

## East of England Aggregates Working Party

24<sup>th</sup> January 2013 – 2-4 pm  
CR6, County Hall, Chelmsford

<b>ATTENDEES</b>	
Andrew Cook - Chair	Essex CC
Richard Greaves	Essex CC
Trish Carter Lyons	Herts CC
Graham Ward	DCLG
Paul Clark	Thurrock BC
Richard Drake	Norfolk CC
Graham Gunby	Suffolk CC
Simon Treacy	MPA/Lafarge Tarmac
Ken Hobden	MPA
Mick Daynes	MPA/Hanson
Michael Courts	MPA/Brett
Kirsten Hannaford-Hill	MPA/Cemex
David McCabe	MPA/Lafarge
Richard Ford	MPA/Brett
Lesley Stenhouse	Essex CC
Steve Winstanley	Peterborough City Council
Emma Fitch	Cambridgeshire CC
Peter Dawes	BAA/Frimstone
Natalie Chillcott	Central Beds, Luton & Bedford BC
Philip Dash	Essex CC
Sue Garwood (notes)	Essex CC
<b>APOLOGIES</b>	
Chris Waite	SEEAWP/EEAWP
David Atkinson	Cambs CC
Richard Fifield	MPA/Brett
Terry Burns	Suffolk CC
Nick Horsley	MPA/Sibelco

<b>ITEM</b>	<b>NOTES</b>	<b>ACTION</b>
<b>1.0</b>	<p><b>Welcomes, Introductions and Apologies</b></p> <p>Introductions were made. AC explained that he had taken over the ECC planning functions following Roy Leavitt's retirement at the end of December and would be chairing this meeting today. However, the position of chairmanship is on the agenda and will be open for discussion.</p> <p>Apologies as per list above.</p>	
<b>2.0</b>	<p><b>Minutes of Last Meeting &amp; Matters Arising</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RL invited BAA to attend WTAB meeting.</li> <li>• A member of the Marine Management Organisation has been</li> </ul>	

	<p>invited to attend EEAWP meetings. Phil McBryde will be attending in future but was unable to attend today</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LAA update – overtaken by events. Inspector took message back.</li> <li>• All other actions will be covered under agenda items today.</li> </ul> <p>It was agreed that minutes of the last meeting were a true reflection, other than the following points of accuracy –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Terry Burns is from Suffolk CC and Richard Drake from Norfolk CC – they were transposed on attendee list.</li> <li>• MPA reps – attendee list to show they belong to MPA and not just the companies they are from.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>3.0</b></p>	<p><b>EEAWP Future Chairmanship/Secretariat</b></p> <p>AC explained that ECC were not precious about keeping hold of the EEAWP chairmanship and secretariat and asked if anyone wanted to volunteer to chair in future.</p> <p>There was some discussion over whether the chairmanship and secretariat should be held by the same authority and conflicting views were held. GW reported that the position of EEAWP secretariat is currently being tendered for but he was unable to reveal who had put in bids. He explained that there is a source of income associated with the secretariat and that it is not just restricted to LAs, any AWP member can put in a bid.</p> <p><b>Post Meeting note: GW has recirculated the link to the tender document.</b></p> <p>All agreed that Essex should continue to chair pending the outcome of the CLG secretariat tender and once that has been decided, which should be by the time of the next EEAWP meeting, a further discussion and decision can be made regarding the chairmanship. An item for the next agenda.</p> <p><b>Revised Terms of Reference</b></p> <p>The decision over EEAWP chairmanship and time limit of holding post will be included in the revised ToR. AC asked the group if they felt there was anything that needed to be added to the draft ToR. GW &amp; KH recommended all to review the CLG Tender paperwork for update on ToR. All to feed back thoughts when revised ToR issued. The comment was made that it should refer to AWP rather than RAWP.</p>	<p><b>LS</b></p> <p><b>ALL</b></p>
<p><b>4.0</b></p>	<p><b>National Co-ordination Group Feedback</b></p> <p>As discussed, GW mentioned the tender for secretariat responsibilities currently taking place. He added that if there is any reason to re-tender, he would let everyone know. The minimum requirement for AWP groups to meet is once a year but it is for this group to decide. It was agreed that twice yearly is sufficient and as the workload of AWP is likely to get compressed into the first half of the year, the timing might need to be</p>	

