

## Section 2 - Your Representation

Here you should summarise the aspects of the *application* you agree and/ or disagree with and say why. Outline what information, local knowledge or evidence you have which supports this. Please aim to limit this section to no more than 500 words (please use extra paper if needed).

I STRONGLY OBJECT TO THE WHOLE PROPOSED SCHEME BECAUSE:

### 1) ARCHAEOLOGY

- a) AREA AROUND STONEHENGE IS A WORLD HERITAGE SITE, SO DEVELOPMENT SHOULD NOT BE ALLOWED WHICH COULD REVERSELY AFFECT THIS. THE PROPOSED TUNNEL IS MUCH TOO SHORT, WITH INTRUSIVE DEEP CUTTINGS AND LARGE DOUBLE TUNNEL PORTALS WITHIN THE W.H.S.
- b) ROAD WOULD ONLY PARTIALLY BE REMOVED FROM VIEW/AUDIBILITY, AND PROPOSED HUGE MODERN CONSTRUCTION OF DISPROPORTIONATE SCALE TO PREHISTORIC ONES WOULD DIMINISH THEIR SENSE OF AWE AND WONDER.
- c) WESTERN END OF TUNNEL IS TOO NEAR VERY IMPORTANT GROUP OF LONG BARROWS AND A BRONZE AGE SETTLEMENT.
- d) RISK OF HARM TO BLICK MEAD NEOLITHIC SITE (EG. DUE TO HYDROLOGY CHANGES) AND ITS SETTING. GROUND WHICH MAY CONTAIN UNDISCOVERED
- e) A LARGE AREA OF ARCHAEOLOGY WITHIN THE FOOTPRINT OF THE SCHEME WOULD BE TOTALLY DESTROYED. ARCHAEOLOGICAL EXCAVATIONS, HOWEVER CAREFUL, ARE IMPERFECT, SO THIS RISKS LOSING IMPORTANT INFORMATION FOR FUTURE GENERATIONS, WHO MAY HAVE IMPROVED TECHNIQUES.
- f) RISK OF ACCIDENTAL DAMAGE TO ARCHAEOLOGY, AS WITH ANY LARGE CONSTRUCTION PROJECT INCREASED BY HIGH DENSITY OF VALUABLE OR LIKELY UNDISCOVERED ARCHAEOLOGY IN PROXIMITY OF SCHEME. (ALREADY ONE SUCH INCIDENT AT BLICKMEAD MESOLITHIC PLATFOOT)
- g) EXPERT INTERNATIONAL ADVISORS TO UNESCO ARE OFFENDED TO THIS SCHEME.
- h) STONEHENGE RISKS LOSING DESIGNATION AS A WORLD HERITAGE SITE IF SCHEME WERE TO BE BUILT.   
 THIS
- i) PROJECTED LIFETIME OF SCHEME VERY SHORT (ONLY 120 YRS) COMPARED TO PERMANENT HARM TO ARCHAEOLOGICAL LANDSCAPE VALUED BY HUMANITY FOR THOUSANDS OF YEARS.
- j) LOSS OF FREE VIEWS OF STONEHENGE FOR MOTORISTS TRAVELLING PAST.
- k) OUTSTANDING VALUE OF THE WHOLE STONEHENGE PREHISTORIC LANDSCAPE, FAMOUS THROUGHOUT THE WORLD, DESERVES MORE TIME (AND IF NECESSARY EXPENSE) TO ACHIEVE A BETTER TRAFFIC SCHEME THAT AVOIDS DAMAGE TO ALL ARCHAEOLOGY (EG. A LONGER TUNNEL OR A SURFACE ROUTE WELL AWAY FROM ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES)

### 2) OTHER LANDSCAPE ISSUES

- a) SCHEME STILL CLEARLY RECOGNIZABLE AS A ROAD, WITH CUTTINGS, TUNNEL ENTRANCE, NOISE & POSSIBLY LIGHT (INC VEHICLES ON FLYOVER) - ROAD HASN'T 'DISAPPEARED'.
- b) DOUBLE-DECK VIADUCT AND ROUNDABOUT FLYOVER WOULD BE LARGE, INCONGRUOUS MODERN STRUCTURES IN A RURAL AREA.
- c) VIEWS ON P.R.O.W.S WEST OF SCHEME & NEAR RIVER TILL WOULD BE SPOILED.
- d) ALL VEHICLES UNABLE TO USE TUNNEL STILL SEEN USING DIVERSION CONTD ON PAPER

P.2.

