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Hearing Session 9: Minerals; Waste; Renewable Energy

10am – Wednesday 30\textsuperscript{th} April 2014
Main discussion matters

1. Policy SP22 Minerals.

i. Does policy SP22 and its accompanying text adequately and sufficiently clearly set out how national and regional requirements concerning aggregates provision are met, so far as is reasonably possible, by the Plan? In particular, is the stance of the Plan in relation to maintaining land bank supplies during the Plan period adequately explained and justified? Does paragraph 2.81 sufficiently clearly explain the basis of the policy’s provisions?

1.1 It is considered that policy SP22 and its supporting text, as amended in para. 1.7, clearly sets out the requirements of planning aggregate provision over the plan period. National Planning Policy, MTAN1 paras. 45-50, requires an authority to identify allocations for future working in their LDP where there is an insufficient landbank of permitted reserves to meet the identified demand. It also identifies that it is unlikely to be possible or desirable to maintain an adequate landbank in every mineral planning authority. In Newport’s case the review of the RTS now evidences that there is no longer a requirement to maintain a landbank (see below) but the Mineral Planning Authority (MPA) has done all it can to safeguard potential resource areas for possible future supplies.

1.2 The identified demand is set out in the First Review of the Regional Technical Statement (RTS) (as issued on 3rd March for endorsement by Members on 1st April 2014 and attached in Appendix 1). This has not identified an apportionment for Newport, and therefore it is no longer necessary for Newport to demonstrate that it has an adequate landbank to meet the regional demand covered by the revised RTS. The proposed amended wording to paragraphs 2.80 and 2.81, outlined below, is considered adequate to explain and justify the Council’s landbank position.

ii. Does the wording of SP22 need to make more direct reference to maintaining a land bank of aggregate supply?

1.3 Given the first review of the RTS, it is considered that the current wording of SP22 and in particular the need to consider mineral applications in a regional context is sufficient. Newport does not have a supply of aggregate and the RTS review notes that Newport is not required to make specific provision over the plan period. The LDP does however, through SP22, comply with all the recommendations set out in the revised RTS to fulfil its role in the regional context and enable the authority to contribute towards supply should circumstances change in the future.

iii. What is the position concerning a new RTS? Are there likely to be significant implications for the policy approach proposed in the LDP?

1.4 The RTS has been through its first review and the revised documents, having been through a rigorous process of inspection and peer review by Regional Aggregates Working Party (RAWP) members and a two-month programme of wider (public) consultation, were endorsed by a majority (fifteen out of twenty five) of all Mineral Planning Authorities in Wales at a meeting on the 1st April 2014. Endorsement by the remaining authorities is understood to be done over the coming weeks. Newport City Council has formally endorsed the report via a decision by the Cabinet Member for Development and Regeneration.
Moreover, the RAWP Secretaries were able to state, at the 1\textsuperscript{st} April meeting, that they were not aware of any intended objections, refusals or abstentions. Once endorsed by all local authorities, the First Review will be given Welsh Government Ministerial endorsement. The apportionment, allocations and recommendations provided by the RTS 1\textsuperscript{st} Review relate to the specific LDP period for Newport.

1.5 With respect to Newport, the RTS review has concluded that, ‘By virtue of its lack of suitable crushed rock resources, and lack of historical demand for land-won sand and gravel production, the planning authority is not required to make any future provision of land-won primary aggregate within it LDP’. This is on the assumption that the supplies of alternative aggregates from marine, secondary and recycled sources, remain comparable to those achieved over the ‘baseline’ period used for the First Review, i.e. 2001 - 2010 inclusive. This assumption will need to be monitored and any changes reflected, as necessary, in the next review of the RTS. The other change from the original RTS is that of considering the feasibility of sea borne rock imports. Through discussions with the mineral operators it is understood that the potential for sea borne imports is extremely limited, in the case of Newport, but the wharves are available if required. The original recommendations of protecting wharves and railheads for sustainable transportation of aggregate; continued use of marine, secondary and recycled aggregates; and safeguarding of primary aggregate resources remain in place.

1.6 This is a significant change from the original RTS which stated the need for Newport to find 8.5 million tonnes of aggregate. This new approach is welcomed by Newport because, instead of basing need purely on a per-capita approach, it takes into account the spatial distribution of suitable resources, and also the reality of recent historical sales figures.

1.7 The implications on the LDP will require the replacement of paragraph 2.80 and 2.81, supporting text to policy SP22. The proposed new wording is set out below:

‘Land use planning policy guidance for mineral extraction and related development is set out in Minerals Planning Policy Wales (2001) and supplemented by Mineral Technical Advice Note 1: Aggregate (2004) and Technical Advice Note 2: Coal (2009). Mineral planning is considered at the regional scale, the overall consideration of supply and demand for the South Wales region is carried out by the South Wales Regional Aggregates Working Party (SWRAWP). The role of the SWRAWP is to examine issues of aggregate provision and to produce a Regional Technical Statement (RTS) which sets out the strategy for the provision of aggregates in South Wales.

There is no current landbank in Newport and resources are limited. National Planning Policy requires local authorities to maintain a landbank to meet demand where there is an insufficient landbank of permitted reserves to meet the identified demand. The RTS First Review (2014) does not require Newport to make specific provision for the supply of primary land-won aggregate, based on the limited availability of resources within the area and a lack of evidence of demand from past sales of land-won aggregate over the past 10 years. Applications for mineral workings will be considered on a case by case basis, recognising that circumstances can change in the future. The RTS First Review requires Newport to safeguard of potential resources, continue the use of marine, secondary and recycled aggregates and protect wharves and rail for the sustainable transportation of aggregate.’

1.8 As noted above, the 1\textsuperscript{st} Review of the RTS (2014) does not require Newport to provide a supply of primary land-won aggregate. This is based on the very limited availability of suitable resources and the lack of demand from past sales of land-won aggregate over the past 10 years. The Review does, however, require the safeguarding of potential resources,
continued use of marine, secondary and recycled aggregates and the protection of wharves and railhead facilities for the sustainable transportation of aggregates. The LDP policies achieve this.

iv. Is additional text to policy SP22 (and to paragraphs 10.13 and 10.14) referring to other dock-related freight and to policy T1 necessary to make the Plan sound?

1.9 References to the continued use of rail and wharves for aggregate purposes are made specifically in relation to the requirements stated in both the adopted and first review of the RTS. It is not considered necessary to mention other dock-related freight in the mineral policies of the plan.


i. Is policy M1 Safeguarding of Mineral Resource sufficiently clear in articulating: i) the status of safeguarding areas identified on the proposals map; ii) the intended approach to development proposals within these areas; iii) the circumstances of overriding need where, exceptionally, development may be permitted?

2.1 It is considered that policy M1, and supporting text in paragraph 10.1, requires amending to clarify that it is the safeguarded areas identified on the proposals map and those situations where development may be permitted. Proposed wording is set out below:

M1 Safeguarding of Mineral Resource

DEVELOPMENT THAT WOULD STERILISE OR HINDER EXTRACTION OF SAFEGUARDED MINERAL RESOURCE AREAS FOR:

a) HARDROCK RESOURCES; OR

b) SAND & GRAVEL RESOURCES,

WILL NOT BE PERMITTED, UNLESS THERE IS AN OVERRIDING NEED FOR THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT, AND;

i. THE RESOURCE IS RECOVERED BEFORE THE DEVELOPMENT IS UNDERTAKEN; OR

ii. THE DEVELOPER CAN EVIDENCE THAT WORKING THE RESOURCE IS IMPRACTICAL OR ENVIRONMENTALLY UNACCEPTABLE.

2.2 This policy clearly indicates the strict view the Council will take in protecting those limited and finite resources within its boundaries in line with national and regional policy and strategy. The Council, however, remains flexible in its approach to allow development within these areas in exceptional circumstances, but not to the sterilisation of the resource without adequate justification. This amendment will also require the final sentences of paragraphs 10.3 and 10.5 to be deleted. The supporting text in paragraph 10.2 could be amended to clarify the status of the safeguarding resource areas i.e. not an inherent acceptance of development, see paragraph 2.4 below.

2.3 The policy wording has clarified that it is only in exceptional circumstances that development will be permitted in mineral safeguarding areas. There are limited resources within the
Newport authority area and what is safeguarded within the Plan is category 1 (high quality) resource. These limited and potentially valuable resources must be protected for the future. Therefore, development that would sterilise or hinder the extraction of mineral resources must be considered to be of greater importance than the future supply of construction aggregate from the particular site involved. The developer has two choices; either the resource will need to be extracted before the development takes place or the developer evidences that the extraction of the resource would be impractical or environmentally unacceptable.

iii. **Are the safeguarded mineral resource boundaries on the proposals map consistent with the most up to date relevant information available (including the BGS Mineral Resource and Aggregates Safeguarding Maps of Wales)? Is the proposals map annotation sufficiently clear and unambiguous?**

2.4 The safeguarded mineral resource areas illustrated on the proposal plans for the LDP are taken from the BGS Aggregate Safeguarding Maps of Wales (2012), which has built on from the Mineral Resource Map of Wales (2010). Text to clarify this will be added to paragraph 10.2 of the Plan, as set out below:

‘The identified mineral resource areas are identified on the Proposal Map. These are based on the recommendations given in the ‘Former Gwent’ Aggregates Safeguarding Study produced by Cuesta Consulting Limited in May, 20091). These resource areas can be divided into two groupings – potential hard rock resources and potential land based sand & gravel resources. It is important to note that safeguarding does not necessarily indicate an acceptance of working, but that the location and quality of the mineral is known, and the environmental constraints associated with extraction have been considered.’

2.5 Currently, the Proposals Plan shows two polygons depicting safeguarding areas of hard rock aggregate and Sand & Gravel resources. These polygons both have the reference to policy M1. This is considered to be ambiguous so amendments are proposed to both the policy (as detailed in paragraph 2.1, above) and to the proposal plans, as detailed below.

2.6 The proposal plans will be updated so that the polygons are identified through policy M1(a) Hardrock Resource or M1(b) Sand & Gravel Resource.

iv. **Does policy M2 Mineral Development adequately reflect the RTS context of underlying unmet need – should it be permissively worded, subject to protection of amenity and environment?**

2.7 The RTS First Review has altered the need to supply 8.5 million tonnes of primary land-won aggregate from sites within Newport to nil. Nonetheless, it is considered that policy M2 is permissive of mineral workings at the national, regional and local scale, even though the potential for such proposals coming forward in Newport is considered to be extremely

---

1 The ‘Former Gwent’ study was undertaken in 2008/09 and was carried out on behalf of four adjoining Mineral Planning Authorities (Torfaen, Blaenau Gwent, Newport and Monmouthshire). This was done in order to inform the development of the emerging LDPs for these authorities, in advance of the completion of the British Geological Survey (BGS) Safeguarding Map of Wales, which was only published in 2012.
limited. The policy recognises that such development can have negative impacts and requires the protection of amenity and the environment.

v. Is policy M3 Oil and Gas necessary? What evidence demonstrates this? What practical or useful purpose does the policy serve?

2.8 There have, over the years, been applications for exploration of potential oil and gas resources in Newport; the most recent being in 2012 for the exploration drilling for oil/gas. It is considered that policy M3 is therefore required because it provides clear guidance particularly to the time limits imposed on exploration works. The policy also complies with MPPW para. 64 as the policy distinguishes between the three states of exploration, appraisal and development phases associated with oil and gas workings. Moreover, new technologies or practices may emerge during the lifetime of the Plan: omitting Policy M3 will result in a policy vacuum which is provides uncertainty to all parties.
3 Renewable Energy.

i. Does policy CE11 adequately guide appropriate renewable and low carbon energy development by reflecting the evidence provided by the Council’s Renewable Energy Assessment? Does it set out clear tests and the criteria against which proposals will be evaluated?

3.1 The Torfaen County Borough and Newport City Council Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Assessment (SD80) is first and foremost an assessment at the macro level regarding the potential for renewable and low carbon energy in the Newport City Council area. The study is a useful document for directing development to appropriate locations, however there are numerous issues relating to individual renewable energy schemes such as the cumulative impact of development and site specific issues. As such it is inappropriate that the study should be used to formally allocate sites in the LDP. Policy CE11 does make reference to the study and this is considered appropriate.

3.2 There are a number of criteria based policies in the plan against which an application for a renewable energy proposal would be assessed. In particular the GP policies would be used in the assessment of a renewable energy proposal. Of particular relevance would be Policies GP1, GP2 and GP5. In light of these policies it is not necessary to repeat the criteria in these policies in policy CE11. Ultimately the plan should be read as a whole.

ii. Is paragraph 4.55 (solar panels on non-domestic buildings) accurately worded, in that terms and exclusions apply?

3.3 Certain exclusions do apply it is therefore appropriate to include additional text as follows:

The installation of solar panels (up to 50MW) on non-domestic buildings are permitted development under Part 43 (installation of non-domestic micro generation equipment) of Schedule 2 of the General Permitted Development Order. Some terms and exclusions apply, and the Development Management section should be contacted for further details.

iii. Is additional wording to paragraph 2.66 (following policy SP18 Employment Sites, expressing support for energy and infrastructure projects within the docks area which contribute to the climate change strategy in Wales, needed to make the Plan sound?

3.4 Section 39 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that every local planning authority in Wales must prepare a Local Development Plan (LDP) for its area. Authorities must exercise the function with the objective of contributing to the achievement of sustainable development and must have regard to national policies and advice issued by Welsh Ministers. It is therefore agreed that the Policy should be amended to reflect that energy and infrastructure projects in the docks should contribute to sustainable development. The paragraph should include additional text as follows:

Newport Docks provides a particular opportunity to provide for port related employment. One aspect of this is in energy generation, where it has certain locational advantages, including accessibility for fuel and distance from residential or other uses upon which there might be an impact. This includes facilitating development that reduces emissions of greenhouse gases in a sustainable manner, including renewable and low carbon energy generation.

i. Does the plan fully reflect the relevant waste policy framework within which it must operate - in particular, do policies W2, W3 and supporting text paragraphs 11.5-6 properly reflect the Collections, Infrastructure and Markets Sector Plan and the waste arising predictions based on tonnages rather than land take?

4.1 The policy framework referred to in the LDP (SD3) reflects the position at December 2013, with particular reference to TAN 21 Waste (2001) and supplementary Clarification Letter (CL-01-12).

4.2 In February 2014, the Welsh Government published approved TAN21 (2014), which replaces the requirement to provide for the land use requirements of the Regional Waste Plan with monitoring arrangements to assess the capacity of the region against the Collections, Infrastructure and Markets Sector Plan tonnage figures. These figures are at a regional level and are not disaggregated down the local authority level. Monitoring arrangements and regional collaboration are established in TAN 21 as the means of identifying gaps in the capacity requirements and potential identification of sites at a local authority level. Guidance on the monitoring arrangements is anticipated to be published within the next six months.

4.3 The updated TAN 21 maintains its focus for the provision of waste facilities on general employment land and notes at paragraph 3.19 that general employment sites and major industrial areas are likely to be suitable locations for waste facilities.

4.4 To reflect the changes in national policy, the Council suggests the amendments set out in Appendix 2 are made to the Plan.

ii. Is allocation W1 Docks Way Waste Disposal Site consistent with paragraph 11.12 concerning flood risk? What evidence demonstrates that the allocation has been fully assessed against the provisions of TAN 15 and that the views of Natural Resources Wales concerning flood risk and flood consequences have been sought and taken into account?

4.5 The allocation made under W1 of the LDP (SD3) reflects the extent of an extant planning permission for a landfill site and other waste management facilities (ref: 93/1209). There is also a valid waste permit on the site issued by NRW. In order to meet the conditions of the waste licencing arrangements, flood defences in the form of a 9m AOD bund were implemented along this stretch of the River Ebbw in 2006.

4.6 The majority of the site is contained within Tan 15 Zone B, with an area at the southern end, situated within Zone C2.

4.7 Natural Resources Wales (NRW) has been consulted on the Plan throughout the plan process. With specific regard to Policy W1, NRW responded at the Revised Deposit Consultation Stage that it considers the policy to meet the tests of soundness (Representation Ref: 3683.L144). However, in light of the above question discussions have
4.8 Notwithstanding NRW’s revised position on the C2 element of the waste site, the Council has included this site within the Plan as an existing commitment, to add clarity on where landfill capacity exists within the authority and safeguard it for continued use. As noted in NRW’s response, the landfill element of the site currently has 16 years capacity with potential for a further 5 years agreed under the existing waste licence. The Council is not proposing to add any additional capacity or extend the area of the landfill over and above what already has planning permission and an agreed permit. Flood mitigation measures were implemented in 2006 in order to comply with the conditions of the waste licence, the Council does not therefore consider its inclusion in the plan to be contrary to the advice set out in paragraph 11.12 as due consideration has been given and action taken to address flood issues. Moreover, amending the Plan allocation as now proposed by NRW would not address NRW’s concerns because the relevant consents are extant, and therefore there would be no benefit in amending the Plan. The Council contends that the Plan is sound as submitted.

iii. Does the Plan’s content remain consistent with national policy guidance following the publication of the new TAN 21 and edition 6 of PPW?

4.8 The amendments set out in Appendix 2 are considered to provide a way forward that is consistent with the recently revised TAN 21 and PPW (ed 6).
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Foreword

Since the original Regional Technical Statements (RTS) were issued in October 2008, forward planning for minerals has formed an intrinsic part of the Local Development Plan (LDP) process. The LDPs have benefited from the clear direction the RTS has provided on the new sustainable approach to mineral development in Wales. Several LDPs have now been adopted in South Wales and all have embraced the principal objectives of the RTS to provide adequate reserves of aggregate for the construction and other industries in the most sustainable manner reasonably achievable.

It is particularly satisfying to see certain elements of the RTS, such as the safeguarding of mineral resources, now enshrined in development plans to ensure such resources are protected for future generations. More importantly, new allocations, defined areas of search and preferred areas have also been incorporated into some LDPs.

This First Review of the RTS has been prepared, on behalf of the North Wales and South Wales RAWPs, by Cuesta Consulting Ltd., with advice and peer review from a Steering Group which included representatives from both Regional Aggregate Working Parties (RAWPs), the Mineral Products Association, the British Aggregates Association, Natural Resources Wales and the Welsh Government. The Steering Group provided vital technical information, updating and refining that given in previously published RAWP reports and in the original Regional Technical Statements. The Steering Group also provided or confirmed expert judgement, where this was called for in situations where precise factual detail was not available, and has provided a consensus endorsement of the various recommendations.

The First Review RTS covers the 25 year period up to 2036, but further reviews will still be initiated every 5 years, in accordance with MTAN1, to ensure that the RTS can react to any significant change in circumstances, such as the recent deep recession which has informed this review. This will ensure that any major changes to supply and demand can be addressed and the RTS changed or modified as appropriate. This process underpins the plan, monitor and manage approach to aggregate planning in the UK.

The new edition will continue to be considered as a strategic document for the purposes of Local Development Plan preparation and may be a material consideration in the development control process. We remain confident that all authorities will continue to embrace and implement the recommendations of the revised RTS in their development plans on a voluntary basis, and that WG will not need to have recourse to its powers of direction.

We would like to take this opportunity to gratefully acknowledge the considerable amount of work that has been undertaken to complete the First Review, which includes the significant efforts of the RTS steering group and the diligent work of the consultant appointed to undertake and complete the work on schedule on behalf of the Welsh Government, and the participation of elected Members and other key stakeholders.

The First Review has built on the foundation of the original RTS but now offers greater clarity and is more concise. Most importantly, it provides a strong and improved statement of the desire to ensure that sustainability is at the heart of all future mineral planning in Wales.

Martin Hooker
Chair of the South Wales Regional Aggregates Working Party.

Andrew Farrow
Chair of the North Wales Regional Aggregates Working Party.

March 2014
Statement from the Welsh Government

Text to be added, once the document has been approved by the RAWPs and Member Forums

... to comprise an explicit statement (from the Minister) confirming the Welsh Government’s endorsement of the RTS as the outcome of regional collaborative working and the basis for continued collaboration.

... The statement will complement the observations made in the Foreword, acknowledging the importance of the role of the Member Forum in providing political endorsement at a local level and recognise the technical role of the RAWP.

... Reference to the clarification letter CL/xx/14 covering MTAN 1 and the RTS
Executive Summary

Minerals Technical Advice Note 1: Aggregates (2004) (MTAN 1) requires the preparation of Regional Technical Statements (RTS) for the areas covered by both the North Wales and South Wales Regional Aggregates Working Parties (RAWPs). Whereas MTAN1 develops the national policy set out in Minerals Planning Policy Wales (MPPW), the RTSs provide the supporting detail which allows this to be implemented. This document and its two Regional Appendices are the outcome of the first review and revision of the original RTSs.

The new (‘First Review’) edition of each RTS comprises this main document and the corresponding Regional Appendix for North Wales or South Wales, which are issued separately. Together, they provide a strategy for the future supply of construction aggregates\(^1\) within the Region concerned, taking account of the latest available information regarding the balance of supply and demand, and current notions of sustainability, including the proximity principle and environmental capacity. It must be emphasised that the RTS documents and the recommendations within them are of a strategic nature. They are not intended to provide site-specific information or guidance.

The RTSs thus provide recommendations to each Mineral Planning Authority (MPA) regarding the quantities of aggregate which need to be supplied from their area (apportionments) and the total tonnage of any new allocations (areas for future working) which may need to be made in their Local Development Plan (LDP) to ensure that adequate provision is maintained throughout the relevant Plan Period.

The First Review has identified the historical pattern of demand upon each individual MPA for the production of land-based primary aggregates, based on average sales over a 10 year ‘baseline’ period (2001 to 2010, inclusive). This is a deliberate departure from MTAN 1, which requires landbank calculations to be based on the average of the latest three years’ production figures (implying that this provides a suitable measure of ongoing demand). The change to a 10-year average was recommended unanimously by the Steering Group and has been endorsed by the Welsh Government as a pragmatic means of avoiding the risk of under-provision, which would occur if reliance were placed on a three-year average which spanned the recent economic recession.

The review of factors relating to the availability of alternative materials, imports, exports and economic growth has suggested that the historical supply pattern over the baseline period should generally provide a good guide for the determination of future apportionments, both in terms of overall quantities and in terms of broad geographical distribution. No evidence was found of socio-economic ‘drivers’ which would suggest otherwise. The new apportionments are therefore geared towards meeting an overall level of demand for crushed rock of 5.8 million tonnes per annum (mtpa) in North Wales and 10.47 mtpa in South Wales; together with a total of 1.08 mtpa of land-won sand & gravel in North Wales and 0.33 mtpa in South Wales. The latter figure is low because of the heavy reliance in South-East Wales, in particular, on marine-dredged sand & gravel.

\(^1\) The RTS process deals only with aggregates and therefore excludes data relating to the production of other related products such as cement, building stone, silica sand and industrial limestone.
The review has also found that, in most areas, the existing pattern of supply is sensibly balanced in terms of proximity and environmental capacity, within the restrictions imposed by the distribution of workable resources and the requirements of economic and commercial viability. Where this is the case, the recommended apportionments are guided purely by the historical sales data. However, the review has also identified some areas where there might be merits in adjusting the apportionments and allocations, and thereby slightly modifying the future supply pattern in order to improve sustainability and/or to avoid perpetuating unjustified inequities in the historical balance of supply between neighbouring authorities which share similar resources.

The Review has identified one area, in South West Wales, where apportionments and allocations can only be given for a group of neighbouring authorities, pending further investigations that are needed through collaborative working at that level. More generally, although specific apportionments (and allocations where necessary) have been identified for individual MPAs, collaboration between neighbouring authorities is encouraged in all areas. One of the difficulties with this is that different authorities will always be at different stages with respect to LDP preparation. However, there is not a ‘one size fits all’ solution to this problem, and the RTS is therefore unable to provide generic guidance on this issue. Rather, it is incumbent on LPAs to work together to resolve such problems, using their own initiative.

Allocations for future working are identified for areas where the existing landbanks (as of the baseline date of 31st December 2010) are insufficient to maintain the required apportionment over the whole of the Plan period, and for 10 years beyond (in the case of crushed rock) or for 7 years beyond (in the case of sand & gravel), in accordance with MTAN 1. In making these calculations, the reserves at dormant sites, and at one site where planning permission is currently suspended, have been excluded from the landbank figures, although they are identified separately. This is a possible second departure from MTAN 1, but again is deliberate. It is supported by a large majority of Steering Group members and has been endorsed as a pragmatic clarification of MTAN 1 by the Welsh Government. In the few authorities where permitted reserves still remain at dormant or suspended sites, the RTS recommends that these are kept under review by the relevant MPA and, where deemed appropriate by them, may be used to offset any RTS requirements for new allocations.

In some cases, the allocations required have already been identified in LDPs and, in others, the shortfall has already been addressed through the granting of new permissions since the baseline date.

Where it is justified by new evidence, it remains open for individual MPAs to depart from the apportionment and allocation figures recommended by the RTS. In doing so, however, an MPA would need to demonstrate that their intended departure would not undermine the overall strategy provided by the RTS itself (e.g. by working together with other MPAs to ensure that sub-regional and regional totals are still achieved) and this would be likely to become a key issue at Examination and/or Public Inquiry.

Where the local authorities involved are unable to reach agreement, or if individual local authorities do not accept the Regional Technical Statement, the Welsh Government will, as
a last resort, consider its default powers to intervene in the Development Plan process (MTAN 1, paragraph A3).

As with the original RTS documents, at this broad level and given the detailed analysis and Plan-making that will be required to implement the RTS through Local Development Plans, it was not considered appropriate or required that Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) should be carried out as part of the First Review.
1. The Purpose of the RTS

Introduction

1.1 Minerals Technical Advice Note 1: Aggregates (2004) (MTAN 1) requires the preparation of Regional Technical Statements (RTS) for the areas covered by both the North Wales and South Wales Regional Aggregates Working Parties (RAWPs). Whereas MTAN1 develops the national policy set out in Minerals Planning Policy Wales (MPPW), the RTSs provide the supporting detail which allows this to be implemented.

1.2 This First Review of the original RTS documents comprises this main document and the Regional Appendices for North Wales and South Wales, which are issued separately. The two components of the new RTS for each Region (i.e. the main document and the relevant Appendix) are intended to provide a strategy for the future supply of construction aggregates within that Region, taking account of the latest available information regarding the balance of supply and demand, and current notions of sustainability (see below). Together, the two revised RTSs aim to ensure that an adequate and steady supply of aggregates can be maintained throughout Wales (and beyond, in the case of materials that are exported), taking into account the key objectives of sustainable supply outlined in MTAN 1.

Sustainability Objectives

1.3 The fundamental requirements for sustainability in Wales are enshrined within both legislation (Government of Wales Act 2006) and in Policy (Minerals Planning Policy Wales (2000). In line with these requirements, the overarching objective in planning for aggregates provision, as set out in paragraph 7 of MTAN1 is “to ensure supply is managed in a sustainable way so that the best balance between environmental, economic and social considerations is struck, while making sure that the environmental and amenity impacts of any necessary extraction are kept to a level that avoids causing demonstrable harm to interests of acknowledged importance”.

1.4 Subsidiary objectives in paragraph 29 of MTAN1, which relate to delivering a more sustainable pattern of supply include:

- examining very carefully existing reserves on a national and regional basis to see if they are adequate in the short, medium and long term;
- only granting permission for future extraction to take place in the most environmentally acceptable locations, in accord with development plans that are informed by the Regional Technical Statement which in turn is based on the environmental capacity assessment;
- actively reducing the proportion of primary aggregates used in relation to secondary, recycled or waste materials;
- minimising the transportation of aggregates by road;
- seeking self-sufficiency within regions, thereby avoiding the need to transfer the environmental costs of aggregates extraction to other areas; and
The Scope and Purpose of RTS Recommendations

1.5 Each RTS provides a mechanism for encouraging the national sustainability objectives to be met by the individual Mineral Planning Authorities (MPAs) within each Region over a period of up to 25 years (for crushed rock) or 22 years, in the case of land-based sand & gravel (sufficient to cover the MTAN1 requirements for maintaining minimum landbanks of 10 years and 7 years, respectively, throughout the full 15-year term of each LDP).

1.6 The Regional Appendix for each RTS provides more specific recommendations to the constituent MPAs regarding the quantities of aggregate which need to be supplied from each area (apportionments) and the nature and size of any allocations which may need to be made in their Local Development Plan (LDP) to ensure that adequate provision is maintained throughout the relevant Plan Period. Paragraph 50 of MTAN1 specifically requires the relevant parts of the RTS strategy to be incorporated into individual LDPs.

1.7 It must be emphasised, however, that each RTS, and the recommendations within it are of a strategic nature. The documents are not intended to provide site-specific information or guidance. It is for the individual MPAs to determine how the strategic requirements identified in the new RTS should be met within their areas. This includes identifying allocations (where these are required by the RTS or, in some cases, by other local factors), and setting out corresponding policies within their LDPs to guide the Development Management process for future mineral extraction.

1.8 Moreover, where it is justified by new (e.g. more up to date, more detailed or more precise) evidence, it is open for individual MPAs to depart from the apportionment and allocation figures recommended by the new RTS when preparing their LDP policies. In doing so, however, an MPA would need to demonstrate that their intended departure would not undermine the overall strategy provided by the RTS itself (e.g. by working together with other MPAs to ensure that sub-regional and regional totals are still achieved) and this would be likely to become a key issue at Examination and/or Public Inquiry. Where the local authorities involved are unable to reach agreement, or if individual local authorities do not accept the revised Regional Technical Statement, the Welsh Government will, as a last resort, consider its default powers to intervene in the Development Plan process (MTAN 1, paragraph A3).

1.9 For each Region, the RTS recommendations are informed by the analysis of:

- careful and continual assessment of existing and anticipated future exports of aggregates to areas outside Wales (in consultation with those importing regions outside Wales) to determine whether that supply is the best environmental and practicable option for all.

- available resources, reserves, sales and landbanks of primary land-won aggregates;

- the availability and supply of marine, secondary and recycled materials;
o levels of demand upon the region for the supply of aggregates, including exports;
o levels of imports of aggregate into the region;
o the proximity principle, in relation to the transportation of aggregates; and
o the environmental capacity of areas to accept the impacts of future quarrying

1.10 Further details of the key principles and approaches used within this analysis are set out in the next chapter.

**Strategic Environmental Assessment**

1.11 Whether Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) should be undertaken was considered as part of the original development of the Regional Technical Statements. It was felt, however that, as the RTS documents primarily represent a collaboratively prepared evidence base and are neither required nor constitute a plan or programme for the purposes of the SEA Directive, such an assessment was not necessary. As with the original RTS documents, therefore, at this broad level and given the further detailed analysis and Plan-making that will be required to implement the RTS through Local Development Plans (where SEA is a formal requirement), it was not considered appropriate or required that SEA should be conducted as part of the First Review.

**Glossary and Abbreviations**

1.12 Several of the terms used above (e.g. apportionments, allocations, landbanks, reserves and resources) have very specific meanings with respect to minerals planning, which need to be understood. These are all defined in the Glossary of Terms at the back of this report. Similarly, a number of commonly-used abbreviations, although explained in the text where they are first introduced, are summarised in the list which follows the glossary.
2. **Key Principles and Approaches**

*The RTS Process*

2.1 A key principle which underpins the overall approach within the RTS and MTAN1 is the need to move away from the old, demand-led system of *Predict and Provide* to the more modern concept of *Plan, Monitor and Manage*. These terms originated in relation to the planning for housing provision but can also be applied to minerals.

2.2 It is important to recognise, however, that the Plan, Monitor and Manage system still depends, crucially, on an assessment of demand. At the heart of MTAN1 is the aspiration that, once a reasonable estimate of demand has been obtained, any subsequent fluctuations above that level should be accommodated by increased supplies from secondary and recycled sources, rather than being seen as a justification for granting new planning permissions for primary aggregate extraction. Whilst that aspiration is widely supported, there is evidence to suggest that the percentage contribution available from secondary and recycled sources, having risen from around 10% of the total aggregates market in the 1990s to around 28% in 2010 (as a direct result of financial incentives and promotional work to increase acceptability) is now likely to have peaked. As a consequence of this, the future use of recycled/secondary materials is likely to depend mainly on the level of future construction output (since the availability of recycled materials is closely dependent on rates of new construction). It is therefore perhaps more reasonable to assume that secondary and recycled aggregates will continue to provide a high proportion of total aggregate production, but will not be able to be relied upon to fulfil any future peaks in demand on their own: there may also need to be increased contributions from primary aggregate sources.

2.3 The RTS process supports this approach by investigating the likely continued availability of secondary and recycled aggregates from all available sources within each area, and factoring this in to an assessment of the residual demand for land-based primary aggregates, as informed primarily by historical sales data. That residual level of demand is then translated into *apportionments* for each local authority, subject to the consideration of other sustainability issues including proximity and environmental capacity (see below).

2.4 An important tool in the ongoing management of the supply of aggregates is the monitoring of *landbanks*. A landbank, as defined in paragraph 45 of MTAN1, is the stock of planning permissions for the winning and working of minerals at *active* and *inactive* sites\(^2\), at any given point in time and for a given area. Where there is an insufficient landbank of permitted reserves in a particular area to meet the identified demand, over a sustained period of time, the RTS recommends the need for *allocations* for future working to be identified in LDPs. Provided that the reserves at *dormant* sites have not already been included in the landbank.

---

\(^2\) Detailed definitions of active, inactive, dormant and suspended sites are given in the *Glossary of Terms* at the back of this report, as are the full definitions of resources, reserves, apportionments, landbanks, allocations and provision.
calculations\(^3\), and where a Mineral Planning Authority considers that such reserves are likely to be capable of being worked within the relevant period (subject to the agreement of modern conditions) it is suggested here that these may be offset against the requirement for new allocations. The same logic applies to sites where permission has been suspended, following a stalled IDO or ROMP review (see Glossary for full explanations of these various terms).

2.5 Thereafter, by virtue of the Plan-led approach, additional applications for new reserves are unlikely to be granted except within allocated sites or areas, unless there are compelling reasons why fluctuations in demand cannot be met from those locations or from alternative (secondary and recycled) sources. The situation is monitored annually by the RAWPs and managed, as required, through periodic (5-yearly) revisions of the Regional Technical Statements.

2.6 In terms of its overall approach, the RTS concept represents an important modification of the more general Managed Aggregate Supply System (MASS) which had previously operated across both England & Wales for many years. The main difference is that the Welsh system explicitly seeks to incorporate two key principles of sustainability with respect to aggregates supply: the *proximity principle* and the notion of *environmental capacity*, as explained below.

### The Proximity Principle

2.7 This relates simply to the objective of minimising unnecessary transportation of bulk materials, particularly by road, by ensuring that sources of supply (e.g. aggregate quarries) are located as closely as possible to the main centres of demand (primarily centres of population and major infrastructure projects). The original Regional Technical Statements aimed to accomplish this by providing ‘per capita’ apportionments for future aggregate provision (i.e. proportionate to the population within a given area, as a surrogate for the likely distribution of demand). In this revision of the RTSs, general consideration has been given instead to variations in *population density*, but account has also then been taken of a range of other influences, including access routes and transport distances, which neither population nor population density figures are able to reflect. This analysis has, necessarily, been of a qualitative nature because of the complexities involved, and to avoid the spurious precision associated with inappropriate quantitative analysis. Further details are given in Chapter 4 and in the Regional Appendices.

