

Minutes of London Aggregates Working Party

10 November 2021

Virtual Meeting via Microsoft Teams

Chair: Celeste Giusti GLA

Secretariat: Helen Conlon Capita

Attendees:

Name	Organisation
Celeste Giusti	GLA
Helen Conlon	Capita
Aimee Collins	Capita
Vineeta Sharma	DLUHC
Aimee Smith	DLUHC
Angela Watts	Brett Aggregates
Joe Collinson	London Borough of Bexley
David Payne	Mineral Products Association
James Sutton	Ingrebourne Valley Limited
Linda Beard	London Borough of Havering
Mark Richie	Marine Minerals
Mark Wrigley	The Crown Estate
Mike Pendick	Tarmac/MPA
Phil Aust	Day Group and MPA
Simon Tracey	Brett Aggregates / BAA
Tony Cook	SEEAWP

Apologies:

Name	Organisation
Andrew Scott	Cemex
Elliot Kemp	GLA
James Trimmer	PLA
Mark Kelly	Cemex
Ewan Coke	London Borough of Redbridge
Peter Huxtable	BAA

Item	Description
------	-------------

- | | |
|----|-------------------------------------|
| 1. | Introductions and apologies |
| 2. | Minutes and actions of last meeting |
| 3. | Aggregates Facilities Safeguarding |
| 4. | LAWP Annual Report |
| 5. | DLUHC |
| 6. | AoB |
| 7. | Date of Next Meeting |

1. Introductions

- 1.1 Celeste Giuste (CG) welcomed everyone to the meeting.

2 Minutes of the last meeting

- 2.1 Helen Conlon (HC) went through the minutes of the last meeting. HC noted that the safeguarding guidance was considered at the last meeting and it was agreed that it would be uploaded to the GLA website. HC will arrange for this to be uploaded. Tony Cook (TC) noted that Action 4 had also been raised at SEEAWP Meeting on 28 October 2021.
- 2.2 With regards to any mapping, David Payne (DP) comments that if digital maps are going to be put online, they need to be quite detailed, including boundaries of safeguarded sites and associated consultation areas, to avoid confusion surrounding the safeguarding and to make it most useful. GLA should do this and host on the GLA website as it is necessary for implementation of London Plan policy, and GLA has the GIS skills and resources.
- 2.3 The 2019 annual report has been finalised and website has been updated.
- 2.4 HC asked AWP members their thoughts on the most effective way to keep other working parties updated on things that are going on in neighbouring boroughs which may affect waste and minerals. It was suggested that this question be something which is brought up at the next annual AWP secretaries meeting.

3 Aggregates Safeguarding

- 3.1 HC refers to Tom Campbell's drafted report which will be added to the website and suggests that some of the policies are refreshed considering the new NPPF and the adopted London Plan.

- 3.2 With regards to the mapping- the first draft needs more detail which will be added. The data used to compile this map was taken from Appendix 1 of the previous AWP annual monitoring report.
- 3.3 For a more interactive map, this is not something that the secretary would be able to arrange as it would require specialist software and licencing so the maps produced will be quite basic. Celeste Gusti says that she will investigate this and see whether GLA have access to the appropriate software/ licencing to accommodate this.
- 3.4 It is stated by Phil Aust (PA) that the draft map had several sites missing from it, however HC ensures these will be added and the map circulated is a draft only. PA mentioned that it may be useful to reference a Tfl resource which was compiled several years ago which was produced to do a similar thing; to record safeguarded rail depots. This resource was in connection with the Construction Logistics Planning Program and is a website-based record of all these sites.
- 3.5 David Payne (DP) comments on the key, noting that the quarries are missing from it along with certain boroughs which have been left out. HC notes this to be amended in the next version of the map.
- 3.6 HC enquires about the list of sites used and asks whether this is complete.

ACTION: CG to enquire about software/licencing availability at GLA to produce interactive map

4 London Aggregate Working Party Annual Report

- 4.1 HC notes that she has collated the data from the 2020 forms which were sent out earlier in the year. No data returns received for quarries and HC continues to chase this. HC also noted that figures from the last AMR will be updated with those from the Aggregate Mineral survey.
- 4.2 HC, Vineeta Sharma (VS) and Aimee Smith (AS) collectively agreed that certain parts of the new report template may need amended for the London AWP.
- 4.3 PA notes that there are missing and incorrect figures, specifically, table labelled as 'XX' needs attention. PA also draws attention to 'table 3' as the title does not reflect the contents; (table is headed 'Permitted Reserves and Imports in London', however contents are those of 'Reserves and Capacity of Infrastructure.') AS also takes note of this on behalf of DLUHC.
- 4.4 AS notes that a meeting has been arranged between DLUHC and AWP secretaries to discuss the template as they are aware there are some issues with this and want reports to be consistent.
- 4.5 DP states that it is important to have commentary around the safeguarding of sites given London is almost totally reliant for aggregates supply on imports and landings of marine dredged aggregates. He also feels that that commentary should outline some of the key

differences between London and other AWP areas, in that the London Plan provides strategic policy and sets apportionments. DP notes that there are Boroughs missing from figure 2 and highlights and requests that these are added. Finally, DP recommends that there is more detail regarding the role of the AWP at the beginning of the report.

- 4.6 TC endorses the previous comments made by other members of the AWP and mentions that there should be commentary made on soft sand as everything that is dealt with in the plan is regarded as sand and gravel.
- 4.7 Table 5 is also brought up by several AWP members who note inconsistencies with the data. ST recommends that there be a definition of both 'Amounts Produced' and 'Amounts Managed' to make the table clearer.

5 DLUHC update

- 5.1 AS informs members that there is a business case being put together to update guidelines.
- 5.2 AS also provides an update on the Aggregate Mineral Survey carried out by BGS. AS noted that a 'lessons learnt' meeting has taken place which highlighted some of the functionality issues of 'Survey Monkey'. AS notes that survey monkey will not be used again and DLUHC have already started looking at alternatives.
- 5.3 DP makes comments on which parts of the managed aggregate supply system that works and what parts don't. These thoughts have now been shared with AS.

6 AOB

- 6.1 PA enquires on whether members are expecting LAA's. HC noted that she has only received headline LAA figures from one MPA.
- 6.2 TC draws attention to the national terms of reference and enquires about their status. TC also wishes to ensure that the plea that was made by the GLA for better liaison were the London Plan is concerned was confirmed and whether it was made an item? HC explains that there have been conversations had with Jordan Richard whereby they have briefly discussed the different ways to keep other working parties up to date. HC then confirms this will be a matter explained more thoroughly in the next meeting with all AWP secretaries which is due to take place on the 24th of November.
- 6.3 DP mentions the 50th year anniversary for Quarries and Nature document and film will be circulated to AWP members.

7 Date of next meeting

- 7.1 The date of the next London Aggregates Working Party Meeting will be held in six months' time.