

Supplementary Hearing Statement on behalf of Lincolnshire County Council (Minerals and Waste Policy and Compliance Team) in response to the Inspector's Supplementary Questions

17 June 2020

Matter 3 – Minerals Provision Policies

Policy MP1

Q28: Given the reducing level of sales of aggregates in Nottinghamshire, is the use of the 10-year sales average a robust approach to planning for aggregate provision, and is any alternative reliable approach available?

- 28.1 No. As detailed in our original Hearing Statement dated 9 April 2020, the 10-year sales average is not a sound basis upon which to plan for future sand and gravel provision in Nottinghamshire, because the depressed sales figures mask the underlying demand in Nottinghamshire that is being increasingly met by unsustainable imports from other authorities, particularly Lincolnshire. Reliance on the depressed 10-year sales average also fails to account for the future growth and significant infrastructure projects identified in Nottinghamshire's latest Local Aggregate Assessment.
- 28.2 There is a general consensus that the depressed sales seen in Nottinghamshire in recent years, and the subsequent increase in imports, are largely the result of commercial decisions made by mineral operators during the recession to rationalise their operations; temporarily mothballing some sites, and focussing production in others.
- 28.3 Given the importance of Nottinghamshire as a sand and gravel producer and the extensive resources that exist within the county, it is reasonable to expect that as demand increases and existing sites are worked out, operators would look to expand their operations once again and increase production in Nottinghamshire. However, Nottinghamshire's proposal to base future provision (and landbanks) on the depressed 10-years average sales would prevent this 're-balancing' of mineral movements from occurring, and would 'lock-in' the recent unsustainable trends by limiting the ability of the industry, and the plan, to respond to increased demand.
- 28.4 As set out in our original Hearing Statement, we therefore consider that a more appropriate and sound approach to determining the provision that

Nottinghamshire should make for sand and gravel would be to base it on the assumption that sales in Nottinghamshire will return to a similar proportion of total sales in the East Midlands achieved prior to the recession.

28.5 The general principle of departing from the 10-year average sales and setting a provision rate to reflect pre-recession sales proportions is not unique, and was seen for example in Oxfordshire's minerals and waste core strategy (adopted September 2017), where the county had experienced a similar decline in sales due to the commercial decisions of operators during the recession.

28.6 It is acknowledged that there is no set methodology for determining a provision rate based on pre-recession sales proportions. However, for the Inspector's consideration, we suggest that the following approach should be utilised as a simple, robust alternative method for calculating the baseline sand and gravel provision in Nottinghamshire (see Appendix 1: Table 1 for associated data and calculations):

- Average sand and gravel sales in the East Midlands prior to the recession (2003-2007) were 9.99 million tonnes per annum (mtpa).
- Nottinghamshire's proportion of these sales was 37.2%.
- Average sand and gravel sales in the East Midlands post-recession (2014-2018) were 6.93 mtpa.
- When applying pre-recession proportions to recent sales, this would give an alternative baseline provision figure for Nottinghamshire of **2.58 mtpa** (6.93 x 0.372).

28.7 The data for these calculations is taken from the East Midlands Aggregate Working Party (EMAWP) Annual Monitoring Reports. The latest available report (for 2017) is included as Appendix 2 to this statement. The report for 2018 is yet to be formally published but associated data has been included to ensure the most up to date information is utilised. Whilst the 2018 data should be regarded as provisional at this stage, the removal of this data from the calculations would not significantly change the results. Earlier reports are available on the gov.uk website:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/aggregates-working-parties-annual-reports>

28.8 It is considered that the 5 year period from 2003 to 2007 provides a good basis for setting the proportions as it represents a period of relatively steady sales prior to the recession. Similarly, following a period of more volatile and reduced sales between 2008 and 2013, it is considered that 2014 onwards is

an appropriate period to look at recent sales. When using the draft 2018 EMAWP figures this also provides another 5 year period for comparison.

28.9 The proposed alternative baseline figure of 2.58 mtpa is a combined figure for sand and gravel and Sherwood Sandstone due to the way aggregate sales are reported by the EMAWP. This figure is significantly higher than the currently proposed combined figure of 2.07 mtpa (1.7 + 0.37), and it is considered this would represent a reasonable increase to the provision rate to address the underlying demand in Nottinghamshire which is currently driving imports. It is also important to note that the proposed alternative figure of 2.58 mtpa should be seen as an alternative 'baseline', and that adjustments may still therefore be considered necessary to reflect the identified future growth and infrastructure projects, and any emerging sales trends.

28.10 A simple way of splitting this alternative figure into its sand and gravel and Sherwood Sandstone constituents would be to apply the same methodology as above to the sales figures for these separate components (sales detailed in Nottinghamshire's Local Aggregate Assessments). This would result in the following figures (see Appendix 1: Table 2 for associated data and calculations):

- Sand and gravel proportion of East Midlands sales (2003-2007): 31.9%
- Applying this proportion to recent sales (2014-2018) gives **2.21 mtpa**
- Sherwood Sandstone proportion of East Midlands sales (2003-2007): 5.3%
- Applying this proportion to recent sales (2014-2018) gives **0.37 mtpa**

28.11 Whilst it is acknowledged that Sherwood Sandstone is identified separately to sand and gravel due to its specialist uses, the pre-recession sales figures show that the proportions of these two components of Nottinghamshire's overall sand and gravel output were generally stable and consistent. As such, we consider that the above methodology provides a simple and reasonable indication of how Nottinghamshire's sand and gravel provision could be split.

Q29: Does the Sand and Gravel Delivery Schedule in Appendix 1 of the Plan demonstrate a steady and adequate supply of aggregates over the Plan period?

29.1 No. As set out in detail in our original statement, the productive capacity of existing and allocated sites identified in the Sand and Gravel Delivery Schedule declines over the plan period and is insufficient to meet the provision rate proposed in the plan, let alone providing any flexibility to accommodate future growth and account for current imports.

29.2 Additional allocations for sand and gravel extraction are therefore required in order to ensure there is sufficient productive capacity to allow a steady and adequate supply of aggregates over the Plan period. These allocations should also be based on a higher provision rate (as suggested above) for the reasons already outlined.

Appendix 1: Data and Calculations

Table 1: Aggregate sand and gravel sales in the East Midlands (*millions of tonnes*)

| | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018* |
|--|--------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Derbyshire | 1.48 | 1.37 | 1.34 | 1.19 | 1.22 | 1.11 | 0.91 | 1.04 | 1.10 | 0.81 | 0.82 | 0.95 | 1.13 | 1.29 | 0.94 | 1.05 |
| PDNP | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 |
| Leicestershire | 1.49 | 1.42 | 1.36 | 1.27 | 1.33 | 1.09 | 0.84 | 0.91 | 0.92 | 0.91 | 1.10 | 1.46 | 1.41 | 1.5 | 1.46 | 1.18 |
| Lincolnshire | 3.16 | 3.00 | 3.20 | 3.37 | 2.47 | 2.27 | 1.99 | 1.79 | 1.92 | 1.85 | 1.88 | 2.15 | 2.19 | 2.17 | 2.38 | 2.32 |
| Northamptonshire | 0.69 | 0.62 | 0.58 | 0.43 | 0.36 | 0.25 | 0.17 | 0.22 | 0.24 | 0.40 | 0.51 | 0.52 | 0.27 | 0.4 | 0.32 | 0.58 |
| Nottinghamshire** | 3.94 | 3.89 | 3.60 | 3.65 | 3.52 | 2.82 | 1.60 | 1.88 | 2.06 | 1.91 | 1.73 | 1.77 | 1.91 | 1.59 | 1.69 | 2.02 |
| Total East Midlands | 10.77 | 10.29 | 10.07 | 9.91 | 8.91 | 7.54 | 5.50 | 5.83 | 6.23 | 5.89 | 6.04 | 6.85 | 6.91 | 6.95 | 6.79 | 7.15 |
| Nottinghamshire proportion of East Midlands sales (%) | 36.58 | 37.8 | 35.75 | 36.83 | 39.51 | 37.4 | 29.09 | 32.25 | 33.06 | 32.43 | 28.64 | 25.84 | 27.64 | 22.88 | 24.89 | 28.25 |

Source: East Midlands Aggregate Working Party (EMAWP) Annual Monitoring Reports (some figures/totals may vary slightly due to rounding)

** Data for 2018 taken from the latest Draft EMAWP Report for 2018 (awaiting final publication)*

*** Sales figures for Nottinghamshire include sand and gravel and Sherwood Sandstone*

Average pre-recession sales (2003-2007)

- East Midlands: 9.99 mtpa
- Nottinghamshire: 3.72 mtpa (37.2% of East Midlands total)

Average post-recession sales (2014-2018)

- East Midlands: 6.93 mtpa
- Nottinghamshire: 1.80 mtpa (25.9% of East Midlands total)

Amended baseline figure for Nottinghamshire based on pre-recession proportion of recent sales:

- $6.93 \times 0.372 = \mathbf{2.58 \text{ mtpa}}$ (sand and gravel and Sherwood Sandstone)

Table 2: Nottinghamshire pre-recession aggregate sand and gravel sales (millions of tonnes)

| | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 |
|--------------------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Sand and gravel | 3.34 | 3.37 | 3.08 | 3.15 | 2.97 |
| Sherwood Sandstone | 0.60 | 0.51 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.55 |

Source: Nottinghamshire Local Aggregate Assessment July 2013:

<https://www.nottinghamshire.gov.uk/planning-and-environment/minerals-local-plan/local-aggregate-assessment>

Average pre-recession sales (2003-2007)

- Sand and gravel: 3.18 mtpa
- Proportion of East Midlands total (9.99 mtpa) = 31.9%

- Sherwood Sandstone: 0.53 mtpa
- Proportion of East Midlands total (9.99 mtpa) = 5.3%

Amended baseline figures based on pre-recession proportion of recent sales:

- Sand and gravel: $6.93 \times 0.319 = \mathbf{2.21 \text{ mtpa}}$
- Sherwood Sandstone: $6.93 \times 0.053 = \mathbf{0.37 \text{ mtpa}}$

Appendix 2:

**East Midlands Aggregate Working Party Annual Monitoring Report
2017 - incorporating data from January – December 2017**

(Included as a separate, stand alone document)

East Midlands Aggregate Working Party

Annual Monitoring Report 2017 - incorporating data from January – December 2017



For further information on this document and the East Midlands Aggregates Working Party, please contact:

| | |
|------------------|--|
| Chairman | Lonek Wojtulewicz Head of Planning, Historic and Natural Environment Leicestershire County Council County Hall Glenfield LE3 8RA Tel: 0116 305 7040 lonek.wojtulewicz@leics.gov.uk |
| Secretary | Carolyn Williams Group Leader: Minerals & Waste Planning Unit Urban Vision Partnership Ltd Civic Centre Chorley Road Swinton Salford M27 5AS Tel: 0161 604 7746 carolyn.williams@urbanvision.org.uk |

The statistics and statements contained in this report are based on information from a large number of third party sources and are compiled to an appropriate level of accuracy and verification. Readers should use corroborative data before making major decisions based on this information.

Published by Urban Vision Partnership Ltd on behalf of the East Midlands Aggregates Working Party.

This publication is also available electronically free of charge on www.communities.gov.uk and www.urbanvision.org.uk.

Executive Summary

The East Midlands Aggregate Working Party (AWP) is one of nine similar working parties throughout England and Wales established in the 1970's. The membership of the East Midlands AWP is detailed in Appendix 1.

This Annual Monitoring (AM) report provides sales and reserve data for the calendar year 1st January – 31st December 2017. The report provides data for each of the sub-regions in the East Midlands, which are as follows:

- Derbyshire
- Leicestershire
- Lincolnshire
- Northamptonshire
- Nottinghamshire
- Rutland
- Derby
- Leicester
- Nottingham
- Peak District National Park, which incorporates areas within Sheffield, Barnsley, Kirklees, Oldham, Cheshire East and Staffordshire

It is not a policy-making body, but is charged with data collection to facilitate planning by Mineral Planning Authorities (MPAs), national government agencies and the industry, and to inform the general reader.

Crushed Rock

- Total Crushed Rock Sales of 28.41.mt in 2017, up 1% on 2016 figures (28.11mt).
- Total Crushed Rock Reserves of 1,281.43mt, down 2% on 2016 figures (1,306.46mt).
- The Crushed Rock Landbank (based upon 10 years average sales) is 54.93 years, down from 55.49 years in 2016.

Land-won Sand and Gravel

- Total Land-won Sand and Gravel Sales of 6.79mt, down 2% on 2016 figures (6.95mt).
- Total Land-won Sand and Gravel Reserves of 57.59, down 2% on 2016 figures(60.90mt).

Supplementary Hearing Statement on behalf of Lincolnshire County Council (Minerals and Waste Policy and Compliance Team) in response to the Inspector's Supplementary Questions

17 June 2020

Matter 3 – Minerals Provision Policies

Policy MP1

Q28: Given the reducing level of sales of aggregates in Nottinghamshire, is the use of the 10-year sales average a robust approach to planning for aggregate provision, and is any alternative reliable approach available?

- 28.1 No. As detailed in our original Hearing Statement dated 9 April 2020, the 10-year sales average is not a sound basis upon which to plan for future sand and gravel provision in Nottinghamshire, because the depressed sales figures mask the underlying demand in Nottinghamshire that is being increasingly met by unsustainable imports from other authorities, particularly Lincolnshire. Reliance on the depressed 10-year sales average also fails to account for the future growth and significant infrastructure projects identified in Nottinghamshire's latest Local Aggregate Assessment.
- 28.2 There is a general consensus that the depressed sales seen in Nottinghamshire in recent years, and the subsequent increase in imports, are largely the result of commercial decisions made by mineral operators during the recession to rationalise their operations; temporarily mothballing some sites, and focussing production in others.
- 28.3 Given the importance of Nottinghamshire as a sand and gravel producer and the extensive resources that exist within the county, it is reasonable to expect that as demand increases and existing sites are worked out, operators would look to expand their operations once again and increase production in Nottinghamshire. However, Nottinghamshire's proposal to base future provision (and landbanks) on the depressed 10-years average sales would prevent this 're-balancing' of mineral movements from occurring, and would 'lock-in' the recent unsustainable trends by limiting the ability of the industry, and the plan, to respond to increased demand.
- 28.4 As set out in our original Hearing Statement, we therefore consider that a more appropriate and sound approach to determining the provision that

Nottinghamshire should make for sand and gravel would be to base it on the assumption that sales in Nottinghamshire will return to a similar proportion of total sales in the East Midlands achieved prior to the recession.

28.5 The general principle of departing from the 10-year average sales and setting a provision rate to reflect pre-recession sales proportions is not unique, and was seen for example in Oxfordshire's minerals and waste core strategy (adopted September 2017), where the county had experienced a similar decline in sales due to the commercial decisions of operators during the recession.

28.6 It is acknowledged that there is no set methodology for determining a provision rate based on pre-recession sales proportions. However, for the Inspector's consideration, we suggest that the following approach should be utilised as a simple, robust alternative method for calculating the baseline sand and gravel provision in Nottinghamshire (see Appendix 1: Table 1 for associated data and calculations):

- Average sand and gravel sales in the East Midlands prior to the recession (2003-2007) were 9.99 million tonnes per annum (mtpa).
- Nottinghamshire's proportion of these sales was 37.2%.
- Average sand and gravel sales in the East Midlands post-recession (2014-2018) were 6.93 mtpa.
- When applying pre-recession proportions to recent sales, this would give an alternative baseline provision figure for Nottinghamshire of **2.58 mtpa** (6.93 x 0.372).

28.7 The data for these calculations is taken from the East Midlands Aggregate Working Party (EMAWP) Annual Monitoring Reports. The latest available report (for 2017) is included as Appendix 2 to this statement. The report for 2018 is yet to be formally published but associated data has been included to ensure the most up to date information is utilised. Whilst the 2018 data should be regarded as provisional at this stage, the removal of this data from the calculations would not significantly change the results. Earlier reports are available on the gov.uk website:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/aggregates-working-parties-annual-reports>

28.8 It is considered that the 5 year period from 2003 to 2007 provides a good basis for setting the proportions as it represents a period of relatively steady sales prior to the recession. Similarly, following a period of more volatile and reduced sales between 2008 and 2013, it is considered that 2014 onwards is

an appropriate period to look at recent sales. When using the draft 2018 EMAWP figures this also provides another 5 year period for comparison.

28.9 The proposed alternative baseline figure of 2.58 mtpa is a combined figure for sand and gravel and Sherwood Sandstone due to the way aggregate sales are reported by the EMAWP. This figure is significantly higher than the currently proposed combined figure of 2.07 mtpa (1.7 + 0.37), and it is considered this would represent a reasonable increase to the provision rate to address the underlying demand in Nottinghamshire which is currently driving imports. It is also important to note that the proposed alternative figure of 2.58 mtpa should be seen as an alternative 'baseline', and that adjustments may still therefore be considered necessary to reflect the identified future growth and infrastructure projects, and any emerging sales trends.

28.10 A simple way of splitting this alternative figure into its sand and gravel and Sherwood Sandstone constituents would be to apply the same methodology as above to the sales figures for these separate components (sales detailed in Nottinghamshire's Local Aggregate Assessments). This would result in the following figures (see Appendix 1: Table 2 for associated data and calculations):

- Sand and gravel proportion of East Midlands sales (2003-2007): 31.9%
- Applying this proportion to recent sales (2014-2018) gives **2.21 mtpa**
- Sherwood Sandstone proportion of East Midlands sales (2003-2007): 5.3%
- Applying this proportion to recent sales (2014-2018) gives **0.37 mtpa**

28.11 Whilst it is acknowledged that Sherwood Sandstone is identified separately to sand and gravel due to its specialist uses, the pre-recession sales figures show that the proportions of these two components of Nottinghamshire's overall sand and gravel output were generally stable and consistent. As such, we consider that the above methodology provides a simple and reasonable indication of how Nottinghamshire's sand and gravel provision could be split.