2.8 The proximity principle is also modified by recognition that certain types of ‘high specification aggregate’ (HSA) serve quite different markets and are therefore required for distribution over much greater distances (Thompson, Greig & Shaw, 1993; Thompson *et al.*, 2005). This applies especially to the skid-resistant aggregates derived from the Pennant Sandstones of South Wales (and to a lesser extent from a range of other formations within Powys and elsewhere in Wales), which are essential for road surfacing applications throughout England and Wales.

---

\(^3\) There are differences of interpretation (of MTAN1 guidance) regarding whether or not the reserves at dormant sites should be included in landbank calculations that are used for the purpose of assessing the need, or otherwise, for new allocations. As explained in the Glossary, for the purposes of this review, such reserves, and those at suspended sites, have been excluded.
Separate consideration also needs to be given to the issue of high purity limestone production for use as a metallurgical flux, for chemical production and for the manufacture of cement. Whilst these are all non-aggregate end-uses, they are frequently produced from the same geological resources as crushed rock aggregates, but the quarry locations may be determined or justified primarily by the requirements for the higher value industrial products.

**Environmental Capacity**

2.9 By comparison, the notion of environmental capacity is a more controversial issue. The basic principle is clear enough: i.e. that quarrying should be focused, as far as possible, on areas which have the greatest capacity to ‘absorb’ the environmental impacts that may be associated with quarrying activity, and thus to contribute to future supply with a minimum of adverse impacts. The controversy derives from the lack of consensus in terms of how ‘environmental capacity’ should be defined, and from the way in which the concept was used in the original RTSs.

2.10 In Wales, two previous research projects provided the evidence base for the system that is currently used: **EMAADS** (Establishing a Methodology for Assessing Aggregates Demand and Supply - Arup, 2004) and **IMAECA** (Implementing the Methodology for Assessing the Environmental Capacity for primary Aggregates - Enviros, 2005). These projects resulted in a set of ‘traffic light’ maps (as they are often referred to) being produced to indicate areas of relatively high (green), medium (amber) and relatively low (red) environmental capacity. The thresholds between these categories were arbitrarily set, but the differentiation between them does at least provide a starting point for the consideration of environmental capacity and thereby enables nationally consistent strategic decisions to be made, by the RAWPs, with respect to future aggregates provision.

2.11 The colours shown on these maps reflect combined scores from the assessment of twelve different ‘national environmental indicators’ for each square kilometre. These comprised:

(i) Settlements
(ii) Roads
(iii) Land Use
(iv) SSSIs
(v) Heritage
(vi) Public Enjoyment
(vii) Landscape
(viii) Local Landscape
(ix) Watercourses
(x) Spheres of Influence
(xi) Existing Workings
(xii) Cumulative Effects
2.12 It is important to understand that the IMAECA tool was designed to be used *only* to inform the Regional Technical Statements and explicitly *not* to be used directly in Local Development Plans, Development Management processes and decisions or planning appeal decisions.

2.13 However, despite this information being available, and being described for each MPA within the original RTs, the environmental capacity results from the IMAECA study had no influence at all on setting the apportionment figures within those reports. That may partially have been due to concerns about not prejudging matters that should properly fall to be dealt with through the Local Development Plan process. This certainly applies to any site-specific judgements but, at a more strategic level, there is both scope and wide support for environmental capacity data to inform and potentially influence the bigger picture.

2.14 The consideration of Environmental Capacity at this strategic level deliberately avoids the direct use of more detailed ‘primary’ environmental information such as the locations of individual designations (other than National Parks and AONBs). Once again, this is to avoid being site-specific and to avoid prejudging issues which need to be addressed in more detail through LDP and Development Management processes at a local level - either within individual local authorities and/or through joint working between neighbouring authorities. Joint consideration of the relationship between mineral resources and environmental designations on a sub-regional basis would potentially allow more detailed consideration to be given to these important issues at a spatial scale which extends beyond the boundaries of an individual local authority. This could tie-in well with the Area-Based Natural Resource Management Approach being promoted by Welsh Government through the Environment Bill White Paper. National Parks and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONBs) are treated differently, in the RTS, to other national designations. This because MTAN 1 specifically notes (at paragraph 49) that landbanks do not need to be maintained in these areas, and (at paragraph 53) that the RAWPs should take into account the need to protect these areas from extraction. This is in line with the Minerals Planning Policy Wales, which states that mineral extraction should not take place in National Parks and AONBs, save in exceptional circumstances.

**Changing the Pattern of Supply**

2.15 Important consideration also needs to be given to existing patterns of supply. MTAN 1 suggests that these patterns are largely a historical residual and ‘*...will need to gradually change to reflect current notions of sustainability*’. That may, or may not be the case, however, since the historical supply patterns already have much to commend them: they reflect the *spatial distribution of available resources* (which is of fundamental importance, since minerals can only be worked where they are found) and the *economic imperative* of industry to establish quarries as close as possible to areas of demand (in order to minimise transport costs), subject to a range of environmental designations, planning policies and other constraints. Over many decades, quarries which have become uneconomic because of changing demand or outdated transport networks and rising costs have
naturally fallen into disuse. Those which remain are generally (though not always) well-placed to serve the current markets although some remain in conflict with designations, environmental concerns or neighbouring land uses which, in many cases, post-date the mineral planning permissions involved. Where this is the case then, unless there are no sensible alternatives in terms of the availability of resources, it may not be appropriate for the historical supply pattern from a given area to be used as a proxy for future supply from that area.

2.16 Together, the implementation of the proximity principle and the notion of environmental capacity, as described above, may gradually induce changes to the existing patterns of supply. But this would only be justified if it is found that, once all aspects of sustainability are taken into account, alternative patterns are seen to have clear advantages over those which currently exist. Even where changes are clearly justified, these cannot generally be immediately implemented, since (unless Prohibition Orders are issued) existing quarries will be able to continue until their existing planning permissions expire and/or until they run out of permitted reserves.

2.17 Nevertheless, the RTS can help to influence future changes in supply pattern, where this is found to be desirable, by adjusting the apportionments given to individual MPAs. This, in turn, will then help to focus new allocations in the areas required, and should eventually result in a shift towards a more sustainable pattern of supply. Chapter 4 of this report presents an overview of the existing supply pattern, highlighting the need for limited adjustments in certain areas, drawing on the more detailed analyses presented in the two Regional Appendices (A and B).
3. **Assessment of Demand**

*Approach*

3.1 The starting point for the apportionment of future supply requirements for construction aggregates in Wales is to make an assessment of the likely future demand.

3.2 In 2004, MTAN 1 (paragraph 20) initially provided an estimate of likely future demand for all construction aggregates across Wales of 23 million tonnes per annum (mtpa). Taking into account the expected economic growth in Wales, at that time, it was anticipated that the total demand for aggregates would not exceed 23-27 mtpa by 2010. Paragraph 24 of MTAN1 further noted that the proportions of overall primary aggregates production within South Wales and North Wales have remained consistent (63% and 37%, respectively), for many years. As noted in the original RTS documents, targets for the production of alternative aggregates (i.e. secondary aggregates, recycled materials and marine-dredged aggregates) have traditionally been ‘top-sliced’ leaving a residual demand for land-won primary aggregates. Paragraph 34 of MTAN 1 envisages that any unexpected increase in overall demand beyond the estimated range should be met, wherever possible, by increased production from secondary and recycled aggregate sources, in preference to being used as a justification for new permitted reserves of land-based primary aggregates (or for increased supply from marine aggregate sources).

3.3 As required by MTAN1, the first generation of Regional Technical Statements set about to reassess future demand. Attempts were made to consider changes in overall demand, and in the proportional contributions that could be made from secondary, recycled and marine aggregate sources. However, for the purposes of identifying future apportionments, the main focus was on estimating the future demand for land-won primary aggregate in each region. This was done on the basis of historical sales figures (Method A) and on a ‘per Capita’ basis (Method B). In each case, the forecasts were based on average production data over a three-year baseline period (2003-2005) with and without a modest (1%pa) level of growth being applied for the period to 2010 (remaining constant thereafter).

3.4 For the purpose of the present analysis, a number of options were considered, in full consultation with the project Steering Group. Given that actual demand has fallen significantly in recent years, the estimates of demand set out in MTAN1 were considered to be unrealistic, except as an upper bound figure. It was also considered that any attempt to forecast future demand through detailed econometric analysis would offer little (if any) advantage, given the uncertainties associated with such work and the unprecedented nature of the recent prolonged economic recession. It was considered essential, however, for there to be some form of realistic ‘top-down’ analysis, in order to avoid the shortfalls in provision that would almost inevitably arise from a purely ‘bottom-up’ approach based only on local assessments.
The preferred approach was to base the assessment of the likely future demand for land-based primary aggregate on historical sales data, taking a longer-term (10 year) baseline period to span a range of conditions before and after the onset of the recent recession. It was agreed that the starting assumption would be that the average annual future demand, over the whole of the period covered by the RTS, would be equivalent to the average annual sales over the baseline period. It was also agreed, however, that this sales-based analysis would need to be modified by taking broad account of any anticipated changes in future economic conditions (e.g. GDP projections, population forecasts, housing growth and major infrastructure projects), and any likely changes in the availability of alternative aggregate sources (marine, secondary and recycled aggregates). Careful consideration would also be needed, however, to avoid perpetuating (through new permissions or allocations) historical patterns which are demonstrably unsustainable or which place unequal burdens on adjoining areas with similar availability of unconstrained resources. All of these factors are likely to vary from one part of Wales to another, and can therefore most usefully be considered at the scale of an individual MPA or at least at a sub-regional, rather than regional or national level. It is at the MPA level, therefore, where the analysis begins. Figure 3.1 illustrates the distribution of MPAs in Wales and their relationship to the two RAWPs. The MPAs include the three National Park Authorities.

**Historical Sales Data**

Historical sales figures are published in the annual reports issued by each of the RAWPs. The data is supplied in confidence by the individual mineral operators to the relevant MPA, and is then collated by the RAWP secretaries for the purpose of publication. In some cases, this published data is available for individual MPAs but, in other cases (where there are less than three quarry operators within a given MPA), the data for two or more authorities have to be grouped together in order to maintain confidentiality.

For the purposes of this review it was suggested by industry representatives on the Steering Group that, rather than relying upon such combined data, in order to determine future apportionments for each individual MPA it would be desirable to know the historical sales figures by individual MPAs. Whilst this could not be done for individual years without breaching confidentiality, the RAWP secretaries agreed that it would be possible to issue sales data for each MPA when averaged over a 10-year period (2001 to 2010), since different combinations of individual quarries would have been active at different times during that period. 10-year averages were therefore compiled by the RAWP Secretaries from annual data originally supplied to them by industry, and refined in a few cases by the author from other public domain information, in order to provide a more detailed breakdown. The results are presented in Table 3.1, below. The effect of using 10-year (rather than 3-year) averages cannot be ascertained at an individual MPA level, because three-year averages are not available, but this is examined at the broader regional and national levels in paragraph 3.47 and Table 3.5, below.
Figure 3.1: The Distribution of Mineral Planning Authorities (MPAs) between the two Regional Aggregate Working Parties (RAWPs) in Wales
Table 3.1: 10-year average historical sales figures for land-based primary aggregate production in Wales, 2001 - 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mineral Planning Authority</th>
<th>Land-won Sand &amp; Gravel Aggregates (mtpa)</th>
<th>Crushed Rock Aggregates (mtpa)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wrexham</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flintshire</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denbighshire</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conwy + Snowdonia NPA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglesey</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwynedd</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-totals, North Wales</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>5.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceredigion</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pembrokeshire</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pembrokeshire Coast NPA</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmarthenshire</td>
<td>0*</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swansea</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neath Port Talbot</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powys</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgend</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brecon Beacons NPA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merthyr Tydfil</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vale of Glamorgan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhondda Cynon Taf</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiff</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caerphilly</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blaenau Gwent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torfaen</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newport</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monmouthshire</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-totals, South Wales</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>10.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS Wales</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>16.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE:** Collated by the RAWP secretaries from MPA data, and refined in some cases from public domain information (e.g. planning applications, Inspectors’ reports and LDP documents) to provide a more detailed or updated breakdown. Lists of individual sites within each Region are given in the Regional Appendices (A and B).

*The figure for sand & gravel production in Carmarthenshire is more than zero, but too small to be shown to two decimal places*

3.8 The Regional sub-totals and the overall National total shown in Table 3.1 correspond very closely to the Regional and National averages obtained directly from the data published in the annual RAWP reports for this period (see Tables 3.3 and 3.4, later in this chapter), but the new breakdown by MPA is more refined and provides an improved baseline for assessing future demand and apportionments.
3.9 The historical sales figures presented above effectively represent the demand that has been placed upon each MPA, in terms of aggregates required within those areas and elsewhere, including exports between the two Regions and to England. Further observations relating to the geographical variations indicated by the sales figures are given in each of the Regional Appendices.

3.10 It is important to note that the historical sales figures also represent only the residual demand for land-based primary aggregates, since the overall demand was also satisfied, to varying degrees, by supplies from secondary, recycled and marine aggregate sources, as well as by small amounts of imports from primary aggregate sources in England.

3.11 By default, therefore, using historical sales data as a basis for estimating future demand assumes that the supply of secondary, recycled and marine aggregates will continue as before (with different levels of contribution from each source in each of the various MPAs). It also assumes that the factors influencing the overall scale of construction activity will remain broadly unchanged.

3.12 In practice, however, these assumptions may be incorrect and adjustments may therefore need to be made in order to reflect changes in any of these factors which are considered likely to affect actual demand in future years. These are examined below.

**Influences on Future Demand**

3.13 Factors which could potentially influence changes in the future demand for land-based primary aggregates, compared with the baseline period, are considered below, under three main headings:

- *supply factors* (relating to the continued availability of alternative materials);
- *import/export factors*; and
- *demand factors* (relating to influences on overall construction activity).

3.14 In each case, the observations which follow (summarised from the more detailed assessments given in the Regional Appendices, A and B) relate to the anticipated changes compared to the average conditions over the 2001-2010 baseline period, and they relate only to the reasonably foreseeable future (no more than 10 years), since longer-term predictions are likely to be increasingly unreliable.

3.15 It is important that these observations are kept under review and adjusted each time the RTS is revised.

**Anticipated Changes in Supply Factors**

**Secondary Aggregates**

3.16 Secondary aggregates comprise the by-products of various industrial processes, including metallurgical slags and power station arisings, but also the by-products from certain types of non-aggregate mineral extraction, such as colliery spoil and
slate waste, and from the recycling of glass, ceramics, asphalt planings and rail ballast.

3.17 Aggregate production from metallurgical slags occurs only in South Wales. Port Talbot continues to produce both blast furnace (iron) and steel slag, whilst the processing of older stockpiles of blast furnace slag also continues at the former Llanwern steel works (which ceased new production in 2001). Secondary aggregates are produced from all of these materials. At present there are no indications that the total quantity of aggregate produced at either of these sites will change in the foreseeable future, and therefore no foreseen implications for changes in the demand for primary aggregates.

3.18 Coal-fired power station arisings, comprising pulverised fuel ash (p.f.a) and furnace bottom ash (f.b.a) are currently produced only at the Aberthaw Power Station, in South Wales. It is understood that the utilisation of p.f.a. is likely to increase, but that the quantities are small and the use is only for relatively low-grade end uses.

3.19 Small amounts of aggregate minerals (sandstone and occasionally sand) arise adventitiously from the reworking of former colliery spoil tips or from the working of opencast coal. The amounts and their suitability for use as construction aggregates are highly unpredictable, however, and quantities can vary greatly over time. Many former colliery waste tips in Wales have either been landscaped as part of reclamation schemes or utilised for base fill material. Volumes still available are very limited in North Wales but more significant in parts of the South Wales coalfield. The overall potential for producing aggregate from this material is considered to be small, for a combination of local, fiscal and regulatory reasons, but could be locally significant, particularly within Torfaen and Blaenau Gwent. Here, there may be opportunities for the material to make up for the very limited existing and potential sources of primary aggregate production, although the quality of the material and the quantities available for anything other than low grade fill, have yet to be demonstrated.

3.20 Sandstone arisings from new opencast workings have been important as ‘windfall’ resources at a number of sites within the South Wales coalfield, but these are classed as primary aggregates and are therefore not considered further here.

3.21 Crushed slate, derived either from slate waste (as a by-product of roofing material production) or quarried specifically for use as aggregate, features significantly in the overall pattern of supply with in North Wales (particularly in Gwynedd), but not in South Wales. Slate is included in the overall figures for crushed rock production within the North Wales RAWP reports and, over the 10-year baseline period, has accounted for up to 16.2% of total crushed rock sales in the region, with evidence of a rising trend in both proportion and actual sales up to a peak in 2007. Although output has fallen during the recent recession, the proportions have remained high, suggesting an underlying increase in the market for slate production.

---

4 It might appear more logical to group these recycled materials with aggregates produced from recycled construction, demolition and excavation wastes (CD&EW). However, the coverage of CD&EW is already well defined in terms of survey returns, so those items are included here as secondary aggregates.
aggregate. However, given that slate production is already included in the crushed rock statistics, this trend has no implications for the overall level of future demand for primary aggregates, only for the balance between slate and other types of crushed rock.

3.22 The various sources of secondary aggregate noted above, together with recycled aggregates, as discussed below, are currently exempt from the Aggregates Levy, in a deliberate attempt to minimise the use of primary aggregates.

3.23 In August 2013, HMRC announced that a European Commission investigation into certain exemptions and reliefs contained within the aggregates levy was being undertaken to determine whether or not these amounted to ‘State Aid’ (Revenue & Customs Brief 24/13). In September 2013, HMRC further announced that it was taking steps to suspend the application of those elements of the levy that now form the subject matter of the formal EC investigation because it is obliged to do so under Article 108(3) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (Revenue & Customs Brief 27/13). On 10th October 2013, HMRC announced that it intends to make a number of previously exempt materials taxable from 1 April 2014 (Revenue & Customs Brief 30/13). Of particular relevance to Wales, these materials include slate, shale, colliery spoil and (perhaps) aggregates made from metallurgical slag. Most recently, on 18th December 2013, the Government published draft legislation on the suspension of those exemptions, exclusions and reliefs from the aggregates levy which are the subject of the EC State aid investigation (Finance Bill 2014). Final details of the EC investigation are currently awaited but the implication is that they could have significant implications for the balance between primary and alternative aggregates, if the exemptions are found to be unlawful. These implications have not yet had chance to be factored into the following analysis. However, the Government is strongly of the view that the exemptions in question do not give rise to State aid, and is providing information to the Commission to support that view as part of the formal investigation process. The Bill incorporates provisions for secondary legislation to restore any suspended exemptions, if appropriate, following the outcome of the EC investigation.

Recycled Aggregates

3.24 Aggregates produced from the recycling of construction, demolition and excavation wastes (CD&EW) form an important contribution to the overall supply of construction aggregates. The 2008 RTSs identified a total output for the whole of Wales of 3.97mt, based on 2005 survey data, and suggested a roughly 3 to 1 split between South Wales and North Wales, based on earlier surveys and population ratios. They also noted that, despite the lack of quantitative detail, it is inevitable that the greatest volumes of CD&EW arisings and usage are in the urban areas. The RTS documents emphasised, however, that all statistics for this sector need to be used with a high degree of caution, because of the low rate of response to the surveys.

3.25 The situation, in terms of available data, has not improved since the original RTSs were published. No new survey data is available, so any observations on recent or future trends can only be regarded as broad approximations. If anything, the
efficiency of recycling is likely to have increased, and the introduction of WRAP’s (2005) ‘Quality Protocol’ for the production of aggregates from inert waste may have increased the proportion and usage of higher value products derived from the various recycled sources. Such improvements, however, represent only small increments on the progress which had previously been made - primarily as a consequence of the price advantages resulting from the landfill tax and, to a lesser extent, the aggregates levy. The industry view is that there is little opportunity for significant further increase in the proportion of construction aggregate likely to be derived from this sector. As noted earlier, the future availability of recycled aggregates seems likely to be inextricably linked to the overall rates of construction activity and economic growth, so the safest assumption is that it will rise and fall in a very similar way to overall demand, and will thus have a neutral impact on the demand for primary aggregates, compared to the baseline period (2001 to 2010).

Marine-dredged Aggregates

3.26 Marine-dredged aggregates are of major importance in South Wales, with supplies being sourced from the Severn Estuary and the Bristol Channel, but are of very limited importance in North Wales. In south East Wales, marine-dredged material accounted for more than 96% of all sand & gravel production over the baseline period (2001 to 2010), reflecting the almost complete lack of historical (or current) land-based sand & gravel extraction in that area, despite the existence of potential land-based resources.

3.27 For the time being, it seems reasonable to suppose that marine-dredged aggregates will continue to supply a similar proportion of overall demand as they have done over the last decade, so the demand for land-won aggregates in any of the sub-regions of either South Wales or North Wales is not likely to be affected.

Anticipated Changes in Import/Export Factors

3.28 Wales has always been a net exporter of land-won aggregates. Data on both exports and imports is recorded in the 4-yearly Aggregate Minerals (AM) Surveys, and data for exports in the last three surveys is summarised in Table 3.2, below.

3.29 In North Wales, the main aggregate exports, by far, are those of Carboniferous Limestone which primarily (more than 90% in 2005 and almost 100% in 2009) are supplied to North West England. The AM Survey figures generally show that, as overall sales have fallen in recent years - particularly since 2005, the proportion (as well as the totals) of exports also fell. This implies that, during periods of recession, for general-purpose limestone aggregates, there is a reduced dependence by importing regions on supplies from more distant sources, as would be expected. But the reverse is also likely to be true: as the economy rebounds from the recent recession, the demand for exports from North Wales is likely to increase once again, and more quickly than the overall rate of economic growth.

3.30 In South Wales, the main export is of sandstone, the vast majority (almost 90%) of which is High Specification Aggregate (HSA) - skid-resistant road surfacing material
with a Polished Stone Value (PSV) of 58 or above, and generally much higher (Thompson, Greig & Shaw 1993; Thompson et al., 2005). Reference to Table 3.2 shows that, although there was a reduction in sandstone exports between 2005 and 2009, the difference was much less marked than was the case for limestone exports from North Wales, especially in percentage terms. This reflects the fact that the market for skid-resistant road aggregate has held up better, during the recent recession, than has been the case for more general-purpose limestone aggregate (presumably because of the safety imperative of continuing to maintain skid resistance on major roads).

In terms of being able to predict future sales, however, there is considerable uncertainty: there could be a higher than average upsurge in demand as road maintenance requirements catch up with the lack of all but essential spending during the recent recession (and particularly with the cumulative resurfacing requirements triggered by recent harsh winters); or there could simply be a continuation of recent levels of demand, as any improved availability of central and local authority funding is diverted to other, more neglected, areas of public finance. There is therefore no evidence that the demand for exports of aggregate from South Wales will be any greater over the next 10 to 15 years than it was over the baseline period of 2001 - 2010.

Imports of land-based aggregates from England are very minor, by comparison with exports. In North Wales, imports in 2009 amounted to just 0.03mt of land-won sand & gravel, and only 0.653mt of crushed rock, more than 90% of which comprised igneous rock and sandstone from neighbouring South Wales. In South Wales in 2009, land-based imports amounted to 0.064mt of sand & gravel and 0.172mt of crushed rock, primarily from South West England.

Imports and exports of marine-dredged sand and gravel between England and Wales are only relevant to the RTS apportionment exercise if they affect the continuity of supply of these materials to Wales and thus give rise to increased demand on land-based resources. This is potentially an issue in South East Wales which, as noted earlier, is heavily dependent upon marine aggregates. At present (2013), Wales is a net importer of marine sand & gravel, dredged from the English side of the median line in the Bristol Channel and the Severn Estuary. This is likely to change in the next few years, however, subject to the approval of new licence applications within Welsh waters. In practice, although this will change the balance between imports and exports, the new licences should ensure that there is no disruption of the continuity of supply.
### Table 3.2: Summary of key export statistics for aggregates from recent AM Surveys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Note: all figures exclude sales for non-aggregate use</th>
<th>AM2001 (mt)</th>
<th>AM2005 (mt)</th>
<th>AM2009 (mt)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>North Wales</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land won Sand &amp; Gravel Sales</td>
<td>1.342</td>
<td>1.192</td>
<td>0.589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S&amp;G Exports*</td>
<td>0.544</td>
<td>0.508</td>
<td>0.128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exports as % of S&amp;G total</strong></td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limestone Sales</td>
<td>6.062</td>
<td>4.641</td>
<td>2.636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limestone Exports*</td>
<td>3.344</td>
<td>2.973</td>
<td>1.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exports as % of Limestone total</strong></td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Igneous Sales</td>
<td>1.136</td>
<td>1.022</td>
<td>0.610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Igneous Exports*</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>0.277</td>
<td>0.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exports as % of Igneous total</strong></td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandstone Sales</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandstone Exports*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exports as % of Sandstone total</strong></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Crushed Rock Sales**</td>
<td>7.198</td>
<td>5.663</td>
<td>3.245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total CR Exports*</td>
<td>3.436</td>
<td>3.251</td>
<td>1.178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CR Exports as % of CR total</strong></td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South Wales</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land won Sand &amp; Gravel Sales</td>
<td>0.115</td>
<td>0.304</td>
<td>0.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S&amp;G Exports*</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exports as % of S&amp;G total</strong></td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limestone Sales</td>
<td>6.536</td>
<td>6.137</td>
<td>4.554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limestone Exports*</td>
<td>0.262</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td>0.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exports as % of Limestone total</strong></td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Igneous Sales</td>
<td>0.838</td>
<td>1.238</td>
<td>1.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Igneous Exports*</td>
<td>0.572</td>
<td>0.430</td>
<td>0.694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exports as % of Igneous total</strong></td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandstone Sales</td>
<td>2.648</td>
<td>3.498</td>
<td>2.605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandstone Exports*</td>
<td>1.457</td>
<td>1.941</td>
<td>1.258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exports as % of Sandstone total</strong></td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Crushed Rock Sales**</td>
<td>10.310</td>
<td>10.873</td>
<td>8.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total CR Exports*</td>
<td>2.302</td>
<td>2.527</td>
<td>2.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CR Exports as % of CR total</strong></td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* ‘exports’ includes movement between South Wales and North Wales, as well as to other regions (mostly in England).
** crushed rock sales exclude slate

### Anticipated Changes in Economic Demand Factors

3.34 Before considering future changes it is worth considering the relationships between aggregate sales and economic factors over the baseline period (2001 to 2010). The data presented in Table 3.2, above, illustrates the substantial reduction of aggregate sales between the AM surveys of 2005 and 2009, spanning the start of the recent economic recession in 2008. This can be seen in more detail in the annual series of data from the South Wales and North Wales RAWP reports, as shown in Tables 3.3 and 3.4, below.
3.35  Tables 3.3 and 3.4 also show population figures and derived ‘per capita’ sales (tonnes of aggregate sales per person), the purpose of this being to illustrate the complete lack of correlation between population (which has risen steadily over the period) and aggregate sales, which have generally fallen. The tables also show annual GDP change figures, for the UK as a whole, as a broad indicator of economic activity. These clearly show the onset of the recession in 2008 and 2009, and the modest level of growth in 2010, compared with the earlier parts of the baseline period, broadly tying-in with the sales data.

Table 3.3: Annual sales of land-won primary aggregate, 2001 to 2010 (N. Wales), compared to population data and annual GDP change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NORTH WALES</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>10 year averages*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crushed Rock * (mt)</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.51</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>5.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand &amp; Gravel * (mt)</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total * (mt)</td>
<td>8.59</td>
<td>7.87</td>
<td>7.57</td>
<td>7.65</td>
<td>7.34</td>
<td>7.46</td>
<td>7.36</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>7.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population ** (millions)</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual GDP change, UK ***</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>-1.0%</td>
<td>-4.0%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1.78%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* SOURCE: Annual RAWP reports for North Wales. Note that the 10 year averages shown here are slightly different from those used in Table 3.1 and elsewhere in this document, which were derived from new figures collated by the RAWP secretaries for the specific purpose of this review.

** SOURCE: Welsh Government population data

*** SOURCE: Eurostat website

Table 3.4: Annual sales of land-won primary aggregate, 2001 to 2010 (S. Wales), compared to population data and annual GDP change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOUTH WALES</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>10 year averages*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sand &amp; Gravel * (mt)</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total * (mt)</td>
<td>10.11</td>
<td>9.86</td>
<td>11.36</td>
<td>12.19</td>
<td>11.29</td>
<td>11.74</td>
<td>12.75</td>
<td>11.77</td>
<td>8.28</td>
<td>7.37</td>
<td>10.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population ** (millions)</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per capita Sales (tonnes)</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>4.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual GDP change, UK ***</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>-1.0%</td>
<td>-4.0%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1.78%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* SOURCE: Annual RAWP reports for South Wales. Note that sales figures are the totals from sub-regions and do not always match with the Regional totals shown in the Annual Reports, due to discrepancies within some of those reports. Also, the resulting 10 year averages shown here are slightly different from those shown in Table 3.1 and elsewhere in this document, which were derived from new figures collated by the RAWP secretaries for the specific purpose of this review.

** SOURCE: Welsh Government population data

*** SOURCE: Eurostat website
3.36 As indicated by footnotes in each of the tables, the 10 year averages shown here are slightly different from those used in Table 3.1 and elsewhere in this document, which were derived from new figures collated by the RAWP secretaries for the specific purpose of this review.

3.37 Since 2010, GDP growth in the UK has fallen back again, to 0.9% in 2011 and 0.1% in 2012. The latest available forecasts for the next few years (from the Economic and Fiscal Outlook report published on 5th December 2013 by the Office of Budget Responsibility) are for 1.4% in 2013, 2.4% in 2014, 2.2% in 2015, 2.6% in 2016 and 2.7% in both 2017 and 2018. These forecasts suggest a slow return to the levels of growth seen in some of the earlier parts of the baseline period, but falling a long way short of the peaks seen in 2003 and 2007. The average of the GDP figures (out-turn and forecast) from 2011 to 2018, as quoted above, is 1.88% per annum. This compares with an average of 1.78% per annum for the 2001 to 2010 baseline period and suggests that demand figures up to 2018 are, if anything, likely to be very slightly higher than those for the baseline period. Consideration also needs to be given, however, to the possibility of a return to more substantial growth in the period beyond 2018. Whilst there is currently no evidence to quantify or even suggest such growth, it would be prudent to allow for it, in order to avoid the risk of under-provision.

3.38 Other potential sources of information that have been considered regarding the likely future demand for construction aggregates include population growth forecasts and Local Authority housing forecasts. Population forecasts are published by the Welsh Government and show a continued expansion of the population in all of the sub-regions. As noted above, the demand for aggregates has no significant correlation with population totals - at least not on the scale associated with year-on year variations. A more useful measure, however, may be the average rate of population growth over a period of time. For the 10 year baseline period (2001 to 2010) the average rate for the whole of Wales was 4.8% (i.e. an average of 0.48% per year). For the forecast data, the average growth rates are slightly higher: 0.51% per year for the period from 2011 to 2031 (the furthest date for which figures are currently forecast). Whilst there is no statistical justification for assuming that rates of population growth will correlate with changes in demand for aggregates, they provide the only mechanism for looking further ahead than the current economic forecasts.

3.39 Local Authority housing forecasts provide a link between the Welsh Government’s population forecasts and future construction activity. The link is not necessarily a robust one though, since the houses and associated infrastructure will only be built if the necessary funding is made available - either by private sector investment and/or by Local Authorities.

3.40 Aside from predictions of economic growth and associated general construction activity, a further important element in the demand for aggregates is that relating to major infrastructure projects. These are considered further within the Regional Appendices (A and B). However, despite numerous strategic projects being identified, there is no clear evidence to indicate whether or not these are likely to
represent an increase or a decrease in future construction activity, compared with the baseline period. For this reason, they have not been used in the assessment of future demand. For the future, it is essential that there should be improved monitoring of both the completion and forecasting of such large scale projects, in such a way that they can be factored-in to the demand for construction materials.

**Summary of Influences on Future Demand**

3.41 Subject to the outcome of the formal EC investigation into certain exemptions from the Aggregates Levy (see para. 3.23 above), little justification has otherwise been found for modifying the overall scale of future demand for primary aggregates that has been indicated by the historical baseline sales figures shown in Table 3.1, above. Whilst there is some evidence that short term rates of economic growth are likely to be slightly higher those seen during most of the baseline period (2001 - 2010), implying a slightly increased level of demand in future years, there is also a need to allow for the possibility of further increased growth during later years within the period covered by the revised RTS. That possibility is at least hinted at by future projections of population growth, but is also in keeping with the more general long-term economic cycle of peaks and troughs. If the Aggregate Levy exemptions are suspended, or if the Levy itself is eventually abolished, this could have significant implications in terms of the future demand for primary aggregates. Whilst it would not be justified to rely on such factors in terms of clear predictions, it would be prudent not to ignore them for the purposes of ensuring an adequate level of future provision of construction aggregates.

3.42 All such factors will need to be kept under review between now and the next review of the RTS. It is considered unlikely, however, that any of these would be likely to trigger a need for the RTS to be revised any earlier than the next scheduled five-yearly review. Whilst some circumstances (e.g. a major, unexpected increase in construction activity or the possible abolition of the aggregates levy) may give rise to a marked increase in the demand for primary aggregates, there will generally be sufficient availability of permitted reserves to accommodate these changes in the relatively short term, until the next scheduled review.

3.43 As noted earlier, the historical sales figures represent the demand which has hitherto been placed upon individual MPAs to supply aggregates for use within those areas and elsewhere, including exports to England. The figures do not equate to consumption within those individual areas.

3.44 Unfortunately there are no detailed statistics available for the consumption of aggregates within individual MPAs in Wales, only within broad sub-regional groupings which provide very limited insight. Inevitably, however, there are geographical imbalances between production and consumption, simply as a consequence of the geographical differences between the spatial distribution of resources and the locations of urban development and infrastructure. Despite those differences, however, there is an economic imperative for quarries to be located as close as possible to the main centres of consumption.
3.45 This is not to say that the current distribution of quarries is perfectly aligned with either the proximity principle or the notion of environmental capacity, however. For this reason, the historical demand/sales figures shown in Table 3.1 do not necessarily represent the geographical pattern of apportionments that would ideally be required in future years. Chapter 4 of this report provides an analysis of the proximity and environmental capacity influences which need to be considered, and balanced against practical issues and other aspects of sustainability, before the final apportionments for each MPA can be assessed.

**Regional Demand**

3.46 At a Regional level, the fine-tuning associated with proximity and environmental factors becomes less significant in determining the geographical balance of supply between the two RAWPs. The two regions are largely independent in terms of the linkages between supply and demand, with only a limited amount of aggregate transportation between them. The main factor in assessing the future demand over the next 22/25 years at this level is therefore assumed to be the average sales of such materials over the baseline period from 2001 to 2010, inclusive, subject to any factors which might influence changes in this demand within the foreseeable future. As noted above, and as explained in more detail within the Regional Appendices, subject to the future of exemptions from the Aggregates Levy, the analysis of these factors has not identified any justification for modifying the future contributions from marine, secondary and recycled sources, or for making adjustments for changes in imports or exports, or future economic trends. The baseline figures for residual primary aggregate production are therefore considered to be valid as they stand.

3.47 The overall demand for land-based primary aggregate production in each of the Welsh Regions over the periods covered by this review can therefore be grossed-up from the analysis of individual MPA figures presented in Table 3.1, and is summarised in Table 3.5, below. This table also shows, for comparison, the three-year averages over the period 2008 to 2010, compiled directly from figures given in the Annual RAWP reports. The comparison reveals the extent to which any reliance on three-year averages would greatly under-estimate the overall levels of provision required, by comparison with the 10-year averages.

