

## AGREED MINUTES

### East of England Aggregates Working Party

Meeting on 25 February 2016 starting at 2pm

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

#### ATTENDEES

<b>Members</b>	
Andrew Cook	Essex County Council (Chairman)
Roy Romans	Bedfordshire Authorities
Richard Drake	Norfolk County Council
Trish Carter-Lyons	Hertfordshire County Council
Irina Davis	Suffolk County Council
James Cutting	Suffolk County Council
Chris Stanek	Peterborough City Council
Alethea Evans	Essex County Council
Richard Hatter	Thurrock Borough Council
<b>Others</b>	
Richard Ford	Brett/MPA
Mike Pendock	Tarmac/MPA
Kirsten Hannaford-Hill	Cemex/MPA
David Payne	MPA
Bob Smith (standing in for Keith Bird)	Hanson/MPA
Peter Lemon	BAA/Midland Aggregates
<b>Others</b>	
Eamon Mythen	DCLG
Richard Read	SEEAWP, LAWP
Sue Marsh	EEAWP Secretariat
Jerry Smith	EEAWP Secretariat
<b>Apologies</b>	
Peter Dawes	BAA/Frimstone
Hannah Sheldon-Jones	East Midlands AWP
Ann Barnes	Cambridgeshire County Council

Item No.	Subject	Owner
1	<p><b>Welcome, Introductions &amp; Apologies</b></p> <p>Apologies – as set out on previous sheet. Introductions were made.</p>	AC
2	<p><b>Minutes of the last meeting &amp; matters arising</b></p> <p>RD wished to clarify the minutes in respect of Item 6 to confirm that Norfolk CC used the 10 year average approach for calculating landbanks and the apportionment for calculating allocations in its Minerals Local Plan to provide flexibility. RD also clarified the safeguarding policy currently applied encouraged house builders to be aggregate neutral as a minimum. With regards to Item 8 RD clarified that Norfolk were not producing a combined LAA but holding fire until a publication date for the National Survey is known and will wait if available early in the New Year. RD to provide suggested amended text.</p> <p>With reference to Item 5 (POS/MPA LAA Practice Guidance) DP confirmed that no amendments had been made to date but once they had been he would circulate to the group.</p> <p>With reference to item 7 it had been reported that a letter had been received by the Secretariat confirming that the draft BGS data could be used. It was agreed that this should be circulated to AWP members (SEM to action)</p> <p>Minutes were otherwise agreed and can be viewed here incorporating the amendments by RD: <a href="#">EEAWP 22 Oct 2015 Agreed Minutes</a></p>	AC
3	<p><b>National Survey - Update</b></p> <p>SEM relayed that AWP Secretariats had received a draft of the National Survey to check figures that were being queried by BGS. The Secretariat has been told that the national survey would be available in Spring 2016.</p> <p>EM elaborated to say that BGS were checking some figures which inevitably arose with national surveys and BGS then invited to go through the survey with DCLG. DCLG expect s to complete that exercise at the end of March 2016.</p>	SEM

	<p>DCLG will publish the National Survey but there would need to be Ministerial Clearance first. EM reported that he secured dedicated support for this and the survey would be published as soon as possible. However, the date of publication would be affected by two purdah periods from late April for six weeks up to the May elections and a second ahead of the EU referendum on 23 June.</p>	
<b>4</b>	<b>Annual Survey – Update &amp; any Issues</b>	<b>SEM/All</b>
	<p>SEM confirmed that monitoring forms had been sent out to the MPAs before the end of Jan 2016. To date no returns had been received but two requests had been made to extend the time period for returns. SEM confirmed that the return period for collated surveys could be extended to 28 March 2016 but not beyond as the AMR would need to be prepared covering 2 years in order to produce a draft ahead of the June meeting.</p> <p>BS was aware that several counties hadn't issued survey forms to operators until the middle or end of Feb.</p> <p>JC reported that Suffolk CC had yet to circulate to industry and AE similarly reported that Essex CC hadn't circulated to Thurrock as still awaiting contact confirmation details. BS considered that Hanson's returns could be returned within a week of receipt.</p> <p>General consensus was to adopt 28 March 2016 as the target for returns of collated surveys.</p>	
<b>5</b>	<b>Preparation of LAAs (2014 &amp; 2015)</b>	<b>MPAs</b>
	<p>RD reported that Norfolk CC may prepare an Addendum to their Local Aggregate &amp; Silica Sand Assessment 2014 (see <i>Item 6</i>) once the national results are available given it is currently based on 2009 figures. RD expects to start work on 2015 as soon as that information is available but anticipates this resulting in more of a refresh than in earlier years.</p> <p>With data anticipated to be available in June, MPAs are expected to complete their LAAs by October.</p> <p>RR confirmed that Central Bedfordshire aim to produce a single LAA to cover both data sets.</p> <p>CS confirmed that Peterborough would be doing likewise albeit jointly with Cambridgeshire.</p>	

