

Minutes of Yorkshire and Humber AWP Meeting 17th November 2020 Virtual Meeting via Microsoft Teams

Chair: Vanessa Rowell Capita

Secretariat: Vanessa Rowell Capita

Attendees:

Dave Parrish	Yorkshire Dales National Park
Carole Howarth	West Yorkshire Combined Authority and Bradford
Michael Hodges	Breedon
Geoff Storey	Mineral Products Association
Mark Hill	North York Moors National Park
Mark North	Minerals Planning Association
Helen Miller	Leeds City council
Joan Jackson	North Yorkshire CC
Ben Ayres	MPA and BAA
Hannah Henderson	MHCLG
Tiffany Lloyd	Tarmac
Mark Wrigley	Crown Estate
Malcolm Ratcliffe	W Clifford Watts & MPA
Andrew Willerton	North Lincolnshire Council
Ryan Shepherd	Rotherham council
Nick Reeves	Kirklees Council
Roger Gray	Hull City Council
Rachel Thirlwall	Marine Management Organisation
Peter Huxtable	BAA
Louise White	Leeds City Council
Helen McCluskie	Doncaster council
Anita Seymour	Calderdale Council
James Durham	East Riding of Yorkshire Council
Farzana Tabasum	Kirklees Council

Apologies:

Ian Garrett Wakefield Council

Chris Hanson
Katie Gowthorpe
Vicky Perkin

Sheffield City Council
East Riding of Yorkshire Council
North Yorkshire County Council

Item	Description
1.	Introductions and apologies
2.	Minutes and actions of last meeting
3.	Yorkshire & Humber AMR - ratification
4.	Local Aggregate Assessments
5.	Aggregate Minerals Survey update 2019
6.	Planning White Paper
7.	MPAs Update
8.	Industry Update
9.	MCHLG update
10.	AOB

1. Introductions

1.1 Vanessa Rowell (VR) explained that Vicky Perkin has sent her apologies and therefore VR will be the Interim Chair for this meeting. VR Welcomed everyone to the meeting.

2. Minutes and actions of last meeting

2.1 VR went through the minutes from the last meeting asking if there were any comments on the minutes.

2.2 It was confirmed that the minutes are a correct record of the last meeting.

3. Yorkshire & Humber AMR 2019

3.1 VR sent the draft AMR around for comments prior to the meeting. Mark North (MN) questioned whether the AWP was confident that they were making a full contribution to local and national aggregate needs. MN stated that as the LAA system progresses, it is short of coherent data and thought it might be useful to caveat the AMR report.

3.2 James Durham (JD) noted that the system should be set up to assess whether each region was meeting their apportionment to their national targets. The current guidelines are old with projections only going up to 2020 nationally and the system isn't working as there is nothing to work to. JD noted that some LA's

are doing their own forecasts and suggested that the AWP add up all targets that have been set through mineral plans or LAA's for the region and see whether we are meeting this target within the AMR.

3.3 Malcolm Ratcliffe (MR) thought that in previous reports, the AMR did include a short paragraph to state that it is not possible to fulfil this part of the national remit as there were no up to date guidelines and asked whether it would be possible to do this again. VR responded by saying that she took comments on board and would look into amending the report.

3.4 MN stated that this issue is something that should be flagged with the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MCHLG). MN also agreed that a sort paragraph should be added to the AMR to state that the AWP does not have confidence that they are making a full contribution.

Action: VR to include a caveat in the YHAMR 2019 that the AWP is unable to fulfil its role of ensuring that the area is making a full contribution towards meeting national aggregate needs. Once included – verify for ratification.

4. Local Aggregate Assessments

4.1 In terms of Local Aggregate Assessments (LLAs), Carole Howarth (CH) stated that the thought process for the West Yorkshire area was to delay the LLA's until next year and produce a combined report that would take account of 2019 figures. At the West Yorkshire Combined Authority meeting in July, Heads of Planning agreed this approach and the LLA will be delayed until next year, and it will be a combine one for 2019 and 2020.

5. Aggregate Minerals Survey 2019

5.1 VR stated that mineral surveys are still ongoing and will be attending a steering group meeting to get an update on the response rates to form A and form B. VR will feed back the outcomes of this meeting with the AWP.