---

5 In the AM2009 survey, 9.2% (0.6mt) of the crushed rock production in South Wales was transported to destinations within North Wales, whilst only 0.2% of the crushed rock production in North Wales was transported into South Wales.
Table 3.5: Baseline assessment of Regional demand for land-based primary aggregate production in North Wales and South Wales, 2011 to 2036

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Aggregate Type</th>
<th>Historical 3-yr sales average, 2008 to 2010 *(mtpa)</th>
<th>Historical 10-yr sales average, 2001 to 2010 **(mtpa)</th>
<th>Total requirement over 22 years (sand &amp; gravel) or 25 years (crushed rock), based on 10-yr averages (mt)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Wales</td>
<td>Land-won Sand &amp; Gravel</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crushed Rock</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL Land-won aggregate</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.43</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.88</strong></td>
<td><strong>169</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Wales</td>
<td>Land-won Sand &amp; Gravel</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crushed Rock</td>
<td>8.95</td>
<td>10.47</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL Land-won aggregate</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.14</strong></td>
<td><strong>10.80</strong></td>
<td><strong>269</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The 3-year sales averages are calculated from the annual figures for 2008, 2009 and 2010, as shown in Tables 3.3 and 3.4 above.

** The 10-year averages shown here are slightly different from those shown in Tables 3.3 and 3.4, as they are derived from the new figures collated by the RAWP secretaries for the specific purpose of this review (as detailed in Table 3.1).

### 3.48

The figures in the right-hand column of this table represent the total level of provision for aggregates production which needs to be made in each region over the period covered by this review, based on multiples of the historical 10-year averages. The multiples are 22 years for land-based sand & gravel (i.e. 2011 to 2033) in order to maintain minimum landbanks of 7 years throughout the 15 year period of each LDP; and 25 years for crushed rock (i.e. 2011 to 2036), in order to maintain minimum landbanks of 10 years, as required by MTAN1. The sub-Regional apportionment of these figures among individual MPAs is addressed in Chapter 5 of this report, following the assessment of proximity and environmental capacity issues in Chapter 4.

### National Demand

At the National level, the average annual future demand upon Wales over the next 22 or 25 years (as appropriate), for the supply of primary, land-based construction aggregates, is assumed to be equivalent to the average sales of these materials over the baseline period (2001 to 2010, inclusive). As noted earlier, this measure naturally incorporates allowances for the continued production and sales of marine, secondary and recycled aggregates and for the balance between imports and exports over that period and, subject to HMRC’s decisions on the future of exemptions from the Aggregates Levy, the foregoing analysis has not found any reason to amend these factors for the purposes of estimating future demand over the next 22-25 years. The National demand for land-based primary aggregate production over the next 22 years (for sand & gravel) or 25 years (for crushed rock), combining the data for the two regions, is therefore as summarised in Table 3.6, below:
Table 3.6: Baseline assessment of National demand for land-based primary aggregate production in Wales, 2011 to 2036

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aggregate Type</th>
<th>Historical 10-yr sales average, 2001 to 2010 *(mtpa)</th>
<th>Total requirement over 22 years (sand &amp; gravel) or 25 years (crushed rock) (mt)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land-won Sand &amp; Gravel</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crushed Rock</td>
<td>16.27</td>
<td>407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL Land-won aggregate</td>
<td>17.68</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* NOTE: The totals shown here are slightly different from those shown in Tables 3.3 and 3.4, as they are derived from the new figures collated by the RAWP secretaries for the specific purpose of this review, as detailed in Table 3.1.

Assessment of Reserves and Landbanks

3.50 The final part of the picture which needs to be understood in order to develop sensible apportionments and allocations for future working is that relating to the existing landbanks of permitted reserves.

3.51 The relevant details are shown in Table 3.7, below, and have been compiled from various sources. Most of the data were originally collated by the RAWP secretaries from confidential information supplied by their constituent MPAs, but have since been refined, in some cases, from public domain information (e.g. planning applications, Inspectors’ reports and LDP documents) to provide a more detailed breakdown than had previously been possible within the RAWP annual reports, and to exclude the reserves at dormant sites and suspended permissions (see below). The figures quoted are either already in the public domain and/or are totals for active and inactive quarries operated by three or more separate companies at the time in question (December 2010).

3.52 As noted earlier, a landbank (as defined in paragraph 45 of MTAN1) is the stock of planning permissions for the winning and working of minerals at active and inactive sites. Although inactive sites can include those which are dormant (see Glossary of Terms), Table 3.7 excludes the reserves at dormant sites, since these are required by paragraph 47 of MTAN1 to be counted separately (see Table 3.8, below). This represents a possible but deliberate departure from MTAN1. The logic for the suggested departure is that dormant reserves, whilst having the benefit of planning permission, cannot be reactivated (and thus provide an effective contribution to the landbank) until they have been through the Review of Old Mineral Permissions (ROMP) process and modern planning conditions have been agreed. For similar reasons, Table 3.7 also excludes the reserves at one site where quarrying has been suspended, pending the resumption and eventual outcome of a stalled ROMP review. Those reserves are included in Table 3.8.
## Table 3.7: Existing permitted reserves and corresponding landbanks as at 31st December 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mineral Planning Authority</th>
<th>Land-won Sand &amp; Gravel Aggregates</th>
<th>Crushed Rock Aggregates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reserves (mt)*</td>
<td>Landbank (years)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrexham</td>
<td>15.24</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flintshire</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denbighshire</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conwy + Snowdonia NPA</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglesey</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwynedd</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-totals, North Wales</strong></td>
<td><strong>18.94</strong></td>
<td><strong>17.5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceredigion***</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pembrokeshire</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pembrokeshire Coast NPA</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmarthenshire</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swansea</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neath Port Talbot</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powys</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgend</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brecon Beacons NPA</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merthyr Tydfil</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vale of Glamorgan</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhondda Cynon Taf</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiff</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caerphilly</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blaenau Gwent</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torfaen</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newport</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-totals, South Wales</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.85</strong></td>
<td><strong>14.7</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS, Wales</strong></td>
<td><strong>23.79</strong></td>
<td><strong>16.9</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: Collated by the RAWP secretaries from MPA data, adjusted in some cases to exclude dormant sites which had previously been included (in the South Wales RAWP reports) and refined in other cases from public domain information (e.g. planning applications, Inspectors’ reports and LDP documents) to provide a more detailed or updated breakdown.

* The quoted reserves exclude those at dormant sites and at one stalled ROMP site where planning permission has been suspended. The reserves at those sites are counted separately, as required by MTAN 1, and are presented in Table 3.8, below. As far as possible the reserves quoted above also exclude material that is likely to be utilised for non-aggregate purposes (e.g. cement production, building stone, silica sand or steel making). Lists of currently active and inactive, as well as dormant or suspended sites within each Region are provided in the Regional Appendices.

** Landbanks (including sub-totals and totals thereof) are calculated as total reserves (as presented here) divided by average historical sales during the baseline period (2001-2010), as detailed in Table 3.1.

*** The sand & gravel reserves for Ceredigion include the new permission at Crug yr Eyr, even though this was eventually granted after December 2010.
Table 3.8: Permitted reserves at dormant / suspended sites, as at 31st December 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mineral Planning Authority</th>
<th>Land-won Sand &amp; Gravel Aggregates</th>
<th>Crushed Rock Aggregates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Permitted Reserves (mt)</td>
<td>Permitted Reserves (mt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrexham</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flintshire</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denbighshire</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conwy + Snowdonia NPA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglesey</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwynedd</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-totals, North Wales</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceredigion</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pembrokeshire</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pembrokeshire Coast NPA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmarthenshire</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swansea</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neath Port Talbot</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powys</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgend</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brecon Beacons NPA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merthyr Tydfil</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vale of Glamorgan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhondda Cynon Taf</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiff</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caerphilly</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blaenau Gwent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torfaen</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newport</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monmouthshire</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-totals, South Wales</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.35</strong></td>
<td><strong>55.5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS, Wales</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.35</strong></td>
<td><strong>55.5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE:** Collated by the RAWP secretaries from MPA data. In many cases the reserve figures are estimates.

3.53 Lists of currently active, inactive, dormant and suspended sites within each Region are provided in the Regional Appendices.

3.54 For the purposes of this review of the RTSs, and as another deliberate departure from MTAN1 in order to reflect current circumstances, the length of time represented by each landbank is based on the historical 10-year average sales figures for each individual authority (as shown in Table 3.1, above).

3.55 As illustrated in Table 3.7, many parts of Wales already have substantial crushed rock landbanks, even without those at dormant and suspended sites, which is sufficient to maintain the *existing* pattern of supply throughout the 25 year period.
covered by the revised RTS (i.e. to 2036) and sometimes well beyond. This does not apply everywhere, however. Some authorities would be facing shortfalls where they have insufficient or no permitted reserves, except at dormant or suspended sites.

3.56 In addition, some authorities with seemingly adequate landbanks overall may actually be facing shortfalls in terms of specific aggregate types. General purpose crushed rock aggregates, such as those obtained from granite or limestone, are generally not interchangeable with those required for high specification end uses such as skid-resistant road surfacing materials, which are generally derived from particular types of hard sandstone or dolerite. Similarly, aggregate derived from slate, or slate waste, may not be able to substitute for other rock types in all end uses. Ideally, separate landbanks for different types of aggregate are needed but, in practice, the number of sites in each category would generally be too small for such figures to be presented without breaching confidentiality. This has not therefore been possible.

3.57 More generally, the issue of shortfalls and the need for new allocations cannot be assessed simply on the basis of maintaining the existing supply pattern, without first considering whether or not that pattern may need to change. This might be the case, for example, in any areas where there are marked imbalances between the locations of quarries and the distribution of demand, despite the existence of workable resources in closer proximity to that demand. Equally, it might need to change if historical production has been in one authority, despite the presence of equally suitable resources in an adjoining area; or if existing quarries are in areas of relatively low environmental capacity and there are similar resources in areas of higher capacity which could serve the same markets just as well. One further area of potential concern is the extent to which the ‘former Gwent’ area of SE Wales is at least partially dependent on imports of Carboniferous Limestone from the neighbouring Forest of Dean in Gloucestershire, England. Whilst a recent planning permission at one of the quarries in that area has extended the timescale over which such supplies can be relied upon, this cannot be assumed to apply indefinitely. This, however, is an issue which can be monitored and addressed, if necessary, during the next formal review of the RTS.

3.58 All of these issues are examined in Chapter 4, below, and in more detail within the two Regional Appendices. Apportionments, shortfalls and suggested allocations are then addressed, in the light of that information, within Chapter 5.
4. **Analysis of the Existing Supply Pattern**

*Introduction*

4.1 Having assessed the likely future demand for construction aggregates, MPPW requires that there should be an adequate and steady supply to meet this demand, and that this should be provided as sustainably as possible. This, in turn, requires consideration to be given to the proximity principle and to the notion of environmental capacity, as well as to the historical pattern of supply and the distribution of both existing landbanks and potential new resources.

4.2 In the original (2008) RTSs, proximity was only considered in terms of the ‘per capita’ demand analysis which, as noted earlier, is difficult to justify. There is little, if any, correlation between aggregate sales and population size. However, population density, together with the location of existing urban development, may at least provide an indication of the geographical areas where new construction is most likely to be concentrated. Proximity to such areas may then be seen as one measure of the sustainability of existing quarries, and a desirable factor in the location of new ones - subject, of course, to the availability of resources in those locations and to the consideration of other practical and environmental factors.

4.3 The concept of environmental capacity was considered, in the original RTSs, only in terms of providing qualitative descriptions for each MPA, based on outputs from the IMAECA analysis. As explained in para. 2.13, above, it had no influence at all on the current apportionments or allocations (although future working within National Parks was discouraged as a more general matter of Policy - MPPW paragraphs. 21 and 22; and MTAN1 paragraphs. 46, 49, 51, 52 & 53).

4.4 For the purposes of this review, a determined attempt has been made to use both the proximity principle and environmental capacity to better effect, in conjunction with an understanding of resource availability and historical supply patterns, in order to enhance, if possible, the spatial distribution of future supply sources.

4.5 In considering such enhancement, it must be remembered that supply patterns are crucially dependent on the availability of suitable resources and on the commercial viability of working them. As already noted, minerals can only be worked where they are found. Moreover, they can only be worked on a commercial scale where quarry operators are willing to invest in their extraction, and in the procedures necessary to avoid (or minimise) potential adverse environmental impacts. In most cases, the economic and commercial factors involved for individual sites cannot adequately be assessed at the strategic level represented by the RTS.

4.6 It must also be remembered that improved proximity might sometimes be at the expense of reduced environmental capacity; whilst improved capacity might be at the expense of increased transportation distances, with consequential increases in carbon emissions and traffic impacts. The two factors therefore need to be considered in combination.
4.7 Consideration also needs to be given to other factors, including the relative merits of extensions to existing quarries as opposed to new ‘greenfield sites’; the need to avoid stifling competition between different operators; and the need to maintain productive capacity - particularly at larger or more efficient units. These detailed issues can most effectively be dealt with at a local level, however, once the overall strategy has been established. For this reason, the following analysis begins with a consideration of the broad, National and Regional picture, with more detail being provided in the sub-Regional analyses presented in Appendices A and B. The key findings are then carried through to the assessment of future apportionments and allocations, in Chapter 5.

National and Regional Analysis

Distribution of Quarries and Resources

4.8 As noted above, the distribution of suitable geological resources is of fundamental importance in understanding the distribution of existing quarries, and in understanding the limitations involved in locating potential new ones. Once again, it is important to stress that minerals can only be worked where they are found.

4.9 Figure 4.1, below, shows the distribution of crushed rock quarries in Wales which were active in 2013, together with the outcrops of the key resources. The quarry locations are taken from an updated edition of the BGS ‘Britpits’ database, limiting the selection to those which produce hard rock aggregates, either as a primary product or (in the case of slate waste tips) as a secondary material. Larger scale maps, which show the locations of inactive and dormant, as well as active quarries, are presented in the more detailed analysis contained within the Regional Appendices (A and B).

4.10 The resource outcrops on Figure 4.1 are taken directly from the BGS Mineral Resources Map of Wales (Humpage & Bide, 2010), but are limited to those resources which are important for the production of crushed rock aggregates. These include all ‘Category 1’ resources, as identified on the BGS maps, and some (but not all) ‘Category 2’ resources. They fall into seven main groups, as follows:

- Carboniferous HSA sandstones (Category 1)
- Pre-Carboniferous HSA sandstones (Category 2)
- High Purity Carboniferous Limestone (Category 1)
- Other Carboniferous Limestone (Category 2)
- HSA dolerites (Category 1)
- Other igneous rock formations (Category 2)
- Slate (Category 2)

---

6 A 2012 edition of the Britpits database was supplied by the BGS at the outset of this study but was then updated by various members of the Project Steering Group in July and August 2013, particularly in terms of current operational status and ownership.
4.11 The term ‘HSA’ refers to ‘High Specification Aggregate’, which is suitable for use as skid-resistant road surfacing aggregate as defined in the original ‘Travers Morgan’ report on these materials for the former Department of the Environment (Thompson, Greig & Shaw, 1993). They are characterised by a high Polished Stone Value (PSV≥58) in combination with a low Aggregate Abrasion Value (AAV≤16) and tend to command a premium price compared with other types of road aggregate. They are also transported over much greater distances in order to meet specification requirements in areas which have no comparable indigenous resources (which includes most of eastern and southern England). HSA aggregates in Wales include certain types of hard sandstone (particularly the Carboniferous ‘Pennant’ Sandstones of the South Wales coalfield, and some older sandstones - mainly within Powys), and certain types of dolerite (a particular variety of igneous rock) which occurs within various parts of south-west, north-west and mid-Wales. It should be noted that some of the extensive sandstone formations within mid-Wales and North Wales that were identified as potential HSA resources within the 1993 Travers Morgan report have since been refined by the most recent and more detailed BGS resource mapping, such that only parts of those resources are now identified as potential sources of HSA material on a commercial scale.

4.12 The usual caveat should be added that not all of the outcrops, of any of the rock types or formations listed at para. 4.10, above, will necessarily be suitable for commercial quarrying. This is because all geological materials are inherently variable, from one part of their outcrop to another. Moreover, the commercial viability of extraction is also influenced by a large number of other practical issues including the local extent of the deposit, land ownership, access, and distance from market, as well as planning and environmental constraints.

4.13 Above all, it must be emphasised that Figure 4.1 (and Figure 4.2 below) displays the extent of potential resources and not reserves or permitted reserves. Resources are geological materials, including rocks and naturally occurring sand & gravel, which have the potential to be used for a particular purpose (in this case as construction aggregates). Reserves are those parts of a resource which are known to be suitable for this purpose (usually as a result of detailed ground investigations and laboratory testing) and permitted reserves are those reserves which have valid planning permission for the winning and working of the materials in question.

4.14 Excluded from Figure 4.1 are a range of weaker sandstones and limestones, including some ‘Category 2’ resources, which are not currently exploited as sources of crushed rock aggregate on anything other than an extremely local scale (e.g. for use on farms etc.), and where this is most unlikely to change in future, because of their inherent unsuitability for more commercial applications. Such resources include all Devonian sandstones and all post-Carboniferous sandstones and limestones. Whilst many of these have been identified by the BGS as being worthy of safeguarding within Local Development Plans (Wrighton & Humpage, 2012), they do not represent practical alternatives to the resources listed above, in terms of their ability to meet the same commercial specifications, and are therefore not considered further here.
4.15 Figure 4.2, below, provides a similar map of the distribution of land-based sand & gravel pits (including inactive and dormant sites as well as active ones) together with the corresponding potential resources. The latter are once again taken largely from the BGS Mineral Resources Map of Wales, and include a wide range of sediments which have potential as sources of natural aggregate.
4.16 Figure 4.2 also shows, within NW Wales and SE Wales, more specific potential resource blocks which were identified in more detailed studies carried out for the National Assembly for Wales (Thompson et al., 2000; University of Liverpool, 2003). These are not necessarily the only potential worthwhile resources, but they are the most rigorously assessed, within the areas concerned.

4.17 Figure 4.3, below, shows the areas which are within an illustrative 20km radius of one or more currently active crushed rock quarries; and Figure 4.4 provides a similar illustration in respect of both land-based sand & gravel quarries and ports which receive marine-dredged aggregates. In most cases, the economic radius of distribution from these locations is considerably greater than 20km: typically up to 50km for ‘ordinary’ graded aggregate or further in the case of value-added products (e.g. ready-mixed concrete and asphalt materials) that are often produced at remote depots for onward distribution, and much further still in the case of High Specification Aggregates or High Purity limestone. The diagrams merely illustrate that the existing pattern of supply within Wales already conforms reasonably well to the Proximity Principle: very few parts of the country (those shown in black on Figure 4.3) are more than 20km from a source of crushed rock aggregate and most of those which are further away fall within 20km of either a land-based sand & gravel pit or a wharf which imports marine-dredged aggregates. Elsewhere, the distances are more than 20km but rarely more than 30km, and in most cases these are remote rural areas which are unlikely to generate significant levels of demand.

4.18 Figure 4.5, which follows, shows the distribution of crushed rock quarries in relation to the scale of demand upon individual MPAs for crushed rock aggregate production in Wales, as measured by average historical sales figures for each MPA over the baseline period (2001-2010). The shading corresponds to the figures given in Table 3.1, above, and it is emphasised that this illustrates the demand being made upon these areas, including both domestic consumption and exports to adjoining areas, including England. Figure 4.6 then provides a similar map for land-based sand & gravel production.

4.19 The focus of demand for crushed rock production is clearly seen to be in North-East Wales - particularly Flintshire (which is where most of the exporting Carboniferous Limestone quarries are located); and in Powys, where a number of sandstone and igneous rock quarries supply HSA material to England - particularly to adjoining parts of the West Midlands. In the rest of South Wales the picture is distorted by the much smaller size of many of the individual unitary authorities, particularly in the south-east, where the totals for each MPA are less than for the much larger county of Powys, even though overall production within SE Wales is double the total for Powys.

4.20 Historical crushed rock sales in South Wales have been concentrated within the Carmarthenshire, Bridgend, Vale of Glamorgan, Rhondda Cynon Taf and Cardiff MPAs (which is where most of the larger Carboniferous Limestone quarries in

---

1 The exception being Snowdonia National Park, which is combined with Conwy in Table 3.1, for confidentiality reasons, but which in fact had very limited production over the baseline period, from a single site.
South Wales are located), and in the adjoining MPAs of Caerphilly and Neath Port Talbot, where additional HSA sandstone quarries are also located.

**Figure 4.3: Illustrative 20km radii from all active crushed rock quarries in Wales, 2013.**
Figure 4.4: Illustrative 20km radii from all active sand & gravel pits & wharves in Wales, 2013.
4.21 Whereas much of the crushed rock demand upon NE Wales derives from the neighbouring parts of North West England, particularly Merseyside, most if not all of the limestone production in South East Wales appears to be utilised locally, within the producing areas, and within the adjoining MPAs of Swansea and Neath.
Port Talbot, to the west, and those of Merthyr Tydfil, Caerphilly and the ‘Former Gwent’ authorities to the east. Although Carboniferous Limestone resources do exist in these adjoining areas, they are either less extensive and/or more heavily constrained (see Appendix B for more detailed analysis).

4.22 The fact that little or none of the limestone from South Wales is exported further east, into England, is evidenced by the fact that additional Carboniferous Limestone from the Forest of Dean in Gloucestershire is currently being imported into the former Gwent area to make up for what would otherwise be an overall shortfall of supply. Although SE Wales has significant exports of crushed rock to England, most if not all of those exports are of HSA from the Pennant Sandstone formations of the South Wales Coalfield.

4.23 Overall, the pattern of demand for crushed rock aggregate production outlined above relates largely to the availability of resources, the location of established supply units and the proximity of these to the main areas of construction activity and/or to major transport routes such as M4 corridor. Further analysis of the supply pattern, including the relationships between quarry locations, resources, markets, major designations and environmental capacity, is provided in paragraphs 4.27 et seq., below, and in the two Regional Appendices.

4.24 Looking to the future, any undue reliance on historical supply data would inevitably reinforce and perpetuate the same patterns of supply. More careful consideration is therefore needed where such reliance would unnecessarily perpetuate adverse environmental effects or unjustified inequalities in the balance of supply between neighbouring authorities (see also para. 4.24, above); or where undue reliance might otherwise be placed on the continued availability of supplies from an adjoining MPA or country (e.g. imports from Gloucestershire into SE Wales). In addition, any imposed change to the existing supply pattern may, in some cases, either necessitate working less suitable, thinner or otherwise less viable resources, where these exist, or (in some cases at least) may entail increased transportation distances, with consequential increases in carbon emissions and traffic impacts. All of these issues are explored in more detail in the sub-Regional analyses within Appendices A and B.

4.25 In the case of sand & gravel production, as illustrated in Figure 4.6, below, the picture is greatly distorted by the reliance of South East Wales, in particular, on marine-dredged aggregates from the Bristol Channel and the Severn Estuary. South West Wales is less dependent on marine aggregates and has a small number of active land-based sites. Powys is too far removed from the coast to be influenced to any significant degree by marine aggregates, but still has only one very small land-based sand & gravel site currently in operation. It is reliant instead on crushed rock material, despite the apparent resources of natural sand & gravel within the upper reaches of the Severn, Wye and Usk valleys. In North Wales, there are, once again, apparently plentiful resources of natural sand & gravel in Gwynedd (as indicated in both BGS and Liverpool University mapping) but the supply pattern is dominated by one major quarry within Wrexham and (to a much
Regional Technical Statement for North Wales and South Wales: 1st Review.

Cuesta Consulting Limited

45

Date: 3rd March 2014

QA Reference: C/WG/024

Status: Final (subject to endorsement)

smaller extent) by two further units within Wrexham and two or three others in Flintshire. Further details are given in the Regional Appendices.

Figure 4.6: Spatial Distribution of Anticipated Demand for Land-won Sand & Gravel upon each MPA, based on Average Sales 2001 - 2010, with locations of Sand & Gravel Pits (2013)

Land-based Sand & Gravel Pits
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4.26 Overall, in South Wales and much of North Wales, the relative lack of land-based sand & gravel production is influenced to a very large extent by environmental and landscape concerns, as well as by the relative ease of availability of alternative materials (marine aggregates, crushed rock and slate, including slate waste).

**Distribution of Population and Transport Links**

4.27 Figure 4.7, below, illustrates the variation in population density by local authority area, using data for 2010. It also shows urban areas, A-roads and motorways, together with the locations of all currently active quarries. It should be noted that not all of the roads shown are necessarily used for the transportation of aggregates, and that additional local roads will also be utilised close to individual quarries, distribution depots or customer locations. Equally, some of the exported material is transported by rail, though the quantities involved are not large. Together, the areas of high population density and the main urban areas provide a good indication of where construction activity is most likely to be concentrated, but the locations of major transport routes, such as the A55 in North Wales, and the M4 corridor in South Wales have important influences on export distribution.

4.28 In North Wales, the variation in population density has some similarities with the distribution of historical crushed rock sales (Fig 4.5) with a strong focus of both in Flintshire, where the road network also provides ease of access for exports into the conurbations of North West England, including the Wirral, Liverpool and Warrington. The correlation is absent in Wrexham, however, which also has a high population density and good road networks, but no crushed rock production, and only limited resources outside the AONB. As demonstrated by the more detailed analysis within Appendix A, however, there may be merits in adjusting the future supply pattern for crushed rock production by focusing new allocations within Flintshire, Wrexham, Conwy or north Denbighshire. There is also a need to maintain sand & gravel supplies within North West Wales by developing further resources in Gwynedd.

4.29 In South Wales, there is some coincidence between the areas of high population density and urban areas, on the one hand, and the distribution of crushed rock sales and quarries, on the other, but the relationship is less clear than in the north and the need for adjustments to the future supply pattern is, in some cases, more compelling. In particular, the areas of Newport, Torfaen, Blaenau Gwent and Caerphilly have higher population densities than those of the Vale of Glamorgan, Bridgend and RCT, but it is in the latter areas where most of the Carboniferous Limestone outcrops and quarries are located. The distribution of crushed rock quarries in this area as a whole is therefore not ideally matched with the main areas of demand, suggesting that there may need to be some adjustment in terms of future apportionments, on the grounds of proximity. This, however, needs to be examined in more detail and balanced against both environmental capacity and commercial factors. Further commentary is given in Appendix B.
Figure 4.7: LPA Population Densities (2010) and main urban areas, as approximations for the pattern of demand for construction aggregates, with motorways, A-roads, national landscape designations and locations of all active quarries & pits (2013)
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4.30 In mid Wales, there is a marked contrast between the very low population density of Powys and the high level of demand placed upon that County, in terms of crushed rock sales (compare Fig 4.6 with Fig 4.4). This, as noted earlier, is primarily due to the presence of five large quarries which export High Specification Aggregates by road to markets in England. Taking that into account, together with the distribution of these important resources, these quarries are clearly well-placed in terms of proximity to the relevant markets and transport routes.

Distribution of Environmental Capacity

4.31 Figure 4.8, below, illustrates the spatial variations in Environmental Capacity across most of Wales, as indicated by the ‘combined scores’ from the IMAECA Geographic Information System tool developed by Enviros Consulting Ltd. (2005). As explained more fully in paragraphs 2.10 et seq., above, the tool provides values, relative to arbitrary thresholds between the three coloured categories, for each 1km square which was assessed by the IMAECA project. The areas assessed were identified on the basis of whether or not aggregate resources were present within all or part of each square. Areas which were considered not to contain such resources were not assessed, which is why many parts of the country are left blank.

4.32 It should be noted that, whilst the GIS tool allows separate results to be shown for different resource categories, those categories do not entirely match with the current BGS mineral resource maps and the resource outlines are therefore quite different. It is therefore more useful to look at the overall picture, as shown in Fig 4.8 (and, at a slightly larger scale but at the same level of detail, in the various maps which accompany the sub-Regional analysis in Appendices A and B).

4.33 It must be emphasised that the IMAECA results are intended only to provide a very broad indication of the capacity of different areas to accept the environmental impacts of additional quarrying activity. They are necessarily generalised and are specifically not intended to take the place of conventional ‘sieve-mapping’ within individual Local Authorities, where more detailed constraint maps can be used and site-specific issues can be examined to determine the relative pros and cons of different factors. The IMAECA results have also been criticised for the fact that the presence of an existing quarry is treated, in the IMAECA analysis, as a factor which reduces the capacity for further quarrying in that area. Whilst there might be some justification for this, in terms of seeking to minimise cumulative impacts, it conflicts with the widely-held notion that well-designed extensions to existing quarries are likely to be more acceptable, at least in terms of public perception, than the introduction of quarrying to previously undisturbed ‘greenfield’ sites.

4.34 Bearing all of that in mind, the IMAECA results nevertheless provide a useful starting point for comparing environmental capacity issues with other factors (including resource availability, proximity and commercial viability) in areas where the historical supply pattern is thought to be in need of improvement, from a sustainability point of view. This is examined further in the Regional Appendices (A and B), the key findings of which are summarised at the end of this chapter.
Figure 4.8: Environmental Capacity Assessment (combined scores for each km²), as assessed by the IMAECA project, with locations of all active quarries & pits (2013)
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* Assessed as part of the ‘IMAECA’ project, (Implementing the Methodology for Assessing the Environmental Capacity for Primary Aggregates - Envisos Consulting Ltd., 2005).
Sub-Regional Analysis of Supply Patterns

4.35 More detailed, sub-regional analyses of the inter-relationships between each of the various factors outlined above are presented in the Regional Appendices for North Wales (Appendix A) and South Wales (Appendix B). Observations are given on the extent to which the existing supply patterns comply with the broad sustainability criteria relating to the proximity principle and environmental capacity, within the limitations imposed by the availability of resources.

4.36 Where those observations suggest that the existing supply patterns could be improved, in terms of sustainability, through adjustments to the distribution of future apportionments and allocations, the suggestions have been carried through to the analysis presented in Chapter 5, below.

4.37 Briefly summarised, the suggestions for making such adjustments are as follows:
- Adjusting apportionments for land-based sand & gravel provision within North Wales such that new allocations become focused on the resources within north Denbighshire and Gwynedd in order to generate an improved balance of supply overall (see paragraph A45 in Appendix A);
- Adjusting the balance of apportionments and allocations for land-based sand & gravel provision within mid- and southwest Wales, as necessary, in order to find a longer-term solution to the aspiration of reducing future production within the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park (see paragraphs B45 and B54 in Appendix B);
- Reducing crushed rock apportionments in Anglesey and Gwynedd, with corresponding increases in Flintshire/Wrexham and/or Conwy or north Denbighshire, in order to focus any new allocations in the latter areas (see paragraphs A36 and A43 in Appendix A);
- Considering a reduction of future HSA sandstone output in Neath Port Talbot, provided that a corresponding increase can be agreed within other MPAs further east, in order to focus any new allocations (as and when they become necessary, in future RTS reviews) on areas that will help to reduce the transportation impacts associated with HSA exports to England (see paragraphs B52 and B67 in Appendix B);
- Considering an increase in the crushed rock allocation for Carboniferous Limestone in Caerphilly, unless the existing unit at Machen is likely to be reactivated within the near future (see paragraph B64 in Appendix B);
5. Future Apportionments and Allocations

Introduction

5.1 The two main outputs of the RTS process are required to be the identification of apportionments for each Mineral Planning Authority in Wales for the 22 or 25 year period\(^8\) concerned; and the identification of any allocations that may need to be designated within individual LDPs in order to secure this level of provision.

5.2 The assessment presented in Chapter 3 of this review has identified the historical pattern of demand upon each individual MPA for the production of land-based primary aggregates, based on average sales over the preceding 10 year ‘baseline’ period (2001 to 2010, inclusive). The review of factors relating to the availability of alternative materials, imports, exports and economic growth has suggested that this historical supply pattern is likely to provide a good guide for the determination of future apportionments, both in terms of overall quantities and broad geographical distribution. No evidence was found of economic factors which would suggest otherwise.

5.3 However, in accordance with the over-arching principles set out in Chapter 2, future apportionments and allocations also need to reflect the consideration of other sustainability factors, particularly those relating to proximity and environmental capacity. These factors have been considered in Chapter 4 (and in more detail within the Regional Appendices). That work has found that, in most areas, the existing pattern of supply is sensibly balanced in terms of proximity and capacity, within the restrictions imposed by the distribution of workable resources, and the requirements of economic viability. However, it has also identified some areas (as summarised in para. 4.37, above) where there might be merits in adjusting the future supply pattern in order to improve sustainability.

Suggested Apportionments

5.4 Table 5.1, below, sets out the suggested apportionments for each individual MPA within Wales, based on the historical sales data presented in Table 3.1, with adjustments in some areas to deal with the suggestions from para. 4.37, above. For convenience, Table 5.1 shows figures for the annualised apportionments and the historical sales averages (for comparison), as well as the total apportionment required from each MPA over the full period covered by the RTS (i.e. 22 years for sand & gravel, and 25 years for crushed rock provision). It must be emphasised, however, that it is only the total apportionment over the duration of a particular LDP which matters and that, at the start of the relevant Plan period, the overall provision can be achieved through a combination of existing landbanks and (where necessary) new allocations. There is no requirement for an MPA to maintain or limit their annual sales in line with either the annualised apportionment or the historical sales averages.

---

\(^8\) This First Review RTS covers the period from 2011 to 2033, inclusive, for sand & gravel provision, and to 2036 for crushed rock provision. This is based on the need to maintain minimum landbanks of 7 years (for sand & gravel) and 10 years (for crushed rock) throughout a 15 year LDP. Given that individual LDPs will have different start dates, the annualised apportionment should be used to calculate the total provision required in each case.
Table 5.1: Suggested Apportionments for Future Aggregates Provision in Wales, 2011 to 2033 (sand & gravel) or 2036 (crushed rock)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mineral Planning Authority</th>
<th>Land-won Sand &amp; Gravel</th>
<th>Crushed Rock</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Apportionment (Provision) over 22 years (mt)</td>
<td>Annualised Apportionment (mtpa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Apportionment (Provision) over 25 years (mt)</td>
<td>Annualised Apportionment (mtpa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrexham</td>
<td>12.76</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>78.25</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flintshire</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22.25</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denbighshire</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conwy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30.75</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snowdonia NPA*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglesey</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwynedd</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-totals, N. Wales</strong></td>
<td><strong>23.76</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.08</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>145.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.80</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceredigion</td>
<td>7.26</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pembrokeshire</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pembys Coast NPA*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.75</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmarthenshire</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62.75</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swansea</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26.75</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neath Port Talbot</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.25</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powys</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgend</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brecon Beacons NPA*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merthyr Tydfil</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.25</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vale of Glamorgan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27.25</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhondda Cynon Taf</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.25</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiff</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caerphilly</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blaenau Gwent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torfaen</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newport</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monmouthshire</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-totals, S. Wales</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.26</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.33</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>261.75</strong></td>
<td><strong>10.47</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS Wales</strong></td>
<td><strong>31.02</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.41</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>406.75</strong></td>
<td><strong>16.27</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE:** Derived from the historical sales figures presented in Table 3.1, with adjustments to address the requirements summarised in para. 4.37 above, and discussed further in the text below. Green shaded cells indicate apportionments that are set higher than historical sales. Those shaded pink indicate corresponding reductions. The sub-total figures for North Wales and South Wales, and the totals for all of Wales remain unchanged from the figures indicated by historical sales.

