

Minutes of Yorkshire and Humber AWP Meeting 23rd July 2021 Virtual Meeting via Microsoft Teams

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

Attendees:

Carole Howarth	Bradford City Council
Vicky Perkin	North Yorkshire CC
Mark Kelly	Cemex/MPA
Lee Weatherall	Marshalls/MPA
Mark Wrigley	Crown Estate
Michael Eaglestone	Wakefield Council
Geoff Storey	Aggregate Industries Ltd. UK/MPA
Mark North	Minerals Products Association
Joan Jackson	North Yorkshire CC
Tiffany Lloyd	Tarmac/MPA
Nick Reeves	Kirklees Council
Peter Huxtable	BAA
Louise White	Leeds City Council
James Durham	East Riding of Yorkshire Council
Farzana Tabasum	Kirklees Council
Stephen Cowan	Tarmac/MPA

Apologies:

Andrew Willerton	North Lincolnshire Council
Helen McCluskie	Doncaster Council
Andy Duncan	Rotherham Council
Anita Seymour	Calderdale Council
Dave Parrish	Yorkshire Dales NPA
Katie Gowthorpe	East Riding of Yorkshire Council
Nick Everington	Crown Estate
Nick Horsley	MPA
Richard Holmes	Sheffield City Council

Item	Description
1.	Introductions and apologies
2.	Minutes and actions of last meeting
3.	AM2019 update
4	YHAWP Annual Monitoring Survey and Local Aggregate Assessments
5.	MPAs Update
6.	Industry Update
7.	MCHLG 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. No comments were made.

3. AM2019 Update

3.1 VR gave an update on the AM2019. VR mentioned that a final collation of the data was expected in July but it has not come through yet.

3.2 MN mentioned that MHCLG have had the survey results back and can expect the survey to be published in the next 4 weeks.

4. YHAWP Annual Monitoring Survey and LAA update

4.1 VR asked for an update from the MPAs on the circulation of Forms A and B for the YHAWP Annual Monitoring Survey and an update on LAA progress.

4.2 CH mentioned that ME is leading on the West Yorkshire LAA. The data has been collected from the five West Yorkshire Authorities and the data is now being collated. Looking to go out for consultation on the West Yorkshire LAA in September 2021.

4.3 ME mentioned that he has all the data from the five West Yorkshire Authorities. There are variances in the quality of the data received, so some estimates will need to be made. ME has BGS data for 2019 and own data for 2020. ME will forward this information on to VR. ME has compared the data to the housing delivery and they both track nicely on a chart. Quarry sales have slumped in line with housing delivery in the 2019 year.

- 4.4 JD mentioned that the annual survey for East Riding they're struggling to get returns on the primary aggregates. Secondary aggregates they can make an estimate based on the waste data interrogator. Out of nine, only three have responded to the primary aggregates data. Holding off on progressing the LAA until there is better data but can't hold off much longer and will need to make estimates for the remaining operators. The Pandemic may well have had an impact on receiving returns from operators, either because staff are off with Covid, or because staff have been told to self-isolate due to being in close contact with someone who has Covid. JD mentioned that he has also not yet received the data from North Lincolnshire which is required to prepare the Humber LAA. JD raised a query on whether there is a better way of getting the necessary data from operators, as at the moment, it is not compulsory to submit returns, so operators who are busy are not completing them.
- 4.5 ME mentioned that operators do have to provide returns for the annual minerals raised enquiry data and doesn't understand why it is not the same for minerals planning, yet for inland revenue the data is obligatory.
- 4.6 MN agrees that response to the survey should be obligatory, and that this is a matter MHCLG should take onboard. Generally, minerals planning is suffering from a lack of data. If MPA members are not submitting, get in touch with MN. MN mentioned that Lonek is retiring, and Hannah Henderson has been promoted and will no longer be working in the minerals department at MHCLG. Both will be replaced, but the lack of continuity of personnel at MHCLG in the minerals department is problematic. Clear from the feedback on the Planning White Paper that there needs to be separate work stream on mineral planning.
- 4.7 PH mentioned if there are BAA members that are not returning data, please let PH know and he will get in touch with them. Also concerned about lack of continuity and experience in minerals planning at MHCLG.
- 4.8 JJ gave an update on North Yorkshire's LAA. Not started yet as still awaiting data from some of the major operators. JJ to get in touch with MN and PH after the meeting. Had more returns from the smaller operators, but not so much the major operators.

