Sydney Head Office
Suite 2
174 Willoughby Rd
St Leonards NSW 2065
T: 02 9908 1270

Melbourne Office
Suite 11
70 Racecourse Rd
Nth Melbourne VIC 3051
T: 03 7015 5112

ABN: 36 105 797 715
PO Box 270
Neutral Bay NSW 2089
E: info@acousticdynamics.com.au
W: www.acousticdynamics.com.au

Project 7179
5 May 2026

Attention: Lane Cove West Responsible Planning Group

Dear Residents

12 MARS RD LANE COVE WEST – PROPOSED DATA CENTRE
NOISE EMISSION ASSESSMENT – EXPERT PEER REVIEW

1 INTRODUCTION & BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. Acoustic Dynamics is engaged by the **Lane Cove West Responsible Planning Group**, to conduct a peer review of the acoustic report and advice prepared in support of the proposed construction and operation of the Project Mars Data Centre located at 12 Mars Road, Lane Cove West.

2. A State Significant Development Application (SSDA) (ref: *SSD-82052708*) has been prepared in support of the data centre. The proposal seeks approval to demolish existing structures on the site, the construction, fit-out and operation of a data centre.

3. The proposal includes the following:

   i. Site preparation works including demolition, bulk excavation and removal of existing structures on the site, tree and vegetation clearing and bulk earthworks;
   ii. Construction, fit-out and operation of a three-storey data centre with a gross total floor area of approximately 21,832m^2 comprising:
      - 24 car parking spaces;
      - 2 loading dock spaces;
      - 2 levels of technical data hall floor space; and
      - Three (3) level office and amenities building.
   iii. Provision of required utilities, including:
      - Diesel storage tanks;
      - Waste storage tanks;
      - Electrical substations on-site;
      - 49 back-up emergency generators on the rooftops of the development;
      - Eight (8) cooling towers on the south-western rooftop of the development;
      - Two (2) load bank; and
      - 40 air-cooled chillers on the rooftops of the development.
   iv. Vehicle and pedestrian access from Mars Road;
   v. Associated landscaping and site servicing;
   vi. Installation of site services and drainage infrastructure; and
   vii. A floor space ratio of approximately 0.65:1.

4. The data centre is proposed to operate 24-hours a day, 7-days a week.

5. The following documents are referenced and considered as part of this review:

   i. SLR Consulting Australia (SLR) acoustic report document titled: "*Project Mars Data Centre – 12 Mars Road, Lane Cove West NSW SSD-82052708 Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment"* dated 16 February 2026, Revision v2.0, SLR Reference *610.032285.00003*; and
   ii. Architectural Plans prepared by HDR Inc. dated 3 December 2025.

6. This document provides a peer review of the acoustic report prepared in support of the proposal, and considers whether potential noise impacts are management measures have been adequately addressed.

2 ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

The following local council, state government and federal legislation is applicable to noise assessment for the proposal. The relevant sections of the legislation are presented below.

2.1.1 PROTECTION OF THE ENVIRONMENT OPERATIONS ACT 1997

7. The POEO Act provides generic regulatory instruments that can be applied to manage noise emission from a development site. Acoustic Dynamics advises that the operation of building services and other sources associated with the development not generate *"offensive noise",* as defined within the Act:

> *"**offensive noise** means noise–*
>
> *(a) that, by reason of its level, nature, character or quality, or the time at which it is made, or any other circumstances:*
>
> *(i) is harmful to (or is likely to be harmful to) a person who is outside the premises from which it is emitted, or*
> *(ii) interferes unreasonably with (or is likely to interfere unreasonably with) the comfort or repose of a person who is outside the premises from which it is emitted, or*
>
> *(b) that is of a level, nature, character or quality prescribed by the regulations or that is made at a time, or in other circumstances, prescribed by the regulations."*

2.1.2 INTERIM NOISE CONSTRUCTION GUIDELINE (ICNG)

8. The ICNG outlines and establishes noise criteria for construction activities during regular construction hours (7:00am to 6:00pm Monday to Friday, 8:00am to 1:00pm Saturday, no works on Sundays or public holidays) in various zoning areas. Two noise trigger levels criteria are determined. The first is the "Noise Affected" criterion, which is based on the existing background noise level of a given area, referred to as the "Rating Background Level" (RBL). The "Noise Affected" criteria is calculated as **RBL + 10 dB**.

