

MINUTES of a meeting of the **AGGREGATES PANEL** held on
22 May 2003

ATTENDANCE

Members of the Panel: N.Copping (Chairman), F Clayton (for B York),
B C Engel (for J Anderson), R Sanderson,
I Simpson, W Storey.
Additional Members: D Ashley
Officers Attending: Sue Davidson, Julie Reeve, Clare Foxwell
Others : Ian Mundy – LaFarge
Ian Malone - Resident
Administrator: Joyce Brooks

MINUTES

1. **Apologies** were received from J Anderson, M Saunders and B York.

The Panel expressed their appreciation of George Wenham's past attendance at Aggregates Panels and said that his vast knowledge about aggregates had provided a valuable input to the Panel over many years and would be sadly missed.

Anne Fisher introduced herself as the new Assistant Director of Environment for the Strategy Group.

2. **Minutes** of the meeting held on 28 March were agreed as a true record.
3. **Matters Arising** – there were none.
4. **Consolidation of recommended changes to the First Deposit Draft Minerals Local Plan Review**

This paper set out the amendments made to the first deposit draft at the previous Panel meeting and sought the Panel's agreement to including them in the 2nd deposit draft of the Plan.

The following additional amendments were agreed :

Page 4 –MP10 – 2nd sentence to read “Where the cumulative impact of all activity in the area exceeds the environmental capacity of the locality, planning

Page 5 – MP12 - Sue Davidson to reword the sentence “The County Council will encourage progressive restoration where appropriate”.

The Panel accepted Appendix A, together with the above amendments.

5. **Recommended responses to objections to the first Minerals Local Plan Review – recommendations not to amend the Plan**

This report considered comments on the Plan on :

- Objections to the Plan where the officer recommendation is that proposed changes, or other comments, are not accepted;
- Comments in support of the Plan.

The Panel was advised that Pages 20-86 of the response document relating to sites specific would be considered at a later Panel together with the Supplementary Guidance.

Chapter 1 – Pages 1-4 – Introduction to the Plan and the planning system in relation to minerals land use planning. Accepted.

Chapter 2 – Pages 5-7 - Aims for the Plan.

Cllr Sanderson asked if the changes and delay to the Structure Plan process would have any impact on the Minerals Local Plan. She was advised that the Structure Plan would still have a roll forward to 2016 and Local Plans would still have to conform to the draft Structure Plan. The process was still robust. Accepted.

Chapter 3 – Pages 8-94 (excluding 20-86 sites specific) – Strategic Policies looking at where mineral supply for the County might come from in the future and the process for determining how many sites would be included.

Sue Davidson advised the Panel that although proposals for identifying Mineral Consultation Areas had been received, they would not be recommended.

Cllr Clayton asked if the proposal for the new hospital at Hatfield would conflict with aggregate removal. Sue Davidson said that her understanding was no specific site had been identified in the hospital consultation document. If any proposal for a hospital in the Hatfield area were to be on green belt it would be a departure from the Development Plan. Careful consideration would need to be given as to whether such a development could work in conjunction with mineral extraction or whether there would be special circumstances to override the sterilisation policy.

Cllr Simpson asked if the process of identifying sites had been changed as many residents had been worried unnecessarily when sites had been identified and then discounted. Sue Davidson said that the process had not been changed, but this exercise was thought to be the most transparent.

Cllr Simpson was also concerned about MP7 and that operators could try to prolong the life of quarries by slowing down extraction to enable recycling to continue. Sue Davidson said that the policy had been

amended to avoid having permanent recycling facilities that exceeded the life of extraction sites, but the principle of having recycling on mineral/landfill sites had been agreed. A condition generally related to the life of the site that allowed some flexibility, but there would need to be an extension through a separate planning application if this seriously prolonged extraction. There also needed to be taken into account the question of whether prolonging the life of the site would have an adverse impact when secondary aggregates were being used instead of primary ones. Accepted.

Chapter 4 Pages 94-127 - Operational activities at quarries

Sue Davidson explained that “cumulative impact” related to everything that was going on around the area, not what had happened historically.

Cllr Engel queried the clause “the Council may in certain specific circumstances require restoration bonds.... It was agreed that the clause should remain and that legal advice should be sought about its robustness should it be challenged. Accepted.

Appendix 1 – Pages 127/8 - Function, period and scope of the Plan.

The Conclusion and Recommendations were accepted by the Panel as amended at the meeting.

6. **A.O.B.** - There was none.

Future Meetings

3 June – cancelled.

12 June 2.00 p.m. – hold

8 July – 2.30 p.m. in the Mimram