



Chairman - Keith Duff
Secretary – George Muskett

**Minutes of the Fifteenth Meeting of the UK Minerals Forum,
held at The IoMMM HQ, 1 Carlton House Terrace, London SW1Y 5DB
on Thursday 23 June 2011 at 11.00am.**

Present; -

Keith Duff - Chairman
George Muskett - Secretary

Andrew Bloodworth – BGS
David Brewer - Coalpro
Ruth Chambers - CNP
John Cummins – DoENI
Mick Daynes – CBIMG/mpa/Hanson
Anne Eggleton - EA
Alan Everard – CBIMG/mpa/Tarmac
Clare Harding – DECC
John Herton – BCA/Lafarge
Lester Hicks
David Highley
Ken Hobden - mpa
Peter Huxtable – CBIMG/BAA/IOM3
Bob LeClerc – CBIMG
Hugh Lucas –CBIMG mpa AI
Brian Marker - Former Chairman
Mark Plummer – CLG
Richard Read – Hampshire CC/POS
Ian Selby – Crown Estates
Hannah Townley – Natural England
Andy Tickle - CPRE
Simon van der Byl- CBIMG/mpa
Chris Waite - SEERAWP/LAWP
Dave Walton – Sibelco
Peter Whittington - BIS
Paul Wilcox - Staffs CC/POS
Paul Wilkinson – The Wildlife Trusts

Apologies

Chris Hall – CBIMG/BCC
Bob Fenton – CBIMG/MAUK
Nick Horsley – CBIMG/SAMSA Sibelco
Darren Moorcroft – RSPB
Lucy Yates – DCLG
Graham Marchbank – Scottish Government
Joanne Smith – Welsh Assembly Government

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

15/1 Welcomes and Introductions

The Chairman welcomed Anne Eggleton to her first meeting. It was noted that Mark Plummer and Paul Wilkinson would be arriving late due to other commitments.

15/2 Minutes of the Last Meeting (17.03.2011)

These were agreed, subject to minor typographical amendments and the acknowledgement that Andy Tickle had offered his apologies for not being able to attend the meeting.

15/3 Matters Arising, not dealt with elsewhere

These were summarised in the paper (UKMF/15/P1) tabled at the meeting.

Minute 12/4 - Hosting of WG Reports on UKMF website – completed

Minutes 12/4 & 14/7– The discussions with Defra were incomplete due to re-organisation within Defra, but should be concluded shortly. **Action: Chairman/NJ**

Minute 14/4 –WG1 -The differences of opinion on the content of WG1 report had been discussed, but were yet to be fully resolved. **Action: Paul Wilcox**

Minute 14/4 – WG2 – This was concluded by correspondence with Sector Skills Council.

Minute 14/4 – WG3 – The Devolved Administrations had identified relevant contacts and reviewers for the report had been identified and circulated. Funding was still an issue. **Action: Brian Marker**

Minute 14/7 – Summary of ToR 7 drafted and placed on website – completed

Minute 14/9 – Negative environmental approach to minerals to be put on November Agenda. **Action: Secretary**

Minute 14/12 – HSE representative on Forum to be pursued. **Action Chairman/NJ**

Working Groups at LWM4 - Bob LeClerc advised that final reports would be required by 9 September. Presentations, consisting of 10 slides (maximum) and 5 points per slide would be needed by end of September at the latest. A proforma for these power point presentations is being developed and WGs should concentrate on first producing their final drafts in the required timescale.

A summary of the report for delegate packs, of no more than one side A4, should be produced and WGs should devise 4-6 questions drawn from the report for the interactive voting session at the conference.

15/4 Working Group Progress Reports

The Chairman stated that the draft WG reports were to be considered today to ensure that we were where we wanted to be. He asked that questions focus primarily on substantive issues, with editing details being passed direct to working group chairmen.

Working Group reports had been previously circulated. Discussions were as follows.

WG1 – UKMF/15/P2

Paul Wilcox considered that WG1 had got as far as it could with the draft.

In response to an invitation for questions, it was asked whether it was realistic to apply the Group's approach to cement raw materials and brick clay in view of the relatively small volumes involved. It was suggested that, as the approach was a general template, not necessarily applying in specific circumstances, the reference to clay and cement in para. 8.3 should be removed to leave it as a general statement.

