

Submission ID: SAEE3ADAB

Please find an update from Priory Farm Aviators - This includes direct feedback to a recent face to face meeting and some minutes that were both misleading and inaccurate.

It also contains direct feedback to specific hearing commentary which again was both inaccurate and misleading.

David S Brown - Chairman - Priory Farm Aviators

Norwich to Tilbury

Update from Priory on current (and long standing) position

1 July 2026

Interested Party Reference number: [REDACTED]

Update post June 12th, 2026 (Teams) meeting and clarification of SoCG standing

- A quick look at the proposed diagram shows a change in circuit patten TOWARDS Tibenham - something that simply wont be allowed hence ALL our current turns head West of our airfield - this proposes a turn East
- Also, mention of 'old' and 'new' circuits, We never indicated one was a predecessor or successor of the other - BOTH are in active use by differing types of aircraft and experience - typically larger aircraft or new arrivals tend to use the 1000' circuit - smaller and more experienced (to the runway) use the 500'
- From the hearing transcripts I can see reference to the 'surprise' that the circuits appear to have 'changed' since the process began. For clarity, both the 500' and 1000' circuits have been in existence for decades ! The detail has been available on the website for decades and was published on SkyDemon many years ago
- The key points from the yet and to remain unsigned SoCG are
- There can be NO alteration of procedures as we have repeatedly stated due to the proximity of Tibenham
- The recent suggestion of an additional 'dog leg' away from the 01 departure at Priory (to avoid the pylons) serves to demonstrate the above – we are then in direct conflict with Tibenham
- Lowering the pylons – as mentioned in the June meeting, serves no real purpose, which we all agreed on. In fact it made it potentially worse as you advised lower would mean more frequent pylons to support thereby increasing the amount of vertical metal !
- Markers don't really serve as a deterrent (although would obviously assist in eyeballing in any emergency)
- The proximity to the existing (and to REMAIN) 500' Priory circuit makes the likelihood of a bad result post any engine issues on departure of EITHER runway untenable.
- There was mention in the Hearing transcript about the likelihood of Priory signing the SoCG – that is NOT likely to happen

+++++

Also: In specific reference to the recorded transcript of a subsequent hearing.

01:02:09:19 - 01:02:43:15

Louise, brace for the applicant. Um. Priory Farm. So you refer to the meeting that we held with them on the 12th of June. Um, it was a productive meeting. Um, we haven't had the opportunity to speak with them since last summer.

This implies little or no contact in 12 months and yet there have been numerous mailings too and fro to validate and rectify narratives within the SoCG. Saying 'no opportunity to speak' is somewhat misleading. All these followed the face to face meeting at Dunston Hall in August last year.

Um, a key development was, um, that the operator has re plotted their aerodromes, circuit patterns. Um, and there are some differences between various published routes that they have at the moment. So, um, we've undertaken an additional impact assessment relating to the newly plotted 500 foot circuit, which now no longer overlies the overhead line.

Routes have NOT been replotted, having been in existence for decades ! These have been available both locally and in recent years published on apps like SkyDemon

01:02:43:19 - 01:03:06:12

Um, but it is in close lateral proximity. Um, so that assessment has been shared with the operator. Um, we've provided an initial view in terms of, um, what that means and mitigation, um, related to it as well. Um, and we're looking to have another meeting with them to discuss that further. Um, so that we can get their perspective on mitigation.

There is probably even less chance of mitigation now given the confirmed proximity and – mention by ASL to route towards the already blocked airspace of Tibenham

For the avoidance of doubt – we DO talk to Tibenham extensively about general day to day operations as well as the shared concern about the impact that NG will have on both our operations and income

01:03:08:07 - 01:03:18:16

Thank you. Are you, um, are you confident that a signed statement of common ground will be, um, possible with, uh, Priory Farm within the timeline of the examination?

01:03:19:25 - 01:03:42:01

Um, Louise, brace for the applicant. Um, I think we're confident that that, um, the discussions are progressing productively. We're hoping that there's going to be matters agreed within the statement of common ground. More so than currently. Um, and and that we're we'll be able to sign a statement of common ground whether or not it's got all matters agreed in it. Um, is is for consideration.

NO – would have been a more honest answer !

What matters are 'hoping to be agreed' ?

