

## **UK MINERALS FORUM**

**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 Fourth Meeting of the UK National Minerals Forum, held at The Geological Society, Burlington House, Piccadilly London WC1 on Tuesday 15 January 2008 at 10.15am.**

### **Present;-**

Dr. Brian Marker –Chairman  
Duncan Pollock - Secretary

Andrew Bloodworth – BGS  
David Brewer –Coalpro  
Ruth Chambers – WCL/CNP  
Tom Clarke - DoENI  
Dwight DeMorais- BCA/Lafarge  
Bob Fenton- CBIMG/MAUK  
Richard Gill – DBERR  
Chris Hall –CBIMG/BCC  
Lester Hicks  
Nick Horsley –CBIMG/SAMSA/WBB Minerals  
Jon Humble – English Heritage  
Peter Huxtable –CBIMG/BAA /IOM3  
Nigel Jackson – CBIMG  
Bob LeClerc- CBIMG  
Hugh Llewelyn -Defra  
Bill McKenzie – CLG  
Sue Martin – Welsh Assembly Government  
Diana Maxwell –CBIMG/BCA  
Jeremy Murfitt – CBIMG/QPA/Aggregate Industries  
Andy Price – DorsetCC/POS  
Andy Tickle- CPRE  
Simon van der Byl – QPA  
Paul Wilcox – Staffs CC/POS

### **Apologies:**

Natalie Bennett –Natural England  
Peter Bide -DCLG  
David Brock –Mills and Reeve  
Chris Dobbs –CBIMG/QPA/Tarmac

Peter Doyle – English Stone Forum  
David Highley-BGS  
Ian Mitchell – Scottish Government  
David Sandbrook – Consultant

### **1. Welcomes and Introductions**

The Chairman welcomed new members to their first meeting.

### **2. Minutes of the last Meeting (19.9.07)**

These were agreed subject to the following amendments: -

P6.Item 14 - Archaeology – the correct title was “ The Associate Parliamentary Minerals Group”

### **3. Matters Arising, Not Dealt with Elsewhere**

P2. – Item 3. – Reported – the WCL Planning Committee had considered the establishment of The Forum and wished to maintain their representation. They could not, however, manage to offer reps. on all the Working Groups

P6, Item 15 – BGS reported that their “Underground Storage” Fact sheet had been drafted and would be out for consultation within the next 2-3 weeks. There was a rolling programme of updating the other Fact sheets.

### **4. Terms of reference –Update**

Reported by Nigel Jackson – he had completed the Forum Organogram a copy of which had been circulated with the agenda papers. This was agreed but could evolve as The Forum develops. There was also a need to put the diagram on the Forum website.

**Action – NJ/BGS**

### **5 Living With Minerals 3 (3.11.08)**

Reported by Nigel Jackson – this event was now fully organised as a nearly all-day event for 3.11.08 at the QE II Centre, London. It would have a bigger exhibition area than previously. Key presentations would come from: -

- Richard Lambert – a CBI perspective
- and, subject to being invited and accepting, The Baroness Andrews – a CLG view
- An EC, DG Environment speaker.

The main event would be a long working session, focussed around the work of Working Groups 1 – 4. Each Working group would present a short report/ powerpoint of their conclusions. There would be a professional facilitator plus facilitators for the 4 Working Group sessions. The aim was for the event to be “Challenging,entertaining,enjoyable and productive”.

So far, 5-6 sponsors had been signed up plus 6 exhibitors.

The event would be followed by an evening reception on the House of Commons Terrace.

In answers to questions raised the following additional points were made: -

- It was intended to circulate the Working group reports to delegates 2-4 weeks before the event.
- There would be 30-40 tables each of ten for the main working session.
- There would be an allocation of “free tickets” for selected NGOs etc.
- Publicity would be by e-mail/hard copy.
- There was a need to engage key stakeholders in the devolved states.

## **6. Working Group 1 – Security of Supply**

In the absence of David Highley, Andrew Bloodworth (BGS) reported the following outcomes from the first meeting of the Group :-

- The group had met in December 2007 but had suffered because of competing demands for attendance at other WG meetings on the same day.
- David Highley had prepared a report of the meeting, which was being cleared with WG members prior to wider circulation.
- The first meeting had been productive and wide ranging with a steep learning curve.
- A full set of reports would be prepared for discussion at the next WG meeting.
- Key factors identified for discussion were: -
  - availability of mineral resources.
  - viability of resources
  - access to minerals/licence to operate
  - transport.
- Different minerals raised different issues – e.g. Transport was very different for coal cw. sand & gravel.
- Regulation affected investment decisions – globally for some minerals.
- Only for aggregates was there good data on replenishment of reserves.
- There was a need for long term planning on the lines of the Bovey Basin Strategy in Devon.
- There was a need for a policy statement/guidance on “ need “ - a factor endorsed by all members of the Group.
- Climate change/carbon issues could affect security of supply.
- The Working Group clearly had common issues with the work of the other WGs.
- The next meeting would be in April 2008 prior to the full UKNMF meeting.

In the discussions following that report, members made the following key points: -

- Licence to operate issues would be crucial.
- There was a need to consider cross-border supply issues within the UK States.
- It was unclear which Government Department would define “need”.

- There was a need to ensure all Government Departments worked in concert on minerals supply policy issues.
- The WG needed POS/QPA representation,
- Various CLG/BGS commissioned reports on aggregates supply, including a “Doomsday Report” on future supply options were due around the end of April 2008.

### **Working Group 2 – National Parks and AONBs**

Noted the progress report of WG 2 meeting held on 7.1.08 and which had been circulated with the agenda papers. Andrew Bloodworth (BGS) drew attention to the following key points: -

- The Peak District and Yorkshire Dales National Parks were far more affected by mineral workings than the other National Parks.
- For AONBs the key mineral activities were in the South West region.
- The Group had identified a need for greater Government engagement/advocacy on mineral issues especially the need for clear policies on “need”.
- BGS would make a presentation at the next WG meeting (13.3.08) on the results of their research on “Alternative Sources of Aggregate Outside the National Parks/AONBs”.
- The Group would consider the economic/environmental impacts of alternative aggregate supply scenarios and the consequential impact on areas other than non-designated countryside.
- The role of National Parks and likely change over the next 30 years or so – CNP/Natural England and Peak Park reps would be reporting on the issue.
- CNP had some work in progress comparing the National Parks – landscape/population/future extraction issues.
- The issue of people v the environment would be a key issue for the group along with changing public attitudes.
- The issue of the differing role of aggregates/ specialist minerals was central to the work of the Group.

Reported - English Heritage was about to publish a report on the dimension stone industry –the issue of building stone for heritage was also relevant to the work of WG2.

### **8. Working Group 3 Carbon and Proximity**

Lester Hicks gave the following report: -

*UKNMF – 4<sup>TH</sup> MEETING - 15<sup>TH</sup> JANUARY 2008*

#### **ORAL REPORT FROM WG3 – CARBON AND PROXIMITY IN MINERALS**

- *1<sup>st</sup> meeting 13<sup>th</sup> December. Core membership + corresponding members;*
- *Remit from Forum 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting agreed + RMX, asphalt and recycled aggs;*
- *Meeting was focussed on scoping the issues and areas for examination;*

- *Transport seen as a key energy/carbon issue:*
  - *Continuing importance of local supply in aggregates;*
  - *Carbon in transport a major issue in imports and significant in adding to the carbon content of coal – the main mineral import;*
  - *High and increasing fuel costs probably the most powerful driver to energy efficiency and carbon reduction – but this will have to be demonstrated if not to be knocked down by critics as a “get out of jail free card”. First step is to try to get some industry data on this;*
  - *Bulk movement important for hard rock and specialised minerals serving national markets. Water and rail not a universal solution – but the exclusion of sites with planning permission from Freight Facilities Grant a problem – to be taken up with DfT.*
  - *Back loads after “dry” minerals hauls need more investigation. What is the extent at present and scope to do more?*
  
- *Role of Existing Climate Change Agreements and the new Carbon Reduction Commitments:*
  - *Complex areas to unravel. Need to define present and future boundaries of statutory action;*
  - *Existing CCAs cover some downstream processing – e.g. on cement, bricks and other ceramics, calcium carbonate, lime, gypsum, kaolin and ball clay and potash. Need to establish how far upstream there go – in cement a long way, as far as primary crushers on source quarry sites. Being investigated;*
  - *Aggregates including RMX and asphalt not included in CCAs;*
  - *CCA interface with new Carbon Reduction Commitments not clear – being investigated.*
  - *How CRCs will bite on aggregates production not clear – trigger is electricity use at national organisation level. How will this bite on UK aggregate majors- subsidiaries of multinational organisations? Will SMEs be caught at all? Being investigated;*
  
- *Carbon footprinting:*
  - *Possible tool to help minerals operators address energy use and carbon in their quarrying/mining and initial transport operations;*
  - *Group (via Convenor) to participate this spring without commitment in consultations on the emerging PAS [Publicly Accessible Standard] 2050 standard (being developed by BSI for Carbon Trust and Defra).*
  
- *Energy efficiency measures at mineral sites:*
  - *Along with transport seen as the Group’s main likely area of practical focus;*
  - *Need to look further at relevance of QPA Good Practice Guide 315 – Energy and Resource Management –Fuel, Power and Water, a guide for managers in the minerals industries. Scope for updating to be considered.*
  
- *Other issues:*
  - *Need to keep in touch with smaller sector trade associations – via the circulation to corresponding Members and Bob Fenton of MAUK- to join the Group;*
  - *Need to keep in mind the potential burdens of carbon reduction action on SMEs, though fuel costs perhaps an even more powerful driver for them;*
  - *Site restoration and planting unlikely to be a credible source of carbon offsetting to excuse energy use and emissions – nor a sensible business option in view of energy cost pressures;*
  - *Need to tie in with other relevant work, e.g. ALSF-funded research.*

## Overview

1. *Need to position minerals in relation to national level statutory action e.g. on CCAs and CRCs. What is covered and what is not?*

2. *Subject to 1, likely focus on action on transport to direct mineral users or processors, and on quarry/mine extraction/haulage and handling.*
3. *Potential to update existing QPA Good Practice Guidance.*
4. *Emerging national standard on carbon footprinting may be a useful tool to help operators identify most effective action. But companies won't accept systems that don't meet their needs.*
5. *Fuel costs seen as a primary market-driven incentive to reduce energy use/embodied carbon – but evidence this works will be needed if other action (e.g. self-regulation codes/voluntary good practice/ use of footprinting) is not recommended as a result.*

In the discussion, the following points were made: -

- The Group had kept away from the issues of site restoration and planting.
- It would be useful to study examples of active site layouts where gravity was fully utilised in the plant and supply to plant design.
- The UK should not expect to export its carbon footprints to other states.
- For coal extraction/transport the footprint comparisons were –0.5% UK, 9% Russia and 4.5% South Africa.
- The WG could report on the issue of back loading –this was only possible for some minerals e.g.- sand&gravel and silica sand. It did raise problems however, lorry cleaning and on other demands for trucks at busy times. Back loading was not possible on rail.
- BGS were keen to play a part in WG£3 – there was a need for clearer statistics on transport/carbon footprints.
- MIRO was researching other methods of minerals transport.
- The WG would also look at the role of marine transport.

## **9) Working Group 4 – Cumulative Impact of Legislation**

Noted- the progress report circulated with the agenda papers. Simon van der Byl drew attention to the following key issues: -

- The Group needed reps from POS/Planners, EA/HSE, and NGOs.
- Not all regulation was bad – the industry often welcomed the certainty of regulation.
- The Group had a comprehensive list of the legislation affecting all mineral extraction except for coal.
- There was a need for case studies of the cumulative impact of legislation.
- Regulation covered 2 phases of working: -
  - i) from concept to permission
  - ii) from operation to restoration
- There was a need to look also at EU regulation and the impact on global companies.
- It was important not to encourage development of new regulations.
- The Group intended to have 2-3 meetings with a facilitator and was seeking a recently retired planner to assist.

In the discussions following, members made the following key points.

