

File With _____

SECTION 131 FORM

Appeal NO: ABP 314485-22Defer Re O/H ☐Having considered the contents of the submission dated/ received 14/12/2023
fromBob Lynon and Teeme McMahon 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: 19/12/2023

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: _____

✧ Old Barn, Kilsallaghan, Co. Dublin. K67D6 H0 ✧

Submission to An Bord Pleanála regarding Dublin Airport Authority Relevant Action.
Ref No. PLOEF 314485

F.C.C reference No.F20A/0668

ABP - 314485

Bob Lynam and Jeanne Mc.Mahon.

I have been living in Kilsallaghan for the most part of the past 75 years and have been living at our current address with Jeanne for over thirty years now.

It had been our wish that our daughter with her partner and our two grandchildren would have the opportunity to return to live in Kilsallaghan from working in the U.K. where she could build a house and have our grandchildren educated in a local school. The development and operation of the new Northern runway by D.A.A. has turned that dream into a nightmare that we would not wish to inflict on anyone especially family. D.A.A have failed to abide by conditions attached to their planning and have failed to engage in any meaningful efforts to alleviate the noise problems created by their non-compliance. In addition they now seek to make a bad situation worse by altering the night flight regulations.

When the Northern runway was first applied for we examined the proposed flight paths and we felt reasonably confident that we would not be affected significantly if operated in accordance with planning application details. We were led to believe that departing flights would either travel 5 nautical miles or reach 3000 feet before they could deviate from the flight path. By that stage the planes would be far enough away from our house or high enough over ground to be of little importance. In our submission to F.C.C we warned that any information supplied and conditions attached to the permission were useless if not complied with or enforced. We also stated that it was our opinion that agreed flight paths for the existing southern runway were not being complied with. We made the mistake of assuming that the runway would be operated in accordance with their submission to Fingal Co. Council Planning Department. How many other residents around the airport would have strongly objected to that planning proposal had they known that planning conditions would be ignored. The conditions have to be adhered to. We now live in a cauldron of continuous noise when the northern runway is in use for departing flights. Before the noise of one aircraft has faded it is joined by the next departure.

When the new runway began operating we had low flying jets flying directly over our house. The flight paths bore no relationship to what had been proposed and approved. No satisfactory explanation was ever given as to how or why this happened. I believe their expression was that this was due to an unanticipated variance. Was it incompetence at the planning stage or a belief that D.A.A. were too important to be restricted by mere planning conditions. The one good thing that came out of their action was the realisation that D. A. A. was a neighbour that could not be trusted. We were eventually told that these flight paths would in time be modified to be 'closer' to the approved paths. This cavalier a la carte approach to planning conditions appears to be only available to D.A.A. After approximately six months the flight paths were modified but still do not comply with planning permission. The Airport should be forced to operate under the original Planning Permission in relation to flight paths.

The local school at Kilcoscan is now completely unsuitable for the education of local children because of this non-compliance. Insulation is not the answer. Stuffy classrooms and noisy playgrounds cannot be good for the health of children.

AN BORD PLEANÁLA
LDG:
ABP: 068852-25
14 DEC 2023
Fee: € 50 Type: Cash
Time: 11:40 By: Hand

D.A.A. say they will talk to residents and that some sound insulation may be available for those worst affected. We are entitled to be able to open our windows and doors and use our gardens as we did before this unauthorised development. .

In their submission to An Bord the increased monitoring of noise levels around the Airport is referred to as one of their noise 'mitigation' proposals. This on it's own has no mitigation benefits in relation to noise reduction and the results will be as irrelevant as their existing noise complaints procedure.

The Airport should not be allowed to increase the number of nigh time flights or change their hours of operation. This would clearly worsen the situation for people who are already badly affected by the operation of this runway. Instead of being offered hope they are being offered more frequent disruption on a permanent basis. Any change from a limit on flight numbers during night time to a noise quota will result in a noisy life sentence for those already badly affected. The development of quieter engines will result in more flights rather than an improvement of conditions for local residents.

D.A.A. have an overblown opinion of the role that they play in the Irish economy. In their submission they fail to take into account or mention the significant number of flights that have no benefit or are in actual fact damaging the Irish economy. The establishment of Dublin Airport as a major hub for air travel will be of benefit to Dublin Airport only. They are acting like a third world country in their race to the bottom importing garbage from more developed countries Local residents are and will continue to pay the cost with their health. As the nations number one polluter they should be trying to lessen their damage to the environment. The polluter should pay instead of the local population.

The main local objectors to these proposals have highlighted very significant errors and shortfalls in the information supplied by D.A.A It is incumbent that An Bord obtain satisfactory answers to the items highlighted

How does the number of flights in and out of Dublin Airport during night times compare to Heathrow Airport and Charles De Gaulle Airport.

Why are people paying significant property taxes on their devalued property

What compensation is available to people who have had their homes devalued.

I believe that an Oral Hearing should be held so that the people and communities most affected by this existing development and the proposed changes to it can have an opportunity to ask their questions and get the answers that they deserve.

It is important that the Board is seen to act impartially and without fear in this matter and that those who flout the planning laws and regulations are not unfairly rewarded.

Signed: Bob Lyman

Signed: John Miller