

AGREED MINUTES

East of England Aggregates Working Party

Meeting on 7 November 2019 starting at 1400

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

ATTENDEES

Members	
Richard Greaves (RG)	Essex County Council (Chairman)
Roy Romans (RR)	Bedfordshire Authorities
Phil Dash (PD)	Essex County Council
Emma Chapman (EC)	Hertfordshire County Council
Caroline Jeffery (CJ)	Norfolk County Council
Chris Stanek (CS)	Peterborough City Council
Graham Gunby (GG)	Suffolk County Council
Kirsten Hannaford-Hill (KH-H)	Aggregate Industries / MPA
Peter Larwood (PL)	Frimstone Ltd / BAA
Georgie Sutton (GS)	Marine Management Organisation
Mark North (MN)	MPA
Alan Everard (AE)	Tarmac / MPA
Others	
Jerry Smith (JS)	EEAWP Secretariat
Dee Walker (DW)	EEAWP Secretariat
Apologies	
Angela Watts (AW)	Brett / MPA
Trefor Evans (TE)	British Aggregates Association
Ann Barnes (AB)	Cambridgeshire County Council
Emma Fitch (EF)	Cambridgeshire County Council
Shaun Denny (SD)	Cemex / MPA
Mark Page (MP)	Hanson / MPA
Julie Greaves (JG)	Hertfordshire County Council
Richard Drake (RD)	Norfolk County Council
Richard Read (RR1)	SEEAWP / LAWP
Lewis Williams (LW)	Sibelco / MPA
Claire Victory (CV)	Southend on Sea Borough Council
Richard Hatter (RH)	Thurrock Borough Council

Item No	Subject	Owner
1	Welcome, Introductions & Apologies	RG/JS
	RG welcomed everyone to the Group and introductions were made for the benefit of new attendees. Apologies are as set out on previous sheet.	
2	Minutes of the last meeting & Matters arising	RG / JS
	<p>CJ highlighted a correction in Item 5 (Draft Norfolk LAA) in that Table 7 sets out the '<i>Status of sand and gravel site allocations</i>' and identifies which have since received planning permission.</p> <p>JS confirmed that the finalised Annual Monitoring Report had been submitted to MHCLG on 29 July 2019.</p> <p>CS confirmed that the Cambs & Peterborough Draft Statement of Common Ground had been revised following the previous EEAWP meeting and will be submitted in the near future.</p> <p>Minutes of the previous meeting, with the above correction, were accepted as a true and accurate record.</p>	DW
3	Consideration of Draft Local Aggregate Assessments (LAA)	ALL
	<p>The following LAA drafts for 2018 had been circulated to the Group in advance of the meeting. RG observed that amongst the circulated LAAs some landbanks have gone up and some gone down. MN advised that Cambs had largest increase last year due to the A14 project and is retaining a steady increase. RG invited the each MPA representative to summarise their own Draft LAA.</p> <p>NORFOLK</p> <p>CJ confirmed that the Draft Norfolk LAA had been previously presented to the Group and was awaiting an update in respect of inert waste figures so had not been re-circulated as nothing has changed to date. CJ commented that the latest consultation in respect of the Minerals & Waste Local Plan had generated 3,800 representations, albeit some 3,000 were pro-forma's all concerned with the same site, and that this has a significant administrative impact. AE highlighted the impact this could have on industry if say a further 12mths is added to the process. CJ reported that sites were, however, still coming forward and PD made the observation that the extant plan still exists.</p> <p>HERTFORDSHIRE</p> <p>EC presented a summary of the headline figures within the LAA as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land won sand & gravel sales (tonnes) – 1.21Mt, an increase from 2017 data • Permitted reserves of sand & gravel at end of year – 10Mt, (boosted by a permission for 450,000 tonnes at Furze Field) albeit an overall fall from 2017. • Landbank based on apportionment fell to 7.2yrs • Landbank based on 10yr and 3yr sales – 8.5yrs • Sales recorded in 2018 are above the 10 and 3yr average sales figures • Rail depot imports (sand & gravel) – 47,277 • Rail depot imports (crushed rock) – 595,907 tonnes, up 100,00 tonnes. • Road planings accounted for some 500,000 tonnes approx. 75% of which was recycled in Hertfordshire. So that figure (37,500 tonnes) has been added to the total aggregate processing figure. 	

A few sand & gravel applications are pending determination including extraction of some 3.5Mt of sand and gravel at Land adjoining Coopers Green Lane, Hatfield Quarry; a resolution to grant permission at BAE Hatfield Aerodrome subject to signing a S106 (which needs to go back to Committee); and a variation of condition application regarding an extension at Rickney's Quarry involving 1.24Mt.

