

Land and Environment Court of NSW  
Macquarie Street  
**SYDNEY NSW 2000**

Postal Address  
P.O. Box 432  
Gladesville  
N.S.W. 1675  
AUSTRALIA  
A.C.N. 068 727 195  
A.B.N. 19 068 727 195  
Telephone: 02 9879 4544  
Fax: 02 9879 4810  
Email: [AtkinsAcoustics@bigpond.com.au](mailto:AtkinsAcoustics@bigpond.com.au)

10 January 2007

**Atkins Acoustics and Associates Pty Ltd.**

Consulting Acoustical & Vibration Engineers

**REVIEW OF NOISE IMPACT ISSUES**  
**LAND & ENVIRONMENT COURT**  
**PROCEEDINGS No 10834 of 2006**  
**WOOLLAHRA MUNICIPAL COUNCIL at CRANEBROOK SCHOOL**  
**PREPARATION AND JUNIOR SCHOOL (STAGE 1)**

Class 1 proceedings were filed in the Land and Environment Court of NSW by Cranebrook School (*the Applicant*) appealing against a deemed refusal of consent from Woollahra Municipal Council (*the Respondent*) to a staged Development Application (DA 508/2005/1) for a combined junior school and preparatory school at 6 and 6A Kent Road Rose Bay.

The development site (*the site*) identified as 6 and 6A Kent Street Rose Bay comprises Lot 1 DP 82503 (6 Kent Road) and Lots 1 and 2 DP 1033645. Lot 2 DP 317149, Lot 6 DP 17607 (6 Kent Road). 6 Kent Road and is occupied by the Cranebrook Preparatory School which comprises a part 2 storey building known as “Dickens House”, and playing fields known as “Dangar Playing Fields”. The site has an area of 41,602m<sup>2</sup>. The land is relatively flat and the majority of the site comprises grassed playing fields. The land to the east, north and west of *the site* is developed with a mix of free standing and multi unit residential developments. The land to the south of *the site* consists of multi use sports grounds.

The Development Application (*DA*) seeks consent for:

- Building envelopes for the purpose of classrooms, multi-purpose and music rooms, administration and staff facilities, gymnasium, canteen, art, science and library facilities, and tennis courts;
- Use of the site for a junior and preparatory school for 460 students (comprising of 150 preparatory students and 310 junior students) and 45 staff;
- A gross floor area of 6300m<sup>2</sup>;
- Vehicle access, egress and circulation layout and 70 off street parking spaces;
- Works including the demolition of the existing bowling club, remediation of the site and stormwater drainage works.

For the purpose of my preliminary review and assessment I have relied upon the documents provided by “*the Applicant*” and “*the Respondent*”, site inspections and discussions with a number of residents.

With respect to the documents provided I have reviewed the acoustic report (*Noise Impact Assessment*) prepared by Wilkinson Murray ((July 2005) for *the Applicant* and a report (36.4584.R1ZSC) dated 18 September 2006 prepared for Ms D Hampshire (*Resident*).

Referenced to *the Respondents* “Statement of Issues” dated 7 November 2006 and filed with the Court 8 November 2006, I have the referred to matters listed as Issues 9, 10 and 11. In addition I have referred to noise assessment procedures referenced in the NSW, Department of Environment and Conservation (*DEC*), Noise Guide for Local Government (*NGLG*), Woollahra Municipal Council Local Environment Plan 1995 (*LEP95*) and Woollahra Municipal Council Development Control Plan for School and College Development (*DCP95*).

The main noise sources that would be associated with the proposal include on-site traffic, outdoor play activities, classroom activities, sporting activities, outdoor teaching activities and activities associated with the gymnasium uses. Referenced to the JBA Urban Planning Consultants Statement of Environmental Effects (*SOEE*) Section 4 refers to core hours associated with the school and states:

*“ The core hours of activity associated with the school will occur between 8.30am and 3.00pm during weekdays. Before school care is from 7.00am - 8.00am and after school care is from 3.00pm – 6.00pm. Some sporting events will occur also during weekends.”*

In preparing my assessment I recognise that the residential properties that would be exposed to noise from the proposal are generally exposed to noise from existing activities including sporting events, car park activities and the existing preparatory school. I also recognise that the character and level of noise would change as a result of the proposal.

From my preliminary review of the proposal I confirm my conclusions below:

1. Overall a complete understanding of the proposed usage of the site is required and should be documented in a Site Operational Management Plan prior to completing my assessment.
2. The *Noise Impact Assessment* fails to provide a graphical presentation of the ambient noise measurement results and justify the high background noise levels recorded at 683 New South Head Road. I would expect that the background noise level at this property and other properties along New South Head Road to be lower than reported in *Noise Impact Assessment*.
3. I have concerns with respect to noise impacts from vehicles and activities generated from the site access driveway off Kent Road. Additionally the *Noise Impact Assessment* fails to address noise from vehicles and associated activities related to the parking spaces adjacent to 4A and 8 Kent Road.

4. The *Noise Impact Assessment* identifies that traffic noise levels on the site access road would exceed normally accepted criteria by 8-10dB(A) and recommends that as result of practical constraints, other than road surface treatment, no additional noise mitigation. I disagree with the findings and recommendations.
5. In general the classroom building layout provides self-shielding for noise associated with classroom and teaching activities. Albeit confirmation is required with respected to window locations, undercroft areas and play ground areas to demonstrate that noise impacts can be controlled. To control classroom breakout noise windows may need to be closed and alternative ventilation provided. Clarification is required to confirm that alternative ventilation, if required, is practical and would be installed.
6. The gymnasium is located to maximise distance separation and shielding to residential properties. With appropriate building noise control design I consider that noise emanating from the gymnasium could be controlled. Clarification is required to confirm that sound locks, building materials selections and alternative ventilation, if required, are practical. In addition the Site Operational Management Plan should address the activities associated with the gymnasium and it usage.
7. The northern fenced line of the tennis courts would be approximately 2 metres from the common boundary with properties fronting New South Head Road. The tennis court baseline would be approximately 8 metres from the common boundary. Noise associate with the tennis activities is predicted to exceed 56-59dB(A) and the recommended assessment criteria (background +5dB(A)). I am not satisfied that noise from the tennis court activities could be controlled to levels that would satisfy the recommended criteria without additional noise mitigation. In addition the Site Operational Management Plan should address the activities associated with the tennis court usage and hours of usage.
8. Noise from activities associated with the playing fields is predicted to exceed the recommended assessment criteria when assessed to exposed residential boundaries. Albeit I recognise that noise from the existing layout and activities would not satisfy the recommended assessment criteria. The Site Operational Management Plan should address the activities associated with the playing fields and hours of use.

Unless instructed other wise I will continue to finalise my statement of evidence for filing with the Court. It would be desirable if the above matters could be addressed prior to finalising my Statement.

Yours sincerely,  
**ATKINS ACOUSTICS & ASSOCIATES PTY LTD.**

Graham Atkins