

## **NuLeAF: NUCLEAR LEGACY ADVISORY FORUM**

### **LGA SPECIAL INTEREST GROUP ON RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT AND NUCLEAR DECOMMISSIONING**

**Minutes of the Steering Group held on 15 October, 2009,  
Council Room, King's College London**

---

*Present:*

Cllr Allan Holliday (Chair) - Copeland Borough Council

Fred Barker – NuLeAF

John Bennett – Dorset County Council

Sue Brett – Cumbria County Council

Cllr Mike Davidson - Allerdale Borough Council

Peter Day – Oxfordshire County Council

Catherine Draper – NuLeAF

Nicola Horne - Plymouth City Council

Adrian Hurst - Hartlepool Borough Council

Sean Morris – Manchester City Council

John Pitchford - Suffolk County Council

Cllr George Regan – Dundee City Council

Gemma Skillern – Essex County Council

Cllr Jane Storey - Suffolk County Council

Mark Woodger - Maldon District Council

In the afternoon, Lesley Sewell, Head of Corporate Planning at the Nuclear Decommissioning Authority (NDA) gave a presentation and answered questions on the NDA's approach to corporate planning.

		ACTION
<b>1</b>	<b>WELCOME AND APOLOGIES</b>	
1.1	Cllr Holliday welcomed everyone to the meeting, especially first time attendees.	
1.2	Apologies were received from: Cllr Tim Knowles, Cllr Tony Markley and Stewart Kemp – Cumbria County Council, Steve Giblin and Cllr Gary Oldham – Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council, Cllr Geoff Lilley – Hartlepool Borough Council, Kerry Rickards and Doug Bamsey – Sedgemoor District Council, Cllr David Potts – Local Government Association, Cllr Matthew Riddle and Helen Ainsley – South Gloucestershire Council, Cllr Ken Williams – Barrow-in-Furness District Council, Lucy Atkinson – Merseyside Environmental Advisory Service, Cllr Andrew Nunn – Suffolk Coastal District Council, Cllr Ralph Ryke – Leeds City Council, Derek Miller – Dundee City Council, Cllr Neil Swannick – Manchester City Council, Andy Appleby – London Borough of Harrow, Lesley Stenhouse – Essex County Council	

<b>2</b>	<b>MINUTES OF THE MEETING ON 15 JULY, 2009</b>	
2.1	The Minutes were approved as a true record of the meeting and would be posted on the website.	CD
<b>3</b>	<b>MATTERS ARISING</b>	
3.1	FB highlighted item 7.5. On point 1, the Briefing Paper on socio-economic support is available on the NuLeAF website. On point 3, FB had written to the NDA and would be meeting briefly with Tony Fountain, the new NDA CEO at the November NSG to brief him on NuLeAF's work. All other actions are covered within the reports for the meeting.	
<b>4</b>	<b>LOW LEVEL WASTE (LLW) STRATEGY AND DEVELOPMENTS</b>	
4.1	FB introduced the report which covered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NDA consultation on the proposed UK LLW Strategy;</li> <li>• the UK nuclear industry LLW Management Plan;</li> <li>• initiatives undertaken following the meeting of the LLW Officer Working Group on 10 September; and</li> <li>• the forthcoming seminar on case studies in radioactive waste management and planning</li> </ul>	
4.2	Members reported on related developments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MD advised the group of the opening of the new metal recycling facility operated by Studsvik outside Workington</li> <li>• AH advised the group that Copeland BC had received a presentation about the proposed LLW disposal facility at Keele Head.</li> </ul>	
4.3	The Steering Group agreed that the Executive Director should enter into discussions with the NDA and LLWR Ltd, seeking further detail about key initiatives in the LLW Management Plan, with a view to review and comment where appropriate.	FB
<b>5</b>	<b>HIGHER ACTIVITY WASTE (HAW): DISCUSSIONS ABOUT OPTIMISATION</b>	
5.1	FB introduced the report which outlined: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the NDA's preliminary response to discussion at its National Stakeholder Group about ways of optimising the management of HAW;</li> <li>• NDA plans for development of a HAW topic strategy;</li> <li>• Next steps for considering the issues.</li> </ul>	
5.2	JS asked for clarification regarding the depth implied by	

	<p>the term 'near surface' (relating to the possibility of near surface disposal of short-lived ILW). FB said this was 10s of metres and facilities would be engineered for the purpose.</p>	
5.3	<p>GR gave an update on the situation in Scotland – the consultation document regarding Scottish policy on the management of higher activity wastes was in draft form.</p>	
5.4	<p>JB advised the group that it was being proposed that facilities at Winfrith should be used to process dessicant waste from other sites. Dorset CC is considering whether this is permissible under the terms of the original planning permission.</p>	
5.5	<p>The Steering Group agreed to consider a report at its next meeting on NDA thinking about 'credible options' for optimising the management of HAW.</p>	FB
<b>6</b>	<p><b>IMPLICATIONS OF COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY (CIL) PROPOSALS</b></p>	
6.1	<p>FB introduced the report on the Government's proposals for the Community Infrastructure Levy and its implications for community funds associated with radioactive waste management developments. The report addressed two pertinent questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• could the CIL be applied to radioactive waste management developments?</li> <li>• would the proposed restrictions on planning obligations affect the scope for establishing and using Community Funds?</li> </ul> <p>Points made in discussion include:</p>	
6.2	<p>It is proposed that the CIL will be levied on developments with buildings above a certain size and usage. Members considered this to be overly restrictive, as there will be certain types of development which won't fall within the CIL, but which will have significant infrastructure implications eg quarries.</p>	
6.3	<p>Members agreed that the suggestion that CIL should be linked to the planning fee structure rather than building floor size had merit and, subject to the draft consultation response by PoS/LGA, was one which NuLeAF could support.</p>	
6.4	<p>In response to a comment from JP that it would seem uncertain whether future Community Funds would be established through S106, as in the past, or through some</p>	

