

KINGS CLIFFE PARISH COUNCIL

Report of a Public meeting called by the Parish Council at the Memorial Hall, Kings Cliffe on Thursday 2nd July 2009 at 7.30.pm. to discuss the proposed submissions by East Northants Resource Management Facility (Landfill Site).

Present : Chairman A. Howard, County Councillor H. Smith, District Councillor. R. Glithero, H. Blunt, Clerk; N.C.C. Chief Planning Officer Roy Boulton and Development Control Phil Watson; Environment Agency Kevin Burton, Team Leader. Nuclear Regulator David Prescott and Pollution Prevention Officer Roy Mantas; Roger Coulthard, Matthew Kirk and members of King's Cliffe WasteWatchers and one hundred and fifty members of the Public.

Chairman Andrew Howard welcomed everyone to the meeting and introduced the Councillors and representatives of Northamptonshire County Councillors and the Environment Agency.

He then explained that the meeting would consist of –

- An account of the Planning Process presented by Roy Boulton from NCC
- A description of the role of the Environment Agency by their various representatives
- A presentation by Kirk and Chris Leuchars on behalf of KC WasteWatchers
- Open Forum for debate from the floor

Roy Boulton comprehensively explained the complexity of this type of planning application and how it will be dealt with by Northamptonshire County Council.

The three gentlemen from the Environment Agency outlined their various roles in the process, this focused on the statutory regulatory process rather than issues affecting the village

Kirk gave a brief summary of the WasteWatchers concerns and Chris Leuchars presented a Powerpoint presentation.

The Chairman thanked speakers. Before opening the debate, the Chairman stated that the proposed submissions first came to the knowledge of the Parish Council in May, when Augean sent documents to coincide with their latest newsletter, which was sent to every household in the village. Augean then called a dedicated meeting with local Parish Councils and held an exhibition for the Public, both of which were well attended.

Subsequently, at the monthly Parish Council meeting on 11th June, the KC WasteWatchers attended and it was unanimously decided to call a Public meeting. The Chairman also explained that Augean had not been invited as they had had their opportunity to speak to the Public

Open Forum

As there were many questions, the main concerns are detailed as below:-

1. The members of the EA appeared to give no consideration to the implications of the application to this area

2. How will the site be monitored and for how long will it continue ?
3. What happens when the site is full – who is responsible for it and for how long?
4. Are Aucean given incentives by the Government to take this waste and where do their priorities lie – with their shareholders or with the local community?
5. NCC have admitted nuclear waste is a new area form of waste – from whom will they obtain the necessary expertise to deal with this proposal?
6. As this appears to be the first example of this kind of waste proposal, how can anyone be sure what is safe and what is not?
7. How much tonnage will the site be expected to take and how will this impact on the community – will there be many more road movements?
8. What would happen if there was an accident with one of the vehicles – who would deal with this and how would it affect the community?
9. Why move the waste materials it in the first place?
10. When will the submission be made and how long before it is decided after that?
11. What is the actual scale of radio activity in layman's terms?
12. What will the response of Highways be to this submission?
13. Why are local people not monitored by local doctors for the effects already happening from the Landfill site?
14. Why does the soil need to be moved at all?
15. What are the views of other local village and were they invited
16. What is the criteria for re-consultation?
17. What steps should the Public take to object to this submission?
18. How to we find experts to tell us the facts – i.e. Greenpeace, Friends of the Earth and independent parties?
19. Is there a persistent escape of radiation from Cumbria – these answers are needed for comparison?
20. Why not dispose of it in old mine shafts?

All the points above were addressed by the relevant authority, but many comments were made that authorities have to be impartial, therefore there was some dissatisfaction with the replies.

In conclusion and in view of the very obvious concerns of the Public, it was decided that more meetings are to be called, possibly with Phil Hope M.P., Aucean and Government experts. The Chairman said that the Parish Council had no funds to employ independent expertise and the point that too many meetings would lower the attendance was invalid. Those with real concerns would be happy to attend as many meetings as it may take.

He thanked everyone for attending and closed the meetings at 9.25.pm.