

Parton Parish Council

Question	Agree	Response
1 – Geology	Partly	We believe that we should know much more about the geology of the area before we are committed to a process which might prove difficult to withdraw from especially as areas where it is said the geology is more suitable have shown no interest. We would not be happy if the government wanted to persuade the area that whilst not ideal the geology would be acceptable.
2 – Safety, security, environment and planning	Not Sure	Why cannot the government now say that any planning application would not be dealt with locally? The planning authority locally would be one of the councils that are involved in the present consultation. That cannot be right. It is said that a planning application is many years away but it offends common sense to argue that the system might change. It could still be said that any planning application would be dealt with the then current national planning authority.
3 – Impacts	No	The consultation documents underestimate the impacts of a repository on the area. In our area already there are major worries that a very low level waste site will mean fewer visitors and business unconnected with the nuclear industry will stay away. Young people in the area want to be able to choose different careers and not be wedded to the nuclear industry. We should be aiming to diversify not more of the same.
4 – Community benefits	No	A benefits package must not disadvantage any community. Look at the new road from Howgate to Lilyhall. A real benefit for everyone saw Parton people where it is nigh on impossible to get into the flow of traffic especially when turning towards Whitehaven. If the package is negotiated by local authorities only then it is bound to be unfair to the host community who will suffer most. If a financial package is secured there needs to be an organisation quite separate from the local authorities administering the fund without councillors or at least executive/cabinet councillors being involved.
5 – Design and engineering	Not Sure	Is it not possible to provide more detail? It is said to be the initial opinions but these hardly amount to information on which any one could make an informed decision. Why cannot we be told what will happen to spoil if a host communities only agree on the basis that spoil is moved right away. It is not good enough to keep repeating that issues will be sorted out later. That might be when the area is left with no choice but to stay in the process.
6 – Inventory	Not Sure	Why cannot it be said now that everything that the government decides will go in will go in? Talk of local people negotiating or having an influence about the inventory is beyond belief. The only possible involvement might be the size of the prize (see community benefits).
7 – Siting process	No	The consultation document refers to credible support and the only way that can be measured is by allowing every individual who might be affected a vote. An opinion survey, however it is argued that it will be accurate, does not allow the individual to have their say. This is the only democratic way that credible support can be calculated. It would not be expensive given that there is to be a poll for police commissioners this autumn and the cost of the election/referendum could be shared. Now is the time for a referendum because once the next stage is reached different areas are considered and people might be content that if a GDF is sited many miles away but would not agree if it were on their doorstep. If only a very small poll were undertaken at a later date then those who opposes in principle would be denied a say. A democratic mandate is required by the borough

		councils and the county council before they can justify entering the next stage.
8 – Overall views on participation		We would need much more detail and the agreement to a referendum on whether the area should enter the stage where a search for a site in Copeland and Allerdale is started before we could agree to move forward.