

Technical Secretary: C R Waite, 22 Sittingbourne Road, Maidstone, Kent ME14 5LW
: Tel: 01622 764335, e-mail: chriswaiteplanning@blueyonder.co.uk

DRAFT

Minutes of Meeting of SEEAWP held on 13 November 2013 at Eland House, Bressenden Place, London

Present:

John Kilford	Chairman		
Matt Meldrum	West Berks	Mark Worringham	Reading BC
Lester Hannington	Bucks CC	Tony Cook	E Sussex CC
Peter Chadwick	Hants CC	John Prosser	Kent CC
Catherine Smith	Medway	Peter Day	Oxfordshire CC
Paul Sanderson	Surrey CC	Alethea Evans	W Sussex CC
Chris Mills	Isle of Wight	Mark Chant	Milton Keynes
Claire Potts	S Downs NPA	Bob Smith	MPA
Richard Ford	MPA	David Payne	MPA
Mark Russell	BMAPA	Steve Cole	BAA
Eamon Mythen	DCLG	Chris Waite	Technical Secretary

1 Welcome & Apologies

- 1.1 The Chairman welcomed Mark Worringham, Alethea Evans and Lester Hannington to their first SEEAWP meeting. Apologies were received from Stewart Mitchell and Ken Hobden (MPA), James Trimmer (PLA), Nick Everington (The Crown Estate), Mark Plummer (DCLG) and Sue Marsh (Eof E AWP).

2 Minutes and Matters Arising from 3 July 2013 meeting

- 2.1 Matters raised, other than those to be dealt with under an agenda item, were as follows:

2.5 The reserves data had not yet been received. Nick Everington had informed the Secretary that its production was imminent and had offered some of the data in advance. The Secretary replied that it was best for SEEAWP to receive all the data together.

2.6 BGS resource survey reports and maps are now on the Crown Estate website

3.1 PD said that minute 3.1 read as though SEEAWP members could only raise issues on the minutes in exceptional circumstances. The Chairman replied that he had not meant to suggest any restriction for amendments which would correct serious inaccuracies or factual

errors, but he sought to avoid minor text changes that would not significantly alter the substance of what had been minuted. Any proposal for an amendment should normally await the next meeting, unless harm or consequent mistakes might otherwise occur.

It was agreed that the minutes should be publicly available, and to that end, as DCLG had decided not to include them on their web, MPAs were asked to place them on their web sites. To avoid misunderstandings, the Secretary would clearly put Draft on minutes before they were cleared at the following SEEAWP meeting.

4.3 The last collated returns for AM2012 were received by the Secretary on 30 October.

4.4 No advance had been made on the definition of silica sand. The Chairman asked for the authorities with silica sand resources to draw up a definition. Raising the issue of AWP's collecting data on non energy minerals awaits an AWP Secretaries and NCG meeting. AWP Secretaries meeting had been set for 19 December.

5.3 & 5.5 The responses received on Oxfordshire and Surrey draft LAAs had been sent to the authorities.

5.6 The secretary had issued the checklist drawn up by DP.

5.8 SEEAWP views on Somerset draft LAA had been sent.

6.1 At the request of CM it was agreed to overcome an omission in the minutes in regard to the report by Mark Plummer by adding a further point:

- there is an update to Schedule 14 of the 1995 Environment Act separate from the Lord Taylor revised guidelines

7.4 The question of terms of reference (ToR) for AWP Chairmen awaits an NCG meeting for which there is currently no date. SEEAWP felt that a ToR was desirable, and the Chairman agreed that he would welcome it, as presently there is no guidance on a Chairman's role. It was proposed that AWP Secretaries should also have ToR drawn up. The Secretary responded that he felt a ToR would be unlikely to add to the specification for Secretaries in the current contract. The specification is sufficiently detailed, but he would raise the proposal at the AWP Secretaries forthcoming meeting.

