

# *Minerals Local Plan background document*

---

## *Strategic cross boundary issue: Crushed rock supply in Worcestershire*

### *Summary of action undertaken under the duty to cooperate*

*September 2016*

**Document Details:**

Contact: Marianne Joynes  
Minerals Planning Policy,  
Strategic Planning and Environmental Policy,  
Directorate of Economy and Infrastructure  
Worcestershire County Council,  
County Hall,  
Worcester,  
WR5 2NP

Email: [minerals@worcestershire.gov.uk](mailto:minerals@worcestershire.gov.uk)

Tel: 01905 766374



# Contents

1. Chronology.....	5
March 2015 – West Midlands AWP consultation.....	5
June 2015 – Ongoing engagement with West Midlands AWP MPAs .....	6
June 2015 – Initiating engagement with East Midlands, South Wales and South West AWP.....	7
November 2015 - West Midlands AWP meeting.....	11
December 2015 - Letter to AWP and WM AWP MPAs .....	11
July 2016 – Consultation on draft 2016 Local Aggregates Assessment and Summary of action undertaken under the duty to cooperate .....	13
2. List of Appendices .....	15
Appendix 1: WCC Memo for AWP, 5 March 2015.....	15
Appendix 2: Draft WMAWP minutes 27 March 2015 .....	15
Appendix 3: Letter from Staffordshire County Council.....	15
Appendix 4: Email from Dudley Metropolitan Borough Council.....	15
Appendix 5: Email to South West AWP 5 June 2015 .....	15
Appendix 6: Email to South Wales AWP 17 June 2015.....	15
Appendix 7: Email to East Midlands AWP 17 June 2015.....	15
Appendix 8: Response from South Wales AWP 1 July 2015.....	15
Appendix 9: Response from East Midlands AWP Chair 1 December 2015 .....	15
Appendix 10: Response from South West AWP 6 July 2015.....	15
Appendix 11: Email to Gloucestershire County Council 17 July 2015.....	15
Appendix 12: Email to South Gloucestershire Council 17 July 2015.....	16
Appendix 13: Response from Gloucestershire County Council 4 August 2015.....	16
Appendix 14: Response from South Gloucestershire Council 21 August 2015.....	16
Appendix 15: Record of GCC SGC and WCC meeting 19 October 2015 .....	16
Appendix 16: WMAWP minutes 30 November 2015 .....	16
Appendix 17: Letter to AWP 18 December 2015 .....	16
Appendix 18: Letter from Walsall Council 10 February 2016.....	16
Appendix 19: Response from South West AWP 3 February 2016.....	16
Appendix 20: Response from South Gloucestershire 12 February 2016 .....	16
Appendix 21: Response from West Midlands AWP 25 August 2016 .....	16
Appendix 22: Response from Mineral Products Association 16 August 2016.....	16
Appendix 23: East Midlands AWP 30 August 2016 .....	17
Appendix 24: South Wales AWP 31 August 2016 .....	17
Appendix 25: Response from South West AWP 7 September 2016.....	17

Appendix 26: Response from South Gloucestershire 26 August 2016 ..... 17

# 1. Chronology

- 1.1. In late 2014/early 2015 Worcestershire County Council identified an issue in relation to Worcestershire's crushed rock supply.
- 1.2. Through work on the Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) AMR 2014 and associated Local Aggregates Assessment (LAA), the preparation of a mineral resource assessment to inform the Minerals Local Plan consultation and the development of a spatial strategy for that consultation it was identified that there are currently no sales of, or permitted reserves for, crushed rock in Worcestershire and that future development is likely to be limited. Apart from applications for small extensions to Fish Hill Quarry, near Broadway, a site which has now closed and is undergoing restoration, no applications for planning permission for mineral working to produce crushed rock aggregate have been submitted to Worcestershire County Council since 1992. No proposals for new crushed rock sites have been submitted to the Council as part of the first two consultations on the emerging Minerals Local Plan for Worcestershire or subsequent "call for sites".
- 1.3. The Council was therefore concerned about the ability of the county to supply crushed rock in the future and identified that this was a strategic cross boundary issue requiring constructive, active and ongoing engagement to maximise the effectiveness of Minerals Local Plan preparation.

