

From: [REDACTED]
To: [A303 Stonehenge](#)
Subject: Redetermination of A303 Stonehenge scheme
Date: 09 March 2022 16:31:17

Good afternoon,

I would like to pass on my concerns, following the response from National Highways to the Secretary of State for Transport, regarding plans for the A303 near Stonehenge.

Firstly, I am troubled that National Highways has not acknowledged or accepted any changes to the scheme which were put forward by the 2021 World Heritage Committee. Given the huge historical importance of this site, this is a significant oversight which can not be ignored. Why has National Highways chosen not to consider the changes suggested?

For my second point, there is an additional issue which must be considered by National Highways; clearly, any new scheme around Stonehenge will generate increased emissions, which is contrary to the latest intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change report. How will National Highways address this? They have made no mention of it in their revised scheme. In addition, the Environment Act 2021 sets out new guidance around nature recovery, and this is not reflected either, in their current plans for the A303.

There are also alternatives to consider which would be less damaging to Stonehenge and its surrounding area, such as a southern bypass route - and National Highways has not fully explored this. In addition, it has not fully investigated the possibility of creating a longer tunnel that would reduce impact on the site. Furthermore, measures such as reducing road traffic and emissions, and improving overall access to the South West have not been fully considered either. These are huge omissions.

The Secretary of State himself has found that the impact of the scheme on the western cutting area would be "significantly adverse". This has not been acknowledged or addressed at all by the Highways Agency.

In summary, the Highways Agency has not taken into consideration points made by other groups with expertise and knowledge relating to the proposed scheme, and the response they have given does not go far enough to protect and preserve the area adequately.

Yours sincerely,
Sue Lenihan

