



**Chairman – Lester Hicks**  
**Secretary – Chris Waite**

**Minutes of 24th Meeting of the UK Minerals Forum,  
held at The IoMMM HQ, 1 Carlton House Terrace, London SW1Y 5DB  
on Thursday 26 June 2014 at 11 00am.**

**Present: -**

Lester Hicks - Chairman

Ruth Bradshaw - CNP

Bob Brown – CPRE  
Laura Cohen – British Ceramic Federation  
Ruth Chambers – Independent  
Alan Everard – Lafarge Tarmac  
Jim Davies – EA  
Tony Cook – POS/LGA  
David Highley – Independent  
Ken Hobden - MPA  
Lonek Wojtulewicz – POS/LGA

Bob LeClerc - CBIMG

Jo Mankelow – BGS  
Nick Tennant – DCLG  
Eamon Mythen - DCLG  
Jon Humble - EH  
Joanne Smith – Welsh Assembly  
Mark North – Kier Minerals Ltd  
Paul Wilkinson – The Wildlife Trusts  
Nigel Jackson – CBIMG/MPA  
Peter Day – POS  
Chris Waite – Secretary

**1 Welcome and Introductions**

1.1 The Chairman welcomed Nick Tennant, Head of Planning for Minerals and Sustainable Waste Management team at DCLG to his first UKMF meeting.

**2 Apologies for absence**

Apologies were received from:

Simon van der Byl – CBIMG/MPA

Mick Daynes - Hanson

Keith Duff – former Chairman  
Bob Fenton – CBIMG/MAUK  
Brian Marker – Independent  
Nick Horsley – Sibelco

Andrew Tyler – OMYA UK Ltd

Jane Chelliah-Manning - BIS

Peter Huxtable – CBIMG/BAA/IoM3

Graham Marchbank – Scottish Government  
Naledi Hinds - DECC  
Hannah Townley – NE  
Barney Pilgrim – HJ Banks

**3 Minutes of the Last Meeting (20 March 2014)**

3.1 The minutes were agreed subject to amendments proposed by LC to the end of the third sentence of paragraph 6.3 to read, '.....about the precise impacts on compensation in high energy using sectors.'; and the end of the fourth sentence to read '....despite the welcome doubling of the Annual Investment Allowance until the end of 2015.'

#### 4 Action Points from the last meeting not dealt with elsewhere

4.1 Mineral planner training (from the 2010-2011 Working Groups): The Chairman said that after the last meeting, in reply to an enquiry from NH, loQ reported a peer review of its draft Mineral Planner in-service distance learning unit was due "soon" from Martin Layer of Smiths of Bletchington, staff at Heaton Planning, Keyworth, Nottingham and planning consultant Martin Millmore. However, by mid-June this had still not been done, and the Chairman had again urged its importance if the product was to be useable. Nevertheless, loQ still hoped to launch in September, at a price not yet fixed but "not expensive". They agreed it would need publicity targeted at local authority mineral planning staff. The Chairman felt it was unfortunate the Unit has not been tested with front-line mineral planners. This was not familiar territory for loQ; planners need more depth on minerals policy and the underlying law than quarry managers. Nevertheless, having got this far it was still worth trying to get a worthwhile product onto the market. There was undoubtedly a skills and resource gap in mineral planning authorities which should be addressed.

LW agreed it was important to have input from practicing MPA mineral planners and said he would speak to his contacts in Heaton Planning. **Action: LW and Chairman**

4.2 Minerals awareness in revised school curricula (from the 2010-2011 Working Groups): In BM's unavoidable absence, the Chairman drew attention to the previously circulated note on a meeting BM had attended with representatives of the Earth Science Teachers Association (ESTA) at Keele University on 17<sup>th</sup> May. After discussion they both felt considerable further work would be needed to change the primary and secondary curriculums to explain the role of minerals in the economy and society and the impacts of extraction; engagement with other teacher groupings (e.g. geography, economics, environment); detailed curriculum analysis and development; and negotiating agreed proposals with the curriculum authorities (for both primary and secondary) and the exam boards (secondary). ESTA (and presumably other teachers' bodies) could advise and assist, but would not have the skills and resources to lead this work

To secure its aims the Forum would therefore have to pick up and drive this as a live project. That would require some money, and sustained time and commitment. On the evidence of previous projects BM and the Chairman had concluded the Forum did not have the resources and capacity to carry forward the required work.

