

Note of the NWaRAWP. RTS Sub-group Meeting.

9th September 2004.

Present; A. Dale,	CCW
M. Adair,	Hanson/QPA Wales
G. Nancarrow,	Flintshire
S. Hill,	Tarmac/QPA Wales
R. Sheffield,	Wrexham
C. Morgan,	Welsh Assembly Government
D. Williams,	Independent Operators
R Bennion,	NWaRAWP

1. Apologies.
I Evans, Chair NWaRAWP; G Jones, Denbighshire.
2. Matters Arising from meeting held on 30th April 2005
All matters arising dealt with in this agenda.
3. Progress with RTS.
As agreed at the last meeting RB presented his ideas for contents of the RTS. (Attached)
 - **Preface, Intro. Planning** – no comments.
 - **Resources** – it was agreed that the geology/resource section should initially rely on the IMAECA study, subject to a satisfactory assessment. There may be a need for the NWaRAWP to commission detailed studies into alternative resource requirements identified by the RTS
 - It was agreed that resource was a factor of location as well as geology
 - **Reserves** this would evolve from the RTS preparation.
 - **Market** this section would probably prove to be the most problematical. It was agreed that the RTS should include “something for everyone” with an interest in the supply of aggregates. MA said that the high quality product market was fairly stable, at about 30% of current sales, and likely to remain so for the foreseeable future, however the fill market was more difficult to predict. It was this area of the business that could, possibly, be supplied from other sources although the RTS would need to address the issue of the impact on the ability of the industry to continue to supply high quality products if forced out of the fill market. It was expected that the quarry section of the Smiths Gore survey would throw some light on this large but variable section of the market.
 - **Allocation**, this should be presented as a number of options for the agreement of the political tier of the RAWP.
 - **Recommendation**, this should direct the politicians towards the best option.

A number of issues regarding the content of the RTS and the mechanism for delivery were raised;

- RB cautioned that the RTS should not try to mirror the waste plan too closely as there were significant differences, minerals could only be worked where they lay, much of the demand came from outside the region, there were already fixed points of supply.
- It was conceivable that the RTS could say that the continued supply of aggregates could only take place if other environmental and social assets were sacrificed, it would be up to the RTS to recommend. Once accepted it would be for Aus to deliver through the UDPs, WAG had, in its approach to UDPs, demonstrated that it would take the necessary action to ensure/force UAs to play the designated role in the supply of aggregates.
- Members would have to be fully aware of their role on the Political RAWP. RB said that I Evans was to raise the matter of member involvement at a meeting of N Wales CPOs in September with a view to reconvening the N Wales Members Planning Forum in October. This forum would, inter alia, act as the political tier of the RAWP
- The RTS would be subject to public consultation but it was unlikely that this would follow the waste plan model, there would be specific consultation with advertising to tell the public where the draft RTS could be inspected
- The RTS will have to address the issue of patterns of supply including recommendations on preferred sites, RB referred to a letter from QPA requesting that the issue of active/inactive/dormant sites be discussed at the next RAWP meeting discontinuance/prohibition notices. The RTS should not be seen as a means of saying no to mineral development; it should be the basis of a planned pragmatic programme of supply. It should contain an objective analysis including the economic benefits.
- RB said that landbanks alone may not be the best way forward in determining reserves of aggregates and the process would require some acknowledgement of production capacity. That being the ability of the industry to meet the demand for certain products

4. IMAECA

On schedule to report in March 2005. Next steering group meeting on 22nd September 2004. RB said the RAWP secs were still awaiting training on GIS.

5. CDW and Secondary Survey

Smiths Gore with the RAWPs was carrying out a survey of arisings for 2003. The results, expected in March 2005, would finally provide answers to many of the questions regarding the use and potential use of recycled CDW. The survey includes an attempt to measure CDW arisings as well as output. The survey had taken on board the quarry industry survey form devised by MA after the last meeting. The form had been discussed in detailed by the project group and the final edition together with all the other survey forms would be available to the project steering group in October. RB raised his serious concerns about the quality of the AM survey returns particularly in respect of the end use category; he suggested surveys should request info on product sizes not end use. MA said that the SG survey should sort out this problem.

6. Funding/RAWP Contract

The matter of increased costs involved with the additional work to provide secretarial services to meet the requirements of the MTAN were being discussed, the additional sums were significant. RB said that if agreement were not reached it could threaten the production of the RTS. CM said he was confident of a successful outcome.

7. Letter to the Treasury

Following the last meeting MA had provided a draft proposal advising the Treasury of the NWaRAWP concerns about the impact of the Aggregates Levy. There had been a very positive response requesting that additional facts and figures be provided. RB said that he was having some problem getting the info. particularly from the industry and consequently he had not responded. Enquiries of the BAA secretary revealed a similar picture. Matter to be raised at the next NWaRAWP meeting.

8. Date of Next Meeting

This will be set at the next meeting of the NWaRAWP