

## Minutes of Yorkshire and Humber AWP Meeting 30<sup>th</sup> November 2021 Virtual Meeting via Microsoft Teams

**Chair:** Vicky Perkin                      North Yorkshire CC  
**Secretariat:** Vanessa Rowell        Capita

### Attendees:

Vanessa Rowell (VR)	Capita
Vicky Perkin (VP)	North Yorkshire CC
Lee Weatherall (LW)	Marshalls/MPA
Michael Eaglestone (ME)	Wakefield Council
Geoff Storey (GS)	Aggregate Industries UK
Mark North (MN)	Minerals Products Association
Nick Reeves (NR)	Kirklees Council
Peter Huxtable (PH)	BAA
Louise White (LW)	Leeds City Council
James Durham (JD)	East Riding of Yorkshire Council
Farzana Tabasum (FT)	Kirklees Council
Aimee Collins (AC)	Capita
Mark Hill (MH)	North York Moore's
Rob Marsden (RM)	Hanson
Katie Gowthorpe (KG)	East Riding Yorkshire Council
Christina Davey (CD)	DLUHC
Chris Hanson (CH)	Shepherd City Council
Helen McCluskie (HMc)	Doncaster Council
Helen Miller (HM)	Leeds CC
Malcolm Ratcliff (MR)	MPA

### Apologies:

Andy Duncan	Rotherham
Carole Howarth	Bradford
Joan Jackson	North York
Mark Wrigley	Crown Estate
Nick Everington	Crown Estate
Nick Horsley	Mineral Products Association
Richard Holmes	Sheffield CC
Roger Gray	Hull CC
Dave Parrish	Yorkshire Dales

Item	Description
1.	Introductions and apologies
2.	Minutes and actions of last meeting
3.	YHAWP Annual Monitoring Report
4	Local Aggregate Assessments
5.	MPAs Update
6.	Industry Update
7.	DLUHC Update
8.	AOB

## 1. Introductions and apologies

## 2. Minutes and actions of last meeting

2.1 VP went through the minutes from the last meeting asking if there were any comments on the minutes. NR commented on item 5 (pg.3/4) stating that there were several typographical errors regarding place names. VR confirms that those changes will be made.

## 3. YHAWP Annual Monitoring Report

3.1 MN begins by stating that in this AMR, there is no statement which outlines whether the areas making a full contribution towards meeting both national and local aggregate demand; MN feels that this is important as it sends a message to DLUHC outlining whether the party feels that aggregate provision is working or not. MN concludes by stating that as an AWP it cannot be said that the information is there to confirm that local and national contribution in terms of aggregate demand is being made accurately, due to lack of surveys. PH supports this point and insists that the loss of AMRI has been detrimental. JD explains that this a repeat debate and that DLUHC should supply the revised national guidance for how many tonnes each region needs to be providing, however in the absence of this JD suggests that the party should be concentrating on Local Plan targets and whether they are being met as an interim solution.

3.2 HM continues by explaining that the AWP plays a role in trying to understand why some mineral resources won't come forward. HM calls on MPA's to explain why when sites are allocated, the authority won't come forward. MN explains that it is a commercial decision for individual companies. Also, mineral plans are taking too long to be put in place and there isn't enough confidence in certain local authority areas to submit applications. GS reinforces this point by also mentioning the geology of the Leeds City Council area, where there is an absence of high-quality carboniferous limestone and large-scale concrete and sand resources.

3.3 VR confirms the comments made on the AMR have been received and are being taken onboard.

**Action: AWP to make a statement for the AMR, stating that it cannot be confirmed that a full contribution is being made towards meeting both national and local aggregate needs in the absence of data confidence.**

#### **4. Local Aggregates Assessments**

4.1 VR asked for an update from the MPAs on LAA progress.

4.2 **West Yorkshire-** ME states that the LAA has been through two rounds of consultation to the AWP and neighbouring AWPs, and it has been updated according to those comments. ME continues that there is still minimal levels of sand and gravel production, and an increased reliance on aggregate rail and marine dredged aggregate. Sand and gravel production in West Yorkshire is dwindling, there is a proposal for a replacement site in Wakefield to replace the exhausted one in Kirklees. ME concluded by stating that West Yorkshire remains dependent upon neighbouring regions for higher specification aggregates, with their main supplier remaining the National Park and the Yorkshire Dales.

