



An  
Bord  
Pleanála

## Addendum Report

**ABP-303719-19**

---

<b>Development</b>	Karting Track Development and associated works
<b>Location</b>	Cahir Abbey Industrial Estate, Cahir Abbey, Cahir County Tipperary.
<b>Planning Authority</b>	Tipperary County Council
<b>Planning Authority Reg. Ref.</b>	18600140
<b>Applicant</b>	Buttimer Engineering
<b>Type of Application</b>	Permission
<b>Planning Authority Decision</b>	Grant
<b>Type of Appeal</b>	Third Party v Grant
<b>Appellants</b>	Tom and Brenda Hackett
<b>Date of Site Inspection</b>	15 October 2020
<b>Inspector</b>	Gillian Kane

## 1.0 Background

1.1.1. This report should be read in conjunction with the Inspectors Report dated 19<sup>th</sup> June 2019.

1.1.2. Following said report, the Board issued a direction (08/07/2019) that a section 132 notice to the applicant be issued, advising as follows:

“The Board is of the opinion that the proposed development is of a class specified under article 93 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) requiring the submission of an Environmental Impact Assessment Report. In accordance with section 132 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended and having regard to article 109 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) the applicant is required to submit, on or before (allow 4 months), the following: an Environmental Impact Assessment Report (EIAR) which should comply with the revised provisions of articles 94 and 112 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended).”

1.1.3. Following a request to extend the time period, on the 27<sup>th</sup> February 2020 the applicant submitted an EIAR.

## 2.0 Submissions

### 2.1. Tipperary County Council

2.1.1. The Co. Co. wish to note that page 16 of the EIAR is incorrect, as the EIAR was not submitted in response to a request for further information by the Planning Authority. The Planning Authority were satisfied that an EIAR was not required. Section 1.5 of the EIAR discusses alternatives in the form of financial and organisational considerations but not why the site was chosen in the context of environmental effects. The Planning Authority consider the principle of the development is acceptable for the subject location and is in conformity with the zoning objectives of the Cahir LAP 2011.

### 2.2. Appellant

2.2.1. The name of the applicant has changed to OBO Buttimer Engineering. The EIAR therefore does not refer to the current application under appeal.

- The Karts to be used are likely to be 270cc. gas powered. Any change in the engine used will result in noise level changes.
- Section 4.2 of the EIAR notes that there are no specific noise criteria for Karting Tracks. Future noise levels cannot be accurately calculated. Therefore the summary in section 4.9 is meaningless. The applicant cannot guarantee that the proposed noise levels which are at the maximum allowable will not be exceeded when the development is operational.
- The architectural impact of the proposed development on the Protected Structure Cahir Abbey House has not been adequately assessed.
- The proposed operation hours of 12.00-22.00 will result in increased noise and light pollution, and traffic volumes, in addition to the normal Industrial Estate (08.00-18.00). Saturday times of 12.00-18.00 will occur at the minimum estate noise levels.
- The location of kart testing and maintenance has not been specified.
- Noise levels in Cahir Abbey House and Gardens have not been adequately assessed.
- The Board is requested to refuse permission for the proposed development.

### **3.0 Environmental Impact Assessment**

- 3.1.1. As required by Schedule 6 the EIAR submitted to the Board contains a non-technical summary, a reference list detailing the sources for the assessments within the EIAR, and a list of the experts who contributed to the preparation of the report. As is required under Article 3(1) of the amending Directive, the EIAR describes and assesses the direct and indirect significant effects of the project on the following factors: (a) population and human health; (b) biodiversity with particular attention to the species and habitats protected under Directive 92/43/EEC and Directive 2009/147/EC; (c) land, soil, water, air and climate; (d) material assets, cultural heritage and the landscape. It also considers the interaction between the factors referred to in points (a) to (d).
- 3.1.2. I have carried out an examination of the information presented by the applicant, including the EIAR. I am satisfied that the EIAR has been prepared by competent

experts to ensure its completeness and quality, and that the information contained in the EIAR and supplementary information provided by the developer is up to date, adequately identifies and describes the direct and indirect effects of the proposed development on the environment, and complies with article 94 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2000, as amended. I note the error in the EIAR, noted by the Planning Authority namely that the EIAR was requested by the Board not the Planning Authority. This error is not considered to be material.