*Where apportionments are shown for National Parks, these relate to production from existing permitted reserves in those areas. There is no requirement for National Parks to provide future allocations.

5.5 There is inevitably a strong bias in this table towards the existing pattern of supply. This is because that pattern is inextricably linked to the existing distribution of permitted reserves, and because the operators at those sites have well-established
markets and distribution networks. Some deliberate differences have been introduced, however, where there are opportunities and justifications for doing so, in order to encourage a more sustainable pattern of future supply. In each case, the suggested adjustments seek to optimise the balance between proximity, environmental capacity and commercial reality. They are specifically focused on the findings of the detailed sub-regional analyses, as presented in Appendices A and B, and summarised in para. 4.37, above. Further explanations are given below for each one.

5.6 Land-based sand & gravel apportionments in North Wales have been increased in Denbighshire and Gwynedd, and correspondingly reduced in Flintshire, in order to generate an improved balance of supply overall. Specifically, this should help to reduce the dominance of supplies from NE Wales, allowing those in Wrexham, in particular, to remain focused on the markets within that area and in adjoining parts of North West England. It should also help to encourage the development of new resources within Gwynedd and North Denbighshire, which in turn should allow the markets in those areas to be supplied from more local sources. This, however, is dependent upon suitable resources being found in that area; specifically, resources which include an appropriate balance between fine aggregate (sand) and coarse aggregate (gravel). If that cannot be achieved, the fine aggregate fraction might still need to be supplied from NE Wales or, perhaps, from marine-dredged sources off the North Wales coast. The suggested requirement for Gwynedd could potentially be shared with Anglesey, through local cooperation in preparing their LDPs, although Anglesey has very limited sand & gravel resources and no current extraction.

5.7 The apportionments and allocations for land-based sand & gravel within Pembrokeshire, the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park, Ceredigion, and Carmarthenshire have been combined. This is primarily in order to encourage cooperation between these authorities in finding a longer-term solution to the aspiration of reducing future production within the National Park, once existing permitted reserves in that area have been exhausted. The present supply pattern in this part of Wales is (quite understandably) focused on the areas which have the main concentrations of high quality glacio-fluvial sand & gravel deposits, to the east and south west of Cardigan. A large proportion of these deposits fall within the National Park but some of them extend into adjoining parts of Pembrokeshire and Ceredigion. Other potential resources do exist, however, although the commercial viability of some of those, particularly in Carmarthenshire and parts of Pembrokeshire, is compromised by the availability of marine-dredged material landed at Burry Port and Pembroke Dock. The apportionment for Powys has also been transferred to this group of authorities in recognition of the fact that the current reserves and output from the one site in Powys are extremely small, and unlikely to be sustained in future years. Although the apportionment for Powys has been reduced to zero, this does not preclude the potential need for temporary borrow pits being utilised within that County to support specific major infrastructure demands for concrete aggregate, such as wind farms (as is the case for all other areas).
5.8 Crushed rock apportionments in Anglesey and Gwynedd have been reduced, with corresponding increases in Flintshire and/or Wrexham, in recognition of the fact that the major markets for crushed rock aggregate supplied from North Wales are likely to be predominantly within those areas and further east, in neighbouring parts of north west England (see Appendix A). It is also suggested that the apportionments for Flintshire and Wrexham are combined, in order to provide greater flexibility. At present, as shown in Appendix A, there are no crushed rock workings in Wrexham and virtually all of the unworked limestone resources in that area fall within the AONB. It may, however, be possible to find some scope for future working through detailed collaborative working between the two adjoining MPAs. The suggested change will focus the requirement for new allocations on Flintshire/Wrexham although increases could alternatively be sought within Conwy and/or north Denbighshire, subject to views from NWaRAWP members.

5.9 It has been suggested in Appendix B (para. B52) that there might be some merit in reducing future output from Neath Port Talbot and increasing that from other MPAs further east within the Pennant Sandstone outcrop (e.g. Rhondda Cynon Taf, Caerphilly, Torfaen or Blaenau Gwent), in order to reduce the road transportation distances of HSA exports to England. That said, a high proportion of the resource outcrop within Neath Port Talbot coincides with areas of high environmental capacity whereas such areas are more limited within the outcrops further east. In practice, the shortfall in Neath Port Talbot has since been addressed by a new permission to extend the existing operations at Gilfach Quarry, from which part of the output is exported by train via the railhead at Neath Abbey. For future reference, however, if such a shift in supply pattern were considered beneficial, in the light of more detailed and balanced considerations of proximity, environmental capacity and other aspects of sustainability, this could be encouraged by reducing the requirement for any further new allocations or permissions within Neath Port Talbot, and transferring part of the apportionment to one or more of the MPAs further east, subject to agreements between the MPAs involved. This, however, is a matter for future revisions of the RTS.

5.10 The remaining suggestion carried forward from Appendix B is the possible need for further crushed rock allocations (of Carboniferous Limestone) within Caerphilly, in order to encourage an improved compliance with the proximity principle in supplying limestone aggregates to Newport and Torfaen, further east. To achieve this, there is no requirement to increase the level of apportionment in Caerphilly - only to fulfil it. Ideally, the inactive permission at Machen will able to be brought back into production in due course. If this unit and the much smaller one at Cwmleyshon nearby remain inactive (despite the projected economic recovery) the apportionment will not be able to be fulfilled. This, however, would be entirely in the hands of the mineral operator and could not be used as a justification for new allocations. A similar situation arises in Monmouthshire where the only remaining permitted reserves are at an inactive quarry (Ifton). In each case, unless the local authority served Prohibition Notices (and made compensation payments as necessary), the existing permitted reserves at these inactive quarries will remain a valid part of the landbank. Under those circumstances, then unless the inactive units are reactivated by their operators, the supply position will remain
unbalanced, with material having to be transported into the eastern part of SE Wales from more distant quarries further west or further north, or from the Forest of Dean in Gloucestershire, to the east. Whilst this would clearly be in conflict with the proximity principle, the issue would largely be beyond the scope of the local authorities to resolve. It would, of course, be open to those authorities to consider applications for new quarries, even without having a requirement for new allocations, if there were compelling evidence that the inactive quarries were never likely to re-open. Such applications might be justified on the grounds of reduced transportation impacts and reduced reliance on supplies from other MPAs, but those benefits would need to be balanced against issues relating to the development of a new greenfield site.

**Comparison with Existing Landbanks**

5.11 Landbank figures for the end of the baseline period (December 2010) have already been presented in Table 3.7, in Chapter 3. As explained in Chapter 3, the existing landbanks relate to the reserves at active and inactive sites but deliberately exclude the reserves at dormant and suspended sites. Those are presented separately in Table 3.8 and are discussed further at para. 5.19, below.

5.12 As noted under Table 3.7, the adequacy or otherwise of existing landbanks, in terms of contributing to the provision required in each MPA by the RTS, needs to be considered in the light of any adjustments to the pattern of future apportionments that are justified by proximity and/or environmental capacity criteria. Those adjustments are now incorporated in Table 5.1 and explained in the foregoing text.

5.13 Taking these adjustments into account, Table 5.2, below, compares the total provision for land-won sand & gravel now required (over the period 2011 to 2033), with the size of existing sand & gravel landbanks (from Table 3.7). Table 5.3 then provides similar comparisons for crushed rock, for the period up to 2036. In each case, the resulting surpluses (shown in green) or shortfalls (shown in red) of available reserves are indicated in the third column. The resulting minimum requirements for new allocations are then shown in the last column. It should be noted that these relate to the landbank position at the end of 2010, and that in some cases the allocation requirements may already have been partially or entirely fulfilled, either by new permissions granted since 2010, or by allocations that have already been identified in LDPs.

5.14 As far as possible, the information in each table is presented for individual MPAs but, where confidentiality restrictions on the landbank data do not allow this, the figures for some adjoining MPAs have been grouped together. In the consultation exercise, the clarity of being able to provide specific apportionments for individual authorities has largely been welcomed, both by local authorities and by industry, although some consultees suggested there may be merit, in some areas at least, of adopting a more ‘sub-regional’ approach which further encourages co-operation between adjoining authorities. Moreover, in view of the emerging ‘City Regions’ concept in Wales and the outcome of the Williams Commission, which is thought
likely to recommend reducing the current 22 councils to 12 or fewer, the notion of sub-regional working will need to be re-examined in the next RTS review. In doing so, however, it should be kept in mind that the groupings of authorities needed to achieve deliverable minerals planning solutions (which have to take account of the fixed distribution of geological resources) may not necessarily be the same as the groupings required for other, administrative purposes (or the groupings which, hitherto have been dictated by commercial confidentiality).

**Allocations Required to Meet Shortfalls**

5.15 In the case of land-based sand & gravel provision, Table 5.2 reveals that only Wrexham and Powys had a surplus of existing permitted reserves in December 2010 (in the latter case this being purely due to the decline in production from the two small sites previously involved) and that up to seven other MPAs (three in North Wales and a grouping of four in South Wales) will need to find new allocations in order to deliver the total provision required over the period covered by this review of the RTS (except where the indicated shortfall has already been covered by new permissions granted since December 2010). In North Wales, new allocations are called for in Flintshire, Denbighshire and, especially, Gwynedd. In South Wales the requirements are more modest, and are focused on Carmarthenshire, Pembrokeshire (including the National Park\(^9\)) and Ceredigion. The justification in each case has been summarised in paragraphs 5.6 and 5.7, respectively. The remaining MPAs have neither a surplus nor deficit for sand & gravel provision, but in all cases this is simply because they currently have no production and no apportionment. In South East Wales, this position is critically dependent upon the continued availability of marine-dredged aggregates. If that source of supply were to be disrupted, there would be an urgent need to reconsider the apportionments to all of the authorities in that area.

\(^9\) Although the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park makes an important contribution to the existing provision of sand & gravel in West Wales, it is not expected to contribute to future provision (beyond the expiry of existing permissions) unless there are no environmentally acceptable alternatives.
Table 5.2: Comparison of total apportionments for land-based sand & gravel, 2011 to 2033 with existing (December 2010) landbanks of permitted reserves.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mineral Planning Authority</th>
<th>Total Apportionment (Provision) for sand &amp; gravel over 22 years - from Table 5.1 (mt)</th>
<th>Existing Sand &amp; Gravel Landbank - at 31 December 2010 - from Table 3.7 (mt)</th>
<th>Surplus (+) or Shortfall (-) of Existing Reserves (Landbank minus Apportionment) (mt)</th>
<th>Minimum Allocation needed in LDP to meet the Required Provision for Land-based Sand &amp; Gravel (as at the base date of December 2010) (mt)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wrexham</td>
<td>12.76</td>
<td>15.24</td>
<td>+2.48</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flintshire</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denbighshire</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conwy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snowdonia NPA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglesey</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwynedd</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>-3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-totals, N. Wales</strong></td>
<td><strong>23.76</strong></td>
<td><strong>18.94</strong></td>
<td><strong>-4.82</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceredigion</td>
<td>7.26</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>-2.94</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pembrokeshire</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pembs Coast NPA*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>+0.53</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmarthenshire</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swansea</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neath Port Talbot</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powys</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>+0.53</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgend</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brecon Beacons NPA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merthyr Tydfil</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vale of Glamorgan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhondda Cynon Taf</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiff</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caerphilly</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blaenau Gwent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torfaen</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newport</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monmouthshire</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-totals, S. Wales</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.26</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.85</strong></td>
<td><strong>-2.41</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.94</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS Wales</strong></td>
<td><strong>31.02</strong></td>
<td><strong>23.79</strong></td>
<td><strong>-7.23</strong></td>
<td><strong>10.24</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** Where allocation requirements are shown these are the minimum amounts required to meet the RTS requirements. In many cases an application for an individual new permission will exceed these amounts, in the interests of economic viability. Such applications should not be rejected purely on the grounds of exceeding the minimum requirements shown here. In some cases, the suggested allocations may already have been partially or entirely fulfilled, either by new permissions granted since 2010, or by allocations that have already been identified in LDPs.

*Although the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park makes an important contribution to the existing provision for this group of authorities, it is not expected to contribute to the suggested allocation of new reserves, unless here are no environmentally acceptable alternatives.*
**Table 5.3: Comparison of total apportionments for crushed rock aggregates, 2011 to 2036 with existing (December 2010) landbanks of permitted reserves**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mineral Planning Authority</th>
<th>Total Apportionment (Provision) for crushed rock over 25 years - from Table 5.1 (mt)</th>
<th>Existing Crushed Rock Landbank - at 31 December 2010 - from Table 3.7 (mt)</th>
<th>Surplus (+) or Shortfall (-) of Existing Reserves (Landbank minus Apportionment) (mt)</th>
<th>Minimum Allocation needed in LDP to meet the Required Provision for Crushed Rock (as at the base date of December 2010) (mt)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wrexham</td>
<td>78.25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-3.84</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flintshire</td>
<td>74.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denbighshire</td>
<td>22.25</td>
<td>22.07</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conwy</td>
<td>30.75</td>
<td>67.43</td>
<td>+36.68</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snowdonia NPA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglesey</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>-1.31</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwynedd</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>8.51</td>
<td>+1.76</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-totals, N. Wales</strong></td>
<td>145.0</td>
<td>178.11</td>
<td>+33.11</td>
<td>5.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceredigion</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>+8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pembrokeshire</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>+14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pems Coast NPA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmarthenshire</td>
<td>26.75</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>+20.25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swansea</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neath Port Talbot</td>
<td>14.75</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-5.75</td>
<td>5.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powys</td>
<td>62.75</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>+56.25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgend</td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>+28.25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brecon Beacons NPA</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>+73.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merthyr Tydfil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhondda Cynon Taf</td>
<td>17.25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-4.25</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiff</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>+19.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caerphilly</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>+8.8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blaenau Gwent</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-1.25</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torfaen</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newport</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monmouthshire</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>+8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-totals, S. Wales</strong></td>
<td>261.75</td>
<td>473.5</td>
<td>211.75</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS Wales</strong></td>
<td>406.75</td>
<td>651.61</td>
<td><strong>244.86</strong></td>
<td><strong>30.13</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** Where allocation requirements are shown these are the minimum amounts required to meet the RTS requirements. In many cases an application for an individual new permission will exceed these amounts, in the interests of economic viability. Such applications should not be rejected purely on the grounds of exceeding the minimum requirements shown here. In some cases, the suggested allocations may already have been partially or entirely fulfilled, either by new permissions granted since 2010, or by allocations that have already been identified in LDPs.

* This requirement has already been fulfilled by a recent (2012) permission to extend Gilfach Quarry, which has provided 8.42 million tonnes of additional permitted reserves (but see para. 5.9 for further observations).
5.16 In the case of crushed rock provision, the figures shown in Table 5.3 suggest that many areas have a surplus of existing permitted reserves, but that four of those in North Wales (Wrexham, Flintshire, Denbighshire and Anglesey) and a further four in South Wales (Neath Port Talbot, Vale of Glamorgan, Rhondda Cynon Taf and Blaenau Gwent) were facing a shortfall of reserves (as of December 2010) and, except where these have already been addressed by new permissions granted since that time, will need to find new allocations when preparing or reviewing their LDPs. In addition, Caerphilly might need to find a new allocation for Carboniferous Limestone, depending on its assessment of the likelihood of two inactive quarries being brought back into production in the near future. The justifications are provided in paragraphs 5.8 to 5.10, above.

5.17 In each case, where sufficiently detailed information exists, it is recommended that the allocations should ideally take the form of Specific Sites, as defined in paragraph 14 of Minerals Planning Policy Wales i.e. “where mineral resources of commercial significance exist, and where any planning applications which come forward for those sites are likely to be acceptable in planning terms”. Where that is not possible, they should normally at least take the form of Preferred Areas (“areas of known resources with some commercial potential, and where planning permission might reasonably be anticipated”), within which operators should be encouraged to bring forward more specific proposals.

5.18 A key requirement is to be able to demonstrate, within the LDP, that adequate provision has been made and this, in turn, means that the quantity of workable reserves within the allocation needs to be known, as far as possible. In most cases, this is only likely to be feasible within Specific Sites. Preferred Areas will generally not have sufficient information to be able to do this, though it may sometimes be possible for reasonable estimates to be made. Areas of Search (“...broad areas that are believed to contain mineral resources of commercial significance but whose extent is uncertain...”) will usually have only minimal information on the suitability and commercial viability of the resources for commercial development and, as noted in Paragraph 14 of MPPW, it will not usually be appropriate to only rely on these for the purposes of making allocations. There will be some situations, however, where there is insufficient knowledge about potential resources to identify anything other than Areas of Search. Where this is the case, it is recommended that the Area(s) so identified should provide the potential for the release of new reserves which are far greater than the minimum allocation recommended, in order to allow for the uncertainties involved. In some cases it may be better, in terms of deliverability, to rely on specific sites (whether existing permissions or new allocations) in neighbouring authorities (additional to those MPAs’ own requirements), where such reliance has been agreed through collaborative working, in preference to relying upon the uncertainty associated with broad Areas of Search.

5.19 As noted in Chapter 2 (para. 2.4), where an MPA considers that the reserves at dormant sites are likely to be capable of being worked in the relevant period (subject to Environmental Impact Assessment and the agreement of modern
conditions) it may be possible for those reserves to be offset against the requirement for new allocations. The same logic would apply to reserves at suspended sites. The logic would only work, however, if the sites in question meet the same expectations as for other allocations, i.e. that they comply with the definition of Specific Sites or at least Preferred Areas, as given in MPPW.

5.20 Finally, it should be noted that the recommendations made above are based on currently available information regarding reserves, production, proximity and environmental capacity. As noted in ‘Box 1’ of the original RTS documents, the suggested apportionments and allocations do not take fully into account all factors that may be material to the ensuring an adequate supply of aggregates obtained from appropriately located sources. Such factors may include such things as:

- The technical capability of one type of aggregate to interchange for another;
- The relative environmental cost of substitution of one type of aggregate by another;
- The relative environmental effects of changing patterns of supply; and
- Whether adequate production capacity can be maintained to meet the required level of supply.

5.21 For such reasons, and as already noted in Chapter 1 (para. 1.8), where it is justified by new evidence, it is open for individual MPAs to depart from the apportionment and allocation figures recommended by the RTS. In doing so, however, an MPA would need to demonstrate that their intended departure would not undermine the overall strategy provided by the RTS itself (e.g. by working together with other MPAs to ensure that sub-regional and regional totals are still achieved) and this would be likely to become a key issue at Examination and/or Public Inquiry. Where the local authorities involved are unable to reach agreement, or if individual local authorities do not accept the Regional Technical Statement, as a last resort the Welsh Government will consider its default powers to intervene in the LDP process, (MTAN 1, paragraph A3).
6. **Consultation Process**

6.1 This First Review of the RTS documents for North Wales and South Wales has been undertaken as a collaborative exercise with several stages of consultation and technical peer review.

6.2 At the outset of the project, initial consultation meetings were held with a range of stakeholders to ensure that the Review was properly focused and that key sources of information were made available for consideration. The organisations and/or representative individuals consulted were as follows:

- Steve Bool, Secretary of the South Wales Regional Aggregates Working Party
- Gary Nancarrow, Secretary of the North Wales Regional Aggregates Working Party
- Ken Hobden and others\(^{10}\), representing the Mineral Products Association
- Huw Davies, of the Environment Agency Wales (EAW)*
- Karen Maddock-Jones of the Countryside Council for Wales (CCW)*
- Murray Alston of the British Aggregates Association
- Ian Selby of the Crown Estate
- Mark Russell of the British Marine Aggregate Producers Association

*From 1\(^{st}\) April 2013, EAW and CCW combined with the Forestry Commission (Wales) to form “Natural Resources Wales” (NRW).

6.3 The findings of this early stage of consultation are detailed in the Interim Report, issued on 28\(^{th}\) March 2013 (pdf copies available on request from the author).

6.4 Initial drafts of the revised RTS were then produced in stages between April and September 2013. At each stage, consultation was held with a Project Steering Group made up of the RTS sub-committees of the two Regional Aggregate Working Parties (including mineral operators, mineral planning authorities and Natural Resources Wales). This consultation entailed issuing drafts for comment, Steering Group meetings chaired by Joanne Smith of the Welsh Government, and the preparation of revised drafts incorporating responses to all Steering Group comments received, including the receipt of new technical data. Each successive draft superseded previous versions.

6.5 The third draft was issued to the entire membership of both RAWPs and comments on that version were received at a joint North Wales and South Wales RAWP meeting on 30\(^{th}\) September 2013. Following revision, a further draft was issued for wider (public) consultation and drawn to the attention of all interested parties - specifically including the Member Forums for each RAWP. That version was made available via the Websites of both RAWPs for an eight-week period of Public Consultation.

\(^{10}\) MPA representatives at this meeting comprised: Ken Hobden (MPA); Mark Russell (MPA); Malcolm Radcliffe (MPA); David Harding (MPA); Malcolm Lawer (Lafarge Tarmac); Ross Halley (Lafarge Tarmac); Lisa Trivett (Lafarge Tarmac); Shaun Denny (CEMEX); Simon Chaffe (Matthews & Son); and Mark Frampton (Hanson UK).
Consultation, between 28th October and 23rd December, 2013. Within that period, two consultation events were held, on 20th November at Bridgend in South Wales and on 21st November at Llandudno Junction in North Wales. At each event, the RTS review process was clearly explained and the findings, including recommendations to individual MPAs, were presented for discussion and comment. This final stage of consultation was the main opportunity for elected members to scrutinise the document and to be satisfied that it was acceptable and fit for purpose, taking account of both local views and technical advice from their respective officers.

6.6 A further revision of the documents was carried out following the analysis and Steering Group discussion of the public consultation responses. Where conflicting views had been received during the Public Consultation exercise, the Steering Group advised on the most sensible and sustainable resolution, making use of their combined technical expertise.

6.7 This final edition (of the main document and both regional appendices) will be presented to a combined meeting of the two Member Forums, at which political endorsement of the document by Members representing all constituent Mineral Planning Authorities within Wales will be sought. It is not anticipated that any significant changes will need to be made following this meeting, given the extent of previous scrutiny, but if any major disagreements are encountered, these will be considered by the Welsh Government, as final arbiter.

6.8 The final edition will be endorsed for publication by the Welsh Government. The document will also be translated, at that stage, into Welsh, and electronic (pdf) copies of both English and Welsh versions will subsequently be made available via the RAWP Websites.

6.9 In the interests of sustainability, it is not intended that printed copies will be issued.

---

11 Full details of these events are given on the respective RAWP Websites. Up to 40 places will be available at each event, which will be free to attend, but places will need to be booked in advance (before 10th November) by contacting the author (alan.thompson@cuesta-consulting.com).
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## Glossary

The following terms are frequently used in relation to aggregate supply and apportionment. The terms are listed in topic groupings rather than alphabetically.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition, in relation to the supply of aggregates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOPIC: Aggregate Materials</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregate</td>
<td>Crushed rock, natural sand and gravel or artificial granular material that is used in construction, often in conjunction with a suitable binding agent such as bitumen or cement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Aggregates</td>
<td>Aggregates sourced directly from naturally occurring geological materials as a primary product (as distinct from secondary aggregates, including excavation wastes, produced as a by-product from the extraction or processing of geological materials for other primary purposes).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Aggregates</td>
<td>These are usually by-products of other industrial processes, or the arisings from non-aggregates extractive operations, that have been processed to meet the specification requirements for construction aggregate materials. They can be sub-divided into manufactured and natural materials, depending on their source. Examples of manufactured secondary aggregates are pulverised fuel ash (PFA) and metallurgical (iron and steel) slags. Natural secondary aggregates include china clay sand, ball clay sand, aggregate produced from slate waste or colliery spoil and excavation wastes (as defined below). All of these are exempt from the aggregates levy, giving them a deliberate cost advantage over primary materials, in an attempt to encourage their greater use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction, Demolition and Excavation Wastes (CD&amp;EW)</td>
<td>A term referring to wastes (see below) arising from the construction or demolition of buildings and/or civil engineering infrastructure, or from excavations associated with land levelling, foundations or other civil engineering works. Aggregates may be derived from some of these various waste streams, either as recycled materials or from excavation wastes (both of which are defined separately below).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste</td>
<td>Any substance or object which the holder discards or intends, or is required, to discard. In CD&amp;EW surveys, materials arising from construction or demolition works, or from associated excavations, which are beneficially used in an unprocessed form on the site on which they arise are generally not regarded as waste, because they are not generally regulated as waste.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road planings</td>
<td>A particular example of CD&amp;EW materials, comprising aggregate and bituminous or cement binder materials that have been ‘planed’ from the surface of a worn out road prior to resurfacing with new or recycled materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycled Materials suitable for use as Aggregate</td>
<td>These are materials, usually arising from construction or demolition projects, which have previously been used for construction purposes, and which are capable of being recycled or re-used as construction aggregates for a second or further time. In the Finance Act 2001, all materials previously used in construction are exempt from the aggregates levy, giving them a deliberate cost advantage over primary aggregates in an attempt to encourage their greater utilisation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Excavation Waste suitable for use as Aggregate | These are materials that may be suitable, with or without processing, for use as secondary aggregates, arising from excavation works:  
  a) on the site of any building or proposed building, where the excavation is undertaken exclusively for the purposes of laying foundations, pipes or cables;  
  b) on the site of any river, canal, watercourse or navigational channel, where the excavation is undertaken exclusively for the purpose of creating, restoring, improving or maintaining that feature;  
  c) along the line or proposed line of any highway or proposed highway, where the excavation is undertaken for the purpose of constructing, improving or maintaining the highway and not wholly or mainly for the purpose of extracting aggregate.  
Each of these categories, as defined more precisely in the Finance Act 2001, is exempt from the aggregates levy, giving these materials a deliberate cost advantage over primary materials in an attempt to encourage their greater utilisation. |
| Mineral Wastes | Mineral wastes are identified in MTAN1 as a further category of material with potential for use as aggregate. The term is specifically used to encompass aggregates from slate waste, colliery spoil, and crushed rock fines (i.e. the “dust” generated from crushing and screening operations in hard rock primary aggregate quarries). It may also include aggregates produced from the excavation and processing wastes at building stone (dimensional stone) quarries. Aggregates produced from slate waste and colliery spoil are classed as secondary materials (see above) and are exempt from the aggregates levy. The same is not true of crushed rock fines, or of the residue from building stone production, both of which remain classed as primary aggregates and are not exempt. |
### TOPIC: Supply and Demand

| **Production** | The overall rate at which products are generated, in tonnes (or millions of tonnes) per year, whether or not they are sold. In quarrying, production includes any unsaleable materials that may be produced, including overburden, interburden and processing waste, which may or may not be useable. |
| **Sales** | The rate at which products are sold, in tonnes (or millions of tonnes) per year. In quarrying, for the reasons outlined above, this will usually be less than the rate of production. |
| **Consumption** | The rate at which products are used, within a specified market area, measured in tonnes (or millions of tonnes) per year. |
| **Demand** | The need or desire for a product, backed by an ability to pay. Demand is measured over a given time period, and is affected by budgets, prices, preferences and the availability and price of alternative products. Demand for aggregates may be expressed in terms of the rate at which it is expected to be used within a particular market area (which is rarely known), or the rate at which it is expected to be supplied from a given source area, and is measured in tonnes (or millions of tonnes) per year. |
| **Supply** | The amount of a product which is supplied. Supply of aggregates is normally expressed in relation to a particular source area and is measured in tonnes (or millions of tonnes) per year. |
| **Distribution** | The pattern of market destinations served by the sales from a particular quarry or group of quarries. |
| **Proximity Principle** | The general concept of minimising the transportation of aggregates (and other bulk materials) by road, in accordance with para. 26 of MTAN1, in order to reduce associated impacts on the environment. |

### TOPIC: Resources, Reserves and Landbanks

| **Resources**  
(of primary aggregate) | Geological materials, including rocks and naturally occurring sand & gravel, which have the potential to be used as aggregates. The presence of a resource does not imply an acceptance of mineral working. |
| **Permitted Reserves**  
(of primary aggregate) | Primary aggregate resources which have the benefit of planning permission for the winning and working of minerals. |
| **Landbank**  
(of primary aggregate reserves) | In general, a landbank is a stock of planning permissions for the winning and working of minerals within a specified area, expressed both in millions of tonnes and in terms of the number of years' supply which they represent. The latter is usually calculated on the basis of recent rates of production. |
| **Current Landbank**  
(of primary aggregate reserves) | In MTAN1 (paragraph 45), this is defined as "the sum of all permitted reserves at active and inactive sites at a given time and for a given area", and is required to be based on "the latest 3 years production figures" (production, in this case, usually being represented by sales). For the purposes of this review, and in the interests of adopting a more practical approach to the strategic planning of aggregates provision in Wales, two deliberate departures from this definition were agreed by the Steering Group. Firstly, although 'inactive sites' technically include those which are dormant or suspended, the current landbank has been taken to exclude those sites (but see also 'Dormant Reserves' below). Secondly, in recognition of the recent prolonged economic recession, the agreed method of calculating the landbank has been to use the average of the latest 10 (rather than 3) years' sales figures. |
| **Dormant Reserves** | The permitted reserves of primary aggregates at Dormant sites (see below). MTAN1 (paragraph 47) requires these to be "clearly shown in the landbank calculations as a separate category". For the purposes of this review, such reserves and those at sites where permission has been suspended (see below) have therefore been excluded from the main landbank calculations used to determine future allocation requirements, though in some cases they might be taken into account by local authorities to offset any requirement for new allocations, subject to more detailed local knowledge. |
| **Future Landbank**  
(of primary aggregate reserves)* | In MTAN1 (paragraph 45), the Future (or "Extended") Landbank is defined as "land specifically allocated for the working of aggregates" (but see footnote below)* |
| **Apportionment** | The rate for which the mineral planning system requires provision to be made, in Development Plans, for the supply of aggregates from a given area or region. This may be expressed either in terms of millions of tonnes over a specified period, and/or as an averaged 'annualised apportionment' in millions of tonnes per year. |
| **Allocation** | The identification, within a Local Development Plan, of an area of land for future mineral working. In Wales, the size (in terms of tonnage) of allocations required in specific LDPs are defined in the Regional Technical Statements, but only for areas in which the cumulative apportionments over the period covered by the RTS are in excess of the available landbank of permitted reserves, at the time of the baseline date used in the assessment (in this case 31/12/10). |
| **Provision** | The total amount of aggregate required to be supplied from a particular local authority over the duration of its Local Development Plan. The overall provision may comprise both a landbank of permitted reserves and allocations for future working. |

* The term 'future Landbank' is somewhat confusing, since a landbank is a stock of planning permissions and (by definition), allocations do not have this status. Allocations may thus form part of the overall 'provision' within a Local Development Plan, but cannot form part of the landbank.
### TOPIC: Quarry Status

#### Active Site

Active sites in Wales are explicitly defined by the Town and Country Planning (Fees for Applications and Deemed Applications) (Amendment No.2) (Wales) Regulations 2006 as sites where "a) development to which the relevant mineral permission or landfill permission relates is being carried out to any substantial extent; or b) other works to which a condition attached to such permission are being carried out to any substantial extent". "Substantial extent" is not defined, but relevant guidance is provided in Minerals Planning Guidance Note 14 (MPG14): Environment Act 1995:- Review of Mineral Planning Permissions.

#### Inactive Site

Defined by the Town and Country Planning (Fees for Applications and Deemed Applications) (Amendment No.2) (Wales) Regulations 2006 as one "which is not an active site", as defined above. Inactive sites thus include, but are not limited to, those which are classified under the Environment Act 1995 as being dormant and those where planning permission has been suspended (see below).

#### Dormant Site

As defined in the Environment Act 1995, this refers specifically to quarries with mineral permissions granted between 30th June 1948 and 22nd February 1982 (i.e. "Phase I" and "Phase II" sites, as defined in the Act) where no minerals development was carried out to any substantial extent in, on, or under the site at any time in the period beginning on 22 February 1982 and ending with 6 June 1995. These sites still have valid planning permissions but, since 1st November 1995 it has not been lawful to recommence or carry on working a dormant site until full modern planning conditions have been approved by the Mineral Planning Authority (MPA), through the process of an initial ROMP review (see below).

In some areas there are additional, ‘dormant IDO’ sites, as defined within the Planning and Compensation Act, 1991. These are sites which were originally granted consent under ‘Interim Development Orders’ (IDOs), in the period between 22 July 1943 and 1 July 1948, and which were subsequently registered under the 1991 Act (thus retaining valid planning permission), but where no substantial work was carried out between 1 May 1989 and 30th April 1991. For these sites, a scheme of operation and restoration conditions is required to be submitted to the relevant MPA together with an acceptable Environmental Assessment, before they can lawfully be reactivated.

#### ROMP

The acronym for ‘Review of Old Mineral Permissions’ carried out in accordance with the Environment Act 1995. Sites which obtained planning permission between 1948 and 1982, whether active, inactive or dormant, were required by this Act to be subject to an Initial Review in order that modern planning conditions can be agreed. In addition, all sites (including reactivated ISO permissions) are required to be subject to subsequent Periodic Reviews at intervals of not less than 15 years. ROMP applications cannot be refused, since valid planning permissions already exist.

However, court judgments, guidance and regulations have since clarified that both the ROMP process, and the approval of new conditions at IDO sites, amount to obtaining new development consents and are therefore subject to Environmental Impact Assessment.

#### Stalled ROMP / Suspended Permission

Where a ROMP review has begun but has not been completed (e.g. because an Environmental Statement has not been submitted), the ROMP process is said to have ‘stalled’. In accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Undetermined Reviews of Old Mineral Permissions) (Wales) Regulations 2009, planning permission then becomes ‘suspended’ - i.e. it ceases to authorise any minerals development. As with dormant sites, suspended permissions cannot lawfully be operated until the process (including Environmental Impact Assessment) has been completed and modern conditions agreed.
Abbreviations

The following abbreviations are commonly used throughout the RTS.
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NPA  National Park Authority
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WG  Welsh Government
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Appendix B: South Wales Region - Detailed Analysis & Recommendations

Introduction

B1. This appendix is intended to complement, and should be read in conjunction with, the main document of the First Review of the RTS. It provides additional detail, specific to the South Wales RAWP Region, relating to the analysis of demand and the consideration of existing supply patterns. This information then feeds back into the determination of new apportionments and allocations (where required) for future aggregate provision, as presented in Chapter 5 of the main text. The final part of the Appendix incorporates that information into specific recommendations and guidance for each individual Mineral Planning Authority within South Wales.

Sub-Regional Analysis of Demand in South Wales

B2. As explained in Chapter 3 of the main document, the starting point for assessing the future demand for aggregates over the period covered by the revised RTS (i.e. 2011-2036) has been taken to be the average of actual or estimated sales figures for the preceding 10 years ‘baseline’ period (2001 - 2010), within each MPA. The historical sales represent the demand that has been placed upon those authorities in terms of aggregates required within those areas and elsewhere, including exports to England, particularly from the sites within Powys and South East Wales.

B3. They also represent the residual demand for land-based primary aggregates over that period, since the overall demand was partly satisfied by supplies from secondary, recycled and marine aggregate sources, as well as by imports from primary aggregate sources in England (though these are generally very limited).

B4. The figures for South Wales are shown in Table B1, below. The origin of the data is explained fully in Chapter 3 of the main text.

