

From: [REDACTED]
To: [A303 Stonehenge](#)
Subject: Stonehenge Consultation
Date: 03 April 2022 21:25:17

Dear Planning Inspectorate

You have invited further comments to the 5 matters that the Secretary of State has asked be considered: Alternatives, Policy, Carbon, Environmental Information and Any Other Matters.

It remains the case that the tunnel as proposed is a monstrous environmental act of vandalism upon and around the World Heritage site that is Stonehenge. The cost in terms of disruption to traffic, trade and livelihoods during the building process and the suggested financial benefit to the national economy in the long run has always been a very close call/calculation and the current rise in the cost of motoring fuel will mean fewer vehicles on the roads and the economic case for spending £2 bn on 3kms of road must surely disappear.

The argument that it will bring construction jobs to the area does nothing for the local residents and the argument that the big construction companies will go bankrupt if not given this contract by government is not a sound economic argument for continuing to push on with a white elephant of a construction project. "Oven ready" has been proven to be a dodgy concept by the current government, it has lost its salience. One should also point to the Cross Rail fiasco which is years over due and billions over budget. I cannot believe that the economic case for this project still makes sense to any sober and serious minded politician.

The proposed tunnel is too short and a longer one would prove too costly in your eyes. I live nearby and am aware of the proposal to fill the neighbouring Winterbourne Stoke landscape with thousands of lorry loads of chalk slurry excavated from the tunnel, the sight of the proposed bridge/road passing over Winterbourne Stoke and linking to Barrow Down. That side of the proposed development is rather forgotten in the current debate. It has been called "significantly adverse".

Further there have been questions raised about the practicality of any tunnel: is it fit for purpose when one considers the type of large lorry traffic such as straw lorries? If there was to be any sort of tunnel closure or heaven forbid a tunnel fire there is no service road or relief road. The impact on neighbouring Larkhill and its military business would be significant.

Alternatives: Why is the tourist traffic to the World Heritage site (which is almost all from the east) funneled past the site to the new roundabout going east west. Why not at least

consider a one way system past and through Larkhill from the Durrington end and then send it back eastwards (along the A303) or at least northwards in the direction of Bath (A360) from there?

A re-examination of the Development Consent Order must be the least that the Secretary of State for Transport ought to be compelled to do.

Yours sincerely

Emma Cook

West Lavington

Wiltshire