

# King's Cliffe Local Liaison Group Meeting

6 February 2013

## Present

Phil Watson (PW)  
Mark Laurenson (ML)  
Simon Moyle (SM)  
Gene Wilson (GW)  
Eleanor Nicholson (EN)  
Chris Leuchars (CL)  
Michael Day (MD)  
Roy Mantas (RM)  
Fiona Cowan (FC)  
Heather Smith (HS)

## Representing

Northamptonshire County Council (NCC)  
NCC  
Augean  
Augean  
Jennings Nicholson Associates (for Augean)  
King's Cliffe Parish Council (KCPC)  
KCPC  
Environment Agency (EA)  
Collyweston Parish Council  
Councillor (NCC – Prebendal)

## 1. Apologies

1.1 Apologies were passed on from:

Tony Slipper	Tixover Parish Council
Felicity Stevenson	Easton on the Hill Parish Council
Daphne Sharpe	Easton on the Hill Parish Council
David Burgess	Woodnewton Parish Council
Kevin Burton (KB)	EA
Palden Dorje (PD)	East Northamptonshire Council (ENC)

## 2. Minutes of Previous Meeting (2/5/2012)

2.1 **Gene Wilson (GW)** – Clarified that the white lining works referred to at paragraph 3.5 of the minutes were undertaken in relation to Thornhaugh landfill and were undertaken by Peterborough City Council but paid for by Augean. The resurfacing works were in relation to the ENRMF and Augean contributed via their £5000 annual contribution.

## 3. Operator Update

3.1 **Simon Moyle (SM)** – Explained that there have been no major operational issues and no complaints received. SM advised that a leachate action plan has been submitted to the Environment Agency (EA) and that a new wheel spinner has been installed. SM explained that a joint monitoring exercise had recently been undertaken with the EA. In terms of the rest of plans for the year, cell 5B is to be engineered in the Summer and significant investment is also proposed at the treatment plant with new kit and various reconfigurations.

3.2 **GW** – Explained that Augean's current Chief Executive Officer (CEO) Paul Blackler is standing down with a new CEO to start in approximately 3 months. The new CEO has not yet been named. The Financial Director is Acting CEO in the meanwhile.

3.3 GW noted that the examination into the application for the extension to 2026 had now closed and that no further documents would be accepted. The Inspector has three

months to complete his report and the Secretary of State a further 3 months to determine the application with an expected decision date around 22 July.

- 3.4 GW mentioned that Thornhaugh has been granted a new planning permission to 2029 with no change to the waste streams accepted.
- 3.5 GW noted that monitoring data continues to be updated on Augean's website.
- 3.6 GW explained that Augean were looking at hosting another open day at the site but given the last one was sparsely attended suggested engineering construction days could be held. GW suggested not extending the invite to the HPA and Harwell but that the EA might wish to attend. GW asked for views on the preferences of the group and any alternative suggestions.
- 3.7 **Roy Mantas (RM)** – Asked how the previous open days were advertised.
- 3.8 **Eleanor Nicholson (EN)** – Explained that several thousand flyers were distributed within the local villages and ads placed in the local papers.
- 3.9 **RM** – Suggested that Augean ask people to register their attendance in advance with the day to be postponed if there aren't sufficient numbers.
- 3.10 **Fiona Cowan (FC)** – Suggested the HPA and Harwell should be invited as people want to hear from them as they have some independence. FC suggested that the publicity should include questions that have been asked and issues that have been raised.
- 3.11 **Michael Day (MD)** – Asked how many people attended last year.
- 3.12 **GW** – Explained 8 attended but 5 were related in some way to staff members so in reality it was 3.
- 3.13 **FC** – Noted that limited attendance did not reflect a lack of concerns.
- 3.14 **Chris Leuchars (CL)** – Suggested that people want to see the waste actually being buried but that probably wasn't possible. Alternatively they'd like to see somebody attend from the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG). CL explained that he had been twice and didn't expect to see anything new.
- 3.15 **Phil Watson (PW)** – Proposed that a different event, perhaps in the village hall, might attract more interest.
- 3.16 **FC** – Suggested that an event post the Secretary of State's decision on the application to extend the site might receive more interest.
- 3.17 **GW** – Explained that exhibitions in villages have been held previously but as attendees often have to travel some way to the venue it is just as easy to host at the site with the added benefit of seeing the site.

