

File With

SECTION 131 FORM

Appeal No

ABP— 314485-22.

Defer Re O/H

Having considered the contents of the submission dated/received 23/12/24.
from Sarah Maguire. I recommend that section 131 of the Planning
and Development Act, 2000 be/not be invoked at this stage for the following reason(s):

No new material issues.

Section 131 not to be invoked at this stage.

Section 131 to be invoked — allow 2/4 weeks for reply.

Signed

Dan Wigglesworth

EO

Date

31/12/24.

Signed

SEO/SAO

Date

F. Khattipov 21/1/25

M

Please prepare BP — Section 131 notice enclosing a copy of the attached submission.

To

Task No

Allow 2/3/4 weeks

BP

Signed

EO

Date

Signed

AA

Date



Planning Appeal Online Observation

Online Reference
NPA-OBS-004156

LDG: 0769 87- 24

Online Observation Details

Contact Name
Sarah Maguire

Lodgement Date
23/12/2024 15:51:04

Case Number / Description
314485

Payment Details

Payment Method
Online Payment

Cardholder Name
Sarah Maguire

Payment Amount
€50.00

Processing Section

S.131 Consideration Required

☒ Yes — See attached 131 Form

☐ N/A — Invalid

Signed

Don Wigglesworth

EO

Date

31/12/24.

Fee Refund Requisition

Please Arrange a Refund of Fee of

€ 50.

Lodgement No

LDG— 076987-24.

Reason for Refund

Overpaid

Documents Returned to Observer

☐ Yes ☒ No

Request Emailed to Senior Executive Officer for Approval

☒ Yes ☐ No

Signed

Don Wigglesworth

EO

Date

31/12/24.

Finance Section

Payment Reference

ch_3QZDuOB1CW0EN5FC0hDz75ie

Checked Against Fee Income Online

EO/AA (Accounts Section)

Amount

€

Refund Date

Authorised By (1)

SEO (Finance)

Authorised By (2)

Chief Officer/Director of Corporate Affairs/SAO/Board Member

Date

Date

An Bord Pleanála case 314485

Dear Sir/Madam,

Could I please make a further submission in "relation action".

Environmental Impact Assessment

Communities in the area have been informed that flightpaths do not form part of the planning permission for the North Runway. However, that is not correct as under the chapter on noise in the EIAR for the North Runway, flightpaths were specifically asked to be included by An Bord Pleanála, in order to assess impact.

The flightpaths used and assessed within the EIAR, were subsequently adopted by Fingal County Council to control development under those same flight path contours for nearly 15-years post the grant of permission. The purpose of this was to prevent future communities being impacted by noise, and to allow for appropriate decision making by people purchasing or developing property in North County Dublin.

Before purchasing my house in the Ward, County Dublin, I checked these maps to ensure that that I would not be impacted by the north runway. However, I find my property is now directly below the new flightpath, and I am impacted every day by continuous noise, with air traffic in excess of the level envisaged in the planning permission.

The draft decision ABP-314485, is silent on this. DAA say the changes to flightpaths are due to a safety requirement approved by IAA. The IAA say that they only assess the safety of the paths that have been submitted to them, and that they have not been asked to review the originally proposed flightpaths.

The draft decision now extends the use of Runway 10L-28R to be used (6:00 to 11:59), without addressing the issue of the flightpaths, therefore compounding this issue. This entirely undermines the EIAR process, as it appears as though there is no penalty on a developer for failing to accurately identify and assess impacts. Given the scale and importance of this project, it has the potential to impact confidence in the consent and delivery of the National Development Plan.

It is unclear how An Bord Pleanála can assess a permission to alter the operation of a previously consented development without addressing conformance with the original EIAR, and why none of the authorities are inclined to ask IAA to confirm whether it is possible to use the originally proposed flightpaths. Safety is being used as a reason, however, the safest form of take-off is a direct straightline takeoff. It is a sight to behold to witness large airplanes struggle to bank right at low altitude, immediately after takeoff. This action also results in increased noise at ground level and increased fuel use.

The noise control proposals also do not stipulate how these will be measured, which is of concern, as the current levels are far above those indicated by DAA (I have measured levels over 60dB inside my house in early morning). There are no noise monitoring points directly under the new flightpaths, and the noise levels are modelled based on altitude and distance. There does not appear to be any check between modelled and actual. Also the use of average figures is not reflective the lived experience beneath a flight. If eight flights take off and four fly directly over my house, I do not experience 50% of the noise level of a flight. It merely means that I will be woken up 4 times instead of 8 times.

Kind Regards,

Sarah Maguire, Fleenstown, The Ward Co Dublin. D11 XT85