

## DRAFT MINUTES

### East of England Aggregate Working Party

Date/Time: Thursday 2<sup>nd</sup> October 2014. 14:00

Venue: Priory House, Chicksands, Bedfordshire

#### ATTENDEES

<b>Members</b>	
Roy Romans (RR)	Bedfordshire Joint authorities
Ann Barnes (AB)	Cambridgeshire County Council
Terry Burns (TB)	Suffolk CC
Gemma Wildman (GW)	Peterborough CC
Trish Carter-Lyons (TC)	Herts CC
Paul Clarke (PC)	Thurrock BC
Jonathan Quilter (JQ)	Essex CC
Nick Campbell (NC)	Norfolk CC
Kirsten Hannaford-Hill (KH)	Cemex/MPA
David Payne (DP)	MPA
Kirsten Hannaford-Hill (KH)	Cemex/MPA
Brian Chapman (BC) (substituting for Mick Daynes)	Hanson/MPA
Peter Lemon (PL)	BAA/Middaggs
<b>Others</b>	
Susan Marsh (SEM)	AWP Secretary
Natalie Chillcott (NC)	Bedfordshire Joint Authorities/Secretariat
<b>Apologies</b>	
Andrew Cook	Essex County Council (chair)
Mick Daynes (MD)	Hanson/MPA
Mike Pendock (MP)	Lafarge Tarmac/MPA
Jonathan Garbutt (JG)	Hope Construction Materials/MPA
Nick Horsley (NH)	Sibelco/MPA
Richard Ford (RF)	Brett/MPA
Peter Dawes (PD)	Frimestone Ltd/BAA
Chris Waite (CW)	SEEAWP Secretariat
Eamon Mythen (EM)	DCLG

No.	Subject		Owner
1	<b>Welcome, introductions and apologies</b>	SM, as secretary, substituted as chair for the meeting as AC was unable to attend at the last minute. Apologies – as set out on previous sheet. Introductions were made	<b>SEM</b>
2	<b>Minutes of the last meeting &amp; matters arising</b>	Minutes of last meeting were approved without amendment.  As there had been a request for a representative from the Crown Estate to attend the AWP meeting (item 9) SM had contacted them, It was agreed that either Sue Kidd or Nick Everington would attend the AWP meeting in February 2015.	<b>SEM</b>
3	<b>Survey:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Annual survey</b></li> <li>• <b>4 year survey</b></li> </ul>	All agreed to follow a similar timetable used for the 2013 survey/AMR:  <b>Early January 2015:</b> Secretariat to send Annual Survey forms to MPAs to distribute to local operators by <b>end of January 2015</b> . <b>End February 2015:</b> MPAs to provide the Secretariat with the collated Annual Survey returns. <b>March-April 2015:</b> Secretariat to produce the AMR including checking back on queries with MPAs and operators. <b>Mid May 2015:</b> Circulate Draft AMR to AWP members <b>4th June 2015:</b> AWP meeting to discuss draft AMR and approve for submission to DCLG. <b>End of June 2015:</b> Submit AMR to DCLG.  No clarification has been provided by DCLG as to when the 4 year survey will be actioned. It is likely that there will be two surveys sent out in early 2015	<b>SEM</b>