3.1.3. Article 3(2) includes a requirement that the expected effects derived from the vulnerability of the project to major accidents and / or disasters that are relevant to the project concerned are considered. The EIAR addresses this issue within chapter 8.

3.1.4. **Chapter 1** refers to EIA screening and the obligation to prepare the EIAR with reference to the direction from the Board. It provides information in relation to the EU Directive 2014/52/EU which is an amendment of Directive 2011/92/EU. It provides details on the project team, the purpose and scope of the EIAR and a brief description of the development. Details of the planning history of the site and the Cahir Abbey Industrial Estate are presented and details of the Applicants operations in the estate.

3.1.5. Referring to **Alternatives**, section 1.5 of the report states that the proposed track will be located on an unused area of the applicants landholding. It states that the proposed development will provide an income stream for the applicant, safeguard employment and provide a leisure resource. The report states that from a financial point of view, no alternative sites are viable and therefore alternative sites were not examined. Article 5(1)(d) of the 2014 Directive requires that the EIAR includes “a description of the *reasonable* alternatives studied by the developer, which are relevant to the project and its specific characteristics, and an indication of the main reasons for the option chosen, taking into account the effects of the project on the environment”. It is not stated in the EIAR, but one can assume from reading that the alternative to the proposed development on the subject site is to do nothing.

3.1.6. I am satisfied that the consideration of alternatives, whilst not comprehensive, is nonetheless adequate for the purpose of the EIAR.

- 3.1.7. **Chapter 2** of the EIAR provides details of the site location and context, the landscape as characterised by the Tipperary Draft Landscape Character Assessment 2016, the built environment including the adjoining Cahir Abbey House, and the planning context provide by the Cahir LAP 2011.
- 3.1.8. **Chapter 3** provides a description of the proposed development in terms of the subject site and an overview of the proposed development. The development is described as an outdoor karting track in the south-eastern corner of the site, with a tarmac area at the centre. The shape of the hardstanding will remain constant but the layout of the track will change to allow for different degrees of difficulty. The track is stated to be idle for much of the time with the greatest use on Saturdays between 12.00-18.00. The karts will use four-stroke gas-powered internal combustion engines with a likely engine capacity of 270cc. The track will be restricted to a maximum of 10 no. karts. Maintenance works will occur in the proposed workshop in the north-eastern corner. Construction is expected to take 4 no. months. Car parking will be accommodated in the existing car park.
- 3.1.9. The proposed development includes two steel-clad buildings – a changing room with toilet area and a workshop. Six 62-watt LED lanterns will surround the track and in the centre on 6m columns. Appendix 4 of the EIAR contains an illuminance study. Signage on the perimeter fence will be 288m long x 0.6m high. The track will be bound on all sides by a grassy verge. Foul water will discharge to the existing sewer network and onwards to the Cahir WWTP and ultimately to the River Suir. A SuDS compliant surface water drainage scheme will be installed.

### 3.2. **Likely Significant Direct and Indirect Effects**

The likely significant indirect effects of the development are considered under the following headings, after those set out in Article 3 of the EIA Directive 2014/52/EU:

- population and human health;
- biodiversity, with particular attention to species and habitats protected under Directive 92/43/EEC and Directive 2009/147/EC;
- land, soil, water, air and climate;
- material assets, cultural heritage and the landscape;

- the interaction between the factors referred to in points above

3.2.1. **Chapter 4 – 13:** Chapter 4 addresses Noise & Vibration, Chapter 5 addresses Water, Land & Soils, Chapter 6 considers Material Assets, Chapter 7 considers Air Quality & Climate, Chapter 8 Population and Human Health, Chapter 9 Biodiversity, Chapter 10 Landscape & Visual Impacts, Chapter 11 Archaeology & Cultural Heritage, Chapter 12 Traffic, Chapter 13 Interactions. The EIAR includes four appendices: 1: AA Screening Report, 2: Flood Risk Assessment, 3: PICADY analysis Traffic and 4: Illuminance Study. Each of the chapters are considered in detail below, with respect to the relevant heading of the Directive.

### 3.3. **Noise & Vibration**

3.3.1. Chapter 4 of the EIAR refers to noise and vibration. The chapter states that the proposed development is highly unlikely to give rise to ground borne vibration and therefore it is not considered. In relation to standards, the report notes that as there are no noise standards or guidance documents applicable to karting noise, it was the recommendation of the Environment Officer that a daytime limit of 55dB and night-time limit of 45dB be applied. The nearest noise sensitive receptor (NSR) is Cahir Abbey House, 190m to the south of the proposed track. Baseline noise is generated by the existing Industrial Estate, the R640 traffic, traffic from the town of Cahir and the M4 motorway traffic. Noise monitoring was undertaken with noise monitoring terminals placed at Chair Abbey House and to the rear of the dwellings on Abbey Road and at a later monitoring exercise at lands adjoining the quarry. In terms of noise likely to generated by the proposed development, noise sources are the karts, maintenance activities and vehicle movements. Noise emissions from a gas-powered Sodikart, similar to that proposed for the subject track were measured at a Karting Facility in Longford. Using a worst case scenario, with all ten Karts operating, the predicted noise levels are shown in Table 4.1. Noise levels at each of the three sensitive locations are shown to be within the parameters suggested by the Environment Officer. Mitigation measures proposed include a 2m high Acoustic Barrier along the southern section of the track; running a maximum of 10 Karts on the track at any given time; no public address system or external telephone bells and the immediate removal and repair of any Karts with worn silencers, and an acoustic barrier along the north-eastern and eastern boundary of the development site.

3.3.2. Regarding the appellants submission that because no guidelines exist specific to karting activities, therefore future estimations regarding noise levels are not accepted, I note the use of an existing karting facility in the noise monitoring analysis and consider this acceptable.

3.3.3. I am satisfied that potential effects would be avoided, managed and mitigated by the measures which form part of the proposed scheme, the proposed mitigation measures and best practice measures. I am satisfied therefore that the proposed development would not have any unacceptable direct, indirect or cumulative effects on noise and vibration.

### 3.4. **Water Land & Soils**

3.4.1. Cahir is located in the lowlands of the River Suir valley with the Galtee Mountains to the west. Underlying soils are shallow, well-drained mainly acidic mineral soils. Bedrock is sandstone and limestone. This is said to be consistent with the large quarry to the east of the site. No geological heritage sites are on the subject site. In terms of hydrology, a small stream 200m west of the site leads to the River Suir which is approx. 550m south of the site. The status of the waterbodies in the wider area is presented in Table 5.3. The aquifer underlying the subject site is classified as Regionally Important, whilst that underlying the west of the site (Cahir Abbey House) is High. Identified risks include leaks of hydrocarbons and excess silt in surface water run-off. There will be no impact on groundwater or surface water due to lack of connectivity. Standard and best practice construction methods will be employed and will be presented in a Construction, Environmental Management Plan prior to the commencement of works. No significant residual impacts are predicted.

3.4.2. I am satisfied that potential effects would be avoided, managed and mitigated by the measures which form part of the proposed scheme, the proposed mitigation measures and best practice measures. I am satisfied therefore that the proposed development would not have any unacceptable direct, indirect or cumulative effects on water, land and soils.

### 3.5. **Material Assets**

3.5.1. Chapter 6 of the EIAR addresses the impacts of the proposed development on Material Assets.

- 3.5.2. No significant effects are predicted for other services assessed: electricity, gas, water, sewage and telecommunications networks.
- 3.5.3. I am satisfied that potential effects would be avoided, managed and mitigated by the measures which form part of the proposed scheme, the proposed mitigation measures and best practice measures. I am satisfied therefore that the proposed development would not have any unacceptable direct, indirect or cumulative effects on material assets.

### 3.6. Air Quality & Climate

- 3.6.1. The impact of the proposed development on air quality and climate is addressed in chapter 7. The main substances of interest are sulphur dioxide, nitrogen oxides (nitric oxide, NO and nitrogen dioxide NO<sub>2</sub>, collectively referred to as NO<sub>x</sub>.) The report states that emissions during operation will be negligible. The chapter states that the potential for fugitive dust emissions is greatest during the summer months and due to the predominant south-westerly winds, receptors located to the north-east are most likely to receive elevated dust levels. As the proposed development will take place within an existing industrial estate, there is unlikely to be any significant change to background dust levels. The existing quarry to the east provides a buffer which will minimise the impact.
- 3.6.2. Sensitive receptors within the study area are existing business within the industrial estate and Cahir Abbey House. Predicted impacts during the construction period will arise from construction machinery and vehicles and a short-term increase in traffic on the local road. Very little excavation will be required. Best practice measures will be implemented during the construction phase to minimise emissions at source which will result in operational impacts being short term and imperceptible. For the operational phase, additional traffic will be minor. No dust emission or other significant impact on air quality will occur. Section 7.5 of the report outlines mitigation measures to control dust. Once these are implemented, no residual impacts are predicted.
- 3.6.3. I am satisfied that potential effects would be avoided, managed and mitigated by the measures which form part of the existing and the proposed scheme, the proposed mitigation measures and best practice measures. I am satisfied therefore that the



proposed development would not have any unacceptable direct, indirect or cumulative effects on air and climate.

### **3.7. Population & Human Health**

- 3.7.1. The likely significant effects of the proposed development on the population and human health are addressed in Chapter 8 of the EIAR. The areas examined are the population and settlement, land use, employment and economic activity, and the impacts on human health.
- 3.7.2. The only natural disaster likely to influence the development is flooding. A site-specific flood risk assessment (SSFRA) was undertaken and submitted to the Planning Authority following a request for further information. The details of the assessment are repeated in the EIAR. The OPW Fluvial extent map of 2016 shows that part of the site is at risk from an extreme fluvial event associated with the nearby stream. Following the SSFRA it was found that flood waters will be retained within the confines of the stream channel and there will be no impact on the subject site. There will be no increased risk of flooding within the site or to third parties from the proposed development. No additional flood prevention or mitigation measures are required.
- 3.7.3. In terms of predicted impacts on human health, the proposed development is predicted to have a positive impact on employment and tourism. The predicted slight increase in traffic during construction will be managed by a traffic management system, and will therefore be short-term and minor. No visual impacts are expected. No specific mitigation measures are required.
- 3.7.4. I am satisfied that potential effects would be avoided, managed and mitigated by the measures which form part of the proposed scheme, the proposed mitigation measures and best practice measures. I am satisfied therefore that the proposed development would not have any unacceptable direct, indirect or cumulative effects on population and human health.

### **3.8. Biodiversity**

- 3.8.1. The Lower River Suir SAC (Site Code 002137) is 160m south-east of the subject site and the Galtee Mountains SAC (000646) is approx. 8.1km to the west. Chapter 9 of the EIAR refers to Biodiversity and states that there is no direct hydrological

connection to either of the SACs. Details of the proposed surface water disposal system with infiltration system to an on-site soakaway and designed in accordance with SuDS principles are provided. The Site Specific Flood Risk Assessment concludes that there will be no flood risk to the proposed development and no storage of petrol or other contaminants is proposed on site. No significant effect on ground or surface water is predicted. No cumulative effects are predicted.

