

From: [REDACTED]
To: [A303 Stonehenge](#)
Subject: Final Report on the joint World Heritage Centre (Stonehenge)
Date: 23 September 2022 20:58:33

I note (somewhat wearily) that the Applicant again insists that it would not be worth the additional cost of locating the Western portal outside the WHS.

I have from the beginning (a presentation by the Applicant in Tisbury, Salisbury on ?2015) asked that this cost be identified. It has not been.

Before any clearance to proceed is given, please can the Applicant be instructed to ascertain this cost, so that the assertion can be assessed by those paying the bill - ie, taxpayers.

Although I would reluctantly accept that the scheme should go ahead were this adjustment to the western portal to be implemented, I also know that the justification for the scheme on the grounds of value is fundamentally flawed. If the same costing were undertaken now, as it should be, it is more than likely that it would not justify the scheme.

There has been a highway along this route probably for thousands of years and travellers throughout this time have enjoyed the view of Stonehenge. Given the very obvious decline in traffic overall and including along this route, there is the additional option of installing traffic flow controls eg minimum speed limits on the surface to alleviate 'bunching' which could very easily now be policed via drones and ANPR. This should include traffic lights at the western roundabout where observation of the highway code is invariably lacking.

Were this alternative to be put forward as an alternative, this scheme would not I suspect attract even the low level of support given previously.

From:
Elizabeth Forbes

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]