

**From:** [Chris Burrows](#)  
**To:** [Manston Airport](#)  
**Subject:** Resubmission of original unsigned email  
**Date:** 15 August 2023 18:38:41

---

Manston Airport Judicial Review. My Ref. MAN - 067

Dear Sir/ Madam,

Once again I would like to register my objection to the reopening of Manston Airport.

It seems to me that despite all the evidence presented from the very beginning of this long running saga, that the government decision makers have given themselves the prerogative to ignore all received evidence to the contrary and decided to follow only the biased presentation put forward by RiverOak Strategic Partners.

I am sure that I am not alone in wondering why this is so. Certainly Sir Roger Gale has very publicly asserted his unwavering support for this project, and given the very clear bias towards the aviation sector in general within government, it is not difficult to imagine the considerable influence that Sir Roger has been able to leverage to promote RSP ,s project. Initially he is known to have used its support as an election issue by somewhat inflating the level of local support. As we know, this gained traction from the efforts of the airport support groups, and the added idea that no airport would mean housing instead.

And so we come to a judicial review of the SoS decision to grant a DCO.

Here is not the place to submit yet more pros and cons but to question the legality of the SoSs decision in the face of so much negative received wisdom on the need for this project. Has political or personal bias influenced his decision? I am mindful here of the governments Jet Zero policy which appears to be firmly entrenched in government policy, again in the face of overwhelming evidence from many highly credible sources which state that this policy has serious shortcomings and indeed there have been at least two recommendations from the CCC itself, a government appointed body, which has stated that there should be no further airport expansion until the aviation industry is actually on track in it's reduced emissions targets.

The SoS in my view must surely be legally bound to consider all aspects of any decisions made. He must surely be required to be completely impartial in his considerations and be able to demonstrate sound reasons for his decisions.

Does the fact that any government policy, however faulty it can arguably be shown to be, mean that it is exonerated from being challenged and reversed?

I object to the DCO being granted on the grounds that the SoS did not give due consideration to the evidence presented of the lack of need and to the negative effect that further airport expansion such as at Manston will have on the environment regarding CO2 emissions.

Kind regards, Chris Burrows.

Sent from my iPad