


From:   
To: [A303 Stonehenge](#)  
Subject: Further to my earlier submission ref: 20020027.  
Date: 30 May 2019 16:26:47

---

Dear members of the Panel,

As requested, please find below my five-minute oral submission, which I read out to you on 22 May in Salisbury.

“I’m speaking as an ordinary member of the public, but with a great deal of respect for what archaeologists and scientists have revealed about the area around Stonehenge.

There are two sides in this debate about the tunnel road project.....those for....and those against....but who should we believe?

Well, lets just look at the claims of two organisations.....who normally behave ethically.....but who support the tunnel. English Heritage and Historic England. They’re the national bodies who are giving the tunnel project, historical legitimacy. And it’s no coincidence that they both stand to gain enormously from it.

It’s best if I refer to them both jointly as English Heritage, as on the tunnel issue they are working in unison, and English Heritage are the organisation I’ve had quite a lot of correspondence with, my last being just 3 weeks ago. (I HAVE PUT THIS CORRESPONDENCE AT THE END OF THIS SUBMISSION)

Well.....lets look at English Heritage’s claims..... to see if they are credible..... and truthful.

If you do a Google search using the key words “English Heritage and Blick Mead”, you’d expect to get a lot of results from such a leading historical organisation, letting the public know about Blick Mead. I mean, it’s just over a mile from Stonehenge and obviously related to it in some way. However, the only result you get, from the whole of the Web, is just three sentences.

Could it perhaps be, that English Heritage don't want people to know about Blick Mead.....as then they might realise how important it is....and perhaps think it shouldn't be damaged.

Anyway, as regards the actual credibility of those three sentences. The first one says, "*There is no evidence that the proposed tunnel will damage the Mesolithic site of Blick Mead*"....Come on English Heritage...this is completely untrue.....and the Blick Mead team have already given an abundance of scientific evidence to refute it. And even without that, it's obvious that Blick Mead's going to be damaged. The dig site's only about 20 metres from the current road and the new road is not like a long roll of stair-carpet that you can easily just lift up and then lay down a new one. Especially as the building of the new road will require a wide corridor of construction access either side. So, I think it's completely dishonest of EH to say "*There is no evidence that the proposed tunnel will damage the Mesolithic site of Blick Mead*".

Coming to sentence two, "*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)*". Well, EH have used this figure of 700 metres to imply that Blick Mead is a long way away from any danger. As I said earlier, Blick Mead is just 20 metres from danger, so this 700 meters figure they have used gives a completely false and misleading impression. Presumably, 700 meters is what they think is the distance from Blick Mead to the roundabout. In fact, that distance is 500 meters. So their 700 meters figure is wrong.....its actually an exaggeration of 40%.

And the rest of sentence two is incorrect as it says, "*any infrastructure needed to improve the Countess roundabout are well away from the site*". This is just not true, because emerging from the roundabout....500 meters away and not 700.....will be a massive four lane flyover...23 feet tall....(JUST TO SAY THAT IT CAME OUT DURING THE HEARING THAT IT COULD BE AROUND 9.8 METRES TO 10 METRES WITH THE SOUND BARRIER BUT RUBIN TAYLOR QC WILL BE CLARIFYING THE EXACT MEASUREMENT LATER) on a huge embankment..... as well as..... two slip roads feeding traffic in and out of this large flyover, and one of these slip roads will merge into the two westbound traffic lanes,

right by the Blick Mead dig site. So it's completely dishonest of EH to say, "*any infrastructure needed to improve the Countess roundabout are well away from the site*".

Coming lastly to sentence three, EH say, "*Highways England is aware of the water table issues and will be assessing any potential impact on the site*". This really is just trying the buck onto Highways England. It's obvious that the site will dry out if the road is built....and it's scientifically proven that this will result in the loss of carbon dating evidence. Of course EH know all this.....but they just don't want to admit the truth, as that would then weaken their case for the tunnel.