	<p>AE confirmed that Essex would also produce a single LAA incorporating Southend-on-Sea and Thurrock.</p> <p>ID confirmed that Suffolk would also produce a single LAA and TC-L confirmed similarly for Herts.</p> <p>Aim would be to approve these LAAs at the October meeting.</p>	
<b>6</b>	<b>Norfolk CC Draft LAA &amp; Silica Sand Assessment 2014</b>	<b>RD</b>
	<p>This draft had been circulated prior to the meeting. With reference to the Executive Summary (pages 5-7) RD highlighted that annual production of sand &amp; gravel was up 22% from 2013 suggesting the start of an upward trend. Norfolk CC has allocated for 2.57mt and don't intend to deviate as that figure built in some flexibility. Little change in the 3 year rolling average (up 2%). Three planning permissions had been granted for new sand &amp; gravel extraction in 2014.</p> <p>Carstone production was up 62% but relatively few sites and the 10 year rolling average was coming down (9%) although the 3 year rolling average remains about the same.</p> <p>Recycled &amp; Secondary Aggregate production was up 17% with some movement up and down to the 3 year and 10 year rolling averages respectively.</p> <p>Conclusions are that the plan is currently up to date for delivering a steady supply of aggregate for Norfolk's needs.</p> <p>RR queried, with respect to secondary &amp; recycled aggregate (p 21), whether there was any useful information on the capacity of existing facilities i.e. are facilities at capacity or is there spare capacity. RD responded that officers would look to pull this information together but noted that a sizeable element of production does not arise from permitted sites and no records of sites where work is carried out for a handful of days. Therefore there is never a clear view on secondary aggregate although companies may feed into these figs. RR accepts it will never be wholly accurate but knowledge of best estimates would aid understanding &amp; add to data the EA produce.</p>	

	<p>AC queried the low figure of 1,000 tonnes of marine sourced aggregate. RD commented that there was no landing wharf in Norfolk so material was going to London, Rotterdam and Suffolk. Some hard rock used for beach defences &amp; interesting to see how this may be revealed in the surveys but Norfolk CC wouldn't count beach recharge as it doesn't enter the market. The Industry treats similarly.</p> <p>The draft LAA was presented for technical advice to the AWP and that it was agreed by AWP members that no strategic issues were identified. NCC will be formally notified of this (SEM to action)</p>	
<b>7</b>	<b>Future Funding of AWP Secretariat</b>	<b>SEM</b>
	<p>SEM commented that confirmation of on-going funding of the Secretariat had only been received from DCLG in October 2015. These AWP Secretariat contracts only ran until the end of March 2015. Confirmation was received of continued funding for FY 2016/2017 in late January. Will learn at the end of March whether the allocation of funds has been agreed for the remainder of the period up to FY 2019/20 at the end of March 2016.</p> <p>EM confirmed that 9 AWP contracts have been awarded in England for the period 2015/16, 2016/17 &amp; 2017/18 on the following basis:  Hants CC – London &amp; South East  David Jarvis – South West  Central Bedfordshire Council – East England  Urban Vision – East Mids, West Mids, North West, Yorks &amp; Humberside  Northumberland CC– North East</p> <p>A bid for funding had been made under Spending Review (SR) 15 to maintain contracts. EM had informed Finance colleagues that DCLG would have to exercise a Feb 2016 break clause if funding wasn't made available resulting in the submission of a special business case which was accepted allocating funding for the AWP's in 2016/17. By the end of March, it will be known whether there is longer AWP funding for 2017/18, 2018/19 &amp; 2019/20 over the SR period.</p> <p>EM commented that DCLG's prime purpose was seen as increasing housing supply based on high public aspirations for home ownership. Other objectives were cited as shifting power from central to local government as seen through devolution, focussing on Local Plan</p>	