9. Should construction works be proposed outside of standard construction hours, the "Noise Affected" criterion is calculated as **RBL + 5 dB**.

10. The second is the "Highly Noise Affected" criterion, which is a fixed criterion of **75 dB(A)** for residential receivers, and take into account to the amenity expectations of a given noise receiving area.

2.1.3 NOISE POLICY FOR INDUSTRY (NPFI)

11. The NPfI outlines and establishes noise criteria for industrial noise sources in various zoning areas. The criteria are determined on the basis of the existing noise environment, and take into account to the amenity expectations of a given noise receiving area.

2.1.4 SLEEP DISTURBANCE

12. The NSW EPA has investigated overseas and Australian research on sleep disturbance. The assessment of noise for sleep disturbance relies on the application of a screening that indicates the potential for this to occur. The EPA's NGLG provides the following guidance for the assessment of such a screening test:

> *"Currently, there is no definitive guideline to indicate a noise level that causes sleep disturbance and more research is needed to better define this relationship. Where likely disturbance to sleep is being assessed, a screening test can be applied that indicates the potential for this to occur. For example, this could be where the subject noise exceeds the background noise level by more than 15 dB(A). The most appropriate descriptors for a source relating to sleep disturbance would be $L_{A1(1\ minute)}$ (the level exceeded for 1% of the specified time period of 1 minute) or L_{Amax} (the maximum level during the specified time period) with measurement outside the bedroom window."*

13. Additionally, the guidelines of the NPfI provide the following additional information:

> *"Where the subject development/premises night-time noise levels at a residential location exceed:*
> - *$L_{Aeq,15min}$ 40 dB(A) or the prevailing RBL plus 5 dB, whichever is the greater; and/or*
> - *L_{AFmax} 52 dB(A) or the prevailing RBL plus 15 dB, whichever is greater".*

3 SLR NOISE IMPACT ASSESSMENT – 16 FEBRUARY 2026

14. The SLR acoustic report (dated 16 February 2026) contains an assessment of noise impacts associated with the proposed data centre.

3.1 RECEIVER LOCATIONS

15. Within *Section 1.2 Nearest Receivers*, SLR identifies the nearest noise sensitive receivers.

16. Given the high number of residential receivers, SLR has elected to group receivers into “Noise Catchment Areas” or “NCAs”. These areas would typically have an ambient background noise environment and therefore the same assessment criteria. This is common practice in acoustic assessments to simplify reports. In this case, results are provided for the most affected receiver within the nominated NCAs instead of hundreds of impacted individual residential receivers.

17. A map showing the grouping of residences into NCAs is provided in *Figure 9* of the report.

18. Receivers are largely residential in nature. However other notable receiver locations include Blackman Park to the south/southwest of the development, and the Lane Cove Community Nursery immediately to the east of the site.

19. Acoustic Dynamics has reviewed how the NCAs have been allocated, and is in general agreeance with the allocation.

3.2 EXISTING NOISE ENVIRONMENT

20. Unattended long-term noise logging was conducted at one location in each NCA in February, March, April, November and December 2025. Noise logging was conducted for two (2) weeks at each location, and forms the basis of the criteria determined in accordance with the requirements of NSW EPA’s NPfI and ICNG.

21. Acoustic Dynamics advises that the noise logging locations for NCA01 (L01), NCA03 (L03), NCA04 (L04) and NCA05 (L05) are well positioned and likely to be representative of the existing background noise levels in these NCAs.

22. We query whether the noise logger location (L02) for NCA02 is a conservative representation of the RBL for all receivers within NCA02. The logger was placed on the rear balcony of 10 Banksia Close, Lane Cove West, immediately adjacent to the site under assessment.

23. L02 is described in Appendix B of the SLR report as being affected by “*distant road traffic noise from Epping Road, with some industrial noise*”. Additionally, the photo of the noise monitoring location shows the noise logger has line-of sight to the existing development at 12 Mars Road. We query whether the existing operations of the site may have impacted the measurements made by the noise logger at this location, potentially raising background noise levels and resulting in a less-conservative criterion. Given the eastern façade of the existing development rises quite high above the western most residences in NCA02, it is unlikely that more distant industrial noise is impacting the logger at L02.

