

Hi,

Please find attached the SSG response to the GDF consultation.

Kind regards,

Steven Turner
Communications Specialist
Research Sites Restoration Limited
392.10 Rutherford Avenue
Harwell Oxford
Didcot
OX11 0DF

Tel: REDACTED

Fax: REDACTED

REDACTED

www.research-sites.com

Please submit general enquiries via rsrl.enquiries@research-sites.com

SSG response to GDF Consultation

Question1

We agree but a Referendum of the electorate is essential to ensure that the consent or otherwise of the local populace is valid. This should be held after the proposed location is shown to be suitable . Note the boundary may be wider than the District if it is to properly include the affected community.

We are concerned that the general public has little awareness of the GDF proposals and raising of national awareness is essential so the public understands the need and what is involved if informed decisions are to be made.

Question2

We agree but care should be taken to keep the Consultative Partnership to a reasonable size .If it were too big it would become unwieldy. However it must include representatives of the affected community.

Question3

We agree but the independent verification must be truly independent and non-political to ensure public trust. Option 3 in 2.85 is probably the way forward, based on a pool of peer reviewers or a new independent advisory board.

Question4

We agree but again independent technical review of all processes are needed . We have concerns that Volunteering may not give an answer but it is the starting point.

Question5

We agree. Non-intrusive geophysical investigations will give timely provision of new geological information to local communities.

Question6

We agree but it is important to give full clarification of the inventory which is lacking at present. This must include Volumes, classification including half-lives and Origin. It will be difficult to gain a public understanding of the inventory but it is important to try.

Question 7

We agree. There is a a need to establish a GDF somewhere and we accept that the only way forward is for the government to come up with a sufficiently generous socio-economic package to attract at least one or possibly more contenders . The package should be for the lifetime of the GDF. Funding during consultation is essential as is compensation for disruption during construction. The potential scope of the package must be made clear from the start of the process. There is also no

information on what would happen to any waste arising from new nuclear stations beyond those currently proposed.

Question8

We agree National Parks, AONBs, SSSIs and other designated areas should be excluded from the visible workings. More information is needed on construction waste volume and disposal options and the environmental impact thereof.

Question9

The impact of construction and operation on the local area is not clear and again more information is essential.

We strongly support the need for a GDF to be built and operational as soon as practical to facilitate the final decommissioning of sites like Harwell.