

MINUTES

East of England Aggregates Working Party

Meeting on 13 June 2018 starting at 2pm

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

ATTENDEES

Members	
Richard Greaves (RG)	Essex County Council (Chairman)
Roy Romans (RR)	Bedfordshire Authorities
Emma Fitch (EF)	Cambridgeshire County Council
Phil Dash (PD)	Essex County Council
Julie Greaves (JG)	Hertfordshire County Council
Chris Stanek (CS)	Peterborough City Council
Richard Drake (RD)	Norfolk County Council
Cameron Clow (CC)	Suffolk County Council
Others	
Chris Hemmingsley (CH)	Brett/MPA
Keith Bird (KB)	Hanson/MPA
Amy Balding (AB)	Marine Management Organisation
Eleanor Johnston (EG)	Marine Management Organisation
Mark North (MN)	MPA
Apologies	
Sue Marsh (SM)	EEAWP Secretariat
Jerry Smith (JS)	EEAWP Secretariat
Kirsten Hannaford-Hill (KH-H)	Aggregate Industries/MPA
Ann Barnes (AB)	Cambridgeshire County Council
Shaun Denny (SD)	Cemex / MPA
Peter Dawes (PD1)	Frimstone Ltd/BAA
Graham Gunby (GG)	Suffolk County Council
Nick Horsley (NH)	MPA
Mike Pendock (MP)	Tarmac/MPA
Richard Read (RR1)	SEEAWP, LAWP

Item No.	Subject	Owner
1	Welcome, Introductions & Apologies	RG
	<p>RG welcomed everyone to the group and introductions were made for the benefit of new attendees from the Marine Management Organisation.</p> <p>Apologies – as set out on previous sheet.</p>	
2	Minutes of the last meeting & matters arising	RG/SM
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wharf Capacity Study RG recapped that funding was available in the south-east to investigate combined wharf and rail capacity which Richard Hatter (RH) had previously volunteered to take forward. SM confirmed that contact had been made with RH to ascertain progress but no substantive reply received. It was understood that RH had been unwell and no doubt had returned to a backlog with this project having slipped. Noted that RH's undertaking was to scope out a brief with a view to engaging external consultants to carry out the project. The group reaffirmed its support for the brief to be progressed and noted that James Cutting (JC) (Suffolk CC) had previously been involved. It was agreed that SM would contact RH again to ascertain whether he is in a position to progress the brief and requesting that he inform the Group if he is unable to do so. SM would copy in GG, JC and CC. • POS Practice Guidance on the Production & Use of LAAs MN confirmed he had spoken with David Payne (DP) about this guidance covering production capacity and reported that DP is due to discuss this next week with RR1. MN agreed to take the matter forward with DP following that discussion. • National Meeting of NCG RG undertook to see what support there was with AWP Chairs to meet in the autumn. RG understood that some draft work was being undertaken through the AWP Secretariat as to the national picture in terms of sales and reserves which would also look at a forecasting methodology that could be used to derive new apportionment figures. SM will check that we have the relevant information included and liaise where appropriate. <p>MN confirmed that the MPA had met with Simon Gallagher (SG) at MHCLG. The MPA's concerns had been positively received, although time would tell. It had been confirmed that zero staff within the department were currently engaged in minerals planning. SG also confirmed that the proposed NPPF changes on minerals was purely a word saving exercise and so it was hoped that the deleted text would be re-inserted. A further meeting was promised although tight to schedule before recess in July.</p> • London Plan SM confirmed that a positive response to the London Plan had been sent welcoming the safeguarding of rail infrastructure and wharves. 	<p>SM</p> <p>MN</p> <p>RG</p> <p>SM</p>

