

**CUMBRIA COUNTY COUNCIL – MINERALS AND WASTE DEVELOPMENT  
FRAMEWORK 2007 TO 2018**

**CHAIRMAN** Cllr Geoff Blackwell  
**PORTFOLIO HOLDER:** Cllr Elaine Woodburn  
**LEAD OFFICER:** Fergus McMorrow  
**REPORT AUTHOR:** Zena Bergmann

**Summary:** To consider the sections of the Cumbria County Council Minerals and Waste Development Framework 2007 to 2018 which are relevant to radioactive waste.

<b>Recommendation:</b>	That views of members are sought on this consultation prior to a response being developed and submitted.
------------------------	--

**Impact on delivering the Corporate Plan:** Will impact on Council's objective to "create and sustain a healthy local economy"

**Impact on other statutory objectives (e.g. crime & disorder, LA21):** Major impact on environmental sustainability

**Financial and human resource implications:** None directly. However, offset packages related to the Low Level Waste Repository will impact on community resources.

**Project & Risk Management:** None

**Key Decision Status**

- **Financial:** None  
- **Ward:** None

**Other Ward Implications:** All

**INTRODUCTION**

As part of the planning regulations, Cumbria County Council has recently issued its discussion paper to look at the Issues and Options for the Cumbria Minerals and Waste development Framework 2007 to 2018. The Framework will set out proposals and policies for planning, mineral working and waste management developments (including radioactive waste) and for protecting the environment over the period until 2018. See attached relevant extracts related to Radioactive Waste.

## **CONTENT**

The document provides details on the different types of radioactive waste and sets the scene explaining about recent consultations eg CoRWM and DEFRA LLW Policy Review. It then goes on to discuss what it needs to provide, particularly with regard to Low Level Waste. It then refers to policies and asks several questions related to them – reproduced below in **bold** with suggestions to include in the Council’s response underneath each one for discussion:

## **QUESTIONS**

### **QUESTION 11**

***Do you consider that Structure Plan policy ST4 (page 59 of the extract) is adequate as an interim Core Strategy policy for High and Intermediate Level Radioactive Wastes?  
OR***

Point 3 may create difficulties for the volunteering process proposal by CoRWM. It is generally vague and the concept of “less harm” not clear. Is it expected that every possible location is checked against some agreed criteria defining “less harm”?

Point 4(e) should apply to all areas not just the National park.

***Do you consider that the plan should make provision now for additional interim safe storage management of these wastes?***

It is probably best the plan does not make special provision for interim safe storage, but policy ST4 should apply.

### **QUESTION 12**

***Additional facilities for storing or disposing of Low Level Radioactive Wastes should only be provided for wastes that arise within the County?***

***Do you have any comments on this suggested policy?***

Members may wish to consider how this may be affected by the DEFRA LLW Policy Review. It seems incongruous that ILW facilities might be acceptable if complying with ST4 but LLW facilities not.

### **QUESTION 20**

***Additional facilities for storing or disposing of Low Level Radioactive Wastes that arise within Cumbria shall only be provided at the site near Drigg if:-***

***a) full account can satisfactorily be taken of the site’s long term suitability in relation to climate change and coastal erosion;***

Complies with our policies

**b) detailed investigations show that the site has sufficient radiological capacity;**

Complies with our policies

**c) the facilities cannot be provided within the Sellafield/Windscale complex;**

This implies that the site end state for Sellafield should be a LLW Repository. This may not have been agreed by us.

**d) the proposals satisfy the environmental criteria of Generic development Control policies;**

This seems reasonable but will need further checking before we respond.

**e) the proposals include an appropriate off-set package of benefits to compensate for hosting such a facility**

Complies with our policies. However, it would be better if the wording was changed – “to compensate” could be removed.

**f) With the exception of no more than one lorry load per week, all wastes for storage/disposal at additional facilities within the site shall be brought in by rail**

It is appropriate to push for a complete new access road into the site to bypass Drigg village.

***Do you have any comments to make on the above suggested policy?***

The views of the Nuclear Working Group will be considered in developing our final response, which will be considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee before being submitted to the Executive.