5.2 MN stated that he would also be attending the steering group meeting and thought it may be helpful for the AWP to feed back any gaps they are identifying in terms of returns. MN noted that they are in close contact with BTS and to date, all the majors have responded and any outstanding forms are being chased.

5.3 VR stated that any feedback in advance of the steering group meeting should be passed on to VR or MN.

6. Planning White Paper

6.1 Following the publication of the Planning White Paper, VR confirmed that a response was sent to MHCLG with the main point being that there was a lack of information on mineral planning in the proposals. VR also noted that the paper is proposing to change the standardised methodology for housing numbers which will have an impact on minerals planning system.

6.2 MN asked MHCLG whether there was any feedback on the Planning white Paper. In response to this, Hannah Henderson (HH) provided an update and noted that the consultation closed on 29th October. The department are now in the process of analysing responses. HH confirmed that stakeholder engagement was carried out during the consultation period with mineral reps who were encouraged to put in a response which highlighted the importance of minerals planning. HH also stated they have spoken to the Planning Reform Team internally about this and it is being considered. The next stage of this process is the formal government response but there is no confirmed timeline for this, however, given the size of the consultation it may take a while. HH also stated that further opportunities for engaging with stakeholders is still under consideration but HH will continue to provide updates on this as it progresses.

6.3 Peter Huxtable (PH) asked whether there was a breakdown of responses. HH stated that she was not involved in analysing responses and there was a specific team doing this, but it is assumed that HH's team will work with the reform team on this in terms of mineral planning.

6.4 MN stated that as far as he was aware, all AWP's responded to this consultation along with all the bodies that represent the mineral sector.

7. MPA's Update - Progress on Development Plans

West Yorkshire Combined Authority

7.1 CH stated that the Core Strategy is in place and a partial review of this is ongoing. Policies on minerals that are in place are very strong.

East Riding and Yorkshire Council

7.2 Adopted joint mineral plans with Hull in November 2019 and there are no plans to review this yet. The Council have started work on reviewing local plan and hoped to go out to consultation on this in November (2020) but this was delayed due to planning reforms and Covid-19. Work is being carried out on the evidence base and it is hoped that consultation will take place in Spring.

Doncaster Council

7.3 Doncaster are in the middle of local plan examination hearings. Currently working on action points and are waiting on input from the Planning Inspector.

Kirklees Council

7.4 Kirklees local plan was adopted last February and there have been no further changes since then.

Leeds City Council

7.5 Leeds Council has lost high court challenge for the site allocation plan and must redo 37 sites in the green belt and will have to stay there until the council go through the process again. The council have done a brief review on minerals policies and have noted that updates are needed. These updates will be carried out as part of the local plan review which will be carried out in two parts. The first part of the local plan review will focus on climate change policies to reflect emergency commitments and the second part will include the minerals and waste policies. The Core Strategy, which was adopted in 2014. A review in 2019 resulted in reduced housing numbers.

Rotherham Council

7.6 Rotherham's local plan is up to date and in place but pursuing a partial review of the core strategy and are aiming to hold first consultation around Autumn 2021.

Wakefield Council

7.7 Wakefield – have Published submission draft of new local plan which includes minerals and waste policies. The Policy map shows safeguarding areas for minerals. Main change is that growth areas for housing and employment strongly coincide with magnesium limestone resource. The plan also includes other safeguarding areas for coal, sand and gravel. Consultation on the draft plans will run to 20th December 2020 with the aim of submitting this to the Secretary of State towards the end of 2021.

Hull City Council

7.8 Hull – have a joint mineral plan with East riding. The local plan adopted in November 2017 and currently in stage of considering how this will be reviewed.

North Yorkshire Council

7.9 The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) for the local plan still need to be completed, which will go to the Inspector once finalised. The Council hope to go out to main modification consultation towards the end of this year.

North East Lincolnshire Council

- 7.10 Local plan regulation 19 consultation was due to take place in Autumn 2020, but this has been delayed and likely to take place early 2021. The local plan has also extended its plan period from 2020 – 2038.

