

MEMO

Project:	25-43 Wangaratta Street, Richmond	Document No.:	Mm 001 R01		
To:	Wangaratta South Pty Ltd	Date:	3 February 2020		
Attention:	C/O Contour – Tim McBride-Burgess	Cross Reference:	-		
Delivery:	Email	Project No.:	20190242		
From:	Tim Nicholls	No. Pages:	8	Attachments:	No
Subject:	Response to SLR review - Acoustics				

Distribution:

Name	Company	Information	Action
Steve Ingram/Gus Cooper/Tim Fowler	Cremorne Properties	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Paul Grant/Cian Davis	Bates Smart	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

INTRODUCTION

SLR Consulting Australia Pty Ltd (SLR) has been engaged by the City of Yarra to provide a review of Marshall Day Acoustics Pty Ltd (MDA) acoustic assessment report (RP 001 R03 20190242 dated 2 October 2019) prepared for the town planning application for the proposed commercial development at 25-43 Wangaratta Street, Richmond. A copy of SLR's review document is provided in Appendix A.

This memorandum provides a summary of the comments from SLR's review and MDA's corresponding responses and proposed actions.

It is proposed that MDA will update the acoustic report to address the items noted in SLR's review.

SUMMARY OF SLR REVIEW

SLR's review highlighted several items for further consideration, including:

- Loading bay noise
- Carpark entry door noise
- Café noise
- Noise from office terraces
- Rail noise impact upon the facade.

The items contained in SLR's review are discussed and responded to in detail below.

MDA RESPONSE

A summary of each item raised in SLR's review, and any further action to be taken, is presented in Table 1.

Table 1: SLR review comments and MDA response

Section reference	SLR comment	MDA response	Action
Section 1.0 - Background information			
Hours of operation	<p>The proposed hours of operation are not provided in the introductory sections of the report. In Section 6.1 it is stated that use of the facility is not proposed to occur at night, and in Section 9.2* it is indicated that the terraces are assumed to be used during normal office hours only. However, we understand that extended hours of operation may be sought by the application. If this is the case, noise during the evening and night periods should be addressed.</p> <p><i>* Assumed to mean Section 9.3</i></p>	<p>Given the intended operation of the development as a commercial operation, it is difficult to define strict hours of operation as it may be necessary from time to time for employees to access and use the building during evening and night-time periods.</p> <p>Notwithstanding, the report does discuss potential noise sources from the development during the evening and night-time periods as well as daytime – where certain activities are expected to exceed noise limits during evening and night-time periods, this has been addressed in the report accordingly.</p> <p>It is proposed to amend the wording of Section 6.1 and Section 9.3 to reflect the remainder of the report.</p>	<p>Amend wording to Section 6.1 and Section 9.3 to reflect the remainder of the report.</p>

Section reference	SLR comment	MDA response	Action
Location of noise generating uses	We note that the potential noise generating uses associated with the development (e.g. the loading bay and food and drinks tenancy) are located along the eastern boundary of the subject site, closest to the noise sensitive receivers. This layout is not ideal for acoustics.	This comment is noted. We have received the following advice from the town planning consultant: 'We understand that the City of Yarra preferences access from vehicles, including loading and waste collection from laneways. This outcome ensures primary pedestrian streets are uninterrupted by crossovers and opportunities for active frontages are maximised. Specifically, Clause 22.07 – Development abutting Laneways of the Yarra Planning Scheme states that <i>“where appropriate, laneway access for vehicles is to be used in preference to street frontages to reduce vehicle crossovers.”</i> For these reasons, the application proposes vehicle access and loading from Botherambo Street in favour of Wangaratta Street.'	No further action required.
	The development is proposed to include several terraces on the eastern façade. Whilst not identified in the introductory sections of the report, noise from their use is addressed in the report.	Noted.	No further action required.

Section reference	SLR comment	MDA response	Action
Section 2.0 - SEPP N-1 noise limits			
Determination of noise limits	The background noise measurement locations and measured levels look reasonable. Our calculations of the SEPP N-1 zoning levels and noise limits agree with MDA's.	Noted.	No further action required.
Section 3.0 - Noise from the Subject Development			
Mechanical plant noise	Agree with MDA's approach. Recommended that a review of all acoustically significant mechanical plant be conducted during the detailed design phase of the project.	Noted. A detailed review of mechanical services plant would normally be conducted during the detailed design phase of the project.	No further action required.
Loading Bay noise	<p>MDA assume that deliveries will only be conducted during the day period, and that they are not likely to occur more than once or twice a day. Deliveries are typically proposed to involve vans and small rigid trucks. An indicative SEPP N-1 assessment of noise from deliveries is provided in the report. The SEPP N-1 effective noise level from one delivery is predicted to be 3 dB over the day period SEPP N-1 noise limit of 55 dBA, due to noise from trucks arriving and leaving the site. The provided assessment assumes engines will be turned off while trucks are in the loading bay. MDA suggest that the predicted exceedance is reasonable given the commercial interface and given that all practical measures have been implemented to control noise from the loading bay.</p> <p>While we agree that a marginal exceedance of SEPP N-1 limits from occasional use of the loading bay during the day period is unlikely to be a critical compliance issue, we nevertheless note that SEPP N-1 limits are mandatory, and that if there is a risk of ongoing non-compliance, and/or of use of the facility being underestimated, it would be advisable to locate the loading bay in a less sensitive area (e.g. on the western side of the site). This would eliminate noise issues from its use.</p>	<p>The prediction of delivery noise has been reviewed with some parameters amended – refer below.</p> <p>As discussed above, it is understood that for architectural/practical reasons, it is not feasible to locate the loading bay on the west elevation.</p>	

Section reference	SLR comment	MDA response	Action
	It is also not clear that all practical measures for controlling noise from the loading bay have been implemented. The loading bay could, for example, be fitted with sound absorptive material to minimise reverberant build-up of noise.	<p>The noise prediction for the loading bay in RP001 R03 assumed the delivery truck would emit noise for a period of one minute per 30 minute period. However, upon further review we believe this over-estimates the length of time that the vehicle will emit assessable noise under SEPP N-1. Because the loading bay opens directly onto the street, the assessable duration of noise from an arrival and departure is expected to be quite short (i.e. a matter of seconds).</p> <p>Furthermore, a sound absorptive lining in the loading bay and an acoustic loading bay door will be recommended. The loading bay door will remain closed during loading/unloading activities.</p> <p>These additional considerations result in predicted compliance from loading bay activities.</p> <p>Additional management control measures will also be recommended.</p>	<p>Update the report to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revise the duration correction for the delivery vehicle • Sound absorptive lining in the loading bay • Acoustic door to the loading bay <p>Management controls to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loading door to remain closed when loading bay is in use • Loading bay not to be used outside of SEPP N-1 defined Daytime hours • Vehicle operators encouraged to use white-noise reversing beepers to minimise noise disturbance.
	The assumption that deliveries occur only during normal office hours should be provided as a recommendation in the report (e.g. in Section 10), particularly if the development is likely to operate during the evening and night periods.	Noted. The report will be updated to include daytime only operation as a recommendation.	Report to be updated to include daytime only operation as a recommendation.
Carpark entry door noise	Given that some access to the carpark is likely at night it is recommended that the report be updated to include sleep disturbance targets for the door.	Noted. The report will be updated to include sleep disturbance targets for the door and a specification/noise limit for the door system.	Report to be updated to include sleep disturbance targets for the door and a specification/noise limit for the door system.

Section reference	SLR comment	MDA response	Action
Patron (voice) noise – Café	The proposed advice is reasonable. Use of the external area for dining should also be restricted to the day period.	Noted. The report will be updated to clarify this.	Section 9.2 will be updated to clarify that the external area should not be used during the evening/night-time periods.
Patron (voice) noise – terraces	<p>The indicative assessment provided is satisfactory for the assumed use by office staff during office hours. We assume that the evening assessment has been provided to address noise impacts during the early evening period only, given that daytime use of the facility is proposed. If this area was used for functions during the evening, we would expect higher voice sound power levels to be used.</p> <p>If extended hours of operation are proposed, we would recommend that the terraces are not used during the night period.</p>	Noted. The report will be updated to include noise management control recommendations for the terraces.	Section 9.3 will be updated to include noise management control recommendations.

Section reference	SLR comment	MDA response	Action
Section 4.0 - Road and Rail Noise to the Offices			
Noise Targets	The design targets are reasonable. We note that these targets are not mandatory, and that Yarra Council do not always require an acoustic report addressing road and rail impacts to commercial developments.	Noted.	No further action required.
Road and Railway Noise Measurements	<p>The traffic noise measurements are generally reasonable. Upper levels of the development will have a greater exposure to road noise from Swan Street, however the site is some distance from this road, and a line of sight is unlikely to have implications for facade treatments.</p> <p>The ground level railway noise measurements are more of a concern, as it seems unlikely that the measurement location had a line of sight to the railway. MDA may have (used) this data obtained at ground level to predict rail noise to upper levels of the building, however this is not clear from the report.</p>	<p>Whilst potential rail noise impact is not considered critical at town planning stage for a commercial development, noise data from a similar commercial development site will be used to assess potential noise impact at the upper levels to confirm the potential facade glazing requirements.</p> <p>However, it is expected that there will be no significant additional impact on the facade glazing requirements, over and above what would normally be required for a commercial development.</p>	Section 6.3 to be updated to include additional noise data and further analysis of potential noise impact at upper levels.
Facade upgrade Treatments	<p>The advice provided is reasonable subject to MDA's confirmation that rail noise has been predicted to upper levels of the building.</p> <p>The provided acoustic rating for 6/12/6.38 double glazing is approximately 3 dB higher than our data suggests.</p> <p>However, it is unclear from the report why the higher performance glazing has been applied to this space and consequently a downgrade of the rating is unlikely to have implications for the project.</p>	The report will be updated to clarify this.	Section 11.1 (previously 10.1) to be updated.