

#### Question 4

I have no issue with the approach taken but I am concerned about the next step following the production of the package of outputs for each geological region.

I attended the London seminar and understand that once geological surveys are completed local authorities in regions which "show promise" will be offered inducements to undertake more work in their regions to better understand the suitability of the local geology. I also understand that this "courting" of local authorities has already begun.

Before any local authority is approached another filter should be applied otherwise sizeable amounts of public money will be wasted, that is - **whether London will tolerate a geological disposal facility (GDF) located in the south.**

My understanding is that waste must be transported by rail, rather than road and that a GDF in the south would require all waste travelling through London – it is assumed the government would not commit to an exclusive new dedicated railway line, given the expense and the line's visibility. A facility say near Dungeness would require all waste from the other nuclear power stations going through London, whereas a facility in the North would only require waste from Dungeness travelling through the capital. **Thus it should first be established whether London Boroughs will tolerate high amounts of waste traversing their boundaries.**

The awareness of waste transport through London is very low. It would not take much for a well organised campaign- helped by say the London Mayor and/or other relevant council leaders/ politicians - to create a major political storm about waste travelling through the capital. As a result of this opposition, a geographically suitable site in the South could then be forced to be abandoned. Therefore, it is absolutely imperative that this issue is resolved before money is wasted on seducing local authorities.

**Louise Barton**

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

