

DRAFT MINUTES

East of England Aggregates Working Party

Meeting on 5th February 2015 starting at 1pm


Venue: County Hall, Market Street, Chelmsford, CM1 1QH

ATTENDEES

Members	
Andrew Cook (AC)	Essex County Council (Chairman)
Richard Drake (RD)	Norfolk County Council
Trish Carter-Lyons (TC-L)	Hertfordshire County Council
Terry Burns (TB)	Suffolk County Council
Phil Dash (PD)	Essex County Council
Richard Ford (RF)	Brett/MPA
Brian Chapman (BC) – substituting for Mick Daynes	Hanson/MPA
Peter Dawes PD)	Frimstone/BAA
David Payne (DP)	MPA
Others	
Sue Marsh	EE AWP Secretariat
Natalie Chillcott	EEAWP Secretariat
Karen Down	EM AWP Secretariat
Nick Everington (NE)	Crown Estate
Gemma Nicholson	Hertfordshire County Council
Richard Greaves (RG)	Essex County Council
Apologies	
Kirsten Hannaford Hill	Cemex/MPA
Roy Romans	Bedfordshire Authorities
Jonathan Garbutt	Hope Construction Materials/MPA
Nick Horsley	Sibelco/MPA
Eamon Mythen	DCLG
Richard Fifield	BMAPA
Paul Clark	Thurrock Borough Council
Mick Daynes (sub Brian Chapman)	Hanson/MPA
Ann Barnes	Cambridgeshire County Council
Mike Pendock	Lafarge Tarmac/MPA
Gemma Wildman	Peterborough County Council

No.	Subject	Papers	Owner
1	Welcome, introductions and apologies	<p>Apologies – as set out on previous sheet.</p> <p>Introductions were made.</p> <p>AC informed AWP members that Mick Daynes would be retiring from Hansons at the end of March. MD had said that it had always been a pleasure to work with the EoE team where we tend to have a higher degree of pragmatism and sense in many of the member mineral planning authorities, who have experienced minerals officers representing them and who have an understanding of both planning and the industry.</p>	AC
2	Minutes of the last meeting & matters arising	Minutes of last meeting were approved without amendment.	AC
3	Survey: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual survey • 4 year survey 	<p>DCLG have asked the Secretariat not to send out the annual mineral survey to MPAs until instructed to do so.</p> <p>DCLG have indicated that BGS will be appointed to undertake the national 4 year survey on 2nd February 2015. This has not yet been confirmed.</p> <p>DCLG recognise the delay in sending out the national 4 year survey will mean the 30th June 2015 deadline to submit the EEAWP AMR to DCLG will not be met. It may also affect the delivery of LAAs</p> <p>DP on behalf of the MPA offered to contact DCLG for an update.</p>	SEM
4	Crown Estate presentation on Marine Minerals Planning	Nick Everington gave a presentation on the Crown Estate and the role of marine aggregates. NE said that in 2013 16mt of marine aggregate was extracted	

		<p>from the sea bed. This increased by a million tonnes in 2014. The trend was upwards but had still not reached the 2007 figure of 20MT.</p> <p>A 8500t capacity dredger equates to 4500 lorry movements.</p> <p>Post presentation question and answers:</p> <p>NE- The is no link between marine dredging and coastal erosion.</p> <p>TB- The NPPF asks for MPAs to take account of marine aggregates in LAAs, but all the marine aggregates extracted off the coast of Suffolk at sent to London, Belgium or Holland, therefore is it sensible to include marine aggregates?</p> <p>NE- It is a market led-issue. Permitted marine resources are significantly less than actual reserves. Therefore, if land-won reserves become depleted there may be scope to use marine aggregates.</p> <p>Also some mineral does not get unloaded at a wharf but it used directly for reclamation and coastal erosion projects.</p> <p>PD – Hampshire rely on marine aggregates in its Local Plan.</p> <p>TB- Which is more cost effective- marine aggregates or land-won aggregates?</p> <p>NE- Marine aggregates = high capital costs and transport costs. Low processing costs.</p> <p>Land-won aggregates = cost of stripping removing overburden. Lower transport costs.</p> <p>No difference in quality (both meet British standards) but different shape.</p> <p>TB- What is the depth of extraction? Average depth = 37cm</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>over licensed areas. It takes 2-7 years for the seabed to recover. There are limits to the depth of extraction (must not reach the bedrock).</p> <p>TB- How wide is the aperture of the dredger? NE- A few feet in diameter.</p> <p>TB- Are there any restrictions in place to avoid certain areas? NE- A number of organisations including fishing organisations are consulted during the application process. Therefore an application could be refused. There may be seasonal restrictions.</p> <p>Wessex Archaeology studies archaeological finds.</p> <p>NE – Significant investment in dredgers in the 1970s-1980s. These ships are now approaching the end of their lives. Investment in new ships will be needed. Current trend towards larger ships (10,000 tonne), for efficiency reasons.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"> Crown Estate Presentation to East</p>	
5	Crown Estate - consultations	<p>Please email NE by 13th February if you want to make any comments on the recent consultation.</p> <p>TB had suggested that EEAWP are added to the list of consultees on Crown Estate consultations. To do this a form has to be returned to the Crown Estate and a disclaimer signed. SM said that she is reluctant to sign the disclaimer as she will need to circulate information to EEAWP members and there is no control over who they might show it to. NE said that the</p>	SEM NE

