

SEERAWP South East England Regional Aggregates Working Party

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 SEERAWP held on 8 June 2007 at DCLG Offices, Eland House, Bressenden Place, London

Present:

John Kilford	Chairman	Nigel Jackson	QPA
David Nkrumah-Boateng	SEERA	Bob Smith	QPA
Anthea Hoey	Berkshire Unitaries	Stewart Mitchell	QPA
Richard Matthews	Bucks CC	Mark Russell	QPA BMAPA
Tony Cook	E Sussex CC	Peter Bide	CLG
Roger Stow	Hants CC	Bill Mackenzie	CLG
Dick Feasey	Kent CC	Andrew Lipinski	CLG
Peter Day	Oxfordshire CC	John Cheston	GOSE
Karen Hearnshaw	Surrey CC	Denis Spooner	MFA
Bryan Geake	Medway	Chris Waite	Secretary
Hannah Moores	Milton Keynes		

1 Welcome & Apologies

1.1 The Chairman welcomed Karen Hearnshaw, Hannah Moores and Denis Spooner to the meeting. Apologies had been received from Richard Read and Jeremy Smith (Hants CC), David Lamb (Surrey CC), Mike Elkington (West Sussex CC), Lillian Harrison and Ken Hobden (QPA) and James Trimmer (PLA).

2 Minutes and Matters Arising from 25 September 2006 meeting

2.1 The minutes were agreed.

2.2 The following were dealt with under matters arising:-

para 2.2 The Secretary had obtained the contact names for wharves from BGS and sent them to MDS for the wharves & rail depot survey. He would send these to QPA to comment on as there were gaps, and BMAPA offered to supply their contacts as well. BGS did not carry out a survey of rail depots in 2005, and therefore MPAs had been asked to bring their contacts list to the meeting today. Data was supplied completing the contacts for all rail depots. The Secretary would send these to MDS this weekend, and to QPA.

para 3.2 A letter had been sent to CLG on the importance of timely monitoring of the Guidelines.

para 3.3 MRSRG had been agree to make separate provision for soft sand in the apportionment review.

para 5.1 AM2005 had been issued in February and is on the CLG and SEERA web sites.

para 7.2 Both QPA and BAA had responded to the English Heritage paper on Mineral Extraction and the Historic Environment, challenging its purpose as well as its content. The next stage is an industry meeting with EH.

3 SE Plan, EIP and Review of Sub Regional Aggregate Apportionment

3.1 The SE Plan EIP concluded on 30 March and the Panel report is expected to be submitted to government by the end of July.

3.2 David Nkrumah-Boateng said that in order to give LUC one more month to the end of September to complete the apportionment report, it would not be ready for a SEERAWP meeting on 10 September. The report would go to RPC on 29 November, so an October SEERAWP date would be suitable. It was agreed that a date would be decided at item 10.

3.3 Tony Cook asked whether LUC had considered the details of the views received as a result of the consultation exercise, as the Note of 15 May meeting only referred to some elements of the views, for example by Hampshire. DNB confirmed that LUC had received copies of all the views received and there had been a discussion on such items at the Steering Group, although the Note tended to focus on the bigger issues such as representations on Green Belt. LUC had also had a separate meeting with Surrey in view of their views and experience of assessment in their DPD. It was agreed that LUC would be asked at the next Steering Group on 14 June whether they would contemplate meeting other MPAs if requested to do so eg Kent and Hampshire.

4 2005 National Aggregates Minerals Survey

4.1 The Collation of the Results of the National Aggregates Minerals Survey for 2005 was published in March. This 4 yearly survey has a wider coverage, including inter-regional movements, consumption, and data on sub regions, than the annual surveys undertaken by RAWPs. The report SEERAWP 07/07 drew attention to the implications of the additional information for the SE region. The recommendations to SEERAWP were to thank CLG and BGS for the Collation which provides an essential data source for aggregates planning at the national and regional scale, to accept the commentary in SEERAWP 07/07 on the implications for the SE region, and to make the report available on the CLG and SEERA web sites – to be associated with AM2005 regional report. SEERAWP accepted the recommendations.

