

## AGREED MINUTES

### East of England Aggregates Working Party

Meeting on 2 Nov 2016 starting at 2pm

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

#### ATTENDEES

<b>Members</b>	
Richard Greaves	Essex County Council (Chairman)
Roy Romans	Bedfordshire Authorities
Phil Dash	Essex County Council
Trish Carter-Lyons	Hertfordshire County Council
Chris Stanek	Peterborough City Council
Richard Drake	Norfolk County Council
Graham Gunby	Suffolk County Council
Ann Barnes	Cambridgeshire County Council
Chris Hemmingsley	Brett/MPA
Kirsten Hannaford-Hill	Aggregate Industries/MPA
Keith Bird	Hanson/MPA
Peter Dawes	Frimstone Ltd/BAA
Mark North	MPA
Mike Pendock	Tarmac/MPA
<b>Others</b>	
Sue Marsh	EEAWP Secretariat
Jerry Smith	EEAWP Secretariat
<b>Apologies</b>	
Mike Hurley	Sibelco/ MPA
Eamon Mythen	DCLG
Richard Read	SEEAWP, LAWP

Item No.	Subject	Owner
1	<b>Welcome, Introductions &amp; Apologies</b>	<b>RG</b>
	<p>Apologies – as set out on previous sheet.            Introductions were made. With the Group’s agreement, the order of the agenda was changed to deal with the Items relating to the National Coordinating Group feedback &amp; Consideration of statement on apportionment/10 year average before considering the LAAs for 2014 &amp; 2015.</p>	
2	<b>Minutes of the last meeting &amp; matters arising</b>	<b>RG/SEM</b>
	<p>Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) had been submitted to DCLG and RG had signed letter to EM in respect of the lack of update of the sub-regional apportionment figures but SEM reported no feedback to date. Now that the AMR has been agreed, it will be uploaded to the EEAWP web page on the CBC website. It will also be placed on the DCLG website in due course.</p> <p>MN reported that the England and Wales Aggregate Mineral Survey 2014 had been issued by DCLG that day (2 Nov) and he had circulated that information to some members. It was agreed that the link would be circulated to all members. The link is:  <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/aggregate-minerals-survey-for-england-and-wales-2014">https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/aggregate-minerals-survey-for-england-and-wales-2014</a></p> <p>The Minutes of the last meeting held on 29 June 2016 were accepted as being an accurate record and a copy signed by the Chairman.</p>	
3	<b>National Coordinating Group feedback</b>	<b>SEM</b>
	<p>SEM provided feedback from meeting of 20 Oct 2016 of AWP Secretaries. Concern was expressed that Eamon Mythen had been unable to attend at the last minute due to work priorities and Chris Bazley-Rose was only able to attend a small part of the meeting. CB-R therefore requested that the Secretaries produce a list of questions arising from the discussions for DCLG to respond to.</p> <p>The matters discussed were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Funding:</u>            Funding of AWP’s was in place for 2016/17 but not for 2017/18. Secretaries had expressed the need for continuity of contract especially as the contract would expire after annual surveys had been sent out but before the AMR had been produced. They urged DCLG to take a longer term view.</li> </ul>	

- LAAs:

A template for an executive summary was being promoted on basis that that it would be easier to make a regional assessment. A query had been raised as to whether POS/MPA guidance was being updated which MN confirmed to be the case.

- National Coordinating Group:

Suggested that a meeting would be welcomed around March 2017 and that this request should be formally made to DCLG. DCLG seek confirmation of need for a meeting and the questions to be addressed. Suggested contract related issues include fact that Secretariat contractually obliged to submit AMR to DCLG by 30 June but not achieved by any of the Secretariat (though EEAWP, LAWP and SEEAWP close). Lack of clarity in contract - need to take account of LAA but also to produce AMR by June 30 each year. Pressure for contract to be altered with AMR to be submitted by end of Dec rather than end of June. Some AWP are getting their MPAs to produce the LAAs on data collected before the AMR is produced. Query as to whether the MPAs should be using data collected on behalf of the AWP to produce their own document (LAA) and whether the AWP or the industry would be comfortable with this. Also how confidentiality issues are dealt with as there is more scope to aggregate data in an AMR but more difficult with individual LAAs.

- National Survey:

Some discussion on changing to a 5 yearly survey instead of a 4 year survey to save money. No one knew why the interval was 4 years. Would that be easier for industry or better to have movement data more frequently?