- 3.18 **FC** – Noted interest in recent rainfall and this impact on the site. Also the suggested changes in the soil treatment and the impacts in terms of extending the site would be of particular interest.
- 3.19 **CL** – Expressed an interest in the leachate treatment process.
- 3.20 **Heather Smith (HS)** – Suggested that ads in the parish letters may be more useful than standalone newsletters.
- 3.21 **CL** – Suggested the focus should be on seeing the soil treatment facility.
- 3.22 **RM** – Suggested the event be shortened to just the morning or afternoon.
- 3.23 **GW** – Undertook to circulate a proposal.
- 3.24 **CL** – Asked how much LLW has been disposed of at the site so far.
- 3.25 **GW** – 1368 tonnes of LLW (predominantly VLLW) to the end of 2012 which equates to £6844 for the community fund.
- 3.26 **RM** - Explained that the average radioactivity of the LLW received was 7 or 8 Bequerels/gram with a couple of drums above 100 Bequerels/gram.
- 3.27 **CL** – Asked if the higher radioactivity waste was treated any differently.
- 3.28 **RM** – Explained that it was all dealt with the same way. RM noted that one drum had been quarantined following a labelling issue.
- 3.29 **SM** – Clarified that the drum had been checked at the source but had come a load earlier than it was supposed to. The paperwork was completed the next day and the drum was able to be deposited. SM suggested this showed the procedures work.
- 3.30 **GW** – Explained that the procedures for dealing with LLW were all based on radioactivity of 200 bequerels/gram.
- 3.31 **RM** – Pointed out that this was a very conservative approach.

#### **4. EA Update**

- 4.1 **RM** – Explained that the EA had attended the examination into the extension application on 18-19 October and also the December sessions and that they had answered various questions in relation to matters such as impacts on groundwater, engineering, off site monitoring, regulations, legislation etc and that written info had also been submitted where appropriate.
- 4.2 **RM** confirmed that a leachate management plan had been submitted and that it included a commitment by Augean to be below permitted leachate levels by July 2013. If leachate can't be treated on site it can be tankered off site to a suitable facility. RM explained that if the site was not compliant by July 2013 the EA would consider enforcement action.

- 4.3 **SM** – Explained that some leachate was tankered off site over Christmas to Augean’s Avonmouth facility for treatment. Closer facilities at Peterborough sewage treatment works (STW) and Milton Keynes STW were considered but did not have the capacity to accept the waste.
- 4.4 **CL** – Expressed concern at hazardous and radioactive leachate being treated at STW.
- 4.5 **GW** - Clarified that monitoring showed the leachate was neither hazardous or radioactive but that the Avonmouth facility was in any case qualified to take both.
- 4.6 **RM** – Explained that three days of independent monitoring at the site had finished today with sampling targeted to capture any impacts from operations at the site. The radiological monitoring included testing boreholes, leachate, surface water samples, soil samples and sampling at the brook and horsewater spring. RM explained that a bid had been made for the £30,000 to fund another set of testing at this time next year. In the longer term an alternative could be that the radiological monitoring could be combined with a programme of annual monitoring (Radiation in Food and Environment (RIFE) monitoring) which is ongoing at nuclear installations. A bid has also been made to fund another round of non-radiological monitoring and is considered likely, by RM, to be successful.
- 4.7 RM explained that the funding for the radiological testing comes from DEFRA to the EA’s nuclear regulatory group. The site is monitored from the Central Anglian area fund with money allocated where it is considered it is most worthwhile. RM expressed confidence that the bid would be successful with results likely within a couple of weeks.
- 4.8 RM explained that the EA’s assessment team analyses the results and that they will be published to the EA’s website when complete. RM noted that this may be some time away as results from last year are still not finished.
- 4.9 **PW** – Undertook to circulate any reports that were passed to NCC.
- 4.10 **EN** – Undertook to circulate to stakeholders.
- 4.11 **GW** – Reminded the group that there were links to monitoring data on Augean’s website and King’s Cliffe Parish Council’s website.
- 4.12 **RM** - Added that there is an ongoing review of the soil treatment procedures to ensure that the operation is fit for purpose. RM confirmed that no complaints have been received by the EA and that no enforcement action has been taken by the EA.