It was agreed that the provenance of factual data referred to in the report should be made clear, and also that such data should, as far as possible, be set out in Annexes.

The Group was asked if it had considered the effect of CrossRail on mineral freight movements. In response it was said that obstacles had been considered generally and that the potential take-over of existing rail paths by CrossRail had been raised in Parliament during the passage of its enabling legislation. It was believed that current levels of freight traffic in its area could be maintained. However it might be worth mentioning CrossRail as an example of major new rail schemes which would in future create a similar need to defend established mineral freight paths on the network.

In further discussion it was noted that Network Rail had already addressed a number of pinch-points in the rail freight system with targeted investment that had benefitted mineral traffic, for example, assisting coal imports. Perhaps this should be acknowledged in the report.

The Chairman then drew attention to the points raised by Andy Tickle's email, tabled at the last meeting, and invited discussion.

Andy Tickle said that he was pleased with the dialogue that had taken place following the concerns raised at the last meeting and that there was more agreed upon than not.

He was supportive of the work that the Group had done, especially on carbon reduction, but that there were a couple of outstanding points. He wondered if seeking a new policy framework for aggregates and coal (6.1) was not too large a hammer to crack the nut of the transportation issues involved. He felt that it went beyond what was necessary. He also wondered if the style of language used was appropriate in some cases. He instanced '*forcing* long-distance aggregates supply back onto roads...' He also thought that references to carbon capture in para. 7.2, whilst logical, were not relevant to the transportation issue.

In extended discussion on this latter point it was suggested that the future of coal and transport was indeed tied up with the need to reduce CO₂ emissions. Government policy requires carbon reduction across the economy and for coal fired power generation that in turn would require installation of carbon capture and storage (CCS). The pace of CCS installation could therefore impact on the future rate of coal burn and in turn that would affect the tonnage of coal to be transported from mines or ports. The transfer of CO₂ from carbon capture plants to points of sub-surface injection was itself a further transport issue. However it was also argued that while carbon capture was potentially relevant to the scale of future coal consumption it was not directly linked to its present pattern of transportation and could appear to fall outside WG1's brief if no explanation was made in the text. Whilst the CCS issue could warrant further consideration by the Forum at a later date it was not restricted to coal alone and to justify its inclusion in the report it would require further supporting arguments in the text.

On the question of planning policy for coal it was noted that the emerging NPPF recognizes coal as a nationally important mineral, although that framework was not yet settled and would be open to public consultation. In that context it was interesting, in the light of the discussions on CCS, that the facilitation of underground carbon storage was the first of the proposed detailed national policies for energy minerals in the PAG draft issued in May.

It had to be noted that the draft report was being written in 'real time' and with the moving target of government policy could become out of step if not constantly reviewed against emerging policy.

It was further mentioned that there was a tension however between maximizing, (or just even protecting), present volumes of freight traffic, and the current Government's focus on passenger traffic. Minerals traffic has to fight hard for its place on the network and the impending need to replace the current generation of rail-served quarries ideally with new rail haul routes should not be overlooked. This requires minerals to be given both a clear policy preference for rail and better consideration of the rail option in both plans and individual planning decisions. Without that the default position would inevitably be road transport. The word *forced* might sound dramatic, but that was the reality of the situation.

The Chairman concluded by asking that the 'moving target' position was captured in the draft and that the detailed terminology is considered in the light of the concerns of the environmental members and the discussions. It was accepted that, if wording cannot be agreed between Paul Wilcox and Andy Tickle, it would be better to state clearly the areas of difference to inform the debate at LWM4.

Members were asked to contribute any comments by way of tracked changes to the draft and forward to Paul as soon as possible.

Action: Members/ PW/AT

WG2 – UKMF/ 15/P3

David Brewer advised that this was not a ‘first draft’ report to LWM4 as the question of funding the identified initiative of a five day course has not been resolved. He was therefore intending to take this to CBIMG in July to investigate the possibility of industry funding. Meanwhile UKMF comments would be helpful in framing that approach.

