

Technical Secretary: C R Waite, 22 Sittingbourne Road, Maidstone, Kent ME14 5LW

: Tel: 01622 764335, e-mail: chriswaiteplanning@blueyonder.co.uk

**Minutes of Meeting of SEEAWP held on 23 February 2015
at Local Government House, Smith Square, London SW1P 3HZ**

Present:

John Kilford	Chairman		
Matt Meldrum	West Berks	Mark Worringham	Reading
Ian Church	Windsor & Maidenhead.	Vanessa Rowell	Wokingham
Lester Hannington	Bucks CC	Tony Cook	E Sussex CC
Bryan Geake	Kent CC	Claire Potts	S Downs NPA
Catherine Smith	Medway	Peter Day	Oxfordshire CC
Paul Sanderson	Surrey CC	Rupy Sandhu	W Sussex CC
Chris Mills	Isle of Wight	Laura Davidson	Milton Keynes
Bob Smith	MPA	Richard Ford	MPA
Stewart Mitchell	MPA	David Payne	MPA
Mark Russell	BMAPA	Steve Cole	BAA
Nick Everington	The Crown Estate	Eamon Mythen	DCLG
Chris Waite	Technical Secretary		

1 Welcome & Apologies

- 1.1 The Chairman welcomed those who were new to the meeting. Apologies were received from Lisa Kirby (Hampshire), Simon Treacy (MPA) and Sue Marsh (EEAWP).

2 Minutes and Matters Arising from 27 October 2014 meeting

Minutes:

Following discussions with Surrey, DP proposed an amendment to the first three sentences of paragraph 3.9. This would now read: DP said that a similar issue applied to Surrey, where a shortfall in supply of sharp sand and gravel was forecast to take place at or near the end of the Plan period. The South East as a whole, together with Buckinghamshire and Hampshire had significant sharp sand and gravel resources. Surrey 2014 LAA expected to continue to import land won sharp sand and gravel from other authorities within the region for the foreseeable future. Surrey and SEEAWP agreed this amendment.

Matters Arising not dealt with under other agenda items:

2.1 7.1 TC said that there was now an agreed draft of the POS/MPA LAA Guide. This would now be prepared for the web and copies would be circulated to AWP representatives via the Secretary.

8.4 PS said that the points he had raised with mpa regarding their Note on Confidentiality and Survey Returns had been resolved. He would send a note to the Secretary to circulate to the AWP.

3.4 MM reported that discussions with adjoining MPAs on provision for soft sand, including Wiltshire were on going. A resolution would take place in the W Berks Minerals & Waste Plan.

3.6 MW said that he had replied to the Secretary. Four of the Berkshire authorities were still discussing whether they might prepare a joint plan. Slough had declined to take part.

3.12 In response to the Chairman all authorities agreed that LAAs would be titled the same year as covered by the survey.

3.13 The Secretary confirmed that he had sent letters to each MPA as agreed by SEEAWP, and a copy of one to mpa and BAA for information.

5.2 EM said that in response to DCLG consultation, UKMF and POS supported the National Survey to cover 2014. BGS had finally been authorised this month to undertake the survey. He would be contacting Jo Mankelow this week to establish the BGS programme to get the survey up and running. The procedures would be the same as in previous years, including forming a Steering Group, and he anticipated that the survey forms would be the same as last time. He understood that SEEAWP was concerned for the forms to be issued as soon as possible. EM confirmed that the following national survey would be for 2017 in order to return to the 4 year cycle.

3 West Sussex & Kent Draft LAAs

West Sussex draft LAA

- 3.1 The draft LAA had been circulated by the Secretary. He reported that the coverage of the LAA was comprehensive, including an assessment of aggregate requirements to 2031 based on the 10 year average using the latest 2004-2013 data. The LAA had also taken local circumstances into account, including to the extent of recognising that three of the five existing Minerals Plan allocations were undeliverable. Future allocations for aggregates would need to consider the implications of the South Downs National Park designation.
- 3.2 CP said that to assist forward planning, a study by consultants had been commissioned jointly by East and West Sussex, Hampshire and the SDNPA. This was due to report in April.
- 3.3 SM drew attention to Table 8 in the LAA which showed for 2012 and 2013 combined, 1Mt more sales than marine aggregate landings. What was the reason for this? RS said that he had also been concerned at the level of change and was investigating with the operators and The Crown Estate whether the figures were correct, or whether there had been double counting. He would advise the Secretary when this was resolved so the AWP could be informed.
- 3.4 The Secretary was asked to write to West Sussex approving the draft.

