

## East of England Aggregates Working Party meeting

26<sup>th</sup> July 2013 – 10:00- 12:30

King's House, 245 Amptill Road, Bedford

<b>ATTENDEES</b>	
<b>Members:</b>	
Andrew Cook - Chair	Essex CC
Trish Carter Lyons	Herts CC
Neil Campbell	Norfolk CC
Graham Gunby	Suffolk CC
Paul Clark	Thurrock Borough Council
Steve Winstanley	Peterborough City Council (PCC)
Hamish Barrell	Essex CC
Roy Romans	Bedfordshire Authorities
Ben Lawless	Cambs CC
Eamon Mythen	DCLG
Simon Treacy	MPA/Lafarge Tarmac
Mick Daynes	MPA/Hanson
Kirsten Hannaford-Hill	MPA/Cemex
David Payne	MPA
Peter Dawes	Frimstone/BAA
Richard Ford	Brett/MPA
Nathanael Percival	Marine Management Organisation (MMO)
<b>Others</b>	
Sue Marsh	Secretariat
Natalie Chillcott	Secretariat
<b>APOLOGIES</b>	
David Atkinson	Cambs CC
Ann Barnes	Cambs CC
David McCabe	Lafarge Tarmac
Graham Ward	DCLG
Keith Frost	Cemex
Richard Greaves	Essex CC
Barrie Smart	MMO
Peter Lemon	Middaggs
Chris Waite	Secretary SEEAWP
Richard Drake	Norfolk CC
Richard Fifield	Brett
Ian Thomas	WMAWP Secretary
Richard Hatter	Thurrock Borough Council

ITEM	NOTES	ACTION
1.0	Welcomes, Introductions and Apologies	NC/SEM

	<p>Introductions were made. List of apologies to be drawn up (<i>see above</i>)</p>	
<b>2.0</b>	<p><b>Minutes of Last Meeting</b> Andrew Cook confirmed that he has sent a thank you letter to Roy Leavitt.</p> <p><b>Matters Arising</b> See items 3.0- 9.0</p>	
<b>3.0</b>	<p><b>Terms of Reference</b> Suggested changes include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State when the next BGS Survey will be undertaken.</li> <li>• Remove reference to the regions.</li> <li>• Reword 6b to refer to forecasts rather than trends.</li> <li>• Add a reference to the role of the Chairman as stated in Item 4 below.</li> <li>• Add reference to scrutiny of LAAs in the AWP area and, where appropriate, in other AWP areas</li> </ul> <p>Sue Marsh to circulate revised terms of reference.</p>	<p><b>ALL</b></p> <p><b>SEM</b></p>
<b>4.0</b>	<p><b>Role of Chairman</b> Andrew Cook was voted in unanimously to act as chair for the EEAWP for the next 12 months (until June 2014). This was on the basis that the following election process would be adhered to elect a Chair person in the future:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- EEAWP member to be nominated for the position of Chair during the summer AWP meeting.</li> <li>- Each EEAWP mineral planning authority and organisation member would have one vote</li> <li>- The role would last for one year, after which time the process would be repeated.</li> </ul> <p>No vice Chair was elected as the AWP Secretary is empowered to act as Chair if necessary (for example, when there is a conflict of interest or should the Chair be unable to attend)</p>	<b>ALL</b>
<b>5.0</b>	<p><b>AMR 2012 – new requirements by DCLG to submit report by end of June each year.</b></p> <p>Agreed timetable for the production of the AMR 2013:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Late December 2013:</b> Secretariat to send Annual Survey forms to MPAs to distribute to local operators</li> <li>- <b>End February 2014:</b> MPAs to provide the Secretariat with the collated Annual Survey returns.</li> <li>- <b>March – April 2014:</b> Secretariat to produce the AMR including checking back on queries with MPAs.</li> <li>- <b>Mid- May 2014:</b> circulate Draft AMR to AWP members</li> <li>- <b>Early June 2014 :</b> AWP meeting at which AMR approved for submission to DCLG.</li> <li>- <b>End of June 2014:</b> submit AMR to DCLG.</li> </ul>	



