



Chairman-Keith Duff – keith@duff21.fsnet.co.uk
Secretary - Duncan Pollock - pollock25@talktalk.net.

Minutes of the Tenth Meeting of the UK Minerals Forum, held at The IoMMM HQ, 1 Carlton House Terrace, London SW1Y 5DB on Thursday 12 November 2009 at 10.30am.

Present; -

Keith Duff - Chairman
Duncan Pollock - Secretary

Andrew Bloodworth - BGS
John Cummins - DoENI
Mick Daynes - CBIMG/mpa/Hanson
Bob Fenton - CBIMG/MAUK
Chris Hall - CBIMG/BCC
Lester Hicks
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
Hugh Lucas - AI/mpa
Brian Marker - retiring Chairman
Mark Plummer - CLG
Richard Read – Hampshire CC/POS
Joanne Smith - Welsh Assembly Government
Andy Tickle - CPRE
Simon van der Byl - mpa
Chris Waite - SEERAWP/LAWP
Paul Wilcox - Staffs CC/POS
Lucy Yates - CLG
Apologies:

David Brewer - Coalpro
John Brumwell - BIS
Ruth Chambers - CNP
Dwight Demorais - Lafarge
Chris Dobbs - CBIMG/mpa/Tarmac
Peter Doyle -English Stone Forum
Richard Gill - BIS
David Highley
Hannah Townley - Natural England

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

10/1 Welcomes and Introductions

The Chairman introduced himself as taking over the Chair from Brian Marker. Prior to his retirement, he had been Chief Scientist at English Nature for 15 years and was a geologist by profession. He had worked closely with Government, local government, NGO's and industry and intended to be a neutral chairman.

He proposed a vote of thanks to Brian Marker who had led the UKMF for three productive years since its inception.

The Chairman welcomed Lucy Yates (CLG) to her first meeting.

10/2 Minutes of the Last Meeting (18.6.09)

These were agreed.

10/3 Matters Arising, Not Dealt with Elsewhere

Re Minute 9/3 - Environment Agency representation

Discussed - how to progress this issue.

Agreed: - (i) –the correct EA contact to approach was Claire Robertson, the EA “Mineral Industry Champion”, who was based in Peterborough.

(ii) Simon van der Byl would provide contact details to the Chairman, who would make the approach to Claire Robertson.

Action – SVB/Chairman

Re Minute 9/4 – LWM3 Revised Brief

Noted: - the Revised Brief and working group reports had been published, and both were on the Forum website - thanks expressed to Andrew Bloodworth.

Re Minute 9/6(a) Carbon Issues

Reported – CBIMG had discussed this issue on 8th. July. Nigel Jackson had been asked to discuss with Lester Hicks what the next steps should be regarding carbon issues in the light of the findings of the Boston Consulting report commissioned by the Carbon Trust.. This had not yet taken place, but would be held as soon as practicable following this meeting with the aim of making progress for UKMF as well as CBIMG.. Simon van der Byl reported that the asphalt industry had published its “Carbon Footprint Calculator”, which was relevant to this issue. Chris Hall reported similar work by BCC.

Agreed – Nigel Jackson and Lester Hicks would report back on this issue at the next meeting. **Action – NJ/LH**

Re Minute 9/10 – Contacts at DECC

Reported – the likely DECC contact was Niall Mackenzie. Once Richard Gill had supplied contact details, the Chairman would approach him –**Action – RG/Chairman**

10/4 LWM3 & 4, and Forum Working Groups.

Noted: - the LWM 3 Brief and Working Group reports had been published. There was a need to publicise the leaflet more widely.

Agreed – Nigel Jackson would draft an appropriate cover letter for Chairman to sign, for dispatch to a wider audience. NJ also to recommend the circulation list. **Action – NJ/Chairman**

Reported - by Nigel Jackson - because of the recession, LWM4 had been put back by one year and was now booked for 7 November 2011 at the QE 2 Conference Centre in London. It would be followed by an evening reception at the House of Commons. It would be appropriate for the Forum to feed topics into the LWM4 programme if members wished.

Agreed – there should be a discussion at the next Forum meeting on possible issues for input to LWM4 from the Forum. **Action – Secretary**

CBIMG would be bearing the cost of LWM4 with the aim of breaking even or making a small profit.

