



Chairman - Keith Duff
Secretary - Duncan Pollock

Minutes of the Thirteenth Meeting of the UK Minerals Forum, held at The IoMMM HQ, 1 Carlton House Terrace, London SW1Y 5DB on Thursday 18 November 2010 at 10.30am.

Present; -

Keith Duff - Chairman
Duncan Pollock - Secretary

Andrew Bloodworth - BGS
David Brewer - Coalpro
John Cummins - DoENI
Mick Daynes - CBIMG/mpa/Hanson
Chris Hall - CBIMG/BCC
Clare Harding – DECC
John Herton – BCA/Lafarge
Lester Hicks
David Highley
Ken Hobden - mpa
Jon Humble - English Heritage
Peter Huxtable – CBIMG/BAA/IOM3
Nigel Jackson – CBIMG/mpa
Bob LeClerc - CBIMG
Brian Marker - Former Chairman
Mark Plummer – DCLG
Richard Read – Hampshire CC/POS/LGA
Clare Robertson - Environment Agency
Ian Selby – Crown Estates
Joanne Smith – Welsh Assembly Government
Andy Tickle – CPRE
Simon van der Byl- CBIMG/mpa
Chris Waite - SEERAWP/LAWP
Paul Wilcox - Staffs CC/POS/LGA
Lucy Yates – DCLG

Murray Gardner – NERC
Mike Ackroyd - NERC

Apologies

Ruth Chambers - CNP
Peter Doyle - English Stone Forum
Alan Everard –CBIMG/mpa/Tarmac
Bob Fenton – CBIMG/MAUK
Nick Horsley – CBIMG/SAMSA/Sibelco
George Muskett –Secretary Designate
Hannah Townley – Natural England

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

13/1 Welcomes and Introductions

The Chairman welcomed John Heron (BCA/Lafarge) and Ian Selby (Crown Estates) to their first meeting. He also welcomed Murray Gardner and Mike Ackroyd (NERC) who would be giving a presentation on Knowledge Exchange.

13/2 Minutes of the Last Meeting (17 June 2010)

These were agreed, subject to a spelling correction to Minute 12/6 (top of page 6) and to a minor grammatical change to Minute 12/9 –bullet 2 page 7.

13/3 Matters Arising, not dealt with elsewhere

Minute 11/3 – Post Election Letter – this had not yet been drafted but would be actioned following discussions at this meeting.

Action – Chairman/NJ

Minute 11/12 – Agreed – the final letter should be recirculated to members.

Action – Secretary

Minute 12/4 – Agreed –Not all the WG progress reports for the website had been supplied. It was agreed that revised summary information should be sent to the Secretary by the end of November.

Action – Secretary and convenors.

-The template for the WG reports was in preparation. **Action –NJ**

Minute12/5(a) –Noted –The CBI infrastructure contact was Murray Birt

13/4 Presentation by Murray Gardner –Knowledge Manager – Earth Sciences – NERC

Murray Gardner gave an illustrated presentation on the work of the NERC Knowledge Exchange Group.

Copies of these presentations and a further NERC document had been circulated to members by the Secretary on 19 November and points of emphasis are summarised below: -

Murray Gardner introduced his presentation by pointing out that the NERC Science Research Budget had been “frozen” as a result of the Comprehensive Spending Review, which was good news as NERC had been expecting worse

NERC’s Science Themes were listed as: -

Climate Systems
Biodiversity
Sustainable Use of Natural Resources
Environmental Pollution
Earth Systems Science
Natural Hazards
Technologies.

NERC had 4 wholly owned research centres: -

The Centre for Ecology and Hydrology
BGS
The British Antarctic Survey
The National Oceanography Centre.

The work of the NERC Knowledge Exchange team was summarised as follows: -

“The Knowledge Exchange Team seeks to develop effective mechanisms and processes to achieve greater economic and societal impact of NERC-funded research. NERC uses the following definition of impact:

"An action or activity has an economic impact when it affects the welfare of consumers, the profits of firms and/or the revenue of government. Economic impacts range from those that are readily quantifiable, in terms of greater wealth, cheaper prices and more revenue, to those less easily quantifiable, such as effects on the environment, public health and quality of life."