Kent draft LAA

- 3.5 The revised draft had simply updated data and had been circulated. However, one company in Kent considers that a substantial proportion of its soft sand reserves, some 4Mt, should be reclassified as silica sand. BG said that this was now before the Inspector who would hold the public Examination into the Kent Minerals Plan. If confirmed, this would reduce the reserves of mortar and building sand, and would be reflected in the 2015 LAA.
- 3.6 PD asked why the sand and gravel figures did not include hoggin and bulk fill? BG said that this was to be clearer on the good quality aggregate needs. However, he recognised the LAA did not identify the amount of hoggin & bulk fill, and that this was out of step with other LAAs and the AM reports.
- 3.7 CP asked whether Kent could establish the export figures to SE counties, breaking down the 'rest of the South East' grouping. BG was advised that he might be able to obtain this if he contacted Jo Mankelow at BGS who oversaw the 2009 survey.
- 3.8 SC said that the potential change in the reserves of soft sand was so large, the LAA needed 'a health warning' and proposed the following recommendation. 'Whilst SEEAWP planned to approve the factual changes in the draft LAA, it recognises that this is subject to change at the Public Examination into the Kent Minerals and Waste Local Plan'. SEEAWP agreed the recommendation.
- 3.9 In response to the Chairman, West Sussex and Kent agreed that they, together with all other SEEAWP MPAs, would submit 2015 LAAs to the Autumn SEEAWP meeting.

4 Marine Aggregates

Marine Aggregates – Capability & Portfolio 2014

- 4.1 The Secretary said that the latest Capability and Portfolio by The Crown Estate had good news for this region as, due to licenses granted in the last 12 months, the reserves of primary aggregates had been increased to over 20 years at the average off take of the last 10 years. The report provides valuable data for MPAs in drawing up their LAAs.
- South Coast Plans: Options Workshops
- 4.2 The Marine Management Organisation (MMO) had organised three Workshops on the Options report which had been circulated to SEEAWP. Several SEEAWP representatives had attended one or other of the workshops. All had found the exercises that MMO asked to be completed on the day complicated, and it was difficult to come to conclusions on the options presented. These had been drafted so they were distinct, but in doing so lost some credibility and included inconsistencies. TC said that the key problem was that draft policies were absent from the presentations. The representatives at the workshops were asked to comment on the narrative and objectives without seeing what policies would emerge.
- 4.3 MR said that the Options were only part of the process leading up to the draft Plans. He considered that in a number of areas the MMO was going beyond the powers of a Marine Plan and that the only policy option that would be acceptable to government would be the flexible option. He had three main points:
- policy wording needed to be consistent across the Plan areas. This would be important when the adjoining Thames Plans were prepared.

- one option was proposing greater weight of protection for aggregate exploration/option areas than for marine licence/applications areas. This needed to be corrected.
 - MMO need to reconsider its proposed sustainability approach that would weigh one user, including aggregates, against another. Was this appropriate for a Marine Plan?
- 4.4 SEEAWP agreed to make a response to MMO as drawn up by MR on the basis of the above. He would draft it this week, which would enable the Secretary to circulate, including to the London AWP for their agreement as a joint response.

5 Soft Sand; Intra-regional Movement of Aggregate; Overall Supply

- 5.1 At the October meeting industry representatives expressed concern as to whether sufficient provision was being made for soft sands, and whether MPAs were paying sufficient attention to meeting the anticipated shortfalls arising from the imbalance in reserves and resources in the west and east of the region.

Soft Sand

The Secretary wrote to those MPAs which did not have specific figures for soft sand in their 2014 LAA assessments to ask in confidence for a soft sand figure. He sought to establish whether these MPAs were making provision for 0.2mtpa, which in addition to the 1.6mtpa specified together in 4 LAAs, would meet the 1.8mtpa regional 10 year sales average. SEEAWP 15/03 set out the results. Although a number of MPAs had no soft sand resource or produced a very low level of sales, principally from sharp sand and gravel sites, the authorities that had not specified a figure were together proposing to provide for at least 0.2mtpa.

Location of Supplies and Intra-regional Movement

- 5.2 The LAA assessments show a shortage of sharp sand and gravel supplies in the east of the region, including Kent and Surrey, whereas the reverse is the case for soft sand supplies, 70% of which are in Kent and Surrey (however this resource may be reduced - see paragraph 3.5 above). LAAs have had regard to circumstances in neighbouring authorities, and have emphasised the opportunity for marine supplies and recycled material to assist in making up a shortfall, rather than land-won imports from other SE authorities.

