

**Minutes of the South Wales Regional
Aggregates Working Party –
RTS Sub Committee
Wednesday 17th October 2007 at 09:30 a.m.
Civic Offices, Angel Street, Bridgend(draft)**

<u>Present:</u> -	Action: -
<p>Martin Hooker (Chairman) – Bridgend County Borough Council Steve Bool (Secretary) – Bridgend County Borough Council Neville Morgan – Neath Port Talbot County Borough Council Ian Thomas-National Stone Centre Tony Gilman – British Aggregates Association Richard Millard – QPA M Lucas – Vale of Glamorgan Council Carolyn Warburton-Welsh Assembly Government Sue Martin – Welsh Assembly Government Ruth Amundson – Caerphilly County Borough Council Karen Maddock-Jones-CCW M Lewis – Environment Agency Wales Carol A Williams-Pembrokeshire CC</p>	
<p><u>Apologies</u></p>	
<p>Julie Kirk – Pembrokeshire NPA Peter Bide – CDLG (London) Adrian Wilcock – Torfaen County Borough Council</p>	
<p>2. <u>Minutes of the last meeting 30 July 2007</u></p>	
<p>These were agreed as a correct record.</p>	
<p>3. <u>Matters arising</u></p>	
<p>None</p>	
<p><u>Draft RTS list of representations received (circulated prior to meeting)</u></p>	
<p>In view of the list of representations received to date, MH referred to a key issues paper produced by SB, which attempted to highlight the key points raised to date. The key issues were as follows:-</p>	
<p>(i) Top-Slicing</p>	
<p>TG re-affirmed the objection of the British Aggregates Association (BAA) to the apportionment chapter and the way in which the aggregates demand figures was top-sliced at a regional rather than</p>	

<p>local level. RM also felt this situation was unsatisfactory and considerable qualification was necessary. It was possible supply difficulties could arise if c & d waste streams replacing primary aggregates dried up. SM reaffirmed that WAG took a strong view that top slicing was necessary and there was no compromise. RM suggested an explanation of the different views be put forward for further consideration.</p> <p>TG highlighted the fact that the amount of c & d waste in Pembrokeshire was very limited and advocated the onus should be on the MPA to acknowledge this at the local level. It was suggested the SWRAWP could only provide guidance not policy. LDP's should provide the policy-input.</p> <p>It was acknowledged the Faber Manswell C & D waste report 2005 did not include a North/South Wales split. CW considered the input of c & d waste to the overall aggregate supply may balance out over time on a pro-rata basis. SM acknowledged that flexibility would introduce uncertainty and the top-slicing approach was already established in England IT advised the regions in England were bigger and more robust figures of c & d waste tonnage were available. It was suggested a pragmatic approach may be to accept a flexible approach now but keep the figures under review during the first five year review period.</p> <p>CAW confirmed that in Pembrokeshire the MPA were requesting information from applicants on all waste processing facilities handling inert waste as requested in TAN 21 Waste.</p> <p>There was no consensus on this issue but it was <u>agreed</u> to adopt a flexible approach which should be kept under review.</p> <p>(ii) UDP Allocations</p> <p>SM considered UDP allocated land for mineral extraction amounted to an extended landbank and these should be considered as commitments once an allocation was made (as per MTAN1 Aggregates). It would be beneficial to produce a parallel table but as yet no data from MPA's is available.</p> <p>It was <u>agreed</u> IT would source the information from local authorities.</p> <p>(iii) Capacity of Marine Reserves</p> <p>MR outlined his views on the main issues. He confirmed permitted capacity does not necessarily reflect the reserve available. Certain licensed areas may have a high off-take but there may be little useful sand/gravel left in the reserve. The view was proffered channel resources should be seen holistically rather than separate English/Welsh reserves. IT felt reference ought to be made to cross-boundary issues in the Channel as all resources/reserves needed to be taken</p>	<p>IT</p>
--	-----------

<p>into account as they may influence the S. Wales region.</p> <p>SM confirmed the Helwick Bank application had been approved. On the wider scene, in order to understand how much reserves are permitted, it was <u>agreed</u> SM/CW would produce a position statement on the current reserves/licences to be able to ascertain total permitted offtake.</p>	<p>SM/CW</p>
<p>(iv) Apportionment</p> <p>Discussion centred on whether or not the QPA proposal for Box A should be an RTS or a local MPA issue. It was also questioned if it needed to be repeated in every recommendation per MPA. It was <u>agreed</u> to include Box A in each recommendation but re-draft the initial sentences.</p>	<p>IT</p>
<p>TG referred to the BAA objection and suggested instead of making statements such as 'No resource allocation', it would be more appropriate to say <u>limited</u> allocation. IT <u>agreed to</u> preface the statement with an appropriate sentence such as 'on the basis of the data available at present'.</p>	<p>IT</p>
<p>(v) National Parks</p> <p>It was questioned whether or not mineral extraction proposals constituted <u>major</u> development, as PPW stated major meant national i.e. UK/all Wales, scale development. It was confirmed the RTS does not rule out all mineral development in National Parks provided it meets the tests. It was agreed it was important to recognise that the local needs of communities in National Parks could be served by quarries within the Park as this would satisfy the proximity principle. It was accepted, however, that other environmental factors needed to be taken into account.</p>	
<p>(vi) High PSV Aggregates</p> <p>There was recognition the RTS needed to allow the exports to England to continue for the immediate future. It was <u>agreed</u> to include a separate landbank for high psv in the first review.</p> <p>M.Lucas raised the question as to whether or not high purity limestone should be considered as a special case as per high psv. It was noted this aggregate is normally used for non-aggregate use i.e. cement/steel manufacture, but can be used for aggregate use as in some Vale of Glamorgan quarries. It was <u>agreed</u> this would be considered in the RTS review.</p>	<p>IT</p>
<p>(vii) Use of Secondary Aggregates / c & d Waste</p> <p>Following on from discussions relating to issue 1, ML referred to the</p>	

current EAW survey which is scheduled to be completed soon with a launch in November. The survey reported an excellent response rate of 70%. ML confirmed the main purpose of the survey was to identify the composition of construction waste (all streams). One of the main findings has been the significant re-use of materials on-site compared with previous trends. TG reiterated the level of high end-use for secondary aggregates was generally low but ML disagreed with this view based on the survey results. RM sought to clarify the level of secondary aggregates used for high end use but current data was not as robust to make clear decisions.

4. RTS Timetable

SB outlined the provisional timetable as set out on the agenda. It was confirmed the Member Forum was on the 31st October and not 30th October, at the Innovation Centre in Bridgend (10.30 am).

It was acknowledged the timetable was tight if the RTS was to meet the target of being issued in January/February, 2008.

5. Any Other Business

RM requested that paragraph 8 contained in Appendix 19 (P.145), be included in the introduction to the statement. This suggestion was agreed.

6. Date of Next Meeting

Date to be confirmed.

IT