Some members expressed disappointment at the postponement of the 2010 event but agreed this was inevitable because of the recession, which had already cost 15,000 jobs amongst mpa members.

10/5 UKMF Work Programme – 2010/2011

Discussed: -The three papers circulated with the agenda papers: -

(i) Communities and Communications Toolkit-(WG2009/1)

Brian Marker introduced this paper, making the following key points: -

- Public hostility to mineral working was the biggest challenge to the minerals industry.
- The three authors of the paper had looked at the Community Development Toolkit and concluded that it was designed for developing countries; it was thus not very relevant to a heavily legislated country like the UK.
- They had looked at three options –
 - (a) A communications checklist
 - (b) A guidance document
 - (c) The need for further detailed research

Members then discussed the paper and the three options, making the following key points: -

- The Minerals Products Association had discussed with the Tories their concerns at the “localism” manifesto issue. The Tories seemed to accept that crushed rock supplies needed central planning but believed that sand and gravel needed no central /regional guidance but should be dealt with using the proximity principle – presumably to be managed by the CC’s and UDC’s.
- Paul Wilcox felt a checklist would be too site based, and that there was no need for any more guidance documents.
- Since mineral proposals already require SEA and are covered by lots of other statutory requirements regarding consultation, checklists and guidance documents were unnecessary.
- The key problem was how to engage the public at the strategic level – a stakeholder event/seminar might help to focus the issues.
- There were mixed views on the relevance of an operator’s track record of working and restoration.
- The public needed more confidence in the effectiveness of the monitoring activities of MPAs.
- Communities were often suspicious of getting engaged with the industry and worried that they could be bullied into accepting mineral proposals. There was, however, a need for better community engagement at the pre-application stage.
- There was no need for more research into the topic - the information was already largely there.
- The QPA/mpa “Make the Link” campaign could indicate the way the topic should be dealt with. Whilst the public were beginning to understand issues of energy, food, water, flooding etc., they did not yet understand the link between construction and quarrying.
- Using concrete as an example, once issues of whole-life-costing were fed in, it became a very sustainable product.
- There was a need to focus on the political audience at the local level, perhaps with a pilot local engagement event.

- The CPA publication “Construction in the Economy” provided a useful example of what could be needed.

In concluding the discussion the Chairman made the following points: -

- a) Members seemed to agree that no further research was needed.
- b) The key issue seemed to be the need to keep the topic strategic using “Make-the Link” as a format.
- c) The key concern was how to develop a clear and compelling message, and then progress the issue.

Agreed:-

- i. A Communities and Communications working group should be set up with at least the following “volunteers”: -Brian Marker, Richard Read, Hugh Lucas, Andy Tickle or , and any other willing volunteers.
- ii. The working group should be led by Brian Marker, and should focus initially on a literature review, and on starting to develop the key messages.
- iii. The Group should report progress at the next UKMF meeting.

Actions –as above

CBI Resources

At this point Nigel Jackson reported that CBIMG were prepared to fund up to three working groups with a 12-15 month life and at a cost of no more than £4000 - £5000 per group. The Mineral Products Association were prepared to offer meeting rooms at no cost at their London HQ. The Forum welcomed this, and thanked the CBIMG and the MPA.

(ii) Distributing Minerals to Future Markets and Aggregate Supplies from outside AONB’s and National Parks –(WG 2009/2)

Paul Wilcox introduced the paper and made the following key points: -

- There were two aspects of the work-aggregate distribution issues and the issue of hard rock working from outside the AONBs and National Parks.

In discussing the paper, members responded with the following key views: -

- The timetable for the work was too tight – the 12-15 months offered by CBIMG would be needed.
- A number of BGS research projects were relevant to the work as were three MAUK/ASLF projects.
- There was a need to include the UK ports in any work on distribution patterns.
- A previous SEERAWP report had looked at the subject of aggregates through ports in the South East.
- Phase 1 of the work would necessarily concentrate on aggregates but Phase 2 could be widened to include other minerals
- The BGS distribution modelling research would provide a useful input.

- The work should cover the UK as England “imported” crushed rock from Wales, Northern Ireland and Scotland.

