

Email May 13, 2020 - Township follow up to Applicant Response letter:

Further to our phone conversation earlier this month, please provide an explanation and comment around the movement of material from Phase 3 and 4 to the processing area as such material would need to be conveyed through either Phase 2 or 5 which are in agricultural use that time.

With regard to your Golf Course response comment on April 27, can you confirm if any noise analysis took place on the Golf Course? Also your April 27 response implies that there would be no negative impact from noise, how was that assessment determined?

Email May 19, 2020 - Applicant Response to above:

Please find attached a conceptual drawing of what the field conveyor set up could potentially look like as extraction proceeds through the phases. When extraction occurs in Phases 3 and 4, the conveyor would be located along the perimeter of Phase 2. It would not cross through Phase 5. As previously discussed, the footprint for the conveyor is relatively limited i.e. couple metres in width, compared to the alternative of an internal haul road which would need to accommodate two-way truck traffic. The conceptual location of the conveyor in Phase 2 would generally align with the location of the existing laneway that bisects Phase 2 and 5 (see map below).



Regarding your second question, the golf course was not treated as a sensitive receptor in the noise study per Provincial guidelines and no noise analysis was undertaken specifically for the golf course. There is case law regarding whether golf courses are “sensitive uses” which we can provide to the Township should you be interested. Our April 27 response stated the following:

Based on the proposed 6 m berm, we would expect that potential noise impacts on golfers would be minimized.

The noise study concluded that a 2.8 m berm would meet provincial standards for the residences immediately north of the golf course which are located closer to Phase 1. The site plans identify this berm as 6 m due to recommendations in the visual assessment. Our observation is that by extending this same 6 m berm along the golf course that we would therefore expect the potential noise impacts would be minimized (reduced). This is based on the noise study findings regarding POR 7 & POR 8 with a smaller 2.8 m berm and the fact the golf course berm is doubling in height. Generally speaking a 6 m berm would provide greater noise mitigation than a 2.8 or 3 m berm.

The Region's noise peer reviewer (SS Wilson) has no remaining concerns with the noise study and its findings. The reviewer did not request that the golf course be treated as a sensitive receptor or that noise analysis be undertaken specifically for this use.