In summary, I think those three English Heritage sentences are a mixture untrue statements, deliberately misleading information and deceit. The fact is, this tunnel project wouldn't be going ahead at all, if it didn't have their approval.....But they simply cannot be trusted to tell the truth on this issue. Anyway, please judge for yourselves who's telling the truth.....I know what I think.....but please judge for yourselves.

Thank you."

I ENDED MY ORAL SUBMISSION AT THAT POINT AND THEN YOU ASKED ME SOME QUESTIONS.

Further to my oral submission, I would like to make the following point. National Audit Office say "*Using the standard approach for appraising transport projects, Highways England calculated that the Amesbury to Berwick Down project would deliver only 31p for every £1 invested.*" This is obviously very poor value for money. So Highways England got a private company called Simerica to do a survey asking respondents how much they would be willing to pay to remove the road from the WHS. Using these survey results Highways England then re-calculated their first figure, and are now saying their project would deliver £1.15 of quantified benefit for every £1 spent. This obviously sounds a lot better. However, I would like to point out that this survey is fundamentally flawed for a lot of reasons (as detailed in a Written Representation to you by a leading expert). One of the strongest reasons for me though, is that the people being

surveyed were not told that the tunnel project would damage other parts of the WHS such as Blick Mead to the east of the tunnel, and the “densest concentration of Neolithic burial mounds in Britain” (according to Mike Parker Pearson) to the west. I feel that if people had been told these two things then they would have given completely different answers. For example, if a survey was done on a group of children then most would say “Yes” to an offer of an ice cream, but “No” if they were told they would be smacked whilst eating it. In summary, Highways England's Simetrica survey is fundamentally flawed and so it is completely invalid. It has obviously been rigged to manipulate the figures away from a return of only 31p for every £1 spent, to a return of £1.15p for every £1 spent. In other words, this survey has turned a **loss** of 69p for every £1 spent, into a **profit** of 15p for every £1 spent! I leave you to draw your own conclusions as to whether or not Highways England's Simetrica survey is honest.....and whether or not the tunnel project is good value for money.

I would also like to let you know about some things I have heard 'off the record' during the course of speaking with people about the tunnel etc. This is that the following organisations who stand to gain from this (English Heritage, National Trust and Wessex Archaeology) have told their staff to not express any view against the tunnel road project. This 'censorship' is because those organisations stand to gain a lot from the tunnel project. I think that is the reason why some people in the archaeological community (particularly those who are not yet fully established) haven't said that the tunnel is a bad idea, as that would upset those organisations and possibly affect their future careers. I think it's fair to say that people don't want to be 'blacklisted'. This 'censorship' seems to have created a climate of fear, rather than a healthy debate about whether or not the tunnel is a good idea for the wider Stonehenge landscape. Please therefore would you bear this in mind and (if you feel it warrants it) perhaps make enquiries about it.

In fairness to English Heritage etc I would like to say that the tunnel idea originated many years before Blick Mead was realised to be of such importance to the wider Stonehenge landscape. Now that BM's importance is known, English Heritage etc absolutely must change their minds, otherwise history will judge them harshly as vandals.

Lastly, below is all my correspondence with English Heritage, which I referred to in my oral submission. This correspondence is actually what made me feel that I had to express the view that they simply cannot be trusted to tell the truth about the tunnel issue as they are only concerned with their own interests and not those of the wider Stonehenge landscape. If you start reading from my first email to them (at the bottom) you will see that it all originally started with me genuinely trying to help EH. This then culminated in them saying they “*have nothing further to add*” and referring me to the document, which contains what I referred to you as containing “*deliberately misleading information and deceit.*”

Sebire, Heather <Heather.Sebire@english-heritage.org.uk>

Mon 29/04/2019 16:45

Dear Paul

Thank you for your email – I have nothing further to add beyond my previous statement but I would direct you to the below A303 webpage which contains more information on English Heritage’s position:

<https://www.english-heritage.org.uk/about-us/search-news/stonehenge-tunnel/>

Kind regards

Heather Sebire

Heather Sebire PhD, FSA MCIFA | Senior Property Curator  
Stonehenge | Curatorial Team English Heritage,

From: Paul [REDACTED]

Sent: 27 April 2019 15:47

To: Sebire, Heather

Cc: steven.morris@theguardian.com; info@centuryfilmsltd.com;  
charlotte.higgins@guardian.co.uk

Subject: Re: Thanks Re: Discrepancy in Woodhenge historical

information.