Q29: Does the Sand and Gravel Delivery Schedule in Appendix 1 of the Plan demonstrate a steady and adequate supply of aggregates over the Plan period?

29.1 No. As set out in detail in our original statement, the productive capacity of existing and allocated sites identified in the Sand and Gravel Delivery Schedule declines over the plan period and is insufficient to meet the provision rate proposed in the plan, let alone providing any flexibility to accommodate future growth and account for current imports.

29.2 Additional allocations for sand and gravel extraction are therefore required in order to ensure there is sufficient productive capacity to allow a steady and adequate supply of aggregates over the Plan period. These allocations should also be based on a higher provision rate (as suggested above) for the reasons already outlined.

Appendix 1: Data and Calculations

Table 1: Aggregate sand and gravel sales in the East Midlands (*millions of tonnes*)

| | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018* |
|--|--------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Derbyshire | 1.48 | 1.37 | 1.34 | 1.19 | 1.22 | 1.11 | 0.91 | 1.04 | 1.10 | 0.81 | 0.82 | 0.95 | 1.13 | 1.29 | 0.94 | 1.05 |
| PDNP | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 |
| Leicestershire | 1.49 | 1.42 | 1.36 | 1.27 | 1.33 | 1.09 | 0.84 | 0.91 | 0.92 | 0.91 | 1.10 | 1.46 | 1.41 | 1.5 | 1.46 | 1.18 |
| Lincolnshire | 3.16 | 3.00 | 3.20 | 3.37 | 2.47 | 2.27 | 1.99 | 1.79 | 1.92 | 1.85 | 1.88 | 2.15 | 2.19 | 2.17 | 2.38 | 2.32 |
| Northamptonshire | 0.69 | 0.62 | 0.58 | 0.43 | 0.36 | 0.25 | 0.17 | 0.22 | 0.24 | 0.40 | 0.51 | 0.52 | 0.27 | 0.4 | 0.32 | 0.58 |
| Nottinghamshire** | 3.94 | 3.89 | 3.60 | 3.65 | 3.52 | 2.82 | 1.60 | 1.88 | 2.06 | 1.91 | 1.73 | 1.77 | 1.91 | 1.59 | 1.69 | 2.02 |
| Total East Midlands | 10.77 | 10.29 | 10.07 | 9.91 | 8.91 | 7.54 | 5.50 | 5.83 | 6.23 | 5.89 | 6.04 | 6.85 | 6.91 | 6.95 | 6.79 | 7.15 |
| Nottinghamshire proportion of East Midlands sales (%) | 36.58 | 37.8 | 35.75 | 36.83 | 39.51 | 37.4 | 29.09 | 32.25 | 33.06 | 32.43 | 28.64 | 25.84 | 27.64 | 22.88 | 24.89 | 28.25 |

Source: East Midlands Aggregate Working Party (EMAWP) Annual Monitoring Reports (some figures/totals may vary slightly due to rounding)

** Data for 2018 taken from the latest Draft EMAWP Report for 2018 (awaiting final publication)*

*** Sales figures for Nottinghamshire include sand and gravel and Sherwood Sandstone*

Average pre-recession sales (2003-2007)

- East Midlands: 9.99 mtpa
- Nottinghamshire: 3.72 mtpa (37.2% of East Midlands total)

Average post-recession sales (2014-2018)

- East Midlands: 6.93 mtpa
- Nottinghamshire: 1.80 mtpa (25.9% of East Midlands total)

Amended baseline figure for Nottinghamshire based on pre-recession proportion of recent sales:

- $6.93 \times 0.372 = \mathbf{2.58 \text{ mtpa}}$ (sand and gravel and Sherwood Sandstone)

Table 2: Nottinghamshire pre-recession aggregate sand and gravel sales (millions of tonnes)

| | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 |
|--------------------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Sand and gravel | 3.34 | 3.37 | 3.08 | 3.15 | 2.97 |
| Sherwood Sandstone | 0.60 | 0.51 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.55 |

Source: Nottinghamshire Local Aggregate Assessment July 2013:

<https://www.nottinghamshire.gov.uk/planning-and-environment/minerals-local-plan/local-aggregate-assessment>

Average pre-recession sales (2003-2007)

- Sand and gravel: 3.18 mtpa
- Proportion of East Midlands total (9.99 mtpa) = 31.9%

- Sherwood Sandstone: 0.53 mtpa
- Proportion of East Midlands total (9.99 mtpa) = 5.3%

Amended baseline figures based on pre-recession proportion of recent sales:

- Sand and gravel: $6.93 \times 0.319 = \mathbf{2.21 \text{ mtpa}}$
- Sherwood Sandstone: $6.93 \times 0.053 = \mathbf{0.37 \text{ mtpa}}$

Appendix 2:

**East Midlands Aggregate Working Party Annual Monitoring Report
2017 - incorporating data from January – December 2017**

(Included as a separate, stand alone document)

- The Land-won Sand and Gravel Landbank (based upon 10 years average sales) of 8.93 years, down slightly from 9.14 years in 2016.

Landings of Aggregates

- Little or no material has been landed in the East Midlands for aggregates purposes. Sustained demand for aggregates in the coastal belt is relatively low and navigable coastal wharfage is effectively limited to Boston.
- Wharfage is also available at Gainsborough, Sutton Bridge and Fosdyke but none of these sites are equipped for landing aggregates.

Total aggregate sales, reserves and landbank

During the 2016 monitoring period total aggregate sales increased from 35.07mt in 2016 to 35.20mt in 2017. This is the highest sales figure in the past 10 years and brings the region closer to the pre-recession levels. There has been a gradual increase since 2009 (except the low in 2012) with a marked increase in 2016 with crushed rock sales showing a 17% uplift from 2015 figures and fairly steady figures in 2017 from 2016 levels. This brings total aggregate sales to 6.86mt below the annual guidelines¹ for aggregate provision of 42.06mt. Total aggregate reserves decreased from 1,367mt as at 31 December 2016 to 1,339mt as at December 2017.

Aggregate crushed rock sales, reserves and landbank

Sales of crushed rock aggregate increased from 28.11mt in 2016 to 28.41 in 2017, the highest recorded sales figure since 2008. Sales of limestone increased from 2016 levels. Total reserves of crushed rock aggregate decreased from 1,306mt in 2016 to 1,281.43 at 31 December 2017.

The crushed rock landbank for the East Midlands as at 31 December 2017 was 54.93 years, in excess of the “at least” 10 year requirement of the NPPF. Landbanks for the sub-regions are detailed in the Table 4 in the main report.

Aggregate sand and gravel sales, reserves and landbank

Sales of land-won aggregate sand and gravel have decreased from 6.95mt in 2016 to 6.79mt in 2017.

Reserves of land-won aggregate sand and gravel were 57.59mt as at 31 December 2017, down from 60.90mt in 2016. This figure does not include sand sold for non-aggregate purposes. The sand and gravel landbank for the East Midlands as at 31 December 2017 was 8.93 years (based on 10yrs sales). Landbanks for the sub-regions are detailed in table 4 and table 4a for Lincolnshire specific area breakdown in the main report.

¹ National and regional guidelines for aggregate provision in England 2005 - 2020, Communities and Local Government, June 2009

Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| EXECUTIVE SUMMARY | 3 |
| 1. INTRODUCTION..... | 6 |
| BACKGROUND | 6 |
| PLANNING POLICY | 7 |
| REPORT SCOPE | 9 |
| 2. DEVELOPMENT PLANS | 10 |
| 3. PRIMARY AGGREGATES..... | 12 |
| TOTAL AGGREGATE SALES, RESERVES AND LANDBANK | 12 |
| AGGREGATE CRUSHED ROCK SALES, RESERVES AND LANDBANK | 12 |
| AGGREGATE SAND AND GRAVEL SALES, RESERVES AND LANDBANK | 12 |
| OVERVIEW | 20 |
| DERBYSHIRE | 20 |
| PEAK DISTRICT NATIONAL PARK | 21 |
| LEICESTERSHIRE AND RUTLAND | 23 |
| LINCOLNSHIRE | 25 |
| NORTHAMPTONSHIRE | 27 |
| NOTTINGHAMSHIRE | 28 |
| SUMMARY | 30 |
| 4. SECONDARY AND RECYCLED AGGREGATES..... | 32 |
| DERBYSHIRE | 35 |
| LEICESTERSHIRE | 35 |
| LINCOLNSHIRE | 35 |
| NORTHAMPTONSHIRE | 36 |
| NOTTINGHAMSHIRE | 36 |
| RUTLAND | 36 |
| PEAK DISTRICT NATIONAL PARK | 36 |
| 5. MARINE SOURCES | 37 |
| APPENDIX 1: BREAKDOWN TABLES | 39 |
| APPENDIX 2: AWP MEMBERSHIP | 41 |
| APPENDIX 3: AWP MEETING MINUTES..... | 43 |
| APPENDIX 4: GLOSSARY..... | 53 |
| APPENDIX 5: ACRONYMS..... | 54 |
| APPENDIX 6: ACTIVE, INACTIVE AND DORMANT AGGREGATE MINERAL WORKINGS | 55 |
| APPENDIX 7: MONITORING OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS | 66 |
| PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR PRIMARY AGGREGATE EXTRACTION DETERMINED 1 JANUARY TO 31 DECEMBER 2016..... | 66 |
| APPENDIX 8: THE EAST MIDLANDS LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREAS..... | 70 |

1. Introduction

- 1.1. This 2017 Annual Monitoring Report (AM2017) for the East Midlands has been prepared from returns made by the operators of quarries in the East Midlands in response to a party wide survey and provides sales and reserve data for the calendar year 1st January – 31st December 2017.

Background

- 1.2. The Aggregates Working Parties² (AWPs) were established in the 1970s to collect and monitor data on aggregates provision as an aid to minerals planning. AWP are joint local government-central government-industry bodies that monitor the supply of, demand for, and reserves of, all aggregates including both primary aggregate and alternative sources in the East Midlands mineral planning authority areas. They also consider the implications of supply to, and from, these areas. They are not policy-making bodies, but provide information to facilitate the work of Mineral Planning Authorities (MPAs), national government agencies and the minerals industry. They also feed regional views to the Government through the national forum, the National Coordinating Group (NCG).
- 1.3. The core functions of the AWP, as set out in the Planning Practice Guidance, are to:
- consider, scrutinise and provide advice on the Local Aggregate Assessments of each mineral planning authority within the East Midlands area;
 - provide an assessment of the position of overall demand and supply for the Aggregate Working Party area; and
 - obtain, collect and report on data on minerals activity within the East Midlands area.
- 1.4. The AWP operate under contracts between the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government and the Chairs of the AWP, and receive funding from the Department to prepare papers, reports, and data collations as recommended by the NCG.
- 1.5. The East Midlands Aggregates Working Party (EMAWP) was established in 1974. The membership of EMAWP comprises officers of each of the MPAs, representatives of three industry trade associations; the Mineral Products Association (MPA), the British Aggregates Association (BAA) and the Federation of Demolition Contractors, and officers of the

² Were previously known as Regional Aggregate Working Parties but has now changed to reflect national guidelines.

Department of Communities and Local Government (CLG). It comprises the following sub-regions:

- Derbyshire
- Leicestershire
- Lincolnshire
- Northamptonshire
- Nottinghamshire
- Rutland
- Derby
- Leicester
- Nottingham
- Peak District National Park

1.6. EMAWP is chaired by a Chief Planning Officer or Director from one of the MPAs. The 2017 Chairman was Lonek Wojtulewicz, Head of Planning, Historic and Natural Environment at Leicestershire County Council. The AWP is also serviced by a Technical Secretary, who for 2017 was Carolyn Williams of Urban Vision. The membership of the East Midlands AWP for 2017 is set out in Appendix 2 and minutes of the most recent AWP meeting are presented at Appendix 3.

Planning Policy

1.7. There are several policies that the AWP complies and takes guidance from.

The National Planning Policy Framework

1.8. The NPPF requires MPAs to make provision for a steady and adequate supply of minerals; to define mineral safeguarding areas; to safeguard wharves, rail heads and certain aggregate processing facilities and plant.

1.9. The NPPF requires MPAs to participate in an Aggregates Working Party (AWP); to prepare an annual Local Aggregates Assessment (LAA); to make provision for the land won or other

elements of their LAA in their mineral plans, taking account of the advice of the AWP and the National Aggregate Coordinating Group (NCG) as appropriate.

Guidance on the Managed Aggregate Supply System (MASS)

1.10. AWP's are to produce an annual report on minerals activity in their area, provide technical advice to MPAs on the adequacy of a LAA, and provide an assessment on the position of overall demand and supply in its area, including whether, in its view, the area is making a full contribution towards meeting both national and local needs.

National and Regional Guidelines for Aggregates Provision 2009

1.11. The most recent National and Sub National Guidelines is the National and Regional Guidelines for Aggregates Provision in England 2005-2020 published on 29 June 2009. The levels of provision set out in the Guidelines are summarised in Table 1.

Table 1: National and Regional Guidelines for Aggregates Provision in England, 2005 –2020 (Mt)

| New Regions Mt. | Guidelines for land-won production in Region | | Assumptions | | |
|------------------------------------|--|-----------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|
| | Land-won Sand & Gravel | Land-won Crushed Rock | Marine Sand & Gravel | Alternative Materials (a) | Net Imports to England |
| South East England | 195 | 25 | 121 | 130 | 31 |
| London | 18 | 0 | 72 | 95 | 12 |
| East of England | 236 | 8 | 14 | 117 | 7 |
| East Midlands | 174 | 500 | 0 | 110 | 0 |
| West Midlands | 165 | 82 | 0 | 100 | 23 |
| South West | 85 | 412 | 12 | 142 | 5 |
| North West | 52 | 154 | 15 | 117 | 55 |
| Yorkshire e& the Humber | 78 | 212 | 5 | 133 | 3 |
| North East | 24 | 99 | 20 | 50 | 0 |
| ENGLAND | 1,028 | 1,492 | 259 | 993 | 136 |

Report Scope

- 1.12. As with previous AM surveys, this AM2017 report is primarily to monitor at the East Midlands scale. Data on primary aggregates sales from land-won sand and gravel sites and for crushed rock for 2017 has been provided by operators via the AWP technical secretary who collated the individual site returns. An inventory of quarries is provided in Appendix 6.
- 1.13. Other information on secondary and recycled aggregates and events of interest is also provided along with information on planning decisions and progress on Development Plan Documents. In order to provide an indication of trends, this Annual Report compares data for 2017 with data for earlier years.
- 1.14. The planning context for this report is the National Planning Policy Framework³ (NPPF) at the national level and local plans as the overall strategic plan for the area.

³ National Planning Policy Framework, DCLG March 2012

2. Development Plans

2.1. All of the MPAs in the East Midlands have adopted plans (or saved policies) related to minerals planning as set out in Table 2.

Table 2: Development Plans during 2017

| Authority/County | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Derbyshire | The Issues and Options Report for the Derbyshire and Derby Minerals Local Plan was published in 2010. A rolling consultation was undertaken during 2015 and 2016 and then an additional consultation on hard rock sites was carried out at the beginning of 2017. The full draft Plan will be published at the Winter 2018/19 and submitted for examination winter 2019/20. |
| Peak District National Park | The Peak District National Park has a Core Strategy which was adopted in October 2011. An Issues and Options consultation was carried out for the Park in 2012. It is anticipated that a full version of the policies will be out for consultation in summer 2016. This will include a policies map with more detailed safeguarding areas, including for building stone. |
| Leicestershire | Core Strategy and Development Control Policies documents in respect of the Minerals and Waste Development Framework were adopted in October 2009. Consultation on the proposed changes to the pre-submission draft Leicestershire Minerals and Waste Local Plan (MWLP) took place in November 2017. The MWLP was subsequently submitted to the Secretary of State for examination in March 2018. |
| Lincolnshire | Lincolnshire County Council Minerals and Waste Local Plan is made up of two documents: Core Strategy and Development Management Policies – Adopted 1 June 2016 Site Locations – Adopted 15 December 2017 |

| | |
|-------------------------|---|
| Northamptonshire | The Northamptonshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan was adopted on 1 July 2017. This is a review of the Local Plan adopted in 2014 and which concentrated on sites/allocations with an unchanged plan period (to 2031). |
| Nottinghamshire | Regulation 18 consultation on took place November 2017 to January 2018. The draft plan Reg 18 consultation is planned for July tp September 2018, with Reg 19 Expected December 18 and Submission February 2019 looking for adoption by October 2019. |
| Nottingham City | Part 2 Local Plan (Land and Planning Policy Document – LAPP) Revised Publication is planned to be consulted on through summer 2017 with an anticipated submission for examination in winter 2017. |
| Rutland | The Minerals Core Strategy was adopted in October 2010. An ‘update’ to this plan commenced in 2015 which forms part of the Rutland Local Plan Review. The Review includes extending the plan period to 2036 and updating content in line with the NPPF. The Local Plan Review Issues and Options document was consulted on in November 2015 and the Draft Plan ended on 25 September 2017. Overall plan now delayed due to the incorporation of a new settlement proposal on which there will need to be further consultation before the plan moves to proposed submission stage. |

3. Primary Aggregates

- 3.1. Surveys of the sales (generally equating to production) and permitted reserves, were carried out by MPA's for the calendar year 2017. In line with previous practice in the region, data was sub-divided into crushed rock and sand/gravel and is shown within tables within the main body of this report. A more detailed breakdown of figures is provided within Appendix 1 to the report.
- 3.2. Tables 3-5 provide an overview of sales, reserve and landbank figures for aggregate land-won crushed rock and sand and gravel across the East Midlands region covering the period 1 January to 31 December 2017.

