

455 Phillip Street, Suite 100A
Waterloo, Ontario N2L 3X2
Canada
www.ghd.com



GHD Project: 12666193-LTR-1

30 March 2026

Ms. Catheryne McCutcheon
Vanmar Developments King Carol LP
145 Goddard Crescent
Cambridge, Ontario
Canada
N3H 4R6

Responses to Peer Review Comments on Noise Impact Study for 167-171 King Street South

Dear Ms. Catheryne McCutcheon,

Introduction

GHD prepared a Noise Impact Study dated July 3, 2025 (Study) on behalf of VanMar Developments King Carol LP for the proposed high-rise mixed-use residential Development (Development) located at 167-171 King Street South, Waterloo, Ontario (Site).

GHD received peer review comments provided by RWDI in a letter dated October 22, 2025. The Region of Waterloo also reviewed the Study and did not identify any concerns in the letter titled "Post-Circulation Comments", dated December 23, 2025.

GHD has prepared responses to the RWDI peer review in this letter, and has prepared an accompanying Updated Noise Impact Study, dated March 25, 2026, which is based on an updated concept of the Development and reflects GHD's below responses to the peer review comments.

Responses to Comments

GHD received the following comments (bolded and italicized) with respect to the Noise Impact Study. GHD's response follows each comment.

Comment #1: The Noise Report should additionally refer to the City of Waterloo Term of Reference (TOR) for noise study and ensure the assessment fulfills all the TOR requirements.

The Updated Noise Impact Study (Updated Study) dated March 25, 2026, includes reference of the City of Waterloo Terms of Reference which notes the Waterloo Noise Policy Implementation Guideline. A brief summary of this is included in the Updated Noise Impact Study.

Comment #2: The considered traffic noise criteria does not list the rail noise day and night criteria for building component design, nor the rail traffic Leq (24-hour) criterion for brick veneer or masonry equivalent façade construction. These criteria should be included and considered in the assessment.

The original Study includes day and night indoor sound level criteria for building component design in Table 3.2 and describes thresholds for consideration of building component design in Section 3.2.1.

The rail traffic Leq (24-hour) criterion for brick veneer or masonry equivalent façade construction is included in the Updated Study for reference. This has no impact on the findings or recommendations of the Study, as predicted Leq (24-hour) from the LRT is below the criterion.

Comment #3: It is recommended that the new mix-uses building at 164-168 King St. S and the repurposed mix-uses building at 180 King St. S. to be included in the Land Use Compatibility and noise Assessments.

The Updated Study includes 164-168 King St S and 180 King St S in the guideline D-6 assessment. 164-168 King St S is also included in the detailed stationary noise assessment. 180 King St S is excluded from the detailed stationary noise assessment as 180 King St S is closer to existing high-rise residential uses than it is to the Development. These changes have no material impact on the findings or recommendations of the Study.

Comment #4: It is recommended that wheel squeal at the sharp track bends near the development site to be evaluated and considered in the modelling or suitable technical rationale provided to justify its omission.

During the site visit conducted by GHD on April 24, 2025, wheel squeal was not audible from either of the ION LRT lines during observations of multiple LRT pass-bys. Thus, wheel squeal noise is not considered to warrant further consideration in the Study. The Updated Study includes similar discussion of wheel squeal noise.

Comment #5: The Report should be revised to recommend the installation of central air conditioning with Warning Clause Type D, which is the applicable mitigation measure for high-density residential developments.

The Updated Study has included the recommendation for the installation of central air conditioning with Warning Clause Type D. All mention of “provisions for the installation of central air conditioning in the future” and Warning Clause Type C are excluded from the Updated Study.

Comment #6: The analysis to be revised using more conservative or site-specific sound power levels for the noise sources at 100 Caroline Street South.

The updated noise model utilizes a more conservative sound power level of 81 dBA for the HVAC units at 100 Caroline St S.

Comment #7: The Stationary noise impact at OLAs Should be included in the Report.

The Updated Study includes Figure 5.5 and Figure 5.7 which are noise contour plots calculated at a grid height of 21.05 metres (1.5 metres above the roof of the podium). These are included to demonstrate that compliance is achieved at the outdoor amenities of the Development with respect to stationary noise. The worst-case outdoor POR sound levels are included in Tables 5.1 and 5.2 for ease of reference.

Comment #8: Warning Clause Type E should be recommended.

The Updated Study recommends Warning Clause Type E be included in the agreements of Offers of Purchase and Sale, lease/rental agreements, and condominium declarations for all residential dwellings of the Development.

Comment #9: The impact of the development on itself and on surrounding sensitive receptors must be addressed prior to the issuance of final planning approvals.

Considering that the Development is currently seeking Zoning By-Law Amendment approval, with limited design information available with respect to mechanical and electrical systems, detailed assessment of the impact of noise from the Development on itself and on surrounding sensitive receptors is not practical. Further detailed assessment of noise impacts from the Development on itself and surrounding sensitive receptors is recommended to be deferred to a later date. GHD suggests that the detailed assessment be made a

requirement of the Site Plan Approval application or secured as a condition of a registered development agreement (e.g., to be completed prior to issuance of building permit).

Conclusions

We trust that the responses contained herein are sufficient to address the comments received from the peer reviewer. Should you have any questions, please don't hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Regards



Andrew DeFaria, B.A.Sc.
Acoustical Engineering Graduate



Ben Wiseman, P.Eng.
Senior Acoustical Engineer