

JCRA Comments Response Matrix

| Comment | Response |
|--|---|
| <p>Terms of Reference for Traffic studies to include at a minimum: Egress and ingress, at the site in both directions Capacity of tailbacks Definition of Peak Hours Vehicle Counts at all intersections within a specified proximity to the site that are likely to be used for access to the site Peak hour vehicle counts resulting from the sites' operations Supporting evidence for predicted traffic patterns</p> | <p>These elements are provided in the report Transportation Impact Study - 772 Winston Churchill Boulevard (IBI Group, April 2021). It should be noted that the terms of reference were reviewed and approved by the Region of Peel (the road authority responsible for Winston Churchill Boulevard). Comments on the initial report from the Region of Peel, Region of Halton, and Town of Oakville have been addressed in a forthcoming resubmission.</p> |
| <p>Terms of Reference from Noise Studies to include at a minimum noise from: Mandatory and/or warning back up beepers on vehicles required to have them or planning to have them Noise level comparison based on municipal standards as well as provincial standards Coupling and uncoupling of tractor trailers Loading and unloading of tractor trailers Idling of Vehicles Vehicle Movements on the Site Garbage and Recycling All mechanical equipment on roof top, adjacent to buildings and/or other locations on the property Any anticipated loudspeakers or external (to building) communication systems Vibrations from all on-site activities</p> | <p>The revised noise report does include backup beeper noise, as they are required to be assessed in accordance with the Town of Oakville's Noise By-Law. It should be noted that back-up beepers are emergency devices which are not required to be included in the assessment, according to the MOE NPC-300 guidelines.</p> <p>The sound level limits of the MOE outlined in Publication NPC-300 are applicable in the Province of Ontario and generally adopted in the Town of Oakville and Halton Region. As the acoustical assessment accounts for 24-hour operation of the proposed facility, the more stringent and governing nighttime sound level limits have been considered and found to be met.</p> <p>Coupling/uncoupling and loading/unloading of tractor trailers has been analyzed in the report.</p> <p>Idling of vehicles has been included in the analysis as per the restrictions included in the anti-idle by-law applicable in the Town of Oakville.</p> <p>Tractor-trailer movements on the subject site have been accounted for in the analysis (including backup beepers). As per MOE Publication NPC-300, employee parking lots associated with industries are not considered to be stationary noise sources requiring acoustical assessment.</p> <p>Garbage and recycling pickup is an infrequent activity of short duration and is therefore not necessary to include in the assessment, as per NPC-300. These activities are usually addressed through administrative controls.</p> <p>All mechanical equipment known to be proposed at the subject has been included in the updated analysis.</p> <p>Any loudspeaker systems associated with the building (if required) are not identified at this time. Should an external loudspeaker system be required, the locations should be selected as to have minimal impact on noise sensitive receptors. Any required loudspeaker system can be addressed during implementation, as needed.</p> <p>Based on anticipated warehousing operations at the subject site, associated vibration is expected to be insignificant at the existing residential receptor locations. As noted in the report, a vibration assessment may be warranted once tenants are known, depending on the proposed use.</p> |
| <p>Can an acoustic map be created that indicates the noise levels on individual near-by residents' properties from different sounds to ensure noise levels are not underreported because of 'averaging'?</p> | <p>The assessment of all applicable noise sensitive receptors is based on the assessment of representative receptor locations which are applicable to the other receptors in the area.</p> |
| <p>Will the Town ensure an integrated, external traffic study is undertaken that includes both WCB sites on the Oakville side, 759 WCB site on the Mississauga side, and the Amazon Fulfillment Centre on Avonhead Rd, as well as the container facility on Southdown Road because these tractor trailers also use the same road network?</p> | <p>The traffic study terms of reference were reviewed and approved by the Region of Peel (the road authority responsible for Winston Churchill Boulevard). Comments on the initial report from the Region of Peel, Region of Halton, and Town of Oakville have been addressed in a forthcoming resubmission. Both the terms of reference review process and the first submission comments included direction on the study area, traffic growth rates and other area developments to include in the analysis.</p> |
| <p>Will the Town ensure an Integrated, external Noise study is completed that includes all the above-noted commercial sites on Winston Churchill?</p> | <p>IBI Group will defer to the Town for a response to this comment.</p> |
| <p>Mitigation of traffic and noise should include reducing the capacity of these sites, including any or all of fewer buildings, fewer tractor trailer bays, and fewer vehicle parking spots</p> | <p>The traffic analysis for future background conditions (i.e. "do nothing") establishes baseline future traffic operations with other area developments assumed to be fully operation. When site traffic from a full build-out of 772 Winston Churchill Boulevard is added to the road network, the differences between "do nothing" and full build-out are very minor and can be mitigated with changes to signal timing plans. As a result, we are of the opinion that a reduction in GFA is not required to mitigate traffic impacts.</p> |
| <p>Why is storage of tractor trailers permitted on an E2 site?</p> | <p>IBI Group will defer to the Town for a response to this comment.</p> |
| <p>Please identify all acceptable types of goods that can be stored in warehouses permitted by Town E2 zoning and further confirm that no dangerous goods will be stored on-site or transported therein.</p> | <p>There is no specific list of acceptable goods that can be stored in warehouses.</p> |
| <p>A physical privacy barrier between commercial sites and the nearby residential properties to ensure permanent separation needs to be built as part of these Site Plan Applications.</p> | <p>The site plan was developed in accordance with the Town's By-Laws. The berm that separates the residential properties from the industrial site will act as the physical barrier.</p> |
| <p>A pumping station to provide required sewage and sanitary service that is dedicated to all commercial uses on WCB, and any new Beryl Rd sites should be required, NOT a pipe under residential properties. It is unacceptable to expect residents to bear the burden of providing services required for commercial sites. Applicants can absorb costs and provide resources required to put in needed services. As well, Halton and Peel can share maintenance costs if the pumping station services sites in each Region.</p> | <p>It should be noted, the proposed connection to services does not run under residential properties. Per the Region's comments, this is the only location to connect. A detailed servicing analysis evaluating four connection options was completed and presented to the Region of Halton. The connection through Acacia court is the most technically feasible option and was determined to be the preferred alternative by the Region.</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>While pollution levels are a provincial responsibility, the Town of Oakville must join with and support residents to obtain an updated Clarkson Airshed Study that includes analysis of anticipated and combined emissions from operations, including diesel emissions from truck traffic, at these new commercial and industrial sites and identifies appropriate mitigation.</p> | <p>ORTECH's LUC report includes an assessment of air emissions, including cumulative impacts from both stationary (i.e.: HVAC) and mobile (transport trucks) sources.</p> |
| <p>The Town of Oakville needs to engage with the City of Mississauga to ensure that a holistic and fulsome analysis of traffic, noise, and emissions from all sites is undertaken. Such a study must include road capacity between Lakeshore and the QEW on Winston Churchill, Ford Drive, Beryl, Cornwall and Royal Windsor, Lakeshore Road East/Southdown Rd, all intersections on these streets, and all accessible QEW exit & entry ramps.</p> | <p>The traffic study terms of reference were reviewed and approved by the Region of Peel (the road authority responsible for Winston Churchill Boulevard). Comments on the initial report from the Region of Peel, Region of Halton, and Town of Oakville have been addressed in a forthcoming resubmission. Both the terms of reference review process and the first submission comments included direction on the study area, traffic growth rates and other area developments to include in the analysis.</p> |
