

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

## SECTION 131 FORM

Appeal NO: ABP 314485-22

Defer Re O/H

☐Having considered the contents of the submission dated (received) 29/03/2024  
fromGionluca Micalella 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 issuesE.O.: Pat BDate: 07/04/2024

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: \_\_\_\_\_

M \_\_\_\_\_

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

to: \_\_\_\_\_ Task No: \_\_\_\_\_

Allow 2/3/4 weeks – BP \_\_\_\_\_

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

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

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

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

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

## CORRESPONDENCE FORM

Appeal No: ABP 314485-22

M \_\_\_\_\_

Please treat correspondence received on 29/03/2024 as follows:

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1. Update database with new agent for Applicant/Appellant _____ | 1. RETURN TO SENDER with BP _____                       |
| 2. Acknowledge with BP <u>23</u>                                | 2. Keep Envelope: <input type="checkbox"/>              |
| 3. Keep copy of Board's Letter <input type="checkbox"/>         | 3. Keep Copy of Board's letter <input type="checkbox"/> |

Amendments/Comments Gianluca Micaella response to S.13112/03/24: 02/04/24 ✓

## 4. Attach to file

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| (a) R/S <input type="checkbox"/>            | (d) Screening <input type="checkbox"/>    |
| (b) GIS Processing <input type="checkbox"/> | (e) Inspectorate <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (c) Processing <input type="checkbox"/>     |   |

RETURN TO EO ☐

Plans Date Stamped <input type="checkbox"/>
Date Stamped Filled in <input type="checkbox"/>

EO: Pat BAA: Anthony McNallyDate: 07/04/2024Date: 25/04/2024

*Amice*

## Fergal Ryan

---

**From:** Gianluca Micalella <gmicalella@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** 29 March 2024 22:36  
**To:** Appeals2  
**Subject:** Ref case 314485 - Planning Authority Case Reference: F20A/0668 Dublin Airport, Co. Dublin  
**Attachments:** Dublin Airport - response to appeal.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.

Good afternoon

I am writing with reference to this appeal, with notice linked below:

<https://www.pleanala.ie/en-ie/case/314485>

Further to your correspondence on the above case I wish to make the following observations:

1. noticing that the noise contours have extended hugely affecting hugely our community: a significant number of dwellings are now included within the noise eligibility contours.

- There was no notice of the above in any of the planning notice, implying many people now are affected without knowing and without being ever publicly notified until a public meeting held by St Margarets /The Ward residents group explained this.
- Consequently, the people who now know they are within the contours have not been given the opportunity to make any submission/observation (as they do not qualify because they did not make a submission previously as they did not know being potentially affected).
- An Bord Pleanala did not give a public notice of this significant additional information. This totally unfair with respect to the communities affected

2. The correspondence from Tom Phillips & Associates refers to the ANCA Regulatory Decision regarding eligibility to the noise insulation scheme and suggest that the change in contours is as a result of their assessing that the increased area is as a result of them considering this new area which contains dwellings to have "very significant" effects. We note that the DAA have never carried out significant test criteria within any of the EIAR they have submitted and therefore they have not met with the EIA directive. This is a fundamental flaw in the assessment as the EIA directive is clear, all significant impact on the environment must be identified, quantified and mitigation proposed.

That has not happened to date.

For areas under the North Runway this involves comparing the scenario with no flights from the North Runway to a scenario where there will be night flights. This has not been done and again is a behavioural attitude that highly affect communities and seems going only in the direction of pleasing and encouraging DAA business.

3. Why have the noise contours grown?

St Margarets - The Ward residents carried out noise monitoring on the north runway flight path and found the noise levels to be far beyond those PREDICTED by DAA. Their noise predictions are not accurate and unfounded and it looks like permission is asked by manipulated or not correct numbers.

4. Reference is made to the noise zones on Fingal development plan. These noise zones must now be revised due to the proposed flight path over our area. Fingal county council consider that there should be no residential development allowed in noise zone A as it is considered harmful to health or otherwise considered unacceptable due to the high levels of aircraft noise. However, the flight path now being operated by DAA is putting many existing residences in Noise Zone A and B which is just not acceptable from a health point of view.

5. The noise insulation grant as proposed is not fit for purpose and is totally insufficient to protect for night noise. Measurements of noise in bedrooms of housing already insulated indicate that the noise levels exceeding the recommendation in the Fingal Development Plan are not sufficient to protect human health.

