JLR No.: 29899-002 Revision: 3

Prepared for:

12714001 CANADA INC. 100-768 Boulevard St-Joseph Gatineau, QC J8Y 4B8 Prepared by:

J.L. RICHARDS & ASSOCIATES LIMITED 343 Preston Street, Tower II, Suite 1000 Ottawa, ON K1S 1N4 TEL: 613-728-3571

Site Servicing Report

East Ridge Orleans Subdivision

2983, 3053 and 3079 Navan Road & 2690 Pagé Road, Ottawa, Ontario



Value through service and commitment

Table of Contents

1.0 Introduction				1
	1.1	Backg	round	1
	1.2	Site D	escription and Proposed Development	1
	1.3	Existir	ng Infrastructure and Future Navan Road Widening	4
	1.4	Existir	ng Topography and Grading Plan	4
	1.5	Pre-Co	onsultation. Permits and Approvals	5
2.0	Devia	itions fro	om Standards and Guidelines	
3.0	Wate	r Servici	ng	
0.0	3.1	Water	Supply Design Criteria	5
	32	Dome	stic Water Demands	6
	3.3	Propo	sed Watermain Sizing and Roughness	7
	34	Fire Fl	low Requirements	7
	0.1	341	General	0 8
		342	Required Fire Flow	8
	35	Water	Servicing and Boundary Conditions	0 8
	0.0	351	Water Servicing	0 8
		352	Fire Protection	0 Q
	36	Simula	ation Results	10
	0.0	361	Peak Hour	10
		362	Maximum Day Plus Fire Flow	10
		363	Maximum HGI	
	37	Water	Age Analysis	
	3.2	Water	Servicing Conclusions	
10	Wast	vvalei Swotor 9	Servicing Conclusions	12
4.0	/ 1	Backa	round	12
	4.1	Dacky	sed Sanitary Sewer System	12
	4.2	Theor	etical Sanitary Deak Flow	
	4.5	Waste	water Servicing Conclusions	
50	Storm	Servici	ng and Stormwater Management	
5.0	5 1	Evictin	ng and Stornwaler Management	15
	5.1		ng Conditions and Dackground	.15
	5.2 5.3	Desigi	sed Stormwater Management Annroach	10
	5.5	5 2 1	Boundary Condition	/
		522	Groundwater Table	/
		533	Allowable Pelease Pate	/ 10
	51	Dropo	allowable Nelease Nale	20
	5.4	5 / 1	Pupeff Coefficients (C Easters)	20
		54.1	Minor System Sorvicing	20
		5.4.Z	Inlet Control Dovices	20
		54.5	Water Quality	20
	55	0.4.4 Chone	Water Quality	∠ı
	5.5 5.6	Storm	yes in Stormwater Management Approach	ZZ
	0.0		water management modeling Approach	∠3
		5.0.1 5.6.0	Integration of the Drangood Dand	∠3
		5.0.Z	Simulation of Street Sogments	∠3
		5.0.J	Simulation of Street Segments	24
	F 7	5.0.4 Madal	Aujoining Existing Areas	24
	ວ./	ivioael	ling Parameters	25

Site Servicing Report 2983, 3053 and 3079 Navan Road & 2690 Pagé Road, Ottawa, Ontario

	5.7.1	Hydrological Parameters	25
	5.7.2	Simulation of Storm Distributions	25
	5.7.3	Simulation of Park and Amenity Blocks	26
5.8	Storm	Servicing Strategy	26
5.9	Simula	ation Results	27
	5.9.1	Low Point Ponding Analysis	27
	5.9.2	Major System Flow	28
	5.9.3	Storm Sewer HGL Analysis	29
	5.9.4	Spillover Pond Operation	30
	5.9.5	Draw-down Time	31
	5.9.6	Allowable Release Rate	32
	5.9.7	Capture Rates	32
5.10	Storm	and Stormwater Management Conclusions	34
Erosic	n and S	Sediment Control	34

6.0

List of Tables

Table 3-1: Water Design Criteria	6
Table 3-2: Theoretical Water Demands	7
Table 3-3: Watermain Roughness Coefficients	7
Table 3-4: Watermain Internal Diameters	7
Table 3-5: Hydraulic Boundary Conditions at Connection-1 on Pagé Road	9
Table 3-6: Hydraulic Boundary Conditions at Connection-2 on Navan Road	10
Table 4-1: Wastewater Servicing Design Criteria	14
Table 5-1: Groundwater Elevations	17
Table 5-2: Design Runoff Coefficients	20
Table 5-3: Water Quality Volumes Comparison	22
Table 5-4: Park and Amenity Block Release Rates and Storage	26
Table 5-5: Low Point Ponding Depths	28
Table 5-6: Major System Overland Flow Routes Analysis – Velocity x Depth (3hr Chicago)	28
Table 5-7: HGL Analysis (3hr Chicago)	29
Table 5-8: Spillover Pond Operation (3-hour Chicago Storm)	31
Table 5-9: Spillover Pond Operation (12-hour SCS Storm)	31
Table 5-10: Comparison of Release Rates and Allowable	32
Table 5-11: Sum of ICD Capture Rates	33

List of Figures

Figure 1: Location Plan	3
Figure 2: Total Drainage Area Breakdown	19
Figure 3: Draw-Down Time	32

List of Appendices

- Appendix A Pre-consultation Meeting Notes and Site Servicing Checklist
- Appendix B Concept Plan, Draft Plan of Subdivision and Topographic Survey
- Appendix C Background Drawings Existing Infrastructure
- Appendix D1 Water Demands and FUS Calculations
- Appendix D2 WaterCAD Schematics
- Appendix D3 City Correspondence Boundary Conditions
- Appendix D4 Simulation Results Peak Hour
- Appendix D5 Simulation Results Maximum Day + Fire Flow
- Appendix D6 Simulation Results Maximum HGL
- Appendix D7 Water Age Analysis
- Appendix E1 Wastewater EUC ISSU Design Excerpt
- Appendix E2 JLR Sanitary Design Sheet
- Appendix F1 Storm EUC ISSU Design Excerpts
- Appendix F2 Sample Functional Runoff Coefficients
- Appendix F3 JLR Storm Design Sheet
- Appendix G1 Modelling Schematics
- Appendix G2 CB Tables
- Appendix G3 HGL Analysis
- Appendix G4 Street Ponding Areas
- Appendix G5 Historical References
- Appendix G6 C-Factors
- Appendix G7 Water Quality and Impact Study

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Background

In 2023, J.L. Richards & Associates Limited (JLR) was retained by 12714001 Canada Inc. (the Owner) to prepare a Site Servicing Report in support of a Plan of Subdivision Application for their subject properties sited at 2983, 3053 and 3079 Navan Road and 2690 Pagé Road herein referred to as the subject properties. The owner intends to purchase the following five (5) separate parcels of land, where each parcel will have its own developmental application. The following report only focuses on one of these parcels, which is the one under the Plan of Subdivision. The development approval process of these parcels is as follows:

- One (1) Plan of Subdivision.
- One (1) Residential Site Plan.
- Two (2) Mixed Use Residential and Commercial Site Plans; and
- One (1) Commercial Site Plan.

This Site Servicing Report has been prepared to outline the design objectives and criteria, servicing constraints and detailed strategies for developing the subject lands with water, wastewater, storm, and stormwater management services in accordance with the following:

- The November 2009 Servicing Study Guidelines for Development Applications in the City of Ottawa (City);
- The Ottawa Sewer Design Guidelines (2012) and associated Technical Bulletins;
- The 2005 Gloucester East Urban Community (EUC) Infrastructure Servicing Study Update (ISSU) prepared by Stantec Consulting Ltd.;
- Response E-Mail (dated January 18, 2021) on servicing requirements;
- Updated Geotechnical Investigation Proposed Residential Development 2983, 3053 and 3079 Navan Road Ottawa, Ontario prepared by EXP (dated September, 2024);
- Geotechnical Investigation Navan Road Subdivision Off-Site Servicing Navan Road and Brian Coburn Boulevard Ottawa, Ontario prepared by EXP (dated September, 2024);
- Operation and Maintenance Manual East Ridge Orleans Subdivision prepared by JLR (dated August 27, 2024);
- Landslide Hazard and Risk Assessment Revision 1, Proposed Residential Development 2983, 3053 and 3079 Navan Road Ottawa, Ontario prepared by Paterson Group Inc. (dated July 4, 2024); and
- The Functional Servicing Report prepared by JLR (dated February 10, 2023).

A copy of the pre-consultation meeting notes is included in Appendix A.

1.2 Site Description and Proposed Development

The municipal addresses for the subject properties are 2983, 3053, and 3079 Navan Road & 2690 Page Road. The subject properties are located within the urban limits of the City of Ottawa. The total developmental area is ±5.31 ha and is bounded by Pagé Road, Brian Coburn Boulevard and Navan Road (refer to Figure 1 for the Location Plan). The area of the subdivision parcel is 2.87 ha. A review of Google Maps and GeoOttawa indicate that the existing area is entirely vegetated.

Site Servicing Report 2983, 3053 and 3079 Navan Road & 2690 Pagé Road, Ottawa, Ontario

As described in Section 1.1, the Owner intends to subdivide the site into five (5) separate parcels each one of them being dealt with its own approval process. The subject parcels are depicted in Figure 1.



J.L. Richards & Associates Limited.

JLR #:

29899

File Location: P:\29000\29899-002 - Navan Subdivision\05-Production\01-Civil\Figures\29899-002 KEYPLAN FIG 1.dwg

February 15, 2024 1:19:37 PM PLOT DATE: The Draft Plan of Subdivision and the proposed Concept Plan for the proposed development (prepared by PMA Architects) as well as the topographical survey for the properties (prepared by Stantec Geomatics Ltd.) are included in Appendix B.

1.3 Existing Infrastructure and Future Navan Road Widening

A review of existing services was completed along the frontages of the subject properties to identify existing sewers and watermains. Based on the review of the Drawings for Pagé Road, Navan Road and Brian Coburn Boulevard obtained from the City of Ottawa (Appendix C), the following infrastructure has been identified to exist within municipal right-of-way (R.O.W.):

Watermains:

- 305 mm diameter Ductile Iron watermain along Navan Road (circ. 1976)
- 305 mm diameter Ductile Iron watermain along Pagé Road (circ. 1974)

Sanitary Sewers:

- 250 mm diameter PVC sanitary sewer along Pagé Road (circ. 2005)
- 300 mm diameter PVC sanitary forcemain along Pagé Road (circ. 2005)
- 400 mm diameter PVC sanitary forcemain along Pagé Road (circ. 2007)

Storm Sewers:

- Short section of 750 mm diameter PVC storm sewer along Navan Road (circ. 2016)
- Short section of 525 mm diameter PVC storm sewer along Brian Cobourn Boulevard (circ. 2016)

Future Navan Road Widening

The City's Transportation Master Plan (2013) anticipates a future road widening of Navan Road, from Brian Coburn Boulevard to Mer Bleue Road, to four (4) lanes, therefore increasing the Rightof-Way to 37.5 meters. At the direction of the City, the servicing design and drawings have been revised to reflect this ultimate condition.

1.4 Existing Topography and Grading Plan

Based on the topography of the subject property (refer to Appendix B), there is a southeasterly slope from Brian Coburn Boulevard to the intersection of Navan Road and Pagé Road. The site topography indicates a 4-to-5-meter elevation drop from the center of the development to the entrance on Navan Road.

A Grading Plan (refer to Drawing G1) has been developed for the proposed site. Centre line of road grades from the local streets were designed to tie into existing Roads from the adjacent streets (Navan Road and Pagé Road). The road grades shown on Drawing G1 were developed to: i) convey the subdivision's runoff to street catch basins, ii) contain flows up to the 1:100-year

via roadway sags, and iii) evacuate safely flows in excess of the 1:100-year storm via a major system flow route.

1.5 Pre-Consultation, Permits and Approvals

A pre-consultation meeting was held on January 18, 2021 (Appendix A) which summarized the planning process, servicing constraints and design criteria for the subject properties. From a storm perspective, the storm discharge criteria and allowable peak flow used for the preparation of this Report is presented in Section 4.1 (below). Also included at the end of Appendix A, the servicing checklist was prepared for this Application.

In terms of the Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) requirements, an Application for an Environmental Compliance Approval (ECA) is expected to be required for the sanitary, storm, and SWM works for the subdivision including works along Navan Road. However, an Application for an ECA is not anticipated for the individual site plan blocks.

2.0 Deviations from Standards and Guidelines

Municipal infrastructure is to be designed in accordance with municipal and provincial standards. More specifically, infrastructure proposed as part of East Ridge Orleans Subdivision must be designed in accordance with the 2012 Ottawa Sewer Design Guidelines (OSDG) and associated Technical Bulletins. The analyses described in the following sections for East Ridge Orleans Subdivision Water Servicing (Section 3.0), Wastewater Servicing (Section 4.0), Storm Servicing and Stormwater Management (Section 5.0) have shown that all systems were designed in accordance with regulatory requirements. However, there is one proposed deviation for the Storm Servicing and Stormwater Management (Section 5.0) which is consistent with the East Urban Community Infrastructure Servicing Study Update (EUC ISSU) (Stantec, 2005).

The EUC ISSU required a capture rate of 85 L/s/ha within the lands draining to Pond #3. The 85 L/s/ha capture rate is less than the 1:2-year design event and therefore there is ponding on the street in the 1:2 year event. The ponding is present only for the duration of the storm and the approach has been accepted by city review staff in previous correspondence. Further information on the approach is contained in Section 5.0.

3.0 Water Servicing

3.1 Water Supply Design Criteria

Any additions to the City of Ottawa water distribution system must be designed in accordance with the Ottawa Design Guidelines for Water Distribution (July 2010) and Technical Bulletins ISDTB-2014-02, ISTB-2018-02 and ISTB-2021-03. The Design Guidelines require that the proposed water distribution system will satisfy the pressure constraints for the peak hour demand, maximum day demand plus fire flow, and maximum pressure in the system.