On the specific points raised at the last meeting, the lack of justification for the statistics used had been addressed as far as possible and the Sector Skills Council has been approached, although no meeting took place as this was deemed unnecessary.

On the question of supplementary funding, it was asked if industry was the only possible source to subsidise the proposed training initiative. In reply David said that the Group had looked exhaustively at other potential sources, but the public sector was losing resources and facing budget cuts, whilst existing courses were failing to attract students. This situation was not helping industry in the least, with shortages of adequately trained staff leading to costly delays in planning and the possibility of having to face the expense of public inquiries if decisions were not made or unjustified refusals were issued.

However should industry decide in CBIMG that it would not be appropriate to help finance a five day course the question of how to pay for it would need to be put to LWM4.

One member thought that there should be more in the report about the options available, but nevertheless the work so far was a significant achievement.

In further discussions it was noted that local authorities had to manage their diminishing resources in the light of a wide range of new initiatives such as local energy projects which also now includes energy from waste. There was an imbalance between available skills, the changing demands of the economy and planning for future development. The resources available to authorities also differed significantly. This was an issue that merged with WG3’s work on education and communication and was worthy of discussion at LWM4.

Areas that had not been explored in the draft WG2 report but which could warrant further consideration were mentoring, the exchange of staff between authorities and/or the private sector, and sharing of services between authorities. Whilst a specific course for those having to deal with minerals, but without the skills, was the pragmatic solution these other avenues could also be considered.

An alternative to supporting the development of a new course would be to support existing courses and see what transpired with time. However it was pointed out those existing courses either did not directly target the area of concern or were already

struggling through lack of resources. Meanwhile expertise was being lost and an early solution needed to be found.

In view of the various issues raised in discussion it was felt that since LWM4 will have a broad audience it could be presented with 'what if' scenarios for debate. The issues and the consequences of not addressing them could then be discussed.

Responding to the debate David agreed that the issue of funding was a difficult one, but WG2 did not have the resources to pursue all fronts. He would now approach CBIMG and consider the outcome. If CBIMG could not agree to provide the required subsidy to get a 5 day course moving he agreed that the full range of issues and possible options would need to be aired at LWM4.

Action: David Brewer

WG3 – UKMF/15/P4

Brian Marker advised that they had concentrated on the practical materials:

- i) Education aimed at schools -
BGS has developed material to fit with National Curriculum. Possibility that it will be trialed in selected schools
- ii) Techniques of communication -
Advice to planners on communicating to public
- iii) Preparation of information for public –
This has received extensive input from Barney Pilgrim and Andy Tickle and the text should be stable by end of July. There is a need for illustrations for slides, BGS/mpa/ others

The material is being produced in current context with rolling changes up to LWM4.

John Cummins confirmed that he will convey the Northern Ireland response to BM.

Derivative versions of the materials will have to be devised for the particular circumstances of the devolved administrations.

Peter Huxtable drew attention to his recent email on the Nuffield 'A' level Mineral Process Chemistry teaching module that was developed in the late 1970s. Whilst interesting and useful at the time in bringing mining and minerals into the school syllabus, it was felt unlikely to fit the current, quite strict, requirements of the National Curriculum.

It was agreed that the materials produced would be circulated/made available to UKMF members over the summer for comment, and that they should also be made available in advance to LWM4 delegates.

Action: Brian Marker

Working Group Reports - Sign-Off Process

It was proposed that the sign-off process would entail i) final draft reports to be sent to the Secretary by 10 August for circulation to all Forum members, ii) comments from Forum members to be sent direct to Group conveners by 24 August, iii)

conveners to rationalize responses and iv) Chairman to settle any outstanding issues and sign-off for forwarding to Bob LeClerc by 9 September.

After discussion, it was agreed that the final draft reports would be placed on the UKMF website, to avoid the circulation of lengthy emails; the Secretary would then circulate the link to members. Therefore final drafts should be sent to Andrew Bloodworth by 10 August at the latest. AB to advise the Secretary when the reports are available on the website.

15/5 Environment Update

In the absence of Jon Humble and any comments, the Environment Update report was taken as read.

