

Loweswater Parish Council

Question	Agree	Response
<p>Letter in addition to response form</p>		<p>Re: MRWS Consultation: The response of Loweswater Parish Council</p> <p>At the recent meeting of Loweswater Parish Council the following question was put to councillors:</p> <p>‘Does this Parish Council believe that the Managing Radioactive Waste Safely Project should move forward to Stage 4 of the project, this being desk based studies to ascertain the suitability of the geology of Allerdale for housing an underground repository.’</p> <p>Members of the public were also present at the meeting and engaged with the debate that councillors undertook. A variety of issues and concerns were raised and these included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The geological information already available about West Cumbria is some of the most detailed in the country and it is doubtful whether there is a need for further investigations. The geology is already known to be unsuitable for a repository. • The project as a whole would have some economic benefit to the area though the likelihood of large numbers of new, sustainable jobs being created for local people was remote. • There is unhappiness about the process as a whole and feel that it should be driven by geology not geography. The areas with the most stable geology in the country should have been identified first and then volunteer communities should have been sought. The deep clays of Norfolk, Oxfordshire and London provide the most suitable geology for a waste repository. • Although there are further opportunities in the process for withdrawal, it is uncertain whether parish councils or the public will have another opportunity to have their say. It maybe that once into stage 4 the whole process becomes unstoppable. • The waste created by the massive excavation works would cause massive problems locally. • Both the tourism and farming industries could be adversely affected by the project. The Lake District is of national importance and nothing should be done that could impact upon the World Heritage application. <p>At the end of the debate the vote was as follows:</p> <p>Those in favour of moving to Stage 4: 2 councillors Those opposed to the move to Stage 4: 4 councillors</p> <p>The decision of Loweswater Parish Council not to support the MRWS Project moving to Stage 4 in Allerdale will be relayed to the following organisations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Allerdale Borough Council 2. Cumbria County Council 3. Cumbria Association of Local Councils 4. Lake District National Park

		Should you wish any further information regarding this decision then please do not hesitate to contact me.
1 – Geology	No	<p>I have no doubt that the geology of the Lake District National Park is UNSUITABLE for the location of the dump.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reports on the NIREX (1995-6) confirmed unsuitability in the Longlands Farm site area. • Both the Skiddaw Slates and the Borrowdale Volcanics consist of a range of Lithologies (6 in the Skiddaw Slates area of the Loweswater Parish). There is a lack of sequence and succession of the rocks. There are many UNCONFORMITIES. • In many of the areas reviewed in Scandinavia the basement rocks are SHIELD areas – ancient resistant rocks MUCH MORE appropriate – these are the ONLY other areas in Europe where waste is being buried at present. • Rocks within the Park act as aquifers with at best uncertain geology. Aquifer areas very inappropriate for a dump. • There is a need to dispose of the WASTE – below ground – and therefore we should select the BEST GEOLOGICAL AREAS in the UK and focus on these sites for further RESEARCH first. • Rocks in the Lake District National Park are mainly pyroclastic rocks; they have complicated patterns with faulting and folding as well as considerable angles of dip and weakness. • 3 zones of England are more appropriate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) London clays b) Oxford clays c) Part of Lincolnshire, West Norfolk, Bedfordshire.
2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We are asked to take on trust that the safety problems will be solved in the future! Regulatory bodies were in place for Three Miles Island (USA) Chernobyl (USSR) Fukushima (Japan) and even for the recent banking crisis – hardly giving the public confidence! • Lake District National Park covers 900 sq miles (approx). Its raison d’etre is protection of the environment yet this is the proposed area for the dump! • Huge amounts of rock spoil to be stored for ages, above ground, for backfill – waste is an eyesore. • Lake District Park being considered for WORLD HERITAGE STATUS – incompatible with underground dump.
3 – Impacts	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visual impacts underestimated within the document. • Large spoil heaps inevitable, arranged in bunds. Very visible undermining the principles behind a National Park. • Technology of the above ground facilities not so far implemented anywhere in the UK. Stores needed for some of our reactors when their lives are ended maybe prodigious. • Very doubtful of local job opportunities. Skilled labour almost certain to be brought into Cumbria, on a temporary basis. • *House and land prices are very likely to fall certainly WILL NOT be enhanced. Some businesses unlikely to be attracted to the area. • Rural industry, especially farms, food products and tourism MORE likely to suffer – NOISE, POLLUTION, HEAVY TRANSPORT (Lorries/ rail movements) will increase – leading to a poorer environment and deleterious effects. • *N.B. Land/house prices in the Sellafield area are significantly lower than the Duddon valley/Ennerdale areas.
4 – Community benefits	Not Sure/ Partly	It is clear that the principles agreed with the Government as the basis for future negotiations are very important. We are NOT told these principles in specifics BUT only in general. This is accepted at the stage of the investigation.

		We are insufficiently confident that the negotiations will be adequately managed. We believe the benefits, whether it be in terms of remuneration packages or infrastructural and /employment opportunities, are unlikely to be appropriate relative to the impact of the M.R.W.S. programme.
5 – Design and engineering	Not Sure/ Partly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is extremely difficult to respond in detail to this section since the generic design concept and engineering choices are SITE specific. The principles outlined in the document should be appropriate since all options are being kept open. Uncertainties and recommendations for future work will need substantial further work before Loweswater Parish Council could be persuaded that the design concepts and retrievability options are adequate. • However, technical and engineering matters should not be left to the NDA to solve in the future. The NDA is also responsible for the waste so an independent scrutiny panel must be appointed.
6 – Inventory	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are real problems of DEEP DISPOSAL. Nowhere in the world, to our knowledge, is there a repository like this ONE being recommended since this will be for BOTH – HIGH LEVEL and INTERMEDIATE LEVEL radioactive waste. • There would have to be more detail and certainty as to what is to go into the repository before any final decisions are made (see Page 86).
7 – Siting process	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insufficient confidence in the “Right of Withdrawal” programme as outlined. We recognise that the voluntarism approach is appropriate in theory but in practice lack the confidence that this maybe implemented if it is felt work should be stopped if the programme moves to Stage 4 (Figure 13 p 87)
8 – Overall views on participation		<p>It is to be emphasised that although both Councils have put themselves forward to be considered as possible sites this was not the right way forward.</p> <p>Loweswater Parish Council is NOT against Nuclear Energy. It is supportive of the UK’s programme and nuclear is an integral part of the UK’s energy programme. But as shown on pages 1,2 and page 3 the locations to be considered should initially have been located PRIMARILY with geological, environmental and planning and impacts of the repository as the key factors initially DETERMINING locations in the UK.</p>