

Parish Council of St John's Castlerigg & Wythburn

Question	Agree	Response
1 – Geology	No	<p>Finding a suitable rock formation that can act as an effective barrier is essential for the construction of a safe disposal facility. So far we have not heard of any area within the county that is suitable. Geological experts have not recommended any such places in Cumbria.</p> <p>Dr J Dearlove and Prof A Godmundson both stated “The Partnership” can rely on BGS study. The partnership was not originally happy with BGS survey and asked for further clarification. That further work did not use any Cumbria specific data, therefore, it is a fallacy to say BGS work can be relied upon. Prof David Smythe states West Cumbria should be ruled out on geological ...hardly a ringing endorsement of the BGS study!</p> <p>Dr Dearlove feels it is only Prof Smythe’s personal opinion that the area is not suitable – What is the difference between a personal opinion and a Professional? Surely if a location was suitable, all experts would agree? 20 years ago NIREX deemed that Cumbria was unsuitable to bury nuclear waste hence the above ground storage.</p> <p>Cumbria has volcanic-fractured fault lines and is subject to earthquakes, as recent as 2010. It is the wettest place in England with continual movement of ground water. Other mountainous countries are providing sites away from these locations, e.g. Sweden, Finland and Switzerland. Radiation and gases could easily return to the surface through the many fractures and faults which are filled with water.</p> <p>BGS study has not revealed a suitable place so far, thus we believe that if the area were suitable, a ringing endorsement would have been made by now. We need a definite opinion about suitable geology first. Find first then consult, instead of asking the question and then trying to find a place here in Cumbria. It is not fair to tempt us with money while risking the health and lives of everyone in the future.</p>
2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	No	<p>Safety – If the area is not geologically safe, a solution elsewhere needs to be found or surface storage needs to be a stopgap. Area not safe as geology not proved. Only preserved safety. Area on coast not safe 20 years ago. This time we know they are going to look further afield but complex geology we know.</p> <p>Security – with such a large development security would be a huge problem, for most of the country. Waste arriving and waiting to be stored.</p> <p>Environment – Given water pollution seeping through the faulted and fractured land, the perception of the whole area will be changed. Cumbria, the Lake District no longer would become a “World Heritage Site”. National Park at present does not seem to address this problem and consider the consequences.</p> <p>Planning – Local Planning rules will not be enforced as this is a Government driven scheme. NO local planning policy. Viability of West Cumbria in particular will change.</p>

3 – Impacts	No	<p>This will impact on the Lake District and Cumbria as a whole. Not just West Cumbria.</p> <p>A marketing policy for farming and food is to be developed but the fact that this will be needed shows that the impact of the repository will affect the whole area. There is a danger in underestimating people's perception of Cumbria. For example, after Foot and Mouth in 2001, visitors stayed away and went to other places. Will there be a reduction in the consumption of locally produced food, as the "Cumberland Brand" may not be welcomed.</p> <p>Land and property prices will fall, West Cumbria is a very small strip, although well populated, part of the country. Infrastructure, for transportation, north and south will be needed because of the high mountains in the middle.</p> <p>This will make great changes which will impact on the landscape people come to enjoy.</p>
4 – Community benefits	No	<p>As yet the partnership has not said who will benefit. Cost of infrastructure needed. There is insufficient information. There is no trust in going forward to stage four. Questions of ownership and mineral rights. Seems like a bribe for the people of West Cumbria, emphasis on money more than environmental impact on health and safety. Unsafe to rely on the promise of community benefit. Change of government may mean withdrawal of the "promise" of money.</p>
5 – Design and engineering	No	<p>The ability to retrieve and monitor this waste should be a cornerstone of the design. The waste removable if needed.</p> <p>We are not satisfied that the design addresses the issue of vast quantities of water in region. We have had severe flood episodes in 1985, 1995, 2005 and 2009. The EA now forecast a 20% increase, which will need to be managed.</p> <p>Developments should have been made to make it possible for nuclear waste to be reused or recycled properly and safely.</p> <p>Why should West Cumbria collect everyone else's? Statement does not say it will definitely only be England's. Omit?</p>
6 – Inventory	No	<p>Partnership tries to reassure us in the document but future changes to government always give rise to questions.</p> <p>One nuclear issue is that it can be said to be irresponsible to continue to produce waste that you can't deal with. Outside England as well! Omit?</p>
7 – Siting process	No	<p>A suitable place in England should have been found first for such a huge project. We feel it is wrong for West Cumbria to volunteer without a suitable site.</p> <p>It seems a flawed approach to address such a huge question. There are far more suitable areas in England with stable geology.</p> <p>All other countries have found a suitable site first: - Sweden, Finland, France, Switzerland and USA.</p> <p>This should not have gone beyond stage two without a suitable site being found and tested.</p> <p>Canvassed in West Cumbria because they have dealt with nuclear fuels since 1951.</p>

		<p>The two councils Copeland and Allerdale receive credible local support but only in this comparatively small area immediately affected. Only two on committee but the huge use of the rest of the country has not been considered. Infrastructure access around the central massif. Financial pressures problems for host community and people did not bother to object earlier. County compliant. Not a good safety record over the years.</p> <p>Poor record for something so dangerous and not fully understood.</p>
<p>8 – Overall views on participation</p>		<p>Our conclusion is from the information given that West Cumbria should withdraw.</p> <p>Right to withdraw later gives no confidence.</p> <p>Nowhere in Cumbria seems to have the suitable geology.</p> <p>Need to find somewhere in England first and then consult with community. Not the way it has been done here.</p> <p>Continuing is disrupting life in Cumbria – farmers, tourists especially as the National Park is such an important part of the county and so close to West Cumbria.</p> <p>Continuing concerns about safety in this “fractured fault lined” area with so much water – gas and water emissions.</p> <p>Not enough information about other waste to be stored here – has to arrive from wherever, and “how” a big question. Only narrow coastal strip north and south of Copeland and Allerdale.</p> <p>The impacts on community have not really been addressed in wider area – considering huge area of fells inaccessible in middle of county.</p>