



Andrew C J Rhind-Tutt



3rd April 2022

National Infrastructure Planning
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Bristol
BS1 6PN

Dear Examining Authority,

TR010025 – 002292 Re-Determination of the Application by National Highways (formally Highways England) for an Order granting Development Consent for the A303 Amesbury to Berwick Down – Unique Reference 20020916

Thank you for your letter of 23rd February 2022 regarding the above and for providing the link to the Secretary of State's (SOS) request for comments from all interested parties.

My comments are as follows:

1. I am the owner of Bowles Hatches, which neighbours Amesbury Abbey, occupies 4.4 acres and is situated alongside the Avon and the A303 at SP4 7AP. The property, which includes land within the Stonehenge and Avebury World Heritage Site and sites of archaeological interest, will be significantly impacted and blighted by the proposed flyover and dual carriageway at Countess Road grade separated junction. To date I have had no contact regarding any proposals to address the environmental impact this Scheme will have on the heritage, biodiversity, amenity, privacy and the rare flora and fauna found at this site. Nor have I received any information on flood prevention schemes in the event of a catastrophic failure in any water management program specific to Bowles Hatches.
2. The Road Investment Strategy 2 2020-2025 states that an average of 34% of the traffic on Strategic Road Networks comprises of HGVs. Traffic flow records show that the largest proportion of HGV traffic on the A303 West bound at Stonehenge comes from Southampton docks via the A34. The route options to the West for this HGV traffic is either the A35, A36 or A34/A303. The A34/A303 is the furthest distance, yet it is chosen because the A35 is slow and the A36 gridlocks at Salisbury due to a lack of an adequate bypass. The proposed scheme is Stonehenge World Heritage site specific and fails to take into account any regional issues that could be addressed at the same time.

3. The alternative route that I presented to the examining body in July 2019, was not considered fully with regards to its ability to reduce traffic movement of freight from Southampton and provide a cost effective solution to provide regional transport improvements, thereby satisfying RIS 2 and future regional needs for freight movement from the docks and across Wiltshire.
4. It is the principle of the alternative route that I put forward, not a detailed design showing the precise route the road would take. With careful consideration this alternative route could utilise existing byways and roads, enable the removal of unsightly power lines, avoid AONB sites and could address the points the applicant has used to eliminate the route without consultation.
5. I believe that due consideration should now be given to a wider solution that provides a significant reduction in HGV movement through the City of Salisbury and the Stonehenge and Avebury World Heritage Site.
6. The Applicant has failed to show any lifetime costings within this scheme. There appears to be no program to maintain the water table when the tunnel ceases to be in operation. This fundamental detail has been missing from the first proposals, places huge problems and cost implications for future generations to address and resolve.
7. The Applicant makes reference to the visual effect the proposed scheme will have on Bowles Hatches in the winter of year one, but disingenuously refers to the effect in the summer of year 15. I object to the applicant relying upon vegetation to remove the visibility of a 7m raised carriageway with vehicles in summer and to not mention the effect in winter after year 1. This scheme will blight Bowles Hatches and adequate mitigation has not been mentioned or discussed with me.
8. The Applicant makes reference to there being no additional street lighting at the Countess junction. However, there is already a scheme of high level lighting on the A303 at this junction, and there is no plan showing how the grade separated junction is to be lit safely without replacing some of the existing lighting.
9. The Applicant's current proposals continue to create a difficulty in access and egress at Longbarrow junction for users of the A360 and visitors to Stonehenge at any time the contraflow is in place in the proposed tunnel and a lane change is required west bound upon exit of the tunnel. Any estimated time savings predicted by the applicant through using the tunnel would be negated by lengthy diversions as and when this happens and cause further traffic issues in the local vicinity. The Applicant has not addressed this.
10. With unprecedented significant increases in labour, material and fuel costs, the applicant has not declared the revised construction estimates nor has he shown how the scheme will be deemed value for money in accordance with the recorded figure by Keith Nicol of DCMS who stated on record that an increase in £100m would make the scheme unaffordable.

11. I request that this redetermination response is considered at a second examination should the matter proceed.

Please confirm safe receipt of this email.

Yours sincerely,



Andrew Rhind-Tutt