

From: [REDACTED]
To: [A303 Stonehenge](#)
Subject: Redetermination of A303 Stonehenge scheme
Date: 23 March 2022 15:46:19

Dear Planning Inspectorate,

I am concerned to learn of stark failures by National Highways in its latest submissions.

National Highways has not updated the construction costs for the scheme nor have they updated the carbon assessment impact and costs. This seems to me to be an extraordinary omission on their part (indeed for any company) in the current climate/environmental situation we are facing with regard to global warming; extraordinary too in a company that I understand aspires to both high accounting/financial standards and 'green' credentials.

National Highways has not fully assessed alternative routes less damaging to the World Heritage Site. I would favour **a southern bypass route. A southern bypass route would be cheaper even if there might be some problems with it.** A longer tunnel (which is not, as I understand, proposed by National Highways) may reduce the impact on the World Heritage Site; however, a longer tunnel (indeed any tunnel) will inevitably be far more polluting in its construction than a southern bypass route, not to mention far more expensive. For these reasons I am opposed to any tunnel and in favour of a southern bypass route.

National Highways has not explored alternatives to hard engineering solutions in the context of safeguarding and enhancing the World Heritage Site: for example, a package of measures to reduce road traffic, road emissions and improve access to the South West. They have placed far too much weight on commuters and not enough on climate, environment and heritage. It may be that National Highways thinks there is some sort of balance or compromise to be made between these issues but I very much doubt that such a thing is possible.

National Highways **has not made any changes to the Scheme to take the 2021 World Heritage Committee Decision into account.** Nor has it acknowledged that the Secretary of State found the Scheme's impact on the proposed western cutting area would be "significantly adverse".

Stonehenge is an important World Heritage site – unique in its kind – and it attracts many visitors from across the world. It is shameful and unjustifiable for National Highways to ignore the World Heritage Committee Decision in the way that it has. I cannot believe that this omission is anything other than deliberate on their part. It is inconceivable that they did not know about it. It shows a lack of care and attention to detail in their planning, [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

As you will already know there has been much criticism of National Highways' smart motorways (particularly all-lane running) and its reaction to that criticism over the years and since it was told to pause the roll-out. You may also be aware that the current chief executive, [REDACTED] spear-headed smart motorways before he took up his current post and of the decisions he made to push ahead and ignore concerns (the reduction of lay-bys in particular) which have come back to bite the company. Whatever one's position on that or on Stonehenge, there seems to be a pattern in National Highways in that it feels it can ignore criticism from and points raised by parliament and from other areas including the courts. One of National Highways core values is supposed to be "integrity", yet it is apparently ignoring its responsibilities and presenting the planning inspectorate with incomplete submissions which do not take account of their responsibility in relation to climate change nor the preservation of a site of unique archaeological importance.

What Highways England should be doing is setting out all the options with all of the pros and cons of each even if they favour one of them, but they only seem to have given attention to what they want to do, without actually providing the assessments that they have been asked for.

I hope that you will take note of this attitude/lack of care and attention to detail along with the other issues I have mentioned and bear it in mind in reaching your decision.

Janyce Hawliczek

[REDACTED]