



**Chairman – Dr. Brian Marker-** [brian@amarker.freemove.co.uk](mailto:brian@amarker.freemove.co.uk).

**Secretary - Duncan Pollock** - [pollock25@talktalk.net](mailto:pollock25@talktalk.net).

**Minutes of the Eighth Meeting of the UK Minerals Forum, held at The IoMMM HQ 1 Carlton House Terrace London SW1Y 5DB on Friday 13 March 2009 at 10.30am.**

**Present:-**

Dr. Brian Marker –Chairman  
Duncan Pollock - Secretary  
Keith Duff – Vice-Chairman-Elect

David Brewer - Coalpro  
Ruth Chambers – WCL/CNP  
John Cummins - DoENI  
Chris Dobbs –CBIMG/MPA/Tarmac  
Bob Fenton -CBIMG/MAUK  
Chris Hall- CBIMG/BCC  
David Highley  
Nick Horsley- CBIMG/SAMSA/Sibelco  
Peter Huxtable – CBIMG/BAA/IOM3  
Bob LeClerc – CBIMG  
Hugh Llewelyn -Defra  
Nigel Jackson –Lafarge/ CBIMG/MPA  
Jo Mankelow –BGS  
Sue Martin – Welsh Assembly Government  
Mark Plummer - CLG  
Richard Read HampshireCC/POS  
Joanne Smith – Welsh Assembly Government  
Andy Tickle- CPRE  
Simon van der Byl –CBIMG/ MPA  
Chris Waite – SEERA/SEERAWP  
Paul Wilcox – Staffs CC/POS  
David Wilkes -CLG

**Apologies:**

Natalie Bennett- Natural England

Andrew Bloodworth –BGS  
Mick Daynes – CBIMG/MPA/Hanson  
Dwight DeMorais – BCA/Lafarge  
Peter Doyle –English Stone Forum  
Lester Hicks  
Jon Humble – English Heritage  
Miles Watkins – CBIMG/QPA/ AI

### **8/1 Welcomes and Introductions**

The Chairman welcomed Keith Duff, Jo Mankelow, Mark Plummer and Joanne Smith to their first meeting.

Keith Duff ex. English Nature was attending with a view to serving As Vice-Chairman.

Joanne Smith (WAG) will replace Sue Martin when the latter retires in September.

Mark Plummer (CLG) has replaced David Wilkes as the key CLG lead on minerals.

### **8/2 Minutes of the Last Meeting (2.12.08)**

Noted: -The set of minutes attached to the agenda papers was not the finalised set previously circulated on 23.12.08. The Secretary apologised for the mix-up and agreed to re-circulate the correct set.

### **8/3 Matters Arising ,Not dealt with Elsewhere :-**

Re. Minute 7/7(ii) there had been no response from the Environment Agency about them joining the Forum.

Agreed:- this issue should be pursued – **Action** – Initially by Simon van der Byl to pursue unanswered e-mail

Re. Minute 7/4 (i). Members felt some form of Regional event should be pursued with MPA elected members present. A Southeast Event hosted by Hampshire CC was suggested.

Agreed:- Nigel Jackson/Richard Read and Paul Wilcox would discuss this possibility.

### **8/4 Forum Working Groups**

Reported: - This item was on the agenda for members to decide where to go next with the Working groups. There was a need to get the Working Group reports to the signing-off stage.

a) Working Group 1 – Security of Supply

Reported: - by David Highley – all comments received from members on the draft final report, circulated in January 2009, had been incorporated in the draft included with the agenda papers. Some of the points received would be reported to the EU Raw Materials Supply Group.

There were no further suggested amendments to the report.

#### b) Working Group 2 – Mineral Extraction in National Parks and AONBs.

Reported – by Ruth Chambers the draft final report had been circulated and agreed. The Working Group had been greatly assisted by the BGS ALSF Research Project on alternative sources of aggregates.

Agreed: - the final report as circulated, subject to the figure for the number of AONBs being corrected to 40 not 41.

#### c) Working Group 3 – Carbon and Proximity in Minerals Supply

Members expressed considerable concern at the figures for “product/waste” shown in the matrix attached to the draft report. The figures for silica sand were clearly wrong.

Agreed: - the main report was correct but could not be finalised until the matrix had been completely reappraised.