Total aggregate sales, reserves and landbank

- 3.3. During the 2017 monitoring period total aggregate sales increased from 35.07mt in 2016 to 35.20mt in 2017. This is the highest sales figure in the past 10 years and brings the region closer to the pre-recession levels. There has been a gradual increase since 2009 (except the low in 2012) with a marked increase in 2016 with crushed rock sales showing a 17% uplift from 2015 figures and fairly steady figures in 2017 from 2016 levels. This brings total aggregate sales to 6.86mt below the annual guidelines⁴ for aggregate provision of 42.06mt. Total aggregate reserves decreased from 1,367mt as at 31 December 2016 to 1,339mt in 2017.

Aggregate crushed rock sales, reserves and landbank

- 3.4. Sales of crushed rock aggregate increased from 28.11mt in 2016 to 28.41mt in 2017, the highest recorded sales figure since 2008. Sales of limestone/dolomite increased significantly on 2016 levels with. Total reserves of crushed rock aggregate decreased from 1,306mt in 2016 to 1,281.43mt at 31 December 2017.
- 3.5. The crushed rock landbank for the East Midlands as at 31 December 2017 was 54.93 years, in excess of the "at least" 10 year requirement of the NPPF. Landbanks for the sub-regions are detailed in the Table 4.

Aggregate sand and gravel sales, reserves and landbank

⁴ National and regional guidelines for aggregate provision in England 2005 - 2020, Communities and Local Government, June 2009

- 3.6. Sales of land-won aggregate sand and gravel have decreased from 6.95mt in 2016 to 6.79mt in 2017.
- 3.7. Reserves of land-won aggregate sand and gravel were 57.59mt as at 31 December 2017, down from 60.90mt in 2016. This figure does not include sand sold for non-aggregate purposes. The sand and gravel landbank for the East Midlands as at 31 December 2017 was 8.93 years (based on 10yrs sales). Landbanks for the sub-regions are detailed in table 4 and table 4a for Lincolnshire specific area breakdown.

Meeting Local and National Requirements

- 3.8. One of the core functions of the AWP is to assess if the area is “making a full contribution towards meeting both national and local aggregate needs”. To enable such an assessment requires up to date information on national and local requirements, however the latest national guideline figures are now considered out of date and the assessment itself only runs to 2020. In addition, there is a need for information contained within the four yearly surveys produced by BGS, however there is currently no commitment to undertaking a survey in 2019. This survey provides vital information on the movement of aggregates between regions and allows areas to see where past demand has come from. However what is still missing is an accurate assessment of future demand and this is something which can only be addressed through updates to the national figures which can then be fed in to LAA. In addition, the LAA’s could also benefit from providing more concise information on future requirements to ensure that these needs can be met.

Table 3: Sales for aggregate purposes (2008 – 2017) (million tonnes)

| Monitoring Period | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | Total 10 year sales | Average 10 year sales |
|--|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Aggregate Crushed Rock Sales | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Derbyshire | 6.90 | 7.36 | 6.62 | 6.35 | 6.24 | 5.70 | 4.17 | 5.77 | 8.62 | 8.87 | 66.60 | 6.66 |
| PDNP | 4.12 | 1.75 | 1.69 | 1.50 | 1.78 | 2.60 | 2.73 | 2.84 | 3.81 | 3.32 | 26.13 | 2.61 |
| Leicestershire and Rutland | 14.88 | 11.77 | 12.23 | 12.42 | 11.07 | 13.22 | 14.37 | 13.68 | 14.25 | 14.78 | 132.66 | 13.27 |
| Lincolnshire (Limestone/Dolomite) | 0.52 | 0.46 | 0.45 | 0.39 | 0.51 | 0.45 | 0.38 | 0.43 | 0.76 | 0.85 | 5.19 | 0.52 |
| Lincolnshire (Chalk)⁵ | 0.07 | 0.04 | (a) | (a) | (a) | (a) | (a) | (a) | 0.13 | 0.08 | 0.32 | N/A |
| Northamptonshire | 0.21 | 0.16 | 0.18 | 0.24 | 0.14 | 0.20 | 0.25 | 0.28 | 0.55 | 0.51 | 2.71 | 0.27 |
| Nottinghamshire | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 |
| TOTAL CRUSHED ROCK SALES | 26.70 | 21.54 | 21.17 | 20.89 | 19.74 | 22.17 | 21.89 | 22.99 | 28.11 | 28.41 | 233.62 | 23.36 |
| Aggregate Sand and Gravel Sales | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Derbyshire | 1.11 | 0.91 | 1.04 | 1.10 | 0.81 | 0.82 | 0.95 | 1.13 | 1.29 | 0.94 | 10.10 | 1.01 |
| PDNP | - | - | - | - | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | N/A |

⁵ (a) denotes that this data is confidential/unavailable.

East Midlands AWP Annual Monitoring Report 2017

| Monitoring Period | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | Total 10 year sales | Average 10 year sales |
|--|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Leicestershire | 1.09 | 0.84 | 0.91 | 0.92 | 0.91 | 1.10 | 1.46 | 1.41 | 1.50 | 1.46 | 11.58 | 1.16 |
| Lincolnshire <i>(see Table 3a)</i> | 2.27 | 1.99 | 1.79 | 1.92 | 1.85 | 1.88 | 2.15 | 2.19 | 2.17 | 2.38 | 20.58 | 2.06 |
| Northamptonshire | 0.25 | 0.17 | 0.22 | 0.24 | 0.40 | 0.51 | 0.52 | 0.27 | 0.40 | 0.32 | 3.29 | 0.33 |
| Nottinghamshire | 2.82 | 1.60 | 1.88 | 2.06 | 1.91 | 1.73 | 1.77 | 1.91 | 1.59 | 1.69 | 18.96 | 1.90 |
| TOTAL SAND & GRAVEL SALES | 7.54 | 5.50 | 5.83 | 6.23 | 5.88 | 6.04 | 6.85 | 6.90 | 6.95 | 6.79 | 64.51 | 6.45 |
| Total Aggregate Sales | 34.24 | 27.04 | 27.00 | 27.12 | 25.63 | 28.21 | 28.73 | 29.89 | 35.07 | 35.20 | 298.12 | 29.81 |

Table 3a: Breakdown for Lincolnshire's Sand and Gravel Sales (million tonnes)

| Monitoring Period | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | Total 10 year sales | Average 10 year sales |
|-----------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Lincoln/Trent Valley | 0.52 | 0.73 | 0.82 | 0.87 | 0.81 | 0.88 | 1.07 | 1.02 | 1.13 | 1.18 | 9.03 | 0.90 |
| Central | 0.64 | 0.54 | 0.35 | 0.37 | 0.35 | 0.35 | 0.36 | 0.41 | 0.35 | 0.26 | 3.96 | 0.40 |
| South Lincs | 1.12 | 0.72 | 0.62 | 0.68 | 0.69 | 0.66 | 0.72 | 0.76 | 0.69 | 0.94 | 7.59 | 0.76 |

Table 4: Landbanks for aggregates (2017) (million tonnes)

| | 2017 Aggregate Sales (million tonnes) | Average Annual Sales 2008 – 2017 (million tonnes) | Permitted Reserves at 31/12/17 (million tonnes) | Landbank as at 31/12/2017 (years) (based on 10 years average sales) | 2005 – 2020 annual apportionment figures (million tonnes) | Landbank based on 2005-2020 apportionment (years) | LAA forecast of annual rate of future demand (million tonnes) (as at 31/12/2017) | Landbank based on LAA provision figure (years) |
|--|---|---|---|---|--|---|--|---|
| Aggregate Crushed Rock | | | | | | | | |
| Derbyshire | 8.87 | 6.66 | 593.45 | 89.11 | 8.74 | 67.90 | 7.44 | 79.76 |
| PDNP | 3.32 | 2.61 | 238.75 | 91.38 | 4.05 | 58.95 | 1.79 | 133.38 |
| Leicestershire and Rutland | 14.78 | 13.27 | 404.28 | 30.47 | 16.90 | 23.92 | 13.39 | 30.19 |
| Lincolnshire (Limestone/Dolomite) | 0.85 | 0.52 | 20.52 | 39.46 | 1.10 | 18.65 | 0.53 | 38.72 |
| Lincolnshire (Chalk) | 0.08 | (a) | 5.07 | (a) | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Northamptonshire | 0.51 | 0.27 | 16.02 | 59.07 | 0.30 | 53.40 | 0.39 | 41.08 |
| Nottinghamshire | 0 | 0.00 | 3.34 | N/A ⁶ | 0.10 | 33.4 | 0.02 | 111 ⁷ |

⁶ There is a 3.34Mt dormant reserve in Nottinghamshire, however as this has not been worked in recent years the average sales reserve is too low to calculate landbanks based on past 10 years sales.

⁷ Figures taken direct from LAA in account of current dormant status of the existing reserve.

| | 2017 Aggregate Sales (million tonnes) | Average Annual Sales 2008 – 2017 (million tonnes) | Permitted Reserves at 31/12/17 (million tonnes) | Landbank as at 31/12/2017 (years) (based on 10 years average sales) | 2005 – 2020 annual apportionme nt figures (million tonnes) | Landbank based on 2005-2020 apportion ment (years) | LAA forecast of annual rate of future demand (million tonnes) (as at 31/12/2017) | Landbank based on LAA provision figure (years) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|---|
| TOTAL CRUSHED ROCK LANDBANK | 28.41 | 23.33 | 1,281.43 | 54.93 | 31.19 | 41.08 | 23.56 | 54.39 |
| Aggregate Sand and Gravel | | | | | | | | |
| Derbyshire | 0.94 | 1.01 | 9.81 | 9.71 | 1.49 | 6.58 | 1.03 | 9.53 |
| PDNP | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Leicestershire | 1.46 | 1.16 | 2.67 | 2.30 | 1.51 | 1.80 | 1.14 | 2.30 |
| Lincolnshire | 2.38 | 2.06 | 20.19 | 9.80 | 3.28 | 6.16 | 2.07 | 9.75 |
| Northamptonshire | 0.32 | 0.33 | 3.20 | 9.73 | 0.78 | 4.10 | 0.50 | 6.40 |
| Nottinghamshire | 1.69 | 1.90 | 21.72 | 11.02 | 3.81 | 5.48 | 1.70 | 12.29 |
| TOTAL SAND & GRAVEL LANDBANK | 6.79 | 6.45 | 57.59 | 8.93 | 10.87 | 5.30 | 6.44 | 8.94 |

Table 4a: Breakdown for Lincolnshire's Sand and Gravel Landbank

| | 2017 Aggregate Sales (million tonnes) | Average Annual Sales 2008 – 2017 (million tonnes) | Permitted Reserves at 31/12/17 (million tonnes) | Landbank as at 31/12/2017 (years) (based on 10 years average sales) | 2005 – 2020 annual apportionment figures (million tonnes) | Landbank based on 2005-2020 apportionment (years) | LAA figure (million tonnes) (as at 31/12/2017) | Landbank based on LAA provision figure (years) |
|-----------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|---|
| Lincoln/Trent Valley | 1.18 | 0.90 | 7.21 | 8.01 | N/A | N/A | 0.88 | 8.19 |
| Central Lincs. | 0.26 | 0.40 | 6.36 | 15.90 | | | 0.43 | 14.79 |
| South Lincs. | 0.94 | 0.76 | 6.62 | 8.71 | | | 0.76 | 8.71 |

Overview

- 3.9. The total average sales, reserves and landbank for the East Midlands as a whole for 2017 are as per Table 5. Details on the how material sold from sites within the midlands is distributed throughout England and Wales is analysed the BGS Aggregate Minerals Survey⁸, the most recent of which was undertaken in 2014. The breakdown tables for the East Midlands is provided in Appendix 9.

Table 5: Overview

| | Average Annual Sales 2008 – 2017 (million tonnes) | Reserves (million tonnes) | Landbank as at 31/12/2016 (years) (based on 10 years average sales) |
|------------------------|--|----------------------------------|--|
| Crushed Rock | 28.41 | 1,281.43 | 54.93 |
| Sand and Gravel | 6.79 | 57.59 | 8.93 |

Derbyshire

- 3.10. There are four active operations producing sand and gravel in Derbyshire, three along the Trent Valley (Glacio-fluvial deposits) and one at Mercaston (Sherwood Sandstone). One site (Elvaston) is inactive and there is a further site with permitted reserves at Potlocks Farm, Willington, which is not operational. Attenborough Quarry has now been worked out and the quarry closed at the end of 2015. A planning application for an extension to Willington Quarry was approved during 2016 and will allow production to continue for another seven years. A planning application to extend Swarkestone Quarry and maintain production for a further eight years is under consideration. The loss of production from Attenborough is likely to be replaced by production at quarries in nearby Nottinghamshire.
- 3.11. Derbyshire is one of the largest producers of aggregate grade crushed rock in this country. There are a total of thirteen quarries producing crushed rock for aggregate in the area, eleven of these working the Carboniferous Limestone resource mainly in the areas around Buxton and Matlock, one working the Permian Limestone resource near Whitwell and there is one active gritstone quarry, near Glossop. There are a further four quarries which are currently inactive. At current rates of production, reserves at these active and inactive sites would last around 100 years.

⁸ Collation of the results of the 2014 Aggregate Minerals survey for England and Wales

- 3.12. In 2009, Derbyshire imported around 200,000 tonnes of sand and gravel from other MPAs in the East Midlands (mainly from Nottinghamshire). It imported a further 196,000 tonnes from other areas. In 2014, 356,000 tonnes was imported into the area from other regions. It exported around 480,000 tonnes in 2009 and 442,000 tonnes in 2014. It can be seen, therefore, that Derbyshire is a net exporter of sand and gravel. This implies that Derbyshire is providing sufficient sand and gravel to meet its own needs and therefore able to supply other local needs. From a review of other LAAs, future production from quarries in adjoining MPAs, which serve similar markets to the Derbyshire sand and gravel quarries, will be sustained at similar levels for the foreseeable future. The overall balance of production from these areas supplying similar markets is, therefore, likely to remain similar.
- 3.13. In 2009, 31% of the 9 million tonnes of aggregate grade crushed rock that was quarried from Derbyshire and the PDNP was used within this same area and around 44% of the total production was consumed in the East Midlands (including Derbyshire and the PDNP). The figures for 2014 are 27% and 32% respectively. In terms of exports, a significant proportion of Derbyshire and Peak District's production goes to the North West, 25% in 2009 and 36% in 2014. Yorkshire/Humber, West Midlands and East of England together also take a significant amount (26% in 2009 and 8% in 2014) and the South East, London, Wales and the South West regions together take about 2%.
- 3.14. Additional provision will have to be made for 3.31 million tonnes of sand and gravel for the Plan period to 2030. (This will be reduced to 1.24mt once the additional reserves at Willington Quarry are incorporated into the figures in the next LAA). This provision will be made in the emerging Minerals Local Plan for Derbyshire and Derby through allocated sites and also preferred areas. Sites have been put forward by mineral operators which are being assessed through the Local Plan process and the sites which are allocated in the final Plan will address the future requirement for sand and gravel to 2030. Annual monitoring will ensure that a seven year landbank is maintained throughout the Plan period.
- 3.15. Derbyshire are relying on production at quarries in Nottinghamshire to replace loss of production at one of the sites in their area and already relies on imports from their and other areas, although is a net exporter. It is anticipated that additional provision will be secured within the emerging Minerals Local Plan through allocated sites and preferred areas.

Peak District National Park

- 3.16. The Peak District has historically provided a considerable volume of minerals, including aggregates. There are currently seven quarries producing aggregates, which has been a

reduction from previous reports due to planning permissions ending or sites closing prior to permitted end dates due to economic reasons.

- 3.17. Ballidon Quarry, Parwich, Old Moor Quarry, Buxton (part of Tunstead Quarry in Derbyshire County Council's administrative area), and Topley Pike Quarry, Buxton, all have long term permissions and unworked reserves and will continue to provide limestone aggregates at a significant scale. Stoke Hall Quarry, Grindleford produces gritstone aggregate along with dimensional stone, this is a small scale producer of aggregates. Ivonbrook Quarry, Grangemill, produces limestone aggregates at a medium scale, reserves are depleting and restoration is anticipated in the short term.
- 3.18. The PDNP has a policy in its Core Strategy (Policy MIN1) which does not allow for further new quarries or extensions to existing quarries, in order to reduce progressively the amount and proportion of aggregate grade crushed rock that is quarried from within the Park in order to protect the nationally protected landscape.
- 3.19. Another important consideration in this respect is that the NPPF seeks to provide for the maintenance of landbanks for non-energy minerals outside areas such as National Parks. Future contributions of aggregate from the Peak District National Park will need to be considered in light of this.
- 3.20. Through previous discussions with members of the Aggregate Working Party in preparing the 2005-2020 apportionment figures, it was agreed that quarries in Derbyshire (i.e. those within the county boundary not covered by the National Park) (serving similar markets to those in the National Park which are likely to cease production) would compensate for the majority of the displaced provision from the PDNP. Derbyshire County Council has agreed to continue this approach throughout this Plan period.
- 3.21. Derbyshire and PDNP is a significant net exporter of aggregate grade crushed rock to other areas, amounting to an average of around 9 million tonnes each year. Derbyshire has significant resources of hard rock compared to many other areas in the country and it will be important, therefore, to maintain this level of supply in order to sustain and stimulate national economic growth.
- 3.22. Leicestershire is the only adjoining authority which produces aggregate crushed rock to any significant extent. The Leicestershire LAA indicates also that there will be sufficient reserves in the future to sustain production at recent levels. It is likely, therefore, that the overall

balance of production from areas supplying similar markets to Derbyshire and the PDNPA is likely to remain similar over the timescales covered by the authorities Development Plans.