		seeking figures for different years (as the 4 year survey will be seeking 2013 figures)	
4	<b>Scrutiny of LAAs</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Bedfordshire authorities</b></li> <li>• <b>Cambridgeshire &amp; Peterborough</b></li> <li>• <b>Greater Essex</b></li> <li>• <b>Hertfordshire</b></li> <li>• <b>Norfolk</b></li> <li>• <b>Suffolk</b></li> </ul>	<p>Each LAA was discussed.</p> <p>Only one strategic issue was raised during the meeting: PL suggested that due to the geology there is a shortfall of gravel in the permitted reserves in Norfolk (not sand). He considered that this may result in additional pressure on surrounding authorities to meet demand for gravel. NC confirmed that Norfolk CC considers that they have planned sufficiently for a steady and adequate supply of sand and gravel for the plan period. RR asked whether any surrounding authorities had any monitoring information to suggest that gravel is being imported in to Norfolk, nobody knew of any imports. It was concluded that this situation will be monitored to establish whether importation is taking place.</p> <p>Non-strategic comments which were raised during the meeting include:</p> <p>Industry noted that it would be helpful if each LAA included a table of the strategic sites identified in the relevant local plan and whether or not the sites have been permitted.</p> <p>Industry and the MPA also suggested that LAAs should identify major infrastructure projects and planned growth including housing but there should be greater clarity given as to the results of this on change in demand for aggregates. There was discussion on this and the</p>	<b>MPAs</b>

		<p>difficulties of aligning growth within an area with aggregate demand as it could be sourced from elsewhere.</p> <p>The MPAs are confident the 7 year aggregate sand and gravel landbank will continue to be maintained for their area, but it is difficult to predict when and where future development will be located and the tonnage of aggregate which will be required. This is partly due to the fact that housing figures are contained within district plans, which are at differing stages which makes it difficult to calculate the aggregates needed. It is, therefore, difficult to understand the amount of growth and where it will be located due to the differing stages of plan production at any point in time.</p> <p>RR noted that each LAA should form part of the Monitoring Report for each respective authority.</p> <p>The ways in which Essex differentiated between Preferred and Reserved sites was discussed.</p> <p>PL raised concerns that whilst Norfolk appeared to have adequate permitted reserves of aggregate there may actually be a shortfall in permitted aggregate gravel reserves as some permissions are for sand only.</p> <p>The tables contained in the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough LAA was considered useful.</p> <p>DP suggested that there is not a downward trend in sales in Hertfordshire, but is relatively</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>stable when compared with other authorities.</p> <p>RR suggested that the NPPF encourages Plans to cover a 15 year plan period.</p> <p> Cambs Pboro presentation LAA 201</p> <p> LAA presentation Beds.pptx</p> <p> LAA_Presentation Essex.pptx</p> <p>It was agreed that the MPAs could proceed with any changes required as a result of comments made either at the meeting or from other consultations without further recourse to the AWP.</p>	
<b>5</b>	<b>AMR2013</b>	Submitted by 30 <sup>th</sup> June 2014 as per contractual requirements	<b>SEM</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>National Co-ordinating Group feedback</b>	<p>AWP Secretaries scheduled to meet on 3<sup>rd</sup> October at DCLG.</p> <p>A number of matters are to be discussed including renewal of Secretariat contracts, changes to the terms of reference of the AWP, the 4 year survey, core contents of AMRs, draft analysis of AWP reports for 2012, issues with survey information and if the data collected is what is actually required.</p>	<b>SEM</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>National Planning Issues</b>	<p>No update was available on national planning issues.</p> <p>DP had recently attended LAWP and was able to update members on information that EM had provided to that on national planning issues. In particular:</p>	<b>SEM DP EM</b>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AWP's will continue to be funded</li> <li>• PPS 10 update will be published shortly</li> <li>• There is the potential issue of sending more than one survey to operators.</li> </ul> <p>EM has subsequently provided an update on national planning issues and this is appended to the draft minutes.</p>	
<b>8</b>	<b>Update on local plans</b>	Please refer to the Local Plan update sheet Oct 2014 which is available to download from the CBC website.	<b>MPAs</b>
<b>9</b>	<b>Any other business</b>	<p>SEM said that the AWP had been consulted on the West Yorkshire LAA. She agreed to forward comments on it and asked for them by 10 October.</p> <p>Cemex intend to respond directly to West Yorkshire.</p>	<b>SEM</b>
<b>10</b>	<b>Date of next meeting</b>	<b>5<sup>th</sup> February 2015</b> <b>County Hall, Chelmsford</b>	<b>SEM</b>