

## AGREED MINUTES

### East of England Aggregates Working Party

Meeting on 29 June 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 Greaves	Essex County Council
David Hodbod	Hertfordshire County Council
Chris Stanek	Peterborough City Council
Richard Drake	Norfolk County Council
Graham Gunby	Suffolk County Council
<b>Others</b>	
Chris Hemmingsley	Brett/MPA
Kirsten Hannaford-Hill	Cemex/MPA
Bob Smith	Hanson/MPA
Peter Dawes	Frimstone Ltd/BAA
Mark North	MPA
Mike Pendock	Tarmac/MPA
<b>Apologies</b>	
Ann Barnes	Cambridgeshire County Council
Eamon Mythen	DCLG
Phil Dash	Essex County Council
Alethea Evans	Essex County Council
Keith Bird	Hanson/MPA
Jonathan Garbutt	Hope Construction
Richard Read	SEEAWP, LAWP

Item No.	Subject	Owner
1	<b>Welcome, Introductions &amp; Apologies</b>	<b>AC</b>
	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 Item of Election of Chair for the forthcoming year at the end.	
2	<b>Minutes of the last meeting &amp; matters arising</b>	<b>AC</b>
	The Minutes of the last meeting held on 25 February 2016 were accepted as being an accurate record.	
3	<b>Consideration of Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) for 2014 and 2015</b>	<b>ALL</b>
	<p>SEM recapped that the AMR, circulated in advance, covered the years 2014 &amp; 2015 as it had not been possible to produce an AMR for 2014 given no Secretariat was in place and BGS had undertaken the national survey. SEM noted that the later than intended circulation of the AMR for 2014 &amp; 2015 was principally due to the late return of data from a major operator &amp; MPA member. Following receipt of some initial suggestions/corrections a further draft with tracked changes had been circulated for consideration. The draft AMR had used figures from the 2014 national survey which BGS had advised had been signed off by the Minister but had yet to be formally released as they still had to be approved by an expert. SEM understood that its formal release would include some additional data but given that neither the timescale for release nor content of such data is known (and therefore its appropriateness to the AMR), SEM suggested this should not hold up submission of the AMR and an addendum could always be provided at a later date.</p> <p>MN had provided various comments which had largely been picked up in the tracked changes and welcomed the proposed insertion of an executive summary for headline numbers.</p> <p>GG had picked up the matter from a colleague late in the process and questioned some of the figures supplied for Suffolk fearing agreement would not be achievable today. RG &amp; DH similarly needed to make further checks in respect of information for Essex &amp; Herts respectively.</p> <p>GG wished to double check the Suffolk figure in Table 2 and queried 1M sales figure in Table 4. SEM had noted</p>	

similarity between the reserves figures in Table 4 and the figure for reserves of primary aggregate. GG considered this could explain the entries. SEM explained that the previous AMR did not include the table, although there had been explanatory text about non-energy minerals as DCLG required this matter to be included within the AMR. MN had not come across such a table in other AMRs. It was agreed that Table 4 be removed.

GG would try to provide road planing figures for Suffolk CC (Table 5) & would clarify two entries in Appendix 8 for Cliff Quay, Ipswich, (notwithstanding different grid refs and operators) whilst facilities at Bury St Edmunds & Lowestoft appeared to be absent. GG also felt the list of major construction projects (Table 6) for Suffolk could be expanded.

MN welcomed the NPPF extract now quoted in full (para 1.9) but queried whether it would be preferable for Table 2 to show the 10 year figures in line with the text. JS commented that the figures for the 10 year period would duplicate data in Appendix 4a and 4b but had attempted to make the text at para 2.6 clearer. RR suggested it may be best to run with Table 2 as set out as the AMR relates to two calendar years but to pick up MN's point next year when dealing with a single year's return. This was agreed.

There was discussion on Figure 1 as to the benefit of the red line showing the 10 year average sales in a linear format rather than a rolling 10 year average and the Group agreed that this line be removed.

With reference to paras 8.2 and 8.5 JS & RN explained that this had been amended to reflect Norfolk's use of the sub-national apportionment figure. RN confirmed that Norfolk applies a planned requirement for 2.57Mt pa (its apportionment figure) plus an additional year for flexibility to reflect growth. The 10 year average is used to calculate the landbank of permitted reserves rather than for allocations.

