

Enfield Acoustics Pty Ltd  
ABN 15 628 634 391  
PO Box 920  
North Melbourne, VIC 3051  
(03) 9111 0090



August 27, 2019

COESR Pty Ltd c/- Planning & Property Partners  
13/1 Collins Street  
Melbourne VIC 3000

## **Technical Memorandum: Acoustic Review**

### **Re: Cape Otway Road Australia (CORA)**

Enfield Acoustics has been engaged to review the Cape Otway Road Australia (CORA) proposal with respect to how noise impacts and conditions should be considered. It is understood that:

1. The Subject Land at and around 1300 Cape Otway Road, Modewarre, where it is proposed to develop CORA, is required to be re-zoned for the purposes of the proposed use;
2. The proposed use will be a tourism, elite sports training facility and accommodation with ancillary buildings, amenities and uses;
3. The Minister for Planning has appointed a Development Advisory Committee (DAC) to consider and advise him in relation to the project; and
4. The EPA has raised issues required to be addressed, including noise matters, which the DAC has requested more information on.

This document provides a high-level assessment of the matters raised and broadly addresses noise conditions for the project which can be resolved during more detailed planning and development in the future.

In a letter dated 5 April 2019, the EPA raises the following:

*Noise must not exceed the recommended levels as set out in Noise from Industry in Regional Victoria (NIRV; EPA Publication 1411, 2011), demonstrated through a noise assessment report. It is advised that noise impacts from the development, such as (but not limited to) the electrical substation, should be considered as part of any assessment and appropriate noise mitigation measures implemented if required. This should also include noise impacts from various uses within the site.*

On review of the development masterplan, the proposal will include a mix of sensitive (accommodation) and non-sensitive (retail, sport training facilities, etc) uses.

With respect to the non-sensitive uses proposed, these uses will need to comply with EPA Publication 1411: NIRV.

There are existing residential uses on Connies Lane as well as proposed sensitive uses on the Subject Land which would also drive any noise attenuation requirements in practice. The development is not progressed enough to confirm exact noise emissions from non-residential uses proposed on the site, however in my experience the following can be expected:

1. Retail and food & drink areas generally emit low levels of noise. Services and plant are also relatively easy to control in these scenarios with off-the-shelf noise attenuators to fans and refrigeration.
2. Any music noise emissions from proposed food & drink premises would also need to comply with State Environment Protection Policy No. N-2 (SEPP N-2), were music noise emissions proposed during trading.
3. Similarly, sports training facilities do not typically require any substantial services that warrant major concerns with respect to noise emission levels.
4. Use of outdoor sports fields are normally found to comply with noise policies because of their transient use. Other uses not normally assessed under NIRV (e.g. field whistles, voices, etc) would not be expected to generate impacts at sensitive uses where the use of sports fields is limited to reasonable hours and do not conflict with normal respite periods (i.e. 7am-10pm).
5. The microbrewery proposed can reasonably be expected to include refrigeration plant and flues which may emit some noise. As above though, such plant can be enclosed and attenuated if required and such engineering design is best left to later stages of development.

With the exception of the Hotel proposed, residential uses are proposed to be sited some distance from non-sensitive uses. Given the above (low probability of noise / adequate buffers), the risk of any adverse noise impacts occurring are considered to be low for the proposal.

For the hotel specifically, it is normal practice to consider reasonable internal amenity unless private outdoor spaces are to be a feature of the design. Again, while the risk of adverse impacts is low, any residential development could easily incorporate appropriate window glazing to address noise concerns. I note that NIRV does not prohibit this so there would be no policy conflicts where NIRV is referenced on a permit.

While any re-zoning of land affects how NIRV noise limits are calculated, this is typically not found to be material in practice. The following approximate noise limits would be suitable for all non-sensitive uses to comply with:

- 45dB(A) during day hours, being 7am-6pm Monday to Friday and 7am-1pm Saturday
- 40dB(A) during evening hours, being 6pm-10pm Monday to Friday, 1pm-10pm Saturday and 7am-10pm Sunday
- 35dB(A) during night hours, being 10pm-7am

### **SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS**

In summary, I agree with the EPA that non-sensitive uses (being those which are non-residential, commercial or trade) should be required to comply with EPA Publication 1411: NIRV. However I do not expect this to result in any material impost to the project in practice, given the proposed uses are considered low impact with respect to:

1. Siting of the uses; and
2. Probability of noise emissions from non-sensitive uses.

While the above concerns are often dealt with via tenancy agreements for retail and small trading outlets, it would be appropriate to ensure that individual planning permits for site uses make reference to EPA Publication 1411: NIRV and SEPP N-2, or that the Comprehensive Development Zone references the same standards (NIRV and SEPP N-2). While the risk of noise impacts is deemed to be low in this instance, explicit reference to the correct standards and guidelines ensures that consideration for the above is given during detailed design development.

Where the above considerations are made, I am satisfied that the noise concerns raised by the EPA are addressed.

Regards



Darren Tardio  
Director  
Enfield Acoustics Pty Ltd