## **5. Community Fund**

- 5.1 **GW** – Explained that due to staff sickness and misunderstandings there had been some delay with SWEET clarifying if it could administer the community fund and at what fee. GW expressed that he hoped to hear by the end of next week and that he considered that this would be the simplest solution with King’s Cliffe Environmental Association (KCEA) to make the decisions on funding allocations, subject to approval of NCC.

- 5.2 **HS** - Clarified that the fund could be used to fund salaries, maintenance etc which aren't covered under the landfill tax regs.
- 5.3 **GW** – Pointed to the Resource Centre which had been set up in part by landfill tax, funded by Augean for a year and then partly for three years but that it wasn't sustainable.
- 5.4 **FC** – Expressed concern that the operation of KCEA is not fully transparent, particularly to villages other than King's Cliffe.
- 5.5 **HS** – Suggested the bigger issue is that applications for funding haven't been coming forward.
- 5.6 **MD** – Could only recall two instances of applications being turned down but noted that on occasion only some of the money sought had been granted.
- 5.7 **SM** – Added that sometimes applicants did not understand the eligibility criteria.
- 5.8 **FC** - Suggested it was hard to find the eligibility info.
- 5.9 **SM** – Pointed FC to the SWEET website <http://www.sweet-uk.com/kcea/applic.html>
- 5.10 **MD** – Noted that the KCEA has actively gone to the media looking for projects and additional members and that it was difficult to know what else to do.
- 5.11 **FC** – Suggested knocking on doors, placing ads in village magazines, local papers, on tv and radio.
- 5.12 **MD** – Emphasised that all the relevant parish councils know about the fund and that it is very surprising more applications haven't come forward.
- 5.13 **FC** - Suggested there are easier alternative sources of funding. Agreed that it was difficult to overcome perceptions but hoped things could improve.
- 5.14 **PW** - Asked if the LLG could help.
- 5.15 **MD** – Suggested having HS on the group would help.
- 5.16 **HS** – Responded that she would happily be part of the group and that she can direct people to the fund as she hears about suitable proposals.
- 5.17 **GW** – Undertook to look at the material on Augean's website to see if it could be improved. GW noted that the landfill tax criteria is government set while the community fund could be more open.
- 5.18 **HS** – Asked if SWEET rule out any potential applicants.
- 5.19 **GW** - Explained that they provide advice only.
- 5.20 **PW** – Explained that KCPC had written to NCC asking about Nuclear Decommissioning Authority (NDA) community funding and circulated the relevant letter (attached). PW also

circulated correspondence (attached) that this matter had been pursued by NCC with the Nuclear Legacy Advisory Forum (NuLeAF). PW also referred to an extract from Augean's Environmental Statement submitted with their application to the National Infrastructure Directorate showing their direct and indirect financial contributions to the local economy.

- 5.21 **GW** – Noted that the extract was part of the socio-economic assessment undertaken to accompany the application to the National Infrastructure Directorate.
- 5.22 **PW** – Explained that the matter of NDA funding was raised with the Inspector at the December examination sessions by KCPC.
- 5.23 **GW** – Pointed to Augean's response to the Inspector on this matter.
- 5.24 **CL** – Clarified that KCPC weren't asking for funding from Augean but rather the NDA.
- 5.25 **PW** – Referred to section 3 of the September NuLeAF paper which states that
- '... the Steering Group agreed to review potential approaches – including the case for a national framework – when agreement has been reached in West Cumbria and further information is available about the implications of current discussions about ways of securing Very Low Level Waste (VLLW) and Low Activity Low Level Waste (LALLW) disposal routes and ILW treatment and storage consolidation. NDA's preliminary view is that a bespoke approach may be most appropriate in each case, drawing on the lessons identified in the approach in West Cumbria, but without adopting a nationally agreed framework. The current Executive Co-Directors intend to continue discussions with NDA and other interested parties.*
- 5.26 PW undertook to continue to press through NuLeAF that the matter needs to be pressed with the NDA. Commented that the NDA are reluctant to get tied into other agreements. PW acknowledged that he could understand KCPC's view that the NDA should look at nationally significant sites in an equitable fashion.
- 5.27 Regarding the final paragraph in the KCPC letter PW noted that the matter was raised by CL at the examinations and that the examination has now closed.
- 5.28 **CL** – Suggested NCC write direct to the NDA.
- 5.29 **PW** – Explained that he had no instructions from the Committee to pursue this matter.
- 5.30 **GW** – Suggested KCPC apply caution with regard to calculating their comparisons on contributions as the sites aren't necessarily comparable - while the dose may be the same everywhere the hazard is not. Similarly GW pointed out that Dounreay and Drigg are not landfills and therefore don't pay landfill tax. GW noted that there is no contribution at Clifton Marsh aside from landfill tax.
- 5.31 **PW** – Agreed to pursue at the next NuLeAF meeting in June and to raise with Councillor Ben Smith. **Action PW.**