| <p>What consequences are imposed on commercial businesses that violate municipal by-laws, such as noise and traffic restrictions, including speed and types of vehicles? We expect suspension and/or removal of occupancy permits must be included as a consequence to ensure businesses do not ignore municipal by-laws and/or treat financial penalties as a cost of doing business.</p> | <p>IBI Group will defer to the Town for a response to this comment.</p> |
| <p>Are there any similar size warehouse facilities in Oakville or Halton adjacent to R1 residential that can be identified and provide a comparison with respect to noise and traffic generated by these sites, including any other warehouses that are five storeys high and warehouse operations with over 120 tractor trailer bays?</p> | <p>There are many examples that can be found along Speers Road, however the Town will need to speak to the development statistics and study findings.</p> |
| <p>772 Winston Churchill's 50' building height is too high for its proximity to a residential neighbourhood and should be reduced for improved compatibility with the nearby residential area.</p> | <p>Proposed building heights are within current municipal zoning By-Law standards & height restrictions. Building B is approx. 113.06m (374') at its closest point to the nearest residential lot, and is also shielded by significant hedgerow of trees adjacent to soccer field.</p> <p>Building A has been designed for an internal clear height of 40 feet from finish floor to the underside of structural steel joist (at the lowest point). This is normal design practice for large industrial speculative buildings these days to accommodate common warehouse racking heights.</p> <p>The building overall height is determined by adding the depth of the structural elements (to the 40ft), approximately 3'-6", plus the heights of the exterior parapets to screen the HVAC units from the street. The highest parapet for this building is approximately an additional 5'-5" above finished roof height.</p> <p>This results in an overall building height for building A to be 48'-11" to the top of the highest parapet.</p> |
| <p>772 Winston Churchill's 50' building height is equivalent to a five-storey building. On-line research indicates 36 ft. heights are the norm with some movement to 42 ft. and occasionally 50 ft. However, 50 ft. warehouses are unlikely to be built on spec as they require specialized, high-capacity utilities including power and water for enhanced sprinklers for fire prevention as well as advanced automation and building specifications. It seems likely this is being designed with a specific tenant in mind that is not being disclosed. The Town should require full transparency of potential tenants to ensure accuracy and relevance of SPA supporting documents.</p> <p>https://methodarchitecture.com/industrial-clear-height-36/ https://renx.ca/demand-technology-fuel-todays-cre-industrial-revolution/</p> <p>Landscaping that enhances privacy and reduces noise for near-by residents is critical, so this needs to be taken into consideration on landscaping designs.</p> | <p>Proposed building heights are within current municipal zoning By-Law standards & height restrictions. Building B is approx. 113.06m (374') at its closest point to the nearest residential lot, and is also shielded by significant hedgerow of trees adjacent to soccer field.</p> <p>Building A has been designed for an internal clear height of 40 feet from finish floor to the underside of structural steel joist (at the lowest point). This is normal design practice for large industrial speculative buildings these days to accommodate common warehouse racking heights.</p> <p>The building overall height is determined by adding the depth of the structural elements (to the 40ft), approximately 3'-6", plus the heights of the exterior parapets to screen the HVAC units from the street. High branching deciduous trees have been introduced to assist in noise abatement and privacy screening</p> |
| <p>How will these developments impact the Clearview Creek Watershed? Converting natural vegetation to 75% coverage by buildings and pavement will cause increased flooding that will be exacerbated by climate change. We note that a shared storm water management pond is included in the 560 WCB site plan application. However, a comprehensive and integrated storm water management plan must be undertaken for both properties, posted on the Town website and reviewed and approved by Halton Conservation to ensure the rising risks from flooding that results from the increased frequency of 100-year storms are mitigated. The combination of a storm water receptor and a storm water management pond together with other needed flood mitigation controls, such as non asphalt, drainage friendly ground cover in parking areas, are required on the proposed Winston Churchill sites due to the elimination of natural vegetation and drainage and the increased incidence of the 100-year storms and flood levels due to climate change.</p> | <p>The proposed stormwater management design for the 772 Winston Churchill Development has been completed in accordance with a previously completed Clearview Creek Subwatershed Study, dated May 2007. Stormwater will be detained on the site and released slowly, at the target flow rates established in the Subwatershed Study. The discharged stormwater will also be treated to provide quality controls, in accordance with the mandatory standards set by the Town of Oakville and the Credit Valley Conservation Authority.</p> |
| <p>How will these developments affect Joshua Creek, and will they be incorporated in the current Joshua Creek Flood Mitigation Study? Will changes to the Clearview Creek have an impact on Joshua Creek. Flood risk mitigation must be reviewed with holistic perspective, not as individual water systems.</p> | <p>Stormwater management for the development area will be provided in accordance with local municipal agencies, in order to prevent a negative impact on the adjacent Clearview Creek and the local watershed. The site SWM design has also been completed in accordance with the Clearview Creek Subwater Shed Study.</p> |
| <p>How will the Town address the expected increase in coyotes in near-by residential areas resulting from building massive commercial sites on land that is part of the coyotes' natural habitat?</p> | <p>IBI Group will defer to the Town for a response to this comment.</p> |
| <p>Will these Site Plan Applications be decided at Town Council to ensure residents have an opportunity to delegate their feedback on the applications?</p> | <p>IBI Group will defer to the Town for a response to this comment.</p> |
| <p>The JCRA analysis includes the new development at 759 Winston Churchill Blvd (east side). Furthermore, we have included 2175 Cornwall Rd. details for comparison purposes only, to better understand the scale of the proposed developments on Winston Churchill.</p> | <p>It should be noted that the terms of reference were reviewed and approved by the Region of Peel (the road authority responsible for Winston Churchill Boulevard). Comments on the initial report from the Region of Peel, Region of Halton, and Town of Oakville have been addressed in a forthcoming resubmission. Both the terms of reference review process and the first submission comments included direction on the study area, traffic growth rates, and other area developments to include in the analysis.</p> |
| <p>Our analysis is based upon the full operating capacity for these sites per the Site Plan applications. Analysis that uses less than 100 % of available capacity would result in false or inaccurate information.</p> | <p>The traffic analysis assumes full build-out / full operation of the 772 Winston Churchill Boulevard Site.</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| NB: This analysis does not include the new Amazon Delivery facility on Avonhead Rd. in Mississauga (located east between Winston Churchill and Southdown Rd. and south of Royal Windsor). It is expected this newly opened facility will also significantly increase tractor trailer truck traffic, delivery truck traffic and employee vehicle traffic on Avonhead, Royal Windsor, Winston Churchill, and Southdown Road. | The traffic study terms of reference were reviewed and approved by the Region of Peel (the road authority responsible for Winston Churchill Boulevard). Comments on the initial report from the Region of Peel, Region of Halton, and Town of Oakville have been addressed in a forthcoming resubmission. Both the terms of reference review process and the first submission comments included direction on the study area, traffic growth rates and other area developments to include in the analysis. |
