

Bruce Zhang

Subject: FW: Kariong Sand and Soil Supplies Facility (SSD-8660) – Submissions Report
Attachments: signature_Roger.png

----- Original message -----

From: Roger Kennard [REDACTED]
Date: 11/3/21 4:10 pm (GMT+10:00)
To: "Chris Ritchie (Dept of Planning and Environment)" <chris.ritchie@planning.nsw.gov.au>
Subject: FW: Kariong Sand and Soil Supplies Facility (SSD-8660) – Submissions Report

Hi Chris,

Please see attached comments from our Accoustics Consultant in response.

Kind Regards

Roger Kennard

Director, Business Development

P 1800 287 483
M [REDACTED]
E [REDACTED]
W www.burgtec.com

burgtec.

1800 287 483

info@burgtec.com

25 Awaba Street Lisarow NSW 2250

www.burgtec.com

----- Original message -----

From: Roger Kennard [REDACTED]
Date: 10/3/21 12:45 pm (GMT+10:00)
To: Roger Kennard [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: Kariong Sand and Soil Supplies Facility (SSD-8660) – Submissions Report

Roger Kennard

Director, Business Development

P [1800 287 483](tel:1800287483)

M

E

W www.burgtec.com

burgtec.

📞 1800 287 483

✉ info@burgtec.com

📍 23 Awaba Street Lisarow NSW 2250

🌐 www.burgtec.com

----- Original message -----

From: Oliver Muller

Date: 27/1/21 3:53 pm (GMT+10:00)

To: Roger Kennard

Subject: RE: Kariong Sand and Soil Supplies Facility (SSD-8660) – Submissions Report

Hi Roger,

I have reviewed a few items for this project and note the following :

- The updated enclosed crusher is a positive and will provide more attenuation for sources located within this space. The gap will detrimentally affect the attenuation performance of the shed though.
- The response letter by Waves states that we are incorrect by ignoring that manufacturers data was used. The original report states that the manufacturers data was used but adjusted to use their database spectra. I would request that the manufacturers data is provided by the consultant so this can be demonstrated clearly.
- The comment RE background monitoring states that it is incorrect to claim that line of sight or topographical differences between measurement locations can be used to accurately estimate noise level changes. It is logical to expect that a noise monitor with a clear line of site to the freeway will have a higher noise level than one screened by the ridgeline. Also, I note that the way the RBL is established industrial sources that may be diffuse would not likely influence the background noise levels. On the other hand the constant noise emissions from the M1 which are not diffuse would influence the RBLs, so I don't agree with this statement. Also, it is not for us to monitor to prove/justify the assessment is incorrect as this needs to be done by the proponent.

Let me know your thoughts.

Thanks

Oliver Muller | Principal Acoustic Scientist

BSc(REM & HGeog)|(MAAS)

Muller Acoustic Consulting Pty Ltd (MAC)

PO Box 262, Newcastle NSW 2300



W: www.mulleracoustic.com

Member Firm of the Association of Australasian Acoustical Consultants

 Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail