

From: [REDACTED]
To: [A303 Stonehenge](#)
Subject: comments on proposed alterations to A303
Date: 03 April 2022 16:55:05

I am most concerned at the current proposals

the latest Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change report has rightly led to massively increased concern regarding climate change. We need to take urgent action to reduce emissions. Nothing we do or propose should increase emissions. But any new Stonehenge road scheme will do just that.

In the circumstances, it is disconcerting that National Highways has made no changes to the Scheme to take account of the 2021 World Heritage Committee Decision.

The Secretary of State actually found that the Scheme's impact on the proposed western cutting area would be "significantly adverse." I see no evidence that National Highways has even acknowledged this, let alone taken steps to ameliorate the adverse impact.

We are now also in the situation that the Environment Act 2021 sets new ambitions around nature recovery. It seems that this can be taken as just so much hot air, certainly if the National Highways plans go forward unaltered. They need to be reconsidered in the light of this Act.

If National Highways is determined to go through with road 'improvements', then alternative routes less damaging to the World Heritage Site must be fully assessed. I understand that 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; equally, other alternatives such as a package of measures to reduce road traffic, road emissions and improve access to the South West could be devised, rather than hard engineering solutions, in the context of safeguarding and enhancing the World Heritage Site.

Meantime, it is surely mandatory that National Highways both update the scheme construction costs and also update the carbon assessment and costs. Not doing this treats the taxpayer, and the future of the planet, with contempt.

I request that the Development Consent Order be re-examined.

Thank you

Peter Ehrhardt

[REDACTED]