

MEETING MINUTES

Meeting Title	Theddlethorpe GDF Community Partnership Meeting 24		
Date	Thursday 20 th February 2025		
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 (BHPA)	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
	Chris Keenan	Nuclear Waste Services	Head of Community, Operations & Land
	Matt Swift	Nuclear Waste Services	Senior Project Manager
Guest Presenter			
	Justin Brown*	Lincolnshire County Council	Assistant Director, Growth

Other Observers			
	Edward Wright*	Lincolnshire County Council	Senior Adviser for Energy
	Philip Matthews*	Nuleaf Representative	
	Prof Penny Harvey	CoRWM Representative	
	Simon Webb	CoRWM Representative	
Apologies			
	Rob Druce, Pranali Parikh, Anneline Wilson, Joe Blissett, Simon Hughes, Matt Swift		
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	Significant Additional Investment
4	Area of Focus reactions, feedback and next steps for the Partnership
5	Action Log

Notes

Item	Notes for the record	Lead
1	<p>Welcome, apologies and declaration of interests (any new / changes)</p> <p>The Chair welcomed Prof Penny Harvey and Simon Webb of CoRWM and Philip Matthews of NuLeaf, who are attending in the capacity of observers.</p> <p>Apologies from Rob Druce, Pranali Parikh, Anneline Wilson, Joe Blissett, Simon Hughes and Matt Swift were noted.</p> <p>A CP Member declared that their daughter lives within the new Area of Focus. A CP Member declared that they have work colleagues and other connections who are impacted by the new Area of Focus.</p> <p>Cllr Claire Arnold expressed her concerns around the challenges which she faces in her role as a Partnership Member, especially following the recent announcement on the new Area of Focus. She has found difficulties with the way information from NWS has been delivered and has concerns about the nature of the Test of Public Support (ToPS) scheduled for (at the latest) 2027. She acknowledges that the CP acts as a bridge between NWS and the local communities, and she is uncomfortable being associated with NWS in this process.</p> <p>Cllr Arnold has spoken with the town council and informed them that she will resign from her place on the CP. She will further advise if the town council decide to withdraw their place from the CP. Cllr Arnold thanked the CP and hopes that her</p>	David Fannin

	<p>input has been valued. She urged Cllr Martin Hill to follow the lead of Cllr Craig Leyland and to withdraw Lincolnshire County Council (LCC) from the process.</p> <p>The Chair thanked Cllr Arnold for her contribution during her time as a CP Member including her efforts as community engagement workstream lead and said that her work had been valued. He also acknowledged the concerns which she raised.</p> <p>Cllr Arnold left the meeting at 14:09.</p>	
2	Minutes of previous meeting and matters arising	David Fannin
2.1	A matter arising from the meeting minutes of 16.01.25 was discussed. Request made from CP Member that item 3 on page 5 of the January minutes be rewritten. The minutes were updated and redistributed to Partnership Members on 14.03.35	
3	Significant Additional Investment (SAI)	Justin Brown
	<p>Presentation given by Justin Brown, Assistant Director, Growth – Lincolnshire County Council, which included –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A recap given of the process which leads to SAI and reflection of discussions held at the November CP meeting. • SAI needs to be driven by the local vision and infrastructure requirements of the area. The Community Investment Fund (CIF) is important in the short-term. • The CP have already highlighted seven priority areas (skills, education and training; good quality services; sustainability and sensitivity; attractive build and natural environment; economy and jobs; opportunity and ambition for all; connectivity) • Two key priorities are highlighted - flood protection and education. Both link in with the CP vision work. • Ensure that there are opportunities for people living in local villages as well in the town. Keep the area a viable place for people to live so that they don't move away. • Create something attractive and workable for the local communities and businesses. • Providing affordable housing for key workers is important. • Service delivery which is linked to road and rail infrastructure. Analysis already underway of main roads in the area. LCC would like to work with NWS to consider who uses these roads so that they can build up a proposal. • Enhance and develop the rural environment to align with the CP vision. • SAI is a long-term plan, and it was suggested that CIF could be used to enable the delivery of local strategic programmes in the meantime such as school infrastructure; street scene and environment; public transport, community energy schemes; heritage restoration; youth services. • CP Members said that they would discuss SAI at the next CIP meeting. <p>ACTION: Sarah Fletcher and Tammy Smalley</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A reminder given that there is a visioning meeting on the morning of 20th March. 	

4	Area of Focus reactions, feedback and next steps for the Partnership	
4.1	<p>The Chair invited thoughts and reflections following the recent Area of Focus (AoF) announcement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • East Lindsey District Council (ELDC): Cllr Leyland is to recommend to the council at its next executive meeting that they formally withdraw from the process. The reason is because when the focus for a proposed surface site was the former Theddlethorpe Gas Terminal (TGT), ELDC saw it as important to be involved in the process. Once the Area of Focus changed to an area of agricultural land, ELDC decided that they could not continue in the process. The council recognise that this area of Lincolnshire is facing the prospect of several substantial infrastructure projects, potentially leading to the industrialisation of swathes of countryside. Local opposition is becoming more vocal, and the dynamic has changed. The council prides itself on having close connections with the rural communities and felt that it had to withdraw from the process. ELDC will maintain a dialogue with NWS in the role of local planning authority. Until the withdrawal is formalised, Cllr Craig Leyland will remain on the Partnership. • Lincolnshire County Council (LCC) will remain in the process for now, still holding a position of neutrality, and they want to make sure that the public are fully informed before they are invited to make a decision whether or not to continue in the siting process. • CP Members discussed the test of support for LCC to continue in the process scheduled for (at the latest) 2027. Members recognised that this will not be a formal Test of Public Support (ToPS) which adheres to NWS policy when there is a defined host community and at the appropriate stage in the Development Consent Order process, but that it will be a test of local sentiment and willingness to continue in the siting process. The Partnership recognised that it is for LCC to decide when the vote will take place, and the CP is invited to advise on how the test of support will be conducted. How this is presented to the public and the language used around this is of paramount importance. It is recognised that a robust and meaningful process is needed in order to give assurance to local residents. The message needs to be completely clear. • It was generally acknowledged that the NWS announcement has heightened opposition in the communities closest to the AoF. There is interest in feedback from the recent NWS village hall events and for the Partnership to continue to monitor the situation. • NWS thanked the Members for their comments and acknowledged that this is not an easy process owing to the sensitive nature of the topic. • Other opinions expressed were as follows - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Concern about the messaging and language used by NWS. Keep it simple, otherwise it confuses people. Information about the upcoming test needs to be shared as clearly as possible. ➤ The whole siting process is highly compromised. ➤ CP Members feel that they are not trusted by NWS. ➤ Dissatisfaction with how NWS share their information with CP Members and the timing around this. 	