North York Moors

- 7.11 North York Moors – NYM hope to adopt joint Minerals Plans in spring / summer 2021. The local plan was adopted in July 2020 and hope to be fully up to date by the middle of 2021.

Yorkshire Dales

- 7.12 Yorkshire Dales – local plan was adopted in 2016 and work on new local plan is underway which will take account of the new extended area of the National Park and will run to 2040. There are no aggregate quarries in the extended area. DP confirmed that there are several planning applications the most major one being the applications for dry quarries for the extension of 13 years.

Calderdale Council

- 7.13 Calderdale Council are currently in stage two of local plan enquiry hearings and mineral and waste will be heard as part of this. Hope to have an adopted plan early next year.

Leeds City Council

- 7.14 Louise White (LW) stated that the Council has had a lot of staff leaving recently which has had an impact on how the planning team works. Planning staff are working across different areas of planning department, with LW now working on enforcement matters. Through this, it has been highlighted that operators aren't always adhering to their planning permissions and a lot of resources have been spent trying to rectify this. Louise asked that industry adhere to planning conditions and work with the Council on this.

- 7.15 MN suggested that LW get in touch after the meeting to discuss this.

8. Industry Update

- 8.1 MN stated that demand has picked up following the last lock down however, there was concern about future orders starting to dry up. The Governments infrastructure proposals are welcomed within the industry and it is hoped that these will come forward. MN confirmed that a comprehensive response was

submitted as part of the Planning White Paper consultation. A further policy paper has also been submitted to the Government with suggestions on how to improve the mineral planning system. MN noted that a good thing that has come out of COVID-19 has been the recognition from Government on the importance of the sector in terms of supply.

8.2 PH stated that some members have reported their best year despite COVID-19 and it is hoped that business continues to come forward. In terms of the AMS survey, PH confirmed that have been working closely with BAA and MHCLG and has been chasing up on any outstanding responses. There appears to have been a good coherent response to the Planning White Paper from Industry and AWP. PH noted that their response focused on what industry would like to see from the planning system going forward. In terms of keeping things going, the industry has been speaking to the Treasury and money seems to be around and some of this may be needed to abolish the aggerate levy as this tax is unwelcome. PH also noted that the Minerals industry seem to be treated very differently to the farming community and did not benefit from the same perks (e.g. ability to use red diesel).

8.3 CH asked whether the industry was having any issues that the AWP needed to be aware of in terms of Brexit? MN responded that it depended what sector of the industry you were operating in. In terms of aggerate which was an internal supply, the only thing that may disrupt this would be a no deal by the 31st December as this may cause a lack of confidence within business. Industry is hoping for a smooth transition but hard to tell at this point.

8.4 Geoff Storey (GS) mentioned that the Environment Bill is progressing through the committee stage and noted that this bill would require a biodiversity gain as a condition of planning permission, amongst other things, if passed. There is no indication as to when this would receive royal assent, but it would likely have a significant impact on planning. VR stated that this bill would also seek to introduce nature recovery networks and is something to be aware of on the policy side of things and it would mean substantial change.

8.5 LW mentioned that the Planning Portal were currently holding a conference and there is a talk about biodiversity net gain which can be watched back. LW said that she would send this on to the group. One of things that came out of this talk was that the bill will not have as much of an impact on minerals operators but may hit commercial developers harder.

9. MHCLG – update

9.1 HH stated that MHCLG were going through the procurement process to retender the AWP secretariat contract. This contract ran for three years initially but this was extended. It is hoped that MHCLG will go out to tender before Christmas. HH noted that MHCLG had a discussion with current secretariats to review the current contract and understand whether there was anything that needed to be changed or included in the specification. HH hopes to provide further updates on this before Christmas.

9.2 MN asked for an update on who the main minerals team is within MHCLG. HH stated that Guy Skelton was responsible for running the environmental, mineral and waste side of things. Within this team, there is Lonneck, Aimee Smith and Hannah Henderson. HH noted that prior to this, there was a team solely responsible for Minerals and Waste however this is more joined up so to work on the environmental side of things, but this is subject to change in the future.

10.AOB

9.1 No AOB.