



**BANNNG**  
Blackwater Against New Nuclear Group



**BANNNG UP TO DATE**

**May, 2012**

*An occasional newsletter for supporters of the  
Blackwater Against New Nuclear Group (BANNNG)*

---

**IMPORTANT DATE FOR YOUR DIARY – see page 8**

*18 June, 2012, 7.30 p.m. at Friends Meeting House, Church St., Colchester*

*Speaker:*

*Yoshi Takamura,*

*Lawyer and Environmentalist from Hiroshima*

**Hiroshima, Nagasaki and Fukushima**

*Introduced by Professor Andy Blowers, OBE (Chair of BANNNG), speaking on*

**Fukushima –It Is A Moral Issue**

---

**In this issue....**

<b>1.</b>	<b><i>Editorial - What Happens Next?</i></b>	<b><i>p. 1</i></b>
<b>2.</b>	<b><i>Feature - Meet the BANNNGers: Norma Creighton</i></b>	<b><i>p. 2</i></b>
<b>3.</b>	<b><i>BANNNG Keeps Up The Pressure.....On Radioactive Wastes</i></b>	<b><i>p. 4</i></b>
<b>4.</b>	<b><i>Bradwell and Sizewell – Linking The Communities</i></b>	<b><i>p. 5</i></b>
<b>5.</b>	<b><i>BANNNG Keeping In Touch</i></b>	<b><i>p. 7</i></b>
<b>6.</b>	<b><i>Date For Diary</i></b>	<b><i>p. 8</i></b>
<b>7.</b>	<b><i>Contact BANNNG</i></b>	<b><i>p. 8</i></b>
<b>8.</b>	<b><i>Thanks</i></b>	<b><i>p. 8</i></b>
	<b><i>Annexe 1 – List of BANNNG Responses to Consultations</i></b>	<b><i>p. 9</i></b>

---

**1. Editorial – What Happens Next?**

Since our last Newsletter the nuclear scene locally has become rather quiet. With the Government in July 2011 finally listing Bradwell as one of the eight sites potentially suitable for new nuclear power stations, the first part of BANNNG's campaign was over. Although we did not prevent the listing, we were able to marshal compelling arguments against the proposal in a series of detailed, well-researched papers in response to various Government and other consultations (the latest are discussed in article 3, p.3. Also see list at end of Newsletter). These will stand us in good stead should there be an application for a new Bradwell.

Equally important has been our campaign to raise public awareness and consciousness of the dangers a new Bradwell could bring to the Blackwater area. Our high profile demonstrations have highlighted the problems of flooding and storage of highly radioactive wastes, the difficulties of protecting and evacuating people during a nuclear emergency and the impact a new power station would have on the marine life, ecology and environment of the estuary. Perhaps our most impressive achievement was the collection of 10,000 signatures for the BANNG petition which was delivered to the Minister for Energy in Whitehall.

Now begins the waiting game. The Bradwell site remains unsold and even if a nuclear operator comes forward no permission to develop can be granted unless Sizewell up the Suffolk coast gets the go-ahead (see article No. 4, p.5). Meanwhile much has been happening elsewhere which makes it difficult to judge what happens next at Bradwell.

First, the nuclear industry worldwide remains shaken by the catastrophe at Fukushima. Several countries have decided to phase out their nuclear programmes. Although the UK still has the most ambitious nuclear programme in western Europe, its future is looking decidedly less promising and a slowing down is all too evident.

Second, the crucial test is whether the private sector is prepared to put up the huge capital required to build new nuclear power stations without heavy state subsidy and guarantees of investment returns in the distant future, up to 60 years from now. The prospects at the UK's sites look distinctly fragile at the present. The German energy companies RWE and E.ON have withdrawn from the consortium set up to build at Wylfa in Anglesey and Oldbury in Gloucestershire. A desperate search is on for alternative investors, possibly even from Russia. Although there have been bullish noises there is no commitment as yet for new reactors at Moorside (Sellafield). Even at Hinkley Point, where the planning process is under way, EDF have yet to commit the finance. This leaves a question mark hanging over Sizewell where EDF are also planning two new reactors. At the other three sites – Heysham, Hartlepool and Bradwell – there is no prospective investor in sight.

