

MEETING MINUTES

Meeting Title	Theddlethorpe GDF Community Partnership Meeting 22		
Date	Thursday 19 th December 2024		
Time	From:	14:00	To: 17:00
Location	Coastal Centre, Victoria Road, Mablethorpe, Lincolnshire, LN12 2AQ		
Independent Chair	David Fannin		
Note taker	Victoria Mana (Community Partnership Assistant)		
Invitees			
Community Partnership (CP) Members			
Sector	Name	Organisation	Role
Council	Cllr Martin Hill	Lincolnshire County Council	Leader
Council	Cllr Craig Leyland	East Lindsey District Council	Leader
Council	Cllr Simon Acklam	Theddlethorpe & Withern Parish Council	Parish Council Representative
Council	Cllr Claire Arnold	Mablethorpe & Sutton Town Council	Town Council Representative
Voluntary	Tammy Smalley	Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	Head of Conservation
Voluntary	Rob Druce	Mablethorpe Coastwatch	Sector Manager
Business	Gareth Rowland	British Holiday & Home Parks Association (BHHPA)	Director for Lincolnshire
Business	Carl Richardson	Dunes Family Entertainment Centre Ltd Dunes Food Events Company Ltd	Director Managing Director
Business	Helen Fisher	We Are Carbon	Proprietor
Nuclear Waste Services (NWS)	Sarah Fletcher	Nuclear Waste Services	Regional Manager – GDF Siting
Official Observers			
	Andy Gutherson	Lincolnshire County Council	Executive Director of Place
	Pranali Parikh	East Lindsey District Council	Director of Economic Development
Nuclear Waste Services			
	Nicky Kirkby	Nuclear Waste Services	Operations Manager
	Nicola Clarke	Nuclear Waste Services	Community Engagement Manager
	Anneline Wilson	Nuclear Waste Services	Regional Communications Manager
	Joe Blissett	Nuclear Waste Services	Grants Manager
	Simon Hughes	Nuclear Waste Services	Siting & Communities Director
	Matt Swift	Nuclear Waste Services	Senior Project Manager
Guest Presenters			
	Richard Griffin	Nuclear Waste Services	Senior Policy Adviser
	Rachel Cornah*	Nuclear Waste Services	Principal Site Evaluation Manager

Other Observers			
	Claire Dobson	Nuclear Waste Services	Assistant Project Manager
	Edward Wright	Lincolnshire County Council	Senior Adviser for Energy
Apologies			
	Cllr Claire Arnold; Pranali Parikh Nicky Kirkby; Nicola Clarke; Anneline Wilson; Joe Blissett; Simon Hughes; Matt Swift; Richard Griffin; Claire Dobson		
Notes	*Attended Meeting Online		

Agenda

Item	Description
1	Welcome, apologies and declaration of interests (any new / changes)
2	Minutes of previous meeting and matters arising
3	The UK Policy Framework - update on Working with Communities and implications for the refresh of the Community Partnership Agreement
4	Areas of Focus – update and briefing on the search process
5	Community Investment Funding Strategy and Annual Report
6	Community Vision progress report
7	Action Log
8	AOB

Notes

Item	Notes for the record	Lead
1	Welcome, apologies and declaration of interests (any new / changes)	David Fannin
	Apologies from Cllr Claire Arnold, Pranali Parikh, Nicky Kirkby, Nicola Clarke, Anneline Wilson, Joe Blissett, Simon Hughes, Matt Swift, Richard Griffin and Claire Dobson were noted. No new / updated declarations of interests.	
2	Minutes of previous meeting and matters arising	David Fannin
	Minutes from previous meeting were approved.	
3	The UK Policy Framework - update on Working with Communities and implications for the refresh of the Community Partnership Agreement (CPA)	Richard Griffin & Craig Leyland
3.1	NWS legal team have confirmed that the updated policy of May 2024 did not introduce any word changes to Appendix 1, 'Working with Communities', (pp 91 – 117). Some numbering has been updated within the document. In the absence of Richard Griffin, CP Members read through the presentation slides (nos. 7 – 12) relating to this item.	