Dear Heather,

Your reply is trying to deny that there will be very considerable and irrevocable damage done to Blick Mead (BM) if the A303 tunnel and road project gets built. For example you say you “do not believe that the scheme will damage it as the A303 is already duelled past the site”. This is a gross oversimplification of the matter as the A303 road is not like a long roll of stair-carpet that you can easily just lift up and then lay down a new one. Especially as the current A303 is only about 20 metres from the actual BM dig site itself. The construction of the new road will be a massive engineering project with an additional 23 foot tall four lane dual carriageway flyover with deep reinforcing pillars, plus two extra lanes feeding in from the roundabout. All this will cause physical, actual damage far beyond the imprint of the final result of the road. This is because in order to construct the new road there will have to be extensive construction works (and the access for all this) on either side of where the final imprint of where the completed road will end up. All of this will result in two long parallel swathes of damage to both sides of the new road (except where the tunnel itself will be as this will have a different set of problems). The BM dig site is only about 20 metres from the current road so it is obvious that the construction of the new road will damage it. Yet you glibly claim that BM won't be damaged!

In fact Highways England's bungling has already damaged BM by boring a ten-foot deep hole down through the archaeologically priceless 6,000 year old platform, which has what appear to be ritually preserved auroch hoofprints on it. This was staggeringly incompetent, and to make matters worse they seem to be lying by trying to blame the BM people for their blunder. It's absolutely outrageous!

Furthermore, the long-term result of all the construction near to BM will be that the site will dry out and so carbon dating opportunities will be lost. This is a scientifically proven fact and if you dispute it then please substantiate your claim with credible evidence (rather than your untrue claims that BM won't be damaged). BM is on a spring

line that has remained constantly moist for thousands of years, which is why it has such a wealth of carbon dates. These are from 9,000 years ago and for a continuous period of around 3,000 years. Carbon dates from this Mesolithic era, especially showing such a long period of occupation, are extremely rare in the UK. They are helping to unlock the secrets of how hunter-gatherers gradually evolved into the settled community that built the magnificent and fascinating wider Stonehenge landscape and are crucial to our understanding of this pivotal transition period in history. However, if the tunnel project gets built then BM will dry out and this will result in the loss of carbon dating opportunities in the future and that will be an absolute tragedy.

I make the additional important point that there is very likely to be enormous archaeological potential further along the spring line from BM, on the other side of the A303 (ie the north side of the A303) and this will also be damaged if construction work occurs.

In summary to all the above, this road project will cause very considerable and irrevocable damage to BM. Please therefore will you explain to me your reasoning for your disingenuous claim that it won't be damaged.

It is not just BM that will be seriously and irrevocably damaged as there will be similar damage at the western tunnel portal. Your colleague 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!"

Their views are fully supported by the large consortium of independent archaeologists, some of whom are on the A303 Scientific Committee and leading archaeologists in the Stonehenge landscape.

In conclusion I say that this Stonehenge tunnel project will significantly harm two (and more actually) important parts of the WHS, and UNESCO agree with my view. I think you are compromising your own personal archaeological integrity, credibility and reputation by using (abusing really) your role as Stonehenge Senior Historic Property Curator and a key archaeologist on the A303 Scientific Committee to support this project. I think you are only supporting it as you work for English Heritage and the tunnel suits their selfish financial interests rather than what would be best for the wider Stonehenge landscape. If the tunnel project gets built then it will be an absolute tragedy which you personally will have played a major part in making happen.....and which history will judge you shamefully by.

