

Dear sir/madam,

My email bounced back. Here is my comment again:

Cumbria has already been assessed and rejected for safe storage of nuclear waste. In that study it was concluded that the wider topography/geology of the region would tend to force any leaking waste upwards into the sea, and thence into the food chain, and that locally the geology was not sufficiently homogenous, stable and crack-free to prevent any such leaks. Furthermore the geology is iron-rich, so that ground water passing through a storage chamber would be corrosive to containers/vitrification over the time-period required.

There are other areas of the country, e.g. areas of Norfolk, which don't have these problems, and so would be suitable.

The Government has put itself, through a misguided and irresponsible policy of asking for Authorities to volunteer to store this material, in the position of having only one option, i.e. storage under Cumbria, which has now been vetoed under the decision framework of the time. It appears that the political solution to this impasse is to change the decision framework, i.e. to cut out the objecting Authority. This is a desperate attempt to present a solution which has already proven unworkable by an experienced and knowledgeable panel of scientists.

Better would be to do what other countries have done - to study the whole of the United Kingdom and assess which areas are geologically suitable; and then proceed from there. It is the only sensible and workable solution to this problem; no new nuclear facilities should come on line until this is resolved. This is the most important action we as a country will take; it would be a crime against our children and grandchildren, and other species, to compromise long-term certainty for short-term political popularity/gain.

Yours sincerely

Jonathan Heriz-Smith

--

HERIZ • PAYNE

Jonathan Heriz-Smith, Dip.Arch. RIBA
Director

Heriz Payne Ltd
33a High Street
Glastonbury
Somerset
BA6 9HT

Tel: REDACTED
Fax: REDACTED

email: REDACTED