

M & R HOSIER REP: 20020373 – COMMENT ON VIEWS PROVIDED BY THE APPLICANT AT DEADLINE 7

[AS-079] LVIA Figure 7.97

Dynamic view 3 from proposed PRoW and PMA within the WHS looking east.

We agree that it is an improvement not to see the lorries within the location and congratulate the photographer for capturing so many lorries on such a small stretch of road at the same time for the baseline image.

We are not sure why the PRoW has only got fencing along one side, as this is of no practical use for prevention of trespass to private land.

We still disagree with the requirement for this new PRoW within the WHS, especially as the visual shows the lack of inter-visibility of monuments within the sightline of the area.

The location plan accompanying the views shows the area where the dynamic view was taken from. However, it does not show the location of the western portal or green bridge 4. This omitted detail is important, as from initial assessment it looks as if the western portal has not been placed in the correct location. It could simply be that the visual has just used the same uniform block to depict the chalk grassland rather than adding any perspective to the grassland around the western portal. Therefore, we trust this is a perspective issue rather than an error.

[AS-080] LVIA Figure 7.98

Dynamic view 4 from southern edge of green bridge 4, looking east.

From first impressions, it appears that the Applicant has raised the ground level to the height of the oilseed rape crop (in the baseline summer view). This inflated ground level has been carried over onto the view shown on proposed (summer year 15) photomontage. This has the effect of misrepresenting the true visual impact of the western portal. For a more accurate representation, the Applicant would need to reduce the ground level by 4-5 feet. The topography of the green bridge 4 is such that, at its southern most section, it is in the bottom of the dry valley, so from here it will be looking up the valley to the western portal.

[AS-081] LVIA Figure 7.99

Dynamic view 5 from the centre part of green bridge 4, looking east

[REP-024] OEMP Annex 4A, Key Principles A, P-PWS02 references *“colours in keeping with the surrounding landscape and to echo local materials. The design should adopt an earthy tone to create spaces which are warm and natural in appearance.”* In our opinion, the retaining cutting walls depicted within the visuals stand out in stark contrast, rather than blending into the landscape. The eye is drawn to these features.

The views provided do not offer any feeling of greater interconnectivity to the monuments within the WHS. Indeed, my focus is on the cutting and portal, as there are no monuments visible from this location, apart from the top of the longbarrow of the Diamond Group.

[AS-082] LVIA Figure 7.10

Dynamic view 6 from the proposed restricted byway (former A303) looking east

We had asked the Applicant to provide a view from the proposed restricted byway (former A303) down onto the location of the western portal, to establish how much of the portal and retaining walls would be seen at this position. However, the Applicant has provided this image from the current layby next to Winterbourne Stoke Clump (wood) instead.

[AS-083] LVIA Figure 7.101

View from the eastern edge of green bridge 4 looking east

This view is terrible! The eye is drawn more to the walls than the road and completely misses the brief as stated within OEMP Under Vision, 4.2.10 (a) *“should maximise the concealment of structures and features outside of the tunnel”* and *“choice of materials and colour tone and finishes”* Under Key Principals A, OEMP P-PWS02 *“the colours to be in keeping with the surrounding landscape, and to echo local materials”* and B, OEMP P-PWS03 *“The surface finish of the western cutting retaining walls (within the WHS) to be in keeping with the character of the surrounding landscape.”*

This view highlights the issue that the Scheme is just replacing a single carriageway with a double carriageway within the WHS.

The view from green bridge 4 is equivalent to any bridge over any dual carriageway anywhere in the country. In this instance it just happens to be situated within the WHS. There is no inter-visibility to the monuments and we do not believe the Vision 4.2.6 (a) *“has taken into consideration the unique historic landscape in which it sits”*, and in our opinion this does not meet the brief in relation to OUV and the WHS.

[AS-084] LVIA Figure 7.102

View from the western edge of green bridge 4 looking east

The proposed (summer year 15) view speaks for itself.

This could be taken from any bridge over a dual carriageway and in our opinion with the noise of the traffic this does not, as per [REP-024] OEMP Annex 4A *“take full account of the character of the unique historic landscape”* in which the bridge sits. Added to this the objective to *“ensure visibility of the Scheme is minimised, the design is elegant and impacts positively on the user experience of the WHS”* is not achieved.

To conclude, the positive benefits of removing the road into a tunnel within the central part of the Scheme are overwhelmingly let down by the intrusion of the new dual carriageway at the western end of the WHS. We find it hard to believe that the organisations charged with protecting our

heritage are endorsing such modern infrastructure within the WHS, but it may be because this section is of little importance to them, as it is under private ownership.

In our opinion, [AS-084], [AS-083] and [AS-081] illustrate the importance of extending the tunnel so the western portal emerges outside the WHS, or underlying the need to consider an alternative route that goes around the WHS.