

## North East England Aggregates Working Party Note of Meeting

<b>Meeting Date:</b>	Friday 12 November 2021	<b>Meeting Venue:</b>	Meeting held virtually
<b>Meeting Chair:</b>	Claire Teasdale	<b>Note Taker:</b>	Jack Freeman

### **Attendees:**

#### Chair:

Claire Teasdale (CT)

#### Technical secretary:

Kevin Tipple (KT) (also representing Northumberland County Council)

#### Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities representatives:

Vineeta Sharma – Minerals and Waste Team

Aimee Smith – Minerals and Waste Team

#### Mineral Planning Authority representatives:

Susannah Buylla – Northumberland National Park Authority

Rachel Cooper – South Tyneside Council

Claire Dobinson-Booth – North Tyneside Council

Jack Freeman – Northumberland County Council

Lucy Greenfield – Gateshead Council

Jason Mckewon – Durham County Council

David Nelson – Darlington Borough Council

Jamie Simpson – Sunderland City Council

Helen Smith – Hartlepool Borough Council

Rebecca Winlo – Gateshead Council

#### Aggregates industry representatives:

Nick Everington – The Crown Estate

Michael Hodges – British Aggregates Association (and Breedon Group)

Nick Horsley – Mineral Products Association

Geoff Storey – Aggregate Industries UK

### **Apologies/not in attendance:**

David Bage (Stockton on Tees Borough Council), Neil Beards (Tarmac), Tom Brown (Hanson Aggregates), Charlton Gibben (Middlesbrough Council), Fiona Hurworth (Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council), Peter Huxtable (British Aggregates Association), Jon Rippon (Newcastle City Council)

### **Agenda:**

1. Welcome and introductions
2. Notes and actions from the meeting held on 8 July 2021
3. Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities and Aggregates Working Party Update
4. Draft Annual Report 2020
5. Permitted Reserves of Aggregate Minerals
6. Local Aggregate Assessments
7. Industry update
8. Mineral Planning Authority updates
9. Any other business
10. Date of next meeting

Item	Details	Action
1.	<p><b>Welcome and introductions</b></p> <p>The Chair welcomed those attending. Introductions were made and apologies were noted.</p>	
2.	<p><b>Notes and actions from meeting held on 08 July 2021</b></p> <p>The draft minutes of the meeting held on 08 July 2021 were circulated prior to the meeting. The draft notes were reviewed and an update on the actions identified in the meeting notes was given:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Item 5 – KT has correlated comments and sent to DLUHC. The draft report has been prepared. Some outstanding returns were not received from three sites with estimates used instead. MH will chase these up.</li> <li>• Item 7 – On the agenda today.</li> <li>• Item 8 – Industry update has been circulated.</li> </ul> <p>NH mentioned that the MPA providing training had not really progressed, but that the MPA were still looking at a range of options of training and professional development.</p> <p>No other matters were raised and the notes of the meeting held on 8 July 2021 were agreed.</p>	
3.	<p><b>Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities and Aggregates Working Party Update</b></p> <p>VS shared an update on behalf of DLUHC.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Name change – The department changed its name to the Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (DLUHC) in September 2021 following the appointment of Michael Gove as the new Secretary of State.</li> <li>• Staffing changes – VS joined the minerals and waste policy team in July 2021 and Hannah Henderson (who attended the last North East AWP meeting) has left the team to take up a new role elsewhere in Government. Lonek Wojtulewicz retired in August 2021 and Guy Skelton has taken over responsibility for the minerals and waste team. Another person is expected to join the team shortly. VS and Aimee Smith are the contacts on AWP matters within the minerals and waste team at DLUHC.</li> <li>• National guidelines for aggregates provision – The business case for updated guidelines is currently being worked on but there are no firm timescales.</li> <li>• Planning Reform – In relation the Planning White Paper and its proposals, DLUHC is currently in a state of pause whilst the new secretary of state is assessing things.</li> </ul>	

