

**Derwent Forest Shadow Board  
Monday 21 February 2004  
Allerdale House**



**Present** Sue Godfrey (Chair)  
Mike Phillips  
Cllr. Jim Musgrave  
Stewart Swift  
Cllr. Timothy Heslop  
Charles Woodhouse

**In Attendance:**

Bob Pointing / Alan Smith/ Ann-Marie Cowperthwaite – WLR  
Dick Cuckson - Cumbria CC  
David Martin – Allerdale BC  
James Rebanks - RRC

- |  | <b>Actions</b> |
|--|----------------|
| <b>1.0 Apologies:</b>  |                |
| 1.1 Apologies were received from Michael Hulme, Ian Swingland and Tim Oliver   |                |
| <b>2.0 Minutes of Previous Meeting and Matters Arising</b>   |                |
| The minutes were approved.   |                |
| Item 5.2 International Conference for Potential Developers. BP believes this is still a good idea. The MIPIM conference in March which WLR are attending with RRC will provide a good opportunity to raise awareness of Derwent Forest to 20,000 people.                     |                |
| Tim Smit lecture in Manchester 13 April 2005, it was thought that DF Shadow Board should be represented if possible. James Rebanks has already obtained a ticket and can provide feedback.   | <b>JR</b>      |
| <b>3.0 Project Status Report</b>   |                |
| 3.1 AMAC presented her report.   |                |
| <b>3.2 Funding</b>   |                |
| Discussions with the NWDA have indicated that the proposals will have to be for a minimal reclamation scheme in the first instance. Further funding might be made available once commercial interest has been demonstrated.. Clarity was sought regarding timescales for the |                |

## Actions

proposals and the likely total of the approved sum.

SS suggested that the proposals should be pitched at under £10M if possible. This would allow the project to be reviewed by the NWDA board. He suggested that a larger application would be taken to the Central Project Review Group, which would add 8-12 months to the timescale.

The £10M total would be the sum of **all** public sector funding including any ERDF monies.

SS believed that a new application should be made once the basic remediation costs were known and agreed. This would take 2-3 months to receive NWDA approval.

BP ran through the current budget allowance within WLR business plan for Derwent Forest and added the point that the NWDA Chair had expressed his backing for Derwent Forest.

AMAC stated that she was not confident that the whole site could be remediated for under £10M given the existing studies that had been carried out, so perhaps areas of the site should remain fenced off to allow the majority to be made safe.

DC stated that a sit down meeting to discuss minimal reclamation had not been held. It was noted that all parties were involved in discussions re minimal reclamation by e-mail and telecons prior to the previous minimal costs being issued to NWDA in Dec 2004.

It was agreed to arrange a meeting asap with WLR, CCC,ABC and Capita.

**AMAC/DC/DM**

(Post meeting note. Meeting scheduled for 09-03-05 at ABC)

MP stated that ABC would not be in a position to recommend the proposals to council if ABC's liability risks were not covered. A risk assessment of the reduced scheme would be required.

DM reiterated that that the main risk was the day to day maintenance costs. He fully expected that the environmental liability would be quantifiable due to the in depth surveys of the site and as such would be able to be covered by insurance warranties. He agreed to look into the cost of these items to feed into the basic scheme.

**DM**

DC stated that Environmental Warranties were utilised on the Kingsmoor Park scheme

JM reinforced ABC's view that they would not be in a position to proceed unless they were confident that these matters were suitably covered.