| There does not appear to have been a light study regarding the surrounding area | Please note that photometric plan submitted by MJA is for results within property lines. All luminaires are full cut-off and spillage to suit town standards. If required a light study for the surrounding areas will have to be provided by others |
| What if the acoustic models are not met after opening? Will there be regular acoustic testing? | <p>The acoustic analysis is prepared in consideration of 'predictable worst case' operations at the subject site, accounting for the available information at the time of preparation. Should the assessed operations change as a result of the building tenancies, the acoustical analysis would need to be revisited to ensure any proposed mitigation measures remain sufficient to provide compliance with the applicable sound level limits of the MOE.</p> <p>The MOE has a Environmental Compliance Approval (ECA) process. Depending on the nature of the proposed operations, an ECA may be required.</p> <p>Regular acoustic testing is not required and is not proposed. The assessment of the anticipated worst-case operations is conservative (current assessment and any required revision due to operational changes) and demonstrates compliance with the applicable sound level limits. Should noise complaints arise as a result of the subject development, they would be addressed through municipal by-law enforcement.</p> |
| How can a 3-4 metre acoustic barrier effectively buffer noise from a 14.9 metre building with some of its functions on the rooftop? | <p>The continuous noise sources such as the mechanical equipment and truck movements are additive to assess compliance.</p> <p>The proposed at-grade barrier acts as acoustical mitigation for the ground-level noise sources at the subject site.</p> <p>The rooftop mechanical units are to be adequately screened by the building roof edge parapets</p> |
| What about the nature that lives on that plot of land, coyotes, deer, rabbits, beavers? You want to destroy that | As the stream corridor is being maintained post-development, the movement corridor for deer and coyote will be maintained. The stream and stream corridor will also continue to provide habitat for beavers post-development. |
| What are "acceptable" sound levels? Can the neighbourhood be guaranteed we will not hear trucks at night? What are the projected lighting solutions? | <p>The applicable sound level limits are established by the MOE, are applicable in the Province of Ontario, and generally adopted in the Town of Oakville and Halton Region. There are different applicable limits for the daytime and nighttime periods are based on the worst case one hour assessment, to provide protection of noise sensitive uses (such as residential) from environmental noise.</p> <p>The applicable sound level limits do not, however, guarantee inaudibility.</p> <p>Jade Acoustics has no comments regarding lighting solutions, as this is outside of the scope of our involvement.</p> |
| Re: the sanitary pipe: It is completely different than the pipe in front of our houses because these pipes are from residential neighbourhoods, not from an industrial facility. | Sanitary pipes provided for residential and commercial are both PVC and subject to the same design and installation requirements. The main difference would be the increase in flow. The anticipated industrial development would be a dry industry, and therefore would only generate flows from employee washroom use, handwashing and lunch time usage. Industrial type sanitary flows are not anticipated from the proposed development. |
| I see 100 trips per hour peak but I am concerned with off-peak volumes. Do you have such projections? Evening and nighttime operations with attendant noise and light pollution are very worrisome. | The trip generation for the proposed development is based on data provided by the Institute of Transportation engineers for typical developments of this nature. This peer-reviewed data is considered the industry standard for estimating trips during the AM and PM peak hour. However, data outside of these time periods is not available. |
| In regards to the Traffic Study, what percentage of the traffic proceeds north to QEW/Winston Churchill and what percentage turn left onto Royal Windsor drive? With new developments on Beryl, the Amazon facility and the warehouse next door, will a more inclusive study be done including all of these? | The site trip distribution is presented in Exhibit 3-11 of the report, and is based on existing travel patterns in the study area. The transportation impact study includes trips from the noted development, as well as additional growth to account for growth outside of the study area. |
| Some of the worst noise is from truck backup beepers operating at all times of the day or night. This has already been a problem with the industrial area east of the 4 pad arena. | As back-up beepers are emergency devices, they are not required to be assessed for noise, per the MOE NPC-300 guidelines. However, the Town of Oakville's Noise By-law does indicate that back-up beepers need to be assessed as stationary sources of noise. In accordance with the Town's by-law, the back-up beepers have been included in the analysis. With that said, the site design provides screening and acoustic buffering from the truck courtyard and loading bay area through building massing and orientation. The proposed acoustic barrier along the southeast property limits will also provide additional attenuation of the noise from the truck courtyard area. |
| Has an Air Quality Study been done? | In Process **INCLUDE FINDINGS ONCE COMPLETE |
| How long will it take to complete the construction | At this time, there is no construction schedule, however when one is available it will be shared. |
| How does this benefit the surrounding community? How does it help us? Because right now it just looks like a huge mess of trucks/pollution/noise | Any tenant who moves into the building will be providing many jobs and will support the long-term economic growth of the Town of Oakville. |
| The traffic study states truck traffic will access QEW to the North. Does this assume that the trucks cannot use Beryl Road given the Ford drive intersections are already overwhelmed? | The site trip distribution is presented in Exhibit 3-11 of the report, and is based on existing travel patterns in the study area. This approach accounts for existing congestion, as it reflects actual usage. |
| Does the noise study include backup beeper noise? | The noise report does include backup beeper noise, as they are required to be assessed in accordance with the Town of Oakville's Noise By-Law. It should be noted that back-up beepers are emergency devices which are not required to be included in the assessment, according the MOE NPN-300 guidelines. |

| | |
|---|---|
| The brief talk about acoustics referred to “receptor locations”. What are they? Can we get an acoustic map that would let homeowners assess their personal noise exposure? | In the context of acoustics, ‘receptor location’ refers to a point of reception associated with a noise sensitive use (such as residential). These locations include plane of window and outdoor areas. The assessment of all applicable noise sensitive receptors is based on the assessment of representative receptor locations which govern the conclusions regarding sound level limit compliance and are representative of other receptors in the area. |
| There was a study saying the air pollution regarding data center, have you investigated this matter? | In process **INCLUDE FINDINGS ONCE COMPLETE |
| I am not sure that the noise issue was thoroughly answered given 24/7 operations and the loading and unloading of large trucks | The noise assessment, as required by the guidelines, considers a ‘worst case predictable’ operation at the subject site during all time periods, based on known and/or representative information that is currently available. Operations during all hours were accounted for, as were the associated applicable sound level limits for each respective timeframe. The assessment is considered conservative as all continuous operations are assessed as cumulative during any one hour that they operate. Impulsive noise, such as loading/unloading are assessed separately and are not additive. The worst case operation is assessed and mitigation is provided to address that operation. |
| Is there connectivity to the proposed development at the signalized intersection and the sidewalk along Winston Churchill Road? | A sidewalk from the development will be brought to the property line. Any municipal sidewalk within WCB would be at the direction of the Town or Region. |