In discussions at the AWP meeting, it was questioned whether the suggested frequency of monitoring (5 years) would be sufficient to pick up changes in distribution – was there a risk in not spotting trends? GG felt it may mess up data sets and felt it better to keep to a regular pattern. KB confirmed that the changed period arose from the contract delay. MN considered it best to keep to 4 yrs and general consensus was to concur.

RR felt it was the right way round to produce the AMR & then the LAA. The AMR could still take account of the previous LAA. If LAA was produced first, MPAs would be doing so prior to the AMR being signed off by the AWP & confidentiality lost. Accepted that it may be

	<p>helpful to have an up to date LAA to allow plan preparation to progress but that would need to be made clear to industry and it may be that industry is content with that approach provided survey is complete and confidentiality maintained.</p> <p>SEM said that these views would be passed on to the members of the AWP Secretariat.</p> <p>Questioned how many MPAs put their LAA through Cttee/Panel for approval. TC-L confirmed Herts CC do. RR confirmed that Central Bedfordshire Council treats the LAA as a factual document rather than a policy one. A similar approach was taken by Essex &amp; Norfolk. MN aware that some MPAs in other AWP's do take to Cttee/Panel for approval.</p> <p>KH-H sought confirmation that disaggregated figures are destroyed once collation had taken place and RR confirmed this to be the case.</p>	
4	<p><b>Consideration of statement on apportionment/rolling 10 year average from MPAs</b></p>	<p><b>RG &amp; MPA reps</b></p>
	<p>Discussion was invited regarding the statement in SEM's previously circulated email of 18 Oct 2016 concerning the fact that the current apportionment figure is based upon the revised national guidelines covering the period to 2020. This statement said:</p> <p><i>The current appointment figure is based upon the revised national guidelines that cover the period to 2020. At the time of writing, the National Co-ordinating Group is not scheduled to meet in the foreseeable future. As Mineral Planning Authorities in the East of England are preparing or have prepared Plans with end dates significantly after 2020, the weight which can be given to the guidelines is likely to reduce considerably in future. Therefore, in the likely absence of updated guidelines emerging, the default position is for the provision for sand and gravel in plans to be based upon the methodology contained in national policy and guidance. (National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 145 and Planning Practice Guidance paragraphs 61-71)</i></p> <p>With the National Coordinating Group not meeting for the foreseeable future, and with MPAs preparing Plans with end dates significantly after 2020, the weight which can be applied the guidelines is likely to reduce considerably in the future. In the absence of updated guidance emerging, the default position is for sand &amp; gravel provision to be based upon the methodology set out in NPPF para 145 &amp; PPG paras 61-71.</p> <p>It was noted that the statement represents a shift from the position expressed in the EEAWP Chairman's letter of March 2013 which committed MPAs to follow the apportionment route.</p>	

	<p>GG commented that the Suffolk plan goes up to 2036 although the guidelines only go to 2020 and suggests MPAs are best advised to look at the NPPF and PPG for criteria checklist. The Suffolk LAA allows landbank to be pinned on a chosen 10 yr average because of x or to adopt something else. Essentially it is left for individual authorities to justify the position they take.</p> <p>MN registered some nervousness should the guidelines be ignored and felt it best to use the guidelines whilst noting that other approaches could be used i.e 10 yrs, 3yrs and sub-national guidelines.</p> <p>RG noted that the guidelines would be obsolete by 2020 and that weight accordingly decreases as evidenced in the views of Inspector's around the country. The 2013 letter is therefore unhelpful in that it could potentially be used to scupper emerging plans and questioned whether the EEAWP letter needed updating for clarity.</p> <p>Whilst previously reliance could be placed on sub-regional guidelines, this is no longer the case with the need to now follow the NPPF and PPG. Views expressed that the AWP simply needs to reflect that NPPF guidance is being followed and noted that Inspector accepted Oxon CC's argument for an uplift on the basis that annual figures were unusually depressed following mothballing of 3 quarries.</p> <p>After further discussion it was agreed that the 2013 letter be withdrawn and a new letter would be issued to AWP members by The Chair to highlight the need to reflect national guidance as per the last sentence in SEM's quoted extract.</p>	<p><b>SEM/RG</b></p>
<p><b>5</b></p>	<p><b>Consideration of Local Aggregate Assessments (LAAs) for 2014 &amp; 2015</b></p>	<p><b>ALL</b></p>
	<p>RG invited reps from the MPAs to summarise key findings from respective LAAs.  <u>Bedfordshire Authorities:</u>  RR summarised the key points noting that this time it covered two years (2014 &amp; 2015) rather than one. He highlighted a significant difference with a lower figure recorded for reserves in 2014 compared with 2015 but that this was unexplained given the authorities have not been able to interrogate data collected for 2014. Figures for 2016 are expected to be closer to those collected for 2015. No particular issues arise applying the NPPF guidelines in respect of landbank figures. Regarding the take-up of reserves allocated as strategic sites in the</p>	

Forward Plan, RR reported discussions were underway to bring these forward. In conclusion the LAA indicated compliance with national guidance.