Leicestershire and Rutland

Leicestershire

- 3.23. Sales in 2017 from Leicestershire operations were 2% lower than in 2016 for sand and gravel; and around 2% higher for crushed rock.
- 3.24. There are 5 sand and gravel sites currently active in Leicestershire, at Brooksby, Cadeby, Husbands Bosworth, Lockington, and Shawell. Two of these sites involve the working of alluvial and river terrace deposits, while the remainder work glacial deposits.
- 3.25. Igneous rock extraction within Leicestershire is currently taking place at 4 sites, namely Bardon; Cliffe Hill; Croft; and Mountsorrel. Whitwick and Groby quarries are currently inactive, although coating and concrete plants are maintained at Groby. Two carboniferous limestone quarries are operational within Leicestershire at Breedon on the Hill and Cloud Hill.
- 3.26. In 2014, a significant quantity (61.6%) of crushed rock was exported from the county. Thirteen per cent of material was distributed to other authorities within the East Midlands. The main destinations for material exported beyond the East Midlands were the East of England (17.3% of total sales); London and the South East (11.9%); and the West Midlands (10.6%).
- 3.27. There will be a potential shortfall of sand and gravel reserves within Leicestershire over the period to 2031 of some 13 million tonnes based on the production guideline i.e. the average of 10 years sales data. The Pre-submission Draft Minerals and Waste Local Plan (July 2016) includes proposals for the extraction of 7.2 million tonnes of potential reserves. The Plan allows for additional provision to be made from unallocated areas provided certain criteria are met.
- 3.28. Whilst the theoretical permitted reserves of igneous rock appear to be adequate, technical considerations led the East Midlands Aggregates Working Party (EMAWP) to express concern in 2010 regarding the medium to long term ability of Leicestershire to supply crushed rock, at existing levels, particularly to areas like the South East and London. The EMAWP advocated that action be taken to address concerns over medium to long term future supplies of igneous rock from Leicestershire, bearing in mind the nationally strategic and uncertain nature of the Leicestershire resources beyond the existing permissions.

- 3.29. This situation has also been recognised in a report from the British Geological Survey ('An evidence based approach to predicting the future supply of aggregate resources in England' 2011) which concluded that "by far the most important foreseeable shortfall in the medium- to long-term is amongst the four rail-connected igneous quarries in Leicestershire."
- 3.30. The current strategy for aggregate minerals, as set out in Policy MCS2 of the existing Minerals Core Strategy (and reiterated in the Pre-Submission Draft Minerals and Waste Local Plan), is to release reserves of crushed rock to be worked as extensions to existing extraction sites where they are required to ensure sustainable supply.
- 3.31. Permissions were granted in 2011 and 2015 to release approximately 150Mt of new reserves at existing quarries.
- 3.32. There are sufficient permitted crushed rock reserves to meet requirements up to 2031. If production at any of the existing active sites cannot be maintained, it may be possible to increase production capacity at other sites which are currently inactive in order maintain the level of provision from quarries within Leicestershire.

Rutland

- 3.33. Rutland is relatively small in terms of mineral production and there are currently only four quarries with planning permission, all for the extraction of crushed rock (limestone). Limestone is currently extracted from Clipsham Quarry (Clipsham), Greetham Quarry (Greetham) and Woolfox Quarry (Greetham).
- 3.34. Greetham Quarry is the main production unit for crushed rock in the county but has limited reserves remaining. The medium-scale operation Woolfox Quarry also has limited reserves, however Clipsham Quarry (also of a medium-scale) has relatively longer term reserves remaining. The permission at Woolfox Quarry is due to expire in the short term (2019) however the operator does have the benefit of a new planning permission to extend the extraction end date and import inert materials for restoration should they choose to implement it (ceasing in C.2032); trends in sales over recent years indicate that the extended end date will be utilised in order for the quarry to be fully worked. Clipsham Quarry has the potential to provide a supply to 2028.
- 3.35. Thistleton Quarry is a relatively large scale quarry but remains inactive. It is old ironstone permission with modern planning conditions for limestone extraction. It is uncertain when the

quarry will become active as it is dependent on, amongst other things, the construction of a dedicated quarry haul road.

Lincolnshire

- 3.36. The principal aggregate produced in Lincolnshire is sand & gravel. Over the past 10 years (2008-17), sales have amounted to an average of 2.06mt per year. Due to the large size of the county, it is divided into three Production Areas (PA) known as:
- the Lincoln/Trent Valley PA (with production focussed to the south-west of Lincoln);
 - the Central Lincolnshire PA (with production mainly focussed in the Lower Bain Valley);
and
 - the South Lincolnshire PA (with production mainly focussed in the Baston-Langtoft-West Deeping Area).
- 3.37. There are 11 active sand and gravel workings in the County divided between the three Production Areas. Both the Lincoln/Trent Valley and the South Lincolnshire Production Areas have landbanks of permitted reserves exceeding the 7 year minimum (based on the most recent mineral survey data). Additional reserves for the Trent Valley PA of 2.2mt at Whisby Quarry remain subject to the completion of a planning obligation which will add a further 2.2 years to the landbank for this area. In addition an application for 7mt is pending determination at Norton Bottoms Quarry which could also add a further 7 years
- 3.38. In the South Lincolnshire PA there is potential for an additional 0.29mt of reserves to be exploited subject to determination of an application for an irrigation reservoir at Tithe Farm, Langtoft. However this would contribute only a limited increase to the overall landbank.
- 3.39. In 2014, only 38.4% of sand and gravel extracted within Lincolnshire went to destinations within the County. The remainder was exported mainly to the rest of the East Midlands (41.3%), but with significant quantities going to Yorkshire and Humberside (8.8%) and to the East of England (7.9%). 163,000 tonnes of sand and gravel were imported into the County in 2014 (Collation of the Results of the 2014 Aggregate Monitoring Survey for England and Wales, DCLG, March 2016) (a reduction of 68% on 2009) making the County a significant net exporter of sand and gravel (some 1,160,000 tonnes).
- 3.40. The County has allocated sites in its adopted Plan to meet future needs however comparison of the three year average sales against the 10 year average sales shows that the relative importance of the Lincoln/Trent Valley Production Area has increased over the other

Production Areas. This appears to be due to operators in the Trent Valley with quarries on both sides of the Lincolnshire/Nottinghamshire county boundary focussing production in Lincolnshire, thus lowering production and sales in Nottinghamshire and increasing production in the Lincoln/Trent Valley Production Area. Data indicates that in 2014 there was a reduced demand for sand and gravel within Lincolnshire and that, as a result operators supplied wider markets outside the county. This situation may therefore be reversed as the market improves in Lincolnshire. Accordingly, the relationship between markets in Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire will need to be closely monitored going forward

- 3.41. The County also produces limestone for aggregate from quarries located along the Lincoln Edge down into the Kesteven Uplands, between Lincoln and Stamford, 9 of these are currently operational. The production of limestone for aggregate went into decline after the year 2000 when sales reached 1.5mt, and subsequent production fell to its lowest level at 0.377mt in 2014. Over the past 10 years (2008-2017) production has averaged 0.52mt per year, however the most recent three year average at 0.68mt demonstrates that demand and in turn sales have risen in the shorter term. The county currently has a landbank of permitted reserves of 39.46 years is based upon the 10 year average which is significantly above the 10 year minimum advised in the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 3.42. There were no significant changes in the distribution data for crushed rock extracted in Lincolnshire in the years 2009 and 2014, as shown in Table 14. In both years, most of the crushed rock went to destinations within the County (84.6% in 2009 and 87.2% in 2014). The largest markets outside the county were elsewhere in the East Midlands, particularly the adjacent County of Leicestershire (11.9% in 2014). The limited market for Lincolnshire's crushed rock reflects its limited uses as an aggregate.
- 3.43. Imports of crushed rock into Lincolnshire totalled 317,000 tonnes in 2009 which rose to 446,000 tonnes in 2014 (Collation of the Results of the 2009 Aggregate Minerals Survey for England and Wales, DCLG October 2011). Lincolnshire was therefore a net importer of crushed rock in both years, but with a higher amount (398,000 tonnes) in 2014.
- 3.44. Lincolnshire has sufficient permitted reserves of crushed rock to last well beyond the period of the CSDMP which ends in 2031. The County Council has therefore not allocated further sites in the Site Locations (Pre-Submission Draft). Policy M5 (Limestone) and Policy M6 (Chalk) of the CSDMP do, however, allow further reserves to be released provided they meet a proven need that cannot be met by existing sites/sources and accord with all Development Management Policies and Restoration Policies set out in the Plan.

- 3.45. A very limited amount of chalk is also produced in the county from quarries located in or adjacent to the Lincolnshire Wolds A.O.N.B. Two are currently operational, but no information is available on production levels or whether the material is being used as aggregate. The figures used for the annual returns are therefore an estimate. It is also important to note that historically, Lincolnshire's crushed rock apportionment did not include chalk

Northamptonshire

- 3.46. The supply contribution from active sand and gravel sites in Northamptonshire is currently relatively limited and well below that required in relation to the provision figure in the adopted Minerals and Waste Local Plan. In 2017 sand and gravel extraction took place at only two locations in Northamptonshire. Of these two sites the largest production was from Earls Barton West and 2017 was its first operational year. The other location was Passenham, which is a location that straddles the county boundary and where in 2017 extraction also took place on that part within the Milton Keynes minerals planning authority area. A further sand and gravel quarry is permitted at Earls Barton Spinney, this permission is implemented but currently not operational. Sales from this location will commence in 2018.
- 3.47. The supply contribution from active crushed rock sites is currently firmer than that for sand and gravel and for the second year running was significantly higher than the provision figure in the adopted Minerals and Waste Local Plan. The 10 year annual average sales figure is still below the adopted provision figure. In 2017 limestone extraction continued at Ringstead and moved in to the western extension to Collyweston Quarry, with smaller contributions from Harley Way (Oundle), Rushton and Pury End. Sandstone extraction for aggregate and building stone purposed continued at Harlestone. The large ROMP site at Wakerley Quarry that has substantial limestone reserves at over 11 Mt. commenced extraction late in 2017.
- 3.48. Two further sites are permitted for small scale extraction for non-aggregate purposes; Collyweston State Mine (inactive) and Stonepits Quarry, Benefield (unimplemented). Small scale sandstone extraction is permitted at the ROMP site at Boughton-Pitsford-Moulton. It is a dormant site with extraction expected to re-commence in 2018.
- 3.49. Northamptonshire has three permitted sand and gravel quarries. In 2014 (the most recent figures available) 0.52 Mt of sand and gravel was produced in Northamptonshire of which 0.17 Mt (33%) was exported. 1.1 Mt of sand and gravel was imported, leaving an export/import balance of +0.58 Mt; making the county a significant net importer. Sand and gravel is imported from a range of different areas although mainly from the East of England and the rest of the East Midlands region.

- 3.50. If sites allocated for sand and gravel development in the county, or from alternative non-allocated sites, do not continue to come forward for development over the plan period (and this has indeed largely been the case post 2009) then there would continue to be some reliance on imports from sites elsewhere. It is reasonable to assume that this is likely to generally be from areas that the county currently takes its imports from. Northamptonshire is a net importer of material and sees this continuing unless sites come forward for extraction.
- 3.51. The 2014 AM survey shows that movements of crushed rock are not self-balancing and the county's imports of crushed rock are significant. Of the 0.24 Mt produced in the county, 0.10 Mt (42%) was exported with 0.14 Mt remaining within the county and 0.9 Mt imported. Imports outweighed exports by 0.8 Mt, over three times the amount the county produced in 2014.
- 3.52. Crushed rock is imported from a range of different areas, although predominately from Leicestershire in the East Midlands region, accounting for between 60 - 70% of all imports; predominantly as igneous rock from the Charnwood Forest area of Leicestershire.
- 3.53. In 2014 the majority (58%) of crushed rock produced in Northamptonshire (limestone and ironstone) stayed within the county. Exports elsewhere in the East Midlands amounted to 70% of all exports, including Leicestershire and Rutland (accounting for 46%) with the remainder exported to the East of England region (30%).
- 3.54. There will likely continue to be a reliance on imports of crushed rock even if allocated or non-allocated sites for limestone extraction come forward over the plan period due to the demand for higher quality igneous rock, not produced in the county. It is reasonable to assume that future imports are likely to be from areas that the county currently takes its imports from.
- 3.55. The supply contribution of limestone sites is firmer than for sand and gravel and there are currently significant permitted reserves (particularly as Wakerley Quarry is now operational) to maintain the government recommended 10 year landbank.

Nottinghamshire

- 3.56. Mineral production from Nottinghamshire continues to be dominated by extraction of sand and gravel, extracted from eleven sites across the county, primarily split between the Idle Valley and Trent Valley. A cluster of sites in the Trent Valley (Langford Lowfields and Besthorpe) supply a large proportion of Nottinghamshire's output of sand and gravel. Reserves in the Idle Valley are reaching the end of their life, with remaining production limited

to sites at Misson and Scrooby. To the South of the County, East Leake Quarry has recently been granted permission to which will extend the life of the site for 10-12 years. Two additional sites across the County with planning permission have yet to be implemented (Sturton le Steeple, Cromwell).

- 3.57. Extraction of Sherwood Sandstone is from five sites in Nottinghamshire, though only four of those sites are currently active. Principal output is from sites located between Nottingham and Mansfield (Bestwood 2, Burnstump). A secondary source of Sherwood Sandstone is derived as a by-product from the significant Silica Sand quarry within Nottinghamshire (Two Oaks). Sherwood Sandstone extraction also continues alongside sand and gravel extraction at Scrooby in the Idle Valley.
- 3.58. Limestone production is dominated by a quarry at Nether Langwith, north of Mansfield with permission to extract 3.35 Mt of material. This site became operational in May 2001 and had an expected life of 13 years. However, this site was mothballed in 2009 due to the economic downturn. During 2016 a planning application was submitted to extend the working life of the quarry until 2035. Remaining activity in the county is limited to at present, one small building stone quarry at Linby.
- 3.59. Exports of both sand and gravel and Sherwood Sandstone continue to remain a significant proportion of sales. This trend is likely to continue over the next plan period as sand and gravel resources, particularly those in Rotherham and Doncaster are limited. Resource depletion in the Idle Valley is likely to be the biggest factor potentially influencing exports to South Yorkshire. It is likely that sand and gravel will either be sourced from quarries around Newark or from other areas outside of Nottinghamshire that may be closer.
- 3.60. The biggest planning issue for Nottinghamshire and Nottingham is the long term provision of sand and gravel over the plan period. There are twelve permitted sand and gravel quarries in Nottinghamshire, although at present only nine are in full production with a further quarry, Girton, only working existing stockpiles. Further reserves will, however, need to be released over the life of the Minerals Local Plan to 2036, as existing quarries are worked out. A call for sites with the minerals industry along with additional work will be undertaken as part of the Minerals Local Plan evidence base. The emerging local plan will need to identify future resources through consultation with Industry.
- 3.61. Limestone resources in Nottinghamshire and Nottingham are relatively limited therefore the majority of crushed rock used is imported. The 2014 Full East Midlands Annual Minerals

Survey states that 1.26 million tonnes of crushed rock were imported into Nottinghamshire, whilst no mineral was exported.

- 3.62. The survey identified Leicestershire, Derbyshire (including the Peak District National Park Authority) and Yorkshire and Humberside (predominately Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council) as the main sources of crushed rock.
- 3.63. The most recent Leicestershire LAA states that adequate reserves are available to meet expected future demand over the plan period. The Derbyshire LAA also states that adequate reserves remain available to meet expected future demand from outside Derbyshire. This takes into account the reduction in output from the Peak District National Park. The Doncaster and Rotherham LAA identifies a 30 year landbank for crushed rock based on 2016 figures.
- 3.64. Concern has been expressed by Industry that the Nottinghamshire LAA should not include the landbank figure as this is calculated based upon a single mothballed site and would prefer that the reserves figure is instead presented. That said, the LAA provides both figures.
- 3.65. The importation of crushed rock from adjoining areas to meet the County's needs is set to continue as limestone sales from Nottinghamshire remain at zero. The permitted but mothballed quarry at Nether Langwith contains permitted reserves and could be re-opened by the operator to meet additional demand in the future.

Summary

- 3.66. There is clearly a challenge with regards to the future provision of sand and gravel reserves within the AWP area, particularly in areas such as Leicestershire and Northamptonshire which are becoming increasingly reliant on imports. In some instances, Local Plans require proposals for extraction to come forward from Industry on unallocated sites, e.g. Leicestershire.
- 3.67. There appears to be no significant issues with the future provision of crushed rock within the AWP area. Some areas such as Northamptonshire and Nottinghamshire are reliant upon imports and other areas like Derbyshire and Leicestershire are large exporters of material, this is likely to continue. On going cooperation between neighbouring authorities will therefore be essential to ensure adequate reserves are provided in the future. There remain concerns over the medium to long term future supplies of igneous rock from Leicestershire, bearing in

mind the nationally strategic and uncertain nature of the Leicestershire resources beyond the existing permissions.

