

DRAFT MINUTES

East of England Aggregate Working Party

Date: Wednesday 29th January 2014

Venue: County Hall, Chelmsford (committee room 6) 2pm

ATTENDEES

Members	
Andrew Cook – Chair (AC)	Essex County Council
Trish Carter Lyons (TCL)	Herts County Council
Richard Drake (RD)	Norfolk County Council
Paul Clark (PC)	Thurrock Borough Council
Steve Winstanley (SW)	Peterborough City Council
Hamish Barrell (HB)	Essex County Council
Roy Romans (RR)	BBC,CBC and Luton
Ann Barnes (AB)	Cambridgeshire County Council
Terry Burns (TB)	Suffolk County Council
David Payne (DP)	MPA
Mike Pendock (MP)	Lafarge Tarmac/MPA
Others	
Susan Marsh (SEM)	AWP Secretary
Natalie Chilcott (NC)	AWP Secretariat
Jonathon Quilter (JQ)	Essex County Council
Apologies	
Richard Fifield (RF)	Brittania Aggregates/Bretts/MPA
Nick Horsley (NH)	Sibelco/MPA
Kirsten Hannaford-Hill (KH-H)	Cemex/MPA
Jonathan Garbutt (new member) (JG)	Hope Construction Materials /MPA
Peter Dawes (PD)	BAA
Eamon Mythen (EM)	CLG
Mark Plummer (MP)	CLG
Richard Ford (RF)	Bretts/MPA
Chris Waite (CW)	SEAWP Secretary
Mick Daynes (MD)	Hanson/MPA
Lesley Stenhouse (LS)	Essex CC
Richard Greaves (RG)	Essex CC

No	Subject		Owner
1	Welcome, Introductions and Apologies	<p>Introductions were made</p> <p>Attendance list and apologies set out above</p>	SEM /NC
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minutes of Last Meeting and Matters arising 	<p>Members approved the Minutes which relate to the 26th July 2013 meeting.</p> <p>EEAWP meeting draft minutes, final minutes and agendas will be available to download from the Central Bedfordshire Council website. Draft minutes will be circulated via email for comment before being placed on the website.</p> <p>http://www.centralbedfordshire.gov.uk/planning/minerals-and-waste/east-england-aggregates.aspx</p> <p>Matters arising See items 3-8</p> <p>(Attached below is a resume of the comments that have been sent out on behalf of the EEAWP ***)</p>	SEM
3	AMR 2013 Survey	<p>All representatives of Authorities within the East of England confirmed that they understood the importance of providing the collated survey returns by <u>17th March 2014</u>.</p> <p>All except Essex and Thurrock have sent out the survey forms. JQ agreed to contact PC about this as a matter of urgency.</p> <p>Operators have been given a deadline of the 28th February to submit their returns to the relevant MPA.</p> <p>SEM confirmed that all AWP's are working towards the same timetable.</p> <p>MP said that Authorities should check that the surveys are being sent to the correct individuals. He noted that several individuals have left or changed jobs as a result of the merger of Lafarge and Tarmac and that it would be advisable to get</p>	<p>All</p> <p>JQ/PC</p> <p>Industry reps</p> <p>All MPAs</p> <p>MP</p>

		<p>current contact details confirmed for Lafargetarmac as, otherwise, survey information may not be provided. He requested that every authority informed MP of their contact details for the company so that he could advise whether or not that was still the appropriate person and, if not, who should be contacted. (MP's email address is: mike.pendock@lafargetarmac.com)</p> <p>The draft Report will be produced by end of April.</p> <p>EEAWPMR will be used to inform East of England Local Aggregate Assessments. SEM said that a summary of the LAAs for the AWP area would be included as an appendix to the EEAWP AMR 2013.</p>	NC/ SEM
4	EEAWP – Scrutiny of Local Aggregate Assessment - CCC/PCC	<p>SW gave a short presentation on the draft Cambridgeshire and Peterborough LAA. He said that it was a net exporter of aggregate (1.72MT sales in 2012 – down on apportionment). There is 27MT landbank – 15/16 years. There are sufficient reserves in place. The Plan area is divided into 3 areas (north, middle and south). All areas produced less than appt. though the middle and south were close. As a crushed rock producer it produces less than 1% of sales in England. Sales are down on appt. (planned appt. 0.3MT). There is a 12.8 year supply but no allocated sites and there may be issues of long term supply. Recycled/secondary aggregates difficult to quantify.</p> <p>. RR did not anticipate that what was reported would have any adverse impact on other authorities. DP said that the LAA was to the point and easy to read; helpful to maintain 7yr and 10 yr landbank throughout Plan period but there were continued reliances on East Midlands (AB said that she had checked reserves with operators). These points had already been submitted on behalf of the</p>	SW/AB All