Section 4.2.2 of the Design Guidelines require that all new development additions to the public water distribution system be designed such that the minimum and maximum water pressure, as well as the fire flow rates, conform to the following:

- Under maximum hourly demand conditions (peak hour), the pressures shall not be less than 276 kPa;
- During periods of maximum day and fire flow demand, the residual pressure at any point in the distribution system shall not be less than 140 kPa (20 psi);
- In accordance with the Ontario Building Code in areas that may be occupied, the static pressure at any fixture shall not exceed 552 kPa (80 psi);
- The maximum pressure at any point in the distribution system in unoccupied areas shall not exceed 689 kPa (100 psi); and
- Feedermains, which have been provided primarily for the purpose of redundancy, shall meet, at a minimum, the basic day plus fire flow demand.

Table 3-1 summarizes the design criteria for water distribution systems, which will serve as the basis for the detailed design of the proposed on-site watermains.

Design Criteria	Design Value
Average demand	280 L/cap/day
Maximum demand	2.5 x Avg
Peak hour	2.2 x Max Day
Density Townhouse	2.7 ppu
Density 1 Bedroom Apt (used for basement	1.4 рри
apartment units)	
Density Average Apt (used for Condo Units)	1.8 ppu
Commercial	
Average demand	28,000 L/gross ha/day
Maximum demand	1.5 x Avg
Peak hour	1.8 x Max Day
Fire Flow Requirements	
Municipal ROW / Private Site with Hydrants	FUS
Service Lateral Only	OBC & NFPA 13
Pressure/Flow	
Peak hour	>276 kPa (40 psi)
Maximum day plus fire flow	>140 kPa (20 psi)
Minimum hour (maximum HGL)	<552 kPa (80 psi)

Table 3-1: Water Design Criteria

3.2 Domestic Water Demands

The estimated domestic water demands presented in this section are based on the site layout and unit count shown in the Draft Plan (Appendix D1). The proposed subdivision consists of 67 row townhouse units. The developer is considering the option of converting the row townhouse units into duplex units, which would consist of row townhouse units with 1-bedroom apartments in the basements. The estimated water demands have been updated to include the potential addition of a 1-bedroom apartment to the basement of each townhouse unit within the proposed subdivision. As the adjacent condominium buildings (to be submitted as separate applications) will be serviced from the subdivision, their water demands were also accounted for in the current design.

The residential consumption rate for average day demand was set in accordance with the City's Technical Bulletin ISTB-2021-03. The boundary conditions from the City are shown in Appendix D3. The water demand calculations can be found in Appendix D1. The water demand calculations account for the condominium and commercial buildings; however, their detailed design is not included in this report. Table 3-2 summarizes the theoretical water demand results based on the proposed site details, the potential 1-bedroom apartment units under consideration and the Design Guidelines.

Demand Scenario	Residential Water Demand	Commercial Water Demand	Total Water Demand
	(L/S)	(L/S)	(L/S)
Average Day	2.42	4.31	6.74
Maximum Day	6.06	4.46	10.53
Peak Hour	13.33	4.84	18.17

Table 3-2: Theoretical Water Demands

3.3 **Proposed Watermain Sizing and Roughness**

The overall watermain layout for the subject properties is shown in the Servicing Plan (Overall Servicing). Table 3-3 summarizes the watermain roughness coefficients presented in Section 4.2.12 of the Design Guidelines. The internal pipe diameters were modelled based on Section 4.3.5 of the Design Guidelines and are summarized in Table 3-4.

Table 3-3: Watermain Roughness Coefficients

Watermain Diameter	C-Factor
150 mm	100
200 to 250 mm	110
300 to 600 mm	120

Table 3-4: Watermain Internal Diameters

Nominal Diameter	Inside Diameter
150 mm	155 mm
200 mm	204 mm
300 mm	297 mm

3.4 Fire Flow Requirements

3.4.1 General

In terms of required fire flow (RFF), the Fire Underwriters Survey (FUS) method shall be used for any public or private site where watermains and fire hydrants are being designed. Hence, the required fire flow (RFF) for the site was calculated using the FUS (2020) method.

3.4.2 Required Fire Flow

The required fire flow (RFF) per the FUS (2020) was calculated based on the townhouse size, properties, exposure to adjacent units and Appendix I of TB-2018-02.

Based on the proposed layout for the subdivision, the critical RFF was calculated to be 217 L/s at TH Model 5 as presented in Appendix D1:

Critical Fire Area (TH Model 5): One (1) proposed block of seven (7) townhouse units adjacent to the backs of the existing properties on Navan Road.

It is also noted that the RFFs for the critical fire areas in the private site plans (Blocks 14, 15, 16, and 17) were calculated to ensure the proposed servicing can provide adequate fire protection to the future Site Plans. The highest RFF was found to be 250 L/s, belonging to Block 17. Thus, the 15,000 L/min (250 L/s) boundary conditions provided by the City (refer to Table 2-6 and 2-7) were used to account for the future site plan applications.

3.5 Water Servicing and Boundary Conditions

3.5.1 Water Servicing

The proposed water servicing for the Navan Road development will consist of a local 203 mm diameter watermain loop within the subdivision as illustrated in the Servicing Plan (Overall Servicing). The 203 mm diameter watermain loop for the subdivision will connect to the existing 305 mm diameter watermains at the two (2) proposed connection locations:

- the existing Pagé Road 305 mm diameter watermain which will be extended via a 203 mm diameter watermain through the cul-de-sac on Pagé Road and along Brian Coburn Boulevard; and
- the existing Navan Road 305 mm diameter watermain, located west of the intersection between Navan Road and Pagé Road.

The 150 mm diameter watermain for the townhouses in Block 1 will connect to the existing 305 mm diameter watermain on Pagé Road and extend along Stompin' Tom Lane.

3.5.2 Fire Protection

Fire protection to the subdivision is anticipated to be achieved by six (6) on-site hydrants and the existing hydrants on Pagé Road and Navan Road. As shown in the Servicing Plan, the on-site hydrants will be located along the 203 mm diameter watermain loop and along the 150 mm diameter watermain on Stompin' Tom Lane.

Hydrant spacing is in accordance with ISTB-2018-02, which states that the aggregated fire flow capacity of all fire hydrants within 150 m of a building shall not be less than the required fire flow of the building. Furthermore, ISTB-2018-02 highlights that the maximum capacity of fire flow for a hydrant is 95 L/s if the hydrant is within 75 m of a building. For hydrants located between 75 to 150 m from a structure, the hydrant flow capacity shall be assumed as 63 L/s.

Fire protection for the private site plans (Blocks 14, 15, 16, and 17) will be detailed as part of their respective Site Plan Applications. For the purposes of this report, it will be demonstrated that the proposed watermains are anticipated to have sufficient flow for fire protection of the subdivision while considering the future detailed design of the four (4) Site Plan blocks.

2.5.3 Boundary conditions

The performance of the proposed water distribution system for the subject properties was evaluated under various domestic demands and fire flow conditions using the hydraulic boundary conditions provided by the City (refer to Appendix D3 for a copy of the City correspondence). New boundary conditions were provided for the updated water demands generated by the additional basement apartment units being considered for the proposed subdivision. Tables 3-5 and 3-6 summarize the hydraulic boundary conditions received from the City that were used in the Hydraulic Network Analysis (HNA).

Demand Scenarios	Head (m)
Peak Hour	127.0
Maximum Day + Fire Flow #3 14,000 L/min (233 L/s)	124.9
Maximum Day + Fire Flow #4 15,000 L/min (250 L/s)	124.4
Maximum Pressure Check	130.7

Table 3-5: Hydraulic Boundary Conditions at Connection-1 on Pagé Road

Demand Scenarios	Head (m)
Peak Hour	126.8
Maximum Day + Fire Flow #3 14,000 L/min (233 L/s)	122.7
Maximum Day + Fire Flow #4 15,000 L/min (250 L/s)	121.9
Maximum Pressure Check	130.7

Table 3-6: Hydraulic Boundary Conditions at Connection-2 on Navan Road

3.6 Simulation Results

A HNA was carried out to assess the proposed water servicing. Boundary conditions were provided by the City (Appendix D3) and used in this analysis. Simulations were carried out under peak hour demand, maximum day demand plus fire flow, and maximum pressure conditions.

3.6.1 Peak Hour

The peak hour demand shown in Table 3-2 was distributed throughout the nodes within the site. Using the boundary conditions shown in Table 3-5 and Table 3-6, the simulation results found the minimum pressure on site to be 401 kPa (58.2 psi) as shown in Appendix D4. Based on the simulation results, the minimum pressure criterion of 276 kPa (40 psi) is anticipated to be met everywhere on this site.

3.6.2 Maximum Day Plus Fire Flow

To ensure adequate fire protection, the maximum day demand shown in Table 3-2 was analyzed simultaneously with the fire flow. The simulation was conducted using the boundary conditions presented in Table 3-5 and Table 3-6.

The fire flow simulation was carried out by allowing WaterCAD® to calculate the maximum fire flow that can be drawn from each node without allowing any part of the system to experience pressures less than 140 kPa (20 psi). Using the 15,000 L/min (250 L/s) boundary condition provided by the City (refer to Table 3-5 and 3-6), the system is expected to deliver a minimum of 13,000 (217 L/s) within the site, which is the highest duplex townhouse block requirement. This demonstrates that the fire flow requirements for all townhouse units within the subdivision can be met. Hydrant node H-12 is expected to deliver a minimum of 7,800 L/min (130 L/s), and the existing fire hydrants on Pagé Road will provide the required fire flow of 167 L/s for Block 1. It is noted that the boundary conditions used in this scenario are conservative for the subdivision itself but are simultaneously accounting for the future site plan applications. The results from this assessment show that the future site plan fire flow requirement (250 L/s max.) can be met with the proposed servicing.

3.6.3 Maximum HGL

The Design Guidelines require that a high-pressure check (maximum hydraulic grade elevation) be performed on the proposed system to ensure that the maximum pressure constraint of 552 kPa (80 psi) is not exceeded. Based on a zero (0 L/s) demand condition and corresponding boundary conditions (refer to Table 3-5 and Table 3-6), a maximum pressure of 471 kPa (68.3 psi) is expected (refer to Appendix D6 model output results). These values are below the maximum pressure constraint of 552 kPa (80 psi), therefore pressure reducing valves (PRVs) are not anticipated to be required.

3.7 Water Age Analysis

Water quality degradation is often a function of water age within distribution systems and can be exacerbated during initial phases of development given that watermains are commissioned in advance of full occupancy.

East Ridge Orleans Subdivision is a ± 5.31 ha subdivision with 67 row townhouse units that will warrant the construction of local 150 mm diameter watermains (± 74.0 m in length), mostly 200 mm diameter watermains (± 726.0 m in length), and a section of 300 mm diameter watermain (± 19 m in length). These watermains will provide supply to East Ridge Orleans Subdivision during partial and full occupancy.

It should be noted that the analysis below was completed solely for the Subdivision, as the Site Plans would be approved and constructed at a later date. This approach is conservative as the local watermains supporting the Site Plans would marginally increase the volume of the commissioned watermains while the population of the mid-rise buildings would substantially increase the overall demand. Furthermore, as discussed in section 3.2, the developer is considering converting the basement of each row townhouse unit into 1-bedroom apartment units. This would further increase the overall demand and thus reduce the water age for every townhouse that is constructed.

The water age analysis that follows was carried out under an assumed three (3) growth scenarios that reflect phasing of development as follows:

- Initial phase where only 17 townhouse units (plus 17 basement apartment units) would be occupied within six (6) months (±3 units/month);
- Second phase where 17 additional townhouse units (plus 17 basement apartment units) would be occupied within six (6) months, 34 units in total; and
- Full build-out of East Ridge Orleans Subdivision where all 67 townhouse units (plus 67 basement apartment units) are occupied.

List of assumptions used in the water age analysis is as follows:

 Domestic demand of 200 L/capita per day, reflecting a typical winter demand (excluding outside water usage); however, should occupancy be initiated during the summer period, the outside water usage could well be in the order of 1,049 L per single unit which would improve water age; and • All 150, 200 mm, and 300 mm diameter watermains part of East Ridge Orleans Subdivision are commissioned on day one.

Based on the calculations shown in Appendix D7, the overall volume of the proposed 150 mm, 200 mm, and 300 mm diameter watermains is 26.44 m³. Based on other water age analysis completed by JLR for subdivision located outside of the greenbelt, the City had indicated that a 3-day travelling time was expected from the Lemieux WTP to the given subdivisions. Therefore, the desktop calculations for the above-noted three (3) growth scenarios have maintained the 3-day travelling time. Results are as follows:

- An overall water age of 6.0 days was estimated (including the 3-day travelling time) once 17-unit are occupied based on a daily theoretical demand of 9.2 m³;
- An overall water age of 4.5 days was estimated (including the 3-day travelling time) once 34-unit are occupied based on a daily theoretical demand of 18.4 m3; and
- An overall water age of 3.8 days was estimated (including the 3-day travelling time) under full build-out of East Ridge Orleans Subdivision (67 units) based on a daily theoretical demand of 36.2 m³.

Based on the above calculations, once 17 row townhouse units (plus basement apartment units) are occupied, water age will be below the maximum 8-days per the Guidelines. The maximum water age design target of 8-days was applied in previous subdivisions that have similar components as East Ridge Orleans Subdivision. As noted above, it was assumed that the travel time from the Lemieux Water Treatment Plant to the East Ridge Orleans Subdivision is 3 days, as per the assumption from previous subdivisions. Given that chloramination is used, the City of Ottawa's web site states the following:

"Chloramine is a more stable and persistent disinfectant. It preserves the quality of the purified water as it travels through the City's large and expanding water distribution system".