EC reported an increase of around 40,000 tonnes in the amount of sharp sands and gravels imported into the county's rail aggregate depots with importation of crushed rock up 100,000 tonnes to approximately 600,000 tonnes. Around 75% of road planings arisings get recycled and so a figure has been added in to reflect the 50,000 tonnes of arising from this source in 2018 although EC has amended the figures with regards to processed aggregates following discussions with the Highways Division. Hoping to submit plan anytime between January – March 2020 with examination mid-2020 and adoption late 2020.

[NB Post meeting a re-drafted LAA was circulated to the Group containing some updates regarding road planings].

BEDFORDSHIRE AUTHORITIES

RR presented a summary of the figures within the Draft LAA:

- Land-won sand and gravel sales – 1.675Mt, slightly up from 2017
- Permitted reserves of sand & gravel – 15.2Mt, slightly down from 2017
- Landbank based on 10yr sales – 11.3yrs
- Landbank based on 3yr sales – 9.1yrs
- Landbank based on apportionment – 8.3yrs. All landbank calculations fell slightly from the previous year.

Planning permissions were granted in 2018 for some 1.35Mt of additional reserves, although this comprised some material that could serve the aggregate and non-aggregate markets.

RR reported a number of applications in hand totalling some 5.79Mt expected to get planning permission by the end of this year therefore the landbank figure should increase next year. AE questioned the operator of Black Cat (Table 1) as Tarmac, as it should be Breedon.

JS

GREATER ESSEX

Apologies for the lateness in submission. PD presented a summary of the figures within the Draft LAA:

- Sales of sand & gravel – 3.56Mt, down 0.6% from 2017
- Apportionment figure stands at 4.31Mt and sales represent 82% of the apportionment figure
- Sales were in excess of both the 10yr sales average – 3.23Mt; and
- 3yr sales average – 3.46Mt
- Landbank (Apportionment) – 6.74yrs
- Landbank (10yrs) 9.3yrs

As at 1 January 2019, there were 4 applications determination totalling additional reserves of some 10.29Mt (sand & gravel). The landbank calculation applying the apportionment figure would increase to 9yrs if these pending applications were factored in.

	<p>AE queried the reference at 4.5.6 regarding a Wharf Baseline Capacity Study. PD explained this arose from the Local Plan Inspector who considered that the plan should be more marine aggregate aware notwithstanding that there are no landing facilities within Essex to claim them. The Inspector therefore asked Essex CC to devise a monitoring indicator, although only committed to looking at this as recognised that wharfage and accessing the rail network are the limiting factors. GS could not comment on this as the South East Marine Plan is currently out for review and she is restricted by Purdah.</p> <p>CAMBRIDGESHIRE & PETERBOROUGH CS presented a summary of the figures within the Draft LAA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 21 sand & gravel sites had permissions in place • Sand & gravel sales – 3.2Mt, this had fallen from 2017 which was influenced by the A14 contract • Reserves - 41.83Mt • 10yr sales – 2.38Mt • 3yr sales – 3.11Mt • Landbank (based on apportionment figure) – 14.5yrs • Landbank (based on Core Strategy provision) – 13.94yrs • Landbank (based on 10yrs average sales) – 17.57yrs • Landbank (based on 3yrs average sales) – 13.46yrs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Crushed rock sales 0.11Mt • 10yr sales – 0.28Mt • 3yr sales – 0.24Mt • Reserves – 2.45Mt • Landbank (based on 10yrs average sales) – 8.16yrs <p>Limestone supply is reducing as only 2 sites remain, one of which supplies non-aggregate market. The landbank is therefore falling. CS advised that figures are still awaited in respect of recycled and secondary aggregates.</p> <p>SUFFOLK GG confirmed that the revised Draft LAA had been recirculated to reflect comments made by the Group at the last meeting.</p> <p>GENERAL COMMENTS JS commented that some LAA’s stated 2018 and some stated 2019, need to be consistent in approach. Agreed front covers need to state “2019 (covering the calendar year 2018)”.</p> <p>PD raised that a dashboard was suggested with the headline figures. RR confirmed that the Beds LAA has this within theirs. JS will circulate this for others to insert within theirs as makes it easier to review the headline figures. MN stated that it was a good set of LAAs.</p> <p>RG advised ALL that a 2-week deadline be set for comment and for submission.</p>	<p>REPS FROM MPAs</p> <p>JS</p> <p>ALL</p>
<p>4</p>	<p>MPA Update</p>	<p>MN</p>
	<p>MN referred to the following economic & market outlook update, which had also been circulated to the Group prior to the meeting:</p> <p>ECONOMIC & MARKET OUTLOOK</p>	

