

Objections to Application D14-2022-008

Thank you to the Planning Department of the Township of Leeds and The Thousand Islands for hosting this mandatory public hearing on Application D14-2022-008.

I am the co-owner of 490 County Road 2 East, and I feel that the value of our property will be negatively impacted by two issues revealed in the application, specifically excessive noise, and the potential ugliness of the property.

Please accept this document as a written submission of my concerns.

I have made specific comments to these concerns in the attached pages.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'T. Hawkins', with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Tim Hawkins
490 County Road 2 East



The Noise Assessment May be Underrepresented

According to the Noise Impact Study, Page 4, the noise level for a wood chipper is stated to be 106 dBA. This to me seems to be a low assessment and may be out of date. I checked the web site of Vermeer Corporation, a leading manufacturer of brush chippers and whole tree chippers. The company has ethically published noise levels for many of its tree care machinery products. Some examples of Vermeer's brush chipper noise levels are:

AX17 Brush Chipper	https://www.vermeer.com/na/brush-chippers/ax17	116 dBA
BC1000 Brush Chipper	https://www.vermeer.com/na/brush-chippers/bc1000xl-gas	119 dBA
BC1200xl Brush Chipper	https://www.vermeer.com/na/brush-chippers/bc1200xl-gas	124 dBA

Whole tree chippers have similar noise levels.

Although the difference is 10-18 decibels seems minor, the decibel scale for measuring noise levels is logarithmic rather than linear, so the difference between the 106 dBA referenced in the Noise Impact Study and the noise levels specified by a major manufacturer, is actually 10 to 18 times louder.

Another issue is the location of the equipment during operation or servicing. As correctly reported in the Noise Impact Study, noise levels are reduced relative to distance. However, the Noise Impact Study assumes the equipment will only be operated inside or close to the shop. If any wood chipper is operated at a distance that is on the Applicant's property and closer to any residence, the measured noise levels at the residence will be higher. Wood chippers are transportable and as such can be operated anywhere on the applicant's property.

Finally, the Noise Impact Study concludes: "The combined sound levels generated from all mechanical sources are expected to be 4 to 19 dB below the quietest ambient traffic sound levels at R1 to R5 during the quietest hour of the day." If the wood chipper noise levels published by Vermeer, one of the major manufacturers of wood chippers, are applied to the measurements in this study, I suggest the noise levels would be well above the provincial minimum noise criteria.

I am also concerned about location of the temporary storage of organic materials. The applicant intends to store wood waste on site as per the Provincial Policy Statement Policies Review and Analysis, Section 1.1.1.d. However, there is no reference in any of the site plans of any area designated for organic material storage.

Will the applicant store organic materials in the area currently designated for future development (big red circle in the figure below)? Or the roughly triangular shaped area at the front of the property, between the 14-meter MTO setback and the 30-meter wetland setback (small circle)? Otherwise, any storage areas would impinge upon the provincially significant wetland and other setbacks.

[illegible]

What is the local tree care industry standard for wood waste storage? I did a personal survey of nine of the many tree service providers along the Kingston to Brockville corridor, randomly selected from a list of over twenty businesses of various sizes that identify themselves as tree care providers.

Many of these businesses seem to be small, either part time or sole proprietors. Their storage piles, if any, were not conspicuous.

Tree services in urban areas have administration offices for serving the public and their equipment and storage areas are presumably elsewhere.

Two tree care providers had large piles of wood waste on site. A farm seemingly unaligned with the tree business had similar. Two storage areas were partially shrouded by groves of living trees. One company had their storage piles close to the road. Pictures taken from the driveway are below.



None of the storage piles was very appealing. I would oppose any such development so close to our property.