

UK MINERALS FORUM

Chairman – Dr. Brian Marker - brian@marker.freeseerve.co.uk

Secretary - Duncan Pollock - pollock25@talktalk.net.

Minutes of the Third Meeting of the UK National Minerals Forum, held at CLG, Eland House, Bressenden Place , London SW1 on Wednesday 19 September 2007 at 10.00am.

Present:-

Dr. Brian Marker –Chairman
Duncan Pollock - Secretary

Mark Baxter -DEFRA
Natalie Bennett –Natural England
John Bennett – Dorset CC
Peter Bide – DCLG
Andrew Bloodworth – BGS
David Brewer -Coalpro
Leon Cook-CBIMG/QPA/Tarmac
Dwight DeMorais- BCA/Lafarge
Bob Fenton- CBIMG/MAUK
Richard Gill – DBERR
Chris Hall –CBIMG/BCC
Peter Huxtable –CBIMG/BAA /IOM3
Nigel Jackson – CBIMG
Bob LeClerc- CBIMG
Bill McKenzie - CLG
Simon van der Byl – QPA
Paul Wilcox – Staffs CC/POS

Apologies:

David Brock –Mills and Reeve
Ruth Chambers –WCL/CNP
Chris Dobbs –CBIMG/QPA/Tarmac
David Highley-BGS
Nick Horsley – CBIMG/SAMSA/WBB
Jeremy Murfitt – CBIMG/QPA/AI
Andy Price-POS/Dorset CC
David Sandbrook – Consultant
Andy Tickle –CPRE

1.Welcomes and Introductions

The Chairman welcomed new members to their first meeting.

2. Minutes of the last Meeting (2.7.07)

These were agreed with the following amendments: -

Page 3 –“agreed (i)” should have read –“The chairman should approach the following....”

- “agreed (ii)” misspelling of Andy Tickle

Page 5 “reported” – should have read “event”, not “even”

Page 10 –“topic Issues “ – agreed , it would be helpful to title these in future .

3. Matters Arising, Not Dealt With Elsewhere :-

Page 2 , under (3) –Dorset Coast Forum, it was reported that Nigel Jackson had not yet prepared the organogram. He agreed to progress this.

Action –NJ

Page 3 – discussed – the need to pursue links with the All Party Parliamentary Minerals Group with reports and presentations. Agreed –it would be appropriate to give the Group an “appetiser” at their January 2008 meeting with a fuller report at their Autumn 2008 meeting. It would also be appropriate to include an item on the Group’s newsletter.

Action – NJ/Bob LeC

Page 3 - “wider representation” – the Chairman reported that he had not yet pursued this issue, pending agreement on the Terms of Reference. CNP,WCL and CPRE were now all represented. A possible oil and gas rep. had been identified.

Action – NJ/BM

-English Heritage also wished to be involved –either Chris Wood or Jon Humble

-LGA were happy for POS to represent them.

Reported - the Chairman also chaired the English Stone Forum and had raised the issue of the relationship between the groups. That group wished to be associated with the UKNMF and the Stone Federation felt the same way.

Page4 QMJ Article - noted this had been published and had been circulated with the agenda papers.

Page 4 WCL -no reports had been received back following their Land Use Planning Committee (3.7.07). Agreed the Chairman would ask for a report to be attached to these minutes.

Action -BM

4. Terms of Reference

Noted;- these had been circulated for comment and a late draft had been attached to the agenda papers.

Three further amendments had since been proposed.:-

- under 2 , “To address issues of minerals supply....”
- under 3, “change “exploitation” to read “extraction”.
- generally, “UK” should be asterisked and footnoted to explain this meant England,Wales,Scotland and Northern Ireland.

Discussed: - the Terms of Reference generally and the wish of some members to strengthen the wording to imply the work was intended to provide authoritative opinions and guidance on key issues. It was clear that this suggestion could place membership of Government reps. in difficulties.