However, they felt it might be possible to leave the existing work in good order for others to pick it up in future if circumstances were favourable. This could involve:

- identifying existing resources and indexing them to curriculum and syllabuses. This would need a few interested people and need not cost the Forum much (e.g. a few co-ordination meetings). BM might be willing to lead this and the Chairman could also help, provide there was active support from enough Forum members;
- compiling a list of people from the Forum's membership (and their parent organisations) willing to give talks to schools in their areas - perhaps hosted by the Geological Society. (comparable to an existing list held by the Geologists' Association for geology in general). It would require committed volunteers from Forum members and their parent organisations, briefed on how to pitch issues for school-children;
- essential support for these measures through awareness raising amongst teachers. This would need to be repeated from time-to-time and might cost the placement of a few advertisements in teachers' journals.

In a short discussion the Forum agreed it could not resource a full development project, but asked the Chairman to liaise with BM and RLeC (on funding) on possibly tidying up the relevant material and setting up a list of speakers for future use.

JH endorsed the value of site visits. LC agreed some training in presentations to schools would be helpful and drew attention to the services of Diane Aston, Training and Education Director at IoMMM.

**Action: BM, RLeC and Chairman**

5.2 Future Scenarios Working Group – see item 5 below.

7.1 UK Territorial Administrations, Scotland – the Chairman had given GM details of the contact at loQ developing the mineral planner training unit. Also see item 9.

9.1 Seminar on National Parks RB said that the date of the seminar had now been fixed. It would be held at Aberthaw Power Station on Thursday 6 November. The focus would be on government policy in Wales and changes to environmental planning policy. RB invited UKMF members to suggest individuals or organisations which might wish to take part in the seminar.

**Action: UKMF members**

## **5 Future Scenarios Working Group**

5.1 JM said speakers at a Conference at St Andrew's University had quoted the Past Trends report in two papers, and the report had been downloaded 650 times between the end of January and May.2014.

5.2 The Future Minerals Scenarios for the UK had been redrafted following comments from the last UKMF and Working Group (WG) meetings. Further minor comments on the text and format had been received on the draft circulated for this meeting, but there were no suggestions for any structural changes. Although some had thought the report too long, it was felt necessary to include current concerns and problems before addressing the future. It was recognized that some of the tables and text need updating with later figures. JM also agreed that the date of the report needed to be made clear – probably July 2014.

5.3 The Chairman agreed that an analysis of the present concerns was needed before proposing scenarios for the future. He had also recommended a short introduction before the Executive Summary setting out the purpose of the report and UKMF ownership. This was **agreed**.

5.4 A suggestion by LW of including housing completion figures in the report was not agreed as it was generally felt that housing alone would not be the main determinant in an upsurge in demand for construction aggregates.

5.5 In response to a question raised by DH it was **agreed** that Table 2 & 3 would be placed in an Appendix. There would then be three annexes – the others being a summary of mineral resources, and on self-sufficiency.

5.6 NT recommended that a strong theme arising from the report was the local growth agenda and how important the supply of minerals was to jobs and investment. The industry was undervalued by government while supply continued in the background. To catch the attention of Ministers and politicians the report could emphasis the consequences for jobs and GDP if it was hampered by lack of a strategy to deliver the required materials.

5.7 KH said that he felt the conclusions in the report and actions from them needed to be more 'punchy'. JH agreed. The Chairman suggested this could be done by revising pages 24-27 on Conclusions and Recommendations without changing the substance. NJ said that for purposes of the further work the CBI Minerals Group was doing to develop the case to government for a UK Minerals Strategy, the present draft report was fine. Other Forum members also were concerned that any word changes could change the careful balance that had been obtained through negotiation between different representatives at the Working Group. JM said that any changes would require time to consult the WG by email with a further redraft.

