

Submitted by:

Mr Chris Knowles
REDACTED
REDACTED
REDACTED
REDACTED

Email: REDACTED

I am responding as a private individual.

5th December 2013

Consultation Questions

- 1. Do you agree that a test of public support should be taken before the representative authority loses the Right of Withdrawal? If so, what do you think would be the most appropriate means of testing public support, and when should it take place? If you do not agree with the need for such a test, please explain why.**

There has been a clear test of public support for a GDF in Cumbria in the previous process. This admirably reflected the principles of localism with the public expressing their views to local town and parish councils. This resulted in the overwhelming vote to reject a GDF by the Cumbria Association of Local Councils. These views were then listened to by Cumbria County Council who voted no. The yes decisions by the two Borough Councils were taken by the Executive and was politically biased and did not represent the views of the overall council or the electorate.

Any test of public support must reflect the views of all affected people, which at a minimum should be the County involved. To suggest that it is not the concern of the residents and businesses in a National Park that is being considered for World Heritage status is cynical, blinkered hypocrisy.

- 2. Do you agree with the proposed amendments to decision making within the MRWS siting process? If not, how would you modify the proposed phased approach, or, alternatively, what different approach would you propose? Please explain your reasoning.**

I strongly disagree with the proposed decision making process. It is a disgraceful attempt to disenfranchise the local population and their elected representatives leaving the decision making to a handful of compliant individuals in Borough council executive committees. The original process failed to engender trust in what was being proposed. This latest charade reinforces the view that the decision to have a GDF in Cumbria has been made and it will be steamrolled through no matter what. You have deeply angered a lot of people. We live in a democracy. The people have spoken and because you don't like the answer you are callously manipulating the process.

Why are the rules for England different from Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland? Scotland can opt out whilst moving their waste to Cumbria; Wales and Northern Ireland counties can still vote but English counties can't!! What gives you people the right to take away our democratic rights without a full and open debate and new laws being passed?

- 3. Do you agree with this approach to revising roles in the siting process set out in the**

White Paper? If not, what alternative approach would you propose and why?

My comments above address this. It is quite breathtaking that you can so blatantly go against the wishes of a community that have understood what is involved and have rejected the proposals so categorically.

4. **Do you agree with this proposed approach to assessing geological suitability as part of the MRWS siting process? If not, what alternative approach would you propose and why?**

Once again you are changing the rules to suit the solution you want. The geology of Cumbria is probably the best known in the UK given the previous attempts to foist these sorts of plans on us. Even the geologist employed by the previous MRWS process agreed it was highly unlikely that a suitable site could be found in the area.

5. **Do you agree with this proposed approach to planning for a GDF? If not, what alternative approach would you propose and why?**

Another cynical attempt to change the rules as you know local planning regulations and other restrictions around National Parks, SSSI's, AONB's etc. would not allow the investigatory drilling let alone the GDF itself.

The process is deeply flawed. If Cumbria was excluded from the process (as it should be having already rejected a GDF) the majority of the changes suggested would not be in the proposal. The lessons learned from the original process are that finding the correct geology following international guidelines that can be trusted is the first priority. At that point only those areas identified should be asked to volunteer to take part. Of course no one will as you well know, which is why you continue to focus on the blinkered West Cumbria councils who believe they have no other possible source of work other than nuclear.