



**Chairman-Keith Duff**  
**Secretary - Duncan Pollock**

**Minutes of the Eleventh Meeting of the UK Minerals Forum, held at The IoMMM HQ, 1 Carlton House Terrace, London SW1Y 5DB on Thursday 18 March 2010 at 10.30am.**

**Present; -**  
Keith Duff - Chairman  
Duncan Pollock - Secretary

Andrew Bloodworth – BGS  
David Brewer - Coalpro  
Ruth Chambers - CNP  
John Cummins - DoENI  
Mick Daynes - CBIMG/mpa/Hanson  
Alan Everard - CBIMG/mpa/Tarmac  
Clare Harding - DECC  
Lester Hicks  
David Highley  
Nick Horsley - CBIMG/SAMSA/Sibelco UK Ltd.  
Jon Humble - English Heritage  
Bob LeClerc - CBIMG  
Hugh Llewelyn - Defra  
Hugh Lucas - AI/mpa  
Brian Marker - Former Chairman  
Joanne Smith - Welsh Assembly Government  
Clare Robertson - Environment Agency  
Hannah Townley -Natural England  
Simon van der Byl - mpa  
Chris Waite - SEERAWP/LAWP  
Paul Wilcox - Staffs CC/POS  
Lucy Yates - CLG  
**Apologies**  
John Brumwell - BIS

Dwight Demorais - Lafarge  
Chris Dobbs - CBIMG/mpa/Tarmac  
Peter Doyle - English Stone Forum  
Bob Fenton – CBIMG/MAUK  
Richard Gill – BIS  
Chris Hall – CBIMG/BCC  
Peter Huxtable – CBIMG/BAA/IOM3  
Nigel Jackson- CBIMG/mpa  
Mark Plummer - CLG  
Richard Read – Hampshire CC/POS  
Andy Tickle - CPRE

NB. mpa in lower case refers to The Minerals Products Association

### **11/1 Welcomes and Introductions**

The Chairman welcomed Clare Harding (DECC), Clare Robertson (EA), Hannah Townley (Natural England) and Alan Everard (Tarmac) to their first meeting.

### **11/2 Minutes of the Last Meeting (12 11.09)**

These were agreed, subject to corrections on p.6 which should have referred to Mark Walton as “Alliance Planning” and on p.9 which should have referred to the “Associate Parliamentary Minerals Group”

### **11/3 Matters Arising, Not Dealt with Elsewhere**

Noted – The schedule of Action Points for the 10<sup>th</sup>. Meeting.

An additional action point was reported: -

Minute 10/8 – asking the secretary to forward previous sets of agreed minutes and agendas to BGS for inclusion on the UKMF web site. This had been discharged.

Regarding Minute 10/4, it was noted that the Chairman and Nigel Jackson had agreed an appropriate letter. It was unclear whether this had yet been sent.

Agreed – the Chairman would pursue the issue with Nigel Jackson.

**Action – NJ/Chairman**

### **11/4 Forum Working Groups –General Terms of reference .**

Reported –Following the last meeting, the three Working Groups had been established. The intention was for each group to produce a report to feed into LWM4 in November 2011.

The Terms of Reference document circulated with the agenda papers had been prepared by Nigel Jackson and Bob LeClerc for the Forum to discuss and agree.

Bob LeClerc reported that CBIMG needed feedback on the document and on the budget proposals. The CBI wholly funded the forum and its Working Groups and had to use its resources wisely.

The paper was then discussed in detail and the following key points were addressed: -

Working Group Membership-this was still evolving and the convenors were asked to let the Forum secretary have a full list of current members.

**Action Convenors/Secretary**

On WG1 (Distributing Minerals etc. Paul Wilcox sought views on whether secondary/recycled sources should be included in the project. There were mixed views on this with a consensus that the group should concentrate on primary aggregates but cover secondary/recycled sources if possible. There was also a feeling that all resources should be covered, both within and without the National Parks/AONBs. David Highley pointed out that the AM2009 survey results should be available in March 2011.

On WG2 (Planning Skills), David Brewer felt that it was important to accept there was a problem and for the group to decide what actions were needed to deal with the problem – an additional objective. He reported that this group was currently light on members.