4.2 Nigel Jackson for QPA endorsed the recommendation that the survey is an essential basis for aggregate supply and demand and the industry is committed to the managed aggregates process. Bill Mackenzie confirmed that if any SEERAWP member wanted a further breakdown of information in the Collation, there is an opportunity to go back to BGS via CLG as they hold more data.

5 Marine Bill White Paper ‘A Sea Change’

5.1 The Chairman reported that he had responded to the White Paper on behalf of SEERAWP on 5 June. Copies of the letter were distributed. The letter was a positive response, as the White Paper met many of the points made in the SEERAWP letter in reply to the consultation last year. However, although the principles were fine, the important level of detail was still to come through the Bill and later stages with the the marine policy statement, marine plans and the formation of the Marine Management Organisation.

- 5.2 Denis Spooner said that he could give no guide as to when the Bill might come forward, as preference was being given to the Planning Bill. He would continue through Defra to pursue the objectives SEERAWP seek in the Chairman's letter.
- 5.3 Mark Russell said he was heartened by the references to social and economic interests, balancing the environmental conservation references. The Users Development Group was undertaking a study to set out the value of operations of the marine industry. He understood that sectoral statements would follow the national policy statement. He expected these to build on MPS1, giving a clearer statement on marine regions.
- 5.4 Tony Cook and Dick Feasey said that their authorities would be replying separately to the White Paper, as may others. The MPAs had other views to send, such as the democratic deficit in the MMO proposal, and for those who are coastal authorities, more detailed views on the integration needed with activities and responsibilities at the coast. DNB said that the Regional Assembly would be responding in a similar manner.
- 5.5 It was agreed that the 5 June letter would be circulated with the minutes, and SEERA, BMAPA and MPAs were invited to send their views to the Secretary, who would circulate them.
- 5.6 MR reported on three other items of interest:
- REAs for the Thames and South Coast had commenced. These will assist licence applications
 - The annual Crown Estate/BMAPA publication on marine reserves at 31 December 2006 is taking longer to produce than anticipated, but should be available at the next SEERAWP meeting.
 - With the transfer of licence decisions to MFA, Defra will not be involved in the pre-application negotiations under the new Regulations. Defra will not produce the quarterly statistics that SEERAWP has been receiving on the progress on GV applications. The Crown Estate may take on this role, with bi-annual production of the data. He recommended that in view of the Crown Estate role, an invitation be sent for a representative to attend SEERAWP. This was agreed. MR would recommend a name.
- 5.7 The Chairman drew attention to a publication he had received entitled 'The Shingle Currency' by the Hants and IoW Wildlife Trust, and said that this could be found at www.southeastmarine.org.uk As most attending had not received this, MR was asked to update BMAPA address list.

6 Recycling of Aggregates

- 6.1 The 2005 Capita Symonds surveys of CD&EW arisings and Other Materials concluded that at the regional level, the 2001, 2003 and 2005 figures were all within the wide confidence limits. It was not possible therefore to identify how much, if any increase in recycling of aggregates had taken place in the SE during that period. The Secretary reported that this was disappointing, and in view of the low response level from operators, the consultants recommended that in future data should be collected through channels where an operator would have to submit the information, rather than through a voluntary survey.
- 6.2 The ERM regional waste survey, of which C&D was a part, did not assist, and surprisingly identified only 9 C&D recycling sites in the SE region, which conflicted with site identification through earlier AM surveys.
- 6.3 Peter Bide pointed out that the Capita Symonds reports were to establish the national position, and were robust in that respect. Peter Day said that the ERM study understandably focused on municipal waste rather than C&DW, but there was clearly an issue over sites which WDAs need to resolve.
- 6.4 It was noted that data on road planings had not progressed, and the Chairman suggested that information should be available from highway colleagues. Doubts were expressed about whether

such data would be readily available or comprehensive, but it was agreed that MPA representatives would ask their highway colleagues for the data, send it to the Secretary, who would then report at the next SEERAWP meeting.

