



Chairman – Dr. Brian Marker- brian@amarker.freeseve.co.uk.

Secretary - Duncan Pollock - pollock25@talktalk.net.

Minutes of the Fifth Meeting of the UK Minerals Forum, held at The IoMMM, 1 Carlton House Terrace London SW1Y 5DB on Thursday 15 May 2008 at 10.30am.

Present:-

Dr. Brian Marker –Chairman
Duncan Pollock - Secretary

Andrew Bloodworth – BGS
David Brewer –Coalpro
Ruth Chambers – WCL/CNP
Tom Clarke - DoENI
Chris Dobbs – CBIMG/Tarmac
Prof. Peter Doyle –English Stone Forum
Bob Fenton- CBIMG/MAUK
Richard Gill – DBERR
Lester Hicks
David Highley
Jon Humble – English Heritage
Peter Huxtable –CBIMG/BAA /IOM3
Nigel Jackson – CBIMG
Bob LeClerc- CBIMG
Hugh Llewelyn -Defra
Sue Martin – Welsh Assembly Government
Jeremy Murfitt – CBIMG/QPA/Aggregate Industries
Andy Price – DorsetCC/POS
Andy Tickle- CPRE
Simon van der Byl – QPA
Chris Waite –SEERA/SEERAWP
Paul Wilcox – Staffs CC/POS
David Wilkes -CLG

Apologies:

David Brock –Mills and Reeve

Dwight DeMorais – BCA/Lafarge
Chris Hall – CBIMG/BCC
Nick Horsley –CBIMG/SAMSA/WBB
Ian Mitchell – Scottish Government

1. Welcomes and Introductions

The Chairman welcomed new members to their first meeting.

2. Minutes of the last Meeting (15.1.08)

These were agreed

3) Matters Arising, Not Dealt with Elsewhere

Minute 3 –Underground Storage Fact Sheets- Reported –These had been finalised, circulated and were available on the BGS website.

Minute 4 – Forum Organogram- Reported –Nigel Jackson had completed this in readiness for the Forum website.

Minute 12 –Mine Waste Directive – Reported -, by CLG – this issue was proceeding based on a clear preference for implementation through the Environmental Permitting Programme route. CLG would be circulating a report on the issue soon, to other Government Departments.

Minute 13 – Inert Waste for Restoration – Reported – this issue was still in discussion and was still a cause of concern to industry.

4) Living With Minerals 3 (3.11.08)

Reported by Nigel Jackson, the following updates :-

- Arrangements for the event were now well advanced.
- The publicity flier had been signed off on the previous day with the event theme – “Shaping UK Minerals Policy”
- Keynote speakers would be – Richard Lambert (CBI), a EU DG Environment speaker and a speaker to fill the “John Gummer spot”.
- After the speeches a “better quality “ lunch would be available and the event would involve less walking between rooms.
- The Working Group sessions were intended to be short sharp and punchy.
- 350/400 delegates were planned for around 40 tables, which would involve a delegate voting system.
- Each Working Group session would be 45 minutes long and the aim was to get the convenors to arrange 4-5 questions for voting.
- The plenary facilitator would be Michael Rodd (ex BBC Tomorrows World).
- There would be 2 Working Group sessions before and after a tea break.
- The event would conclude with a wrap-up session chaired by a “worthy speaker”.

- Following the event there would be a reception at the House of Commons Terrace themed at reporting progress in the two years since LWM2.
- All Forum members would be asked to circulate fliers to their contacts.
- The event had attracted a good level of sponsorship/ exhibitors who had already underwritten the overall costs.
- Fliers would also be distributed at the QPA/RTPI seminar on 22 May.
- Each Forum convenor would give a short presentation on his group's conclusions and which would be circulated in advance.
- The Forum website would be a key tool for dissemination of the event.
- Efforts were being made⁴ to have a good cross section of delegates present and members were invited to let Bob LeClerc (bob.lerclerc@cbi.org.uk) have the names of persons they would like to see invited as VIPs/guests.