4. Secondary and Recycled Aggregates

- 4.1. Recycled Aggregate, which includes inert materials such as concrete, stone, brick and other similar materials, are reprocessed materials previously used for construction purposes and which are often taken from the Construction, Demolition and Excavation (CD&E) waste stream. Secondary aggregates are usually by-products of industrial processes and can include materials such as clay, ash and slag.
- 4.2. The use of secondary and recycled materials not only reduce the requirement for new production of primary aggregate, but also reduces the need for disposal to landfill of CD&E waste materials. The National Planning Policy Framework (para 163) recognises this and strongly promotes the use of secondary and recycled materials as an alternative to primary aggregate.
- 4.3. Since the AWP's were established attempts have been made to measure and gain an understanding of the extent to which recycled and secondary materials have been used (these two categories are also often known as "Alternative Aggregates"). Despite severe difficulties in obtaining reliable data (even for a single year), the National Guidelines, have for laudable environmental reasons, set figures which regions should aim to achieve.
- 4.4. A number of surveys have been conducted going back at least as far as those of the Building Research Establishment in the 1970s for the Verney Report. The AWP's have also made various survey attempts. However, in all cases the results have been very variable in output and quality. Since the 1990s Central Government has commissioned a number of national surveys, findings from the more recent of which have been reported in previous EMAWP Annual Reports.
- 4.5. The most recent study, undertaken by Capita Symonds for 2005 arisings, was published in February 2007. The survey methodology was very similar to that used in earlier surveys undertaken for 2001 and 2003. As in 2003, owing to lessons learned during the 2001 survey, the findings of the 2005 survey were considerably more robust at regional level. However, at sub-regional level they remained unreliable.
- 4.6. The estimate for production of recycled aggregate throughout England had risen from 39.60Mt in 2003 to 46.44Mt in 2005. Information provided by respondents suggested that although modest, the growth was real. In the East Midlands, it was estimated that 5.09Mt of recycled aggregate was produced and that effectively all of this was re-used. This figure is

approximately 17% higher than for 2003. In addition 0.50Mt of recycled soil was produced and re-used, a small reduction from 2003. Of the remaining construction, demolition and excavation waste (CDEW) available in the region, it was estimated that 0.97Mt was used for landfill engineering and restoration, 0.73Mt was used at “exempt” sites and 2.53Mt was disposed of as waste at landfill sites. This final figure is about twice that for 2003 but it appears that it includes material used for backfilling quarry voids which in 2003 was calculated separately and in the East Midlands was estimated to be 1.84Mt. As in 2003, there was little evidence that any hard construction and demolition waste that could be recycled into aggregate was being landfilled as waste.

- 4.7. The survey looked for relationships between arisings of CDEW and other factors and found that, except in London, there was a reasonably constant level of per capita arisings of CDEW around the country. In the East Midlands it was estimated that the average level of arisings per capita was 1.24 tonnes per annum. The results are broken down to a sub-regional level as follows: Derbyshire, 2.0 tonnes per annum; Nottinghamshire & Lincolnshire (excluding N&NE Lincs) 1.0 tonnes per annum; Leicestershire & Rutland 0.76 tonnes per annum; Northamptonshire 1.16 tonnes per annum. Derbyshire apparently has the highest level of recycled aggregate arisings per capita of any sub-region in England. The report does not attempt to explain this but points out that the area has a below average population density, a long history of primary aggregate supply and sits between a number of areas of high population density such as Greater Manchester and Sheffield.
- 4.8. In tandem with the CDEW survey, Capita Symonds carried out a survey of other materials used as aggregate. In the East Midlands the most significant categories of material were colliery spoil and PFA. It was estimated that there were about 1.75Mt of colliery spoil arisings in 2005. However, only 0.36Mt was put to use as aggregate with a further 1.4Mt potentially available. In addition there are believed to be almost 3Mt potentially available in stockpiles. Turning to PFA (Pulverised Fuel Ash), there were about 1.29Mt of arisings in 2005 of which 0.23 Mt was used as aggregate. A further 0.46Mt was put to other used (such as block making) leaving 0.59Mt potentially available. Smaller arisings of other materials were also recorded including FBA (Furnace Bottom Ash), incinerator ash, rail ballast and glass. Of these FBA was the most significant with most of the 0.26Mt arising being put to aggregate uses. However, the increasing use of biofuels and the demise of coal-burning for generation may limit the availability of PFA/BFA for aggregate purposes since this use is not compatible with the use of such fuels.

- 4.9. Following a number of years of increased local activity in the recycled and secondary aggregate sector, the slowing down of new applications in the East Midlands first reported in 2004 steadied around 2008 with few new applications coming forward. However, application numbers have increased in recent years and a number were received in 2015 as reported in Appendix 7. Existing sites continued to operate. A list of active sites producing aggregates in 2017 is set out in Appendix 6.
- 4.10. No surveys of recycled aggregates (other than the road planings survey) have been carried out by EMAWP as, when attempted at national level in the 1990s and 2000s, the percentage of returns has been so poor as to preclude local interpretation. In general, the production of recycled aggregates mirrors the economy. When the economy is in a positive position, there is more demolition/building work being undertaken and so more recycled aggregate being produced and used. The opposite is true during an economic downturn. Production rates of recycled aggregate cannot therefore be easily predicted or relied upon.
- 4.11. The best available data for recycled and secondary aggregates is that provided through analysis of information contained in the Environment Agency's Waste Data Interrogator (WDI). The WDI has been used to identify the amount of CD&E waste produced and handled at licensed waste facilities within each Waste Authority and is presented by sub-region in the table below. It is likely to only represent a proportion of the recycled aggregates in circulation. The most up-to-date data available from the Environment Agency Waste Data Interrogator is from 2017. For ease of repetition, the data has included all waste categorised as Inert in the WDI, this will include wastes which may not be suitable for use as recycled aggregate. The WDI does not include information specifically for the Peak District National Park, therefore arising for the PDNP will be included under the relevant Authorities under which waste data is collected.

| Authority | Amount Produced (tonnes) | Amount Managed (tonnes) |
|--|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Derbyshire & Derby city | 773,823 | 1,059,289 |
| Leics + Leic City | 1,391,115 | 1,472,957 |
| Rutland | 67,631 | 77,023 |
| Lincs | 939,006 | 1,031,445 |
| Northants | 1,468,535 | 1,993,855 |
| Nottinghamshie & Notts City | 1,141,702 | 1,640,430 |

| Authority | Amount Produced (tonnes) | Amount Managed (tonnes) |
|----------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| EM uncodeable | 727,409 | |
| Total | 6,506,221 | 7,274,999 |

- 4.12. Data for 2017, shows that around 6.5mt of CD&E was produced and 7.27mt was managed. Of the waste managed in the EM, 39% was excavation waste (around 5mt) and the remainder(29%) C&D waste (2.26mt). The majority (62%) of excavation waste was managed at landfill sites, with 14% being used in recovery/reclamation. Around 11% was managed in treatment facilities, with further 4% in treatment/transfer facilities and 1% recycled. For construction and demolition waste, only 2% was managed at landfill sites, 13% was recycled and 39% managed at treatment sites. A further 31% was handled through transfer stations and 15% through transfer/treatment facilities.
- 4.13. A brief review of the overall situation within the EMAWP area follows, based on information made available.

Derbyshire

- 4.14. Recycling of construction and demolition waste (and hence the production of recycled aggregate) is often dealt with at temporary sites and sites exempt from permitting by the Environment Agency and hence good quality data on locations of production and amounts produced is not available. Additionally, a large and unknown proportion of this material is often re-used/recycled on site, and therefore does not enter the waste stream, as such making it difficult to record. By applying the growth rate from the East Midlands Regional Waste Strategy 2006, it is estimated that from 2012 to 2030, Derby and Derbyshire will produce around 3 million tonnes of recycled aggregate on an annual basis.

Leicestershire

- 4.15. Existing operational recycling capacity for C&D waste in Leicestershire is estimated to be around 860,000 tonnes. There are currently no industrial processes in Leicestershire which are known to produce 'secondary' aggregates.

Lincolnshire

- 4.16. Existing C&D recycling capacity in Lincolnshire is estimated at around 463,000 tonnes, as set out in the 2017 Lincolnshire Waste Needs Assessment Update

- 4.17. Existing recycling capacity located in Lincolnshire's mineral sites is currently estimated at around 613,000 tonnes. Recycling of CD&E waste is permitted at 18 quarries, however around a third of the waste operations at these sites are currently inactive. The results of this 2017 Mineral Survey indicates around 39% of C&D recycling in the county is managed through facilities located within Quarries and that there is more than sufficient consented capacity for CD&E recycling
- 4.18. It should however be noted that the reliance upon waste data derived from this annual survey is not necessarily the most reliable indication of waste management data, as the county has had limited success with operators engaging with the survey.

Northamptonshire

- 4.19. There are 20 sites in Northamptonshire with permission for the production of recycled aggregates. The recycling capacity for CD&E waste is estimated to be approximately 500,000 tonnes per annum. There are currently no industrial processes in Northamptonshire which are known to produce secondary aggregates.

Nottinghamshire

- 4.20. The total number of aggregate recycling sites permitted in the County and Nottingham City stood at 11, all of which were active in 2017. There is no information on actual outputs.

Power Station Ash

- 4.21. Around 1.7 million tonnes of power station ash is produced from the County's three remaining coal fired stations. About 85% comprises pulverised fuel ash (PFA), the remaining 15% being coarser grade furnace bottom ash (FBA).
- 4.22. PFA is used as a light weight bulk fill and as a cement additive. There is no recent sales data although aggregate sales are likely to account for a significant proportion of total production. Ash that is not sold is disposed of at land raising schemes adjacent to the station. The sites are located at Cottam, West Burton and Ratcliffe-on-Soar.

Rutland

- 4.23. Rutland had two aggregate recycling facilities in 2017. There are currently no facilities that produce secondary aggregates..

Peak District National Park

- 4.24. N/A

5. Marine Sources

- 5.1. Currently approximately 20% of the sand and gravel used in England and Wales is supplied by the marine aggregate industry. Marine aggregates are also used in beach replenishment schemes. Large volumes of aggregates are pumped directly from dredgers onto beaches, providing coastal protection as well as enhancing the amenity value and therefore the economy of an area. The area involved – 20th Annual report on Marine Aggregate Extraction in 2018 produced by the The Crown Estate & British Marine Aggregate Producers Association (BMAPA) states that in 2017, a total of 1,057km² of seabed was licensed for marine aggregate extraction around the UK, of which 90.94km² was actually dredged representing 8.60% of the licenced area. A total of 19.00 million tonnes of sand and gravel were dredged from Crown Estate Licences in 2017.
- 5.2. The National and Regional Guidelines for Aggregates Provision 2001 – 2016 published in June 2003 assumed that marine aggregate will not contribute towards meeting demand in the East Midlands. The same assumption is made in the more recent Guidelines for 2005 -2020 published in June 2009. This is in accordance with the position which has been obtained in most years since EMAWP was established in 1974. There has sometimes been marine dredging off the Lincolnshire coast. Sustained demand for aggregates in the coastal belt is relatively low and navigable coastal wharfage is effectively limited to Boston. Wharfage is also available at Gainsborough, Sutton Bridge and Fosdyke but none of these sites are equipped for landing aggregates.
- 5.3. The above referenced document produced by the Crown Estate and BMAPA identifies that, off the coastline of the Humber region (Holderness and Lincolnshire), 283.91km² of seabed area was licensed for marine aggregate extraction. Within this, dredging actually took place in 17.79km², producing 1.88 million tonnes of aggregate from a permitted tonnage of 4.4 million. This figure has increased from 1.35 million tonnes in 2016. In addition, 0.5mt were dredged for beach nourishment and <0.01mt were dredged for a wind farm project. Of the total marine aggregate dredged, 68.5% (1.29mt) was delivered to mainland Europe, 24.9% to the Humber and North East (0.47mt) , 6.4% (0.12t) to the Thames Estuary and 0.2% was delivered to the East Coast (<0.01mt).
- 5.4. Permitted reserves of marine aggregates in the Humber dredging area for 2017 were 50.90 mt,. The 10 year average annual off take is 1.96mt, down 0.13 mt compared to 2016, and so

the regional reserve life in years at the ten year average annual offtake is 25.99, showing a decrease of 1.7 years compared to 2016. Taken from the Marine Aggregates Capability & Portfolio (2018) produced by The Crown Estate is provided below.

6. HS2

- 4.1 A key project in the Midlands over the next 5 to 10 years will be HS2. Work on phase 1 which will link London to Birmingham is starting now and expected to be complete by 2026. Phase 2 will run from the west Midlands to Manchester in the West and Leeds in the East, with work on this phase due to be complete by 2033.
- 4.2 Tarmac have noted that they are working closely with potential Tier 1 contractors on the detail development work associated with the HS2 scheme and initial indications are that requirements for aggregates and aggregate products within the Midlands area, to be predominantly sourced from local quarries, are as follows
- 4.5Mt - concrete aggregates
 - 4.5Mt - asphalt and Type 1 sub base materials
 - 15Mt - aggregates for fill materials
- These high levels of aggregates will be required within a 5 year time frame 2019 – 2024.
- 4.3 To date, no information has been provided by HS2 or contact made directly with the authorities in the area or the EM AWP to discuss the levels of mineral likely to be required to service this project. It is expected that an increase on current demand locally will result from this project and the AWP will work closely with the HS2 on the need for Minerals. To understand better the implications for minerals supply from the EM AWP for HS2, the AWP will actively engage with the HS2 team and seek to work closely with them moving forward.

Appendix 1: Breakdown Tables

Table 6: Sand and Gravel Sales 2017(all figures in tonnes)

| | SAND | | | | GRAVEL | | S&G for Construction Fill | Unknown Sales | Total Aggregates | Total Non-aggregate use | Total |
|-----------------------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------|---------------|------------------|------------------|---------------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| | Building Sand | Concreting Sand | Other Uses | Coating | Concrete | Other Gravel | | | | | |
| Derbyshire | 46,414 | 246,061 | 0 | 0 | 253,911 | 67,737 | 322,283 | 0 | 936,406 | 0 | 936,406 |
| Leicestershire and Rutland | 26,613 | 859,646 | 578 | 0 | 202,793 | 354,200 | 14,154 | 0 | 1,457,984 | 7,342 | 1,465,326 |
| Lincolnshire | 239,221 | 951,198 | 0 | 26,616 | 507,353 | 394,865 | 259,319 | 0 | 2,378,572 | 3,067 | 2,381,639 |
| Northamptonshire | 2,680 | 93,841 | 0 | 0 | 61,817 | 517 | 157,150 | 0 | 316,005 | 0 | 316,005 |
| Nottinghamshire | 263,132 | 466,875 | 176,806 | | 221,758 | 278,303 | 46,615 | 235,269 | 1,688,758 | 215,357 | 1,904,115 |
| TOTAL | 578,060 | 2,617,621 | 177,384 | 26,616 | 1,247,632 | 1,095,622 | 799,521 | 235,269 | 6,777,725 | 225,766 | 7,003,491 |

Table 7: Subdivision of the above

| | SAND | | | | GRAVEL | | S&G for Construction Fill | Unknown Sales | Total Aggregates | Total Non-aggregate use | Total |
|-----------------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------|---------|----------|--------------|---------------------------|---------------|------------------|-------------------------|-----------|
| | Building Sand | Concreting Sand | Other Uses | Coating | Concrete | Other Gravel | | | | | |
| Lincoln/Trent Valley | 88,877 | 546,048 | 0 | 19,632 | 360,171 | 159,389 | 6,855 | 0 | 1,180,972 | 3067 | 1,184,039 |
| Central | 118,126 | 73,805 | 0 | 5,011 | 12,049 | 35,369 | 11,376 | 0 | 255,736 | 0 | 255,736 |
| South Lincs | 32,218 | 331,345 | 0 | 1,973 | 135,133 | 200,107 | 241,088 | 0 | 941,864 | 0 | 941,864 |

Table 8: Crushed Rock Sales 2017

| | ROADSTONE | | | RAIL BALLAST/ ARMOUR STONE | CONCRETE AGGREGATE | OTHER SCREENED GRADED AGG | OTHER CONSTRUCTION INCL. FILL | USE UNKNOWN | TOTAL AGG. | TOTAL NON-AGG. USE | TOTAL |
|--|----------------|-----------------|------------|----------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------|------------|--------------------|------------|
| | Coated at Site | Coated Remotely | Not Coated | | | | | | | | |
| Derbyshire | 0 | 193,917 | 1,948,050 | 0 | 1,016,232 | 4,676,329 | 1,033,689 | 0 | 8,868,217 | 2,633,864 | 11,502,081 |
| PDNP | 110,743 | 189,589 | 971,915 | 6,994 | 1,106,348 | 404,130 | 532,829 | 0 | 3,322,548 | 4,603,442 | 7,925,990 |
| Leicestershire and Rutland (Limestone/Dolomite) | 241,174 | 0 | 355,517 | 0 | 97,182 | 827,001 | 371,837 | 0 | 1,892,711 | 1,257,988 | 3,150,699 |
| Leicestershire and Rutland (Igneous rock) | 2,240,556 | 1,367,321 | 4,555,292 | 1,602,846 | 1,353,098 | 341,457 | 1,423,968 | 0 | 12,884,538 | 57,197 | 12,941,735 |
| Lincolnshire (Limestone/Dolomite) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 849,772 | 4,547 | 0 | 854,319 | 124,934 | 979,253 |
| Northamptonshire | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12,185 | 184,874 | 313,547 | 510,606 | 3,081 | 513,687 |
| Nottinghamshire | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 2,592,473 | 1,750,827 | 7,830,774 | 1,609,840 | 3,572,860 | 7,110,874 | 3,018,915 | 313,547 | 28,332,939 | 8,570,506 | 37,013,445 |