5.7 It was **agreed** that UKMF should sign off the report, subject to redrafting of the Conclusions and Recommendations, without upsetting the overall balance, and any further minor points sent to JM & DH by 4 July. A final report would be circulated by JM to the WG for clearance, with the objective of completion by mid July. It would eventually be published on the internet (timing and details to be considered later) and the final text passed to NJ for editing in connection with LWM5 (see item 6 below).

- 5.8 UKMF thanked JM & DH and the Working Group for the time and energy taken in producing the Future Scenarios report, bringing together a range of views and positions into an agreed document. **Action: JM & DH, UKMF members**

## 6 Living With Minerals 5

- 6.1 NJ said that the LWM5 Conference in November would provide a good opportunity to present and promote the core messages in both the earlier Past Trends and the Future Scenarios Reports. However, for that they would need to be accessible by a wider and less expert audience. He was prepared to assist with photos and graphics in a streamlined composite document and would employ Barry Hedges (as for previous LWMs) to prepare text which captured the essence of both reports. It was agreed he would consult UKMF on this in September/October by email. A facilitator with suitable gravitas would again be employed at LWM5. UKMF's work on Future Minerals Scenarios would also form an important building block for development by CBI Minerals Group of proposals for a UK Minerals Strategy.
- 6.2 Continuing, NJ said Hugh Lucas was leading the CBIMG preparation of a proposed Minerals Strategy. This would not be drafted until 2015, but a scoping report would be available for LWM5. The objective was to seek Ministerial consent to the Strategy, either the present government before next March, or the next government after May 2015. The emerging Strategy (construction aggregates, coal, clay ceramics and mineral products) would be reported to UKMF as it develops. Onshore oil and gas interests were not included but were being kept in touch. **Action HL and NJ**

## 7 Verbal Report by DCLG

- 7.1 Eamon Mythen reported that DCLG minerals and waste team now had a full staff complement, with Nick Tennant now team leader, and would move to former Home Office accommodation in Marsham St in July & August. He hoped any service disruption would be minimal. There had been no recent Ministerial changes. DCLG's website had been updated to include all AWP Secretary contacts and 2012 monitoring reports (except for the West Midlands which is producing the 2011 & 2012 reports together), and will include 2013 reports when they are all available. An AWP Secretaries meeting would be held before an NCG meeting. Annual Minerals Raised Inquiry: clearance had been obtained for ONS to undertake the 2014 survey. A request to proceed was now before Nick Boles. National 4 Yearly Aggregate Minerals Survey: a number of internal hurdles had been cleared and a bid was to be made to Nick Boles for permission to seek tenders.. This would be for the 2013 calendar year in order to maintain continuity in the 4 yearly data series required by industry, planners and AWPs in analysing and interpreting data. To avoid confusion DCLG agreed to term this AM13 in line with past practice and not AM14. Planning Guidance (NPPG) issued on line 6 March, would have a number of additions relevant to minerals planning - on peat; underground coal gasification; underground storage of natural gas. New planning policy on waste management would also be issued, replacing PPS10. Timing: summer 2014, possibly even before the Parliamentary recess due on 22<sup>nd</sup> July. Permitted Development Rights a consultation in the summer would include proposed retail use class changes, greater flexibility for changes to residential use, some exemptions for waste management site operational facilities and minor developments in support of businesses. Minerals would not be directly affected. Onshore Oil & Gas: DCLG had delivered the planning component of the wider regulatory framework. DECC was now consulting on its proposals (announced on 23 May, consultation closing on 12 August) to simplify underground access for shale gas and deep geothermal operations. Local people would receive notification, but property owners or tenants would not have to be consulted on or give permission for operations below 300m under their land. Provision would be made for a voluntary payment of £20,000 per lateral well to the local community. Implementation would be through the Infrastructure Bill – see below.

Public Health England had published a report on public health impacts of exposure to chemical and radioactive pollutants as a result of shale gas extraction. (NB: the naturally occurring radioactive aspects are common to all oil and gas drilling, not unique to shale gas).