So, it looks as if nothing is likely to happen at Bradwell in the near future and it is certainly unlikely anything will be built before 2025, the target date for new build stations to be up and running. BANNG believes the Government should recognise that new build at Bradwell has missed its deadline and never will be a viable proposition. The longer things go on the more certain it is that other, safer and more sustainable technologies will produce low carbon energy. There seems little point in persisting with a project that will probably never happen but which, so long as it is kept flickering, creates anxiety, blight and public opposition. With this in mind BANNG will press the Minister to remove Bradwell from the list.

## **2. Feature – Meet the BANNGers: Norma Creighton**

This issue starts a new feature, 'Meet the BANNGers', in which some prominent BANNG supporters will be invited to describe what BANNG means for them. We begin with Norma Creighton, a member of both the Core and Community Awareness Groups. In Norma's words,

I was born and brought up in Stock, near Chelmsford, Essex, the eldest of

four children. In 1960, at the age of 12, I went on a school visit to the newly built Bradwell Power Station - arranged to extol the virtues of this high tech wonderful new power source. After a guided tour of the plant and explanation of its workings we were invited to ask questions. I asked what were the arrangements for the disposal of dangerous radioactive waste and was appalled to discover from the reply that no effective means existed or was even contemplated. Even at that age I felt it was foolhardy and immoral to build a power station with the absence of this vital element and, therefore, compromising the safety of the public.

Ever since that time I have been fiercely opposed to nuclear power and its dangers.

I moved to Mersea in 2007 and shortly after I saw a meeting advertised to discuss Bradwell Power Station, which was being decommissioned but there was the possibility of a new station being built at the site. There was no question that I wouldn't be at that meeting! I found the meeting informative and interesting and was particularly impressed by Andy Blowers (one of the panel of speakers) and made sure that I spoke to him, making my feelings on the subject very clear.

At the second meeting which was held at St Peter's Church Hall, I was glad to be able to become pro-active by joining the campaign group which became BANNG. I became involved in demonstrations, fund-raising, door-to-door leafleting on Mersea, arranging public meetings and especially in petitioning on Mersea Island and around the estuary. The BANNG petition involved getting signatures to make the Government aware of the strength of local opposition to a new Bradwell.

In February 2011, a group of BANNGers went up to Whitehall and I was asked to present the 10,000 signature petition to the Minister for Energy, Charles Hendry. I was one of a small delegation of BANNGers invited to meet the Minister inside his offices, where we raised our concerns and asked pertinent questions.



Norma handing over the BANNG Petition to Charles Hendry

My aim is to keep this issue in the public eye, providing our community with the latest and relevant information and to repeatedly reiterate the unsuitability of the site at Bradwell to the Government via the media and any other appropriate means.

I am proud of my association with BANNG and the high profile it has already

achieved. It has been challenging but highly rewarding work because our efforts have raised public awareness and knowledge. The Government knows who we are and that we intend to fight this proposition on behalf of thousands of people living around the Blackwater Estuary. I am certainly committed to try to ensure that the unspoilt natural beauty of this peaceful estuary can be maintained and enjoyed. I hope that BANNG 's formidable resolve to prove the case against new nuclear at Bradwell can weaken and ultimately change the Government's intention to go ahead.

I cannot give up, we must succeed in our endeavour, for to fail is to condemn future generations to deal with the awful nuclear legacy which we will leave behind and that would , in my opinion, be unforgivable!

### **3. BANNG Keeps Up The Pressure.....On Radioactive Wastes**

Since our last issue BANNG has made a further three responses to consultations, bringing the total submitted to fifteen. These have been circulated to BANNG supporters (by e-mail) and the full list is at the end of this Newsletter. If you would like a copy of any of the responses for your collection, then contact BANNG's Secretary, Varrie Blowers ([varrieblowers@yahoo.com](mailto:varrieblowers@yahoo.com)).