Item	Details	Action
	<p>KT asked if the business case for the national guidelines was being prepared because there is an intention to use external consultants to progress elements of the work. VS answered that it was not finalised either way currently. The project is in the discussion and contemplation stage with no timelines at present.</p> <p>GS asked if Lonek Wojtulewicz would be replaced and if it would be someone of the same stature. CT emphasised the North East AWP are keen for someone with the same experience. VS answered that the department is currently working on it and that the decisions would be made at a senior level</p> <p>NH stated that the Mineral Products Association had already written to the Secretary of State and have also had discussions with Guy Skelton. NH also asked if the AWP could help with a refresh of the guidelines and stated that it would be helpful for a meeting of the National Coordinating Group to be held to discuss them. VS answered that AWP's have generally highlighted the need for a meeting and this would be discussed imminently.</p> <p>KT added that the 'Collation of the results of the 2019 Aggregate Minerals Survey for England and Wales' has now been published and is available via the Government website (<a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/aggregate-minerals-survey-for-england-and-wales-2019">https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/aggregate-minerals-survey-for-england-and-wales-2019</a>). A meeting of the project steering group was held in October 2021 to review of the approach taken to the survey and discuss lessons learned.</p>	
4.	<p><b>Draft Annual Report 2020</b></p> <p>KT introduced the draft Annual Aggregates Monitoring Report and stated that the report now follows the new template introduced by DLUHC to ensure consistency across AWP's. Feedback on the use of the template would be useful to see how it works and if anything is missing.</p> <p>KT talked through the contents of the report and covered the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Glossary (Page 4) – The new template includes a Glossary. In reviewing the draft report it would be helpful for members to review the list of terms and definitions, and provide any comments.</li> <li>• Introduction / Executive Summary (Page 7) – Points raised in this section are discussed in the following sections.</li> <li>• Mapping (Page 12) – Figure 1 shows the MPAs in North East England, Figure 2 shows the distribution of quarries and wharves, and Figure 3 shows offshore locations for marine dredged sand and gravel supplied to North East England.</li> <li>• Sales and Imports (from Page 15) – Table 2 shows sales for land-won sand and gravel, crushed rock and marine sand and gravel in 2020 for each MPA. It also includes sales from 2011 onwards and the ten year sales averages. Some sales figures for MPAs are not show to avoid</li> </ul>	

Item	Details	Action
	<p>disclosure of confidential information. There was a drop in 2020 compared to 2019. The commentary in the draft report explains that this is considered to be a result of the Coronavirus pandemic. In previous years there was a gradual increase in sales since 2011.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Permitted Reserves (from Page 19) – Table 3 shows permitted reserves of sand and gravel and crushed rock. A decrease in permitted reserves was recorded in 2020 and this was at a rate that was greater than could be accounted for by sales only. This decrease is therefore considered to be a result of no new planning permissions in 2020 and the permitted reserves being reassessed at a couple of sites. Reserves of both crushed rock and sand and gravel are at their lowest levels since 2015.</li> <li>• Landbanks (Page 22) – The landbanks have been calculated using the demand figures from most recent Local Aggregates Assessments presented in Table 4. For North East England the landbank is 12.9 years for sand and gravel and 33 years for crushed rock.</li> <li>• Secondary and Recycled Aggregates (Page 24) – Waste Data Interrogator information has been used to estimate production of recycled aggregates at those sites where no survey return was provided. This approach provides a better understanding of overall production in North East England. However the figures include sixed sites only and do not include supply from mobile crushers at construction and demolition sites for example.</li> <li>• Development Plans (Page 26) – The current position with relevant local plan documents presented in Table 6. The Mineral Planning Authorities were invited to check this table and the supporting commentary to indicate if any corrections are needed for the final report.</li> <li>• Aggregates Sites (Page 29) – A list of current quarries and wharves in North East England is set out in Table 7. The Mineral Planning Authorities and operators were invited to review list and advise if any corrections are needed.</li> <li>• Planning Applications (Page 32) – No relevant planning decisions were made during the 2020 monitoring period. A number of applications were pending at the end of 2020 and these are detailed in Table 8.</li> <li>• Local Aggregates Assessment (Page 33) – The section of the report includes a statement referring to contribution that of the LAAs in North East England to meeting local and national needs. AWP Members were invited to comment on this and indicate whether they did not agree with the statement as drafted.</li> </ul>	

