

SR

S. 37

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

**SECTION 131 FORM**

Appeal NO: ABP 314485

TO: SEO

Defer Re O/H ☐

Having considered the contents of the submission dated/ received 17/12/24  
from

Edgar Cassidy 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 m issues

E.O.: [Signature]

Date: 20/12/24

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 314485

VI \_\_\_\_\_

Please treat correspondence received on 17/12/24 as follows:

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

2. Acknowledge with BP 233. Keep copy of Board's Letter ☐

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

2. Keep Envelope: ☐3. Keep Copy of Board's letter ☐**Amendments/Comments**Keep Rec Esther Cassidy\* To be scanned**4. Attach to file**(a) R/S ☐(d) Screening ☐(b) GIS Processing ☒(e) Inspectorate ☐(c) Processing ☒RETURN TO EO ☐Plans Date Stamped ☐Date Stamped Filled in ☐EO: [Signature]AA: [Signature]Date: 20/12/24Date: 24/12/24

## Sinead White

---

**From:** Esther Cassidy <tunacassidy@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday 17 December 2024 14:26  
**To:** Appeals2  
**Subject:** #314485 Relevant Action DAA  
**Attachments:** Observation (1).docx

**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.

Hi

Please see attachment re my observation on draft decision for relevant action on case # 314485.

I have made observation previously so exempt from €50 fee.

Many thanks

Esther Cassidy

Ratoath

Co Meath

17<sup>th</sup> Dec 2024

**To whom it may concern**

Please see my observations in relation to the DAA's relevant action

**1. Increased night time flights** will cause significant night time waking due to flights flying over heavily populated areas like Ashbourne Ratoath and surrounding areas that are ever growing.

Adults and children will not get 8 hours straight sleep as is needed for all aspects of physical and mental health.

Already we are been woken by flights during the night and before 6am by planes directly over Ratoath.

There is no meaningful assessment of this noise from increased night flights over 30000+ people.

Sleep deprivation has a huge impact on physical cognitive and mental health. This action from the DAA has already effected my life negatively.

Disturbed sleep effects my driving to work, my ability to perform safely at work along with the physical and mental toll it has on me and my family.

**2. Retention of the deviated flightpaths** currently being used which is not the approved flightpath from 2007 planning permission.

We bought our home 7 years ago in Ratoath with the understanding that the flight path from the new runway would be straight out as per planning permission.

There was no planning permission granted to have the flight path directly over Ratoath. Had there been we would not have bought our home in Ratoath. We adhere, respect the planning permission process and the law of the land. We believe that we all fall under this law regardless whether an individual or an industry.

My understanding is the integrity of the planning process must be respected by all regardless of their size, power or influence?

In this significant deviation of the flight path, it is obvious the DAA have complete disregard for the planning process, the health and well-being of the people of Ratoath, Ashbourne and surrounding areas. Planes are flying over heavily populated towns every few minutes, flying 4000ft at 60db to 70db every few minutes.

It is not a singular aircraft that's the issue. It's the 1300+ flights for 16hrs per month at 60-70dB that's very stressful. The DAA have failed to assess or mitigate the negative effects of this flight path on the population of East Meath.

Also to note the DAA at the time of designing the flight path is contrary to the regulation set out in EU 598/ 2014 on the establishment of rules and procedures with the regard to the introduction of noise related operating restrictions at Union Airports within a balanced approach and repealing Directive 2002/20 /EC

Therefore on the above observations, the application must now be rejected to protect the integrity of the planning process, uphold public health standards, and ensure that the needs of the local community are prioritised over operational convenience.

Thanks you for considering my observation,  
Esther Cassidy, 40 Stonebridge, Ratoath, Co Meath.