## March 2015 – West Midlands AWP consultation

- 1.4. Once the Council had identified that Worcestershire was unlikely to be able to deliver a steady and adequate supply of crushed rock over the plan period Worcestershire County Council (WCC) approached the West Midlands Aggregate Working Party (AWP) to discuss this issue.
- 1.5. WCC's Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Economy, Skills and Infrastructure (Cllr Simon Geraghty) forwarded a memo dated 5<sup>th</sup> March 2015 (see **Appendix 1: WCC Memo for AWP, 5 March 2015**) for consideration at the meeting of 27<sup>th</sup> March 2015 setting out the Council's proposed approach. This was an officer level meeting and was attended by Nick Dean (Minerals and Waste Policy Manager) and Marianne Joynes (Minerals and Waste Policy Planner). The memo asked AWP members to consider:
  - a) If the approach set out in the memo was reasonable
  - b) If there were any reasonable alternatives which would enable, as a minimum, the delivery of the provision levels set out in the memo.
- 1.6. In addition, other mineral planning authorities were asked whether they could agree in principle that:
  - c) on a cross-authority basis, they could meet the additional demand for crushed rock if supply in Worcestershire remains below the minimum 0.093 million tonnes per annum requirement identified through Worcestershire's 2014 LAA<sup>1</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> The 2014 Local Aggregates Assessments can be found as an annex to the 2013/2014 Annual Monitoring Report at [www.worcestershire.gov.uk/amr](http://www.worcestershire.gov.uk/amr). The figure of 0.093 million tonnes per annum is based on Worcestershire's derived average annual sales over the period 2002-2011.

- d) they were able to support the following draft objective from the working version of the *Third consultation on the Worcestershire Minerals Local Plan*:

"To deliver mineral development that ensures steady and adequate sustainable supply of minerals to meet local and national need and delivers a positive legacy by:...(to be resolved)

- Maximising supply of crushed rock within the delivery limitations that exist in the county and cooperating with other authorities to contribute to the maintenance of supply of crushed rock across the local region<sup>2</sup>; reviewing the plan if a minimum 10 year landbank is not maintained across this area."

- 1.7. WMAWP were happy to accept the memo in principle (as recorded in **Appendix 2: Draft WMAWP minutes 27 March 2015**). It was also agreed that the main potential supply of crushed rock to Worcestershire was likely to be from Gloucestershire and that the Chair, in liaison with WCC, would make a formal approach via the South West AWP.
- 1.8. Following the meeting WCC revisited the latest figures available regarding imports and exports of primary aggregates (by region)<sup>3</sup> to identify whether other AWP regions provide significant imports of crushed rock to the West Midlands AWP region (see **Table 1**). WCC requested that the Chair also contacted the East Midlands AWP and South Wales AWP.

**Table 1. Consumption of primary crushed rock in West Midlands (2009)**

AWP region	% of WMAWP imports	% of total WMAWP consumption
West Midlands	-	42.6%
East Midlands	69.2%	39.8%
South Wales	16.6%	9.5%
South West	8.7%	5.0%
Other	5.5%	3.1%

Source: Collation of the Aggregate Minerals 2009 Survey

- 1.9. Whilst the AWP collectively accepted the memo in principle, the delegated powers of officers at the AWP to agree such issues varied between authorities. WCC therefore decided to contact each member MPA of the WMAWP to build on this early-stage engagement and to ensure the opportunity was given for the key questions to be considered by the appropriate person within each authority (see below).

## June 2015 – Ongoing engagement with West Midlands AWP MPAs

- 1.10. On 8<sup>th</sup> June 2015 WCC sent an email with the March 2015 memo (**Appendix 1: WCC Memo for AWP, 5 March 2015**) to all of the mineral planning authorities (MPAs) who are members of the WMAWP, asking for it to be forwarded to their Cabinet Member with responsibility for Minerals Planning.

<sup>2</sup> Worcestershire County Council was proposing the "local region" to be defined by cross boundary agreements with the MPAs which form part of the West Midlands AWP and Gloucestershire County Council.

