

MINUTES of a meeting of the **AGGREGATES PANEL** held on
Friday, 28 March 2003

ATTENDANCE

Members of the Panel: N Copping (Chairman), M Saunders, W. Storey,
G F Wenham, J Usher (for Janet Anderson),
B York

Officers Attending: Sue Davidson, Jon Durbin, Julie Reeve,
Tim Williams

Members of the Public: Simone Rosemund – Mercury
Michael McMullen - Bengeo Rural PC
Celia Rochford - Little Berkhamsted PC
Douglas Tibbles – Ellenbrook Resident
Sydney Paris - Ellenbrook Resident
George Sandell - CAGE
Tony Vickers – Hertford Civic Society

Administrator Joyce Brooks

MINUTES

1. **Apologies** were received from J. Anderson, B Engel and R Sanderson.

2. **Minutes** of the meeting of the 15 January were agreed as a true record.

3. **Matters Arising** –

Sue Davidson advised the Panel that the Government had not yet published its guidelines for Aggregates Provision.

4. **Responses to representations made to the First Deposit Draft Minerals Local Plan Review – proposed amendments to the Plan**

This report informed the Panel of representations made to the First Deposit Draft Minerals Local Plan and sought the Panel's support on the proposed amendments to the Plan. 340 representations had been received with approximately 1,000 individual comments on the Plan.

Two tables were attached to the report, Table 1 listed representations proposing alterations to be accepted by the County Council and the larger Table 2 listing representations where officers recommended that there should be no alterations to the Plan, or there should be further discussion by the Panel.

The Panel agreed to work through Table 1 and defer Table 2 and the identification of sites to a later meeting for further discussion and research.

The Panel agreed the following :

Pages 1-7	agreed.
Pages 8 – 9	some concern over the words reclamation, restoration and afteruse. Officers to reconsider and clarify definitions for consistency. It was suggested that the legal team consider the final document and a glossary.
Page 10	agreed
Page 11	No. 227 – reconsider first sentence with possible deletion of “and necessary”.
Page 12	agreed
Page 13	No. 287 – Replace “at no time” with “not”. Delete reference to Stansted Airport and replace with “aviation”.
Page 14	Clause ii - delete ; insert “and”
Page 15	Seek legal opinion on the use of “adverse” instead of “detrimental”
Pages 16 – 20	Agreed
Page 21	No. 235 – Should read February 2000 not 2002.
Page 22	No. 314 -sensitive land uses (insert including housing, schools)
Page 23	Agreed
Page 24	Delete No. 319
Page 25	Agreed.

The responses were all accepted in principle, with the above minor amendments and those subject to further clarification. A schedule of amendments based on the above to be confirmed at the next Panel meeting.

5. General Themes emerging from responses to First Draft Minerals Local Plan Review 2002

This paper highlighted some of the broader issues raised by respondents for consideration and sought the Panel’s advice on the suggested officer responses.

A number of responses were received about site selection and the Panel was asked to agree General Response No. 1 at Appendix 1. It was also suggested that there should be some cross reference to the Structure Plan. **General Response No. 1 was agreed.**

A further area of concern appeared to be around the role of the mineral supply scenarios. A section had been added to the draft Plan

discussing the implications upon site selection of the different scenarios and General Response No. 2 further clarified the matter.

Cllr Saunders suggested clarification should be given to the fact that not only do we have to provide for the 12 years of the Plan period, but we also have to identify an additional 7 years' supply at the end of the Plan period. He suggested that the scenarios be set out more simply as a chart to make it easier to understand.

General Response No. 2 was agreed, subject to the above amendments.

Go-East objected that paragraph 3.3.1 placed a general requirement on all applicants to demonstrate both the need for a mineral and the lack of alternative, sustainable, supplies, which, in its opinion, goes beyond the guidance of MPG1. They also say that the penultimate sentence of Policy 2 needs to be qualified to take account of quality as well as quantity of reserves.

The Panel agreed that :

- **Policy 1 should remain unchanged insofar as it related to need;**
- **In respect of Policy 2, the supporting text be amended to define “adequate” as a reflection of quantity and quality of mineral it terms of its end use.**

Railtrack objected to Policy 4 because of the lack of a site selection criteria giving preference to a selection of sites served by rail or water. **The Panel agreed that Policy 4 should not be amended to include a site selection criteria.**

Stevenage Borough Council objected to Policy 9 as, in their opinion, the policy does not enable the consideration of alternative replacement rail depots when considering the redevelopment of a railhead, nor does it allow for the consideration of a site no longer being viable for use as a rail aggregates depot.

The Panel agreed that Policy 9 should be amended to allow for the relocation of a railhead or wharf as part of any development and that Railtrack and British Waterways be invited to make specific suggestions for new rail or water served aggregates depots to be evaluated for inclusion in the Plan.

Welwyn Hatfield Council objected to the wording of Policy 14 as it does not specifically refer to the impact of landfill, such as on local communities, roads and the environment.

The Panel agreed that the policy should not be amended to refer to the impact of landfill as stated above but should be amended as shown in paragraph 2.26

6. New Minerals Policy Statement for England on controlling and mitigating the environmental effects of mineral working (MPS2): consultation on revised text

This report advised Members of the public consultation on the Government's proposed Minerals Policy Statement 2 – Controlling and mitigating the environmental effects of mineral extraction in England – a copy of the consultation had previously been circulated.

The report was accepted.

7. A.O.B.

Sue Davidson advised the Panel of the following information items :

- AFS13 Simonshyde – a planning application had been received for the extraction of 2.25m tonnes of sand and gravel working through Hatfield Quarry. It will be going out to consultation next week;
- Appeal on Farm Fields IS2. The appeal had been withdrawn.

Next Steps on Review of Minerals Local Plan

Second Deposit Draft to County Council in July.

Dates for Future Meetings

Thursday, 8 May at 9.30 a.m. Committee Room C
Thursday, 22 May at 9.30 a.m. Mimram Room
Tuesday, 3 June at 2.00 p.m. Ashbourne Room
Monday, 12 June at 2.00 p.m. Ashbourne Room

