Acoustical Consultants Inc.

P.O. Box 32059
1447 Upper Ottawa St.
Hamilton ON
L8W 3K0

October 21, 2021

City of Burlington
Engineering Services, Development & Infrastructure Division
426 Brant Street
Burlington, ON
L7R 2G2

Our File: 19-1199

Attn: Annette Simpson
Senior Engineering Technologist

RE: Site Engineering Comments - 2294-2300 Queensway Drive, Burlington, ON

Responding to your noise comments, dated April 30, 2021, on the above project.

We offer the following comments….

1. Please be advised that the Ministry of Transportation (MTO) may also review and comment on the report, if there are any discrepancies in the requirements between the City of Burlington and the MTO, the most stringent criteria shall apply.
   Agreed

2. Table 4, please double check the car/medium truck/heavy truck values stated. The AADT of 209694 looks correct (169100 x 2% for 13 years) but when I add the values for the QEW they all add up to 139802, shouldn't they add to 209684?
   This has been corrected

3. Table 4, please double check the breakdown calculation for cars and medium trucks, the heavy truck calculation looks fine and the AADT also looks correct (8147 x 2% for 14 years). The Stamson calculations look to have used the correct values.
   Double checked, everything was correct

4. Figure 4 does not show the correct site layout, please provide an updated Figure 4 with the latest proposed layout and clearly identify the proposed noise barrier, start /finish height/density.
   Updated to reflect the current site plan.

5. Please provide a summary table for mitigated noise levels for indoor areas for each receptor.
6. Stamson calculations:
   a. R1 had three segments (QEW EB & WB and Queensway)
   b. R2 through R6 only used 2 segments (QEW EB & WB). Why was Queensway Drive not included in calculations for R2 through R6?
      Queensway Drive noise levels at R1 are 10 decibels less than the QEW traffic noise levels and there have no acoustical impact on the site development.

7. R1 QEW calculations states 59.07 dBA total LEQ, but Table 5A lists 63 dBA, why the difference?
   We do not show that number, our number is 70 dBA.

8. R3 QEW calculations states 57.28 dBA total LEQ but Table 5A states 63 dBA, why the difference?
   We do not show that number, our number is 67 dBA.

9. Please also double check addition for Table 5C.
   There is no addition in Table 5C.

10. Are there any, impulsive sounds in the area?
    No

11. Were field measurements taken, or a site visit conducted? We would ask that a site visit be undertaking and/or measurements on site be taken to confirm/supplement estimated noise levels that were calculated and provided.
    On site field measurements were not taken and are not required for this type of noise study, however several site visits were conducted.

12. Please be advised that a Detailed Noise Study will be required at the Site Plan stage if the OPA/RZ/Subdivision application is approved, when detailed building plans should be available. This needs to be noted in the conclusion and recommendation stage.
    Agreed

13. Please include in the conclusion and recommendation section the (future) individual residential air conditioning units must meet NPC-216 and cannot be placed on front porch or balconies. We would ask that integrated units/wall venting be considered.
    NPC-216 only applies to window air conditioners which are not proposed for this site development.

14. Please include in the conclusion and recommendation section that window air conditioning units are not allowed.
    See above answer.

15. A revised report signed by the engineer is needed.
    Once the OPA/RZ/Subdivision application has been approved and when detailed building plans are available, we will submit an updated noise study stamped by our P.ENG and a Letter of Reliance.

Respectfully submitted,
dBA Acoustical Consultants Inc.



Frank Westaway, Owner