

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [A303 Stonehenge](#)  
**Subject:** Comments on agenda items Hearing 9 22 August 2019  
**Date:** 26 August 2019 17:04:45  
**Attachments:** [1 BHS Subject Specific Hearing 22.8.19 Traffic and Transportation Agenda item 3 comments.docx](#)  
[2 BHS Subject Specific Hearing Traffic and Transportation 22.8.19 Agenda item 4 comments.docx](#)

---

Dear EXA

I was unable to attend Hearing 9 last Thursday due to a funeral, but if possible would like to add my comments on certain of the Agenda items, see the attached documents.

Best wishes  
Myra Bennett

British Horse Society, Wiltshire County Access Officer

**Subject Specific Hearing Traffic and Transportation  
22 August 2019  
Representation from Myra Bennett on behalf of the  
British Horse Society, Wiltshire**

**Agenda items 4.1 and 4.2**

As I have previously commented in a written representation, byways 11 and 12 are major routes up onto the WHS, and with the new, off-road routes proposed over the WHS for walkers, cyclists and horse riders, some way has to be found to ensure that there is as little conflict as possible between motorised users and NMUs on these byways. If this is not done, walkers, cyclists and horse riders may feel less able to access and enjoy the new routes over the WHS as a result of ground conditions and crowding and vulnerability fears on byways 11 and 12.

My comments are:

(1) (as suggested in my previous written representation) that motorised users and non-motorised users are segregated on byways 11 and 12 along their entire length, thus preserving their enjoyment for everyone.

(2) that the TRF's proposed motorcycle-only link between byways 11 and 12 will be difficult to police and that there will still be 4WDs turning at the dead-end junction of byway 11 and the restricted byway formed from the old A303, creating the chaos anticipated by the TRF. In addition, some 4WD users will inevitably attempt to use the restricted link.

(3) that if the byways are to remain open to motorised traffic, it would be better to provide a full byway link of byways 11 and 12, on a separate route alongside the short section of the old A303, with motorised users segregated from the RB, and perhaps with a one-way system in place, for instance up byway 11 and onto byway 12.

**Agenda items 4.3 and 4.4**

I am against the use of the length of the old A303 for small capacity motorised vehicles including motorcycles. I personally feel that the use of motorised vehicles is inevitably detrimental (a) to the tranquility of an area, and (b) to the peace and security of NMUs using off-road rights of way. One of the legacies of the proposed expensive and controversial transformation of the WHS should be tranquility, where it can be provided.

# **1 Subject Specific Hearing Traffic and Transportation 22 August 2019**

## **Representation from Myra Bennett on behalf of the British Horse Society, Wiltshire**

### **Agenda item 3.8 NMC-06**

I note that the amendment downgrades part of the originally proposed new restricted byway (from the new Longbarrow Roundabout and Green Bridge 4 north as far as the old A344) to a shared use cycleway (cyclists and pedestrians) over its most northerly end.

Highways England has described equestrians and carriage drivers coming to the end of the restricted byway at its northerly end as exiting onto the A360 and proceeding round Airman's Corner roundabout to the course of the old A344, but HE does not explain how it will be ensured that horses and carriage drivers are safely to exit onto the A360, nor the fact that this route brings vulnerable users into direct conflict with busy visitor and local traffic as it approaches Airman's Corner (see 9.5.4, p41 Proposed Changes Consultation booklet).

In the same safety vein, neither Option A nor Option B addresses the obvious danger of cyclists and pedestrians crossing directly over the entrance to the visitor centre car park.

I find the NMC-06 amendment to be poorly thought out in its practicality, leaving aside its impact on excluded equestrians and carriage drivers.

I would recommend that HE think again about the merits of compulsory acquisition to lead a new restricted byway round the south side of the car park and the east side of the visitor centre to join the course of the restricted byway formed by the old A344. (See 9.1.2-4 p35 Proposed Changes Consultation Booklet).

### **Agenda item 3.9**

In the case that HE decide not to put in the route round the car park and visitor centre via the use of CA (which I submit would be a missed opportunity in the overall scheme of things) walkers, cyclists and pedestrians would still benefit from a way onto the WHS from the Visitor Centre car park that does not involve entering the Visitor Centre. The new restricted byway, if extended to the southern end of the car park, could provide this. It should be a restricted byway so that equestrians and carriage drivers can enjoy its use even if they have to turn back the way they have come at the A360..