



Chairman-Keith Duff
Secretary - Duncan Pollock

Minutes of the Twelfth Meeting of the UK Minerals Forum, held at The IoMMM HQ, 1 Carlton House Terrace, London SW1Y 5DB on Thursday 17 June 2010 at 10.30am.

Present; -

Keith Duff - Chairman
Duncan Pollock - Secretary

David Brewer - Coalpro
Ruth Chambers – CNP
Laura Cohen – CBIMG/BCC
John Cummins - DoENI
Mick Daynes - CBIMG/mpa/Hanson
Alan Everard - CBIMG/mpa/Tarmac
Clare Harding - DECC
Lester Hicks
David Highley
Ken Hobden - mpa
Nick Horsley - CBIMG/SAMSA/Sibelco UK Ltd.
Jon Humble - English Heritage
Peter Huxtable – CBIMG/BAA/IOM3
Nigel Jackson – CBIMG/mpa
Bob LeClerc - CBIMG
Hugh Llewelyn - Defra
Brian Marker - Former Chairman
Mark Plummer – CLG
Richard Read – Hampshire CC/POS
Clare Robertson - Environment Agency
Chris Waite - SEERAWP/LAWP
Paul Wilcox - Staffs CC/POS
Lucy Yates - CLG

Apologies
Andrew Bloodworth - BGS
John Brumwell – BIS
Peter Doyle - English Stone Forum
Bob Fenton – CBIMG/MAUK
Richard Gill – BIS
Chris Hall – CBIMG/BCC

John Hernon – Lafarge
Hugh Lucas – CBIMG/mpa/AI
Joanne Smith – Welsh Assembly Government
Andy Tickle – CPRE
Hannah Townley – Natural England
Simon van der Byl – CBIMG/mpa

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

12/1 Welcomes and Introductions

The Chairman welcomed Laura Cohen (CBIMG/BCC) and Ken Hobden(mpa) to their first meeting.

12/2 Minutes of the Last Meeting (18 3.10)

These were agreed, without amendment.

12/3 Matters Arising, Not Dealt with Elsewhere

These were summarised on the paper circulated with the agenda. The following updates were reported: -

Minute 11/3 – the letter to Ministers (CLG/DEFRA) was being delayed until the dust had settled post General Election

Minute 11/5 – all outstanding issues had been completed.

Minute 11/10 – the Forum website had been updated and had gone live on 16.6.10.

Minute 11/12 – the letter re. ALSF had been redrafted with assistance from NJ/BobLeClerc/RC and BM and would be sent after checking whether there was anything on the Levy/ALSF in the Budget due the following week and, subject to members' views. The letter sought support for the ALSF and drew attention to the declining amounts spent by Local Authorities on real improvements in the aggregate quarrying areas. The letter would remind Ministers of the purpose of the fund. Members were asked to send comments on the draft to the Secretary asap. The letter would refer to marine issues.

Action – Members and Secretary

12/4 UKMF 2010/11 Working Groups

Discussed: - the programme and arrangements for the three Working Groups.

Agreed: -

- i. The Working Groups should aim to complete their reports to a 31 July 2011 deadline.
- ii. Summary progress reports for each Working Group were needed for the Forum website and which should cover –a) WG objectives
b) Progress
c) List of WG members
- iii The above reports should be forwarded to the Secretary by 2.7.10.
- iv CBIMG would try and harmonise the style of the reports for the website.

Action: -Convenors and Members

Noted: -- The Working Group progress reports circulated with the agenda papers differed in format and style.

Agreed: - for future Forum meetings, the WG progress reports should be provided in summary form rather than as full minutes. Nigel Jackson offered to produce a template for the reports to the Forum.

Action – Convenors to note format of reports required for future meetings.

Action – NJ to produce template for reports

12/5 UKMF 2010/11 Working Group Progress Reports

a) Working Group 1 – Distributing Minerals to Future Markets and Aggregate Supplies from outside the AONBs and National Parks

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

Paul Wilcox highlighted the following issues: -

- The scope of the work had changed as it could now form part of a MIRO research project on this subject- an ALSF funded project-covering aggregates in England.
- The Working Group was still waiting for the full MIRO brief and for notification of the contractor.
- The MIRO project was to be completed in January 2011.
- The AM 2009 results were expected in March 2011.

- Both of the above reports would be needed to enable the WG to report to the March 2011 Forum meeting.
- The current changes to the Planning System would affect the outcome of the WG report.
- Both Peter Huxtable and Jerry McLaughlin(MPA) were members of the MIRO evaluating committee which would assist in keeping the WG work and that of MIRO in harmony.