	A correction was note to the draft minutes (Item 2, 3 rd bullet point) which should have stated 'RG' rather than 'RR' but otherwise the minutes of the last meeting were approved, seconded and signed as a true and accurate record.	
3	Consideration of Draft Annual Monitoring Report	ALL
	<p>JS provided an overview of the findings from the draft report which had been previously circulated. The format followed previous versions although the Executive Summary includes tables containing the headline figures and comparison with the previous year. Sales of sand & gravel in the East of England had risen by 1.1Mt (8.7%) to 12.7 Mt, the highest annual figure in any year since 2008. Table 2 showed this to be attributed to Cambs & Peterborough on account of the A14 upgrade and wider growth agenda projects for Cambridge whilst sales elsewhere within the authorities proved remarkable stable compared with 2016. The 3 year sales average (2015 -17) stood at 11.7 Mt, a 1% uplift from the corresponding figure 2014 – 16 whilst the 10 year average sales of 10.5 Mt (2008 – 17) represented a marginal decrease from 0.5% compared to last year's report.</p> <p>S & G reserves as at 31 Dec 2017 stood at 125.8 Mt, a fall of 12.9 Mt (9.3%) from 2016. This indicates a 12 year landbank based on 10 year average sales compared with a landbank of 13.1 years recorded in 2016. The 2017 landbank slips to 8.5 years based on the sub-national apportionment figure compared with 9.4 years in 2016. As shown in Table 3, all MPAs bar one can demonstrate a landbank in excess of 7 years calculated using the sub-national apportionment figures, however all the MPAs have landbanks in excess of this threshold when calculated based on the rolling average 10 year sales.</p> <p>JS reported that, as in previous years, data for crushed rock in Norfolk and Cambridgeshire & Peterborough was combined for confidentiality purposes. Crushed rock sales fell by 12.5% from 2016 although the level of sales for 2017 and the 3 year average (2015-17), which experienced a significant drop of 18.5%, were nevertheless maintained at the sub-national apportionment figure of 0.4 Mt and still represented an increase over sales in 2015. The 10 year average sales for crushed rock marginally fell by 0.5% to 0.39Mt.</p> <p>Crushed rock reserves stood at 4.5 Mt, an 8.6% drop from 2016, giving a landbank of 11.6 years based on 10 year average sales or of 11.2 years based on sub-national apportionment figures.</p> <p>2017 saw a surprisingly low tonnage of new sand & gravel reserves permitted, just 0.035 Mt being an extension to an existing site in Cambridgeshire & Peterborough. This is substantially below the level of permissions granted in 2016 (11.6 Mt) but JS highlighted that if</p>	

<p>undetermined applications receive permission, reserves could potentially be replenished by up to 16.4 Mt.</p> <p>Road planing figures were awaited from three authorities but assurances given to provide and Table 5 and accompanying text would therefore be updated.</p> <p>Summaries for individual MPAs were set out in Section 8, but JS drew attention to an apparent discrepancy in the figures for the Bedfordshire authorities in terms of the 2017 reserves when compared to the year's sales figure in relation to the previous year's reserves. Interrogation of this situation has been limited on account of the survey disposal requirements for the previous year but para 8.10 identifies a range of factors which collectively are considered to provide some explanation.</p> <p>JG queried returns on aggregate recycling data and JS responded that this was patchy but would try and expand. RR suggested that the waste interrogator could assist individual MPAs seeking information on throughputs was needed.</p> <p>MN complimented JS on the draft report but suggested a caveat be added to the final sentence in the Exec Summary (<i>which advises MHCLG that the EE authorities continue to make a full contribution to aggregate needs</i>) on the basis that this is only based on a partial picture using the 10-year figures. Noting that the NPPF requires <i>other relevant information</i> to be taken into account, MN suggested that the recent year on year increase in sales of c.1 Mt will present a future problem given the declining reserves. RR commented that the data feeds into the LAA which presents an opportunity for more detail to be added for each authority. RG noted that a caveat could be added signalling concern of increasing sales against declining reserves and capture the possible risk of this moving forward, but commented that such a problem may or may not happen on account of the potential permissions in the pipeline. EF explained that the situation was exacerbated by borrow pits for the A14 not being used as intended on account of the timing of ministerial announcements meant that the developer could not build in sufficient time for archaeology etc in the project programme. It was generally concluded that future projects can lead to increased demand over and above reserves presenting an issue for individual MPAs to address in preparing their LAAs. This comes back to the guidelines argument and the fact that what it's based on needs further work. It was agreed that a health warning be added to the Exec Summary but highlighting that it was for individual MPAs to capture in future LAAs.</p> <p>MN offered his assistance if further figures for imports and exports needed chasing up.</p>	
---	--

