

From: [REDACTED]
To: [A303 Stonehenge](#)
Subject: Response to the invitation to comment on information submitted by the Applicant.
Date: 04 April 2022 19:31:09
Attachments: [Response to the Secretary of State for Transport April 2022.pdf](#)

Hello,

Please find attached my response to the invitation to comment on information submitted by the Applicant.

Kind regards,

Brian

--

[REDACTED]

The Secretary of State for Transport's proposed Redetermination of the A303 Amesbury–Berwick Down (Stonehenge) Scheme.

Brian Edwards, Visiting Research Fellow, The Regional History Centre, University of the West of England, Bristol, and Deputy Representative of the Avebury and Stonehenge Archaeological and Historical Research Group (ASAHRG) to the steering group of the Stonehenge, Avebury and Associated sites World Heritage Site (WHS).

Reference number: [REDACTED]

4 April 2022

My previous submissions on this subject:

Edwards, B. (2019, April). 'Issues around the past and present value of the A303 in the public consciousness,' Examination of Highways England's A303 Stonehenge DCO Application TR010025, Reference number: 20020830.

Edwards, B. (2020, August 10). 'A response to the Secretary of State for Transport requesting views on any implications arising from new discoveries for the A303 development at Stonehenge 16 July 2020'.

In response to the invitation to comment on information submitted by the Applicant I offer the following observations:

Despite decisions and statements in relation to harm to the WHS by the Secretary of State for Transport, the World Heritage Committee, five independent Planning Inspectors, and the High Court; the Applicant maintains a contrary stance.

There is no evident change to the Applicant's position in respect of alternatives.

The Applicant has not offered a comprehensive assessment of a viable route around Salisbury, which would relieve the section of the A303 through the WHS of freight traffic routed between the West Country and Southampton.


Much is stated in reference to Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) without acknowledgment there is no substantial harm to OUV, or further damage to the WHS, if the A303 remains as it is.

The Applicant still fails to acknowledge the full impact on OUV of introducing cuttings within the WHS. The cuttings will forever remove future opportunities to stand at places where things happened in prehistory within a short walk of the Triangle, and strip the WHS of layers of OUV and unacknowledged heritage assets.

The Applicant has yet to comment on and factor in changes introduced to the Highway Code 29 January 2022.

The Applicant is yet to comment on the failure to introduce electric car charging points at the Stonehenge Visitor Centre.

The Applicant is yet to comment on the indicative pattern of Stonehenge visitor figures 2020-2021 compared to the overall 25% increase on 2020 noted by the Association of Leading Visitor Attractions (ALVA).



In conclusion:

I remain opposed to this highly damaging Scheme and in my opinion a re-examination of the Development Consent Order is required.

Brian Edwards

4 April 2022