These responses form a formidable record of research, argument and recommendations on many of the complex issues surrounding new nuclear development with particular reference to Bradwell. If Bradwell is ever put forward then BANNG is ready to demonstrate that a new power station is an untenable and outrageous proposition that must be sunk without trace. These latest responses are on different aspects of long-term management of radioactive wastes. A new nuclear power station at Bradwell would have to accommodate long-lived, highly radioactive wastes including spent fuel on a low-lying site increasingly vulnerable to flooding and coastal processes. There is, at present, no credible method of safely managing these wastes into the far future. So, these dangerous wastes will be left in deteriorating circumstances for future generations to manage.

#### ***Where and how will the wastes be managed?***

The straight, simple and honest answer is that we have no idea. Towards the end of last year the Government set out its views on identifying potential sites for a deep repository to accommodate all the UK's waste. BANNG's response is our Paper Number 13. BANNG was concerned with several aspects of the plans. We felt the Government was placing far too much emphasis on geological disposal as the solution and not considering alternatives. Disposal is not a single strategy but one possible component in an integrated process which includes storage. While supporting the voluntary process, whereby potential host communities can opt in as well as withdraw from site selection, BANNG wants the concept extended to include all the sites at which long-term storage will take place as well. In particular, BANNG believes communities with new build sites such as Bradwell should also be offered the right to accept or reject long-term storage of highly radioactive wastes. **It is manifestly unfair that some places should be offered the choice while others simply have the wastes thrust upon them for the indefinite future.**

### ***Why not bury it in Cumbria?***

It is, perhaps, not surprising that the only part of the country that has expressed any interest at all in the possibility of hosting a deep geological repository is West Cumbria. After all, Sellafield is where most of the high-level wastes, spent fuel, plutonium and uranium are stored. A Partnership to consider the issues has been working for the last three years and soon has to decide whether West Cumbria should enter a site selection process. BANNG has responded to a consultation on this question (BANNG Paper No. 15). We consider the question premature since the repository is only at an early stage of design and there are no other areas in the country with which to compare suitability for a site.

The Government's strategy is stacked on West Cumbria agreeing to proceed. But, with only one area in the frame and no detailed plans for achieving safe disposal, there can be no certainty that an acceptable site will be delivered in the near future, if ever. So, all the more reason for a comprehensive approach including a strategy for safe and secure storage and consideration of what to do with wastes from new build, should they arise in the future. **With no solution in sight it is madness to contemplate dumping more wastes around the country in places like Bradwell.**

### ***Essex County Council confused and out of touch***

Essex County Council has displayed a remarkable ignorance of the problem of radioactive waste. In a recent consultation on its Waste Disposal Document, the County makes no mention of the possibility of dangerous nuclear wastes, including spent fuel, being stored at Bradwell indefinitely. In the same document the Council states that wastes from the former Bradwell power station will be disposed of in 'the new national geological radioactive waste repository to replace the existing repository at Cumbria'. But, there is no 'existing repository' for intermediate-level wastes let alone spent fuel - and little more than the hope that one may be developed in the distant future.

BANNG has repeatedly told the County Council about the perils of storing dangerous wastes at sea level on a coastline vulnerable to flooding. Yet, Essex County Council appears unaware or uninterested in the prospect facing present and future generations. BANNG's Chair, Andy Blowers, states: 'There is no way of knowing what future conditions will be like or whether future generations will have the capacity to cope with managing dangerous wastes in difficult conditions'.

In its response to the Essex consultation (BANNG Paper No. 14), BANNG has urged the Council to oppose the long-term storage of spent fuel and other wastes at the Bradwell site and to make its opposition clear to the Government before any proposals are made for any new nuclear power stations at the site.