	<p>It was agreed that a revised version with tracked changes picking up the above be circulated by the end of next week inviting any further comments within a further week with a view to submitting the final version to MHCLG by the end of June. To do this missing data relating to road planings etc. would need to be supplied by MPAs before then to be incorporated in the updated report.</p>	<p>JS</p> <p>MPAs</p>
4	Draft Suffolk LAA 2017	GG/CC
	<p>CC provided an overview of Suffolk's LAA highlighting that Suffolk's sand & gravel landbank at 31 Dec 2017 stood at 11.82 Mt providing a landbank of 10.5 years. A shortfall in provision to 2036 of 9.3 Mt had been identified. New sites in the Preferred Options Plan would provide 14.77 Mt, although only 12.18 Mt of which was expected to be worked in the plan period providing a safety margin of 31%.</p> <p>CC made reference to large infrastructure projects within Suffolk including Sizewell C nuclear power plant and two bridges but commented that none were expected soon. Some large residential projects were, however, expected to commence in 3-4 years.</p> <p>JG asked whether there had been any objections from local communities to over-provision of aggregate reserves. Objections had focussed on an extension to an existing site in an AONB, although CC commented that housing provision in Suffolk was further behind than it should be. JG commented that Herts had received a substantial number of objections citing over-provision of aggregate reserves. RR observed that most authorities don't deliver housing at the rate they need to as supply and sales don't follow forecasts. It was noted that this has been exacerbated by the requirement to roll housing figures forward where not provided. The NPPF will allow discounting of under provision of housing delivery figures albeit only for newly adopted plans.</p> <p>SM undertook to circulate the Draft LAA post the mtg. It was agreed that feedback be provided by the end of next week 22 June as a response would need to be co-ordinated on behalf of the AWP.</p>	<p>SM</p> <p>ALL</p>
5	Statements of Common Ground (NPPF review)	
	<p>RG invited thoughts as to what more may need to be done around preparing Statements of Common Ground. RR observed that the focus was on housing with no thought given as to how it applies to minerals and waste, especially how minerals are moved across the country and referred to silica sand in Central Bedfordshire which is transported nationally. He suggested therefore that several Statements of Common Ground may be required e.g. a specific one dealing with silica sand.</p> <p>JG commented that such statements were to be based on strategic priorities and, whilst no definition is given as to what's strategic, she concluded that as a minerals local plan is a strategic document the importation of crushed rock by rail would, for example, necessitate a</p>	

	<p>SCG to be produced and provides an opportunity to for minerals and waste to be placed on the strategic agenda.</p> <p>CS made reference to one SCG between the AWP. Whilst it was noted that AWP's could produce a SCG, guidance states that each authority needs to. PD felt authorities couldn't be expected to contact all other MPAs. RR suggested that the matter is discussed with other AWP Chairs. It was also argued that it may be better to await the guidance from the revised NPPF. RG expressed some concern around the role of AWP's if national figures are not replaced with the importance of AWP's taking on a new role involving greater scrutiny. MN agreed with need to get minerals on the strategic agenda as per their status as a county function and argues that every project should produce its tonnage requirements which would assists MPAs if the guidelines are not updated.</p> <p>RG commented that AWP's responded to Govt. to say that the MASS system had proven to work for some time and individual authorities had also written along consistent themes. MN added that the consistent response by POS and the AWP's at short notice was welcomed by the industry.</p> <p>Reference was made to the approach by BAA to Clive Betts MP, Chair of the Communities & Local Govt Select Cttee to outline the threat around the extinction of MASS. Mention was also made of this being the theme to the recent MPA/RTPI Mineral Planning Conference and specifically to the presentation by Atkins focussing on the approach to financing major projects highlighting that it is always the public who pay. RG reported his attendance at an event in Westminster on nationally significant infrastructure projects. This was also attended by Stephen Dance, Head of Infrastructure Delivery, Infrastructure and Projects Authority, who may appreciate the links between the supply chain and project delivery.</p>	RG
6	Defra Consultation – Environmental Principles and Governance after Brexit	VE/SM
	<p>Building on the 25 Year Environment Plan it proposes to set up an independent environmental body post Brexit to take the Government to task on the delivery of that plan, noting that no European Court option would be available. Should it advise on planning policy? RR felt the concern should be at the suggestion of another body and its overlap with Planning. Also implications from giving third parties another route to challenge decisions by mounting an argument that a decision is somehow contrary to an aspect of the 25 Year Environment Plan.</p> <p>The consultation runs until 12pm on 2 August 2018 but as far as formal group response it was agreed that the AWP has no policy setting or decision-making remit and therefore more down to individuals to respond.</p>	ALL