<sup>3</sup> Collation of the Aggregate Minerals 2009 Survey

- 1.11. A response was received from Cllr Mark Winnington, Staffordshire County Council (Cabinet Member for Economy, Environment and Transport): "*Having considered the evidence for crushed rock sales within the wider West Midlands area, I understand that your proposals for your Minerals Local Plan will not have significant implications for either the provision or consumption of crushed rock in Staffordshire. On this basis, I do not object to the approach for the provision of crushed rock as set out in your memorandum dated 5 March 2015.*" (See **Appendix 3: Letter from Staffordshire**)
- 1.12. The Planning Manager (Policy) at Dudley Metropolitan Borough Council replied that "*It is not normal practice to put duty to co-operate requests before the relevant Cabinet members, however officer support is confirmed in principle.*" (See **Appendix 4: Email from Dudley Metropolitan Borough Council**)
- 1.13. No other formal responses were received from West Midlands minerals planning authorities at this stage.

## June 2015 – Initiating engagement with East Midlands, South Wales and South West AWP

- 1.14. On the behalf of Worcestershire County Council, the Chair of the West Midlands Aggregate Working Party sent letters with a copy of the March 2015 memo (**Appendix 1: WCC Memo for AWP, 5 March 2015**) via email to:
- the South West Aggregate Working Party on 5<sup>th</sup> June 2015 (see **Appendix 5: Email to South West AWP 5 June 2015** and **Appendix 5a: Letter from West Midlands AWP to South West AWP**)
  - the South Wales Aggregate Working Parties on 17<sup>th</sup> June 2015 (see **Appendix 6: Email to South Wales AWP 17 June 2015**, **Appendix 6a: Letter from West Midlands AWP to South Wales AWP Chair** and **Appendix 6b: Letter from West Midlands AWP to South Wales AWP Secretary**)
  - the East Midlands Aggregate Working Parties on 17<sup>th</sup> June 2015 (see **Appendix 7: Email to East Midlands AWP 17 June 2015** and **Appendix 7a: Letter from West Midlands AWP to East Midlands AWP**)
- 1.15. This sought the view from the Chair of each of the AWP's on the approach Worcestershire County Council proposed to take, asking whether they agreed that Worcestershire's approach was appropriate and acceptable to the AWP.

### Response from South Wales AWP – 1<sup>st</sup> July 2015

- 1.16. Following clarification over the timescale in which a response was required and Worcestershire County Council's stance towards crushed rock development, the Chair of the South Wales AWP responded on 1<sup>st</sup> July 2015 stating that "Given the support of the MPA and the arguments set out in your paper and email, I accept that the duty to co-operate has been discharged" (see **Appendix 8: Response from South Wales AWP 1 July 2015**).

### Response from East Midlands AWP – 1<sup>st</sup> December 2015

- 1.17. The hiatus in the AWP secretary contracts during this period meant that the East Midlands AWP had not been able to properly address the request sent in June 2015 through a convened meeting of the East Midlands Aggregates Working Party. However, a "draft" response of preliminary comments was received from the Chair of

the East Midlands AWP on 1<sup>st</sup> December 2015 (see **Appendix 9: Response from East Midlands AWP Chair 1 December 2015**).

- 1.18. These comments concluded that "whilst the quantity of Worcestershire's crushed rock production is relatively small compared to the East Midlands and is therefore capable of being met by the East Midlands, I would have concerns if Worcestershire did not attempt to meet its share of demand from the significant resources that are potentially available", but that "the approach of ensuring that the resources available can come forward on the basis of a criteria based policy to meet an identified need, then I would be willing to support that approach in principle, subject to the formal agreement of the EMAWP".