The above calculation will be updated once the occupancy plan is developed by the Client based on their sales.

3.8 Water Servicing Conclusions

Based on the water simulation results, the proposed subdivision can be serviced by the 203 mm diameter watermain loop and the 150 mm diameter watermain illustrated in the Servicing Plan. Simulation results under peak hour demand and maximum hydraulic grade line (HGL) show that the pressure requirements listed in the Design Guidelines were achieved. Furthermore, fire flow requirements can be met for the site, noting that water servicing and fire protection for the Site Plans (Blocks 14, 15, 16 and 17) will be detailed as part of their respective site plan applications.

4.0 Wastewater Servicing

4.1 Background

East Urban Community Infrastructure Servicing Study Update (EUC ISSU, Stantec 2005)

The subject properties are tributary to a proposed sanitary sewer that will be part of the Navan Road right-of-way (ROW). The proposed system is intended to flow in a southeasterly direction, bypassing Pagé Road, and ultimately discharging into the existing Renaud Road 600 mm diameter trunk sanitary sewer. From that point, wastewater flows will be conveyed in a southwesterly direction by the Renaud Road 600 mm diameter trunk sanitary sewer until discharging to the Forrest Valley Pump Station and pumped to the Forest Valley Trunk sewer.

The subject properties are part of two tributary areas denoted in the EUC ISSU as Area 13A and 13B. Appendix E1 contains a copy of the overall sanitary drainage plan from the EUC ISSU highlighting Area 13A and 13B.

<u>Area 13A:</u>

Based on the design sheet included in the EUC ISSU (Appendix E1), the subject properties are part of the 6.60 ha that forms Area 13A and tributary to the sewer reach identified as MH13A to MH13, spanning from Pagé Road to Renaud Road as per the EUC ISSU Design Sheet. A copy of this design sheet is attached to Appendix E1.

<u>Area 13B:</u>

Based on the design sheet included in the EUC ISSU (Appendix E1), the subject properties are also part of the 10.50 ha that forms Area 13B and tributary to the sewer reach identified as MH13B to MH13A, spanning from the subject properties' entrance to Pagé Road.

The following are key highlights from the approved Functional Servicing Report for this site dated February 2023:

- The existing Renaud Road trunk sanitary sewer at Navan Road has an invert of 77.17 m and obvert of 77.77 m.
- There are two (2) existing forcemains along Pagé Road (±157.6 m) with top of casing elevations of ±76.69 m that would need to be crossed to extend sanitary servicing along Navan Road. A contingency plan will be required for crossing the two existing forcemains.
- There is an existing 250 mm diameter sanitary sewer along Pagé Road that flows in a southerly direction from Navan Road to Renaud Road which was not part of the EUC ISSU Design. From the background documents provided the existing sanitary sewer has a south invert of 78.02 m at existing MH 10 at the Pagé and Navan Road intersection as shown in the Servicing Plan.

4.2 Proposed Sanitary Sewer System

The proposed sanitary sewers were agreed upon in the Functional Servicing Report for this site dated February 2023. Within the subject properties and along Navan Road were conceptually sized in accordance with the Ottawa Sewer Design Guidelines ((OSDG) - (October 2012)) and associated Technical Bulletins.

The proposed sanitary sewers have also been designed to accommodate any catchment areas identified within the EUC ISSU Report (Stantec, 2005) as well as the future Navan Road widening.

Key design parameters reflecting the revised sanitary parameters have been summarized in Table 4-1 below:

Design Criteria	Design Value	Reference
Residential average flow	280 L per capita/day	ISTB-2018-01
Residential peaking factor	Harmon Formula x 0.8	City Section 4.4.1
Commercial average flow	28,000 L/gross ha/day	ISTB-2018-01
ICI peaking factor (1)	1.0/1.5	ISTB-2018-01
Infiltration Allowance 0.05 L/s/ha (dry I/I) 0.28 L/s/ha (wet I/I)	0.33 L/s/ha	ISTB-2018-01
Minimum velocity	0.6 m/s	OSDG Section 6.1.2.2
Maximum velocity	3.0 m/s	OSDG Section 6.1.2.2
Manning Roughness Coefficient	0.013	OSDG Section 6.1.8.2
Minimum allowable slopes	Varies	OSDG Table 6.2, Section 6.1.2.2

4.3 Theoretical Sanitary Peak Flow

Wastewater flows from the subdivision were estimated based on the draft plan and design criteria from Table 4-1. Although the adjacent site plans will be submitted as separate applications, they will still be serviced via the subdivision infrastructure therefore their domestic demands were also accounted for. Based on this design criteria, a total combined peak wastewater flow of 13.67 L/s (Navan) + 0.59 L/s (Pagé) = 14.26 L/s was estimated. Note that a peak design flow of 4 L/s was used for the future gas station site plan.

This peak wastewater flow of 14.26 L/s represents part of the overall flows allocated for Areas 13B and 13A, which are shown as 10.50 ha and 6.60 ha in the EUC ISSU sanitary design sheet (Appendix E1).

Therefore, when the areas included in Area 13A (6.60 ha) as shown in the EUC ISSU, are combined with the flows from Area 13B (10.50 ha) wastewater flows of 20.91 L/s were estimated to discharge southeasterly from existing MH 10 towards the Renaud Road 600 mm diameter trunk sanitary sewer. Although, the calculated peak flow of 20.91 L/s is greater that the allocated peak flow of 19.36 L/s (11.33 L/s from 13A + 8.03 L/s from 13B) as shown in the EUC ISSU design sheet, the flow from the EUC ISSU was based on 350 L/cap/day. Given the updated design parameters of 280 L/cap/day prescribed in ISTB 2018-03 from the previous 350 L/cap/day, and the existing 250 mm sanitary sewer system on Pagé Road currently has a free-flowing capacity of 29.0 L/s (250mm diameter sewer with an As-Constructed slope of 0.74%), it is expected that this sewer will have adequate capacity to accommodate the flows generated from the subject site. The total combined flows stated above of 20.91 L/s. Based on the existing design sheet information, there is sufficient capacity in the downstream pipe from Navan to Renaud.

4.4 Wastewater Servicing Conclusions

The subject properties will be serviced by a local sanitary system consisting of 200 mm diameter sewers discharging to two locations i) Navan Road and ii) Pagé Road (refer to Servicing Plan).

The Navan Road system will discharge into an off-site 200 mm diameter sewer that will be tributary to the existing 250 mm diameter sanitary sewer located along Pagé Road east of Navan Road. The Pagé Road system will be discharged into an existing 250 mm diameter sanitary sewer located along Pagé Road. Both systems merging at the Pagé and Navan intersection and ultimately tributary to the Renaud Road trunk sewer. The theoretical peak wastewater flows of 13.67 L/s and 0.59 L/s were calculated based on the design criteria described in the Ottawa Sewer Design Guidelines and associated Technical Bulletins as shown in the Design Sheet included in Appendix E.

5.0 Storm Servicing and Stormwater Management

5.1 Existing Conditions and Background

The subject property is bounded on three (3) frontages; Navan Road, Pagé Road and Brian Coburn Boulevard. As noted in Section 1.3, short sections of storm sewers are existing on Navan Road and Brian Coburn Boulevard. These storm sewers have limited capacities and were not sized for the subject properties.

There are no existing storm sewers fronting the properties that have capacity to accommodate the subject properties. However, storm servicing and stormwater management for the subject properties have been reviewed as part of the East Urban Community Infrastructure Servicing Study Update (EUC ISSU, Stantec 2005). A summary of the EUC ISSU that pertains with the properties follows:

East Urban Community Infrastructure Servicing Study Update (Stantec, 2005)

The subject properties are tributary to a proposed storm sewer system that will be part of the Navan Road right-of-way (ROW). The proposed storm sewer system is intended to flow in a southeasterly direction, past the Pagé Road intersection, and to ultimately connect to the existing Renaud Road 1350 mm diameter trunk storm sewer. From that point, the captured storm sewer flows will be conveyed in a southwesterly direction by the Renaud Road 1350 mm diameter trunk storm sewer, pass the Pagé Road intersection until discharging to an existing end-of-pipe facility referred to as Pond #3, which in turn outlets to Mud Creek. This facility was designed to provide an enhanced protection level (80% total suspended solids removal), erosion control as well as providing quantity storage for its serviced area.

The minor system flow allowance for the subject properties should be set based on the design criteria developed as part of the EUC ISSU. The subject properties are within the drainage area for Pond 3 which requires control in the minor system to 85 L/s/ha and to the 1:10 year event on arterial roads, including Navan Road.

Mud Creek Cumulative Impact Study (Stantec, May 2020)

Pond #3 in the East Urban Community discharges into Mud Creek and therefore the development contributes flows to Mud Creek. Historical land use alterations and land development within the Mud Creek watershed has led to erosion of stream bed and bank materials as evidenced by stream bank instabilities. The Mud Creek Cumulative Impact Study completed a cumulative

impacts assessment for upper Mud Creek whereby the potential impacts of foreseeable public and private developments were considered. The study recommended the implementation of a series of restoration measures in four locations and Pond #3 is upstream of two of these locations, Sites #12 and #13, which are approximately 475 m in length.

The implementation plan for the restoration includes establishing an approach to funding/cost sharing for the natural inventories, design, construction, and post-construction monitoring activities. The major funding partners will include the city, land developers and the National Capital Commission. As urbanization of lands tributary to some of the erosion works occur, the Draft Condition that will be formulated by the City should reference the mechanism that they have, or will, established to cost share the length of erosion works that the subject site will contribute while accounting the site's imperviousness.

5.2 Design Criteria

Storm and stormwater management servicing for the East Ridge Orleans Subdivision was developed in accordance with the 2012 Ottawa Sewer Design Guidelines (OSDG) and the subsequent Technical Bulletin PIEDTB-2016-01. These two documents are herein referred to as the Design Guidelines in this section. A summary of the key storm and stormwater management criteria follows:

- Control minor system flows to the allowable release rates of 85L/s/ha and adjoining rear yard flows from existing properties along Page Road and Navan Road controlled at 43 L/s/ha at the existing manhole at the intersection of Navan Road and Renaud Road;
- Proposed Storm sewers are designed to convey under free flow conditions the 1:2-year storm event and the 1:10-year peak flows on Navan Road as a minimum using the Rational Method and using the regressions derived from Intensity-Duration-Frequency (IDF) equations as per the Design Guidelines;
- Proposed ICDs throughout the site are designed to capture the 85 L/s/ha, per discussions with the city, as a deviation from the city of Ottawa sewer Design Guideline requiring the 1:2-year storm event to be captured.
- Provide a freeboard in the sewer network to the underside of footing (USF) of 300 mm during the 1:100-year storm where weeping tile connections are present;
- The runoff coefficients (C-factors) for the residential development were based on the maximum lot coverage permitted by the proposed zoning, as per the Design Guidelines. C-factors for non-residential land uses to be calculated based on the ratio of pervious and impervious surfaces depicted on proposed site plans;
- Minimum roadway profile grades at 0.5%;
- Roadway cross-fall of 3% was used for all streets;
- Minimum roadway slope of 0.1% from crest-to-crest for overland flow route;
- Minimum rear yard slope in the absence of perforated pipe system of 1.5% along with swale side slopes of 3 horizontal to 1 vertical;
- Maximum street ponding depth of 350 mm (static and dynamic) as per the Design Guidelines and maximum depth of rear yard flow to be 300 mm;
- Minimum vertical clearance of 0.15 m between the spill elevation on the street and the finished grade (garage elevation);
- Minimum vertical clearance of 0.30 m between the rear yard spill elevation and the ground elevation at the building in the rear yards;

- During the Climate Change event, the street ponding is not to reach the lowest building opening while the storm HGL must remain at or below the USF except for the HGLs on Stompin' Tom Lane that must remain below the surface since the foundation drain connections are downstream of the inline ICD;
- The product of the velocity and depth of major system flows on streets during the 1:100year design storm event is not to exceed 0.60 m²/s; and,
- Major system flows, up to and including the 1:100-year design storm event, are contained within the site using the street sags and spillover pond facility.
- The stormwater management system on each of the individual Site Plans is to detain the 1:100-year flows while releasing at a maximum peak flow rate equivalent to 85 L/s/ha therefore underground or rooftop storage will be required within the site plan parcels.
- Peak flows estimated based on an inlet time of ten (10) minutes, as per the Technical Bulletin ISDTB-2012-4.
- Quality control will be accommodated by Pond #3 to meet an MECP Enhanced Level of Protection (80% TSS removal).
- Provide measures to ensure that site preparation and construction is in accordance with the current Best Management Practices for Erosion and Sediment Control.
- Per the draft plan conditions, a 1.5 m black vinyl-coated chain link fence is required for the North and South boundaries of Block 13.

5.3 Proposed Stormwater Management Approach

5.3.1 Boundary Condition

It is proposed to incorporate storm sewers along Navan Road to create a connection point to the existing minor storm sewer system. The connection point will be located approximately 160 meters south-west of the intersection of Navan Road and Page Road. The boundary condition of the storm sewer on Navan Road is set as the 1:100-year HGL specified for the Trunk Storm Sewer on Renaud Road in the EUC ISSU. The elevation specified at MH603 is estimated from the report at 77.5 m. It should be noted that this elevation is below the outlet from the subject parcels and therefore does not have significant impact on the site servicing.

5.3.2 Groundwater Table

A geotechnical investigation has been done to determine the groundwater levels in the vicinity of the pond. BH-5 is located within the pond block and provides the groundwater level in the area of the pond. The geotechnical investigation recorded groundwater levels from August 2nd 2023 to August 7th 2024. Below are the readings of the GWL at BH-5 between these dates with the highest recorded reading being 81.28 m.

