



# **A303 Amesbury to Berwick Down (Stonehenge) Wiltshire TR010025**

## **Wiltshire Council (A303-AFP022) Response to Deadline 8 Submissions**

### **Contents**

1. Introduction .....	2
2. Comments on (Rev 6) Draft Development Consent Order [REP8-005] .....	2
3. Comments on (Rev 5) Outline Environmental Management Plan [REP8-007] .....	2
4. Comments on (Rev 4) Draft Detailed Archaeological Mitigation Strategy [REP8-009].....	3
5. Comments on the Trail Riders Fellowship Written Summaries of Oral Submissions at Issue Specific Hearings [REP8-055] .....	3
6. Conclusion .....	4

## 1. Introduction

- 1.1 Wiltshire Council has reviewed the Deadline 8 submissions and the Additional Submissions accepted into Examination subsequent to that Deadline. The Council's response to selected submissions is contained herein.
- 1.2 These comments are submitted without prejudice to any further representations the Council may wish to make during the Examination.

## 2. Comments on (Rev 6) Draft Development Consent Order [REP8-005]

- 2.1 The Council has reviewed the (Rev 6) Draft Development Consent Order (dDCO) [REP8-005].
- 2.2 Since the Deadline 8 submissions, the Council has been in intensive discussions with HE to finalise the core documents for submission at Deadline 9 (25<sup>th</sup> September). The Council is pleased to say that these discussions have been productive and that only the following issues remain from the Council's perspective.
- 2.3 The Council considers that the use of the word "improved" at Reference 38 within Schedule 3, Part 3 is misleading as there will be no junction from the improved A303 with Allington Track. The Council believes that the wording should be amended as follows: "...410m south east of existing junction of the A303 with Allington Track".
- 2.4 Furthermore, it is the Council's understanding that within the dDCO to be submitted at Deadline 9, Article 39 (2) will now read: "*Where the undertaker proposes to close the tunnel it must, except in an emergency, and subject to any tunnel closure management plan produced in accordance with paragraph 4 of Schedule 2-*". Whilst this amendment is broadly welcomed by the Council, the Council considers that instead of "*produced in accordance with paragraph 4 of Schedule 2*" it should be "*produced in accordance with the OEMP*". This is because the TCMP comes from the OEMP and not the plans as set out in paragraph 4 of Schedule 2.
- 2.5 From the early sight of the dDCO to be submitted by HE at Deadline 9, the Council notes there have been some additional amendments that are technical in nature, such as the additional Requirement regarding the replacement Stone Curlew breeding plot and the identification of specific routes as share-use cycle tracks. These will be reviewed by Council officers, and the Council's final position on these amendments will be confirmed at Deadline 10.
- 2.6 Finally, the Council is supportive of all of the ExA's proposed changes to the dDCO as outlined within PD-018. The Council notes that not all of these have been incorporated into the latest draft prepared by HE and it is the Council's position that they should.

## 3. Comments on (Rev 5) Outline Environmental Management Plan [REP8-007]

- 3.1 The Council has reviewed the (Rev 5) Outline Environmental Management Plan (OEMP) [REP8-007].
- 3.2 Since the Deadline 8 submissions, the Council has been in intensive discussions with HE to finalise the core documents for submission at Deadline 9 (25<sup>th</sup> September). The Council is pleased to say that these discussions have been productive.

- 3.3 It is the Council's understanding that a revised OEMP will be submitted by HE at Deadline 9. The Council will review this and inform the ExA of its position in advance of Deadline 10.

#### **4. Comments on (Rev 4) Draft Detailed Archaeological Mitigation Strategy [REP8-009]**

- 4.1 The Council has reviewed the (Rev 4) Draft Detailed Archaeological Mitigation Strategy (DAMS) [REP8-009].
- 4.2 Since the Deadline 8 submissions, the Council has been in intensive discussions with HE to finalise the core documents for submission at Deadline 9 (25<sup>th</sup> September). The Council and HE are very close to agreeing the few outstanding items on the DAMS.
- 4.3 The Council hopes that these items can be satisfactorily resolved by the close of the Examination so that a final version of the DAMS can be submitted to the ExA prior to Deadline 10. The Council will update the ExA on the Council's final position prior to Deadline 10.