### Response from South West AWP - 6<sup>th</sup> July 2015

- 1.19. A response was received from the South West AWP on 6<sup>th</sup> July 2015 (see **Appendix 10: Response from South West AWP 6 July 2015**). It indicated that Gloucestershire and South Gloucestershire authorities may also make individual responses.
- 1.20. In summary, the response stated that "No objection to the principle of the WCC proposals has been received from SW AWP members but it is considered that there is insufficient up to date and robust evidence on provision to currently embrace a joint policy as suggested". (WCC had not intended to propose a joint policy approach and therefore recognised that further communication and clarification would be required.)
- 1.21. The SW AWP considered that aggregate supplies from resources within the West Midlands should be the first and preferred option, whilst acknowledging that movement of aggregates is primarily determined by the commercial operations of industry. However it was considered that collective permitted crushed rock reserves in the South West could easily provide for an additional 0.093 mtpa if shortfall in supply in Worcestershire could not be made up by supplies in the West Midlands.
- 1.22. However the SW AWP consider it likely that supply from the South West would primarily be from the limestone quarries in Gloucestershire and South Gloucestershire due to their proximity to Worcestershire. It was noted that permitted reserves and productive capacity in South Gloucestershire are considerable, but that this was not the case in Gloucestershire.
- 1.23. Constraints on future supply from Gloucestershire, including the impact of the Cotswolds AONB are being considered through Gloucestershire's draft MLP. Nevertheless, the Gloucestershire LAA and its draft MLP account for the export of rock to Worcestershire and the flexible approach being taken in the plan is considered by the council to be sufficient to ensure that current supplies are maintained for the foreseeable future. Further engagement with Gloucestershire and South Gloucestershire Authorities was encouraged.
- 1.24. It was noted in SW AWP's response that Worcestershire's LAA had not been referred to the SW AWP for comment. (WCC noted this comment, although the South West AWP Secretary had been contacted during the Second Stage Consultation on the Minerals Local Plan in November 2013 which included consultation on background evidence including the LAA. WCC will invite explicit comment from the SWAWP on future iterations of the LAA.)



- 1.25. Further engagement with Gloucestershire County Council and South Gloucestershire Council is detailed below.

## July 2015 – Continuing engagement with Gloucestershire County Council and South Gloucestershire Council

- 1.26. On 17<sup>th</sup> July 2015 WCC wrote to Gloucestershire County Council and South Gloucestershire Council following the South West AWP's reply (including a copy of the March 2015 memo, **Appendix 1: WCC Memo for AWP, 5 March 2015**), asking whether they were able to support WCC's proposed approach (see **Appendix 11: Email to Gloucestershire County Council 17 July 2015** and **Appendix 12: Email to South Gloucestershire Council 17 July 2015**).

### Gloucestershire County Council response

- 1.27. Robin Drake responded (on behalf of the Lead Commissioner for Strategic Infrastructure, Gloucestershire County Council) on 4<sup>th</sup> August 2015 (see **Appendix 13: Response from Gloucestershire County Council 4 August 2015**). This response stated that Gloucestershire County Council (GCC) was fully appreciative of cross-border movements of crushed rock from Gloucestershire into Worcestershire and that this represents a recognisable trend which has occurred for some time and is likely to continue into the future. As such GCC raised no objection to Gloucestershire being highlighted as one of a number of likely contributors to the supply of crushed rock to meet anticipated demand generated from within Worcestershire for now and in the foreseeable future.
- 1.28. However the response raised some concerns about the proposed approach in relation to identifying future crushed rock provision requirements, making particular reference to a lack of information provided about anticipated future demand within Worcestershire, and that constructing a mechanism to contribute towards achievement of a sub-regional apportionment is unnecessarily complex.
- 1.29. The response also highlighted that the Worcestershire administrative area doesn't contribute a supply of crushed rock anymore and has not done so for a number of years. Also, for a number of "potentially quite laudable and defensible reasons" this is unlikely to change for the foreseeable future. The supply trend over time as identified within the Gloucestershire LAA evidence suite indicates that a part of the supply sourced from Gloucestershire leaves the county to contribute towards meeting the demand for materials from elsewhere, including for Worcestershire. The relative proportions have been fairly consistent for some time. Consequently, putting in a policy framework that aims to (at least) maintain this trend as part of the overall trend from Gloucestershire should afford sufficient confidence to those areas outside of Gloucestershire that a realistic, achievable supply to contribute towards meeting their needs will be in place.

### South Gloucestershire Council response

- 1.30. Robin Levenston (Strategic Planning Policy & Specialist Advice Team, South Gloucestershire Council) responded on 21<sup>st</sup> August 2015 (see **Appendix 14: Response from South Gloucestershire Council 21 August 2015**). This stated that South Gloucestershire Council (SGC) concurred with the comments of the South West AWP, and that "It is not clear from the papers as to why Worcestershire County Council are being asked to contribute to the WM AWP sub-national requirements for crushed rock, as it has not done so for a number of years: there are considerable constraints in terms of future working in your administrative area and no sales of, or permitted reserves for crushed rock since 2012. Notwithstanding this, the Council

supports WCC's positive stance with regard to potential future applications for future working in its administrative area."