15/6 National Planning Policy Framework

The Chairman noted that Forum members would be making their own representations to Government, but felt it would be useful for the Forum to briefly discuss any major issues arising.

Mark Plummer outlined the Government's role, confirming that Greg Clarke had invited the views of the Practitioners Advisory Group (PAG) but that it was not Government policy. Consultees need to look at the document as a whole as it attempts to avoid duplication of policy. CLG had received responses from the Planning Officers Society, the Minerals and Waste Group, Mineral Products Association, British Ceramics Confederation and CBI Minerals Group.

It was intended to get the draft NPPF out for public consultation towards the end of July, before the recess.

In response to a question on the production of best practice guidance, MP said that detailed consideration on this has still to take place. He was not able to say what is to be produced or by whom or indeed what status it may have. It will not be part of this consultation, but would form parallel discussions.

The NPPF consultation paper will need to be read alongside the Localism Bill in order to get the full picture.

Members welcomed the presumption in favour of sustainable development, but wondered if there would be a workable definition of sustainable development in the NPPF.

It was confirmed that the draft NPPF is currently being worked on in order to meet internal clearance procedures but it could not be confirmed if such a definition was in the draft. There would be the usual 12 weeks consultation period.

In view of the short period to publication MP confirmed that further representations could be made, but there may not be an opportunity to act on them. Responses should be made to PAG, but MP was happy to receive comments.

In reply to a question, MP confirmed that Government is taking on board the recent Natural Environment White Paper and the UK National Ecosystem Assessment, citing the cessation of peat production as an example. The planning system has a role in deciding such issues and NPPF is a vehicle for this.

MP took the opportunity to run through his update on matters in DCLG.

It was agreed that the final version of the report from Working Group 1 would be copied to DCLG once it had been signed off by the Chairman. It would be intended as a contribution from UKMF, not as a formal response to the NPPF consultation.

Action: Chairman to send final report to Mark Plummer

15/7 HoC Science and Technology Committee Report on Strategically Important Metals

Bob LeClerc introduced this item which has common threads with minerals, in areas such as the requirement on Government to be 'joined up' on resource issues, its need for a comprehensive understanding of resources and the uncertainty in the planning process inhibiting UK investment.

The Chairman commented that the quotes circulated by Bob seemed to fit with the concerns of WG1.

Andrew Bloodworth noted that the final recommendation in the Report was that, due to the delays and uncertainties in the current planning system, investment in mines in the UK was being prevented and that in order to make the most of the UK's valuable domestic resources mines should be classified as nationally significant infrastructure.

Peter Huxtable noted that the Government Waste Policy Review referred to the National Security Strategy that had identified a risk of disruption in supplies of resources essential to the UK such as minerals.

AB advised that a number of government departments had made enquiries of BGS over the last year regarding security of supply of 'strategic' or 'critical' metals and minerals. The EC has been developing its Raw Materials Initiative which may become formalized as an 'Innovation Partnership' backed by substantial research funding. He felt that the debate had focused too much on what minerals/metals should/should not be on the 'critical' list and that broader issues related to supply security should be looked at.

In response to a query AB advised that he understood the BIS and Defra are taking the lead on the response to the Science and Technology Committee report

Mark Plummer confirmed that the Government would be responding to the Committee's recommendations through a statement in the House in due course.

15/8 Living with Minerals 4

In the absence of Nigel Jackson, Bob LeClerc drew attention to the marketing brochure that had been tabled at the meeting. The programme for the conference on

07 November commenced with registration at 10.00hrs and ran through until the close at 18.30hrs. The day's events culminated with a House of Commons Reception, hosted by the Associate Parliamentary Minerals Group at 19.00 hrs.

He was grateful to the sponsors that had come forward so far, but more would be most welcome. A website had been set up and he asked that UKMF circulate this to members. Booking for the conference could also be done via the website.

15/9 Any Other Business

The Chairman asked that any apologies for absence from future meetings were given in good time. It would be helpful to catering and the costs thereof to know who would be staying for the lunch.

15/10 Dates of Meetings in 2011

Thursday 17 November 2011.

At 1 Carlton House Terrace London SW1 - starting at 11.00hrs

Final draft 02.11.11