5. MPA's Update - Progress on Development Plans

North Yorkshire

- 5.1 JJ mentioned that NYCC have gone out for consultation on their main modifications until 15th September.

East Riding of Yorkshire Council

5.2 Adopted joint minerals local plan with Hull in November 2019. Out for consultation at the moment on their draft Local Plan update, and in terms of minerals, this includes the mineral safeguarding areas in draft to comment on. There is also a Minerals Safeguarding Area background paper and there's a policy on what non-minerals development in those safeguarding areas should do. It includes requirements for minerals assessments in certain instances. Out for consultation until Friday 6th August.

Bradford Council

5.3 Now moving forward with 'one local plan'. Had an adopted Core Strategy and site allocations DPD, but now a change to a local plan which will encompass both of these, plus waste policies. Went out for Reg 18 consultation, with the closing date being 24th March 2021. The consultation document doesn't include mineral site allocations. Conducted a call for sites for minerals and waste sites. A couple of years from adoption. The policies for minerals and waste in the existing Core Strategy proposing to roll forwards to the 'one local plan.'

Wakefield Council

5.4 Submitted new local plan for examination. In terms of minerals, policies are not different to those in the adopted local development framework. Anticipate hearings to be held towards the end of 2021. Main issue is that the main area of growth coincides with the remaining maglimestone resource. Recently approved a sand and gravel quarry. It will be exporting sand and gravel exclusively via mineral barge up to Leeds.

Kirklees Council

5.5 Still got 2019 Local Plan in place and there are no plans to review it currently. At the end of March this year submitted an application for a Transpennine express upgrade. This includes station upgrades and Huddersfield, Dirton and Merfield, a new station at Ravensthorpe, doubling the number of tracks from two to four, enhancements to one of the junctions and electrification of the railway. There is going to be an increase in demand for aggregate in the area. There are potential issues with a couple of minerals sites along the route. First is the MPA plant at Calder Road at Ravensthorpe. It is a protected minerals infrastructure site. Network rail say operations at that site will not be effected but newlay concrete have placed an objection and are liaising with Network Rail on a way forward. The other site is the quarry at Forge Lane in Ravensthorpe. This is an active sand and gravel quarry which has planning permission up until 2024 and currently Kirklees Council are seeking clarity from Network Rail on when the restoration works on this site will be complete. Also would like to know when all the sand and gravel will be extracted from the site before Network Rail acquire the land. Our concern is that the mineral resources will be sterilised on site so we are looking for clarity on this.

Doncaster Council

5.6 Doncaster Council has recently completed its examination in public on the Local Plan (which contains the minerals policies). Subject to the proposed changes agreed with the Inspector the plan was then found sound and the examination is now closed. The Local Plan is scheduled for adoption at Full Council in September 2021.

6. Industry Update

6.1 MPA Mineral Products Markets -The recovery in construction activity and mineral products gained strong impetus since March. MPA members' feedback to date indicates that this impetus continued over the course of the second quarter. Double digit growth expected in construction this year continues to be challenged by supply chain issues, particularly for imported products and materials, which are likely to persist into the second half of 2021. However this is challenged by access to goods and materials. Availability of haulage is also an issue. HS2 is taking lorries out of the market and also plant operatives as well. There is also the added difficulty of semi-conductor shortages worldwide, which means trying to get new lorries and plants is difficult – up to 18 month lead in times.

