



Norfolk Gliding Club Ltd

Tibenham Airfield, Diss, Norfolk, NR16 1NT
www.norfolkglidingclub.com
admin@norfolkglidingclub.com
T:01379 677207

Norwich to Tilbury EN020027

Interested Party Reference Number [REDACTED]

Response to ISH 4 – Thursday 25 June

Agenda item 7 - Aviation Safety

Action Point 24

Action Point 24 (directed at the Applicant) states

Continue positive dialogue with the aerodromes where matters are outstanding.

Provide an update on how you are working towards resolution of outstanding matters and towards resolution via the statements of common ground

On behalf of Norfolk Gliding Club, I would make the following comments

Since the first consultation in 2023 there has been very little 'positive' dialogue and the experience of the joint Applicant/BGA/NGC meeting of Monday June 29 demonstrates how one-sided it has become (see Response to ISH 4, ref 00:45:06:28)

As matters stand it is unlikely there will be further discussion with NGC by the Applicant until they accept their responsibilities and agreements which can be summarised as

A recognition that they do not comply with EN – 1 in that, despite identifying Tibenham as an airfield creating routeing risk in 2022 as shown in APP-356, the Applicant failed to follow that up where EN – 1 states

'It is essential that new energy infrastructure is developed collaboratively alongside aerodromes

In addition, they fail to comply with the later part of that statement

Safety, operations and capabilities are not adversely affected by new energy infrastructure'

A recognition they do not comply with the three elements of NPPF paragraph 200
'decisions should ensure that new developments can be integrated effectively with existing businesses' - a need to close runways on safety grounds cannot be construed as 'effective integration'

'Existing businesses should not have unreasonable restrictions placed on them as a result of development permitted after they were established' – we consider the need to close runways due to the safety issues the project would cause to be unreasonable

'the applicant (or agent of change) should be required to provide suitable mitigation' – had the Applicant collaborated with us from the outset (ie in 2022) a different route alignment could have been agreed which would have resolved all these safety issues. The choice not to do so was of their own making, not ours

The decision by the Applicant to withhold the agreed information from the August 2025 consultation prevented any positive dialogue at the consultation which was adjourned as a result. That information is still outstanding and it will not be possible to agree either a SoCG or AIA until it has been received in full. We recognise that time is of the essence in terms of the examination timetable but again, the decision to withhold the information was made by the Applicant, not NGC


Safeguarding Officer
Norfolk Gliding Club