

SWRAWP
Minutes of the RTS Sub Committee
4th July,2005

<p><u>Present:</u> -</p> <p>M Hooker, Bridgend County Borough Council N Morgan, Neath Port Talbot County Borough Council C A Williams, Pembrokeshire County Council & National Park Authority R Amundson, Caerphilly County Borough Council A Bull, Powys County Council M Frampton, QPA S Martin, Welsh Assembly Government</p> <p>1. <u>Apologies:</u> - A Wilkes, Environment Agency S.Bool,Bridgend CBC M.Lucas, Vale of Glamorgan</p> <p>2. <u>Minutes of the last meeting – 23/2/05</u></p> <p>Agreed as a correct record.</p> <p>3. <u>Matters arising</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p>4. <u>IMAECA</u></p> <p>Reference was made to how soon the WAG protocol would be ready.It was confirmed that this would be available shortly but the status had still to be confirmed.</p> <p><u>Item 2.</u> MF raised a question about the need to distinguish between EMAADS and IMAECA.Would details such as the reference to tonnes/head be used or the <u>coloured</u> output?Would there be reference to the proximity principle? MF emphasised it was important to have a mechanism to assess demand and how to match it with supply.Comment was made by CW/RA that their authorities appeared to demonstrate good sustainable patterns.AB highlighted the fact that Powys exported a significant amount of hard rock to England.</p> <p><u>Item 3.</u>It was acknowledged that the volume of aggregates contained in the landbanks was high and demand was fairly stable.Apparently,the ODPM model highlights a fall in the intensity of use. There was a discussion about the special factors influencing the tonnes/head figure.It was acknowledged that areas could be influenced by exports,high PSV resources and non-construction uses.</p> <p><u>Item 5.</u> With regard to reserves,it was thought more work was needed</p>	<p><u>Action:</u> -</p>
---	--------------------------------

<p>to determine the robustness of reserve figures. This would be required to assess the likelihood of reactivation and how “live” the reserves were. Reference was made to the use of the Mineral Valuers in Carmarthenshire where the authority have been able to obtain Aggs Levy funding for mineral assessments as part of the prohibition order process on four sites. The question was raised as to whether or not we needed a national analysis on the prohibition order process. It was agreed that SB would ask Duncan Pollock of the QPA for list ONE and the SWRAWP would produce list TWO. SB to forward a copy of list ONE to SM.</p>	<p>SB</p>
<p>AB posed the question as to what the possible alternative after uses for list TWO sites would be. A general discussion followed about the knock-on effect in land values.</p>	<p>SB</p>
<p><u>Item 7.</u> Marine. It was acknowledged that the source of sand and gravel in the Bristol channel and S. East was changing. Should and can this supply be managed? The issue of the degree of control over exports was discussed. Who sets the policy? Are licence conditions able to be imposed? What would be the relationship to pSAC’s?</p>	
<p><u>Item 8</u> The question was posed as to what would happen if IMAECA shows limited environmental capacity for some land based sand and gravel resources. Should they be taken out of the safeguarding areas? It was noted that Bridgend CBC have received a High court challenge to their UDP and such a challenge was considered by the BBNP.</p>	
<p>The issue of restoration opportunities for on-shore sand and gravel sites was discussed. Bearing in mind their general location in low lying areas there may be problems of flood risk, birdstrike, groundwater issues etc, but they can provide significant opportunities for formal/informal recreation.</p>	
<p>Supply options was another issue discussed and the limitation/ even embargo on aggregate extraction in National Parks and AONB’s. It was agreed that such an approach was too simplistic.</p>	
<p><u>Item 12/13.</u> The date of the Smiths Gore dissemination seminar on the research report on construction, demolition and quarry waste was confirmed as the 19th July, 2005, at the Millenium stadium, Cardiff, at 11a.m.</p> <p>The effect of operators paying for Environment Agency exemptions from July, 2005, was discussed. The implications could be significant but it is difficult to predict changes in trends at present. Any fees generated would hopefully be spent on increased monitoring and enforcement. SB to check sources of china clay to determine the current situation.</p>	<p>SB/MH</p>
<p>The issue of the growing volume of stockpiles in quarries (saleable material not waste) was noted with concern. It was acknowledged that</p>	

<p>more work needed to be carried out to determine the precise causes and possible ways of overcoming the problem. It was agreed that SB would check/confirm the figure in para 15 re the % mix of primary secondary aggregates to overcome the Aggregates Levy.</p> <p>Item 18.CRF's It was agreed SB would check the figure of 2 million tonnes of quarry waste in the Smiths Gore report.Is this figure the annual increase in the size of quarry "waste tips"?</p> <p>Item.25 Geological resources With reference to IMAECA it was acknowledged that the geological resource areas may need to be refined and if so,further investigative work would be required.BGS?</p> <p>Item.27 Capacity of quarry output. It was acknowledged that the capacity of most quarries could not be controlled by the planning process(note:the introduction of new plant with attendant increases in traffic generation can be controlled under P.D. rights.The GPDO allows for the refusal of such development if there is"injury to the amenity of the neighbourhood". It was agreed that the Water Act would also need to be taken into account.</p> <p>Item 30 Changes in the construction methods/use of alternative materials.</p> <p>Item 33 Fiscal It was acknowledged that the Landfill Tax may increase on a yearly basis but the Aggregates Levy is likely to remain stable for the immediate future.</p> <p>Item 36.Ratio of population to consumption. Concern was expressed about the present situation in authorities such as Swansea which does not have any hard rock quarries.Considerable reliance is therefore placed on sites in the adjoining Neath area.</p> <p>Item 38 Public consultation. It was noted there should be a reasonable limit to key interested organisations but the SEA requires greater consultation across a wide consultee base. It was agreed that a statement of community involvement or similar format ought to be carried out for the public consultation element of the RTS.SB to see the CIS report. MH suggested a paper be drafted indicating how the public consultation exercise be undertaken and the cost implications. CW to forward to SB information on the link to the TRL report on SEA and circulate to members of the sub com.</p> <p>Item 42 HIA and SEA</p>	<p>SB</p> <p>SB</p> <p>CW</p>
---	--

<p>SM referred to Ian Mathews who has been working on the Waste Strategy in Wales.SB to contact him with a view to obtaining details.On the issue of SEA,it was agreed it would be useful to draft an options paper and timetable for the next SWRAWP meeting in September.The question of who would be responsible for preparing the SEA was raised.Could this be covered in-house and if not,what would be the estimated cost?</p> <p>7.IMAECA weightings. It was suggested that a laptop be set up at the next meeting to illustrate the weightings and how they could be changed. It was agreed that the issues paper be refined before sending out to the RAWP members.</p> <p><u>AOB</u> None.</p> <p>Date of next meeting SB to arrange a date for next month(revised issues paper to be put before SWRAWP in September,2005).Date now confirmed as 3/8/05 in Bridgend.</p>	<p>SB</p> <p>SB/SM</p>
--	--------------------------------------