

NULEAF LOW LEVEL WASTE OFFICER WORKING GROUP

Note of the meeting held on 26 February 08, LG House

Present:

Fred Barker	NuLeAF
Peter Day	Oxfordshire CC
Adrian Dyer	West Somerset DC
Richard Evans	Cumbria CC
Barry James	Somerset CC
David Palk	Suffolk CC
Sharon Thompson	Kent CC
Mark Woodger	Essex CC

1 Note of the Meeting on 18 December

The note of the meeting on 18 December was agreed as an accurate record and would be placed on the NuLeAF website.

FB reviewed the actions. He reported that:

- The first meeting of the NDA LLW Strategy Group had not yet taken place. It was hoped this would meet in April, with the output forming the substantive agenda item for the 28 April meeting of the officer group.
- Representatives of the Programme Board for the non-nuclear industry LLW strategy review would be meeting with the group at its meeting on 24 June.
- FB had received information from the Planning Inspectorate about progress with MWDF preparation across the country and agreed to circulate it to members of the group

2 Update on Developments at Specific Sites

RE reported on developments associated with the LLWR near Drigg in Cumbria. Permission had been granted for development of vault 9 (to be operated as an interim store pending resolution of long-term safety case issues). It was anticipated that construction would start in June or July. Discussions are underway about the 'delivery vehicle' for the Community Fund (possibilities include setting up a community interest company, a charitable company limited by guarantee, or a partnership venture).

AD reported on discussion at the Hinkley Point Site Stakeholder Group, where the Chair had argued that a Community Fund should be associated with development of a LLW disposal facility at the site. The planning application for the facility had not yet been made.

DP reported on discussion with British Energy (BE) about possible new build at Sizewell, indicating some concerns that further thought needs to be given about the potential for consolidation of radioactive waste management facilities. He added that

BE and Magnox Electric had been asked for feedback on SCC's waste issues report, but that a substantive response had not been received.

3 Draft Briefing Paper for Planners

Further to agreement about the proposed scope of the briefing at the last meeting, FB had prepared a draft which had been circulated for discussion at the meeting. Feedback from DEFRA and the Environment Agency had been taken into account in the drafting.

Comments from members of the group included:

- The briefing should make it clear that every waste planning authority should address radioactive waste management in their MWDFs.
- Further detail of reference material should be given, in addition to the hyperlinks in the draft.
- The text on VLLW should enable the reader to visualise the types of material involved.

Action: It was agreed that FB should finalise the briefing for publication on the NuLeAF website. DP agreed to approach the POS with a view to publication on the POS website. FB agreed to ask Deborah Sacks about circulation to regional planners, and to send copies to the LGA and PAS.

4 Paper on Community Funds

FB introduced the draft paper on community funds and LLW disposal facilities. The following points were made in discussion:

- The draft has identified the relevant legislation. Consideration needs to be given to the potential role of local government's 'well-being' power, in addition to S106.
- It is not clear whether the Community Infrastructure Levy will be applicable to radioactive waste management developments. It is possible that these will be exempt.
- The potential justifications for providing community funds for site-based developments include the national benefits associated with optimisation of use of the LLWR and efficiency savings.
- The scope of the proposed national framework should be extended to include the process for initiating discussions and reaching agreement and guidance on how a fund should be administered.
- All types of purpose-designed radioactive waste management facilities should in principle come within the scope of the framework, other than geological disposal which is being considered separately in the MRWS programme.
- Subject to detailed drafting, the paper had identified the relevant factors to take into account in determining what would amount to a proportionate approach. A simple formula might be appropriate for generating a rough estimate, which could then be adjusted through consideration of other relevant local factors.

Action: It was agreed that FB should finalise the paper, taking into account the above comments, and that he should liaise with KR about setting up meetings with NDA and others to discuss the proposed framework.

5 AOB

RE suggested that the next meeting consider the work that the NDA was undertaking to promote Integrated Waste Strategies.

6 Future Meetings

The next meetings of the group are on 28 April and 24 June.