No comments were raised other than those previously supplied to JS by MN which would be incorporated.

Hertfordshire County Council:

TC-L reported that the LAA 2015 had been presented to Panel Members on 2 Nov 2016 for information. Figures had been updated. Five active sand and gravel extraction sites plus one inactive. Sales were increasing similar to the previous year and stood at 1.22 Mt. This exceeded the 10 yr average of 1.16 Mt and the 3 yr average of 1.19 Mt. The landbank stood at 9.5 yrs based on the EEAWP apportionment figure; 11.4 yrs based on 10 yr average sales and 11.1 yrs based on 3 yr average sales. A slight decline was noted in the tonnage of secondary & recycled aggregate processed.

TC-L reported that sites within the Minerals Local Plan are subject to applications yet to be determined. The MLP was being reviewed. Growth is expected to go up and HCC intends to plan in line with the sub-regional apportionment figure to ensure an adequate and steady supply of minerals.

MN praised the format of the LAA and welcomed the mentioning of safeguarding for railheads and wharves.

Norfolk County Council:

RD confirmed annual production in 2015 of sand & gravel stood at 1.4 Mt representing a 3.6% increase from 2014. The 10 year average, at 1.49 Mt, was slightly down on the previous year. Four planning permissions had been granted in 2015, all relating to allocated sites, which increased reserves by 4.35 Mt. Landbank stands at 12.28 years applying the 10 year average sales.

Annual production of Carstone showed a small increase over the 2014 figure but remains under 75,000 tonnes. The apportionment figure of 200,000 tonnes for Carstone has only been met once in the last 20 years (2008). Landbank for Carstone is under 17 years applying the 10 year average. The Minerals & Waste Local Plan Review will look at new sites up to 2036.

In response to queries that had been separately raised as to the appropriateness of including silica sand, RD explained that this had been included as minerals data

to save the separate publication of a 3 page release and to capture all minerals data in a single document.

Essex County Council:

PD reported that sales had fallen from 2006 (4.07 Mt) to 2015 (3.45 Mt), although sales in 2014 (4.37 Mt) had been the highest in the last 10 years. The landbank stood at 7.35 years. 6 Mt of additional reserves have been permitted increasing the landbank to 10.92 Mt if taken into account. Not proposing to revise the Plan due to a plentiful supply.

Cambridgeshire County Council & Peterborough City Council:

AB confirmed that the LAA covered the years 2014 & 2015 and had been jointly prepared with Peterborough City Council.

Sand & Gravel reserves totalled 45 Mt in 2014 and 43 Mt in 2015 with sales of 2.5 Mt in both 2014 & 2015. Applying the EEAWP sub-regional annual apportionment figure of 2.88 Mt indicates a landbank of 15 years in 2015. Based on the Core Strategy Provision of 3 Mtpa reduces the landbank 14 years whilst applying the rolling 10 years sales average indicates a landbank of 18.76 years.

In terms of limestone, AB reported the number of sites falling from 6 in 2011, to 4 in 2014 and to 3 in 2015. Whilst the apportionment figure is 200,000 tpa, the adopted Core Strategy makes provision for an apportionment of 300,000 tpa. This provides a landbank of 8.9 years in 2015. Consolidated sales figures for 2014 & 2015 so not released for confidentiality reasons. AB asked whether the AWP would be happy for figures to refer to 2 of 3 active sites. The AWP raised no objection on the basis that the release for reserve figures prevents interrogation and so this would be recalculated for 2 of 3 sites. AB confirmed that no further sites had been allocated but the Core Strategy includes a criterion based policy against which new applications for limestone would be assessed.

RR queried whether the limestone sales served a different market. AB confirmed that the limestone was very low grade and so its markets differed from the primary resources.