Date	Water Elevation (m)
June 19 th 2021	80.47
August 2 nd 2023	80.53
September 21 st 2023	80.47

Table 5-1: Groundwater E	levations
--------------------------	-----------

Site Servicing Report 2983, 3053 and 3079 Navan Road & 2690 Pagé Road, Ottawa, Ontario

Date	Water Elevation (m)
October 6 th 2023	80.43
October 19 th 2023	80.45
November 6 th 2023	80.56
November 23 rd 2023	80.79
December 19th 2023	81.18
January 29 th 2024	81.25
February 22 nd 2024	81.24
March 18 th 2024	81.25
April 17 th 2024	81.28
May 13 th 2024	81.28
June 14 th 2024	81.23
July 18 th 2024	81.16
August 7 th 2024	81.11

5.3.3 Allowable Release Rate

The method to determine the allowable peak flow is based on multiplying the total drainage area tributary to the proposed development by the controlled release rate of 85 L/s/ha (in accordance with the EUC ISSU). As shown in Figure 2, the total drainage area of the development consists of the following:

- 1) The internal tributary drainage area is 5.22 ha. Which is the total site area of 5.28 ha with a small area of 0.06 ha removed that will sheet flow uncontrolled to Navan Road. The internal tributary drainage area is 5.22 ha and can be accounted towards the allowable release rate at 85 L/s/ha.
- 2) In addition to the internal drainage area, the area from existing abutting properties on Navan Road (0.2 ha) and Pagé Road (1.14 ha) which currently drain towards the proposed development and will be captured via the proposed stormwater system within this new development. This external tributary drainage area of 1.34 ha drains to the internal development at a current rate with a C equivalent to 0.2, which translates to a pre-development flow of 43 L/s/ha.

The total allowable release rate from the site is therefore a combination of 5.22 ha at 85 L/s/ha (444 L/s) and 1.34 ha at 43 L/s/ha (58 L/s), for a total allowable release rate of 502 L/s.



cted and may	DESIGN:	MM	
scribed work	DRAWN: CHECKED:	TR	
s Limited.	JLR #:	29899-002	FIGURE 2

5.4 Proposed Minor System Servicing

5.4.1 Runoff Coefficients (C-Factors)

Runoff coefficients (C-Factors) were calculated based on the weighted product between the percentages of the pervious and impervious areas. A sample runoff coefficient calculation based on zoning setbacks and maximum driveway widths was carried out. To better reflect the differences in impervious surfaces within the subdivision, the overall C-Factor was broken down by assigning a higher C-Factor to the front areas that includes the roadways and driveways and a lesser C-Factor to the rear yard areas. On this basis, C-Factors used in the Rational Method calculations have been summarized in Table 5-2: Design Runoff Coefficientsbelow (refer to Appendix G6 for the Runoff Coefficient calculations). Runoff coefficients for the remaining drainage areas were obtained from the EUC ISSU (Stantec, 2005). Refer to Appendix G5 for the EUC ISSU Storm Drainage Area Plan and Design Sheet.

Scenario	Runoff Coefficient
Rear Yards – Townhouse Units Only	0.61
Front Yards and ROW	0.66
Residential and Commercial Site	0.77
Plans (Blocks 14, 15 and 17)	0.77
Commercial Site Plan (Block 16)	0.90
Park Block (Block 7)	0.40
Spillover Pond Block (Block 13)	0.83
Abutting Properties on Navan Road	0.30
and Pagé Road	0.30

Table 5-2: Design Runoff Coefficients

5.4.2 Minor System Servicing

The proposed storm sewers of Navan were sized using the Rational Method based on the C-Factors presented in Table 5-1 above. The rainfall intensities used in the Rational Method was based on the rainfall regression equations presented in Section 5.4.2 of the OSDG along with an inlet time of ten (10) minutes at the upstream end of the system. The Rational Method Storm Sewer Design Sheet is included in Appendix 'F', while the Storm Drainage Plans included in the drawing set provide details associated with the storm drainage areas.

5.4.3 Inlet Control Devices

Storm servicing for Navan was developed to limit all flows transmitted to the storm sewers and meet the 0.35 m criterion as the maximum street ponding depth requirement. To achieve this criterion, servicing was developed using ICDs at inlets to the minor system.

The ICDs were selected based on the dynamic model head differential between the maximum HGL at the grate and the higher of the geodetic elevation of the centroid of the ICD or the downstream HGL, in each catch basin lead. Each ICD was sized to transmit the targeted peak flow of 85 L/s/ha for the internal proposed area and 43 L/s/ha for the adjacent existing areas, draining into the site, based on the calculated water level depth at the top of grate. When water rises above the top of grate in the roadway sag, flows transmitted to the storm sewers will marginally increase due to the increase in the hydraulic head. Based on the range of flows and hydraulic heads at each catch basin, the following types of ICDs are proposed:

- IPEX MHF Tempest Type A;
- IPEX MHF Tempest Type C;
- IPEX MHF Tempest Type D;
- Vortex ICD 65;
- Vortex ICD 80;
- Vortex ICD 95;
- Vortex ICD 100;
- Vortex ICD 105;

Note that for Stompin' Tom Lane the street catchbasins interconnected ICD was sized to control to the 1:2 year storm event rather than the allowable 85 L/s/ha as additional underground storage is provided.

Comprehensive ICD Tables referred to as the Catch Basin Table were prepared and are included in Appendix 'G2'. The Catch Basin Tables show specific information including top of grate elevation, pipe size and invert, the restricted capture rate and ICD type. The information shown on the Catch Basin Tables was extracted and shown on Drawing D1. In addition, ICD curves have been included in Appendix G8 for the ICDs listed above.

5.4.4 Water Quality

The subject properties are contained within the catchment of Pond #3 in the East Urban Community, which provides water quality control for the receiving runoff. The Certificate of Approval (C of A) was issued for the pond in 2001 and is attached in Appendix G7. The C of A were amended for various subdivision developments in 2011 and following the EUC Stormwater Management Facility #3 Design Brief Update (Stantec 2005). The latest sizing information for the pond is reported in the 2005 Design Brief. The Pond is reported to have been sized to provide 70% TSS removal water quality treatment for 180.66 ha of land at a weighted percentage imperviousness of 45.3% (see extract in Appendix G7).

The level of imperviousness of the proposed development is increased from that in the 2005 Design Brief Update. The combined catchments going to the downstream end of Navan Road had an average imperviousness of 40% in 2005 (see extract in Appendix G7) across 17.97 ha. The average imperviousness with the development across the 17.97 ha is 57%. 17.97 ha is 10% of the total area to the pond. A 17% increase in imperviousness across 10% of the area, increases the overall imperviousness by 1.7%, therefore the development increases the weighted percentage of imperviousness of the overall catchment to the pond from 45.3% to 47.0%. The sizing implications of such a change are compared in Table 5-3 below.

Parameter	Value from 2005 Design Brief	Value incorporating new developments
Total Contributing Area (ha)	180.66 ha	180.66 ha
Imperviousness of Contributing Area (%)	45.3%	47.0%
Unit Area Storage Volume Requirements as per Table 3.2 of the MOE SWMPD	100.3 m³/ha	102.0 m³/ha
Required Total Water Quality Volume	18,113 m³	18,440 m³
Required Permanent Pool Volume	10,887 m³	11,210 m³
Permanent Pool Volume Provided (Total above sediment)	18,986 m³	18,986 m³
Required Extended Detention Volume (40m ³ /ha)	7,226 m ³	7,226 m³
Extended Detention Volume Provided	22,873 m ³	22,873 m³

Table 5-3: Water Quality Volumes Comparison

From the analysis summarized in Table 5-3, the pond facility still has sufficient permanent pool volume capacity to provide water quality treatment for the level of development proposed. The increase in volume required, 1,323 m³, is 4% of the residual capacity of the pond, therefore, water quality control is provided.

In May 2020, Stantec prepared a Mud Creek Cumulative Impact Study, which included water quality modelling for the Mud Creek subwatershed, which encompasses the proposed development site. The proposed site development was included in the future modelling as being 100% commercial, at 100% imperviousness, with no Low Impact Development (LID) or other water quality controls applicable to the site. Pond #3 was identified in the report as providing 80% TSS removal and no recommendations were made to require additional water quality controls on the development area. Given that the weighted average imperviousness for the Site is less than what it had been assumed (100%), Pond #3 will provide the required water quality treatment for the site. Extracts from the 2020 draft report are included in Appendix G7.

5.5 Changes in Stormwater Management Approach

The following changes in stormwater management approach have been incorporated into the design since February 2023:

• As a result of additional survey, grading changes have led to some of the site area being considered as uncontrolled and part of the Navan Road existing rear yard drainage area being redirected away from the site. This has reduced to the total area from 7.15 ha to 6.55 ha. Consequently, the allowable release rate from the site has reduced from 530 L/s to 502 L/s.

- The grading changes have resulted in the need for rear-yard storage for Block 9 to prevent rear yard uncontrolled site flow discharging directly off site. Storage has been provided by using a 900 mm pipe located along the rear of the properties.
- The grading changes have resulted in the redirection of Block 11 rear-yard flows between Block 11 and Block 12 from the original overland flow route between Block 10 and Block 11.
- Updated survey points along existing rear-yard areas for properties fronting Page Road have identified that a portion of flows tributary the rear-yard swale along Blocks 2,3 and 4 needed to be redirected to Block 14. As a result, the swale cross-section area has been reduced.
- New information on the existing infrastructure present at the intersection of Navan Road and Page Road has created a need to transition to a double barrel configuration of smaller size from a single barrel configuration.
- The minor system connection for Stompin' Tom Lane storm sewers has been redirected into the subdivision rather than into the Page Road sewers, which has triggered the requirement for storage and controlled release of flows from Stompin' Tom Lane.

5.6 Stormwater Management Modelling Approach

5.6.1 Dual Drainage Model

The analysis of both major and minor drainage systems was carried out to demonstrate their compliance with respect to the design criteria described in Section 5.2. The performance of the major overland system and minor storm sewer system was analyzed with PCSWMM. This software is a dynamic model which allows both hydrologic and hydraulic components to be simulated in the same platform and allows the simulation of the interaction between the major and minor systems. The PCSWMM software platform was used to:

- Generate the surface runoff hydrograph for each sub-area under various recurrences.
- Subdivide each inflow hydrograph into its minor and major system components based on the proposed inlet capture rates and roadway sag storage.
- Assess cascading, if any, and carry out dynamic routing of storm flows to determine flow depths along the roadways. As previously stated, the maximum major overland flow depths along the subdivision's roadways are to be limited to 350 mm or less, as per Technical Bulletin PIEDTB-2016-01.
- Demonstrate that the HGL along the storm sewers during the 1:100-year event without sedimentation is 300 mm below the basement's USFs.

5.6.2 Integration of the Proposed Pond

To evaluate the design of the proposed spillover pond Stormwater Management Facility, a storage node was implemented to act as the pond. The PCSWMM model requires a stage-area curve to represent storage. The curve was created from the contour lines resulting from the CAD grading. The pond will detain runoff from up to the 1:100-year event and will have a controlled release to the downstream sewer segment exiting the site. The pond's-controlled rate will be such to achieve the overall allowable release rate for the site when combined with the minor system flows.

5.6.3 Simulation of Street Segments

Flow directed to a street segment is split at the major system node representing the low point in the street sag; flows are broken down into minor and major system components using an outlet rating curve representing the ICD capture and assigning the minor system flow directly into the minor conduit while maintaining the major system flows on the surface conduit. Flow through the outlet link is calculated based on the HGL above the elevation of the ICD and its rated capacity under various water surface elevations. The ICD rating curves are those provided by the manufacturer.

The storage in roadway sag is included in the model as being inherent within the major system conduits. The dynamic capability of PCSWMM means that the static and any dynamic flow is calculated in the model to provide one depth value at each sag location. The low points and high points in the street conduits are taken from the Civil 3D surface.

The subdivision's grading was developed with roadway static storage depths to maximize detention and attenuation of major overland flows while those of lesser volume sags were designed to maximize the conveyance capability of the dynamic section of the cross-section during events where cascading occurs.

5.6.4 Adjoining Existing Areas

Abutting Properties on Navan Road and Pagé Road have their backyards sloping towards the subject site. The design of minor and major systems must therefore account for these flows.

The flows from the rear-yards along Page Road will drain into a proposed rear-yard swale leading to the downstream pond. The flows coming from these parcels were calculated based off the parameters in section 5.3.3. The resulting solution consists of designing a swale in three sections to account for the flows coming the rear yards of the existing parcels as well as the rear yards of the proposed series of townhomes backing onto the proposed swale.

The flows generated from the rear yards of existing lands along Navan Road will drain into rear yard catch basins strategically placed in low points to drain surrounding grassed areas. The flows collected in the structures will be redirected into the proposed minor system via ICDs to control the inflow rate of water from existing lands.

5.7 Modelling Parameters

5.7.1 Hydrological Parameters

The following parameters were used in the hydrologic component of PCSWMM:

- Areas and Imperviousness: Catchment ID and drainage areas used by PCSWMM match those shown on either Drawing DST or Figure G1 (Appendix G1). C-Factors reported in Section 5.4.1 were used to estimate PCSWMM's imperviousness.
- **Catchment Width**: The catchment width is approximately twice the length of the street segment through the subcatchment, in accordance with the OSDG for most catchments where there is an even split on the road. In some cases, the catchment width is the length of the road section if the catchment is all to one side of the road.
- **Manning's Roughness Coefficient**: Manning's Roughness Coefficients of 0.013 and 0.25 were used for the impervious and pervious surfaces, respectively which are consistent with the OSDG.
- **Horton Infiltration Parameters**: The Modified Horton method used in PCSWMM is compatible for both events where rainfall intensity exceeds the infiltration capacity and where the rainfall intensity is below the infiltration capacity.