- 1.31. The response went on to highlight that, should no applications come forward, other sources of supply will need to be drawn upon and in this respect, South Gloucestershire Council concurs with the view held by the SW AWP and Gloucestershire County Council that the approach to addressing the supply issue should in the first instance be investigated with other MPAs in the WM AWP. However, further information was given regarding the LAA in the West of England and South Gloucestershire context, including that the West of England LAA indicates that there is a history of crushed rock being exported to the West Midlands by operators in South Gloucestershire, and that South Gloucestershire, as a significant net exporter of crushed rock, is making adequate provision through its Local Plan to help contribute towards ensuring that supply issues outside of the Council's administrative boundary are able to be addressed by industry.

**Meeting: Officers of Worcestershire County Council, Gloucestershire County Council, South Gloucestershire Council, 19<sup>th</sup> October 2015 <sup>4</sup>**

- 1.32. A meeting was requested by WCC following the responses from GCC, SGC and the South West AWP. WCC wished to verify their understanding of those comments and discuss the next stage of their approach (see **Appendix 15: Record of GCC SGC and WCC meeting 19 October 2015**).
- 1.33. SGC and GCC confirmed that they consider that for Worcestershire the most practical approach regarding the provision of crushed rock is to consider all the issues and constraints outlined in the March 2015 memo as part of the Local Aggregates Assessment, and thereby remove the requirement to set a figure for the steady and adequate supply of crushed rock from Worcestershire, as the issues outlined mean that it is unlikely to be able to produce any crushed rock. Worcestershire should recognise that it has not been contributing to the supply of crushed rock since 2010, and that it is unlikely to be able to do so in future. This would remove the requirement for WCC's MLP to have a policy mechanism as outlined in the June 2015 memo.
- 1.34. WCC agreed that this would be a sensible and pragmatic approach, but considered that this needed to be discussed and agreed with the minerals planning authorities in the West Midlands as well as the WM AWP. WCC undertook to refer the discussion back to the West Midlands and confirm with GCC, SGC and SW AWP in due course.
- 1.35. As no crushed rock has been provided from Worcestershire since 2010, GCC and SGC recognised that the minerals market currently meets demand from Worcestershire, and suggested that no specific action over and above the current situation is required by surrounding authorities, as their individual Local Aggregates Assessments will already be taking this into account in recent years' sales figures. Worcestershire's AMR could seek to monitor where its supply comes from if necessary.
- 1.36. WCC undertook to refer discussion back to WM MPAs and WM AWP with a view to seeking agreement that WCC's next LAA should remove the requirement to set a figure for the steady and adequate supply of crushed rock from Worcestershire.

---

<sup>4</sup> The previous South West Aggregate Working Party (SW AWP) secretary had been invited to attend, but was unable to represent the SW AWP as the secretariat contract was not in place.

## November 2015 - West Midlands AWP meeting

- 1.37. Worcestershire's crushed rock issues were discussed at the WM AWP meeting of 30<sup>th</sup> November 2015 (see **Appendix 16: WMAWP minutes 30 November 2015**). This was an officer level meeting and was attended by Marianne Joynes (Principal Planner, Minerals and Waste Policy) and Philip Ward (Planner).
- 1.38. This reviewed the constraints on Worcestershire's crushed rock resources and the earlier discussions with the WM AWP. An outline was given of the responses received from the South Wales AWP and South West AWP (the response from the East Midlands AWP was not received until after the meeting), and the discussions held with Gloucestershire County Council and South Gloucestershire Council.
- 1.39. It was also highlighted that, although it was proposed that the draft Minerals Local Plan would contain positive policies to enable crushed rock development, the two Strategic Corridors which were outlined in the March 2015 memo that had been identified primarily for crushed rock resources were unlikely to be included in the final plan due to them being unlikely to be deliverable.<sup>5</sup>
- 1.40. The WM AWP recognised that with the constraints outlined and the lack of interest in Worcestershire's resources shown by the minerals industry over many years, as well as the fact that no sites for crushed rock have been proposed in response to "calls for sites" in 2014 and 2015, that it was unlikely that Worcestershire would be able to provide crushed rock for the foreseeable future and that this should be recognised in Worcestershire's Local Aggregates Assessment. The WM AWP agreed this approach to the Local Aggregates Assessment and suggested that an enabling approach could be put in place through criteria-based policies in the emerging Minerals Local Plan should crushed rock proposals come forward.