Andy Blowers says: 'BANNG's 10,000 signature petition made it palpably clear that local communities do not want these dangerous wastes in a dangerous location on their doorstep. Local communities have a right to expect the Council to recognise the potential threats posed by nuclear wastes on our shores and to protect present and future generations from them'.

#### 4. Bradwell And Sizewell – Linking The Communities

##### *Pointing the way together*

Pete Wilkinson, well-known campaigner against nuclear energy, spoke to a large and attentive audience of BANNGers at the Methodist Hall in West Mersea on 27 March. Pete, a founder of both Greenpeace and Friends of the Earth in the UK, spelt out the threats to community health and well-being posed by proposals for new mega reactors at Sizewell in Suffolk and Bradwell in Essex. He declared the nuclear industry and emergency services were totally unprepared for a major emergency and local populations were blissfully unaware of what to do or where to go.

Andy Blowers, Chair of BANNG, also spoke at the meeting and emphasised that the nuclear industry appeared to be faltering in its ambitious UK new build programme. Nonetheless, plans for Sizewell were far advanced and an application for development appeared to be imminent. If Sizewell got the go-ahead then the way would be open for possible development at Bradwell. All the more reason, therefore, for BANNG to recognise its common interest with Sizewell.

Both Pete and Andy stressed the contrasts between the two areas. Sizewell already had an operating mega reactor and spent fuel was also stored on the site. The local community, with workers dependent on the plant, was markedly pro-nuclear and local Councils and MPs all supported the continuing development of the nuclear industry on the Suffolk coast. By contrast, the Blackwater communities were generally opposed to new nuclear development. But BANNG had much to learn from Sizewell's experience about what might lie in store for Bradwell. At the same time, BANNG could offer its own experience and support in a campaign to stop new nuclear at Sizewell. BANNG's success with its petition, its meetings with local Councils, its visible campaigning and its detailed and well-researched responses to Government consultations could provide valuable support.

There was a vigorous and informed exchange of views at the meeting. BANNG supporters felt there was much to be gained from a joint approach to their campaigns. Pete Wilkinson invited BANNG representatives to a meeting with the Suffolk group, Communities Against Nuclear Expansion (CANE), which was enthusiastically accepted.

##### *BANNG offers support to CANE's campaign*

On 24 April, eight members of BANNG's Core and Community Awareness Groups travelled up the coast to Leiston in Suffolk to join a meeting organised by CANE to coordinate opposition to new nuclear at Sizewell. There were also representatives of Friends of the Earth, Shut Down Sizewell Campaign and the Stop Nuclear Power Network. Opening the meeting CANE's Chair, Joan Girling, said this was an opportunity to bring together groups in a coordinated and combined opposition to the proposals of EDF.

BANNG's Andy Blowers outlined what the group had achieved in its four years and indicated that it would be prepared to share its experience and offer support in any campaign organised by CANE. He stressed that an effective challenge to new nuclear could only be offered if a campaign was pro-active, professional, organised and committed. Other speakers commented how important it was both to combine forces

but also to make sure that they were effectively deployed on the various tasks. There was a feeling that, with the enemy already in the midst, time was short and considerable effort on a variety of fronts would be necessary.

After the meeting, Barry Turner, BANNG's Vice-Chair, commented. 'With a planning application for Sizewell C imminent, it's important to get an effective campaign up and running. BANNG has shown it is possible to be very effective if you are professional and committed to the cause. But, it is tough work. There's much to be done and little time and BANNG is prepared to do what it can to give support to our colleagues in Suffolk. It matters to us as well as them'.

## **5. BANNG Keeping In Touch.....**

### ***..... with the Councils***

Part of BANNG's work is to keep local Councils informed of the issues. Over the years we have enjoyed a good relationship with Colchester Borough who have indicated their opposition to new build at Bradwell. We have also presented the key issues to members and officers of Essex County Council at Chelmsford. We have also had three meetings with Maldon District Council in whose area the Bradwell site is located. Most recently Andy Blowers, Barry Turner and Barry Jones, a member of the Core Group, met with the Council Leader, Cllr. John Archer, and Deputy Leader, Cllr. Alan Cheshire.

