

From: [REDACTED]
To: [A303 Stonehenge](#)
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: TR010025 A303 Amesbury to Berwick Down RE DETERMINATION 4
Date: 02 August 2022 22:35:19

For the attention of the A303 Stonehenge Case Team

I am responding as an Interested Party reg no. **768184** and would be grateful for confirmation you have received this.

I reiterate that I represent in my capacity as an Archdruid, the Female Druids United, the environmental voluntary network Sacred Grove Western Isles and the free access to Stonehenge campaigning group Open Access to Stonehenge and we continue to OBJECT to this Planning Application. There are no elements of this proposed development project, that I nor those I represent, can support.

The tunnel would bring permanent archaeological and conservational damage to the WHS and deny free and full public amenity both to the public and those who hold Stonehenge and its environs as a sacred temple and landscape.

Planning Act 2008 and the Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010 Re-determination of the Application by Highways England for an Order granting Development Consent for the A303 Amesbury to Berwick Down (“A303 Stonehenge”)

1. I am responding to Request for Comments sent to me on 13 July 2022 on the Re Determination 4 set of documents demanded by the Secretary of State for Transport Grant Shapps, which are 14 sets of highly technical reports and data and as before, ranging from page quantities 2, 5 [maps & plans] 2x11 [maps & plans] 2x19 [maps & plans] 42, 43, 47. 65, 68, 81 82 84, total 579 pages to be read and considered often by lay public in 16 days not counting weekends!
2. The time allowed for perusal and assessment is insufficient even if this fourth set of documents are less than previous RDs that had documents with over 1,000 pages with no abstract, summary or schedule of changes.
3. UNESCO together with ICOMOS, The Consortium of Stonehenge Experts, Stonehenge Alliance and other experts opinions notwithstanding, I can only reiterate that I agree with their submissions and refer you to what I have already submitted regarding this inadequate and quashed Application.
4. I have no faith whatsoever in the veracity, viability and environmental validity of this Application.
5. Nothing that the Applicant has provided as prior evidence has convinced a learned Judge, five highly experienced Planning Inspectors nor the experts mentioned in 3. above, so I cannot rely on any new evidence without the guidance of either the original Examining Panel or a new Panel.
6. I reaffirm my previously filed Comments/Complaints relating to this Application re the validity of the procedure of the Application and **inequitable access to public consultation information on Planning Inspectorate website and process significantly affected by substantial changes to the Application.**
7. I restate my previously filed Request for a full **Re-examination of this Development Consent Order** by an Independent panel /Examining Authority **BEFORE the Secretary of State Re-determines this Application for a DCO for the identical road scheme File Ref: TR010025.**

Lois Lloyd BSc(Hons)