I thank you in anticipation of your reply to all my points above. In particular to my question for you to fully explain your untrue claim BM won't be damaged. I also ask you to explain your justification for the damage that will be caused at the western portal. I hope you don't choose to take the easy way out by not replying to this email. In view of the urgency and seriousness of this matter I think that not more than 10 days would be a reasonable time for your reply.

Yours sincerely,

Paul Gossage.

From: Sebire, Heather <Heather.Sebire@english-heritage.org.uk>

Sent: 11 December 2018 15:09

To: Paul

Cc: Trethowan, Jessica

Subject: RE: Thanks Re: Discrepancy in Woodhenge historical information.

Dear Mr Gossage

English Heritage is generally supportive of the scheme that Highways England are proposing for the A303 because we believe it will have a great beneficial impact on the World Heritage site –



opening it up for people to explore and giving Stonehenge its appropriate setting.

Re Blick Mead I am not sure why you think the site will be destroyed.

We do not believe that the scheme will damage it as the A303 is already duelled past the site. We agree Blick Mead is an important site, in addition to the rest of the very rich prehistoric landscape around Stonehenge. We expect Highways England to undertake full detailed environmental, heritage and hydrological impact assessments (some of which are underway-as agreed with the excavator) and understand that Historic England will be reviewing these assessments carefully to fully understand the potential impacts of any design before it is progressed.

The proposed tunnel will be further away from Stonehenge than the existing road. Highways England has already undertaken a lot of work to ensure that archaeological impacts of the necessary infrastructure are avoided or limited and the tunnel itself will pass well below the layers where archaeology is present.

Anyway I hope this answers your question

Kind regards

Heather Sebire

Heather Sebire PhD, FSA MCIFA | Senior Property Curator  
Stonehenge | Curatorial Team English Heritage,

From: Paul [REDACTED]  
Sent: 18 November 2018 18:30  
To: Sebire, Heather

Subject: Re: Thanks Re: Discrepancy in Woodhenge historical information.

Hi Heather,

Re my email below simply asking

"Why is it that EH are supporting the proposed A303 tunnel and flyover etc when it will virtually destroy the rare and valuable Blick Mead site, as well as damage other important parts of the Stonehenge landscape?"

Please can I press you for your definitive answer by the end of Wednesday evening.

I thank you in anticipation of your reply.

Yours sincerely,

Paul Gossage.

From: Paul [REDACTED]  
Sent: 09 November 2018 11:22  
To: Sebire, Heather

Subject: Re: Thanks Re: Discrepancy in Woodhenge historical information.

Hi Heather,

Re my email below simply asking

"Why is it that EH are supporting the proposed A303 tunnel and flyover etc when it will virtually destroy the rare and valuable Blick Mead site, as well as damage other important parts of the Stonehenge landscape?"

Please can I press you for your answer within a week?

I thank you in anticipation of your reply.

Yours sincerely,

Paul Gossage.

From: Paul [REDACTED]  
Sent: 25 October 2018 08:09  
To: Sebire, Heather

Subject: Thanks Re: Discrepancy in Woodhenge historical information.

Hi Heather,

Thanks for clarifying things. Your reply is very much appreciated. I thought that what you are saying would turn out to be the case. But I just wanted to be sure of this and also to let you know the discrepancy so that EH can correct it.

Whilst writing this email, it has just occurred to me that I could put another question to you that is really baffling me. Why is it that EH are supporting the proposed A303 tunnel and flyover etc when it will virtually destroy the rare and valuable Blick Mead site, as well as damage other important parts of the Stonehenge landscape.

I thank you in anticipation of your reply.

Yours sincerely,

Paul Gossage.

From: Sebire, Heather <Heather.Sebire@english-heritage.org.uk>  
Sent: 16 October 2018 10:41  
To: Paul; CISCUSTOMER

Subject: RE: Discrepancy in Woodhenge historical information.