- **MPA MARKET FORECAST UPDATE.** Following a broad-based weakening in the first half of 2019, construction market demand for mineral products including aggregates, asphalt, ready-mixed concrete (RMC) improved in 2019 Q3 compared to the previous quarter. Seasonally adjusted sales volumes indicated growth in mortar sales was strongest, up 5.2% compared to 2019 Q2, followed by asphalt (4.1%), aggregates (1.7%) and RMC (1.4%). The outturn for 2019 so far remains nonetheless weak, with sales volumes for asphalt (-0.6%) and mortar (0.4%) across the first 9 months of the year broadly flat in comparison to the same period in 2018, while there were sharp declines in sales of aggregates (-2.2%) and RMC (-2.0%).
- **ECONOMIC OUTLOOK.** The two main issues for future growth from an MPA market's perspective remain the economic impact of Brexit, particularly in a 'No Deal' scenario, and the risks to the delivery of major infrastructure projects. Regardless of any political outcome, the UK economy is slowing, with weaknesses emerging in all three main sectors of the UK economy (services, manufacturing and construction). Forecasters expects GDP growth of 1.0% in 2020, although this is primarily predicted on a smooth Brexit.
- **CONSTRUCTION.** ONS data suggest that GB construction output in 2019 so far has remained resilient, despite flattening over the summer months. In their latest forecast, the Construction Products Association (CPA) expects overall construction output to remain broadly flat this year, with growth resuming slowly from 2020 and in 2021. In addition to ongoing economic and political uncertainty, concerns surrounding the delivery of infrastructure projects have increased over the year, resulting in downgrades to construction forecasts. The CPA expects growth in construction output to remain below 1% per annum in 2020 and 2021 as a result of downgrades to the rail and road subsectors.

CS stated that planning applications are generally down, especially in the Peterborough area. MN stated that things are commercially challenging and not likely to change until Brexit is resolved.

RR stated that construction of national infrastructure projects needs to consider borrow pits as it may be difficult sourcing within the site's locality. MN advised that the MPA has been lobbying Government to infrastructure and large housing developments conduct a mineral supply audit to ensure it is understood where resources are coming from and in what quantity.

AE advised that Hanson took the Hinkley project but that has been to the detriment of other smaller scale projects. MN commented that Staffordshire likely to supply a significant proportion of aggregates to the HS2 construction project. This is likely to substantially reduce permitted reserves over a short period of time and put pressure on local day to day supply.

ENVIRONMENT AGENCY DEWATERING

MN set out the issues surrounding dewatering exemptions being removed. An EA information leaflet on the topic had previously been circulated. Water abstraction was exempt on mineral sites until recently but now removed with the need to apply for licences including new sites. The 'Day Job' licences are being affected as the EA does not appear to trust the planning system to protect water resources. This impacts on the deliverability of Minerals Local Plans as sites may not be operated. RG & MN attended a meeting with the

	<p>EA earlier this week to discuss matters. A working party has been set up to work through the issues and the effects of the EA changes. MN noted that there are structural difficulties within the EA which has been an obstacle for preparing guidance for these new working practices however the MPA & POS are looking to create guidance with EA input.</p> <p>CS asked what the time period is to get a licence. AE advised that he is aware of a 150,000t borrow pit in Cambridgeshire being 13 months into the EA process at a current cost of £50k & an agreement with the borehole landowner still requires signing so that they won't sue the EA! MN advised that there are 4 tests, if you fail one you fail the lot!</p> <p>MN has raised the issue with Lonek Wojtulewicz (LW) and that it is likely to be a problem. It may see the EA participate to a greater extent on minerals local plan consultations and the scoping of EIA projects.</p> <p>RG invited anyone to bring any cases to the next meeting for further discussion.</p>	<p>ALL</p>
<p>5</p>	<p>National Planning Issues</p>	<p>RG / JS</p>
	<p>JS had attended a meeting of the AWP Secretaries convened in Birmingham by LW and Sara Lewis (SL) from MHCLG at which the current work streams and priorities for the MHCLG team were outlined albeit, at that time, there were funding uncertainties on account of the spending review. With respect to the Aggregate Minerals Survey (AMS), it was reported that budget had been identified to undertake the survey for 2019 and, as more recently advised, this has since received ministerial clearance. SL has been updating the contract specifications and hopes to have a contractor in place by the start of the New Year. The meeting reviewed the survey forms and discussed possible improvements to the forms and data collection options with a move away from Access databases. An AMS Working Group, comprising some AWP Secretaries with experience of past AMS's, POS rep and industry reps, has been established to take this work forward and met in September.</p> <p>As part of that work, SL has shared a draft version of Form B for the AWP Secretaries to pilot on which JS had provided feedback. A draft of Form A is to follow and JS repeated calls for any industry volunteers present who have previously completed these forms to advise him if they are interested in getting involved to provide feedback. MN confirmed that Tarmac has agreed to be involved. SL is seeking trials of the forms with data (real or imaginary) to test the functionality and identify areas where guidance would be helpful. SL intends to circulate the survey in late Feb/early March when contractors have been appointed and they have had the opportunity to evaluate the preferred data collection system. RR raised concern with the limited time left to procure, advertise & appoint consultants, particularly given the existing AWP contracts expire at the end of March. JS reported that as the contract had been previously extended twice, it needed to go through the procurement process and that LW had bid for a 3-year funding stream. SL wanted to ensure that all the appropriate contacts are collated for the login details to be sent to the correct people and JS will update the contact list for each MPA by the end of the year.</p> <p>In respect to MASS, it was reported that LW was still working on getting the guidelines updated and MN reported that a MHCLG Economist had met with the MPA. It was reported that LW is having problems with why Government is dictating top down and he is meeting Steve Quartermain and Simon Gallagher soon to discuss further. LW's view was understood to be that since the guidelines are still contained within the NPPF, it's difficult to see why the matter needs to secure Ministerial input.</p>	<p>INDUSTRY REPS</p> <p>JS</p>

