

Burn Gliding Club IP 20050600

Response to: EN010140/APP/9.11: The Applicant's Responses to Deadline 5 Submissions
April 2025 (Submitted at DL6)

Burn Gliding Club (BGC) has signed (22 April 2025) a Statement of Common Ground with the Applicant and has identified a number of matters where it disagrees with assertions and statements made by the Applicant.

For clarity and completeness, where these assertions and statements are also made in the above document, BGC wishes to draw the following matters to the ExA's attention.

Table 3.2

Comment A4: The BGC *normal* hours of operation are between 10am and 30 minutes after sunset but these are not formal limitations and *vary*.

Comment A6: BGC is the expert on safety risks arising from glint and glare and should be fully engaged in this modelling.

Comment B2: Burn Gliding Club **does** benefit from the restriction on planning permitted development rights within 3km of the aerodrome. It is listed as an aerodrome in the CAA CAP481 and does, therefore, meet the definition of an aerodrome under the GPDO.

Comment B4: BGC has consistently explained that the Applicant's '*High-level Investigative Report*' is flawed and the references to the % of 'available land' is not a relevant issue as any land of the shown within zones likely to be used in an emergency could be crucial to aviation safety.

Comment B5: The lack of detail and assertions in the 'High-level Investigative Report' are questioned by BGC and definitive assessment is required.

Comment C1: The prospective developer of the Port Jackson / Halt / Sandpit Farm sought information and feedback from Burn Gliding Club at an early stage. BGC has evaluated the Port Jackson scheme and does not consider it will create a significant safety risk to the gliding operations. While Port Jackson contributes to the accumulation of solar farms in the Selby area, this demonstrates that BGC is acting responsibly and its focus remains on the aviation safety risks arising from the Helios project and the poor quality of the prospective developer's risk assessment.

However, in its comments on this Applicant's assessment, close to Burn Airfield, BGC is not talking only about an increase in glare but increased

frequency of eyes being exposed and incapacitated due to a series of incidents.

Comment C1.1: BGC does not accept that the Applicant's Glint and Glare Study is robust or supports the conclusions set out in the Applicant's Response.

Table 3.3

Comment 1.1: This is the only reference to '*thermal updrafts*'. BGC has made clear that the updated report referred to by the Applicant is based on a well-known metric used by its consultant Pager Power but this is not calibrated for, or applicable to, gliding activity. This is supported by the CAA CAST which expects that an empirical thermal updraft assessment should be undertaken to provide definitive information.

Comment 6.2: The Applicant has not given full consideration to the provisions of EN-1, particularly Section 5.5.

BGC 24 April 2025