3 Local Aggregates Assessments

LAA Checklist

- 3.1 To assist the AWP in giving views on MPA LAAs a checklist had been issued with the papers. LH approved of the five sub headings, but considered that the rest of the checklist went into too much detail and beyond the NPPF and NPPG requirements. A 'checklist' suggested a tick box for all of the lines in the paper. The Chairman pointed out that the checklist was designed as an aid to the AWP and was not prescriptive. However, LH remained concerned if the checklist was adopted as the basis for the AWP response to an LAA, and then publicly available at a Local Plan hearing.
- 3.2 PD said that the POS/mpa were seeking to draw up an LAA guide for AWP's, and the checklist might be considered as part of that. He would feed back on this to the Secretary. The checklist was not adopted by SEEAWP, but, pending its replacement by other guidance, it would provide something of an informal 'aide memoire'.

Procedure and Timetable

- 3.3 SEEAWP considered that it should give a response to each draft LAA that it received, separate from the minutes. The Secretary asked SEEAWP to be clear in the views it wished to send to each MPA.
- 3.4 CM had asked for SEEAWP to recommend a timetable for MPAs to submit their LAAs to the AWP. The MPAs said that although it is recommended that the LAA is included in an authority's annual monitoring report, there is no specific timetable for the report. MPAs wished to have the annual survey data as soon as possible each year in order to update the LAA. However, SEEAWP saw no problem in the AWP annual report (which is to be submitted to DCLG by the end of June each year) using region wide LAA totals which would be based on data some 16 months old.

LAAs in the South East

- 3.5 The Chairman congratulated the MPAs on all preparing a draft LAA by this meeting, or in the case of the 5 Berkshire authorities, having commissioned a report for the whole of Berkshire. The Secretary said that he had passed on the views on the draft LAAs received from individual SEEAWP members to the appropriate MPAs.

Milton Keynes draft LAA

- 3.6 MC said that the draft LAA came to no conclusion between the four options for land-won sand and gravel. As there were no active workings for a number of years it was inappropriate to use the 10 year sales average for land-won sand and gravel. The three year figure of 0.17mtpa was more appropriate. In response to the Chairman he confirmed that although there was an issue of a site straddling the boundary between Milton Keynes (MK) and Northamptonshire, there was no concern from East Midlands AWP with the MK approach.
- 3.7 BS on behalf of industry said that MK had a considerable consumer base and that an assessment of population growth and housing would be a better measure than the sales average of the last 5 years. He considered that this would justify a figure of 0.2mtpa or more. MC said that there had been a disappointing response to the call for sites even though there were workable resources.
- 3.8 SEEAWP asked for a response to be sent supporting the rejection of the 10 year sales average for land-won sand and gravel working. Some support was given to the 3 year figure of 0.17mtpa, but MK were asked to undertake an assessment of future population, housing completions and infrastructure which might well justify a figure of 0.2mtpa or more.

West Berks LAA

- 3.9 MM explained the problems of obtaining data to prepare an LAA for West Berkshire. He acknowledged that this was a long draft LAA as it was principally prepared as an initial step for an Issues and Options document for a Local Plan. He had been able to establish that the 10 year sales average for land-won sand and gravel was some 439,000 tonnes, and the LAA proposed that this was the figure for which provision should be made. The landbank had declined to just over 7 years and needs to be made up if to be maintained. Rail imports of hard rock are a significant supply, but the tonnages are largely exported to other authorities. The figures for secondary and recycled aggregate are particularly significant to supply for West Berkshire as these now exceed land-won sales.
- 3.10 The Chairman questioned West Berkshire relationship with the other Berkshire authorities. MM said that West Berkshire had supplied its data to them and supported the proposal for

an LAA to be prepared for the whole of Berkshire – see below. However, West Berkshire would be likely to pursue its own LAA in parallel in future years.

- 3.11 SEEAWP complemented the preparation of a draft LAA despite the data constraints and supported the provision of land-won sand and gravel at the 10 year sales average which gives headroom for growth in the economy.