Please check that you have completed all relevant sections, otherwise you may not be able to take part in the later stages of the *Examination*.

Please sign your form and give today's date, below:

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Date 10. January 2019.

The Planning Act 2008 process is primarily a written *Examination* process and if you are registered as an *Interested Party* you will have an opportunity, later in the *Examination* process, to provide a more detailed *Written Representation*.

You cannot reserve a right to make a *Representation* later without providing a summary of the points you intend to submit at this stage.

Your *Representation* should take the form of a summary of what you agree with and/ or disagree within the *application*, and any impacts you think it would have.

Please note that your *Representation* **must not** include material that is:

- vexatious or frivolous;
- about compensation for Compulsory Acquisition of land or of any *interest* in or right over land; or
- about the merits of policy set out in a National Policy Statement.

The information you include in the *Representation* section of this form will be used by the *Examining Authority* to carry out its *Initial Assessment of Principle Issues* and to decide the best way to examine the *application*.

3) WILDLIFE

- a) DISTURBANCE TO RARE BIRDS (STONE CURLEW AND GREAT BUSTARD).
- b) LOSS OF COUNTESS CUTTING COUNTY WILDLIFE SITE.

4) RECREATION / TOURISM

- a) SCHEME ONLY IMPROVES VIEWS AND TRANQUILITY IN CERTAIN LOCATIONS WHILE WORSENING OTHERS.
- b) VISITORS WISHING TO STAY LONGER TO EXPLORE AND LEARN ABOUT WHOLE STONEHENGE-RELATED LANDSCAPE (THUS REDUCING TRAFFIC) MAY BE PUT OFF BY LARGE CUTTINGS & TUNNEL SCARRING LANDSCAPE.
- c) CURRENTLY VISITORS CAN CHOOSE TO AVOID BUSY TRAFFIC PERIODS, WHEREAS THE NEW ROAD SCHEME WOULD BE PRESENT YEAR-ROUND, THE WHOLE TIME.
- d) MANY PROPOSED ACCESS IMPROVEMENTS (OR ALTERNATIVES) COULD OCCUR ANYWAY WITHOUT NEED FOR THIS DAMAGING SCHEME.

5) TRANSPORT / ECONOMY

- a) ROAD IMPROVEMENTS OFTEN ATTRACT INCREASING TRAFFIC, WITH RESULTING PROBLEMS, THUS SOON BECOMING OBSOLETE. NO FURTHER 'IMPROVEMENTS' WOULD BE POSSIBLE HERE - THEREFORE UNDERLYING TRAFFIC ISSUES SHOULD BE ADDRESSED AT SOURCE. (EG IMPROVE PUBLIC TRANSPORT TO WEST COUNTRY).
- b) SCHEME IS RATED 'POOR VALUE FOR MONEY'.

6) SPIRITUAL

I BELIEVE IT IS MORALLY IRRESPONSIBLE AND DISRESPECTFUL TO THE CLEAR REVERENCE AND IMPORTANCE ATTACHED TO THIS UNIQUE LANDSCAPE OVER THOUSANDS OF YEARS BY NUMEROUS CULTURES FROM THOSE WHO BUILT MONUMENTS TO MODERN-DAY PILGRIMS, TO PHYSICALLY DESTROY PART ~~OF~~ OF THAT LANDSCAPE AND THE WISDOM IT MAY HOLD FOR FUTURE GENERATIONS, UNDER GUISE OF 'IMPROVING' ~~THE~~ COSMETICALLY, FOR A POSSIBLY VERY SMALL AND TEMPORARY ECONOMIC GAIN.

PAGE 2