- 3.8.2. Details of the site survey undertaken in October 2019 are presented. The nature of the subject and surrounding sites are such that ecological value is low. Predicted impacts on terrestrial habitats, fauna and other mammals are negligible. The impact on birds from increased noise and disturbance is predicted to be long-term and slight.
- 3.8.3. The AA screening report (Appendix 1 of the EIAR) undertaken for the proposed development concluded that having regard to the nature and scale of development proposed and to the nature of the receiving environment, no appropriate assessment issues arise and it was not considered that the proposed development would be likely to have a significant effect individually or in combination with other plans or projects on any European site. No cumulative impacts are identified. Mitigation measures are detailed in section 9.7 and relate to protection of habitats, protection of water quality & surface water management and noise.
- 3.8.4. I have considered all information submitted in relation to biodiversity and I am satisfied that it has been appropriately addressed in terms of the application and the information submitted by the applicant and that no significant adverse effect is likely to arise.

### **3.9. Landscape & Visual Impacts**

- 3.9.1. Chapter 10 of the EIAR addresses the impact of the proposed development on landscape and the visual impact. The assessment of the landscape and visual impacts of the proposed development refers to the policies of the Tipperary County Development Plan 2016 and the Tipperary Draft Landscape Character Assessment 2016 and to the existing character of the industrial area within which the subject site is located. In terms of a visual landscape baseline, the chapter notes the industrial nature of the wider area and that the greatest impact will be from houses on the hillside 1km to the northwest. This impact is stated to be negative, long term and not

significant. Landscape and visual effects are deemed to be not significantly different from the visual impact of the existing industrial estate. I concur with this finding.

3.9.2. I am satisfied that potential effects would be avoided, managed and mitigated by the measures which form part of the proposed scheme, the proposed mitigation measures and best practice measures. I am satisfied therefore that the proposed development would not have any unacceptable direct, indirect or cumulative effects on landscape and visual.

### **3.10. Archaeology & Cultural Heritage**

3.10.1. Chapter 11 of the EIAR assesses the impacts of the proposed development on cultural heritage. There are no RMP, archaeological monuments or NIAH sites within the subject site. Given the industrial nature of the site and the wider area, the report states that there will be no impact on archaeology or cultural heritage from the proposed development.

3.10.2. I am satisfied that there will not be a significant negative impact from the proposed development on the adjoining protected structure Cahir Abbey House.

3.10.3. I am satisfied that potential effects would be avoided, managed and mitigated by the measures which form part of the proposed scheme, the proposed mitigation measures and best practice measures. I am satisfied therefore that the proposed development would not have any unacceptable direct, indirect or cumulative effects on archaeology or cultural heritage.

### **3.11. Traffic**

3.11.1. The penultimate chapter of the EIAR refers to Traffic. It notes that baseline traffic volumes were established by way on on-site traffic counts. Assuming an opening year of 2020, the plan years of 2025 and 2035 are used to estimate the likely impact on the road network (Full details provided in Appendix 3). The analysis finds that the R640 Upper Abbey Street / Tipperary Road would continue to operate well within capacity and that the junction to the industrial estate / business park would operate well within practical capacity without any significant queuing or delays. Construction traffic during the estimated six-week construction period would increase peak hour traffic volumes by up to 4.6%. This is stated to be relatively low and would have no significant impact on the local road network. Operational impacts with up to 85 no.

daily users and staff are stated to be slight to moderate. No cumulative impacts are likely. No mitigation measures are required and no residual impacts are predicted. The chapter concludes that the proposed development would have no significant adverse traffic impact on the surrounding road network.

3.11.2. I am satisfied therefore that the proposed development would not have any unacceptable direct, indirect or cumulative effects on traffic.

### 3.12. **Interactions**

3.13. Chapter 13 of the EIAR assesses the interaction of impacts. Each of the topics is comprehensively addressed in the preceding chapters of the EIAR. No new impacts would arise as a result of the identified inter-relationships, beyond the impacts already discussed elsewhere.

3.14. I am satisfied that the interactions between topics has been adequately assessed and that the finding of no additional potentially unacceptable environmental impacts will arise as a result of the proposed development.

### 3.15. **Reasoned Conclusion on the Significant Effects**

3.15.1. Having regard to the examination of environmental information contained above, all submission received and in particular to the EIAR and the submission from the prescribed body, it is considered that the main significant direct and indirect effects of the proposed development on the environment are, and will be mitigated as follows:

- Potential positive effect on population in terms of increased employment and tourism revenue,
- Potential effects arising from noise which will be mitigated by a 2m high Acoustic Barrier along the southern section of the track; running a maximum of 10 Karts on the track at any given time; no public address system or external telephone bells, the immediate removal and repair of any Karts with worn silencers, and an acoustic barrier along the north-eastern and eastern boundary of the development site.