5 Berkshire Unitary Authorities

- 3.12 RW had issued a paper confirming that the authorities (5BUAs) had commissioned consultants to prepare an LAA that would encompass the whole of Berkshire, ie incorporating data from West Berkshire. The 2012 findings were set out for all Berkshire, including sales and reserves of land-won sand and gravel, aggregate sales at rail depots, and sales of C&D aggregates and capacity of C&D recycling sites. The 10 year sales average for land-won sand and gravel was 878,000. This is proposed to be adopted for future provision.
- 3.13 SEEAWP welcomed the proposal to complete the coverage of LAAs for the South East and for it to cover the whole of Berkshire. SEEAWP supported the provision of the 10 year sales average for land-won sand and gravel.

Buckinghamshire LAA

- 3.14 LH said that the views received on the earlier draft LAA at the last SEEAWP meeting had been taken on board. The LAA concluded that the 10 year sales average of 0.96mtpa should be adopted, rather than the figure of 1.09 in the Core Strategy. It is intended to start a Minerals and Waste Plan next year.
- 3.15 RF confirmed that the views of Bretts had been addressed. SEEAWP supported the provision for land-won sand and gravel at the 10 year sales average of 0.96mtpa.

West Sussex LAA

- 3.16 AE introduced the draft LAA which included part of the South Downs NPA area. The LAA proposed to adopt the 10 year sales average of 0.5mtpa for land-won sand and gravel. This was the combined soft sand/sharp sand and gravel total. A split had not been made whilst awaiting the outcome of the combined Hampshire, East Sussex, West Sussex, South Downs NPA study of soft sand. SC cautioned that although on BGS survey data there appeared to be soft sand resources outside the National Park, it should not be presumed that this area would yield viable reserves. Detailed investigation would be needed and in his experience much will be discarded as non viable. This could lead to an overall shortfall of soft sand supplies as the reserves in the National Park become depleted.
- 3.17 Industry welcomed the helpful summary at each section, and the LAA gave good direction to industry on sites. SEEAWP supported the proposed provision of land won sand and gravel at the 10 year sales average of 0.5mtpa, but considered that a separate provision within this for soft sand was desirable.

Hampshire LAA

- 3.18 PS said that the revised LAA used the Adopted Plan figure of 1.56mtpa for land-won sand and gravel sales. This is higher than the 10 year sales average giving flexibility for economic growth. The landbank is in excess of 7 years.
- 3.19 SEEAWP supported the LAA which proposed that provision should be made for 1.56mtpa for land-won sand and gravel sales.

East Sussex LAA

3.20 TC introduced the draft LAA which was also for Brighton and Hove City Council and part of the South Downs NPA area. He handed out an addendum which amended the consumption data in the LAA. The LAA uses the Adopted Plan figure of 0.1mtpa for land-won sand and gravel. There is an adequate landbank at the present time. Care has been taken to account for the sales from the major site that straddles the E Sussex and Kent boundary. Natural England is content with the LAA.

3.21 SEEAWP supported the provision to be made for land-won sand and gravel at 0.1mtpa

Medway Towns LAA

3.22 CS said that there had been no land-won sand and gravel sales for a number of years and that using a 10 year sales average would be inappropriate. Medway had one sand and gravel site with planning permission for 1.2Mt of aggregate, but it had not been started. It is proposed to use the draft Core Strategy figure of 0.18mtpa. This would give a 6-7 year landbank from the permitted site. CS said that obtaining figures for secondary and recycled aggregates was a problem.

3.23 SEEAWP supported the provision to be made for land-won sand and gravel at 0.18mtpa.

Oxfordshire LAA

3.24 PD said that Oxfordshire had received criticism of the draft LAA suggesting a figure of 1.2mtpa for land-won sand and gravel. Objectors draw attention to the NPPF asking authorities to plan for an annual LAA based on a rolling average of 10 years sales data, and saw no reason why Oxfordshire should deviate from this. They questioned whether the methodology used in arriving at 1.2mtpa was robust enough to justify the figure. The 10 year average is 1.0mtpa whereas the 2012 sales in Oxfordshire were 0.7Mt. The 10 year average would therefore provide headroom for growth. What were the AWP's views on Oxfordshire adopting the 10 year average figure?

