

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [A303 Stonehenge](#)  
**Subject:** Comment regarding the proposed A303 development project  
**Date:** 28 September 2022 12:33:01

---

The Rt Hon Anne-Marie Trevelyan MP  
Secretary of State for Transport

Dear Minister,

I am writing to express my concern over the proposed development project which threatens one of Britain's most important national heritage sites: Stonehenge.

I note from the developers' response the positive acknowledgment by the advisory mission of the efforts they have taken to consult with concerned parties, quoting at length from the passage on p 43 in their letter, which mainly covers the quality of the information and documents provided to the mission for their examination.

What, then, with regards to the results of the mission's enquiry?

There is scant reference to the mission's specific concerns on pp 31/32 of the effects to the visual and functional integrity of the henge which have remained largely untampered with since its construction. I am extremely concerned by the fact that the mission indicates that 'additional expertise in cultural landscape conservation, management, and interpretation' would be beneficial.

I am not convinced that the provision for 'consultation and collaboration with heritage bodies on design matters' (applicant letter of 9 Sep 22, page 2) are sufficient to deal with the concerns raised.

I cannot avoid rhetoricising the issue by asking why, given the level of consultation that has happened, there is still the need for additional expert advice and input to be given.

There is no need for rhetoric. The facts of the report are stark and clear.

The mission's conclusions are that the proposed scheme needs 'substantial amendment' (Section 3.3.3, p 44); the proposed 'western portal and associated dual carriageway, within a cutting, would also have an adverse impact' which 'should not proceed without substantial amendment to avoid this impact' (p 42) Given the overall mitigating tone of the report, the strong wording of this paragraph gives clear cause for concern. 'Substantial amendment' is not the same as 'consultation and collaboration' based on a scheme which raises such grave concerns - concerns that should give pause for thought and the request for further specific amendments before any consent is given.

I note that the Stonehenge Alliance continues to object to the proposals (as they stand) and that their hope is that the scheme will be abandoned.

While I am personally adamantly against any interference with the exceptional heritage site - and remain unconvinced that the intervention proposed would bring benefits which outweigh any potential problems in the long term, and that any amendments would improve matters, I understand the views that stakeholders have put forward and hope that whatever decision is reached will not only preserve the heritage site for future generations to enjoy, or simply conserve it, but will enhance this exceptional site and treat it as a gift which we are entrusted to look after and pass on in better shape than we have received it. Rather than adding to traffic I would like to see a scheme which reduces it more generally - for if we do not reduce carbon-based emissions more widely more quickly, and go back to a simpler way of living, there will be no heritage site to preserve.

You, as minister, have a duty to ensure this happens. I am sure you take this duty seriously and will act responsibly with regard to requesting further consideration be made to address the concerns the majority of people have about the project. While their objections are held for different reasons, and in different intensities, the general feeling is that any proposal which undercuts the site is wrong on a basic, primal level of gut instinct. And that should be respected.

Yours sincerely,

Leon Conrad  
[REDACTED]