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Executive Summary

Devon County Council has commenced preparation of a Minerals Core Strategy, which will be the first Development Plan Document within its Minerals and Waste Development Framework. To achieve early and effective stakeholder participation in the development of the Core Strategy, the County Council has held two stakeholder workshops to allow discussion of the issues that will need to be addressed and to identify potential options for addressing those issues. Adams Hendry Consulting Ltd was appointed to facilitate stakeholder workshops and to report the outcomes independently and objectively.

This Report presents the outcomes of the stakeholder workshops in a sequential way and sets out factual information relating to the establishment of the workshops, reflects on achievements and concludes with recommendations arising from the work of the participants.

Two stakeholder workshops took place in February and March 2007 at Sandy Park Conference Centre in Exeter. The first workshop considered the impacts of minerals development, the spatial vision and objectives for the Core Strategy, whilst the second workshop explored the issues of minerals supply and safeguarding in more detail. The format for each stakeholder workshop comprised presentations from officers from Devon County Council followed by participatory group tasks on the subject of the presentations.

The outcomes were derived from the group tasks and the interactive sessions which were provided at both events. The events have allowed interested stakeholders an early opportunity to engage with officers and positively contribute to the MWDF plan preparation process. The stakeholder workshops have played an important role in meeting the objectives set out in Devon County Council’s draft Statement of Community Involvement. The outcomes will be used to inform the Issues and Options Consultation for the Devon Minerals Core Strategy Development Plan Document.

The process has been independently led and facilitated and the stakeholder workshops have largely been shaped by the stakeholders themselves. Reflecting on the facilitation objectives, the meetings concluded with stakeholders feeling that they had been given an opportunity to participate in a worthwhile process and that the outcomes of the process will be used to influence future planning for minerals in the area.

As independent facilitators, Adams Hendry recommend:

(i) Officers take on board the outcomes from the stakeholder events in further consultation exercises;
(ii) The continued role of the stakeholder events as a ‘test bed’ for the emerging documents should the need arise;
(iii) Retain the on-line forum and web-pages as a means of information dissemination, and
(iv) Officers scheduling further stakeholder events at appropriate junctures in the plan preparation process.
1. **Introduction**

1.1 Devon County Council has commenced preparation of a Minerals Core Strategy, which will be the first Development Plan Document within its Minerals and Waste Development Framework. To achieve early and effective stakeholder participation in the development of the Core Strategy, the County Council has held two stakeholder workshops to allow discussion of the issues that will need to be addressed and to identify potential options for addressing those issues.

1.2 Adams Hendry Consulting Ltd was appointed to facilitate the stakeholder workshop process and agreed to report independently and objectively under the following key objectives:

- Disseminate information
- Manage the stakeholder workshops objectively and independently
- Channel discussions in a constructive manner
- Support the work of the workshop members
- Find outcomes based on consensus

1.3 The extent to which these objectives were achieved is discussed in Section 8 of this report.
2. Purpose and Structure of Report

2.1 This Report presents the outcomes of the Stakeholder Workshops in a sequential way and sets out factual information relating to the establishment of the Meetings, reflects on achievements and concludes with recommendations arising from the work of the participants.
3. **Establishing the Stakeholder Workshops**

3.1 The County Council established the potential stakeholders for the workshops from its database of participants in previous minerals policy consultations together with everyone who expressed an interest in mineral planning in response to consultation on the Council’s Statement of Community Involvement and any other bodies that the Council felt may be interested in participating. Invitation letters explaining the purpose of the workshops to take place on 14 February and 22 March 2007 were sent to over 230 stakeholders and the workshops were also publicised through the County Council’s website together with the websites of the Devon Strategic Partnership and the Devon Rural Network.

3.2 A total of 44 individual delegates attended one of the stakeholder workshops. A breakdown of attendees is shown in Figure 3.1 below and a full list of attendees is provided in Appendix 3.

