

**SWRAWP**  
**Minutes of the RTS review Sub Committee**  
**15<sup>th</sup> June, 2011**

<b><u>Present:</u> -</b>	<b><u>Action:</u> -</b>
<p>Martin Hooker, Consultant Steve Bool, BCBC Jon Lane, BCBC Ken Hobden, MPA Mark Frampton, MPA-Hanson Ruth Amundson, Caerphilly County Borough Council Hugh Towns, Carmarthenshire CC Adrian Wilcock, Torfaen CBC Adrian James, CCW Jo Smith, Welsh Government</p> <p><b>1. <u>Apologies</u></b></p> <p>Karen Maddock Jones, CCW Tony Gilman, BAA Carolyn Drayton, Environment Agency Wales Neville Morgan, Neath PTCBC Malcolm Lawer, MPA-Tarmac</p> <p>The sub committee were given a presentation which set out the current position regarding the RTS under the following headings:- (i) where are we now? (ii) assessing demand (iii) environmental capacity (iv) recent research</p> <p>To start, discussion took place about the need for a full review given the current landbank and the low output levels caused by the economic recession. There was some debate as to whether or not a straightforward update would be more cost effective than a full review. Having considered the views of those present it was agreed to carry out a review based on any outline strategy to be prepared under the SWRAWP contract.</p> <p>The principle of applying the 15 year minimum landbank (minimum 10 years plus 5 years until any first review under the LDP regulations) was questioned compared with the requirement in para 49 of MTAN1 for a minimum 10 year landbank for crushed rock to be maintained during the entire plan period. It was acknowledged LDP's were required to be reviewed every 5 years and this included mineral issues. Consequently any authority making provision for only a 15 year landbank at the outset could review this after a short period of time to reflect the need for additional provision to be made.</p>	

The sand and gravel(land won) figures in the RTS for Carmarthen were noted as being incorrect.Such discrepancies would need to be picked up in any review.

The application of the apportionment process to the relatively small geographical areas of the 18 unitary authorities in the SWRAWP area was considered to be difficult.Such small areas did not lend themselves well to sub-regional apportionment due to cross boundary supply patterns with analysis of landbank and sales figures made difficult by the confidentiality rules intended to keep individual site statistics discreet.Whilst it was acknowledged sub regional apportionment to the former county areas might be more appropriate this could not be implemented easily through LDP's.Regrettably there was currently no other mechanism to deliver this process.

There was some discussion about the need for collaborative working,in particular,how Newport would be able to meet its RTS apportionment figure now given the actions of Caerphilly CBC,Mons CC,Torfaen CBC and Blaenau Gwent CBC to-date.The RTS foreword was however clear that the RTS needed to be embodied in LDP's.

The methodology used to underpin the RTS was discussed in comparison with other processes in other regions in England.Most appeared to use reference to past sales as a baseline for projected sales forecasts.

It was noted the Cambridge econometric model for forecasting demand has not been used for some years.

The limitations of IMAECA,the environmental capacity tool,were outlined.It was agreed any change to the weightings would,subject to legal advice,need to be SA'd.Overall, it was felt it was very difficult to identify a suitable mechanism to determine environmental capacity.Environmental designations were obviously important but could not be considered alone as socio-economic factors also need to be taken into account to achieve sustainable development.

In view of the foregoing it was agreed the following recommendations be referred to the full SWAWP meeting in October on the issues that need to be addressed to discharge the SWRAWP contract.

## **Recommendations for the content of the outline draft strategy for the RTS review:-**

### **1.Baseline data**

The data contained in AM2009(the 4 year national survey) be used as the baseline data.

### **2.RTS methodology**

The criteria and/or methodologies for assessing landbank provision, sub-regional demand, and apportionment to be re-assessed and alternatives/options considered if more appropriate for S Wales.

### **3.Stakeholder involvement**

The nature and extent of stakeholder involvement be determined including preparation of consultation reports.

### **4.Transparency**

The measures to ensure transparency of process to be defined.

<p><b>5.Status of document.</b> The current status of the document to be clarified if necessary and reviewed.</p> <p><b>6.C&amp;D waste/secondary aggregates.</b> The collection of robust data needs to be undertaken to be able to top slice the figures from the regional hard rock demand figures.The use of “top slicing” needs to be examined to see if it is still an appropriate method.</p> <p><b>7.Marine</b> The contribution of marine –won sand and gravel to the overall use of aggregate demand needs to be examined.</p> <p><b>8.Collaborative working</b> The mechanisms to ensure all authorities sign up to collaborative working to deliver any apportionment needs to be clarified.</p> <p><b>9.Consumption per head</b> The consumption figure of 4.4 tonnes per head used in the current RTS methodology to assess demand needs to be checked/re-assessed(KH to check)</p> <p><b>10.Environmental capacity</b> The use of IMEACA should continue but be interpreted in the context of local circumstances.</p> <p><b>11.Geological resource data</b> The gaps in the baseline BGS data need to be examined and rectified.Important rock types such as high psv sandstone and high purity limestone need to be assessed and the merits/implications of including separate landbanks for these rock types considered in depth.</p> <p><b>12.Critical path analysis</b> A flowchart/spreadsheet needs to be developed showing the timescale and programme of actions that need to take place to ensure the RTS review is completed and adopted by late 2013.</p> <p><b>13.Level of spatial definition</b> All stakeholders should be able to identify the planning unit to which local apportionment applies.</p> <p><b>14.SEA.</b> Strategic environmental assessment will need to be carried out including scoping.</p> <p>The opportunity to discuss the RTS review further at LA officer level at forthcoming POSW meetings was highlighted. It was agreed the minutes,including the outline draft strategy for the RTS review(above), be circulated to the sub committee members before the next SWRAWP meeting scheduled for the 5.10.11.</p>	<p><b>KH</b></p>
---	------------------