **Wood and Cardboard**
 - **Metal**
 - **Other Plastics (e.g. Fertiliser bags, tunnel coverings etc.)**
 - **Chemical Containers**

Polythene - 95% of potato polythene is exported from the Island because the charge for local disposal is ridiculously high.

Wood and Cardboard - broken pallets are mostly recycled locally. They are either repaired or turned into kindling wood. Cardboard is taken to La Collette for burning or recycling.

Metal - is taken to Bellozanne at no charge or a small fee is paid for certain items.

Chemical Containers - are taken for safe disposal.

In reply to the questions posed in your letter :-

1. To consider the rationale behind the introduction of user pays charges for non-household waste.

We are unhappy with this. From the outset the Chief Officer made it clear that this was to achieve savings in his Department to be spent on health and education. So businesses, not individuals, are meant to pay for core services used by individuals and not business. How does this comply with the States "user pays" policy ?

2. To assess the charging mechanisms and determine how they will be applied.

No comment.

3. To determine whether the proposed charges are reasonable and fair.

We have a fear that the charges will be too high. Liquid charges for high users, (e.g. Jersey Dairy, the brewery and hotels) will have a huge impact on costs, increasing their water bills by effectively 80%.

We believe that solid waste charges again, are too high. When charges are too high different industries will start exporting their own waste, which is ridiculous. This has happened already with potato growers exporting their polythene because it saves at least £150 per tonne.

4. To consider the potential impact of the proposed charges, alongside the current charges on non-householders.

No comment.

5. To determine what impact the proposed charges will have on environmental behaviours.

It will have some impact but many businesses have already cut waste to save money.

6. To assess the adequacy of the present facilities in regards to waste management and recycling.

No comment.

7. To assess how the issue of fly-tipping will be addressed in respect of the proposed solid waste charges.

This is a big concern for farmers and land owners who already see a lot of green waste

being dumped.

This will take a lot of manpower and increased fines if the States are to keep this under control.

Finally, the agricultural industry is expected to take a lot of the green waste that is generated at La Collette. I hope the Department will consider this service that we provide for nothing when introducing charges that may affect our Industry.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Peter C. Le Maistre".

PETER C. LE MAISTRE
PRESIDENT