- 5.32 **Update – PW has communicated with NuLeAF Director who has confirmed he will request ‘community funding’ is an agenda item for the next NuLeAF steering group meeting. Councillor Ben Smith has also been updated on the concerns around community funding.**
- 5.33 **CL – Reiterated they felt short changed by the NDA who are making huge savings and passing on requirements for any contributions solely to the operator.**
- 5.34 **PW – Advised that community fund discussions to continue outside the meeting with first cheque due shortly after 1 April.**
- 5.35 **HS – Reminded the group that the focus is to be on revenue funding.**

## **6. NCC Update**

- 6.1 **PW – Partial review out for consultation**
- 6.2 ***Update - see email sent by NCC 18 Feb 2013 (attached)***
- 6.3 **HS – Asked if there was a ten mile limit set for the community fund and suggested five miles might be more appropriate.**
- 6.4 **PW – Undertook to check the limit in the agreement.**
- 6.5 ***Update – there is 10 mile limit in the legal agreement.***

## **7. Date of Next Meeting**

- 8.1 **The next meeting was set for 2pm Wednesday 12 June at the King’s Cliffe Memorial Hall. If required it was agreed that a meeting could be called in advance.**



## Community benefits: an overview

Paper for NuLeAF/NDA Stakeholder engagement meeting, 25<sup>th</sup> September 2012

### 1. Introduction

This short paper sets the context for discussion between NuLeAF members and the NDA around this issue of community benefits.

NuLeAF has a Strategic Objective *to seek to ensure that a consistent, proportionate and transparent approach can be taken to the establishment of Community Funds associated with key radioactive waste management facilities*. This Objective was developed in response to the concerns expressed by many local authorities about the need for all such facilities to support communities through a range of means. A central aim is the development of a Community Benefits Protocol.

### 2. Background

NuLeAF and member authorities have discussed the issues around community benefits over a number of years. In March 2008 NuLeAF published Briefing Paper 14 on **Community Funds and the development of radioactive waste management facilities**<sup>1</sup>. The issue has been discussed at a number of Steering Group meetings and workshops and there has been direct engagement with NDA and other relevant parties.

The principles of community benefit are well established and already operational in a number of cases:

- The process for identifying a Geological Disposal Facility (GDF) is underpinned by the need for community consent. The consultation states that host communities *'will expect Government and the NDA to ensure that the project contributes to their further development and well-being'*
- A community fund has been established by Government and the NDA to support communities around the Low Level Waste Repository (LLWR)
- The Ministry of Defence (MOD) is looking into the issue of community benefit as part of its Submarine Decommissioning Project (SDP)
- In terms of new nuclear, Somerset councils and EDF Energy have recently signed an agreement that will deliver up to £100 million for local communities to mitigate the impact of the planned Hinkley Point C station
- The principle of community benefit is well established for other developments, particularly those around renewable energy. Wind farms regularly provide funds

---

<sup>1</sup> See [www.nuleaf.org.uk](http://www.nuleaf.org.uk)



for community facilities and/or offer host communities part ownership of the development thereby delivering an income for the local area<sup>2</sup>

There is also a legislative underpinning for such funds stretching back over a number of years:

- The **Energy Act 2004** required NDA to consider the socio-economic impacts of its activities on local communities and gave it a function of giving *'encouragement and other support to activities that benefit the social or economic life of communities.'*
- **The Town and Country Planning Act 1990** established Section 106 which provides that a developer may enter into a planning obligation enforceable by a local planning authority.
- The **Community Infrastructure Levy** can be used to support development by funding infrastructure that the council, local community and neighbourhoods want. The Levy came into force on 6 April 2011.

### **3. Discussion between NuLeAF and NDA**

At its meeting in October 2011, the NuLeAF Steering Group approved a note setting out the basis for discussion with NDA around the development of a protocol for community benefit (see Appendix).

