

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 04 August 2026 16:59
To: Norwich to Tilbury
Subject: Re: Deadline 8 – Written Submission – Interested Party Ref: [REDACTED]

Dear Planning Inspectorate,

I write as a director and the Accountable Manager of Raydon Wings Aerodrome.

Further to our previous correspondence, we write to inform you that we have been unable to enter into an SoCG with the Applicant because the Applicant sees such agreement as an opportunity to rewrite history and to fill in clear gaps in its conduct with respect to the process it is required to follow as set out in NPPF EN1 and associated policy. We refuse to assist the Applicant in misleading the Inspectorate in this way.

As detailed in our previous correspondence, it is abundantly clear that the Applicant has failed to engage with airfield operators early in the design process and, upon the erroneous advice of its aviation expert it, instead, took the view that it need not consider the effects of its proposals on unlicensed aerodromes along the graduated swathe.

This position was corrected in March 2025 by [REDACTED] of the CAA CAST team following which the Applicant again failed to follow CAA advice (to engage with Raydon Wings Aerodrome) and chose, instead, to fabricate its own “safety assessments” designed to persuade the Inspectorate that “there is nothing to see here”. By March of 2025, the designs were advanced and the Applicant, wishing to avoid any additional work, chose to bake in its errors as opposed to correcting its mistakes.

Since ISH2, we have had one Teams meeting with the Applicant during which the Applicant was not willing to discuss any changes to the proposed scheme but was keen to discuss mitigations to construction related disturbance, presumably in order to give the impression that it had engaged with Raydon Wings in some meaningful manner. It has not.

We have provided the Applicant with our HAZID and Risk Assessments relating to the proposed scheme. We have heard nothing since. We have also provided a list of the commercial opportunities that have been frustrated by the proposed scheme. Clearly, we cannot invest in infrastructure and staff until we understand the quantum of the threat to our survival, hence we have not been in a position to take advantage of these approaches. If this scheme goes ahead as proposed, we will have no option but to close the aerodrome.

We ask that the Inspectorate refuses the Application until such time as the Applicant has actually followed the correct processes set out in planning policy such that the SoS can be assured that the impact of the Applicant’s proposals upon proximate aviation interests have been fully minimised as per EN1. In the case of Raydon Wings, the Applicant has made no adjustments whatsoever and has consistently refused to discuss making adjustments. It is clear that, in the case of Raydon Wings Aerodrome, EN1 has not been adhered to in any meaningful way.

We would be grateful for your confirmation of receipt.

Yours sincerely,



Raydon Wings Aerodrome
Details Ltd

