

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 20 June 2005 at Ashdown House, 123 Victoria St, London

Present:

John Kilford	Chairman	Steve Lamb	QPA
Mike Gwilliam	SEERA	Nigel Jackson	QPA
Catherine Rose	SEERA	Bob Smith	QPA
Richard Mathews	Bucks CC	Stewart Mitchell	QPA
Anthea Hoey	Berkshire Unitaries	Duncan Pollock	QPA
Tony Cook	E Sussex CC, Brighton & Hove	Brian Marker	ODPM
Richard Read	Hants CC, Portsmouth & Southampton	Bill Mackenzie	ODPM
Bill Murphy	Kent and Medway	Andrew Lipinski	ODPM
Peter Day	Oxfordshire CC	John Cheston	GOSE
David Lamb	Surrey CC	Andrew Brown	EoERAWP
Steve Brown	West Sussex CC	Chris Waite	Secretary
Rebecca Trowse	Milton Keynes		

1 Welcome & Apologies

- 1.1 The Chairman welcomed Andrew Brown, and apologies were received from Graham Liddiard (Bucks CC), Keith Frost (QPA), Richard Pearson (BMAPA), Mike Lowe (BAA), James Trimmer (PLA) and Richard Linton (GLA).

2 Sub Regional Apportionment of Provision for Recycled and Secondary Aggregates

- 2.1 The Chairmen welcomed Jon Grantham, Taran Livingston and Catrin Owen from LUC, to make a presentation upon a methodology for the sub regional apportionment of provision for recycled and secondary aggregate. LUC has been appointed by the Regional Assembly to carry out this study in order to respond to the EiP Panel recommendation.
- 2.2 Jon Grantham explained the purpose of the study, the suggested criteria, and weighting to be used. He sought a refinement of this from the discussion today. The next stage would be to apply the criteria and weighting, to calculate the overall score for each sub region, and express this in a ranking

as a percentage of the total. This would enable the volume of provision required to be calculated, and set against existing provision.

2.3 Five questions were proposed to the meeting:

- is the purpose of the methodology clear and correct?
- has any issue/criteria been overlooked?
- should any criteria proposed be altered or omitted?
- are the proposed weightings correct?
- what comments are there on the 8 Notes for Discussion?

2.4 In the discussion that followed, a number of points were made, including:-

- the methodology can be applied to whatever recycled and secondary figure is chosen
- excavation material suitable for restoration should be excluded from this figure
- initially, and perhaps fundamentally, the methodology should reflect the pattern of arisings (rather than demand)
- there should be a policy driven slant to the methodology such that maximum utilisation of C&D waste should be promoted through its application
- the methodology is transparent, and will identify where there is a shortfall in provision
- this figure would be useful as a planning delivery tool for both the LPA and industry
- the methodology could be simplified to just criteria 1 & 2
- LPAs would then consider existing capacity and environmental issues acting as constraints on new sites
- LPAs would take into account C&DW handled by mobile crushers at this stage (an average of 50% is taken for use off site)

2.5 LUC invited comments upon the draft methodology by Friday 1 July. These comments should be sent to Taran Livingston at Livingston_t@london.landuse.co.uk (*there is an underscore between Livingston and t*) SEERAWP members are also asked to advise Taran if they wished to attend 20 July Workshop at BGS in London

3 Minutes and Matters arising from 8 February meeting

3.1 The following amendments were agreed:

para 1.1: Peter Day represents Oxfordshire CC

para 3.5: penultimate sentence to read: To overcome this, CDs are being prepared by MIRO. That for the MIST programme is already available and that for the ODPM SAMP programme would become available in about 6 weeks time.

3.2 On matters arising:-

para 2.1 : demolition industry representative: QPA had not found a volunteer

The letter to David Tomlin had been sent.

para 3.4: DEFRA are to hold a Technical Conference on 6 July under the Marine ALSF, entitled 'Marine Aggregate Extraction: Helping to determine good practice'. It was agreed that the Secretary would attend and report back.

para 3.5: the data link to the list of ALSF projects is <http://alsf.defra.gov.uk/> and also obtainable through a link to the ALSF home page:

<http://www.defra.gov.uk/environment/waste/aggregates/index.htm>

para 3.6: the Surrey officer Simon Elson has not been invited to any discussions/meetings on birdstrike. This remains a big issue – see item 5 below

para 4.2 & 4.4: QPA will not consider joining MRG until after NCG

para 7.2: East of England has acknowledged SEERAWP views on the East of England Plan

para 8.2: SEERAWP views on MPS1 have been sent to ODPM and a copy of 25 February letter issued with the agenda for this meeting.

para 9.2 & 9.3: Bill Murphy reported that both the Warwick Conference and the Kent Stakeholder meeting had been well attended, and the same themes were covered, ie the operation of the new planning system

4 GOSE: Report on Proposed Alterations: South East – Regional Minerals Strategy; and South East Plan

4.1 Proposed Alterations: John Cheston apologised for the GOSE report on the Proposed Alterations not having been issued. This was due to the waste section rather than that for minerals. He hoped that the report would be cleared by 21 July and published shortly afterwards, with a 12 week consultation period.