B5. The figures for land-based sand & gravel production in South Wales are greatly distorted by the reliance of South East Wales, in particular, on marine-dredged aggregates from the Bristol Channel and the Severn Estuary. South West Wales is less dependent on marine aggregates and has a small number of active land-based sites, primarily within the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park and Ceredigion. Carmarthenshire has one small operation, as does Neath Port Talbot (dedicated to supplying the adjoining steelworks), but neither has significant output. Powys is too far removed from the coast to be influenced to any significant degree by marine aggregates, but still has only one small land-based sand & gravel site currently in operation. It is reliant instead on crushed rock material, despite the apparent resources of natural sand & gravel within the upper reaches of the Severn, Wye and Usk valleys.

B6. The figures for crushed rock production within South Wales are dominated by the output from Powys, where a number of sandstone and igneous rock quarries supply HSA¹ material to England - particularly to adjoining parts of the West Midlands. In the rest of South Wales the picture is affected by the much smaller size of many of the individual unitary authorities, particularly in the south-east, where the totals for each MPA are less than for Powys, even though overall production within SE Wales is double the total for Powys. Historical crushed rock sales in South Wales have been concentrated within the Carmarthenshire, Bridgend, Vale of Glamorgan, Rhondda Cynon Taf and Cardiff MPAs (which is where most of the larger Carboniferous Limestone quarries in South Wales are located), and in the adjoining

¹ The term ‘HSA’ refers to ‘High Specification Aggregate’, which is suitable for use as skid-resistant road surfacing aggregate as defined in the original ‘Travers Morgan’ report on these materials (Thompson, Greig & Shaw, 1993). See paragraph 4.11 of the main RTS document for further details.
MPAs of Caerphilly and Neath Port Talbot, where additional HSA sandstone quarries are located.

Table B1: Summary of average sales figures for land-based primary aggregates in South Wales, 2001 - 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mineral Planning Authority</th>
<th>Land-won Sand &amp; Gravel Aggregates (mtpa)</th>
<th>Crushed Rock Aggregates (mtpa)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Powys</td>
<td>0.03 incl. Neath Port Talbot</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brecon Beacons National Park</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceredigion</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pembrokeshire</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pembrokeshire Coast National Park</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmarthenshire</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swansea</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neath Port Talbot</td>
<td>With Powys</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgend</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merthyr Tydfil</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vale of Glamorgan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhondda Cynon Taf</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiff</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caerphilly</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blaenau Gwent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torfaen</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newport</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monmouthshire</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-totals, South Wales</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>10.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: Collated by the South Wales RAWP secretary from confidential MPA data, for publication in annual RAWP reports, but refined in some cases from other public domain information (e.g. planning applications, Inspectors’ reports and LDP documents) to provide a more detailed or updated breakdown.

B7. Significantly, there has been no crushed rock production, during the baseline period, within Swansea, Torfaen and Newport, and very little in either Blaenau Gwent or Monmouthshire. In the case of Torfaen and Newport this is a reflection of the very limited outcrop of suitable resources, although Carboniferous Limestone was formerly extracted from Penhow Quarry in Newport. In the case of Swansea, the resources are plentiful but are either within the Gower AONB or constrained by existing urban development. Further observations on the relationships between production, resources, markets and environmental capacity are given in paragraphs B35 et seq., below.

B8. By default, the use of historical sales data as a basis for estimating future demand provides a built-in allowance for the supply of secondary, recycled and marine aggregates, assuming that these various factors will continue as before (with different levels of contribution in each MPA). It also assumes that the factors influencing the overall scale of construction activity will remain broadly unchanged. In practice, adjustments may need to be made in order to reflect changes in any of these factors which are considered likely to occur in future years, within each MPA.

B9. The need for any such adjustments to be made is assessed below, both for South Wales as a whole and, where appropriate, for individual sub-regions or MPAs. The issues are considered under the headings of:

- supply factors (relating to the continued availability of alternative materials),
- import/export factors and
o **demand factors** (relating to influences on overall construction activity).

B10. In each case, the observations relate to the anticipated changes compared to the average conditions over the 2001-2010 baseline period, and they relate only to the reasonably foreseeable future (no more than 10 years), since longer-term predictions are likely to be unreliable. It is important that these observations are kept under review and adjusted each time the RTS is revised.

**Anticipated Changes in Supply Factors**

**Secondary Aggregates**

B11. Secondary aggregates comprise the by-products of various industrial processes, including metallurgical slags and power station arisings, but also the by-products from certain types of non-aggregate mineral extraction, such as colliery spoil and slate waste, and from the recycling of glass, ceramics, asphalt planings and rail ballast.

B12. Aggregate production from metallurgical slags is an important source of secondary aggregate within South Wales. Port Talbot continues to be the main source of blast furnace (iron) and steel slag production, whilst the processing of older stockpiles of blast furnace slag also continues at the former Llanwern steel works (which ceased new production in 2001). Aggregate production from these sites, within Neath Port Talbot and Newport unitary authorities, respectively, contributes to the overall demand for construction aggregates both within these authorities and within neighbouring parts of industrial South Wales. However, in view of the continuing nature of these activities, there is currently no foreseen implication for the future requirements for aggregates provision from other sources.

B13. Coal-fired power station arisings, comprising pulverised fuel ash (p.f.a) and furnace bottom ash (f.b.a) are currently produced only at the Aberthaw Power Station, in South Wales. It is understood that the utilisation of pfa is likely to increase, but that the quantities are small and the use is only for relatively low-grade end uses.

B14. Small amounts of aggregate minerals (sandstone and occasionally sand) arise adventitiously from the reworking of former colliery spoil tips or from the working of opencast coal. In South Wales, significant quantities of colliery spoil still exist in tips that have not been removed or landscaped under the Derelict Land Reclamation Scheme (and successors). The overall potential for producing aggregate from this material is small, however, for a combination of local (social and planning), fiscal and regulatory reasons, but could be locally significant, where the quality of the material is suitable for the end-uses required. Planning permission for the reworking of former tips exists at Tower Colliery (RCT), but is not being actively exploited at present. Reworking of the spoil from the former opencast workings at Tir Pentwys (straddling the border between Torfaen and Blaenau Gwent) has also been considered and is currently the subject of Preferred Area allocations in both authorities.

B15. Sandstone arisings from new opencast workings have been important as ‘windfall’ resources at a number of sites within the South Wales coalfield, but these are classed as primary aggregates and are therefore not considered further here.

B16. Slate waste is produced in very small quantities in South Wales, from the northern part of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park and in southernmost Ceredigion. However, the extent to which this resource has been utilised as aggregate is understood to be minimal, and the prospects for future utilisation are equally limited. Mention was made in the original RTS of the possibility of importing secondary aggregates from the much greater quantities of higher quality slate waste in North Wales, though this was also seen as a ‘remote’ prospect and no progress has since been made.

---

1. It might appear more logical to group these substances under CD&EW. However, the coverage of CD&EW is already well defined in terms of survey returns, so those items are included here as secondary aggregates.
The various sources of secondary aggregate noted above, together with recycled aggregates, as discussed below, are currently exempt from the Aggregates Levy, in a deliberate attempt to minimise the use of primary aggregates. In August 2013, HMRC announced that a European Commission investigation into certain exemptions and reliefs contained within the aggregates levy was being undertaken to determine whether or not these amounted to ‘State Aid’ (Revenue & Customs Brief 24/13). Of particular relevance to Wales, these materials include slate, shale, colliery spoil and (perhaps) aggregates made from metallurgical slag. On 18th December 2013, the Government published draft legislation on the suspension of these exemptions (Finance Bill 2014). Final details of the EC investigation are currently awaited but the implication is that they could have significant implications for the balance between primary and alternative aggregates, if the exemptions are found to be unlawful. These implications have not yet had chance to be factored into the following analysis. However, the Government is strongly of the view that the exemptions in question do not give rise to State aid, and is providing information to the Commission to support that view as part of the formal investigation process. The Bill incorporates provisions for secondary legislation to restore any suspended exemptions, if appropriate, following the outcome of the EC investigation.

**Recycled Aggregates**

Aggregates produced from construction, demolition and excavation wastes (CDEW), but excluding asphalt planings, recycled rail ballast and recycled glass, form an important contribution to the overall consumption of construction aggregates. The 2008 RTSs noted a total output for the whole of Wales of 3.97mt, based on 2005 survey data, and suggested a roughly 3 to 1 split between South Wales and North Wales, based on earlier surveys and population ratios. They also noted that, despite the lack of quantitative detail, it is inevitable that the greatest volumes of CD&EW arisings and usage are in the urban areas. The RTS documents emphasised, however, that all statistics for this sector need to be used with a high degree of caution, because of the low rate of response to the surveys.

The situation, in terms of available data, has not improved since the original RTSs were published. No new survey data is available, so any observations on recent or future trends can only be regarded as broad approximations. If anything, the efficiency of recycling is likely to have increased, and the introduction of WRAP’s (2005) ‘Quality Protocol’ for the production of aggregates from inert waste may have increased the proportion and usage of higher value products derived from the various recycled sources. Such improvements, however, represent only small increments on the progress which had previously been made - primarily as a consequence of the price advantages resulting from the landfill tax and, to a lesser extent, the aggregates levy. The industry view is that there is little opportunity for significant further increase in the proportion of construction aggregate likely to be derived from this sector. The future availability of recycled aggregates is likely to be inextricably linked to the overall rates of construction activity and economic growth, so the safest assumption is that it will rise and fall in a very similar way to overall demand, and will thus have a neutral impact on the demand for primary aggregates, compared to the baseline period (2001 to 2010).

**Marine-dredged Aggregates**

In South Wales, the availability of marine-dredged sand & gravel is of major importance, with supplies being sourced from both Welsh and English waters within the Severn Estuary and the Bristol Channel. Over the 2001 to 2010 baseline period marine aggregate landings within South Wales accounted for an average of almost 79% of total sand & gravel production. In south East Wales (i.e. excluding landings in Pembrokeshire and Carmarthenshire) marine-dredged material accounted for an even greater proportion (averaging more than 96%), reflecting the almost complete lack of land-based sand & gravel extraction in this area, despite the existence of potential land-based resources. Discussions with the Crown Estate in 2013 suggest that similar levels of production are likely to continue in future years, in line with the current Interim Marine Aggregates Dredging Policy (IMADP) and the Welsh Assembly’s 2002 Position Statement on sand & gravel supply for South East Wales. Current uncertainties include the pending review of IMADP; the renewal or replacement of existing licences, including a major new licence
application in the deeper waters of the Outer Bristol Channel; the emergence of marine spatial planning; and the inclusion of mineral safeguarding within the Marine Policy Statement. It is also possible that applications for land-based extraction within some of the areas now being safeguarded may come forward in future years.

B21. For the time being, it seems reasonable to suppose that marine-dredged aggregates will continue to supply a similar (fairly high) proportion of overall demand as they have done over the last decade, so the demand for land-won aggregates in any of the MPAs in South Wales is not likely to be affected.

Anticipated Changes in Import/Export Factors

B22. Wales has always been a net exporter of land-won aggregates. Data on both exports and imports is recorded in the 4-yearly Aggregate Minerals (AM) Surveys, and data for exports in the last three surveys is summarised in Table B2, below.

Table B2: Summary of key export statistics for South Wales from recent AM surveys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Note: all figures exclude sales for non-aggregate use</th>
<th>AM2001 (mt)</th>
<th>AM2005 (mt)</th>
<th>AM2009 (mt)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Wales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land won Sand &amp; Gravel Sales</td>
<td>0.115</td>
<td>0.304</td>
<td>0.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S&amp;G Exports*</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exports as % of S&amp;G total</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limestone Sales</td>
<td>6.536</td>
<td>6.137</td>
<td>4.554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limestone Exports*</td>
<td>0.262</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td>0.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exports as % of Limestone total</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Igneous Sales</td>
<td>0.838</td>
<td>1.238</td>
<td>1.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Igneous Exports*</td>
<td>0.572</td>
<td>0.430</td>
<td>0.694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exports as % of Igneous total</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandstone Sales</td>
<td>2.648</td>
<td>3.498</td>
<td>2.605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandstone Exports*</td>
<td>1.457</td>
<td>1.941</td>
<td>1.258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exports as % of Sandstone total</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Crushed Rock Sales**</td>
<td>10.310</td>
<td>10.873</td>
<td>8.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total CR Exports*</td>
<td>2.302</td>
<td>2.527</td>
<td>2.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR Exports as % of CR total</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* ‘exports’ includes movement between South Wales and North Wales, as well as to other regions (mostly in England).

B23. In South Wales, the main export is of sandstone, the vast majority of which is High Specification Aggregate (HSA) - skid-resistant road surfacing material with a Polished Stone Value (PSV) of 58 or above, and generally much higher (Thompson, Greig & Shaw 1993; Thompson et al., 2005).

B24. In 2002, the total output of HSA sandstone from South Wales was 1.280mt³. This amounts to some 88% of the previous year’s (AM 2001) figure of 1.457 for all sandstone exports from South Wales (the difference representing the change from 2001 to 2002 and the inclusion of some non-HSA sandstone in the latter figure). Of the total HSA sandstone output from South Wales in 2002, some 69% is known to have been exported to England, with the remaining 31% being utilised in Wales, (including domestic consumption within South Wales and imports to North Wales). Of the total HSA sandstone exported, most was supplied from five quarries and two opencast sites in the Pennant Measures of the South Wales coalfield (from which 58% of HSA output was exported to England in 2002); whilst the remainder was sourced from three HSA sandstone quarries in Powys (from which a much higher proportion - 88% - was exported to England).

3 Source for this and subsequent data on High Specification Aggregates: unpublished information collated by the author as part of the Capita Symonds’ analysis of High Specification Aggregates production in 2002 (Thompson et al., 2005).
B25. Reference to Table B2 shows that, although there was a reduction in sandstone exports between 2005 and 2009, the difference is much less marked than is the case for limestone exports from North Wales (see Appendix A), especially in percentage terms. This reflects the fact that the market for skid-resistant road aggregate has held up better, during the current recession, than has been the case for more general-purpose limestone aggregate (presumably because of the safety imperative of continuing to maintain skid resistance on major roads).

B26. In terms of being able to predict future sales, however, there is considerable uncertainty: there could be a higher than average upsurge in demand as road maintenance requirements catch up with the lack of all but essential spending during the current recession (and particularly with the cumulative resurfacing requirements triggered by recent harsh winters); or there could simply be a continuation of recent levels of demand, as any improved availability of central and local authority funding is diverted to other, more neglected, areas of public finance. This applies just as much to exports of high specification igneous rock (which account for much smaller, though still significant volumes) as it does to the HSA sandstones. There is therefore no evidence that the demand for exports of aggregate from South Wales will be any greater over the next 10 to 15 years than it was over the baseline period of 2001 - 2010.

B27. Imports of land-based aggregates are very minor, by comparison with exports. In South Wales in 2009, land-based imports amounted to 0.064mt of sand & gravel and 0.172mt of crushed rock. Almost all of the latter are known, from the AM2009 survey, to have been of limestone aggregate from South West England, and are likely to have been primarily from the Forest of Dean into neighbouring parts of Monmouthshire and Newport, as has traditionally been the case.

B28. Imports and exports of marine-dredged sand and gravel between England and Wales are only relevant to the RTS apportionment exercise if they affect the continuity of supply of these materials to Wales and thus give rise to increased demand on land-based resources. This is potentially an issue in South East Wales which, as noted earlier, is heavily dependent upon marine aggregates. At present (2013), Wales is a net importer of marine sand & gravel, dredged from the English side of the median line in the Bristol Channel and the Severn Estuary. This is likely to change in the next few years, however, subject to the approval of new licence applications within Welsh waters. In practice, although this will change the balance between imports and exports, the new licences should ensure that there is no disruption of the continuity of supply.

**Anticipated Changes in Economic Demand Factors**

B29. Before considering future changes it is worth considering the relationships between aggregate sales and economic factors over the baseline period (2001 to 2010). Since economic growth/recession figures are available only for the country as a whole, this analysis is presented in the main text rather than in this Regional appendix (see paragraphs 3.34 onwards), with only a brief summary being given here.

B30. The analysis used annual GDP change figures, for the UK as a whole, as a broad indicator of economic activity, and compared these to the annual series of aggregate sales data from individual RAWP reports. The GDP figures clearly show the onset of the recession in 2008 and 2009, and the modest level of growth in 2010, compared with the earlier parts of the baseline period, broadly tying-in with the available sales data. Since 2010, GDP growth has fallen back again, but the average growth (from out-turn and forecast) from 2011 to 2018, is 1.88% per annum. This compares with an average of 1.78% per annum for the 2001 to 2010 baseline period and suggests that demand figures up to 2018 are, if anything, likely to be slightly higher than those for the baseline period. Consideration also needs to be given, however, to the possibility of a return to more substantial growth in the period beyond 2018. Whist there is currently no evidence to quantify or even suggest such growth, it would be prudent to allow for it, in order to avoid the risk of under-provision.
B31. Other potential sources of information that have been considered regarding the likely future demand for construction aggregates include population growth forecasts and Local Authority housing forecasts, though neither of these provide any clear indications of changes in demand within the short to medium-term future.

B32. Aside from predictions of economic growth and associated general construction activity, a further important element in the demand for aggregates is that relating to major infrastructure projects. Consultations with the South Wales RAWP Technical Secretary and RAWP members suggests that such projects may include the following:

- M4 (toll) Newport Relief Road
- Circuit of Wales (International Motor Sport Complex), Blaenau Gwent
- A465 Heads of the Valleys road dualling (Sections 2, 3, 5 and 6)
- Cardiff Eastern Bay Link Road
- Swansea Bay tidal lagoon
- Severnside Airport, Newport
- Severn Barrage (subject to further evidence on economic feasibility)
- Various large-scale on-shore wind farm proposals

B33. Whilst these and other infrastructure projects might well go ahead, there is no clarity, at present, on the timescales involved or on the associated demand for construction aggregates. Equally, there is no readily available information on the quantities of aggregates used in major projects that were undertaken during the baseline period (2001 to 2011). There is therefore no basis for any meaningful comparison between the recent past and the short- to medium-term future.

Summary of Sub-Regional Demand Assessment

B34. Subject to the outcome of HMRC’s decision regarding the possible suspension of certain exemptions from the Aggregates Levy, and to the outcome of the formal EC investigation into those exemptions (see para. B17, above), little justification has otherwise been found for modifying the assumption that future demand upon MPAs in South Wales should be based simply on the average sales figures for the baseline period (2001 to 2010), as detailed in Table B1, above, subject to any fine-tuning of the balance between individual MPAs to take account of proximity and environmental capacity issues, as discussed in the following section. Whilst there is some evidence that short term rates of economic growth are likely to be slightly higher than those seen during most of the baseline period, implying a slightly increased level of demand in future years, there is also a need to allow for the possibility of further increased growth during later years within the period covered by the revised RTS. That possibility is at least hinted at by future projections of population growth, but is also in keeping with the more general long-term economic cycle of peaks and troughs. If the Aggregate Levy Exemptions are suspended, or if the Levy itself is eventually abolished, this would have significant implications in terms of the future demand for primary aggregates. Whilst it would not be justified to rely to such factors in terms of clear predictions, it would be prudent not to ignore them for the purposes of ensuring an adequate level of future provision of construction aggregates.

Sub-Regional Analysis of Supply Patterns in South Wales

B35. For convenience, the following analysis is presented in relation to three broad, sub-regional areas: Mid Wales, South West Wales and South East Wales. Maps corresponding to each of these areas are presented in Figures B1 to B16. For each area, the maps deal with individual mineral types (or in some cases two mineral types where these are clearly separated and where they are at least partially interchangeable in terms of aggregate end-uses - e.g. limestone and slate or sandstone and igneous rock).
B36. In each case there are two maps. The first one deals with ‘proximity’ issues (i.e. the relationships between resources, quarry locations, major roads and the distribution of both population density and urban areas). The second one then deals with environmental capacity issues (using the output from the IMAECA analysis).

B37. As noted in the main document, it must be emphasised that these maps show the extent of potential resources and not reserves or permitted reserves. **Resources** are geological materials, including rocks and naturally occurring sand & gravel, which have the potential to be used for a particular purpose (in this case as construction aggregates). **Reserves** are those parts of a resource which known to be suitable for this purpose (usually as a result of detailed ground investigations and laboratory testing) and **permitted reserves** are those reserves which have valid planning permission for the winning and working of the materials in question.

B38. All of the maps are presented at the same scale (slightly larger than the scale used for North Wales in Appendix A). All of the quarry locations shown on the maps are detailed in Tables B3 to B5 later in this Appendix.

B39. As noted in the main document, not all of the roads shown on the ‘proximity’ maps are necessarily used for the transportation of aggregates, and that additional local roads will also be utilised close to individual quarries, distribution depots or customer locations. Equally, some of the exported material is transported by rail, though the quantities involved are not large. Together, the areas of high population density and the main urban areas provide a good indication of where construction activity is most likely to be concentrated, but the locations of major transport routes have an additional important influence on export distribution.

**Mid Wales**

B40. Maps showing the distribution of quarries, resources and other factors for Mid Wales are presented in Figures B1 to B4. This area comprises the northern part of the South Wales RAWP region, including the main part of Powys (north of the Brecon Beacons National Park), and Ceredigion. The northernmost part of Powys is excluded from these maps, though it can be seen on Figures A1 to A6 in Appendix A, and is largely irrelevant in terms of significant aggregate resources and production.

B41. For this area, the two pairs of maps deal with **HSA sandstone & igneous rock**, and with **land-won sand & gravel**, respectively. Limestone resources are largely absent within mid Wales, though a small outcrop of Silurian limestones are worked alongside HSA sandstones at Strinds Quarry, close to the English border. Slate resources occur within the southernmost part of the Snowdonia National Park, and were formerly worked at the Aberllefeni Mine in Gwynedd, close to the Ceredigion border. They also occur in the north-eastern part of Pembrokeshire but those resources are considered separately in the South West Wales section, below.

B42. Figures B1 and B2 deal with resources of **HSA sandstone and igneous rocks**. The term ‘igneous rock’ is used here, and in the maps, as shorthand for ‘igneous and metamorphic rock’, which in practice covers an extremely wide range of rock types, but all with similar suitability for use as general purpose hard rock aggregates. In some cases, (shown on the maps as ‘HSA Dolerite’), the rocks are suitable for use as High Specification Aggregate (as defined in Chapter 4 of the main document).

B43. In Powys, HSA is produced from three sandstone units (Dolyhir, Gore and Cribarth) and from two igneous quarries (Builth, in the centre of the County, and Criggion, close to the English border near Welshpool). All five of these units export aggregates to England and all of them exploit very localised geological outcrops which provide material that is capable of meeting HSA specifications. To varying degrees, similar material is likely to exist in adjoining parts of the same formations, but only within a few kilometres of the existing quarries. Other active sites within Powys cater only for local needs although one of these (Tan-y-Foel) has the potential, at least, for producing HSA sandstone. Overall, the scope
for significantly modifying the existing supply pattern of sandstone and igneous rock within central Powys, whilst still maintaining the overall level of output required, is therefore extremely limited. There would be potential benefits to be gained, in terms of proximity, by limiting future planning permissions to resource outcrops closest to the English border, although those areas (around Criggion, Gore and Dolyhir quarries) are seen to have low environmental capacity (in part, if not entirely, because of the existing quarries).

B44. Three active sandstone quarries are located within Ceredigion and, although two of these (Altgoch and Ystrad Meurig) have previously been recognised as HSA producers, all of them are believed to supply only to local markets.

B45. Figures B3 and B4 deal with land-based sand & gravel production within Mid Wales. Powys has only a single active gravel pit, with very limited output. Other potential resources exist within areas of generally high to moderate environmental capacity, within central Powys, but these are mostly within the upper reaches of river valleys and are unlikely to offer much in the way of commercially viable opportunities - not least because of the widely dispersed population and hence limited local demand. Three active gravel pits are located within Ceredigion. Historical sales from this area, although higher than in almost all other parts of South Wales, are still very modest (see Table B1, above), reflecting the limited extent of ongoing development in this predominantly rural County. Here again there are additional potential resources available within areas of generally high environmental capacity, but nothing that would specifically enhance the sustainability of the existing supply pattern. For the future, there is a case for combining future apportionments in this area with those in Pembrokeshire and Carmarthenshire, in order to encourage a joint approach to reducing the contributions currently made by the Pembrokeshire National Park. This is considered further in the following section on South West Wales.

South West Wales

B46. Figures B5 to B10 present three pairs of maps relating to South West Wales - i.e. most of the former Dyfed and West Glamorgan counties (Ceredigion, Pembrokeshire, Carmarthenshire, Swansea and Neath Port Talbot). The northernmost part of Ceredigion is excluded from these maps, though it can be seen on Figures B1 to B4, as described above. For this area, the three pairs of maps deal, respectively, with Carboniferous Limestone & slate resources, sandstone & igneous rock resources, and land-won sand & gravel.

B47. Carboniferous Limestone resources, as shown on Figures B5 and B6, are present in the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park, Pembrokeshire, Swansea, Carmarthenshire and the Brecon Beacons National Park. The resources within Swansea are located on the Gower Peninsula and are almost entirely within the Gower AONB. Active limestone quarries exist only in Pembrokeshire and Carmarthenshire and appear to be reasonably well-placed (given the distribution of unconstrained resources) in terms of their proximity to the main centres of demand (i.e. the main urban areas). A number of inactive quarries are also present along the narrow limestone outcrop in Carmarthenshire, close to three currently active sites, suggesting that there may not be sufficient demand in that area, at present, to sustain more operational sites. Potentially (subject to more site-specific assessment), these and other locations within this area might provide opportunities for increasing future supply, if there were a significant increase in future demand, but they would offer no additional benefits in terms of proximity to markets and only limited (if any) benefits in terms of environmental capacity. They would therefore do very little to alter the overall sustainability of the existing supply pattern.

B48. Figures B5 and B6 also illustrate the location of slate resources and quarries within SW Wales. The resources are almost entirely restricted to the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park and adjoining parts of Pembrokeshire, extending very slightly into the western edge of Carmarthenshire. All three of the slate quarries which remain active in this area, and just one active slate waste tip, are located just outside the National Park boundary but none of these are known to produce aggregates in any significant quantity. Options may exist for developing secondary aggregates from these sites but the commercial viability of doing so
would be far less than in North Wales, not least because of the lack of proximity to significant markets.

B49. Figures B7 and B8 show the resources of both igneous rock and sandstone within SW Wales. **Igneous rocks** of various types (dolerite, quartz diorite and rhyolite) are currently exploited at only three sites in this area. Two of these (Bolton Hill in Pembrokeshire and Garn Wen in Carmarthenshire) are capable of producing HSA material, whilst the third (Rhyndaston, in the Pembrokeshire Coastal National Park) produces roadstone with a slightly lower Polished Stone Value. None of them export to England and their output is likely to be used primarily within the SW Wales sub-Region. Bolton Hill is well-located with respect to the local market areas of South Pembrokeshire and Garn Wen is able to reach markets further north and west, including Carmarthen. Rhyndaston is less well-located in this respect and falls within the National Park, although the continuation of the same geological resource beyond the Park boundary here falls largely within an area of relatively high environmental capacity. This also applies to the continuation of the resources near Bolton Hill. Potential improvements to the overall sustainability of the supply pattern could therefore be generated by developing future resources close to these quarries but outside the National Park, and in areas of high environmental capacity, if and when new permissions are required.

B50. **HSA sandstones** within SW Wales primarily comprise those of the westernmost part of the South Wales Coalfield (i.e. Pennant Sandstones). These are primarily exploited at three sites within the Neath Port Talbot area, two of which (Gilfach and Cwm Nant Lleici) are known to export to England, as well as supplying local markets. The third active unit here (Bwlch Ffos) is an opencast coal site, from which Pennant Sandstone is periodically generated as a ‘windfall’ by-product. Bwlch Fos has been known to export HSA to England, though perhaps not on a regular basis. Carboniferous sandstones are also quarried on a smaller scale at two sites in south east Carmarthenshire. A range of older (Silurian) sandstones occur, sporadically, in parts of northern Carmarthenshire and Ceredigion. These are worked at a small number of sites throughout the area, some of which are capable of producing HSA material, but in all cases the output from these sites is thought to serve only local markets within the sub-Region.

B51. In terms of proximity and environmental capacity, the local sandstone quarries appear to be in sensible locations in relation to the dispersed markets which they serve. The Pennant Sandstone quarries are in the easternmost part of the sub-Region, as befits their important role in supplying material to England (as well as to South Wales) and the windfall site at Bwlch Ffos, whilst also meeting that requirement, is located primarily because of its suitability for opencast coal extraction.

B52. The current (December 2010) landbank of crushed rock reserves within Neath Port Talbot is lower than in most unitary authorities within South Wales (see Table 3.7 in the main document), suggesting a need for new allocations to be found, if the existing pattern of supply is to be maintained. In practice, the issue has been resolved by the recent granting of a new permission to extend Gilfach Quarry, providing 8.4 million tonnes of additional permitted reserves. Part of the output from Gilfach (and potentially up to 30% in future years) is exported by train via the railhead at Neath Abbey. Nevertheless, for future reference, there might be merit in deliberately seeking to change the existing supply pattern by reducing future output from Neath Port Talbot and increasing that from other MPAs further east within the Pennant Sandstone outcrop (e.g. Rhondda Cynon Taf, Caerphilly, Torfaen or Blaenau Gwent), in order to reduce the road transportation distances of HSA material that is exported to England. It must be remembered, however, that proximity is only one aspect of sustainability which must be balanced against many other factors. For example, a high proportion of the resource outcrop within Neath Port Talbot coincides with areas of high environmental capacity whereas such areas are more limited further east. This is examined further at para. B67 in the section on South East Wales, below, and in Chapter 5 of the main document.

B53. **Land-based sand & gravel** resources in South West Wales are illustrated in Figures B9 and B10. Other than the sites in Ceredigion, already referred to in the section on Mid-
Wales, there are only three other active sand & gravel pits within this area. Two of these (Pantgwyn and Trefilgin) are located within important outcrops of glaciofluvial sediments within the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park, to the south west of Cardigan, and both have recently gained new reserves, following appeal, in recognition of the scarcity of permitted reserves elsewhere in this area. The third (Uwynjack) is a very small site which exploits river gravels near Llandovery in Carmarthenshire. A fourth site which previously extracted sand from the dunes at Margam is now inactive. Other potential resources exist and, although many of those within river valleys, especially, fall within areas of low environmental capacity, others appear to be better placed in this respect. These include resource blocks close to Swansea, identified in the Symonds Group study, and extensive glaciofluvial deposits within the Teifi valley, around Llanybydder in Carmarthenshire. The fact that none of these are being exploited at present suggests that there is insufficient demand and/or commercial interest, not least because of the ready availability of marine dredged sand from the Bristol Channel. This almost certainly diminishes the commercial prospects for working resources in Swansea, Neath Port Talbot, and much if not all of Carmarthenshire.

In the interests of seeking a reduction of future quarrying within the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park, that MPA has already begun to work with Pembrokeshire County Council in developing a joint approach to future minerals provision and it would therefore be sensible to combine their future apportionments and allocations. Moreover, given the limited extent of resources within Pembrokeshire, outside the National Park, and in the interests of achieving the most sustainable balance of future supplies across all parts of west Wales, there would be merit in combining these requirements with those for Ceredigion and Carmarthenshire. These suggestions are therefore carried forward into the assessment of future apportionments in Chapter 5 of the main document.

**South East Wales**

Figures B11 to B16 present three pairs of maps relating to the various Unitary Authorities of South East Wales, together with the whole of the Brecon Beacons National Park in southern Powys, and overlapping with Carmarthenshire, Swansea and Neath Port Talbot from the SW Wales maps. For this area, the three sets of maps deal, respectively, with Carboniferous Limestone, HSA sandstone, and land-won sand & gravel. There are no slate or igneous rock resources in the area.

**North Crop**

In this area, the limestones occur largely within the Brecon Beacons National Park and are currently (or have until recently been) worked at three main sites: Penderyn (within the National Park, in the northern part of Rhondda Cynon Taf); Vaynor (north of Merthyr Tydfil, on the boundary of the National Park) and Trefil (in Blaenau Gwent, outside the National Park). All of these sites are well-placed, in terms of proximity, to serve the densely populated valleys of the South Wales coalfield, with most of those areas being within 20 to 30km of one or more of the quarries. However, all of the quarries are located within areas of low environmental capacity and all but one of them (Trefil) are located either wholly or partly within the National Park, placing major constraints on any future expansion.

Trefil is also now constrained by a new geological SSSI designated on land previously allocated as a Preferred Area for future mineral development, adjacent to the quarry, but this represents the only location within the North Crop limestone resources where an existing permission could be extended without encroaching into the National Park.
B59. At Vaynor, which is currently inactive, the adjoining resources outside the National Park are partially sterilised by other development and could not be developed as an extension of the existing quarry.

B60. A fourth limestone quarry (Blaen Onneu), located within the National Park to the north-east of Trefil, is a stalled ROMP review, where permission has been suspended and where a new development consent would therefore be required before any quarrying could recommence. For this reason, the reserves at this site are excluded from the landbank calculations, though they are included within the separate tally of reserves at suspended and dormant sites in South Wales.

B61. The existing crushed rock landbank within Blaenau Gwent (see Table 3.7 in the main document) was 17.9 years at the end of 2010 - insufficient to satisfy the total provision required to maintain the existing supply pattern for the 25 year period covered by the RTS. This contrasts with the situation in the Brecon Beacons National Park and Merthyr Tydfil, where the existing landbank (combined in Table 3.7 for reasons of confidentiality) is more than 114 years. Further allocations will therefore be required in Blaenau Gwent unless a different pattern of supply would offer greater sustainability. These will need to be more specific, in terms of tonnage, than the existing preferred area.

South Crop

B62. The second, and most important area of Carboniferous Limestone resource in SE Wales is that within the ‘south crop’, extending from Bridgend in the west, through the Vale of Glamorgan and Cardiff to Caerphilly in the east. No less than 12 active limestone quarries are located in this area, although two of these (Aberthaw and Pant) are largely or wholly dedicated to cement production, rather than aggregates, and another (Cornelly) supplies both industrial limestone, to the Steelworks at Port Talbot, as well as aggregates. Most of these units are located close to the M4 motorway and, together, they are able to supply the major local markets of Cardiff, Newport, Bridgend, Port Talbot as well as the southern part of the coalfield valleys. One additional quarry (Machen) is also able to supply by rail although this has primarily been for the supply of rail ballast, which no longer takes place, and the unit is currently inactive.

B63. The concentration of quarries in this area is a direct reflection of the availability of both resources and communication links but is not perfectly matched with the overall pattern of demand within SE Wales, as indicated by population density and urban development. In particular, the areas of Newport, Torfaen, Blaenau Gwent and Caerphilly have higher population densities than those of the Vale of Glamorgan, Bridgend and RCT, but it is in the latter areas where most of the Carboniferous Limestone outcrops and quarries are located. Although most of the urban areas mentioned above are reasonably close to one or more of the active quarries, the areas within much of Newport and Torfaen are significantly further away.