The proposed development is not likely to have significant adverse effects on water, land & soils, air quality & climate, population & human health, biodiversity, landscape and visual, archaeological & cultural heritage, and traffic.

The likely significant environmental effects arising as a consequence of the proposed development have therefore been satisfactorily identified, described and assessed. They would not require or justify refusing permission for the proposed development or requiring substantial amendments to it.

## **4.0 Conclusion**

- 4.1.1. Having regard to the previous Inspectors Report dated 19 June 2019, the Direction of the Board dated July 2019, the information provided in the Environmental Impact Assessment Report and Appendices submitted in February 2020, the observations on the EIAR made by the Planning Authority and the Appellant and having regard to proposed location within an established Industrial Estate, it is considered that the Karting Track Development and associated works is acceptable.,

## **5.0 Recommendation**

- 5.1. I recommend that planning permission for the proposed development be granted for the reasons and considerations and subject to the conditions as set out below.

## **6.0 Reasons and Considerations**

- 6.1.1. Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development, the zoning of the site for light industrial and employment related uses in the Cahir Local Area Plan 2011, within which zoning commercial 'Sports/Leisure Facilities' are permitted in principle and to the established character and pattern of development in the vicinity of the site it is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would not seriously injure the amenities of residential or other property in the vicinity of the site and would be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

### **Environmental Impact Assessment**

The Board completed an environmental impact assessment of the proposed development, taking into account:

- (a) the nature, scale and extent of the proposed development;
- (b) the environmental impact assessment report and associated documentation submitted in support of the application;
- (c) the submissions from the planning authority and the appellant in the course of the application, and
- (d) the Inspector's report and the Addendum Inspector's Report .

The Board considered that the environmental impact assessment report, supported by the documentation submitted by the applicant, identifies and describes adequately the direct, indirect, secondary and cumulative effects of the proposed development on the environment.

The Board agreed with the examination, set out in the Inspector's report, of the information contained in the environmental impact assessment report and associated documentation submitted by the applicant and submissions made in the course of the application.

The Board considered that the main significant direct and indirect effects of the proposed development on the environment are, and will be mitigated as follows:

- Potential positive effect on population in terms of increased employment and tourism revenue,
- Potential effects arising from noise which will be mitigated by a 2m high Acoustic Barrier along the southern section of the track; running a maximum of 10 Karts on the track at any given time; no public address system or external telephone bells, the immediate removal and repair of any Karts with worn silencers, and an acoustic barrier along the north-eastern and eastern boundary of the development site.

The proposed development is not likely to have significant adverse effects on water, land & soils, air quality & climate, population & human health, biodiversity, landscape and visual, archaeological & cultural heritage, and traffic.

The likely significant environmental effects arising as a consequence of the proposed development have therefore been satisfactorily identified, described and assessed.

The Board completed an environmental impact assessment in relation to the

proposed development and concluded that subject to the implementation of the mitigation measures proposed as set out in the environmental impact assessment report and subject to compliance with the conditions set out herein, the effects on the environment of the proposed development by itself and in combination with other development in the vicinity would be acceptable. In doing so, the Board adopted the report and conclusions of the Inspector.

## 7.0 Conditions

- 1 The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application as amended by the further plans and particulars submitted on the 3<sup>rd</sup>, January 2019, and the EIAR submitted to An Bord Pleanála on the 23<sup>rd</sup> January 2020, except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Where such conditions require details to be agreed with the planning authority, the developer shall agree such details in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development and the development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars.

**Reason:** In the interest of clarity.

- 2 The mitigation and monitoring measures set out in the Environmental Impact Assessment Report submitted with this application shall be carried out in full, except where otherwise required by conditions attached to this permission.

