



6th January 2015,

Attention: Kristy Welfare
Assessing officer,
Lane Cove Council
PO Box 20 Lane Cove
NSW 1595

Your ref: DA 14/175

Dear Kristy,

RE: Amended Development Proposal 390–398 Pacific Highway Lane Cove

I refer to your email of the 29th December 2014 requesting my comment on the amended plans and the acoustic report to provisions of SEPP 65. I refer also to my previous report of 26 November 2014.

The following comments have been prepared based on the drawings and documents supplied by Council including:

- Amended Drawings by Nettleton Tribe partnership proprietary Ltd, including 4336–DA 01–03, 02–03, 03–05, 04–04, 05–04, 06–04, 07–04, 08–04, 09–04, 10–04, 11–02, 12–02, 13–02, 72–01 dated December 2014
- Acoustic Report by PKA consulting dated October 2014
- We take on face value the accuracy of all the documents given to us and rely on them to form our assessment.

We have visited the site.

This report will deal with the main issues raised in my previous report and the subsequent information provided.

Solar Access,

The amended proposal achieves solar access to 70% of the apartments. This must be qualified by the fact that some apartments only have 2hrs of sun and some count hours after 3pm. Given the constraint of the approved development to the north of the site it is my opinion that that this amount of solar access is acceptable.

Cross ventilation,

The amended proposal has 61% cross ventilated units, which is acceptable, however, the acoustic measures recommended in the acoustic report raises concerns about the required 'alternative ventilation' systems required for all but 8 units.

Acoustics,

In my previous report, I suggested that the amenity of the units facing the Pacific Highway, especially those on the lower levels, might be compromised by road noise. The report reveals that not only the lower units would be subjected to unacceptable levels of noise but that there is an almost equivalent level of noise at the higher levels and on the side facades.

On site measurements of noise at front and rear of site are :

The results of the attended measurements and corrections are presented in table 2 below:

Elevation	Measured at Rear of Site L _{eq} dBA	Measured at Side of Site L _{eq} dBA	Measured at Front of Site L _{eq} dBA	Level Difference dB (Front to Rear)	Level Difference dB (Front to Side)
Ground	43	62	74	31	12
6 meters	46	64	73	28	10

Table 4.2 Attended Measurement Results

The acoustic report includes measurements for each of the facades of the building. These are summarised as follows:

Table 4.3 below shows the external noise levels at each façade of the building, due to road traffic noise.

Façade	Level	Day Time	Night Time
North	Ground - 7	71-63	67-59
North	B1	60	55
East (Front)	Ground - 7	71	67
South	Ground - 7	71-62	67-57
South	B1	60	65
West (Rear)	All Levels	51	47

Table 4.3: Façade noise levels due to road traffic

SEPP 102 recommendations are:

“where external noise levels are above 60 dB(A) (day) for 55 dB(A) (night), the affected façade will need to be acoustically upgraded to achieve the internal noise level required by the SEPP”

The measurement metrics applied in the DoP criteria are the $L_{eq(15hr)}$ Day and $L_{eq(9hr)}$ Night levels. From this the following criteria would apply to the site:

Internal Space	Time Period	Internal Noise Level – Windows Closed	Measurement Descriptor
Sleeping areas (bedroom)	Night (10pm to 7am)	35 dB(A)	$L_{eq(9hr)}$ Night
Other habitable rooms (excl. garages, kitchens, bathrooms & hallways)	Day or Night	40 dB(A)	$L_{eq(15hr)}$ Day or $L_{eq(9hr)}$ Night

Table 5.1: Internal noise goals from DoP guidelines / SEPP Clause 102

Readings for the north, east and southern facades are significantly above the recommended internal noise levels goals with windows closed. The report explains that in a partially open window can provide a 10 dB(A) reduction. This will not be anywhere near sufficient.

The report concludes that with the exception of units B1, B2, B3 and some parts of units 104, 204, 304, 404, 504, and the Western bedroom of unit 606, all units require an alternative ventilation system, as well as an acoustic design for walls and double glazing for windows and doors.

It is my understanding that achieving the required amount of ventilation through alternative ventilation systems is difficult and costly. The acoustic report makes recommendations as to how this can be achieved, however the precise nature of the proposed systems and their impact on the amenity of the units need to be provided by the applicant.

Balcony sizes.

Balcony sizes have generally been increased where possible and are now acceptable.

Setback to Mafeking Ave,

Setback to Mafeking Avenue has not been altered and remains at 6 m from the North West corner. Council’s minimum set back is 7.5 m.

One mitigating factor is the amount of landscaped area in the road reserve between the road and the property boundary which gives the visual impression of a larger set back.

Unfortunately, the encroachment results in additional overshadowing 2 properties on the western side of Mafeking Avenue.



Conclusion.

The proposal generally meets the objectives of the principles of good design, however the acoustic report has some serious implications with respect to how acoustic performance and cross ventilation can both be achieved. The detail of the solutions will need to be understood and verified by a suitably qualified person prior to submission for CC.

The setback situation is unchanged.

Please do not hesitate to contact me should you require any further information or clarification.

Yours faithfully

Tim Williams
Architect AIA