| Are there restrictions that would assure us of no hazardous materials being brought to or handled on the site? | The only restrictions are those imposed by the Zoning By-Law regarding use. There are no restrictions on materials on site, however it is not the intention of One Properties to lease to a hazardous material company. |
| Does the noise study include backup beepers 24/7 that exceed 100 dB. What guarantees are there to ensure that noise is controlled into the future? | The noise report does include backup beeper noise, as required by the Town of Oakville’s Noise By-law. However, as they are emergency devices they are not required to be included in the assessment, according to the MOE NPN-300 guidelines. The site and building design provide screening and an acoustical buffer from the existing residential community to the west. The noise emissions from the occupied facilities would generally be addressed through municipal by-law enforcement. In addition, depending on the operations that move into the buildings, the MOE may require an ECA for the industries to address noise, vibration and air quality. |
| Can you confirm that if this development is proposed to be operational 24 hr/day? | Until a tenant has signed a lease, we cannot guarantee what the hours of operation will be. |
| You have drawn a parallel between the facility located at 3260 Cornwall and what is being proposed here. 24/7 operations had existed at this facility and are no longer active. Several residents brought noise complaints against this property. We are not comforted by the noise study as presented. As a point of interest, there are no other commercial ventures of this nature adjacent (less than 150M) away from existing residents anywhere else in Oakville. | While both facilities permit 24/7 operations, the proposed buildings at 772 Winston Churchill Blvd. have been designed to provide significant screening of the operations by the buildings themselves. In addition, sound barriers are proposed to meet the sound level limits for the residential uses to the southeast. |
| Why can’t the sanitary pipe exit onto Winston Churchill where there is not a residential neighbourhood? | At this time, there is no available infrastructure to connect to within Winston Churchill Boulevard. The closest servicing connection is through Acacia Court. |
| The neighbouring Blackwood development would appear to be additive with respect to noise, pollution, traffic, etc. How does that factor in to your assessment? How do we get a total picture? | In terms of the acoustical assessment, the proposed development at 772 Winston Churchill Boulevard has been assessed independently of the neighbouring Blackwood facility as required by the guidelines. As the applications are separate and located within separately owned parcels, the guidelines do not require a combined assessment. However, due to the proposed design of the each of the sites, the buildings themselves will provide the necessary screening to meet the guidelines and reduce the sound level at the existing residences. Jade Acoustics has no comments with regard to the additive nature of pollution, traffic, etc. |
| What goods will be loaded/unloaded/stored on these sites? | We will not be able to provide this information until a tenant has been secured |
| Can anything be done to shut off truck backup signals? | As this is a safety issue, it is not possible In addition as the trucks may not be owned by the tenant of the building, altering the back-up beepers is not feasible. |
| Why is the split 30/70 for truck/auto? What will each do? | The trip generation, as well as the truck / automobile split for the proposed development is based on data provided by the Institute of Transportation engineers for typical developments of this nature. This peer-reviewed data is considered the industry standard for estimating trips during the AM and PM peak hour. We anticipate that all truck traffic will approach / depart the site to / from the north, while automobile traffic may use all travel paths noted in the study. |
| Why is the building so tall e.g. 50’. What kind of tenants required a 50’ warehouse? | 48'-11" represents the overall height of the building from finish floor level to the top of highest parapet. The actual internal clear warehouse height is 40 feet to underside of steel joist. 40 feet clear height is the industry standard for this size of speculative industrial building. (See previous response for details) |
| Would the potential tenant be able to add additional amendments to the site? You mention that there is not yet a tenant | Once the plan is site plan approved, tenant will only be able to make changes to the internal building layout through the building permit process, but not the external layout of the site. |
| Was there any consideration given to the existing wildlife that resides in this area? There are a number of | This will be discussed in more depth in the ecological report and through approvals with the CVC. |
| It is intended to be a sole tenancy or might there be a myriad of tenants, with different operating schedules, hazardous materials, etc.? | The tenants have not yet been determined. |
| Will there be dedicated turning lanes so that Winston Churchill direct traffic will have clear passage past the entrances and exits? | Yes. Dedicated northbound left turn lanes and southbound right turn lanes are proposed. A dedicated southbound left-turn lane is assumed to serve future Orr Road. |

| | |
|--|---|
| In your trip count is one trip an arrival plus a departure, or would arriving and departing count as two trips? | the proposed development is expected to generate up to 113 net new vehicle trips during the Weekday AM Peak Hour (87 inbound trips and 26 outbound trips) and up to 116 net new vehicle trips during the Weekday PM Peak Hour (31 inbound trips and 85 outbound trips). |
| Will there potentially be other noise sources on-site as with the recycling plant, or does all the noise arise from vehicle traffic? | As the tenants of the proposed facility are not known at this time, the acoustical analysis accounts for all known information and presents a 'predictable worst case' analysis. Should the tenant specific uses change or additional noise sources are added, the analysis would need to be revisited to ensure compliance with the applicable sound level limits. |
| If the building is only 10 m, then is that an effective sound barrier? | The proposed buildings are effective for screening of ground-level noise sources. Where there are gaps in the site plan to allow movement of vehicles, additional sound barriers are proposed. |
| Did you consider any other spots to run sewage pipes as opposed to a residential area? | Yes, four alternatives for sanitary connections were analyzed and provided to the Region of Halton for their review. The connection through Acacia Crt was determined to be the preferred route by the Region, as the other alternatives had various technical issues that made them unsuitable. |
| Some backyards back directly onto the truck entrance driveway, what will be done to ensure acoustic models are met? | The acoustic modelling accounts for a 'predictable worst case' scenario. With respect to truck maneuvering, the model conservatively accounts for anticipated peak hour activity, when the most truck maneuvering is expected to occur. Should actual uses at the facility alter the parameters of the assessment, the assessment would need to be revisited to ensure compliance with the applicable sound level limits. |
| The area is already acknowledged to be a taxed air-shed due to the combined impact of cement plant and refinery. What will this development add to PPM counts through diesel and car exhaust, brake dust and other sources? | We have modeled NOx from engine exhaust and HVAC combustion equipment as well as fine particulate from engine exhaust and road dust. These values have been added to 90th percentile background levels measured at Oakville station (4.5 km NW of the site). The combined concentrations for facility operations as well as background are below the federal ambient air quality standards at the closest point of reception. As the facility is not expected to increase the levels of these contaminants above the standards, we're assessing the site to not have any serious impacts on the area. |
| It is not clear how sound will be reduced by it occurring between buildings. Also, the site plan shows parking on the residential side of the site, outside of the corridor between the buildings. | <p>The sounds generated from the activities within the truck courtyard will be screened by the proposed western building located between the courtyard and the residential community to the west. Additional sound barriers are proposed to address the residential uses to the southeast.</p> <p>In terms of the parking spaces shown on the site plan, passenger vehicles and employee parking lots are not considered to be stationary sources of noise requiring acoustical assessment, as per MOE guideline NPC-300. The movement of cars in a parking area are acoustically insignificant.</p> |
