

SECTION 131 FORM

File With _____ S. 37

Appeal NO: ABP 314485

TO: SEO

Defer Re O/H ☐

Having considered the contents of the submission dated/ received 23 / 12 / 24

from Paul Doonan 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 issues

E.O.: [Signature]

Date: 21/1/25

To EO: _____

Section 131 not to be invoked at this stage. ☐

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

S.E.O.: _____

Date: _____

S.A.O.: _____

Date: _____

M _____

Please prepare BP _____ - Section 131 notice enclosing a copy of the attached submission

to: _____

Allow 2/3/4 weeks – BP _____

EO: _____

Date: _____

AA: _____

Date: _____

File With _____

CORRESPONDENCE FORMAppeal No: ABP 314485Please treat correspondence received on 23/12/24 as follows:

. Update database with new agent for App licant/Appellant _____

. Acknowledge with BP 23. Keep copy of Board's Letter ☐

1. RETURN TO SENDER with BP _____

2. Keep Envelope: ☐3. Keep Copy of Board's letter ☐

Amendments/Comments

Resp Recd

4. Attach to file

(a) R/S ☐(b) GIS Processing ☒(c) Processing ☒(d) Screening ☐(e) Inspectorate ☐RETURN TO EO ☐

	Plans Date Stamped <input type="checkbox"/>
	Date Stamped Filled in <input type="checkbox"/>
EO: <u>[Signature]</u>	AA: <u>F. Wharfedale</u>
Date: <u>21/12/25</u>	Date: <u>21/12/25</u>

Alfie Staunton

From: Paul Doolan <paul.doolan@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday 23 December 2024 14:50
To: Appeals2
Subject: Case Number: ABP-314485-22 Planning Authority Reference Number: F20A/0668
Attachments: ABP-314485-22 Planning Authority Reference Number F20A0668.pdf

Caution: This is an **External Email** and may have malicious content. Please take care when clicking links or opening attachments. When in doubt, contact the ICT Helpdesk.

To whom it concerns,

In relation to the above case number.

Please see attached my appeal to An Bord Pleanála's draft decision.

Regards,

Paul Doolan
0861039183

Lagore Big,
Ratoath,
Co Meath

An Bord Pleanála case reference: PL06F.314485

Planning authority case reference: F20A/0668

Observation reference: NPA-OBS-002892

To whom it concerns,

It is baffling that the board has granted approval to this application when the applicant (DAA) remains in breach of multiple aspects of its original planning conditions.

My family and I had assumed that the multiple breaches of planning conditions contained within the application would be recognised by the board and rejected. Why is a state company being allowed to pick and choose what planning conditions it recognises based on what is convenient to it?

The inspectors report has rightly concluded that the proposals request for additional operating hours on the north runway will result in significant additional awakenings. The impact this has on overall health is well documented, including increased risk of cardiovascular disease, mental health disorders and sleep related cognitive impairment.

In its application the DAA fails to assess or mitigate the adverse effects of nighttime noise adequately. The use of average metrics like % of highly sleep disturbed and L night do not capture the acute impacts i.e. awakenings which have immediate and long term health consequences.

Insulation measures being proposed as a fix all solution to aircraft noise by the applicant do not mitigate noise to the extent of eliminating sleep disturbances or general undisturbed enjoyment of the home environment during the day. For reference, we live in an A rated dwelling on the outskirts of Ratoath approx. 12km from the north runway. The property has external insulation, a pumped cavity wall and a 50mm internal insulated board, it is air tight with a heat recovery ventilation system and triple glazed windows. In spite of this we hear every flight over the area from 07.00 in the morning inside the house. My children are woken within five minutes of the flights starting, without exception.

As bad as the current situation is we can still go to bed at 22.30 and get eight hours of sleep per night, before the flights begin off the north runway at 07.00 the following morning. If this decision is upheld, it will now be impossible to get the recommended amount of sleep required for general well being. This is particularly concerning for children under ten who require between ten and sixteen hours sleep.

The proposed additional operating hours from the north runway from 7.00 to 23.00 to 06.00 to 00.00 are totally unacceptable. Adding a further two hours of aircraft noise during a time when most people are asleep only makes an already bad situation worse. The flight path issue must be resolved first before any operation changes can be considered.

The DAA clearly have no concern for the affected parties. I had hoped the board would see this behaviour for what it is and deny the application until these issues were resolved. This was particularly important as the DAA are unwilling to engage voluntarily.

Why is it, the board regularly rejects development on the basis of preservation of wildlife habitat i.e. bat or badger habitat etc but when thousands of peoples lives and sleep are ruined by a state company, in breach of multiple planning conditions and operating flight paths that bear no resemblance to those within its planning permission, it remains indifferent?

The divergent flight paths currently in operation deviate significantly from those approved in the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) These deviations expose previously unaffected areas to significant noise impacts creating unassessed risks. The deviations breach Condition 1 of the planning permission which requires adherence to the originally assessed flight paths. To compound this, the divergent flight paths are poorly designed with no consideration to noise disruption on affected communities.

For example, to attempt to loop aircraft over Ratoath and under Dunshaughlin is totally nonsensical as the towns, even now (without further expansion) are too close together to avoid housing estates, schools, nursing homes and creches being directly overflown and the general noise pollution this creates in the towns.

To plot a noise preferential route, directly at a densely populated town like Ratoath is baffling, considering Ratoath, Dunshaughlin and Ashbourne are surrounded by tens of thousands of acres of low-density farmland. It makes absolutely no sense to route hundreds of aircraft a day off a runway and direct them 12km north of that runway, only to fly directly over two of the only densely populated towns in the area before turning. Why not at the bare minimum turn under the towns?

These unauthorised flight paths undermine the integrity of the planning system and sets a dangerous precedent for future development. Granting permission under these conditions violates planning laws and obligations under the EIA directive. Any inference that the IAA instructed or caused the DAA to deviate from the route in their planning is incorrect. That the board could not request this information from the IAA as part of this process is also disappointing.

We are relying on An Bord Pleanála to protect us from the rouge behaviour of the DAA. It seeks to use the planning system to legitimise its mis management. Instead of growing within the planning system, it is ignoring planning conditions it finds inconvenient and bullies or ignores anyone who objects. It routinely talks about international standards in relation to running an airport but then fails to abide by these standards in relation to flight paths, noise mitigation, night flights and planning conditions.

As part of this application, affected communities need An Bord Pleanála to immediately:

- Halt the operation of unauthorised flight paths and revert to flight paths approved under the original EIS.
- At the very least maintain the 13,000 nighttime flights cap
- Implement the noise quota system to incentivise quieter aircraft
- Reject the proposed additional hours of operation on the north runway for the reasons outlined above

Prior to buying our house in Ratoath in 2019 I checked the flight paths for the north runway multiple times before buying. Every day now we have issues with aircraft noise.

That a state company then routinely denies this, in spite of all the evidence to the contrary is wrong and should not be indulged.

We are relying on the board to protect us from this behaviour. Please do not underestimate the effect this has on people and families on a daily basis.

Regards,

Paul Doolan