<p>6.5</p> <p>6.6</p> <p>6.7</p>	<p>other mechanism, FB stated that in all probability, especially for large projects such as the GDF, a range of mechanisms will be required.</p> <p>MD was concerned that where the GDF is concerned any Community Fund established should not be limited to the period during which waste was emplaced.</p> <p>In response to a question about the involvement of the Infrastructure Planning Commission, FB said that government has stated that it is minded that the GDF will be considered by the IPC.</p> <p>The Steering Group agreed to delegate authority to the Chair and Executive Director to respond to the consultation, taking into account discussion at the Steering Group and the views of the LGA and Planning Officer Society on the wider issues associated with the CIL proposals.</p>	<p>FB/AH</p>
<p><b>7</b></p>	<p><b>INTERACTIONS BETWEEN NUCLEAR LEGACY MANAGEMENT AND NEW NUCLEAR BUILD</b></p>	
<p>7.1</p> <p>7.2</p> <p>7.3</p>	<p>FB introduced the report which covered initial discussions between the Strategy Review Group and the NDA on potential synergies between legacy management and new nuclear build.</p> <p>The following points were made during discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• JP welcomed the discussion with NDA, but was concerned that the issue could be put on the 'too difficult' pile. NuLeAF needs to keep the pressure on to ensure this doesn't happen.</li> <li>• SM was concerned that the boundaries between new build and legacy management should not be blurred to the extent that new build is encouraged.</li> <li>• MW suggested it was important to look at the full life cycle of new build, and legitimate for NuLeAF to consider waste management and decommissioning implications.</li> <li>• Others agreed that it was important for NuLeAF to consider these implications.</li> <li>• JP pointed out that Government had said that new build would not proceed without sufficient progress in waste management. He suggested NuLeAF would be well placed to comment on what progress had been made.</li> </ul> <p>FB noted that there are different views amongst member authorities on the extent to which interactions between</p>	<p>FB</p>

	<p>new build and legacy management should be exploited, but that the Strategy Review Group had agreed that NDA should promote public debate on the subject. A view on where NuLeAF stood could be taken if it became necessary to do so. The national policy statement on new build is due for publication next month, this would inform the debate. FB would present a report to the next meeting.</p>	
7.4	<p>The Steering Group agreed that it would write to the NDA to request that it promote debate amongst its stakeholders at national and local level about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the potential interactions between nuclear legacy management and new nuclear build</li> <li>• how a more co-ordinated 'across site' approach could be taken to waste management and clean-up in locations that have or are proposed to have multiple licensed nuclear sites; and</li> <li>• the pros and cons of the ways in which the synergies with new nuclear build could be exploited to the benefit of nuclear legacy management.</li> </ul>	FB
<b>8</b>	<b>PROGRESS REPORT</b>	
8.1	<p>FB introduced the report which gave updates in developments on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• siting a Geological Disposal Facility (GDF)</li> <li>• Scottish Government policy on higher activity wastes (HAW)</li> <li>• the Submarine Dismantling Project (SDP)</li> <li>• Government policy on plutonium management</li> <li>• COWAM in Practice</li> </ul>	
8.2	<p>FB highlighted the development of the West Cumbrian MRWS Partnership. The first stage of Public and Stakeholder Engagement (PSE) was about to take place. A Memorandum of Understanding had been agreed and Cumbria CC was now a full member of the Partnership. The Partnership website was also developing as a resource.</p>	
8.3	<p>Government had written again to all local authorities updating them on the GDF process and reiterating that the invitation to Express an Interest was still open.</p>	
8.4	<p>SM queried whether lessons learnt from the Nirex experience were being heeded. FB assured the SG that a very different approach was being taken as a result of the emphasis on voluntarism and partnership. This means that local stakeholders are driving the process.</p>	
8.5	<p>The launch of the consultation on draft HAW policy in</p>	

	Scotland will be later than the anticipated October date given in the report.	
<b>9</b>	<b>NEXT MEETING</b>	
9.1	The next meeting of the Steering Group will be held on 27 January, 2010 in Manchester Town Hall.	
<b>10</b>	<b>ANY OTHER BUSINESS</b>	
10.1	None	
<b>11</b>	<b>PRESENTATION</b>	
	<p>Lesley Sewell, Head of Corporate Planning at the Nuclear Decommissioning Authority (NDA) gave a presentation and answered questions on the role of corporate planning within the NDA. The presentation has been posted on the NuLeAF website as has a paper written by Mark Wareing on the 'value framework' used by the NDA in their decision making process.</p> <p>In response to questions from the Steering Group, LS clarified that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• government decides the size of the grant it makes to the NDA, but NDA determines how that grant is spent,</li> <li>• normally there is a three year rolling spending review cycle, but at the moment this is in abeyance pending next year's general election</li> <li>• NDA is currently going through a Public Value Programme (PVP) on all its spending, but process is in early (long list) stages</li> <li>• when the PVP reaches the short list stage, NDA will consult with its SLCs, who in turn will engage with SSGs. (The SG advised LS that the NDA/SLCs also needed to engage directly with local authorities, this was especially important on any issue which would have socio-economic impact).</li> <li>• NDA set the outcomes required, but it was up to the SLCs how they delivered it within budget and any other constraints imposed by NDA</li> </ul>	