

03 DEC 2013

26 November 2013

DECC Consultation
on the GDF Siting process

1. Do you agree that a test of public support should be taken before the representative authority loses the Right of Withdrawal?

Yes. Public support is essential and should be tested at every level from County to Parish.

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?

No I do not agree. I want to see the decision made by the County authority and the chair held by someone not engaged in the process.

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?

I am opposed to your suggestion. We still have no clarity about what constitutes a Host Community and yet you are prepared to designate the process and decision making to local rather than regional authorities. It seems very undemocratic to me.

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?

I want to see geological suitability with low cost of construction and safety the main priority in any siting process. The MOD owns a suitable site in East Anglia but it cannot volunteer. Talk to them. Look for suitable geology and low population.

5. Do you agree with this proposed approach to planning for the geological disposal facility?

Why diminish the role of the County Council to a Consultative one? This decision should be discussed and taken regionally

6. Do you agree with this clarification of the inventory for geological disposal – and how this will be communicated with the volunteer host community? If not, what alternative approach would you propose and why?

NO. You have yet to clarify who the Host Community is so it is not possible to suggest communication proposals or any alternative approach without establishing that.

7. Do you endorse the proposed approach to community benefits associated with a GDF. If not what alternative approach would you propose and why?

Community benefits will not replace the inevitable displacement of people and businesses. IF there is to be a GDF then careful selection of its site is essential. As above, seek a site of geological suitability and low population so that expensive "community benefits" and costs are kept to a minimum. I do not endorse the proposed approach.

8. Do you agree with the proposed approach to addressing potential socio-economic and environmental effects that might come from hosting a GDF? If not, what alternative approach would you propose and why?

Prioritise independent information and evaluation of both the economic and environmental impact. That needs to be actions rather than just words! This is why it is essential to have distance from the often economic vested interests of local councils or associated industries.

Yours sincerely

Mary P Lawley

Mary P Lawley).