		<b>Actions</b>
	BP suggested that WLR should work further on the basic remediation scheme and present the proposals in one months time.	<b>AMAC</b>
<b>3.3</b>	<b>Project Implementation</b>	
	Concern was expressed by AMAC regarding the level of service provided to date by the Design Consultants.	
	Design deliverables have been late, and crucial reports relating to the groundwater monitoring, initially due in August 2005, are still awaited.	
	The consultants have not fulfilled their obligations as Planning Supervisor. DC did not accept the comments made and it was agreed to hold a further meeting to discuss these issues.	<b>AMAC/DC</b>
	<b>Recommendation 1 was approved and subject to the aforementioned meeting, a full review of Consultants services will be carried out.</b>	
<b>3.4</b>	<b>Wind Monitoring</b>	
	The wind and solar monitoring mast was erected in October 2004 and the first interim data sheet has been received. A full interpretive report will be received at the end of 2005 once a full years data has been collated.	
<b>3.5</b>	<b>UK Coal Negotiations</b>	
	Copies of correspondence between CCC and UK Coal were once again requested. DC agreed to supply.	<b>DC</b>
	SG stated that a full account and mandate of the proposed terms of any transfer will need to be submitted to the Shadow Board before negotiations with UK Coal are concluded.	
	DC commented that he will report to the board once negotiations have progressed to a suitable stage. SG commented that the Shadow Board should be kept fully informed prior to the completion of all negotiations.	<b>DC</b>
	SS queried if the road was still required.	
	DC commented that given the previous discussion on funding there was obviously no money for the road at the present time however CCC's negotiations would be based on an option to buy the land and an exclusivity deal with UK Coal.	
	MP stated that the project was not in the position at present to pursue the CPO option.	

		Actions
	<p><b>Recommendation 2 was amended and the SB agreed that CPO proceedings might be instigated at the suitable time within the project programme if UK Coal reject the final land purchase offer.</b></p>	
	<p>JM asked if CCC would be able to assist in the funding of the road. TH stated that he would look into this issue.</p>	TH
3.6	<p><b>MOD and land transfer.</b></p>	
	<p>MOD have been kept updated on the funding position for Derwent Forest.</p>	
	<p>There are outstanding issues regarding who pays the ongoing security costs on the site past April 2005 and also regarding the long term liability indemnity for the site. BP suggested a meeting between ABC, WLR and Caroline Simpson to discuss the latter.</p>	DM/BP/NWDA
	<p>MOD will be erecting their own multihazard warning signs around the site in the near future. This is a requirement of the site owner.</p>	
	<p>It is a future intention to erect Derwent Forest logos in conjunction with the partners logos once the extent of the project has been agreed and funding approved.</p>	
3.7	<p>Following meetings with Broughton and Broughton Moor Parish Councils it was agreed that a Parish Council Liaison committee would be the best forum for maintaining good links with the community. The first meeting is planned for 08-03-05.</p>	AMAC
	<p>SG agreed this would be a good idea and that their aspirations and ideas should be used.</p>	
3.8	<p><b>Publicity</b></p>	
	<p>It was noted that the decision re the final use of Derwent Forest was still foremost in local newspapers' agenda.</p>	
3.9	<p><b>Planning Application</b></p>	
	<p>The Planning Application has been deferred until 07-04-05. Planning objections have been received from several bodies, including the Environmental Agency, English Nature and CCC Highways division.. These have not been helped by the lack of progress of the design team against previously agreed actions.</p>	
	<p><b>Recommendation 3 was rejected as it was agreed that CCC policy was an internal matter for CCC to resolve.</b></p>	
	<p><b>Recommendation 4</b>  <b>It was agreed that CCC should provide a final date for the issue of</b></p>	DC



**Actions**

DM stated that Shadow Board does not want a 'large scale' wind farm on the site.

AS pressed for further clarification as there have been a large number of Renewable Energy companies who have expressed interest in the site. It was agreed that a letter should be issued to the interested companies, outlining that a wind farm is not envisaged for the site but explaining that local generators, for the purpose of supplying site developments only, may be acceptable.

**AS**

**7.0 AOB**

There was no other business discussed.

**8.0 Date of next meeting**

Wednesday 23 March at 6.00pm Innovation Centre (1st floor Board room) Westlakes Science and Technology Park (light refreshments available from 5.30pm). **Please note change of venue**

Ann-Marie Cowperthwaite  
Westlakes Renaissance  
March 2005