

File With

## SECTION 131 FORM

Appeal No

ABP— 314485-22

Defer Re O/H

☐

Having considered the contents of the submission dated/received 14/12/2023  
from Michael Conreally 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

21/12/2023

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-002966

### Online Observation Details

Contact Name  
Michael Conneally

Lodgement Date  
14/12/2023 12:15:55

Case Number / Description  
314485

### Payment Details

Payment Method  
Online Payment

Cardholder Name  
michael conneally

Payment Amount  
€50.00

### Processing Section

S.131 Consideration Required

☒ Yes — See attached 131 Form

☐ N/A — Invalid

Signed

*Pat R*

EO

Date

21/12/2023

### Fee Refund Requisition

Please Arrange a Refund of Fee of

€

Lodgement No

LDG— 068842-23

Reason for Refund

Documents Returned to Observer

☐ Yes ☐ No

Request Emailed to Senior Executive Officer for Approval

☐ Yes ☐ No

Signed

EO

Date

### Finance Section

Payment Reference

ch\_3ONDpXB1CW0EN5FC1DH8RKOq

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

Our Ref : Conneally Family Observation  
Your Ref : PL06F.314485  
E-mail : [mickconneally@hotmail.com](mailto:mickconneally@hotmail.com)  
Postal : Ashlawn, Oldtown,  
Co. Dublin. A45 H421.  
Phone : 087-3221482  
Date : 13-12-2023

An Bord Pleanála  
64 Marlborough St,  
Rotunda,  
Dublin 1.  
D01 V902.

Re : **Bord Pleanála Case Reference: PL06F.314485.**  
**Observation on 'Relevant Action' application.**

Dear Sirs,

We are Residents of Oldtown, Co Dublin. A community subject to immense and unjust suffering at the hands of the Dublin Airport Authority, the applicant in the above case.

We have reviewed the particulars submitted by the applicant in this application and our observations are presented in the following pages.

#### **Executive Summery.**

The relevant action application is a naked attempt by the DAA to circumvent the laws of the land. The documents submitted under this application and in particular those that proclaim to consider the effects on human health display such contempt for the communities that neighbour Dublin Airport it is apparent that the applicant believes such matters barely warrant consideration when set against their desire to continue to grow their asset and profits.

The Communities of North County Dublin have been inflicted with unreasonable levels of discomfort and distress at the hands of this entity. The community, families and children of North County Dublin are suffering daily from exposure to aircraft noise that Dublin Airport generates. The DAA would have an Bord believe not only that this is not the case, but that a further erosion of the right to peace of this communities in now an economic necessity. The DAA would have an Bord believe that 6 hours of sleep a night is sufficient for growing children.

The DAA has made no meaningful efforts to engage with the communities in the vicinity. They have maintained a charade of engagement to placate the planning process, such as their appointment of an unempowered community liaison Officer, who traverses the areas telling traumatised families there is nothing that can be done for them. All the while stifling the proper application of the law of the land and threatening economic calamity on the State if their wishes are not acquiesced to.

While there are many issues to be addressed in relation to the behaviour of the DAA in relation to the Communities of north county Dublin, our observations below are focused on issues relating to the health of the Communities, families and individuals in the area. This being a matter on which we can unfortunately speak with experience. We believe the consideration given by the DAA to this matter is not merely inadequate, but deliberately misleading and attempts to open the door for further damage to our communities.

The Bord must **REJECT** the application contained in PL06F.314485.

### **Health, welfare & community wellbeing considerations.**

The current reality vis-a-vie aircraft noise in Oldtown is that my children are woken by aircraft noise at approximately 7am each morning and struggle to get to sleep at an appropriate hour for their age each night due to the noise. This is simply not enough sleep for growing children. This is the reality of the situation that DAA have inflicted on our family and on families across north county Dublin, which is not mitigated in any way by the plethora of costly consultants' reports submitted with the application.

An increase in the duration of heavy aircraft traffic affecting children's development should therefore be unconscionable to any reasonable entity. However, it has become apparent to the Communities of north county Dublin that the DAA considers their health and welfare to be an impediment to growth, to be overcome by whatever means necessary.

We have reviewed the contents of the EIAR Supplement Chapter 7 with great concern. The primary purpose of the revised section seems to be to divert attention from the extremely detrimental effects of the aircraft noise on children and families that the DAA have inflicted on the residents of North County Dublin. The document consists of a considerable amount of irrelevant statistical data presented so as to give the overall impression that those dealing with sustained and traumatic aircraft noise effects in their home environments are in no way worse off than the country at large.