Agreed :-

i. The Group would be led by Paul Wilcox with Chris Waite acting as technical secretary to the group. The timetable for the project would be amended in the light of the 12-15 months offered by the CBIMG.

The working group should be set up with at least the following “volunteers”: -Jo Mankelow (BGS), Bob Fenton, Peter Huxtable, Mick Daynes, Jerry McLaughlin (mpa), David Brewer, plus, if possible, Ruth Chambers and a ports rep.

- The work should include issues relating to ports, and a mention of coal may be appropriate here.
- Phase 2 should be widened to include other minerals.
- A progress report should be made to the next UKMF meeting.

Comment [MD1]: Leader needed for group – any volunteers from amongst the membership?

Actions – as above

(iii) Planning Skills Issues (WG 2009/3)

Paul Wilcox introduced this paper, in the absence of David Brewer, and made the following key points: -

- There was a need to identify the scale of the problem, both in the MPAs and in the industry.
- There was much background information relating to the topic.

Members responded with the following key points: -

- More facts and figures on the scale of the problem were needed, to generate useful metrics.
- There was a need to ascertain which planning courses and mineral planning courses were available.
- The RTPI would have much data on availability of planning courses.

Agreed :-

- A working group should be set up, led by David Brewer, with at least the following “volunteers” –Ken Hobden (mpa), Paul Wilcox, a CLG rep, a BGS rep., ?Alan Thompson (Capita), ?Mark Walton (Alliance Planning), plus RTPI/RICS reps.
- The project should be UK wide.
- The 12-15 month timescale was appropriate.
- The Group should report on progress to the next UKMF meeting.
- Chairman would speak with David Brewer, and write inviting external members of the working group

Actions – as above

10/6 Pilot Local Engagement Event

Nigel Jackson reported that it had not yet been possible to prepare a paper, but he would get together with Richard Read to progress this. A test event in Hampshire might be appropriate.

Agreed – after discussion, agreed that an event should be deferred until after the General Election, and that the third quarter of 2010 would be appropriate.

Action – NJ/RR

10/7 Managed Aggregate Supply System – (MASS)

In introducing this item, Lester Hicks suggested that it could be easier for him as an Independent member than for others present to raise a political issue, even though it had already been alluded to several times under earlier items. Other work he was doing with English mineral planning authorities indicated that for many (and most Counties, now all Conservative controlled) public-facing work on preparing mineral development plan documents had been put on hold until after the 2010 General Election.

This was partly in response to a letter Caroline Spelman, the Shadow Communities Secretary, had sent in August to Conservative leaders of authorities about the proposed scrapping of regional planning, as part of the Party's drive to promote localism. Though this did not mention the MASS, the letter promised authorities would be able to "put the brakes on elements of Regional Spatial Strategies they find undesirable" and "undo unwanted policies imposed on them.....changing elements which are particularly unpopular or undesirable". It was clear county leaders felt this applied to the proposed latest sub-regional aggregates apportionments, in line with their existing and growing resistance to them in several regions. They foresaw being freed at a stroke from the politically difficult issue of identifying future areas or sites for mineral extraction, principally for aggregates.

In the event of a Conservative government after the 2010 election there was on present indications every prospect of the MASS being ended. Reversion to the direct sub-regional apportionments previously made by the RAWPs was unlikely, given the hostility of political leaders in mineral planning authorities and the strength of the Conservatives' current drive towards localism. The potential savings in costs of running the system would also be attractive in the inevitably brutal public expenditure climate of the next few years (as was clear from item 10, later on the Agenda). Ending the MASS would create a number of problems for those involved in it:

- increased costs in plan making, considering applications and defending appeals, as each authority researches and develops its own evidence on local and regional aggregates demand and supply in the absence of common data. National and local political leaders did not seem to have registered authorities would be obliged to address this to secure sound, SEA-compliant plans;
- similarly increased costs for companies, NGOs and local community groups involved in plan preparation and applications;

- authorities with surplus resources becoming reluctant to supply authorities in deficit areas not prepared to grant new permissions themselves, leading to ad hoc. local approaches to supply that would be sub-optimal in economic and environmental terms;
- loss of expertise in collecting and analysing supply data regionally and nationally – once lost not easily replaceable in any later supply crisis;
- removal of the only systematic and structured area of dialogue on mineral planning and supply between government and the other stakeholders in England

. Aggregate extraction accounts for about 75% of the UK's land-won minerals by tonnage. It is the only form of mineral working where successive governments have hitherto seen wider benefits in a shared system of supply management. Remove this and the remaining work of the Forum would, on present indications of limited government interest, become thin and disjointed. It was therefore worth the Forum considering the issue now; before firm political commitments were made under which the MASS could well disappear.