B64. Improving this situation, in terms of proximity, would require the reactivation of Machen quarry (in Caerphilly) to supply those areas, and/or new allocations to be identified in the eastern part of the outcrop, within Newport and/or Torfaen. However, although Newport and Torfaen do have Carboniferous Limestone resources, the outcrop in those areas is very thin and much of it is sterilised by existing built development. Most of the available resources are also within areas where the environmental capacity is low, but that applies equally to most (though not all) of the south crop resources. The main areas with higher capacity within the south crop appear to be those in the southernmost part of Caerphilly, in the east, and around Cowbridge in the Vale of Glamorgan, further west. Of these options, increasing the output from Caerphilly, and eventually seeking new allocations there would help to reduce the transport impacts associated with supplying limestone aggregate to the Torfaen and Newport areas. Although the existing landbank of crushed rock reserves within Caerphilly is more than adequate to maintain the existing supply pattern for 25 years (see Table 3.7 in the main document), this covers two active HSA sandstone quarries as well as the two inactive limestone units (Machen and Cwmleyshon). Reactivating the larger of those units (Machen) would achieve the...
suggested increase in output from Caerphilly, but that is entirely in the hands of the mineral operator. Depending on the likelihood or otherwise of Machen being reactivated in the near future, it might therefore become necessary to identify a further allocation for Carboniferous Limestone production within the southern part of Caerphilly, despite the size of the existing landbank. It is beyond the scope of the RTS to investigate the prospects for individual quarries so this will need to be a matter for the Mineral Planning Authority itself. These suggestions are all carried through to the analysis in Chapter 5 of the main document.

**Monmouthshire**

**B65.** The third area of Carboniferous Limestone resources in SE Wales is the extensive outcrop within southern Monmouthshire, the eastern part of which falls within the Wye Valley Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. There are currently no active quarries in the whole of this area (Livox having closed in 2013) but there is one inactive quarry at Llifton which has significant unworked permitted reserves. Beyond that site, virtually the whole of the unworked resources fall within areas of low environmental capacity. Pressure for future quarry development here might be offset by the potential availability of supplies from Machen quarry in Caerphilly, to the west (though that unit is currently inactive), and from other quarries within the neighbouring Forest of Dean, in England. Imports from the Forest of Dean already take place but, in recognition of the proximity principle, it may be preferable for the site at Llifton to be reactivated. That, however, is entirely in the hands of the quarry operator.

**B66.** Figures B13 and B14 show the distribution of **Pennant Sandstone** resources and quarries within South East Wales, in relation to the variations in population density, urban development, transport routes and environmental capacity. The resources in the western part of these maps have already been discussed under the section on SW Wales, above. In the remaining areas, Pennant Sandstone is quarried (primarily for HSA use) at two locations in Caerphilly (Hafod Fach and Bryn), one in Merthyr Tydfil (Gelligaer) and one in Rhondda Cynon Taf (Craig-yr-Hesg). All of these quarries are well-placed, within the overall resource outcrop, to supply both local markets within SE Wales and to export HSA to England. In the case of Hafod Fach, part of the output is exported by rail. The sales, both for local consumption and exports, include end-uses other than skid resistant road surfacing, though this is usually because it is often convenient and economical to use the same aggregate in some of the lower layers of road construction as that which is required for use in the surface course.

**B67.** Pennant Sandstone resources are widespread within SE Wales and, as shown on Figure B14, these include areas of relatively high environmental capacity - particularly within Rhondda Cynon Taf, Caerphilly, and parts of Blaenau Gwent. Whilst these areas of higher or moderate capacity are less extensive than those within Neath Port Talbot (see para. B52, above), they may, nevertheless offer prospects for future resource development, as indeed may those of lower apparent capacity - particularly in the case of extensions to existing quarries. In terms of proximity to export markets, however, these areas offer greater benefits than those further west, particularly where there is access to rail transportation. This may be an important factor when considering the pattern of future allocations, subject to being balanced against other aspects of sustainability, though this is not required at present (see Chapter 5 of the main document).

**B68.** Figures B15 and B16 illustrate the distribution of potential **sand & gravel resources.** There is currently no land-based sand & gravel extraction in the whole of SE Wales, and this has generally been the case for decades. This is due in part to the ready availability of marine dredged sand from both the Severn Estuary and the Bristol Channel, but also reflects the environmental sensitivity of many of the inland areas which might contain potentially suitable resources. The situation is compounded by the lack of detailed knowledge of those resources (not least because there has been virtually no history of extraction). Reconnaissance-level surveys were commissioned by the Welsh Assembly for the most promising areas, identified in terms of Quaternary geology and geomorphology (Thompson et al., 2000), and were investigated further in a comparative environmental assessment of both marine and land-based resources (Thompson et al., 2002). The first of
these studies identified a series of potential resource blocks, which are shown by the deep red shading on Figures B15 and B16. Most of these were identified within the Usk valley, both within and outside the Brecon Beacons National Park, but also in several other areas further west. However, almost all of the resource blocks fall within areas which have since been assessed as being of low environmental capacity. Thus, while ever the current policy of supporting marine aggregates dredging from sustainable sources remains in force, it seems unlikely that any land-based sand & gravel resources in this area will need to be developed.

**Current Sources of Supply in South Wales**

Tables B3 to B5, below, list the currently active, inactive and dormant or suspended aggregate quarries in South Wales (updated to August 2013). The lists exclude quarries devoted to the manufacture of cement, building stone, silica sand, shale or other non-aggregate products, although they include two quarries which supply both aggregates and industrial limestone.

**Table B3: Active Aggregate Quarries in South Wales (2013)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarry Name</th>
<th>Operator</th>
<th>Commodity</th>
<th>Easting</th>
<th>Northing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BLAENAU GWENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trefil</td>
<td>Gryphon Quarries Ltd</td>
<td>Limestone</td>
<td>311975</td>
<td>213690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BRECON BEACONS NATIONAL PARK</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penderyn</td>
<td>Hanson Aggregates</td>
<td>Limestone</td>
<td>295500</td>
<td>209000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BRIDGENG</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornelly</td>
<td>Lafarge Tarmac</td>
<td>Limestone</td>
<td>283625</td>
<td>180160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaen’s</td>
<td>T S Rees Ltd</td>
<td>Limestone</td>
<td>282380</td>
<td>180430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAERPHILLY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryn (HSA)</td>
<td>Bryn Quarry Ltd</td>
<td>Sandstone</td>
<td>312600</td>
<td>196400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hafod Fach (HSA)</td>
<td>Lafarge Tarmac</td>
<td>Sandstone</td>
<td>322580</td>
<td>196500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CARDIFF</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taff’s Well</td>
<td>CEMEX UK</td>
<td>Limestone</td>
<td>312200</td>
<td>182200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ton Mawr</td>
<td>T S Rees Ltd</td>
<td>Limestone</td>
<td>311560</td>
<td>182350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CARMARTHENSISHIRE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blaen-y-Fan</td>
<td>CEMEX UK</td>
<td>Limestone</td>
<td>245640</td>
<td>211520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coed Moelion</td>
<td>Mr Richards</td>
<td>Sandstone</td>
<td>250800</td>
<td>212400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coygen</td>
<td>GD Harries &amp; Sons Ltd</td>
<td>Limestone</td>
<td>228430</td>
<td>209210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garn Wen</td>
<td>G D Harries &amp; Sons Ltd</td>
<td>Igneous</td>
<td>216740</td>
<td>226880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garnbica</td>
<td>Gower Plant</td>
<td>Limestone</td>
<td>251720</td>
<td>214610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Llwynjack</td>
<td>C J Lewis</td>
<td>Sand &amp; Gravel</td>
<td>275400</td>
<td>231300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennant</td>
<td>Natural Welsh Stone</td>
<td>Sandstone</td>
<td>248225</td>
<td>206950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torcoed</td>
<td>Lafarge Tarmac</td>
<td>Limestone</td>
<td>249000</td>
<td>213870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ty Howel</td>
<td>Daniel L Williams</td>
<td>Sandstone</td>
<td>259847</td>
<td>244668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CEREDIGION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alltgoch / Bryn</td>
<td>G D Harries &amp; Sons Ltd</td>
<td>Sandstone</td>
<td>249100</td>
<td>248500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criug-yr-Eyr</td>
<td>R Powell</td>
<td>Sand &amp; Gravel</td>
<td>242075</td>
<td>250310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pant</td>
<td>Rob Cutter</td>
<td>Sand &amp; Gravel</td>
<td>265825</td>
<td>256575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penparc</td>
<td>Cardigan Sand &amp; Gravel Co Ltd</td>
<td>Sand &amp; Gravel</td>
<td>220000</td>
<td>248260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tylau</td>
<td>W J Evans</td>
<td>Sandstone</td>
<td>258380</td>
<td>260590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ystrad Meurig (HSA)</td>
<td>Hanson Aggregates</td>
<td>Sandstone</td>
<td>271810</td>
<td>269570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MERTHYR TYDFIL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gelligaer (HSA)</td>
<td>Hanson Aggregates</td>
<td>Sandstone</td>
<td>311550</td>
<td>199600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### NEATH PORT TALBOT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bwlch Ffos (HSA opencast)</td>
<td>Horizon Mining Ltd</td>
<td>Sandstone</td>
<td>286860</td>
<td>202391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cwm Nant Lleici (HSA)</td>
<td>Bardon Aggregates - Southern</td>
<td>Sandstone</td>
<td>273175</td>
<td>207080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilfach (HSA)</td>
<td>CEMEX UK</td>
<td>Sandstone</td>
<td>275370</td>
<td>199880</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PEMBROKESHIRE COAST NATIONAL PARK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carew</td>
<td>T Scourfield &amp; Sons</td>
<td>Sand &amp; Gravel</td>
<td>204900</td>
<td>204300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pantgwyn</td>
<td>Cware Pantgwyn Quarry Ltd</td>
<td>Sand &amp; Gravel</td>
<td>212400</td>
<td>242820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trefin</td>
<td>Cware Trefin Quarries Ltd</td>
<td>Sand &amp; Gravel</td>
<td>214000</td>
<td>243900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhyndaston</td>
<td>Mason Brothers Quarry Products Ltd</td>
<td>Igneous</td>
<td>189250</td>
<td>223625</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PEMBROKESHIRE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bolton Hill</td>
<td>G D Harries &amp; Sons Ltd</td>
<td>Igneous</td>
<td>191800</td>
<td>211400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cefn</td>
<td>Dyffrig Davies</td>
<td>Slate</td>
<td>220500</td>
<td>242900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cronllwyn</td>
<td>Cronllwyn Quarry</td>
<td>Slate Waste</td>
<td>198550</td>
<td>235195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gellhalog</td>
<td>G D Harries &amp; Sons Ltd</td>
<td>Limestone</td>
<td>215800</td>
<td>210700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glogue</td>
<td>Mansel Davies &amp; Son Ltd</td>
<td>Slate</td>
<td>221900</td>
<td>232840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plascwrth</td>
<td>M Evans</td>
<td>Slate</td>
<td>211880</td>
<td>227400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### POWYS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Builth Wells (HSA)</td>
<td>Hanson Aggregates</td>
<td>Igneous</td>
<td>305105</td>
<td>252125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caerfagu</td>
<td>Caerfagu Products</td>
<td>Sand &amp; Gravel</td>
<td>304400</td>
<td>265350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criggion (HSA)</td>
<td>Hanson Aggregates</td>
<td>Igneous</td>
<td>328900</td>
<td>314400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolyhir (HSA)</td>
<td>Lafarge Tarmac</td>
<td>Sandstone</td>
<td>324300</td>
<td>258425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gore (HSA)</td>
<td>Lafarge Tarmac</td>
<td>Sandstone</td>
<td>325700</td>
<td>259250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little-Wern-Willia</td>
<td>R Mills</td>
<td>Sandstone</td>
<td>321900</td>
<td>253500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middletown</td>
<td>Border Hardcore &amp; Rockery Stone Co Ltd</td>
<td>Igneous</td>
<td>329880</td>
<td>312850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strinds</td>
<td>Lafarge Tarmac</td>
<td>Limestone</td>
<td>324200</td>
<td>257865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strinds (HSA)</td>
<td>Lafarge Tarmac</td>
<td>Sandstone</td>
<td>324200</td>
<td>257865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tan-y-foel (HSA)</td>
<td>H V Bowen &amp; Sons Ltd</td>
<td>Sandstone</td>
<td>301240</td>
<td>301460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tredomen</td>
<td>A K Jones, Powys Plant Hire</td>
<td>Sandstone</td>
<td>311820</td>
<td>230400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### RHONDDA CYNON TAF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Craig-yr-Hesg (HSA)</td>
<td>Hanson Aggregates</td>
<td>Sandstone</td>
<td>307917</td>
<td>191726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Wood</td>
<td>Hanson Aggregates</td>
<td>Limestone</td>
<td>301600</td>
<td>179650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendy</td>
<td>Lafarge Tarmac</td>
<td>Limestone</td>
<td>305340</td>
<td>181095</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### VALE OF GLAMORGAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ewenny</td>
<td>Lafarge Tarmac</td>
<td>Limestone</td>
<td>290250</td>
<td>176805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithalun</td>
<td>Hanson Aggregates</td>
<td>Limestone</td>
<td>289560</td>
<td>176500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longlands</td>
<td>Green Circle Aggregates Ltd</td>
<td>Limestone</td>
<td>292770</td>
<td>177220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pantyffynnon Quarry</td>
<td>Seth Hill &amp; Son Ltd</td>
<td>Limestone</td>
<td>304565</td>
<td>174000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table B4: Inactive Aggregate Quarries in South Wales (2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarry Name</th>
<th>Operator</th>
<th>Commodity</th>
<th>Easting</th>
<th>Northing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BRECON BEACONS NATIONAL PARK</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ammanford</td>
<td>Messrs Griffiths &amp; Williams</td>
<td>Limestone</td>
<td>264910</td>
<td>217640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BRIDGEND</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cefn Cribwr</td>
<td>T S Rees Ltd</td>
<td>Sandstone</td>
<td>287400</td>
<td>182800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grove</td>
<td>Lafarge Tarmac</td>
<td>Limestone</td>
<td>282249</td>
<td>179871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAERPHILLY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cwmleyshon</td>
<td>Hanson Aggregates</td>
<td>Limestone</td>
<td>321000</td>
<td>186930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machen</td>
<td>Hanson Aggregates</td>
<td>Limestone</td>
<td>322555</td>
<td>189000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CARDIFF</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blaengwynlais</td>
<td>Lafarge Tarmac</td>
<td>Limestone</td>
<td>314610</td>
<td>184265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cefn Garw</td>
<td>J R Bassett</td>
<td>Limestone</td>
<td>314000</td>
<td>183000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creigiau</td>
<td>Lafarge Tarmac</td>
<td>Limestone</td>
<td>309000</td>
<td>181975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CARMARTHENSHIRE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alltygarn</td>
<td>Aggregate Industries Ltd</td>
<td>Silica Sandstone</td>
<td>258676</td>
<td>215794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clyrychyn</td>
<td>Lafarge Tarmac</td>
<td>Limestone</td>
<td>225900</td>
<td>221500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crwbin</td>
<td>Lafarge Tarmac</td>
<td>Limestone</td>
<td>247805</td>
<td>213360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinas (HSA)</td>
<td>Lafarge Tarmac</td>
<td>Sandstone</td>
<td>262740</td>
<td>235530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MERTHYR TYDFIL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaynor</td>
<td>Hanson Aggregates</td>
<td>Limestone</td>
<td>303600</td>
<td>209900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MONMOUTHSHIRE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ifton</td>
<td>Hanson Aggregates</td>
<td>Limestone</td>
<td>346400</td>
<td>188770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEATH PORT TALBOT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margam Sand Pit</td>
<td>Associated British Ports</td>
<td>Sand</td>
<td>275500</td>
<td>188500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PEMBROKESHIRE COAST NATIONAL PARK</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottom Meadow</td>
<td>E Morgan</td>
<td>Limestone</td>
<td>203750</td>
<td>205870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syke</td>
<td>G D Harries &amp; Sons Ltd</td>
<td>Sandstone</td>
<td>187120</td>
<td>210915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POWSYS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cribarth (HSA)</td>
<td>Bardon Aggregates - Southern</td>
<td>Sandstone</td>
<td>295320</td>
<td>252550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhayader (HSA)</td>
<td>Lafarge Tarmac</td>
<td>Sandstone</td>
<td>297395</td>
<td>265875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VALE OF GLAMORGAN</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garwa</td>
<td>Lafarge Tarmac</td>
<td>Limestone</td>
<td>297940</td>
<td>179840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wenvoe</td>
<td>CEMEX UK</td>
<td>Limestone</td>
<td>313410</td>
<td>174000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table B5: Dormant or Suspended Aggregate Quarries in South Wales (2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarry Name</th>
<th>Operator</th>
<th>Commodity</th>
<th>Easting</th>
<th>Northing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BRECON BEACONS NATIONAL PARK</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blaen Onneu (suspended)</td>
<td>Hanson Aggregates</td>
<td>Limestone</td>
<td>315480</td>
<td>216850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Llanfair</td>
<td>N Markham - David</td>
<td>Sandstone</td>
<td>320705</td>
<td>219975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BRIDGEND</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormy Down</td>
<td>Hobbs Holdings Ltd</td>
<td>Limestone</td>
<td>284185</td>
<td>180380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAERPHILLY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caerllwyn</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Thomas</td>
<td>Sandstone</td>
<td>318350</td>
<td>193700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cefn Onn</td>
<td>Trustees of Wyndham Lewis Estate</td>
<td>Limestone</td>
<td>317400</td>
<td>185200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darren Felin Farm</td>
<td>Unknown Operator</td>
<td>Sand &amp; Gravel</td>
<td>318441</td>
<td>199348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ochr Chwth</td>
<td>Hanson Aggregates</td>
<td>Limestone</td>
<td>323325</td>
<td>189810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CARMARTHENSHIRE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cerrig-yr-Wyn</td>
<td>J Mousley</td>
<td>Igneous</td>
<td>233610</td>
<td>216100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glantowy</td>
<td>Mr A Lewis</td>
<td>Sand &amp; Gravel</td>
<td>274745</td>
<td>232375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limestone Hill</td>
<td>Dan Williams</td>
<td>Limestone</td>
<td>246670</td>
<td>216260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Llwyn-y-Fran</td>
<td>Hobbs Holdings Ltd</td>
<td>Limestone</td>
<td>257690</td>
<td>216032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maesduilais</td>
<td>Hobbs Holdings Ltd</td>
<td>Limestone</td>
<td>251725</td>
<td>214520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pen-y-banc</td>
<td>Mrs Antonia Jones-Davies</td>
<td>Limestone</td>
<td>247035</td>
<td>212960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pwll-y-March</td>
<td>Gower Plant</td>
<td>Limestone</td>
<td>259475</td>
<td>216380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ty'r Garn</td>
<td>Mr Gareth Morgan</td>
<td>Limestone</td>
<td>250245</td>
<td>214170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PEMBROKESHIRE COAST NATIONAL PARK</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penberry</td>
<td>Messrs Jamiesons</td>
<td>Igneous</td>
<td>176940</td>
<td>229220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PEMBROKESHIRE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilfach</td>
<td>G Davies</td>
<td>Slate</td>
<td>212765</td>
<td>226995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treffgarne</td>
<td>G D Harries &amp; Sons Ltd</td>
<td>Igneous</td>
<td>195875</td>
<td>223965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POWYS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garreg</td>
<td>Hanson Aggregates</td>
<td>Igneous</td>
<td>328760</td>
<td>311935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VALE OF GLAMORGAN</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argoed Isha</td>
<td>Mr Rosser</td>
<td>Limestone</td>
<td>299250</td>
<td>179050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beupre</td>
<td>Unknown Operator</td>
<td>Limestone</td>
<td>300560</td>
<td>173210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cnap Twt</td>
<td>Duchy of Lancaster &amp; others</td>
<td>Limestone</td>
<td>291055</td>
<td>175350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruthin</td>
<td>Lafarge Tarmac</td>
<td>Limestone</td>
<td>297390</td>
<td>179220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Andrews</td>
<td>Mr T Bowles</td>
<td>Limestone</td>
<td>314350</td>
<td>171340</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B70. Whilst any of the sites listed in these tables may be able to contribute to future supply (subject to the suspended and dormant sites obtaining new development consents through the ROMP process⁴), it is only the active and remaining inactive sites which contributed to the reserves figures presented in Table 3.7 of the main document. Reserves at dormant sites are noted separately in Table 3.8 of that document. The active sites and some of the currently inactive ones, together with a small number of other sites which have since closed, contributed to the historical sales over the baseline period (2001 to 2010).

B71. Full lists of active, inactive and dormant sites for individual years prior to 2013 are given in the relevant annual RAWP reports.

---

⁴ ROMP is the acronym for the Review of Old Mineral Permissions, under the Environment Act 1995. Further details are given in the Glossary at the end of the main report.
Apportionments, Allocations and Guidance to MPAs in South Wales

B72. The following pages set out the recommendations and guidance for each individual MPA in South Wales, drawing upon the figures calculated in Chapter 5 of the main document. The MPAs are dealt with in alphabetical order.

B73. In each case, reference to the ‘Plan period’ relates to the end date of the Local Development Plan which has been adopted, or is in preparation (whichever is later) for that particular planning authority.

B74. It should also be noted that the annualised apportionments given for each authority are provided only for the purpose of guiding the total apportionments required over the duration of that particular authority’s LDP.

B75. In all cases, the recommendations are based on currently available information regarding reserves, production, proximity and environmental capacity. As noted in ‘Box 1’ of the original RTS documents, the suggested apportionments and allocations do not take fully into account all factors that may be material to the ensuring an adequate supply of aggregates obtained from appropriately located sources. Such factors may include such things as:
   o The technical capability of one type of aggregate to interchange for another;
   o The relative environmental cost of substitution of one type of aggregate by another;
   o The relative environmental effects of changing patterns of supply; and
   o Whether adequate production capacity can be maintained to meet the required level of supply.

B76. For such reasons, and as already noted in Chapter 1 of the main document, where it is justified by new evidence, it is open for individual MPAs to depart from the apportionment and allocation figures recommended by the RTS. In doing so, however, an MPA would need to demonstrate that their intended departure would not undermine the overall strategy provided by the RTS itself (e.g. by working together with other MPAs to ensure that sub-regional and regional totals are still achieved) and this would be likely to become a key issue at Examination and/or Public Inquiry. Where the local authorities involved are unable to reach agreement, or if individual local authorities do not accept the Regional Technical Statement, the Welsh Government will consider its default powers to intervene in the planning process, as a last resort (MTAN 1, paragraph A3).
BLAENAU GWENT

Apportionment for the future provision of land-won primary aggregates

The planning authority is required to make future provision for land-won primary aggregates within its Local Development Plan on the basis of the following annualised apportionments:

- Land-won sand & gravel provision: Nil
- Crushed rock aggregates provision: 0.17 million tonnes per year until the end of the Plan period and for 10 years thereafter.

These figures are based on the assumption that average annual demand for land-won primary aggregates within the area, over the period to 2036, will be comparable to the average annual sales over the baseline period used in the First Review of the RTS (i.e. 2001 to 2010).

They are also based on the assumption that supplies of alternative aggregates, from marine, secondary and recycled sources, will continue to be maintained in proportions comparable to those experienced during the baseline period.

The accuracy of these assumptions will continue to need to be monitored by the planning authority, using information from various data sources and new surveys (e.g. by NRW, WG etc.) and that data will be used to inform a revision of the apportionment requirements, if this is needed, as part of the next review of the RTS.

It should be emphasised that the annualised apportionments noted above are given only as a guide to the calculation of the total apportionment required over the duration of the LDP. In practice, sales will vary from year to year and there is no requirement for the authority to maintain or limit these in line with either the annualised apportionment or the historical sales averages.

The need for provision to extend beyond the Plan period is based on the requirement in MTAN1 for maintaining landbanks of 7 years for sand & gravel and 10 years for crushed rock, throughout the full duration of the LDP. Subject to this requirement being met, the overall provision at any given time may comprise both landbanks of permitted reserves and allocations for future working, where these are required (see below).

Comparison with existing landbanks

The total apportionments for Blaenau Gwent, as calculated in Table 5.1 of the main document, over the 25-year horizon covered by the First Review of the RTS are zero for land-won sand & gravel and 4.25 million tonnes for crushed rock. These compare with existing landbanks of zero for sand & gravel and 3 million tonnes for crushed rock (as at 31st December 2010).

Allocations required to be identified in the Local Development Plan

In order to address the resulting crushed rock shortfall, new allocations totalling at least 1.25 million tonnes will need to be identified within the LDP. The main requirement (as in the original RTS) is to supplement the existing reserves of Carboniferous Limestone, and a Preferred Area for this has already been identified within the recently adopted LDP (November 2012). The area also has substantial resources of HSA sandstone, however, the future exploitation of which would be beneficial in terms of helping to shift the overall pattern of sandstone production further east, towards the principal markets in England. Again, a preferred area for this is identified within the LDP, along with part of a former opencast site where HSA sandstone might be able to be recovered from former overburden and waste materials.

Consideration should also be given to whether any of the factors set out in paragraph B75 above give rise to any further requirements for resource allocations.
As far as possible, any allocations should be identified as Specific Sites or, failing that, as Preferred Areas. If, as a last resort, it is only possible to identify broad Areas of Search, these should be sufficient to offer the potential of much greater quantities of reserves, in order to reflect the uncertainties involved.

Alternatively, the planning authority may wish to explore collaborative working with one or more adjoining authorities which have a surplus of crushed rock reserves, as indicated in Table 5.3 of RTS 2.

This option should only be pursued, however, where the sites that make up the proposed shared landbank offer advantages, in terms of the proximity principle, environmental capacity and other sustainability criteria, compared with the option of developing new allocations within Blaenau Gwent itself. Any shared landbank agreements should be made in writing with the consent of all parties.

In practice, the options here are very limited in terms of the main requirement for Carboniferous Limestone: although surplus reserves of limestone exist within the Brecon Beacons National Park, Merthyr Tydfil, Caerphilly and Monmouthshire, in all cases these are at sites which are currently inactive and/or within or immediately adjacent to the National Park.

**Use of alternative aggregates**

In the absence of any significant known land-based sand & gravel resources, Blaenau Gwent relies upon supplies of marine-dredged sand, imported via three wharves in Newport.

Secondary aggregates in the form of overburden material from former opencast coal workings may be available for use as general fill and, in part, as a substitute for primary High Specification Aggregate. The main source, at Tir Pentwys, straddles the border with neighbouring Torfaen and has been identified as a Preferred Area within both LDPs. The exploitation of the material within Blaenau Gwent, however, is dependent on access through Torfaen, part of which is the subject of a current planning application; a decision on which will effectively determine the future of this resource.

There is also likely to be continued recycled aggregate production within the area from construction, demolition and excavation wastes.

The residual requirements for primary land-won aggregates assume that all of these alternative materials will continue to be utilised and the authority should continue to encourage this.

**Safeguarding of primary aggregate resources**

Relevant resources of both crushed rock aggregates and land-based sand & gravel have been safeguarded within the LDP, in accordance with detailed advice based on the use of British Geological Survey mapping, prior to the publication of the BGS safeguarding maps.

**Safeguarding of wharves and railheads**

All existing and potential new railheads should be identified for safeguarding within the LDP, in order to provide a full range of sustainable transport options (whether or not they are currently utilised).
BRIDGEND

Apportionment for the future provision of land-won primary aggregates

The planning authority is required to make future provision for land-won primary aggregates within its Local Development Plan on the basis of the following annualised apportionments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land-won sand &amp; gravel provision</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crushed rock aggregates provision</td>
<td>0.75 million tonnes per year until the end of the Plan period and for 10 years thereafter.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These figures are based on the assumption that average annual demand for land-won primary aggregates within the area, over the period to 2036, will be comparable to the average annual sales over the baseline period used in the First Review of the RTS (i.e. 2001 to 2010).

They are also based on the assumption that supplies of alternative aggregates, from marine, secondary and recycled sources, will continue to be maintained in proportions comparable to those experienced during the baseline period.

The figures exclude the provision of limestone for non-aggregate use (primarily for use in the steel industry within neighbouring Neath Port Talbot), for which separate consideration will need to be given in the LDP.

The accuracy of these assumptions will continue to need to be monitored by the planning authority, using information from various data sources and new surveys (e.g. by NRW, WG etc.) and that data will be used to inform a revision of the apportionment requirements, if this is needed, as part of the next review of the RTS.

It should be emphasised that the annualised apportionments noted above are given only as a guide to the calculation of the total apportionment required over the duration of the LDP. In practice, sales will vary from year to year and there is no requirement for the authority to maintain or limit these in line with either the annualised apportionment or the historical sales averages.

The need for provision to extend beyond the Plan period is based on the requirement in MTAN1 for maintaining landbanks of 7 years for sand & gravel and 10 years for crushed rock, throughout the full duration of the LDP. Subject to this requirement being met, the overall provision at any given time may comprise both landbanks of permitted reserves and allocations for future working, where these are required (see below).

Comparison with existing landbanks

The total apportionments for Bridgend, as calculated in Table 5.1 of the main document, over the 25-year horizon covered by the First Review of the RTS are zero for land-won sand & gravel and 18.75 million tonnes for crushed rock. These compare with existing landbanks (excluding dormant sites) of zero for sand & gravel and 47 million tonnes for crushed rock (as at 31st December 2010). These figures exclude limestone reserves which are allocated for non-aggregate use.

Allocations required to be identified in the Local Development Plan

In view of the surplus of existing permitted reserves, no further allocations for future working are required to be identified within the LDP. However, consideration should be given to whether any of the factors set out in paragraph B75 above give rise to any other requirements for resource allocations.

As far as possible, any allocations should be identified as Specific Sites or, failing that, as Preferred Areas. If, as a last resort, it is only possible to identify broad Areas of Search,
these should be sufficient to offer the potential of much greater quantities of reserves, in order to reflect the uncertainties involved.

**Treatment of Dormant sites**

One dormant limestone quarry exists within Bridgend, as detailed in Table B5, above. The planning authority should assess the likelihood of this quarry being worked within the Plan period, subject to the completion of an initial review of planning conditions and submission of an Environmental Impact Assessment. If there is a likelihood of reactivation, and if the quarry is considered by the authority to conform to the definition of ‘Specific Sites’, as set out in paragraph 14 of Minerals Planning Policy Wales, it may be offset against any requirements that may otherwise be identified for allocations for future working.

**Use of alternative aggregates**

Bridgend is currently reliant, for supplies of sand, on marine-dredged material imported via wharves in neighbouring Neath Port Talbot (and perhaps Cardiff). This is despite the existence of limited potential land-based resources within its area, as indicated on BGS resource maps and in reconnaissance-level mapping carried out for the Welsh Government by Symonds Group Ltd. in 2000.

There are no secondary aggregate sources of any significance within Bridgend, although steel/blast furnace slag is undoubtedly delivered by road and/or by sea from Neath-Port Talbot.

In addition, construction, demolition and excavation wastes are generated and recycled at a number of points within the area.

The residual requirements for primary land-won aggregates assume that all of these alternative materials will continue to be utilised and the authority should continue to encourage this.

**Safeguarding of primary aggregate resources**

Resources of both crushed rock aggregates and land-based sand & gravel should be safeguarded within the LDP in accordance with the British Geological Survey’s safeguarding maps, or such other geological information as may be available and suitable for this purpose.

**Safeguarding of wharves and railheads**

All existing and potential new railheads should be identified for safeguarding within the LDP, in order to provide a full range of sustainable transport options (whether or not they are currently utilised).
CAERPHILLY

Apportionment for the future provision of land-won primary aggregates

The planning authority is required to make future provision for land-won primary aggregates within its Local Development Plan on the basis of the following annualised apportionments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land-won sand &amp; gravel provision</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crushed rock aggregates provision</td>
<td>0.76 million tonnes per year until the end of the Plan period and for 10 years thereafter.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These figures are based on the assumption that average annual demand for land-won primary aggregates within the area, over the period to 2036, will be comparable to the average annual sales over the baseline period used in the First Review of the RTS (i.e. 2001 to 2010).

They are also based on the assumption that supplies of alternative aggregates, from marine, secondary and recycled sources, will continue to be maintained in proportions comparable to those experienced during the baseline period.

The accuracy of these assumptions will continue to need to be monitored by the planning authority, using information from various data sources and new surveys (e.g. by NRW, WG etc.) and that data will be used to inform a revision of the apportionment requirements, if this is needed, as part of the next review of the RTS.

It should be emphasised that the annualised apportionments noted above are given only as a guide to the calculation of the total apportionment required over the duration of the LDP. In practice, sales will vary from year to year and there is no requirement for the authority to maintain or limit these in line with either the annualised apportionment or the historical sales averages.

The need for provision to extend beyond the Plan period is based on the requirement in MTAN1 for maintaining landbanks of 7 years for sand & gravel and 10 years for crushed rock, throughout the full duration of the LDP. Subject to this requirement being met, the overall provision at any given time may comprise both landbanks of permitted reserves and allocations for future working, where these are required (see below).

Comparison with existing landbanks

The total apportionments for Caerphilly, as calculated in Table 5.1 of the main document, over the 25-year horizon covered by the First Review of the RTS are zero for land-won sand & gravel and 19 million tonnes for crushed rock. These compare with existing landbanks (excluding dormant sites) of zero for sand & gravel and 27.8 million tonnes for crushed rock (as at 31st December 2010).

Allocations required to be identified in the Local Development Plan

In view of the surplus of existing permitted reserves, and provided that the currently inactive site at Machen is reactivated as and when this is justified by rising demand, no further allocations for future working are required to be identified within the LDP.

However, if Machen remains inactive, despite growing demand, consideration may need to be given to the allocation of additional reserves elsewhere, as discussed in paragraph B64, above.

Consideration should also be given to whether any of the other factors set out in paragraph B75 above give rise to any other requirements for resource allocations.

As far as possible, any allocations should be identified as Specific Sites or, failing that, as Preferred Areas. If, as a last resort, it is only possible to identify broad Areas of Search,
these should be sufficient to offer the potential of much greater quantities of reserves, in order to reflect the uncertainties involved.

**Treatment of Dormant sites**

A total of four dormant quarries exist within Caerphilly, as detailed in Table B5, above. The planning authority should assess the likelihood of each of these sites being worked within the Plan period, subject to the completion of an initial review of planning conditions and submission of an Environmental Impact Assessment. Where there is a likelihood of reactivation, and where the site(s) in question are considered by the authority to conform to the definition of ‘Specific Sites’, as set out in paragraph 14 of Minerals Planning Policy Wales, they may be offset against any requirements that may otherwise be identified for allocations for future working.

**Use of alternative aggregates**

In the absence of any current land-based sand & gravel pits within Caerphilly or adjoining areas (despite the existence of potential land-based resources, as indicated on BGS resource maps), supplies of sand from marine-dredged sources are imported via the wharves in Newport and/or Cardiff. All of Caerphilly lies within 30 to 40 km of those wharves.

Substantial quantities of colliery spoil are understood to exist above Bedwas, Machen, and Llanbradach, but these are generally remote from transport links and therefore difficult to utilise effectively. Moreover, as noted in the original RTS, previous efforts to obtain planning permission for the removal of tips in Machen have been refused. Recycled aggregates from construction, demolition and excavation wastes are likely to be available within most of the major towns within the borough.

The residual requirements for primary land-won aggregates assume that all of these alternative materials will continue to be utilised and the authority should continue to encourage this.

**Safeguarding of primary aggregate resources**

Resources of both crushed rock aggregates and land-based sand & gravel should be safeguarded within the LDP in accordance with the British Geological Survey’s safeguarding maps, or such other geological information as may be available and suitable for this purpose.