DH commented that figs for Herts in Appendices 5a & 5b needed amending as the figures included a scheme for which the s106 had not been signed and thus pp had not been issued. DH to advise and add a further 3 sites absent from Appendix 7.

CS noted that with reference to Table 5, data was not

	<p>available for Peterborough for 2014 but would provide a combined figure for 2015. With reference to confidentiality, CS was content that the figures in Appendices 4a &amp; 4b reflected the combined figure.</p> <p>RR highlighted the discrepancy in the reserves figures for the Bedfordshire authorities between 2014 &amp; 2015 but unable to shed light on this without access to the year on year returns.</p> <p>RR sought views regarding a reserve which can be used for aggregate and non-aggregate uses (industrial sand). The site generates sales of several hundred thousand tpa. The operator has indicated that the reserves should go down as a non-aggregate use but RR argues that it surely must be registered as a reserve to avoid discrepancy between sales and reserves. RR confirmed the MPA does hold data from the application as to total reserves but the deposit could be, and is, used for both and both are significant. Suggested that the ratio put forward in the application could be used although the reality changes borehole data as the site is worked. GG suggested adopting a 50:50 approach and for the operator to challenge. However, there was general agreement that an appropriate proportion of the reserve should be identified as being for aggregate purposes. MN offered to discuss the matter with RR outside of the meeting.</p> <p>RG noted a typo on Table 4 'Cobbs Farm'.</p> <p>JS confirmed text in red at para 8.7 was purely to highlight apparent discrepancy in the 2014 figures as RR had commented on earlier.</p> <p>AC noted that whilst various data updates are to be supplied, nothing substantive had arisen in the discussion and summarised the discussion issues as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Executive Summary to be added;</li> <li>- Table 2 – Suffolk to check;</li> <li>- Table 4 – to be removed;</li> <li>- Table 5 – Suffolk to seek data;</li> <li>- Appendix 8 – Suffolk to check/supply additional data;</li> <li>- Table 6 – Suffolk to supply additional data;</li> <li>- Page 3 – NPPF quote in full accepted;</li> <li>- Page 4 – text changes noted;</li> <li>- Fig 1 – remove red line;</li> <li>- Paras 8.2. &amp; 8.5 – text revisions accepted;</li> <li>- Table 6 – typo on a Herts scheme;</li> <li>- Appendix 5a &amp; 5b – Herts to provide data for 2015;</li> </ul>	<p>JS GG JS GG</p> <p>JS</p> <p>JS DH</p>
--	---	---

	<p>- Appendix 7 – Herts to provide revision;  - Table 5 – Peterborough to provide data for 2015;  - Page 26 typo ‘Farm’  - Various appendices – missing data authorities to check.</p> <p>It was agreed that outstanding data be supplied to JS within a week and for the final document to be recirculated at the end of the next week. AC would then sign off the AMR on behalf of the Group.</p>	<p><b>CS  JS  ALL MPAs</b></p>
<b>4</b>	<b>National Co-ordinating Group feedback</b>	<b>SEM</b>
	SEM reported that the group had not met and no future date had been set.	
<b>5</b>	<b>National Planning Issues</b>	<b>EM</b>
	<p>SEM reported that Eamon Mythen had intended to attend but other priorities had arisen post referendum. EM has provided an email giving the following DCLG update:</p> <p>Following the outcome of the SR15 financial settlement, DCLG came to the decision to stop funding the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Annual Mineral Raised Inquiry Survey (PA1007 Business Monitor) - undertaken by the Office of National Statistics</li> </ul> <p>The annual UK manufacturers’ sales of product survey, undertaken by the ONS, reporting on mineral companies’ sales, will continue.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Annual Opencast Coal Mining Survey – undertaken by the BGS.</li> </ul> <p>DCLG will continue funding the following projects to support mineral planning:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Joint Minerals Information Programme</li> <li>• Aggregate Mineral Survey (4yrl survey)</li> <li>• 9 x Aggregate Working Parties Technical Secretariat</li> </ul> <p>Update – Annual Mineral Survey 2014</p> <p>On 29 June DCLG has been given Ministerial clearance to publish the AMS 2014, which be done in the near future when a publication date from ePublications/DCLG</p>	