Dear Mr Gossage

I can only apologise for not getting back to you sooner due to

pressure of other work

Thank you for pointing out this discrepancy. In fact the correct view at present is that the guidebook that is correct. The original record of Cunnington's excavations suggest that the child's skull had been split, but in reality is likely that the skull had not yet fused properly and was part of the natural decay of the skeleton. Unfortunately the skeleton was lost when the Natural History Museum was bombed during WWII, so there is no way to check.

We will correct the website as soon as possible.

Many thanks again

Kind Regards

Heather Sebire

Heather Sebire PhD, FSA MCIFA | Senior Property Curator  
Stonehenge | Curatorial Team English Heritage

From: Paul [REDACTED]  
Sent: 15 October 2018 17:10  
To: CISCUSTOMER  
Cc: Sebire, Heather

Subject: Re: Discrepancy in Woodhenge historical information.

Dear English Heritage,

This issue below has dragged on for three months now and my patience is finally exhausted. If I do not receive a genuinely meaningful reply within seven days, I will be asking your CEO to look into the matter.

Yours faithfully,

Paul Gossage.

From: Paul [REDACTED]  
Sent: 28 September 2018 19:51  
To: CISCUSTOMER  
Cc: Sebire, Heather

Subject: Re: Discrepancy in Woodhenge historical information.

Dear English Heritage,

Please would somebody clarify who is dealing with this matter detailed in the email trail below.

I thank you in anticipation of your reply.

Yours faithfully,

Paul Gossage.

From: CISCUSTOMER <CISCUSTOMER@english-heritage.org.uk>  
Sent: 05 September 2018 16:52  
To: [REDACTED]  
Cc: Sebire, Heather

Subject: FW: Discrepancy in Woodhenge historical information.

Good afternoon Mr Gossage

Thank you for your email regarding the discrepancy in Woodhenge historical information.

I am sorry that you have not received a reply but your enquiry was forwarded to the Senior Properties Curator at our Bristol Office.

I have copied them in on this email.

Thank you for contacting English Heritage.

Kind regards

Deborah Pinner | Customer Services Advisor | Customer Services  
English Heritage

From: Paul [REDACTED]  
Sent: 23 August 2018 19:38  
To: CISCUSTOMER; Sebire, Heather

Subject: Re: Discrepancy in Woodhenge historical information.

Dear English Heritage,

Please would somebody clarify who is dealing with this matter.

I thank you in anticipation of your reply.

Yours faithfully,

Paul Gossage.

From: CISCUSTOMER <CISCUSTOMER@english-heritage.org.uk>  
Sent: 09 August 2018 08:54  
To: Sebire, Heather  
Cc: [REDACTED]

Subject: FW: Discrepancy in Woodhenge historical information.

Dear Heather

I'm not sure if you're the best person to help with this enquiry,  
apologies if not

Thank you for your assistance

Kind regards

David Pope

Customer Service Advisor | Customer Services English Heritage

From: Paul [REDACTED]  
Sent: 25 July 2018 15:10  
To: CISCUSTOMER

Subject: Discrepancy in Woodhenge historical information.

Dear Sir/Madam,

Please can I ask why there is a significant discrepancy regarding the historical information you give about the grave of the three-year-old child at Woodhenge. It is under the flint cairn which is nearly in the centre of Woodhenge.

Your website in the link below says:

“One clue was the discovery at the centre of the site of the burial of a three-year-old child whose skull had been split open with an axe – apparently a sacrificial victim.”

However, page 23 of your guidebook says:

“The excavator suggested that the child’s skull had been split, but a more likely explanation is that the individual bones of the skull had not fused together at the time of the child’s death.”

There is a big difference between these two statements so please would you let me know which one is true?

Also, please can I ask you to correct the wrong statement?

I thank you in anticipation of your reply.

Yours faithfully,

Paul Gossage.