6. This application, if granted, will create a significant increase in GHG emissions (*meanwhile common people will see another increase in carbon taxes*), going in completely opposite direction to what all Irish Political parties see converging on a most respectful use of resources and emissions.

- Do we need an exaggerated increase in flights ?
- Do we need big companies using night slots to pay less (nights flights are rarely used for tourism) ?

In summary, planning looks like a simple postscript for DAA.

Actions carried over by DAA show they do not respect planning legislation or decisions of An Bord Pleanala. And this is emphasised by the fact that they are already disobeying previous Fingal County Council enforcement proceedings over the 65 nighttime flight breach (...an enforcement against any citizen will be probably rightly operative and none of us will be able to wait law to be changed, without complying with any laws).

In conclusion, I ask for this application to be refused.

Trusting all points above all clear (even if I do not personally have the resources of DAA granting me the best solicitors or counselling in Dublin) and **all interest of the communities living around the airport area are well considered**, I respectfully thank you

Best regards

Gianluca Micaella

30, Hollystown Park  
D15E1X2

Dublin 29<sup>th</sup> March 2024

Submission: Ref case 314485 - Planning Authority Case Reference: F20A/0668 Dublin Airport, Co. Dublin

1. noticing that the noise contours have extended hugely affecting hugely our community: a significant number of dwellings are now included within the noise eligibility contours.
  - there was no notice of the above in any of the planning notice, implying many people now are affected without knowing and without being ever publicly notified until a public meeting held by St Margarets /The Ward residents group explained this.
  - consequently, the people who now know they are within the contours have not been given the opportunity to make any submission/observation (as they do not qualify because they did not make a submission previously as they did not know being potentially affected).
  - An Bord Pleanala did not give a public notice of this significant additional information. This totally unfair with respect to the communities affected
2. The correspondence from Tom Phillips & Associates refers to the ANCA Regulatory Decision regarding eligibility to the noise insulation scheme and suggest that the change in contours is as a result of their assessing that the increased area is as a result of them considering this new area which contains dwellings to having “very significant” effects. We note that the DAA have never carried out significant test criteria within any of the EIAR they have submitted and therefore they have not met with the EIA directive. This is a fundamental flaw in the assessment as the EIA directive is clear, all significant impact on environment must be identified, quantified and mitigation proposed. That has not happened to date. For areas under the North Runway this involves comparing the scenario with no flights from the North Runway to a scenario where there will be night flights. This has not been done and again is a behavioural attitude that highly affect communities and seems going only in the direction of pleasing and encouraging DAA business.
3. Why have the noise contours grown. St Margarets - The Ward residents carried out noise monitoring on the north runway flight path and found the noise levels to be far beyond those PREDICTED by DAA. Their noise predictions are not accurate and unfounded and it looks permission is asked by manipulated or not correct numbers.
4. Reference is made to the noise zones on Fingal development plan. These noise zones must now be revised due to the proposed flight path over our area. Fingal county council

consider that there should be no residential development allowed in noise zone A as it is considered harmful to health or otherwise considered unacceptable due to the high levels of aircraft noise. However, the flight path now being operated by DAA is putting many existing residences in Noise Zone A and B which is just not acceptable from a health point of view.

5. The noise insulation grant as proposed is not fit for purpose and is totally insufficient to protect for night noise. Measurements of noise in bedrooms of housing already insulated indicate that the noise levels exceed the recommendation in Fingal Development Plan are not sufficient to protect human health.

6. This application, if granted, will create a significant increase in GHG emissions (meanwhile common people will see another increase in carbon taxes), going in completely opposite direction to what all Irish Political parties see converging on a most respectful use of resources and emissions.

- Do we need an exaggerated increase in flights ?

- Do we need big companies using night slots to pay less (night flights are rarely used for tourism) ?

In summary, planning looks like a simple postscript for DAA.

Actions carried over by DAA show they do not respect planning legislation or decisions of An Bord Pleanála. And this is emphasised by the fact that they are already disobeying previous Fingal County Council enforcement proceedings over the 65 nighttime flight breach (...an enforcement against any citizen will be probably rightly operative and none of us will be able to wait law to be changed, without complying with any laws).

In conclusion, I ask for this application to be refused.

Trusting all points above all clear (even if I do not personally have the resources of DAA granting me the best solicitors or counselling in Dublin landscape) and all interest of the communities living around the airport area are well considered, I respectfully thank you

Sincerely

Gianluca Micalèlla