It was a convivial and constructive meeting. BANNG underlined the key problems with the site – its vulnerability, storage of spent fuel for the long-term, impacts on the estuary and emergency planning. The Maldon councillors said they had learned much from BANNG's detailed documents which would help if any application for the site came forward. Meanwhile, with no activity at the site it was felt that both sides should keep in touch.

Barry Jones, who lives in Maldon District, felt the meeting had been very promising. 'I was impressed with the open-minded attitudes shown by the Leader and his Deputy. I feel confident we have a good relationship with Maldon which will be helpful in the future'.

### ***.....with the Government***

BANNG is a member of the DECC (Dept. of Energy and Climate Change)/NGO Forum which brings together representatives of local community groups at nuclear sites, national anti-nuclear groups, Government departments and regulators. The Forum is co-chaired by Andy Blowers and BANNG is represented by its Vice-Chair, Barry Turner. The Minister for Energy, Charles Hendry, attends the meetings.

The Forum has discussed some major issues affecting all sites. The discussions on health impacts of nuclear power stations will bring together different perspectives in the hope of establishing some common ground. The Forum is also considering flooding scenarios post-2100 and the problems of managing dangerous spent fuel on floodable sites well into the next century. Another issue covered by the Forum is Emergency Planning and the difficulties of warning and evacuating large populations in the event of a major nuclear incident. Future meetings will cover other issues, in

particular, the long-term management of nuclear wastes and the problem of nuclear costs and liabilities.

‘The Forum is very useful in three respects’, says Barry Turner. ‘First and foremost, it allows for a free exchange of information and views on the major issues facing communities living with the threat of nuclear energy. Second, it gives an opportunity for local groups to meet with each other which enhances a sense of community and reduces the sense of isolation that can be experienced. And, third, there is the opportunity of meeting decision makers face-to-face and challenging policy - sometimes to good effect’.

## **6. Date for Diary**

### ***BANNG meeting – Focus on Fukushima***

Yoshi Takamura, a lawyer and environmentalist, who lives in Hiroshima, is coming to speak in Colchester on 18 June. His theme is ‘Hiroshima, Nagasaki and Fukushima’ which points up the links between nuclear power and nuclear weapons. The talk will be especially relevant in a post-Fukushima context which highlights the dangers to safety and security posed by nuclear power stations, especially at coastal locations.

Yoshi’s talk will be introduced by Andy Blowers, who will speak on the subject of ‘Fukushima – it is a moral issue’. The meeting will be held at the Friends Meeting House, Church Street, Colchester (near the Mercury Theatre) at 7.30 pm. The meeting is free and all are welcome. So, please come along and bring your friends.

## **7. Contact BANNG**

Membership enquiries: Norma Creighton ([norma.creighton@uwclub.net](mailto:norma.creighton@uwclub.net))  
Treasurer (for donations): Lynn Hartley ([lhandjh@tiscali.co.uk](mailto:lhandjh@tiscali.co.uk))  
Secretary: Varrie Blowers ([varrieblowers@yahoo.com](mailto:varrieblowers@yahoo.com))

## **8. Thanks**

Thank you for responding so well to the request to renew donations. Please encourage others to join BANNG as the more supporters, the better.

