

From: [REDACTED]
To: [A303 Stonehenge](#)
Subject: A303 / Stonehenge: further comments following archaeological discoveries
Date: 13 August 2020 12:55:01

A303 STONEHENGE: REQUEST FOR COMMENTS AND FURTHER INFORMATION FOLLOWING RECENT ARCHAEOLOGICAL DISCOVERIES

I have previously opposed the proposed tunnel in evidence to the NSIP enquiry (see [Examination library](#)). The recent archaeological discovery of a number of massive prehistoric pits surrounding Durrington Walls has illustrated and reinforced one of the major reasons for my opposition to it: the enormous destruction that it would entail of potential archaeological evidence.

It is simply not possible that archaeological investigation carried out in advance of the works can retrieve all the potential information. The sampling will be coarser, and new techniques of investigation are developed almost daily. Most members of the project's own [Scientific Committee](#) hold this same view.

As [distinguished archaeologists have recently written](#), only fully rigorous scientific research excavation would have uncovered the significance of the latest discovery. The discovery of the pits 'must fundamentally reconfigure all current knowledge and understanding of the prehistoric landscape' ([Paul Garwood](#)).

There is massive public opposition to the tunnel (inquiry, [REP3-078](#)). Now the public petition against the destructive works has risen in less than 6 months from 50,000 to 134,382 as I write ([overseas](#), [UK](#)).

People know that it is the Stonehenge landscape, celebrated by artists and writers for centuries, that confers the full majesty on the monument. It is unthinkable that this landscape could be scarred by massive tunnel cuttings and interchanges, the monstrous scale of which would dwarf and diminish Stonehenge.

And this destruction would deliver appalling value for £1.5bn - £2.4bn (2016 prices which will surely at least double due to overspends – [NAO 2019](#), [PAC 2019](#)).

Suzanne Keene

[REDACTED]

The Rt. Hon. Grant Shapps, MP,
Secretary of State for Transport,
Great Minster House,
33 Horseferry Road,
London SW1P 4DR.

10 August 2020

C/o by email: Susan.anderson@dft.gov.uk

Dear Secretary of State,

A303 STONEHENGE: REQUEST FOR COMMENTS AND FURTHER INFORMATION

Your decision on the A203 / Stonehenge tunnel has been deferred until November. I hope you will find this letter useful to your deliberations.

I have previously opposed the proposed tunnel in evidence to the NSIP enquiry (see [Examination library](#)). The recent archaeological discovery of a number of massive prehistoric pits surrounding Durrington Walls has illustrated and reinforced one of the major reasons for my opposition to it: the enormous destruction that it would entail of potential archaeological evidence.

It is simply not possible that archaeological investigation carried out in advance of the works can retrieve all the potential information. The sampling will be coarser, and new techniques of investigation are developed almost daily. Most members of the project's own [Scientific Committee](#) hold this same view.

As [distinguished archaeologists have recently written](#), only fully rigorous scientific research excavation would have uncovered the significance of the latest discovery. The discovery of the pits 'must fundamentally reconfigure all current knowledge and understanding of the prehistoric landscape' ([Paul Garwood](#)).

There is massive public opposition to the tunnel (inquiry, [REP3-078](#)). Now the public petition against the destructive works has risen in less than 6 months from 50,000 to 134,196 as I write ([overseas](#), [UK](#)).

People know that it is the Stonehenge landscape, celebrated by artists and writers for centuries, that confers the full majesty on the monument. It is unthinkable that this landscape could be scarred by massive tunnel cuttings and interchanges, the monstrous scale of which would dwarf and diminish Stonehenge.

And this destruction would deliver appalling value for £1.5bn - £2.4bn (2016 prices which will surely at least double due to overspends – [NAO 2019](#), [PAC 2019](#)).

I do sincerely hope you will decide against this poorly conceived scheme,

Yours sincerely



Suzanne Keene (Dr.)