SEEAWP South East England Aggregates Working Party

Technical Secretary: [redacted]

Address: c/o Strategic Planning, Hampshire County Council, First Floor, EII Court West, The Castle, Winchester, SO23 8UD

Tel: [redacted] **Email:** [redacted]

Minutes of the meeting of SEEAWP on the 14 November 2019 at Hampshire County Council

Attendees:

[redacted]

Chairman
SEEAWP Technical Secretary
SEEAWP Secretariat
Hampshire/JCEB/IOW
West Sussex
Surrey
Surrey
Oxfordshire
Oxfordshire
East Sussex
Kent
Buckinghamshire
SDNPA
West Berkshire
Milton Keynes
Minerals Products Association
Brett
BAA/Summerleaze
Tarmac
Cemex
Grundons
Day Group
Aggregate Industries
Crown Estate

1. Introduction and Apologies

Apologies were received from [redacted] (Milton Keynes), [redacted] (Medway), [redacted] (Hampshire), [redacted] (West Berkshire), [redacted] (Aggregate Industries), [redacted] (Crown Estate, Royal Haskoning DHV)

2. Minutes and related matters

2.1 Minutes of 27 June 2019 Meeting

It was agreed that the sense of the following statement be integrated in to Minute 3.1 (wharf capacity) to better reflect the discussion.

‘[redacted] (Crown Estate) view is that capacity on the wharf side is not a problem it is on ship side. Ship capacity is being replaced by larger vessels. The industry is investing in ships that will be constrained by the lock gates at Shoreham. Most dredging is taken straight to a site for processing (not ship). Over a 25% of dredged materials is going to Benelux countries. He thinks that the investment in bigger ships will mean more dredged material will end up in EU markets. Look at Crown Estate publication for more details.”

2.2 Progress on actions arising from 27 June meeting

The outstanding actions are:

1. Secretary to circulate PDF version of the SEEAWP LAA Guidance
   [redacted] stated that the SEEAWP Guidance was available on the SEEAWP website.
   https://www.hants.gov.uk/landplanningandenvironment/seeawp

2. MPAs to ensure their respective planning authorities are aware of the MPA/POS Mineral Safeguarding Guidance; the final version needs circulating which enable the MPAs to present it to their respective planning authority liaison groups.

Action 1: Secretary to circulate PDF version of the SEEAWP LAA Guidance

Secretary note: Guidance circulated on 6 December 2019

Action 2: Relevant mineral planning authorities to ensure their respective local planning authorities are aware of the POS/MPA Mineral Safeguarding Guidance.

https://www.mineralproducts.org/documents/MPA_POS_Minerals_Safeguarding_Guidance_Document.pdf

2.3 Correspondence

The Secretary drew attention to the correspondence attached to the Agenda concerning the Heathrow Expansion and Leicestershire LAA. He also referred to the evidence of possible sand and gravel resource within the Heathrow site that could be surplus to the project’s requirement and should not be lost to the market.

[redacted] stated Aggregate Industries are in discussions about the Colnbrook rail depot and a possible relocation.

The Secretary advised that the reference to the long-term aggregates supply from Leicestershire needs referring to the NCG

Action 3: Secretary to write to MHCLG about the Leicestershire issue.

Secretary note: Matter raised at AWP Secretaries meeting on 19 December 2019 – MHCLG considering the organisation of a National Aggregates Coordinating Group (NCG).

3. Local Aggregates Assessment 2019

The Secretary advised that the Miscellaneous Notes (as amended by the mineral planning authorities and appended) be the basis of the LAA presentations and taken as read.

The Secretary referred to some general issues:

1. LAAs should include LAA Rates for all supply options as advised in the Guidance
2. LAA Rates should not be treated as confidential as they are based on average sales (subsequently modified in some cases) and can be published in LAAs including the summary table (Dashboard).

Buckinghamshire County Council

[redacted] explained the Buckinghamshire growth forecasts reflect the district development growth forecasts.

[redacted] was surprised that sales are as low as reported as the Berryhill Farm sales are approximately 800,000 tonnes. [redacted] stated that the Hertfordshire side of the site has been extracting more than the Buckinghamshire side.

[redacted] queried why SSG data is not published, but [redacted] stated that the LAA uses combined S&G data to respect confidentiality. The Chairman suggested that a footnote be added to the table.

The Secretary added that the LAA did not take into account post 2018 information including the impact of the Buckinghamshire Mineral Plan adopted earlier in 2019. [redacted] said the LAA would be the last LAA for Buckinghamshire County Council (Buckinghamshire would be a unitary authority in April 2020) – this should be added to the conclusion.

The Chairman asked that that a LAA Rate for Recycled/Secondary Aggregates (R/SA) be included.

Central and Eastern Berkshire (CEB)

[redacted] explained how the LAA rate was calculated, she added the R/SA Rate would be transposed from the text to the Dashboard.

[redacted] asked about soft sand resources and [redacted] responded a soft sand study couldn't find an adequate resource.

East Sussex

[redacted] explained that there is insufficient data to calculate a 10-year average sales as a basis for the LAA Rate. Furthermore the SSG Rate is halved as 50% of material goes to Kent.

[redacted] challenged the logic of this approach. [redacted] stated that historically when working out the landbank it has been divided by 2, and they feel that it's a fair representation of what is happening. However, [redacted] added that Kent seem not to have adjusted their figures to reflect this.

[redacted] explained that review of the Minerals and Waste Plan was underway and the (halved) SSG LAA rate represents the amount which needs to be provided for the Plan Area. There is an indication that the Plan Rate may need to double the LAA Rate.

[redacted] queried some errors in Table 5 in the Annual Report. [redacted] agreed.

There was further discussion on this matter and the Chair stated that there needs to be a reconciliation or footnote in the LAA. [redacted] added she was agreeable to explaining the issue in a footnote, but won't be changing the LAA Rate and the matter would revisited in a SoCG with Kent.

The Secretary noted that LAA Rates are estimates of demand for aggregates based upon average sales and adjusted for local circumstances. The problem for East Sussex is that the resource is running out, which is a supply matter and that may have to be resolved by the rest of the region taking up the strain. However, [redacted] and others queried whether that issue was being recorded.

[redacted] stated that East Sussex understand that if they don't have land won material, demand needs to be met from other sources. Soft sand is being imported from Surrey, Kent, and West Sussex mainly by road.

The Chair asked about the rail depot in East Sussex as the source of the material seems to be from Cliffe (Medway) and this might be 'double counted'. [redacted] said that this is referred to in the LAA. The Secretary added that double counting was an issue for aggregates monitoring (AM) and will have to scrutinised more fully in the future.

[redacted] asks to receive the AWP letter before Christmas.

Action 3: Secretary to write to East Sussex as soon as possible. The AWP letter would include a resume of the discussion at the meeting.

NB Actioned

<u>Hampshire</u>

[redacted] advised SEEAWP about a 'missing site' which meant some revisions to the LAA (and AM information).

[redacted] queried the recorded wharf capacity issues in Southampton. However, [redacted] added that the capacity data is recorded to give an impression to SEEAWP about future problems rather than an exact picture. [redacted] stated that there was an issue in obtaining capacity data from operators. The Secretary added that SEEAWP is dependent on operators' views of capacity and urged their engagement on the issue.

The Chair noted that R/SA sales are reducing and queried whether the LAA rate would change. [redacted] replied that this will be looked at properly in a full review next year.

<u>Isle of Wight (IoW)</u>

The Secretary said the IoW had referred in past LAAs the issue of the chain ferry and it impact on dredger size and wharf capacity on which the Island could be increasingly dependent on.

Kent

[redacted] and [redacted] queried the SSG 27.7 year landbank as the method of estimation seemed contrary to guidance. [redacted] stated that he has used 2018 sales to show the point that the landbank is artificially high. The Secretary agreed that the 27-year figure is quite misleading as when using the LAA rate the landbank is 9.5 yrs.

There followed some discussion about the calculations in the Kent LAA. [redacted] agreed this would be re-examined so a consistent LAA methodology is used across the region.

NB A revised Kent LAA Dashboard is being circulated

Oxfordshire

[redacted] stated that some minor errors in Table 5 of the Annual Report and the Secretary confirmed these would be revised and requested for clarification on current planning applications. The Chair pointed out an error on the dashboard in that the crushed rock LAA Rate should be 0.778mt

Medway

The Secretary advised SEEAWP that [redacted] was unable to attend, but explained that Medway has only one active quarry with a large landbank. The Medway import facilities are very important in the region and elsewhere. The LAA rate is currently much higher than capacity when combining Medway and Kent data.

The Chair added that there are three 3 LAA rates missing.

Milton Keynes

[redacted] stated that the LAA rates for recycled aggregates and the rail depot could only be calculated on a maximum of 7-years data, however, the Secretary responded that, nevertheless this would be useful.

Surrey

The Secretary thought that the RSA figures seemed high

West Berks

The Secretary thought that rail depot capacity in West Berkshire maybe an issue as Hampshire and the rest of Berkshire are dependent on West Berkshire rail depots.

[redacted] added that this is a general problem with rail depots as there is an issue of rail freight paths on the network, particularly in the South East.

West Sussex

The Secretary said that there had been discussions between [redacted] and [redacted] on the LAA. [redacted] said that some revised wording has been suggested. He added that the LAA Rate is derived from a 10-year sales average which will be reviewed yearly and that any proposals will be judged against their merits. He agreed to add a reference to a landbank based on a 3-year average sales. The Chair queried whether Table 21 should make clear that the LAA Rates chosen were the maximum annual requirement figures.

[redacted] further added that the wording he proposed would be reflected in the Dashboard and the Summary. [redacted] agreed to circulate revised text changes

NB It was agreed that the LAAs 2020 should be considered by SEEAWP in the reverse alphabetical order.

Action 3: The Secretary to write to all mineral planning authorities about SEEAWP's views on their respective LAAs

Secretary note: Letters sent last week of December 2019

4. SEEAWP Annual Report 2018

The Secretary explained that the Report needed some corrections of the errors indicated by members although it was unlikely the changes would change the conclusions.

The Chair suggested that the last paragraph of the Executive Summary should paraphrase the conclusions in the main text. The conclusion should also stress that although overall the South East makes a full contribution to aggregates needs it should explain there is some variation over the region particularly as some mineral planning authorities are not meeting the 7-year landbank requirement. There was discussion if this caveat be expanded but it was thought that these details are already in the main text, particularly Section 12 – Local Aggregates Assessments.

There was some discussion about how plan allocations might contribute to aggregates needs and be added to the Executive Summary. However, it was noted that this matter is addressed to some degree in the text, but it might be a matter that next year's LAAs could cover more fully. However, [redacted] thought that the plan periods could be as much as 20 years and therefore it would be difficult to say what time the application comes forwards. Even so, the Secretary suggested the information might be imperfect, but it would provide an idea of potential reserves.

Action 4: Mineral planning authorities to advise the Secretary by the end of November about further corrections to the Annual Report. The Secretary will make amendments and submit it to MHCLG in December

5. MHCLG Update

The Secretary reported that there had been a meeting of the AWP Secretaries with MHCLG ([redacted] and [redacted]) and another is arranged for 19 December. There had also been a meeting of a Steering Group for the AM 2019 survey.

It seems the results of the survey may not be available until the autumn and that could have an impact on the SEEAWP work programme, including preparation of LAAs. Some pilots for the survey have been taking place on data gathering, and it seems the 'returns' might be submitted directly to the MHCLG contractor. [redacted] informed everyone that the survey Form A would be processed through Survey Monkey and Form B via Delta. It was noted that R/SA and Rail Depot data would not be collected by the national survey although SEEAWP would undertake its own early in 2020.

It was agreed that the AWP Secretaries and the MPAs need to have a role in checking the data.

The Secretary added that there is no further information on processing new AWP Contracts and they may not be in place by April 2020.

[redacted] asked whether the confidentiality clause that has been added to SEEAWP's AM surveys will be applied to the 2019 survey and asked that this query be fed back to the AM Survey Steering Group ([redacted]).

6. SEEAWP work programme 2020

Although there is some uncertainty about key matters (AM Survey timetable and AWP Contract) and a work programme cannot be finalised, a SEEAWP meeting will be arranged for April.

