

File With \_\_\_\_\_

## SECTION 131 FORM

Appeal NO: ABP 314685

TO: SEO

Defer Re O/H ☐Having considered the contents of the submission dated/ received 20/12/24  
fromDublin Chamber 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 w 1800E.O.: Date: 30/12/24

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 2/3/4weeks – BP \_\_\_\_\_

EO: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

AA: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

File With \_\_\_\_\_

**CORRESPONDENCE FORM**

Appeal No: ABP \_\_\_\_\_

M \_\_\_\_\_

Please treat correspondence received on \_\_\_\_\_ as follows:

1. Update database with new agent for Applicant/Appellant \_\_\_\_\_

2. Acknowledge with BP \_\_\_\_\_

3. Keep copy of Board's Letter ☐

1. RETURN TO SENDER with BP \_\_\_\_\_

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

Amendments/Comments

4. Attach to file

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

EO:

Plans Date Stamped ☐Date Stamped Filled in ☐

AA:

Date:

Date:



## SID Online Observation

Online Reference  
SID-OBS-002535

James  
BP23

### Online Observation Details

Contact Name  
Stephen Browne

Lodgement Date  
21/12/2024 23:25:24

Case Number / Description  
314485

Dublin Chamber

### Payment Details

Payment Method  
Online Payment

Cardholder Name  
Stephen Browne

Payment Amount  
€50.00

### Fee Refund Requisition

Please Arrange a Refund of Fee of

€

Lodgement No

LDG—077228-25

Reason for Refund

Documents Returned to Observer

☐

Yes

☐

No

Request Emailed to Senior Executive Officer for Approval

☐

Yes

☐

No

Signed

EO

Date

### Finance Section

Payment Reference

ch\_3QYc2yB1CW0EN5FC19utqjW

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



Bord Pleanála Case reference: PL06F.314485

Planning Authority Case Reference: F20A/0668

## **Observations on An Bord Pleanála Draft Decision: Dublin Airport NRAA**

### **Introduction:**

Dublin Chamber is the representative body for businesses in the Greater Dublin Area. Its membership reflects the full spectrum of economic activity in the city region and ranges from startups and sole traders to large multinationals. This gives the Chamber a keen insight into the needs of businesses and their employees. Dublin Chamber members are united by the vision that the Dublin region will be globally renowned for its economic competitiveness, sustainability, and quality of life. As Dublin's economy and population continue to grow and the port reaches its capacity limits, the need for expansion becomes increasingly evident. Dublin Chamber believes that night movements on the North Runway in Dublin Airport are crucial in maintaining air connectivity, which in turn is essential in supporting the employment provided by inward investment, exporting firms and tourism across Ireland.

### **Economic Impact**

Building a parallel runway system has been part of Dublin Airport's development plan since the 1960s. As part of the original planning permission for North Runway in 2007, highly restrictive conditions on nighttime use were applied. The daa sought planning permission to amend them in 2020, and daa proposed the introduction of a noise quota system at night, which is the industry standard approach for managing night-time noise at large airports. daa also sought to change the permitted operating hours of the North Runway from the existing hours of 7am to 11pm, to allow it to operate from 6am to midnight. Operational flexibility is required during the peak 6am-7am window given Ireland is one hour behind continental Europe. In particular, early morning departures and late evening arrivals are needed for short haul operations, and long haul operations require early morning arrivals for, for example, transatlantic flights.

In June 2022, the Aircraft Noise Competent Authority (ANCA) published its regulatory decision regarding appropriate noise mitigations and runway operating restrictions to apply at Dublin Airport. The application was subsequently approved by Fingal County Council (FCC), prior to the opening of the North Runway. In August 2022, daa delivered the €320m North Runway and associated facilities on time and on budget. However, due to an appeal to ABP, the FCC decision did not come into effect, preventing efficient utilisation of this vital national infrastructure. In our Business Outlook Survey we have found that 80% of Dublin Chamber members say that international air

connectivity is important to their businesses, with over two thirds saying that Europe is the most important market to their business. We are concerned that the reduction in early morning movements at Dublin Airport could severely reduce air connectivity to Europe and hamper access to this important market.

