

Portinscale Artists

| Question | Agree | Response |
|---|-------|---|
| 1 – Geology | No | There is the largest rainfall in England in the area (described as West Cumbria although most of it is in North and South Cumbria). The water in the lakes is used as drinking water. Cumbria has the most diverse types of rock in the country therefore many fault lines between the various rocks. The storage of nuclear waste underground is not a proven technology – there are no sites in the world where such waste has been stored underground for any reasonable length of time. The fracking required to dig out such a site has caused earthquakes (Blackpool). There is a reasonable risk of destroying Britain’s favourite National Park. It seems there has been much arm twisting to ensure this goes ahead as there are no other ‘volunteers’. |
| 2 – Safety, security, environment and planning | No | This seems a substantial amount of research required before anyone can say it is safe to bury waste of this nature. It would seem that if there is progress to the next stage then it is likely the government will pass legislation to give them sole right of planning permission. Notwithstanding the government looking at comments of the various local planning boards the Secretary of State will be under substantial political pressure to ensure this goes through. Having already spent a lot of money the numbers of residents of the national park is small compared with Workington or Whitehaven (West Cumbria) and it is therefore likely their views will be overridden. The worst danger is to those areas under which the nuclear waste is deposited and its watershed. |
| 3 – Impacts | No | Whilst the job creation would be in West Cumbria (ie Workington and Whitehaven), the underground site is likely to be in North or Central Cumbria over which we have no say. The National Park employs at least 32000 people in the tourist industry. The additional long-term employment prospects for West Cumbria where the above site when finished might be would be about 500. Therefore for 500 jobs could potentially destroy 32000 jobs not counting the destruction of a possible World Heritage site at Britain’s favourite National Park. If or when there is any accident remunerative compensation for reduction in house price when sold is poor compensation for the majority who had chosen to live and work in the National Park. Hands off our National Park as a dumping ground for the country’s and I’ll bet in the future, world toxic nuclear waste. It has already been decided in Essex to ship their nuclear waste to Cumbria as they don’t want it in the South East. |
| 4 – Community benefits | No | <p>The benefits package is too vague to be sure. There is at present proportionally less government money going into West Cumbria (none into the rest of Cumbria) as opposed to the North East. Are they holding back so the benefits package looks better? No amount of benefits would compensate for the ruination of the National Park.</p> <p>The government is likely to be short of funds for a long time – can it afford substantial benefits. The siting of the above ground operations likely West Cumbrian coast – but the worst possible affects would be where the underground site was established – would this be recognised?</p> |
| 5 – Design and engineering | No | How could one agree to a design not yet formulated. It would appear that there would have to be some access as it is unknown how the highly toxic materials will react over a long period of time. The lead and glass covering of the materials are bound to deteriorate leading to leaking underground and possibly over a long period, probable destruction of the environment. Too little is known about storage of materials of this nature. They are much better being stored at each nuclear site rather than Cumbria being the toxic dustbin of the UK. |

| | | |
|---|----|---|
| 6 – Inventory | No | <p>The government are assuming this site will go ahead as they have no other area stupid enough to volunteer. I have already heard that closing nuclear power stations around the country are planning to send their nuclear waste to Sellafield whether or not a suitable geological site is found. The government are therefore proposing to bury everything under the Lakes for at least the next 130 years. Once a site is identified the government is proposing to change planning rules so whatever we say will not count. There is no way they would look for a new site for the waste from the new nuclear power stations. They'll try and bribe us with a new hospital to treat all the people affected by the toxic dump on our doorstep which will last longer than the earth. West Cumbria is making decisions which affect the people in the National Park much more. I understand nuclear waste from abroad (Japan) has been dumped on Sellafield for the last 30 years. Are we so poor that Cumbria will be the world's toxic waste site.</p> |
| 7 – Siting process | No | <p>I notice that where an area disagrees with siting in their area, this may be overridden by governing local authority if they think it would make it difficult to find the right site. This riding roughshod over local opinion. Whitehaven and Workington are keen for this to go ahead under any circumstances and as only they have volunteered so is the government – it's far enough away from London and the South East. When in the final vote comes any referendum would include the larger voting area on the West Coast – which would override the smaller population in North Cumbria who are stuck with West Cumbria councils to make the weight of numbers. Any referendum should include the underground siting areas on their own including the 25 km tunnels. The last place where it should be sited is in Cumbria. There are much better geological sites elsewhere.</p> |
| 8 – Overall views on participation | | <p>Allerdale and Copeland do not represent the views of people in North Cumbria despite our being lumped in with them. We have nothing in common. We are being dragged through this process against our wishes. It is the most ludicrous suggestion to site plutonium, uranium etc under a probable World Heritage area. It should never have been considered and we should stop now.</p> |
| 9 – Additional comments | | <p>Too many acronyms without knowing what these mean.</p> <p>I have heard on television Cumbria described as the sink of Britain. This is because – without our consent or knowledge highly toxic nuclear waste has already been sent to Cumbria to store above ground. How are much more would it be the sink of Britain with possible at least 25 cubic km being transported and stored under or near a National Park. Tourism, by far the biggest earner and employer, would be decimated. Parts of West Cumbria are still throwing milk away from 1957 accident. How much worse for the environment would it be for 25 cubic km of nuclear waste being buried using unproven technology.</p> |
| | | |