“The role of the Knowledge Exchange Team is to:

- Agree priorities
- Define the markets and opportunities
- Map knowledge and R&D needs and identify barriers and hurdles to uptake
- Define KE requirements and put mechanisms for delivery in place
- Feed business needs into future science strategies for NERC and others.

The NERC Theme Leaders for each theme are: -

- Climate System - Dr Richard Wood (Met Office Hadley Centre)
- Biodiversity - Prof Ken Norris (Reading)
- Sustainable use of natural resources Prof Louise Heathwaite (Lancaster)
- Environment, pollution and human health - Prof Roy Harrison (Birmingham)
- Earth system science - Prof Tim Jickells (University of East Anglia)

- Natural hazards - Prof John Rees (BGS)
- Technologies - Prof Alastair Lewis (York)”

The NERC process for converting Theme Action Plans into research projects using the project: “Mineral Resources –Science to Sustain Security of Supply in a Changing Environment” as an example.

This project will go to the NERC Board this month and NERC needed to know whether the industry agreed with –

- i. The vision and justification set out on the slide (No.15)
- ii. Was the industry working on this project?
- iii. Could NERC help?

The Chairman thanked Murray Gardner for his useful presentation and asked Forum members for their contributions.

In the discussion the following points were made: -

- There seemed a need for the Mineral Resources Project to tie up better with the EU Raw Materials Initiative. For this NERC needed to liaise more closely with DEFRA/DECC etc.
- It was not clear how NERC dealt with the conflicting pressures of sustainability, i.e. using minerals sustainably whilst preserving them for future generations.
- NERC needed Members’ views on the Minerals Resources project by the end of January 2011.
- NERC was funded through BIS – there was a need to map out its relationship with other Government departments.
- Waste strategies and sustainable use of resources was within Murray Gardner’s remit.
- There was a need for greater industry representation on the NERC Panels to get a better balance.

The Chairman concluded the discussions with an expression of thanks for such a clear exposition of NERC’s role in Knowledge Exchange.

13/5 DCLG Post Election Update

Mark Plummer and Lucy Yates (DCLG) explained the current situation within DCLG: -

- DCLG had published its 2011/2015 Business Plan, which would be refreshed annually. Also relevant was the Defra Business Plan and the Lawton Report on Biodiversity and which referred to a National Environment White Paper.
- The Business Plan was tied to the Localism Bill, which had resulted from the Coalition Government’s view that planning was too centralized and too bureaucratic.
- Abolition of the Regional Strategies was going ahead through the Localism Bill.

- Abolition of the IPC was going ahead and the role would be passed to the Secretary of State. However, the process would remain largely unchanged.
- There would be a “Duty to Cooperate” on plans between LPA’s and other Public Bodies.
- There would be a proposal to streamline the local plan process and a provision to stop Inspectors from rewriting local plans.
- There would be compulsory pre-application discussions for “large” applications.
- There would be increased planning enforcement powers.
- There would be a proposal for Neighbourhood Plans, which would sit beside Local plans.
- County Councils would retain the minerals and waste-planning role.
- The key issue would be to ensure that Neighbourhood Plans were not used as a preventative tool.
- The Minister had made clear, yesterday, that he was scrapping the pre-determination rules.
- The Localism Bill should be published in November 2010 and currently ran to 380 pages. It would cover Local Government, planning, housing, and London. The second reading would be likely in January 2011 (Commons) to be followed by the Committee Stage. Progress could be followed on the Parliament UK website.

Incentives: There would be a consultation White Paper, setting out possible incentives to Local Authorities to promote local development schemes perhaps by retention of part of the UBR system. This proposal would be published as a “Local Government Resources Review” in January 2011. ALSF, if it was retained, could become a “key part” of the community incentives programme.

National Planning Framework: Ministers wished to see the system of PPSs, PPGs and MPGs and MPSs streamlined whilst retaining a national policy process. MPS1 would be rewritten but was likely to retain safeguarding, land banks and the need for a steady and adequate supply of minerals.

MASS: The future of MASS It was unclear at present, until a decision on the National planning Framework had been made. MP/LY had put in a bid to retain the RAWP’s for a further 4 years whilst Ministers deliberated on the future arrangements for minerals planning. The abolition of the regional strategies would affect this issue.

Planning Fees: A consultation paper on this issue had been issued and a series of workshops were to be held to discuss the mechanics of the fee system. Ministers were anxious to see that fees revenue did not end up as part of the wider local authorities’ pot.

