

**Minutes of the South Wales Regional
Aggregates Working Party –
RTS Sub Committee 14th May,2007.**

<u>Present:</u> -	Action: -
<p>Martin Hooker (Chairman) – Bridgend County Borough Council Steve Bool (Secretary) – Bridgend County Borough Council Richard Millard – QPA Mark Frampton – QPA Neville Morgan – Neath Port Talbot County Borough Council Carole A Williams – Pembrokeshire County Council Ruth Amundson – Caerphilly County Borough Council Sue Martin – Welsh Assembly Government Carolyn Warburton-Welsh Assembly Government Ian Thomas-National Stone Centre Karen Maddock-Jones-CCW Anthony Wilkes-Environment Agency Wales Tony Gilman-BAA Mark Russell-BMAPA</p>	
<p><u>Apologies</u></p>	
<p>M.Lawer-QPA M.Lucas-Vale of Glamorgan A.Bull-Powys CC</p>	
<p><u>2. Minutes of the last meeting 6th March,2007</u> These were agreed as a correct record subject to the reference to the aggregate levy rate of £1.70 being amended to £1.60.</p>	
<p><u>3. Matters arising</u> In view of Andy Bull's impending retirement the question of his replacement was considered.It was agreed that due to the advanced stage of the RTS process it would not be beneficial to introduce a new replacement to the committee but minutes would still be forwarded to Powys CC for information. MR confirmed he had been unable to obtain any figures on maintenance dredging but he would endeavour to let SB know in due course. SB confirmed there had been a patchy response to his request for non-QPA members to divulge their annual output for the purpose of the RTS process. SB confirmed he had a meeting with Graham Bishop to discuss matters relating to the substitution of aggregates by c and d waste and secondary aggregates.GB is going to provide an update to the</p>	<p>MR</p>

<p>Annual report 2005 by the end of July this year. This will provide an updated and valuable database for the RTS process. RM confirmed GM of QPA had produced a 2 page summary on secondary aggregates and recycled c and d waste to be scrutinised at the meeting.</p>	
<p>4. RTS papers IT introduced the papers which he stated were founded on the principles enshrined in MTAN1. There was a suggestion that the amount of sec aggs available could be top-sliced from the amount of aggregates required and the rest apportioned to MPA's. MF questioned if this would distort the assessment of primary aggregates requirement for each MPA and result in an under-provision for primary production in MPA's where sec/recycled aggregates consumption is low. A solution may be to apportion per MPA first then slice off the sec agg contribution afterwards. IT to consider further. The baseline data for such material is reasonably robust. Comparison was made of the per capita consumption in Wales of 0.77 and 0.87 in England. Reference was also made to areas such as the North West region which was broadly comparable to S Wales. It was acknowledged that apportionment of any figures would be difficult down to MPA level.</p>	<p>IT SB</p>
<p>Attention was drawn to the Symonds report where there is reference to 90% of slag being exported but there was no detail as to what this was. Nobody was able to confirm any details about this movement. RM gave details from an industry perspective of the properties and useage of slag in the locality. The constraints are well known (need for weathering) and recognised but the product is still very much a saleable material for low end use especially in urban locations close to market. The sources at Port Talbot were acknowledged and it was noted the volume of stockpiles was significant compared with previous years. ML to advise.</p>	<p>ML IT/SB</p>
<p>AW confirmed the EAW were still in discussion regarding the categorisation of the material as a waste. It was suggested again that sec aggs be top sliced but only on a regional basis. This, however, might disadvantage rural areas if this calculation was used. It was agreed IT/SB would consider this matter further with particular reference to the target figure of 25% in MTAN1 being referred to.</p>	<p>IT/SB/GB</p>
<p>RM referred to the large increase in timber-framed buildings and it was proposed that IT/SB follow this up as an issue. There was also a need to demonstrate the pfa stockpiles at Aberthaw estimated at >14mt had been investigated fully for potential substitution for primary aggregates.</p>	
<p>Marine aggregates.</p>	
<p>Reference was made to the chapter produced by IT and the paper prepared by MR. It was noted the Duke of Beauforts tonnage of sand had not been included which was recognised to be in the order of 150,000pa. This, however, is worked under a planning permission.</p>	<p>IT</p>

