

## Residents Questions

1. As discussed the developer does not appear to understand the importance or details around full utilization as he referenced he needs a tenant to determine that. Are they going to work with a logistics expert and how will we ensure that the predictions are truly maximum capacity? As an example worst case should include all docks in use including where the 2 buildings intersect on 560. Currently they do not.

2. Who will be writing a terms of reference for establishing full use and what will it include? Is it possible to have Stantec or Hatch one of the larger environmental/ acoustical firms who have more experience with full utilization, acoustic modelling and logistics do the full utilization review? We would like to read the terms of reference before released. How will Planning share the full utilization study results for comment with the community before final approval is granted and next steps overall?

3. We have heavy truck restrictions on Winston Churchill from 11pm- 7am. This needs to be maintained. Please confirm the process either Halton or Peel would have to go through to make any changes in terms of restrictions on Winston Churchill.

4. Residents have different assumptions and need clarity on timing for Acacia Court construction and maximum impact to those residents? Access to their properties, ability to work remotely, use of their services throughout construction?

5. We remain concerned about traffic, specifically in the Ford/Royal Windsor, Ford/Cornwall and Royal Windsor/WCB intersections and WCB and Lakeshore. Additionally we want to understand how we can restrict trucks turning left onto Beryl going North on Winston Churchill. What next steps can be taken with Peel and Halton on the need for WCB urbanization?

6. What role will the MOE have on this site and can we find a way to involve them so that monitoring is set up given the scale of the operations? Will the MOE issue fines or dictate changes and is that issued to the property owner or tenants? Can the MOE be engaged to determine in advance a proactive measure such as a noise wall?

7. Is there any monitoring system we can require be purchased that measures noise levels on site daily? If we cannot require what do you need from Council to have it installed at our cost?

8. We refer you to the delegation by Kenneth and Brenna Scholey as they have raised excellent questions regarding the analysis and accuracy of the details in the Noise and Traffic Studies. A response from staff and assurance they are reviewed is needed given the impact to residents.

9. Traffic assumptions: why do both sites have different utilization rates in calculating worse case scenario's? The Site Generated trip data as presented have problems. If we have 44 trucks based on their current data why is the worst case 30 trucks and how is the cumulative impact being established? What will be done to ensure the data is thoroughly vetted this time?

10. Concerns regarding assumptions of all heavy traffic heading north on WCB. See page 5 and 6 of Scholey delegation. The Site Generated trips need to be redone.

11. Noise Studies: Why are R3 and R4 Receptors are positioned furthest away from the residential lands? The night time analysis is based on 15 trucks but that is not worst case. Nighttime contours on the Noise studies already penetrate into the residential properties. By their own modelling the noise levels will exceed. We need a more detailed review of the data for accuracy?

<p>12. Will the Noise feasibility studies be updated to include detailed background sound levels clarify heavy vehicle totals/ percentages and include back up beeper as the applicant has already acknowledged they would be included?</p>
<p>13. 560 noise study (Crozier), some of the assumptions in the model found on page 6 of their report are as follows (figure included). In order to meet the noise bylaws as evidenced by the models, the operation would have to operate at 50% (note the rooftop equipment too). Are they committing to this?</p>
<p>14. When are we getting the new Traffic data and when will it be available for review by the public?</p>
<p>15. Why is the reduction of docks for 560 at the Winston Churchill end not closest to the western residential properties which will make a bigger difference?</p>
<p>16. Residents want to see the actual calculations for the Peak hour as they are questioning the calculation and want transparency.</p>
<p>17. Why is the distance of 50 meters acceptable when it is acknowledged it is a class 2 facility requiring 70 meters?</p>
<p>18. Can we get EV charging on site for electric forklifts to reduce noise emissions?</p>
<p>19. Can dock bays have covers that minimize the noise from uncoupling of the trucks as well as unloading?</p>
<p>20. A resident commented on the applicability of the EPA: does it apply for this site? The resident states the solution is distance and barrier?</p>
<p>21. Has research been done on migratory animals and is it a requirement of any legislation?</p>
<p>22. How will residents be kept up to date on the Site Plan finalization?</p>

**Response to Comment**

This question is related to 560 Winston Churchill- we defer to them.

