

## FINALISED MINUTES

### East of England Aggregate Working Party



Date: Thursday 5<sup>th</sup> June 2014

Venue: Priory House, Chicksands (Central Bedfordshire Council offices)  
2pm


#### Attendees:

<b>Members</b>	
Andrew Cook (AC)	Chair
Roy Romans (RR)	Bedfordshire Joint authorities
David Atkinson (DA)	Cambridgeshire County Council
Terry Burns (TB)	Suffolk CC
Hamish Barrell (HB)	Essex CC
Richard Drake (RD)	Norfolk CC
Trish Carter-Lyons (TC)	Herts CC
Paul Clarke (PC)	Thurrock BC
Nathaniel Percival (NP)	MMO
Peter Dawes (PD)	Frimstone Ltd/BAA
Jonathan Garbutt (JG)	Hope Construction Materials/MPA
Mike Pendock (MP)	Lafarge Tarmac/MPA
Kirsten Hannaford-Hill (KH)	Cemex/MPA
David Payne (DP)	MPA
Mick Daynes (MD)	Hanson/MPA
<b>Others</b>	
Susan Marsh (SM)	AWP Secretary
Natalie Chillcott (NC)	Bedfordshire Joint Authorities/Secretariat
James Delafield	Bedfordshire Joint Authorities
Rachel Wood (RW)	MMO
<b>Apologies</b>	
Chris Waite (CW)	SEEAWP/LAWP
Peterborough City Council	PCC
Richard Fifield (RiF)	Bretts/MPA
Richard Ford (RF)	Bretts/MPA
Mike Courts (MC)	Bretts/MPA
Eamon Mythen (EM)	DCLG
Nick Tennant (NT)	DCLG
David Clarke (DC)	Cdc Demolition

No	Subject		Owner
1	Welcome, Introductions and Apologies	See above.	AC
2.	Confirmation of chairman for the forthcoming year	Andrew Cook agreed to continue his role as Chair.	AC
3.	Minutes of Last Meeting and Matters arising	<p>PC requested the word “Mineral” be deleted from the title – Mineral Core Strategy.</p> <p>It was agreed that the minutes would be approved subject to the above amendment being made.</p> <p>No matters arising that were not addressed elsewhere in the minutes</p>	AC
4.	<p>AMR 2013 - draft report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discuss report</li> <li>• Inclusion or not of capacity of unauthorised sites</li> </ul>	<p>All agreed with the content of the report.</p> <p>RR noted that some new sections lacked detail, but explained that the report is based on the information provided. SM stressed that the information within the AMR is that provided through the survey forms – the Secretariat is not checking through LAAs or other sources of information.</p> <p>DP suggested that it may be appropriate to base landbanks on 10 year sales averages, rather than agreed apportionments in future AMRs.</p> <p>SM said that all EEAWP MPAs (except Norfolk) base their landbanks on apportionment figures, and as such the table on page 7 should not change.</p> <p>RD suggested that the throughput figures from unauthorised sites should/could be included in the report. Most members considered that only figures from permitted sites should be included in official</p>	ALL

		figures, but that a separate paragraph could be included in 'trends' to refer to minerals extracted from unauthorised sites- where the tonnages are considered to be significant for that particular authority.	
5.	Review of Local Aggregate Assessments Report	<p>A non-contentious, factual document, based on information contained in the East of England AWP authorities' LAAs.</p> <p>This is the first year that LAAs have been produced, a variety of formats have been used and varying timescales. In future LAAs will be produced at a similar time for consideration by the AWP. This will help to avoid inconsistencies between LAAs and aid the production of future review documents.</p>	SM
6	National Co-ordination Group Feedback	Nothing to report. Group has yet to meet. Mark Plummer has left the MW team and gone to Housing at DCLG and his replacement ( Nick Tennant) was due to start in mid May but is currently on sick leave. It is thought that nothing is likely to be arranged until Nick is in post.	SM
7	National Planning Issues	<p>See update below.</p>  <p>DCLG Update May 2014.docx</p>	SM
8	East Coast Offshore and Inshore Marine Plans (April 2014)	<p>Presentation given by NP</p>  <p>MMO Presentation 5th June 2014.ppt</p>	NP
9	Marine Aggregate Capability & Portfolio Report 2013 (Reserves and Resources)	The group noted that approx. 50% of UK marine dredged aggregates are exported to mainland Europe. A lot is also sent to the Thames Estuary. Members considered that it would be unjustified and risky to reduce the provision of land-won	

		<p>minerals on the basis of the contribution that may or may not be made from marine dredged aggregates.</p> <p>Most members agreed that the safeguarding of wharfs from other forms of development was justified.</p> <p>It was proposed that a representative from Crown Estates should attend next EEAWP meeting to provide an update.</p>	
10	Norfolk LAA	<p>Members questioned the decision by Norfolk CC to base their landbank on 10 year sales average. Reasons given by Norfolk for taking this approach are-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Norfolk have not met the apportionment figure for 20 years.</li> <li>• It recognises the downward trend in sales evident over the last three years.</li> <li>• The 10 year sales average is considered to be more realistic.</li> </ul> <p>RD noted that their Minerals Local Plan and its allocation of sites is based on the agreed apportionment.</p> <p>MD questioned the merit of inclusion of the word 'Capacity' in a table (page 6) and feared the table may be containing sensitive information which should not be given in a table (he referred to the Competition Commission 's comments on the limits of AWP's considerations of LAAs). RD agreed to retitle the heading of the fourth column of the table "<i>Throughput restricted by planning permission</i>" which was considered more accurate and less misleading.</p>	RD

		<p>Inert waste recycling figures discussed and the difficulty of obtaining accurate figures.</p> <p>All agreed that the new format of a short presentation about the LAA, followed by a Q&amp;A session worked well. This format would be continued at the October AWP meeting when there would be presentations by all the MPAs on their LAAs.</p>	
11	Mineral Planning Authorities – Local Plan progress updates	 <p>MPA Updates for June 2014.docx</p> <p>A note (attached) was circulated in advance of the meeting setting out the stage that development plan preparation had reached at each authority. AWP members then had the opportunity to comment and discuss matters associated with this.</p> <p>HB mentioned that Essex is currently undertaking a call for sites (waste).</p> <p>Norfolk and Cambridgeshire have recently moved to a committee system.</p>	<p>All</p> <p>DA RD</p>
12	Any other business	<p>RD asked for confirmation that the 4 yearly survey will be undertaken in 2014 as the results are very useful and informative.</p> <p>DA mentioned that this would be his last AWP meeting as he would be retiring at the end of July.</p> <p>DA also mentioned that the upgrading of the A14 in Cambridgeshire was being treated as a major infrastructure project and that the borrow pits would be included within the scheme as some 7MT of aggregate would be required. DA had concerns that as this would be a DCO there is a</p>	All

		<p>lack of clarity as to who would be responsible for the monitoring of planning conditions. RR said that he had a way of dealing with this and getting paid for the approval of schemes and he would discuss it with DA outside of the meeting.</p> <p>DA also mentioned the impending City Deal for Cambridge which would effectively result in the City Council and others forming a unitary authority with joint decision making. He was concerned as to how MW fitted into this.</p> <p>The dates for meetings next year will be arranged for similar time periods and will be circulated</p>	
13	Date of Next Meeting	2 <sup>nd</sup> October 2014 (2 – 5pm) Chicksands, Shefford.	All