The parameters used for this method are 76.2, 13.2, 4.14 and 7 representing the Maximum Infiltration Rate (mm/hr), Minimum Infiltration Rate (mm/hr), Decay Constant (1/hr) and Drying Time (days) respectively.

- Initial Abstraction: Initial Abstraction of 4.67 mm and 1.57 mm was used for the pervious and impervious surfaces respectively, consistent with the OSDG.
- 5.7.2 Simulation of Storm Distributions

The City of Ottawa requires that the performance of the minor and major systems be investigated under the 3-hour Chicago design storm. As such, 1:2-year, 1:5-year, 1:10-year, 1:25-year, 1:50-year, and 1:100-year 3-hour Chicago storms were evaluated. In addition, the standard 24-hour SCS and the 12-hour SCS storms were also evaluated to determine which storm is critical. The 12-hour SCS storm was found to be critical for the minor system HGL while the Chicago 3-hour storm was critical for the major overland flow system.

The climate change stress test event, which consists of the 100-year event plus 20%, was run for all three storm distributions. As per the requirements of the Ottawa Sewer Design Guidelines, historical storms were also assessed, including the July 1, 1979, storm, the August 4, 1988, storm and the August 8, 1996 storm.

5.7.3 Simulation of Park and Amenity Blocks

For the blocks 7 and 14 to 17 reserved for amenities, future residential and commercial, the model includes storage nodes for each connection into the subdivision minor system with an outlet link to restrict flow to the minor system to 85 L/s/ha. If the flows exceed 85 L/s/ha, then the storage node will detain the runoff over and above the release rate for the block. The allowable release rates in the 1:100-year event for the blocks are shown in Table 5-4.

Block	Area (ha)	Imperviousness (%)	Runoff Coefficient	Allowable release rate (m ³ /s)	1:100-year Storage Requirement (m³)
Block 7	0.20	28.57	0.4	0.017	33
Block 14+ 0.16ha subdivision parcel	0.72	60.00	0.62	0.049	170
Block 15	0.51	70.83	0.70	0.044	158
Block 16	0.82	94.6	0.86	0.068	296
Block 17	0.56	81.43	0.77	0.048	189

Table 5-4: Park and Amenity Block Release Rates and Storage

5.8 Storm Servicing Strategy

The proposed storm servicing strategy within the subject properties consists of a conventional storm sewer system on the municipal right-of-way (ROW). The storm sewers will be designed with capacity for the 1:2-year event but will only convey the capture of a peak flow rate of 85 L/s/ha. The proposed sewers have been designed to accommodate any catchment areas identified within the EUC ISSU Report (Stantec, 2005) as well as the future Navan Road widening. Refer to Drawing FDST for the Storm Drainage Plan and Appendix F for the Storm Design Sheets.

The storm sewer system will connect to new public sewers on Navan Road (refer to Drawing FSTM for Stormwater Servicing), which are to be designed to convey the 1:10 year event from Navan Road as well as the 1:2-year event from the remainder of the catchment area.

Major overland flow on the ROW within the subject properties, more than the 85 L/s/ha minor system capture, will be directed via a series of sags to a spillover pond facility. The pond facility will detain runoff from up to the 1:100-year event. The pond will have a controlled release into the downstream storm sewer system.

Blocks 14, 15 and 17, and the gas station block (Block 16) will detain on site the 1:100-year event and will discharge at a maximum allowable flow rate equivalent to 85 L/s/ha, plus 43 L/s/ha from external catchments, into the storm sewers in the ROW.

The 2690 Pagé Road parcel, which is directly on Pagé Road, will discharge into the site's conventional storm sewer network with capture at a maximum of 85 L/s/ha, plus 43 L/s/ha from external catchments. Major overland flow will be detained in the street sag in up to the 1:100-year event.

Flows from Stompin' Tom lane are being controlled in the minor system along the easement using a Vortex ICD 95. The ICD will be located at the upstream end of the 527-526 pipe. This will allow for weeping tile, foundation drain, connections along Stompin' Tom Lane to be connected downstream of the ICD.

Additional storage will be provided in the rear yards of Blocks 8 and 9 to ensure capture of the rear yard runoff and prevent spill to Navan Road. The additional storage will be achieved using a 900 mm pipe between CB101A and CB103B, and an ICD at the downstream end to control flows out of the rear yard system and into the minor system.

5.9 Simulation Results

This section presents the results of the simulation of the East Ridge Orleans Subdivision. The modelling includes servicing the future site plans, at a conceptual level.

The performance of the following systems was assessed under the build-out condition:

- The major overland system under extreme storm events (i.e., 1:100 year and climate change events) as per the OSDG; and
- The major overland system during the 1:2-year storm event and determine whether surface ponding is to occur.
- Appendices G3 and G4 provide Storm HGL analyses and Street Ponding Analyses respectively for a range of historical storms and interim conditions.

Note that when assessing reported results and areas there may be minor differences in results presented due to:

- Rounding in GIS areas if ten catchments are rounded up by 0.001 or up to 0.004, this can have a difference across the ten catchments of between 0.01 and 0.04 ha.
- Reporting timestep verses calculation time step the SWMM engine provides graphing of the results using the reporting timestep set by the modeler, which is different from the simulation calculation timestep. Results in the report below are extracted from PCSWMM in a way that extracts the result from the calculation timestep and may differ from results graphed in PCSWMM.

5.9.1 Low Point Ponding Analysis

The results at each of the low points, as generated by a 3-hour Chicago storm distribution, are presented below. Due to the capture rate of 85 L/s/ha being less than the 1:2-year rainfall event, there is ponding in the street sags in the 1:2-year event of up to 90 mm depth. The street ponding lasts for 21 minutes at the deepest location in the 1:2-year event and for 1.76 hours in the 1:100-year event. Table 5-5 shows the street ponding depths at the locations where the catchbasin manhole structures were utilized to convey the surface flow into storm sewer.

Low points correspond to Area IDs from the ponding plan Drawing SWM1.

Ponding Area ID	Top of Grate (m)	Maximum Static Depth	1:2-year Depth (mm)	1:5-year Depth (mm)	1:100-year Depth (mm)	Climate Change Depth (mm)
1A	85.37	90	60	100	180	210
1B	85.37	90	60	100	180	210
2	84.58	290	40	90	190	240
3	83.87	250	60	110	240	280
4	82.3	150	10	60	130	160
5	84.82	250	90	150	230	250
6	83.85	140	70	130	240	280
7	85.21	240	-	40	160	210

Table 5-5: Low Point Ponding Depths

The simulation results compiled in Table 5-4 shows that:

- There is 150 mm ponding in Ponding Area ID 4 and therefore no dynamic flow will occur in events up to and including the 1:100-year event from Ponding Area ID 4, which would spill to Navan Road, therefore all flows are detained on site;
- No ponding occurs on Stompin' Tom Lane (Low Point 7) in 1:2-year event;
- Maximum ponding depth of 240 mm during the 1:100-year event; and,
- In the climate change event, the peak ponding depth is below 280 mm.

5.9.2 Major System Flow

The major system overland flow route simulation results for the 3-hour Chicago storms are summarized in Table 5-6 below showing the values for Velocity x Depth where overland flow is present. All other storms as well as the velocity and depth used to calculate the values below are included in Appendix G4. The depth was obtained by multiplying the depth capacity ratio output from PCSWMM with the transect depth.

Table 5-6: Major System	Overland Flow Routes Ar	nalysis – Velocity	x Depth (3hr Chicago)
-------------------------	--------------------------------	--------------------	-----------------------

Street	U/S ID	D/S ID	1:2	1:5	1:10	1:25	1:50	1:100	Climate
Segment ID			year	year	year	year	year	year	Change
HP1-LP6	HP1	LP6							
HP1-MP8	HP1	MP8							
HP10-	HP10	LP5							
MP10									
HP12-LP7	HP12	LP7							
HP13-LP1	HP13	LP1					0.018	0.02	0.03
HP13-LP2	HP13	LP2					0.004	0.01	0.03
HP14-LP3	HP14	LP3							0.00
HP3-LP5	HP3	LP5							0.00
HP4-HP2	HP4	MajorNa							0.00
		vanRd							
HP4-LP1	HP4	LP1							0.00

Site Servicing Report 2983, 3053 and 3079 Navan Road & 2690 Pagé Road, Ottawa, Ontario

Street	U/S ID	D/S ID	1:2	1:5	1:10	1:25	1:50	1:100	Climate
Segment ID			year	year	year	year	year	year	Change
HP6-LP2	HP14	LP2							0.00
HP6-LP3	HP6	LP3							0.01
HP6-MP6	HP6	LP1							0.02
HP7-LP2	HP7	LP2				0.003	0.003	0.00	0.01
HP7-LP4	HP7	LP4				0.002	0.006	0.01	0.01
HP8-LP6	HP8	LP6							
HP8-MP7	HP8	LP3							
HP9-LP5	HP9	LP5							
HP9-MP8	HP3	MP8							0.00
HP9-MP9	HP9	LP6							
MP7_2-LP7	HP11	LP7							
MP8-LP4	MP8	LP4		0.003	0.004	0.006	0.008	0.01	0.01
RYSW1-	CB104C	CB104B					0.049	0.08	0.11
Swale_1									
RYSW1-	CB104B	CB104A					0.073	0.13	0.20
Swale_2									
RYSW1-	CB104A	CB104					0.092	0.17	0.26
Swale_3									
RY34	CB104	POND						0.05	0.15

Cascading flow only occurs through the street network in the events greater than the 1:2 year. In rainfall events where cascading flow does occur the velocity x depth of each of these major overland flow routes are under the allowable maximum of 0.6 m^2 /s and meeting design criteria for the events up to the 1:100-year design storm event.

5.9.3 Storm Sewer HGL Analysis

The storm sewer HGL under the ultimate servicing scenario is shown at each of the manhole nodes in Table 5-7. Where there is no Underside of Footing (USF) associated with the manhole a dash is shown in the table.

MH ID	USF Elevation (m)	Obvert Elevation (m)	1:100- year Event Max HGL (m)	Critical Freeboard (1:100-yr HGL or obvert) (m)	Climate Change Max HGL (m)	Climate Change Freeboard (m)
500	-	-	77.51	-	77.51	-
500A	-	-	77.6	-	77.6	-
501	-	-	77.79	-	77.79	-
501A	-	-	77.7	-	77.71	-
502	-	-	77.87	-	77.88	-
503	-	-	78.39	-	78.39	-
503A	-	-	77.97	-	77.97	-

J.L. Richards & Associates Limited

Site Servicing Report 2983, 3053 and 3079 Navan Road & 2690 Pagé Road, Ottawa, Ontario

MH ID	USF Elevation (m)	Obvert Elevation (m)	1:100- year Event Max HGL (m)	Critical Freeboard (1:100-yr HGL or obvert) (m)	Climate Change Max HGL (m)	Climate Change Freeboard (m)
504	-	-	78.75	-	78.76	-
CBMH2	-	-	79.53	-	79.54	-
508	81.33	79.98	79.61	1.35	79.62	1.35
509	81.33	80.02	79.71	1.31	79.72	1.31
510	81.87	80.37	79.8	1.50	79.81	1.50
511	-	-	80.27	-	80.28	-
512	-	-	80.92	-	80.93	-
514	83.16	81.35	81.07	1.81	81.08	1.81
516	-	-	83.53	-	83.53	-
517	-	-	83.7	-	83.7	-
522	-	-	80.21	-	80.22	-
524	83.77	81.55	80.75	2.22	80.76	2.22
525	-	-	81.18	-	81.18	-
526	-	-	81.46	-	81.47	-
*527	85.826	82.06	85.13	0.70	85.26	0.566
*528	85.306	82.38	85.13	0.18	85.26	0.046

The simulation results compiled in Table 5-7 shows that:

- *The HGLs at MH 527 and MH 528 tributary to Stompin' Tom Lane are controlled by the downstream inline ICD. The HGL at these manholes must only remain below the road surface elevation because of the weeping tile connection being downstream of the inline ICD. For this reason the freeboard at MH 527 and MH 528 is compared to the manhole TG elevation.
- All other nodes achieve HGLs with at least 300 mm freeboard to the underside of footing or pipe obvert, whichever is more critical, in the 1:100-year event with the smallest freeboard being 1.31m; and,
- All nodes maintain a clearance to the underside of footing in the climate change stress test event.

5.9.4 Spillover Pond Operation

The spillover pond was sized to contain major overland flow while releasing flows at a controlled rate to the minor system storage. Pond side slopes will be 3:1 and have been simulated using a stage-storage curve developed from the proposed grading surface. The pond has been sized to meet the OSDG requirements.

At the bottom of the pond there is a subdrain system with three inlets into the subdrain system which would allow the majority of water in the pond to drain. At the end of storm, the subdrain system will facilitate infiltration of the water held at the bottom of the pond into the subdrain system and enable drying of the soil.

A geotechnical report entitled "Geotechnical Investigation of the Proposed Residential Development 2983, 3053, and 3079 Navan Road Ottawa, Ontario" was prepared by EXP. The borehole data provided in this report specifies that the groundwater table at the proposed spillover pond block (Block 13) is at an elevation of 80.46 meters. As shown in the Pond Drawing (Drawing POND), the bottom of the pond at an elevation of 81.32 is 0.04 metres above the groundwater table per the most critical groundwater readings recorded on April 17th, 2024, and May 13th 2024 and as shown in Table 5-1above. The 0.04 metre difference between the bottom of the pond and the groundwater table represents the most critical point in the pond. Every other point elevation in the pond will provide greater clearance to the groundwater table. A cross-section of the pond is also included in the Pond Drawing (Drawing POND).

The operation of the spillover pond is provided in Table 5-8 for the 3-hour Chicago storm distribution and Table 5-9 for the 12-hour SCS storm distribution.