4.3 HM begins questions by asking if there is any representation in the AWP from the Rail Freight companies or the Canals and River Trust as they are vital in the movement of aggregates in West Yorkshire. HM states that it would be beneficial to the AWP if one or more of these representatives were present at the YHAWP meetings. VP confirms that these individuals would not currently fall under the participant list, the suggestion is then made to HM that possibly another forum that could help resolve any issues could be created- other members of the AWP are invited to comment. GS begins comments on HM's query by stating that the AWP meeting would not be an appropriate forum for these organisations to discuss transportation of aggregates.

4.4 MR concludes by stating that the West Yorkshire joint authorities have done a marvellous job of preparing their LAA. MN and LW echoes these comments.

4.5 NR queries GS on what constitutes an appropriate and inappropriate safeguarding policy. Also, in the context of the West Yorkshire authorities declaring climate emergencies, NR states that it will be more important to safeguard the rail sites and look at how much freight is being moved by rails to see if more aggregates need to be transported from Leeds by rail. GS suggested that a case study to look at would be the Whitehall Road Yard in Leeds.

4.6 No further comments were made on the West Yorkshire LAA 2021 and it was declared ratified by VP.

4.6 **Doncaster and Rotherham-** HMcC begins the update by outlining that the Doncaster LAA has been out for consultation, comments made have been taken onboard and updated accordingly. It shows that the area has stable sand and gravel resources currently and there has been one large permission of approximately 2 million tonnes gone through. Crushed rock has been decreasing, however has remained sufficient in terms of land bank, its performance is outlined at the beginning of the document. The Doncaster and Rotherham LAA 2021 was ratified by the YHAWP.

- 4.7 MR queries table 12 of this LAA, which may have some misinformation regarding cement works in some areas. MR suggests these are corrected by referring to all as ready mix concrete. HMc confirms that these changes will be made.
- 4.8 LW concludes with asking the AWP for advice on what to do (as planners) to ensure that contributions can be made to the West Yorkshire sand and gravel landbank, while bringing forward a site which is attractive to operators. MN replies to this by stating that there could be a call for sites carried out and if nothing comes with that, there could be a critical based approach carried out. MR endorses these comments.
- 4.9 **Humber-** KG begins the update by stating that East Riding are leading on the update and the Humber LAA covers East Riding, Hull, North Lincolnshire, and North East Lincolnshire. There are staffing issues in North Lincolnshire, resulting in vital data being delayed. North Lincolnshire have suggested this data will be available by the end of the year.

**Action: Any member of the AWP with existing knowledge of the Midgley Farm site to contact LW.**

## **5. MPA's Update - Progress on Development Plans**

5.1 North Yorkshire- VP explains that they are awaiting the Inspectors Report. The main modifications were consulted on over July, August, and September. All comments from the public consultation have been collected and are now with the Inspector. JD asks about any update regarding the local government reorganisation in North Yorkshire. VP confirms that there are work streams currently underway and explains that the Local Plan which is yet to be adopted will remain intact throughout this process.

5.2 East Riding- KG provided the update on the Joint Minerals Local Plan with Hull, stating that it was adopted in 2019 and therefore it is not due to be updated now. However, the East Riding Local Plan (2016) is currently under review and it contains a Safeguarding Minerals Policy- there are no proposals for any changes in this policy. Hoping for a pre-submission consultation in autumn of next year followed by adoption by the end of 2023. Draft timescales are subject to Cabinet approval in an updated Local Development Scheme.

5.3 Doncaster- The Local Plan was adopted in September 2021 therefore all policies are up to date. HMc confirms that the judicial review period has now passed and therefore there is a fully functioning Local Plan in place.