## December 2015 - Letter to AWP and WM AWP MPAs

- 1.41. Following the discussion of Worcestershire's crushed rock issues at the meeting of the West Midlands AWP on 30<sup>th</sup> November, a letter (**Appendix 17: Letter to AWP 18 December 2015**) was sent from Cllr Simon Geraghty (Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member with Responsibility for Economy, Skills and Infrastructure) to the South West and South Wales AWP (**Appendix 17a: Email to South West and South Wales AWP 5 January 2016**), East Midlands AWP (**Appendix 17b: Email to East Midlands AWP 5 January 2016**), and members of the West Midlands AWP (**Appendix 17c: Email to West Midlands AWP members 11 January 2016**).
- 1.42. This outlined the next steps which Worcestershire County Council intended to take:
  - To conduct a full review of Worcestershire's Local Aggregates Assessment to address this issue, and to consult on this alongside our Third Stage Consultation on the Minerals Local Plan in 2016.
  - Not to include Strategic Corridors for crushed rock around Bredon Hill or the Malvern Hills.

---

<sup>5</sup> The "Bredon Hill" corridor's proximity to the Bredon Hill Special Area of Conservation (SAC) means that it would be unlikely to meet the requirements of the Habitats Regulations Assessment, and the "Malvern Hills" corridor is unlikely to be deliverable as 83% of the land in that corridor is controlled by the Malvern Hills Conservators who have a unique responsibility to protect the hills from quarrying.

- To include criteria-based policies in the emerging Minerals Local Plan which would enable proposals for crushed rock development to be assessed should they be put forward.

1.43. Worcestershire County Council requested that AWP members obtain member endorsement of their responses to this letter if appropriate in accordance with individual councils' schemes of delegation.

#### **West Midlands Mineral Planning Authorities**

1.44. Walsall Council (Dawn Sherwood, Principal Planning Officer) responded in a letter dated 10<sup>th</sup> February 2016 (**Appendix 18: Letter from Walsall Council 10 February 2016**). This confirmed that Walsall Council had no objection to the approach set out and that Walsall Council was not aware of any evidence that it has ever relied to any great extent on supplies of crushed rock or other aggregate minerals from Worcestershire.

1.45. No other formal responses were received from members of the West Midlands AWP at this stage.

#### **South West AWP**

1.46. The Secretary of the South West AWP responded on 3<sup>rd</sup> February 2016 (**Appendix 19: Response from South West AWP 3 February 2016**) stating that following a recent meeting with the SW AWP at which this matter was discussed, the SWAWP had no comments to make on the letter from Worcestershire County Council regarding the crushed rock provision in Worcestershire.

1.47. South Gloucestershire Council responded separately on 12<sup>th</sup> February 2016 (**Appendix 20: Response from South Gloucestershire 12 February 2016**), stating that "The letter accurately reflects the approach discussed through active and constructive engagement between South Gloucestershire, Gloucestershire and Worcestershire officers. This approach has been discussed and agreed with the Chair of the Planning, Transportation and Strategic Environment Committee. The Council is therefore happy to endorse the approach set out in the letter".

#### **South Wales AWP**

1.48. No responses were received from members of the South Wales AWP at this stage.

#### **East Midlands AWP**

1.49. No responses were received from members of the East Midlands AWP at this stage.

## July 2016 – Consultation on draft 2016 Local Aggregates Assessment and Summary of action undertaken under the duty to cooperate

- 1.50. Worcestershire County Council took the above discussions into account in reviewing and drafting its 2016 Local Aggregates Assessment (using data up to 31<sup>st</sup> December 2015).
- 1.51. The draft 2016 Local Aggregates Assessment was circulated to the West Midlands, South West, South Wales and East Midlands Aggregate Working Parties for comment alongside a draft of this "Summary of action undertaken under the duty to cooperate" in relation to the strategic cross boundary issue of crushed rock supply in Worcestershire.
- 1.52. Worcestershire County Council welcomed comments from the AWP's or AWP members on both the draft 2016 Local Aggregates Assessment and the July 2016 draft "Summary of action undertaken under the duty to cooperate". The comments on the 2016 Local Aggregates were taken into account and summarised in the final document.

