

From: [REDACTED]
To: [A303 Stonehenge](#)
Subject: A303 Stonehenge Road Scheme
Date: 08 March 2022 15:46:10

Dear Sir,

In response to the invitation to comment further on the A303 Stonehenge Road Scheme I would like to make the following points:

I first visited Stonehenge 60 years ago, it was a very special place then, and remains uniquely so in terms of its cultural, historical, archeological and environmental significance, at a national and international level.

Two years ago I returned and walked that whole area around the Stones, the Avenue, the Cursus Woodhenge and Durrington Walls amongst others. It confirmed my view that this is a very special place that should be enhanced and protected, not eroded and fragmented any further.

Despite this, as far as I am aware, National Highways have not made any changes to the Scheme, to take the 2021 World Heritage Committee's clear decision into account, nor given any indication of recognising, nor responding to, the fact that the Secretary of State has found that the Scheme's impact on the proposed western cutting area would be "significantly adverse".

There is still no sign that National Highways have fully assessed alternative routes that would be much less damaging to the World Heritage Site such as a southern bypass route, or, perhaps even better, a longer tunnel; this is the option I would prefer, and I believe it would significantly reduce impact on the World Heritage Site.

I believe much more could be done in the way of exploring such alternatives to the scheme as measures to reduce actual road traffic levels, locally and regionally. Improving access to the South West should, in view of the current climate emergency, focus much more on public transport and far less on cars. The current scheme does not recognise how such key issues have emerged since it was first proposed.

Recent developments in Ukraine suggest oil dependency could make individual and HGV road transport much less attractive than coach or rail in the future.

I believe there is little evidence of updated construction costs; nor of an updated carbon assessment, in light of a climate crisis that has become much more critical since the scheme was first proposed.

Account should also now be taken of the greater priority needed for the unique natural environment around Stonehenge since the Environment Act of 2021.

Yours faithfully,
Jonathan Burrows