Item	Details	Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trends and Analysis (Page 25) –               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Sales - Some commentary on reasons for fall in sales in 2020 and general pattern of increasing sales up to and including 2019 is provided. At a local level it is noted that there has been a decrease in sand and gravel sales from Northumberland over a period where sales in North East England have been increasing. Views on the reasons for the decrease are invited. In County Durham there has been a significant increase in sand and gravel sales over recent years due to Low Harperley commencing production in 2017 and increased production from Quarrington Quarry.</li> <li>○ Reserves – In relation to reserves the commentary discusses the reasons for a decrease in permitted reserves from 2019 to 2020 and identifies reserves are at their lowest levels since 2015. The reserve for Force Garth Quarry is significantly lower than in previous years and this has had a significant effect on the crushed rock reserve figure compared to 2019. Feedback on the references to Force Garth Quarry for the final report is sought.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Key conclusions (Page 38 and 39) – The conclusions cover the contribution of LAAs in North East England to meeting local and national needs, the supply situation and the landbanks of permitted reports, and the influence of planned major construction infrastructure projects could have on future demand and supply.</li> <li>• Appendices (Page 40) – Appendix 1 is included in standard template, but Appendix 2, 3 and 4 have been added to this draft report for North East England. Appendix 2 gives a breakdown of sales by end-use which is collected as part of the annual survey and presenting it in the report allows for comparison with previous years. Appendix 3 shows landings data for marine dredged sand and gravel provided by The Crown Estate. It is not essential to include this in the report, but it was though it would be useful to collate the data for North East England in one place and allow for some comparison with sales.</li> </ul> <p>CT stated that she liked the format and found the information easy to locate.</p> <p>MH queried the reserve figure that had been used for Force Garth Quarry and the rationale for using this figure. There was a discussion between MH, CT and JM regarding site-specific issues around the level of reserves recorded at Force Garth Quarry.</p> <p>NH commented that the glossary definition of landbank in the report did not fit with his understanding but it was recognised that it was consistent with the Planning Practice Guidance. NH asked if the landbank in the report is being calculated on future demand derived from the LAAs or the ten year sales</p>	<p><b>ACTION:</b> Reserve figure for Force Garth Quarry used in the collation to be clarified (KT, MH, JM and CT)</p>

Item	Details	Action
	<p>average figures. KT and JM confirmed that the figures used to calculate the landbanks were taken from the latest LAAs available. On occasion the landbanks are calculated using the ten year sales average but this is done in order to assist with analysis and provide a comparison.</p> <p>NH commented that inclusion of some more of the findings from the 2019 Aggregate Minerals Survey in this report would have been welcome, including information on consumption and where the minerals go. There are a number of concerns around consumption and production in the North West region. JM explained that this information is in the LAA. KT added that some change in movements was observed in the 2019 data, particularly an increase in movements to West Yorkshire.</p> <p>NH stressed the importance of keeping an eye on these movements, and the benefits of finding material locally. MH agreed with these points. GS commented that West Yorkshire is devoid of concreting grade sand and gravel, so this is unlikely to be an issue that goes away. In the past, this area has tended to be supplied from sites in North Yorkshire but reserves here are declining so there is pressure to supply these resources from further afield. NH stated it was concerning the way supply was being assumed in some areas.</p> <p>CT requested that comments on the Annual Report be provided by Friday 3 December 2021.</p>	<p><b>ACTION:</b> AWP members to review draft report and provide comments by Friday 3 December 2021 (All)</p> <p><b>ACTION:</b> Report to be finalised by the end of December 2021 (KT)</p>
5.	<p><b>Permitted reserves of aggregate minerals</b></p> <p>NH introduced the topic and wanted to raise this on the agenda as a major operator (and MPA member) has expressed concern about what is being included in the permitted reserve figures. The concern specifically relates to reserves that have planning permission being included in the landbank before other permits that are required before extraction can begin are in place. Water abstraction licensing could, for example, have a significant impact on available reserves.</p> <p>NH felt it was the right approach to include the reserves in the permitted reserves and landbank figures once planning permission has been granted, but that it was important that the industry made clear any changes in reserve levels to the Mineral Planning Authorities at the earliest opportunity.</p> <p>JM stated that he has tried to ensure dormant sites are not included in the landbank. Operators are surveyed each year and figures are taken on trust.</p> <p>KT felt that the methodology of using reserves with planning permission was clear and was easy for Mineral Planning Authorities to monitor as they had control over the planning consents. The annual survey provided an opportunity for operators to report any changes to permitted reserves, including changes resulting from the outcomes of other regulatory regimes. The 2006 letter from Lester Hicks at DCLG was circulated with the agenda. While it is not directly applicable to the point raised by NH, it does provide a useful reminder of what should be included in the landbanks.</p>	