There have been proposals to move the flights going in and out of Dublin Airport to other Irish airports to alleviate demand. Dublin Chamber accepts the need for increased growth across the country. However, the idea that flights can simply be switched between airports in Ireland is naive and fails to understand the drivers underlying the investment decisions made by airlines in allocating planes to particular routes. In particular, Dublin Airport benefits from acting as a hub airport for passengers moving from Europe and the Middle East to North America and vice versa. “Hub economics” provides more transit passengers through Dublin, which in tandem with a large local population makes a greater choice and frequency of routes available to passengers. Frequent routes to key markets and investors are the backbone of Ireland’s ability to attract Foreign Direct Investment. Dublin Airport is in effect a mass transit hub for many airlines, offering seamless connecting flights to North America, which is particularly attractive due to the US Customs and Border Protection Pre Clearance allowing passengers to arrive in the US as domestic passengers.

#### **ABP Draft Decision**

Dublin Chamber has made numerous submissions over many years to the Board in relation to this issue and on the Airport in general. We fundamentally believe that this decision is flawed and would request that the Board re-examine the issues involved and issue a decision that is more in line with National Aviation Policy. Having reviewed the decision and the associated reports, we believe that it has deviated from its intended goals, particularly around noise quotas. As it stands in the draft, we believe that this if imposed would be a significant backwards step that would adversely affect routes and passenger numbers at the Airport.

We are concerned with ABP’s ‘Draft Decision’ (the “Draft Decision”) (dated 11th September 2024) and supporting ‘Inspectors Report’ (dated 29th May 2024) issued in respect of Reg. Ref. PL06F.314485. In particular, there are serious concerns as to the process followed and the resulting decision. The required process as set out in the 2000 Act (as amended by the 2019 Act) has not been adhered to and this has then resulted in a decision with serious consequences for the Applicant and all users of the Airport as discussed below. As well as critical errors relating to process, there are errors in understanding, calculation and interpretation of submitted application documents.



We wish to highlight our serious concerns with the following newly proposed conditions of the Draft Decision:

Condition 3(e): which, when taken together with existing condition 3(c) for the North Runway, means that in easterly winds, aircraft could neither arrive or depart from the North Runway, and all operations would be forced onto the South Runway between 06.00 and 08.00.

Condition 5: which provides for a 13,000 ATM night limit – resulting in profound impacts on current operations. The net effect of which would be to limit the number of movements to an annual average of 35 per night (11.30-07.00). Depending on interpretation, this could mean an average of between 41-42 per night during the summer and between 26 - 27 per night during winter or an average of c.99 per night during the 92- busy summer period and c.14 per night during the balance of the year. We believe there are a number of calculation errors in the workings whereby this number was arrived at.

We believe that ABP should fundamentally reexamine their process and decision to ensure that proper consideration is given of the requirement for the above operating restrictions and noise mitigation measures.

Section 9.7 of the 2019 Act states “measures or a combination of measures taken in accordance with the Aircraft Noise Regulation, this Act and the Act of 2000 for the airport shall not be more restrictive than is necessary in order to achieve the noise abatement objective”. The practical impact of this section is that if ABP are of the view that the NAO will be achieved by the existing noise mitigation measures or operating restrictions, which elements of the supporting documents appear to suggest, no additional noise mitigation measures or operating restrictions are permitted. The ABP ‘Draft Decision’ and Inspector’s Report do not properly engage with the NAO, and the Draft Decision makes no clear determination on whether ANCA’s RD meets the NAO. This is a critical error in the process undertaken by ABP. Following this, if ABP determined that additional or modified noise mitigation measures or operating restrictions were required (such as those proposed to be imposed by conditions 3(e), 5 and 6), the Balanced Approach must be applied by ABP to identify and select possible mitigation measures. This has not occurred.

The new draft conditions introduced by ABP are non-compliant with EU Regulation 598 and the 2019 Act. In our view the proposed restriction on North Runway use, as set out in condition (3e) and proposed movement limit as set out in condition 5, are neither justified nor required to achieve the NAO, and would have adverse impacts on operations at Dublin Airport, and we ask that they are removed.

Dublin Airport needs to facilitate faster transit times and enhanced routes to maintain competitiveness. Ongoing investment in these areas is crucial to improving Ireland’s overall resilience in the face of domestic and international shocks to the economy. As recognised in the daa’s Economic Impact Study 2023 (Dublin Airport Economic Impact Study), Dublin Airport is a key lynch pin of the



Irish economy. This is recognised at all levels of planning policy, with the National Planning Framework charging Dublin Airport with providing High Quality International connectivity in the national interest. Granting planning permission for North Runway Relevant Action as submitted by daa will maximise return on the investment made at Dublin Airport to date in the North Runway, and ensure this potential fully realised.

Stephen Browne.  
Head of Public Affairs.  
7 Clare Street.  
Dublin 2.