

From: [REDACTED]
To: [A303 Stonehenge](#)
Subject: A 303 road scheme Stonehenge
Date: 08 June 2022 09:18:29

Dear Sir/Madam

I am writing with reference to our concerns over the development of the A303 past Stonehenge and Winterbourne Stoke.

You may treat this email as a letter of objection to the scheme in its' current form.

This covers 3 main issues. These are not our only concerns, but serve to highlight specific shortcomings in the scheme that have the potential to seriously worsen the lives of all local people for many years to come.

Issue 1: There has been a lack of clarity demonstrated by National Highways (NH) staff in historical and current "consultations" on issues that are hugely important to local people.

There has been misleading information and inconsistency in messaging from different NH staff resulting in lack of trust and confidence in the organisation, its' people and its' proposals.

There has been persistent and consistent failure by National Highways staff to respond to specific and general questions about the scheme.

Amongst other issues was the promise that detailed information about the spoil would be promulgated to local people. This still has not happened and the deadline for our responses to the planning application is fast approaching.

Despite repeated requests to have more information about the noise assessment for Winterbourne Stoke the only information we have is a covertly obtained photograph of a plan obtained by a resident.

Even the positioning of the compound and the processing plant has been vague, and we have been given different information by different staff.

Much of the information relevant to those people who will be most affected is buried in 1500 pages of report that is very difficult to navigate. Even the National Highways (NH) website, which we have been encouraged to read for more information, has no entries in the latest news section since March 2021!

Awarding of the scheme to contractors was announced immediately after the local consultations were completed! The actions and strategy of the contractors is likely to have an enormous impact on local communities and the environment. It seems highly plausible that this was done so that we could not ask questions directly to the contractors before the planning deadline.

Local people and communities have not been afforded sufficient access to information to allow them to reach conclusions about how the scheme will affect them or their environment.

Issue 2: The proposed location of the spoil from the tunnel and the resulting impact of the spoil processing plant and compound on local people and the environment.

The proposed site for much of the tunnel spoil is within 400 metres of the nearest residential premises.

The depositing of spoil in the current proposed location will adversely affect the landscape, the vista, the flora, local ecology and the fauna for many years to come. In addition the proposed location will also mean that the processing and transport of the spoil will need to be done near to Winterbourne Stoke, the knock on effect being a dramatic increase in environmental damage including noise, light, air pollution, dust and disruption for local people for the duration of the construction.

If the spoil were to be distributed on the local parts of Salisbury Plain that are not covered by the SSSI then all of the associated problems of it being placed close to Winterbourne Stoke would be alleviated.

We have once again been fed different stories as to why the Salisbury Plain Training Area (SPTA) has not been considered for the spoil. We are firmly of the belief, and have been told so by at least 2 NH staff, that the MOD **“don’t want”** the spoil on their land!!

This is a government scheme, the MOD are part of the organisation that are supporting this project, but for the last 20 years at least the MOD have contributed nothing to make the scheme more palatable or cost effective.

Salisbury Plain is a huge expanse of open down land and all the spoil could be accommodated in one or two locations which would not have an impact on any community. Even if the spoil was deposited on an area of the Plain currently covered by the SSSI then it is still, obviously, a better option than the current proposed location. We have also been told that the MOD want payment if the spoil is to be distributed on Salisbury Plain. Even with this required payment, this option would be cheaper and more environmentally friendly than the current proposed plan.

We have been advised that the current area designated for disposal could be returned to SSSI status in the fullness of time, so why cannot the same be assumed for an area of MOD land on the SPTA if it were utilised?

We get the distinct impression that all parties in these negotiations are reluctant to press the MOD for cooperation.

Issue 3: The height of the proposed viaduct over the Till valley near to Winterbourne Stoke and the level of noise mitigation that will be provided.

Again, the reasons given by NH staff for the proposed height of the viaduct have been contradictory, varying from gradient for lorries, to light levels for the flora and fauna under the viaduct, to the height being necessary to accommodate a lot of the spoil.

Besides there being no firm answers to our questions on the unnecessary height, there is even more misinformation and lack of information about how the noise from this elevated section of the road will be mitigated or reduced. The most common answer is that the contractors will

determine how best to keep noise levels to a minimum. This is totally unsatisfactory when we residents are invited to express our views on the subject. The "Latest News" section of the NH own website, as stated above, has not been updated since March 2021, but part of it states that there will be a 1.5 metre barrier to the south side of the viaduct so cars cannot be seen. There is no mention of noise mitigation. My car is 1.7 metres tall; my understanding is that lorries are a lot taller than that! This is a typical example of inadequate or ill thought out information.

As mentioned earlier the contract was awarded 4 working days after the recent round of local consultations put on by NH staff, so we were not able to question the contractors on noise mitigation. NH staff were unable to answer any questions on

We require some confirmation that the height and type of sound barriers, the type of road surfacing, the nature of mature tree planting (and not saplings) will provide local residents with sufficient guarantees that our lives will not be blighted for evermore by noise from an unnecessarily high viaduct.

As you can see from the above we, as residents of Winterbourne Stoke, are deeply concerned that we are seen as necessary victims of this scheme, and that our views are considered as of low, or no importance to National Highways, or any other organisation involved in the decision making process.

The scheme proposed in 2004 was in many ways environmentally less damaging than this current scheme and we request that you reject the current proposals so that some of the facets of this project can be reconsidered.

I look forward to your acknowledgement of this email.

Yours faithfully

Ian Rennie