5.4 Kirklees- NR explains that the Kirklees Local Plan was adopted in 2019 and therefore there are no plans to review.

5.5 Leeds- HM explains that their Natural Resources and Waste Local Plan was adopted in 2013 and the Minerals Transport Policies were adopted in 2015 so they are both due for review. HM continues that Leeds CC have prioritised the climate emergency and just completed a scope and consulted on a Local Plan update (one) therefore the Minerals and Waste Policies will be updated in the Local Plan update (two) which will be the end of next year. HM admits that this will require significant amount of evidence-base studies to support the policies.

5.6 Wakefield- ME gives an updates on their Local Plan, stating that it is in examination- which started last week and contains Mineral Safeguarding Policies. There were concerns with magnesium limestone resource as a safeguarded area for development. This consultation will be happening in person.

## 6. Industry Update

6.1 MN begins the industry update by noting that the economic update was circulated by VR.

6.2 MPA Sale Volumes - Mineral products markets continued to see high levels of demand over the summer, although there has been a slowdown from the peak seen during the spring. Sales volumes of aggregates and ready-mixed concrete were 6.7% lower in 2021Q3 compared with the previous quarter, 4.3% lower for asphalt and 3.7% lower for mortar. The slowdown reflects a combination pent-up activity from delayed projects starting to unwind, pinch points in the construction supply chain impacting on project delivery, and mineral product producers wrestling with limited haulage capacity and rising costs. Despite the challenges however, demand for mineral products remains brisk.

6.3 UK Economy and Construction - Published alongside Government's Budget 2021, the Office for Budget Responsibility updated their forecast for the UK economy. The better-than-expected economic performance of recent months led to an improved outlook for GDP growth this year to 6.5%, whilst unemployment is expected to rise more modestly than previously thought, peaking at 5.2% in 2021Q4. The economy is then expected to grow by 6% in 2022, although a combination of supply chain bottlenecks, shortages and soaring energy prices are expected hold back activity in the coming quarters and raise prices.

6.4 In construction, output fell by 1.2% on a 3-month basis in August, with rising prices of raw materials and difficulty in sourcing these materials continuing to impact projects on the ground. Looking ahead, supply chain issues, shortages and rising costs are expected to constrain the sector's growth well into next year. The CPA revised up its forecast for construction output this year to 14.3% reflecting stronger demand so far, but also revised down growth for 2022 to 4.8% in 2022.

6.5 RM reiterates comments made by MN and adds that despite constraints due to changes to fuel duties and on haulage, there is a very boisterous market presently, although there has been a relaxation period towards the end of the year. RM concludes by stating the industry will be waiting to see what happens in 2022.

## 7. DLUHC Update

7.1 National Guidelines- CD begins the update by ensuring the AWP that issues raised throughout the meeting about the National Guidelines are being considered by DLUHC and discussions are being held in terms of solutions to these issues.

- 7.2 Annual Reports- There was a conversation prior to this meeting between CD and the AWP secretaries which discussed the next round of reports and the updates to the templates which will be done in the new year.
- 7.3 VP raises a question to CD regarding the Planning White Paper, more specifically on how minerals and waste feature in this, as VP believes it has been ignored in previous years. CD explains that there has been a pause on this document being produced while priorities are taken stock of.
- 7.4 PH reiterates concerns around the loss of primacy within the planning system. PH suggests to CD that planning takes a higher priority in the planning reform to avoid further duplication and costs. CD understands this is a concern throughout the AWP's and ensures that there will be discussions and conversations had to address these issues.
- 7.5 JD concludes the update by reiterating the need for more returns from operators regarding exact figures and data. JD suggests these returns are made mandatory whereby operators would be required by law to fill in these surveys. CD confirms that frustrations are understood and that these issues will be brought back to other members of DLUHC to try to find a solution.

**Action: Different areas to provide CD with percentage rates of returns given by operators.**

## **8. AOB**

- 8.1 JD reminds VR of the proposal to write a letter to DLUHC from the YHAWP (and possibly joining with the other AWPs) stating that there is a need to make survey returns compulsory from operators. MN and VP agree with this notion.

**Action: Draft a letter to DHLUC outlining the concerns and proposed solutions discussed in this meeting.**