| Standard industrial buildings today are 30, 32 ft. high. This proposal is for almost 45ft. Do current by-laws permit this without variance? How much higher than existing buildings in the area would this be? | The maximum building height is 11m, per the zoning by-law. We are within the zoning by-law requirements. |
| Your plan picture doesn't make it clear where the adjacent houses are located... can you please show that and discuss how much buffer there is? Also, it appears that the entrance is placed as close to the residential area along Deer Run... wouldn't it make more sense to place that at the northern end of the development? | The closest part of Building B to the westerly property line is 50.20m (165'±) as indicated on our architectural site plan. The closest rear residential lot line from that point is an additional 82.25m (270ft±) directly across from the existing soccer field and existing hedgerow of mature trees. Total distance of 132.45m (435ft±) refer to attached aerial diagram. There are two office areas proposed for building B. One office area / component is situated on the north side of the building, with main entrance located on the north elevation. The other office component is located at the south west corner of the building with an office entrance located on the west elevation, farthest point from any residential area. |
| There is a safety issue on WCB as it is currently designed given the very large increase in tractor-trailer vehicles on a 2 lane road with no barrier. So the capacity may be viewed as ok for the next 5 years but the safety is compromised given the vehicle increase includes the 121 tractor-trailers that will be on the road, potentially more than once per day. | IBI Group will defer to the Town for comment on the cumulative impact of this and surrounding developments. |
| What is the other acceptable usage possible for this space if not used for warehousing? | Full List of allowed uses: Adult Entertainment Centre, Art Gallery, Business Office, Commercial School, Commercial Self-Storage, Conservation Use, Contractors Establishment, Day Care, Drive-through Facility, Dry Cleaning/ Laundry Establishment, Emergency Service Facility, Financial Institution, Food Bank, Food Production, hotel, Manufacturing, Medical Office, Outside Display/ Sales Area, Outside Storage, Park- Public, Parking Area- Heavy Vehicle, Place of Worship, Public Hall, Public Works Yard, Rental Establishment, Repair Shop, Restaurant, Retail Store- accessory and showroom, School- Private, Sports Facility, Stormwater Management Facility, Taxi Dispatch, Training Facility, Veterinary Clinic, Warehousing and Wholesaling. |
| Are there restrictions on the materials that can be housed in the facility? | To our knowledge, there is no restrictions on the materials themselves. |
| How much higher is the building to the adjacent trees? | This is unknown as the trees have not been measured for height. |
| Will both buildings be constructed at once or is there a risk that Building A gets built and tenanted then the noise will not be mitigated by Building B because there is not a tenant for the building. Is construction contingent on tenancy? | This has not yet been decided, however it is likely the buildings will be constructed using a phased approach. |
| How can the noise study predict the sound levels will be acceptable if the operations are unknown i.e. no tenant at the time the study is done? | <p>The noise assessment considers a 'worst case predictable' operation at the subject site during all time periods, based on known and/or representative information that is currently available. Operations during all hours were accounted for, as were the associated applicable sound level limits for each respective timeframe.</p> <p>If the assumed operations change, an updated noise assessment will be conducted.</p> |
| Can we get a copy of the presentation? | A copy of the presentation has been provided to the Town for circulation. |
| How can the impact on air pollution be measured? What about the impact this would have on the health and safety of young children (i.e. asthma, breathing problems) which may not be known for decades. | We have not commented on potential health impacts that might result due to exposure to what the federal government has deemed to be safe levels of these contaminants. |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>How will this impact Deer Run residents whose backyards are where you are coming through at Acacia Court? What about construction traffic overflow on Deer Run?</p> | <p>"The backyards of the residents on Deer Run should not be impacted by the work being completed on Acacia, as the new sanitary sewer is at least 75m from the rear lot line. There will be noise from the construction activities which will be limited to specified construction hours, typically Mon-Sat from 7:00am-6:00pm. Construction traffic may be required to access Acacia Crt through Deer Run for the sanitary sewer upgrade being completed on Acacia. There will be some construction on Deer Run at the intersection to Acacia while completing the upgraded sanitary sewer connection. "</p> |
| <p>Why are you building if you have no tenants?</p> | <p>It is typical for industrial warehouses to approve and construct a shell building and then have the tenants decided once approval has been granted so they can configure the building interior.</p> |
| <p>Hi, please ensure that the comment on the trips allocated onto Lakeshore being vehicular and not the truck is identified in the TIS resubmission.</p> | <p>The transportation impact study assigns vehicles to the network, rather than trucks and automobiles separately. This is consistent with best practices in transportation impact analysis. However, we recognize that the existing truck prohibition is in place and note that truck demand is expect to be almost exclusively to and from the Queen Elizabeth Way.</p> |
| <p>Could you detail what are these peak hours? From when to when?</p> | <p>The AM peak period is 7:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m., and the PM peak period is 4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. the individual peak hour varies by intersection, but reflects the 60 minutes within those time periods in which the highest traffic volume is observed.</p> |
| <p>Brian: Are the region's acoustic restrictions the same for the night as for day?</p> | <p>The guidelines are more stringent at night than they are during the daytime.</p> |
| <p>Bob Wang: Will the warehouses will be leased out to multiple tenants or it will be run by just one company?</p> | <p>This is not yet known. They may be divided into smaller spaces as opposed to holding one large tenant.</p> |
| <p>Brian: Can you point us to a comparable facility you have developed so we can see the effectiveness of your mitigations and talk to the neighbouring residents?</p> | <p>We will have to go back and take a look at this. There may be a comparable that we could provide. There are certainly many examples of this kind of development near residential.</p> |
| <p>Reagan: Will outside storage and/or trailer parking be permitted on the site? In addition, can you please speak to the intended use? Will it be warehousing or manufacturing? What about the potential for food use?</p> | <p>The zoning for the site has a specific limitation on outside storage specifically within a certain distance to the rear property line. As it is designed there is no intention for outside storage other than for trailer parking itself. You can see both loading dock areas are in the middle of the site. There aren't tenants identified for either building at this time. They are designed with warehousing in mind but it could any of the uses typed within the zoning by-law.</p> |
| <p>Niel Westol: Given the amount of traffic expected from this and 560 WCB, it seems likely that WCB will need to be widened to two lanes each way at least at the two properties. Is this being considered as an associated development?</p> | <p>The design of WCH is currently underway. What we're designing is more simply just for turn lanes themselves. Our analysis shows that while a widening of WCH may be required in the future, it is likely beyond 5-10 years. It also shows that the capacity available on the road today will be sufficient for the foreseeable future.</p> |
| <p>S.L.: If lights are shining from the buildings the neighbours will still see the lights even if it is not direct. I'm also wondering about the acoustic barrier. A 3 to 4 m acoustic barrier was mentioned but I'm not clear how that will buffer noise from a building that is 4.9 meters with some of its function being on the rooftop.</p> | <p>The Town has a standard for photometric and that is 0 light level past the edge of the property line which ESL is in compliance with. The acoustic barrier isn't mitigating for the building itself, the building is the mitigation function for the truck court that is internal. The rooftop units are placed in a way that any acoustic mitigation required for those would be installed as part of the rooftop unit. If there are any exceedances from the rooftop units, then we would screen them. The 3-4 m high barrier on the ground is to mitigate activity in the courtyard.</p> |
