

## **Representation informed by deadline 1 and subsequent submissions**

TR010025

Barry Garwood

The case for the Application is based on assumptions and on evidence that is unavailable or withheld.

See: The request by Andrew Rhind-Tutt for the deeds of covenant of transfer of ownership from Antrobus to Chubb (1915) and from Chubb to the Nation (1918), as acknowledged in the Preliminary Meeting Note.

Doc. ref: TR010025-000568

The response here is a supposed partial transcript of the 1918 document only. There is considerable redaction on the grounds that it is illegible but no copy has been provided.

There then follows an argument that the conditions of the covenant are not valid, which does not appear to have been fully tested.

See: The refusal of Highways England to conform with the request of David Jacques to provide additional hydrology monitoring at Blick Mead, submitted to deadline 1.

Doc. Ref: TR010025-000646

This does rather suggest an unwillingness to co-operate with the scientists. This point is further illustrated by the Applicant's position on releasing data on the geology of the proposed tunnel route.

See: The evidence of Dr G. M. Reeve representing Stonehenge Alliance that Highways England have been reluctant to present findings of recent geological surveys on the apparent grounds that they may be misinterpreted.

Dr Reeve refers to a key article on the geology in the vicinity of Stonehenge, published in 2017 by R.N. Mortimore et al., ( R.N. Mortimore, et al., "Stonehenge—a unique Late Cretaceous phosphatic Chalk geology: implications for sea level, climate and tectonics and impact on engineering and archaeology", Proc. Geol. Assoc. (2017). ).

He notes that this relates to data obtained in investigations during 2003/4 and does not include information on very weak Chalk found in more recent boreholes. It is understood that a lot of new geological information has since been obtained and that the current proposal considers a new alignment to that investigated by R.N. Mortimore et al., (2017)

Dr Reeve quotes the reply of Derek Parody of Highways England dated 1 November 2017 to a request by Stonehenge Alliance for the release of additional site investigation and borehole data.

*"Finally, I can confirm that we do hold some remaining information that is relevant to your request but regret to inform you of my decision not to disclose this at the current time."*

Dr Reeve then notes that following a further request by Kate Fielden, Stonehenge Alliance were given special access to some subsequent borehole data from early 2017 and a subsequent report published later that year, none of which is in the public domain.

It is noted that considerable further investigations have taken place since, but the findings have not been released. As such the Application is based on interpretations of data that cannot be verified and evidence that has not been presented for public scrutiny.

Doc. ref: TR010025-000753

See: The response of Winterbourne Stoke Parish Council and Dr A.D. Shuttleworth to a Written Question on the risks of radiation from elements found in Phosphatic Chalk that will need to be dumped as a result of tunnel arisings.

It is incredible that a Parish Council should be expected to provide a lead on the explanation of nuclear physics, but they have risen to the challenge and produced an elegant explanation of the isotopes likely to be found and associated risk.

The Application appears to consider only Radon gas as a risk and other potentially more dangerous isotopes in its sequence are ignored. It is noted that the work of Professor Rory Mortimore is once again cited as most helpful in informing this response.

Response to Written Question AQ.1.20, ref: TR010025-000689

R.N. Mortimore et al., (2017) does seem to be the definitive work on the Geology in the vicinity of Stonehenge. However Professor Mortimore confirms in correspondence that the paper is based on data from cores taken to inform the 2004 Public Inquiry and some further research he carried out on them. He confirms the current proposal is for a tunnel with different alignment and that Highways England have more recent and relevant data.

I submit that all relevant geological data be made available, at a minimum to Stonehenge Alliance, for credible scientific analysis that can properly inform the Examination of the Application.

I further submit that Highways England consider making this data available to Professor Mortimore if he would like to have it. Another paper would certainly be useful.

I request that the risk of radioactive material other than Radon be examined.

I submit a request that the 1918 deeds of covenant be made available to the Examination as a good quality reproduction, rather than a partial transcript. Making the original document available for sight to interested parties might also be helpful.

I request that more effort be made to find the 1915 deeds of covenant, or failing this any records that inform their content be considered.

I also request that the validity of these documents be examined as part of this Public Examination.