Richard Read felt there was a need to explore the relative carbon aspects of marine dredging, local land-won and long haul aggregates.

Noted: - an ALSF project was looking at this issue – a pilot study of Hampshire and Merseyside would report in the summer of 2009.

Members noted a mix of imperial and metric figures in para. 19 of the main report.

Agreed: - (i) members should write in to the secretariat with their concerns on the matrix.

(ii) These concerns would then be forwarded to Lester Hicks

(iii) The main report could then be accepted once the matrix had been agreed.

**Action:** -members/secretariat/Lester Hicks

#### d) Working Group 4 –Cumulative impact of Policy, Legislation and Regulation

Reported: - by Simon van der Byl - He felt the final report could be expanded to a more narrative style to give compatibility with other WG reports.

e) General - In concluding the discussions on the 4 reports , members made the following points:-

- All the finalised reports should carry the same completion date.
- The WG3 format was felt to be a good example – could all WG reports be edited to this format?
- WG’s 1,2 and 4 should also include the LWM3 voting results.

Agreed: - Nigel Jackson and Bob LeClerc would approach Barrie Hedges to discuss the possibility of editing the reports or summary reports to a similar format.

Actions: -

- i. Check and rewrite WG3 matrix – (members,Secretary,Lester Hicks)

- ii. Contact Barrie Hedges – (NJ and Bob LeClerc)
- iii. Prepare exec. Summaries/press releases
- iv. Press launch of finalised reports –to be discussed at June Forum meeting.

f) LWM3 Briefing Document

Discussed –how to progress completion/rewrite of this document.

Members made the following key points: -

- There was a need to draft an introduction/executive summary.
- Concerns at the document by NGO's /Government reps. needed to be addressed.
- Further input on the note was needed from members.
- The need to republish the LWM3 note needed to be explored from the cost point of view.

Agreed: -Final comments were sought from members before the note was finalised and published

Action: - Members

**8/5 UKMF Work Programme 2009/2010**

Reported:-a draft discussion paper had been prepared by Duncan Pollock and had been circulated with the agenda papers. The recommendation of the WG's had been taken from the LWM3 Briefing Note purely for convenience. There was no intention of discounting members' concerns at the wording of this part of the note.

Discussed: -whether the 4 WG's should continue or whether alternative topics or fewer WG's should be covered. Members made the following key points: -

- WG1 the work was largely complete as was that of WG2 save for the need to explore the issue of "National considerations".
- WG4's work would require continued updating and the issue of RIA's was unresolved.
- The EU Raw Materials Initiative was relevant to the work of WG1/2. There was concern at the lack of Government engagement on this EU issue- this was felt to be a BERR task.
- Members felt the Forum should press BERR to get involved.
- The industry's work on the Mines Waste Directive was a textbook example of how such EU issues should be dealt with – there was a need to write up a report of the process, which had been followed, and to disseminate this as an example of good practice.
- The EU Raw Materials Initiative was, however, different to the MWD work and was unlikely to lead to a draft directive. Most of the project was concerned with high value products and excluded energy minerals.
  - There was a need to focus on how to deal with EU initiatives generally.
  - A fewer number of WG's was generally favoured.

Nigel Jackson made the following points:.

- He felt two well-attended WG's would be better than the present 4 and would be easier to operate.
- The work of WG's 1 & 2 was largely complete.
- WG3 needed thought from industry on what was needed -?  
Voluntary/statutory actions
- WG4 needed to be updated regularly.
- He liked the idea of a Southeast Regional event provided MPA elected members attended.
- A recent MPA Wales event had pointed up the need to address the issue of specifications in relation to sustainability.

He concluded by saying he felt 2 issues needed work – a South East study and the issue of specifications v sustainability.