![Figure 3.1: Attendees](image)

3.3 An analysis of the attendees shows that 26% comprised representatives from the minerals industry, 20% were from District Councils and adjacent authorities, 9% were from Parish Councils and 9% represented interest groups. This is considered to be a relatively balanced group in the context of planning for future minerals extraction in the area. More detail on the breakdown of attendees at each of the individual stakeholder workshops is provided in sections 5 and 6 of this report.

3.4 Prior to each stakeholder workshop, delegates were sent copies of topic papers covering specific issues for minerals planning in Devon as well as details of the agenda.
4 The Agenda and Format of the Meetings

4.1 The meetings began with a welcome and introduction to the event by Maureen Darrie, lead facilitator from Adams Hendry. This was followed by an interactive session during which delegates were invited to answer a series of questions using a PC and remote access handsets allowing individual and immediate responses. This was useful in establishing a benchmark so as to allow both Officers and delegates to assess whether or not the objectives of the meeting had been met.

4.2 Each of the meetings included presentations from Officers from the County Council providing background and context for the subsequent group tasks. Copies of the presentations are included in Appendices 1 and 2. The presentations were followed by facilitated discussions in four workshop groups made up of approximately 8 delegates, each reflecting the range of interest groups present on the day. The format of the workshops was devised to give delegates an opportunity to participate in the identification and consideration of issues and to develop the vision, objectives and options. The workshop discussions culminated with one of the delegates providing feedback to the group as a whole.

4.3 The meetings concluded with an interactive session, again allowing individual delegates to record their views on a number of specific issues. This was followed by a plenary session during which delegates were invited to raise questions or comment on the day. It also provided an opportunity for the Lead Facilitator to summarise the key outcomes and thank delegates for their valuable contribution to the process.

4.4 The detailed agenda, workshops and outcomes from each meeting are set out in Chapters 5 and 6 of this report.
5. Outcomes from Stakeholder Workshop 1

5.1 The first stakeholder workshop was held on 14th February 2007 at Sandy Park Conference Centre in Exeter. It was attended by 27 delegates representing a total of 21 different organisations or companies. A breakdown of the attendees by type of organisation is shown in Figure 5.1 below.

![Attendees at Meeting 1](image)

5.2 The purpose of the meeting was to consider the impacts of minerals development, the spatial vision and objectives for the Core Strategy. Each session began with a presentation from an officer from Devon County followed by a group task as follows:

- Group Task 1: Impacts of Mineral Development
- Group Task 2: A Vision for the Core Strategy
- Group Task 3: Objectives for the Core Strategy

5.3 A broad summary of the discussions in relation to each Group Task is set out below. The detailed outcomes recorded by the facilitators for each group are provided in Appendix 1.

**Group Task 1 – Impacts of Mineral Development**

5.4 The first group task related to the impacts of mineral development and began with a presentation from Stewart Redding on minerals planning in Devon. It was noted that within Devon there are a number of minerals that are worked commercially such as crushed rock, sand and gravel, ball clay, brick clay, building stone and china clay. Mineral extraction can provide economic,
social and environmental benefits as well as temporary environmental impacts. The four workshop groups were asked to identify and rank the key positive and negative impacts associated with minerals extraction. A series of topic headings were suggested to initiate discussion and matrices were provided to record the outcomes.

5.5 Under the heading ‘biodiversity’ the general consensus of the workshop groups was that the restoration of mineral sites offers the potential to enhance biodiversity and can contribute to meeting BAP targets. This was considered an important positive impact. In terms of negative impacts, it was noted that minerals extraction can result in loss of habitat and thus biodiversity in the short-term and that this impact could be compounded by inappropriate restoration schemes.

5.6 The opportunity to restore and enhance the landscape following mineral extraction was generally felt to be a positive impact by each of the groups. The negative impacts identified centred on the fact that the short-term impact on the landscape will often be adverse and in some cases may result in irrevocable losses.

