

File With

## SECTION 131 FORM

Appeal No

ABP— 314485-22

Defer Re O/H

☐

Having considered the contents of the submission dated/received 13/12/2023  
from Cllr Ian Carey 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 issues

Section 131 not to be invoked at this stage.

☒

Section 131 to be invoked — allow 2/4 weeks for reply.

☐

Signed

Pat B

EO

Date

20/12/2023

Signed

SEO/SAO

Date

M

Please prepare BP — Section 131 notice enclosing a copy of the attached submission.

To

Task No

Allow 2/3/4 weeks

BP

Signed

EO

Date

Signed

AA

Date



## Planning Appeal Online Observation

Online Reference  
NPA-OBS-002911

### Online Observation Details

Contact Name  
Ian Carey

Lodgement Date  
13/12/2023 13:55:14

Case Number / Description  
314485

### Payment Details

Payment Method  
Online Payment

Cardholder Name  
Ian Carey

Payment Amount  
€50.00

### Processing Section

#### S.131 Consideration Required

☒ Yes — See attached 131 Form

☐ N/A — Invalid

Signed

*Pat B.*

EO

Date

20/12/2023

### Fee Refund Requisition

Please Arrange a Refund of Fee of

€ 50

Lodgement No

LDG— 068748-23

Reason for Refund

No fee required (existing participant)

Documents Returned to Observer

☐ Yes ☒ No

Request Emailed to Senior Executive Officer for Approval

☒ Yes ☐ No

Signed

*Pat B.*

EO

Date

05/01/2024

### Finance Section

Payment Reference

ch\_30Msu6B1CW0EN5FC1gE8uUv8

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**

13/012/2023

To whom it may concern,

I am one of over 30,000 people who are living under an illegal flightpath since the opening of the North Runway. The 2007 planning condition documentation includes flightpath assumptions which many people have built their lives around. The flight paths in the 2007 planning permission are much different to the ones in use today and since it opened.

The noise from the current flight paths is intolerable. These flightpaths must be changed back to what was proposed in 2007. No further changes can be considered until this crucial issue is first addressed. There is a major health risk to tens of thousands of people due to excessive aircraft noise.

**An oral hearing is absolutely necessary given the gravity of the situation.**

The documents which have been recently submitted by the DAA have changed the flight paths from what was originally granted to what is currently in use.

This is an abuse of the planning system as a change of this magnitude should only be granted with an entirely new planning application.

To allow this application would see ABP accidentally granting retention for the flight paths currently being used which are illegal and causing continued untold distress to tens of thousands of people.

The so-called 'permitted' noise zones in this submission do not match the Environmental Impact Statement for the only granted permission.

To allow this would set a precedent that ABP conditions are to be ignored by the DAA if inconvenient.

Sadly, it seems the DAA have already taken this approach:

- They have breached the planning passenger cap on Dublin Airport and are on track to do so again;
- They have consistently breached the 65 movement cap per night since the opening of the North Runway;
- They are using flight paths not accounted for in the 2007 permission for the North Runway.

If I, or one of my constituents, were to take this approach they would quickly find ourselves in court, or worse, yet the DAA breach these laws with impunity. Laws need to be applied equally to all.

### **Health vs. Economic Benefits**

The documentation submitted by the DAA in support of this application is inadequate in relation to both the health impacts and the economic benefits. In the case of the health impact of noise they are clearly understating the impact. There is a growing body of evidence to show the increased impact of noise on health. The 2018 European Guidelines produced by the World Health Organization rely on 8 peer-reviewed studies

and called on policymakers to substantially increase the protection for citizens against aircraft noise which has been shown to increase the risk of cardiovascular disease, mental health issues and to cause cognitive impairment. It also highlighted the damaging impact of noise on children and their ability to learn. This is all the more relevant because the new illegal flight paths track directly over Kilcoskan National School which has a number of autistic units containing children who are particularly sensitive to noise. ABP should in particular consider taking action against flight paths going directly over noise sensitive community infrastructure such as schools. The health impact of this development has not been adequately quantified in this submission. In light of increasing advice for policymakers on aircraft noise, ABP should seek stronger, not weaker, conditions on the airport to protect communities from noise.