- Some Partnership Members and some members of the public were disappointed with the withdrawal of ELDC from the process.
- Concern that central government will impose their will on a community and that it is important to keep the CP going to advocate for local people and reduce the likelihood of this happening.
- With the councils involved, stronger message given to central government.
- Acknowledgement made that if the councils withdraw, access to millions of pounds of Community Investment Funding is removed along with any potential Significant Additional Investment in the area.
- Range of views expressed at recent engagement events. Role of the CP is to continue to inform people and to listen to their views.
- Local people are generally unclear about the role of the CP and what its purpose is.
- Difference between NWS and the CP still unclear for many people.
- Concern amongst local residents that their houses are unsaleable and have decreased in value and that they do not fit criteria for the Property Value Protection Scheme.
- Residents feel very connected to their local area, and many will be reluctant to invest in their property and environment if they fear that they will be directly impacted by a GDF.
- Residents feel very impacted by the threat of the range of infrastructure proposals in their area.
- Suggestion from locally executed ballots is that many people are still strongly against the GDF and opposition to a GDF is gaining momentum.
- Noted that a test for (at the latest) 2027 is to be held on the basis of a fully informed community – but sense is that there is still a lot of information which needs sharing, e.g. road and railway infrastructure.
- Carefully consider the date for when the test is to be held and the mechanism.
- The Partnership needs to be clear who is enfranchised and who is disenfranchised by whatever mechanism it recommends for testing public willingness to continue on the process.
- Frustration at the speed at which information is brought to CP meetings.
- Frustration that NWS do not share information outside of meetings in a timely manner.
- NWS processes are lengthy and there has already been a long period of uncertainty over this emotive issue.
- Observation made that the planning stage for an infrastructure project usually takes place behind closed doors. In this case, all debate and discussion is playing out in the public arena which makes the process more challenging.
- Safety and suitability of the site chosen for a GDF is a process that takes many years of study. Advancing this work takes time and patience, but the views expressed and desire for a short timeframe are respected and acknowledged.
- Important that the CP continues engagement and monitoring of public sentiment in the Search Area communities.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ It is important to understand the views of young people on issues such as long-term workforce planning, potential training and employment opportunities and other community, economic and environmental benefits additional investment associated with a GDF as well as understanding their concerns and fears; they have most to gain or lose in the long run. ➤ Fixing the foundation of trust is crucial and using the correct language. ➤ Hearing about how other countries are dealing with the process is important; international comparisons and learning are valuable. ➤ Question arose about inviting representative of DESNZ to attend a future meeting – CP Members agreed. ➤ Suggestion made to reserve the first part of each CP meeting just for internal discussion and invite guest speakers to join from 15:00 onwards – CP Members agreed. ➤ Recognised that the information shared in January’s CP meeting was valuable and the members were very engaged in the discussion that followed. CP Members would like to see future meetings of this quality. ➤ Comms and engagement work – CP to drive this going forward but even with NWS support it has been onerous for the workstream leads – their efforts were applauded. Without workstream leads the Chair will consider how this can be progressed and made more effective. ➤ The Chair commented on the need to quickly complete the refresh of the Community Partnership Agreement and fill the current vacancies on the CP. ➤ Name change to be considered for the Partnership. Two alternatives were put forward. It was agreed that this needed further discussion before final decision. 	
5	Action Log	David Fannin
	<p>The action log was reviewed and updates provided.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ As a part of the Community Partnership Agreement (CPA) update, it was discussed if a non-disclosure agreement (NDA) should be included. It was decided that this is not necessary, the code of conduct will be sufficient to underpin the CPA. The CPA is based on the Nolan Principles and modelled on the council code. ➤ Regarding recruitment for the CP, a few people at the recent engagement events had expressed their interest in potentially applying. These people should be contacted to thank them for their interest and will be contacted once the recruitment process has gone live. 	
6	AOB	All
6.1	<p>A CP Member asked when the summary from the January meeting presentations would be available, the expectation being that it should have already been distributed.</p> <p>Response from NWS: the technical summary of Prof Neil Hyatt was emailed to CP Members ahead of this meeting. Prof Lucy Bailey and Fiona McEvoy are producing a video which will be published on the NWS website.</p> <p>Members were asked to read this and feedback on whether this meets expectations for public facing information.</p>	

6.2	CP Members would like to understand what other meetings are taking place, e.g. the Chamber of Commerce meeting attended by the Chair and a CP Member on 19.02.25. The Chair will use the WhatsApp group to communicate this information and encouraged all in the group to do the same.	
6.3	Request made for feedback from the recent engagement events to be made available as soon as possible. Note: a briefing was emailed to CP Members on 03.03.25	