6.2 UK Economy and Construction - The UK economy rebounded more strongly than expected as we gradually navigate our way out of Covid restrictions. GDP increased by 2.3% in April, boosted by strong retail spending and the full reopening of schools. By early June, the majority of UK businesses were back to trading. The 4-week delay in removing the last remaining Covid restrictions is expected to have a limited impact on an otherwise robust economic outlook, but inflation is increasingly becoming a cause for concern.

6.3 In construction, output fell by 2% month on month in April, after a sharp spike in activity in March, when output exceeded its pre-pandemic level. The dip was driven by private new housing and private housing repair & maintenance. However, feedback from housebuilders and wider construction stakeholders suggests that activity remains very strong. The main concern is whether material and skills shortages will eventually put the brakes on growth in the sector.

6.4 MN mentioned that the new NPPF has recently been published. There were some limited changes to the minerals section. The government has indicated that minerals will be reviewed separately. Important that we do keep inviting MHCLG to AWP meetings and it is important that we have a MHCLG representative at the meetings.

6.5 JD mentioned that MHCLG are looking for someone from local authorities to be seconded to MHCLG to minerals and waste. Once they've sourced someone, assume that's when they'll start the workstream of separate minerals guidance.

6.6 VP mentioned she saw the advert too, but the consequences are that an experienced minerals and waste planner moving to MHCLG means that the authority they move from is going to struggle to process applications.

- 6.7 CH replied to MN's comment about the shortage issue in materials. It is becoming a serious issue for housing developments in Bradford. Developers are half building out developments, and then having to switch to a different type of brick because the original type of brick is no longer available.
- 6.8 MN replied saying that brick manufacturers are largely offshore and there are issues with imports. MPA has been telling government not to assume supply. At the moment there is not a problem with aggregates, but that may change. There is under-provision in minerals plans also in the west and east midlands. HS2 is taking up material and that could also impact the YHAWP area. We are pressing for national guidelines to understand any up-and-coming issues with aggregate supply. We also keep pressing that the major infrastructure projects and housing projects should have a material supply audit undertaken. These are undertaken for waste but not minerals. For the Oxford-Cambridge Arc, all the waste arisings are calculated but no mention of minerals when there will be c.1 million houses built.
- 6.9 GS agrees with what MN mentioned. The industry is very busy at the moment. Local authorities will see it in the context of applications for altering operation hours for example. There is a need for the efficient processing of applications for the extension of operating hours to meet demand.
- 6.10 CH replied that the alteration to working hours conditions on minerals sites and the number of conditions is very dependent on where the site is and Councillor involvement. If a site is remote, then there will be less conditions, but sites tend to be within proximity to residential.
- 6.11 GS one of the issues we have in terms of proximity to housing is that we are still finding that local authorities are allowing residential development near to mineral safeguarding areas. Proper safeguarding is not happening.
- 6.12 PH mentioned that he has made available the presentation that came from joint industry and leadership council which is on the topic of the material shortages. Cement is one of the key ones. In the Peak District, Hope cement have so much cement being exported that the rail system cannot handle it. Also, staff shortages, with 2 million people still furloughed and also lorry drivers from abroad not wanting to come to the UK because of the isolation rules and because of Brexit. If the price rises go up of materials, the main concern will be that inflation will start making some inroads into government ability to spend as much money on the infrastructure planning. Had a few issues as an industry with Natural England over biodiversity net gain and SSSIs. The Environment Agency has raised that the aggregates waste protocol to allow aggregates from waste, the EA are now looking to withdraw support from it unless there is a task force that goes in to re-write it.
- 6.13 SC agrees with the statement that there are materials shortages and a rise in demand. The cement issue is particularly acute in Scotland where there are import issues and preservation. There are also breakdowns at plants, the plant

at Dunbar completely ran out last week of cement due to various issues and it is just getting going again.

