

From: [Bennett, JamesP](#)
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [EPSDFOI](#)
Subject: FW: DA201935337 request for all documents from 6 July 2020
Date: Monday, 26 October 2020 4:36:46 PM
Attachments: [REDACTED]

OFFICIAL

Dear [REDACTED]

Thank you for your email requesting documents for DA201935337.

Given that this request goes further than the public register documents available for development applications under the *Planning and Development Act 2007*, I have referred your request to the EPSDD FOI team for their consideration and assessment under the FOI Act. I am conscious that this DA is still under assessment with the authority, with many of the documents you have requested being provided by a third party to the ACT Government, and the proper processes for release of information must be followed.

Thanks
James

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, 21 October 2020 7:47 PM
To: Bennett, JamesP <JamesP.Bennett@act.gov.au>
Subject: DA201935337 request for all documents from 6 July 2020

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the ACT Government. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear James

Please accept my request for further information and all documentation and records relevant to DA201935337 since the last information was provided from you on 6 July 2020. This would comprise all records of communication both phone and electronic and record of meetings held with the applicant and/or proponent. Additionally, would you advise if there has been any further request for the developer to provide information either in the form of an s141 or otherwise or any further amendment submitted by the developer.

Please confirm that the *Fyshwick Metal Processing Plant Noise Assessment* dated 9 March 2020 (see attached), was provided to the EPA for entity comment. Could you provide the EPA response to this assessment. The height of the GF4000 fragmentiser is 5m and the height of the hammermill HP1200 structure is more than 8m. Yet the Wilkinson Murray noise mitigation measures in Table 4-3 are advised at a height of just 1.5m from ground level which is lower than the operating machinery. The report at page 6 presupposes a 3m high noise wall;

The location of the sources for the noise modelling are presented in Figure 4-1. It has been assumed that a 3m tall colourbond fence is around the perimeter of the site and a 3m tall tilt panel wall is adjacent to large machines.

It should be noted that as part of the development approval of the Materials Recycling Facility on Blocks 9 and 11 Section 8, to the north of the site, a 3m noise wall was constructed along the north, north east, east and south east boundary of the site.

The report concluded;

To mitigate noise levels from the site, it is recommended that the shredders are located at least 15m from the site boundary. In order to have no exceedances at the site boundary, a noise wall of at least 4m must surround the north section of the site. Marginal exceedances of up to 2dB could be expected if the north noise wall is 3m in height.

The above recommendation for a “3m noise wall” aligns with the concrete tilt panel wall notified for public representation in Figure 3 on page 5 of the Scriteria of 9 March 2019 which shows “Reinforced steel or concrete tilt panel wall, 3m high” adjacent the Secondary Metal Processor and alongside the Primary Metal processor. There was a second notified Scriteria of 27 March 2019 which referred to a 3m Colourbond boundary fence omitting the tilt wall. For your reference to the distance in regard to noise at the boundary, I have attached the site plans. I understand the developer has not requested in writing on the DA forms that information remain confidential.

I greatly appreciate your attention to my request.

Kind regards

[Redacted signature block]