_	1		
	le	W	ith.
1 1	10	vv	LLI

SECTION 131 FORM

Appeal NO:_ABP_3 4485-22	Defer Re O/H
Having considered the contents of the submission da from Breffix and Orla Conaly I recommend that section be invoked at this stage for the following reason	on 131 of the Planning and Development Act, 2000
E.O.: Pat B	Date: 17/04/2024
For further consideration by SEO/SAO	
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:
VI	
Please prepare BP Section 131 notice	e enclosing a copy of the attached
o: Task No:	
illow 2/3/4weeks — BP	
0:	Date:
A:	Date:

File With)	

CORRESPONDENCE FORM

Appeal No: ABP 314485-22 M Please treat correspondence received on	01/0412024 as follows:
 Update database with new agent for Applic 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 Beffix and Orla 12/03/24:02/04/24	Condy
4. Attach to file (a) R/S	RETURN TO EO 🗌
	Plans Date Stamped Date Stamped Filled in
EO: Pat B	AA: Anthony Mc Nally
Date: 17/04/2024	Date: 25/04/2024

Dan Wigglesworth

From:

Bord

Sent:

Tuesday 2 April 2024 09:57

To:

Appeals2

Subject:

FW: ABP Case Num: ABP- 314485-22

Attachments:

DAA & IAA Transport Committe clip.MP4; ABP submission.docx

Sent: Monday, April 1, 2024 10:35 AM

To: Bord <bord@pleanala.ie>

Subject: ABP Case Num: ABP- 314485-22

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.

Hello,

Please find attached our observation regarding the new noise contours as per letter received. I have attached a video as part of my observation (link included). I am not sure if it can be used but said we would send anyway. Any questions or issues please contact me.

Breffni

		es al	Test;

An Bord Pleanála

64 Marlborough St.

Dublin 1

D01 V902

RE: Case Number ABP- 314485-22 Relevant Action Application Dublin Airport

Dear Sir/Madam

Further to your correspondence to us on the above case we wish to make the following observations/submissions:

- We are extremely disappointed to see our home which was built in 2016 under the premise
 that the planning granted to the DAA would be adhered to, now falls within the noise
 contours (see red circle in map below). We would never have built nor chosen to live here
 had we known what was to come. It should not be this way and can be resolved if the DAA
 simply follow planning permission like all citizens must.
- Our home at times is almost inhabitable and the proposal that we now become eligible for
 insulation in our bedrooms is laughable. We must open windows due to the affects of solar
 gain which will mitigate any insulation we would be entitled to. This is the same for our
 kitchen where our skylights and windows can no longer be opened. Our children no longer
 play in the garden like they used to. Insulation schemes do not work for us and others in the
 community, like our local school which is 150 yards away-. What will work is adhering to the
 original planning permission.



• The IAA have told us that the notion these "new flight paths" must be flown this way is incorrect. They confirmed that they were the only option every presented to them. AirNav Ireland have told the Department of Transport as much & that it is not their job to examine if flight paths fall into planning permission yet they are a contractor to the DAA who must adhere to it. The DAA should have dismissed these flight paths from AirNav at the outset. Instead the DAA (CEO Catherine Gubbins) lied before a Transport Committee meeting indicating they had no idea of these alternative flight paths, a notion which the IAA dismissed (Declan Fitzpatrick) when they were called in saying 'the whole world of aviation knew at least 3 months in advance of these alternative flight paths". We cannot trust the DAA and AirNav are not fir to do the job they are being hired to.



Response to query on North Run way Flight Paths:

Appendix – Response p rovidedto the Department of Transport on 3 April in relation to a separate query

Question received on 31 March

Is it possible for the airport to meet its planning permission through the design of anew Missed Approach Procedure for 28L (South Runway) with the current airsp ace

Response provided on 3 April

Of course, we are more than happy to assist with your request, but it is important to be clearupfront that the planning permission requirement is a matter for daa...It is not appropriate for the IAA ANSP to advise on what conditions daa might bein a position to comply with its planning permission.

TheIAA ANSP cain, however, provide a number of observations in relation to an alternative missed approach procedure for the original runway 28L. The paper we received focuses predominantly on parallel runway operations in segregated mode, but it is important to be clear that any alternative missed approach procedure for 28L that is less than a 30-degree_angle from the take-off track from Runway 28R would impact capacity at Dublin Airport insofar as itwould prohibit independent runway operations:

Link to DAA & IAA before Transport Committee: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1J8Nsqu7L2YU07sK8jVQ5JPohbzEWRIKz/view?usp=sharing

• The problem is fixable. It must be enforced. It cannot be the fault of local communities that the DAA and contractors they hire did not foresee or put in place the resources needed to make parallel runways operational as originally desired. Until they do (hiring more air traffic controllers etc) they should not be allowed to profit from our misery- they have enjoyed that for 18 months at considerable time & expense to local communities.

 In summary planning is an afterthought for DAA. Their actions show that they do not respect planning legislation or decisions of An Bord Pleanála. This application must be refused.

Yours Sincerely,

Signed: Breffní & Orla Conaty

Date: 01/04/2024

Address: Drumord House, Coolquoy, The Ward, Co Dublin, D11 PD87

