

Millom Without Parish Council

Question	Agree	Response
1 – Geology	No	<p>The Parish Council does not support the current proposals for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i)the present consultation to identify a suitable site is too narrowly focussed, offers no geographic comparisons and gives priority to community acceptance in the areas volunteered by principal councils rather than geological suitability and secure containment, ii)the extreme longevity of this project and nature of the elements to be stored makes the utmost caution essential, iii)the opportunity for the Parish Council’s views to be influential may be lost when decision making defaults to principal councils, perhaps before the extended consultation period ends, iv)remaining mineral deposits (e.g. iron ore which was previously mined in the Millom and Furness areas up to 1968) may be made unrecoverable in future centuries by the proximity of a nuclear repository
2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	<p>1. The Parish Council recognises the national importance of the proper disposal and storage of nuclear waste. It is also aware of the time-scales involved both in building and storage. On the one hand urgent action is necessary because of the unsatisfactory nature of the present storage arrangements. On the other hand the essential longevity of storage makes, for example, the eight-and-a-half thousand years since the land-bridge to Europe was lost (due to rising sea levels) seem as yesterday compared with the expected duration of this programme.</p> <p>2. In view of the above, the Parish Council is of the opinion that it is the duty of the government and the nuclear industry to investigate widely and give principal weight to criteria based upon geological considerations in the most rigorous sense. Therefore, the search for a site should not to be confined to the areas of those principal councils which have, at present, expressed an interest, thus excluding a truly wide and impartial study which offers a range of choice.</p>
3 – Impacts	Yes	<p>It is tempting for the Parish Council to take the suggested process forward as indicated in the public consultation documents (‘Geological disposal of radioactive waste in West Cumbria’) due to its urgency and importance and thus agree to await more information at a later date. The Council is of the opinion that this is an unsatisfactory way to address the matter,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First, because it is wrong in principle as the criteria of selection is too restrictive and does not best serve the national interest. • Secondly, in waiting for more information the opportunity to decline to become further involved may pass from small councils and the decision making power default to the principal councils whose views will not necessarily reflect the views of this or other Parish Councils.
4 – Community benefits	Not Sure/ Partly	<p>The examples of community benefits referred to in the report are a minimum starting point for this generation and perhaps the next. However, any benefits for the present community would be relatively short-lived and trivial when put alongside the enormity of the project and its longevity. Any disadvantages, on the contrary, will be long lived and serious.</p>
5 – Design and engineering	No	<p>A long-term project such as this should be sited at an optimum location and be inherently as flexible as possible. It is very likely, that in the time-scale envisaged the methods of disposal, processing or containment of nuclear waste will be modified or improved. It is of fundamental importance, therefore, that flexibility should be built into the system and allow for future</p>

		developments at a safe and secure site
6 – Inventory	No	The Parish Council recognises the national importance of the proper disposal and storage of nuclear waste. It is also aware of the time-scales involved both in building and storage. On the one hand urgent action is necessary because of the unsatisfactory nature of the present storage arrangements. On the other hand the essential longevity of storage makes, for example, the eight-and-a-half thousand years since the land-bridge to Europe was lost (due to rising sea levels) seem as yesterday compared with the expected duration of this programme.
7 – Siting process	No	<p>The present consultation to identify a suitable site is too narrowly focussed, offers no geographic comparisons and gives priority to community acceptance in the areas volunteered by principal councils rather than geological suitability and secure containment.</p> <p>The Parish Council is of the opinion that it is the duty of the government and the nuclear industry to investigate widely and give principal weight to criteria based upon geological considerations in the most rigorous sense. Therefore, the search for a site should not to be confined to the areas of those principal councils which have, at present, expressed an interest, thus excluding a truly wide and impartial study which offers a range of choice.</p>
8 – Overall views on participation		<p>Summary:</p> <p>The Parish Council does not support the current proposals for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) the present consultation to identify a suitable site is too narrowly focussed, offers no geographic comparisons and gives priority to community acceptance in the areas volunteered by principal councils rather than geological suitability and secure containment, ii) the extreme longevity of this project and nature of the elements to be stored makes the utmost caution essential, iii) the opportunity for the Parish Council's views to be influential may be lost when decision making defaults to principal councils, perhaps before the extended consultation period ends, iv) remaining mineral deposits may be made unrecoverable in future centuries by the proximity of a nuclear repository. <p>Comment:</p> <p>A long-term project such as this should be sited at an optimum location and be inherently as flexible as possible. It is very likely, that in the time-scale envisaged the methods of disposal, processing or containment of nuclear waste will be modified or improved. It is of fundamental importance, therefore, that flexibility should be built into the system and allow for future developments at a safe and secure site.</p> <p>Any benefits for the present community would be relatively short-lived and trivial when put alongside the enormity of the project and its longevity. Any disadvantages, on the contrary, will be long lived and serious.</p>
9 – Additional comments		<p>Argument:</p> <p>1-The Parish Council recognises the national importance of the proper disposal and storage of nuclear waste. It is also aware of the time-scales involved both in building and storage. On the one hand urgent action is necessary because of the unsatisfactory nature of the present storage arrangements. On the other hand the essential longevity of storage makes, for</p>

		<p>example, the eight-and-a-half thousand years since the land-bridge to Europe was lost (due to rising sea levels) seem as yesterday compared with the expected duration of this programme.</p> <p>2-In view of the above, the Parish Council is of the opinion that it is the duty of the government and the nuclear industry to investigate widely and give principal weight to criteria based upon geological considerations in the most rigorous sense. Therefore, the search for a site should not be confined to the areas of those principal councils which have, at present, expressed an interest, thus excluding a truly wide and impartial study which offers a range of choice.</p> <p>3-It is in the national interest that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">•First, the proposed site should be determined by a wide examination of suitable areas and that the final selection should be made only from among those sites which best satisfy scientific and geological requirements.•Secondly, South Copeland and the, nearby, Furness peninsula are potentially rich sources of mineral deposits. The cessation of mining in the Millom area was due to the ingress of water and the cost of pumping rather than exhaustion of deposits. It is understood that the possible future availability of mineral deposits has led to other areas being excluded from consideration as suitable sites. <p>4-It is tempting for the Parish Council to take the suggested process forward due to its urgency and importance and thus agree to await more information at a later date. The Council is of the opinion that this is an unsatisfactory way to address the matter,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">•First, because it is wrong in principle as the criteria of selection is too restrictive and does not best serve the national interest.•Secondly, in waiting for more information the opportunity to decline to become further involved may pass from small councils and the decision making power default to the principal councils whose views will not necessarily reflect the views of this or other Parish Councils. <p>5.For the reasons given above this Parish Council does not give its assent to the present proposals.</p>