The purpose of a protocol would be to: (a) provide a nationally agreed framework for negotiation of local community benefits that are separate and additional to mitigation measures (Section 106) and (b) ensure that regional or national needs in radioactive waste management are met in a way that is fair and reasonable at a local level. The proposed scope of the protocol is that it would apply to facilities for the treatment, storage or disposal of radioactive wastes (other than a GDF) that fulfil a role in implementation of national strategies by managing radioactive wastes from more than one site, customer or sector.

A preliminary discussion between the former Executive Director and NDA about the proposed Community Benefits Protocol was held in November 2011. At that time, NDA was not in a position to progress discussions about a national protocol because **it was involved in high level 'pathfinder' discussions with Cumbrian local authorities** about the approach that may be appropriate in relation to the large number of developments that are likely to affect the Sellafield site over the next five years.

The former Director held a follow-up discussion with NDA on 11 April and engaged with the UK Government and other bodies such as Renewables UK.

---

<sup>2</sup> The Wind Farm Protocol sets out the commitment by the members of the trade association, Renewables UK, to deliver real and tangible benefits to those communities that live near onshore wind farms of 5MW and above. It is available at: <http://www.bwea.com/pdf/publications/CommunityBenefits.pdf>.

Based on these discussions the Steering Group agreed to review potential approaches – including the case for a national framework - when agreement has been reached in West Cumbria and further information is available about the implications of current discussions about ways of securing Very Low Level Waste (VLLW) and Low Activity Low Level Waste (LALLW) disposal routes and ILW **treatment and storage consolidation. NDA's preliminary view is that a bespoke** approach may be most appropriate in each case, drawing on the lessons identified in the approach in West Cumbria, but without adopting a nationally agreed framework. The current Executive Co-Directors intend to continue discussions with NDA and other interested parties.

## **ANNEX: SUMMARY OF KEY POINTS ABOUT A POTENTIAL 'RADIOACTIVE WASTE COMMUNITY BENEFITS PROTOCOL'**

### **Context and Rationale**

Discussion about development of a Radioactive Waste Community Benefits Protocol (RWCBP) should recognise:

- **the Government's strong adherence to a 'localism agenda', including policy commitments to ensure that local communities benefit from local development**
- the likelihood of more restrictive, less flexible, use of Section 106 Agreements, resulting from the placing of statutory restrictions on the use of planning obligations, and the scaling back of their use in areas where Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) schemes are introduced
- the limited applicability of the CIL to radioactive waste management developments, where the size of the levy charge (based on the floor space formula) is highly unlikely to be proportionate to the scale of the impacts of a radioactive waste management development
- the adoption or discussion about development of protocols in other or related sectors, including the wind industry, the waste industry and new nuclear build
- **aspects of NDA Strategy that demonstrate the NDA's desire to move forward with the consolidation of treatment and storage of radioactive wastes at a smaller number of sites or that indicate the potential future development of new management or disposal facilities that could fulfil a multi-site role, including the near-surface disposal of short-lived ILW/graphite wastes.**

In this context, the rationales for community benefits provided in accordance with a protocol would be to:

- recognise and reward communities for hosting radioactive waste management facilities with a regional or national role
- help ensure greater acceptance from local communities, thereby helping to secure the deliverability of national strategies for nuclear legacy management.

### **Nature of a RWCBP**

It is intended that a RWCBP would provide a nationally agreed framework for negotiation of local community benefits that:

- are separate and additional to the mitigation measures that might arise solely from a Section 106 Agreement as part of the planning process
- provides flexibility so that local agreements for community benefits can reflect local circumstances.

The protocol should help ensure that the implementation of any local community benefits scheme is undertaken within the boundaries of, and with the support of, an agreed industry and Government backed framework.

The community benefits would be a voluntary contribution from an operator or developer. The benefits would be separate from the planning process and the **mitigation of a development's impacts. As such, the community benefits could not** make an unacceptable development in planning terms acceptable. The benefits should have no influence on planning decisions.

### **Scope of a RWCBP**

The protocol would apply to facilities for the treatment, storage or disposal of radioactive wastes (other than a Geological Disposal Facility) that fulfil a role in implementation of national strategies by managing radioactive wastes from more than one site, customer or sector.

