

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [REDACTED] [A303 Stonehenge](#)  
**Cc:**  
**Subject:** Re: Stone Henge  
**Date:** 28 September 2022 20:22:05

---

Dear Anne Marie Trevelyan

I re-iterate the remarks below from my brother, and add the following.

In addition I urge that the submissions of alternatives presented by the Advisory Mission are reviewed, and not cursorily passed over, and that other submissions from specialist expert leads in the fields of knowledge of Transport and Archaeology are included, and given the proper consideration with a genuine commitment to developing an appropriate scheme that enhances the area and the monument for generations to come.

- I have read the [REDACTED] and agree with its principal finding, i.e. that the scheme would have an adverse impact on the OUV of the WHS and that a southern bypass should be further explored.
- The Mission admitted that at the very least the western limit of the tunnel should be extended to the WHS boundary.
- National Highways has simply reiterated many of the arguments it has raised previously to justify a scheme which is clearly unacceptable to:
  - Government’s independent specialist examiners,
  - UNESCO’s World Heritage Committee, and
  - the former Transport Secretary himself who agreed with the examining panel that the scheme would be “significantly adverse” overall.
- The High Court judgment quashed the DCO in part because the Transport Secretary had not given proper consideration to alternatives.
- National Highways’ response fails to alleviate any of the above concerns.
- I/We continue to object to the proposals and hope that the scheme will be abandoned.
- Should the Transport Secretary intend to proceed with the scheme, I/we trust that it will be subject of another formal public Examination so that all of the 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.

And of course if you are immune to these arguments the realistic alternative for the many that will be opposed to the scheme may be to oppose the implementation and to seek another government that is committed to preserving our natural heritage. I cannot see how the proposed scheme can be justified even in VFM or in expediency terms.

Your sincerely  
Claire Drummond

