

From: [REDACTED]
To: [A303 Stonehenge; savestonehenge@gmail.com](mailto:A303Stonehenge@savestonehenge@gmail.com)
Subject: Submission re Stonehenge re-application: > no case < for any more roads through the 'the Wider Archaeological Area' ('WAA') - my definition
Date: 04 April 2022 21:52:48

To: A303Stonehenge@planninginspectorate.gov.uk

(Seems I got left off this list of approved persons. Here's my submission:)

(1) This is a site of world concern.

My role (founding an internet project (City-Voice.org, @CityVoicEd) supporting 'democracy' in town and country planning) is to observe/record – and publish widely – a wide range of reactions to planning proposals.

Why? Because of a strong perception of shortfalls in the 'democratic' standards and accountability of planning processes – the danger seeming greater the higher the authority; and the balance requires a counterweight.

Among authorities, HighwaysEngland appears especially at risk of making strongly-protested decisions – not clear why: I can only fear bureaucracy-born misdirection (or unseen undue influence?).

Thus while aware that this may not be 'a planning matter' I initially impugn the competence of the applicant (who happens also to be our nation, thus a party in which I have an interest). I do this mainly to rhetorically underscore allegation of the low quality of the proposal. There is a danger that planning authorities consider that actual public feeling about the merits of a proposal are "not a PLanning Matter" Nothing, of course, could be further from the truth.

(2) Quality of the proposals:

(i) CONTEXT

(i.i) National duty: a Planning Matter

- (a) **Our country owns a unique site of world importance;**
- (b) even our country has destroyed assets (e.g. C17 builders wrecked **Avebury**);
- (c) in C20 and C21 we have done better;
- (d) **we have a 'duty to the world' to continue improving.**
- (e) **'National Duty to Protect a World Asset' should be considered a 'Planning Matter'.**

If it is argued that it is not, I propose your decision must submit that it is, and if necessary this concept should be appealed to the Supreme Court (perhaps by a public plaintiff) for a ruling in law:

"Duty to the World's Heritage Assets is a Planning Consideration".

(i.ii) PARAMETERS

- (a) As with Avebury, progress has been made at Stonehenge, in C20 and C21, at low lasting cost: land has been bought, boundaries expanded.

- (b) Even so, A303 continues to barrel through the site.
- (c) If change to this invasion is sought, let's do it well and to completion, not by half-measures (especially if at high expense).

Let us treat the >whole of the site< as the single preservable entity.

If, as I understand, ancient structures and artefacts surround the current visible Stonehenge within a wide area

- **'the Wider Archaeological Area' ('WAA') - my definition,** where discoveries/excavations could happen in the future, then:

(ii) Main SUBMISSION: any new roadbuilding should go >around< the WAA, never through it.

I say this on the basis of this being the only logical conclusion.

Archaeologists will define the **WAA**.

This would continue the practice of **using change as a chance to improve, not stand still**

- in line with the gradual improvement at Avebury and Stonehenge over the last 150 years.

In the prior situation, a highway cuts the WAA site;

- how then can a **new** highway also cutting the WAA site be an improvement?

All that is needed would be to **define the WAA, and build any roads only >around< it.**

- I also repeat (as did MPs in Parliament) that any proposal that will prejudice the Blick Mead deposits must obviously be abandoned.

As I understand it this rules out a proposed overpass.

Stephen B. Fry

Founder/ Editor / Publisher

[REDACTED]