


From: 
To: [A303 Stonehenge](#)
Subject: Further to my earlier submission ref: 20020027
Date: 01 May 2019 11:53:22

Dear members of the Examining Panel,

I would like to add some points in relation to my previous submission (Reference: 20020027).

I think it is common ground amongst almost everyone that Blick Mead (BM) is a very significant archaeological site in the UK (it won Current Archaeology's Research Project of the Year award in 2018). So if you were to do a Google search using the key words "English Heritage, Blick Mead", you would expect to get a lot of results from one of the UK's leading historical organisations, informing the public about BM which is less than two miles from Stonehenge and clearly related to it. However, the only result you get, from the whole of the World Wide Web, is the following three sentences:

"There is no evidence that the proposed tunnel will damage the Mesolithic site of Blick Mead. The proposed tunnel and any infrastructure needed to improve the Countess roundabout are well away from the site (Blick Mead is 700m away from the roundabout). Highways England is aware of the water table issues and will be assessing any potential impact on the site."

If you look at sentence two, it says *"The proposed tunnel and any infrastructure needed to improve the Countess roundabout are well away from the site (Blick Mead is 700m away from the roundabout)"*. EH are using the figure 700m to say that BM is 700m away from any danger. In fact the actual current BM dig site is exactly 500m away from the nearest edge of the roundabout, and not 700m away. I am very experienced with maps and have exactly calculated this by using the very detailed EH 1:10,000 map (which shows 10cm on the map for each km on the ground). So EH's 700m figure is wrong. It is an exaggeration of the true figure by 40%. Furthermore the rest of the sentence is factually incorrect as it says, *"any infrastructure needed to improve the Countess roundabout are well away from the site (BM)"*. This is completely untrue as emerging from the roundabout (500m away and not 700m away!) will be a massive four

lane flyover raised 23 feet high on lots of thick pillars which will all be sunk deep into the ground. Additionally, coming up from the roundabout will be a slip road feeding traffic into this huge flyover. Using Highways England's map (in the pamphlet they give out to the public) this slip road will merge with the two westbound lanes at about 20m from the BM dig site. So, in summary, the *"infrastructure needed to improve the Countess roundabout"* is all very near to BM, and not *"well away from the site"* which EH are dishonestly saying. In summary, I think it's fair to say that sentence two has factual inaccuracies and is untrue and is solely designed to create a false and misleading impression.

I make the additional point that, although the current BM dig site is 20m away, it is logical that there is likely to be significant archaeology in the vicinity of the current site. In other words, further down towards the roundabout where EH think it is acceptable to put a massive 23 foot tall flyover, with large pillars and slip roads etc!

As regards sentence one, EH say *"There is no evidence that the proposed tunnel will damage the Mesolithic site of Blick Mead"*. This is also untrue, and I am sure that the BM team will be giving an absolute abundance of scientific evidence to refute this ridiculously false claim. Even without that, it is obvious to any reasonable person that BM will be damaged as it is only about 20m from the current road. After all, the new road is not like a long roll of stair-carpet that you can easily just lift up in order to lay down a new one. Especially as the construction of the new road would require a wide corridor of construction access etc parallel with the side, and I am sure that would need to be more than 20m. Furthermore, it is obvious that all of the construction of the road and flyover and two extra feeder lanes (in and out of the roundabout) would dry out BM. They are near BM, and slightly lower height/contour wise, so would gradually suck away the moisture from BM and dry it out. And there is plenty of scientific evidence to prove that if any site dries out, then all carbon dating is lost. BM is on a warm spring and so has remained moist for thousands of years and if it dries out then all the carbon dating will be lost. That is a scientific fact.....of which EH are abundantly aware! So I think that first sentence by EH is a lie as there is an absolute wealth of *"evidence that the proposed tunnel will damage the Mesolithic site of Blick Mead"*. Of course EH know all this, but they

won't admit it as it would very significantly weaken their case for the tunnel.

Coming to sentence three, EH say "*Highways England is aware of the water table issues and will be assessing any potential impact on the site*". That is really just trying the buck onto Highways England about the water table issues and the resultant loss of carbon dating. The absolute fact remains that it is obvious that the site will dry out if the road is built and this will result in the loss of carbon dating evidence. It became apparent from what David Jacques said at the Salisbury Racecourse hearing in April that Highways England are not doing this to the archaeological standard that EH should be insisting upon, and yet EH remained silent throughout all of this. EH also appear to have remained silent about the fact that whilst Highways England were "*assessing potential impact on the site*" they bored a very damaging 10 foot deep hole through the 9,000 year old ritual pavement!

In summary, I think EH's three sentences are a mixture of lies, untrue statements, factual inaccuracies and deliberately misleading information. They are the sum total of what they have put on the web about one of the most important sites in the UK, and which is obviously related to Stonehenge which they manage. I think this is all a cynical and calculated strategy of deception so that people don't become aware of how important BM is to the Stonehenge landscape. Because then people wouldn't want to see it damaged by the tunnel road project which EH unscrupulously want to get through, at any cost. I just find it so sad that EH are betraying their core principles and trying to sacrifice BM for their own selfish ends. Anyway that is my view.....but please just judge for yourselves as to the honesty and integrity of English Heritage in those three sentences. And the fact that they say nothing else about BM on the whole of the World Wide Web. I also didn't see any reference to it at their visitor centre exhibition a few months ago when I was there.

I add that it is equally sad that EH are prepared to allow significant damage at the western portal too. Mike Parker Pearson says on YouTube that this area has "*the densest concentration of Neolithic burial mounds in Britain.*" and it will be "*severely damaged*" even though "*it is a special sacred landscape, developed over thousands*

of years which is unique in world terms and should be protected". Similarly, Julian Richards says the tunnel will emerge "right into the heart of an unspoilt and incredibly significant area" which will be a "complete disaster" so he "objects really strongly" and says "future generations will say.....what have you done to this absolutely incredible landscape!"

In summary, I hope you accept my reasoning for saying that I think EH are prepared to lie, deceive and mislead in order to get the tunnel road project through. And that they are even prepared to sacrifice important archaeological sites to the east and west of the WHS, despite UNESCO saying that the benefits of a tunnel cannot be offset against the damage that would be caused elsewhere.

I beg you, please, please, please, don't let this looming tragedy happen.....or history will judge us all very badly.

Yours very sincerely,

Paul Gossage.