

From: [Keith Barker](#)
To: [A303 Stonehenge](#)
Subject: Stonehenge: proposed A303 road widening scheme re-determination
Date: 31 March 2022 12:37:57

Dear Grant Shapps, Secretary of State for Transport

Though living in Glasgow, but as an individual deeply interested in pre-history and the preservation of Neolithic and Bronze Age sites, I am equally deeply concerned about the proposals (eg as contained within the National Highways submission) to deal with the Stonehenge World Heritage Site.

Firstly, I should acknowledge the immense difficulty - in so many ways - of trying to find an appropriate solution that could possibly satisfy all interested parties: such is unlikely. Clearly, Stonehenge must be protected and preserved. Clearly, too, other pre-historic sites - known and possible - around Stonehenge itself also have to be protected. Clearly, however, the interests of necessary road users, local people and even people travelling to view Stonehenge also have to be taken into account. Then there are the more general, contemporary - but essential - concerns about climate change including the impact of road traffic and fuel emissions. Accepted: it's not remotely easy!

In the first instance, I wish to record concern that climate change demands a move away from the kind of increased fuel emissions that are inherent in the proposed - indeed almost any - road scheme changes to accommodate Stonehenge. Notably, for example, the Environment Act of last year has put forward enhanced targets for coping with environmental impact: these must be taken into account and cannot be fulfilled by the proposed scheme under re-examination.

Specifically referring to the contribution of the National Highways I note, and wish to express my concern about, the following:

- There is no mention of estimated costs: surely, setting aside any other considerations, such is pre-requisite to re-determination?
- There is an absence of possible, alternative measures that could lead to the absolutely necessary reduction of already excessive fuel emissions and their negative impact on the immediate environment including health of local people.
- There is no comment upon the World Heritage Committee's position/decision of last year.
- There is, as I understand it, no accommodation of your own position that the proposed scheme would, in fact, have an adverse impact on the immediate area.
- There appears to be no constructive and innovative alternative proposals to the proposed scheme.

Re-emphasising my acceptance of the difficulty in establishing the “right” solution for Stonehenge (and the locality and the environment), I’m clear from what I’ve read that current proposals are entirely inadequate: you/we have to do better! Please, therefore, ensure that the Development Consent order in relation to the Stonehenge World Heritage Site is re-considered and re-determined. Hopefully, then, combined interests' input can find a way forward that we can all accept and enjoy.

Thank you.

Yours sincerely,

Keith Barker