| <p>Brenda: I felt the answer around the noise that would be generated by 24/7 operation was not fully answered to my satisfaction. I'm also wondering whether there is a comparable building that you have studied. Once you have installed the building and what you are talking about in theory actually bares some actuality once the building is in place? I have great concerns about the noise that will be created. I know we've already experienced noise at the recycling plant and that has been a concern in the neighbourhood. I don't feel only meeting what is expected of you would be the best approach to take to mitigate our concerns.</p> | <p>We assume all the operations are occurring at the same time so it is called the predictable worse case (assuming all these operations are happening at the same time. . We will review the mitigation that is being installed to ensure it aligns with what we designed and if it is still not sufficient, there is a noise by-law that would be invoked should there be any questions about the operation. There are various steps along the way that we have to take into consideration before we sign off that the design is what we expect.</p> |
| <p>Councilor Dave Gittings: For clarity, what timing are you looking to for construction? Further, the roadway proposed will be a Region of Peel roadway – will the road be in place concurrently with the warehouses or will the warehouses be constructed first? Looking towards the traffic consultant, I understood that it was based on 30 vehicle movements in each 24 hr period. Is that accurate? Could you review next steps? Where do we go from here?</p> | <p>The timing would be spring of next year. Even though it is a boundary road, one municipality takes responsibility for its programming and that's the Region of Peel in this case. The construction window for the improvements is similar timing as the construction for the buildings themselves so the turn lanes should be completed by the time the buildings open. Our analysis is forecasting approx. 100 vehicles during the am and pm peak hours. This is including arrivals and departures. Assumes full operation and assumes that a shift change occurs at the height of rush hour. We're taking the feedback from this open house and we have the staff comments from our previous submission. We will take all into consideration for our resubmission.</p> |
| <p>Joshua Creek Residents Association Elizabeth: I think it is important to look at the worst-case scenario in terms of noise because the site is permitted to operate 24/7 so we would assume someone is there 24/7 and that all truck bays and parking spaces would be used as they are there to be used. I don't want to be in a situation where people are making complaints after the fact, I'd rather make it upfront. We have done some analysis and will provide a more formal document shortly. There will be 100 new vehicle trips on the road in the peak am and pm hours and I also want to know if the traffic study was done just in the context of 772 or if it took into account 560 as well? The driveway at the south will be opened up through Mississauga. Did you say all traffic in and out is going right only or left only?</p> | <p>We all share a concern regarding what the cumulative effect will be so we have undertaken multiple studies. When we do traffic impact studies we take a look at a future scenario where the development is not constructed so that includes the growth from various sources within the vicinity and we do an analysis with the development constructed and look at the comparison to see what issues are being generated and by whom so we have a pretty good idea of a scenario in the future where the development is not constructed so we can speak to the traffic results of that and a scenario where the development is constructed and we look at the impact this particular development has. We have taken into consideration all the sources of growth occurring in this area and the various developments in the vicinity. Result: there will be a need for minor signal timing upgrades at Winston Churchill and Royal Windsor, but asides from that traffic operations are acceptable for all road users in peak hours. We anticipate the main access to the development will be a full moves signalized intersection. The second access point will not be signalized and will be right-in-right-out only.</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| Brooke: Why does the sanitary pipe have to come through Acacia Court and not Winston Churchill Boulevard instead? Its 100 cars per hour, not per day, correct? | The challenge is that there isn't a sanitary pipe that we can access on WCH. This methodology was reviewed about 10 r 12 years ago, again reviewed recently, and determined by the Region of Halton that Acacia Court is the preferred route. In terms of traffic, we were stating that worst-case scenario there could be 100 vehicles during the height of the AM peak hour and 100 vehicles in the height of the PM peak hour. |
| Don: What type of barriers are you speaking of for this property? Are they natural barriers, brick walls, etc.? Also, the Deer Run residents will be affected by overflow of construction traffic. Finally, what exactly will be held in these warehouses? | Acoustic Barriers – they could be wood barriers in some instances and concrete barriers in other instances. They will most likely be concrete barriers. They will be designed in a more aesthetically pleasing way than a standard highway barrier. The construction window for the sanitary is relatively small – only a few weeks. There will be some disruption by it is for a very limited period of time. Approximately a 3-week construction timeline. The construction equipment can be staged at the back of the properties for the short term. |
| Can we have examples of the sound levels you have determined will be heard by neighbouring residents specific to their homes or streets? | The predicted sound levels at nearby receptor locations due to proposed noise sources are outlined in the noise report. All predicted sound levels are shown to be in compliance with the applicable sound level limits of the MOE of 50 dBA during daytime and evening hours and 45 dBA during nighttime hours. The guidelines do not require inaudibility as this is generally not feasible. Some activities may be audible despite meeting the guidelines. |
| Is there a comparable site close to residents to show how the noise will not impact them ? | Jade Acoustics does not have detailed information on the existing facilities in the area in order to provide comment on a comparable facility with comparable noise sources. |
| How is traffic noise included and assessed when completing the studies? | Truck movements on site (including backup beepers) as well as permissible truck idling is included in an acoustic model and assessed relative to the applicable sound level limits. |
| The turnover of the trucks will impact noise, volume and emissions; the calculations need to be at 100% capacity to properly assess the impact and mitigation required. Will the peer review Traffic study require this? | Jade Acoustics cannot comment on the requirements and terms of reference of any peer review associated with this development. |
| How is cumulative noise accounted for in the studies as multiple facilities are being built? | The subject site located at 772 Winston Churchill Boulevard is an independent site and is not required to be assessed in consideration of cumulative noise from any other existing or proposed facilities. In accordance with the MOE guidelines, the separate cumulative impact of continuous, impulsive, and emergency type noise sources is included in the analysis. Per the guidelines, continuous, impulsive, and emergency type noise sources are each assessed separately. |
| At what levels does the MOE evaluate the noise levels to be too much and mitigation not effective? | The proposed acoustical mitigation is established through sophisticated acoustic modelling in order to achieve compliance with the applicable sound level limits, as has been demonstrated through the current analysis. |
| Will there be a third party review of the noise studies? | Jade Acoustics cannot comment on the intention or need for a third party peer review. |
| The public would like the terms of reference to be documented and publicized (See additional details they would like included in JCRA letter) | The requested terms of reference have been considered. The revised noise study has included all required noise sources to satisfy the MOE, Town of Oakville, and Region of Halton requirements and is based on information currently available regarding potential noise sources to be included in the proposed development. |
