

From: [REDACTED]
To: [A303 Stonehenge](#)
Subject: FW: A303 consultation.
Date: 05 August 2022 07:48:38

Dear Sir or Madam,

This representation is made on behalf of Mr and Mrs Robert Turner and family of Manor Farm, Winterbourne Stoke in respect to the Applicant's (Highways England) response to the Secretary of State's letter date 20 June 2022.

We remain opposed to the scheme as a whole.

In respect to the specific question(s) concerning the western portal extension, we agree with the applicant that;

1. Consideration of the balance of benefits and disbenefits would not justify the significant additional cost ... over and above the cost of the Proposed Scheme"
2. There is no evidence that the additional investment required to extend the tunnel length would deliver meaningful additional benefits to the WHS that would justify the additional cost"
3. We believe that the cumulative affects of the additional transport infrastructure required to accommodate any such alternative option has been underplayed.
4. The studies of the extension feasibilities have only looked at Heritage and do not fully take into account wider considerations, such as landscape, ecology, community. If these factors were assessed as well, the finding would more likely be that the extensions would be more harmful than the current scheme.

Yours faithfully,

Patrick Durnford [BSc HONS MRICS](#)

[DIRECTOR](#)



The Old Dairy, Fonthill Bishop, Salisbury, SP3 5SH
fowlerfortescue.co.uk

From: Patrick Durnford

Sent: 26 July 2022 10:56

To: [REDACTED]

Cc: David Holmes [REDACTED]

Subject: A303 consultation.

Dear Rob and Fiona,

Further to my call with Rob this morning, I thought it might be helpful if I sent through a link to the particular document which sets out Highways England's conclusion in regard to the western extension.

My understanding is that the Heritage lobby were pushing for the western extension. This would obviously take more of your land and therefore is something that would be opposed by you. Highways have assessed the western extension as having only slight to moderate benefit to the World Heritage Site (in Heritage terms alone) whereas the additional costs would be significantly more. For these reasons, they have stated that the DCO as presented remains in their view 'robust' and I don't believe that they are changing their plans.

This is best summarised on pages 27/28 of the document in the link below:

<https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/projects/TR010025/TR010025-003636-A303.4.2.SoS%20letter%2020%20June%202022.Q2.Overarching%20response.Redetermination-4.2.20220711.pdf>

In terms of response, we have only to the 3rd of August. I should think though that you might like the response to be along the following lines;

- We remain opposed to the scheme as a whole.
- In relation to the alternative options for the western portal we would agree with Highways England's assessment that the extension is not warranted on grounds of cost.
- We believe that the cumulative affects of the additional transport infrastructure required to accommodate any such alternative option has been underplayed.
- The studies of the extension feasibilities have only looked at Heritage and do not fully take into account wider considerations, such as landscape, ecology, community. If these factors were assessed as well, the finding would more likely be that the extensions would be more harmful than the current scheme.

I look forward to meeting next Tuesday at 7:00 am at Manor Farm to regroup.

Best wishes,

Patrick Durnford BSc HONS MRICS

DIRECTOR



The Old Dairy, Fonthill Bishop, Salisbury, SP3 5SH
fowlerfortescue.co.uk