

Chairman: **Ian Selby** (*The Crown Estate*)

Secretary: **Alan Thompson** (*Cuesta Consulting Limited*)

**Minutes of the 33<sup>rd</sup> Meeting of the UK Minerals Forum  
held at the IOM<sup>3</sup> offices, 297 Euston Road, London, NW1 3AQ  
on Thursday 22<sup>nd</sup> June 2017 at 11am.**

**Amended**

**Present:**

Ian Selby (**IS**) – Chairman (the Crown Estate)

Alan Thompson (**AT**) – Secretary (Cuesta Consulting Ltd)

Andrew Bloodworth (**AB**) – BGS

Ruth Bradshaw (**RB**) – CNP

Peter Close (**PC**) – Natural England

Lauren Darby (**LD**) – Ceramfed

Jim Davies (**JD**) – Environment Agency

Peter Day (**PDa**) – POS

Peter Dorans (**PDo**) – The Wildlife Trusts

Alan Everard (**AE**) – Tarmac

Steve Gaines (**SG**) – Sibelco UK

Lester Hicks (**LH**) – independent consultant

Nick Horsley (**NH**) – MPA

Peter Huxtable (**PH**) – BAA

David Payne (**DP**) – CBI Minerals Group

Richard Read (**RR**) – The National Trust

Nigel Symes (**NS**) – RSPB

Lonek Wojtulewicz (**LW**) – POS

Guest:

Rob Thain (**RT**) – South Downs NPA

**1. Welcome and introductions**

- 1.1. The Chairman welcomed Rob Thain as an invited guest to introduce an initiative being organised by a group of mineral planning authorities with interest in silica sand; Steve Gaines as a silica sand industry representative; and David Payne, who replaces Ken Hobden as the CBIMG representative.

**2. Apologies for absence**

Apologies were received from:

William Carlin (**WC**) – Scottish Government

Bob Fenton (**BF**) – MAUK

David Highley (**DH**) – Independent consultant

Nigel Jackson (**NJ**) – MPA

Brian Marker (**BM**) – Independent consultant

Mark North (**MN**) – MPA

John Penny (**JP**) – Aggregate Industries

Barney Pilgrim (**BP**) – Banks Group

Guy Robinson (**GR**) – Historic England

Jo Smith (**JS**) – Welsh Government

Andrew Tyler (**ATy**) – Omya UK

Nicola Walters (**NW**) – BEIS

Rob Westell (**RW**) – Raymond Brown

Paul Williams (**PW**) – Hanson

**3. Minutes of the last meeting (2<sup>nd</sup> March 2017), as amended**

- 3.1. The minutes were agreed as a true record of the meeting.

#### 4. Action points from last meeting and matters arising not covered elsewhere

##### 4.1. UKMF Education and Outreach on Minerals

4.1.1. BM (*in absentia*) reported that he had followed-up earlier recommendations of the UKMF regarding education, primarily through discussions with the MPA, Geological Society and Earth Science Teachers' Association. There were three threads:

- i. commenting on changes to the National Curriculum – BM has adopted a watching brief but there are no current developments. However, he has been informed that the MPA is now supporting an initiative by MPQC (<http://www.mpfutures.co.uk/about-us/>) to provide material in support of the National Curriculum through that website, initially with an emphasis on the primary levels. Even so, the Forum might wish to consider whether it should keep in touch with future curriculum developments. BM advised that this can be achieved by requesting ESTA to keep the UKMF Secretary informed of National Curriculum consultations. This was agreed by the Forum.

**Action BM**

- ii. Regarding the possible provision of a leaflet on construction (including mineral products) by the Geological Society - a draft was sent to them but feedback is awaited. BM can pursue this and, if the GS takes this forward, will send the draft to the UKMF Secretary so that the Forum can comment if appropriate. This was agreed by the Forum.

**Action BM**

- iii. Regarding the setting up of a website "portal" for teachers providing information on quarries that might be visited by school parties, BM reported that the Geological Society had showed interest in this idea but the message from the industry seems to be that companies prefer to react to individual requests rather than being proactive with information. The suggestion from both BM and LH was therefore that the Forum should drop any attempts to create a more formalised, proactive system. This was agreed.