5.7 In terms of the historic environment, positive impacts identified by the Groups included that minerals extraction could expose geological features of importance thus improving geo-diversity. The contribution of local stone to local distinctiveness and the creation of the historic environment was also raised. The role of the Aggregate Levy Sustainability Fund was also noted in terms of providing funding for the restoration of the historic environment. Negative impacts recorded by the groups included the physical removal of the historic environment as a result of mineral extraction.

5.8 In discussing the impact on climate change, the Groups generally noted that local mineral extraction was important in terms of reducing ‘mineral miles’. The use of marine aggregates was also raised as it promotes the use of sea and rail transport. The use of quarry voids for flood alleviation was also raised. Negative impacts on climate change centred on transportation and the extraction of non-renewable resources.

5.9 Local employment generation and the economic benefits of the minerals industry were identified as key positive impacts in relation to local communities as was the impact of the Aggregate Levy Sustainability Fund in terms of providing grants for community facilities. Negative impacts included traffic and amenity issues.

5.10 Positive impacts associated with traffic included funding or contributions from the minerals industry to new road infrastructure as well as pro-active traffic management measures such as routing agreements and hours of operation. It can also lead to employment in the haulage industry. Again negative impacts centred on amenity issues such as noise, dust, vibration etc and road safety.

5.11 In terms of the economy, the key positive impacts identified by the groups related to local employment and income generation. Negative impacts included a potentially damaging impact on the landscape, which could have implications for tourism as well the implications for a local economy reliant on the minerals industry as a result of fluctuations in its profitability.

5.12 In terms of ranking, the groups did not reach a consensus. Some of the groups felt that impacts and the relative weight to be attributed to each of the issues would vary depending on the site. Of those groups that did attempt to rank the issues the economy and local communities were considered to be the most important.
Group Task 2 – A Vision for the Core Strategy

5.13 The second group task began with a presentation from Andy Hill from Devon County Council on the Minerals Core Strategy and the role of the spatial vision. Government guidance suggests that the spatial vision should have an emphasis on local distinctiveness, a focus on delivery and be attainable, realistic, deliverable and challenging. It should refer to all minerals and contribute towards achieving the sustainability agenda. Following this introduction, the Groups were asked to break into their workshop groups and to draft an appropriate spatial vision to overarch the Core Strategy.

5.14 The Groups began the discussion by identifying the key issues that should be addressed. The spatial visions suggested by the Groups were as follows:

‘To safeguard and exploit the mineral resources of Devon to maximise the benefits and minimise the costs economically, environmentally and socially.’

‘Meeting the demand for minerals and safeguarding the long term future of resources, whilst:

- Enhancing the special landscape and biodiversity of Devon
- Protecting the needs of Devon’s local communities
- Reducing the contributions to carbon emissions in line with regional and local targets in partnership with local communities and industries.’

‘Deliver a sustainable and diverse minerals industry within Devon recognizing the importance of communities, the environment and the economy.’

‘To ensure sufficient supply of minerals to promote and enhance local distinctiveness and to meet local and essential national requirements whilst sustaining local communities and the economy and safeguarding the quality of the Devon environment’.

Group Task 3 – Objectives for the Core Strategy

5.15 The third and final group task related to the objectives for the Core Strategy and began with an introduction from Maureen Darrie and Andy Hill. The delegates had all been provided with a copy of the Government’s objectives for minerals planning as set out in Minerals Policy Statement 1 in advance of the meeting. Using these national objectives as a starting point, the workshop groups were asked to identify a suite of objectives specifically related to Devon, for inclusion in the Core Strategy. They were also asked to rank what they considered to be the three most important objectives.

5.16 The groups all seemed to approach this exercise from the starting point of the spatial vision drafted in the previous task recognising that ultimately the purpose of the objectives is to contribute to delivering the spatial vision.

5.17 There was a clear commonality in the topics for which the groups drafted objectives. These included safeguarding and supply, recycling and secondary aggregates, environment, transport and community impacts. The detailed objectives drafted by each workshop group are set out in Appendix 1.