*Annexe 1/ List of BANNG Responses to Consultations/p. 9*

## ANNEXE 1

### **LIST OF RESPONSES MADE BY THE BLACKWATER AGAINST NEW NUCLEAR GROUP (BANNG) TO GOVERNMENT AND OTHER CONSULTATIONS ON NEW NUCLEAR BUILD AND STORAGE OF WASTES ON SITES**

BANNG (Blackwater Against New Nuclear Group)(2008) Consultation on the Strategic Siting Assessment Process and Siting Criteria for New Nuclear Power Stations in the UK, Response on behalf of BANNG, November (BANNG Paper No.1)

BANNG (2009a) ‘Have Your Say’ Government Consultation on Nomination of Sites for New Nuclear Power Stations, Response to the Consultation by BANNG, May (BANNG Paper No.2)

BANNG (2009b) The Justification of Practices Involving Ionising Radiation Regulations 2004, Consultation on the Nuclear Industry Association’s Application to Justify New Nuclear Power Stations, Response to the Consultation from Blackwater Against New Nuclear Group (BANNG), March (BANNG Paper No.3)

BANNG (2010a) Consultation on Draft National Policy Statements for Energy Infrastructure: Draft Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1); Draft National Policy Statement for Nuclear Power Generation (EN-6) and Associated Documents, Response of the Blackwater Against New Nuclear Group (BANNG), February (BANNG Paper No.4)

BANNG (2010b) House of Commons Energy and Climate Change Committee, Inquiry into Energy National Policy Statements, Evidence on Behalf of the Blackwater Against New Nuclear Group, January (BANNG Paper No.5)

BANNG (2010c) Environment Agency Generic Design Assessment AP1000 Nuclear Power Plant Design by Westinghouse Electric Company LLC: UK EPR Nuclear Power Plant Design by Areva NP SAS EDF; Consultation Document, Response by Blackwater Against New Nuclear Group (BANNG), October (BANNG Paper No.6)

BANNG (2010d) The Justification of Practices Involving Ionising Radiation Regulations 2004. Consultation on the Secretary of State’s Proposed Decisions as Justifying Authority on the Regulatory Justification of the New Nuclear Power Station Designs Currently Known as the AP1000 and the EPR, response to the Consultation by the Blackwater Against New Nuclear Group (BANNG) (BANNG Paper No.7)

BANNG (2010e) The Energy Act 2008, Consultation on the Financing of Nuclear Decommissioning and Waste Handling Regulations, Consultation on a Methodology to Determine a Fixed Unit Price for Waste Disposal and Updated Cost Estimates for Nuclear Decommissioning, Waste Management and Waste Disposal, Response of the Blackwater Against New Nuclear Group (BANNG), June (BANNG Paper No.8)

BANNG (2011a) Planning for New Energy Infrastructure, Consultation on Revised Draft National Policy Statements for Energy Infrastructure, Response of the Blackwater Against New Nuclear Group (BANNG), January (BANNG Paper No.9)

BANNG (2011b) The Energy Act 2008, Consultation on Revised Funded Decommissioning Programme Guidance for New Nuclear Power Stations and Consultation on an Updated Waste Transfer Pricing Methodology for the Disposal of Higher Activity Waste from New Nuclear Power Stations, Response from the Blackwater Against New Nuclear Group (BANNG), March (BANNG Paper No.10)

BANNG (2011 c) Management of the UK's Plutonium Stocks, Consultation on the long-term management of the UK-owned Separated Civil Plutonium, Response from the Blackwater Against New Nuclear Group (BANNG), May (BANNG Paper No. 11)

BANNG (2011d) Japanese Earthquake and Tsunami: implications for the UK nuclear industry interim report by HM Inspector of Nuclear Installations May 2011, Comment on Behalf of the Blackwater Against New Nuclear Group (BANNG), August (BANNG Paper No. 12)

BANNG (2011e) Managing Radioactive Waste Safely: desk-based identification and assessment of potential candidate sites for geological disposal, Public Consultation, Response of the Blackwater Against New Nuclear Group (BANNG), September (BANNG Paper No. 13)

BANNG (2012a) Essex County Council's Waste Disposal Document: Preferred Approach, Public Consultation, Response of the Blackwater Against New Nuclear Group (BANNG), January (BANNG Paper No. 14)

BANNG (2012b) Geological Disposal of Radioactive Waste In West Cumbria? Public Consultation, Response of the Blackwater Against New Nuclear Group (BANNG) (BANNG Paper No. 15)