4.1.2. PH confirmed that site visits were already taking place on a regular basis and AE noted that there are existing networks, especially within individual companies, which help to maintain educational links. NH noted that Earth Science teachers were generally engaged with the industry but that this was not the case with academics in land use planning.

##### 4.2. Brexit + General Election review of EU Legislation

4.2.1. LH introduced the paper he had circulated ahead of the meeting ("*issues Arising from the 2017 General Election*"). He observed that, in light of the election result, most of the Government's pre-election manifesto commitments had been ditched, including proposals relating to shale gas (the only high-profile minerals issue that had been mentioned). Environmental issues, which could have a bearing on minerals, were hardly mentioned in any of the manifestos, other than reference to a 25-year Environmental Plan, which has been pushed for by many NGOs and is now on Defra's agenda, but the presumption is that this must be a much lower priority than sorting out the Brexit implications for agriculture and fisheries. No environmental issues were mentioned in the Queen's Speech.

- 4.2.2. In the discussion which followed LH's report, it was noted that one inevitable consequence of the election result is the 'static inertia' which now seems to have taken hold of Government thinking. While ever this continues, nothing is likely to change in terms of UK regulations and uncertainty will continue to prevail. It was noted that this, in turn, is likely to halt progress on a number of (unspecified) 'big ticket' ideas from industry, thus compounding the economic stagnation.
- 4.2.3. Members noted that another casualty of all this has been the discontinuing of the ONS annual mineral statistics collection, which then adds to the difficulty of predicting what is needed in terms of ongoing and future supply.

#### 4.3. Sustainable Aggregates Website

- 4.3.1. BM (*in absentia*) reported that the material which he had recovered from the website before MIRO's demise consists of:
  - 1) files lodged originally on the website - these are complete (although some need updating);
  - 2) links to documents held on other sites - these still work for ALSF partners other than Defra (which includes the Cefas material). The problem is that Defra ALSF materials have subsequently been archived on gov.uk thus breaking all of the links.
- 4.3.2. AB noted that the BGS had also 'harvested' the various reports from MIRO.
- 4.3.3. BM is attempting to make contact with relevant people in Defra with a view to restoring the links and to establish what the status of the content of the site is in terms of Crown Copyright and whether or not a license will be needed to restore it to public use.
- 4.3.4. PC noted that Natural England has previously obtained a memorandum from David Middleton at Defra, indicating that the ALSF-funded reports can be used without restriction. PC to forward that email to AT and BM so that the agreement can be confirmed with Defra, with a view to the material then been made public by the MPA and the BAA.

**Action PC, AT & BM**

#### 4.4. Government Engagement

- 4.4.1. The lack of full engagement with the Forum by Government Departments, and by the devolved administrations, is continuing. Whilst it is understandable that there are other priorities, the Forum considers that it is short sighted for the Government to neglect minerals supply and related environmental issues. The Forum therefore agreed that letters should be drafted to the Secretaries of State for DCLG, BEIS and Defra to emphasise the urgent need for re-engagement.
- 4.4.2. LH advised that the letters should remind the Ministers of the origins, purpose and continued relevance of the Forum. They should *inter-alia* re-emphasise that:
  - i. an adequate and steady supply of UK-sourced minerals is fundamental for the construction of all forms of national infrastructure and housing as well as the operation of numerous manufacturing industries, notably in chemicals, ceramics and glass; and that

- ii. mineral supply is a long-term business which impacts upon many different stakeholder interests and that continued supply necessitates long-term, strategic planning and management to achieve the necessary balance.

4.4.3. IS noted that there is also a need for Ministers to clarify where Government responsibility for minerals now lies. From the Forum's perspective:

- BEIS has a vital role to play in emphasising the ongoing need for minerals and the links with wider industrial strategies and infrastructure;
- DCLG has greatly reduced its involvement with minerals over the last decade, but needs to remain engaged in terms of land use planning and the links with housing supply; and
- Defra, with the Environment Agency, are unavoidably involved with regard to environmental issues.