It is envisaged that facilities that only manage radioactive wastes on the single site from which they arise will fall outside the scope of the RWCBP. Such facilities may, nonetheless, require mitigation measures to be put in place as a normal part of the planning process. It is also envisaged that facilities that will be used to manage radioactive wastes or spent fuel

# KING'S CLIFFE PARISH COUNCIL

Freestone Lodge  
50 Bridge Street  
King's Cliffe  
Peterborough  
PE8 6XH

Tel : 01780470799  
Email : kccpcclerk@aol.com

29<sup>th</sup> January 2013

G P Watson  
Development Control Manager  
Planning Development Control  
Northamptonshire County Council  
PO Box 163  
County Hall  
Northampton  
NN1 1AX

Dear Mr. Watson

## Re: Community Funds for sites taking radioactive waste

It has come to our attention that there is a significant discrepancy in the Section 106 agreements signed with local councils in whose boundaries are sites designated for the disposal of large quantities of radioactive waste from the nuclear industry. The table below makes this clear:

Facility	Role	Capacity	Costs	Community Fund	Gate price	Amount per unit
Vault 9, LLWR	National – multi-site and multi-customer service	100,000 cubic metres	Thought to be approx £20 million for construction	£10 million, plus £1.5 million per year of operation (approx 10 years)	£2000-7000 per tonne	£250 per cubic metre
LLW Disposal, Dounreay	Local – Vulcan and Dounreay only	Up to 175,000 cubic metres	Total costs (excluding operation) £90 million	£1 million, plus £300,000 per year of operations (approx 10 years)	No cost	£25 per cubic metre

ENRMF	National – multi-site and multi-customer service	<1m cubic metres – also for hazardous waste	Unknown, but free to NDA	£5 per tonne c.£10,000 in 2012	£150-850 per tonne	£5 per tonne
-------	--	---	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------	--------------

(NULEAF Briefing Paper 16,

June 2009,

p5([http://www.nuleaf.org.uk/nuleaf/documents/Briefing Paper 16 Use of Planning Obligations June 2009.pdf](http://www.nuleaf.org.uk/nuleaf/documents/Briefing_Paper_16_Use_of_Planning_Obligations_June_2009.pdf)) +

Edison Investment Research /Augean 3 Oct 2012

(<http://c3352932.r32.cf0.rackcdn.com/pdf/e08f47f321b96e5130b4c0d9ba0b475b.pdf>)

The Section 106 agreement between the NDA and Cumbria County Council in 2008 over Vault 9 of the LLWR Drigg effectively awards the sum of £25 million over 10 years to the local community, and this works out at approximately £250 per cubic metre.

The Section 106 agreement between the NDA and Caithness Council in 2010 over Dounreay works out at £4 million, equating to approximately £25 per cubic metre.

The Section 106 agreement between Augean Plc and Northamptonshire County Council for the western extension to the ENRMF at King's Cliffe, currently under discussion, is for £5 per tonne (probably about £6 per cubic metre).

It is assumed that the difference in amount between the Dounreay and Drigg agreements is because there is no gate price applicable at Dounreay, and thus no profit for the NDA.

The difference in amount between ENRMF and the other two sites is because the agreement has been negotiated with a private company, and not with the NDA.

We do not believe this to be fair, for the following reasons:

1. The NDA (Nuclear Decommissioning Authority) is in charge of the decommissioning of old nuclear facilities, and is given a large budget from public funds for carrying out the process. The NDA pays for the Community Funds for Drigg & Dounreay. It is NDA nuclear waste that is coming to King's Cliffe. The NDA is effectively paying 1/10<sup>th</sup> in costs for disposing this waste at King's Cliffe, but is contributing nothing to the local community for these savings.
2. Radioactive levels of LLW at Drigg and Dounreay may be higher for some materials, but containment is significantly greater, and projected radioactive emissions are the same as for King's Cliffe. Therefore there is no good reason why residents at Drigg and Dounreay are in greater need of compensation than those around King's Cliffe.
3. Residents of Drigg and Dounreay have benefitted previously from nuclear power generation, and many have been employed in the industry, and in its decommissioning. Notwithstanding this they are still being compensated. At King's Cliffe, few or no local residents are, or have been employed by the nuclear industry, and none work for Augean. Surely the right to compensation is as great if not greater, since the psychological impact for many local residents is more grievous.
4. The wording of the agreement between the NDA and Cumbria County Council refers to:  
*recognition of the national benefit derived from the future accommodation of low level radioactive waste from across the United Kingdom at the LLWR.*

This justification for a community fund would seem to apply just as much to King's Cliffe which is also taking radioactive waste from across the UK in significant quantities.

