Welcome & Apologies

1.1 The Chairman welcomed Russell Gadbury and Nat Percival. Apologies were received from Catherine Smith (Medway), Peter Day (Oxfordshire), Paul Sanderson (Surrey CC), Mike Elkington (W Sussex CC), Claire Potts (South Downs NPA), Nigel Jackson and Helen Hudson (MPA), James Trimmer (PLA), and Richard Linton and Peter Heath (GLA).

Marine Aggregates: MMO presentation on East Coast Plans

2.1 Russell Gadbury, Marine Planning Manager (Plan Production and Implementation) spoke to a presentation entitled ‘SEEAWP Marine Planning Update’ – attached to these minutes. He drew attention to:
the MMO has extensive responsibilities, not just for marine planning but licensing and regulation as well in the complex marine environment. The main sponsor is Defra, but MMO has relationships with a range of other government departments including DCLG.

- marine plans are within the context of the Marine Policy Statement. It is proposed to prepare two plans at a time, taking perhaps 2-3 years. Information on which to base the plans ranges from studies undertaken in the 1920’s to up to date data.
- Marine planning has similarities to terrestrial planning in so far as it is to be plan led and plans are subject to sustainability appraisal.
- the East Coast plans cover a very extensive area, nearly 60,000km2, and need to encompass a wide range of activities. Not too much detail should be expected in the plans, a document likely to be some 150 pages in length with some 20 maps.
- the plans will set out a strategy, give guidance, and contain a section on implementation. There will be little prescriptive policy at this stage.

2.2 Nat Percival (Marine Planner (Implementation) explained how consultation on the plans has taken place and the next stages of consultation. MMO is establishing a plan led management system for implementation of the plans through both internal and external workshops. He also referred to the forthcoming consultation on the South Coast Plans.

2.3 In response to questions RG said:
- the draft plans had been submitted to the Minister. It was expected that the draft plans would be published for consultation before the end of July for a twelve week period.
- MMO was aware of the need for suitable on shore infrastructure to support marine activities and would continue to work with local authorities to this end and for marine plans to compliment terrestrial plans
- the importance of the East Coast for the supply of marine aggregates to construction and the economy in the SE and London was recognised and would be referred to in the draft plans
- there is a 3 year reporting back programme to assess whether a plan needs to be refined, and a six year cycle for plan review
- the plans seek to protect the aggregate resource by area, but with better data it may be possible at a future date to have a policy referring to an aggregate tonnage figure
- the MMO were cognisant of the interdependence of demand for marine and other sources of aggregate and believed that the new approach would lead to a closer working relationship between the different planning processes (although marine and terrestrial planning would remain separate).

2.4 MR said on behalf of BMAPA he welcomed the plans as they are a step in the right direction, providing a policy context where there was none before. He considered that the marine aggregate industry had a lot to gain from the plans. The Chairman thanked RG & NP.
for the presentation and response to questions, and BMAPA and The Crown Estate for arranging the venue.

Marine Reserves

2.5 MR said that The Crown Estate now had all the data from industry on permitted marine reserves, and a first draft of the report had been prepared. The intention was to issue the report in the next two or three weeks. He also reminded the meeting that The Crown Estate landing figures for 2012 have been published and are on the web.

BGS Resource Survey

2.6 MW said the survey had been completed and awaits sign off. It was expected to be accessible on the web in two or three weeks, and will contain extensive plans.

3 Minutes and Matters Arising from 19 March 2013 meeting

3.1 The minutes with the amendments in paras 2.1/5.2, 3.2 and 4.3 were agreed. The Chairman said that he did not wish to see the draft minutes amended and circulated in this fashion again and asked members to desist from seeking changes to the draft minutes unless there were really exceptional circumstances.

3.2 Matters raised, other than those to be dealt with under an agenda item, were as follows:

2.1 3.12 A note of the GLA seminar on cross boundary issued had been circulated.

