

From: Rollo Maughfling [REDACTED]
Sent: 16 July 2019 20:33
To: Richard Price <RICHARD.PRICE@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Subject: Page 107, Question 2.9.

Do I, and those whom I represent, consider that this shows an improvement over the current situation, and will improve the tranquillity of the WHS, thus improving the opportunity for quiet contemplation/enjoyment of the landscape?

No. I do not. The reason being that the studies presented, (Fig 9.4 and 2026 Do Something Noise Levels), are only at best, "guesstimates". They show what might reasonably be assumed to be proper "calculations", about the effect of the new scheme.

However they do not take into account two factors which will undoubtedly make a considerable difference, particularly in relation to the proposed western portal, i.e. topography, and wind direction.

Whereas the eastern portal, on the Amesbury side of the WHS, will be situated well below the brow of the hill, so that the noise generated by entry and exit, will, to all intents and purposes, fall back upon the Amesbury side of the King's Barrow ridge, rather than the Stonehenge side, the western portal situation is completely different.

To the West of Stonehenge, there is only a very slight and gradual rise towards the monument from Longbarrow crossroads, thus, whilst not quite visible from Stonehenge, nevertheless there is almost no natural barrier preventing entry and exit traffic noise from the western portal traversing the entire landscape.

Add to that a light south-westerly, common to Stonehenge, and suddenly traffic at high speed on a four track dual carriageway is not just impacting nearby archaeology/monuments/places of cultural/spiritual significance, it is directly impacting on Stonehenge itself.

Standing there today, the biggest noise impact of the A303, is not the section that runs in a slight dip alongside the monument, but the traffic coming down from King's Barrow ridge, which will be in a tunnel, and the traffic coming from Longbarrow crossroads, which will not.

These predictive surveys are all very well, but fail to take into account the real environment of Stonehenge, which is subject to both matters of local topography and wind direction, and will have its traffic noise problems made considerably worse by the proposed scheme, and the increased level of traffic that it will bring with it.

In a letter to the Guardian of Tues 11th Nov 2014, <https://www.theguardian.com/uk->

[news/2014/nov/11/druids-endorse-a-road-tunnel-at-stonehenge](https://www.theguardian.com/news/2014/nov/11/druids-endorse-a-road-tunnel-at-stonehenge), I asked for two things. Firstly, assurance that if the tunnel was to run any closer than 660 yards to the site of the monument, the present figure being 220 yards, then there needed to be guarantees that vibration damage to the substrata would not effect the monument itself.

Secondly, that all prospective noise and light and environmental pollution would be obviated by the building of a long tunnel, from Vespasian`s camp in the east, to Longbarrow crossroads in the west, passing completely beneath the entire Stonehenge bowl/landscape, and returning Stonehenge to its almost pristine 5000 year old noiseless environment.

For whatever reasons the Guardian chose to omit the fact that it was the long tunnel option that was being discussed at the time, by omitting the word "long" from my letter, and subsequently failing to print a correction for their mistake.

Nevertheless, for reasons discussed elsewhere, particularly in my summary of evidence given at oral hearing of 22/5/2019, there is no way in the world that I, or those whom I represent, can possibly countenance the construction of a short tunnel which would come up in the middle of the Stonehenge landscape, (instead of passing beneath all of it), thereby destroying the sacred landscape, for all time.

Elsewhere, the strength of feeling in relation to the sustainability of access to the droves has been discussed. Here, it is the addition of a further section of tunnel to the west, which will make the difference between an acceptable solution, and a total disaster, one which will bring opposition to the scheme from all sections of the community, not least the road protesters. Has the cost of such considerable opposition been factored into the proposal?

The Council of British Druid Orders represents 17 druid orders and approx. 20,000 druids. There are now an estimated quarter of a million pagans in this country alone, all of whom regard Stonehenge and the Stonehenge landscape as their spiritual "home", and will not take kindly to what they may therefore see as deliberate "vandalism" by Highways England, in situating a tunnel portal so close to Stonehenge itself, and slap bang in the middle of the World Heritage Site and all it`s other archaeology/monuments/places of cultural/spiritual significance.

As I said at the oral hearing of 22/5/2019, the threat of intensified noise and light pollution from a western portal situated so close to Stonehenge itself, and right in the middle of the World Heritage Site, is a conservation nightmare which I cannot strongly enough advise the Planning Inspectorate to avoid.

Rollo Maughfling, Archdruid of Stonehenge & Britain.
Stonehenge Officer, Council of British Druid Orders.
Co-Founder, English Heritage Round Table for Managed Open Access to Stonehenge.

See also:- Summary of evidence given at oral hearing of 22/5/2019 Public Inquiry into A303 Stonehenge.

Re Question HW1.6.

Document in relation to question HW1.6, Stonehenge Traffic Regulation Order Inquiry 22/6/2011, -- Byway 12, An Order for Variance.

Summary of evidence given at oral hearing of 12/6/2019, Public Inquiry into A303

Stonehenge, Issue Specific Hearing 5, 7.2.

Response to Wiltshire Council Legal Submission on Byways Ames 11 & 12.