24. Further, the RBLs at L02 are exactly the same as the results measured at L01 which was in the front yard of 17 Banksia Close. While the noise loggers were deployed at different times of the year, Acoustic Dynamics experience would suggest that the measured L_{Aeq} and RBL results would be lower within the backyard of a property than within the front yard of the property.

25. In consideration of our previous comments in Paragraph 23 above, we would therefore expect additional noise contributors to be present within the backyards of the western-most receivers in NCA02.

26. Additionally, L02 is located near Mars Road and Banksia Close and would be affected by traffic from these streets. Given NCA02 extends as far as 62 Wood Street to the south, dropping in elevation from north to south, it is our opinion that the backyard of 64, 66 or 68 Wood Street would be a more conservative location in which to conduct long-term noise logging, and would likely be more similar to the RBLs measured at L03.

27. Given receivers in NCA02 are predicted to be the most affected during the construction works and operation of the proposed data centre, having an accurate understanding of the RBL for these receivers is arguably the most important part of the assessment.

28. Acoustic Dynamics advises that additional noise logging should be conducted to determine the background noise levels at 64, 66 and 68 Wood Street. The lower of the two logging periods for NCA02 should be used to determine the assessment criteria for residents in NCA02 per the NPfI.

29. It is also noted that no commercial receivers have been identified in the assessment. Acoustic Dynamics is of the opinion that building immediately to the west of the subject site (14 Mars Road) is a commercial building. Even though the building is situated in an area zoned E4 General Industrial, the existing business is commercial in nature and should be assessed as such. Further, we understand that this building houses the offices of Cochlear Australia, and query if the nature of the work performed in the building would be considered acoustically sensitive and worthy of consideration in the assessment.

30. In any case, we advise the criteria for operational noise emission should be at-most **63 dB(A)** as per the requirements of the NPfI.

3.3 ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

31. Within *Section 3*, SLR present the assessment criteria used within their report. The criteria are based on NSW EPA's ICNG for noise during construction works, NSW EPA's NPfI for Industrial Noise Sources and Sleep Disturbance and NSW EPA's Road Noise Policy for noise from traffic generation associated with the proposal.

32. We find the criteria presented by SLR has been calculated accurately, with the exception of the criteria for receivers in NCA02 per our comments detailed in **Section 3.2** above regarding the noise logger location and results used to establish the criteria for these receivers, and the inappropriate classification of 14 Mars Road as an industrial receiver.

3.4 SLR ACOUSTIC ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY

33. Within *Section 4 Methodology*, SLR presents the source noise levels and assessment scenarios used to predict noise emission to the receivers previously identified in *Section 1.3* of the report.

34. Sound Power Levels (SWLs) are presented for all vehicles and mechanical plant associated with the site.

35. Within *Table 23 Mechanical Plant*, SLR discuss the SWLs for the proposed backup generators. Design SWLs are presented for the air intake, discharge and exhaust stack. Presumably, these generators and their enclosures are yet to be designed and constructed, as they are, in Acoustic Dynamics' experience, bespoke to the requirements of any given site.

36. Acoustic Dynamics advises that consideration of breakout noise through the enclosure itself should also be considered, as a "shipping container style" enclosure is likely to be insufficient to adequately mitigate breakout noise from the operation of the generator.

37. Significant care must be taken during the design of the emergency generators, to ensure the noise emission of the assembled generators and enclosures matches the predictions of SLR;

38. Within *Section 4.2.1.4 Mechanical Plant*, SLR states:

> "*Various items of mechanical plant would also be located internally within the data centre. This includes items within the various data halls, electrical plant rooms and mechanical services areas. Details regarding these internal items of equipment are not currently available, however, breakout noise from these items is expected to be relatively minor compared to noise from externally located mechanical plant and testing of backup generators given the internal plant areas are generally separated from the external facades by service corridors (see Figure 3 to Figure 8).*
>
> *The exact requirements for all items of mechanical plant would be determined as the project progresses when specifics are known about tenant requirements. Further noise modelling of all items of mechanical plant would be completed during the production of later noise assessments when the selected mechanical plant is known."*

39. Based on our experience in the acoustic assessment of data centres, Acoustic Dynamics would generally agree that external mechanical plant is more likely to impact the most affected receivers than internal plant. However, data halls within data centres are known to be noisy environments.

