

Technical Secretary: Richard Read BA. MRTPI

Address: c/o Strategic Planning, Hampshire County Council, First Floor, Ell Court West,
The Castle, Winchester, SO 23 8UD

Tel: 07786977547

Email: readplanning@btinternet.com

Minutes of the meeting of LAWP held on 27 June 2017 at City Hall, Greater London Authority

Richard Linton (RL)	Chairman		
Richard Read (RR)	LAWP Secretary		
Emma Shillabeer (ES)	LAWP Secretariat		
James Gleave (JG)	Hillingdon	Richard Ford (RF)	Brett
Catherine McRory (CM)	Greenwich	Simon Treacy(ST)	Tarmac
John Luckhurst (JLu)	Bexley	David Payne (DP)	MPA
Janet Laban (JL)	City of London	Joel Morris (JM)	Hanson UK
Peter Heath (PH)	GLA	Tony Cook (TC)	SEEAWP Chair
James Trimmer (JT)	PLA (Port of London Authority)	Rob Anderson (RA)	Royal Haskoning DHV

1. Welcome, Introductions and Apologies

Apologies were received from Tom McCarthy – Havering, Phil Aust – Day Group, Mark Russel – MPA, Nick Everington – Crown Estate, Andy Scott - Cemex and Eamon Mythen – DCLG.

2. Minutes of meeting of 2 December 2016 and matters arising

The minutes of the meeting were agreed.

3. Aggregate Monitoring 2016 (Provisional) Report

The Secretary reported that the draft London Aggregate Monitoring (AM) 2016 (LAWP 17/01) report is nearly complete, but there still remain some gaps that will be completed in due course, when outstanding data is available. The following points were discussed.

- **Executive Summary:** Key points from the report for 2016 were highlighted: the current two year sand and gravel landbank in London; the

5.4mt of marine aggregate sold at the wharves and; imports of crushed rock of 4.3mt. This means London continues to not meet the London Plan apportionment for local sand and gravel extraction and depends on marine aggregate landings and crushed rock imports.

- **Quarries:** The recent permission granted on appeal in Havering could increase the landbank in London to around 3-4 years, this data will be reflected in next year's AM report.
The issue of confidentiality over 2016 quarry returns was raised with only two active quarries with two operators. RF stated that Brett were happy to for the London sales/reserves figures be disclosed in the interests of having transparent data for mineral planning. It was agreed Harleyford Aggregates Ltd, the operator of the second quarry, be contacted for comment (*Harleyford have since agreed for the London data be published – Sec.*).
- **Wharves:** The Secretary requested that the PLA provide wharf sales figures as in the past, it is not expected that the figures will be that different from those from the AM survey. PLA stated they were happy to provide figures, including that for Conway Wharf (who did not respond to the AM survey). It was highlighted that whilst three wharves (incorrectly stated as four in the Report) account for all London sales in 2016, the significance of the remaining wharves should not be discounted and the Report amended accordingly.
- **Capacity:** A question regarding infrastructure capacity was included for the first time in the 2016 survey, however this received a low response rate. It is reported that 80-90% of capacity is currently being used by current wharf sales, however this is most likely an underestimation. The group discussed the difficulties of accurately estimating capacity as it is dependent on a number of different factors. The Secretary would review the data. (*Advised subsequent to the meeting Peruvian Wharf (Newham LB) is to be recommissioned by the Brett Group and likely to in operation in 2018 - Sec.*).
- **Recycled Aggregates:** The Secretary reported that the 2016 survey response on recycled aggregates was too low to be reliable. Using a number of methodologies for estimating recycled aggregate from construction, demolition and excavation (CDE) waste, it appears that 50% of this material could be recycled aggregate. SLR have produced a report for the GLA on CDE waste arising's (*see next item*). However recycled aggregate estimates are not included.

- **Environment:** The general situation as reported in previous AM reports has not changed. However, there are amenity issues arising from wharf and rail depot activity. Operators have reported issues of encroachment on wharves and rail depots by new land uses such as housing. The issue is made more difficult with new housing on the Thames waterfront opposite wharves, in another Borough. This can result in some Boroughs failing to consider appropriate mitigation measures. The current judicial review application by the consortium of Greenwich peninsular aggregate operators against a Newham planning decision was noted. The Chairman reported that the Mayor took the view that new developments should include appropriate mitigation measures against the impacts of established land uses. JT was of the view there are improvements in addressing this problem.
- **Mineral Development Plans, and Planning Applications:**
 - Hillingdon – currently in the process of reviewing their plan. Local Plan Part 1 sets the framework for safeguarded sites. Development Management policies will identify safeguarded sites and proposed allocations.
 - ST advised noted that an application for extraction of one million tonnes of sand and gravel is currently under consideration by Redbridge
 - Further noted that the appeal against refusal by Havering (Rainham) for extraction of 1.35mt of aggregate by Ingrebourne Aggregates was upheld (principally on grounds of providing a local source of aggregate notwithstanding the green belt) in May.
- **London Aggregate Assessment:** As previously agreed by LAWP, a 'joint' local aggregate assessment (LAA) is prepared for London. The Secretary advised that not only the data of the AM 2016 be included but also recent planning applications, relevant planning policy is referenced to provide an up to date London Aggregate Assessment. The AM report suggests issues that the assessment should address. Secretary and PH to discuss.