	flexible – possibly with a 4 month and 8 month gap. This will be considered at the next meeting.	<b>ALL</b>
<b>5.0</b>	<b>National Planning Issues</b>	
<b>5.1</b>	<b>Nationally Significant Infrastructure Regime</b> – KH mentioned a couple of consultation papers about nationally significant infrastructure – the first one regarding whether or not the current regime should be extended to cover minerals application and the second one regarding a one stop shop approach. He asked the group whether they thought the first one was a good idea and whether individual authorities had given it any thought. RG mentioned that the commercial and industrial proposal is to include mineral sites greater than 100 ha. The general consensus was that a smaller site of less than 100 ha could be nationally more significant as regards quality and type of output and impact on the existing infrastructure, rail network and wharf heads. KH said he has responded to the consultation but he wanted to raise it to see if the AWP group had a view. MPA members said they don't feel that strongly about. It was noted that the AWP is sanctioned to deal with aggregates only. As the consultation is now closed and it is currently going through the House of Lords, the group agreed that they just need to be kept aware of what is going through the National Infrastructure Project as it could have an impact on mineral demand in the future.	
<b>5.2</b>	<b>Taylor Review</b> - There is a call for comment on the consultation into applicable planning guidance until 15 <sup>th</sup> Feb. The MASS guidance has only been out for a couple of months, however it is listed in the Taylor Review under Annex C which covers documents that are to be kept until replaced by revised guidance. KH confirmed that there weren't any major issues that everyone should be aware of before they make any response.	
<b>6.0</b>	<b>EEAWP – Scrutiny of Local Aggregate Assessments</b>  AC explained that this agenda item would be done in two halves – firstly a brief update of the LAAs circulated with the agenda and secondly how AWP can get a process in place to collate views and feed back to each authority. Roy Romans sent a message to say that the group need to make it clear what its purpose is and how we are responding as an AWP. As a group, the AWP should be monitoring and providing technical advice.  KH said the AWP need to think carefully about what NPPF says. You have to produce an annual LAA and show how you have arrived at it. AWP need to look at what the trends are – a need to have flexibility rather than apportionment. There were comments about conflicting paragraphs of the MASS guidance and more clarification was required.  AC asked whether, in terms of an AWP response, everyone was happy that the preferred route is to stick with annual apportionment rather than using a 10 year average and that a draft should be drawn up using those	

words and circulated to all. Not everyone agreed and mentioned other issues about LAA's not complying with the NPPF. It was pointed out that the London AWP have objected to certain points in the Essex LAA and that it is deficient. It was queried how EEAWP should go about issuing comments as a group. It was not considered necessary to have a meeting every time an LAA is submitted and it was thought that this could be done via e-mail. There is no formal LAA consultation period so the following timescales for feedback on the LAA's already submitted were agreed as follows:

- Essex: started 13<sup>th</sup> Jan – feedback required in 2 weeks time
- Suffolk - feedback required by 22<sup>nd</sup> Feb
- Cambs – going to members on 7<sup>th</sup> Feb, so 21 days from then.

According to the East Midlands ToR, the LAA consultation time is within 21 days. If agreement is not reached by AWP, it was thought it may be a possibility to add a caveat. A discussion was had on what AWP should and should not be commenting on. The LAA format should be consistent but it was agreed that there is a broad area where there would not be agreement - depending on local circumstances and definition of technical advice. All agreed that a response to confirm that the AWP agrees with the apportionment of the headline figure and that other issues that are dependent on local circumstances would be dealt with individually by MPAs rather than through the AWP. The amount of aggregate attributed to individual MPAs planned for was considered a matter for the AWP to look at, but how MPAs chose to meet demand was a matter for individual authorities to determine.

KH said each LAA should be finalised by mid year. The annual report should be sent no later than 6 months from when the data is collected. The LAA needs to be produced before that so there is a need to turn things round a bit faster. It was commented that mineral companies are difficult to get information from and KH said he will take that message back. The proposal will be to send out the surveys in December for return end of Jan in future years. It was agreed these deadlines will apply next year and not this year as the mark has already been passed this year.