5) Working Group Reports

a) WG1 Security of Supply

Reported, by David Highley –the following key points :-

- The Group had last met on 22.4.08.
- A discussion paper was presented at that meeting and was now being revised in the light of the discussions.
- Long-term sustainable security of supply was important to all and was essential to secure quality of life.
- Initially security of supply concerns related to oil, gas and coal imports but the group had perceived dependence on a wide range of minerals including roofing and building stone, industrial minerals etc.
- The UK was increasingly dependent on imports and was thus vulnerable to interruptions of supplies e.g. Chinese fluorspar, Russian gas etc.
- There were obvious benefits to maximising UK sourcing-security of supply, economic and social benefits plus not exporting the UK's environmental problems.
- The planning process interfered with market forces but was the key to securing supplies for the future.
- The group had been concerned at the issue of "National need " and who defines what it means. BERR had not been keen to clarify the issue in relation to fluorspar. The UK Coal Forum had tried and failed to get the issue of need into a Government White Paper.
- The group had also discussed diversity of supply and resource efficiency.
- The EU (DG Enterprise) was also raising the profile of the security of supply issue and it was intended that the Forum should report to them of its concerns.
- The group had also discussed the issue of safeguarding.
- The next meeting of WG1 was scheduled to be held on 15.7.08.

In the discussions following this report, members made the following key points: -

- The EU raw materials initiative covered also food.

- The EU was very concerned at the future of cement supplies, post 2012.
- There was a MIRO report commissioned by BERR/EA (note attached) (“Material Security-Ensuring Resource Availability for the UK Economy”) This included discussion of the issue of supplies from unstable countries.
- Andy Tickle made clear that the group did not express unanimous support for a National statement on need and on whether MPS1 was sufficient – this would need to be debated both by the Forum and at LWM3.
- It was generally felt that the group needed to include critical end users in its discussions such as chemical industries, CPA etc.

b) WG2 – National Parks and AONBs

Noted – the notes of the group meeting held on 13.3.08

- Reported- by Andrew Bloodworth the following key points: -
- There had been a lengthy discussion on the issue of National need in relation to planning policy and the “Silkin Test”
- The BGS research –“Aggregate Supplies from outside the National Parks/AONBs –the Scope for Alternative Resources” was especially relevant- the report would be published within the next month or so. It would conclude that there were alternative sources outside the National Parks/AONBs but these were constrained environmentally and by the issue of large land banks in the Parks and AONBs
- The group was also aware of the need to study public perceptions of the National Parks/AONBs in the future. Ruth Chambers and David Bent were to report on this issue to the September meeting of the group
- Duncan Pollock and Andrew Bloodworth were to produce a paper on the need for Government engagement and on the need issue for circulation to group members during the summer.

In the discussions following this report, members raised the following key points:

- Sue Martin queried why the BGS research had not looked in detail at the issue of supplies from Wales – it was agreed that this was relevant but the politics of supplies to England from the devolved states made this too sensitive.
- Jeremy Murfitt queried whether the BGS research had looked in detail at the environmental and economic impacts of all sources –this was reported as outside the scope of the study except in general terms.
- Chris Waite queried whether the BGS report had considered the role of rail, sea and water transport –yes it had.

c) WG3 Carbon and Proximity

Noted- the notes of the group meeting held on 13.3.08 and which had been circulated.

Reported –by Lester Hicks the following key points: -

- Carbon initiatives such as that by QPA and which focussed on voluntary action seemed to indicate the way forward. Such actions merited a wider

dissemination such as the intended reporting to the QPA/RTPI Seminar on 22 May.