**Safeguarding of wharves and railheads**

All existing and potential new railheads should be identified for safeguarding within the LDP, in order to provide a full range of sustainable transport options (whether or not they are currently utilised).
CARDIFF

Apportionment for the future provision of land-won primary aggregates

The planning authority is required to make future provision for land-won primary aggregates within its Local Development Plan on the basis of the following annualised apportionments:

- Land-won sand & gravel provision: Nil
- Crushed rock aggregates provision: 0.86 million tonnes per year until the end of the Plan period and for 10 years thereafter.

These figures are based on the assumption that average annual demand for land-won primary aggregates within the area, over the period to 2036, will be comparable to the average annual sales over the baseline period used in the First Review of the RTS (i.e. 2001 to 2010).

They are also based on the assumption that supplies of alternative aggregates, from marine, secondary and recycled sources, will continue to be maintained in proportions comparable to those experienced during the baseline period.

The accuracy of these assumptions will continue to need to be monitored by the planning authority, using information from various data sources and new surveys (e.g. by NRW, WG etc.) and that data will be used to inform a revision of the apportionment requirements, if this is needed, as part of the next review of the RTS.

It should be emphasised that the annualised apportionments noted above are given only as a guide to the calculation of the total apportionment required over the duration of the LDP. In practice, sales will vary from year to year and there is no requirement for the authority to maintain or limit these in line with either the annualised apportionment or the historical sales averages.

The need for provision to extend beyond the Plan period is based on the requirement in MTAN1 for maintaining landbanks of 7 years for sand & gravel and 10 years for crushed rock, throughout the full duration of the LDP. Subject to this requirement being met, the overall provision at any given time may comprise both landbanks of permitted reserves and allocations for future working, where these are required (see below).

Comparison with existing landbanks

The total apportionments for Cardiff, as calculated in Table 5.1 of the main document, over the 25-year horizon covered by the First Review of the RTS are zero for land-won sand & gravel and 21.5 million tonnes for crushed rock. These compare with existing landbanks of zero for sand & gravel and 41 million tonnes for crushed rock (as at 31st December 2010).

Allocations required to be identified in the Local Development Plan

In view of the surplus of existing permitted reserves, no further allocations for future working are required to be identified within the LDP. However, consideration should be given to whether any of the factors set out in paragraph B75 above give rise to any other requirements for resource allocations.

As far as possible, any allocations should be identified as Specific Sites or, failing that, as Preferred Areas. If, as a last resort, it is only possible to identify broad Areas of Search, these should be sufficient to offer the potential of much greater quantities of reserves, in order to reflect the uncertainties involved.
Use of alternative aggregates

Cardiff is reliant for its sand on marine-dredged aggregates from the Bristol Channel, imported via two wharves within Cardiff docks. Although potential land-based resources are indicated within its area, on BGS resource maps, most of these are sterilised by existing built development.

Some secondary aggregates are available, including steel slag from the electric arc furnace steelworks in Cardiff, but most arisings are fully utilised with relatively small stockpiles.

Construction, demolition and excavation wastes suitable for recycling as aggregate materials are likely to be extensive, amounting to a considerable proportion of the regional total.

The residual requirements for primary land-won aggregates assume that all of these alternative materials will continue to be utilised and the authority should continue to encourage this.

Safeguarding of primary aggregate resources

Resources of both crushed rock aggregates and land-based sand & gravel should be safeguarded within the LDP in accordance with the British Geological Survey’s safeguarding maps, or such other geological information as may be available and suitable for this purpose.

Safeguarding of wharves and railheads

All existing and potential new wharves and railheads should be identified for safeguarding within the LDP, in order to provide a full range of sustainable transport options (whether or not they are currently utilised).
CARMARTHENSIRE

Apportionment for the future provision of land-won primary aggregates

The planning authority is required to make future provision for land-won primary aggregates within its Local Development Plan on the basis of the following annualised apportionments:

- **Land-won sand & gravel provision**: 0.33 million tonnes per year (jointly with Ceredigion, Pembrokeshire and the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park) until the end of the Plan period and for 7 years thereafter.

- **Crushed rock aggregates provision**: 1.07 million tonnes per year until the end of the Plan period and for 10 years thereafter.

These figures are based on the assumption that average annual demand for land-won primary aggregates within the area, over the period to 2036, will be comparable to the average annual sales over the baseline period used in the First Review of the RTS (i.e. 2001 to 2010).

They are also based on the assumption that supplies of alternative aggregates, from marine, secondary and recycled sources, will continue to be maintained in proportions comparable to those experienced during the baseline period.

The accuracy of these assumptions will continue to need to be monitored by the planning authority, using information from various data sources and new surveys (e.g. by NRW, WG etc.) and that data will be used to inform a revision of the apportionment requirements, if this is needed, as part of the next review of the RTS.

It should be emphasised that the annualised apportionments noted above are given only as a guide to the calculation of the total apportionment required over the duration of the LDP. In practice, sales will vary from year to year and there is no requirement for the authority to maintain or limit these in line with either the annualised apportionment or the historical sales averages.

The need for provision to extend beyond the Plan period is based on the requirement in MTAN1 for maintaining landbanks of 7 years for sand & gravel and 10 years for crushed rock, throughout the full duration of the LDP. Subject to this requirement being met, the overall provision at any given time may comprise both landbanks of permitted reserves and allocations for future working, where these are required (see below).

Comparison with existing landbanks

The total apportionments for Carmarthenshire, as calculated in Table 5.1 of the main document, over the 25-year horizon covered by the First Review of the RTS are 7.26 million tonnes for land-won sand & gravel (shared with Ceredigion, Pembrokeshire and the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park) and 26.75 million tonnes for crushed rock (for Carmarthenshire alone). These figures compare with existing landbanks (excluding dormant sites) of 4.32 million tonnes for sand & gravel (between the four authorities) and 47 million tonnes for crushed rock (as at 31st December 2010).

Allocations required to be identified in the Local Development Plan

To address the resulting sand & gravel shortfall, new allocations totalling at least 2.94 million tonnes will need to be identified within the LDPs of one or more of the four authorities over which the apportionment is shared. Paragraph 49 of MTAN 1 notes that landbanks are not required to be maintained within National Parks or Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty. For this reason, allocations will not be required within the National Park unless no environmentally acceptable alternatives can be found within Pembrokeshire, Ceredigion or Carmarthenshire.
In view of the surplus of existing permitted crushed rock reserves, no further allocations for crushed rock are required to be identified within the LDP. However, consideration should also be given to whether any of the factors set out in paragraph B75 above give rise to any other requirements for resource allocations.

As far as possible, any allocations should be identified as Specific Sites or, failing that, as Preferred Areas. If, as a last resort, it is only possible to identify broad Areas of Search, these should be sufficient to offer the potential of much greater quantities of reserves, in order to reflect the uncertainties involved. As noted in the main document, it may sometimes be better (in terms of deliverability) to rely on specific sites in neighbouring authorities (additional to the MPAs’ own requirements), where these have been agreed through collaborative working, in preference to relying upon highly uncertain Areas of Search.

Treatment of Dormant sites

A total of eight dormant quarries exist within Carmarthenshire, as detailed in Table B5, above. The planning authority should assess the likelihood of each of these sites being worked within the Plan period, subject to the completion of an initial review of planning conditions and submission of an Environmental Impact Assessment. Where there is a likelihood of reactivation, and where the site(s) in question are considered by the authority to conform to the definition of ‘Specific Sites’, as set out in paragraph 14 of Minerals Planning Policy Wales, they may be offset against any requirements that may otherwise be identified for allocations for future working.

Use of alternative aggregates

Carmarthenshire is currently reliant upon supplies of sand from marine-dredged sources in the outer Bristol Channel, imported via Burry Port. This is despite the existence of potential land-based resources within its area, as indicated on BGS resource maps.

There are no known sources of secondary aggregates within the County.

Recycled aggregates are likely to be minimal over most of the County, and widely dispersed, although greater concentrations are likely to arise in the south east of the county, coincident with the redevelopment of former industrial areas.

The residual requirements for primary land-won aggregates assume that all of these alternative materials will continue to be utilised and the authority should continue to encourage this.

Safeguarding of primary aggregate resources

Resources of both crushed rock aggregates and land-based sand & gravel should be safeguarded within the LDP in accordance with the British Geological Survey’s safeguarding maps, or such other geological information as may be available and suitable for this purpose.

Safeguarding of wharves and railheads

All existing and potential new wharves and railheads should be identified for safeguarding within the LDP, in order to provide a full range of sustainable transport options (whether or not they are currently utilised).
CEREDIGION

Apportionment for the future provision of land-won primary aggregates

The planning authority is required to make future provision for land-won primary aggregates within its Local Development Plan on the basis of the following annualised apportionments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land-won sand &amp; gravel provision</td>
<td>0.33 million tonnes per year</td>
<td>(jointly with Carmarthenshire, Pembrokeshire and the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park) until the end of the Plan period and for 7 years thereafter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crushed rock aggregates provision</td>
<td>0.2 million tonnes per year</td>
<td>until the end of the Plan period and for 10 years thereafter.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These figures are based on the assumption that average annual demand for land-won primary aggregates within the area, over the period to 2036, will be comparable to the average annual sales over the baseline period used in the First Review of the RTS (i.e. 2001 to 2010).

They are also based on the assumption that supplies of alternative aggregates, from marine, secondary and recycled sources, will continue to be maintained in proportions comparable to those experienced during the baseline period.

The accuracy of these assumptions will continue to need to be monitored by the planning authority, using information from various data sources and new surveys (e.g. by NRW, WG etc.) and that data will be used to inform a revision of the apportionment requirements, if this is needed, as part of the next review of the RTS.

It should be emphasised that the annualised apportionments noted above are given only as a guide to the calculation of the total apportionment required over the duration of the LDP. In practice, sales will vary from year to year and there is no requirement for the authority to maintain or limit these in line with either the annualised apportionment or the historical sales averages.

The need for provision to extend beyond the Plan period is based on the requirement in MTAN1 for maintaining landbanks of 7 years for sand & gravel and 10 years for crushed rock, throughout the full duration of the LDP. Subject to this requirement being met, the overall provision at any given time may comprise both landbanks of permitted reserves and allocations for future working, where these are required (see below).

Comparison with existing landbanks

The total apportionments for Ceredigion, as calculated in Table 5.1 of the main document, over the 25-year horizon covered by the First Review of the RTS are 7.26 million tonnes for land-won sand & gravel (shared with Carmarthenshire, Pembrokeshire and the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park) and 5 million tonnes for crushed rock (for Ceredigion alone). These figures compare with existing landbanks of 4.32 million tonnes for sand & gravel and 13 million tonnes for crushed rock (as at 31st December 2010).

Allocations required to be identified in the Local Development Plan

To address the resulting sand & gravel shortfall, new allocations totalling at least 2.94 million tonnes will need to be identified within the LDPs of one or more of the four authorities over which the apportionment is shared. Paragraph 49 of MTAN 1 notes that landbanks are not required to be maintained within National Parks or Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty. For this reason, allocations will not be required within the

---

5 The Land-based sand & gravel reserves for Ceredigion include the new permission at Crug yr Eyr, even though this was granted after December 2010.
National Park unless no environmentally acceptable alternatives can be found within Pembrokeshire, Ceredigion or Carmarthenshire.

In view of the surplus of existing permitted crushed rock reserves, no further allocations for crushed rock are required to be identified within the LDP. However, consideration should also be given to whether any of the factors set out in paragraph B75 above give rise to any other requirements for resource allocations.

As far as possible, any allocations should be identified as Specific Sites or, failing that, as Preferred Areas. If, as a last resort, it is only possible to identify broad Areas of Search, these should be sufficient to offer the potential of much greater quantities of reserves, in order to reflect the uncertainties involved. As noted in the main document, it may sometimes be better (in terms of deliverability) to rely on specific sites in neighbouring authorities (additional to the MPAs’ own requirements), where these have been agreed through collaborative working, in preference to relying upon highly uncertain Areas of Search.

**Use of alternative aggregates**

As noted in the original RTS, Ceredigion is beyond the notional haulage limit for marine-dredged aggregate from the Bristol Channel. Although there had been some indications that southern Cardigan Bay could provide marine sand and gravel in future years, there has been no further development of this, not least because of the high costs of infrastructure associated with setting this up as a new source of supply.

There are no sources of secondary aggregate within the area and recycled aggregate sources are both minimal and widely dispersed.

**Safeguarding of primary aggregate resources**

Resources of both crushed rock aggregates and land-based sand & gravel should be safeguarded within the LDP in accordance with the British Geological Survey’s safeguarding maps, or such other geological information as may be available and suitable for this purpose.

**Safeguarding of wharves and railheads**

Ceredigion has no operational wharves but has a number of small working harbours. These, together with all existing railheads should be identified for safeguarding within the LDP, in order to provide a full range of sustainable transport options (whether or not they are currently utilised).
MERTHYR TYDFIL / BRECON BEACONS NATIONAL PARK

Apportionment for the future provision of land-won primary aggregates

Jointly, the two planning authorities are required to make future provision for land-won primary aggregates within their Local Development Plans on the basis of the following annualised apportionments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provision</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land-won sand &amp; gravel</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crushed rock aggregates</td>
<td>0.82 million tonnes per year until the end of the Plan period and for 10 years thereafter.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These figures are based on the assumption that average annual demand for land-won primary aggregates within the area, over the period to 2036, will be comparable to the average annual sales over the baseline period used in the First Review of the RTS (i.e. 2001 to 2010).

They are also based on the assumption that supplies of alternative aggregates, from marine, secondary and recycled sources, will continue to be maintained in proportions comparable to those experienced during the baseline period.

The figures exclude the provision of limestone for non-aggregate use, for which separate consideration may need to be given in the LDPs.

The accuracy of these assumptions will continue to need to be monitored by the planning authority, using information from various data sources and new surveys (e.g. by NRW, WG etc.) and that data will be used to inform a revision of the apportionment requirements, if this is needed, as part of the next review of the RTS.

It should be emphasised that the annualised apportionments noted above are given only as a guide to the calculation of the total apportionment required over the duration of the LDP. In practice, sales will vary from year to year and there is no requirement for the authority to maintain or limit these in line with either the annualised apportionment or the historical sales averages.

The need for provision to extend beyond the Plan period is based on the requirement in MTAN1 for maintaining landbanks of 7 years for sand & gravel and 10 years for crushed rock, throughout the full duration of each LDP. Subject to this requirement being met, the overall provision at any given time may comprise both landbanks of permitted reserves and allocations for future working, where these are required (see below).

Comparison with existing landbanks

The total apportionments for Merthyr Tydfil and the Brecon Beacons National Park (combined), as calculated in Table 5.1 of the main document, over the 25-year horizon covered by the First Review of the RTS are zero for land-won sand & gravel and 20.5 million tonnes for crushed rock. These compare with existing landbanks (excluding dormant sites and one suspended site) of zero for sand & gravel and 94 million tonnes for crushed rock (as at 31st December 2010). These figures exclude any limestone reserves which are allocated for non-aggregate use.

Allocations required to be identified in the Local Development Plans

In view of the surplus of existing permitted crushed rock reserves, no further allocations for crushed rock are required to be identified within either of the LDPs. However, consideration should be given to whether any of the factors set out in paragraph B75 above give rise to any other requirements for resource allocations within Merthyr Tydfil.

As far as possible, any allocations should be identified as Specific Sites or, failing that, as Preferred Areas. If, as a last resort, it is only possible to identify broad Areas of Search,
these should be sufficient to offer the potential of much greater quantities of reserves, in order to reflect the uncertainties involved.

Paragraph 49 of MTAN 1 notes that landbanks are not required to be maintained within National Parks or Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty. For this reason, no allocations should be identified within the National Park, unless there are no environmentally acceptable alternatives and efforts should be made to gradually transfer production which currently takes place within the National Park to neighbouring authorities. Given that this production relates only to limestone and that it serves markets which, if not within the National Park, are largely (if not exclusively) to the south and west, it is logical that neighbouring limestone quarries and resources in those areas should be the main focus of any substitution which can be achieved.

**Treatment of Dormant and Suspended sites**

One dormant sandstone quarry exists within Merthyr Tydfil and one in the Brecon Beacons National Park, as detailed in Table B5, above. In addition, the National Park includes one other limestone quarry where planning permission has been suspended, pending the completion of an initial ROMP review. The planning authority should assess the likelihood of each of these sites being worked within the Plan period, subject to the completion of an initial review of planning conditions and submission of an Environmental Impact Assessment. Where there is a likelihood of reactivation, and where the site(s) in question are considered by the authority to conform to the definition of ‘Specific Sites’, as set out in paragraph 14 of Minerals Planning Policy Wales, they may be offset against any requirements that may otherwise be identified for allocations for future working.

**Use of alternative aggregates**

Some imports of sand from marine-dredged sources, imported primarily via wharves in Cardiff to the south, are likely to be utilised in the absence of any current land-based sand & gravel extraction. This is despite the existence of potential land-based resources within both Merthyr and the National Park, as indicated on BGS resource maps and in reconnaissance-level mapping carried out for the Welsh Government by Symonds Group Ltd. in 2000.

As noted within the original RTS, no significant amounts of secondary aggregate are present within Merthyr Tydfil, but volumes of construction, demolition and excavation wastes are likely to be widely available in the main valley areas.

The residual requirements for primary land-won aggregates assume that these alternative materials will continue to be utilised and the authority should continue to encourage this.

Within the National Park, there are very few ongoing mineral workings of any kind and therefore only limited, if any, sources of secondary aggregate. Similarly, there are likely to be only limited quantities of recycled material from local construction and demolition projects. Nevertheless, the National Park Authority should continue to promote the use of these materials where they are available.

**Safeguarding of primary aggregate resources**

Resources of both crushed rock aggregates and land-based sand & gravel should be safeguarded within the LDPs of both authorities, in accordance with the British Geological Survey’s safeguarding maps, or such other geological information as may be available and suitable for this purpose.

**Safeguarding of wharves and railheads**

All existing and potential new railheads should be identified for safeguarding within both LDPs, in order to provide a full range of sustainable transport options (whether or not they are currently utilised).
MONMOUTHSHIRE

Apportionment for the future provision of land-won primary aggregates

The planning authority is required to make future provision for land-won primary aggregates within its Local Development Plan on the basis of the following annualised apportionments:

- Land-won sand & gravel provision: Nil
- Crushed rock aggregates provision: 0.12 million tonnes per year until the end of the Plan period and for 10 years thereafter.

These figures are based on the assumption that average annual demand for land-won primary aggregates within the area, over the period to 2036, will be comparable to the average annual sales over the baseline period used in the First Review of the RTS (i.e. 2001 to 2010).

They are also based on the assumption that supplies of alternative aggregates, from marine, secondary and recycled sources, will continue to be maintained in proportions comparable to those experienced during the baseline period.

The accuracy of these assumptions will continue to need to be monitored by the planning authority, using information from various data sources and new surveys (e.g. by NRW, WG etc.) and that data will be used to inform a revision of the apportionment requirements, if this is needed, as part of the next review of the RTS.

It should be emphasised that the annualised apportionments noted above are given only as a guide to the calculation of the total apportionment required over the duration of the LDP. In practice, sales will vary from year to year and there is no requirement for the authority to maintain or limit these in line with either the annualised apportionment or the historical sales averages.

The need for provision to extend beyond the Plan period is based on the requirement in MTAN1 for maintaining landbanks of 7 years for sand & gravel and 10 years for crushed rock, throughout the full duration of the LDP. Subject to this requirement being met, the overall provision at any given time may comprise both landbanks of permitted reserves and allocations for future working, where these are required (see below).

Comparison with existing landbanks

The total apportionments for Monmouthshire, as calculated in Table 5.1 of the main document, over the 25-year horizon covered by the First Review of the RTS are zero for land-won sand & gravel and 3 million tonnes for crushed rock. These compare with existing landbanks (excluding dormant sites) of zero for sand & gravel and 11 million tonnes for crushed rock (as at 31st December 2010).

Allocations required to be identified in the Local Development Plan

In view of the surplus of existing permitted crushed rock reserves, no further allocations for crushed rock are required to be identified within the LDP. However, consideration should be given to whether any of the factors set out in paragraph B75 above give rise to any other requirements for resource allocations.

As far as possible, any allocations should be identified as Specific Sites or, failing that, as Preferred Areas. If, as a last resort, it is only possible to identify broad Areas of Search, these should be sufficient to offer the potential of much greater quantities of reserves, in order to reflect the uncertainties involved.
Use of alternative aggregates

Marine sand from the Severn Estuary is landed at two wharves in Chepstow, and also at three other wharves in neighbouring Newport. The whole of the county lies within a maximum radius 30 miles from one or more of these wharves and is reliant upon this material. This is despite the existence of extensive potential land-based resources, particularly within the Usk Valley, as indicated on BGS resource maps and in reconnaissance-level mapping carried out for the Welsh Government by Symonds Group Ltd. in 2000.

As noted in the original RTS, there are no significant sources of secondary aggregates in the area.

Recycled aggregates are likely to be available to a limited extent within some of the small rural towns but are these are widely dispersed within the predominantly rural area and are not thought likely to contribute significantly to the overall pattern of supply.

The residual requirements for primary land-won aggregates in Monmouthshire assume that all of these alternative materials will continue to be utilised and the authority should continue to encourage this.

Limestone and land won sand and gravel is also imported by road from England. These imports are less desirable in terms of the proximity principle, but are beyond the control of the local planning authority.

Safeguarding of primary aggregate resources

Relevant resources of both crushed rock aggregates and land-based sand & gravel have been safeguarded within the LDP, in accordance with detailed advice based on the use of British Geological Survey mapping, prior to the publication of the BGS safeguarding maps.

Safeguarding of wharves and railheads

All existing and potential new wharves and railheads should be identified for safeguarding within the LDP, in order to provide a full range of sustainable transport options (whether or not they are currently utilised).
NEATH PORT TALBOT

Apportionment for the future provision of land-won primary aggregates

The planning authority is required to make future provision for land-won primary aggregates within its Local Development Plan on the basis of the following annualised apportionments:

- **Land-won sand & gravel provision**: Nil
- **Crushed rock aggregates provision**: 0.59 million tonnes per year until the end of the Plan period and for 10 years thereafter.

These figures are based on the assumption that average annual demand for land-won primary aggregates within the area, over the period to 2036, will be comparable to the average annual sales over the baseline period used in the First Review of the RTS (i.e. 2001 to 2010).

They are also based on the assumption that supplies of alternative aggregates, from marine, secondary and recycled sources, will continue to be maintained in proportions comparable to those experienced during the baseline period.

The accuracy of these assumptions will continue to need to be monitored by the planning authority, using information from various data sources and new surveys (e.g. by NRW, WG etc.) and that data will be used to inform a revision of the apportionment requirements, if this is needed, as part of the next review of the RTS.

It should be emphasised that the annualised apportionments noted above are given only as a guide to the calculation of the total apportionment required over the duration of the LDP. In practice, sales will vary from year to year and there is no requirement for the authority to maintain or limit these in line with either the annualised apportionment or the historical sales averages.

The need for provision to extend beyond the Plan period is based on the requirement in MTAN1 for maintaining landbanks of 7 years for sand & gravel and 10 years for crushed rock, throughout the full duration of the LDP. Subject to this requirement being met, the overall provision at any given time may comprise both landbanks of permitted reserves and allocations for future working, where these are required (see below).

Comparison with existing landbanks

The total apportionments for Neath Port Talbot, as calculated in Table 5.1 of the main document, over the 25-year horizon covered by the First Review of the RTS are zero for land-won sand & gravel and 14.75 million tonnes for crushed rock. These compare with existing landbanks of zero for sand & gravel and 9 million tonnes for crushed rock (as at 31\(^{st}\) December 2010). These figures exclude any limestone reserves which are allocated for non-aggregate use.

Allocations required to be identified in the Local Development Plan

A new permission for the extension of Gilfach Quarry has been granted since December 2010 and this has more than covered the crushed rock shortfall of 5.75 million tonnes indicated in Table 5.3 of the main document. No further allocations are therefore specifically required by the RTS. However, consideration should also be given to whether any of the factors set out in paragraph B75 above give rise to any other requirements for resource allocations.

As far as possible, any allocations should be identified as Specific Sites or, failing that, as Preferred Areas. If, as a last resort, it is only possible to identify broad Areas of Search, these should be sufficient to offer the potential of much greater quantities of reserves, in order to reflect the uncertainties involved.
Use of alternative aggregates

Neath Port Talbot is reliant, for its supplies of sand, on marine-dredged sources, imported via the three operational wharves at Briton Ferry and Giant’s Wharf. This is despite the existence of limited potential land-based resources within its area, as indicated on BGS resource maps and in reconnaissance-level mapping carried out for the Welsh Government by Symonds Group Ltd. in 2000.

There are considerable secondary aggregate resources within Neath Port Talbot, primarily associated with the reprocessing of steel and blast furnace slag from the Port Talbot steelworks. Most of the slag is fully utilised, partially as construction aggregate and partly as a sustainable alternative to cement. Some of the secondary aggregate is transported by sea to Newport for processing and distribution. One of the largest construction and demolition waste recycling facilities in the region is based at Neath.

In addition, and in common with other MPAs within the South Wales coalfield, the overburden and ‘waste’ associated with opencast coal extraction includes some high PSV sandstone, but these are acknowledged as temporary ‘windfalls’ rather than permanent supply sources (and in any case are included in the figures for primary, rather than secondary aggregates). Future proposals for opencast coal extraction should, nevertheless, be encouraged to utilise such material in order to offset the need for additional allocations of sandstone (subject to there being satisfactory proposals relating to the restoration of these large-scale sites and to the stockpiling and distribution of the stone).

The residual requirements for primary land-won aggregates assume that all of these alternative materials will continue to be utilised and the authority should continue to encourage this.

Safeguarding of primary aggregate resources

Resources of both crushed rock aggregates and land-based sand & gravel should be safeguarded within the LDP in accordance with the British Geological Survey’s safeguarding maps, or such other geological information as may be available and suitable for this purpose.

Safeguarding of wharves and railheads

All existing and potential new wharves and railheads should be identified for safeguarding within the LDP, in order to provide a full range of sustainable transport options (whether or not they are currently utilised).
NEWPORT

Apportionment for the future provision of land-won primary aggregates

By virtue of its lack of suitable crushed rock resources, and the lack of historical demand for land-won sand & gravel production, the planning authority is not required to make any future provision for land-won primary aggregates within its Local Development Plan.

This is based on the assumption that supplies of alternative aggregates, from marine, secondary and recycled sources, will continue to be maintained in proportions comparable to those experienced during the baseline period (2001 - 2010).

The accuracy of these assumptions will continue to need to be monitored by the planning authority, using information from various data sources and new surveys (e.g. by NRW, WG etc.) and that data will be used to inform a revision of the apportionment requirements, if this is needed, as part of the next review of the RTS.

Allocations required to be identified in the Local Development Plan

In view of the lack of apportionment required for Newport, there is no specific requirement for allocations for future working to be identified within the Local Development Plan. This contrasts with the recommendations given in the original RTS which, purely on the basis of the ‘per capita’ approach, required Newport to assess the potential to make a resource allocation in the LDP of 8 to 8.5 million tonnes.

However, consideration should be given to whether any of the factors set out in paragraph B75 above give rise to any other requirements for resource allocations.

As far as possible, any allocations should be identified as Specific Sites or, failing that, as Preferred Areas. If, as a last resort, it is only possible to identify broad Areas of Search, these should be sufficient to offer the potential of much greater quantities of reserves, in order to reflect the uncertainties involved.

Use of alternative aggregates

Newport is supplied with sand from marine-dredged sources within the Severn Estuary and the Bristol Channel, via up to three separate wharves within the city. This is despite the existence of limited potential land-based resources within its area, as indicated on BGS resource maps (most but not all of which are sterilised by existing built development.

The original RTS recommended that the feasibility of sea borne rock imports, via these wharves, should be explored. Discussions with the wharf operators in 2009 suggested that the scope for landing additional tonnages of crushed rock aggregate here is extremely limited (Cuesta Consulting Ltd., 2009). The operations are geared up for the landing and processing of marine-dredged sand. Whilst it would be theoretically possible to land crushed rock, there is insufficient space for both operations to co-exist. In the absence of any current land-based sand & gravel operations in South East Wales, the marine sand is vital to the local construction industry and is therefore unlikely to be displaced by crushed rock imports.

In terms of secondary aggregates, the former Llanwern steelworks previously supplied aggregates derived from blast furnace slag on an ongoing basis, but this ceased when the blast furnace closed in July 2001. The same site does, however, continue to produce Basic Oxygen Steel (BOS) slag from the stockpiles of this material which have accumulated over many previous decades of steel production. In 2009 the operator advised that widely varying estimates had been made regarding the tonnage of ‘reserves’ represented by the remaining stockpiles at Llanwern, ranging up to ‘millions of tonnes’. More conservatively, he estimated that production would be able to be maintained at current rates for ‘at least 10 years’, that is to at least 2019. (Cuesta Consulting Ltd., 2009).

The rail sidings at ‘Monmouthshire Bank’ in Newport were also previously utilised to process spent rail ballast for use as aggregate. However, in March 2009, aggregate
production at this site ceased and Network Rail redistributed the remaining stocks to other sites, elsewhere. This site therefore no longer represents a source of supply for Newport.

Recycled aggregates, produced from construction, demolition and excavation wastes, are likely to continue to provide an important contribution to the overall supply pattern for construction aggregates within this predominately urban area.

The residual requirements for primary land-won aggregates assume that these various alternative materials will continue to be utilised and the authority should continue to encourage this.

**Safeguarding of primary aggregate resources**

Relevant resources of both crushed rock aggregates and land-based sand & gravel should be safeguarded within the LDP, in accordance with detailed advice based on the use of British Geological Survey mapping, prior to the publication of the BGS safeguarding maps.

**Safeguarding of wharves and railheads**

All existing and potential new wharves and railheads should be identified for safeguarding within the LDP, in order to provide a full range of sustainable transport options (whether or not they are currently utilised).
PEMBROKESHIRE / PEMBROKESHIRE COAST NATIONAL PARK

Apportionment for the future provision of land-won primary aggregates

The two planning authorities are already working jointly with regard to minerals planning, with a view to gradually reducing extraction within the National Park. Each authority has an adopted LDP, but they are both committed to working collaboratively with other authorities in south west Wales. In conjunction with Carmarthenshire and Ceredigion they are required to make future provision for land-won primary aggregates within their respective Development Plans on the basis of the following annualised apportionments:

- **Land-won sand & gravel provision:** 0.33 million tonnes per year (jointly with Carmarthenshire and Ceredigion) until the end of the Plan period and for 7 years thereafter.
- **Crushed rock aggregates provision:** 1.09 million tonnes per year until the end of the Plan period and for 10 years thereafter.

These figures are based on the assumption that average annual demand for land-won primary aggregates within the area, over the period to 2036, will be comparable to the average annual sales over the baseline period used in the First Review of the RTS (i.e. 2001 to 2010).

They are also based on the assumption that supplies of alternative aggregates, from marine, secondary and recycled sources, will continue to be maintained in proportions comparable to those experienced during the baseline period.

The accuracy of these assumptions will continue to need to be monitored by the planning authority, using information from various data sources and new surveys (e.g. by NRW, WG etc.) and that data will be used to inform a revision of the apportionment requirements, if this is needed, as part of the next review of the RTS.

It should be emphasised that the annualised apportionments noted above are given only as a guide to the calculation of the total apportionment required over the duration of the LDP. In practice, sales will vary from year to year and there is no requirement for the authorities to maintain or limit these in line with either the annualised apportionment or the historical sales averages.

The need for provision to extend beyond the Plan period is based on the requirement in MTAN1 for maintaining landbanks of 7 years for sand & gravel and 10 years for crushed rock, throughout the full duration of the LDP. Subject to this requirement being met, the overall provision at any given time may comprise both landbanks of permitted reserves and allocations for future working, where these are required (see below).

**Comparison with existing landbanks**

The total apportionments for Pembrokeshire and the National Park, as calculated in Table 5.1 of the main document, over the 25-year horizon covered by the First Review of the RTS are 7.26 million tonnes for land-won sand & gravel (shared with Carmarthenshire and Ceredigion) and 21 million tonnes for crushed rock (for Pembrokeshire and the National Park only). These figures compare with existing landbanks (excluding dormant sites) of 4.32 million tonnes for sand & gravel (between the four authorities) and 35 million tonnes for crushed rock (as at 31st December 2010).

**Allocations required to be identified in the Local Development Plan**

Unless new permissions have been granted since December 2010 to address the resulting sand & gravel shortfall, new allocations totalling at least 2.94 million tonnes will need to be identified within the LDPs of one or more of the four authorities over which the apportionment is shared.
Paragraph 49 of MTAN 1 notes that landbanks are not required to be maintained within National Parks or Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty. For this reason, allocations will not be required within the National Park unless no environmentally acceptable alternatives can be found within Pembrokeshire, Ceredigion or Carmarthenshire, or from the increased use of alternative aggregates, particularly from marine sources.

In view of the surplus of existing permitted crushed rock reserves, no further allocations for crushed rock are required to be identified within either of the two LDPs. However, consideration should be given to whether any of the factors set out in paragraph B75 above give rise to any other requirements for resource allocations.

As far as possible, any land-based allocations should be identified as Specific Sites or, failing that, as Preferred Areas. If, as a last resort, it is only possible to identify broad Areas of Search, these should be sufficient to offer the potential of much greater quantities of reserves, in order to reflect the uncertainties involved. As noted in the main document, it may sometimes be better (in terms of deliverability) to rely on specific sites in neighbouring authorities (additional to the MPAs’ own requirements), where these have been agreed through collaborative working, in preference to relying upon highly uncertain Areas of Search.

Treatment of Dormant sites

A total of three dormant limestone quarries (two in Pembrokeshire and one in the National Park) exist within this area, as detailed in Table B5, above. The planning authorities should assess the likelihood of each of these sites being worked within the Plan period, subject to the completion of an initial review of planning conditions and submission of an Environmental Impact Assessment. Where there is a likelihood of reactivation, and where the site(s) in question are considered by the authority to conform to the definition of ‘Specific Sites’, as set out in paragraph 14 of Minerals Planning Policy Wales, they may be offset against any requirements that may otherwise be identified for allocations for future working.

Use of alternative aggregates

The whole of this area lies within a 30 mile radius of Pembroke Docks, where marine aggregates are landed from dredging in the outer Bristol Channel. The northern part of the area is in closer proximity to land-based sand & gravel sites within the National Park, located to the south-west of Cardigan. The possibility might need to be considered that, as the current permitted reserves at those sites are depleted, marine aggregates may need to provide a greater contribution in future years. For the time being, however, Pembrokeshire should retain a focus on maintaining adequate supplies from terrestrial sources, and all land-based options would need to be thoroughly tested by the Local Plan process before any consideration is given to such a shift in local policy. It should also be recognised that marine sand and gravel cannot always substitute for terrestrial materials in specific end uses.

Slate waste is produced in very small quantities in the northern part of the National Park although the extent to which this has hitherto been utilised as aggregate is understood to be minimal, and the prospects for future utilisation would seem to be equally limited.

Recycled aggregate production from construction, demolition and excavation wastes is likely to be concentrated within the various towns of southern and central Pembrokeshire, outside the National Park.

The residual requirements for primary land-won aggregates assume that all of these alternative materials will continue to be utilised and the authority should continue to encourage this.

Safeguarding of primary aggregate resources

Resources of both crushed rock aggregates and land-based sand & gravel should be safeguarded within the LDP in accordance with the British Geological Survey’s...
safeguarding maps, or such other geological information as may be available and suitable for this purpose.