:

.

The Chairman responded by asking whether the Forum might wish to make a submission setting out the benefits of the MASS approach, if it became clear that the system was at risk.

In response members made the following key points: -

- It would be helpful for the Forum to respond, if possible.
- The Tories had backtracked a little and accepted the need to keep crushed rock as a centrally guided issue.
- There was a need to persuade the Tories that localism would not work for minerals.
- The Tory Green Paper on localism was expected shortly, but not now before Christmas.
- The second Tory spokesman on the subject was John Howell - the new Henley MP, who had a track record of opposing sand and gravel in Oxfordshire.
- The Forum should respond expressing its belief that the MASS system was effective and beneficial
- MASS had worked well for the last 30 years or so and the Forum needed to construct a response.
- The Associate Parliamentary Minerals Group might be a useful point of contact.
- A concerted and unified Forum view could be very helpful, though it was recognised that central and local government representatives/observers could not comment on the political development of party policy ahead of a General Election.

In a discussion on what might happen post-Election it was made clear that a new Government could just scrap any National guidance overnight, if it wished but would need legislation to abolish the Regional planning tier. However, announcement of this

intention would count as “emerging policies”. It was likely that local politicians sympathetic to abolition would not implement “unwelcome” regional material pending abolition. Legal challenges of such inaction were most unlikely in practice, not least because they could hardly be heard in time.

Agreed:-

- i. A suitable UKMF response should be drafted with appropriate caveats
- ii. Such a response should be timed to follow the forthcoming Tory Green Paper
- iii. The response would have to be cleared by members in correspondence
- iv. Concerns could also be addressed to the Associate Parliamentary Minerals Group, though its ability to respond would be limited by the party political nature of the issue.

Action –Chairman and Members

10/8 Forum Website

Reported by Andrew Bloodworth - the Forum website was up and running but needed more up to date copy, especially Forum minutes.

Agreed:- Minutes should be passed to BGS once they had been approved by the following Forum meeting.

Action – Secretary

10/9 – CLG Update

Reported by Mark Plummer the following topics of interest: -

AM2009 - the tendering process was underway

AMRI 2008 – this survey would be published on 20 November 2009.

Parliament – there was growing concern amongst MPs on the issue of opencast coal.

Waste Framework Directive - The stage 1 consultation had been completed. Stage 2 was now in progress.

Mine Waste Directive - CLG/EA/DEFRA were preparing guidance on the relationship between planning and environmental controls.

National Policy Statements – these were being issued for consultation at present.

Marine Bill - work on this was relevant to the issue of MASS.

RAWP Consultation - Papers on this had been circulated with the agenda papers. Mark Plummer felt members could not assume that the RAWP process would continue as a Government function. Central funds were limited – one solution might be to return funding and support to the MPAs. Forum members were urged to

respond to the consultation, since it was critical that a strong evidence base was created.

After discussion it was Agreed – that

- i. There should not be a UKMF response and
- ii. Members should make every effort to respond individually.

Action –Members

10/10 Other issues Of Interest –

The list of other issues listed in the agenda papers was briefly discussed and the following were highlighted: -

EU Soils Directive – The EU Presidency (France) was reopening this topic.

Planning System Review - Four more consultation papers were expected to be issued soon.

Minerals Mapping of Wales - the draft maps would be issued for consultation soon. BGS work on this project was on schedule.

ALSF Local Funding – this was still an issue of concern.

10/11 Any Other Business No additional matters were raised.

10/12 Dates of Meetings in 2010

These have been confirmed as - Thursday 18 March 2010
- Thursday 17 June 2010 and
- Thursday 18 November 2010

All at 10.30 a.m, at 1 Carlton House Terrace London, SW1

23.11.09 version