40. Our review of the proposed architectural plans found that the data halls are largely proposed to be constructed with glazed facades, and therefore less able to reduce noise transmission from internal areas externally.

41. To ensure a conservative assessment has been conducted, it is our opinion that internal noise levels for the data halls should be modelled and assessed. In lieu of product specific data, we would consider a nominal internal noise level to be appropriate for an initial assessment as conducted by SLR.

42. This assumed internal noise level would need to be conservatively high to ensure any necessary recommendations can be accounted for. Such recommendations would include internal acoustic treatment to the data halls, such as absorptive wall linings to reduce reverberation, or increased glazing thickness for façade windows to adequately control breakout noise through the façade.

43. Within the SEARs document for the project (dated 10 April 2025), the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure (DPHI) state the following (emphasis added by Acoustic Dynamics):

> "*Operational noise – The EIS must include an operational noise assessment which:*
> …
> - *Includes details of manufacturer specifications for plant and equipment and the noise source inventory (demonstrating worst-case modelling of plant and equipment for each assessment period, including testing of any back-up power system* ***and a critical power failure scenario***)."

44. Acoustic Dynamics considers that the DPHI's SEARs document requires the assessment of noise emission from the generators on-site during an emergency power failure against the NPfI criteria.

45. Within *Section 4.2.2 Operational Scenarios*, SLR describe the two (2) scenarios to be assessed. A summary is provided within *Table 26* of their report, copied in below as **Table 3.4.1** for reference:

Table 9 Internal Noise Limit

Scenario	Name	Description
OP.01	*Normal Operations*	• *All equipment operating at typical peak capacity, except for backup generators and load banks.* • *Assessed during daytime, evening and night-time periods.*
OP.02	*Maintenance/Testing Operations*	• *All equipment operating at typical peak capacity, including concurrent maintenance / testing of one backup generator with two load banks.* • *Assessed during daytime only.*
Power Outage	*Emergency Power Failures*	• *All equipment operating at typical peak capacity, including all backup generators.* • *Load banks are not included in the power outage scenario as they are used only during testing of the backup generators.*

46. Acoustic Dynamics considers scenarios OP.01 and OP.02 appropriate for the proposed operations, noting that SLR has predicted noise emission from the 'Power Outage' scenario, but not assessed it against the NPfI criteria, nor is it assessed to determine the feasibility of the proposal. It is noted that SLR's predictions indicate that the operation of all emergency backup generators would exceed the night-period criterion of the NPfI by as much as 19 dB(A) during the night period for receivers at NCA02.

47. Further to paragraph 43 and 44 above, we query whether SLR have completed the assessment required by the DPHI and their SEARs date 10 April 2025.

3.5 SLR ACOUSTIC ASSESSMENT RESULTS

3.5.1 PREDICTED CONSTRUCTION NOISE EMISSION

48. Within *Section 5.1 Construction Noise*, SLR provides the results of their assessment of noise emission from the proposed construction works.

49. Acoustic Dynamics' review of SLR's construction noise emission assessment found it to be lacking in detail of noise sources and the modelled scenarios for each stage of the demolition and construction works. I.e. The number of excavators/rock-breakers operating simultaneously, the hours and duration of their use, the location of noise sources and what management/mitigation has been accounted for within the assessment.

50. Receivers at NCA02 are predicted to be the most impacted due to their proximity to the eastern boundary of the site. However, Acoustic Dynamics anticipates that the proposed construction works would likely comply with the Highly Noise Affected noise management level the majority of the time, with the exception of when works are performed in close proximity to the eastern boundary of the site.

51. It is noted that SLR indicate that construction works "…*would only occur during Standard Daytime Construction Hours. There is no expectation that evening or night-time work would be required.*".

3.5.2 PREDICTED OPERATIONAL NOISE EMISSION

52. Within *Section 5.3 Construction Noise*, SLR provides the results of their assessment of noise emission from the proposed construction works.

