

Style Definition: Style1

**Minutes of the South Wales Regional
Aggregates Working Party
Wednesday 27TH February 2008 at**

Present: -

M Hooker, (Chair) – Consultant
S Bool, (Secretary) – Bridgend County Borough Council
I Thomas – National Stone Centre/N Wales RAWP Secretary
C Warburton – Welsh Assembly Government
O Jones – Rhondda Cynon Taff County Borough Council
C Morgan – Brecon Beacons NPA
G Dorrington – Ceredigion County Council
M Lucas – Vale of Glamorgan Council
A Wilcock – Torfaen County Borough Council
M Davies - Monmouthshire County Council
L Healey – Blaenau Gwent County Borough Council
C A Williams – Pembrokeshire County Council
M Russell – QPA (BMAPA)
T Gilman – BAA
R Millard - QPA
M Frampton – QPA (Hanson)
M Davies – Monmouthshire County Council
H Towns - Carmarthenshire County Council
M Dunne – Pembrokeshire NPA
G Bishop – WET
L Christian – Newport County Council
M Lewis - EAW

1. Apologies

A Wilkes - EAW
N R Morgan – Neath Port Talbot County Borough Council
M Lawer – QPA (Tarmac)
S Martin – WAG
R Amundson – Caerphilly County Borough Council
M Wrigley – The Crown Estate

2. Minutes of the last meeting – 17 October 2007

Agreed as a correct record.

3. Matters arising

Para 4 – SB confirmed the AS2007 forms had been circulated to operators. RM to circulate an internal note to QPA members.

RM

Para 5 – IT confirmed he had followed up the query regarding PFA

<p>stockpiles.</p> <p>MH advised he was continuing as SWRAWP Chair for an indefinite period.</p> <p>4. <u>Draft RTS – Consultation Report</u></p> <p>SB advised late responses had been received from Ceredigion County Council, Haverfordwest Town Council and Llangyfelach Community Council.</p> <p>MH introduced the manner in which the meeting would consider the report on a page by page basis picking out significant issues.</p> <p>Page 1 - Barry Town Council</p> <p>CW reported the WAG were attempting to address the public perception issue of the adverse effects of marine dredging.</p> <p>Page 16 – Vale of Glamorgan</p> <p>Regarding marine dredging wharves, it was noted the Barry wharf (currently disused) would be unlikely to be affected by the harbour redevelopment scheme. Nonetheless, it was acknowledged all MPA's needed to ensure their LDP's sought protection of such facilities. CW also reported problems with a wharf in her area which was causing some loss of amenity through dust generation. This highlighted the need to give careful consideration to such issues.</p> <p>The provisional estimate of > 10 mt of pfa at Aberthaw Power Station was discussed and ML felt the estimate should be much greater. TG felt such material was a valuable by-product and should not be disposed of without consideration as a cement substitute. It was agreed a feasibility study would be of benefit to examine the competence of such material as an aggregate and the market for its use. ML confirmed <u>that the new processing plant, once operational, would accept 50% of the ash arisings p.a., and that 40% of the ash processed would be re-used as fuel. Therefore only 20% of actual ash arisings would be used as fuel. The plant in question is still under construction.</u></p> <p>Page 18 – Carmarthenshire County Council</p> <p>On the National Parks issue, HT questioned the results of the IMAECA environmental capacity tool which indicated some areas within the BBNP were less sensitive than areas within Carms. This situation appeared to undermine the WAG policy position on National Parks. MH questioned whether or not the SWRAWP should ask WAG for clarification, and CM felt there was a need for internal discussion within WAG to identify what the current legislation meant and how it should</p>	<p>ALL</p> <p>CW/WAG</p>
---	--

be interpreted. CW confirmed the WAG were happy to let MPA's resolve this at the local level thereby providing some autonomy and flexibility. RM referred to one quarry in the BBNP which was an important supplier to settlements in the Park and this scenario should be recognised in the RTS which should not be over-prescriptive.

TG felt that National Parks had dealt with quarrying historically and questioned whether or not any modern day conflicts needed to be resolved at the regional and local level. MH felt dialogue needed to take place but clear national guidelines were required. The general consensus seemed to be that decisions should be taken at the local level under the aegis of clear guidance.

WAG

IT raised the technical/practical detail of the location of several quarries along the periphery of the BBNP needs to be the subject of some research. CW questioned whether or not the SWRAWP needed a clear steer on the question of quarrying within NPs. IMAECA can only be used as a tool. The objective is a managed supply over the plan period but perhaps options need to be considered to achieve a resolution which is fit for purpose.

RM confirmed the issue of confidentiality was still generating concern within the QPA and it was not easily resolved. The issue, however, was under review.

Page 19 – LDP Timetable

It was acknowledged it was difficult to tie in with the development plan process as every MPA had a different timetable. This made it impossible for the RTS to match the different plan periods.

MF queried the calculation of the period of landbank and it was confirmed that the criterion was for a minimum 15 year landbank at the start of the RTS process, with reviews at five yearly intervals.

CAW was surprised no annual monitoring of the RTS was to take place. SB confirmed the annual surveys would provide the normal statistical update on sales/reserves.

Page 22

Reference was made to the concerns raised by Pembrokeshire National Park members over marine dredging but it should be acknowledged that any decrease in tonnage may increase pressure on exploitation of land based sand and gravel resources.

Page 87 (Appendix 5)

It was agreed to delete the first sentence at the top of page 116

IT

<p><u>regarding the impact of dredging on coastal processes.</u></p>	
<p><u>Regarding the status of the RTS, CW confirmed the RTS will not be a WAG policy document endorsed by the Minister.</u></p>	
<p><u>5. RTS Research – Assessment of Aggregate Resources for Inclusion in LDPs</u></p>	
<p>CW confirmed the WAG research budget would be discussed at a forthcoming meeting in April. At present there are significant demands on the small budget from marine and other issues. Hence, any funding for carrying out research on alternative aggregate resources would be extremely limited, certainly for the next 12 months.</p>	
<p>Following a discussion on what information was required to identify such resources it was agreed the BGS resource maps, plus industry and local knowledge, could be used to provide a sound evidence base for the purposes of the LDP. (MPAs are directed to the BGS website to access the maps)</p>	
<p>As an aside, CW confirmed the Coal TAN was out for consultation until the 23 May, 2008. CW agreed to check if this affected the ‘purdah’ period in the run-in to the elections in May.</p>	
<p><u>6. Officer/Member Training</u></p>	<p>ALL</p>
<p>MH highlighted the need for training particularly the post election period when new members would be in post. This issue has been raised on several occasions and MH advised he was giving a paper on this issue to the RTPI conference in June.</p>	<p>CW</p>
<p>RM voiced QPA concerns regarding the <u>awareness/naivety</u> of politicians who fail to recognise the importance of the industry to the economy. He felt perhaps an element of the Aggregates Tax should be diverted to training or the setting up of joint working arrangements between small unitary authorities. It was agreed MH would report back to the next meeting on any new initiatives/progress.</p>	
<p><u>7. Any Other Business</u></p>	
<p>(i) IT gave an update on the RTS process in North Wales. The draft RTS is currently out for consultation more or less in the same format as the SWRAWP issue. There is a 4th March, 2008 deadline for comments.</p>	<p>CW</p>
<p>(ii) IT reported he was working on the review of the mineral planning system post Verney. Whilst this was essentially for England it also included views from Wales.</p>	<p>MH</p>
<p>(iii) TG – on behalf of the BAA thanked all members of the group for</p>	

their hard work in preparing the RTS over the last three years.

(iv) OJ (RCT) confirmed he would forward his Council's views on the RTS as soon as possible.

(v) LH (Blaenau Gwent) advised her Council had endorsed the RTS.

(vi) CW referred to the Mining Waste Directive which is currently the subject of a consultation exercise. This new legislation would need to be given consideration but it was still uncertain what part the planning system would play in the new process.

(vii) SB referred to the geology conference that is being held between the 24th – 26th June, 2008, in Cardiff. Further details can be obtained from Jeremy.elvins@lafargecement.co.uk

8. Date of Next Meeting

Member Forum (Officers & Members only) – 14th March 2008 at 1.00pm (inc. lunch at 12.15pm), Innovation Centre, Bridgend Science Park, Bridgend

SWRAWP – 17th September 2008 at 10.00 a.m.