Appendix 2: AWP Membership

| Aggregate Working Party Representatives | |
|---|--|
| Chairman | Lonek Wojtulewicz Head of Planning, Historic and Natural Environment Leicestershire County Council County Hall Glenfield LE3 8RA Tel: 0116 305 7040 Mob: 07943585857 lonek.wojtulewicz@leics.gov.uk |
| Technical Secretary | Carolyn Williams Group Leader: Minerals & Waste Planning Unit Urban Vision Partnership Ltd Civic Centre Chorley Road Swinton Salford M27 5AS Tel: 0161 604 7746 carolyn.williams@urbanvision.org.uk |
| Government Representatives | |
| Department for Communities and Local Government | Vicky Engelke Planning for Minerals and Sustainable Waste Management Team DCLG Planning Directorate: Infrastructure and Environment Division Fry Building 2 Marsham Street London SW1P 4DF Tel: 0303 44 41654 Eamon.Mythen@communities.gsi.gov.uk |

| Local Government Representatives | |
|---|---------------------------------|
| Nottinghamshire County Council | Stephen Pointer |
| Peak District National Park Authority | Jane Newman |
| Derbyshire County Council | Richard Stansfield ⁹ |
| Lincolnshire County Council | Adrian Winkley |
| Northamptonshire County Council | Phil Watson ¹⁰ |
| Leicestershire County Council | Nigel Hunt ¹¹ |
| Rutland County Council | Peter Beever |
| Derby City Council | Andrew Waterhouse |
| Leicester City Council | Fabian D'Costa |
| Nottingham City Council | Matthew Gregory |
| Industry Representatives | |
| Mineral Products Association (MPA) HQ | Mark North |
| MPA/Hanson Aggregates | Keith Bird |
| MPA/Tarmac Trading | Tim Deal |
| MPA/Breedon Aggregates | Colin D'Oyley |
| Aggregate Industries | Kirsten Hannaford-Hill |
| Breedon Southern Ltd | Graeme King |
| BAA (East Midlands)/Longcliffe Aggregates | Nigel Weedon |
| Other Representatives | |
| Environment Agency | Jim Davies |

⁹ also represents Derby City Council. (see corresponding members)

¹⁰ Also represents Rutland County Council (see corresponding members)

¹¹ also represents Leicester City Council (see corresponding members)

Appendix 3: AWP Meeting Minutes

East Midlands Aggregate Working Party

Minutes of Meeting

5th July 2017 1-3pm

Venue: Framland Committee Room, Leicestershire County Council, County Hall, Glenfield, LE3 8RA

Attendees

| | | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----|
| Adrian Winkley | Lincolnshire | AW |
| Fabian D'Costa | Leicester City | FDC |
| Jane Newman | Peak District | JN |
| Steve Osbourne-James | Nottinghamshire | SOJ |
| Keith Bird | Hanson | KB |
| Laura Davidson | Northamptonshire and Rutland | LD |
| Lonek Wojtulewicz | Leicestershire (Chair) | LW |
| Mark North | Mineral Products | MN |
| Martin Clayton | Geoplan | MC |
| Carolyn Williams | Urban Vision (Secretariat) | CW |
| Nigel Hunt | Leicester | NH |
| Paul Statham | Leicester City | PS |
| Phil Watson | Northamptonshire and Rutland | PW |
| Mike Daley | Lincolnshire | MD |
| Richard Stansfield | Derbyshire | RS |
| Tim Deal | Tarmac | TD |
| Mark Page | Hanson | MP |
| Kirsten Hannaford-Hill | Cemex | KH |
| Graeme King | Breedon Southern Ltd | GK |
| Philippa Lane | Urban Vision | PL |

Apologies

| | |
|-----------------|--------------------|
| Eamon Mythen | DCLG |
| Jo Davies | Breedon Aggregates |
| John Wilson | Nottinghamshire |
| Richard Leonard | Lincolnshire |

Item 1 - Introduction and Apologies

- 1.1 Lonek Wojtulewicz (LW) welcomed everyone to the meeting. He invited members to introduce themselves for the benefit of the new secretariat. Carolyn Williams (CW) announced the list of apologies.

Item 2 – Minutes from Last Meeting

- 2.1 LW noted that the minutes from the last meeting held in Leicester on 11th November 2016 were issued and invited any comments. No concerns were raised.

Item 3 – Annual surveys

2016 Annual Report

- 3.1 CW provided a summary of the key figures for 2016 and also noted that tables 4 and 4a should include LAA provision for 2016 in order that information provided is the for same year as the data. LW suggested that MPAs should be a position to provide draft LAA figures by September, which would then be ratified at a meeting in October. Steve Osbourne-James ,SOJ, noted that he will be able to provide some figures but they may still be in draft and may be revised following the withdrawal of their plan. AW noted that he would try and meet this deadline but their EiP is taking precedent.

Action: All MPAs to send draft LAA figures to CW by September to update the AMR.

- 3.2 Adrian Winkley, AW, also asked could a draft of the report be available for them to use at the EiP at the end of July. LW asked for approval from the AWP and this was agreed with the note that it was still draft.

Action: CW to issue draft report by 24th July for use by Lincolnshire CC.

- 3.3 CW noted no LAA figure had been included for Leicestershire and Rutland, it was agreed their individual LAA figures would be combined.

Action: CW to update report with combined figures included

- 3.4 SOJ noted that Lisa Bell left the authority at the end of 2016 and Stephen Pointer is now the contact. LW noted that as the report is for 2016, Lisa Bell should still be included, CW to add a footnote noting the change.

- 3.5 Nigel Hunt, NH, noted that tables 3&4 do not match. 3 is correct and 4 incorrect.

- 3.6 Richard Stansfield, RS, noted an error in DCC figures and would clarify these direct with CW.

- 3.7 LW invited other comments on the report. Tim Deal, TD, requested standard approach to decimal places. It was agreed that 2 decimal places should be sufficient.

- 3.8 TD requested some text regarding the difference between active, inactive and dormant sites as listed in Appendix 6. It was put forward by Mark Page, MP, and AW that the dormant sites should the definition as set under the Environment Act. Jane Newman, JN, commented that one of the sites of concern was in PDNP, and it is correct that this is inactive. Following a discussion by a number of members on what was inactive, LW suggested that CW send round a standard definition to be agreed by the AWP and this should be set out prior to the tables in Appendix 6. LW suggested that any authority with specific issues should raise these direct to CW for noting in the report.

- 3.9 Graeme King, GK, questioned should some inactive sites be removed from the list e.g. where the site is yet to be developed, LW said no as these are still a reserve.
- 3.10 AW noted 2 sites incorrectly listed in Appendix 6 and should be inactive, South Witham NO.1 and Castle quarry. He also requested clarification on table 4 regarding the footnote for Nottinghamshire. SOJ to check and confirm to CW.
- 3.11 TD requested a change in the title of appendix 7 Planning permissions. CW suggested changes to this section in line with AWP AMRs elsewhere and used the NW as an example. It was agreed that the tables should be split to show planning applications under consideration and those determined in the reporting year. It was also agreed that end dates for existing sites should be included as part of appendix 6.
- 3.12 Kirsten Hannaford-Hill, KH, commented that EoE AWP are looking at housing completions and asked can the WM AMR show a correlation between housing completions and the need for aggregate. LW asked are the EoE doing it this year, KH confirmed they are not. LW said this should be in the LAAs, SOJ confirmed it is their LAA. LW said this could be an item to be raised at the informal NCG in October.
- 3.13 Laura Davidson, LD, requested date for completion of the report, LW and CW confirmed September a final version could be provided following receipt of LAA information.
- 3.14 MN questioned 25% figures in the exec summary and noted mt notation missing. CW to review and update. MN also asked for more detail in the report, CW suggested the commentary she prepared to update members be included. LW agreed and asked for this to be sent around for agreement.

Action: CW to update all tables to only 2 decimal places

Action: CW to send around a definition of active, inactive and dormant sites for agreement.

Action: SOJ to confirm footnote text for Table 4.

Action: MPAs to send updated details for Appendix 6 if any changes needed and also to provide end dates for existing permissions.

Action: CW to update and rename Appendix 7 to Planning Applications and amend current tables to show split between those determined and those under consideration.

Action: CW to review data in exec summary and update report to include detailed commentary on changes within the region. CW to send around AMR summary she prepared for meeting for approval.

Item 4 – LAAs

4.1 Discussed under Item 3, MPAs preparing LAA in accordance with timetable with drafts to be ready for September for review by AWP prior to ratification in October.

4.2 Lincolnshire 2015 LAA had been sent prior to the meeting. AW asked for sign off on this prior to commencement of their hearings at the end of July.

Action: MPA's to prepare 2016 LAA for September.

Item 5 – Progress on Plans

DCC draft plan due in Autumn, submission end of 2018

Leicestershire CC – proposed changes prior to submission relating to inert waste disposal. Consultation on changes expected September, submission March 2018 with Adoption planned for end of 2018.

Lincolnshire – Site Locations DPD EiP starts w/c 24th July for 1 week, estimated adoption Feb 2018.

Northants – Plan adopted 1st July

Notts – SOJ confirmed this had been withdrawn following a change in political administration and their concern over the S&G forecast which had been prepared on older figures and there was concern this inflated the requirement as S&D sales continue to fall. There is a report going to committee at the end of July for a call for sites and evidence request. Looking to then go straight to submission following this, but not yet confirmed.

PDNP- Development Management Policies delayed by other aspects of the plan, not M&W issues. Re-consulted in Feb 2017, submission expected late Autumn 2017.

Rutland – Consultation end of July

Leicester City - Local Plan, including M&W, out for consultation end July 2017, draft submission July 2018, adoption Dec 18.

A further discussion took place on Nottinghamshire's withdrawal. Mark North, MN, stated that the MPA felt the situation was unacceptable. He questioned what impact this will have on provision in surrounding authorities, namely Lincolnshire. AW stated he would need to look at what impact the decision may have. MN requested the AWP write to CLG on this point. LW confirmed that authorities have a write to withdraw their plans and it is not an AWP issue. It was agreed that the AWP would wait to see what the next LAA for Nottinghamshire says and respond to the Authority through that route. LW commented that members need to think about what contributions their area makes to authorities outside their area.

Tarmac have a number of sites awaiting decision within Nottinghamshire and they are unsure what impact this decision will have on their determination. SOJ confirmed there are a number of sites awaiting determination and other sites due to be submitted without an up to date plan in place. SOJ commented that LAA figures likely to be the 10yr average which would be 1.89mt compared to the current figure of 2.58mt. The revised plan period would also be longer and will run till 2036.

Item 6 – Industry Reports

MPA

- 6.1 MN invited comments and questions on the papers circulated in advance of the meeting.
- 6.2 MPA are pushing the government on minerals issues but are not getting any response. Key issues around delivery of major infrastructure development with no awareness of where the resources will come from. There is a continued presumption that the industry will meet

supply needs. MPA keen to get supply audits on major infrastructure and housing projects to enable to industry to know how much mineral has been used previously to enable estimates future demand.

- 6.3 LW requested the long term aggregates demand report be broken down to regional level. MN confirmed others have asked and he has put this to his economists.
- 6.4 MPA also confirmed they are concerned that the data which used to be collated is in danger of continuing with the loss of the AMRI survey and no known funding for the AWP's post March 2018.
- 6.5 LW also commented that the BGS factsheets need updating and are a useful tool. MN confirmed the BGS want to update them but don't have the resources to do it.
- 6.6 LW confirmed he would right to CLG on behalf of the AWP's on these matters.

Action: LW to draft a letter to CLG on behalf of the EM AWP.

Item 7 – DCLG Update

- 7.1 CLG have not provided an update. CW confirmed that there is an informal National Coordinating Group meeting (NCG) planned for the 11th October which MPA are hosting in London.

Item 8 – Date of Next Meeting

- 8.1 A meeting following the NCG in October. CW to investigate dates and circulate

Action: CW to propose a date and send a meeting invite.

Item 9 – Any other business

- 9.1 JN questioned how others collect their responses as they have had real issues in getting returns. Mike Daley, MD, confirmed he emails, writes and follows up with phone calls. Others confirmed difficulties. CW asked for anyone with issues/difficult operators to notify her and she will liaise with MN.

East Midlands Aggregate Working Party

Minutes of Meeting

8th November 2017 1-3pm

Venue: Guthlaxton Room, Leicestershire County Council, County Hall, Glenfield, LE3 8RA

Attendees

| | | |
|-------------------|-------------------------------------|----|
| Richard Leonard | Lincolnshire | RL |
| Andrew Barton | Peak District | AB |
| Mark Kelly | Cemex | MK |
| Stephen Pointer | Nottinghamshire | SP |
| Keith Bird | Hanson | KB |
| Mike Halsall | Urban Vision (Secretariat) | MH |
| Lonek Wojtulewicz | Leicestershire (Chair) | LW |

| | | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------------|----|
| Mark North | Mineral Products | MN |
| Carolyn Williams | Urban Vision (Secretariat) | CW |
| Nigel Hunt | Leicester | NH |
| Mark Chant | Northamptonshire and Rutland | MC |
| Phil Watson | Northamptonshire | PW |
| Mike Daley | Lincolnshire | MD |
| Richard Stansfield | Derbyshire | RS |
| Tim Deal | Tarmac | TD |
| Mark Page | Hanson | MP |
| Kirsten Hannaford-Hill | Aggregate Industries | KH |
| Graeme King | Breedon Southern Ltd | GK |
| Richard Leonard | Lincolnshire | RL |

Apologies

| | |
|-------------------|--------------------|
| Andrew Waterhouse | Derby City |
| Jo Davies | Breedon Aggregates |
| John Wilson | Nottinghamshire |
| Fabian D'Costa | Leicester City |
| Jane Newman | Peak District |
| Martin Clayton | Geoplan |
| Mark Page | Hanson |
| Gary Redfern | Marshalls |
| Jim Davies | EA |
| Howard Button | NFDC |

Item 1 - Introduction and Apologies

- 1.2 Lonek Wojtulewicz (LW) welcomed everyone to the meeting. He invited members to introduce themselves and indicated a list of apologies had been provided and would be recorded in the minutes.

Item 2 – Minutes from Last Meeting

- 2.2 Kirsten Hannaford-Hill (KH) commented that the minutes identified that she was representing her former company at the meeting and requested this be updated.
- 2.3 Outstanding actions – Still awaiting LAA's from Derbyshire, Leicester City and Lincolnshire. Richard Stansfield (RS) commented DCC's was awaiting approval and would be issued to the AWP before the end of the year.

Item 3 – NCG Update

2016 Annual Report

- 3.15 LW provided an overview of the outcomes from the NCG meeting held in October. He set out the 3 questions posed by Peter Latham at CLG as below, and also ran through the actions which amounted from the meeting.
- is the MASS currently fulfilling its purpose?
 - what is the market failing, if any, and
 - what does the Government need to do to help?
- 3.16 Peter said he would take on board the comments made during the meeting and would get back to the NCG in the next 2-3 months.
- 3.17 LW noted that CLG had realised they had a role in commissioning the BGS surveys, and the attendees re-iterated the importance of the continuation of this survey. It was also noted that no decision was given on the continuation of the AWP's post March 2018.
- 3.18 An update to the current guidelines for aggregate provision was requested by all. Mark North (MN) noted that there was universal agreement between the MPA's and industry for a top down review of the guidelines. It was also requested that major infrastructure projects should be accompanied by supply audits identifying the likely quantities of material required for construction to enable future planning to be undertaken effectively.
- 3.19 Tim Deal (TD) agreed with the points made being an accurate reflection and also commented on the importance of up to date data being required to forecast effectively and to help plan for future delivery.
- 3.20 Carolyn Williams (CW) commented that there was discussion on the review of NPPF, and that the NCG had agreed changes are needed to better reflect building stone quarries, as not all are small sites. CW also raised the discussion on the introduction of Statements of Common Ground and their replacement of Duty to Cooperate. CW raised concern on the day of the difficulties this may present moving forward in the absence of a national requirement for aggregates. CW noted that Greater Manchester had commented on the recent consultation and has picked up on this point, Mark Chant (MC) commented that NCC had also responded.
- 3.21 MN stated that the final minutes are expected on the 14th November. MN questioned whether the AWP's need to write to CLG again. CW confirmed the NW will be doing so and Y&H AWP suggested a global approach from all AWP chairs could be sent. LW agreed this was a good approach.
- Action: CW to circulate NCG minutes when made available. CW to write to other AWP secretaries to discuss sending a global letter from all the AWP's to CLG.**

Item 4 – Annual surveys

2016 Annual Report

- 4.3 CW commented that all comments received on the report following the last meeting had been included. MN requested information included on the sand and gravel note which had been circulated be included in the report and this was agreed.
- 4.4 Richard Leonard requested the inclusion of data from the BGS Aggregates Mineral Survey for England and Wales, 2014 on movements of aggregates.

- 4.5 CW mentioned that she had done some work on CD&E data from the WDI which could be shared to the group and included in the report if considered useful.

Action: CW to update AMR to include information on minerals supply as set out in the sand and gravel note, and similar to be done for Crushed Rock. Information from the BGS report to be included within the report along with suggested additions on CD&E data from the EA's WDI. CW to circulate changes to the report for approval.

Item 5 – LAA – Sand and Gravel Paper.

- 5.1 Mike Halsall (MH) had prepared a note on sand and gravel production in the EM AWP in response to comments from the industry on supply issues moving forward. The note identifies that the EM will have a shortfall in sand and gravel provision if no new sites come forward.
- 5.2 LW led a discussion on this. TD commented that the resource decline which has been raised in comments to authorities on the LAAs was recognising that not enough sites have been put forward for future development, signalling there was a decline in availability of resource in some areas as neither landowners or operators have come forward. LW asked whether the AWP as a whole was meeting its share and how do we co-ordinate with the other AWP's on this issue? MN stated that they are pushing for a consistent message from all AWP's on supply issues and that this is a requirement of NPPF and should be part of the AMR. He also recognised that this is an industry issue as well as an MPA issue.
- 5.3 MC commented that in Northamptonshire a number of sites which had been mothballed have now come forward, and they are expecting applications shortly for sites within the Local plan. There is still room for additional sites to come forward in their area.
- 5.4 Graeme King (KG) stated that land prices have played a big factor in the release of land. Most sites now taken on a leasehold basis, and with higher prices, there is not enough return so sites not coming forward.
- 5.5 TD commented that resource availability played a factor and will go for the easiest first. In some areas, that means there is a lack of developable sites. PW commented that at some point the harder sites will need to be accessed as they will be all that is left.
- 5.6 TD stated there is physical resource depletion as well as lack of sites coming forward. Landowners also have different aspirations for their land making access to minerals difficult. And as more sites are leasehold rather than freehold, there is less control as to what can happen on a site and when.
- 5.7 TD also commented that lack of adopted plans meant it was harder to gain agreement for investment from the global companies who control the UK businesses. Since the recession it is harder to get investment and decisions are made more carefully.
- 5.8 KH commented that if sites are allocated in a plan then this allows more weight to getting the quarry through their capital investment programmes.