We have been steadfast in our inability to sign the SoCG given that basic mitigation options are fundamentally flawed and inappropriate

01:03:42:07 - 01:03:43:21

Okay. Understood. Thank you.

I hope they did 'Understand' ?!

01:03:43:27 - 01:03:52:12

Can I ask Mister Jameson to explain the, um, aeronautic assessment, uh, in terms of Priory Farm, please?

01:03:53:23 - 01:04:28:28

Certainly. Neil Jamieson for the applicant. Um, so as, as mentioned, um, we we've not had engagement with Priory Farm directly since last summer, and, and we really welcomed the meeting, uh, on the 12th of June, which was extremely useful. One of the main learning points for us that came out of that was that the previously provided circuit map had changed, something that we were unaware of until that meeting.

Um, we take that very seriously. We within two days, had redone an impact assessment based on the new information provided to us.

Been available for decades in hand drawn form and published for a number of years. Something that a basic review some 2 years ago would have discovered and we shared a 3D model of the plan at a face to face meeting in Dunston Hall Norwich in 2025

01:04:29:07 - 01:04:59:22

Um, it gave me some concerns and, uh, some relief in, in in other parts. The, the re plotted circuit does not overfly or does not appear to overfly the line anymore. However, it is um, laterally closer to it than the previous A map. And that's the the the matter that we need to discuss further, uh, what priorities uh, operators view is of that.

It may not actually overfly – by feet... but the proximity makes it a very significant danger, particularly at the extremities of the downwind leg

01:04:59:24 - 01:05:27:29

Um, I have some ideas for mitigation, um, for that, um, and we have offered that as an idea. Um, and that's, that's a matter that we need to discuss still is what their view is of that, um, and how that will fit in with their current operations. But we feel that there are solutions possible. Um, whether that be through operational changes or anything else. So we remain hopeful. As far as Priory Farm is concerned.

The ideas we have already responded to – offering an option that turns us INTO the already blocked area at Tibenham is NOT a viable alternate so basically a none starter. If we are using the N runway – so are they !

I also noted in our Teams meeting, which wasn't noted but was acknowledge in the meeting some salient factors that directly affect and 'idealised departure' path depicted in the Priory OCL documents

- Very differing types of aircraft and, thereby, related performance
- Many being low weight, low engine powered
- Pilots not having full currency (locals or the numerous visiting aircraft – we had 75 at the fly in this April)
- The N-S orientation of our only runway means many take offs are crosswind and so NOT providing the idealised exit path that a normal 'into wind' would offer in terms of climb rate
- This was noted and accepted as a concern in our meeting, but not minuted

01:05:28:01 - 01:05:28:16

Thank you.

01:05:28:19 - 01:05:39:27

Casey, for the applicant, could you please explain to the, um, examining authority the the 1000ft circuit as well as the 500ft circuit? And what of what relevance is that?

01:05:40:19 - 01:06:12:12

Uh, so, yes, Neil Jamieson for the applicant. So there are two published circuits. At Priory Farm, there's a low level circuit which is flown at 500ft, roughly 150m above the ground. And there's a wider, larger circuit which climbs to a higher height of 1000ft above the ground. Um, and, uh, both circuits are in use at pilot's discretion in general. The 500 foot circuit, because it's shorter and it's just slightly more demanding to fly as well.

01:06:12:14 - 01:06:46:05

We are told by the operator at Priory Farm that that's generally limited to people who are more experienced, and the thousand foot circuit is either used by people who need a little bit more time to think or are learning to fly, for instance. So. So both circuits could be used. And one potential mitigation to be discussed is that maybe the 500 foot circuit is, is no longer in operation in the future. And everything just uses 1000 foot circuit, which is a situation that exists at many other aerodromes. So, um, there would be no officially published 500 foot circuit.

The (potential) cessation of the 500' circuit was NOT discussed and is most definitely remaining – being favoured by a large percentage of local pilots.

There has never been a discussion with yourselves or indeed anyone about the cessation of such ! Your feedback to the hearing says 'to be discussed' but WHY would you mention that at hearing having NOT discussed with us first ?!

(I can only suspect because there would have been a firm quash of the proposal)

01:06:46:07 - 01:06:55:23

As I say, I emphasize this again. This is all under discussion. Uh, we we look forward to to, uh, Priory Farm's view on all of that.

You now have that view.

David S Brown
Chairman
Priory Farm Aviators
DSB 2 July 2026