April 18, 2023

Blauson Assets Management Ltd.
#106 BIC Fortune Tower
320 McCowan Road
Toronto, Ontario M1J 3N2

c/o Ling Kee Group

Re: Comment Response Letter
320 McCowan Road, Scarborough
Gradient Wind File No.: 19-185-Response Letter

Gradient Wind Engineering Inc. (Gradient Wind) was retained by Blauson Assets Management Ltd. to undertake a detailed environmental noise & vibration assessment for the proposed residential development located at 320 McCowan Road in Scarborough, Ontario (*ref. GW19-185-Detailed Noise & Vibration Final, dated July 20, 2021*). This letter is to respond to the following second-round peer-review comments received from WSP in the memo dated December 21, 2021. The comments are numbered per the numbering sequence in the memo, excluding the verbiage of the first-round commentary which has already been addressed. It should also be noted that the comments pertain to an earlier feasibility study conducted by Gradient Wind (*ref. GW19-185-Noise & Vibration Final R1, dated May 7, 2021)*, and that WSP should review our revised detailed study.

Comment 4: *Note that the future light rail traffic on Eglinton Avenue East was not included in the analysis. Please provide a rationale why this was not included in the analysis.*

> **Gradient Wind:** The Eglinton East LRT is still in the planning stage, and details about its operations are not presently known, such as train type, train volume, train speed, and track details such as whether the tracks will be below grade or elevated in certain areas. Based on Gradient Wind's experience with the Eglinton Crosstown LRT, with an offset distance of 260 m to the north, it is expected that this would be an insignificant source. Noise impacts from any future LRT would fall below those of Eglinton Avenue East (60 dBA), which is a major arterial roadway with 50,000 AADT. As such, the inclusion of the Eglinton East LRT would not impact our conclusions that

upgraded building components are not required along the north facing façades. This information has been added to the revised report.

Comment 6: *The revised report indicated in Table 6, that Receptor No. 6, the 6th Floor Podium Terrace is 63 dBA during the day, thus greater than 55 dBA and thus, noise control measures are mandatory to comply with the design objective. Gradient Wind indicated that mitigation will be explored in greater detail at the Site Plan Application. This item should be included as part of the conditions for this approvals process.*

Gradient Wind: This appears to pertain to the feasibility study. Gradient Wind since issued a detailed study addressing this item.

Comment 7: *Gradient Wind did not go over in detail the NPC-300 criteria. It is WSP's opinion that these criteria should be discussed in the report (i.e. OLA warning clauses and barrier requirements, mandatory A/C vs. provision for adding A/C, building façade requirements, etc.). Please provide further detailed discussion in the revised report.*

Gradient Wind: This appears to pertain to the feasibility study. Gradient Wind since issued a detailed study addressing this item.

Comment 9: *Medium and heavy truck % is typically determined from the turning movements counts provided by the COT. Please provide further explanation as to why this was not included in the revised report.*

Gradient Wind: The 7% and 5% medium and heavy vehicle mix is a conservative assumption where data from municipality was not obtained. This information has been added to the revised report.

Comment 9: *VIA rail traffic information was not supplied. Please provide reference to VIA rail traffic data.*

Gradient Wind: VIA Rail counts were obtained from publicly available service schedules on the VIA Rail website. It should be noted that the VIA Rail impacts are insignificant compared to GO Transit, which is the dominant source of rail noise. This information has been added to the revised report.

Comment 12: *Ground Vibration Criteria - This was not included in the revised report.*

Gradient Wind: See Section 4.4.2.

Comment 14: *Please provide a discussion on how RMS velocities were calculated from the measured vibration data using Instantel units that record in Peak Particle Velocity (PPV).*

Gradient Wind: This has been added to the revised report in Section 4.4.

Comment 21: *Gradient Wind mentions that the building is within 300 m of the rail corridor, thus brick cladding or an acoustical equivalent will be required for the exterior walls. WSP recommends this statement to be removed as this is an is incorrect statement and is not mentioned in NPC- 300. This was never removed, please update as per suggestion above.*

Gradient Wind: This appears to pertain to the feasibility study. Gradient Wind since issued a detailed study addressing this item.

Comment 22: *There was no 24-hour analysis done, which is required when a building is less than 100 m away from the railway right of way, which determines if the building façade requires brick veneer or masonry equivalent. This was never conducted in the revised application, please update as per suggestion above.*

Gradient Wind: Brick cladding or an acoustical equivalent is recommended for the east, south and west facing façades to mitigate indoor noise levels. A 24-hour analysis would therefore be redundant.

Comment 27: *WSP recommends that rooftop sound barriers, to be acoustically effective, should be structurally sound, appropriately designed to withstand win and snow load, constructed without cracks or surface gaps and must meet the minimum surface density of 20 kg/m². Where sound barriers are considered as noise control measures, WSP recommends adding this requirement in their revised report.*

Gradient Wind: This has been added to the revised report in Section 5.1.2. It should be noted that noise barriers at the podium terrace were found to be unfeasible.

Comment 28: *Both studies mentioned in Section 2, that Tower A and B feature cantilevered balconies on various façades. However, the report fails to confirm if these balconies are greater or less than 4 m in depth. This should be confirmed and included within this report, and if greater than 4 metres should be assessed and included within this study.*

Gradient Wind: This has been added to the revised report in Section 2.

Comment 34: *Comment about Type A WC being referenced instead of Type D.*

Gradient Wind: This appears to pertain to the feasibility study. Gradient Wind since issued a detailed study addressing this item.

Should you have any questions, or wish to discuss our findings further, please call us (613) 836-0934 or contact us by e-mail at joshua.foster@gradientwind.com. In the interim, we thank you for the opportunity to be of service.

Sincerely,

Gradient Wind Engineering Inc.

Michael Lafortune, C.E.T.
Environmental Scientist

Joshua Foster, P.Eng.
Lead Engineer

Gradient Wind File #19-185-Response Letter