| Will there is outdoor speakers on the site? | Jade Acoustics has not been provided with information that outdoor speakers will be included in the development. |
| How will the rooftop mechanical be screened for noise reduction? | The proposed rooftop mechanical systems are located such that they will be screened by the proposed building parapets. Should additional rooftop equipment be proposed due to tenant specific needs, the use of local rooftop barriers could be explored if it is found to be required to meet the sound level limits. |
| What can be structures, bylaws or agreements can be put in place to reduce or eliminate noise on nights and weekends? | The acoustical analysis accounts for nighttime sound level limits which are more stringent than the limits during daytime hours in order to protect for nighttime operations. |
| Reverberation is a key cause of noise: what sound proofing designs will be installed to mitigate this issue at the warehouses? What controls can be put in place to reduce coupling and uncoupling noises in the dock bays? | The noise within the warehouse is expected to be contained by the exterior walls of the building. In terms of the coupling and uncoupling noise from trucks, this has been included in the analysis and found to comply with the applicable sound level limits. It should be noted that some audibility may be experienced as meeting the sound level limits does not ensure inaudibility. The orientation of the proposed buildings provides screening of the potential noise sources, which will provide attenuation of potential noise generated in the trucking courtyard. |
| What can be done to safely reduce the back up beeper sounds? | As this is a safety issue, it is not possible. In addition as the trucks may not be owned by the tenant of the building, altering the back-up beepers is not feasible. |
| Will there be speed bumps internal to the site? If yes has that noise been factored into the current studies? | Potential noise from a vehicle travelling over a speed bump is not a concern relative to the noise generated by the vehicle engine, which has been included in the analysis. Consideration of speed bumps in the context of noise is not warranted. |
| Will tractor trailers be stored on site? | As shown on the site plan, there are trailer storage areas proposed at the facility. These areas have been considered in the acoustical analysis. |
| Can the noise wall be on top of the berm? | This comment is unclear as to the suggested berm location. The proposed acoustic barrier in the southeast area of the site and at the north of Building B, along with screening provided by the proposed buildings, provide sufficient noise mitigation to meet the applicable sound level limits. |
| What steps can be taken to reduce the operating hours from 24/7? | Jade Acoustics cannot comment on the hours of operation of the proposed facility. The acoustical assessment accounts for the information provided by the proponent, which accounts for operations over a 24 hour period. |
| Neighbouring Noise issues: What can be done to address the ongoing noise from the recycling plant | Jade Acoustics has no comment on potential noise generated from other facilities. |
| Why allow one unit be higher than another (5 storeys). Is the area to the south not an open space and given both are so close to residents should the heights not be the same or varied? | Proposed Building heights for both buildings abide by current municipal zoning By-Law guidelines and municipal restrictions. Building B overall height is lower than Building A, as there is a current maximum building height restriction of 11.0m imposed 120m offset from the westerly property line adjacent to Park, O1 Zone, as indicated on architectural site plan. (See Oakville Zoning By-laws; Special provisions 201, which states maximum building height within 120 m of the Park (O1) Zone is 11.0m) (See attached) |

| | |
|--|---|
| Why is it acceptable to not have height limits on E2 given its proximity to residents? | There is a height limit restriction on this property, adjacent to the Park (O1) Zone. See previous question and Oakville zoning By-law, special provisions 201. |
| How is open space defined? Does the open space on the south side of the development count and should that not limit the height of 772 Winston Churchill? | Same as above |
| Will the berm get additional coniferous trees to block the building throughout the seasons? | Note that continuous planting bed is proposed along the street frontage. The berm comment is NA |
| Why are they not increasing the berm given the scale of the project? | Note the berm discussion is not applicable as a dry pond is required for SWM purposes |
| Will the newly planted trees to the South be protected | Newly planted trees will be winter wrapped and under warranty |
| Will there be fencing around the facilities in addition to the berm separating commercial and residential areas? | A fence/wall is proposed along the east property line |
| What is being required on site to reduce its environmental impact? | All plantings are in compliance to municipal and provincial parameters including best horticultural practices |
| Please provide a list of tenant uses that meet the Oakville Official Plan? What products/goods can be stored on site? | The specific uses on site can be determined in the Zoning By-Law. Full List of allowed uses: Adult Entertainment Centre, Art Gallery, Business Office, Commercial School, Commercial Self-Storage, Conservation Use, Contractors Establishment, Day Care, Drive-through Facility, Dry Cleaning/ Laundry Establishment, Emergency Service Facility, Financial Institution, Food Bank, Food Production, hotel, Manufacturing, Medical Office, Outside Display/ Sales Area, Outside Storage, Park- Public, Parking Area- Heavy Vehicle, Place of Worship, Public Hall, Public Works Yard, Rental Establishment, Repair Shop, Restaurant, Retail Store- accessory and showroom, School- Private, Sports Facility, Stormwater Management Facility, Taxi Dispatch, Training Facility, Veterinary Clinic, Warehousing and Wholesaling. |
| How do you evaluate the different elements on the site and those that impact the neighbourhood without knowing the tenants? | The Owners can only ensure they have a tenant that operates within the pre-defined allowed uses on site. |
| The applicants referenced E2 Special Provision: where is the special provision documented and when was this done? | The special provisions (E2-201) are documents online in Zoning By-Law 2014-014, Part 15. They were approved in 2002, 2006 and 2008. |
| Can the Town do anything to get tenants more sensitive to residential neighbourhoods? | IBI Group will defer to the Town for a response to this comment. |
| How does the intent of the 'light industrial or E2' line up with large numbers of cars and trucks and the cumulative impact on the neighbourhood? | IBI Group will defer to the Town for a response to this comment. |
| Ian Andersen Hospice is just down the road: how can we minimize the impact to this sensitive land use? | IBI Group will defer to the Town for a response to this comment. However, the tenant will be required to act within the noise/ nuisance by-law during operation. |
| While the site has been allocated as employment lands since 1965 why has the Official Plan not addressed updating for scale and intensity and provided greater clarity into the zoning as this is evolving. | IBI Group will defer to the Town for a response to this comment. |
| Does the Official Plan take into consideration the cumulative impact beside a residential neighbourhood? Does this meet the spirit and intent of the OP? If no what can be done to stop or reduce the impact? | IBI Group will defer to the Town for a response to this comment. |
| How will these facilities affect our own Flood Mitigation needs ? How is the site plan being assessed for Stormwater and Flood mitigation ? | The proposed site will not interfere or impact the adjacent lands Flood Mitigation needs. The proposed site is being designed to contain stormwater from the development area, which will be controlled to pre-development flow rates, or less, in accordance with the Clearview Creek Subwatershed Study. Stormwater storage will be provided on site in a dry pond area, in below ground storage chambers, and on paved surfaces. The site will direct the controlled stormwater outflow to the adjacent existing watercourse along the south side of the property |
| Tenants : what authority do we have to know the tenants before the plan is approved? | The tenancing process is a private process that occurs between the property owner and the future tenant and may occur after site plan approval. |
