



Friday 6th September 2019

Mr Richard Price
Case Officer A303 Stonehenge - Planning Inspectorate
Via email to richard.price@pins.gsi.gov.uk and A303Stonehenge@pins.gsi.gov.uk

My registration number 20020846

Dear Sirs,

Confirmation and queries of points raised at the PINS A303 Stonehenge hearings on 21st & 29th August 2019 and other matters

I refer to points made by myself during all hearings I was present and in response to hearing discussions on 21st and 29th August and wish to re-iterate my concerns and discuss further matters.

I also wish to seek confirmation that requests that have been raised by the PINS on my behalf have been addressed and not ignored by Highways England in hope that they may be considered irrelevant and go away, because they won't!

21st August 2019 – Issue Specific Hearing 8

Cultural heritage, landscape and visual effects and design

Agenda Item 3.2 Mr Keith Nicol of DCMS stated that the value and cost benefit is the critical factor that prevents the tunnel length being extended further than that proposed.

I asked what, therefore, in monetary terms makes the scheme “unaffordable”. Mr Nicol responded to the affect that the scheme value is currently at the “upper” value and anything more than a further £100m above the current costs would make the scheme unaffordable.

Agenda Item 9. Any Other Matters I asked that if more than £100m extra costs would make the Stonehenge Tunnel unaffordable in terms of value and cost benefit, how can Highways England seek accurate tenders when there is likely to be significant unforeseen ground conditions.

It is a known fact in construction contracts that the largest additional costs that often bankrupt contractors is unforeseen ground conditions.

I therefore ask Highways England to demonstrate how they can deliver the scheme within the approved budget, without knowing the extent of ground works and remediation required.

Agenda Item 6. Landscape and Visual

I asked Highways England where the emergency and breakdown vehicles would be positioned within the scheme and how this area would be lit?

Highways England resisted answering my question and continued to state that there is to be no external lighting on the scheme. When I asked for the fourth time if there was to be lighting in the emergency and breakdown areas, Highways England stated that there would be, but this would be contractors lighting?

My question remains, how does Highways England propose to deliver a working dual carriageway through a World Heritage landscape, with tunnel portals and regular contra flows, emergency vehicle laybys with no “external lighting”?

May I request that the Inspectorate does not accept the argument that the lighting would be “temporary” because the number of occurrences predicted, based on the Hindhead tunnel statistics will make this occurrence “regular” and this will significantly impact the OUV of the World Heritage Site. This will be a particular problem at the Western portal region where there will be night sky glow regularly from the additional lighting required and this could occur during solstice sunset celebrations.

Agenda Item 6.2 Visual

At the hearing I asked why the photomontages for the view from the Grade 1 listed Amesbury Abbey gardens, of the proposed Countess flyover alongside the river Avon were not reproduced despite pointing out that they were in error and misleading at the site meeting on 21st May 2019 and new photos were taken.

The planning inspectorate followed up my question and requested that as the new photo’s had been taken, to satisfy the argument Highways England were to produce new photomontages.

I would like to know why these have not yet been submitted? And when we expect to see them? It should be noted that this missing photomontage is an important document and will inform the inspectorate and the owners and residents of Amesbury Abbey Private Nursing Home the significant impact this scheme will have on the Grade 1 listed building and grade 2* Abbey parkland.

May I also request why the photomontages for the same views from Bowles Hatches have not been submitted yet?

In addition photomontages 7.102, 7.107 and 7.91 are all in error and require redrawing.

7.102 fails to show the layout for the regular contraflow arrangements and the signage relevant.

7.107 fails to show the vehicles on the existing road which were captured on the day the photo was taken at Blick Mead and does not show the level of the new road which grade separates at this point.

7.91 shows a green bridge due East that is so large it could change the timings of sunrise for the village of Winterbourne Stoke. This requires an accurate redraw.

Flood risk, groundwater protection, geology and land contamination

Agenda Item 3.2

How can Highways England guarantee that the vast volume of contaminated rain water that falls to the lowest point of the tunnel from both East and West portals can be adequately pumped up to 24hrs a day (when called for) and what mitigation measures will be in place in the event of a power failure?

Agenda Item 8.

What is Highways England's local impact mitigation strategy for any unforeseen damage to the hydrogeology, aquifers and fissures feeding the wider landscape and at what stage would work cease for investigation?

Other Matters

I would like Highways England to explain why they wrote on 29th July stating that Blick Mead was dry during June 2019, when clearly this was incorrect and now having seen my video of 14th June 2019 how they can prove that no changes will take place to the water table in this location.

At the opening hearing on 2nd April 2019 I asked if the planning inspectorate had been handed a copy of the deeds of Stonehenge dated 31st December 1915, between Sir Cosmo Antrobus and Cecil Chubb as these contained restrictive covenants relating to the landscape surrounding Stonehenge and preserved the integrity of the Stone Circle. These covenants are in the public interest, have not been extinguished and will require addressing and satisfying before any development works can be undertaken. Highways England's response confused the covenants with the conditions placed on the deed of gift of the stone circle to the Nation in October 1918. Further, Highways England have inferred that they have searched for the deeds without success and therefore deem them missing and consequently unenforceable.

This is not the case, the deeds, need to be located and presented to the planning inspectorate with a satisfactory explanation as to how the scheme can be delivered without breaching the covenants.

I therefore request that this matter is dealt within a timely manner and in the public interest.

Site Visits

On a number of occasions I have requested that Highways England arrange a site visit for interested parties to observe the proposed diversionary routes for HGV and other vehicles in the event of regular tunnel closures. I note with utter dismay that this has not been provided and am concerned that the unaccompanied visit that recently took place has not taken into

account the unacceptable routes that large HGV lorries from Solstice park will have to take if the tunnel is closed West bound or any barred vehicles that cannot use the tunnel.

I would like Highways England to show a comprehensive map showing all alternative diversionary routes for local HGV traffic.

Please can you confirm safe receipt of this email.

Yours sincerely,



Andrew Rhind-Tutt