5. The agreement also points out that:  
*although the total benefit from the Development in terms of contributing to meeting a national need will outweigh any residual adverse impacts of the Development it is appropriate to make financial provision to meet local needs arising from the Development including assisting participation of the community in the Development and to mitigate the residual economic and other impacts that will be caused by the Development. (para 12)"*

While the economic impacts for Drigg residents involve increased employment opportunities, for King's Cliffe there are no such benefits, and the reaction of the local community over the last three years is good evidence of 'other impacts' caused by the importation of radioactive waste.

There is a strong suspicion among the local community that King's Cliffe has been favoured by the NDA because it is cheap. A site already existed, so the NDA has had to pay nothing in construction costs (compare this with costs at Drigg and Dounreay), and it has compounded this

belief by offering nothing in return. A barrier has been drawn between the 'nuclear community' who are worthy of compensation, and others.

We quite understand the need for public funds to be administered in a way that secures the best results, but we believe that this degree of parsimony is counter-productive. The 2007 Policy on the disposal of LLW was designed to see LLW cheaply and safely disposed of all over the country in order to prolong the life of the LLWR and to reduce decommissioning costs. The clumsy way that the issue has been approached at King's Cliffe is one of the reasons no other sites have come forward to take LLW. The fact that a rule now seems to exist that there should be no incentive for a local community to accept such waste means that site owners can be sure of an expensive and protracted battle if they should decide to apply for permission. Furthermore, the burden for compensation seems (at least at King's Cliffe) to have been placed on the site owner and not on the organisation with responsibility for disposal of this waste. A more appropriate compensation package for King's Cliffe from the NDA, and recognition of the burden placed on local residents, might just make this process easier.

In conclusion, King's Cliffe Parish Council is requesting Northamptonshire County Council to press this issue with the NIC Inquiry, the NDA, the Secretary of State, and any other relevant body, to request fair and equitable compensation in recognition of the contribution of this community, and others within a defined radius, to fulfilling the national need for the disposal of LLW.

Yours sincerely  
For King's Cliffe Parish Council

## Carol Earp

---

**From:** Mark Laurenson [MLaurenson@northamptonshire.gov.uk]  
**Sent:** 18 February 2013 15:06  
**To:** Mark Laurenson  
**Cc:** Mark Chant  
**Subject:** Partial Review of the Northamptonshire MWDF

Dear LLG Members

In advance of the circulation of the minutes of the recent LLG meeting please see below an update from Mark Chant (Head of Planning Services) on the partial review of the County Council's Minerals and Waste Development Framework (MWDF) as it relates to the Council's policy on radioactive waste.

*The Inspector's Report on the MWDF Core Strategy recommended that the review of the MWDF should cover LLW. However because of permission being granted on appeal for LLW disposal at existing cells at the hazardous waste facility at King's Cliffe, we now have to take account of this in our Local Plan work. Furthermore, an application to extend this facility for both hazardous and LLW waste to 2026 is currently with the National Infrastructure Directorate (NID) for determination (due mid to late 2013) and so the Local Plan cannot seek to rule out LLW disposal in the county after 2016 as the NID decision could overturn this.*

*Nevertheless and as expressed in the consultation document, the County Council view of LLW disposal in the county, as the LLW comes from distant and/or nuclear facilities, is that it is not appropriate and that sustainability considerations should require that facilities are provided much nearer to where such waste is generated, preferably at source.*

*It is proposed the Draft Plan includes a specific policy on LLW (Policy 21). Whilst having such a policy would not rule out further such facilities in the county it would provide a statutory policy base on which to determine such applications that may come forward or which are awaiting determination at plan adoption.*

Consultation on the Draft Minerals and Waste Local Plan has begun and runs until 5pm on 14 March 2013. Full detail of the draft review is available online via the following link:

<http://www.northamptonshire.gov.uk/en/councilservices/Environ/planning/policy/minerals/Pages/Parti>

Regards

### **Mark Laurenson**

Principal Development Control Officer

Northamptonshire County Council  
Development Control  
Planning Services  
Floor 3  
Guildhall Road Block  
County Hall  
Northampton  
NN1 1DN

Tel: (01604) 367197

Email: [m Laurenson@northamptonshire.gov.uk](mailto:m Laurenson@northamptonshire.gov.uk)