7. Any other Business

The Secretary said that a SoCG for West Berkshire is to be submitted soon and it was agreed this would be dealt with at the next meeting.

The Secretary noted there had been issues for members of the AWP to receive documents via Dropbox and wished to be advised in due course who needed material circulated in another way.

[redacted] asked about the way SoCGs were to be processed by SEEAWP. The Secretary said that it had been agreed at a past meetings that if there was no suitable meeting for them to be considered it would done through email.

8 Next Meeting

2nd April 2020 - Hampshire County Council, Mitchell Room – 14.00-17.00

Actions

1: Secretary to circulate PDF version of the SEEAWP LAA Guidance

2: Relevant mineral planning authorities to ensure their respective local planning authorities are aware of the POS/MPA Mineral Safeguarding Guidance.

3: Secretary to write to MHCLG about the Leicestershire issue.

4: Mineral planning authorities to advise the Secretary about further correction to the Annual Report who will make amendments and submit it to MHCLG in December

Miscellaneous notes on LAAs 2019 – revised

Note: Includes revisions from East Sussex and Buckinghamshire, and since SEEAWP meeting those from Oxon, CEB, Hants, IoW.

Buckinghamshire

Bucks primarily produces SSG (*Note: Bucks has two producing SS quarry)* and combined S&G sales are lower that past average sales. The landbank is 10.65mt which is 13 years based on LAA Rate 10-year rolling average.

Major demand pressures acknowledged, but difficult to assess impact.

Imports SSG/SS/CR are important, but no active rail depot (*SEEAWP Annual Report notes in Planning Decisions - Appendix G – an application for a depot at Thorney Mill Rail Sidings)*

Mineral allocations used up, but replacement mineral plan adopted 2019, but not factored into LAA

Central and Eastern Berkshire *Note LAA d*oes *not cover Slough*

Sales of sand and gravel and recycled aggregate increased in 2018.

10-year average sales gave the most representative LAA rate of 0.628Mt, in the context of economic uncertainty and economic forecasting. This is a reduction from the 0.71Mt set in 2017 and will be important going forward with the Minerals and Waste Plan.

On the basis of the 2018 LAA rate, the landbank stands at 9.3years for sand and gravel.

There is likely be an increase in future aggregate demand to account for the increased level of planned future infrastructure delivery, but this is set in the context of current economic uncertainty. The 2018 LAA Rate of 0.628MT is considered a realistic estimation of demand and will be revisited yearly to establish whether Central and Eastern Berkshire Authorities are making a full contribution to the Managed Aggregate Supply System.

East Sussex, South Downs and Brighton & Hove

Small SSG resource – reserve of 0.508 mt and landbank of 1.5 years. Sales are comparable with the past. SS reserves 0.35 mt located entirely within the National Park at one site which has been inactive for at least 5 years.

Dependent on imports, some by rail, which have increased and marine/imported CR/S&G which are comparable with past average levels.

New aggregates processing and distribution facility to commence in 2020. (*Development of Fishers Wharf, East Quay, Newhaven)*

Mineral plan under preparation

Hampshire

Sales of sand and gravel and soft sand have increased. There continues to be landbank issues, however permissions granted in 2019 will alleviate this issue for sharp sand and gravel. Landbank issues remain for soft sand.

Although still not meeting our local plan rate requirement. This will be assessed as part of the plan review to be undertaken next year.

The plan rate for sand and gravel is 1.28Mt, a range of economic growth forecasts were applied to the 2018 sales, 3 years av sales and 10 year av sales. The 2018 LAA rate is based on 2018 sales AT 0.92Mt. The same approach was used for soft sand. The LAA rate was again based on 2018 sales, which is very similar to the 3 year average - but this was 0.1MT above.

Sales of recycled and secondary aggregate have reduced for the 4th year running.

Sales of marine sand and gravel have also reduced.

It has come to light that Mortimer Quarry is now operational (commenced in 2018), so we are in the process of updating the LAA. There was an issue with the legal agreement for the site, so the resources haven't been included in the Hampshire reserves to date. The inclusion of this site improves the landbank for sand and gravel to 7.88 years for all sand and gravel (which is different to what is in the AM report). Although this doesn't improve the soft sand landbank figures.