Private Members Bill – “Planning (Opencast Mining Separation Zones) - Andrew Bridgen MP.

This Bill had been introduced on 30 June 2010 and was scheduled for its second reading on 11 February 2011. Coalpro had lots of concerns on this Bill and had met

the minister – Bob Neill MP, to explain these. It was currently unclear if it could affect other minerals. One of the Bill’s sponsors was a Welsh MP.

In the Q & A session following this presentation the following points were made: -

- On fees the aim was for full cost recovery.
- On a Chris Huhne MP proposal to designate LA open spaces this could have mineral resource implications. – Peter Ellis at DCLG was the relevant contact.
- There was to be a “presumption in favour of sustainable development” likely to be delivered through the Localism Bill
- Either type of body could attend the fees consultation workshops commencing On 26 November 2010, themed to industry or LA’s if the offered date was inconvenient.

The Chairman thanked Mark Plummer and Lucy Yates for their presentations and asked members what issues the Forum should take up.

Members made the following points: -

- There should be a fuller discussion at the next Forum meeting.
- It was also essential that DEFRA and BIS attended Forum meetings.
- CBIMG would pursue DEFRA and BIS and were already in touch with DEFRA Minister Caroline Spelman MP. **Action - NJ**
- Industry members were concerned at the current OfT survey of construction and materials costs.

Agreed: - there should be a substantive Forum discussion on DCLG issues at the next meeting.

Action – Secretary.

13/6 Working Group Progress Reports

Full reports had been circulated with the agenda papers. These were then the subject of summaries from their respective convenors: -

a) Working Group 1- Distributing Minerals and Future Markets.

Paul Wilcox noted that questions for Forum members’ consideration had been set out in the progress report. The aim was to produce a first draft report in December 2010 with a view to an amended report being available for the WG meeting in February 2011. This would try to look beyond the present planning system horizon of 15-25 years. The key issues were: -

- The interface with parallel ALSF-funded work being carried out for MIRO by a consortium led by the Buchanan transport consultancy. This was a useful means of extending the reach of the Working Group but it was clear there might be some differences in perspective;
- For example, how should we deal with the issue of minerals in the National Parks/AONBs? (The Buchanan team were uncertain about including this but

the Working Group is clear that it is necessary to include them if we are to have a proper look at all strategic resources and assess their relative potential environmental impacts);

- Should strategic mineral resources be safeguarded?
- Should the Group's approach be based on broad areas of search rather than the Buchanan approach of directly identifying possible sites?
- On infrastructure, it was likely Buchanan would find there would be significant practical problems (and costs) in linking major new mineral sites to their markets. How far were rail connections essential to the establishment of such sites?
- For coal is there a need to look say 25-30 years ahead given present uncertainties in the electricity generation market and government energy policies?
- The need for Forum members to feed views to WG1

In discussion it was agreed that providing rail connections for new production sites would be costly and difficult, even when close to the network. Also, all new production connected to the network had to be matched by new or expanded rail reception and distribution depots in major market areas, and this was equally problematic. In between, Network Rail would then need to provide sufficient train paths, on a crowded network and in competition with growing passenger traffic, which the government was keen to accommodate. It could not be assumed that new strategic sites could all be rail-served, which raised environmental issues relative to existing sites, wherever located.

b) Working Group 2 – Planning Skills

David Brewer highlighted the following points from the progress report:-

- The progress Report, finalized by Lester Hicks, was a good summary of the work of WG2, which had worked well as a Group.
- He asked whether the Forum members were comfortable with the Group's analysis?
- The Group had felt that a full mineral-planning module in a planning course was an unlikely prospect, but that a short two-week mineral planning course might be possible, along with mid-career mineral planning courses.

In response members made the following points: -

- There was strong support for the analysis set out in the paper
- A mid-career mineral planning course could cost £2500, which was not viable in the current financial climate. There may be other less costly models of delivering training for mineral planning staff, which ought to be considered.
- There was a need, however, to get more senior staff/management aware of minerals and waste issues.
- Members were concerned that current financial constraints might make implementation of the options difficult.
- There was a need to include councillors in any minerals planning awareness courses.

c) Working Group 3- Communities and Communications

Brian Marker highlighted the three key areas identified by the Group: -

- i. Education – and in particular the need for teachers to plug the BGS work into the National Curriculum. Texts had been discussed with teachers in August 2010 and were under revision. In the New Year revised material would be discussed with groups of earth science teachers.
- ii. Material aimed at the general public had been drafted, discussed in October 2010 and was being revised for a full meeting of the Working Group on 15th December after which it would be amended and trialed with members of the public drawn from quarry liaison groups and steps would be taken to ensure plain English.
- iii. Methods of communication. This work had just started. Draft material would be considered by the Group on 15th December. After revision, there would be a need to approach both the wider industry and the Planning Officers for information and comments. This work would need to be coordinated with, and informed by, the Pilot Local Engagement study (see below).

In response, members felt that some of the final outputs would benefit from being written in plain language by a journalist to ensure public readability.

13/7 Pilot Local Engagement Study

Reported-That Richard Read and Nigel Jackson were working together on this project – dates for an event in Hampshire were being sought for February 2011 It was agreed that this needed to be coordinated with the work of Working Group 3 above.

13/8 LivingWithMinerals 4 – (7 November 2011)

Reported - Nigel Jackson summarized progress for the event. The following speakers were being arranged or sought: -

John Cridland – New CBI DG.
Sir John Beddington – UK Chief Scientific Advisor
Baroness Andrews – English Heritage
Michael Rodd – facilitator and to run the interactive sessions
Prof. Iain Stewart –
A representative from the EU Raw Materials Initiative.
A City Mining expert on World resources.
A Localism expert.

It was intended to invite a number of earth sciences teachers/ lecturers.

13/9 UK Constituent States Reports

The following reports were made: -

(i) - England. See Minute 13/5 above.

(ii) - Wales. Joanne Smith (WAG) highlighted the following points from her report, circulated with the agenda papers: -

- The future of the Welsh RAWPs was still in the balance.
- A review of the role of the Environment Agency in Wales was underway and could result in a devolved EA for Wales. No outcome to this review was currently predictable.

(iii) - Scotland – No report was made.

(iv) - Northern Ireland – John Cummins reported on the following issues: -

- It was still intended for more powers to be devolved to the local councils, although the timetable for this had slipped to 2015. Planning could, however, be handed over earlier.
- Spending cuts could result in a 30% staff reduction at DoE NI. Two Minerals planning staff had already been lost
- The Aggregates Levy exemption for NI had been discontinued following the Court decision. The implications of this were still being assessed.

13/10 EU Raw Materials Initiative

Simon van der Byl reported on this issue. - An EU communication was not now expected until December 2010. The aim was to identify accessibility of minerals, both metals and other minerals.

A further EU meeting on the issue was scheduled to be held within the next 2 weeks.

13/11 UKMF Secretary

Duncan Pollock reported that he would be retiring as the Forum Secretary following this meeting having fulfilled the role since the inception of the Forum nearly 4 years ago.

The Chairman proposed a vote of thanks to Duncan Pollock for his work as Secretary and reported that George Muskett, formerly of KABCA would take over the role.

Duncan Pollock thanked the Forum for their kind words and wished them well in their future deliberations.

13/12- Membership of the Forum

After discussion it was agreed that representatives from RSPB and The Wildlife Trust (Paul Wilkinson) should be invited to join the Forum

Action: - Chairman

13/13 UKMF Terms of Reference

It was agreed that these should be reviewed at the next meeting of the Forum and should therefore be an Agenda item.

Action – Secretary

13/14 Any Other Business

The following items were raised: -

House of Commons Science and Technology Select Committee Andrew Bloodworth reported that this Committee was looking at the importance of strategic metals to the UK –evidence could be submitted up to 17 December 2010. A number of learned societies (including the Geological Society of London and the Royal Society of Chemistry) would be submitting evidence.

Glebe Fluorspar Mine- Peak District Peter Huxtable reported that this mine was closing at the end of 2010.

Environmental Update It was agreed that a new item be added to the Agenda for the next meeting, entitled Environmental Update, to facilitate discussion on these matters.

Dates of Meetings in 2011

These would be as follows:

Thursday 17 March 2011

Thursday 23 June 2011

Thursday 17 November 2011.

All at 1 Carlton House Terrace London, SW1 – Meetings will start at 11.00 to allow members travelling long distances to use off peak tickets, where available