	preparation, requiring LAs to produce a register of brownfield land whilst maintaining protection of the Green Belt. The supply of minerals is vital in providing the materials for this key objective.	
<b>8</b>	<b>National Planning Update</b>	<b>EM</b>
	<p>EM referred to the Cutting Red Tape Challenge in respect of Minerals which had been subject to a consultation organised by BIS. Issues are being considered and responses from DCLG are expected to be contained in a report due out in April 2016.</p> <p>The John Rhodes Task Group on Local Plans has led to questions seeking information on Minerals Local Plans and there will be a small section on Minerals Local Plans. This is all geared to reforming local plans as the vehicle for delivering housing and will culminate in a report being made available to the minister Greg Clark this month. But as this is a Task Group not a Review DCLG can't oppose the recommendations, only comment on factual accuracy. It will be up to the S of S as to what he chooses to do with the findings. DCLG was under-going restructuring based on achieving its key policy objective.</p> <p>The Annual Mineral Raised Inquiry Survey report is due to be published on 8 March 2016 which will highlight a rise in sales production for minerals.</p> <p>AE referred to the Technical Consultation on Implementation of Planning Changes which had been issued in Feb 2016 and queried how it would impact on minerals and waste. RR echoed this with reference to para 2.2.3 - which suggested that Permission in Principle should be acceptable for minor devt - but would welcome clarification as to which areas relate to minerals and which don't. Similarly, references to determinations by Govt approved external bodies.</p> <p>EM responded that para 2.2.3 is in respect of housing delivery in line with the overall policy objective noted above but it was a consultation exercise and the wider implications will need to be considered in respect of other sectors.</p> <p>RR queried whether the Red Tape Initiative and the John Rhodes Task Group findings will feed into the consultation which closes on 15 April 2016 at 23:45 hrs. EM agreed there could be some overlap but noted that the Red Tape Challenge had generated a wide range of</p>	

	<p>issues (e.g. salaries, planning guidance, H &amp; S regulations, shortage of suitably qualified Minerals &amp; Waste Planners etc) which BIS are looking at whilst DCLG are considering those recommendations relevant to them.</p> <p>JC queried whether there were any minerals and waste rumblings coming out of Devolution. EM commented that Devolution Deals have the freedom to decide what they cover. Minerals &amp; waste issues have not been identified in any deals. General consensus that they had either been forgotten or not considered 'shiny' enough to secure deals notwithstanding they should be reflected given the linkages.</p> <p>PL mentioned a meeting with Anna Soubry, Rory Stewart and Tarmac to discuss matters relating to minerals. They referred to the shortage of qualified MW planning officers. Also the primacy of MPAs and the encroachment of the EA and NE.</p>	
<b>9</b>	<b>National Co-ordinating Group feedback</b>	<b>SEM</b>
	EM commented that once all the AWP meetings had been concluded in March and the National Aggregates survey has been published, the intention is to set up an AWP Technical Secretariat meeting with a view to holding a National Co-ordinating Group meeting. .	
<b>10</b>	<b>Update on Local Plans</b>	<b>MPAs</b>
	An update on Local Plans had been circulated in advance of the meeting and was taken as read with the exception of an update on Thurrock from RH who confirmed that consultation starts on 26 February 2016 in respect of a consolidating plan. This takes a high level approach combining all aspects not just minerals and waste. There has been slippage in the anticipated announcement of the Lower Thames Crossing with an announcement now expected in Sept. which will have a major impact on construction materials. RH confirmed that the understanding is that it will be a tunnel rather than a bridge but routes either side remain under consideration with the Minister yet to announce his preferred route.	
<b>11</b>	<b>SSPOLG London Plan- feedback</b>	<b>SEM</b>
	SEM attended the meeting last October with Tony Cook (representing the SE) and Deborah Sacks (from the Waste perspective) looking at the implications for the London Plan. A particular issue discussed was the problem of other devt impinging on/replacing existing	

	<p>wharves.</p> <p>JC commented that post this meeting the need for wider political co-operation has been recognised and for leaders to meet. RH referred to a Growth &amp; Infrastructure Members Group at Thurrock with £100K being available for Technical Studies (e.g. looking at wharves and minerals) which may be carried out in conjunction with London. JC worked with the GLA on the SE stock take available on the GLA website which JC could circulate. Acknowledged as an issue but this early in the process needed to get agreement on other key issues, such as transport, before looking at wharves, minerals etc.</p> <p>RH noted that the £100K was an initial pump prime and Officers would need to identify gaps in the evidence base and enable Members to identify top priorities.</p>	
<b>12</b>	<b>AOB</b>	<b>ALL</b>
	DP highlighted the MPA/RTPI Conference on 18 May 2016 at The Grange St Paul's Hotel, London, and welcomed agenda topics and offers to speak.	
<b>13</b>	<b>Time and Date of Next Meeting</b>	<b>AC</b>
	A date for the June meeting would be circulated with the draft minutes and is suggested as 23 June 2016 at Central Bedfordshire Council, Priory House, Monks Walk, Chicksands, Shefford SG17 5TQ commencing at 2pm .	