4.4.4. It was felt that these responsibilities need to be confirmed and/or clarified by the Ministers or their staff, and that there is a clear need for 'joined-up thinking' across all three departments. Members noted that the letters should point out that participation with the UKMF would provide one very effective way of achieving this, and would also help those departments to hear the views and understand the perspectives of other stakeholders.

4.4.5. It was agreed that IS and AT will take soundings from colleagues and draft letters to be issued to Ministers on behalf of the UKMF.

**Action IS & AT**

4.4.6. *Post meeting note:* bespoke letters were drafted to each of the three Ministers but, with advice from LH, a decision was taken to postpone sending these out until after the summer recess, so as to avoid falling foul of any Cabinet reshuffle that might take place before the autumn.

#### 4.5. UKMF Terms of Reference & Website

4.5.1. IS and AT reported that the updated Terms of Reference had been uploaded onto the UKMF Website, in accordance with the resolution on this at the previous meeting, and that all other web pages had also been updated.

#### 4.6. Options for video conferencing at future meetings

4.6.1. IS noted that his initial conversations on this had led to the view that many different options were available, but needed further investigation before coming to a firm view on what might be best. IS will continue to research and report back at the next meeting.

**Action IS**

#### 4.7. Industry Representation

4.7.1. All present were content with the current position regarding the numbers and range of industry representatives

#### 4.8. Academic representation

4.8.1. Following further discussion, AB agreed to speak to Professor Kip Jeffries (Camborne School of Mines) about this possibility. NH advised that Dr. Pat Foster (also at CSM) could be an alternative. PH suggested another option would be to

contact Mark Osbaldeston or Dr. Rob Donnelly at the University of Derby's Centre for Mineral Products.

**Action AB**

#### 4.9. Draft UK Minerals Strategy - Consultation Responses, & Reflections

4.9.1. DP has been reviewing the consultation responses to the CBI's draft Minerals Strategy issued earlier in the year. He reported that around 50 responses had been received. All were helpful. None were from Government Departments or Agencies, but all other interest groups were represented. He summarised the general consensus of views as follows:

- **Structure:** doesn't read like a strategy – takes too long to get to the key points and actions;
- **Tone:** raised some hackles – too many pejorative statements which are not supported by evidence and therefore unconvincing. Also, references to red tape need review in light of the Grenfell fire;
- **Content:** no clear consensus on whether the document should aim for brevity or detail/evidence. The general feeling of the meeting was that it should be brief, with supporting evidence more tailored and included in appendices;
- **Ownership & Audience:** it is not sufficiently clear who 'owns' the document or who it is aimed at. The latter needs to be clarified before the content can be properly focused: it is an industry document, setting out industry's concerns.

4.9.2. DP will attempt to revamp the document over the summer, after which it will need to go back to the CBI Minerals Group for approval/further consultation.

**Action DP**

4.9.3. IS invited members to voice any other reflections which they might have regarding the draft Strategy.

4.9.4. AB noted that, following Brexit, International Trade in minerals might be an angle that will strike a chord with Government, and should be reflected in the strategy. He also noted that the Strategy should not shy away from stating the obvious in order to convince readers of the importance of the mineral sector to the economy.

4.9.5. In similar vein, LW commented that the Strategy should emphasise the links between raw materials and built development.

4.9.6. RR suggested that the growing skills shortage in minerals planning is an issue that ought to be flagged-up as part of a skills & investment strategy.

#### 4.10. Involvement of Junior Colleagues

4.10.1. AB apologised for overlooking this. ALL are now invited to bring junior colleagues along to future meetings (but with prior notification to the secretary in order to maintain manageable numbers).