#### **5. Comments on the Trail Riders Fellowship Written Summaries of Oral Submissions at Issue Specific Hearings [REP8-055]**

- 5.1 The Council has reviewed the Trail Riders Fellowship Written Summaries of Oral Submissions at Issue Specific Hearings submitted at Deadline 8 [REP8-055] and wishes to make the following comments on Agenda Item 4.1 (Amendments 1 to 4).

##### **Amendment 1:**

- 5.2 At paragraph 3, the Trail Riders Fellowship (TRF) consider that a width of 6-8 feet would be ample to enable two motorcycles to safely pass one another and that such a width would render the specified width Byways Opens to All Traffic (BOAT) width unsuitable for 4-wheel vehicles. At paragraph 4, the TRF suggests that there are many possibilities as to how a specified width BOAT could look and that "It would depend on how WC (as the proposed Highway Authority for the de-trunked A303) would want it to look." They suggest that it could be segregated from the adjacent Restricted Byway, or not, and that segregation could be, "by way of ditches, earth bunding, fencing, hedging, or a raised kerb or a combination of any of those things" and that there is no reason to think that the segregation would be "unattractive or discordant in context".
- 5.3 The Council considers that the TRF have failed to appreciate the practicalities and effects of physical means of segregation in the suggestions that they have put forward. Irrespective of the Council's position that it would not object in principle to the provision of a link for motorcycles between Byways AMES 11 and 12, using the route of what will become the former A303, the segregation of approximately 2.5 metres riding width within the present corridor which has a width of between 9.0 to 10.0 metres, with the addition of any of either ditches, earth bunding, fencing, hedging or raised kerbs, would reduce the width available for private use vehicles including agricultural users, to be shared with restricted byway users (pedestrians, equestrians including carriage drivers, cyclists and invalid carriages to no more than 6.0 to 7.0 metres, perhaps less, within which the existing proposals for the restricted byway include a 3.0 metre bound surface together with grass verges, however, these might be shared between these distinctly different (from one another) users. Whilst motorcycles would not be part of the mix, the reduced width would severely compromise the convenience, safety and enjoyment of all other users. The TRF also appear to have completely disregarded

how such constructions could be considered or made to be acceptable within (such a prominent part) of the World Heritage Site (WHS), given the wide-ranging variety of protections from heritage, archaeological, landscape etc. that prevail.

**Amendment 2:**

- 5.4 The same considerations apply as identified in the Council’s comments on Amendment 1, of practicalities and effects of physical segregation.
- 5.5 At paragraph 7, the TRF contend that there are BOATs, which as a matter of law, “accommodate some vehicular use...even though they do not carry rights of way for all vehicular traffic.” They give an example of a BOAT being subject to a weight or height restriction. However, that argument is surely suspect, as a restriction of that nature would not permanently extinguish or stop-up the right of way for any traffic to which it applied; it would be achieved by a separate prohibition of driving order that applies only for the period that it remains in force and could be revoked at any time if no longer needed.

**Amendment 3:**

- 5.6 Wiltshire Council would not support any motorcycle use of the sections of the proposed Restricted Byway, between Longbarrow Roundabout and Byway AMES 12, and between Countess Roundabout and Byway AMES 11. Such use will not be necessary, because under the DCO as proposed, motorcycles will not be prevented from using Byways AMES 11 and AMES 12.

**Amendment 4:**

- 5.7 Wiltshire Council would not support any motorcycle use of the sections of the proposed Restricted Byway, between Longbarrow Roundabout and Byway AMES 12, and between Countess Roundabout and Byway AMES 11. Such use will not be necessary, because under the DCO as proposed, motorcycles will not be prevented from using Byways AMES 11 and AMES 12.
- 5.8 The same considerations apply as identified in the Council’s comments on Amendment 1, of practicalities and effects of physical segregation.

**6. Conclusion**

- 6.1 Wiltshire Council’s response to selected submissions made at Deadline 8 are outlined above.
- 6.2 These comments are submitted without prejudice to any further representations the Council may wish to make during the Examination.