Working Group 3( Communities etc) . The aims and objectives were agreed.

Process Generally:-The following key points were made:-

- The Minerals Products Association could offer its London meeting rooms for the WG meetings including a hi-tech video conferencing facility to save some members needing to travel to London.
- On the November deadlines there was a feeling that this might be too close to LWM4, and that it might be better to work to a July 2011 deadline.
- Agreed – this should be kept under review and discussed again at the June 2010 Forum meeting. **Action – Secretary**
- On budgets/use of experts it was agreed that the WGs should try and sort this out for themselves within the limitations of the finances set out in the report.

### **11/5 Working Groups Progress Reports:-**

Noted –The groups had been incorrectly numbered in the agenda paper. This would be corrected –

**Action –Secretary**

## **Working Group 1 Distributing Minerals to Future Markets and Aggregate Supplies from outside the National Parks/AONBs**

Reported- by Paul Wilcox –

Two papers had been circulated with the agenda papers – a note of the Group’s first meeting in January 2010 and a finalised brief/working programme for the Group. There was a need for the Group to encompass views from the devolved administrations including data on cross-border flows and also to cover coal. A detailed mineral resource base was essential for the Group’s work. The Group would concentrate on the Stage 1 resources work and then move on to Stages 2/3 (Analysis) later in the project. The next meeting had been arranged for June 2010. The group needed to talk to DEFRA regarding ALSF funding but were unsure whether ALSF funding could cover issues of the devolved nations and of coal.

There was a brief discussion on the process for securing ALSF funding which was in two stages – an” expression of interest” brief followed by the full ALSF application.

Simon van der Byl noted that the General Election outcome would influence the work of the Group, as would the results of the EU Raw Materials Initiative.

Agreed: -

- i. The ALSF funding issue should be pursued. **Action – Convenor/CBI**
- ii. Contact names in the devolved administrations were needed. **Action – Secretary**
- iii. The work should cover all resources and not just those in the National Parks/AONBs
- iv. The work should include coal issues including imports

## **Working Group 2 –Planning Skills Issues**

Reported by David Brewer: -Progress in establishing the Group had so far been slow, and he was having difficulty getting sufficient volunteers and agreed dates for the first meeting. He intended to start the work by e-correspondence. It was as yet unclear whether the focus should be on minerals planning skills only or on the wider skills issues generally. He had a helpful input from Lester Hicks and was in touch with POS (David Palk - Suffolk CC). Mark Plummer (CLG) had also provided useful material. There was a need for input from RTPI/RICS . He was concerned at the lack of input so far from Forum members. He was also unclear whether large mineral planning application cases were being delayed by shortages of skills in the MPA’s, in the industry and in the consultee agencies. He also felt the recession may have been delaying casework and wondered whether planning skills shortages were still a front line issue.

He asked for support on three key issues

- i. A meeting in May.
- ii. The need to offer solutions after the basic research and,

- iii. Is there just a minerals planning skills shortage or is it about MPA resources generally?

Simon van der Byl reported that the EU Raw Materials Initiative could result in an EU wide best practice guide, with perhaps pressure for a one-stop shop permitting system. He also wondered whether the skills shortages were also a problem in the agencies.

Members felt that the WG membership should include Mark Walton (Alliance Planning), Ken Hobden (mpa) and an RTPI representative.

Nick Horsley also reported that the ROMPs system could be delayed by shortages of qualified minerals planners. He promised to circulate an article in the Daily Telegraph (18 March 2010) and which seemed to say that there had been a 94% increase in planners.

**Action – Nick Horsley**

Lester Hicks felt that part of the problem was that minerals and waste planning were not attractive careers in the eyes of graduate planners, and there was a need to retain a minerals planning element in the Planning Schools. Subject to confirmation by CLG, he understood the Welsh Assembly Government was intending to make planning student bursaries conditional on courses maintaining minerals and waste modules.

Hugh Lucas believed that there was also a problem with planners having their advice ignored by planning committees.

Bob LeClerc reported that the forthcoming report of the Penfold Review on Non-Planning Consents would be relevant to the work of the Group.

DEFRA reported on the current study of the interface between the permitting and planning systems.