Event	Max HGL	Max Depth	Total Inflow	Peak Release	Max Storage
	(m)	(m)	(L/s)	Rate (L/s)	Volume (m3)
1:2 year	81.53	0.21	80	5	45
1:5 year	81.68	0.36	173	5	128
1:10 year	81.78	0.46	240	5	194
1:25 year	81.91	0.59	333	6	282
1:50 year	82.01	0.69	412	6	357
1:100 year	82.12	0.8	510	6	452

 Table 5-8: Spillover Pond Operation (3-hour Chicago Storm)

	Max HGL	Max Depth	Total Inflow	Peak Release	Max Storage
Event	(m)	(m)	(L/s)	Rate (L/s)	Volume (m3)
1:2 year	81.55	0.23	110	5	53
1:5 year	81.71	0.39	224	5	146
1:10 year	81.82	0.5	300	5	219
1:25 year	81.95	0.63	404	6	311
1:50 year	82.03	0.71	475	6	376
1:100 year	82.11	0.79	550	6	444

 Table 5-9: Spillover Pond Operation (12-hour SCS Storm)

The modelling results show that the pond contains flow in up to the 1:100-year event. The frequent event flows are from the immediate catchment runoff, rear yard swale and overflow from the street. The maximum water level in the pond is 82.12 m, which provides at least 300 mm freeboard to the surrounding area. Maximum pond depth is 800 mm which is less than 1.5m.

5.9.5 Draw-down Time

The draw-down time for the pond to drop from its Max HGL of 82.12m to 81.32m is approximately 27 hours per the Figure 3 shown below.


Figure 3: Draw-Down Time

5.9.6 Allowable Release Rate

The allowable release rate for the site is calculated as per Section 5.3.3. The stormwater management system was design to control to the allowable release rate and the results are shown in Table 5-10 below for the critical 3-hour Chicago event:

	Allowable Release	1:100-year 3-hour Chicago Release
Node	Rate (L/s)	Rate (L/s)
MH503	502	502

5.9.7 Capture Rates

The capture rates for each of the ICDs contributing directly to the downstream outlet on Navan Road are shown in Table 5-11 below.

Site Servicing Report 2983, 3053 and 3079 Navan Road & 2690 Pagé Road, Ottawa, Ontario

ICD Location	Allowable Capture Rate (I/s)	Peak Capture Rate (I/s)	1:2 year Ponding Depth at low point (mm)	1:2 year Ponding Time of Peak (hh:mm)	
CB02	77	11	40	1.10	
CB03	21	23	40	1.12	
CB04	25	13	60	1.12	
CB05	20	13	00	1.15	
CB06	15	12	10	1.11	
CB07	15	12	10	1:11	
CB09	26	12	00	1.12	
CB10	20	12	90	1.15	
CB100	14	47	0	1:13	
CB102	8	8	0	1:19	
CB103	26	59	0	1:16	
CB11	26	13	70	1.12	
CB12	20	13	70	1.15	
CBMH517A	13	12	60	1:14	
Pond Outlet	-	6	-	1:42	
Park	17	17	-	1:14	
BLOCK 15	11	33	-	1:22	
BLOCK 15_RY	44	10	-	1:04	
BLOCK 16	68	68	-	1:14	
BLOCK 14		14	-	1:34	
BLOCK 14_RY	49	46	-	1:10	
BLOCK 17	48	48	-	1:19	
Stompin' Tom Control ICD	22	14	-	1:35	
SUM	-	516	-	-	

Table 5-11: Sum of ICD Capture Rates

• The sum of all the ICDs peak capture rates is greater than the release rate from the site, however, the time of the peak release rates varies across the ICDs which means that the total dynamic peak flow is smaller.

- All capture rates compared with the allowable capture rate is provided in the ICD Tables in the drawings. ICDs have been sized to meet the allowable flow however in two low point locations the allowable exceeds the ICD maximum flow by up to 2 L/s. In such cases the model has been tested using the next largest ICD size, however, the larger ICD size resulted in significant flows unable to be mitigated in the rest of the system. Ponding in the impacted low points during the 1:2-year event occurs for only 21 minutes and is a maximum of 90 mm ponding depth.
- The ICD downstream of Stompin' Tom Lane is overcontrolling flows from upstream in order for the site to achieve the 85 L/s/ha. Overcontrolling this ICD does not result in any additional major system ponding as opposed to overcontrolling other ICDs which would increase surface ponding depths and volumes.
- The release rate from Block 14 is higher than the prorated allowable release rate. This is due to surface storage limitations and existing rear yards along Page road draining into Block 14. The difference between the peak capture rate and the allowable capture rate is compensated for elsewhere in the site to achieve the allowable 85 L/s/ha at the outlet of the site.

5.10 Storm and Stormwater Management Conclusions

The release rate from the site is dictated by the East Urban Community Infrastructure Servicing Study Update (EUC ISSU, Stantec 2005). The site contributes to the Navan Road storm system, which, under the 2005 EUC ISSU, has quality control provided by a downstream stormwater management pond, Pond #3. The 2005 EUC ISSU sized the downstream pond and storm sewer system to accept a flow of 85 L/s/ha from the site, including external rear yards areas at 43 L/s/ha, which has been provided for through ICDs and a spillover pond on site to capture the major system flows. A spill-over pond operation and maintenance manual has been provided under a separate cover called East Ridge Orleans Subdivision Spill-over Pond Operation and Maintenance Manual.

The stormwater servicing and management concept is proposed to provide stormwater servicing for the Navan development, as shown on the Servicing Plan (Drawing S1 and S2).

6.0 Erosion and Sediment Control

Erosion and sediment control measures, as outlined in the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) Guidelines on Erosion and Sediment Control for Urban Construction Sites, will be implemented to trap sediment on site. The following erosion and sediment control measures could be implemented during construction:

- Supply and installation of a silt fence barrier, as per OPSD 219.110.
- Supply and installation of siltsack or sentinel CB inserts between the frame and cover of catch basins and maintenance holes adjacent to the project area during construction, to prevent sediment from entering the sewer system.

- Stockpiling of material during construction is to be located along flat areas away from drainage paths. For material placed on sloped areas, stockpiles are to be enclosed with a silt fence to protect watercourses.
- All catch basins are to be equipped with sumps, inspected frequently, and cleaned as required.
- Temporary ICDs are to be placed blocking part of the sewer pipe in the connecting storm maintenance holes to eliminate construction debris from entering the existing storm sewer system. The ICDs are to be removed after the proposed storm sewers have been fully cleaned.
- A mud mat is to be built at each of the site entranceways to prevent the transport of sediment onto paved surfaces. The mud mat shall be:
 - Minimum of 20 m in length for the full width of the entrance way (10 m wide minimum).
 - Minimum of 400 mm thick underlain with a geotextile (or graded aggregate filter); and
 - Constructed with 50 mm diameter clear stone for the first 10 m (extending from the paved street) and the remainder of the length with 150 mm diameter clear stone.

The proposed removal and reinstatement measures as well as the erosion control measures shall conform to the following documents:

 "Guidelines on Erosion and Sediment Control for Urban Construction Sites" published by Ontario Ministries of Natural Resources, Environment, Municipal Affairs, and Transportation & Communication, Association of Construction Authorities of Ontario and Urban Development Institute, Ontario, May 1987. "MTO Drainage Manual", Chapter F: "Erosion of Materials and Sediment Control", Ministry of Transportation & Communications, 1985.

"Erosion and Sediment Control" Training Manual by Ministry of Environment, Spring 1998.

• Applicable Regulations and Guidelines of the Ministry of Natural Resources.

This report has been prepared by J.L. Richards & Associates Limited for 12714001 CANADA INC.'s exclusive use. Its discussions and conclusions are summary in nature and cannot properly be used, interpreted or extended to other purposes without a detailed understanding and discussions with the client as to its mandated purpose, scope and limitations. This report is based on information, drawings, data, or reports provided by the named client, its agents, and certain other suppliers or third parties, as applicable, and relies upon the accuracy and completeness of such information. Any inaccuracy or omissions in information provided, or changes to applications, designs, or materials may have a significant impact on the accuracy, reliability, findings, or conclusions of this report.

This report was prepared for the sole benefit and use of the named client and may not be used or relied on by any other party without the express written consent of J.L. Richards & Associates Limited, and anyone intending to rely upon this report is advised to contact J.L. Richards & Associates Limited in order to obtain permission and to ensure that the report is suitable for their purpose.

J.L. RICHARDS & ASSOCIATES LIMITED

Prepared by:

Prepared by:

Tatyana Roumie, Civil Engineering Graduate Mathieu Lacelle, Civil Engineering Graduate

Reviewed by:

Reviewed by:

Karla Ferrey, P. Eng. Senior Associate, Manager, Ottawa, Civil Development Bobby Pettigrew, P. Eng. Senior Water Resource Engineer

Appendix A

Pre-consultation Meeting Notes and Detailed Design Report Checklist

Guy Forget

From:	Curry, William <william.curry@ottawa.ca></william.curry@ottawa.ca>
Sent:	Monday, January 18, 2021 10:53 AM
То:	Gabrielle Snow
Cc:	Belan, Steve; Tim F. Chadder; Baird, Natasha; Lucie Dalrymple; Guy Forget
Subject:	Re: Navan Road - Second Pre-Application

Gabrielle,

- 1. Site Plans for this file are to be a C of .5. Subdivision is to be calculated as per the SDG. Your permitted with a 5-year pipe design and store up to the 100-year for both subdivision and Site Plan.
- 2. If you discharge to a pipe that discharges to a City SWM facility, then no additional quality controls are required. However, you are required to confirm with the Conservation Authority.
- 3. No, but the City does confirm it is the responsibility of the proponent to demonstrate the site is serviceable for water, storm and sanitary and that the receiving sewers have capacity. The Functional Servicing Report provides the ultimate servicing solution for watermain storm and sanitary.
- 4. Unknown currently. Who owns 2973...apparently the City. Depends if they sell it or what? More ideal if it was within a City Block or City ROW but not an easement.
- 5. No. No occupancy unless it is serviced properly.
- 6. You may discharge to the **ditch and not the 750mm Ø storm** along Navan Road if that is to be your determined outlet. Quality Controls are provided by the Conservation Authority. 5-year Pre to post with a tc of 20 minutes Pre and a tc of 10 minutes with a 0.5 C, store up to the 100-year.
- 7. You are permitted to use infiltration designs anywhere within the city but they must demonstrate functionality and have supporting documentation.
- 8. You must demonstrate, not assume the 750 mm Ø storm pipe was designed to include your entire site. The road-side ditch primarily runs towards Page Road. This will require further investigation. The City will not support any municipal owned infrastructure within the proposed Gas Station parcel. 2973 is City Owned.

Any info you may require is available from the Info Centre "ISD Information Centre / Centre Information" informationcentre@ottawa.ca

The City reserves the right to change any decisions provided herein should new information warrant it.

thanks

Will Curry, C.E.T.

Planning, Infrastructure and Economic Development / Planification, d'infrastructure et de développement économique City of Ottawa | Ville d'Ottawa 613.580.2424 ext./poste16214

William.Curry@Ottawa.ca

From: Gabrielle Snow <gsnow@jlrichards.ca>
Sent: Friday, January 15, 2021 3:51 PM
To: Belan, Steve <<u>Steve.Belan@ottawa.ca</u>>; Curry, William <<u>William.Curry@ottawa.ca</u>>
Cc: Tim F. Chadder <<u>tchadder@jlrichards.ca</u>>; Lucie Dalrymple <<u>Idalrymple@jlrichards.ca</u>>; Guy Forget
<<u>gforget@jlrichards.ca</u>>
Subject: DS: Naves Decd. Second Dec Application

Subject: RE: Navan Road - Second Pre-Application

CAUTION: This email originated from an External Sender. Please do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the source.

ATTENTION : Ce courriel provient d'un expéditeur externe. Ne cliquez sur aucun lien et n'ouvrez pas de pièce jointe, excepté si vous connaissez l'expéditeur.

Hi Steve and Will,

Leading up to the second pre-application meeting for 2983, 3053 and 3079 Navan Road, I wanted to forward you some questions regarding servicing:

Question 1: The City to confirm that the quantity control criterion from the EUC ISU prevails; The 1:100 year postdevelopment peak flows for the overall subdivision be limited to the 1:5 year peak flows calculated based on a C-Factor of 0.60.

Question 2: The City to confirm that the quality control criterion from the EUC ISU prevails; Given that 2983 Navan Road is tributary to Pond #3 which was sized to meet the enhanced protection level, there is no be any additional water quality control requirements for the subdivision.

Question 3: The City to confirm that the ultimate servicing solution for storm & sanitary hinges on proposed storm and sanitary sewers along Navan Road, from 3053 Navan Road to Renaud Road.

Question 4: Given that water servicing to support the subdivision requires looping, can an easement be granted within 2973 Navan Road to facilitate water servicing as this future watermain connection would be the supply for both the subdivision and future gas station? The second watermain connection would be within 3053 Navan Road.

Question 5: To support the gas station under interim condition, would the City entertain that wastewater flows be captured by a holding tank assuming that the car wash would not be commissioned.

- **Question 6:** Given that the lands for the future gas station currently sheet flows to the open ditch system & CB/DICB and 750 mm diameter storm sewer along Navan Road, its is assumed that storm servicing for the gas station can be developed to maintain the same drainage pattern. As such, the City to confirm the quantity control criterion for the gas station. The 1:100 year post-development peak flows from the gas station be limited to pre-development levels (C-Factor of 0.20). Prior to outlet into the 750 mm diameter storm sewer, a proposed OGS would be sized to achieve the enhanced protection level (TSS 80%).
- **Question 7:** To minimize runoff volume discharged to the 750 mm diameter storm sewer, rooftop flows from the building and car wash could be captured and infiltrated. Although infiltration for this type of usage is generally not recommended, the City to confirm whether infiltration of the rooftop flows would be permitted.
- Question 8: In support of servicing for the overall subdivision and gas station, would the City be favorable of an easement within the 2973 Navan Road to facilitate water and storm servicing (connection to the existing 750 mm diameter storm sewer)? As alternate, would the City entertain selling the eastern part of 2973 Navan Road?