- The role of statutory intervention was felt to be a big unknown e.g. the cement and brick carbon reduction schemes and which indicated a limited scope for further reductions. The group felt that carbon reduction schemes could impact on quarrying using electricity consumption as a benchmark.
- DEFRA had commissioned research on these issues.
- Transport emissions crossed over to the proximity issue e.g. Russian gas.
- WG3 needed more expert input from industry and a wider spectrum of stakeholders.
- The final meeting of the group was scheduled to be held on 12.6.08.

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

- Many SMEs had signed up to carbon reduction policies.
- A QPA report on carbon issues would be published the following week.
- The Crossrail debate had focussed on the lack of consistency of policy in relation to rail freight.
- Transport methods other than road, rail or water needed research e.g pipelines
- .MWDF policies on climate change, carbon and proximity were often inconsistent around the country.
- The construction industry only became concerned at building materials issues when shortages or price rises occurred.

d) WG4 Cumulative Impact of Legislation

Noted – the notes of the group meeting held on 10.3.08 and which had been circulated.

Reported –by Simon van der Byl the following key points: -

- The group needed wider support and representation
- Two phases of legislative impact had been identified- Phase 1- concept to planning permission.
Phase 2- operational period.
The third phase – restoration to closure had been “parked” as an issue.
- Legislation/regulation deters applicants and was therefore a security of supply issue
- The current Government review of the planning system was relevant.
- The group needed members from the NGOs and MPAs.
- The final meeting was scheduled to be held on 10.6.08.

In the discussions following this report, the following key points were put: -

- David Wilkes queried how minerals were different to other industries in this respect – it was agreed that minerals were different because once a building

was complete the permission was spent whilst a mineral permission operated for the life of the quarry.

- David Brewer felt over- regulation impacted on competition and could prevent entry to new players –SMEs felt the planning system was a barrier to entry.
- The June meeting of the group may not be the final one. A further meeting might be needed.

e) Conclusions

Agreed: -the final outputs from the Working groups needed to be with the Forum by 14.9.08 and the Forum needed to reach conclusions by 10.10.08. The mid Sept. to mid Oct. period would be crucial to the inputs to the LWM3.

6) Forum Website

Reported- by Andrew Bloodworth the following key points: -

- He and Nigel Jackson had been working on the website design. A sample page was tabled.
- The website was ready to go subject to members' views
- It would have a simple structure based around a set of pages and relevant links.
- It would include notes of Forum meetings but not those of the WGs.
- It could include the Minerals Planning article by Ruth Chambers/Andy Tickle.
- The site could include space for feedback.
- Subject to members' views it could be operational at the end of June with a launch at the EI Conference in Cardiff.

Agreed-

- i. It would be appropriate for Forum minutes to be included once cleared by members.
- ii. Term of Reference should be included.
- iii. There would be links to LWM3
- iv. Feedback comments would need to be cleared via the Forum Secretariat.
- v. Final agreement on content would rest with the Chairman.

Action :- AB/NJ/DTP/BobLC/BM

7) Planning System Reform

Reported by CLG – the Planning Bill was currently before the House of Commons .It was unlikely to receive Royal Assent before the summer recess and could run into the next session. The issue of strategic allocations in MWDF core strategies remained of concern.

8) Archaeology

Reported –the Joint Minerals and Historic Environment Forum publication – “Minerals Extraction and Archaeology – a Practice Guide” was to be launched later

that day at Portcullis House by the Lord Redesdale. 50 delegates were expected. A link to this publication would be put on the Forum website.

9) Associate Parliamentary Minerals Group

Reported –the next meeting of this group was scheduled to be held on 17.6.08. Planning Minister Ian Wright was speaking and would report on changes to the planning system.

10) Any Other Business

Noted the Minerals Planning article by Ruth Chambers and Andy Tickle and which had been well received.

BGS Student event 21.6.08 Reported – this was an East Midlands student role-playing event based around a minerals planning inquiry scenario chaired by Dick Bate. It was designed for 16-17 year olds and had proved to be a useful event and format.

11) Date of Next Meeting

22.9.08 at the Geological Society. Burlington House London WC1 at 10.30am.