Paul Wilcox reported that Unitary Authorities tended to seek generalist planners as they had insufficient work for specialised minerals planners. He also reported that POS were doing a benchmarking study, service-wide to compare planning resources/use of planners.

### **Working Group 3 - Communities and Communications.**

Noted:-The progress report circulated with the agenda papers.

Reported:-by Brian Marker-the Group had yet to meet but was currently scoping the issues by e-correspondence. Three elements had been identified: -

- i. A strategic statement explaining the importance and need for minerals.
- ii. The need for a supplementary Q & A brief to answer some of the commonly asked questions, and –
- iii. The need for case studies to show how communities and NGOs deal with mineral issues.

The Group would concentrate initially on elements (i) and (ii) and hoped to report progress at the June Forum meeting. Phase (iii) work including methodology on how to relate to a target audience should be ready for reporting to the November Forum meeting. The aim was to prepare a first draft report early in 2011. The Group needs suggestions on how to proceed and on the draft Q & A's.

Simon van der Byl advised again on the relevance of the General Election and of the EU Raw Materials Initiative to the work of the Group.

Brian Marker felt it would take some time after the Election for planning policies to be firmed up. Lester Hicks felt, nevertheless, the broad direction of policies, post election should be clear, unless there was a hung Parliament

Paul Wilcox believed that a key question from a community would be what could the industry do for them?

Hugh Lucas felt it was unrealistic for the Group to produce a detailed manual of community involvement –there was neither the time nor the resources for this. The issue was how to get the key messages across in the light of the need for minerals.

Lester Hicks noted that communities often regarded a minerals application as a “Trojan Horse” for later proposals for landfill. The refusal that week by Northants CC of proposals for disposal of low-level radioactive waste in a former clay pit confirmed that post-mineral uses were themselves often controversial. Local people were concerned that the move from Greenfield sites to mineral working would lead on to further, possible permanent, unwelcome, brownfield uses. Improvements to communications had to look beyond the immediate mineral proposal.

Brian Marker concluded he would adjust the brief in the light of the views tabled and would provide an update report to the June Forum meeting. **Action – Brian Marker**

Noted: - Emma Bee (BGS) should be added to the list of Group members

#### **11/6 LWM4**

Discussed: -the possible key theme for LWM4, now confirmed for 7 November 2011

Bob LeClerc reported there was a need to theme the conference. CBIMG would attempt to do this at their April 2010 meeting with a view to a first flyer being issued in June 2010.

Members made the following key points: -

- The Working Group reports should, as before, be a key component
- The outcome of the General Election would shape the LWM4 issues.
- The work of The Associate Parliamentary Minerals Group was relevant and would help to get politicians involved.
- Issues of non-aggregate strategic minerals should be covered.

- Some of the issues at the May 2010 MPA/RTPI Conference would be relevant
- Energy issues were coming to the fore again.
- Whole life costing was also a relevant issue along with climate change and community issues.

Agreed: -The issues should be discussed again at the June Forum meeting.-

**Action –**

**Secretary**

### **11/7 Pilot Local Engagement Event.**

In the absence of Nigel Jackson and Richard Read no progress could be reported.

Agreed: - This should be addressed again at the next meeting. **Action – Secretary**

### **11/8 Carbon Issues/Carbon Trust**

Lester Hicks noted that he had not yet been able to meet Nigel Jackson on this issue.

Continuing he stressed the continuing relevance of carbon issues for the minerals sector. He noted that the need was to consider how the sector, collectively might take action rather than doing further work in the Working Groups. Politically, although the General Election was imminent, carbon issues had gone down the political agenda. Climate change scepticism had emerged as a key political problem. However, the present government was still working hard on climate change matters. A new draft PPS on climate change and renewable energy had been issued for consultation by CLG the previous week.

Clare Harding (DECC) confirmed that carbon issues had moved down in priority and that climate change scepticism and how to deal with it was a key problem, but that officials were pressing on with work on carbon reduction and adaptation to climate change.

Lester Hicks reported that the National Policy Statement on Energy was not now due until after the General election.

Andrew Bloodworth felt carbon remained a key policy issue for the mineral industries especially with the current plethora of proposals for carbon capture and in-situ coal gasification. He noted that some of the carbon capture schemes required use of other minerals.