Also, would it be possible to get information on the following for Brian Coburn Blvd:

- Built infrastructure for lanes (i.e. turning lanes, bike lanes etc.);
- Traffic signals;

Infrastructure underground.

Thanks in advance and have a great weekend,

Gabrielle Snow Intern Planner

J.L. Richards & Associates Limited 700 - 1565 Carling Avenue, Ottawa, ON K1Z 8R1 Direct: 343-803-3913

J.L. Richards & Associates Limited ENGINEERS · ARCHITECTS · PLANNERS



J.L. Richards & Associates Limited is proactively doing our part to protect the wellbeing of our staff and communities while improving our communication technology. We are pleased to announce that we have implemented direct phone lines for all of our staff, allowing you to connect with us regardless of whether we are working remotely or in the office. We are dedicated to delivering quality services to you through value and commitment, as always. Please reach out to us if you have any questions about your project.

From: Gabrielle Snow
Sent: Friday, January 15, 2021 10:53 AM
To: 'Belan, Steve' <<u>Steve.Belan@ottawa.ca</u>>
Cc: 'Sauve, Diane' <<u>Diane.Sauve@ottawa.ca</u>>; Tim F. Chadder (<u>tchadder@jlrichards.ca</u>) <<u>tchadder@jlrichards.ca</u>>
Subject: RE: Navan Road - Second Pre-Application

Hi Steve,

Please find the revised concept plan attached. Note that the only changes made were removing a row of townhouses and replacing them with another 3-storey condo building along the southeast corner.

Can you please confirm that the meeting on the 18th is still on? If it is, can Raad and Carmine be sent invites? Their emails are: <u>rakrawi@groupeheafey.com</u> <u>carmine@zayoungroup.com</u>

Should you have any questions, please feel free to reach out.

Thanks again,

From: Belan, Steve <<u>Steve.Belan@ottawa.ca</u>>
Sent: Thursday, January 14, 2021 4:38 PM
To: Gabrielle Snow <<u>gsnow@jlrichards.ca</u>>
Subject: RE: Navan Road - Second Pre-Application

Thank you

From: Gabrielle Snow <<u>gsnow@jlrichards.ca</u>> Sent: January 14, 2021 4:02 PM To: Belan, Steve <<u>Steve.Belan@ottawa.ca</u>> CAUTION: This email originated from an External Sender. Please do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the source.

ATTENTION : Ce courriel provient d'un expéditeur externe. Ne cliquez sur aucun lien et n'ouvrez pas de pièce jointe, excepté si vous connaissez l'expéditeur.

Hi Steve,

Quick update, the client might provide us with an updated concept plan tomorrow that would include minor changes only however there is a chance that the concept plan I provided earlier will be the final draft to be discussed at the pre-consult meeting. If we receive an updated concept plan from them, I will be sure to promptly send it your way.

Thanks,

Gabrielle

Gabrielle Snow Intern Planner

J.L. Richards & Associates Limited 700 - 1565 Carling Avenue, Ottawa, ON K1Z 8R1 Direct: 343-803-3913

J.L. Richards & Associates Limited ENGINEERS · ARCHITECTS · PLANNERS



J.L. Richards & Associates Limited is proactively doing our part to protect the wellbeing of our staff and communities while improving our communication technology. We are pleased to announce that we have implemented direct phone lines for all of our staff, allowing you to connect with us regardless of whether we are working remotely or in the office. We are dedicated to delivering quality services to you through value and commitment, as always. Please reach out to us if you have any questions about your project.

From: Gabrielle Snow
Sent: Thursday, January 14, 2021 3:30 PM
To: Belan, Steve <<u>Steve.Belan@ottawa.ca</u>>
Cc: Tim F. Chadder (<u>tchadder@jlrichards.ca</u>) <<u>tchadder@jlrichards.ca</u>>
Subject: RE: Navan Road - Second Pre-Application

Hi Steve,

My apologies for the wait on receiving the concept plan—we only just received it from the client. Please find the concept plan attached to this email.

Should you have any questions, please feel free to reach out.

Additionally, would it be possible to get Raad and Carmine added to the zoom meeting? They have not received invites. Their emails are: <u>rakrawi@groupeheafey.com</u> <u>carmine@zayoungroup.com</u>

Thanks,

From: Belan, Steve <<u>Steve.Belan@ottawa.ca</u>>
Sent: Thursday, January 7, 2021 12:49 PM
To: Gabrielle Snow <<u>gsnow@jlrichards.ca</u>>
Subject: RE: Navan Road - Second Pre-Application

Gabrielle,

I have asked the Admin Assistant to set up a Zoom Call for the 18th some time between 11 and 3. You should receive an email some time. If you haven't by Monday, remind me again please.

Steve

From: Gabrielle Snow <gsnow@jlrichards.ca>
Sent: January 07, 2021 11:46 AM
To: Belan, Steve <<u>Steve.Belan@ottawa.ca</u>>
Cc: Tim F. Chadder <<u>tchadder@jlrichards.ca</u>>
Subject: RE: Navan Road - Second Pre-Application

CAUTION: This email originated from an External Sender. Please do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the source.

ATTENTION : Ce courriel provient d'un expéditeur externe. Ne cliquez sur aucun lien et n'ouvrez pas de pièce jointe, excepté si vous connaissez l'expéditeur.

Hi Steve,

I have gotten word from our client that we should be getting the concept plan by next Friday, Jan 15th. Once we receive it, I will share it with you.

Would it be possible to set up a meeting for the week of Jan 18th? Tim and I have the most availability on the 19th and 20th.

Thanks in advance,

Gabrielle

Gabrielle Snow Intern Planner

J.L. Richards & Associates Limited 700 - 1565 Carling Avenue, Ottawa, ON K1Z 8R1 Direct: 343-803-3913

J.L. Richards & Associates Limited ENGINEERS · ARCHITECTS · PLANNERS



J.L. Richards & Associates Limited is proactively doing our part to protect the wellbeing of our staff and communities while improving our communication technology. We are pleased to announce that we have implemented direct phone lines for all of our staff, allowing you to connect with us regardless of whether we are working remotely or in the office. We are dedicated to delivering quality services to you through value and commitment, as always. Please reach out to us if you have any questions about your project.

From: Belan, Steve <<u>Steve.Belan@ottawa.ca</u>> Sent: Monday, December 14, 2020 2:39 PM **[CAUTION]** This email originated from outside JLR. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If in doubt, please forward suspicious emails to Helpdesk.

Gabrielle,

I am reluctant to set up a meeting until I know that your group has prepared some kind of concept plan. This will is my last week before the Christmas Holidays and therefore very busy. If you have some material to share I will make a meeting for Thursday afternoon.

Regarding the parkland dedication, There is no plan for a park in the secondary plan. However, it will be up to the parks planner to make this call. I would imagine it will also depend on the number of units that you are proposing. I have spoken with them any they have indicated that they will get back to me.

Steve Belan

From: Gabrielle Snow <gsnow@jlrichards.ca>
Sent: December 07, 2020 3:30 PM
To: Belan, Steve <<u>Steve.Belan@ottawa.ca</u>>
Cc: Tim F. Chadder <<u>tchadder@jlrichards.ca</u>>; Lucie Dalrymple <<u>Idalrymple@jlrichards.ca</u>>
Subject: Navan Road - Second Pre-Application

CAUTION: This email originated from an External Sender. Please do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the source.

ATTENTION : Ce courriel provient d'un expéditeur externe. Ne cliquez sur aucun lien et n'ouvrez pas de pièce jointe, excepté si vous connaissez l'expéditeur.

Hi Steve,

I hope this email finds you well.

I am reaching out to request a second pre-application meeting as it relates to the proposed Navan Road development. As mentioned during the last meeting, the client was able to acquire abutting properties (2983 Navan Road, 3053 Navan Road) in addition to 3079 Navan road. Since a number of additional development plans and considerations have changed as a result, we are looking to have a second meeting.

We are aiming to get you the site plan, pre-application meeting form and additional materials by early next week. With this in mind, do you think it would be possible to schedule the pre-application meeting end of week next week or sometime early the week after?

Also, would you be able to confirm that cash in lieu of parkland would be accepted for this development?

Thanks in advance,

Gabrielle

Gabrielle Snow Intern Planner J.L. Richards & Associates Limited 700 - 1565 Carling Avenue, Ottawa, ON K1Z 8R1 Direct: 343-803-3913





J.L. Richards & Associates Limited is proactively doing our part to protect the wellbeing of our staff and communities while improving our communication technology. We are pleased to announce that we have implemented direct phone lines for all of our staff, allowing you to connect with us regardless of whether we are working remotely or in the office. We are dedicated to delivering quality services to you through value and commitment, as always. Please reach out to us if you have any questions about your project.

This e-mail originates from the City of Ottawa e-mail system. Any distribution, use or copying of this e-mail or the information it contains by other than the intended recipient(s) is unauthorized. Thank you. Le présent courriel a été expédié par le système de courriels de la Ville d'Ottawa. Toute distribution, utilisation ou reproduction du courriel ou des renseignements qui s'y trouvent par une personne autre que son destinataire prévu est interdite. Je vous remercie de votre collaboration.

This e-mail originates from the City of Ottawa e-mail system. Any distribution, use or copying of this e-mail or the information it contains by other than the intended recipient(s) is unauthorized. Thank you. Le présent courriel a été expédié par le système de courriels de la Ville d'Ottawa. Toute distribution, utilisation ou reproduction du courriel ou des renseignements qui s'y trouvent par une personne autre que son destinataire prévu est interdite. Je vous remercie de votre collaboration.

This e-mail originates from the City of Ottawa e-mail system. Any distribution, use or copying of this e-mail or the information it contains by other than the intended recipient(s) is unauthorized. Thank you. Le présent courriel a été expédié par le système de courriels de la Ville d'Ottawa. Toute distribution, utilisation ou reproduction du courriel ou des renseignements qui s'y trouvent par une personne autre que son destinataire prévu est interdite. Je vous remercie de votre collaboration.

This e-mail originates from the City of Ottawa e-mail system. Any distribution, use or copying of this e-mail or the information it contains by other than the intended recipient(s) is unauthorized. Thank you. Le présent courriel a été expédié par le système de courriels de la Ville d'Ottawa. Toute distribution, utilisation ou reproduction du courriel ou des renseignements qui s'y trouvent par une personne autre que son destinataire prévu est interdite. Je vous remercie de votre collaboration.

This e-mail originates from the City of Ottawa e-mail system. Any distribution, use or copying of this e-mail or the information it contains by other than the intended recipient(s) is unauthorized. Thank you. Le présent courriel a été expédié par le système de courriels de la Ville d'Ottawa. Toute distribution, utilisation ou reproduction du courriel ou des renseignements qui s'y trouvent par une personne autre que son destinataire prévu est interdite. Je vous remercie de votre collaboration. **[CAUTION]** This email originated from outside JLR. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If in doubt, please forward suspicious emails to Helpdesk.

Gabrielle,

I have already provided my Submission list to Steve for distribution.

I can offer these other items at this time.

I reviewed the report prepared by IBI and they followed the parameters of the Stantec EUC to demonstrate the site was serviceable for zoning purposes only. Historically I can tell you IBI tends to take their own liberties in what they deem we the City should accept.

There were several documents submitted for zoning and I don't know if Taggart is making those available to the applicant.

I will require a FSR for this file for Draft Plan of Subdivision, regardless of what was submitted.

Info only

I looked at the existing topographical plan of survey and it will require more existing elevations to be considered acceptable.

The Storm and Sanitary **pipe(s)** Outlets are as per the EUC and are to be on Navan Road and connected to Renaud Road. Design to City Standards may be another issue if you read IBI's report.

This site is lower than all the surrounding roads. Preloading would be ideal for this site. Note that the attempts to sometimes retain trees and preload areas is a conflict and some trees can't be saved.

The watermain option out to Page; you should consider or attempt to go through the City owned parcel between the proposed Townhouses and Brian Coburn. Also the easement location within that private parcel is critical as we accept nothing else within the easement other than asphalt and curbs. Maybe it is best to go in a straight line and loose some trees.

It is hard to believe you need a Dry Pond for this site with all the green spaces. I know this is just concept currently. Private Bio-swales could be considered

elsewhere...etc. Water table here is a concern.

Let me know if I can assist further.

Thanks

Will Curry, C.E.T.

Planning, Infrastructure and Economic Development / Planification, d'infrastructure et de développement économique City of Ottawa | Ville d'Ottawa 613.580.2424 ext./poste 16214 110 Laurier Ave., 4th FI East; Ottawa ON K1P 1J1

William.Curry@Ottawa.ca

This e-mail originates from the City of Ottawa e-mail system. Any distribution, use or copying of this e-mail or the information it contains by other than the intended recipient(s) is unauthorized. Thank you.

Le présent courriel a été expédié par le système de courriels de la Ville d'Ottawa. Toute distribution, utilisation ou reproduction du courriel ou des renseignements qui s'y trouvent par une personne autre que son destinataire prévu est interdite. Je vous remercie de votre collaboration.

From: Belan, Steve <Steve.Belan@ottawa.ca>
Sent: Friday, April 23, 2021 2:15 PM
To: Tim F. Chadder <tchadder@jlrichards.ca>; Gabrielle Snow <gsnow@jlrichards.ca>
Cc: Curry, William <William.Curry@ottawa.ca>; Young, Mark <Mark.Young@ottawa.ca>; Castro, Phil
<phil.castro@ottawa.ca>; Giampa, Mike <Mike.Giampa@ottawa.ca>
Subject: Pre-con Follow-up - 3079 Navan Road

[CAUTION] This email originated from outside JLR. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If in doubt, please forward suspicious emails to Helpdesk.

