

From: [REDACTED]
To: [A303 Stonehenge](#)
Subject: Re: A303 Amesbury to Berwick Down (TR010025)TR010025-003643
Date: 03 August 2022 17:56:57

Thank you for your recent letter from the SoS dated 13th July

I have briefly reviewed the information provided by the applicant and wonder why only alternative routes *for a high speed permanent road* have been considered.

For example, a temporary (50 year) road alongside the existing, with a 20mph min/30mph max restriction, laid over a protection sheet and on a deep pre-loaded MOT platform could provide a cheap, fast to construct and removable one way westbound route for two lanes whilst keeping the existing lanes for one way eastbound 40mph min 60 mph max through traffic. This also preserves all "the archaeology" as is (albeit slightly compressed). It also has no groundwater issues (unlike the tunnel).

A financial benefit of the tunnel is to give access to the public to WHS land south of the A303 (see Contingent Valuation Study). Although most of that that land will not in fact be accessible (most of it is private land), a temporary solution provides the opportunity for the public to safely park in temporary lay-bys to access the area of land under National Trust control

Over 5 km, this solution adds ten minutes or so to that one way traffic over the 50 years or so in which it would be in use. However, constructing a tunnel could cause a similar magnitude of total delay over the construction period (which I imagine would be quite a few years). The speed restriction would allow a greater traffic flow (this is known as 'bunching': where a greater volume of cars per hour is carried at slower speeds). The speed restriction would also reduce carbon emissions. The volume of MOT needed would make a decent store for future generations to use on other projects: vehicle technology may be completely different in 50 years.

This type of solution does nothing for the "sunrise" sight-lines from Stonehenge. However, there has been no actual proof provided during the consultation that sight-lines to solstice were important to the builders of Stonehenge (though it may be a reasonable working assumption). Regardless, there are ways around this issue (eg screening) and, in the scheme of things, a road that can be removed does no long term harm.

There way be a reason why only permanent high speed alternatives would have been considered (as opposed to financially viable and ecologically sound alternatives). However, this was not obvious from the documentation.

My kind regards

Jon Morris

Ir. BEng CEng FStructE FICE Eurlng MHKIE
Director: On behalf of One Engineering Ltd

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

The One Engineering logo is a Trademark of One Engineering Ltd, a company registered in England with company number 0658 5432. One Engineering offices are registered at Hyperion House, Hyperion Avenue, Polegate, BN265HU. If you are not the intended recipient of this e-mail, please preserve its confidentiality and advise the sender immediately of the error. Any, disclosure, copying, distribution or action taken, or omitted to be taken, by an unauthorised recipient relying on the contents of this e-mail is not permitted. One Engineering Ltd cannot accept liability for damage resulting from malicious software so please carry out your own checks before opening any attachment.