		<p>Mineral Products Association.</p> <p>There was some discussion about the difficulty of obtaining reliable figures for recycled/secondary aggregates. RR said that the RTAB had carried out a study but it was difficult to get responses. RR indicated that Tom Ellis (Environment Agency) had recently sent an email highlighting a Wrap report on trends in landfilled C,D and E waste. This is the link: http://www.wrap.org.uk/content/factors-causing-waste-soil-be-sent-landfill .</p> <p>Monitoring of SWMPs may assist - waste audits require policy support and also difficulties in getting these applied to major development proposals due to competing priorities. HB noted that a useful report on National figures has been published, but it was based on a number of assumptions. The EEAWP raised no objections to the document</p>	
5	<p>National Co-ordination Group Feedback</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Feedback from Joint Secretaries meeting 	<p>SEM reported that the Joint Secretaries meeting in December 2013 had focused on the type of survey to be undertaken in 2014. MP had advised that the finance was not available until April 2014 (at which time consultants still had to be appointed) to start the survey. In which case, it would be impossible for AWP's to achieve the deadline of 30th June 2014 to submit the Annual Report to DCLG. The Secretaries had pressed CLG to agree to the usual survey being carried out in 2014 with consultants being appointed in time for the 4 year survey to start at the beginning of 2015.</p> <p>MP subsequently confirmed that the usual survey would be sent out in January and the 4 year survey would take place next year.</p> <p>It is likely that the next survey will cover a 5 year period and the following one, 3 years, so that the 4 year survey timetable will be corrected. Only one survey will be sent out each year (i.e either the EEAWP survey or the 4 yearly survey).</p> <p>SEM to ask MP/EM for an update on the 4 yearly survey and report back to EEAWP members.</p>	<p>All to note</p> <p>SEM</p>

		SEM reported that a meeting of the National Chairs was proposed in early 2015.	SEM/ EM/ MP
6	National Planning Issues	<p>As EM was not able to attend SEM reported that DCLG had indicated that the new web based version of the Minerals Planning Guidance will be published/go live over the coming weeks – the exact date was not available.</p> <p>RD said that National Infrastructure Projects now include large scale mineral extraction sites. This only related to sites over 350ha and industrial minerals sites were included. AB commented that the project on the A14 which included borrow pits could be one of these.</p> <p>DP said that the MPA had written updated guidance on LAAs. Comments have been received from POS and there have been workshops with industry. This is being progressed.</p> <p>It was agreed that there would be a discussion on this at the next meeting.</p>	EM All to note DP
7	Mineral Planning Authorities – Local Plan progress updates	<p><u>Bedfordshire Authorities:</u> The Minerals Local Plan: Strategic Sites and Policies is currently going through the formal adoption approval process. Anticipated to be adopted Thursday 30th January. The 6 week period for challenge will then commence. It is likely that CBC, BBC and LBC will review the saved General and Environmental policies in the MWLP (2005) and then incorporate these policies, together with others required by the NPPF, in their respective main stream Development Management Plans for their unitary authority areas. The Local Development Scheme would be amended accordingly as no separate LDD would be produced as originally.</p> <p><u>Cambridgeshire and Peterborough:</u> Minerals and Waste Core Strategy adopted in 2011 and the Site Allocations Plan in 2012. No policy work, other than</p>	All to note

		<p>monitoring, currently being undertaken.</p> <p><u>Hertfordshire:</u> Currently working with the Districts on housing sites. Final version of the LAA is available to download from the Hertfordshire website. Suggested amendments to the LAA have been incorporated.</p> <p><u>Essex: Minerals Plan Examination</u> in public held in November 2013, The Inspectors Report was due on 24th January 2014 but is not published yet as a number of modifications are required . These will be the subject of a public consultation towards the end of February for 6 weeks. Anticipated date of adoption has been delayed and is now anticipated to be July 2014.</p> <p><u>Norfolk:</u> Minerals and Waste Site allocations Plan adopted 28th October 2013. Review of the Core Strategy to be undertaken in 2016.</p> <p><u>Thurrock:</u> A meeting has been arranged to discuss the scope and timetable of the production of a new plan. Currently undertaking a focused review of the Core Strategy, which includes mineral policies, to achieve consistency with NPPF’.</p> <p><u>Suffolk:</u> Intend to undertake a review of the Mineral Plan (adopted 2008).</p>	
8	Any other business	<p>The Worcestershire Minerals Local Plan was discussed briefly. All agreed that given the location of Worcestershire in relation to the East of England it is unlikely that it will cause any issues for the EEAWP region especially as it was not a big minerals producer</p> <p>It was agreed that Worcs CC would be informed that: <i>Notwithstanding any comments that individual members of the AWP may make on the Plan, the EEAWP does not believe that the content of this Plan will have any significant impact on the AWP area and, therefore, does not have</i></p>	<p>ALL</p> <p>SEM</p>