5.18 The Groups did not generally feel it was appropriate to rank the objectives.
Interactive Session

5.19 The day began and ended with an interactive session using the ‘voting handsets’. The two sessions comprised a series of questions, the outcomes of which are set out below:

**Session 1**

1. I have a good knowledge of the planning system. Y/N
2. I have a good knowledge of the new planning system. Y/N
3. I have a good knowledge of planning for minerals. Y/N
4. I am directly affected by a mineral extraction site. Y/N
5. Using the text function (and one word response), identify what you believe is the key issue for Devon in planning for minerals extraction.

5.20 A total of 25 delegates participated in this exercise. In total 88% felt that they had a good knowledge of the planning system, however only 64% felt that they had a good knowledge of the new planning system. Only 36% of delegates considered that their knowledge of planning for minerals was good. The majority of delegates (64%) confirmed that they are not directly affected by a mineral extraction site.

5.21 In response to question 5, delegates identified a number of key issues for Devon in planning for minerals extraction. The most common suggestions were the environment, supply and reserves.

5.22 Full details of the interactive session are included at Appendix 4.

**Session 2**

1. My knowledge of the new planning system has improved as a result of the event. Y/N
2. My knowledge of minerals planning has improved as a result of the event. Y/N
3. The organisation of the event was very good, good, satisfactory or poor?
4. The venue was very good, good, satisfactory or poor?
5. Facilitation of the event was very good, good, satisfactory or poor?
6. I would attend a future event. Y/N
7. Using the text function (and one word answer), the key issue facing planning for minerals in Devon is…?

5.23 A total of 24 delegates participated in the second interactive session. In response to the first two questions, 50% agreed that their knowledge of the new planning system had improved and 67% felt that their knowledge of minerals planning had improved as a result of the event. Delegates generally agreed that organisation, the venue and facilitation of the event was either very good or good and 96% indicated that they would attend a future event.

5.24 As in the previous interactive session, delegates were asked to identify what they considered to be the key issue facing planning for minerals in Devon. Although the most common issues were sustainability and supply, there was no real consensus with delegates suggesting a wide range of issues, a number of which were not raised in the first session.

5.25 Full details of the interactive session are included at Appendix 4.
6. **Outcomes from Stakeholder Workshop 2**

6.1 The second stakeholder workshop took place at Sandy Park Conference Centre, Exeter on the 22nd March 2007. It was attended by 29 participants, 12 of whom had attended the first workshop. A breakdown of the attendees by type of organisation is shown in Figure 6.1 below.

![Figure 6.1: Attendees at Meeting 2](image)

6.2 The purpose of the meeting was to consider the issues surrounding the supply and safeguarding of minerals. The format for the day comprised three presentations from officers from Devon County Council each followed by a group task on the subject of the preceding presentation:

- Group Task 1 – Supply of Minerals
- Group Task 2 – Safeguarding Options
- Group Task 3 – Community Impacts and Benefits

6.3 The agenda, presentations, task sheets and outcomes from this meeting are included at Appendix 2.

**Group Task 1 – Supply of Minerals**

6.4 The first group task began with a presentation from Andy Hill on the supply of minerals in Devon. Delegates were asked to discuss what options (and advantages and disadvantages thereof) exist for the Core Strategy to:

A. Influence demand for aggregates (for example through sustainable construction methods)?
6.5 In summary, the groups concluded:

**Influencing demand for aggregates**

6.6 There was consensus across all the groups that secondary and recycled aggregates should be promoted and marketed to reduce demand for, and use of, primary aggregates - especially those of the highest grade.

6.7 Two groups discussed the setting of targets for the use of secondary and recycled aggregates to achieve this but did not reach any firm conclusions as to whether they felt this option would be successful. Another group felt that it was just as important to maximise the productive use of those primaries which have been worked and if secondaries are to be used they need to be transported in a sustainable way.

6.8 Two groups came up with the option of restricting levels of supply to meet only local demand with any shortfall having to be met through the use of recycled aggregate, thereby promoting self-sufficiency.