In replying to the above points members made the following key points: -

- The use of specifications was primarily an aggregates issue.
- Safeguarding of wharf/rail depot and other infrastructure sites was a crucial issue meriting study on the wider issue of safeguarding minerals infrastructure and the ability to deliver materials to the market.
- The issue of alternative sources of materials and the drift from designated areas to non-designated areas was also worthy of study.
- The need to engage with elected members and local communities on aspects of the mineral planning process was relevant – the so called “localism agenda” now favoured by the Conservative Party.
- There was much concern at the need to examine the skills shortage of minerals planners both in the MPA's and in the industry. A skills shortage was rapidly approaching with many expert retirees being replaced by inexperienced general planners. This was causing delays in the development control system. Some MPA's were now contracting out their minerals service. Loss of planning fee and monitoring fee income was not helping maintenance of staffing levels.
- The need to improve communications on mineral planning matters to address the negative perceptions to the industry by the public and the lack of effective and constructive consultation and engagement.

Discussed :- the relevance of the Forum to the Devolved Nations

Sue Martin (WAG) felt the Forum was helpful and she reported on the skill issues in Wales where small UDA's could not maintain minerals teams.. Some UDA's were having to share minerals staff..

It was proving difficult to keep the 2 Wales RAWPs going.

John Cummins (DoENI) also found the Forum helpful. He felt that ongoing participation in the Forum would assist in developing industry/Government relationships in Northern Ireland. He agreed with the comments on skills shortages and reported that in two years 11 local authorities would be taking over the DoE NI's local planning role.

## Conclusions: -

The Chairman concluded the discussions by noting that 6 issues had emerged: -

1. Skills shortages / local engagement and communications.
2. Consultation procedures on EU issues.
3. Safeguarding of infrastructure, carbon, proximity.
4. Specifications/sustainability.
5. Shift from designated areas.
6. Towards a Minerals Policy –David Highley’s paper.

He suggested a paper be prepared for the next meeting setting out what could be done and which were the most important issues. This was agreed

**Actions Agreed:** -each proposer to supply the Chairman with a paragraph of support:

1. European Issues – Peter Huxtable
2. Skills Shortage – David Brewer
3. Specifications/sustainability- Nigel Jackson/Simon van der Byl
4. Infrastructure/safeguarding- Paul Wilcox
5. Shift from designated areas – Chris Waite.
6. Community/local engagement –to be included in above.

## Relationship with the UKMF Terms of Reference:-

Members then discussed, briefly, the need for future work to come within the frame of the Forum Terms of Reference.

Agreed: -there was no case for expanding or amending the current Term of Reference.

Most of the above projects were within the frame of the TOR. There was a need to disseminate “good news” stories such as on biodiversity.

## **8/6 Forum Papers Signing-Off Procedures:-**

Agreed: - the process set out on the discussion paper circulated with the agenda papers.

## **8/7 LWM 3 Outcomes**

Reported: - by Nigel Jackson: -

The CBI considered the LWM3 to be a success and was committed to LWM4 in November 2010. Money was now tight and an alternate, cheaper venue to the QEII Centre may be sought along with a less costly format. The inter-active part of the event would be retained.

## **8/8 UKMF Website**

Noted: -the launch of the website should be timed to the completion of the WG Reports.

### **8/9 Other Relevant Issues**

The following issues were briefly discussed: -

- i. Habitats Directive –draft guidance was expected from the EU DG Environment. Natalie Bennett was involved with the UK aspects of this project
- ii. Soils Directive –the Czechs wanted big changes to this Draft directive and which were of concern
- iii. Planning System the Killian/Pretty review had reported on the need for new planning guidance/regulations. The review was not specific to minerals.
- iv. Mines Waste Directive – the Directive had not yet been transposed into UK Regulations. These would be laid by the end of March 2009. The Emergency Planning Regulations needed to in force by the end of June ‘009. A short 6-week consultation exercise would be needed before the start of “election purdah”.
- v. Minerals Mapping – All-Wales and Trial Safeguarding Maps. Sue Martin reported that these ALSF projects would be discussed at a BGS hosted event at Newtown on 21.5.09.

### **8/10 Any other Business**

Reported: - BBC Countryfile was covering minerals issues in Portland on 15.3.09.

- ALSF Local funding –DEFRA had been contacted re. Members’ disquiet at the misuse of ALSF funds for Local Authority general expenditure. A reply had been received which seemed to have missed the point..

-The next BGS “Quarrying or Not” event was scheduled for 30.6.09.

### **8/11 Dates of Next Meetings:-**

Thursday 18 June 2009

Thursday 12 November 2009

Both at the IoMMM HQ, 1 Carlton House Terrace, London SW1Y 5DB

