

From: [REDACTED]
To: [A303 Stonehenge](#)
Subject: Issues on the road scheme
Date: 02 April 2022 10:43:28

From: Mr John Davison, [REDACTED]

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the scheme.

The Secretary of State for Transport wants to make a new decision on the Stonehenge road scheme. He asked National Highways for responses to five matters he wishes to consider:

- Alternatives,
- Policy,
- Carbon,
- Environmental Information, and
- Any Other Matters.

The scheme appears out of alignment with other government policy. For instance Actions to deliver the objectives in the Government's Cycling and Walking Strategy were set in place in 2017. The actions worked towards the ambition to make cycling and walking the natural choice for shorter journeys, or as part of a longer journey. This means that for passenger transport (cars) the ambition is modal shift. As this sinks in, reduced car ownership means reduced reservoir of cars to justify capacity increase for the A303. In Govt document 'Gear Change: One Year On' (published 2021) there was a commitment to further funding for Active Travel, reinforcing the modal change message.

Since the Examination closed there have been changes:

- 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.

National Highways has a very large budget under RIS2, so has much more time to produce documents and responses than individual members of the public. Despite such resources, they seem to have got it wrong:

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;
- 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.

I think that if a job cannot be fully justified or has flawed, it really should not go ahead

Kind regards
John