Item	Details	Action
	<p>GS added that the Environment Agency and Natural England could have impacts on reserve data, and that limestone reserves could be vulnerable due to de-watering issues. An example was given which relates to perceived impacts of dewatering a limestone quarry on a nearby Special Area of Conservation.</p>	
6.	<p><b>Local Aggregate Assessments</b></p> <p>JM introduced the Joint LAA for County Durham, Northumberland and Tyne and Wear LAA and apologised for the short notice of the document being provided to the AWP for circulation.</p> <p>The LAA has been updated to include data for 2019 and 2020 data. There may be some discrepancies with figures in the AWP report where estimates have been needed due to some data not being disclosed due to commercial confidentiality.</p> <p>JM highlighted the areas of the report that had been updated the most and drew attention to a few key points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Permitted reserves generally have fallen in line with sales</li> <li>• Reserves are generally healthy in crushed rock, but looking at the detail behind the figures suggests that further sites are needed</li> <li>• Sand and gravel is the opposite situation, with Durham and Northumberland having smaller landbanks than Tyne and Wear. Sales were at a ten year high in 2019 but fell 6.6% in 2020, attributed to the pandemic</li> <li>• The three year sales average remain higher than the ten year sales average</li> <li>• After looking at factors affecting demand, it was concluded to continue using the three year sales average as it is more representative, with figures for 2020 excluded</li> <li>• This will slightly increase demand requirement</li> <li>• Recommendation that LPAs look at releasing further reserves, particularly in sand and gravel</li> </ul> <p>It was agreed that AWP members should be given three weeks to provide comments on this document. KT stressed the importance on agreeing whether the calculation methods were appropriate.</p> <p>HS provided an update on the Tees Valley LAA, stating that it would include data from 2018, 2019 and 2020 and was almost complete. The LAA will be circulated imminently when completed.</p>	<p><b>ACTION: Comments on the LAA to be provided to KT by Friday 3 December 2021 (All)</b></p> <p><b>ACTION: Response of the AWP to be drafted and sent to the MPAs (KT)</b></p> <p><b>ACTION: KT to liaise with HS regarding the Tees Valley LAA (KT and HS)</b></p>
7.	<p><b>Industry update</b></p> <p>CT invited the industry representatives present to provide an update.</p> <p>NH provided an update on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mineral Products Association Economic Briefing for Q3 2021 – This was circulated with the meeting agenda. The strong rebound in sales</li> </ul>	

Item	Details	Action
	<p>during 2021 has slowed for reasons that include issues elsewhere in the supply chain that is impacting on construction projects, limited haulage capacity and rising costs. The press release can be viewed at <a href="https://mineralproducts.org/News-CEO-Blog/2021/release37.aspx">https://mineralproducts.org/News-CEO-Blog/2021/release37.aspx</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Priorities for Government document – The Mineral Products Association have submitted a ‘Priorities for Government’ document to Government, which sets out the priorities for Government and industry to minimise uncertainty and encourage investment in the sector. It sets out how industry will decarbonise and the support needed to achieve this as well as how the industry will enhance biodiversity and improve resource efficiency. It also covers the aggregates levy and ensuring major projects consider aggregates supply through having resource and supply chain assessments. There is a concern that major projects such as HS2 are placing a demand on resources that is impacting on their availability to supply local projects. The ‘Priorities for Government’ document can be viewed at: <a href="https://mineralproducts.org/MPA/media/root/Publications/2021/Delivering_for_the_UK_Priorities_for_Government_2021.pdf">https://mineralproducts.org/MPA/media/root/Publications/2021/Delivering_for_the_UK_Priorities_for_Government_2021.pdf</a></li> <li>• AMRI Survey – This is critical for benchmarking, particularly where returns to the AWP surveys have not been provided, and the Mineral Products Association are pushing for its reinstatement.</li> <li>• AMPS Survey – This survey was not published last year but is expected to be published in the coming weeks to cover both 2019 and 2020. NH stated that the ten year average replenishment rate of sand and gravel was 63% and 76% for crushed rock. These rates have been falling. The average time an application is in the planning system is three years.</li> </ul> <p>GS pointed out that sites continue to be busy as a result of demand from construction projects. The importance of aggregates to A66 dualling had been raised with Rishi Sunak as part of the route passes through his constituency but this could also be raised with the Treasury. GS also emphasised the importance of protecting rail facilities to facilitate the transport of minerals.</p> <p>AS added that including information about projects that could have a significant demand for aggregate minerals is included in the Annual Aggregates Monitoring Report is useful to help push this agenda and understand where demand is high.</p> <p>*Nick Everington (NE) from The Crown Estate had to leave the meeting before this item was discussed. Following the meeting NE provided an update on some matters that might be of interest to AWP members:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Following a good level of market interest The Crown Estate launched a marine aggregates tender in September 2021. The window for submission of bids will close in early January 2022. Subject to the output of a plan level Habitats Regulations Assessment, we anticipate making the award of rights to successful bidders, in the form of</li> </ul>	