	<p>MN commented that the West Midlands AWP has advised that Client Earth has written to 100 LA's threatening JR if carbon reduction target policies are not included within their plans – Southend on Sea / Suffolk have received a letter. RG suggested there may be a government response. Advice received to date suggests that providing a plan contributes to carbon reduction, then a specific policy is not needed. CS highlighted that Cambridgeshire CC & Peterborough City Council have a policy in their emerging Minerals and Waste Local Plan promoting electric HGVs and recharging facilities.</p> <p>MN confirmed that SL remains the point of contact at MHCLG.</p>	
6	Minerals Local Plan Update	MPAs / ALL
	<p>An update was circulated prior to the meeting using the agreed template and was noted.</p> <p>GG confirmed that a site may possibly be knocked out of the Suffolk Minerals & Waste Local Plan on the matter of the balance of need for sand & gravel working/AONB location with the question being are there exceptional circumstances to work sand and gravel within the AONB? The Inspector acknowledges there is a case for its inclusion but does not feel that it is sufficiently exceptional. GG confirmed that the best mineral lies in a designated landscape in the NW area of the county, but it would contribute a significant 1Mt of coarse aggregate to the overall Suffolk figures supplying Norwich and Ipswich in particular, with the sand being of poor quality. Other operators also rely on that stone. GG commented that the quarry has been there 50yrs prior to the AONB and that this represents another extension. RG asked if the AWP as a whole should make representations to the Inspector regarding the implications on neighbouring MPA areas. MN felt it would be useful for the AWP to comment. CJ raised that the Norfolk Plan can supply their own county and planning was sufficient. GG advised that the Inspector considers there is harm and it would change landscape character, but Suffolk CC believe they have made the case for its inclusion. MN's view is that mineral extraction is not exempt from AONB. The AONB sets a higher threshold to clear which would be tested at the planning application stage.</p> <p>Asked what implications the removal of this site may have for its plan, GG explained that the 30% headroom would now reduce to a 20% surplus over the 10-year average sales plus the Sizewell C issue to factor in. GG was aware that Cemex is preparing a response arguing that it would not be possible to provide coarse aggregate requirements. General consensus was that the AWP can be concerned with the removal of the 1.0Mt from the East of England figures with the coming forward of Sizewell C needing to be considered. MN confirmed that he had responded to the latest Sizewell C consultation stage, particularly the notion for rail and HGVs to supply limestone from the Mendips. There was general consensus that the purpose of this group is to challenge these regional issues and should stand by assessments of each LA but not get involved with any site-specific matters.</p> <p>Agreed that RG would draft a letter for circulation from the AWP stating that the Group would like to make sure the Inspector takes account of future demand for the coarse material given its regional / national significance. Concerns raised with supply for the region if there is depletion in the amount being planned for and that these implications, including sustainability implications, need to be considered. RR suggested that unless someone has any issues then it can be agreed by email.</p> <p>Terms of Reference will need to be reviewed to consider voting issues / making representations for future situations such as this. RG going to speak with other AWP's with</p>	<p>RG / JS</p> <p>RG</p>

	<p>regards to voting issues / making representations on regional issues and bring back to a future meeting.</p> <p>ESSEX COUNTY COUNCIL Out for initial Duty to Cooperate on policies that may need to be considered reviewing with public consultation aimed at April 2020 or sooner.</p> <p>CAMBRIDGESHIRE & PETERBOROUGH Out for Reg 19 shortly with submission Spring 2020.</p>	
7	Any Other Business	ALL
	Nothing.	
8	Dates of Next Meetings	RG
	<p>The dates for the meetings were confirmed as: 6 February 2020 and 4 June 2020 at 1400hrs Venue: Essex County Council, County Hall, Market Square, Chelmsford, CM1 1QH Further dates will be agreed at the next meeting.</p>	ALL TO NOTE