		<p><i>any real comment to make.</i></p> <p>.</p> <p>DP asked for LAAs to include landbank figures in terms of tonnage of aggregate, as well as number of years.</p> <p>The Mineral Products Association has produced some guidance on LAAs which will be available soon.</p> <p>JQ asked when the EEA WP AMR 2013 will be available to download from the DCLG website, and whether it could be saved on the CBC website. RR said that this was not a problem but thought that DCLG should be consulted first. It may be possible to put a link to the DCLG website rather than the actual document. . SEM to clarify with DCLG.</p> <p>AC requested that if there are any nominations for the chair of the AWP the Secretary should be advised at least 2 weeks prior to the next meeting (21st May 2014). The appointment of a new Chairman will be included in the Agenda for that meeting.</p>	SEM
			SM
9	Date of Next Meeting-	5th June 2014. 2:00pm -5:00pm, Priory House, Chicksands.	

***** Comments sent out on behalf of the EEA WP following the meeting on 26th July 2013 and as a result of subsequent requests for feedback from the AWP.**

Item 6 (2) Feedback had been given to both Norfolk CC and the shared Bedfordshire authorities on their draft LAA's after the end of the deadline of

31st August given for further responses. The feedback in both instances was: 'No additional comments have been raised by AWP members beyond those discussed and agreed as the AWP's position at the meeting on 26th July 2014'

Item 10: Response to Oxfordshire County Council on their draft LAA:

' Thank you for submitting your draft LAA to the East of England AWP for consideration at its meeting on 26th July 2013.

EEAWP members noted that a different approach has been taken in the LAA resulting in slightly higher provision than if a 10 year sales average was used, though less than the agreed apportionment figure. The AWP is satisfied that this will not lead to the East of England needing to increase mineral provision. It is also noted that Oxfordshire County Council have taken on board comments raised by the industry previously'.

Surrey County Council

Response of AWP: 'Thank you for submitting your draft LAA to the East of England AWP for consideration at its meeting on 26th July 2013.

EEAWP raised no issues or concerns with the LAA other than the high levels of recycled aggregates proposed to support the Plan.'

Feedback from SCC: We recently adopted our Aggregates Recycling Joint Development Plan Document (Feb 2013) at which our targets for increasing recycled aggregate production were tested and accepted by the Inspector following independent Examination. The potential to achieve our targets is supported by significant quantities of C&D waste which are imported into Surrey from London. The results of the AM2012 Survey indicate that production has continued to increase in Surrey for the 5th consecutive year since surveys were resumed.

Buckinghamshire County Council

Response of AWP: 'Thank you for submitting your draft LAA to the East of England AWP for consideration at its meeting on 26th July 2013.

EEAWP accepted the general thrust of the LAA but felt that there are issues around the landbank. It is noted that a different approach has been taken to that adopted by EEAWP. '

Item 11 : Marine Management Organisation - East Coast Plan
AWP members given until 31st August to comment.

Response of AWP: 'I am writing to confirm that no comments were made by any member of the AWP on the East Coast Plan. It will, therefore, fall to individual authorities to comment separately if they wish to do so.'

Email consultation to AWP members since the meeting on:

Medway District Council LAA:

Response of AWP: ' The East of England Aggregate Working Party thanks you for consulting it on the draft Medway Local Aggregate Assessment. The

EE AWP supports Medway's intention to continue to plan for the supply of aggregate based on the sub-regional target and considers that this represents an appropriate methodology so as to plan for growth.

You may wish to take into account the following points, based on the comments of some members:

- The LAA does not touch on a number of areas that guidance suggests – such as environmental constraints and the economic justification section is not detailed, and
- There is no wharf capacity information and exports are not detailed by destination – though it is noted that Medway Council in conjunction with Kent County Council intend to carry out an updated study of minerals aggregates facilities in 2014 which will provide further information on the capacity of key infrastructure'

Also circulated to EEAWP members:

Milton Keynes Council LAA

Bucks CC LAA updated

North West AWP report 2013 and LAA Assessment Report

South East AWP report 2013