53. SLR's predicted noise levels are provided within *Table 33*, predicting compliance at all receivers.

54. The predicted noise levels presented by SLR appear to be generally consistent with the noise contours at 1.5 metres and 4.5 metres presented in *Appendix D* of the report. However, noise contours for the Evening period are not presented.

55. However, we query how predicted noise levels for NCA02 for assessment scenario OP.01 are higher (48 dB(A)) than OP.02 (47 dB(A)), despite noise sources being added to the assessment and predicted noise emission increasing at all other receivers. Most notably, the predictions for "Active recreation (NCA02)" (Lane Cove Community Nursery) increase from 52 dB(A) to 53 dB(A).

56. The noise contours presented by SLR in *Appendix D* appear to present the same result, despite the illogical conclusion.

57. Further explanation and correction of the predicted noise emission results is required before the results of modelling can be relied-upon.

58. While the change in noise level between the Day, Evening and Night periods can generally be attributed to reduced vehicles traffic, it is unclear how much contribution each source of noise is providing. Additionally, the location of the most affected receiver in each NCA is not clearly identified.

59. In the interest of full disclosure and to understand which residences are to be most affected, Acoustic Dynamics recommends expanding Table 33 or a supplementary table in an appropriate appendix to include the contribution level for each NCA from "mechanical plant", "vehicular traffic" and "emergency generator testing", as well as the location of the most affected receiver in each NCA.

60. *Table 35* of the report presents SLR's predicted maximum noise level (L_{Amax}) at residential receivers as generated by "*light vehicle movements and parking*" on the proposed site. Compliance is predicted at all receivers following the incorporation of the mitigation measures presented in *Section 7.2* of the report. However, our review of the recommendations presented in *Table 38* in *Section 7.2* found no mitigation measures that are explicitly related to mitigation of noise from "*light vehicle movements and parking*". Additionally, predicted L_{Amax} noise contours have not been provided.

61. As discussed in Section 3.2 above, the criterion for the assessment of operational noise emission to receivers at 14 Mars Road should be **63 dB(A)**. Therefore, noise emission during assessment scenario OP.02, as predicted by SLR, may exceeds the relevant criterion by 5 dB(A). Acoustic Dynamics assumes receivers at 14 Mars Road are the most affected "industrial" receiver identified by SLR. However, a review of the noise contours in *Appendix D* are not conclusive.

3.6 SLR MITIGATION & MANAGEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS

3.6.1 CONSTRUCTION IMPACTS

62. Within *Section 7.1 Construction Impacts*, SLR provide a list of recommendations to be incorporated during the construction of the proposed data centre.

63. Acoustic Dynamics advises that the recommended mitigation and management measures are representative of standard mitigation measures to control noise and vibration emission to the most affected receivers. However, site-specific recommendations are necessary to ensure the impacts of noise and vibration emission during construction comply with the relevant criteria.

64. In particular, we highlight the following recommendations which will ensure noise and vibration emission during construction is minimised:

    i. Use the minimum sized equipment necessary to complete the work and where possible, use alternative, low-impact construction techniques;
    ii. Long term stationary noise sources should be enclosed or shielded from nearby sensitive receivers where possible;
    iii. Implement community consultation to provide surrounding receivers with information such as the total construction time, what works are expected to be noisy, their duration and mitigation measures that are being applied to minimise the noise;

iv. Preparation of a Construction Noise & Vibration Management Plan prior to the commencement of any works; and

v. Implementation of a noise and vibration monitoring program for the duration of the construction works to verify the construction of the development is being suitably managed to comply with the relevant criteria at any affected receivers.

3.6.2 OPERATIONAL NOISE IMPACTS

65. Within *Section 7.2 Operational Noise Impacts*, SLR provide a list of recommendations to be incorporated during the operation of the proposed data centre.

66. *Table 38* of the report provides an itemised list of mitigation options, their impact and benefit to the receivers and determination if the mitigation option is feasible and reasonable.

67. While this list of mitigation options contains options that are able to be implemented, is does not provide explicit recommendations that are required to be implemented to achieve compliance with the relevant noise emission criteria once operations begin.

68. As an example, the mitigation option for "*Acoustic Screening*" (Ref: *P1* in *Table 38*), describes the incorporation of solid screening and acoustic louvres of the rooftop as "*indicative*", suggesting that further changes to the operation and design of the building are likely. Given the detail provided in the assessment, it would be expected that that more solid recommendations would be made given the scale of the development.