6.9 One group felt one option would be a code for sustainable construction which could be promoted through the Core Strategy.

**Delivering primary aggregates**

6.10 Providing to meet the local apportionment was raised as an option by two groups; one feeling that it would represent the simplest approach, the other suggesting that apportionments can rule out local sources of materials and hinder competition. Other options for which there was no consensus include:

- Letting the market decide level of supply
- Site identification and safeguarding
- Match geographic demand and supply (reactive)
- Provide for a network of supply (proactive)

**Potential shortfalls in sand and gravel production**

6.11 Two groups who considered this felt that imports from outside of Devon would a logical solution to any future shortfalls, although not necessarily the most sustainable.

6.12 Other suggested options related to the use of marine dredged sand, crushed rock and recycled materials (such as construction and demolition waste and waste material from ball and china clay extraction).

**Promoting secondary and recycled aggregates**

6.13 This topic prompted much debate within the two groups who considered it. Options which were suggested included:
• A hierarchy of materials to be used in developments with secondary / recycled at the top
• Specify a percentage of recycled or secondary aggregates to be used in new development
• Allow market forces to increase the use of these materials through taxation

6.14 A number of issues were also raised in respect of these materials:

• Strict grade requirements or specifications unnecessarily preclude the use of secondary and recycled aggregates
• The use of such materials is not devoid of environmental impact (production, transportation etc.)
• Aggregates tax distorts the market rendering operators unable to sell good secondaries in direct competition with primaries of higher grades.

**Delivering ball clay and china clay**

6.15 Both groups who considered this issue agreed that the safeguarding of these resources should be strengthened given their national and international importance, despite the fact that ample reserves are permitted at present.

**Meeting identified needs for new mineral resources**

6.16 One group felt that a mixture of identifying new sites and extending existing sites would be the best approach for meeting needs for new mineral resources whereas the other group who considered this question felt that existing resources should be used as a priority, ahead of developing extensions to sites, with new sites being developed only as a last resort.

6.17 Perhaps due to the broad nature of the questions there was very little consensus arising from this group task. The debate was full and participative and the variety of options which did arise will provide a good basis for the next formal stage of consultation.

**Group Task 2 – Safeguarding Options**

6.18 The second Group Task began with a presentation by Andy Hill on safeguarding options and was in three parts. The outcomes for these will be discussed in turn.

6.19 **Part 1** required the delegates to discuss the advantages and disadvantages of various approaches to safeguarding mineral resources, namely:

**A** Based on existing permitted sites

6.20 The theme throughout all the groups was that this is not the desired approach. The disadvantages being that it lacks flexibility and would not provide any protection for additional or future resources, and in some ways is contrary to national policy in MPS1.

**B** Based on existing permitted sites plus any adjacent potential reserves

6.21 This was considered to be a more flexible approach than A but still lacked foresight and flexibility. In focusing purely on existing sites and extensions thereof, this approach may not allow for adequate buffer zones between mineral workings and other development. It also ignores new sites which may result in less harm to the environment if worked.
6.22 This approach was generally considered to be more flexible, responsive, and would provide more certainty to industry and the public about future minerals development than either A or B, with one group naming it as their preferred option, and another naming it as their preferred option with B underlying it. Two of the groups identified blight as a disadvantage of this approach and there was considerable debate about how you define ‘economic value’ and how far you should take the term ‘potential’.

6.33 A number of other approaches were suggested by the groups, including:

- Selective safeguarding based on the potential impacts of extraction (preferred option for one group)
- Using constraints mapping as a method of identifying safeguarding areas
- Based on resources of social, environmental, cultural and economic value not necessarily associated with an existing site (preferred option for one group)
- Selection of small nodule sites to minimize environmental impact.

6.34 There was no overall consensus between the groups but some trends emerge from the outcomes.

6.35 Part 2 of the second Group Task required the groups to discuss whether potential sources of historic building stone should be safeguarded at locations that do not currently have planning permission, and if so, how the sites should be selected.

