Dear Secretary of State,

I wish to make the following representations in connection with the redetermination of the above scheme:

Alternatives

National Highways has not seriously considered the proposed alternative route around the southern edge of the World Heritage Site (WHS), which would be less intrusive, less damaging to the WHS and probably less expensive. Another option not seriously considered, probably because of lack of experience in constructing long road tunnels in the UK compared with the rest of Europe, is constructing a tunnel that goes beneath the whole 5.5km width of the WHS. That would be a long tunnel - but one that is shorter than more than 100 other road tunnels in the world (see



Carbon Emissions

National Highways has not updated the carbon assessment and costs since the Examination closed. Concern for climate change has increased with the latest Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change report and the need to take urgent action to reduce emissions highlighted by many contributors to COP26. Any new Stonehenge road scheme would increase emissions and greater consideration should have been given to methods of reducing demand for car and lorry travel along this route e.g. by increasing the attractiveness of rail passenger and freight travel along the more or less parallel line between London and Exeter.

Benefit assessment

The benefits of the scheme need reassessing in the light of the post-covid traffic situation. It is common knowledge that there is significantly more working from home and a consequence of this is that there will be less commuting along the A303 and other trunk roads.

Lack of due regard to the World Heritage Site designation

Secretary of State found the Scheme's impact on the proposed western cutting area would be 'significantly adverse' and UNESCO has warned of the potential impact on the WHS - an impact which could threaten the very designation as a WHS. The significance of this landscape as one of worldwide renown still does not seem to be recognised by National Highways - enhancing and protecting this landscape should be the prime concern - not optimising narrowly-defined financial cost/benefit analyses. The Stonehenge landscape is part of our national identity and a significant part of the world's heritage; this needs to be recognised by those making decisions on this proposed scheme.

Yours sincerely,

John Moon

