

Haile and Wilton Parish Council

Question	Agree	Response
1 – Geology	Not Sure/ Partly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why is the data obtained by the Nirex study not in the public domain and being consulted and used? • Concerns regarding that a ‘make do’ attitude will be adopted to enable a solution to be found and help bring forward the siting programme to 2029 • Conflicting external information with regard to the geological suitability of the area by specialists like Professor Smythe
2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Not Sure/ Partly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We deem this question not applicable at this stage in the process but we assume that all legislation will be covered. This matter should be further reviewed should the siting process progress – These matters will become very important in the later stages of the project.
3 – Impacts	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A very comprehensive list has been drawn up and acknowledges the areas requiring more attention. • The chapter lacks depth around the disruption that will be caused during the construction of the facility and the huge environmental impacts of the rock removal process; the creation of spoil heaps, infrastructure issues, extra traffic involved, land needed and general scale of the operation.
4 – Community benefits	Not Sure/ Partly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any community package needs to be sustainable, transformational and offer long-term inward investment to help mitigate the perceived environmental decline of the area. • The ‘host community’ should be consulted and gain the maximum benefit package with a ripple effect of benefit packages for others areas. • The identified ‘host communities’ needs to have the right of withdrawal at any point in the process • The community needs to be engaged and details of the proposed benefits package outlined at the earliest opportunity in the process.
5 – Design and engineering	Not Sure/ Partly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too early in the process to comment on the design and engineering of the facility. It could, at least, have discussed the anticipated arrangements for dealing with water flows, gases, explosive hazard, criticality, etc. • There is no mention of the extent of monitoring that is foreseen for the facility, nor the period during which waste could be retrieved.
6 – Inventory	Not Sure/ Partly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very wide inventory spectrum from sludge’s to uranium/plutonium which is not necessarily currently well defined.
7 – Siting process	Not Sure/ Partly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ‘Partnership’s Seven Principles for Community Involvement’ seem to encompass a viable way forward. • The consultation document acknowledges the need to change the representation on the decision making body to reflect the evolving situation. <p>Problems arise from the way that the ‘way forward’ might be interpreted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The areas highlighted in red on the map on page 27 encompassing the industrial areas of Carlisle, Workington, Whitehaven,

		<p>Egremont and Maryport which have already been excluded due to the BGS screening study, therefore it is only right that representatives from these towns should now have much less of an influence in the process going forward.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Also, it is a current perception that it is very unlikely that the repository will be sited within the Lake District National Park, therefore like the above; representatives from it should have less of a say. • Once any area is identified as a suitable site that community should be consulted to see if they are agreeable to the benefit package on offer. • Throughout the process the identified host community should have the option to withdraw and 'Voluntarism' should be core principle, not just for the County Council and Borough Councils but for those individuals communities directly affected by the siting process. A 'free' right of withdrawal should be available at any stage to all concerned as the project progresses.
8 – Overall views on participation		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All areas of the UK were invited “to take part in the search for somewhere to put a repository, without any commitment to have it”. Our views are that the areas covered by Allerdale and/or Copeland Councils have the same opportunity as the rest of the UK to take part or not, without any commitment to have it.
9 – Additional comments		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The majority of the current Public Relations activities are not seen to be very engaging for the majority of the community in the consultation area. • The language in the consultation document is very ambiguous, to the extent that it could be interpreted that the repository is good or bad for the area. • The process is at a very early stage, so a lot of information is unavailable to make an informed submission to the consultation process currently. • There is no thought given in the document to how an independent Scotland's waste might be dealt with, particularly in-light of the NDA's move to relocate waste from the Dounreay site in Scotland to Sellafield over the coming decade. • What kind of geology would automatically eliminate an area from the process? • There is no mention that individual compensation packages will be offered to businesses and individual households affected by the siting of the repository.