The Chairman suggested that Lester Hicks, Nigel Jackson and Andrew Bloodworth get together to prepare a view ready for the next Forum meeting to include suggestions of what the Forum might do, in the light of the outcome of the Election.

**Action – LH/NJ/AB**

### **11/9 CLG Review of Minerals Policy Statements /CLG Update.**

Reported: - by Lucy Yates (CLG)

- CLG were currently working on proposals to streamline the planning system – the recent BGS workshops were part of this process and had proved to be a useful forum.
- The reports on the BGS workshops should be with CLG by the end of March after which CLG would need to decide whether to publish them, after the Election.
- CLG were examining new styles of policies in streamlined form and will consider the different options such as a minerals PPS..
- The AM2009 forms were finalised. The start of the survey was imminent.
- The RAWP Review has informed a submission to Ministers regarding future options. The submission is still being considered and CLG would report to RAWP Secretaries once the outcome is known.
- Three consultations were currently live – on improving engagement with statutory/non statutory consultees, - on pro-active planning from pre-application to delivery, and on Planning Obligations.
- The reports on the BGS workshops should be with CLG by the end of March after which CLG would need to decide whether to publish them – after the Election
- There was also a CLG consultation on a Planning Policy Statement – “Planning for a Low Carbon Future in a Changing Climate” and a Planning Policy Statement for a “Natural and Healthy Environment”

### **11/10 UKMF Website**

Reported:- by Andrew Bloodworth – there was a need to update the website and to decide how to do this on a continual basis this. He felt a small group was needed to steer the process.

Agreed: -:-Andrew Bloodworth,Bob LeClerc,David Highley,Clare Robertson and the Chairman should all assess the current website to identify potential improvements and make recommendations on actions needed. This should be done by e-mail.

**Action :- Chairman,Andrew Bloodworth,BobLeClerc and Clare Robertson**

### **11/11 The EU Raw Materials Initiative.**

Reported: - by Simon van der Byl - there were two parallel working groups dealing with this issue with Jo Mankelow (BGS)/Ken Hobden(mpa) on one and Simon van der Byl on the other. Both would hold final meetings in April. Land Use Consultants (Jon Grantham) had been retained to progress the reports. The work had shown there was a lack of EU wide knowledge of geological resources, and a lack of consistency of information.

One outcome would be to improve the EU wide geological base and to make the data more accessible. A best practice guide on permitting was a likely outcome. There remained a possibility of an EU wide minerals policy statement. Final reports had to

be with the Commission by the end of June. The groups would meet on Madrid on 16/17 June to agree the final report.

Statistics on geological resources, production and distribution remained inconsistent.

Although the study was not looking at energy minerals or all metals, there was a parallel study by the European Fossil Fuels Forum, which was covering energy issues. DECC reported that the next meeting this Forum was in April 2010.

### **11/12 Other Issues of Interest**

- a) EU Habitats Directive –No progress reported
- b) EU Soils Directive –No progress reported
- c) EU Mines Waste Directive – Noted –the Environment Agency was working with CBIMG to progress implementation and key meetings are coming up in April in anticipation of the December 2010 deadline for applications.
- d) Minerals Mapping in Wales –Reported – the Aggregates Safeguarding Maps were being progressed and the overall resources maps should be ready for dissemination on June 2010.
- e) ALSF Local Funding Issues –Reported: -CNP was meeting DEFRA to discuss the need to maintain the ALSF system. It was agreed that the Forum should support continuation of ALSF with an appropriate letter **Action – Chairman/Ruth Chambers/Brian Marker.Nigel Jackson to agree draft for Chairman to send**

Agreed –The “Other issues of Concern” agenda item should be deleted from future agendas and dealt with under “AOB” **Action – Secretary**

### **11/13 Any Other Business**

Bob LeClerc felt it would be useful for each Forum meeting to have brief progress reports from the Wales, NI, and Scots representatives. This was agreed.

**Action - Secretary.**

### **11/14 Dates of Next Meetings**

Thursday 17 June 2010 and Thursday 18 November 2010 at 10.30 am in London.