Item	Details	Action
	<p>Exploration and Option Agreements, in late 2022.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Crown Estate have published the 2021 edition of the annual marine aggregates capability and portfolio brochure. This document provides information relating to consented reserves of marine aggregates, together with extraction and delivery data, on both a regional and national basis.</li> <li>• The Crown Estate have also published the 23rd Area Involved report. This report is jointly produced with industry (BMAPA). It identifies the location and intensity of aggregate dredging activity during the 2020 calendar year. This document is produced as part of a commitment, made in 1999 by The Crown Estate and the British Marine Aggregate Producers Association (BMAPA), to review all marine aggregate extraction over a rolling five-year period, to surrender areas no longer containing useful resources of sand and gravel, and to provide annual reports relating to the extent of dredging on all licence areas.</li> </ul> <p>The publications referred to above, together with other information that may be of interest, including annual marine aggregate landing statistics and regional licence location plans, can be accessed via the following link:  <a href="https://www.thecrownestate.co.uk/en-gb/what-we-do/on-the-seabed/minerals-dredging/">https://www.thecrownestate.co.uk/en-gb/what-we-do/on-the-seabed/minerals-dredging/</a></p>	
8.	<p><b>Mineral Planning Authority updates</b></p> <p>Brief updates were provided by the Mineral Planning Authority representatives present at the meeting.</p> <p><u>Darlington Borough Council</u>  Consultation is taking place on proposed main modifications to the Local Plan until 30 November 2021. The Local Plan is expected to be adopted in January 2022. There is some awareness that the Joint Tees Valley Minerals and Waste DPDs pre-date the NPPF and work to consider a review is now needed. It is hoped some resource can be given to this once the Darlington Local Plan has been adopted.</p> <p><u>Durham County Council</u>  The County Durham Plan was adopted in October 2020 and a Mineral and Waste Allocations and Policies DPD is now being prepared. Consultation on a draft document under Regulation 18 ended on 5 November 2021. Consultation on a Regulation 19 version of the document is expected in Autumn 2022.</p> <p><u>Hartlepool Borough Council</u>  The Hartlepool Local Plan was adopted in May 2018. The Council is currently waiting for the outcomes of the proposals to reform local plans detailed in the Planning White Paper before deciding what to do regarding a review of the Local Plan. It is recognised that there is a need to look at the Joint Tees Valley Minerals and Waste DPDs and decide whether work on a review should commence in partnership with the other Tees Valley authorities.</p> <p><u>Northumberland County Council</u>  A consultation on proposed main modifications took place in Summer 2021. Consultation responses were sent to the Inspector in September 2021 and the</p>	

Item	Details	Action
	<p>Inspectors are currently finalising their report on the soundness of the plan. Adoption is now likely to be in early 2022.</p> <p><u>Northumberland National Park Authority</u> Northumberland National Park Local Plan was adopted in July 2020. Currently no plans to commence a review.</p> <p><u>Gateshead Council</u> The 'Making Spaces for Growing Places' was adopted in February 2021. A new 'call for sites' is expected to begin in January 2022, which would include mineral sites.</p> <p><u>South Tyneside Council</u> Work is continuing to progress on the preparation of a new Local Plan. Consultation on a draft Local Plan under Regulation 18 is expected to begin in February 2022.</p> <p><u>Sunderland City Council</u> A draft allocations and designations document was published for consultation in December 2020. A designation to safeguard Eppleton Quarry is included in the draft document.</p>	
9.	<p><b>Any other business</b></p> <p>No matters raised.</p>	
10.	<p><b>Date of next meeting</b></p> <p>It was agreed that the next meeting would be arranged for May/June 2022, followed by another in October 2022.</p> <p>CT thanked all for attending and closed the meeting.</p>	<p><b>ACTION:</b> Arrange meeting for Spring 2022 (KT)</p>