

**Minutes of the
Regional Technical Statement (RTS)
Sub Committee
Tuesday 7th November 2006 at 10:00 am**

<u>Present: -</u>	<u>Action: -</u>
<p>M Hooker (Chairman), Bridgend County Borough Council S Bool (Secretary), Bridgend County Borough Council M Lucas, Vale of Glamorgan Council N Morgan, Neath Port Talbot County Borough Council M Lawer, QPA M Frampton, QPA R Millard, QPA D Harding, BMAPA S Martin, Welsh Assembly Government C Warburton, Welsh Assembly Government T Gilman, BAA C A Williams, Pembrokeshire County Council / National Park Authority A Bull, Powys County Council</p>	
<p>1. <u>Apologies</u></p> <p>Karen Maddock-Jones, CCW Mark Russell, BMAPA Anthony Wilkes, EAW Ruth Amundson, Caerphilly County Borough Council</p>	
<p>2. <u>Minutes of the last meeting – 26 July 2006</u></p> <p>CW raised a query regarding the capacity of the marine wharves citing the problem at Pembroke Dock where the use of wharves was transient and permitted development. Industry representatives explained capacity was determined by the area of the wharf and the access to the wharf which was governed by the tides. SB confirmed there had been a difference between the Crown Estate figures and the annual survey returns from operators of 200k. It was accepted that the development of the Baglan Park may have generated a significant 'one-off' increase which included sediment as well as sand. It was acknowledged this material was not subject to the Aggregates Levy. SB to investigate further with Mark Russell (BMAPA).</p> <p>MH referred to the impact of global warming which was generating major proposals such as the Severn Barrage. It was agreed such issues as climate change were likely to dominate future discussions on key energy developments.</p>	SB / MR
<p>The issue of whether or not reserves which can be used both for</p>	

<p>SM confirmed that in some unitaries there were low landbanks and in these cases the RTS needed to consider if existing patterns were unsustainable.</p> <p>MF stated the 'preferred' option 2 referred to in the draft RTS had not been determined / approved and hence the process had jumped ahead. SB clarified the reason for this which was primarily caused by the QPA's delay in response to the draft options consultation stage. Furthermore, the WAG had directed that the process be continued to the resource allocation (apportionment) stage so that this would help allay concerns / and uncertainty as to how the full process might look like. RM felt the draft RTS document gave the basic framework but needed to be refined still further.</p> <p>MH stated he was concerned about the carbon footprint issue but it was important to consider a holistic approach in the future.</p> <p>It was suggested that an amendment be made to the QPA's proposed option (point 3) to read 'where environmentally acceptable' and that a statement be appended to the option to read 'the option covers the first 5 years of the RTS plan'.</p> <p>MH emphasised the main purpose of the RTS is to advise the LDP's to safeguard finite resources for future use.</p> <p>SB highlighted the need to resolve any differences and reach agreement on the way forward to meet the RTS timetable as set out in Paper 9. This timetable required the draft RTS consultation paper to be approved for consultation purposes at the SWRAWP committee scheduled for the 15th November 2006.</p> <p>TG suggested that the QPA option for supply paragraph 4 needed to identify an <u>environmentally acceptable</u> short / medium supply pattern, plus insert new paragraph 5, 'the safeguarding of land based minerals that may be needed in the longer term'; plus insert new paragraph 6, 'new quarries may be approved where they meet the principles of sustainable development'; and renumber paragraph 5 to 7. This would then constitute the QPA's modified option 4.</p> <p>It was agreed this option would be considered further by QPA and tabled at the next SWRAWP meeting. It was agreed the next SWRAWP meeting scheduled for 15th November 2006 be cancelled and an <u>extraordinary</u> meeting be convened to consider a revised draft RTS consultation paper. In general, it was felt the document needed to be more coherent and the process explained in full rather than appendices.</p> <p>It was agreed TG would forward a revised QPA option 4 to DH, who would circulate it to RTS sub committee members via SB.</p> <p>It was agreed the SWRAWP meeting dated 15th November 2006 and</p>	<p>TG / DH / SB</p> <p>TG / DH</p>
--	--