The point of listing, for example, the nearest medical facilities to the Airport (section 7.5.30) amongst other superfluous information seems to be to generate sufficient text mass to cloak the more pertinent statements made in relation to the actual issue at hand. For example, the unsupported and asinine statement in section 7.4.7 - *'As such, there is little evidence evaluating the relationship between aircraft noise and sleep disturbance'* is buried in the depths of the document. An Bord can rest assured that there is ample evidence for such a relationship in our household and in our community more broadly. Further, this would be vehemently contested by numerous prominent scientists. Any peer review process would flag this immediately as a bias statement.

The finding of section 7.8.26 and their treatment in section 7.8.29 is extremely troubling. The finding that some 30,000 people may experience disturbance at the extreme end of the scale (which the authors condescendingly and inaccurately describe as being 'annoyed') is barely addressed at all. The report states merely that the figure is *'a very minor increase in the number'* which fails to address two extremely relevant issues:

- 1) These are individuals who could have their lives ruined in this process. Their cognitive functions may be impaired, their employment advancement prospects may be reduced or eliminated, the mental and physical health could be affected in a manner that they may never recover from. I can speak from experience that this level of noise has caused a severe and traumatic relapse of PTSD in a member of our household that has been devastating for all concerned.
- 2) The uplift between the two figures is irrelevant. The entirety of the population in question is due to the actions of DAA and their failure to provide adequate remediation and redress measures. I can speak with confidence for Oldtown where the current flight paths are not those presented in the 2007 planning application, so everyone in this community rightly attributes any lack or loss of amenity to the actions of the DAA.

*(Further to the above, the flight paths and adherence to permitted routes is currently subject to the legal challenge, so it is arguable that the involvement of an Bord at this stage is premature)*

In reality, the contempt shown for the victims of the DAA's actions illustrates the intent of the report clearly, as well as the intent of the DAA more broadly in pursuing this action.

Section 7.9 of the report advises that *'No additional mitigation measures related to population and human health are proposed during the operation for the proposed relevant action'*. Which can be rephrased, with no loss of accuracy as *'DAA sees nothing wrong with allowing growing children 6 hours*

of sleep, at best, from now on'. The contempt of the DAA for the communities affected by its actions is on full display here.

In general, the selective use of information and the dismissive tone of Chapter 7 reveals that it is written purely with the intent of supporting the proposition by the Applicant. This is expected, given the authors are in the employ of the applicant - however, An Bord should be cognisant that the veneer of scientific legitimacy with which the document presents itself is misleading.

This document is not a peer-reviewed scientific paper or anything of the sort. It deigns to usurp the trappings of scientific reporting but even then, cannot do so plausibly; the references and footnotes are intermingled and there is multiple duplication of referencing to add bulk to the document. It is a transparent faux-scientific charade of a document designed to deceive.

The above examples are only a sample of the shortcoming of the document, which are many and varied. Should An Bord have any doubts about this a comprehensive review by experts in public health policy, vulnerable individuals and juvenile development should be undertaken. An Bord should be fully and impartially informed as to the issues relating to these areas of concern.

An Bord should be aware that the contents of Chapter 7 are essentially a well-illustrated opinion piece produced by a paid participant. The document cannot be taken as an unbiased source and An Bord should afford the findings the weight they deserve. i.e. None.

On this basis, it must be concluded that the DAA have not given any meaningful consideration to the health and safety of the surrounding communities. The effect of the decision of an Bord may affect the communities of north county Dublin for generations. The information provided simply does not allow An Bord to make such a decision with any confidence.

An Bord must reject this application.

#### **Summary:**

The slavish adherence of Chapter 7 (revised) of the EIAR to the ambitions of the commissioning funder, the DAA, has sabotaged the reports' independence. This document reflects the DAAs contempt for the communities of north County Dublin and toes the line of their paymaster so fully that patently ridiculous statements are present in the report.

The report is fundamentally flawed and cannot be relied upon by an Bord. An Bord must therefore concluded that no meaningful consideration has been given to the wellbeing of the Communities affected by their actions. As such, there in no means to approve this application.

An Bord **MUST REJECT** this application.

Please feel free to contact the undersigned if there is anything further you require.

Yours sincerely,



Michael Conneally

CEng, IntPE, RConsEI, MIEI.

Ashlawn, Oldtown, Co. Dublin. A45 H421.