### West Midlands AWP

- 1.53. The response from the West Midlands AWP (**Appendix 21: Response from West Midlands AWP 25 August 2016**) concluded that the AWP as a whole "believes that the LAA meets the requirements as set out in relevant guidance". An appendix was attached to this response containing comments from the Mineral Products Association.

### Mineral Products Association

- 1.54. The Mineral Products Association (**Appendix 22: Response from Mineral Products Association 16 August 2016**) raised some points in relation to specific wording and the structure of the Local Aggregates Assessment, but did not raise any concerns regarding the proposed approach to crushed rock.

### South West, East Midlands and South Wales AWP's

- 1.55. The secretaries of the East Midlands AWP (**Appendix 23: Response from East Midlands AWP 30 August 2016**) and South Wales AWP (**Appendix 24: Response from South Wales AWP 31 August 2016**) confirmed that their members had made no comments on either document.
- 1.56. The South West AWP (**Appendix 25: Response from South West AWP 7 September 2016**) confirmed that they did not have any collective comments to make on Worcestershire's draft LAA and had agreed that any comments should come directly from individual MPAs. Individual comments were received from South Gloucestershire Council.

## South Gloucestershire Council

- 1.57. South Gloucestershire Council (**Appendix 26: Response from South Gloucestershire 26 August 2016**) were pleased to note that the discussions between South Gloucestershire, Gloucestershire County Council and Worcestershire County Council had been reflected in the duty to cooperate statement and that those discussions had informed the approach the County Council had taken to the supply of crushed rock, stating that "this approach is considered to be sensible and pragmatic, reflecting that Worcestershire has no permitted reserves, no productive capacity and no landbank for crushed rock."

## 2. Next steps

- 2.1. The 2016 LAA reflects the discussions outlined in this document and has been used as the baseline for preparing the Third Stage Consultation on the Minerals Local Plan. The Third Stage Consultation will take place from 14<sup>th</sup> December 2016 to 8<sup>th</sup> March 2017.

### 3. List of Appendices

(The appendices are available as separate PDF documents)

Appendix 1: WCC Memo for AWP, 5 March 2015

Appendix 2: Draft WMAWP minutes 27 March 2015

Appendix 3: Letter from Staffordshire County Council

Appendix 4: Email from Dudley Metropolitan Borough Council

Appendix 5: Email to South West AWP 5 June 2015

Appendix 5a: Letter from West Midlands AWP to South West AWP

Appendix 6: Email to South Wales AWP 17 June 2015

Appendix 6a: Letter from West Midlands AWP to South Wales AWP Chair

Appendix 6b: Letter from West Midlands AWP to South Wales AWP Secretary

Appendix 7: Email to East Midlands AWP 17 June 2015

Appendix 7a: Letter from West Midlands AWP to East Midlands AWP

Appendix 8: Response from South Wales AWP 1 July 2015

Appendix 9: Response from East Midlands AWP Chair 1 December 2015

Appendix 10: Response from South West AWP 6 July 2015

Appendix 11: Email to Gloucestershire County Council 17 July 2015

Appendix 12: Email to South Gloucestershire Council 17 July 2015

Appendix 13: Response from Gloucestershire County Council 4 August 2015

Appendix 14: Response from South Gloucestershire Council 21 August 2015

Appendix 15: Record of GCC SGC and WCC meeting 19 October 2015

Appendix 16: WMAWP minutes 30 November 2015

Appendix 17: Letter to AWP 18 December 2015

Appendix 17a: Email to South West and South Wales AWP 5 January 2016

Appendix 17b: Email to East Midlands AWP 5 January 2016

Appendix 17c: Email to West Midlands AWP members 11 January 2016

Appendix 18: Letter from Walsall Council 10 February 2016

Appendix 19: Response from South West AWP 3 February 2016

Appendix 20: Response from South Gloucestershire 12 February 2016

Appendix 21: Response from West Midlands AWP 25 August 2016

Appendix 22: Response from Mineral Products Association 16 August 2016



Appendix 23: Response from East Midlands AWP 30  
August 2016

Appendix 24: Response from South Wales AWP 31  
August 2016

Appendix 25: Response from South West AWP 7  
September 2016

Appendix 26: Response from South Gloucestershire 26  
August 2016