		<p>confidentiality disclaimer was important. AC asked NE to investigate whether there are other organisations like EEAWP that are consultees and how they deal with the disclaimer issue and to suggest a solution to SM.</p>	
6	Apportionment/10 year average discussion	<p>Essex = The Plan is based on the apportionment.</p> <p>It is likely that future Local Plans (reviews) will need to be based on the 10 year average.</p> <p>The MPA predict a 3% increase in aggregate sales and agree that the 10 year average is the best (but not a great) option. They note that authorities (e.g Oxfordshire and Kent) have had difficulty in justifying the use of an alternative approach.</p> <p>The MPA does not support plans which using wording such as “permit sites if landbank drops below 7 years.”</p> <p>RD suggested that looking at 3 year trends can be very helpful.</p> <p>All concerned that in the future the 10 year average will fall below actual sales.</p> <p>MASS guidance was still a material consideration. Concern that guidance was not being updated.</p>	AC
7	National Co-ordinating Group feedback	<p>SM said that the AWP Secretaries meeting in October Nick Tennant had been keen to arrange a NCG meeting early in 2015. However, nothing further had been mentioned about this since then.</p>	SEM
8	National Planning Issues	<p>SM read out the update that had been received from DCLG.</p> <p>On 2 February the contract period for the delivery of the</p>	SEM

		<p>Aggregate Mineral Survey 2014 begins and we will be in contact in the near future about the logistics for implementing the AMS 2014.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Annual Mineral Raised Inquiry (AMRI) 2013 will be published in February, I will let the AWP's Secretariat know the specific date of publication once agreed. • We are progressing the competitive tender for the AWP's Technical Secretariat, we are progressing through the internal clearance processes at this moment. • The GE purdah period starts on Monday 30 March. 	
9	Update on local plans	<p>See attachment. No follow up questions were asked</p>	MPAs
10	Time and date of next meeting	<p>4th June 2015. 2:00pm. Priory House, Chicksands . Note: The time and date of this meeting may be subject to change.</p>	AC
11	Any other business	<p>DP asked for the MPA to be involved in the review of any Mineral Local Plans. DP talked about the Minerals Planning Survey which the MPA had been doing for many years but had not been published previously. MPA note that reserves are not being replenished and planning applications are not being made for various reasons – capital cost of developing site, cost of application, sites previously mothballed etc. If trends continue and reserves are depleted then scenarios need to be developed to manage this. DP to send SM a link to the MPA website. Link to the press release about the AMPS report http://www.mineralproducts.org/</p>	AC

		<p>14-release42.htm within which are links to the summary report http://www.mineralproducts.org/documents/AMPS_Report_Summary_2014.pdf and main report http://www.mineralproducts.org/documents/AMPS_Report_FINAL_dec2014.pdf</p> <p>DP also said that there was an LAA Guide to be published jointly by the MPA and POS.</p> <p>NE agreed to provide an update from the Crown Estate for the next meeting.</p> <p>AC suggested that a letter should be sent to DCLG on behalf to the EEAWP to ask for more support and guidance for minerals operators as the national economy and housebuilding depends on an ongoing supply of minerals. Topics – survey, secretariat contract, NCG meeting and apportionment/10 year average.</p>	
--	--	---	--