

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [A303 Stonehenge](#); [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Stonehenge DCO re-examine and refuse to grant  
**Date:** 03 April 2022 22:36:42

---

**Dear Sir, Madam**

**To the Planning Inspectorate**

**I am calling for a re-examination of Development Consent Order, to prevent a wanton act of vandalism being visited on the World Heritage site, and our cultural heritage, Stonehenge. Better alternatives must be presented which will achieve public backing for an enhancement that properly befits the importance of the Stonehenge site to our understanding of who we are.**

In my opinion the omission on current cost estimates, UNESCO's position and new information since the Examination closed in October 2019 are compelling grounds for a re-examination by an independent panel BEFORE the Secretary of State redetermines an application for a DCO for the very same road scheme

**National Highways has not:**

- **made any changes to the Scheme to take the 2021 World Heritage Committee Decision into account;**
- acknowledged that the Secretary of State found the Scheme's impact on the proposed western cutting area would be "**significantly adverse**";
- **fully assessed alternative routes less damaging to the World Heritage Site** e.g., a southern bypass route would be cheaper even if there might be some problems with it, while a longer tunnel would reduce impact on the World Heritage Site;
- **explored alternatives to hard engineering** solutions in the context of safeguarding and enhancing the World Heritage Site – e.g. a package of measures to reduce road traffic, road emissions and improve access to the South West;
- updated the scheme construction costs; nor
- updated the carbon assessment and costs.

**Other changes 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, not increase them as any new Stonehenge road scheme would; and
- the Environment Act 2021 sets new ambitions around nature recovery.

In terms of vfm there're are clear arguments that the site should demand high initial investment that will repay itself by delivering a well-conceived scheme that enhances the integrity and the beauty of this area, and will add to our understanding of the plentiful new discoveries of a vast complex of sites and uses in the area that we are heir to; and by protecting it we will undoubtedly reap far greater benefits than the false economy of a scheme that will destroy it.

Please advise me of how I can keep track of the determination of the Secretary of State in this matter. I would be grateful if you would publish my comments on the National Infrastructure Planning website.

Thank you

Claire Drummond