4.4/4.5 AM2011 was finalised with a suitably amended wording

5.1 A response to the Isle of Wight draft LAA consultation had been sent and circulated.

4 DCLG Specification for AM Surveys and AM2012

4.1 SEEAWP noted the views of the AWP Secretaries meeting on the DCLG specification for AM surveys as set out in SEEAWP 13/06. In reply to the Chairman, the Secretary said that these views would no doubt need to be agreed by NCG, but as they were supported by MP at the meeting he did not anticipate any different outcome.

4.2 SEEAWP agreed with the proposal of the Secretary to substitute Local Plan figures, submitted LAA figures, or the 10 year average sales figures where neither of the former were available, in lieu of the regional apportionment figures for land-won aggregate in the AM2012 table giving comparison between permitted reserves and landbanks.

4.3 The Secretary updated the meeting on the returns he had received for AM2012 from MPAs. He now had complete returns from six MPAs. TC confirmed that the returns from the South Downs NPA would be included in the Sussex and Hampshire collations. MM said that West Berks would prepare and submit its own returns. Due to a misunderstanding the survey forms had only recently been sent to operators, but with a request for returns by the end of July. The outstanding returns therefore are for East and West Sussex, Kent, West Berks, the other five Berkshire UAs and Medway – which has promised their return in a week. It was agreed that every effort would be made for the outstanding collated returns to be sent to the Secretary by 31 July.

4.4 The Secretary said that he had also written to Hampshire, Surrey and Kent suggesting that it would be possible to produce silica sand figures of the combined last three years average sales and permitted reserves at the end of 2012 without breaking confidentiality. Surrey had
responded favourably. However, JP said that he thought it wrong for SEEAWP as an aggregate working party to produce figures for silica sand – a mineral in which its purist form should be reserved for glass making and other specialist non-aggregate purposes. Moreover JP and BS said there is a problem over the definition of silica sand, which could be applied to the whole of the extensive Folkestone beds when only a small percentage is of this high purity and so capable of meeting such specialist industry specification. In response to the Chairman it was agreed that a definition of silica sand could be drawn up to overcome this issue. However, the Secretary was asked to raise at NCG why AWPs are being asked to cover non energy minerals, including silica sand.

5  Local Aggregates Assessments

5.1  Buckinghamshire draft LAA

The Secretary said that he had circulated the draft LAA, and although SA had said that it might contain gaps at this stage, in his view it was comprehensive in its coverage. The draft concluded with a comparison between the 10 year average sales of land-won sand and gravel and the apportionment adopted in the Buckinghamshire Minerals and Waste Core Strategy – with no recommendation as to which figure would be recommended for inclusion in a Minerals Plan.

5.2  RF questioned figures in the draft which did not tie up arithmetically; the permitted reserves at the end of 2012 and therefore the landbank that was quoted did not reflect sales subtracted from the 2010 permitted reserves in the Core Strategy. SEEAWP members said that an explanation should be given in the draft LAA and to RF on the point being raised, which might be due to an industry reassessment of reserves, but this was too detailed a point for an AWP observation on the draft LAA. AE said that members should not look for too much precision in LAAs which are to be reviewed annually, and MPAs when drafting an LAA should prepare for a landbank in excess of 7 years.

5.3  Oxfordshire Draft LAA

The Secretary said that the draft LAA had been circulated, and he had received one response from CM supporting the LAA in principle but seeking clarification on certain aspects. The response would be sent to Oxfordshire to respond. The draft LAA concluded with options for the land-won sand and gravel comparing the 10 year average sales with the figure adopted in the Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Core Strategy (M&WCS). However, in addition Oxfordshire proposed a figure derived from an alternative methodology which applies consumption per capita and of past balance of sales against consumption to forecasts of Oxfordshire’s population. The LAA did not say which figure would be recommended for inclusion in a Minerals Plan.