3.25 DP said that the temporary mothballing of three aggregate sites accounted for the low sales in recent years. Having adopted a local methodology devised by independent consultants, this was about to be dropped due to local pressures. BS said that the draft LAA submitted to SEEAWP gave the technical justification for the 1.2mtpa figure. No further data had been supplied to show the logic was flawed or to discount this finding.

3.26 JP said that he had attempted to use the methodology adopted by Oxfordshire's consultants in revising the Kent LAA. He had found it most unsatisfactory, utilising national population consumption figures from the 2009 national survey applied to the MPA area. He had changed his mind since the previous consideration of the draft LAA and supported using the 10 year provision. This gained support from some other MPA members.

3.27 The Chairman sought to find a response that would encompass the views of SEEAWP. However, it was pointed out that Oxfordshire had not consulted on a further draft LAA revision to explain the current thinking. As no such draft had been submitted to the AWP for it to consider, SEEAWP decided that it could not give a written response.

Matters arising from LAAs

3.28 A number of MPAs are having difficulty in obtaining reliable and comprehensive data on secondary and recycled aggregate. The Chairman asked members to continue pursuing data, despite the difficulties, as this source is clearly a major contributor to aggregate supply.

- 3.29 It appeared that consultation with mpa may have been regarded by some MPAs as having consulted the industry. MPAs are reminded to also consult BAA.

LAAAs from MPAs in adjoining AWPAs

- 3.30 The Secretary reported that the First Review of the Technical Statement for Wales recommended apportionments for authorities in Wales at the ten year sales average. This will enable the limited amount of crushed rock exported to the South East from Wales to continue.

4 Marine Aggregates

- 4.1 SEEAWP 13/09 reported that the SEEAWP response to the MMO East Coast Plans had been sent on 5 October. The MMO will consider all the responses and expect to submit the Plans to the Secretary of State in Spring 2014.
- 4.2 A workshop on the South Coast Plans had been attended by MR and the Secretary in October. This enabled views to be given at this stage in the preparation of the plans.
- 4.3 The BGS report on marine aggregate resources had been completed and is now on The Crown Estate website. However, the reserves data from The Crown Estate is still awaited.

5 New National Planning Guidance and Update by DCLG

- 5.1 EM updated the meeting on:
- NPPG: the large number of responses were being assessed; he could not give a date when the guidance would be re-launched.
 - EU EIA Directive: the UK is seeking reforms to avoid additional burdens on the planning system
 - Onshore Oil & Gas: guidance was issued in July 2013 and secondary legislation is under consideration
 - Red Tape Challenge: the reduction in regulations will be a benefit to plan making and industry applying for planning permission.
 - National Aggregate Survey for 2013: the funding was in place but could not be accessed until 1 April 2014. However, in response to a question, EM thought that it might be possible to go out to tender, appoint, and prepare for the survey before 1 April 2014. SEEAWP urged that this should be done if at all possible so that the survey proper could start in April.
- 5.2 SEEAWP were dismayed at the delay in starting the 2013 survey as this provides the information on imports and exports and enables a better fix on consumption in an MPA's area. It was suggested that SEEAWP should perhaps undertake a limited survey of sand and gravel sales and reserves at the beginning of 2013 in order to assist LAA updates. However, this would mean cooperation by operators with two surveys, and before such action was taken SEEAWP should know the wider views of industry and other AWPAs. The Chairman said that any discussion on pursuing this at the AWP Secretaries meeting required a proposition. It was agreed that PD, LH, BS and SC would take this up outside the meeting and have a proposition prepared and submitted to the Secretary by 12 December in order that it could be circulated in advance of the AWP Secretaries meeting.