Bob LeClerc reported that the CBI work on infrastructure was relevant and he would provide the details of the relevant CBI contact to the convenor.

Action – Bob LeClerc

b) Working Group 2 – Planning Skills Issues-

Noted – The progress report circulated with the agenda papers.

David Brewer highlighted the following key issues: -

- After a slow start the Working Group was now well established with a good list of members at the 17 June meeting.
- The main issue was not just a numbers issue. There had been an increase in overall planner numbers in recent years but not of minerals planners.
- Minerals planning was not seen as an attractive career option and there was a continuing loss of senior minerals planners through retirements and reorganisations.

In the discussions on the report members made the following key points: -

- Issues (i) and (ii) were felt to be contradictory and needed rewording to emphasise that both minerals applications and onward monitoring needed minerals specific skills.
- Training of councillors was felt to be a thorny issue –councillors already had training days and the real need was to get them to think strategically when dealing with minerals issues.
- The new localism agenda of the Coalition Government would test the need for strategic decision-making.
- The councillor presentations at the recent MPA/RTPI conference were helpful and pointed up the need for better councillor training on mineral issues- was there a case for a “Minerals Champion” on each planning committee?.
- The RTPI Planning Summer School might provide a useful forum for instructing councillors on minerals issues.
- There was a potential problem when local MPs got involved with mineral cases, especially if PQs were tabled.
- Much of this issue crossed over into the work of WG3.

c). Working Group 3 - Communities and Communication

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

Brian Marker highlighted the following key issues: -

The aim was to build understanding and trust - people needed to be drawn into a dialogue at the pre-application stage. He felt there were three threads to the work: -

- i. The need for making public all available information and the need to explain to the public how the system worked.
- ii. Investment in the future-better educational material –use of the BGS sessions for schools, the need for an education package on the lines of MPA’s “Virtual Quarry”.
- iii. The issue of how to communicate –a later part of the work.

By the end of July 2010, the group should have progressed issues (i) and (ii) but might need back up from a professional advisor.

The aim was to have made substantial progress for the LWM4 deadline and to ensure harmonisation on the issues with WG2.

Mark Plummer (CLG) drew attention to the BGS/CLG contract relevant to this work and which would report in March 2011. Funding remained available for dissemination of that work. He would contact Brian Marker and David Brewer to discuss what help the BGS work can give to these WG projects. WG 3 would talk to CLG in this respect in July/August 2010.

In conclusion the Chairman asked for the WG progress reports for the next Forum meeting to cover the need to give a feel for the emerging WG issues and the need or not to secure Forum guidance on future WG work.

Action - Convenors

12/6 LWM4

Reported by Nigel Jackson the following key issues re. LWM4:-

- The event remained a big commercial risk for CBI
- Reports from the Hillhead exhibition indicating a returning confidence in such events.
- The aim was to cover a wide list of topics to attract a wider, larger audience.
- The LWM3 event had made a surplus last time and needed to this time as well to aid the funding of the UKMF.
- The aim was to get the CBI DG or John Cridland to give the keynote address.
- A “Star” speaker was also needed.
- The event needed to cover global/EU and UK issues and International speakers were needed.

- Other issues to be covered were the EU Raw Materials Initiative, Education-Make The Link and the work of the three Forum WGs.
- Michael Rodd would facilitate the event, as at LWM3 before and interactive voting could again be included.
- The overall conference theme had yet to be discussed- he was meeting Bob LeClerc to discuss this later that day.
- He aimed to have a draft programme for the event in time for the November 2010 Forum meeting.
- Publicity for the event would start before the Summer-sponsors/exhibitors would be sought.
- Baroness Andrews (English Heritage) was suggested as a speaker.
- The work of the Associate Parliamentary Minerals Group was also relevant to the event.

Action NJ to report to the next meeting on progress.

12/7 Pilot Local Engagement Event

Discussed: -how to progress such an event. Members made the following key suggestions: -

- Was it intended to cover one County area or a group of Counties?
- The origin of the idea predated the setting up of the three Working Groups.
- The Minerals Products Association had made a public offer at the recent MPA/RTPI conference to run such an event-there was need for members to have a discussion with Hampshire CC on how to progress this suggestion - (NJ/RR/BM)
- Minerals Liaison Groups in Essex, Kent and Somerset pointed the way to run such an event.
- An event in Surrey arranged for their Planning Committee and based around a mix of industry presentations and site visits was a good example of a format for such an event.
- A Pilot local engagement event could be a valuable way of road testing the sorts of approaches emerging from the thinking of WG 3.

