

Section 2.1 includes a paragraph that appears to discuss a different site.

Pinchin: Updated.

- Section 2.2 incorrectly describes indoor sounds level limits as sound level limits at the exterior of the building façade/windows.
- Section 2.2 discusses sound level limits for living/dining rooms during daytime hours. While daytime sound level limits for schools are consistent with those for living/dining rooms, to be consistent with the proposal, the report should state that the sound level limits apply to schools as opposed to living/dining rooms.
- Section 2.2 discusses sound level limits that apply to bedrooms during nighttime periods, which does not appear to be relevant to the proposal.

Pinchin: Section 2.2 updated.

- The report provides an opinion that the site is in a Class 1 area. Staff are of the opinion that the site is in a Class 2 area.

Pinchin: Changed to Class 2 area.

- No point of reception was selected to predict sound levels at the outdoor play area. How has it been verified that the proposed outdoor play area complies with the sound level limits for outdoor living areas (OLAs)?

Pinchin: See end of Section 3.0.

- Section 4.3 indicates that the Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) was provided by the City of Guelph, and that an annual growth rate of 1.5% was advised by the City of Kingston. Table D.1 identifies the traffic figures that were used for the report, and Note 2 states that the growth rate was advised by the City of Guelph. Please append the details confirming the traffic data and the advised growth rate, and if necessary, update the body of the report to confirm the municipality that advised of the annual growth rate used in the report. Please note that if the growth rate used in the report was advised by a different municipality, staff may not necessarily accept the growth rate used.

Pinchin: Updated. A copy of the email is included in Appendix D.

- Section 4.3 indicates that the construction of the building components (i.e. windows and walls meeting the Ontario Building Code (OBC) requirements would be sufficient to provide the required sound attenuation, whereas indoor assessments need to be reviewed and additional clarification will be necessary. NPC-300 assumptions regarding use of outside of plane of window include the intervening wall section meeting OBC standards for new construction. As the building has existing wall sections their potential for acoustic mitigation will need to be verified by inspection and calculation using acoustic modeling software, or field-verification using MECP-approved measurements. Alternatively, the exterior walls need to be reconstructed to current OBC standards for new construction. While these elements usually form part of the Detailed Noise Study, they could be done separately; if done separately this information would need to be provided as a separate report submitted as part of a complete application.

Pinchin: The construction details on walls and windows/doors were confirmed by the Client. Based on the information provided, it is Pinchin's opinion that the walls and windows/doors meet or exceed the OBC's acoustical requirements. See end of Section 4.3.

- The report indicates that a warning clause is required, however does not clarify how the warning clause requirement should be implemented.

Pinchin: The warning clause is to be included in the property's purchase/lease agreement, See Sections 4.3 and 5.0.