3.2	<p>Question on terminology: policy refers now to ‘most hazardous waste’ rather than ‘higher activity waste’ which appears to be a change in policy suggesting that not all intermediate level waste will be placed in the GDF and may be stored in near surface disposal facilities. CP Members requested further clarity on the definition of categories of waste when Prof Neil Hyatt attends the CP meeting in January 2025.</p>	
3.3	<p>Richard Griffin’s presentation re-states the role of the CP and its relationship with the developer with regards to identifying relevant information that people want or need about the siting process and facilitating discussion with the community. This is an acknowledged area for improvement. The CP has developed its forward programme of meeting topics to achieve this. Subject matter experts have been invited to attend CP meetings for deeper discussion of core siting and evaluation issues. The CP has requested associated non-technical briefings to be developed that can help inform discussion and questions and be shared publicly.</p>	
3.4	<p>The Partnership currently has three vacancies for business and community members. Discussion followed on unclear or unresolved issues in the recruitment process. Key points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The CP discussed eligibility of elected county, district, parish and town councillors who apply for vacant business and voluntary sector membership and are not the appointed local government Authorised Representatives. To date, this has not been permitted as four council places are allocated on the CP. It was agreed that, in the future, recruitment should reflect that the preference is to recruit people as individuals who are not elected councillors, but that the focus is on enabling the partnership to fulfil its purpose. 2. It was agreed that individual members may be members of, but do not formally represent, non-governmental organisations and special interest groups. Recruitment would be by invitation to apply through an open process. The CP will not be inviting particular organisations to join the partnership because there are many relevant organisations and special interest groups. 3. Schedule 2 and Appendix 8 in the CPA need to be updated to provide clarity on membership conditions and include Parish and Town Councils under authorised representatives. ACTION: Craig and Nicky 4. It was suggested that reference to people who bring ‘voluntary/community’ and ‘business’ sector experience to the CP could be amended to people who are ‘reflective of the search area’ which would align with national policy. 5. It is important that the CP includes a range of opinions on hosting a GDF. The CP agreed that the recruitment process must make it clear that it welcomes applicants from all sides of the debate to continue to ensure a broad range of views. 6. There is a pressing need to fill the vacancies. It was agreed recruitment could begin ahead of the anticipated announcement on the Areas of Focus. 7. Some previous applicants were not successful because they did not have the skills or experience that would add value to the work of the CP. The CP needs people who live or work in the area and want to be part of constructive examination of the core issues. The recruitment process needs to attract 	

<p>3.5</p> <p>3.6</p> <p>3.7</p>	<p>suitable people, and it was agreed that previously unsuccessful applicants should not be invited to apply again.</p> <p>8. ACTION: Craig and Nicky - It was agreed that the recruitment pack and role description would be updated and relevant areas to encourage recruitment from should be -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Farming community 2. Education 3. Health and wellbeing 4. People with young families <p>Code of Conduct: The CP reflected on areas for improvement regarding trust, accuracy and timing of communication, and information sharing including between the developer, CP members and the public and special interest groups. It was agreed that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The CP’s core purpose and reputation rely upon clarity and consistency and personal responsibility for following the code of conduct. 2. If confidential information is shared in a CP meeting which a CP Member wishes to share outside the CP, they must initially speak with the Chair. 3. If a CP Member needs clarification about what information is confidential, they must speak with the Chair. 4. Any material provided via email should be labelled ‘strictly confidential’ if it is not to be distributed beyond the Partnership. 5. If a CP Member provides incorrect information to the public, either one of the RPLAs, NWS or the CP Chair may respond, whichever is the most appropriate. <p>Social Media Management: Discussion concluded that the provisions of the Code of Conduct should apply to personal social media activity relating to CP membership. The Code of Conduct should be amended to specify that social media should be used responsibly and to clarify steps to be taken in the event of abuse, misinformation or disinformation. Any issues should initially be addressed by the Chair. ACTION: Craig and Nicky</p> <p>The Chair reported on conversations with NWS regarding information sharing. It has been agreed that as the CP moves into its next phase in January 2025 and focuses on the core issues for siting and evaluation, Prof Neil Hyatt will be the primary interface across the many technical programme workstreams and subject matter experts. The aim is to ensure consistent relationship management and understanding of complex technical information.</p>	
4	Areas of Focus – update and briefing on the search process	Rachel Cornah
4.1	<p>Overview and presentation provided of the search process for identifying the GDF site. Key points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sub-surface areas – up to 22km offshore • Surface areas – policy is to avoid built up areas >20ha and protected environments • Accessways – closest to best geology as possible 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no change to the defined Search Area • No licences have been applied for yet for drilling, the process for applying for a DCO will take more than 3 years to conclude • Further information can be found Communities and GDF - GOV.UK <p>4.1.1 <u>Question</u> - is there a specific date for the new Area of Focus announcement. <u>Response</u> – announcement will be end of January / early February with follow up events planned for February (details to be confirmed). These events will be attended by subject matter experts and will provide more detailed information</p> <p>4.1.2 <u>Question</u> – is there one site to be announced or several? <u>Response</u> – no decision has been made yet.</p> <p>4.1.3 <u>Comment</u> – The CP appreciates that it has always been the case that the surface facility could be anywhere in the search area, but that Theddlethorpe Gas Terminal site has always been the assumed preferred location, hence its reference in the name of the CP. We will need to consider a name change for the partnership that reflects the new Area(s) of Focus. <u>Response</u> - Because of other interests in that site, NWS has had to widen out their Area of Focus. It may be problematic with the public if multiple sites are identified as possible options rather than keeping the focus on one specific place.</p> <p>4.1.4 <u>Question</u> - what is the timetable for identifying the preferred location for the surface facility? <u>Response</u> – 10 – 15 years before NWS make that decision.</p> <p>4.1.5 <u>Question</u> – could the underground part of the GDF be placed under land rather than the sea? <u>Response</u> – preference is for the site to be under the sea in the inshore area.</p> <p>4.1.6 <u>Question</u> – have licences for the DCO process been granted yet? <u>Response</u> – no drilling licences yet issued. Messaging will be needed around timelines for this process.</p> <p>4.1.7 <u>Question</u> – the policy refers to settlement size. What is classed as an urban area as the understanding is that tunnelling is to be avoided under urban zones. <u>Response</u> – an urban area is classed as more than 20 hectares (hence this would not apply to most settlements in this area). Consideration will be given during the whole process.</p> <p>4.2 A CP Member stated that local expectations were established early on at community events that there will not be any tunnelling under residential homes. This is an important matter for those whose properties might be affected. The implication is that this has changed now that the focus is moving away from the gas terminal site. It was suggested that if any CP member has this in writing it would help to clarify how the expectation arose. The CP requested clarity on tunnelling policy so that information can be shared following the announcement on Areas of Focus. ACTION: Andy Gutherson to speak with Martin Walkingshaw.</p>	
--	--	--