69. Further, we are surprised that an Operational Plan of Management (ONMP) has not been prepared for the development, even as an indicative, site-specific plan referencing the mitigation measures listed in *Table 38*.

70. Acoustic Dynamics appreciates that SLR was unaware of what tenants would occupy the site while preparing their report. However, given the proposed type of development, a large-scale data centre that operates 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, it could be reasonably assumed what activities would occur, and what management measures would need to be implemented to mitigate noise emission to the surrounding receivers.

71. Operations of the facility have been proposed by the applicant, and this proposal has then been assessed by SLR. A detailed, site-specific ONMP must be prepared and submitted to demonstrate what management measures assumed during the assessment of the proposed operations are necessary to allow the proposal to operate in compliance with the relevant operational noise emission criteria. Further requirements for this ONMP are made in **Section 5** below.

72. Until such a time as a suitably detailed ONMP has been provided enabling review and verification, Acoustic Dynamics does not consider the assessment to sufficiently address the SEARS requirement to "*outline the proposed mitigation, management and monitoring measures that would be implemented*".

4 ACOUSTIC DYNAMICS NOISE MODELLING AND PREDICTIONS

73. Acoustic Dynamics endeavoured to undertake noise modelling and acoustic predictions based upon the information contained within the SLR report.

74. To enable accurate replication of the SLR model, significant additional information would be required to be provided, which has not been provided within the SLR Report.

75. The information omitted from the SLR report, which would enable replication of the noise modelling includes:
    - Exact co-ordinates of receiver locations
    - Receiver heights (RLs);
    - Detail regarding breakout noise from emergency generators, air-cooled chillers;
    - The assumed building envelope construction and sound transmission characteristics; and
    - Heights of on-site vehicle noise sources.

76. Without this information, it is not possible to reliably conduct noise modelling to verify the SLR noise modelling and prediction results.

5 REQUIRED FURTHER INFORMATION

77. Acoustic Dynamics advises that the following information is required to provide confidence that a thorough and conservative assessment of the proposal has been conducted:

    i. Supplementary noise logging must be conducted for NCA02, including:
        - Two (2) weeks of noise logging at location L02;
        - Two (2) weeks of concurrent noise logging within the backyard of 64, 66 or 68 Wood Street.
    ii. Use the lowest RBLs from each period to re-establish noise emission criteria, should the results be lower than what was previously measured;
    iii. Establish if commercial receivers exist within Lane Cove West Business Park (such as 14 Mars Road), and assess them accordingly
    iv. Include within the operational noise emission assessment:
        - Break-out noise from emergency generator enclosures during operation;
        - Break-out noise from the data-halls;
    v. Provide predicted SWL or internal SPL levels, and assumed thickness of glazing, as appropriate;
    vi. Expand the Operational Noise Assessment results table (*Table 33*) to include:
        - Noise emission contributions from source groups (i.e. mechanical plant, vehicular-traffic, emergency generator testing, data hall breakout noise etc.);
        - Results for the three (3) most affected receiver locations within each NCA, including the address, location on the property and height and co-ordinates of the receptor point;
    vii. Provide an explanation and necessary correction for the difference in noise between scenarios OP.01 and OP.02 for receivers at NCA02;
    viii. Identify which emergency generator is being used during OP.02;

ix. Provide relevant results (1/1 or 1/3 octave band) for the assessment of low-frequency and tonal noise. Results should be provided for each receiver assessed in the revised *Table 33*. These results are best provided as an Appendix to the report;

x. Provide L_{Amax} noise contours for the assessment of sleep disturbance, as well as for OP.01 during the night period;

xi. Explicit recommendations must be provided detailing what is required to achieve the predicted noise emission levels. Including, but not limited to:
- Acoustic screen/louvre height, extent and construction/make and model;
- Required transmission loss/noise reduction of acoustic louvre products;
- Detailed design criteria for the emergency generators and the associated enclosures and fans;
- A detailed, site-specific Operational Noise Management Plan;