- It was important to look at the impacts on SMEs . However, this point could be over emphasised as the key impacts of regulation were on site managers regardless of the size of the company.
- It was also important to look at competition issues, both entry to markets and remaining in markets.
- The Group was looking at regulation, not taxation.
- The group needed also to look at consistency of local regulation around the UK.
- There was a need for case examples of conflicting Government standards e.g. birdstrike, Government/EA conflicts.
- POS were researching the issue of better regulation using waste management in Staffs CC as an example. Possible conflicts – EA/EH/HSE. -Report in 6-12 months.
- There was a need to involve the devolved states in WG discussions.

### **10) UKNMF Website**

Reported –By Andrew Bloodworth ( BGS) - little progress had so far been achieved. A Forum website could be up and running within 3-4 weeks of a decision.

Agreed – BGS should meet Brian Marker and Nigel Jackson to progress the issue.

**Action –AB/NJ/BM**

### **11) Planning White Paper/Planning Bill**

Reported – by CLG – the Planning Bill (England only) was currently at the Committee stage. Two key points had emerged –

- The procedures for national infrastructure projects, which in the published Bill did not include minerals.
- The Community Infrastructure Levies, which would allow LA’s to set, levies locally by size/type of development.

WAG was likely to follow the England model.

In the discussion on this issue, the following key points were made: -

- Valuation for the levies would present LA’s with a skills shortage – the proposals were unlikely to be a “ model of simplicity”
- A deep coalmine proposal might still qualify as a “national infrastructure energy project”. The categories could not be changed by subsequent regulation.(Sec’s Note- Minute altered to reflect better understanding of the Bill /Regulatory powers)
- POS were looking closely at the levy issues.
- There would need to be a collective, off-the-peg model levy scheme for LA’s to use.
- CLG were still looking at radical approaches to a review of planning policy including a single one-off all-purpose PPS.
- The Bill also included changes to the appeal system, compensation, revocation and to TPO’s

## **12 Mine Waste Directive**

Reported – there had been little progress on the MWD since the last meeting. There were two outstanding issues-

- Definitions of inert waste.
- The consultation on the options for implementation

of the regs. within the UK.

An EC draft on financial guarantees was of great concern – “Guidelines for financial Guarantees and Inspection for Mining Waste Facilities” produced by Montec.

This report, although well researched, was proposing to discard the hard won exemptions in the MWD and was proposing universal bonding. The report had been prepared for the EC DG Environment.

## **13) Inert Waste for Restoration of Quarries.**

Reported –Discussions were still in progress on the definitions of inert wastes. A recent DEFRA/EA paper had responded to QPA’s serious concerns.

The EU Council of Ministers was looking at a Draft Directive on Waste and this defined, helpfully, what was not waste. This seemed to exclude overburden from waste, which was helpful.

There was a brief discussion on how this issue impacted on Northern Ireland, Wales and Scotland.

## **14) Soils Directive –**

Reported – The EU had voted on 20.12.07 to not take this issue any further forward. The issue was not dead, however, only “Referred back”.

## **15) Archaeology**

Reported by Jon Humble (English Heritage) The Joint Archaeology Forum was to hold its sixth meeting on 17.1.08- it had proved to be a useful forum with a good dialogue. It had initially focussed on pre-application evaluation issues but the remit had now been widened. A Good Practice Guide on Pre Application Evaluation had been prepared for the 17 January meeting following which it would be published for consultation. It had not yet been decided how to launch/roll out this project.

The remit of the Forum was now much wider and would include the need to cover the industrial heritage of mining and quarrying.

A Heritage Bill was expected during 2008.

## **16) Associate Parliamentary Minerals Group**

Reported -A meeting of this Group was planned for the following week. Richard Gill (BERR) was to give a presentation. It was intended to disseminate the work of the UKNMF also via the APMG.

### **17) Any Other Business**

UKNMF representation – Agreed –it would be appropriate to invite Chris Waite (SEERA/SEERAWP/LRAWP) on to the Forum.

### **Action DTP**

Reported - Ruth Chambers & Andy Tickle had been asked to prepare an article on the Forum for “Minerals Planning” and would be happy to receive contributions from Forum members.

Noted The Government intended that the Regional Assemblies would disappear by 2010 with their planning work to be taken over by the RDA’s.No final decisions had yet been taken.

### **18) Dates of Next Meetings.**

15 May 2008 and 22 September 2008 both in Central London starting at 10.30 am.

DTP 21.1.08

.