4.2 Mike Gwilliam expressed serious disappointment at the delay at this stage of the process, which meant that the Regional Assembly, despite taking the decision to review minerals and waste in advance of the South East Plan as sought by government, now found the review was trailing behind. SEERAWP expressed similar views - the delay does not reflect well on government or the new planning process. Government is practising double standards when it proposes to penalise LPAs that do not meet LDS milestones, but itself takes undue time in clearing this report. It is of particular concern that the delay might even extend to beyond the summer recess.

4.3 South East Plan: the report SEERAWP 05/09 included a copy of the letter seeking SEERAWP and MRG/OMG Group members views on the approach to minerals for the period 2016-2026. The letter proposed that the approach should be a flat projection to reflect the approach taken by ODPM to the 2011-2016 period. A summary of the replies received was also attached to the report.

4.4 Mike Gwilliam said that the replies were something of a mixed bag. He would not take this issue forward until the GOSE report had been published.

5 MRG/OMG and Progress of Local Development Schemes

5.1 Bill Murphy Chairman of MRG/OMG reported that the meeting held that morning had been well attended by both industry and MPAs. He reported that:-

Progress of LDSs: nearly all had been approved, but whereas some were progressing core strategy and site allocation in parallel, others were approaching this in two stages. Consultation had been/was being undertaken on SA/SEA. Complications might follow at the options stage. The process continues to be complex, creating problems for industry appreciating when appropriate to seek to influence documents, and consequently it had been decided to hold a joint seminar between MPAs and industry practitioners.

Annual Monitoring for Non Aggregates: industry accepted the rationale, but is seeking a consistent basis across the country. NCG is focussed on aggregates. A separate meeting is needed with ODPM taking part.

CAA and Birdstrike: this remains a significant issue, and the research being undertaken has a 2-3 year timescale.

Archaeology: industry is concerned that the interpretation of PPG16 and CBI Code has diverged. This will be taken up between CBI and ODPM.

River Basin Planning: this heightens concerns even more than the Catchment Area Management Strategies. An EA representative is to be invited to the next MRG/OMG meeting.

6 AM2004, Freedom of Information Act & Environmental Information Regulations; and AM2005

- 6.1 AM 2004 & Confidentiality: Duncan Pollock reported that QPA recognised that there was no complete protection for confidentiality. QPA had made a policy decision on a practical solution and was still discussing this with ODPM. This would clear the way for AM2004 to be put back on track, and could be applied to AM2005. Brian Marker said certain actions remain to be settled. A decision might be reported to TSG, but this might well be too early.
- 6.2 AM 2005: Brian Marker said that all ODPM research proposals were now competing for the same fund, and decisions had been delayed due to the General Election and appointment of new Ministers. It could well be October before a decision is made. If this did take place it would still be feasible to prepare the survey and issue the forms early in 2006. A further letter from SEERAWP: at this stage would not aid. This could be considered by NCG.

7 Aggregate Replenishment Survey

- 7.1 The Secretary said that the report SEERAWP 05/12 repeated the results of the MPA part of the survey, last reported November 2004. He had also issued the QPA part of the survey provided by Duncan Pollock last week. A comparison of the two sections gave no clear explanation as to why reserves are not being replenished. The key is to find a solution, for the decline in reserves should not be allowed to continue.
- 7.2 A discussion followed upon the survey findings and practical experience of MPAs expecting applications in allocated or preferred areas following consultation, but which had not materialised.
- 7.3 It was agreed that the only way to get to the bottom of this was for aggregate companies involved in such situations and SEERAWP MPAs to meet and thrash out the real issues. John Kilford offered to chair the meeting, which should take place in September, either in ODPM offices in London or at the Regional Assembly offices in Guildford. The Secretary would liaise with QPA on the necessary arrangements.
- 7.4 Mike Gwilliam asked for a report to be drawn up from this meeting, suitable to be presented to the Regional Assembly members and ODPM. The Assembly needed to know of the seriousness of the situation, and to be primed that further planning permissions will need to be granted.

8 QPA Sustainable Development Strategy

- 8.1 Nigel Jackson introduced this recently produced QPA document. It sets out QPA core values which are aligned with the four principles of the original UK Strategy for Sustainable Development – social progress, environmental protection, natural resources, and economic prosperity.. The intention is to collect data from QPA operators on sustainability indicators under these headings and to publish the results in an Annual Report each year. The first report will be at the end of 2005, warts and all. As not all SEERAWP members had seen a copy of the Strategy, he would arrange for one to be sent to each member.

- 8.2 SEERAWP welcomed the strategy and the proposed Annual Reports, and asked for a letter conveying this to be sent to QPA.