Agreed –NJ/RR/BM would meet to map out a possible frame for such an event. MIRO might be able to assist.

Action – NJ/RR/BM.

12/8 Carbon Issues

Reported – Nigel Jackson and Lester Hicks had met to discuss this topic. There was a need for the CBIMG to collectively come up with a statement on what the industry was doing on carbon issues-a possible statement to sum up the considerable work being done across all product sectors.CBI would look at the outputs from LWM3. Lester Hicks felt carbon issues were currently low on the political agenda but that the issue would return to the fore within 12 – 18 months or so as the new Government

worked through its agenda. Nigel Jackson noted that the big issue on carbon in minerals was currently cement production and the potential impact of EU regulation on domestic /EU plants - --there was a dialogue between that industry and BIS/DECC on this.

Carbon issues were also very important to the heavy clay industry and very much-affected international competition. The “Life cycle carbon footprint” was the current key issue.

Lester Hicks commented that the former Working Group had looked at the carbon footprint of the extractive industries and at the transportation of raw materials but had not covered the mineral-processing sector where it was clear that for some products energy use in manufacturing was a dominant issue.

Agreed: - this item would be removed from the future agendas but would be reported as necessary.

12/9 2010 General Election – Planning System

Reported- by Mark Plummer –the following key issues:-

- CLG Minister Eric Pickles was the author of “Control Shift” the key localism agenda setting.
- Actions planned so far for the proposed Localism Bill included: -
 - a) Abolition of regional strategies- letter of intent sent.
 - b) Abolition of Infrastructure Planning Commission –to keep the process but the final decision-maker being a Minister
 - c).Incentivising development.
 - d) Abolition of the RDAs
- National framework for development – what to do with PPS’s, MPS’s and National Policy statements /
- Ministers were interested in minerals and the link with development and minerals policy issues. Advice had been sent to Ministers.
- CLG had opened talks on the issue with MPA and POS and would widen these to include BAA and CNP.
- The role of the RAWPs, regional and sub-regional apportionments had yet to be decided.

Discussed: - Members made the following key points: -

- It was vital to get ministers to make the link between minerals extraction and development and the UK economy.
- BIS needed to be involved in any discussions on the planning system.
- The EU Raw Materials Initiative had flagged up the UK Minerals planning system/policy guidance as “Best Practice”-Ministers needed to be made aware of this.
- Marine issues remained a DEFRA concern and were not currently affected by the “Localism” agenda.

- It was unclear how the above changes would affect the development plan system.

12/10 UK Constituent States

Noted: - The progress reports for England, Wales and Northern Ireland circulated with the agenda papers. The following key issues were highlighted: -

a) England:-

- Ministerial portfolios were agreed but had still to be worked through in detail. (eg.should one minister look after minerals planning ?)
- Ministers were keen to use IT technology and made much use of Twitter sites!
- On the implementation of the Mine Wastes Directive in England and Wales, MPA had written to Caroline Spelman and had yet to receive a reply.
- A reply on MWD issues had also been received from the Environment Agency, and further details on implementation were on the EA website.
- There was no evidence that the mine waste system would change under the new Government.
- RAWP Secretaries had their contracts renewed to September 2010 after which their future was uncertain.

b) Wales: -Noted the Welsh RAWPs had been the subject of renewed contracts for a further 4 years.

c) Northern Ireland: - John Cummins highlighted the following key issues: -

- The economic significance of the industry to NI as summarised by the statistics of the industry in his report. – The importance of the aggregates industry, which was, by far, the largest of the extractive industries along with the existence of a small number of high value ore mines such as the Omagh goldmines.
- The absence of a PPS on minerals and the lack of minerals mapping.
- The issues associated with the reorganisation of Local Government and the aim to return planning control to the local authorities.
- The potential impact, if any, of the UK localism agenda on mineral planning in Northern Ireland.

12/11 UKMF Website

Reported: - This was now updated and live- thanks to Andrew Bloodworth and his BGS team.

12/12 ALSF

Noted: - the letter to Ministers re. ALSF concerns would be finalised later next week.

12/13 EU Raw Materials Initiative

Noted: - the report of this was being finalised in Madrid today (17.6.10). It would need to be considered by the November (2010) meeting of the Forum.

Action – Secretary

12/14 Murray Gardner (Knowledge Transfer Manager, Earth Sciences – NERC)

Agreed: - He should be invited to give a presentation to the November (2010) Forum meeting.

Action – Chairman

12/15 Any Other Business

No points were raised.

12/16 Date Of Next Meeting – Thursday 18 November 2010 at the IoMMM London.at 10.30am.

9 July 2010 finalised version