- 5.9 TD noted that there are more resources available in some areas i.e. Northants than Leics, and it may be that allocations of supply need to switch between areas. MC commented that having an up to date plan doesn't always solve the issue.
- 5.10 It was agreed that some text needs to be included in the AWP report on supply to recognise this issues.

Action: CW to add additional text to the report on supply of sand and gravel and prepare similar note for crushed rock.

Item 6 – Progress on Development plans

MPA

- 6.7 Northamptonshire – adopted the Northampton Minerals and Waste Local Plan on 1 July this year and as part of this process it was agreed that a review of the Local Plan should commence within 2 years of adoption i.e. no later than 1 July 2019.
- 6.8 Rutland – PO consultation on the wider Local Plan with Minerals included. Not many reps received on minerals, mainly on housing.
- 6.9 Nottinghamshire – Recommencing Regulation 18 work, looking at whether the levels proposed in the LAA area right or not. Consultation commences 20th November until 14th January and will include a call for sites. Draft plan expected May/June 18.
- 6.10 Derbyshire – PO consultation due end of November for 12 weeks. Includes 2 sand and gravel sites.
- 6.11 PDNP – Consultation on DM document due early in the new year, with expected date for adoption Summer 18. The Core Strategy update will follow this.
- 6.12 Leicestershire – proposed changes (primarily related to inert waste disposal) are currently out for consultation until 22nd December. It is anticipated that the Minerals and Waste Local Plan will be submitted for examination in March 2018.
- 6.13 Lincolnshire – Examination on Sites Document took place in July 2017. This was found sound. The plan went through Executive on the 7th November and is going forward for Adoption in December.

Item 7 – Update from Industry

- 7.1 Demand for construction mineral products was lower in 2017Q3 compared to both the previous quarter and 2016Q3 across all materials, except for mortar. Demand for mortar increased by 1.6% in 2017Q3 compared to the previous quarter, but sales volumes were down by 1.1% for aggregates, 1.8% for ready-mixed concrete (RMC) and 2.9% for asphalt. This is the second consecutive quarter of decline for both aggregates and RMC, and the third for asphalt.

Item 8 – Date of Next Meeting

- 8.1 It was agreed that a meeting should take place before the end of March 2018 in the event that the AWP funding does not continue beyond 2017/18. Dates to be circulated.

Action: CW to propose a date and send a meeting invite.

Item 9 – Any other business

9.1 None

Appendix 4: Glossary

Apportionment - currently set by the 'National and regional requirements for aggregate provision in England 2005-2020', a specified amount of aggregates to be produced annually on a sub-regional basis.

Core Strategy/Local Plan - a plan setting out the spatial vision for the Local Planning area, the spatial objectives and strategic policies to deliver that vision.

Duty to co-operate - introduced by the Town & Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, requires Local Authorities and other public bodies to co-operate on planning issues.

High Specification Aggregate - natural and artificial coarse aggregates which meet the physical test criteria for Polished Stone Value and Aggregate Abrasion Value.

Licence Application Area - areas which are in the process of being developed for new licence dredge areas. These areas are subject to a full environmental impact assessment and public consultation before permission is granted by the Marine Management Organisation.

Licence Option Area - awarded by the Crown Estate following a successful tender by a company seeking to develop a new dredging area. The company is permitted to explore the area for viable resources during a period of 5 years, during which the licence application process must be completed.

Licensed Dredge Area - active licensed dredge areas.

Local Development Framework - a set of Local Development Documents which include the Local Development Scheme, Statement of Community Involvement and Local Plan.

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) provision rate – requires mineral planning authorities to making provision for the maintenance of landbanks of at least 7 years for sand and gravel and at least 10 years for crushed rock, whilst ensuring that the capacity of operations to supply a wide range of materials is not compromised.

Appendix 5: Acronyms

| | |
|--------------|--|
| AM | Annual Monitoring |
| AMR | Annual Monitoring Report |
| AWP | Aggregate Working Party |
| BAA | British Aggregates Association |
| BGS | British Geological Survey |
| BMAPA | British Marine Aggregate Producers Association |
| CDEW | Construction, Demolition and Excavation Waste |
| CLG | Communities and Local Government |
| HSA | High Specification Aggregate |
| LDF | Local Development Framework |
| MDF | Minerals Development Framework |
| MLP | Minerals Local Plan |
| MPA | Mineral Products Association |
| MPAs | Mineral Planning Authorities |
| MPG | Minerals Planning Guidance |
| MPS | Minerals Planning Statement |
| Mt. | Million Tonnes |
| NCG | National Co-Ordinating Group |
| NFDC | National Federation of Demolition Contractors |
| NPPF | National Planning Policy Framework |
| RPB | Regional Planning Body |
| RPG | Regional Planning Guidance |
| RSS | Regional Spatial Strategy |
| RTAB | Regional Technical Advisory Body |
| UDP | Unitary Development Plan |

Appendix 6: Active, Inactive and Dormant Aggregate Mineral Workings

Active, Inactive and Dormant Aggregate Mineral Workings in 2017 (material in dormant sites not surveyed).

* Sites producing materials used for non-aggregate purposes only

Sites currently in “suspension”

Active

An site is considered Active where mineral operations are currently being carried out to a substantial extent during the survey year.

| Quarry name | Grid Ref | Material | End Date |
|-----------------------------|------------|-----------------|------------|
| Derbyshire | | | |
| Slinter Top | SK 278 555 | Limestone | 2021 |
| Grange Mill | SK 810 726 | Limestone | 2042 |
| Dowlow | SK 850 692 | Limestone | 2042 |
| Brierlow (Hindlow) | SK 263 557 | Limestone | 2042 |
| Whitwell | SK 530 732 | Dolomite | 2025 |
| Tunstead/Old Moor | SK 100 745 | Limestone | 2042 |
| Brassington Moor/Longcliffe | SK 237 570 | Limestone | 2042 |
| Bonemill | SK 247 559 | Limestone | 2042 |
| Doveholes | SK 880 766 | Limestone | 2042 |
| Willington | SK 276 275 | Sand and Gravel | |
| Mercaston Pit | SK 268 444 | Sand and Gravel | 2042 |
| Swarkestone | SK 347 277 | Sand and Gravel | |
| Mouselow | SK 240 951 | Sandstone | 2042 |
| Shardlow | SK 426 294 | Sand and Gravel | |
| Stancliffe | SK 267 668 | Sandstone | |
| Dene | SK 287 559 | Limestone | 2042 |
| Leicestershire | | | |
| Breedon | SK 406 233 | Limestone | 31/12/2042 |

| Quarry name | Grid Ref | Material | End Date |
|--|------------|-----------------|-------------|
| Cloud Hill | SK 413 212 | Limestone | 31/12/2025 |
| Cliffe Hill | SK 456 108 | Igneous | 31/12/2032 |
| Bardon Hill | SK 455 130 | Igneous | 31/12/2051 |
| Croft | SK 511 965 | Igneous | 31/12/2029 |
| Mountsorrel | SK 562 151 | Igneous | 21/12/2040 |
| Lockington | SK 476 296 | Sand and Gravel | 02/12/2025 |
| Husbands Bosworth | SP 643 829 | Sand and Gravel | 31/07/2020 |
| Shawell | SP 540 809 | Sand and Gravel | 31/12/2044* |
| Booksby | SK 673 153 | Sand and Gravel | 31/12/2026 |
| Cadeby | SK 446 180 | Sand and Gravel | 31/12/2021 |
| * includes permission for landfill operation | | | |
| Lincolnshire | | | |
| Holywell (build only) | SK 982 159 | Limestone | 04\11\2039 |
| Longwood | TF 061 592 | Limestone | 22\02\2042 |
| Brauncewell | TF 022 518 | Limestone | 17\04\2042 |
| Glebe (build only) | SK 989 410 | Limestone | 21\02\2042 |
| South Witham (No2) | SK 917 190 | Limestone | 01\04\2020 |
| Creeton | SK 999 205 | Limestone | 21\02\2042 |
| Dunston | TF 053 632 | Limestone | 27\05\2025 |
| Metheringham Heath | TF 054 614 | Limestone | 21\02\2042 |
| Station Quarry, Great Ponton | SK 934 303 | Limestone | 10\10\2055 |
| Whisby | SK 894 669 | Sand and Gravel | 19\04\2067 |
| Norton Bottoms | SK 867 589 | Sand and Gravel | 24\02\2064 |
| Kirkby on Bain | TF 233 608 | Sand and Gravel | 20\03\2069 |
| Tattershall (Park Farm) | TF 207 601 | Sand and Gravel | 31\12\2027 |
| North Kelsey Road | TA 093 012 | Sand and Gravel | 21\06\2019 |

| Quarry name | Grid Ref | Material | End Date |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|------------|
| West Deeping | TF 119 102 | Sand and Gravel | 05\06\2052 |
| Manor (Farm) Pit | TF 125 145 | Sand and Gravel | 15\02\2066 |
| Baston No1 | TF 138 148 | Sand and Gravel | 14\06\2020 |
| Baston No 2 | TF 143 136 | Sand and Gravel | 22\02\2042 |
| South Thoresby | TF 394 762 | Chalk | 27\11\2052 |
| Colsterworth Triangle | SK 900 324 | Limestone | 08\06\2066 |
| Harmston | SK 992 619 | Limestone | 26\07\2034 |
| Copper Hill Quarry | SK 979 426 | Limestone | 17\03\2044 |
| Highfield | TF 451 691 | Chalk | 21\02\2042 |
| Little Ponton | SK 932 325 | Limestone | 02\02\2042 |
| Castle | SK 987 433 | Limestone | 10\12\2049 |
| King Street (West Deeping) | TF 113 100 | Sand and Gravel | 24\10\2057 |
| Kettleby | TA 048 083 | Sand and Gravel (no reserves in Lincolnshire) | |
| Northamptonshire | | | |
| Pury End | SP 707 460 | Limestone | 30\06\2020 |
| Collyweston Eastern Extension | SK 997 700 | Limestone | 03\10\2030 |
| Harlestone | SP 709 639 | Sandstone & Ironstone | 31\12\2021 |
| Passenham Quarry | SP 773 477 E477322 N239039 | Sand & Gravel | 15\05\2024 |
| Ringstead Grange | SP 981 739 | Limestone | 27\05\2018 |
| | | | |
| Harley Way | TL 006 880 | Limestone | 31\12\2029 |
| Rushton Landfill | NG 485 283 | Limestone | 30\09\2030 |
| Earls Barton West | SP 843 623 | Sand & Gravel | 28\08\2027 |
| Wakerley | SP 875 818 | Ironstone & Overlying | 27\02\2062 |

| Quarry name | Grid Ref | Material | End Date |
|--------------------------|------------|-----------------|------------|
| | | Minerals | |
| Nottinghamshire | | | |
| Langford Lowfields | SK 815 606 | Sand and Gravel | 2018 |
| Besthorpe | SK 815 651 | Sand and Gravel | 2023 |
| Scrooby Top | SK 890 651 | Sand and Gravel | 2017 |
| Finningley | SK 976 680 | Sand and Gravel | 2018 |
| East Leake | SK 270 551 | Sand and Gravel | 2027 |
| Misson West | SK 942 679 | Sand and Gravel | 2018 |
| Burntstump | SK 511 605 | Sand and Gravel | 2030 |
| Bestwood 2 | SK 525 566 | Sand and Gravel | 2020 |
| Misson Newington | SK 942 679 | Sand and Gravel | 2018 |
| Misson Bawtry Road | SK 942 679 | Sand and Gravel | 2031 |
| Carlton Forest | SK 822 666 | Sand and Gravel | 2018 |
| Peak District NPA | | | |
| Hope* | SK 157 817 | Limestone | 21/02/2042 |
| Ballidon | SK 201 555 | Limestone | 31/12/2036 |
| Ivonbrook | SK 234 585 | Limestone | 31/12/2015 |
| Hazlebadge Hills* | SK 174 802 | Limestone | 30/11/2017 |
| Old Moor | SK 109 739 | Limestone | 31/12/2046 |
| Topley Pike | SK 101 722 | Limestone | 31/12/2026 |
| Stoke Hall | SK 237 770 | Sandstone | 21/02/2043 |
| Chinley Moor* | SK 049 852 | Sandstone | 31/05/2016 |
| Dale View* | SK 250 642 | Sandstone | 16/09/2030 |
| Bretton Moor* | SK 203 779 | Sandstone | 30/09/2031 |
| Birchover* | SK 242 624 | Sandstone | 30/06/2041 |
| Wattscliffe* | SK 222 621 | Sandstone | 21/02/2042 |
| New Pilhough* | SK 250 645 | Sandstone | 31/12/2023 |

| Quarry name | Grid Ref | Material | End Date |
|------------------------------|------------|-----------|---|
| Shire Hill | SK 053 944 | Sandstone | 21/02/2042 |
| Wimberry Moss | SK 965 765 | Sandstone | 21/02/2042 |
| Burntwood Quarry* | SK 267 666 | Sandstone | 17/12/2028 |
| Once a Week* | SK 157 681 | Limestone | 30/09/2043 |
| Rutland | | | |
| Woolfox | SK 950 136 | Limestone | 09/06/2019 |
| Greetham | SK 931 146 | Limestone | 30/09/2020 |
| Top Grange Quarry Ketton* | SP 980 055 | Limestone | IDO area: 21/03/2042 Extension: 31/12/2026 |
| Clipsham Quarry Extension | SK 969 150 | Limestone | 2028 |
| Hooby Lane, Stretton* | SK 936 164 | Limestone | 31/12/2043 |

*Site producing materials for non-aggregate purposes only

Inactive

A site is considered inactive where there are no substantial mineral operations being carried out during the survey year.

| Quarry name | Grid Ref | Material | |
|-------------------|------------|-----------------|------|
| Derbyshire | | | |
| Hayfield | SK 300 869 | Sandstone | 2042 |
| Bolehill | SK 368 661 | Sandstone | 2042 |
| Hindlow | SK 960 678 | Limestone | 2042 |
| Middle Peak | SK 276 543 | Limestone | 2042 |
| Hillhead | SK 850 692 | Limestone | 2042 |
| Bolsover Moor | SK 500 712 | Dolomite | 2042 |
| Elvaston | SK 430 313 | Sand and Gravel | |
| Potlocks Farm | SK 314 287 | Sand and Gravel | |

| Quarry name | Grid Ref | Material | |
|---|------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| Hardwick Hall | SK 455 640 | Building Stone | 2042 |
| Hall Dale | SK 280 635 | Sandstone | 2042 |
| Dukes | SK 334 546 | Building Stone | 2042 |
| Ashwood Dale | SK 550 791 | Limestone | 2042 |
| Ball Eye | SK 288 574 | Limestone | 2042 |
| Leicestershire | | | |
| Whitwick | SK 448 159 | Igneous | 21/02/2042 |
| Grobby | SK 526 820 | Igneous | 31/12/2038 |
| Charnwood | SK 485 179 | Igneous | 21/02/2042 |
| Slip Inn | SP 544 888 | Sand and Gravel | 30/09/2019 |
| Lincolnshire | | | |
| Heydour (building only) | SK 992 410 | Limestone | 21\02\2042 |
| Ropsley | TF 000 363 | Limestone | 10\02\2052 |
| Red Barn, Castle Bytham | SK 976 200 | Sand & Gravel | 25\09\2067 |
| South Witham No 1 (Mick George) | SK 915 189 | Limestone | 12\06\2062 |
| Norton Disney | SK 883 601 | Sand and Gravel | Restoration Phase |
| Tetford Hill | TF 329 759 | Chalk | N/A |
| Northamptonshire | | | |
| Stone Pits (unimplemented) | SP 981 887 | Limestone | 30/05/2018 |
| Earls Barton Spinney | SP861 619 | Sand & Gravel | 21/07/2023 |
| Collyweston Slate Mine (unimplemented) | TF 009 326 | Limestone | 24/09/2025 |
| Nottinghamshire | | | |
| Nether Langwith | SK 543 695 | Limestone/Dolomite | 2017 |
| Cromwell | SK 805 625 | Sand and Gravel | 2026 |

| Quarry name | Grid Ref | Material | |
|------------------------------|------------|-----------------------|------------|
| Sturton Le Steeple | SK 802 847 | Sand and Gravel | 2030 |
| Yellowstone (Building Stone) | SK 537 515 | Limestone | N/A IDO |
| Girton | SK 821 676 | Sand and Gravel | 2026 |
| Peak District NPA | | | |
| Beelow | SK 094 793 | Limestone | 21/02/2042 |
| Stanton Moor # | SK 246 634 | Sandstone | 20/02/2042 |
| Rutland | | | |
| Thistleton Quarry | SK 900 170 | Ironstone (Limestone) | 31/12/2042 |