**Action ALL**

## 5. Regular stakeholder key issues reports:

### 5.1. UK Government policy report (DCLG / BEIS / Defra)

- 5.1.1. No Government reps in attendance and no reports available. Re-engagement is needed (see Item 4.4, above)

**Action IS**

### 5.2. National Government reports (Wales/Scotland/ Northern Ireland)

- 5.2.1. **Wales:** No report available from the Welsh Government, but various points were raised by others:
- 5.2.2. RB noted that consultation has been launched on the Sustainable Management of Natural Resources in Wales (<https://consultations.gov.wales/consultations/taking-forward-wales-sustainable-management-natural-resources>)
- 5.2.3. NH reported that there is also consultation on Electoral Reform on Local Government in Wales (<https://consultations.gov.wales/consultations/electoral-reform-local-government-wales>) and that responses to an earlier consultation on a National Development Framework for Wales are currently being reviewed (<https://consultations.gov.wales/consultations/national-development-framework-wales>).
- 5.2.4. *Post-meeting note:* in response to a query raised at the meeting, regarding the next review of the Regional Technical Statements (RTS) for aggregates provision in Wales, JS advised that: “MTAN 1 requires 5 yearly reviews of the RTS and, on the basis of the current timetable, an updated RTS should be expected in 2019. There is currently no budget to commence the review. However, the two RAWPs in Wales have been undertaking some preliminary work to refine the parameters for review”.
- 5.2.5. JS also advised that the Welsh Government is currently reviewing Planning Policy Wales (which now includes national policies on minerals) and will be looking to consult on the new policy later this year/early next.
- 5.2.6. **Scotland:** No report available from the Scottish Government, although Simon Bonsall had provided a comprehensive update at the last meeting. Simon’s role on the UKMF has been passed on to a new colleague, William Carlin, but William was unable to attend this meeting.
- 5.2.7. **Northern Ireland:** No report available and contact appears to have been lost with previous UKMF reps, who may no longer be in post. PC advised that he may be able to find a new representative via his links with QPA NI. AB noted that the province is effectively paralysed at present by the suspension of the power-sharing agreement at Stormont. Gold mining within the Sperrin Mountains – an AONB in County Tyrone – continues to be a major, controversial issue.

**Action PC**

### 5.3. Environment update (NE/EA/HE/CNP/CPRE/NT/Wildlife Trusts/RSPB)

- 5.3.1. In advance of the meeting, ATi reported that **CPRE** has now signed off on a revised Policy Guidance Note on Shale Gas (<http://www.cpre.org.uk/resources/policy-guidance-notes/item/4608-policy-guidance-note-shale-gas>), which responds with a strengthened position amid a rising level of concern about fracking, especially in

relation to increasing stripping away of planning decisions from local democratic structures.

- 5.3.2. ATi also noted that Backdale Quarry – a small, yet problematic quarry in the Peak District, which rose to prominence nationally in the debate over control of old mineral permissions, is now being restored in accordance with the Prohibition Order confirmed last year. This marks the end of a twenty-year long campaign by the local community which caused repercussions nationally, leading to an amendment of EIA regulations.
- 5.3.3. Regarding **Historic England's** update of the Minerals and Archaeology Practice Guide, GR reported in advance of the meeting that, "*whilst significant progress has been made on other aspects of the guidance, and the latest draft has largely been well received, there can be no doubt that the issue of evaluation trenching remains the hardest of the outstanding nuts to crack. Members of MHEF have yet to agree wording on the percentage of a site's potential development area that should usually be assessed by evaluation trenching (when a good level of other information is available e.g. a detailed desk-based assessment etc.) Discussions continue to work out how to proceed*".
- 5.3.4. On behalf of the **National Trust**, RR reported that, with regard to development near to heritage assets, the judgment at Barnwell Manor Wind Energy Ltd v East Northants District Council, English Heritage, National Trust & SSCLG [2014], quashed an Inspector's decision to approve four wind turbines on land near the 17th century Barnwell Manor in Northamptonshire. The scheme was within the purview of 40 designated heritage assets, including the Grade I listed Drayton House and the National Trust property Lyveden New Bield.
- 5.3.5. Sullivan LJ said the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 gave a '*strong presumption against the grant of planning permission*' where 'listed' heritage assets are concerned. The decision has proved to be controversial and there is some indication that Sullivan has since modified his stance in later judgments. Nevertheless, any objectors to developments near heritage assets, such as the Keighley Energy from Waste Proposal near the National Trust property of East Riddesham Hall seem to rely on Barnwell. All who are engaged in minerals need to be mindful of this issue.
- 5.3.6. On behalf of RSPB, NS reported that this year sees the 10<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of the Nature After Minerals initiative, being successfully undertaken in partnership with industry. NS will send through an update on this and other RSPB news.