We currently have issues getting capacity returns for Hampshire's wharves, but the information we do have indicates that they are running near capacity.

In terms of sites, Roeshot has been approved, Kingsley going to committee shortly. There are discussions underway regarding other sites which we are hopeful will come forward in the near future.

Isle of Wight

Total sales of aggregates on the Isle of Wight have shown a slight increase on previous years.

Land won and recycled aggregate have both increased

LAA rate for S&G based on 3-year average sales, which gives landbank of 8.6 years. Plan apportionment rate was 100Tt, there is very little difference between 3 year and 10 years average sales. When looking at economic forecasts and recent sales, the 3 year sales rate appeared most appropriate and was the higher of the two.

Recycled aggregate at the highest level for 10 years

Crushed rock and marine won sand & gravel have decreased.

When measured against the IoW plan rate they do not meet their minimum requirement, however when the 2018 LAA rate is applied the minimum sand and gravel provision rate is met.

Aiming to produce a new minerals plan in the future however currently focussing on the local plan

No sites came forward in 2018 and one wharf closed in 2018, raising confidentiality issues.

Kent

Only a 'dashboard' submitted.

Sales in 2018 below averages except for CR rail depot sales.

LAA Rates for sand and gravel based on 10myear average provides for land banks of 17 and 28 years for SS and SSG respectively. CR data confidential. Increasin g reliance on imports and noted capacity at wharves and depots have sufficient capacity

NB Data and conclusions appear to conflict with AM tables in Annual Report

Oxfordshire

Both sharp sand and gravel and soft sand aggregates sales levels are higher than past 10 and 3-year averages. Crushed rock sales are higher than the ten year sales average but lower than the current 3 year average

The SSG LAA Rate is unchanged from previous LAA as current sales are below it – 13-years landbank

SS revised to reflect recent increase in sales and to provide for future demand – 13-year landbank

CR – also revised to reflect sales and to provide for future demand - 10-year landbank

Rail depot – mainly CR imports – data confidentiality, but capacity margin limited

Mineral plan Part 2 – will address outstanding requirements, but some sites permissions pending commencement and Annual Report indicates applications pending

Medway

Only one active quarry and with an inactive there is proportionally a large landbank.

Marine aggregates and imports of rock by sea and rail (there is a query about the data for the latter) important locally and regionally. Capacity for growth *Possible data consistency issues need resolving – see Kent above.*

Milton Keynes

Limited no. of SSG sites and current sales are comparable/lower than past average sales. There is no SS but a rail depot imports SS and CR - some data confidential

LAA Rate based on 10-year sales average and there is a 5-year landbank.

Mineral plan allocates 4 quarries and support expansion of the depot sites

Surrey

All aggregates sales are above previous averages - SS landbank 18 years; SSG landbank 5.5 years based on LAA Rate close to average sales.

Only one rail depot but nos. of neighbouring mpa facilities supply Surrey

Supply of SSG can be maintained in short to medium term, but longer term will be dependent more on R/SA, imported marine (Thames wharves), SS from other mpas and CR from neighbouring rail depots.

New mineral plan to commence preparation 2020.

West Berkshire

SSG/SS sales at lowest on record. SSG reserves largely bound up in one quarry. LAA Rate maintained from last LAA and above average sales – 14-year land bank

SS have very limited reserve < one-year land bank

Mineral plan under preparation to address a requirement of 0.9mt SSG and 0.8mt SS

Rail depot LAA Rate based on 3-year average sales – limited capacity margin.

West Sussex

Limited SSG sales low - one site plus incidental sales from SS quarries – land bank of 23 years

SS sales about 0.3mt in 2018 and above past average levels – LAA Rate based on 10-year sales average adjusted for local considerations gives landbank of 6 years

Imported aggregates through depots and wharves - LAA Rates for CR, 0.9mt and S&G 1.7mt reflect relative importance of these sources. Wharves and depots appear to have a capacity margin of +30%

Adopted mineral plan but a review of soft sand DPD underway.