7	MPA Update	MN
	<p>MN referred to a summary of the MPA construction/economic data previously circulated.</p> <p>Economic & Market Outlook</p> <p>MPA MARKET FORECAST UPDATE. MPA markets are expected to be 5% up in 2020 for asphalt and crushed rock sales compared to 2017, whilst continued, though slower, growth in housebuilding over the forecast period will help mortar sales, which are expected to be 8% up in 2020 compared to 2017. The profiles for sand and gravel and RMC have been revised down this year, reflecting poorer than expected outturn in 2017 and lower sales volumes in the first quarter of 2018. RMC sales are expected to be up 2% in 2020 compared to 2017, whilst sand and gravel sales are expected to increase by 1%.</p> <p>ECONOMIC OUTLOOK. The ONS estimates that the economy grew by just 0.1% in 2018Q1 compared to the previous quarter, after 0.4% in 2017Q4. The bad weather is at least partly blamed, having particularly affected construction activity and some areas of retail. Current UK economy forecasts point to continued but subdued growth this year and next of about 1.5% pa, with a shift away from consumption, towards business investment and a boost from trade.</p> <p>CONSTRUCTION. The sector had a difficult start to the year, first hit by the collapse of Carillion, then affected by the snow. Latest ONS data shows construction output fell by 2.7% in 2018Q1 compared to the previous quarter, with declines in all sub-sectors of construction, except for work related to new industrial buildings.</p> <p>The Asphalt Industry Alliance (AIA) & ALARM Survey Each year the AIA commissions an independent survey of local authority highway departments in England and Wales, the Annual Local Authority Road Maintenance (ALARM) Survey, which takes a snapshot of the general condition of the local road network, based on information provided directly by those responsible for its maintenance, thus providing a means of tracking any improvement or deterioration. March 2018 saw the 23rd annual survey with findings covering the financial year 2017/18. The survey highlights that you could drive almost around the world on the length of roads in England and Wales that could fail in the next 12 months. It would take 14 years to get local roads back into a reasonable steady state, with total funding needed in excess of £9 Billion to deal with potholes.</p> <p>MN also highlighted that ‘Living with Minerals 6’ will be held in London on 11 July 2018 launching the ‘UK Minerals Strategy’ as an industry-led document as Govt. wasn’t interested in including minerals in its industrial strategy. This will cover all UK minerals, not just aggregates.</p>	
8	National Planning Issues (including safeguarding guidance)	VE/SM/ RG