xii. The Operational Noise Management Plan must include, but is not limited to:
- Staff induction procedures including training around noise management and mitigation;
- The site must be staffed 24-hours a day, 7 days a week to ensure noise emission from the premises is adequately controlled;
- A realistic testing schedule for the emergency generators to demonstrate the expected duration and frequency of emergency generator testing;
- Maintenance schedule for all mechanical plant and acoustic treatments (i.e acoustic louvres, acoustic absorption, barriers/screens etc)
- Clear restrictions on evening and night-time operations, including heavy vehicle movements and loading dock use;
- A detailed complaint response procedure; and
- Detail of all acoustic mitigation measures incorporated into the development, including the height of acoustic screens and barriers, generator enclosures and required SWL levels for all plant.

xiii. Post-assembly testing at the manufacturer must be conducted of any bespoke mechanical plant, such as the emergency generators, to ensure noise emission from these sources matches the prediction noise emission used by SLR within their DA assessment;

xiv. Post-commissioning testing be performed following installation to ensure each individual item of plant matches the prediction noise emission used by SLR within their DA assessment; and

xv. Provide a detailed ongoing noise monitoring program to ensure noise emission from the site does not change over time. Such a noise monitoring program should include monitoring at all five (5) NCAs containing residential receivers. Monitoring locations must be based on the most affected receivers as identified within the revised operational noise emission assessment, including periods when emergency generators are tested.

6 CONCLUSION

78. Acoustic Dynamics has conducted a peer review of the acoustic report prepared by SLR Consulting Australia in support of the proposed data centre located at 12 Mars Road, Lane Cove West. The review was carried out in accordance with the requirements of NSW Environment Protection Authority (EPA).

79. Our review has considered the proposed use of the site, and whether the noise impacts from these operations have been accurately assessed.

80. Our findings are summarised as follows:

    i. The most affected receivers have been accurately identified, grouped into appropriate Noise Catchment Areas (NCAs);
    ii. The existing ambient noise environment for most locations has been determined using background noise logging at appropriate locations;
    iii. The exception being the background noise measurements used to establish noise emission criteria for NCA02 at location L02 may include noise emission from the existing premises and may have been placed in an inappropriate location;
    iv. The methodology used to calculate the predicted noise emissions has been identified. However, additional information is required to be able to verify SLR's predictions;
    v. Assumed/modelled source noise levels are identified. However, additional information is required to be able to verify SLR's predictions;
    vi. An assessment of noise impacts as they relate to the NSW EPA's Interim Construction Noise Guideline and Noise Policy for Industry have been assessed;
    vii. More detailed information regarding noise contribution from different groups of noise sources (i.e. mechanical plant, vehicular traffic and back-up generator testing) are required to be able to verify the assessment performed by SLR;
    viii. More detailed information regarding the most affected receiver in each NCA are required to be able to verify the assessment performed by SLR;
    ix. Indicative mitigation measures have been identified, but not explicitly recommended;
    x. An Operational Plan of Management has not been prepared to illustrate how noise emissions can be adequately controlled through management measures; and
    xi. Background noise measurements within the dwellings above (or a representative location of this) was not conducted.

81. Further to the identification of the items above, we have provided a list of information required to determine if the noise emission assessment conducted by SLR is sufficiently thorough and conservative to ensure noise emission from the proposal will comply with the relevant noise emission criteria.

82. Based on our desktop review of SLR's assessment, Acoustic Dynamics advises that the report does not contain sufficient information to determine whether the proposed development can achieve acoustic compliance or avoid unacceptable acoustic impacts at the most affected receivers. A list of required further information is provided in **Section 5** above.

83. Without provision of this information, including revised background monitoring, revised modelling, source contribution data and finalised mitigation requirements, it is not possible to adequately review the acoustic assessment or to be confident that the proposal can be constructed and operated to achieve acoustic compliance during all phases and modes of operation.

84. We trust the above information meets with your immediate requirements and expectations. Please do not hesitate to contact us on 02 9908 1270 should you require more information or clarification.

Kind Regards
ACOUSTIC DYNAMICS

JAMES COLLA
Associate, MDesSci(Audio & Acoustics), MAAS

Document	Rev	Date	Prepared	Reviewed	Authorised	Approved
7179L001.JC.260505	0	5 May 2026	JC	RH	RH	