Agreed:-

- i. a compromise rewording of the overarching aim to read – “To provide an overarching and authoritative National Minerals Forum, drawing together all key stakeholders to debate, raise awareness of issues and identify potential solutions relating to the prudent use, sustainable management and security of supply of indigenous UK minerals.”
- ii. The revised TOR should be recirculated for members’ views

Action –BM

5. Working Group Projects

Discussed: - the issues raised in the Briefing Note circulated with the agenda papers and which set out the proposed basis of the 3/4 Working Groups. There were intended to be three meetings of each group - in December (07), March and June (08). and which would feed into the cycle of plenary meetings. Each meeting would be programmed to last about 5 hours. The intention was for final group reports to be made to the LWM Conference on 3.11.08. The group outputs were intended to be 3-5 page summary reports plus short PowerPoint presentations .It was not intended that they would carry out primary research but should focus on basic issues, drawing on existing sources of information. Each group would have an assigned expert who would be funded for up to 8 days work @£325/day, funded from CBI.

The intention was for each group to prepare reports for a wider audience and to identify key issues /information for debate at LWM08. Final reports would be circulated to LWM08 delegates in advance of the event.

It was as yet unclear how Groups 1a and 1b would interrelate. This would be determined in the first set of meetings.

Working Group 1a - Declining Reserves, Future Supply and 1b - National Parks and AONBs In the discussions, the following key points were made: -

- DEFRA would want to be involved with 1b but not 1a.
- POS would like to be on both groups.
- Coalpro would like to be on 1a
- Natural England would like to be on 1b.
- DBERR has limited staff resources but would like to be associated with 1a but to concentrate on 3.They would wish to be copied in on all group papers.
- Devolved administrations would be invited to be involved but at the very least would be sent all key papers.

Working Group 1a- Reserves/Supply

BGS would lead this group and hoped to retain David Highley as their expert. Clearly WCL would need to be involved along with reps. from the various industrial minerals. It was felt important to make clear from the outset, the difference between “resources” and “reserves”. The group would also cover issues of fire and brickclay.

Working Group 1b – National Parks and AONBs.

Discussed: - the need for this group to deal with facts rather than emotion and to identify the key issues for the wider audience debates. There was a need for issues to be identified based on what could be influenced and what could not.

- Members felt there needed to be a National Park Officers rep. on the group as well as POS and CNP.
- The problem of consideration of AONB issues was also felt to be difficult.
- Members agreed that the Group should in its first year, concentrate on protected landscape issues leaving habitat issues for later discussion.
- Peter Huxtable reported, at this point, that the problem of serious raw material shortages was now emerging as an EU issue and which could result in many current directives needing to be revisited. The various EU industry groups were already meeting on these issues.
- Duncan Pollock reported that he was prepared to act as the “expert” to group 1b.

Working Group 2 – Proximity, Carbon and Minerals Supply

Reported:- DEFRA had not been able to offer a likely name for a convenor for this group. Lester Hicks might be approached as an alternative.

Discussed:- the issue of the relevance of downstream activities and whether the group should simply concentrate on extraction activities. The issues of supply and carbon emissions were very different for a sand and gravel site when compared with a cement plant/quarry. The Group would need to address its remit in this respect from the outset. For coal, for instance, Coalpro felt the Group must concentrate on the extraction issues and not deal with burning. Likely Group reps would include BCA, CLG, BGS, Coalpro, Industrial Minerals and POS.

At this point there was a brief discussion on the confidentiality of working group activities. It was agreed that there would need to be informal reporting back to lead bodies such as LGA and CBI but these should not extend to any public reporting of Group papers, before these had been completed and agreed by the Group members.

Working Group 3 – Cumulative Impact of Policy/Legislation.

Discussed:- the problem of dealing with a continuously moving target. Likely participants were DBERR, CLG, POS, WCL, Coalpro.. CBI was happy to lead this task and would approach Chris Waite as the possible expert. Andrew Adams was also suggested.

It was agreed that the Group should also address the issue of RIAs, the problems of joined up policy/legislation development and the lack of adequate time for consultees to respond.