	<p>submission of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan and its examination on soundness. There were technical papers supporting this Plan which included most of the matters set out in the draft LAA. He noted that neither the minerals industry nor any other mineral planning authorities questioned the approach taken. The content had not been contentious.</p> <p>-No issues raised by the EEAWP. -Deadline for comments from individual AWP members - End of August 2013.</p> <p><b>Norfolk Draft LAA 2013</b> The LAA had been drafted to address some of the matters raised by the Local Plan Inspector – in particular to justify apportionment and planning for growth. DP said that the justification for apportionment was welcomed by the MPA. AC echoed that comment. -No issues raised by the EEAWP. -Deadline for comments from individual AWP members - End of August 2013.</p> <p>SEM to send Norfolk LAA to Graham Gunby.</p>	
<p><b>7.0</b></p>	<p><b>National Co-ordination Group Feedback.</b></p> <p><b>Feedback from Joint Secretaries meeting.</b></p> <p>The minutes of the Joint Secretaries meeting were attached to the agenda. This was the first time all the Secretaries, including newcomers, had met. Discussion was mainly focused on the new requirements specified by DCLG for inclusion in the AMR; the difficulties in obtaining some of this information and which authorities were slow in providing returns.</p>	
<p><b>8.0</b></p>	<p><b>National Planning Issues</b></p> <p>EM introduced himself to the AWP and said that he was replacing Graham Ward. EM explained that he is a chartered planner by professional background.</p> <p><b>1. The Taylor Review</b> – has been produced by policy leads and signed off by Minister. The guidance is web based and will be publically available shortly and will be a “living resource” so that it can be updated periodically.</p> <p>There will be guidance on Viability and the Duty to Co-operate which will state the mechanism for co-operation.</p> <p><b>The Nationally Significant Infrastructure Regime</b> has been extended. Minerals are included. The regulations will not set thresholds. Each case will be agreed by the Secretary of State.</p> <p>AC felt that it was good that projects would be considered on a case by case basis.</p>	

	<p><b>Legislation - Review of Old Mineral Permissions (ROMPs) and Interim Development Orders (IDOs)</b>  Greater flexibility will be given for MPAs to review ROMPS. GIA Section 10 came into force on 22<sup>nd</sup> June 2013.</p> <p><b>Shale gas including fracking</b>  Guidance will be issued in advance of the Lord Taylor review. Red line issues will be clarified and also fees. There will be a consultation soon. [note: Consultation on 'Revised requirements relating to planning applications for onshore oil and gas' started 2<sup>nd</sup> September 2013 and runs until 14<sup>th</sup> October 2013]</p> <p>The PAS website will be updated following announcements.</p> <p>EM to check whether guidance includes Strategic Issues on Minerals and Waste.  EM confirmed that existing guidance will be replaced when new guidance is issued.</p>	<b>EM</b>
<b>9.0</b>	<p><b>OFT and Competition Commission Report on Aggregates, Cement and Ready Mixed Concrete Market Investigation (Provisional Findings)</b></p> <p>DP provided a summary – no adverse effects on competition found. Issues with the cement market, rather than the MPAs and mineral extraction.</p> <p>Section 11 is most relevant as this deals with the role of AWP. RR said that Section 11 feeds into Item 13 on transparency.</p>	
<b>10.0</b>	<p><b>LAAs from MPAs outside the East of England</b></p> <p><b>1 Oxfordshire LAA</b>  A different and more complex approach has been taken by OCC (forecasts of population growth in Oxfordshire together with a calculation of per capita consumption and application of another factor (ratio of sales to consumption) to derive an alternative figure to the straight 10 year average of sales. OCC consider that this provides a more robust indication of future demand and has resulted in slightly higher provision than if a 10 year sales average was used, though less than the agreed apportionment figure. This approach is welcomed by the MPA as the earlier draft LAA didn't properly consider why sales had been dropping in the county and it had become a net importer (due to quarries ceasing production and capacity being lost and mineral being imported from Glos and Wilts.</p> <p>It was noted that the Plan had been withdrawn by OCC due to concerns expressed by the Inspector on Duty to Co-operate and the unusual methodology.</p> <p>EEAWP Response- Note that a different approach has been taken, but is satisfied that it will not lead to the East of England needing to increase mineral provision. It is also noted that OCC have taken on board comments raised by the industry previously.</p>	