	<p>Thought helpful to have national guidance on safeguarding given that some MPAs have produced and tested their safeguarding guidance over time. Kent, Hants and Devon have formed a project team for which David Payne (MPA) has been involved in scoping the work, for example, aiming for mineral resource assessments to be consistent across the country. It's a joint POS/MPA commissioned document and moves on the historic work BGS did. With regard to timetable, it is intended to produce the scope in the next few weeks and then the draft by September.</p> <p>SM reported that she had received no response to her request for a national planning update from Vicky Engelke. This reflects MN's earlier comment that MHCLG presently had zero staff involved in minerals planning. It was noted that MHCLG needed to be pressed in respect of Secretariat funding and the 4 year BGS survey due next year. MN advised that the AWP's should collectively press for progress. It was agreed that the EEAWP could re-state its concerns on the above issues and MASS by writing to Simon Gallagher (SG), Director of Planning, MHCLG. It was also felt that SG should be invited to the meeting of the National Chairs of the AWP's and MN agreed to provide contact details.</p> <p>The question was also asked as to who the AWP's should send their Annual Monitoring Reports to and it was suggested that these needed to go SG as the sole contact.</p>	<p>SM</p> <p>MN</p> <p>SM</p>
9	MPA Update on Local Plans	MPAs/ All
	<p>An update had been circulated prior to the meeting using the previously agreed template and was noted.</p> <p>RD informed the Group that the Initial Public Consultation into Norfolk's Minerals & Waste Local Plan Review is due to commence mid-June for 6 weeks. The section on waste will include criteria-based policies.</p> <p>CC confirmed that Suffolk's Minerals & Waste Local Plan was out to its pre-submission consultation from 11 June and closes on 23 July.</p> <p>As new Members to the group, RG invited AB & EJ from the Marine Management Organisation to explain their roles. EJ explained that her key role is involved in the implementation of the East Marine Plan which was published in 2014. AB described marine aggregates as a transformational activity and outlined her role as ensuring policies do what's required. The April 2017 Review concluded it would be premature to amend or replace the East Marine Plans and the next review would be 2020. Work is also underway developing policies for the South East Marine Plan which is going for adoption.</p> <p>RG commented that the contribution of marine aggregate was an important one recalling that Essex CC had been challenged on the basis that the marine aggregate market was growing and consequently</p>	

	<p>it was claimed that there was too much provision made for land-won sand & gravel.</p> <p>In response to a question from RR as to whether the plans are monitored annually, AB confirmed that they are continuously monitored but a formal report is only produced every three years. RD and MN both advised that Crown Estates control how much mineral has been dug, where it's sent etc and its website holds useful information http://www.marineaggregates.info</p> <p>AB and EJ accepted RG's suggestion that they provide the group with a more in depth presentation at its October meeting.</p>	AB/EJ
10	AOB	All
	<p>MN noted the review of National Parks and AONBs, which potentially impacted 300 quarries accounting for 27% of production, but feared the membership of the review body did not instil confidence.</p> <p>RG made reference to the Highthorn opencast coal site which is subject to a challenge by Banks Mining following the Secretary of State's decision to reject the proposals. Consideration of the environmental impact took account of the end use impact and raises the question of implications for other sectors e.g. shale gas.</p> <p>JG raised the issue of Health Impact Assessments (HIA) and referred to an application which had attracted numerous representations, including several from local doctors, raising objections to the proposal on health grounds. The issue is to be raised at a public inquiry adjourned until October 2018. Whilst no policy requires a HIA to be undertaken, JG reported that HCC's Members wished to see HIAs accompany major applications. It was noted that the EIA Regs 2017 now cover health, although this is something different. MN commented that the HSE had released a statement in respect of crystallised silicosis which clearly states that no cases of this occupational disease have been documented amongst the general public and would circulate the statement. Some 3,000 X-rays had been undertaken as part of an evidence base to help the MPA counter future challenges which identified only a single potential case of silicosis and that person had worked in diamond mines in Africa. Arguments centre on the fine dust going beyond 250m as per PM 2.5. JG commented that a late HIA was submitted 2 days prior to the public inquiry and explained that a school lies close to the potential site. Officers were resisting Members' desire to make HIA a policy requirement in the emerging Mineral Plan. The group agreed that health was a topic that should be scoped as part of the EIA process.</p>	MN
11	Date of Next Meetings	Chair
	24 Oct 2018 at 14:00 hrs, Essex CC. NB Draft LAAs to be circulated ahead of the meeting.	All

