

STATES OF JERSEY

r

SOLID WASTE STRATEGY (P.95/2005): AMENDMENT

**Lodged au Greffe on 7th June 2005
by Deputy M.F. Dubras of St. Lawrence**

STATES GREFFE

SOLID WASTE STRATEGY (P.95/2005): AMENDMENT

In paragraph (a)(viii), for the words “bring forward for the approval of the States proposals for a future inert waste disposal site” substitute the words “bring forward within two years for the approval of the States a feasibility study of future land-based inert waste disposal sites, such as those described in the report of Deputy M.F. Dubras of St. Lawrence dated 7th June 2005, without recourse to any further marine reclamation sites in accordance with Policy M1 of the Island Plan 2002”.

DEPUTY M.F. DUBRAS OF ST. LAWRENCE

REPORT

The Solid Waste Strategy put forward by the Environment and Public Services Committee sets out a direction based on a vision that builds on the work of several previous Committees, together with a set of specific urgent actions to be implemented over a time-scale ranging from immediate to very long-term.

Inert waste

Having addressed a number of critical elements of the proposed direction in the first seven items under (a) of the proposition, the Committee then deals with waste ‘left overs’ and under (a)(viii) invites the States to charge it, first, “to develop improved aggregate recycling facilities” and then, secondly, to bring forward “proposals for a future inert waste disposal site”.

The first aspect effectively falls within a whole new philosophy for the Island community towards increased levels and improved methods of recycling much higher percentages of what would otherwise be waste material to be, simply put, permanently disposed of. A determination and a meaningful approach to more recycling has to be enthusiastically welcomed. It is the second aspect, however, which I wish to target.

Proposal for future disposal sites

I welcome the general proposal outlined in Section 6. However, I am not satisfied that the Committee is prepared to determinedly advance the work necessary in a timely fashion. There is both an attitudinal change needed as well as an urgency to get on with verifying the feasibility of changing direction for the future disposal of inert waste away from the current approach of so-called ‘land reclamation’ or “marine land recovery facility” (which I have always considered to be land ‘creation’ by covering the sea-bed with man-made spoil) (see also Appendix 1 to, in future, only re-filling man-made ‘craters’ on land. In our context, as described in the Committee’s report, the most obvious opportunity is to capitalize on the existence of a few large quarries.

The Committee Report in section 6 infers that it will only get down to serious business of finding the next site(s) as La Collette II nears its capacity after being ‘super-filled’ by around 2015. To do so would be foolhardy! Whilst acknowledging that previous Planning and Environment Committees in developing the Mineral Strategy and the 2002 Island Plan did identify some preliminary thinking, it seems to me and others that it would be far wiser to commit some resources to start the detailed feasibility studies now. Indeed, it would probably be smart to plan to begin utilizing the next site well before La Collette is full for a number of reasons. But, also, we should be thinking far beyond the next decade.

I believe, therefore, that the States should charge the Committee now to begin the evaluation, including preliminary environmental impact assessments, of a number of sites, probably drawing from the Central Planning Vote for 2006 to fund the work and report back to the States within 2 years at the most. In addition to the discussions that have proceeded with the owners and operators of La Gigoulande quarry in St. Mary, it is my belief that the Ronez quarry which has the potential of many times the capacity of La Collette would prove to be a very much longer-term asset in this regard. It is understood from documentation in the public domain that it is expected to be an active quarry until at least 2040 and that although there is a long-term plan of Ronez being suitable for a specialist port, as an alternate site for imported aggregate materials instead of St. Helier, all options must be explored in the public interest for the wisest long-term use (Appendix 2 to follow).

Further, it is my conviction that it would be quite unacceptable morally to contemplate any further projects for this purpose which involved despoiling the marine environment. I believe that, perhaps with the exception of a possible scheme for St. Aubin, which is designated on the Island Plan Map with a blue star recording a States’ decision on 23rd July 1996, a clear commitment should be made now. This would be a strong message consistent with our actions establishing RAMSAR sites, the shoreline zone and the marine protection zone and be an added impetus to engaging all stakeholders with the proposed strategy.

Financial and manpower statement

It is believed that there are no significant additional resources to that proposed by the Committee, only that they

would begin to be expended sooner from designated funds.

POLICY M1 (ISLAND PLAN, 2002)

Extract from Jersey Island Plan 2002

Marine Environment: page 7.4

Marine Protection Zone

- 7.1 The long term, wise use of marine resources is essential in the management of Jersey's unique, fragile and economically important shores and coastal waters. This was foreseen in the designation of a Marine Protection Zone. This is an overarching designation and forms the basis for the safeguarding and sustainable use of the Island's marine resources.
- 7.2 The Countryside Character Appraisal included in its scope the inter-tidal character areas around the Island and the offshore reefs and islets. The appraisal concluded that these are so important that they must be given the highest level of protection against development and that they should be managed for conservation.
- 7.3 Development in the Marine Protection Zone including, for example marinas, land reclamation, tipping or dredging for aggregates, will not normally be permitted. Where appropriate, the Planning and Environment Committee will require an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) to be carried out for significant development in the Marine Protection Zone in order to fully determine the potential impacts of development proposals.
- 7.4 For clarity, where offshore reefs and islets lie above Mean High Water (i.e. they are not intertidal areas) they are designated as part of the Zone of Outstanding Character and Policy C4 will apply. For development proposals in all inter-tidal marine areas, Policy M1 will apply.

POLICY M1 – MARINE PROTECTION ZONE

The sustainable use of the Island's marine environment will be ensured by the Marine Protection Zone extending from Mean High Water to the territorial limits, as designated on the Island and Town Proposals Maps.

Within this zone there is a presumption against all developments except those which are essential for navigation, access to water, fishing and fish farming and coastal defence.

Where permitted, development should not materially harm the amenities, character or ecological balance of the area because of its construction disturbance, siting, scale, form, appearance, materials, noise or emissions.

Appendix 2 was not available from the proposer at the time of lodging and will be issued as an addendum to this report when available.