Action 1: RR to contact Harleyford Aggregates Ltd to ask whether they agree to the 2016 London sand and gravel sales and reserves data to be published (Harleyford have agreed - Sec).

Action 2: PLA to provide RR with wharf figures for 2016, and any relevant commentary (PLA information and comments submitted – Sec).

Action 3: RR to review AM 2016 to take account of these Minutes and additional information when available.

Action 4: RR and PH to discuss content for the forthcoming London Aggregate Assessment.

4. The London Plan

LAWP 1702 was introduced by the Secretary. The Chairman reported that a review of the Plan is currently underway. The public draft for consultation is due at the end of the year, public examination due late summer/autumn 2018 and publication (adoption) is anticipated in 2019. The following topics were discussed:

- **Apportionment:** The need for apportionment in London was discussed. It was agreed that it is relevant, in order to ensure London continues to supply land won sand and gravel. An apportionment is also required to calculate a landbank that indicates whether there is a need to release sites. An important consideration in the recent Ingrebourne Aggregates appeal.
It was concluded that the current level – five million tonnes or 0.7 mtpa - and distribution of the apportionment should be maintained. A lower level may make extraction within London unsustainable. Under the managed aggregate supply system (MASS) set out in the PPG net aggregate consuming regions like London are required to make a contribution from their own resources.
- **Safeguarding sites:** Whilst apportionment is not met in London, the need for safeguarding sites within local plans is necessary to highlight how the apportionment could be met, e.g. Redbridge Mineral Plan. In addition, with competing land interest in London, there needs to be good policies in place for mineral extraction in the form of safeguarding to prevent sterilisation and for sites to be available for industry to exploit. DP stated that ‘site allocations’ are the best way to encourage industry to submit planning applications that can help maintain an appropriate landbank.
(Issues on the safeguarding of aggregate infrastructure – wharves and rail depots - discussed under previous item – Sec.)
- **Recycled Aggregates:** The report produced by SLR for the GLA https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/task_2_-_cde_and_haz_waste_forecasts.pdf on forecasting construction, demolition and excavation (CDE) waste was discussed further. It was highlighted the report does not account for waste from big schemes, such as HS2 and Cross Rail, and does not estimate recycled aggregates produced in London. The report suggests that an apportionment for CDE waste e.g. Policy 5.20 in the London is impracticable. Instead policy should be directed to supporting CDE waste recycling at current sites,

major construction projects and active quarries. Industry reported they already try to create this synergy. A policy to encourage recycled aggregate site applications would be beneficial. A point was raised about these operations in the green belt. PH agreed to look at the current policy.

- **London Aggregates Assessment:** It was suggested that the London Plan should reflect the current practice whereby the GLA prepares with assistance from the Boroughs, a Local Aggregate Assessment for all of London

5. Aggregate Demand/Supply Scenarios Economic Forecast.

The MPA has produced a document titled 'Long-term aggregates demand & supply scenarios, 2016-30'. The MPA believe it would be useful to share the information with AWP's and mineral planning authorities. The document looks at GDP, population forecasts and construction activity forecasts to populate four future 'scenarios'. These are to inform the discussion over the delivery of future needs. It notes that aggregate requirements over the period would be between 200-270mt a year depending on the intensity of aggregate use in construction.

It was identified that the London region would most likely fit into 'Scenario 4' whereby land-won sand and gravel is substituted by a mixture of marine dredged aggregate and crushed rock imports.

It was also explained that in the absence of any update on the 'Aggregate Guidelines' by the DCLG some thought is being given to providing a regional narrative to the scenarios.

Action 5: DP is happy to receive comments on the documents, especially on how the document could be used by AWP's and mpa's.

6. Marine Plans

The South Marine Plan is expected to be published in the Autumn.

7. DCLG Update

Apologies were received from EM. It was reported that a National Aggregate Co-ordinating Group is scheduled for 11th October.

8. AoB

The Secretary referred to LAWP 17/03. In light of the importance of Somerset as a source of crushed rock for London, the LAA is worthy of note. The LAA outlines that Somerset have a large reserve and a landbank based on an

apportionment above current and average sales. The conclusion is that London can rely on Somerset continuing as a major supplier of aggregate.

Action 6: RR will respond to Somerset on their LAA.

9. Date of Next Meeting

A provisional date is for late November, but will be finalised by RL and PH.