This is a question that is better directed at the Town of Oakville.

This is a question that is better directed at the Town of Oakville.

At this time we are still in the design phase of the sanitary sewer being installed in Acacia Court. As soon as a design is finalized and a plan is in place, the property owners, their engineers and construction team will provide

This is a question that is better directed at the Town of Oakville.

This is a question that is better directed at the Town of Oakville.

This is a question that is better directed at the Town of Oakville.

This is a question that is better directed at the Town of Oakville.

IBI Group and Crozier Associates conducted indepent traffic studies using industry standard methodology. Small differences may be present due to different imputs or different corporate practices. However, the IBI Group study was peer reviewed by an idependant tranportation firm retained by the Town. The revised final report incorporates comments from the peer review, but it is noted that the peer reviewer indicated that the incorporation of these comments was unlikely to change the overall conclusion. Trucks and automobiles are distinguished to the greatest extent possible given industry-

As there is a heavy vehicle prohibition on Lakeshore Road East west of Winston Churchill Boulevard, trip assignment in the report has reflected this prohibition. Arcadis IBI Group is of the opinion that the predominant travel path for trucks will be to and from the QEW corridor to the north.

Receptors R3 and R4 are valid receptors based on the site visit and are entirely independent of residential lands to the west, represented by R5 and R6. The inclusion of 18 trucks per building, is the predictable worst case based on known information from the traffic consultant.

Backup beepers are included in Jade's most current analysis.  
The analysis is based on the exclusion sound level limits included in NPC-300.  
The background sound levels could be investigated; however, it is expected that

This question is related to 560 Winston Churchill- we defer to them.

The latest TIS report is dated November 2022.

This question is related to 560 Winston Churchill- we defer to them.

Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual are presented in Exhibit 3-10 of the report. ITE is considered to be the industry standard reference for

The separation distance when measured property line to property line is 50 m. The D-6 Land use guidelines indicate that a property line to property line approach is the default to allow both the industrial facility and the residential receptor to have full enjoyment of their property, but that alternate measurement points may be appropriate. The setback distance of 85 m, measured from the nearest residential property line to the retaining wall on the site is used in the LUC assessment to reflect the portion of the property which is deemed unusable. The unusable portion of the property consists of a retaining wall and drainage creek.

We are not yet in the detailed design phase for the building, but will note this question. Ultimately, it will be up to the tenant to decide.

The report has assessed the uncoupling/coupling operations at the loading bays. The buildings themselves provided significant noise attenuation to meet the guidelines, particularly for the receptors to the west and the proposed sound barrier provides noise attenuation to the receptors along Winston Churchill Blvd.; therefore no additional mitigative measures are required.

This is a question that is better directed at the Town of Oakville.

A migratory bird study was not required as part of this application.

This is a question that is better directed at the Town of Oakville.

	General Theme/ Comment	Response to Comment
Noise and Air	Sound Level contours indicate residential properties closest to the warehouses could be exposed to noise levels exceeding 45 dBA.	R5 and R6 in Jade's report (best representative of the residential area to the west) are predicted to experience sound levels well below 45 dBA. All predicted mitigated sound levels at R1 through R4 (along Winston Churchill Boulevard) are predicted to experience sound levels of 45 dBA or less in all time periods. The predicted sound levels in all time periods are at or below the MOE NPC-300 sound level limits.
	Trail located between Residential properties and the warehouses could be exposed to even higher sound levels	The trail is not a considered a noise sensitive receptor by the guidelines. However, based on the predicted sound levels at the adjacent residential receptors, the sound levels on the trail will be below the residential sound level limits.
	To safeguard noise exceedances, the modelled values should be BELOW limits set by the by-law.	The MOE and Town of Oakville guidelines require that specific sound level limits be met. The analysis is based on the known predictable worst case and is considered conservative as all sources are considered to be operational during a one hour time period. The analysis does show that accounting for the predicted worst case operations the sound level limits are below the guidelines at residences to the west.
	Peer review states that stationary noise assessment should be completed that incorporated both properties to quantify cumulative effects.	As each of the sites is a separate application, the MOE guidelines do not require that a cumulative analysis be conducted. The Peer Review letter specifically indicates the critical receptors with respect to the cumulative impact are located along Winston Churchill Blvd. It is noted, in the peer review, that the impact may be up to a barely perceptible 3 dB and a cumulative assessment was recommended for completeness. As the predicted sound levels at the receptors to the west are below the guidelines for both proposed warehouse properties, the cumulative impact would not exceed the guidelines.
	Historical air quality data exists and should be used.	Availability of this data is limited. Deer Run appears to have stopped collection in 2017. And would not have recent enough data to be relevant. CASIA values from the Overview Study can be added to the report for reference.