6.14 In respect of the comments of PH on biodiversity metric MN mentioned that Biodiversity net gain metric 3.0 is designed for housebuilders and not for minerals planning. The MPAs concerns are not being taken into consideration. The MPA published a robust press release recently which got a reaction from DEFRA.

6.15 VP asked MN whether DEFRA might be open to exemptions being part of the requirement. MN replied saying this might be optimistic.

7. MHCLG – update

7.1 A report template for the AWP Annual Monitoring Reports has been sent to the AWP Secretaries

7.2 National Guidelines - We are progressing the update to the national guidelines however they will not be available in time to inform the upcoming annual monitoring reports.

7.3 National Terms of Reference – this is being updated in line with the comments received from the AWP.

8. AOB

8.1 MW gave an update on the Crown Estate. The Crown Estate are proposing to run a marine aggregates tender round in 2021. A high level of interest was shown in response to us inviting expressions of interest earlier this year. Subject to successfully concluding a Plan-level Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) it is anticipated that exploration agreements would commence in late 2022.

<https://www.thecrownestate.co.uk/en-gb/media-and-insights/seabed-and-coastal-notice/aggregates-potash-and-other-minerals/>

8.2 We have published the port landing statistics for 2020. These confirmed that over 18 million tonnes were extracted in the calendar year.

<https://www.thecrownestate.co.uk/en-gb/what-we-do/on-the-seabed/minerals-dredging/>

8.3 In the coming months we will be releasing the 2021 Capability and Portfolio report and the 23rd Area involved report.

8.4 MN mentioned that the MPA has recently published its minerals today magazine which includes an article on minerals supply. The LAA system should be

forecasting demand. There are too many LAAs that are deficient in forecasting which is why we need national guidelines.

- 8.5 ME replied stating that with LAAs there is information that largely stops at geographical boundaries. Some of these issues though are at a national supply level. The LAAs do make adjustments for potential increases in demand. The LAA system is fundamentally based on looking backwards. The main criteria is average historic supply level.
- 8.6 JD added that we need operators to feed in to the LAAs. When considering geographical areas, often those areas are getting smaller as large county council authorities get abolished and turned into smaller unitary authorities. Sometimes the solutions to scarcity of aggregates is going to come from outside the LAA authority.
- 8.7 GS mentioned the North Yorkshire County Council re-organisation. Mentioned that in County Durham, it lead to the breaks being put on the minerals plan. GS asked VP what she thinks will happen with North Yorkshire and minerals.
- 8.8 VP responded stating that there has been an announcement of a unitary North Yorkshire covering the whole of North Yorkshire but excluding the City of York. Cumbria have been split into two unitary authorities and Somerset is becoming one unitary. In North Yorkshire we are so close to getting adoption of the minerals and waste plan, the hope is that it will be adopted at the end of 2021. The timetabling is ambitious with a new structure by April 2022 and elections to a new authority May 2022 and the new authority coming into existence in April 2023. Concerned about having in the future an all-encompassing plan with minerals and waste included, as you are going to have issues which hold up other areas of the plan.
- 8.9 GS mentioned that Leeds dealt with minerals under a separate natural resources banner pulling it out of it being held up by housing.
- 8.10 CH mentioned that Bradford did have a separate waste DPD which is now within the one local plan. Overall CH reckons the future is not to have separate minerals and waste local plans. The result is that minerals and waste policies are minimised in comparison to housing for example.
- 8.11 ME mentioned Greater Manchester has a separate minerals and a separate waste local plan.
- 8.12 VP mentioned that the division over the county is not going to be following the 6 district council areas but is going to follow the 6 MP constituency boundaries. This will have significant consequences for decision making on planning. Ryedale District Council will be going from 30 councillors to 11. There are currently 72 members on the county council and this is going to increase to 90 for the whole of the unitary authority. This is a significant reduction overall if you add up the amount of members over each of the constituent councils.

8.13 VR mentioned that the next meeting will be in October/November and will be held virtually. All members of the AWP agreed virtual meetings are most appropriate.