- 5.3 EM said that Mark Plummer apologised for not being able to attend the meeting, but he had a meeting with the Minister. The Department had a heavy workload but if SEEAWP members had a particular query, EM would seek to ensure that a reply was given. He noted SEEAWP's view that an NCG meeting in early 2014 would enable a number of matters to be discussed at the national level, and would convey this to Mark Plummer.

6 AM2012 Draft Report

- 6.1 The Secretary summarised the key figures and recommendation in the draft AM2012 report:
- land-won sales of sand and gravel and rail imports had declined, but in contrast marine dredged aggregate landings had increased for the second year running.
 - reserves of both sand and gravel and rock had declined, but there was some 12.5Mt of sand and gravel in undetermined applications, and a 16.2Mt ragstone quarry extension had been permitted in 2013.
 - 2.5Mt of CD&EW was recorded as recycled at fixed sites, but coverage was incomplete
 - all SE MPAs had submitted a draft LAA except for 5 Berkshire Unitary Authorities, but they have commissioned a joint LAA for the whole of Berkshire
 - the combined LAAs proposed provision of 8.65mtpa of land-won sand and gravel at the regional level, and 1.25mtpa of crushed rock. Such provision would be in excess of the 10 year sales average for sand and gravel (7.8Mt) and match the 10 year sales average for crushed rock
 - on this basis it was proposed that SEEAWP advised NCG that the region is proposing to make a full contribution to both national and local needs.
- 6.2 Table 4 in the draft report was the key table leading to the above recommendation. In previous years this table had compared the MPA and AWP reserves and landbanks against the guideline apportionments. The 2012 Table 4 substituted figures from MPAs' LAAs, indicating if the figure was derived from an adopted local plan, a ten year sales average, or a different figure to the 10 year sales average. With the note from Berkshire setting a 0.88mtpa figure, the total for the region added up to 8.65mtpa. At this rate reserves of over 80mt would last for some 9.6 years.
- 6.3 The Secretary said that as he had received the last survey data on 30 October the report had been written hurriedly in order to issue it for the meeting. He asked for it to be checked for accuracy, and that confidentiality had been protected. He drew attention to specific sections of the report for MPAs to check:
- para 3.7 and a footnote to Table 1: Berks and Bucks re dormant sites
 - para 9.1: all MPAs re adopted plans
 - Table 1 footnote: Kent and Surrey re non aggregate use, and
E Sussex re workings not likely to be worked before 2014
 - Appendix B: updates with revised wording or confirmation of no change was required from Bracknell Forest, Reading, Slough, and Windsor & Maidenhead
- 6.4 The Secretary noted changes given at the meeting to Table 4 (which would require changes to the text of AM2012) and would delete Novington Pit under E Sussex in Appendix C. He would also have to amend Table 4 and associated text if Oxfordshire decided on provision

of a land-won sand and gravel figure at 1.0mtpa. The total proposed for the South East would then be 8.45mtpa, but the conclusion regarding making a full contribution to local and national needs would remain unchanged. The Secretary was grateful for the offer from AE to provide diagrams to illustrate the Tables in the report.

- 6.5 DP pointed out that although the reserves in the region amounted to a sand and gravel landbank of over 9Mt, this could mask a significant shortfall in soft sand reserves. It was agreed that reference to this would be made in the AM2012 text.
- 6.6 It was agreed that any changes recommended to the draft report and updating from para 6.3 above should be sent to the Secretary by 22 November. PD was given to 26 November to advise the Secretary whether Oxfordshire proposed a figure of 1.0mtpa for provision for land-won sand and gravel. The Chairman and Secretary then be authorised to finalise the AM2012 report, including diagrams, to issue it, and ask for it to be placed on the DCLG and MPA websites.

7 Any Other Business

- 7.1 There was no other business.

8 Date of Next Meeting

- 8.1 The next SEEAWP meeting is to take place **at 2pm on Wednesday 12 March 2014** at DCLG Offices, Eland House, Bressenden Place, London, SW1E 5DU.