It was agreed that there was a need to ensure all are working to the same base survey information regarding rail depots and wharves including marine dredged landings.

***Post meeting note: GW provided the following clarification from CLG: To clarify when your local AMR survey is to be supplied to DCLG detailing 2012 figures. As you can see in para 3.3.13, the tender specification document asks for yearly results six months after the start of the year. DCLG recognises this maybe a tight deadline for this year as it is almost February and your Secretariat is still undecided. So if we said we'd like you to do them as close to the time as possible would that be helpful? Each year after this we would expect you to stick to the target of June.***

<p><b>7.0</b></p>	<p><b>OFT Report and Competition Commission (update) re the Aggregates Market</b></p> <p>The Competition Commission hyperlink was circulated prior to the meeting. The CC is trying to find evidence of AWP's swapping information on commercial issues, which clearly they are not. They are ferretting around but there doesn't seem to be any evidence that drove them towards this survey in the first place. An observation was made about Herts LAA and the information being very site specific. TCL will feed that back to Herts and find out how the information was obtained if confidentiality issues were complied with.</p>	<p><b>TCL</b></p>
<p><b>8.0</b></p>	<p><b>AMR 2011 and 2012 Survey</b></p> <p>AMR 2011 has been published and is pretty much the final version. The majority of the document is okay but a couple of minor points were raised. LS will circulate an e-mail to the group to pick up any comments anyone has and will finalise document. Timetable for completion to be finalised - aim to hit the June date (see GW email)</p> <p>Reminder – to apply caution to maintain commercial sensitivity re specific sites data.</p> <p>It was noted that future AMR reports would need to include “conclusions” having regard to overall trends at sub-national level and within the LAA's and overall provision.</p> <p>Future surveys – to be circulated in December, ready for operators to complete in January.</p>	<p><b>LS/secretariat</b> <b>ALL</b></p> <p><b>Secretariat</b></p> <p><b>ALL</b></p> <p><b>Secretariat</b></p> <p><b>Secretariat</b></p>
<p><b>9.0</b></p>	<p><b>MPA Local Plan Updates</b></p> <p><b>Essex</b> – Went out to consultation on pre submission version on Thursday for 6 weeks consultation with a view to hitting IIP in October.</p> <p><b>Herts</b> – Paper is currently with members on how to progress with MLP. Work due to start this year.</p> <p><b>Thurrock</b> – Going to public consultation for issues options in March. Does seem there will be some delay due to budget cuts. M &amp; W plan is prime candidate so could be won't hit timescale.</p> <p><b>Norfolk</b> – Minerals hearing on 26-28<sup>th</sup> March, Waste will be 9-11<sup>th</sup> April - 3 days each. Minerals to be returned by 8<sup>th</sup> Feb, Waste by 28<sup>th</sup> Feb.</p> <p><b>Suffolk</b> – Have adopted plans in previous scheme. Debate going on as to what plan they review first. Minerals adopted in 2008 so could do with update.</p>	

	<p><b>Cambs &amp; Peterborough</b> – Core strategy adopted July 2011 which runs to 2026. Paper produced already showing conformity with NPPF. Statement of community involvement. No other plans.</p> <p><b>Beds Authorities</b> – Local Plan hearing today and tomorrow. Report out in March all being well, will then be working on general environmental policies.</p>	
<b>10.0</b>	<b>AOB</b>	
<b>10.1</b>	JMIP – GW announced this is going to tender tomorrow. <b><i>Post meeting note: hyperlink to tender interest document was circulated to all.</i></b>	
<b>10.2</b>	Tarmac & Lafarge – as from 7 <sup>th</sup> January, they are now operating as one company called Lafarge Tarmac.	
<b>10.3</b>	AC will draft a letter thanking Roy Leavitt for his past efforts as EEAWP chair and secretariat and will circulate to all for approval.	<b>AC</b>
<b>11.0</b>	<b>Date of Next Meeting</b>	
	To be advised.	