

Group 1 Improving Access to Footpaths

West Cumbria Sites Stakeholder Group (WCSSG) Low Level Waste Repository Sub-Committee Group tasked with developing access improvements to footpaths/roads in Drigg village locality. Meeting held on the LLWR Site on Monday 18th July 2005 at 1330 hrs.

Present

Cllr Sue Brown	County Councillor
Mr David Cook	Drigg and Carleton Parish Councillor
Mr John Hetherington	Cumbria County Council
Mr Bill Paul	Stakeholder Manager, LLWR

1. Purpose of Group

At the previous meeting of the sub-committee on the 27th May 2005 the group had selected two particular issues of concern to tackle as priorities. One of these was to improve access to footpaths. A summarised version of how these issues were expressed at the sub-committee is as follows:

A Holmrook Hill

Priority	Issue
1	Clean debris
2	Increase height of retaining wall
3	Insufficient lighting at bottom of hill

B Station Road

Priority	Issue
1	Repair and replace drainage
2	Install footpath
3	Re-model the junction

C Maintain and clear all existing paths

Priority	Issue
1	Maintain & repair existing footpaths

The team added a new item to the list. A long outstanding issue was the need to update the road direction signage at Holmrook. The existing 'BNFL Drigg Depot' signage needs to be updated to reflect the now accepted title of 'LLW Repository Site'.

Taskforce members: Cllr Sue Brown, Mr John Hetherington, Cllr David Cook, and Mr Bill Paul.

The purpose of the group is to consider the issue in greater detail by:

- 1) Assessing what the principal concerns/issues are,
- 2) Proposing how to implement actions to address these concerns/issues, and
- 3) Make proposals and recommendations to the sub-committee.

2. Tour of Areas

The group travelled to Holmrook hill, Station road to understand the items listed above.

3. Discussion

Following the visit the team clearly understood the extent of the work required to improve the condition of the footpaths and roads in the village area. Some of this work was basic maintenance and not construction work. There was clear support from the team that there was a need to conduct this work and there was an understanding that the majority of the work would be controlled through CCC Highways.

The main issues were how to allocate some priority to enable this work to be actioned in the near future, and would this entail finding some alternative method of funding.

Sue Brown explained she was a member of the Copeland Local Committee that would consider similar paths/road infrastructure work requests to this. However, in her opinion, and supported by John Hetherington, the Drigg village work would not meet the criteria that would enable the work to advance to a report to the Local Committee for action. However, Sue said she would speak to Jonathan Marriott (Area Manager, Capita) to help raise the visibility of this work for the Drigg village.

After some discussion John Hetherington proposed that the most probable way of implementing this work was through the Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act. It may be possible to tie this work into a condition of a forthcoming planning application for the

LLWR site. John also mentioned that the most appropriate time to do this may be when the DEFRA LLW review has been completed and the NDA waste strategy is available. This is probably twelve months away but could work in smoothly with the application for Vault 9 temporary storage planning application.

The team agreed that they would benefit from a greater understanding of the proposed future transport strategy for the LLWR. Bill Paul said he would arrange a presentation for a future sub committee meeting.

David Cook mentioned that when British Nuclear Group talk about the future construction material deliveries to the site for new vaults and capping, they use the words that the intention is to bring the 'majority' of the material onto the site by rail. David said, as a member of the DCPC, he believed the requirement should be that 'all' construction materials should be transported by rail. Bill Paul explained that this was not feasible for all materials. The proposed presentation on the future transport strategy should help explain this.

4. Conclusions

4.1 The team agree that this path/road work for the Drigg village is necessary.

4.2 The path/road work request for the Drigg village is very unlikely to trigger the criteria for the Copeland Local Committee to action this work.

4.3 The most realistic way of implementing this work is through a Section 106 condition attached to a relevant planning application for the LLWR.

5. Recommendations

5.1. The Sub Committee should use its influence to promote the visibility of this path/road work for the Drigg village.

5.2. The sub committee should seek agreement from all stakeholders that the Section 106 method is the appropriate way to implement this work.

Distribution

Those present plus other members of sub-committee