6.36 All of the groups unanimously agreed that potential sources of historic building stone should be safeguarded at locations that do not currently have planning permission. Suggestions for site selection include:

- Utilise amateur geological knowledge
- The quarry must offer a unique stone which is in limited supply with a high risk of sterilization, in order to be selected
- Make use of the historic buildings register, or develop one specifically for Devon

6.37 Part 3 required the groups to identify the advantages and disadvantages of various approaches to safeguarding mineral transportation resources such as wharves and railheads, namely:

A Based on those currently used

6.38 All groups agreed that this approach is needed as a minimum but lacks foresight and takes no account of potential future requirements.

B Based on those with potential to be used

6.39 The groups generally felt that this approach embraced a more flexible stance and keeps options open for the future, but has the potential to blight sites which may be suitable for much
needed redevelopment. It is very difficult to predict future transportation requirements. Despite this two of the groups identified this approach as their preferred option.

C Any other approaches?

6.40 Other approaches identified include:

- The County Council purchasing sites as a measure of protection
- A more radical approach of safeguarding any site which has potential to be used in the future
- The Central Government should take a lead and restore the freight grant, perhaps utilising the aggregates levy.

**Group Task 3 - Community Impacts and Benefits**

6.41 The third Group Task began with a presentation from Andy Hill and required the groups to debate and consider five key questions relating to the adverse and beneficial impacts of minerals development on local communities. Their responses are provided in full in Appendix 2 but summarised below:

Q1 How could key impacts on local communities of mineral working be addressed through the Core Strategy?

6.42 Three groups listed landscape, traffic, noise, dust, mud on roads and visual impacts as being key impacts resulting from minerals development. The groups variously felt that existing development control processes, consultation and liaison and carefully worded new policies in the Core Strategy were the best ways of addressing these impacts.

Q2 What positive contribution could the Core Strategy make for local communities?

6.43 Local liaison groups, increasing access to the countryside, beneficial restoration projects, flood alleviation schemes, and the Aggregates Levy Sustainability Fund were all cited by the groups as approaches that the Core Strategy could promote.

Q3 What approach could the Core Strategy take to the restoration of mineral sites?

6.44 The groups felt the Core Strategy should:

- Encourage a site by site approach to restoration
- Emphasise the importance of local distinctiveness in restoration projects
- Encourage a net gain in biodiversity
- Encourage ongoing site-management
- Encourage innovation and flexibility
- Identify that some former quarries would provide suitable sites for traditionally ‘bad neighbour’ uses such as inert tipping as part of their restoration.

Q4 Should the Minerals Core Strategy concentrate on delivering minerals and minimising/avoiding harm to the environment and local communities, or should it take a wider view and seek to address sustainability issues such as climate change where this can be achieved through mineral development?
6.45 Three of the groups felt that the Core Strategy should take a wider view and seek to address sustainability issues, but one felt that it should concentrate on delivering minerals and the implications of doing so for Devon. This group felt that sustainability issues are adequately addressed at the regional and national level.

Q5 In what ways can the Core Strategy and future stages of the LDF engage stakeholders and encourage communities to get involved with minerals planning?

6.46 The groups came up with the following suggestions:

- Liaison groups
- The internet – for example www.virtualquarry.co.uk
- Education and school trips
- Television
- Newsletters
- Forums
- Marketing

**Interactive Session**

6.47 As with the previous stakeholder workshop, the day began and ended with an interactive session using the ‘voting handsets’. The two sessions comprised a series of questions the outcomes of which are set out below:

**Session 1**

1. Did you attend the first meeting? Y/N
2. If you attended the first meeting, do you feel that the outcomes reflected the discussions? Y/N
3. Are you directly affected by a mineral extraction site? Y/N
4. Rank the following mineral impacts in order of importance to you:
   A) Landscape; B) Economy; C) Traffic; D) Biodiversity

6.48 A total of 29 delegates participated in this exercise. The results indicated that 48% of delegates had attended the previous meeting and confirmed that the outcomes were an accurate reflection of discussions. The majority of delegates (48%) were not directly affected by a mineral extraction, however 41% were.