	<p>New air quality and noise monitoring stations- JCRA and the Town will select the locations prior to project execution and construction. Existing MOE monitoring stations should also have their equipment updated. Provide and record continuous data measurement of air quality and noise and make the data public. When air quality and noise exceedances occur, the Applications need to mitigate immediately, prepare an incident report, conduct an investigation and notify the JCRA. Applications will schedule a meeting with the JCRA every 6 months to review results of air quality and noise monitoring. Costs of establishing air and noise monitoring systems and carrying out ongoing calibration will be part of the applications operating budgets and can be redistributed to tenants.</p>	<p>Unattended noise monitoring is not of any benefit, as ongoing unattended off-site noise monitoring does not guarantee that all registered sounds are a result of the developments in question. All sources in the area such as road traffic, rail traffic, aircraft, existing industries, activities of people in the neighbourhood, wildlife and bird activity, in addition to the operations at the proposed warehouses would be measured. Without video surveillance and detailed review of the output, it would be difficult to determine the source of the sounds measured. A better approach would be to conduct attended sound measurements, if complaints are registered.</p>
Traffic	<p>Volume to Capacity Ratios are poor and highlight the current traffic flow is stressed and it's important to differentiate between automobiles and transport trucks.</p>	<p>While existing and future background (i.e. without the proposed development) analysis indicates that congestion is present, IBI Group is of the opinion that signal timing plan adjustments can mitigate these instances by allocating capacity from movements with residual capacity to those which are capacity constrained. Trucks and automobiles are distinguished to the greatest extent possible given industry-standard source data.</p>
	<p>Amazon warehouse was not included in the traffic counts, therefore the data is out of date.</p>	<p>The traffic counts were grown to simulate a 2020 Existing Conditions as if the Coronavirus disease (COVID-19) outbreak did not occur, and the forecasted traffic for the development located at 2175 Cornwall Road location in the Town of Oakville was included in future conditions analysis.</p>
	<p>There is a discrepancy in figures and numbers between the Crozier report and the IBI report.</p>	<p>IBI Group and Crozier Associates conducted independent traffic studies using industry standard methodology. Small differences may be present due to different inputs or different corporate practices. It should be noted that the IBI Group study was peer reviewed by an independent transportation firm retained by the Town. The revised final report incorporates comments from the peer review, but it is noted that the peer reviewer indicated that the incorporation of these comments was unlikely to change the overall conclusion.</p>
	<p>Overall concern about increased traffic flow, more importantly increased truck traffic. Concern about how it is impacting pollution in the community.</p>	<p>The IBI Group study was peer reviewed by an independent transportation firm retained by the Town. The revised final report incorporates comments from the peer review, but it is noted that the peer reviewer indicated that the incorporation of these comments was unlikely to change the overall conclusion.</p>

Town should ensure inclusive TIS for Royal Windsor Ave./ Ford Drive/ Beryl Rd corridors is completed to flag key congestion and safety concerns.

The traffic study terms of reference were reviewed and approved by the Region of Peel (the road authority responsible for Winston Churchill Boulevard), and were provided to other review agencies for their comment and input. Both the terms of reference review process and the first submission comments included direction on the study area (as well as traffic growth rates and other area developments) to include in the analysis.