Suffolk County Council:

GG referred to sand & gravel sales of 1 Mt, of which

	<p>marine dredged aggregate accounted for 84,000 tonnes. No sand is used in asphalt production. 18 current sand &amp; gravel workings, 14 of which are active.</p> <p>Exports were principally to Norfolk, Herts and Cambs &amp; Peterborough. Imports principally arose from Essex and Norfolk. Some 90% of crushed rock imports arose from Leicestershire. Aggregate recycling sites totalled 28 as at the end of 2015.</p> <p>Sufficient landbank was identified to cover the period up to the adoption of the Minerals &amp; Waste Local Plan in July 2018. GG highlighted that actual completions accounted for only 30% of planned provision but considers both.</p> <p>The LAA identifies the landbank against various output scenarios and leaves it open although all scenarios indicate sufficient permitted reserves to provide a landbank of at least 7 yrs.</p> <p>MN welcomed use of links and considered the acknowledgement that recycling is dependent upon the economy as a good point to bring out. MN noted that Cambs &amp; Peterborough LAA makes a reference to production capacity (p13). RR commented that this point was raised during the last meeting and wondered whether a question on production capacity should form part of the survey although issues of confidentiality could come into play.</p> <p>It was agreed that a deadline of 16 Nov 2016 be set for final versions to be completed by. From a general discussion it was agreed that just editorial amendments were needed so not necessary to go back to the AWP or have Executive Summaries signed off. The AWP Members were in agreement that none of the draft LAAs considered raised any issues of a strategic nature that are of concern to the AWP. It was suggested that 2 weeks be given for any detailed comments to be made by individual AWP members directly to the relevant mineral planning authority. Noted that West Midlands AWP has agreed an Executive Summary template which MN offered to circulate for use by all. <i>(NB Post mtg SEM circulated template used by Warks CC).</i></p>	<p><b>MPAs</b></p> <p><b>MN</b></p>
<b>6</b>	<b>National Planning Issues</b>	<b>EM</b>
	<p>MN referred to Inspector's reports into Local Plans in which great weight was being attached to AWP's and the conclusions in LAAs. This recognised the importance of AWP's in the strategic acceptance of LAA content.</p>	



	<p>SEM shared an update provided by EM:  <u>General Update:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DCLG only has resources to maintain current planning policy &amp; guidance i.e. maintaining the status quo for minerals &amp; waste.</li> <li>• Minerals &amp; Waste Planning Team moved (in April) from Planning Infrastructure Division into Local Development Plans Division – Steve Evison is new Deputy Director.</li> </ul> <p><u>DCLG Update:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aggregate Mineral Survey (AMS) 2014 survey had been published 2 Nov. 2016. <i>NB Post mtg SEM circulated the following link:</i>  <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/aggregate-minerals-survey-for-england-and-wales-2014">https://www.gov.uk/government/aggregate-minerals-survey-for-england-and-wales-2014</a></li> <li>• Other priorities for the Division are progressing the Neighbourhood Planning Bill; the Housing &amp; Planning White Paper; the response to the LPEG report and Rural Planning Review (plus a number of reviews in various daughter documents to the White Paper). CRT – mineral sector review currently on hold due to other priorities.</li> </ul> <p><u>AWP Secretariat Contracts:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Funding for the Tech Secs is in place for 2016/17 financial year with discussion on-going to secure funding into 2017/18 and beyond. DCLG will seek to maintain the AWP Tech Sec service beyond 2017/18 and will feedback developments on this and the next 4 yearly AMS survey.</li> </ul> <p><u>National Aggregate Coordination Group (NACG):</u>  Down to DCLG to call a meeting of the NACG but no plans to at present due to priorities with other workstreams. Officials instructed to focus on delivery of Ministerial priorities i.e. housing delivery.</p> <p>MN commented that the Minerals Strategy was very much being industry driven. The MPA was producing an information paper for third parties detailing construction information which MN would continue to share.</p>	
<b>7</b>	<b>MPA update on local plans</b>	<b>MPAs/All</b>
	<p>A draft update had been circulated prior to the meeting using the previously agreed template.</p> <p>GG commented that Suffolk CC was about to undertake a call for sites with consultation commencing on 28 Nov. 2016. Proposing to look at existing policies to amend/delete/replace as appropriate. Several sites had not come forward and companies would be asked to resubmit information.</p>	

	TC-L reported that Herts CC would be going through a similar process with a view to establishing a robust evidence base on which to proceed.	
<b>8</b>	<b>AOB</b>	<b>All</b>
	SEM circulated copies of the 18 <sup>th</sup> Annual Report produced by the MPA and The Crown Estate.  RG referred to latest available figures issued in respect of land won and marine aggregate minerals. This showed a 22% uplift in total land-won sand and gravel for East of England. Figures generally still not near 2009 construction levels except London. Figures for London showed a 28% uplift in marine aggregates but a 35% drop in land-won mineral.	
<b>9</b>	<b>Date of Next Meeting</b>	<b>Chair</b>
	8 February 2017 at 14:00 hrs, Essex CC	