**Action NS**

#### 5.4. Planning update (POS)

- 5.4.1. LW noted that a new planning minister- Alok Sharma - is now in place at DCLG, replacing Gavin Barwell, who lost his seat in the General Election. Eamon Mythen – the Department's representative on the UKMF – is moving away from minerals and will be replaced in due course.
- 5.4.2. LW reported that the Aggregate Working Party contracts remain in place and are likely to continue for at least the next three years. In the absence of any commitment from CLG to re-establish a National Coordinating Group, this is now being considered by the various AWP stakeholders themselves. It is likely that the next 'four-yearly' Aggregate Minerals survey (AM18?) will be funded.

- 5.4.3. LW observed that Richard Kimblin QC (No. 5 Chambers) had recently drawn attention to the important links between minerals supply and housing landbanks, and the presumption in favour of sustainable development (... *further details to follow in a note from LW after the POS meeting in July*).

**Action LW**

- 5.4.4. LW also noted that the updated POS/MPA guidance on producing Local Aggregate Assessments was now published on their websites as a 'living document': [http://www.mineralproducts.org/documents/LAA\\_GUIDANCE\\_May2017.pdf](http://www.mineralproducts.org/documents/LAA_GUIDANCE_May2017.pdf).
- 5.4.5. Brief discussion followed on the BAA's concerns about the status of Plantations on Ancient Woodland Sites (PAWS), and the fact that these sometimes preclude access to underlying mineral resources. It was noted that, although PAWS may no longer have ancient trees, they do retain a rich and diverse seed bank within the soil, and therefore need to be protected. The BAA is continuing in dialogue on this issue, but there is no further action for the Forum at this time.

#### 5.5. Industry update (MPA/BAA/BCC/MAUK/Operators)

- 5.5.1. LD drew the Forum's attention to the Ceramic industry's involvement with developing a 'place-based' strategy for Stoke-on-Trent, integrating all aspects of development/regeneration including raw materials supply chain issues.
- 5.5.2. NH raised concerns about the need for greater emphasis to be placed on safeguarding mineral wharves and rail depots. RR expressed particular concerns regarding wharf capacity in London, which is becoming a critical issue. An increasing threat is posed by the construction of residential tower blocks directly overlooking wharves which need to operate on a 24/7 basis.
- 5.5.3. PDa noted his concern that a Planning Inspector had recently disregarded the importance of safeguarding sand & gravel resources on the basis that they were not allocated for extraction within the current Plan Period. Such a misunderstanding of the long-term nature of safeguarding is worrying, and needs to be addressed.
- 5.5.4. DP agreed that the MPA/POS needs to issue updated guidance on all aspects of mineral and infrastructure safeguarding, including prior extraction.

**Action DP**

## 6. Current topic papers:

### 6.1. Long-term aggregates demand and supply scenarios 2016-30.

- 6.1.1. ([http://www.mineralproducts.org/documents/MPA\\_Long\\_term\\_aggregates\\_demand\\_supply\\_scenarios\\_2016-30.pdf](http://www.mineralproducts.org/documents/MPA_Long_term_aggregates_demand_supply_scenarios_2016-30.pdf)) DP introduced the MPA's paper on this topic, which looks at two alternative projections of future demand (based on construction outlook forecasts combined with differing assumptions on future intensity of use), and then considers three alternative supply scenarios. The latter reflect differing assumptions regarding the relative proportions of crushed rock, land-won and marine sand & gravel, with secondary and recycled materials remaining constant as a proportion of the total mix. The paper notes that the supply scenarios are meant to be indicative only, as a basis for discussion, rather than being forecasted outcomes.



- 6.1.2. It was noted, in discussion, that reliable data on the actual contribution made from secondary and recycled sources was still very limited, and highly variable from one local authority to another. Considerable care should therefore be taken in using supply scenarios which extrapolate from these figures.

