

Appendix D: Charging for non-household waste- Options Table

| Option | Pros | Cons |
|--|--|--|
| Don't accept these materials <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Soil and Rubble • Plasterboard | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Financial Savings • Increased capacity on site • No outlet for trade abuse • Encourages alternative methods of disposal for larger works. E.g. skips, hippo bags etc. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perception of increased fly-tipping • No service provision for householders (customer dissatisfaction) • Only costly options available (e.g. Skips, hippo bags, cross- border paid for service etc) • Kent residents may seek cross- border services. |
| Create Kent County wide HWRC cross-border scheme | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduces non-Kent residents waste disposal and may offer financial savings. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Permit Scheme- Costly to implement (£240,000) and operate (£450,000 per year) • Resource intensive for administration • Create queues and congestion • Non-user friendly to residents • Difficult to monitor and could be abused. • CCTV and ANPR – unable to obtain DVLA information (can't track where users are coming from) • Site staff cannot enforce in real-time • Resource intensive (admin and associated costs) • Inter Authority Agreement- financial implication of customer data collection • Unable to forecast expenditure • Potential to aggravate capacity issues- increase tonnages and usability. • Local Authorities unwilling to agree. |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| <p>Introduce voucher or booking system for free disposal of non-household waste streams from Kent residents (limited quantity per month)</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continuation of free service provision. • Excludes non-Kent residents. • Reduces Trade Waste abuse. • Provides robust data monitoring and enforcement mechanisms. • Potential cost savings as a result of reduced trade and cross-border usage. • Reduces impacts on capacity. • Encourages alternative methods of disposal. E.g. skips, hippo bags etc. • Tonnages may decrease. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resource intensive to administer (<i>currently approx. 400,000 visits per year with soil & rubble</i>) • Associated costs to implement. • Adds a layer of process for the customer. • Open to abuse on site. • Difficult to enforce on site- e.g. Customers who turn up unaware of policy (in the short-term). • Perception of increased fly-tipping |
| <p>Charge for non-household waste streams including soil and rubble and plasterboard.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opportunity to re-coup funds to offset haulage and treatment costs. • Provides a service to residents • Cheaper alternative to skips/ hippo bags etc. • Potential to reduce Trade Waste and/or receive payment for its acceptance. • Supports enforcement activities by providing usage data. • Potential to remove material limits, which then also offers service for householders needing to dispose of larger volumes of these materials. • Aligns our policies with those of neighbouring Authorities. • Less appealing for non-Kent residents. • Potential to reduce capacity issues- less visitors, less waste. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perception of increased fly-tipping • Reduced customer satisfaction and options for disposal • Risk of backlash should legislation change to prevent charging. |