Infrastructure Bill: would also transform the Highways Agency into a government owned company and simplify the procedures for nationally significant infrastructure. BIS Select Committee, Extractive Industries Sector: the Minister had asked why government does not have a minerals strategy. RLeC noted that this picked up submissions by CBI Minerals Group and was an opening for industry to propose one. DfT was allocating £168 million for pot hole prevention & repair across England. Brownfield land: to bring forward development a £5million fund was to be launched to support LDOs with a target of putting 90% of sites suitable for housing into production by 2020. In addition, £400million was to be spent on promoting 20 new housing zones in London, and £200million on 10 zones outside London.

Revised EIA Directive: the text had been published in the Official Journal on 25 April, dropping proposals for extending its application. No decisions had been made yet on how the Directive would be transposed by the due date May 2017.

Hampshire CC Oil & Gas Information Day some 200 delegates attended this very informative event in Winchester. The purpose was to explain to those attending what exploration and extraction would actually entail before any proposals were submitted. Professor Sanderson from Southampton University had been particularly helpful in presenting facts about hydraulic fracturing, demystifying misconceptions. EM felt that the day had raised three key issues

- the need for more factual information to counter misinformation
- armed with bad examples of poor regulatory practice in the USA, public cynicism that the government's regulatory framework would be effective and protect communities
- clarification of the scale of activities and cumulative impacts eg could the 3 current sites in Hampshire become 10 or 100?

TC had also attended and while agreeing with EM's report, added that there was a major concern over traffic impacts.

The Chairman said W Sussex CC had held a similar successful day attended by some 160 representatives

Cuadrilla had submitted the first planning applications for an exploration site and a series of associated monitoring stations in south Lancashire. If permission was granted it proposed to drill, hydraulically fracture and test flow of gas from up to four exploratory wells and monitor before and after operations.

## 8 Environmental Update

- 8.1 A paper compiled by John Humble from contributions by from CNP, NE and EH had been circulated. In response to a question, the applicants for a potash mine in the North York Moors National Park maintain that an application would be submitted by the end of July. The report was **noted** and thanks given to Jon and those contributing.

## 9 UK Territorial Administrations

1. Wales: JS said the Planning Bill Wales was being prepared for Autumn, and had repercussions for delivery and structures, including local government reorganization. A National Development Framework for Wales may also be produced this year and it was intended to integrate minerals policy with land policy. An Environment Bill would introduce a regime for natural resource management and be the focus for the new body Natural Resource Wales. Aggregate Assessments had been completed at regional level for the whole of Wales (Wales retains its 2 RAWPs), and would be published after being fully endorsed by local authorities by the end of July. Carmarthenshire had taken on the Secretary role for South Wales RAWP.
2. Scotland: a note by Graham Marchbank had been circulated and **was taken as read**.

3. Northern Ireland: no report had been received.

## **10 Any Other Business**

- 10.1 The Chairman reported on a recent Court of Appeal judgment in a case involving conventional oil and gas drilling in the Surrey Hills AONB and Metropolitan Green Belt. This had confirmed that the statement in planning policy for England (NPPF para. 90) that mineral extraction was [in principle] “not incompatible” with the purposes of the Green Belt also included the preceding stages of exploration and appraisal. The Inspector on appeal had rejected this argument. (NPPF para. 147, uses the better term “minerals development” to cover all 3 stages in relation to oil and gas, but that had not been carried through into para. 90 on Green Belts). The judgment removes the logical nonsense, at least as regards oil and gas development of all types, that extraction, though permissible, could never be achieved, because the necessary preceding stages of exploration and appraisal were not. But for the avoidance of doubt in future cases it would be desirable to amend para. 90.

## **11 Date of Next Meeting**

- 11.1 The next meeting will start at 11am at the IoMMM, 1 Carlton House Terrace on **Thursday 20 November 2014**. Coffee will be served from 10 30am and a buffet lunch at 1 30pm. To avoid over catering, members are asked to indicate 7 days in advance of the meeting if they could not attend or would not be staying for lunch.