As a counterpoint, the economic benefits (or downsides of retaining the conditions) are clearly overstated in the reports prepared by the DAA. Unlike some other sectors, aviation has both a positive and negative impact on the national economy. Every cheap flight that is facilitated through Irish airports creates a cheap flight exiting the country. To get a true picture of the impact of the airport you need to weight the economic impact of inbound tourism against outbound tourism. The report submitted in this application and the economic report it relies upon both fail to quantify the impact of outbound tourism. Some estimates place Ireland as the third richest economy in the world, it is foreseeable in this context that a fair analysis of inward and outward tourism might conclude that the Irish economy could benefit from less people flying. It is impossible to say because such an analysis has not been carried out. The catalytic jobs attributed to the airport are also a clear exaggeration. They rely on a crude correlation between high tech industries and international hubs. This clearly ignores other more salient factors such as tax, education, language, and other supports. An analysis which would reveal the true impact of connectivity on foreign direct investment would have to establish what is either the limiting or motivating factors in the decision to locate businesses in Ireland. This level of analysis has not been done. It is far more likely that the limiting level of connectivity for multinational companies is access to international hubs for regions in which they operate. Ireland has had that level of connectivity for Europe, North America for decades. Without an analysis at that level, the catalytic jobs attributed in the report are not reliable.

### **Growth Forecasts**

The growth forecasts listed in the documentation are also problematic because they omit both industry plans and international action in relation to climate change. The forecasts rely ultimately on IATA forecasts which peg passenger growth to GDP. It is unlikely that this is a reliable predictor of demand going forward. One of the main threats to airport and aviation growth is climate action. Aviation is one of the last remaining industries, both nationally and internationally, to remain broadly untouched by climate change regulation. This is a completely untenable situation and any attempt to reign in emissions in the sector will have a profound impact on the cost of flying. The kerosene exemption is vulnerable to European action in the medium term as a number of countries have taken action against short haul flying. The Refuel directive which will mandate a proportion of aviation fuel to be Sustainable Aviation Fuel will have an increasing impact on the cost of flights. But without doubt the most likely impact of the cost of flights, and in turn growth forecasts, is the aviation industries own plans to be carbon neutral by 2050. The plans to achieve this currently rely massively on the use of Sustainable Aviation Fuels (SAFs). Most SAFs are unscalable. Any that rely on biological



sources simply cannot be scaled up to the level that will satisfy the needs of the aviation industry currently, without any growth. Those that don't directly rely on biological sources will need to compete in the open renewable energy market with ground transportation, home heating, industry etc. It should be possible to estimate such costs based on projections of the electrification of all those sectors and plans for the scaling up of renewables however such an analysis has not been done. It is difficult to envisage a scenario where tackling emissions from aviation does not lead to a sharp increase in the cost of flying in the medium to longer term, particularly as we get closer to 2050. The link between the cost of flying and demand is obvious but it is not acknowledged in the reports submitted. Previous industry reports have claimed a very strong relationship between price and passenger numbers. In 2009, Ryanair commissioned a report which found that the government's €10 tourism tax would lead to a drop of 2.6m in passengers through Dublin Airport. If passenger numbers through Dublin Airport are that price sensitive, then climate action will have a dramatic impact. While the outcome of that report might be questionable it is clear that the cost of flying, which can reasonably be predicted to grow is going to have a significant impact on growth forecasts. An independent analysis of growth forecasts at Dublin Airport should be carried out to inform any decision.

Efforts to promote unsustainable growth in aviation will itself create instability in the Irish economy. Any move towards growth in aviation is likely to push the Irish economy into a damaging boom and bust cycle.

Fundamentally, any action to generate growth in aviation is not compatible with stopping runaway climate change.

From a health, economic, and climate perspective this development is unsustainable and I ask you to uphold the original permission and conditions.

Yours Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ian Carey".

Cllr Ian Carey  
Rowan House,  
Newtown Cross,  
The Ward  
Co Dublin  
D11C623