<p>SM confirmed there was no update available on Helid Bank.</p> <p>It was noted that the key policies from IMADP needed to be inserted in the RTS to give a sound marine policy context.MR indicated there was pressure for a UK approach but because of devolution, the relevant administrations were unlikely to deliver.The statutory regs for England have been issued with Scotland/Wales to come.In Wales,these may be available in September of this year.TG highlighted that sand can also be produced from hard rock (as at Bolton Hill quarry)and this should not be forgotten as part of the supply scenario.There were however known limitations to its use and distribution which marine sand did not have.In particular,the ability to deliver sand into the heart of cities through wharves was recognised as an important asset as it meets the proximity principle.It was highlighted the sustainability of marine dredging exploitation is covered in the <i>Symonds report on comparative impact assessment of land/marine sand and gravel issued in 2002</i>.</p> <p>There was a general discussion about the difficulties the industry may face in dredging in deeper water.SM felt there was a general perception this would be difficult but could be overcome in the face of key factors such as the quality of the material,market demand,climatic conditions etc Deeper dredging was already taking place elsewhere and it was feasible.</p> <p>The importance of undertaking frequent reviews of marine sand supplies from the channel was emphasised so that shortfalls were avoided.</p> <p>Further discussion focussed on the extent and duration of landbank required throughout the RTS period.MTAN 1 is clear that a minimum of 10 years hard rock supply should be available throughout the RTS period of 15 years.Hence, is it assumed there will be a need for 25 years landbank from day one?Also,as several LDP's will run until 2021 should all of the period up until this date be covered?Alternatively,bearing in mind the LDP's are to be reviewed every 5 years should a maximum of 15 years be allocated. It was confirmed landbanks are consented reserves and do not include allocations of land.It was agreed further discussion was required on this issue.Comments by all to IT within 10 days.</p> <p>Primary aggregates paper</p> <p>IT circulated a <u>confidential</u> table indicating the production figures from 2003-2005 on active/inactive sites but <u>not</u> including dormant sites.It was stressed the table did <u>not</u> include any allocations of land. QPA reps expressed reservations regarding the figures in the table which did not differentiate between published and actual reserves that could be worked.Particular concern was raised that the quality of material in a reserve could be variable;there could be clay intrusions or faults; and therefore uneconomic to work.IT/SB confirmed that these were the figures that had been forwarded by the industry as part of the normal annual survey returns for the RAWP's and that historically this had</p>	<p>All</p> <p>SB</p>
--	----------------------

<p>been the case for many years. There was some debate about how long landbanks should be from an industry perspective to give confidence of investment particularly the very high cost of plant/infrastructure. This was accepted but from a sustainable mineral planning perspective, it was acknowledged that extending landbanks unduly prolongs the possible unsustainable nature of operations in a given location. This was clearly contrary to the objectives of MTAN1.</p>	IT
<p>It was agreed IT would investigate the reserve /landbank issue in depth and set out a clear statement on the way forward. IT confirmed the following had not been circulated due to the shortage of time:- 1.Environmental capacity paper as per N.Wales RAWP.He gave an overview of the environmental capacity picture using the red/orange/green colour coding from the model.The outcome appears quite contentious but it was stressed this was only one of the considerations to take into account into determining where best to source aggregate with least impact on the environment.It is therefore essentially a tool to inform the decision making process. On a point of detail IT sought clarification from industry reps as to where the imported tonnage of aggregate coming into Gwent/Mons was coming from.It was confirmed the majority was sourced from in the Forest of Dean and Machen quarry and occasionally imports from the W.Mids/S.West. 2.Transport.To be covered in due course.</p>	IT/SB IT
<p>Schedule of meetings/RTS timetable. It was agreed IT/SB would discuss and issue this for information.It did however centre on the time IT required to finish the draft RTS paper for consultation. It was considered 3/4 weeks should be allowed for consideration by stakeholders of the paper produced.Hopefully the paper can be prepared by the 2nd July and the next RTS sub committee dated 30th July can then approve it ready for consideration by the full SWRAWP.Member approval would then be sought before any consultation exercise commenced. With reference to public consultation it was agreed that given the nature of the document,the extent of public consultation should mirror that agreed for the N.Wales RAWP i.e. public notice(press);website;fliers to MPA's ;and contact with liaison committees as appropriate.</p>	SM
<p>Date of next meeting <u>Monday 30th July at 10.30am</u>(lunch provided)-3.30pm (same venue in Cardiff).Meeting room booked but SM to confirm.</p>	IT
<p>AOB RM drew attention to the perception of the quarry industry which should</p>	

<p>be seen as an essential maintenance industry underpinning the needs of society. This should be emphasised in the RTS and reported as a positive sustainability factor.</p> <p>SM confirmed reference to WAG may change to Welsh Ministers.</p>	
---	--