	<p><b>2 Surrey LAA</b> EEAWP response - Concerns over the levels of recycled aggregates proposed to support the Plan.</p> <p><b>3 Buckinghamshire LAA</b></p> <p>EEAWP response- The general thrust of the LAA is acceptable but there are issues around the implied use of landbank to restrict further reserves being permitted. It is noted that a different approach has been taken to that adopted by EEAWP.</p> <p>SEM to submit representation letters on behalf of the EEAWP.</p>	<b>SEM</b>
<b>11.0</b>	<p><b>Marine Management Organisation presentation</b></p> <p><b>East Inshore and Offshore Marine Plans</b></p> <p>SW said that the AMR2012 should mention marine aggregates. It was pointed out that there was a section in the Report on imports and exports and that included wharves.</p> <p>NP to provide powerpoint slides. (these will be circulated separately)</p> <p>Consultation started on 16<sup>th</sup> July 2013 and closes on 8<sup>th</sup> October 2013. It was agreed that the AWP would be formally consulted. The consultation letter and links would be sent to SEM for circulation. (Already circulated - Response required to SEM by 30<sup>th</sup> August 2013)</p>	<b>NP</b>
<b>12.0</b>	<p><b>Mineral Planning Authorities Local Plan Updates</b></p> <p><b>Essex CC</b> - Minerals Local Plan submitted to the Secretary of State on 12<sup>th</sup> July 2013. 207 responses to it. In process of notifying all parties. Examination in public timetabled for October.</p> <p><b>Herts CC</b> – No further update. Research on clay reserves within Hertfordshire is currently being undertaken.</p> <p><b>Thurrock</b> – Mineral Issues and Options will be produced in January/February 2014.</p> <p><b>Norfolk</b> – Received the inspector’s report on 22<sup>nd</sup> July. The report recommended adoption subject to a number of modifications including silica sand. Anticipated date of adoption= 16<sup>th</sup> September.</p> <p><b>Suffolk</b> –. Plans adopted in 2008 and 2009. Mineral Plan to be reviewed.</p> <p><b>Cambs &amp; Peterborough</b> – No further update as DPDs already adopted.</p>	<b>SEM</b>

	<p><b>Beds Authorities</b> – The Minerals and waste Local Plan combines strategic policies and allocations. A second Hearing session on the Minerals and Waste Local Plan will be undertaken in July-August. The Inspector is expected to submit his report by the end of August after which full Council approval from Central Bedfordshire, Bedford Borough and Luton Borough will be sought.</p>	
13.0	<p><b>Minutes</b>  DCLG will continue to save the AWP AMRs on the DCLG website, but not the minutes. CBC as Secretariat will host agendas and minutes to the AWP meetings on the Minerals and Waste Planning webpage of the CBC website. This can be implemented quite quickly.  AC suggested that the plain agenda for forthcoming meetings (minus agenda items) should also be made available on the website.  RR asked members of the AWP to check for any confidentiality issues and acceptability of document changes before minutes are finalised as these will be publically available.</p>	<b>SEM</b>
14.0	<p><b>AOB</b>  TCL enquired as to whether any other MPAs had examples of mineral extraction prior to development being sought. She also questioned overburden ratios. A number of examples of mineral extraction in conjunction with development were noted (issues in Chelmsford in new development and relating to a distributor road; an example of a science park in Suffolk and another site near Bury St Edmonds), while RR explained overburden ratios varied massively, dependant to the value and nature of the mineral in question.</p>	
14.0	<p><b>Date of Next Meeting</b>  January 2013.  (Note 1: 9<sup>th</sup> September meeting has now been cancelled.)  (Note 2: Dates to be circulated for all meetings next year – January, early June and October 2014)</p>	