5.4  KH said that he supported the adjusted figures rather than the previous 10 year average as these took into account the wider economy and future growth, which resulted in figures not dissimilar to the M&WCS provision. JP said that the import/export balance in 2009 might have changed in 2012. BS asked which of the options in the conclusion would be recommended? MT replied that if the adjusted LAA figures were close to those in the M&WCS, it may well be that Oxfordshire would stick with the M&WCS provision.
Surrey draft LAA

5.5 The Secretary said that he had received one response from CM supporting the LAA in principle but seeking clarification on certain aspects. The response would be sent to Surrey to respond. The draft LAA concluded that it was not intended to revisit provision set out in the Surrey Primary Aggregates DPD adopted in July 2011. This makes provision for an average of 1.4mtpa of land-won sand and gravel over the period to 2026. SEEAWP were content with this stance.

A Checklist for LAAs

5.6 The discussion then turned as to whether this was the only opportunity for SEEAWP to comment on the draft LAAs. The Secretary said that the draft LAAs had been circulated and this was SEEAWP opportunity to give views without any further submission, unless the MPA chose to do so with a redraft. KH and MT said that SEEAWP should focus on strategic views, and DP referred to a checklist that he had prepared to assist MPA in deciding whether a draft LAA was fulfilling its role. He felt that it probably needed simplifying, but it was agreed to share the checklist with SEEAWP. The Secretary would issue it with the minutes.

LAAs from MPAs in adjoining AWPs

Gloucestershire draft LAA

5.7 As stated in SEEAWP 13/07 no views were received on this draft LAA. SEEAWP members were left to respond if they so wished.

Somerset draft LAA

5.8 SEEAWP agreed with the summary in SEEAWP 13/07 of this draft LAA. It was agreed that a reply would be sent drawing attention to the dependence of the SE on rail imports from Somerset, and saying that SEEAWP was pleased to see provision being made for such supplies to be able to continue throughout the plan period.

6 Update by DCLG

6.1 MP reported that:
- the revocation of the SE Strategy had now come into effect as the period for legal challenge had expired
- there is a commitment for the review of planning guidance to be issued this summer. MP thanked those SEEAWP members who had contributed to drawing it up. No existing guidance would be withdrawn in advance of the new guidance being issued.
- bi-lateral meetings have been taking place with industry and POS on the draft Water Bill. The DCLG/Defra objective is to correlate the planning and environmental regimes to enable a single application/permit.
- under the Red Tape Challenge MP will be meeting Oliver Letwin who is looking for further scope to make planning more efficient and effective, with a report to be issued in the Autumn
- Graham Ward has moved to another post, and MP is now supported by EM.
7 **Chairman**

7.1 The Chairman relinquished the chair for this item in order that the Secretary could report. The Secretary had advised SEEAWP that although he was happy to continue as Chairman, JK said he was conscious that he no longer had direct involvement in local government, planning and the minerals industry other than through SEEAWP. He considered it appropriate that the AWP should have the opportunity to consider whether it wished him to continue as Chairman as it was six years since his continuation in the role had been endorsed.

7.2 The Secretary said that he had received five responses; three responses supported the Chairman continuing in the role, quoting his experience both in planning and in chairmanship skills, and for his independence as he was no longer employed by an MPA; two responses said that the role of the chairman needs to be considered in the context of the wider issue of the purpose and operation of the AWP, and whether terms of reference need to be drawn up to reflect the changing role.

7.3 KH said that mpa valued JK’s background experience and knowledge and his independence, and supported him continuing in the role. He wished that more people of the same qualities could be found to chair AWPs. TC explained that he supported JK in the role, but in view of the AWPs’ changing roles it might help AWP chairmen if terms of reference were drawn up. It was noticeable that the Secretary role was spelled out in detail in the recent DCLG specification, but that apart from each AWP electing its own chairman there was no description of a chairman’s role.

7.4 SEEAWP agreed unanimously to invite JK to continue as Chairman. At his suggestion it was agreed that this would not be an agenda item until March 2015. The Secretary was asked to have NCG consider whether terms of reference should be drawn up for AWP Chairmen.

8 **Any Other Business**

8.1 There was no other business.

9 **Date of Next Meeting**

9.1 The next SEEAWP meeting is to take place at 2pm on Wednesday 13 November 2013 at DCLG Offices, Eland House, Bressenden Place, London, SW1E 5DU.