	<p>is known - EM to advise all stakeholders.</p> <p>MN made reference to 'The Minerals Products Industry at a Glance' (2016) document which had been recently circulated &amp; confirmed that the MPA will endeavour to make information more widely available (e.g. its quarterly economic forecast normally restricted to Members outlining where the economy is heading in terms of construction).</p> <p>RD commented that the 2020 figures for sub-regional apportionment are becoming outdated &amp; will be difficult to carry on beyond 2020. Reverting to the 10 yr average produces a lower figure. MN is very aware of the need to update sub-national guidelines. Operators discontent with the 10 yr average given the hit the industry has had since 2008. Scope to adopt 3 yr average if considered more reflective. RR noted the Group had agreed on apportionment approach but accepted that figures were based on a 10 yr figure a long time ago. SEM to draft a comment to EM at DCLG to highlight the issue.</p> <p>GG commented that the Govt desire to see development plan coverage of the country by 2018 with the threat of special measures was helping concentrate minds &amp; helpful having a date to work to. GG noted that this applied to Minerals &amp; Waste plans. Whilst not originally cited as doing so GG referred to the latest recommendations which indicated that there was no reason as to why it shouldn't. AC noted that intervention by PINS etc had yet to be defined as to what form that may take.</p> <p>RR noted that the recently announced 'permission in principle' excludes minerals although not waste.</p> <p>GG referred to difficulties experienced where Mineral Consultation Areas/Mineral Safeguarding Areas covered large proportions of the county. RR explained that Central Bedfordshire &amp; Bedford Borough had adopted a MSA approach identifying smaller parcels of land with the Councils, admittedly single tier, successfully requiring mineral resource assessments to protect deposits. RD confirmed a similar approach in Norfolk which may require prior extraction. MN highlighted the safeguarding of wharves &amp; railheads as particularly key.</p> <p>RD explained Norfolk aimed to insist on devts being minerals neutral i.e. required to be reused on the devt where commercial extraction not viable to at least</p>	<p><b>EM</b></p> <p><b>SEM</b></p>
--	---	------------------------------------

	<p>prevent primary aggregate being sourced from elsewhere.</p> <p>RG reported substantial work on this topic with the districts and that Essex was now inundated with consultations. Experience was that developers presented sparse borehole data &amp; argued that mineral resource assessments indicated reserves were uneconomic to work. Arrangement only working where districts seek to refuse &amp; gives added refusal reason.</p> <p>RR suggested focus should be where districts wish to permit allocated sites &amp; crucial to input at plan preparation stage as picked up in the recent call for sites by Bedford BC &amp; Central Bedfordshire Council. Site can only come forward where a mineral resource assessment addresses the issue.</p>	
<b>6</b>	<b>MPA update on local plans</b>	<b>MPAs/All</b>
	<p>A draft update had been circulated prior to the meeting.</p> <p>RG noted that a biodiversity SPG was due to be uploaded to Essex CC's website next week.</p> <p>Group agreed to RR's suggestion of using a standardised local plan update in future setting out headings of <i>Existing Plans, Plans in Preparation, DM Issues &amp; Staffing/Resources</i> plus scope for <i>Comments</i>.</p> <p>GG confirmed that Suffolk would undertake a call for sites in Autumn &amp; set out site selection criteria. Information above a red line plan would be invited.</p>	
<b>7</b>	<b>Election of Chair for the forthcoming year</b>	<b>SEM</b>
	<p>AC announced that his work commitments with Highways &amp; Transportation necessitate him stepping down as Chairman. AC asked whether there were any volunteers in addition to RG and whether the Group were happy to see Essex CC continue to fill this role. No expressions of interest were received &amp; attendees raised no objection to Essex continuing to fill the role. RG left the meeting and the Group voted in favour of his appointment as Chairman. RG re-joined the meeting &amp; was informed of the decision. RG thanked the Group for its vote of confidence &amp; indicated he planned for future meetings to be attended by an Essex CC rep allowing RG to concentrate on his role as Chairman &amp; avoid any perception of conflict of interest.</p> <p>It was agreed that AC would sign off the finalised AMR &amp; the note to be sent to EM in respect of the</p>	<b>AC</b>

	apportionment figure. RG would chair the next meeting.	
<b>8</b>	<b>AOB</b>	<b>All</b>
	None.	
<b>9</b>	<b>Date of Next Meeting</b>	<b>Chair</b>
	Suggested dates for a late October meeting would be circulated	