5	Community Investment Funding Strategy and Annual Report	David Fannin
5.1	<p>Overview given of the CIF strategy for the remainder of 2024-25 and 2025-26. The CP received the annual report and thanked the Grants team and the CIF Panel, including the 3 co-opted members, for their work.</p> <p>5.2 DF presented brief summary of the annual report which will be emailed separately to CP Members and added:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A ‘light touch’ application form has been created following feedback that the online application form was over-complex for applications of under £10,000. • DF will continue to lead the CIF workstream for the time being. The recruitment of three new CP members will help in the search for a replacement now that DF is Chair of the CP. ACTION: Joe and Mike Brophy to oversee. <p>5.3 Comment made that there is a low take up of CIF applications in the Theddlethorpe area. It was suggested that Joe Blissett should speak with Cllr Simon Acklam to see if he can assist through the parish council connection.</p> <p>5.4 Comment made that the annual report does not focus on legacy and CIF benefits. What has been delivered, and where, is not always clear. This is important for CP reputation and credibility. Joe Blissett to note and strengthen in future reports.</p> <p>5.5 Acknowledgement made by a CP Member that Joe Blissett has brought valuable local knowledge and insight to the role of grant manager and, as a result, CIF is now working much better. The CP extended thanks to Joe.</p>	
6	Community Vision progress report	Carl Richardson
6.1	<p>Feedback received from the public to date is being collated and processed by IOL Marketing, of Alford. Further opportunities for public opinion to be expressed via focus groups planned for early 2025.</p> <p>6.2 More time is needed in March to finetune the visioning work and to achieve sign-off in time for the planned May launch. Key points to note:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vision subgroup considered using an external consultancy to support the visioning work. Only one bid was received which was not considered appropriate and no appointment was made. LCC offered to support instead, and the skills and capacity they could provide in this area was gratefully accepted. • Moving forward, the subgroup will facilitate workshops and roundtable discussions with invited stakeholders (January to March 2025). • Once the high-level vision report is completed in March, it will be shared with the CP for approval and then sent to the rPLAs. • May 2025 – Launch of Community Vision and an exhibition for Significant Additional Investment. 	

6.3	The work that Carl and officers at LCC have put into this workstream was acknowledged and much appreciated.	
7	Action Log	David Fannin
7.1	Update of actions discussed and updated accordingly.	
8	AOB	All
8.1	Meetings in public were discussed – CP Members would prefer to continue to hold most meetings in private.	
8.2	It was suggested that when a subject matter expert has specific information to release, then it would be appropriate to hold a meeting in public.	
8.3	Request made that the Chair provides CP Members with an overview of other meetings held with NWS in between CP meetings in order to understand what is being discussed. Chair agreed to use WhatsApp to facilitate this.	
8.4	Request made that NWS provide the CP with a schedule for what specific technical information will be shared in the upcoming months (rather than generic information).	
8.5	A CP Member underlined the large number of NSIPs being considered in the Greater Lincolnshire / Humberside region (from the Humber to the Wash) and suggested that it would be useful for a future agenda item to consider these and to see them mapped out (NB that this is currently proposed for the April CP meeting).	
8.6	Question about how often CP Members would like Programme of Activities updates – response was quarterly.	
8.7	The Chair asked if CP Members are happy for representatives from NuLeaf and CoRWM to attend future meetings as observers. CP Members agreed.	