Site currently in suspension

Dormant

A site is considered dormant if no minerals development can lawfully be carried out until an application to update the planning conditions has been made to the mineral planning authority and finally determined under the provisions of the Environment Act 1995 or, in the case of Old Mining Permissions, under the Planning and Compensation Act 1991

| Quarry name | Grid Ref | Material | Permitted Date | End |
|---------------------------|------------|-----------------------|----------------|-----|
| Derbyshire | | | | |
| Intake and Redhill | SK 270 551 | Limestone | | |
| Hopton | SK 265 353 | Limestone | | |
| Mugginton | SK 289 435 | Sand and Gravel | | |
| Leicestershire | | | | |
| Sapcote and Granitethorpe | SP 497 935 | Igneous | 21/02/2042 | |
| Goadby Marwood/Branston | SK 790 280 | Ironstone (Limestone) | 21/02/2042 | |
| Holwell | SK 745 238 | Ironstone (Limestone) | 21/02/2042 | |
| Tilton | SK 758 061 | Ironstone (Limestone) | 21/02/2042 | |
| Harston | SK 840 310 | Ironstone (Limestone) | 21/02/2042 | |
| Buckminster/Sewstern | SK 900 225 | Ironstone (Limestone) | 21/02/2042 | |

| Quarry name | Grid Ref | Material | Permitted Date | End Date |
|------------------------------|------------|-----------------------|----------------|----------|
| Eaton/Stathern | SK 788 296 | Ironstone (Limestone) | 21/02/2042 | |
| Saltby/Sproxton | SK 865 255 | Ironstone (Limestone) | 21/02/2042 | |
| Stathern/Knipton | SK 800 313 | Ironstone (Limestone) | 21/02/2042 | |
| Somerby | SK 778 100 | Ironstone (Limestone) | 21/02/2042 | |
| Eaton | SK 788 288 | Ironstone (Limestone) | 21/02/2042 | |
| Lincolnshire | | | | |
| Willow/Thunderbolt | SK 998 182 | Limestone | 21/02/2042 | |
| Digby (Scopwick) | TF 053 572 | Limestone | 21/02/2042 | |
| Grange Farm (Little Bytham) | TF 012 176 | Limestone | 21/02/2042 | |
| Kirkstead | TF 194 602 | Sand and Gravel | 29/09/2041 | |
| Biscathorpe | TF 222 845 | Sand and Gravel | 21/02/2042 | |
| Sudbrook | SK 970 443 | Sand and Gravel | 21/02/2042 | |
| North Kelsey Sandpit | TA 042 011 | Sand and Gravel | 21/02/2042 | |
| Burton | SK 948 738 | Sand and Gravel | 21/02/2042 | |
| Welton le Wold | TF 278 883 | Sand and Gravel | 21/02/2042 | |
| Colsterworth/Gunby/Stainby | SK 915 235 | Ironstone | 21/02/2042 | |
| Buckminster | SK 905 225 | Ironstone | 21/02/2042 | |
| Thistleton/South Witham | SK 925 189 | Ironstone | 21/02/2042 | |
| Denton Harlaxton | SK 885 310 | Ironstone | 21/02/2042 | |
| Colsterworth | SK 905 240 | Ironstone | 21/02/2042 | |
| Burton Coggles | SK 960 257 | Ironstone | 21/02/2042 | |
| Nettleton Mine (underground) | TF 120 980 | Ironstone | 21/02/2042 | |
| Nettleton Mine (opencast) | TF 120 980 | Ironstone | 21/02/2042 | |
| Colsterworth/Skillington | SK 899 250 | Ironstone | 21/02/2042 | |
| Colsterworth (North) | SK 918 250 | Ironstone | 21/02/2042 | |
| Fir Hill | TF 361 829 | Chalk | 21/02/2042 | |

| Quarry name | Grid Ref | Material | Permitted Date | End |
|--|-------------------------|--|----------------|-----|
| Muckton Bottoms | TF 364 823 | Chalk | 21\02\2042 | |
| Saturday Pits | TF 339 252 | Chalk | 21\02\2042 | |
| North Ormsby | TF 288 934 | Chalk | 21\02\2042 | |
| Belchford | TF 306 766 | Chalk | 21\02\2042 | |
| Northamptonshire | | | | |
| Earls Barton | SP 859 640 & SP 859 648 | Silica Sand, Clay & Ganister | 21/02/2042 | |
| Land at Boughton-Pitsford-Moulton | SP 550 684 | Ironstone & Overlying Minerals | 21/02/2042 | |
| Desborough/Rushton | SP 825 840 | Ironstone & Overlying Minerals | 21/02/2042 | |
| Great Oakley | SP 875 855 | Ironstone & Overlying Minerals | 21/02/2042 | |
| Brookfield Cottage, Gretton | SP 917 936 | Ironstone & Overlying Minerals | 21/02/2042 | |
| Glendon South, Kettering | SP 875 807 | Ironstone & Overlying Minerals | 21/02/2042 | |
| Harringworth Sibleys, Harringworth | SP 925 963 | Ironstone & Overlying Minerals | 21/02/2042 | |
| Rothwell | SP 805 815 | Ironstone & Overlying Minerals | 21/02/2042 | |
| Westfield Lodge, Wellingborough | SP 925 705 | Ironstone & Overlying Minerals | 21/02/2042 | |
| Finedon | SP 917 707 | Ironstone & Overlying Minerals | 21/02/2042 | |
| Burton Latimer, Finedon, Irthlingborough, Little Addington | SP 930 728 | Ironstone & Underground Mining | 21/02/2042 | |
| Blisworth | SP 720 520 | Ironstone & Overlying Minerals Limestone | 21/02/2042 | |
| Nassington Yarwell | TL 040 980 | Ironstone & Overlying Minerals | 21/02/2042 | |

| Quarry name | Grid Ref | Material | Permitted Date | End |
|--|------------|---|----------------|-----|
| Rushton Grange, Rushton | SP 825 833 | Ironstone & Overlying Minerals | 21/02/2042 | |
| Desborough East Lodge. Pipewell, West Lodge | SP 813 847 | Ironstone & Overlying Minerals | 21/02/2042 | |
| Twywell | SP 952 788 | Ironstone & Overlying Minerals | 21/02/2042 | |
| Irchester | SP 915 645 | Ironstone & Overlying Minerals | 21/02/2042 | |
| Byfield | SP 515 545 | Marlestone & Overlying Minerals Ironstone & Overlying Minerals | 21/02/2042 | |
| Charwelton | SP 515 565 | Marlestone & Overlying Minerals Ironstone & Overlying Minerals | 21/02/2042 | |
| Cranford | SP 930 790 | Ironstone & Overlying Minerals | 21/02/2042 | |
| Cranford Extension | SP 923 760 | Ironstone & Overlying Minerals | 21/02/2042 | |
| Loddington/Orton | SP 805 790 | Ironstone & Overlying Minerals | 21/02/2042 | |
| Newton Grange, Geddington | SP 883 838 | Ironstone & Overlying Minerals | 21/02/2042 | |
| Burton Latimer | SP 896 758 | Ganister, Ironstone Overlying Minerals & | 21/02/2042 | |
| Desborough, Harrington Road Pit | SP 789 829 | Iron Ore | 21/02/2042 | |
| Desborough, Factory Pit | SP 792 830 | Ironstone & Overlying Minerals | 21/02/2042 | |
| Brookfield (Plantation) | SP 900 920 | Ironstone & Overlying Minerals | 21/02/2042 | |
| Harringworth Lodge (Martins) Harringworth | SP 932 953 | Ironstone & Overlying Minerals | 21/02/2042 | |
| Lampport | SP 760 735 | Ironstone & Overlying Minerals | 21/02/2042 | |

| Quarry name | Grid Ref | Material | Permitted Date | End |
|---------------------------|------------|--------------------------------|----------------|-----|
| Cowthick, Weldon Landfill | SP 923 887 | Limestone | 21/02/2042 | |
| Weekley Hall Wood | SP 875 818 | Ironstone & Overlying Minerals | 21/02/2042 | |
| Park Lodge, Gretton | SP 908 943 | Ironstone & Overlying Minerals | 21/02/2042 | |
| Peak District NPA | | | | |
| Hillhead | SK 083 688 | Limestone | 21/02/2042 | |
| Rutland | | | | |
| Cottesmore/Exton | SK 910 120 | Ironstone (Limestone) | 21/02/2042 | |
| Pilton | SK 920 025 | Ironstone (Limestone) | 21/02/2042 | |
| Thistleton (underground) | SK 930 180 | Ironstone (Limestone) | 21/02/2042 | |
| Big Pitts, Clipsham | SK 968 145 | Limestone | 21/02/2042 | |

Appendix 7: Monitoring of Planning Applications

Planning Applications for primary aggregate extraction determined 1 January to 31 December 2017

| Site Name | Application Number | Address | Detail | Status |
|---|-----------------------|--|---|---|
| Derbyshire | | | | |
| Swarkestone | CM9/0217/98 | Twyford Road Barrow on Trent | Extension. 0.5mt. Sand & Gravel | Permitted 07.08.17 |
| Peak District | | | | |
| Ballidon | xxx | xxx | 14,000 tonnes. Limestone | Granted 19.07.16 |
| Lincolnshire | | | | |
| N23/27/64/0385/14 Whisby Quarry* Eagle Road, Lincoln, LN6 9BT To extract sand and Gravel from land to the West Of whisby Quarry (adj to Swinderby Road and Beehive lane) | N23/27/64/0385/ 14 | Whisby Quarry Eagle Road, Lincoln, LN6 9BT | Extension to existing sites for the extraction of 2.2mt of sand and gravel | Approved subject to legal agreement |
| S26/1611/15 Land at Gorse lane Denton, Grantham* | S26/1611/15 | Gorse lane Denton, Grantham | Application for new site on greenfield land for the removal of 5.9mt of Limestone. | Application refused 03\10\2016 on supply and demand reasons, appeal is pending |
| (ES176\0840\15 Kirkby on Bain Quarry, Tattershall Road, Kirkby on Bain, Woodhall Spa, Lincolnshire* | (ES176\0840\15 | Kirkby on Bain Quarry, Tattershall Road, Kirkby on Bain, Woodhall Spa, Lincolnshire | Application for an extension to existing sand and gravel site for 3.5mt of material | Approved 25/08/2017 |
| South Witham Quarry(Breedons) | S68/1560/16 | Mill Lane, South Witham, Grantham Lincolnshire | Application for extension to existing site including consolidation of | Application withdrawn on 22/02/2017 |

| Site Name | Application Number | Address | Detail | Status |
|--|--------------------|---|--|--|
| | | NG33 5QL | permission and some voluntary surrender of existing reserves for extraction of 1.45mt of Limestone | |
| S42/0583/17 Ancaster Quarry, Heydour. Small scale extension | S42/0583/17 | Ancaster Quarry, Heydour. Small scale extension | Extension for extraction of 40,000t of limestone (block only) | Approved 20/10/2017 |
| S68/0563/17 South Witham Quarry, Mill lane South Witham. Proposed western extension of existing quarry with relinquishment of permitted reserves on land to the north of Mill Lane | S68/0563/17 | South Witham Quarry, Mill lane South Witham | Proposed western extension of existing quarry with relinquishment of permitted reserves on land to the north of Mill Lane resulting in net increase reserves by 500,000t | Approved subject to legal agreement |
| Dunston Quarry | N26/0437/17 | Dunston Quarry, B1188 Lincoln Road Dunston. B1188 Lincoln Road, Dunston | To extend the existing quarry into 4HA of agricultural land to release 400,00t of limestone | Refused 05/06/1017 on supply and demand reasons, appeal pending |
| Northamptonshire | | | | |
| No applications determined | | | | |
| Nottinghamshire | | | | |
| East Leake Quarry 8/14/01781/CMA | 8/14/01781/CMA | | Extension for the release of 7,780,000 of material | Granted 27/06/2017 |
| Peak District National Park | | | | |
| New Pilhough | | Gritstone | Extension for the release of 67,524t of gritstone | Granted 26/06/2017 |
| Dale View | | | Renewal of permission for extraction of | Approved subject to legal agreement being |

| Site Name | Application Number | Address | Detail | Status |
|-------------|--------------------|-----------|---|---------------------|
| | | | 1,009,728 of gritstone | signed. |
| Topley Pike | | Limestone | Application for extension to existing site for the removal of 390,000 of material | Approved 16/02/2017 |

*Please note these sites are resubmissions of previously approved tonnage.

Planning Applications for primary aggregate extraction pending as at 31 December 2017

| Authority/Council | Application Number | Address | Detail | Status |
|-----------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|---|-------------------|
| Derbyshire | | | | |
| Swarkestone | CM9/1215/122 | Twyford Road Barrow on Trent | Extension. 2.5mt. Sand & Gravel | Awaiting decision |
| Ashwood Dale | CM1/0315/159 | Bakewell Road, Buxton | Extension. 5mt Limestone | Awaiting decision |
| Whitwell | CM5/0416/4 | Southfield Lane Whitwell | Extensions. 4.7mt of dolomite inc 1.54mt of aggregate | Awaiting decision |
| Dowlow Quarry | CM1/1017/58 | Buxton | Extension to existing site for the extraction of 4.9mt of limestone | Awaiting decision |
| Slinter Top Quarry | CM3/0817/40 | Cromford | Extension for the extraction of 1.43mt of limestone | Awaiting decision |
| Peak District | | | | |
| Chinley Moor* | | | Renewal 3,500 Tonnes. Gritstone | Awaiting Decision |
| Leicestershire | | | | |
| Shawell Quarry | 2017/0117/03 | Shawell Quarry | Extension for the extraction of 1.8 million tonnes of sand and gravel | UNDETERMINED. |
| Cadeby Quarry | 2017/0902/04 | Cadeby Quarry | Extension to the extraction area yielding | UNDETERMINED. |

| Authority/Council | Application Number | Address | Detail | Status |
|---|--------------------|---|---|---------------------------------|
| | | | approximately 168,000 tonnes of sand and gravel | |
| Northamptonshire | | | | |
| Great Billing Waste Water Recycling Centre | 17/00053/MINFUL | | Application for sand and gravel – 2.5Mt | Pending determination |
| Lincolnshire | | | | |
| S56/2453/17 Tithe Farm Pastures, Tithe Farm, Langtoft, PE69LN | S56/2453/17 | Tithe Farm Pastures, Tithe Farm, Langtoft, PE69LN | Irrigation reservoir on sand and gravel site involving release of 292,500 of material. Received 11/10/2017 | Not yet considered by committee |
| N60/47/1280/17 To extend Norton Bottoms Quarry and consolidate existing planning permissions. | N60/47/1280/17 | | To extend Norton Bottoms Quarry and consolidate existing planning permissions for extraction of 7mt of sand and gravel. Application received 26/07/2017 | Not yet considered by committee |
| Nottinghamshire | | | | |
| College Farm, Barnby Moor 1/18/00043/CDM | | | Application for removal of 900,000t of material. Application received 22/12/2017 | Pending |
| Mill Hill Lane, Barton in Fabis 8/17/02096/CMA | | | Application for removal of 3.4mt of material. Application received 01/09/2017 | Pending |

Appendix 8: The East Midlands Local Government Areas



Appendix 9: Sales of primary aggregates by MPA and principal destination sub-region in 2014: East Midlands

| Source MPA | Destination | Land won sand and gravel | MPA% | AWP% | Crushed Rock | MPA% |
|--------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|--------------|------|--------------|---------------|
| Derbyshire County Council | Derbyshire & Peak District National Park | 269 | 38 | | 1,694 | 27 |
| | East Midland | 223 | 31 | | 326 | 5 |
| | East of England | | | | 114 | 2 |
| | West Midlands | | | | 268 | 4 |
| | North West | | | | 2,262 | 36 |
| | Yorkshire & Humber | | | | 399 | 6 |
| | Elsewhere | 164 | 23 | | 12 | - |
| | Unallocated | 55 | 8 | | 1,184 | 19 |
| | MPA Total | | 711 | | 0 | 6,259 |
| Leicestershire County Council | Leicestershire & Rutland | 837 | 28 | | 5,428 | 38 |
| | East Midlands | 311 | 21 | | 1,879 | 13 |
| | South East | | | | 792 | 6 |
| | London | | | | 890 | 6 |
| | East of England | | | | 2,447 | 17 |
| | West Midlands | | | | 1,494 | 11 |
| | North West | | | | 325 | 2 |
| | Yorkshire & the Humber | | | | 552 | 4 |
| | Elsewhere | 300 | | | 338 | 2 |
| | MPA Total | | 1,448 | | 22 | 14,145 |
| Lincolnshire County Council | Lincolnshire | 826 | 38 | | 373 | 99 |
| | East Midlands | 842 | 39 | | 2 | 1 |
| | Elsewhere | 481 | 22 | | 2 | - |

| Source MPA | Destination | Land won sand and gravel | MPA% | AWP% | Crushed Rock | MPA% |
|--|--|--------------------------|------|--------------|---------------|------|
| MPA Total | | 2,149 | | 33 | 377 | |
| Northamptonshire County Council | Northamptonshire | 350 | 67 | | 142 | 58 |
| | East Midlands | 3 | 1 | | 73 | 30 |
| | Elsewhere | 168 | 32 | | 31 | 13 |
| MPA Total | | 521 | | 8 | 246 | |
| Nottinghamshire County Council | Nottinghamshire | 499 | 28 | | | |
| | East Midlands | 344 | 19 | | | |
| | Elsewhere | 718 | 41 | | | |
| | Unallocated | 210 | 12 | | | |
| MPA Total | | 1,771 | | 27 | | |
| Peak District National Park | Derbyshire & Peak District National Park | | | | 1,002 | 37 |
| | East Midlands | | | | 128 | 5 |
| | West Midlands | | | | 306 | 11 |
| | North West | | | | 1,244 | 46 |
| | Elsewhere | | | | 45 | 2 |
| MPA Total | | | | 2,725 | | |
| Rutland CC DC | Leicestershire & Rutland | | | | 60 | 28 |
| | East Midlands | | | | 102 | 47 |
| | Elsewhere | | | | 53 | 25 |
| MPA Total | | | | 215 | | |
| EM AWP Total | | 6,600 | | 100 | 23,967 | |



Civic Centre, Chorley Road, Swinton, Salford, M27 5AS
Registration Number: 5292634. Registered in England

Commercial in Confidence

Urban Vision is a joint venture with Salford City Council