**Safeguarding of wharves and railheads**

All existing and potential new wharves and railheads should be identified for safeguarding within the LDP, in order to provide a full range of sustainable transport options (whether or not they are currently utilised).
POWYS

Apportionment for the future provision of land-won primary aggregates

The planning authority is required to make future provision for land-won primary aggregates within its Local Development Plan on the basis of the following annualised apportionments:

- **Land-won sand & gravel provision**: Nil
- **Crushed rock aggregates provision**: 2.51 million tonnes per year until the end of the Plan period and for 10 years thereafter.

These figures are based on the assumption that average annual demand for land-won primary aggregates within the area, over the period to 2036, will be comparable to the average annual sales over the baseline period used in the First Review of the RTS (i.e. 2001 to 2010).

They are also based on the assumption that supplies of alternative aggregates, from marine, secondary and recycled sources, will continue to be maintained in proportions comparable to those experienced during the baseline period.

The accuracy of these assumptions will continue to need to be monitored by the planning authority, using information from various data sources and new surveys (e.g. by NRW, WG etc.) and that data will be used to inform a revision of the apportionment requirements, if this is needed, as part of the next review of the RTS.

It should be emphasised that the annualised apportionments noted above are given only as a guide to the calculation of the total apportionment required over the duration of the LDP. In practice, sales will vary from year to year and there is no requirement for the authority to maintain or limit these in line with either the annualised apportionment or the historical sales averages.

The need for provision to extend beyond the Plan period is based on the requirement in MTAN1 for maintaining landbanks of 7 years for sand & gravel and 10 years for crushed rock, throughout the full duration of the LDP. Subject to this requirement being met, the overall provision at any given time may comprise both landbanks of permitted reserves and allocations for future working, where these are required (see below).

Comparison with existing landbanks

The total apportionments for Powys, as calculated in Table 5.1 of the main document, over the 25-year horizon covered by the First Review of the RTS are zero for land-won sand & gravel and 62.75 million tonnes for crushed rock. These compare with existing landbanks (excluding dormant sites) of 0.03 million tonnes for sand & gravel (jointly with Neath Port Talbot) and 119 million tonnes for crushed rock (as at 31st December 2010).

Allocations required to be identified in the Local Development Plan

In view of the large surplus of existing permitted crushed rock reserves, no further allocations for crushed rock are required to be identified within the LDP. However, consideration should also be given to whether any of the factors set out in paragraph B75 above give rise to any other requirements for resource allocations.

As far as possible, any allocations should be identified as Specific Sites or, failing that, as Preferred Areas. If, as a last resort, it is only possible to identify broad Areas of Search, these should be sufficient to offer the potential of much greater quantities of reserves, in order to reflect the uncertainties involved.
Treatment of Dormant sites

One dormant igneous rock quarry exists within Powys, as detailed in Table B5, above. The planning authority should assess the likelihood of this site being worked within the Plan period, subject to the completion of an initial review of planning conditions and submission of an Environmental Impact Assessment. If there is a likelihood of reactivation, and if the site is considered by the authority to conform to the definition of ‘Specific Sites’, as set out in paragraph 14 of Minerals Planning Policy Wales, it may be offset against any requirements that may otherwise be identified for allocations for future working.

Use of alternative aggregates

Powys is not thought to be a significant user of marine-dredged aggregates, in view of its considerable distance from relevant ports and wharves.

Sources of secondary aggregate within the County are thought to be scarce or absent and, in view of the remote and rural nature of much of the County, there is likely to be only a limited degree of recycled aggregate production from construction, demolition and excavation wastes.

Nevertheless, the residual requirements for primary land-won aggregates assume that alternative materials will continue to be utilised to at least the same extent as in the past, and the authority should continue to encourage this.

Safeguarding of primary aggregate resources

Resources of both crushed rock aggregates and land-based sand & gravel should be safeguarded within the LDP in accordance with the British Geological Survey’s safeguarding maps, or such other geological information as may be available and suitable for this purpose.

Safeguarding of wharves and railheads

All existing and potential new railheads should be identified for safeguarding within the LDP, in order to provide a full range of sustainable transport options (whether or not they are currently utilised).
RHONDDA CYNON TAF

Apportionment for the future provision of land-won primary aggregates

The planning authority is required to make future provision for land-won primary aggregates within its Local Development Plan on the basis of the following annualised apportionments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Apportionment</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land-won sand &amp; gravel provision</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crushed rock aggregates provision</td>
<td>0.69 million tonnes per year until the end of the Plan period and for 10 years thereafter.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These figures are based on the assumption that average annual demand for land-won primary aggregates within the area, over the period to 2036, will be comparable to the average annual sales over the baseline period used in the First Review of the RTS (i.e. 2001 to 2010).

They are also based on the assumption that supplies of alternative aggregates, from marine, secondary and recycled sources, will continue to be maintained in proportions comparable to those experienced during the baseline period.

The figures exclude the provision of limestone for non-aggregate use, for which separate consideration may need to be given in the LDP.

The accuracy of these assumptions will continue to need to be monitored by the planning authority, using information from various data sources and new surveys (e.g. by NRW, WG etc.) and that data will be used to inform a revision of the apportionment requirements, if this is needed, as part of the next review of the RTS.

It should be emphasised that the annualised apportionments noted above are given only as a guide to the calculation of the total apportionment required over the duration of the LDP. In practice, sales will vary from year to year and there is no requirement for the authority to maintain or limit these in line with either the annualised apportionment or the historical sales averages.

The need for provision to extend beyond the Plan period is based on the requirement in MTAN1 for maintaining landbanks of 7 years for sand & gravel and 10 years for crushed rock, throughout the full duration of the LDP. Subject to this requirement being met, the overall provision at any given time may comprise both landbanks of permitted reserves and allocations for future working, where these are required (see below).

Comparison with existing landbanks

The total apportionments for Rhondda Cynon Taf, as calculated in Table 5.1 of the main document, over the 25-year horizon covered by the First Review of the RTS are zero for land-won sand & gravel and 17.25 million tonnes for crushed rock. These compare with existing landbanks of zero for sand & gravel and 13 million tonnes for crushed rock (as at 31st December 2010). These figures exclude any limestone reserves which are allocated for non-aggregate use.

Allocations required to be identified in the Local Development Plan

A new permission for the extension of Forest Wood has been granted since December 2010 and a Preferred Area has also been identified in the LDP. The crushed rock shortfall of 5.75 million tonnes indicated in Table 5.3 of the main document is therefore already covered and no further allocations are specifically required by the RTS.

Consideration should also be given to whether any of the factors set out in paragraph B75 above give rise to any further requirements for resource allocations.

As far as possible, any allocations should be identified as Specific Sites or, failing that, as Preferred Areas. If, as a last resort, it is only possible to identify broad Areas of Search,
these should be sufficient to offer the potential of much greater quantities of reserves, in
order to reflect the uncertainties involved.

Alternatively, the planning authority may wish to explore collaborative working with one or
more adjoining authorities which have a surplus of crushed rock reserves, as indicated in
Table 5.3 of RTS 2. This option should only be pursued, however, where the sites that
make up the proposed shared landbank offer advantages, in terms of the proximity
principle, environmental capacity and other sustainability criteria, compared with the
option of developing new allocations within Rhondda Cynon Taf itself. Any shared
landbank agreements should be made in writing with the consent of all parties.

At present, surplus crushed rock reserves (other than those within the Brecon Beacons
National Park) exist within the neighbouring authorities of Cardiff, Bridgend, Merthyr Tydfil
and Caerphilly.

Use of alternative aggregates

As with all other parts of south-east Wales, Rhondda Cynon Taf relies, for its supplies of
sand, on marine-dredged materials from the Bristol Channel. Although limited potential
land-based resources within its area are indicated on BGS resource maps, most of these
are sterilised by existing built development.

Considerable quantities of colliery spoil exist at Tower Colliery, Hirwaun, which closed (for
a second time, following an earlier workers buy-out), in 2008. This material could
potentially be used for low quality fill if there were large contracts nearby, but it would not
meet normal aggregate specifications.

No significant amounts of other secondary aggregates are present within RCT but
reasonable volumes of construction, demolition and excavation wastes are likely to be
widely available for the production of recycled aggregates throughout most of the
urbanised parts of the MPA.

In addition, and in common with other MPAs within the South Wales coalfield, the
overburden and ‘waste’ associated with opencast coal extraction includes some high PSV
sandstone, but these are acknowledged as temporary ‘windfalls’ rather than permanent
supply sources (and in any case are included in the figures for primary, rather than
secondary aggregates). Future proposals for opencast coal extraction should,
nevertheless, be encouraged to utilise such material in order to offset the need for
additional allocations of sandstone (subject to there being satisfactory proposals relating
to the restoration of these large-scale sites and to the stockpiling and distribution of the
stone).

The residual requirements for primary land-won aggregates assume that all of these
alternative materials will continue to be utilised and the authority should continue to
encourage this.

Safeguarding of primary aggregate resources

Resources of both crushed rock aggregates and land-based sand & gravel should be
safeguarded within the LDP in accordance with the British Geological Survey’s
safeguarding maps, or such other geological information as may be available and suitable
for this purpose.

Safeguarding of wharves and railheads

All existing and potential new railheads should be identified for safeguarding within the
LDP, in order to provide a full range of sustainable transport options (whether or not they
are currently utilised). In particular, as noted in the original RTS, opportunities for co-using
rail facilities, (primarily established for opencast coal), for aggregates should be
considered as they arise.
SWANSEA

Apportionment for the future provision of land-won primary aggregates

By virtue of the lack of recent historical demand for HSA sandstone or land-won sand & gravel production within this area; the lack of suitable limestone resources that are not constrained by existing development or by the Gower Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty; and the availability of crushed rock supplies from nearby quarries in adjoining MPAs, the planning authority is not required to make any future provision for land-won primary aggregates within its Local Development Plan.

This is based on the assumption that supplies of alternative aggregates, from marine, secondary and recycled sources, and imports from adjoining MPAs, will continue to be maintained in proportions comparable to those experienced during the baseline period (2001 - 2010).

The accuracy of these assumptions will continue to need to be monitored by the planning authority, using information from various data sources and new surveys (e.g. by NRW, WG etc.) and that data will be used to inform a revision of the apportionment requirements, if this is needed, as part of the next review of the RTS.

Allocations required to be identified in the Local Development Plan

In view of the lack of apportionment required for Swansea, there is no specific requirement for allocations for future working to be identified within the Local Development Plan. However, consideration should be given to whether any of the factors set out in paragraph B75 above give rise to any other requirements for resource allocations.

As far as possible, any allocations should be identified as Specific Sites or, failing that, as Preferred Areas. If, as a last resort, it is only possible to identify broad Areas of Search, these should be sufficient to offer the potential of much greater quantities of reserves, in order to reflect the uncertainties involved.

Paragraph 49 of MTAN 1 notes that landbanks are not required to be maintained within National Parks or Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty. For this reason, no allocations should be identified within the Gower AONB.

Use of alternative aggregates

Swansea imports all of its sand from marine-dredged sources in the Bristol Channel, via wharves in Swansea and in neighbouring Neath Port Talbot. This is despite the existence of potential land-based resources within its area, as indicated on both BGS resource maps and in reconnaissance-level mapping carried out for the Welsh Government by Symonds Group Ltd. in 2000.

Secondary aggregate is also imported (by road) from the Port Talbot steelworks, whilst recycled aggregates from construction, demolition and excavation wastes are likely to be in plentiful supply within the urban areas of Swansea itself.

The residual requirements for primary land-won aggregates, although currently zero, assume that all of these alternative materials will continue to be utilised and the authority should continue to encourage this. It should also promote and facilitate the maximum use of locally-derived recycled aggregates in order to offset the transportation of both primary and secondary aggregates from other sources.

Safeguarding of primary aggregate resources

Resources of both crushed rock aggregates and land-based sand & gravel should be safeguarded within the LDP in accordance with the British Geological Survey’s safeguarding maps, or such other geological information as may be available and suitable for this purpose.
Safeguarding of wharves and railheads

All existing and potential new wharves and railheads should be identified for safeguarding within the LDP, in order to provide a full range of sustainable transport options (whether or not they are currently utilised).
TORFAEN

Apportionment for the future provision of land-won primary aggregates

By virtue of the lack of suitable crushed rock resources that are not constrained by geological limitations or existing development; and the lack of historical demand for land-won sand & gravel within this area, the planning authority is not required to make any future provision for land-won primary aggregates within its Local Development Plan.

This is based on the assumption that supplies of alternative aggregates, from marine, secondary and recycled sources, will continue to be maintained in proportions comparable to those experienced during the baseline period (2001 - 2010).

The accuracy of these assumptions will continue to need to be monitored by the planning authority, using information from various data sources and new surveys (e.g. by NRW, WG etc.) and that data will be used to inform a revision of the apportionment requirements, if this is needed, as part of the next review of the RTS.

Allocations required to be identified in the Local Development Plan

In view of the lack of apportionment required for Torfaen, there is no specific requirement for allocations for future working to be identified within the Local Development Plan. This contrasts with the recommendations given in the original RTS which, purely on the basis of the ‘per capita’ approach, required Torfaen to assess the potential to make a resource allocation in the LDP of 5 to 6 million tonnes.

However, consideration should be given to whether any of the factors set out in paragraph B75 above give rise to any other requirements for resource allocations.

As far as possible, any allocations should be identified as Specific Sites or, failing that, as Preferred Areas. If, as a last resort, it is only possible to identify broad Areas of Search, these should be sufficient to offer the potential of much greater quantities of reserves, in order to reflect the uncertainties involved.

Use of alternative aggregates

The whole of Torfaen is within a maximum distance of 17 miles (26km) of the marine aggregate wharves in Newport. As a consequence, the area is reliant on the supply of sand from marine-dredged sources. Limited potential land-based resources within its area are indicated on BGS resource maps, but most of these are either sterilised by existing built development and/or are unlikely to be commercially exploitable because of their limited extent.

Secondary aggregates in the form of overburden material from former opencast coal workings may be available for use as general fill and, in part, as a substitute for primary High Specification Aggregate. The main source, at Tir Pentwys, has been identified as a Preferred Area within the LDP.

Regeneration schemes in this area are likely to produce construction, demolition and excavation wastes which may be suitable for use as aggregates.

The residual requirements for primary land-won aggregates, although currently zero, assume that all of these alternative materials will continue to be utilised and the authority should continue to encourage this. It should also promote and facilitate the maximum use of locally-derived recycled aggregates in order to offset the transportation of both primary and secondary aggregates from other sources.

Safeguarding of primary aggregate resources

Relevant resources of both crushed rock aggregates and land-based sand & gravel have been safeguarded within the LDP, in accordance with detailed advice based on the use of British Geological Survey mapping, prior to the publication of the BGS safeguarding maps.
Safeguarding of wharves and railheads

All existing and potential new railheads should be identified for safeguarding within the LDP, in order to provide a full range of sustainable transport options (whether or not they are currently utilised).
VALE OF GLAMORGAN

Apportionment for the future provision of land-won primary aggregates

The planning authority is required to make future provision for land-won primary aggregates within its Local Development Plan on the basis of the following annualised apportionments:

- **Land-won sand & gravel provision**: Nil
- **Crushed rock aggregates provision**: 1.09 million tonnes per year until the end of the Plan period and for 10 years thereafter.

These figures are based on the assumption that average annual demand for land-won primary aggregates within the area, over the period to 2036, will be comparable to the average annual sales over the baseline period used in the First Review of the RTS (i.e. 2001 to 2010).

They are also based on the assumption that supplies of alternative aggregates, from marine, secondary and recycled sources, will continue to be maintained in proportions comparable to those experienced during the baseline period.

The figures exclude the provision of limestone for non-aggregate use, for which separate consideration will need to be given in the LDP.

The accuracy of these assumptions will continue to need to be monitored by the planning authority, using information from various data sources and new surveys (e.g. by NRW, WG etc.) and that data will be used to inform a revision of the apportionment requirements, if this is needed, as part of the next review of the RTS.

It should be emphasised that the annualised apportionments noted above are given only as a guide to the calculation of the total apportionment required over the duration of the LDP. In practice, sales will vary from year to year and there is no requirement for the authority to maintain or limit these in line with either the annualised apportionment or the historical sales averages.

The need for provision to extend beyond the Plan period is based on the requirement in MTAN1 for maintaining landbanks of 7 years for sand & gravel and 10 years for crushed rock, throughout the full duration of the LDP. Subject to this requirement being met, the overall provision at any given time may comprise both landbanks of permitted reserves and allocations for future working, where these are required (see below).

Comparison with existing landbanks

The total apportionments for the Vale of Glamorgan, as calculated in Table 5.1 of the main document, over the 25-year horizon covered by the First Review of the RTS are zero for land-won sand & gravel and 27.25 million tonnes for crushed rock. These compare with existing landbanks (excluding dormant sites) of zero for sand & gravel and 13.7 million tonnes for crushed rock (as at 31st December 2010), all of which relates to Carboniferous Limestone. However, these figures exclude limestone reserves which are allocated for non-aggregate use.

Allocations required to be identified in the Local Development Plan

Unless new permissions have been granted since December 2010 to address the resulting crushed rock shortfall, new allocations totalling at least 13.55 million tonnes will need to be identified within the LDP.

Consideration should also be given to whether any of the factors set out in paragraph B75 above give rise to any further requirements for resource allocations.

As far as possible, any allocations should be identified as Specific Sites or, failing that, as Preferred Areas. If, as a last resort, it is only possible to identify broad Areas of Search,
these should be sufficient to offer the potential of much greater quantities of reserves, in order to reflect the uncertainties involved.

Alternatively, the planning authority may wish to explore collaborative working with one or more adjoining authorities which have a surplus of crushed rock reserves, as indicated in Table 5.3 of RTS 2. This option should only be pursued, however, where the sites that make up the proposed shared landbank offer advantages, in terms of the proximity principle, environmental capacity and other sustainability criteria, compared with the option of developing new allocations within the Vale of Glamorgan itself. Any shared landbank agreements should be made in writing with the consent of all parties. In practice, the options here are currently focused on any surpluses of Carboniferous Limestone reserves within Bridgend and Cardiff, since Rhondda Cynon Taf is also facing an overall shortfall in crushed rock provision at the present time.

Treatment of Dormant sites

A total of five dormant limestone quarries exist within the Vale of Glamorgan, as detailed in Table B5, above. The planning authority should assess the likelihood of each of these sites to be worked within the Plan period, subject to the completion of an initial review of planning conditions and submission of an Environmental Impact Assessment. Where there is a likelihood of reactivation, and where the site(s) in question are considered by the authority to conform to the definition of ‘Specific Sites’, as set out in paragraph 14 of Minerals Planning Policy Wales, they may be offset against any requirements that may otherwise be identified for allocations for future working.

Use of alternative aggregates

The Vale of Glamorgan is reliant upon supplies of sand from marine-dredged sources, despite the existence of limited potential land-based resources within its area, as indicated on BGS resource maps and in reconnaissance-level mapping carried out for the Welsh Government in 2000. Until 2005, marine aggregates were imported via Barry Docks but are now supplied from other wharves in neighbouring Cardiff.

There are also substantial resources of secondary aggregate in the form of pulverised fuel ash (pfa) and furnace bottom ash (fba) from the Aberthaw power station, although the quantities utilised for aggregate purposes remain small.

Equally, there is likely to be a modest level of recycled aggregate production from construction, demolition and excavation wastes, primarily in the vicinity of the main urban areas and industrial sites.

The residual requirements for primary land-won aggregates assume that all of these alternative materials will continue to be utilised and the authority should continue to encourage this.

Safeguarding of primary aggregate resources

Resources of both crushed rock aggregates and land-based sand & gravel should be safeguarded within the LDP in accordance with the British Geological Survey’s safeguarding maps, or such other geological information as may be available and suitable for this purpose.

Safeguarding of wharves and railheads

All existing and potential new wharves and railheads should be identified for safeguarding within the LDP, in order to provide a full range of sustainable transport options (whether or not they are currently utilised).
Fig B1: Mid Wales: - Sandstone & Igneous resources in relation to national landscape designations, population density, urban areas and major roads.
Fig B2: Mid Wales: - Sandstone & Igneous resources in relation to assessed Environmental Capacity for future quarrying.
Fig B3: Mid Wales: - Sand & gravel resources in relation to national landscape designations, population density, urban areas and major roads.
Fig B4: Mid Wales: - Sand & gravel resources in relation to assessed Environmental Capacity for future quarrying.
Fig B5: West Wales: - Limestone & slate resources in relation to national landscape designations, population density, urban areas and major roads.
Fig B6: West Wales: Limestone & slate resources in relation to assessed Environmental Capacity for future quarrying.
Fig B7: West Wales: Sandstone & Igneous resources in relation to national landscape designations, population density, urban areas and major roads.
Fig B8: West Wales: - Sandstone & Igneous resources in relation to assessed Environmental Capacity for future quarrying.
Fig B9: West Wales: Sand & gravel resources in relation to national landscape designations, population density, urban areas and major roads.
Environmental Capacity
- Relatively Low Environmental Capacity
- Medium Environmental Capacity
- Relatively High Environmental Capacity
- Not Assessed

* Assessed as part of the ‘IMAECa’ project, (Implementing the Methodology for Assessing the Environmental Capacity for Primary Aggregates - Enviros Consulting Ltd., 2005).

Fig B10: West Wales: - Sand & gravel resources in relation to assessed Environmental Capacity for future quarrying.
Fig B11: South Wales: - Limestone resources in relation to national landscape designations, population density, urban areas and major roads.
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BGS data reproduced under Licence No. 2009/051AA
British Geological Survey © NERC. All rights reserved
Fig B12: South Wales: - Limestone resources in relation to assessed Environmental Capacity for future quarrying.
Fig B13: South Wales: - Sandstone resources in relation to national landscape designations, population density, urban areas and major roads.
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* Assessed as part of the 'IMAECA' project, (Implementing the Methodology for Assessing the Environmental Capacity for Primary Aggregates - Enviros Consulting Ltd., 2005).
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BGIS data reproduced under Licence No. 2009/051AA
British Geological Survey © NERC. All rights reserved.

Fig B14: South Wales: - Sandstone resources in relation to assessed Environmental Capacity for future quarrying.
Fig B15: South Wales: - Sand & gravel resources in relation to national landscape designations, population density, urban areas and major roads.
Fig B16: South Wales: - Sand & gravel resources in relation to assessed Environmental Capacity for future quarrying.
Appendix 2 – Revised Waste Policy Wording

SP21 Waste Management

THE SUSTAINABLE MANAGEMENT OF WASTE ARISINGS IN NEWPORT WILL BE FACILITATED BY PROMOTING AND SUPPORTING ADDITIONAL TREATMENT FACILITIES, MEASURES AND STRATEGIES THAT REPRESENT THE BEST PRACTICABLE ENVIRONMENTAL OPTION, HAVING REGARD TO THE WASTE HIERARCHY, AND THE PROXIMITY PRINCIPLE AND CONTRIBUTE TO AN INTEGRATED NETWORK OF FACILITIES.

2.1 Planning Authorities are required by European Directives and National Guidance to ensure that waste is recovered or disposed of without harming the environment, whilst also meeting stringent waste related targets. The choice of waste management options for a particular waste stream will be guided by the policy principles established in TAN 21 (2014), with particular reference to: The Waste Hierarchy; An Integrated and Adequate Network; Nearest Appropriate Installation; Self Sufficiency; and Protection of Human Health and the Environment. “Best Practicable Environmental Option” (BPEO) taking into account the environmental and economic costs and benefits of different options. The Welsh Government also supports the “proximity principle” requiring that waste should be disposed of, or otherwise managed close to the point at which it is generated, and the principle of “regional self-sufficiency”, each region aiming to provide, as far as possible, sufficient capacity for managing the waste which arises within it.

2.2 Developments should where possible use secondary and recycled aggregates as part of the construction process in accordance with SP22 - Minerals. Wherever possible this should be done without taking materials off site. It is good practice to produce Site Waste Management Plans (SWMP) to encourage resource efficiency and to reduce, recycle and re-use waste on site and as sustainably as possible. The Welsh Government is currently looking at developing regulations requiring the preparation of SWMPs in Wales on construction sites. It is likely that such regulations will be enforced through Building Control and Natural Resources Wales.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevant Objectives and Background Paper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objectives:</strong> 2. Climate Change 10. Waste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Background Paper:</strong> Waste Background Paper</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9 Waste

11.1 Newport has strict EU waste related targets to meet. Newport is aiming to meet these targets through a combination of approaches that adhere to the aim to provide an integrated network of facilities, the proximity principle, dealing with waste as close to where it was generated as possible and to the waste hierarchy of reduce, reuse,
recovery and disposal. At present Newport’s municipal waste is dealt with through the following methods:

- Recycling initiatives and collections carried out in partnership with Wastesavers (a community not for profit recycling group);
- Food collections - Newport is currently working with Rhondda Cynon Taff and Merthyr Tydfil to procure an anaerobic digestion facility to treat food waste collections. Biogen has been announced as the preferred bidder for the anaerobic digestion hub at Bryn Pica, Aberdare. The build and commission process is expected to be complete for 2014;
- A contract tender for the collection of green/card waste has been awarded to New Earth Solutions for 3 years with option for further 2 years without the need to re-tender. The Council’s Docks Way Waste Disposal Site also accepts garden waste.
- Landfill of residual waste at Docksway Waste Disposal Facility, Newport.

11.2 To continue to reduce the amount of waste being sent to landfill and meet the EU and Welsh Government waste targets, Newport City Council is working in a partnership of five Local Authorities in South East Wales – Newport, Cardiff, Monmouthshire, Caerphilly and The Vale of Glamorgan, known as Prosiect Gwyrdd (Project Green). The project is seeking a facility to dispose of the residual municipal waste of the five Councils. Following a period of detailed tender evaluation, the Viridor proposal at Trident Park, Cardiff, has been chosen as the preferred facility to provide a waste management solution for the Member Authorities. The facility will deal with the residual municipal waste from the five Authorities, which cannot be recycled or composted.

11.3 In addition to municipal waste arrangements and facilities, there are a number of private waste treatment facilities located throughout Newport. These deal with a variety of waste streams, including commercial and industrial waste, agricultural waste, and construction and demolition waste. Such waste streams are dealt with through the waste management industry and are monitored and licensed through the Natural Resources Wales.

W1 Waste Site Allocations

LAND IS SAFEGUARDED FOR WASTE DISPOSAL PURPOSES AT DOCKS WAY WASTE DISPOSAL SITE.

11.4 Docks Way Waste Disposal site accommodates a number of waste management facilities in addition to its landfill element. Facilities include household waste recycling centre, open windrow composting facility, landfill gas engines and a waste transfer station. Docks Way Waste Disposal site is a key waste management facility in Newport and is therefore safeguarded for waste disposal purposes.

W2 Sites for Waste Management Facilities

ALL ALLOCATED, PERMITTED AND EXISTING B2 INDUSTRIAL SITES ARE IDENTIFIED AS POTENTIALLY SUITABLE LOCATIONS FOR NEW WASTE MANAGEMENT FACILITIES SUBJECT TO DETAILED ASSESSMENTS, TO MEET THE ESTIMATED LAND REQUIREMENT OF UP TO 12.6 HECTARES.

W3 Waste Management Proposals
DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS FOR SUSTAINABLE WASTE MANAGEMENT
FACILITIES WILL BE PERMITTED SUBJECT TO:

i) MEETING NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY CONSIDERATIONS;

ii) THE NEED FOR PROPOSALS FOR DISPOSING OF THE TYPE, QUANTITY AND SOURCE OF WASTE ASSESSED AGAINST THE LOCAL AND REGIONAL REQUIREMENTS BEING ESTABLISHED.


11.6 The Regional Waste Plan estimates that, within Newport, a maximum of 12.6ha of land will be required for the waste management facilities. The need for future waste facilities will be assessed against the South East Wales Regional Waste Plan, findings of the monitoring arrangements of TAN 21 (2014) and requirements of the Collections, Infrastructure and Markets Sector Plans (July 2012) or subsequent studies that are agreed by the Council to give an accurate assessment of waste capacity requirements.

11.7 In accordance with national guidance, in-building waste facilities will generally be encouraged towards existing general industrial areas (Use Class B2), unless it can be demonstrated that they could be acceptably located elsewhere, or if an assessment indicates that more onerous locational standards should apply. Advances in technology and the introduction of new legislation, policies and practices mean that many modern waste management/resource recovery facilities on the outside look no different to many other modern industrial processes in terms of their operation and impact. The identification of allocated and existing B2 industrial sites as suitable in principle for waste management facilities represents a substantial choice of sites compared with the maximum estimated need of 12.6ha, which the Regional Waste Plan calculates as being required.

11.8 The Regional Waste Plan contains Areas of Search Maps for use in identifying new sites for in-building and open-air waste management/resource recovery facilities. Developers are encouraged to use the recommendations to assist in the identification of potential suitable sites. Any sites identified in this way for development proposals for waste management facilities will be judged on their own merits and in accordance with all the provisions of this Plan.

11.9 Planning applications for waste management facilities will be considered against national planning policy and guidance and other relevant LDP Policies. Technical Advice Note 21: Waste (2001) sets out detailed guidance on specific waste related planning considerations that developers will be required to meet to satisfy the Policy. Additional information relating to Newport’s waste related land use requirements are set out in the Waste Background Paper.

11.10 In accordance with TAN 21: Waste (2001) and the Policies set out in the Plan, waste management facilities will only be permitted if due regard is given to the likely visual impact of the proposed development and its impact on, and the need to protect and enhance, the character of the landscape. If necessary additional design, landscaping, planting and screening should be proposed. Developers will be required to demonstrate potential impact on biodiversity, including designated nature conservation sites. Proposals which are likely to prejudice nature conservation

interests will not be permitted unless the reasons for the development outweigh any likely adverse impact. In addition, restoration of waste sites to after-uses which will enhance or add biodiversity interests will be encouraged.

11.11 Waste management facilities will only be permitted where no unacceptable impacts on air and noise pollution can be demonstrated, particularly on the residents and users of nearby dwellings and other sensitive properties.

11.12 Flood risk is an important consideration in the assessment of waste management proposals. Developments will only be permitted where the issue of flood risk, flood resilience and sustainable drainage measures are addressed in accordance with TAN 15: Development and Flood Risk (2014). Where appropriate, developers will be required to undertake a Flood Consequence Assessment. Impact on surface and ground waters will also need to be thoroughly explored. Proposals considered to have an unacceptable impact will not be permitted. Furthermore, the management of water resources through appropriate conservation and efficiency measures should be achieved in a sustainable manner and without adverse effects on ecology. The Natural Resources Wales has a statutory responsibility to manage water resources through its abstraction licensing procedures.

11.13 Proposals should be designed to a high standard, particularly when proposed in highly visible locations. The development of a facility should adhere to sustainable construction principles. In addition, highest standards of operational practice for the management, working and where appropriate restoration and aftercare of a site will need to be set out.

11.14 It is important that waste schemes do not have a significant adverse effect on land and geological values.

11.15 The impact on the highway will need to be established and where applicable, developers may be required to undertake a Transport Assessment. Proposals considered to have an unacceptable impact on the volume of traffic or road network will not be permitted.

11.16 Proposals that fall within the relevant Schedule of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England and Wales) Regulations 1999 may be required to undertake an Environmental Impact Assessment. A Health Impact Assessment may also be required to establish potential impacts on health or quality of life.

11.17 Planning applications for waste management facilities should be accompanied by sufficient information to allow the environmental impact of the proposal to be adequately assessed. Such information should include the nature of the waste, the broad technical requirements arising from the type of waste, the amount of waste proposed to be treated or disposed of, access, the timescale of the operations and, where appropriate, restoration and after use proposals. In assessing such proposals, close consultation will be undertaken with Natural Resources Wales, and conditions will be attached to any permissions and/or legal agreements sought to ensure adequate environmental safeguards and controls.

**W4 Provision for Waste Management Facilities in Development**

WHERE APPROPRIATE, PROVISION WILL BE SOUGHT IN ALL NEW DEVELOPMENT FOR FACILITIES FOR THE STORAGE, RECYCLING AND OTHER MANAGEMENT OF WASTE.
In order for the Council to continue to meet the challenging waste recycling targets set by the Welsh Government, it is important that new developments facilitate sustainable waste management options. This Policy aims to encourage the recycling of waste materials by the provision of adequate facilities for storage and collection of waste and separation at source. Waste related considerations should be taken into account in the design of the development so that they are properly integrated into it, and fully accessible to collection vehicles.

Further detailed guidance on matters such as the types of facilities required and their design will be set out in Supplementary Planning Guidance.
EXAMINATION IN PUBLIC NEWPORT
LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN 2011 – 2026
POLICY W1 DOCKSWAY LANDFILL AND FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT
MATTERS

Thank you for your enquiry of 24th March 2014.

Our understanding is that the following question has been raised by the Planning Inspector;

“Is allocation W1 Docks Way Waste Disposal Site consistent with paragraph 11.12 concerning flood risk? What evidence demonstrates that the allocation has been fully assessed against the provisions of TAN15 and that the views of Natural Resources Wales concerning flood risk and flood consequences have been sought and taken into account.”

Natural Resources Wales reply is as follows;

Local Development Policy W1 seeks to safeguard the existing waste disposal site known as Docksway Landfill. Our views were sought as part of the revised deposit plan consultation in regard to W1 Docksway Landfill. Our comments contained in representation of 26th July 2013 (ref. 1898716/C.09.90) considered that Policy W1 meets the tests of soundness C2. Having reviewed the question posed by the Planning Inspector and in consideration of flood risk management matters we currently provide the following advice;

Comments made in Newport City Council’s background paper on waste (June 2013) confirms that Newport’s residual waste is disposed of at the Council’s principal waste facility, located at Docksway. At current depositing rates the landfill site has a 16 year life capacity remaining and a potential for a further five years. Having considered the comments made in your Council’s background paper on development and flood risk (June 2013) (which includes the Council’s Strategic Flood Consequence Assessment) our view is that the evidence presented in this paper does not demonstrate that the risks and consequences of flooding can be acceptably managed for the allocation of Docksway Landfill under Policy W1.

The Council will already be aware of the waste management licenses and environmental permits issued for activities at Docksway. Having checked our records in regard to Environmental Permits issued at this site, Docksway Area 2 is supported by a Flood Risk Assessment (prepared by Peter Brett Associates. Dated November 2004. Ref. 14739/025). Having considered this assessment for Local Development Plan purposes, our view is that the assessment only applies to part of the site allocation (Area 2). This assessment would also need to be updated in light of current information and given the requirements of Technical Advice Note 15 Development and Flood Risk (July 2004) (TAN15).
In order to meet the tests of soundness, our view is that three options should be considered being relevant to the requirements of Policy WI;

i. The area of the site affected by Zone C2 of the development advice maps contained in TAN15 and Zones 2 and 3 of our Flood Zone Maps is excluded from the allocation, which will negate the requirement for assessment of the risks and consequences of flooding. (Please refer to the maps enclosed); or

ii. An assessment of the risks and consequences of flooding is submitted and agreed in order to establish the developable area. This assessment is normally undertaken prior to allocation of a site. As part of this assessment it would need to be established whether the area of the former Ebbw River channel (currently an ox-bow lake feature) and any subsequent changes is potentially feasible to extend the landfill or activities; or

iii. Delete the allocation of Docksway Landfill under Policy W1.