

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [A303 Stonehenge](#)  
**Subject:** Comments on National Highways submission re. A303 Stonehenge  
**Date:** 26 September 2022 11:11:30

---

**For the attention of The Transport Secretary, The Rt Hon Anne-Marie Trevelyan MP,**

**Regarding the proposed A303 Stonehenge scheme:**

I feel very strongly that any planning for growth, including road schemes, should not be at the cost of a World Heritage Site. We have just one Stonehenge - it and the associated surroundings of important historical and archaeological sites, should never be put at risk.

Not only has the scheme been rejected by UNESCO, but five Planning Inspectors have also rejected it. There is worldwide dismay that such an important site could be irrevocably damaged. In addition, the consent was quashed by The High Court. Does this not say something about the need to tread very carefully here in order to preserve Stonehenge for now, and for future generations?

I agree with the principal finding of the Advisory Mission, that the scheme suggested would undoubtedly have an adverse impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of this World Heritage Site and that a southern bypass should be further explored. At the very least, the western limit of the tunnel should be extended to the WHS boundary, as admitted by the Mission.

In an attempt to justify a scheme which, as I have noted above, is clearly unacceptable to:

- Government's independent specialist examiners,
- UNESCO's World Heritage Committee,
- the former Transport Secretary himself (who agreed with the examining panel that the scheme would be "significantly adverse" overall),

National Highways has simply reiterated many of the arguments it has raised previously. These arguments do not bear scrutiny and cannot be justified.

Has any proper consideration been given to alternatives? I think not – and there needs to be a great deal of creative thinking before any scheme should be considered for this site. Indeed, The High Court judgment quashed the Development Consent Order in part because the Transport Secretary had not given proper consideration to alternatives.

I continue to object to these proposals and hope that the scheme will be abandoned.

Should the Transport Secretary intend to proceed with the scheme, I trust that it will be subject of another formal Public Examination so that any new information submitted by National Highways and others since 2020 may be fully and openly discussed, and taken into account and advised upon by the Government's independent Planning Inspectorate.

Yours sincerely, and with great concern,

Yvonne Gillian