

From: [REDACTED]
To: [A303 Stonehenge](#)
Subject: STONEHENGE A303 ROAD DEVELOPMENT PLAN
Date: 27 September 2022 12:31:58

Dear Secretary of State for Transport,

STONEHENGE A303 ROAD DEVELOPMENT PLAN - Comments on latest National Highways Submission

I write to make several points in relation to National Highway's response on the The World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/ICCROM Advisory Mission report.

World Heritage Site Listing

The Examining Authority appointed by the Planning Inspectorate, considered the plan over 6 months, and concluded that "...the effects of the Proposed Development on WHS OUV and the historic environment as a whole would be significantly adverse. Irreversible harm would occur, affecting the criteria for which the Stonehenge, Avebury and Associated World Heritage Site was inscribed on the World Heritage List."

The scheme goes against the advice of UNESCO's World Heritage Committee, and in 2021 they confirmed that if the development were to go ahead, the property warrants the inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/ICCROM Advisory Mission stated that at a minimum the west end of the tunnel should be extended to the WHS boundary.

The previous Transport Secretary agreed with the examining panel that the scheme would be overall '*significantly adverse*'.

National Highways in their responses has not acknowledged these points, nor taken account of them.

Transport and Climate Change

To be investing in large road developments during the climate crisis is wrong, given the government's stated commitment to Net Zero by 2050, and the objectives of the Environment Act 2021. Transport experts have examined the outcome of the development and say that it merely pushes the traffic problems further down the line, and only a short distance; *it will not solve the congestion problems that exist in this area*.

National Highways have not fully assessed alternative routes that would impact the site less, nor has it updated the carbon impact.

Costs

National Highways have not updated their construction costs, for the proposed scheme, or alternatives.

Conclusion

The arguments against this wide-reaching and destructive development are many and the plan has met wide opposition from many areas of interest, from heritage and archaeological as well as general public concern for this most cherished ancient site. Hundreds of thousands have signed a petition against the plan, from both here in the UK and across the world.

I believe that the claimed economic, environmental and so-called protective benefits of the development do not stand up to examination.

To carry out such a large scale development in this sensitive and hugely important World Heritage Site would be gross mismanagement of our national historical heritage. The people of the UK are immensely proud of Stonehenge as part of our own ancient history, and as a site of world importance. It is of incalculable value as an archaeological and historical site (over the whole of its WHS extent, many parts of which are yet to be

excavated).

I urge you to refuse the proposed scheme and thereby ensure the protected future of this world class heritage site, for which the UK has a huge responsibility as custodian.

Yours sincerely,

Lindsay Wakeman