- 6.5 The Secretary drew attention to the consultation paper on the Waste Strategy for England 2007 which states that the government is considering, in conjunction with the construction industry, setting a target to halve the amount of C&D going to landfill by 2012. This appears to tie in with the SE Plan objective for 2010, but definitions need to be clear. He welcomed the intention to require site waste management plans for large developments. This would enable recycling to be considered at the pre planning stage, but a simple template is needed rather than a bureaucratic complex form. NJ said QPA would be taking up these points.

7 AM 2006 Progress Report

- 7.1 Each MPA was invited to report on progress, bearing in mind that industry returns should have been in by 31 May. A number of MPAs reported a 40-50% response, but Oxfordshire had only a 20% response, and Surrey and Hampshire had 10 and 11 operator responses outstanding. Reminders had now been sent, or would be sent, seeking responses by mid/end June. CEMEX and Hanson returns were outstanding in more than one authority. QPA said that they would urge their members to respond, and the Secretary would also write to BAA to ask them to do the same.
- 7.2 Roger Stow asked QPA to reconsider its position on confidentiality. It was becoming increasingly difficult with the confidentiality restrictions to make spatial provision for aggregates to support core strategy in an industry with fewer major companies and fewer sites. NJ said that QPA regularly reviewed the position. He would raise the matter again.

8 DCLG

- 8.1 Peter Bide reported on the Planning White Paper, drawing attention to some of its contents. SEERAWP was concerned that MPS1, only recently produced, and which codifies agreements reached over a long period of time is not slimmed down on the altar of 'shorter is better'. QPA was also concerned at the apparent need to pay the same fee again as the initial application, perhaps £150,000, for an amendment or change to a condition.
- 8.2 It was agreed that SEERAWP should respond by 17 August. Views were asked to be sent to the Secretary (in draft if necessary) by 31 July. He would then draft a letter and circulate. Additional comments would be taken on board and the final draft would be signed and sent by the Chairman.
- 8.3 Bill Mackenzie reported that contracts for the four evidence base projects referred to in the last SEERAWP minutes had been let and were underway. They will be dealt with on an integrated basis. A number of those attending SEERAWP have been invited to an aggregate supply workshop next week. Not everyone could be included, but he would ensure that the note of the workshop is sent to the Secretary to circulate to SEERAWP
- 8.4 BM said that MPAs should expect David Knapman seeking data on withdrawn applications, including at the pre application stage, as this was not covered in the BGS report on primary aggregate reserves. This is part of the follow up research, with particular focus on the SE, East Midlands and South West. Industry should also expect Brian Marker to contact them as he is looking at the commercial background to the reasons for the decline in reserves. The time applications take to decision is also an issue. The Secretary said this was looked at in a previous exercise and he would send this to BM.
- 8.5 PB confirmed that CLG had the SEERAWP letter sent after the last meeting pressing for the 4th Review of the Guidelines to be issued for consultation. The economist has undertaken the final run of the data, but is still analysing and writing this up. It may take one or two months before the 4th Review is issued. It was pointed out that the delay would exacerbate problems with more DPDs

potentially using the wrong figures on which to base their proposals. Would a further letter aid? PB said that there was an internal meeting on 27 June. He would advise following that meeting.

8.6 The consultation on the Planning Performance Agreements was noted.

9 Any Other Business

9.1 The Secretary had received amendments to the Key Milestones issued with the agenda. He invited any other amendments by 13 June at which date he would issue the revised chart with the meeting minutes.

9.2 The Secretary explained that there was no OMG to follow the SEERAWP meeting. There was no outstanding issue, and further information on brickworks would be available by the Autumn.

10 Date of Next Meeting

10.1 It was agreed that the next meeting would be held on Tuesday 6 November at 10 30am, and will be in Room GJ/K at Eland House, Bressenden Place, London. This will be followed by an OMG meeting at 2pm. A date of Monday 21 January 2008 was selected for the following SEERAWP (and OMG) meeting.