

**Minutes of the South Wales Regional  
Aggregates Working Party –  
RTS Sub Committee  
Monday 30<sup>th</sup> July 2007 at 10.00 a.m.**

<b><u>Present:</u></b> -	<b>Action:</b> -
<p>Martin Hooker (Chairman) – Bridgend County Borough Council Steve Bool (Secretary) – Bridgend County Borough Council Richard Millard – QPA Mark Russell – BMAPA Tony Gilman – BAA Sue Martin – Welsh Assembly Government Carolyn Warburton-Welsh Assembly Government Ian Thomas-National Stone Centre Neville Morgan – Neath Port Talbot County Borough Council Karen Maddock-Jones-CCW Carole A Williams – PCC/PCNPA Julie Kirk - PCNPA</p>	
<p><b><u>Apologies</u></b></p> <p>Mark Frampton – QPA Malcolm Lawer-QPA Martin Lucas-Vale of Glamorgan Council Anthony Wilkes – Environment Agency Wales Ruth Amundson – Caerphilly County Borough Council</p>	
<p><b><u>2. Minutes of the last meeting 14 May 2007</u></b> These were agreed as a correct record subject to the amendments highlighted in bold. These will be embodied in the revised minutes and placed on the website.</p>	
<p><b><u>3. Matters arising</u></b></p> <p>Regarding the marine industry, RM reiterated the importance of a continuity of supply from the channel to maintain adequate sand to the construction/maintenance industry. IT confirmed he was attempting to be non-specific in the RTS about areas of marine sand to avoid any sensitive data/policy issues. SM advised there were several applications imminent for the extraction of sand by dredging and there appeared to be no problems with supply for the next five years. It was also acknowledged that the full capacity of licences was not being taken up. RM still felt with the cessation of dredging on Nash Bank there were still risks to established supply patterns.</p>	
<p>In relation to paragraph 3 (page 3), IT sought clarification as to what the RTS plan period should be. It was agreed the period should be 15</p>	

<p>years running to 2020, although an extension of 1 year to 2021 would dovetail with the LDP process. With this in mind, it was agreed the period should be <u>16</u> years running to 2021.</p> <p><b><u>Draft RTS for consultation</u></b></p> <p>IT introduced the main RTS paper (excluding the chapter on apportionment).</p> <p>It was confirmed AM2005 had been used for the base data and also the contributions of the industry (Gerry McLoughlins/Mark Russells papers).</p> <p>Reference was made to the contribution of secondary aggregates / recycled material and the way statistics had been analysed and presented to confirm the objectives of MTAN 1 were being met.</p> <p>RM indicated he was unhappy that there was direct reference to the industry being responsible for the delay in the RTS and this should be deleted. This request was agreed. He also emphasised that the industry also undertook/underpinned substantial <u>maintenance</u> work and this should be reflected in the text. Industry was therefore responding to the needs of society and not just supporting new developments / projects for society. It was agreed this would be covered on page 13 – key background.</p> <p>IT confirmed he had split the sec/recycled figures into North/South Wales and the target of 40% for aggregates appeared to have been met. The scope for any significant increase appeared to be limited with pfa having been identified as having the biggest potential for use. The deficiencies of bfs were acknowledged however, but given the tonnages available it was considered further feasibility studies ought to examine the potential. Reference was made to bfs which was being shipped to England. No one could confirm tonnages or source. The issue of how sustainable it was to use bfs for non-aggregate use was discussed, particularly the way processes such as ‘quenching’ for hot slag were undertaken to maximise the use/value of the product. NM made reference to the fact the stockpiles at Port Talbot were significant and his authority were concerned about amenity issues.</p> <p>It was agreed the sustainable use of bfa was outside of the responsibility of the RTS although there was a strong feeling that the matter should be pursued further as a policy issue.</p> <p>In respect of <u>marine</u>, IT confirmed MR’s paper/data had been incorporated where possible and the situation, in principle, appears to be sustainable as the supplies are landed into the hearts of cities / ports thereby reducing transportation.</p> <p>In respect of <u>colliery spoil</u>, it was questioned whether or not this was</p>	<p>IT</p> <p>SM/CW</p>
---	------------------------

<p>being exploited? It was acknowledged the majority of spoil tips had been restored and reverted to the landscape. It was noted Tower Colliery near Hirwaun may be worthy of further consideration because of the impending closure.</p>	IT
<p>The availability / potential for the use of opencast coal overburden material was discussed. Whilst the tonnages may be relatively small it was sustainable to consider possible usage as good quality sandstones may be being lost to tip. Could this material be offered to the community for local use or for building stone for heritage projects?</p>	IT
<p>The chapter on <u>primary</u> aggregates was discussed and the issue of confidentiality was highlighted as a reason for using discreet figures and averages over three years (2003 – 2005). The difficulty of obtaining valid aggregate distribution information was accepted which in turn generated problems for obtaining consumption figures. IT found that the deeper the investigation of base data was carried out, the greater the difficulty of illustrating the figures.</p>	
<p>With reference to <u>consumption</u>, IT confirmed he was basically trying to identify the level of self-sufficiency in each MPA.</p>	
<p>CW queried an issue on Page 44 which affected Pembs figures. These figures have been queried with the BGS and are structurally correct but confidential/unknown figures generate problems.</p>	
<p>Regarding <u>exports</u> (P.52) it was highlighted that high psv sandstone is inextricably linked with high transportation levels because of its high value, quality and demand. Cross boundary flow levels were noted as increasing and English reports assume this will continue (Symonds report on high psv).</p>	
<p>On <u>demand</u>, (P.54), it was clarified that two distinct demand sources ought to be considered. Demand <u>within</u> the region and <u>on</u> the region. Other demand flows such as that between North and South Wales need to be considered. It was noted non-aggregate uses were not included. IT referred to the several tables tabled which identified historical trends. SM queried if these were necessary and it was agreed these be set in the appendix.</p>	IT
<p>On page 57 (review a, b &amp; c) reference was made to the use of the forecast figures which had indicated a generally stable pattern. The QPA demand forecast (4% for secondaries and 1% for primaries) has been applied as one of the scenarios and other elements of demand referred to such as the influence Cardiff has on the region. Figures show a small growth in primary aggregates whereas MTAN1 suggests otherwise.</p>	
<p>IT reported revised growth/demand figures would be reported to the</p>	