9 Marine Aggregates

- 9.1 Favourable GV on an application in the East English Channel: The Secretary reported in SEERAWP 05/13 on the favourable GV issued on an application for extraction in the East English Channel (EEC). Stringent conditions have been attached to the decision, including that extraction is to be limited to no more than 12 mt in total in the first 5 years, and any extraction beyond those 5 years is subject to review. The Crown Estate is now able to issue a licence. The Crown Estate could repeat the conditions or be even more restrictive. The Secretary also pointed out that the DEFRA cap on extraction in the EEC at no more than 8.5mt a year in total means that the South East and London which together import over 10mtpa, will continue to need to have supplies augmented from marine sources other than from the EEC.
- 9.2 Now that the first GV has been issued, there could be optimism that some others would follow, and the Secretary drew attention to the applications in the Appendix on the South Coast that have reached determination stage.
- 9.2 Both industry and MPAs were concerned at the 5 year review and its impact on investment decisions by marine operators, and QPA said that an additional restriction of no extraction for a four month herring spawning period also appears about to be imposed on the approved application.. This would have a major impact upon an efficient use of an expensive vessel and its employees.
- 9.3 SEERAWP: agreed to welcome the first favourable GV for an application to extract marine aggregate in the East English Channel.
- 9.4 Marine Bill: the Queen's speech announced the intention to introduce a Marine Bill in parliament. Brian Marker said that he did not know what was proposed, but there is an inter-departmental meeting on 22 July, at which it is intended that the Bill content will be mapped out. He would keep SEERAWP informed. However, in his opinion the more important impending legislation is the draft Marine Directive issued by the European Commission, which industry should study.

10 London: Draft SPG on Design & Construction

- 10.1 The Secretary reported in SEERAWP 05/14 on a draft Supplementary Planning Guidance on Sustainable Design and Construction issued by the Mayor of London. This sets out 'essential standards' required, and a second tier of the Mayor's preferred standards. In the text on materials, the draft says that developers should procure materials locally wherever practical to reduce transport impacts, and acknowledges that within London opportunities to source new materials are few. However, it seeks to establish as an essential standard that 30% of materials by mass used in development in London are to be sourced from within 35 miles of each site. The Mayor's preferred standard raises this to 50%. It is simply not practical to procure 30% of London's aggregate needs from within 35 miles of the capital, bearing in mind its heavy reliance on imports of hard rock and marine aggregate.
- 10.2 SEERAWP rejected the SPG proposals as wholly inappropriate for aggregates and felt that a letter from SEERAWP to the GLA would be inadequate. Confirmation is needed that these standards, in so far as they apply to aggregates, will be withdrawn. The Regional Assembly were asked to take this up with the GLA, perhaps at the pan regional meeting which would include the Eastern Region.

11 ODPM Legislation & Research

Brian Marker reported that:

- 11.1 MPS1 Annexes : these were awaiting clearance by the Minister amongst all the other papers seeking to beat the 21 July deadline before the recess. He could not say whether this would be successful, but if so the consultation would begin in August and would last for 12 weeks.
- 11.2 Guidelines Second Monitoring Report: the report has been issued for TSG and NCG meetings. SEERAWP members could advise their representatives at TSG or NCG of their views.
- 11.3 TSG & NCG: the TSG meeting will take place on 23 June, and the agenda is set out in SEERAWP 05/15. A date for NCG has not been settled, but ODPM would prefer a date in September rather than October.
- 11.4 New Fees Regime for Monitoring Mineral and Landfill Permissions: copies of this consultation paper have been issued, with views to be submitted by 1 September. The intention is for the new regime to come into effect on 6 April 2006.
- 11.5 The Role of Imports to UK Aggregate Supply: SEERAWP 05/15 summarised the report findings. At 12mt, exports were 4 times the volume of aggregate imported.
- 11.6 Consultation on Development of Research Programme: ODPM has taken into account SEERAWP response to the consultation as set out in the Annex to SEERAWP 05/15. The June update of ODPM research was issued at the meeting

12 Any Other Business

- 12.1 The Chairman reported on the Inquiry on the proposed South Downs National Park, which began in November 2003 and ended in December 2004. The Inspector's report is expected by the end of 2005, the Secretary of State could make a decision in Spring 2006 and the National Park Authority be established by April 2007. However, it is not known now whether there will be a National Park, the boundaries are not clear – a number of alternatives having been canvassed, and (irrespective of the above) the timetable for a decision is unknown. Richard Read pointed out that if modifications to the boundary are made, this could slow down the process, and it should be noted that the New Forest National Park Authority was in office for a year before it became an MPA.

13 Date of next Meeting

- 13.1 It was agreed that the next meeting would be held on Monday 5 September at 10 30 am. The venue will be room 6A/B at Ashdown House, 123 Victoria St, London. MRG/OMG will meet in the same room that afternoon at 2.00pm.