

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Manston Airport](#)  
**Subject:** For the attention of the Manston Airport Case Team  
**Date:** 22 June 2021 16:16:53

---

Dear Sirs

I am writing, again, to question the decision of the Secretary of State to **override the recommendation of the Examining Authority that planning consent should not be granted for the above project.**

Strangely, anything to do with the SOS decision to grant a DCO was removed from the website when I was composing this email, although the PINS' recommendation to refuse the DCO is still there. Why would such important official documents be removed from public view, when representations from interested parties are being sought yet again?

I have to point out that the need for housing is far greater than for another cargo airport, which has already failed three times and which the EA recommended should not be granted planning consent. The EA stated **“the levels of freight that the Proposed Development could expect to handle are modest and could be catered for at existing airports”**, while the erstwhile airport developer had **“failed to demonstrate sufficient need for the Proposed Development”**.

The Examining Authority (comprising a panel of four Planning Inspectors) appointed by the Secretary of State to conduct an examination of the application reported that the airport would: **“have a material impact on the ability of Government to meet its carbon reduction targets”**. The Government needs to demonstrate how the proposed expansions can be reconciled with their Climate Change declarations.

The EA concluded that **‘on balance the benefits of this proposal would not outweigh its impacts’ and recommended that the Government should NOT grant development consent.**

I reproduce below the Planning Inspectors' conclusions:

Clause 8.2.74 the Proposed Development will have a material impact on the ability of Government to meet its carbon reduction targets.

Clause 8.2.25 The applicant has failed to demonstrate sufficient need for the Proposed Development.

Clause 8.2.180 The ExA has significant doubts over the calculation of direct, indirect/ induced, and catalytic job numbers.

Clause 8.2.177 Direct jobs at the airport would be 19% lower than forecast.

Clause 8.2.184 The Proposed Development would adversely affect the tourism industry in Ramsgate.

Clause 8.2.143 The proposed interference with the Human Rights of individuals is not justified.

I can see no logical or coherent reason why the Secretary of State would grant the DCO in the face of such obvious obstacles, particularly as there is currently a huge number of employees laid off at other UK airports whose jobs are at risk of being permanently lost.

Jane Roberts