Overall Provision

- 5.3 In correspondence on the above. DP had sent an outline of a MPA forecast of national land-won sand and gravel sales which could be some 61mt in 2016. This implied a 20% increase 2011-2016. However, even if this forecast was optimistic the Secretary pointed out that with a lower growth figure sales could soon exceed the 10 year average as the years before the recession would no longer be in the calculation.
- 5.4 SC said that although soft sand comprised a small part of the land-won aggregate sales, sufficient flexibility should be available to meet a sudden and significant upturn in demand. He cited Dorset where soft sand sales are now above the 10 year average. He also considered that the principle of local supply being met by local materials should be more heavily weighed in identifying new provision. There needs to be a balance struck protecting a National Park and the impact of transport from east to west or vice versa across the region.

- 5.5 DP said that the mpa forecast was for all aggregates (ie not separating out marine and land-won sources). In response to PD he said that the forecast could be made available to SEEAWP. EM said that AMRI 2013 figures showed a marked increase in sales, some 35%, together with increased employment figures in the industry.
- 5.6 PD disagreed with the Secretary's report which said that the cross over of sales exceeding the 10 years average would have implications for NPPG and the basis of LAA assessments. PD considered that at that stage the 10 years average remained the starting point for LAAs, with the consideration of other relevant local information having a larger part to play. DP agreed, and said that the 3 year average would also have more significance. TC said that as LAAs were taken forward year by year they would be better able to analyse demand/need as land won sales were only part of the total picture. LH said that MPAs are required to cooperate in preparing Local Plans and therefore evidence would need to be provided to support any reliance on supplies from adjoining authorities.
- 5.7 SEEAWP agreed with the Chairman's summary that the issue of soft sand provision would become clearer as Local Plans progressed, that SEEAWP could not influence intra-regional movements at present, and both situations needed to be monitored.

6 DCLG Update

- 6.1 EM reported that:
AMRI for 2013 would be published on 27 February and put on the web. This showed an upsurge in demand and employment in the industry. AMRI for 2014 was to be initiated and steps were being taken to extend the contracts to 2015 and beyond.
AWP Secretary contracts would be for 3 years with a one year break clause to reflect annual spending reviews. OJEU competitive tenders had been delayed but are expected after one more clearance. The purdah period (from 31 March) and outcome of the General Election would not affect appointments. There would be a period when no Secretaries would be in post between 31 March and perhaps May when the contracts are planned to be awarded. He recognized that unless BGS was able to start the process including issuing the survey forms in March, then the national survey would not progress until May.
NCG meeting: discussions were to be held this week whether to have a meeting before or post the Election.

7 Chairman of SEEAWP

- 7.1 The Chairman reminded members that this would be his last meeting. Had SEEAWP decided on a new Chairman for future meetings? PD said that discussions had been held, and ideally an independent Chairman with experience such as held by the current Chairman would be preferred. But no such replacement had been identified. He proposed that Tony Cook be elected Chairman. TC said he was happy to take on this role, on condition that the situation was reviewed in a years time. SEEAWP thanked TC for accepting the post and he was elected Chairman.

8 Any Other Business

- 8.1 On behalf of SEEAWP, TC thanked JK for the cordial way in which he had acted as Chairman, and thanked him for the time and interest that he had taken in fulfilling the role over a number of years. JK said that he had enjoyed the role, and was pleased at how

SEEAWP had reached agreement by consensus, and a way forward had been agreed over issues on which there were differing views.

- 8.2 Similarly TC thanked the Secretary for his role in organising meetings and providing efficient minutes. JK also thanked the Secretary on whom he had depended in keeping in touch and preparing for the meetings.

9 Date of Next Meeting

- 9.1 TC was keen for a date for the next meeting to be placed in diaries. The Secretary reminded SEEAWP that The Crown Estate had offered to host the next meeting with the intention to have a presentation by MMO officers on the South Coast Plans to both SEEAWP and London AWP, as had been done in July last year on the East Coast Plans. It was understood that the writing up and assessment of views taken at the Options Workshops would be completed in May, and MMO would then move forward to preparing the first draft of the Plans. Russell Gadbury was happy to make a presentation as proposed. Although MMO could not specify an appropriate date, SEEAWP agreed that a July date was likely to be most suitable. NE agreed to let TC know dates in July on which the large Crown Estate conference room would be available. TC would select a date and advise the Secretary so he could include in the minutes.

Post Meeting Note: proposed next meeting of SEEAWP – Wednesday 15 July 2015, 2pm at The Crown Estate Office.