

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [A303 Stonehenge](#)  
**Subject:** Redetermination of A303 Stonehenge scheme  
**Date:** 04 April 2022 10:28:28

---

Dear Planning Inspectorate,

I am asking you to rule against the planned tunnel under Stonehenge; I object to the plans for a number of reasons.

Firstly, the scheme is intended to safeguard the monument and the World Heritage site, but it is contradictory to protect it by digging 2 huge entrances and a road tunnel under it- all from within the boundaries of the World Heritage Site! As more archaeological evidence emerges, it is clear that Stonehenge must be seen within a much wider context than the narrow boundaries of the site itself. There are numerous other henges and prehistoric sites in the surrounding area, and the massive roadbuilding scheme planned will cause irreparable damage to the archaeology.

At the very least, to protect the site any tunnel should start and finish from outside the 5.4 km World Heritage site, but the planned tunnel is only 3 km long. There would be considerable disturbance to the ground and possible buried artefacts not just in the narrowly defined area of the tunnel entrances, but also over a much wider area during construction. Building a major roadway and tunnel is not a tidy process; it involves a vast amount of spoil being brought out for disposal, and a similarly large amount of material being brought in for the construction. The World Heritage Organization stated in July 2021 that *"The proposed tunnel length remains inadequate to protect the OUV of the property"*. To be clear, I am totally opposed to the idea of a tunnel, but if one is to be considered, it should start and finish well outside the 'protected' area; ie. it must be much longer, and will inevitably be a lot more expensive.

Secondly, the Department for Transport has not fully assessed alternative solutions, such as a southern bypass, which would be cheaper, and involve less damage to the site they claim to be trying to protect. They should also investigate the potential for other measures to reduce traffic flow and to reduce emissions, whilst improving access to the South West.

Thirdly, the Department needs to address some significant factors that have changed since the plan was first submitted in 2019. These include the following:

- reduction in road traffic volumes caused by responses to the pandemic, and most recently by the massive rise in fuel costs
- significant increase in construction costs of materials, fuel, and labour, caused by the pandemic and the war in Ukraine.
- climate change is now accorded a higher priority by the public and by the Government; the Department should be undertaking measures to lower emissions, but by increasing traffic flow the Stonehenge tunnel will inevitably raise them. They have to take account of (among others) carbon budgets, the 2050 zero target under the Climate Change Act 2008, and the UK's Nationally Determined Contribution under the Paris Agreement.

Furthermore, there are compelling arguments that the Development Consent Order should be re-examined by an independent panel before the Secretary of State considers it, because of the need to give current cost estimates and to take account of UNESCO's worrying conclusion that if the scheme goes ahead, they may place Stonehenge on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Regards,

Paul Judge

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]