## 6.2. Proposed Working Group on Mineral Planning Factsheets

- 6.2.1. IS introduced the notion of identifying suitable topics and focus for the next UKMF Working Group, inviting both AB and Rob Thain to make short, related presentations on the subject. Before any decisions are made on this, however, IS noted a more general need to establish sources of funding to support any work that may be carried out. To date, such work has largely been accomplished through the collaborative working of UKMF members and their colleagues (effectively providing 'in-kind' support), with a small operational budget being provided by the CBI Minerals Group.
- 6.2.2. Whilst the collaborative working and some financial support from CBI MG will hopefully continue, IS noted that, to ensure the continuing success of these initiatives, it would be a welcome gesture if member organisations could each consider a small financial contribution to the group. He suggested that each organisation could perhaps consider contributing in the order of £1-2k annually, which would help to cement the collaborative approach.
- 6.2.3. IS noted that the Forum would, of course, create clear governance around the fund and budget, and that he would be very pleased to discuss individual Members' views on this proposal.
- 6.2.4. Each member organisation is therefore requested to consider this funding suggestion and to contact IS over the next few weeks to discuss the matter and/or offer specific pledges.

**Action: ALL members**

- 6.2.5. AB introduced the idea of updating at least some of the BGS Mineral Planning Factsheets, all of which were originally funded by DCLG but are now becoming progressively out of date. They are frequently downloaded from the BGS website and are often referred to in planning Inquiries and Examinations, but their value in future years will be undermined as they become more dated. The factsheet on silica sand has consistently been the most popular, accounting for about 49% of all UK downloads, but has not been revised since 2009 and would therefore be the highest priority.
- 6.2.6. The BGS would be willing to put some funding into this, but additional support (both financial and in-kind) would be needed from other sources. A potential stumbling block could be that the factsheets are Crown Copyright and that a licence may be needed for them to be revised. AB will examine all of this further (i.e. costs, funding and copyright issues) and will report back at the next meeting.

**Action: AB**

- 6.2.7. The meeting considered the proposal with interest, but noted that it would be prudent not to be too ambitious – better to create an achievable project (e.g.

focusing initially on just one or two factsheets). If successful, and if still a priority, that could be extended to other factsheets in future years.

- 6.2.8. In view of the particular need, at present, to focus on silica sand, Rob Thain of the South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA) was invited to explain how this could potentially tie-in with an initiative which is already underway to gain an improved understanding of the current availability of these resources across the UK. He explained that this had arisen from some work commissioned by the SDNPA as part of the evidence base for the emerging joint (West Sussex & SDNPA) Minerals Local Plan ([https://www.westsussex.gov.uk/media/9030/silica\\_sand\\_study.pdf](https://www.westsussex.gov.uk/media/9030/silica_sand_study.pdf)). Briefly summarised, sands of the Folkestone Formation within and closely adjacent to the National Park have been shown to be silica sand, of varying quality, with one area (at least) having resources that are considered to be of National Importance in terms of their suitability (after high level processing) for the manufacture of clear glass and sodium silicate.
- 6.2.9. Given that the South Downs are also of National importance in terms of landscape protection, a suitable balance needs to be struck regarding the potential future exploitation of these resources. The NPPF requires that mineral extraction should not take place in National Parks other than in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated to be in the public interest. The exceptional circumstances test requires consideration to be given, *inter alia*, to “the cost of, and scope for, developing elsewhere outside the designated area, or meeting the need for it in some other way”. In other words, there needs to be a detailed consideration of potential alternatives, such as extraction from resources in other areas. Whilst such consideration was given in the study referred to above, considerable uncertainties were found to exist in terms of the availability and relative quality / suitability of silica sand resources and reserves within other parts of the UK.
- 6.2.10. To that end, and tied-in with the NPPF’s ‘Duty to Cooperate’ requirement, a number of Mineral Planning Authorities with responsibility for silica sand resources are now working together to develop an improved understanding of the national situation, but there would be considerable benefit to all concerned if the industry and other stakeholders would engage with this initiative. This could either be through the UKMF and/or directly with the Authorities.
- 6.2.11. NH advised that the Silica And Moulding Sands Association (SAMSA) would definitely wish to engage with this, not least to ensure that accurate information is provided (e.g. with respect to the varying suitabilities of different types of sand for different end uses). AT noted that this was already in hand, as detailed in the above-mentioned report, but also that any new or updated information on this was exactly the kind of thing that was being looked for.
- 6.2.12. In conclusion, IS requested all members to let the Secretary know if they would be interested in contributing ideas or information to the local authorities and also whether they agree with the wider notion of setting up a new working group to assist in updating the mineral planning factsheet on silica sand (and perhaps others, in due course).