| Can construction be done in different stages to better assess the impact on the neighbourhood? | The construction process will be reviewed at a future date. As much as possible, the construction team and the owners will try to limit the impact on the neighbourhood. |
| Will the lighting plan for the facility truly be zero light levels at the property line of residents? | Per the Site Lighting Plan, included in the submission, light levels at the property line are proposed to be 0. |
| Will both facilities complete Air Quality studies? Will the Town/ Region including Mississauga share the terms of reference for an integrated study of the impact these facilities will have on air quality, traffic and noise? Will they include the Mississauga sites? | The LUC reports are being prepared separately. ORTECH's LUC concludes that the proposed development will have a minor influence on sensitive land uses. |
| What mitigation of emissions can we seek if modelling shows a cumulative issue from multiple sites? | Possible mitigation measures to reduce cumulative impacts may include low Nox HVAC equipment. Increased uptake of zero emission vehicles and Canada's policy to have 100% of car and passenger trucks zero emission by 2035 is expected to improve local background air quality. |
| What steps will be taken to reduce dust and particulate matter ? | The reduced speed limit on site will mitigate PM emissions. |
| What controls can be placed on the vehicles to reduce emissions? What level of idling will be allowed | The development will be required to comply with the Oakville by-law limiting idling to not more than 3 minutes. ORTECH's air quality assessment incorporates this requirement. Additionally, Canada's policy to have 100% of car and passenger trucks zero emission by 2035 is expected to further reduce emissions related to on-site vehicles. |
| What are the terms of reference for the traffic studies ? | The terms of reference are the agreed-upon study area, time periods, future horizon years, and other base assumptions. This was discussed with and approved by the Region of Peel - the road authority for Winston Churchill Boulevard in September of 2020. |
| How are these studies reflective of <u>what will actually occur</u> on the road network given the numerous estimating the applicants done without tenants and during Covid? | The traffic counts which form the basis of the traffic study were collected in 2017, and volumes were grown by between 4.8% and 13.1% per year (based on observed corridor growth) to estimate a "typical" 2020 base year. Site traffic estimates for background developments and the development are based on typical facilities under full occupancy. In other words, the study's base year reflects a scenario in which COVID-19 did not occur, and the future conditions reflect full, normal occupancy at the development site and background developments. |
| What determines acceptable traffic levels? | As described in Peel Region's Traffic Impact Study Guidelines document, the following criteria were used to identify movements of concern for signalized intersections: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Volume to capacity (v/c) ratios for overall intersection operations, through movements, or shared through / turning movements increased to 0.90 or above; • v/c ratios for exclusive turning movements increased to 1.00 or above; or • Queues that exceed the provided storage capacity. |

| | |
|--|--|
| The turnaround times of trailers will impact traffic and noise : these numbers need to be at 100% capacity use to fairly assess site plan (auto and tractor trailer). Can the details of how the numbers currently being reported were calculated be shared? | The trip generation for the proposed development is based on data provided by the Institute of Transportation engineers for typical developments of this nature. This peer-reviewed data is considered the industry standard for estimating trips during the AM and PM peak hour. |
| How can they get to 100 vehicles in a peak hour of which 30 are trailers when they have that number of bays and the turnaround of even an hour of a trailer would mean exponentially more? | The trip generation for the proposed development is based on data provided by the Institute of Transportation engineers for typical developments of this nature. This peer-reviewed data is considered the industry standard for estimating trips during the AM and PM peak hour. |
| How can peak hours for tractor trailers be 7:30-830 or 5:30 hour: this seems like peak for commuter traffic but not tractor trailers?. | The trip generation for the proposed development is based on data provided by the Institute of Transportation engineers for typical developments of this nature. This peer-reviewed data is considered the industry standard for estimating trips during the AM and PM peak hour. |
| Explain how Winston Churchill Road will be changed to address this traffic and when? Will the road be urbanized with curbs and proper drainage? | The transportation study recommendations could be implemented when determined appropriate by the Region of Peel. |
| Can the Town arrange for a peer review of the traffic studies including the impact of the 759 Winston Churchill warehouse on the east side of Winston Churchill and 2175 Cornwall. | IBI Group will defer to the Town for a response to this comment. |
| Can no left truck turn onto Beryl off Ford be implemented? | This location is outside of our study area. |
| How can traffic signals address the potential of noise with idling trucks waiting to turn in? 'Southdown fiasco' | Traffic signals, when they cycle, can create gaps in traffic which can reduce delay for left-turning vehicles queued on Winston Churchill Boulevard |
| The default seems to be that signal optimization will fix everything: how would that work? | Traffic signal timing is generally designed to favour the movements with the highest volume during a given time period. Our analysis shows that, given the eastbound and westbound movements may experience poor operations, time can be reallocated from the southbound direction to the eastbound direction without resulting in southbound capacity concerns. |
| Why is Moldenhauer Development of a commercial park as well as other development on the Mississauga side, not factored in to Winston Churchill volumes? | In addition to incorporating the specific trip volumes from various developments identified by the municipalities, an additional 2% per year growth rate was assumed to account for other future developments or for developments for which the specific traffic patterns are not clear. This approach was approved by the Region of Peel. |
| Will Deer Run laneway re open? | The transportation study assumes the status quo, and does not assign trips to Deer Run Avenue |
| Frustration that the sanitary line is being put in on Acacia? If the development pays for this connection why are we choosing this method? What mitigation does the developer have to put in place to address neighbourhood disruption? How does the additional line impact the other properties on Winston Churchill? | This is not a decision made by the tenant and is done at the Regional level. IBI will defer to the Region for comment on the impact of the sanitary line on the other Winston Churchill Properties. |
| What is the responsibility of Halton Region and Peel Region in terms of assessment of the cumulative impact these developments will have? | IBI Group will defer to the Region for response to this comment. |
| Who is the deciding authority on noise, traffic and air quality changes for each site? | It is the role of the Town and the Region to review the noise, traffic and air quality studies. IBI Group will defer to the Town and Region for response to comment. |
| Who decides if these applications can proceed to be built as presented? | IBI Group will defer to the Town and Region for response to comment. |
| Can you provide us with a comparable neighbourhood in other parts of Oakville for these types of facilities within metres of a residential property? | There are many examples that can be found along Speers Road, however the Town will need to speak to the development statistics and study findings. |
| Who has the authority to change the zoning or stop these developments? | It is the Town who has the authority to change the zoning. |
| What happened to the Data centre? | The owners decided to no longer proceed with the proposal. |
| What role can the Town or Region have in directing the landowner to choose tenants that have less volume and understand the importance an operation that is sensitive to neighbouring residents? | IBI Group will defer to the Town for a response to this comment. |
| What is the role of a Nuisance or Noise bylaw in controlling the impact of these operations? | It ensures operations that produce sound and light levels do so within a set period of hours in order to limit impact on surrounding developments. |