It was also agreed that the Group could not identify all relevant policy/legislation impacts but should concentrate on key case examples of problems such as “gold-plating” or failures to consult all relevant organisations.

6. Working Group Process

Discussed: - the proposed process for the Working Groups set out in the agenda papers.

Agreed:-

- i. Three meetings pa. were appropriate.
- ii. Following the LWM08 Conference, there should be formal reports to Government on the need to resolve issues identified by the Groups
- iii. There should be oral reporting back to The Forum and liaison with contributors.

7. UKNMF Website

Reported: - by Andrew Bloodworth (BGS) –BGS would be hosting the website. It would be a stand-alone site but with links to BGS etc. A web designer was working on it and would have three prototype logos for views by early October. The designer would need feedback on the content of the site. He agreed to circulate a list of questions for members’ views – e.g. was the site just a repository for reports, for wider use, with a member-only segment etc.

Action – AB

8.LWM 2008

Reported:- this had been booked for the QEII Centre, London for 3.11.08 along with the House of Commons Terrace. Sponsors had been secured to underwrite the event and a programme was being worked up. It was intended to make the Conference more interactive than before with a professional facilitator and break out sessions all on one floor.

9. Planning White Paper

Agreed:- members should forward their response to the White Paper to the secretary for recirculation to the wider membership.

Action- Members

Reported: -by CLG –Ministers were considering the consultation responses and would make an announcement by the end of October.

10. Planning Gain Supplement

Reported: - by Nigel Jackson – a broad CBI group had met HM Treasury on 18.9.07. (Mark Gibson).HMT had made clear that they were prepared to consider alternative models which would generate money. It was clear that many other industries had pressed the “we are different” claim to HMT and which had undermined the quarrying industry case. The issue of unfair trade impacts affecting small operators

had been pressed. HMT had agreed to respond to the main earlier consultation papers. HMT were also prepared to consider a “beefed up” Section 106 system.

11. Mine Waste Directive

Reported: - by Bob LeClerc the EC Directive had to be implemented by 1.5.08. There had been a meeting of all interested parties on 18.9.07 which had looked at the three basic options –

- I. Implementation through the planning system
- II. Environmental permitting through EA/DEFRA
- III. Hybrid EPP/Planning option- currently favoured.

A Ministerial view was expected soon on the preferred option but changes of Government personnel had slowed the process. It seemed unlikely that the 1.5.08 date would be met. This was clearly an issue for Working Group 3.

12. Soils Directive

Reported – this issue highlighted the conflicts between the MWD, Soil Directive and the Waste Directive. The EC were to discuss the draft directive and 660 proposed amendments on 4.10.07. Current drafts could stop soil movements and thus extraction. The draft did not seem to recognise the facts and the need for temporary movements of soils and the UK research on this. The draft was also of serious concern to farmers. There was a live DEFRA consultation on this topic.

13. Inert Wastes for Restoration

Reported- this was also of concern to Working Group 3. The problem of use of inert wastes for exempt “landscaping” continued to limit availability of inerts for mineral restoration and thus compliance with planning conditions. Use of inerts for landscaping was classed as “recovery” whereas inerts for restoration were classed as “disposal”. The issue of non-inerts/hazardous waste definitions was also of concern.

14. Archaeology

Reported – by Peter Huxtable – the joint English Heritage /Industry Forum was progressing well and had considered the vexed issue of pre-application and trial trenching levels. A Good Practice Guide was emerging from the discussions, a late draft of which would be discussed by the forum next week. This would confirm the advice of PPG15/16/CBI Code. It would be launched at a meeting of The All Party Parliamentary Minerals Group early in 2008. This was a good news story – a job well done.

15 Any Other Business

BGS reported that they would soon be consulting on a “underground storage “ draft factsheet. This would come to UKNMF members for views.

16. Date and Place of 2008 Meetings

Tuesday 15 January 2008,

Thursday 15 May 2008

Monday 22 September 2008

All at a Central London venue with a 10.15 start time.