**Action: ALL members**

### 6.3. IOQ training on Mineral Planning for Mineral Planners

- 6.3.1. A flier for this training, being arranged through the Institute of Quarrying, was circulated to members ahead of the meeting. The distance-learning course takes place over six months and comprises six online training units, two webinars and a workshop day, which includes a quarry site visit. Further information can be obtained from the organiser: [Julian.Smallshaw@quarrying.org](mailto:Julian.Smallshaw@quarrying.org) (07870 737 645).

### 6.4. Proposal for a Conference Meeting

- 6.4.1. IS proposed that the Forum may wish to consider co-organising a one-day conference meeting, possibly in 2018, on the subject of the **long-term sustainable development of mineral resources**. This would be organised jointly with the Royal Geographical Society (RGS) and the Geological Society of London (GSL) and would focus specifically on the highly topical global concerns regarding the supply of sand (see [https://na.unep.net/geas/archive/pdfs/GEAS\\_Mar2014\\_Sand\\_Mining.pdf](https://na.unep.net/geas/archive/pdfs/GEAS_Mar2014_Sand_Mining.pdf) and listen to <http://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/b08xbk8t>, which features 'our very own' Andrew Bloodworth).
- 6.4.2. IS has established that the RGS would be interested in being the main organiser. They could offer their prestigious headquarters in Kensington Gore as the conference venue and would be able to provide all of the administrative services as part of the conference fee.
- 6.4.3. The suggested topic could potentially link with the proposals for the UKMF working group on silica sand, as outlined above, but it would explore the much wider global issue of how minerals supply, in general, ties-in with the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (see <http://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/sustainable-development-goals>).
- 6.4.4. Members are invited to consider this proposal which can then be discussed more fully at the next meeting. In the meantime, IS will make further progress on liaising with the RGS and IGS.

**Action: IS**

## 7. Any other business

### 7.1. Secretary Required for Next Meeting!

- 7.1.1. AT will be out of the country at, and leading up to, the date of the next meeting (23<sup>rd</sup> November). A willing volunteer is therefore sought to take notes at the meeting and to write up the minutes, in liaison with IS. AT would still be able to compile and issue the agenda and other papers in advance of the meeting. If you would like to help with this, please contact the Secretary or Chairman ASAP.

**Action: ALL members.**

*Post-meeting note:* Lester Hicks has kindly offered to stand-in as Secretary for the November meeting.

## 7.2. European Minerals Day 2017 (10<sup>th</sup> Anniversary)

- 7.2.1. PH noted that this event takes place over the weekend of 22<sup>nd</sup> – 24<sup>th</sup> September. For further information, see <http://www.mineralsday.eu/>

## 7.3. National Infrastructure Forum

- 7.3.1. NH noted that the annual National Infrastructure Forum (taking place on 13<sup>th</sup> June at ExCel in London) may be of interest to members. Attendance is by invitation only through one of the many contributing organisations, which include the CBI.
- 7.3.2. *Post-meeting note:* next years' event (on 12<sup>th</sup> June 2018) specifically incorporates the "Supply Chain Infrastructure Expo" which may be worth registering interest for now. This may help to 'get the message across' about the essential role of minerals in UK infrastructure proposals which, as noted by NH, is all too frequently overlooked at present.

## 8. **Date of next meeting:**

- Thursday 23<sup>rd</sup> November 2017, 11am-1 30pm  
IoM<sup>3</sup> offices at 297 Euston Road, NW1 3AQ, followed by a buffet lunch.