**Reason:** To protect the environment.

- 3 The developer shall pay to the planning authority a financial contribution in respect of public infrastructure and facilities benefiting development in the area of the planning authority that is provided or intended to be provided by or on behalf of the authority in accordance with the terms of the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended. The contribution shall be paid prior to commencement of development or in such phased payments as the planning authority may facilitate and shall be subject to any applicable indexation provisions of the Scheme at the time of payment. Details of the application of the terms of the

Scheme shall be agreed between the planning authority and the developer or, in default of such agreement, the matter shall be referred to An Bord Pleanála to determine the proper application of the terms of the Scheme.

**Reason:** It is a requirement of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, that a condition requiring a contribution in accordance with the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Act be applied to the permission. and sustainable development of the area.

- 4 Water supply and drainage arrangements, including the disposal of surface water, shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works.

**Reason:** To ensure adequate servicing of the development and to prevent pollution.

- 5 The proposed karting track shall not operate outside the hours of 12.00 noon and 22.00 hours daily.

**Reason:** In the interests of residential amenity.

- 6 The karting track shall not commence operation prior to the installation of the proposed Acoustic perimeter fencing in accordance with the specifications and particulars received by the planning authority on 3<sup>rd</sup>, January 2019.

**Reason:** In the interest of residential amenity.

- 7 (a) During the operational phase of the proposed development, the noise level arising from the development, as measured at the nearest noise sensitive location shall not exceed:-

- (i) An Leq,1h value of 55 dB(A) during the period 0800 to 1900 hours from Monday to Saturday inclusive.
- (ii) An Leq,15 min value of 45 dB(A) at any other time. The noise at such time shall not contain a tonal component.

(b) All sound measurement shall be carried out in accordance with ISO Recommendation 1996:2007: Acoustics - Description and Measurement of Environmental Noise.

If the noise contains a discrete, continuous note (whine, hiss, screech or hum), or if there are distinct impulses in the noise (bangs, clicks, clatters or thumps),



or if the noise is irregular enough in character to attract attention, a penalty of 5dB(A) shall be applied to the measured noise level and this increased level shall be used in assessing compliance with the specified levels.

(c) In the event of noise complaints, noise levels from the activity shall be monitored and the significance of noise levels relative to the limits above shall be determined. A record of any noise complaints shall be maintained on site. In the event of noise levels exceeding permitted limits, measures to reduce noise levels from the development shall be prepared and implemented to the satisfaction of the planning authority.

**Reason:** To protect the amenities of houses and other property in the vicinity of the site.

- 8 (a) The karting track shall be restricted to use by four stroke gas powered karts only.
- (b) No more than ten karts shall occupy the track at any time.
- (c) A public address system or external bell system shall not be operated at the facility.

**Reason:** In the interest of clarity and residential amenity.

- 9 (a) The proposed lighting shall be installed by a suitably qualified lighting specialist and the lighting shall be cowled and directed to reduce light scatter outside the boundaries of the site. Full details of the measures to reduce light scatter outside the boundaries of the site shall be submitted for the written agreement of the planning authority prior to the commencement of development. In the event that the planning authority receives complaints from neighbouring properties about light spillage the planning authority may request the carrying out of a survey (by a suitably qualified and competent person) at the expense of the owner/operator of the facility in respect of light overspill from the facility. In the event that it is found that light overspill from the facility is

resulting in nuisance, the operator of the facility shall take adequate steps to address the matter.

(b) External lighting (other than security lighting) shall be switched off when the facility is not in operation.

**Reason:** In the interest of residential amenity and road and traffic safety.

- 10 The site shall be landscaped in accordance with the scheme of landscaping and boundary treatment indicated on Drg. No. B07-03 submitted with the further information received by the planning authority on 3<sup>rd</sup>, January 2019. All planting shall be adequately protected from damage until established. Any plants which die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased, within a period of five years from the completion of the development, shall be replaced within the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the planning authority.

Reason: In the interest of visual and residential amenity.

---

Gillian Kane  
Senior Planning Inspector

19 October 2020