

## MEMORANDUM

20205 - 28-32 SOMERSET STREET, KINGSWOOD - RESPONSE TO QUERIES - R1.DOCX

---

TO: Boston Global DATE: 29 July 2021  
ADDRESS: Level 29, 259 George Street, Sydney NSW 2000  
EMAIL: -  
FROM: Matthew Furlong  
SUBJECT: **28-32 Somerset Street, Kingswood – Response to Council Queries**

### CONFIDENTIALITY

This document is confidential and may contain legally privileged information. If you are not a named or authorised recipient you must not read, copy, distribute or act in reliance on it. If you have received this document in error, please telephone our operator immediately and return the document by mail

This Technical Memorandum has been prepared by Pulse Acoustic Consultancy Pty Ltd (Pulse Acoustics) to review and advise on the Acoustic RFI queries raised by Penrith City Council in relation to the proposed development application for redevelopment of 28-32 Somerset Street, Kingswood, DA20/0767.

A total of four (4) acoustic items were raised by Penrith City Council, each four items are addressed below.

**Note:** In response to the additional information requested by council, an updated DA Acoustic Report has been prepared and should be read in conjunction with the information below. Reference: 20205 – 28-32 Somerset Street, Kingswood – DA Acoustic Assessment – R4, Date: 29<sup>th</sup> July 2021, Revision: R4

## 1 ITEM 1

### 1.1 Penrith City Council

*“Table 1 of the report identifies that the measured LA90 for the daytime period was 40 dB(A), whereas Table 10 states that the measured LA90 for this period was 45 dB(A). This has meant that the intrusive criteria (and project trigger level) for the daytime period has been set at 50 dB(A) rather than 45 dB(A). This has implications for the noise extrusion assessment, particularly in relation to the driveway noise assessment, where the levels produced would not comply (Table 21). Clarification is needed regarding this aspect, with various sections of the report potentially requiring amendment.”*

### 1.2 Pulse Acoustics Response

- A grammatical error was present in Table 10. The correct LA<sub>90</sub> noise level, excluding construction works associated with Nepean Hospital is 40dBA LA<sub>90</sub>. All tables checked and are amended in the revised report.
- In relation to Table 21, due to an amended architectural layout, a revised assessment of noise associated with the driveway has been undertaken. A minor 1dBA exceedance is predicted for the revised driveway layout and is considered acoustically acceptable, refer to discussion in the amended report for justification.

## 2 ITEM 2

### 2.1 Penrith City Council

*“Though identified as potential source of noise emissions in Section 3.3, noise produced by the basement was not considered in the assessment. The laundry, loading dock, waste storage and carparking for the development are located in the basement levels. The report is to address this potential noise source.”*

### 2.2 Pulse Acoustics Response

- An additional assessment has been included in the revised report which reviews and assess the noise associated with the listed activities outlined above. This can be found in section 4.6 of the revised report.
- In summary, from our review the operation of these listed activities within the basement, all activities will result in compliance with the project acoustic requirements.

## 3 ITEM 3

### 3.1 Penrith City Council

*“The gym and spa on the rooftop level were not assessed in the report. Consideration is to be given to the potential noise and vibration impacts associated with the use of the gym facilities, particularly in relation to the potential impact to adjacent spaces (including the floor below). The gym has been identified as a 'therapy gym' in the application, and will be conditioned as such (ie. not to be used by hotel guests, only pre- and post-operative patients), unless additional use is confirmed by the applicant.”*

### 3.2 Pulse Acoustics Response

- An additional assessment has been included in the revised report which reviews and assess the noise associated with the listed activities outlined above. This can be found in section 4.7 of the revised report.
- In summary, from our review of the fitness areas, all activities will result in compliance with the project acoustic requirements.

## 4 ITEM 3

### 4.1 Penrith City Council

*“Though future developments have been identified in Section 1.3, it is not clear whether the assessment has considered the height of future sensitive receivers when assessing compliance with the criteria, given the buildings approved for future residential use to the east of the site are significantly taller than the current residences. Comment needs to be made in this regard, as it needs to be ensured that future residents are not impacted, particularly by the use of the rooftop facilities.”*

### 4.2 Pulse Acoustics Response

- We can confirm we have assumed all future developments are assessed. In each of the elements assessed within our previous and revised report the approved architectural drawings were reviewed and assessment locations on the adjacent properties were included in our assessment.
- Therefore, we can confirm future residents in adjacent buildings will not be subject to levels of noise which above the formulated acoustic criteria in our reports.

We trust this information is of assistance. If you have any further questions, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Regards

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'M. Furlong', written in a cursive style.

**Matthew Furlong**  
Senior Acoustic Engineer  
Pulse Acoustic Consulting Pty Ltd