<p>NCG but these would not be available until September, 2007. A decision has been taken to proceed in any event.</p>	
<p>It was confirmed the demand split between North and South Wales was approximately 35/65.</p>	
<p>With respect to <u>resources and reserves</u>, the RTS will identify the location and levels of reserves, giving a breakdown of active, inactive, and dormant sites. On <u>dormant sites</u> (P.68) it was agreed SB/IT would check the Powys table. There is a big change between the 2003 and 2005 figure.</p>	SB/IT
<p>There followed a discussion regarding the <u>confidentiality</u> issue. QPA are considering a relaxation for the purposes of the RTS process. In Wales there was a more relaxed attitude to figures being divulged.</p>	
<p>SM referred to table f (P.69) and confirmed it would be beneficial to add an 'active' column and give the overall figures for the total landbank. It was also suggested the titles of some of the tables needed to be revised to adequately describe the contents.</p>	
<p>On <u>environmental capacity</u> (P.70) the IMAECA study and methodology requires further consideration and above all it needs to be stressed what is its status and function i.e. it is to <u>inform</u> and <u>assist</u> the decision making process.</p>	IT
<p>Industry representatives voiced concerns that the <u>IMAECA</u> system could be misinterpreted which emphasised the need for strong caveats. It was agreed a summary of the system ought to be included in the RTS appendix.</p>	IT
<p>On <u>transport</u>, IT referred to the different transport modes such as rail which needed to be fully utilised as part of a sustainable mineral transportation network. Unfortunately, there appears to be several constraints to the wider use of rail and the situation is complex. Increased transportation of aggregates obviously runs contrary to the proximity principle and there are currently capacity problems with the main lines. At present, rail movements are run from Machen Quarry and Cwm Nant Lleici. Overall, it was recommended a feasibility study be funded as part of the WAG research programme as a policy issue. Agreed that all rail depots be protected.</p>	IT
<p>Regarding <u>water</u> (P.80) IT summarised those resources close to the coastline which historically may have been worked from small ports. These, however, are unlikely to be an option. Agreed that ports be protected in the LDP's.</p>	SM/CW
<p>Regarding Road (P.81) transport, the proximity principle is still the dominant factor. RM related some average maximum delivery runs of</p>	

<p>7 miles in the Cardiff area. Distances in rural areas are likely to be longer because of the dispersed settlement patterns.</p>	
<p>In respect of <u>apportionment</u>, IT referred to the main and supplementary papers. In the main paper, methods A &amp; B are rehearsed. Method B is essentially the per capita (population) approach which is advocated by MTAN1.</p>	
<p>In the <u>supplementary apportionment paper</u>, tabled at the meeting it was agreed the duration of the timescales should be extended to <u>2021</u> (reflects LDP timescale) and <u>flat rate</u> growth figures be shown. (these would be reviewed at the appropriate time).</p>	IT
<p>There was recognition that due to the small size of the unitary authorities with a limited number of sites, it would be difficult to apportion to MPA level. Nonetheless, the LDP's need to include such detail.</p>	
<p>Some authorities such as Bridgend, Pembs, Carms and Newport have already allocated areas for future mineral extraction which constitute a qualified 'reserve'. Should this area be converted into a notional reserve figure to augment the permitted reserves? Comments requested.</p>	ALL
<p>In considering the problems posed by the small unitary areas, MH suggested that perhaps the time was right for a sub regional mineral planning regime. From a technical viewpoint there appears to be some merit in this proposal but this may not find political favour in parochial authorities who do not actively embrace regional initiatives.</p>	
<p>SM considered that the paper 14 produced by SB could form the general basis for the way forward now. IT to consider and review.</p>	
<p>IT confirmed more work on the supplementary paper for apportionment was required to achieve a final document. He also confirmed industrial stone would be covered and a matrix prepared to show the relationship between rock types and end-use.</p>	IT/SB
<p>It was generally felt the projected 1% increase in primary aggregate production was reasonable and acceptable for South Wales.</p>	IT
<p>RM requested that a minimum of 4 weeks be allowed to consider any final (draft) RTS document. There is a strong will to progress the work to achieve the issue of the RTS this year.</p>	
<p>It was agreed IT would:-</p>	

<p>(i) produce a completed draft by the <u>end of August</u>.</p> <p>(ii) allow industry and RTS/SWRAWP Members a minimum of 4 weeks to consider the final draft i.e. <u>end of September</u>.</p> <p>It was further agreed that once the consultation at (ii) was complete the RTS Sub Committee / SWRAWP meetings would be held on the same day Wednesday 17<sup>th</sup> October 2007 (9.30 am and 11.00 am) in Bridgend.</p> <p>A Member Forum would also be convened on 31<sup>st</sup> October (10.30 am) in Bridgend. Following the Member Forum consultation would be carried out over a <u>6</u> week period, with a view to the RTS being approved by December, 2007, if at all possible. It was acknowledged this was a tight deadline and key stages needed to be completed on time to meet this date. Hence, any comments on the papers produced be forwarded by the <u>9<sup>th</sup> August 2007</u>.</p>	<p>IT</p>          <p>ALL</p>
--	---