6.49 In terms of the ranking of mineral impacts, the results of the exercise are inconclusive as some delegates chose not to rank each of the impacts but concentrated on the one or two that they considered to be the most important. On this basis, biodiversity was ranked by 34% of delegates, landscape by 24% and economy and transport by 17%.

6.50 Full details of the interactive session are included at Appendix 4.
Session 2

1. Do you agree with the draft vision? Y/N
2. Do you agree with the draft objectives? Y/N
3. Has your knowledge of minerals planning improved as a result of the event? Y/N
4. Do you feel that you have been able to present your views? Y/N
5. Do you feel your views will be taken into account in the Core Strategy? Y/N
6. Would you attend an event sometime in the future? Y/N
7. Has facilitation of the event been very good, good, satisfactory or poor?
8. Organisation of the event was very good, good, satisfactory or poor?
9. Using the text function what do you consider is the key issue facing minerals planning in Devon?
10. Will you respond to future consultation on the Core Strategy? Y/N

6.51 A total of 25 delegates participated in this second session. There was unanimous agreement with both the draft vision and objectives from those delegates that responded to these first two questions (88% and 64% respectively). The majority of delegates (84%) felt that their knowledge of minerals planning had improved as a result of the event. It is interesting to note that although 88% of delegates agreed that they had been able to present their views, only 68% felt that their views would be taken into account in the Core Strategy.

6.52 All of the delegates that responded to question 6 (88%) confirmed that they would attend an event sometime in the future and that facilitation and organization of the event was either very good or good.

6.53 In terms of the key issue for minerals planning in Devon, delegates raised a number of issues the most common of which were environment and safeguarding however there was no clear consensus.

6.54 In response to the last question, all of the delegates that responded (88%) confirmed that they would respond to future consultation on the Core Strategy.

6.55 Full details of the interactive session are included at Appendix 4.
7. **On-line Forum and Communication**

7.1 An on-line Forum was established, accessible through the Adams Hendry’s website:

www.adamshendry.co.uk

7.2 The on-line pages provided links to the agendas, topic papers and outcomes of the stakeholder workshops and additional sources of background information. The web based information proved useful as a central point of information but did not replace the need to communicate by written means to those with a preference for that medium.

7.3 Whilst some delegates took the opportunity to register on the online forum there is clearly potential for it to be used more widely and effectively, and stakeholders need to be encouraged to use this as a means of continual dialogue and communication. The Forum has 9 registered users to date so may prove a useful tool in the future.
8 Conclusions and Recommendations

8.1 The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 has given community and stakeholder engagement renewed emphasis in the plan making process. The Devon Minerals Core Strategy Stakeholder Workshops have played an important role in meeting the objectives set out in the draft Statement of Community Involvement.

8.2 The stakeholder workshops have allowed interested parties an opportunity to engage with Officers and positively contribute to the emerging development plan document. The outcomes from the workshops can be used to inform the preparation of the Issues and Options Consultation for the Devon Minerals Core Strategy Development Plan Document.

8.3 The process has been independently led and facilitated and has been largely shaped by the delegates themselves. Reflecting on the facilitation objectives, the meetings concluded with stakeholders feeling that they had been given an opportunity to participate in a worthwhile process and that the outcomes of the process will be used to influence future minerals planning in the area.

8.4 As independent facilitators, Adams Hendry recommend:

(i) Officers take on board the outcomes from the stakeholder events in further consultation exercises;
(ii) The continued role of the stakeholder events as a ‘test bed’ for the emerging documents should the need arise;
(iii) Retain the on-line forum and web-pages as a means of information dissemination, and
(iv) Officers scheduling further stakeholder events at appropriate junctures in the plan preparation process.