The following are responses to the Peer Review Letter by Valcoustics Canada Ltd., dated February 4, 2022.

a. Vacant lands in the area since these have agricultural zoning which would likely permit the construction of a (noise sensitive) residential dwelling on them;

Pinchin Responses:

Additional receptors (R6, R6-OPOR, R7 and R7-OPOR) were added to represent the potential homes and outdoor PORs on the vacant lands in the area surrounding the proposed development. The assessment showed that the noise impacts on these PORs meet the MECP noise criteria.

b. The existing two storey dwelling immediately to the west of R1. The upper level of a two storey dwelling would receive less ground attenuation than the single storey dwelling at R1. Thus, even though the dwelling is somewhat further away from the proposed facility, it could receive higher sound levels and should be part of the assessment.

Pinchin Responses:

Additional receptors (R5 and R5-OPOR) were added to represent the two-storey home and associated outdoor POR to the west of the development. The assessment showed that the noise impacts on these PORs meet the MECP noise criteria.

c) In accordance with the Town of Caledon Development Standards, the speed that should be used in the modelling to determine the noise impacts from road traffic is the posted speed limit plus 10 km/hr. The assessment presented in the noise study uses the posted speed limit.

Pinchin Responses:

Calculations of traffic noise impact was updated in accordance with the Town of Caledon's Development Standards. Please see the calculation details in Appendix F.

d) The results presented in Table 3c of the report seem to indicate that the predicted daytime and nighttime sound levels exceed the MECP daytime and nighttime noise guideline limits at the receptor locations. Clarification is needed.

Pinchin Responses:

In Table 3c, the predicted traffic noise impacts exceed the MECP exclusionary sound level limits. As a result, noise control measure (i.e. Provision of Central AC) and warning clause were recommended in the report. It was confirmed by the Client that the development will install central air conditioning. Therefore, it is our opinion that the installation of the central air conditioning system meets the noise control requirements. Nonetheless, warning clause type C is still required.

e) Figures 3a, 3b, 3c and 4 are indicated as being noise contour maps. However, these figures fail to present noise contours. If the thick purple line is intended to be the noise contour, it is not clear which sound level it represents since purple could be 40 dBA, 65 dBA or even 70 dBA. Clarification is needed.

Pinchin Responses:

The figures were updated in Appendix B.

f) The Site Plan for the proposed facility indicates there is a large vacant area to the south of the temple to be constructed on the site. It is not clear what these lands will be used for. If these lands could be used for outdoor events (that could include amplified sound), this activity and its associated noise sources needs to be included in the noise impact assessment.

Pinchin Responses:

It was stated in MECP NPC-300 that noise emissions resulting from gathering of people at facilities such as restaurants, fairs and parks are not considered as stationary sources. In addition, it was confirmed by the Client that there would not be outdoor activities such as gathering of people and other events. Consequently, the noise impact study did not include the noise emissions from these events.

g) The sample calculations in Appendix F indicate a sound reflective ground surface is used for some of the receptors while a sound absorptive ground surface is used for others. The reason for this discrepancy is not clear and needs to be explained in the report.

Pinchin Responses:

Calculations of traffic noise impact were updated. Please see the calculation details in Appendix F.