

Bidford Roadshow: 10th March 2006

Attendees: 18 individuals and 16 late arrivals
Cllr Chris Saint (Chair)
Jasbir Kaur (Warwickshire County Council)
Jim Davies (Warwickshire County Council)
Rebecca Bailey (Warwickshire County Council)

1. There was an opportunity to have some refreshments and browse the documents and flyers relating to primarily the Minerals consultation, but also the Waste consultation.
2. The meeting was opened by Councillor Chris Saint (Cabinet member with responsibility for planning issues) at 6:15pm
3. Jasbir Kaur gave a brief presentation on the Minerals Development Framework consultation process
4. Jim Davies gave a presentation on the Minerals Development Framework itself.
5. Then there was an opportunity for questions and answers. Some of the answers were provided on the night whereas other questions were deferred and our considered answers are included in the table below:

Questions	Answers
1. Concern that the event wasn't adequately advertised with only a small article in the local paper.	Publicity consisted of: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Mailshot to to every Parish Council in the county;• Mailshot to everyone on our mailing list (around 1,000 individuals/organisations);• E-mail to each County and District/Borough Councillor;• Posters advertising the events in every library in the county;• Used number of environmental groups and Local Strategic Partnerships for wider circulation to their networks;• Sent out press release before roadshows and reminder press release during roadshow period. Any concerns with how the editor modifies Warwickshire County Council (WCC) press releases needs to be raised with the individual newspapers concerned.
2. It was not clear that this would be a meeting not a roadshow.	WCC can attempt to be more specific in future consultations, but the intention was never to misguide the public to think that the roadshows

	<p>consisted of an exhibition rather than presentations. The term roadshow was merely used to describe the same event being repeated at a number of locations throughout the county.</p>
<p>3. A gentleman quoted from MPS2 Appendix A: Community Consultation and Involvement and wanted to know how we were meeting the requirements set out.</p>	<p>Cllr Saint explained the current stage in the context of the entire Statement of Community Involvement process.</p>
<p>4. Issues were raised about previous consultation events (on the planning application) and the lack of feedback. Particular references made to the event on 28th November – there is a distrust between residents and operators, including discrepancies between figures. There were requests for openness and honesty.</p>	<p>JK outlined the preliminary application consultation process which includes WCC compiling comments from experts and local residents and returning them to the operator. This is continued throughout the application process.</p>
<p>5. There was an in-depth discussion about a specific application that has since been withdrawn.</p>	<p>The purpose of this meeting was not to discuss the detail of previous applications, but with developing a Core Strategy for the Minerals Development Framework.</p>
<p>6. There was criticism of the wording of the questionnaire (especially question 2a) and difficulty in finding the guidance it refers to.</p>	
<p>7. There were questions raised about the value of the Minerals Development Forum.</p>	<p>The aim of the Minerals Development Forum is to bring together community groups, interested individuals, environmental groups and representatives from the minerals industry.</p>
<p>8. Local knowledge is important – how can they get the areas of search out of the plan?</p>	<p>If relevant issues are highlighted as WCC develops its Minerals Core Strategy and Site Allocations plan then these issues will be considered before identifying appropriate sites.</p>
<p>9. What local knowledge will contribute to the Minerals Development Framework and the removal of the site from the plan?</p>	<p>JK suggested collating issues raised in the previous planning application.</p>
<p>10. How can we prevent the</p>	<p>WCC could add time limits to</p>

mothballing of sites?	planning applications through the Minerals Core Strategy if this issue is raised in consultation.
11. What are our levels now compared to our apportionment?	JD referred to the West Midlands Regional Aggregates Working Party report. The landbank was 8.91 yrs in 2003 and is currently estimated to be about 7yrs.
12. What is our current landbank?	JD mentioned that our landbank was 8.1 years in 2003, but there have been problems with collecting more recent figures. The Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) will supply the updated landbank figures once those figures have been collected. The AMR is produced in December each year.
13. Is there a mechanism to encourage re-use targets?	Nationally the incentive to re-use is: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landfill tax • Aggregates Levy to fund research into further recycling and improved efficiency initiatives.
14. How much guidance will we take from WRAP? How are we comparing to other counties?-	Recycled aggregates are an issue for the Waste Development Framework, but there will be links through to the Minerals Development Framework as well.
15. Will the framework allow for the examination of current planning policies?	The Minerals Development Framework will be rewriting these current policies.
16. Requests for operators to be more robust, accountable and open.	The arena for open discussions with operators is through the Resident Liaison Committees. Perhaps consider the inclusion of new means of monitoring in the revised Minerals Core Strategy.

6. Cllr Saint formally closed the meeting at 8 pm.