

SWRAWP
Minutes of the RTS Sub Committee
13th December 2005

Present: -

Martin Hooker, Bridgend County Borough Council
Steve Bool, Bridgend County Borough Council
Carol A Williams, Pembrokeshire County Council & Pembrokeshire
Coast National Park Authority
Sue Martin, Welsh Assembly Government
Mark Frampton, Quarry Products Association
Viv Russell, Quarry Products Association
Ruth Amundson, Caerphilly County Borough Council
Martin Lucas, Vale of Glamorgan Council
Neville Morgan, Neath Port Talbot County Council

1. Apologies

Karen Maddock-Jones, Countryside Council for Wales
Tony Gilman, BAA
Andy Bull, Powys County Council
Anthony Wilkes, Environment Agency Wales

2. Minutes of the last meeting – 3rd August 2005

Agreed as a correct record.

3. Matters arising

1. Smiths Gore C & D & Q Waste Report 2003

It was agreed that SM would check to confirm if final copies of the report had been circulated and if it was available on the WAG website.

2. Exemptions from Aggregates Levy

It was confirmed that provided any aggregate resource had in excess of 50% exempt material such as shale it was exempt from the Aggregates Levy. Post excavation mixtures of exempt materials and taxable aggregate would on a tonnage basis, attract Levy pro-rata to the taxable aggregate content.

3. SWRAWP website

It was agreed that SB would include reference to the SWRAWP website on any agenda / minutes produced. (swrawp-wales.org.uk)

Action: -

SM

SM confirmed that WAG would continue to despatch planning documents electronically but hard copies would be available on request.

4. IMAECA protocol

SM agreed to check if a final copy had been forwarded to Sub-Committee Members.

5. Foreword for issues paper

SB confirmed the foreword had been circulated to members as agreed.

6. C & D Waste

SM confirmed that WAG (David Eccles) would be funding this survey for 2005 through the research budget. This will be commissioned early in the new year.

4. Representations received on the issues / draft options papers

In view of the QPA request to obtain up-to-date data to provide the basis for the formulation of options, it was agreed that the final report on this matter be held in abeyance.

5. Schematic flowchart of RTS process (draft)

SB explained the flowchart was intended to stimulate discussion regarding the likely process to be followed to achieve a clear and robust RTS. Discussions highlighted that some of the actions (in boxes) may need to be considered in parallel with each other. SB confirmed that only one action, or part of the process, could be worked on at any moment in time and therefore the process as shown was not necessarily in sequence (i.e. prioritised).

VR confirmed that current data on imports / exports was required to validate the RTS process. It was noted the last source of such information was the AM2001 and the next would be AM2005. However, the latter survey information is not likely to be made available until 2007. It was agreed the QPA would endeavour to provide this information from operators as a matter of urgency.

VR acknowledged the QPA would need to agree the process but it was not intending to produce their own scoping report or issues/options paper prior to Xmas. The QPA would attempt to satisfy requests from the SWRAWP for information. It may be that best estimates would need to be accepted rather than actual figures.

Discussion focussed on the timespan of the RTS and the general

SB

SM

VR

consensus was that a 5 year timespan was inadequate. Bearing in mind most development plans cover a minimum period of 15 years, a period of 10-15 years was reasonable.

It was acknowledged the schematic flowchart tabled would flow into the generation of options and that the draft options produced had only been developed to illustrate different approaches and broad principles.

It was agreed the process would require the following: -

- (i) published figures
- (ii) industry figures
- (iii) a general industry impression / view of markets / production

It was noted the QPA represented operators who generated approximately 80% of production. The amount generated by BAA members was unknown. TG to confirm if possible. SM felt there should be some indication as to who was responsible for each stage of the process, and the timescale for delivery. A critical path project management approach was seen as a constructive and systematic way of illustrating the process. SB was requested to attempt to set out the process in this manner.

MF queried box 5 of the flowchart and questioned whether or not reference to 'sites' was correct. It was acknowledged 'areas of supply' or 'existing pattern of supply' may be a more appropriate term. It was agreed the latter was more appropriate.

6. SEA – funding and integration into the RTS process

SB confirmed that the current SWRAWP contracts with WAG did not cover SEA. This had been confirmed in discussion with the RAWP's / WAG in March 2005. It was vital to obtain funding to carry out SEA. SM agreed to investigate this matter urgently as it was deemed an essential part of the RTS process. A scoping report is likely to be the first stage in the process (possible call-off contract). It was agreed an all Wales approach would be more cost effective.

Post meeting note: SM(WAG) was unable to agree that the comments in this section were correct.

7. RTS base data – likelihood of reactivation of reserves (lists 1 & 2)

SB confirmed the lists produced by 8 of the 18 MPA's in South Wales had been forwarded to WAG in October 2005.

A discussion took place about the difficulties that MPA officers experienced in determining the 'likelihood of reactivation' on sites. RA highlighted that issues such as a lack of information and the sensitivity

VR

TG

SB

SB

SM

Deleted: ¶

of possible 'prohibition order' sites made decisions difficult. ML advised that in the Vale they were hesitant to contemplate prohibition orders following the Ewenny Quarry case. In discussion, it became evident a significant amount of reserves may be 'hidden' at dormant sites and these no doubt represented an asset value to landowners / companies. There was some deliberation as to how long it would take to determine the accurate amount of "net effective" reserves and it was agreed to consider the matter further notwithstanding the limited time available.

8. AOB

- (i) MF tabled a preliminary version of the schematic flowchart which had been forwarded to him by Duncan Pollock. It was agreed this had been superseded. In order to avoid any confusion SB agreed to issue all RTS documents with a number and / or date in the future.
- (ii) MF reaffirmed the view that the RTS timescale ought to extend for a greater period of 5 years. 10 – 15 years was recommended.
- (iii) Member forum 18th January 2006. In view of the delay caused by the late request of the QPA to validate all data, it was agreed to postpone the next Member Forum meeting in January 2006.
- (iv) Monitoring fees. SM confirmed she had sent a letter to MH as chair of the POSW Minerals and Waste topic group, requesting consideration of attendance on a small working group to be set up to draft a guidance notice on the new monitoring fee regulations. This group will cover waste sites as well as mineral sites and so a WESA representative will also be sought.

9. Date of next meeting: Date to be confirmed by SB / MH – possibly Mid February.

SB

Deleted: ¶

SB

Deleted: ¶

SB

SB / MH