CC: Will Curry, Mark Young, Phil Castro, Mike Giampa

Hello Gabrielle,

I apologize for the delay on getting these out. Please refer to the below and/or attached notes, regarding the Pre-Application Consultation (pre-con) Meeting held on January 18, and March 25, for the property at 3079 Navan Road for ZBLA and subdivision in order to allow the development of in fill subdivision with low-rise apartments, town house unit and a commercial block at the corner of Brian Coburn and Navan. I have also attached the required Plans & Study List for application submission. During the Covid-19 pandemic the City will not be requiring any paper copies as listed in the attached list.

Below or attached, are staff's preliminary comments based on the information available at the time of pre-con meeting:

Planning

- A severance application may be required depending on how the owner wishes to proceed with the creating the commercial block at the intersection
- We need to discuss the order of applications. There are pros and cons to moving forward with a severance of the commercial blocks to address ownership issues.
- We support the move to low-rise buildings along Brain Coburn Blvd.
- Lynda Mongeon would be able to facilitate the transfer of surplus City lands as needed
- Contributions to the Mud Creek restoration will need to be determine.
- The Applicant must now provide a proposed strategy for public consultation as directed by Bill 73

<u>Urban Design</u>

- 1. PRUD appreciates and supports the desire to retain trees on-site. The arrangement and viability of this should be reviewed in depth by our Planning Forester.
- 2. The size and locations of the commercial block is supported. It would be worth exploring the possibility of obtaining additional city lands at the intersection of Brian Coburn and Navan Road to complete the block and allow for possible built form at this gateway location.

- 3. The current drive through configuration/location adjacent to this community entrance is a significant concern. Please re-consider the layout of the commercial site.
- 4. Please review the proposal in conjunction with the EUC Phase 1 CDP.
- 5. PRUD would support the inclusion of a park block to serve the new residents. Consider a location that allows for tree retention, and connectivity to the community to the east.
- 6. Access to Page Road should be discouraged. If this is planned to become a cul-de sac at Navan Road this should also be considered.
- 7. 18.0 m public r.o.w as proposed is supported.
- 8. Please ensure that rear yards with a minimum depth of 7.5 m for townhomes are provided abutting existing residential uses.
- 9. The 3 townhomes on Page Road should be re-considered. This typology is not common on Page Road.
- 10. A design brief will be required in support of your applications. Please see attached terms of reference.

Engineering

The attached "Pre-application consultation servicing memo" summarizes engineering design considerations as per our discussion. [Ensure the memo addresses all relevant engineering issues.]

Required for both Site Plan and Subdivision:

Water Boundary condition requests must include the location of the service and the expected loads required by the proposed development. Please provide the following information:

Location of service connections (MAP)

Type of development and the amount of fire flow required (as per FUS).

Average daily demand: ____ l/s.

Maximum daily demand: I/s.

Maximum hourly daily demand: _____ l/s.

Subdivision Draft Plan requirements

Functional Servicing Report

4 M plan

4 R Plan

Detailed Subdivision Design

Cover Page

Road Cross Sections

Site Plan

Topographical Plan of Survey Plan with a published Bench Mark

Grading & Drainage Plan

General Plan of Services

Plan and profile Plans

CUP

SWM Plan

Erosion & Sediment Control Plan

Landscape Plans and TCR

Design Brief and Stormwater Management Report

Geotechnical Report

Transportation Noise Study

TIA

<u>Site Plan Requirements</u>

Site Plan

Topographical Plan of Survey Plan with a published Bench Mark

Grading & Drainage Plan

General Plan of Services

Erosion & Sediment Control Plan

Design Brief and Stormwater Management Report

Geotechnical Report

Lighting Plan and or and Memo

Stationary Noise Study

TIA

Design Criteria

Storm Pre to post, C of .5, Pre tc 20; post tc 10

5-year pipe minimum and store up to 100-year on site. No 2-year ponding on site.

Permissible ponding of 350mm for 100-year

At 100-year ponding elevation you must spill to City ROW

100-year Spill elevation must be 300mm lower than any building opening

Minimum Drawing and File Requirements- All Plans

Plans are to be submitted on standard **A1 size** (594mm x 841mm) sheets, utilizing an appropriate Metric scale (1:200, 1:250, 1:300, 1:400, or 1:500).

With all submitted hard copies provide individual PDF of the DWGs and for reports please provide one PDF file of the reports. **All PDF documents are to be unlocked and flattened.**

- 1. Site Plans for this file are to be a C of .5. Subdivision is to be calculated as per the SDG. Your permitted with a 5-year pipe design and store up to the 100-year for both subdivision and Site Plan.
- 2. If you discharge to a pipe that discharges to a City SWM facility, then no additional quality controls are required. However, you are required to confirm with the Conservation Authority.
- 3. No, but the City does confirm it is the responsibility of the proponent to demonstrate the site is serviceable for water, storm and sanitary and that the receiving sewers have capacity. The Functional Servicing Report provides the ultimate servicing solution for watermain storm and sanitary.
- 4. Unknown currently. Who owns 2973...apparently the City. Depends if they sell it or what? More ideal if it was within a City Block or City ROW but not an easement.
- 5. No. No occupancy unless it is serviced properly.
- 6. You may discharge to the **ditch and not the 750mm Ø storm** along Navan Road if that is to be your determined outlet. Quality Controls are provided by the Conservation Authority. 5-year Pre to post with a tc of 20 minutes Pre and a tc of 10 minutes with a 0.5 C, store up to the 100-year.
- 7. You are permitted to use infiltration designs anywhere within the city but they must demonstrate functionality and have supporting documentation.
- 8. You must demonstrate, not assume the 750 mm Ø storm pipe was designed to include your entire site. The road-side ditch primarily runs towards Page Road. This will require further investigation. The City will not support any municipal owned infrastructure within the proposed Gas Station parcel. 2973 is City Owned.

Any info you may require is available from the Info Centre "ISD Information Centre / Centre Information" informationcentre@ottawa.ca

The City reserves the right to change any decisions provided herein should new information warrant it.

Feel free to contact the Infrastructure Project Manager, Will Curry, at <u>Will.Curry@ottawa.ca</u> for follow-up questions.

Transportation

A TIA is warranted, please proceed to scoping.

The application will not be deemed complete until the submission of the draft step 2-4, including the functional draft RMA package (if applicable) and/or monitoring report (if applicable).

Although a full review of the TIA Strategy report (Step 4) is not required prior to an application, it is strongly recommended.

Synchro files are required at Step 4.

ROW protection on Navan is 44.5m.

Corner sight triangle: 5m x 5m

A stationary Noise Impact Study is required if there is noise sensitive use within 100m.

Clear throat requirements on Navan as per TAC guidelines

On site plan:

Show all details of the roads abutting the site up to and including the opposite curb; include such items as pavement markings, accesses and/or sidewalks.

Turning templates will be required for all accesses showing the largest vehicle to access the site; required for internal movements and at all access (entering and exiting and going in both directions).

Show all curb radii measurements; ensure that all curb radii are reduced as much as possible

Show lane/aisle widths.

As built plans for Brian Coburn should be available through our Drawing Center; the applicant should contact: ISD Information Centre / Centre Information <u>informationcentre@ottawa.ca</u>.

There may be a fee.

A Noise Study will be required for traffic noise impacts and any newly created stationary noise sources.

Feel free to contact the Transportation Project Manager, Mike Giampa, at <u>Mike.Giampa@ottawa.ca</u>, for follow-up questions.

Environmental

- Environmental impact statements shall be submitted to identify any Species at risk
- A TCR will be required for these applications.
- A permit is required prior to any tree removal on site which can be made available at site plan approval. Please contact the planner associated with the file or Mark Richardson (<u>mark.richardson@ottawa.ca</u>) when the permit is required or for additional information.
- There may be adjacent or co-owned trees on or near the property line. Please ensure that all trees with a Critical Root Zone extending from adjoining sites onto the development site are addressed in the TCR.
- Please identify any City-owned trees Forestry Services will need to provide permission for their removal.
- Please be aware of the City's Bird-Safe Design Guidelines

Parkland

- These lands have not been consider for any previous Parkland dedication /Cash-inlieu of parkland
- Parkland requirements would be based on proposed unit counts.
- It would be preferred that the park is located in the interior of the site. However, we will consider a location with frontage on Brian Coburn and Page next to, but not including the pedestrian/service access to Page Road.

Conservation Authority

- o The Conservation Authority will make comments concerning:
 - Stormwater runoff quality criteria
 - Area specific stormwater runoff criteria

<u>Other</u>

- o [Insert other concerns or notes]
- You are encouraged to contact the Ward Councillor, Councillor Dudas, at <u>Laura.Dudas@ottawa.ca</u> about the proposal.

Please refer to the links to <u>Guide to preparing studies and plans</u> and <u>fees</u> for further information. Additional information is available related to <u>building permits</u>, <u>development charges</u>, and the <u>Accessibility Design Standards</u>. Be aware that other fees and permits may be required, outside of the development review process. You may obtain background drawings by contacting <u>informationcentre@ottawa.ca</u>.

These pre-con comments are valid for one year. If you submit a development application(s) after this time, you may be required to meet for another pre-consultation meeting and/or the submission requirements may change. You are as well encouraged to contact us for a follow-up meeting if the plan/concept will be further refined.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions.

Regards, Steve Belan

ı.

Steve Belan, MCIP, RPP Planner Planning Services, Development Review Services **Planning, Infrastructure and Economic Development** City of Ottawa / Ville d'Ottawa 110 Laurier Avenue West, 4th Floor / 110, avenue Laurier Ouest, 4e étage Ottawa, ON K1P 1J1 Telephone / tél.: 613-580-2424 ext./poste 27591 E-mail / courriel: <u>Steve.Belan@ottawa.ca</u>

This e-mail originates from the City of Ottawa e-mail system. Any distribution, use or copying of this email or the information it contains by other than the intended recipient(s) is unauthorized. Thank you.

Le présent courriel a été expédié par le système de courriels de la Ville d'Ottawa. Toute distribution, utilisation ou reproduction du courriel ou des renseignements qui s'y trouvent par une personne autre que son destinataire prévu est interdite. Je vous remercie de votre collaboration.

12714001 Canada Inc – 2983, 3053 and 3079 Navan Road & 2690 Pagé Road SITE SERVICING REPORT CHECKLIST

REFERENCED STUDIES AND REPORTS	REFERENCE
Functional Servicing Report for 12714001 Canada Inc, 2983, 3053 and 3079 Navan Road & 2690 Pagé Road (J.L. Richards & Associates Limited, February 10, 2023)	Functional Servicing Report

4.1	GENERAL CONTENT	REFERENCE
	Executive Summary (for larger reports only).	N/A
	Date and revision number of the report.	Site Servicing Report
	Location map and plan showing municipal address, boundary, and layout of proposed development.	Site Servicing Report (Figure 1 & 2) All Drawings
\boxtimes	Plan showing the site and location of all existing services.	Overall Servicing (OS)
	Development statistics, land use, density, adherence to zoning and official plan, and reference to applicable subwatershed and watershed plans that provide context to which individual developments must adhere.	Site Servicing Report (Section 1)
	Summary of Pre-consultation Meetings with City and other approval agencies.	Site Servicing Report (Appendix 'A')
	Reference and confirm conformance to higher level studies and reports (Master Servicing Studies, Environmental Assessments, Community Design Plans), or in the case where it is not in conformance, the proponent must provide justification and develop a defendable design criteria.	Reference made to Stantec 2005 EUC ISSU
\square	Statement of objectives and servicing criteria.	Site Servicing Report (Section 1.0, 2.0, 3.0, 4.0, 5.0)
	Identification of existing and proposed infrastructure available in the immediate area.	Site Servicing Report (Section 1.0, 2.0, 3.0, 4.0) Overall Servicing (OS)
	Identification of Environmentally Significant Areas, watercourses and Municipal Drains potentially impacted by the proposed development (Reference can be made to the Natural Heritage Studies, if available).	N/A
	Concept level master grading plan to confirm existing and proposed grades in the development. This is required to confirm the feasibility of proposed stormwater management and drainage, soil removal and fill constraints, and potential impacts to neighbouring properties. This is also required to confirm that the proposed grading will not impede existing major system flow paths.	Grading Plan

Identification of potential impacts of proposed piped services on private services (such as wells and septic fields on adjacent lands) and mitigation required to address potential impacts.	N/A
Proposed phasing of the development, if applicable.	N/A
Reference to geotechnical studies and recommendations concerning servicing.	Site Servicing Report and Drawings
 All preliminary and formal site plan submissions should have the following information: Metric scale North arrow (including construction North) Key plan Name and contact information of applicant and property owner Property limits, including bearings and dimensions Existing and proposed structures and parking areas Easements, road widening and rights-of-way Adjacent street names 	All Drawings

4.2	SITE SERVICING REPORT: WATER	REFERENCE
	Confirm consistency with Master Servicing Study, if available.	N/A
	Availability of public infrastructure to service proposed development.	Site Servicing Report (Section 1.0, 2.0) Overall Servicing (OS)
\square	Identification of system constraints.	Site Servicing Report (Section 2.0)
\boxtimes	Identify boundary conditions.	Site Servicing Report (Section 2.0, Appendix 'D3')
	Confirmation of adequate domestic supply and pressure.	Site Servicing Report (Section 2.0)
	Confirmation of adequate fire flow protection and confirmation that fire flow is calculated as per the Fire Underwriter's Survey. Output should show available fire flow at locations throughout the development.	Site Servicing Report (Section 2.0, Appendix 'D1' & 'D5')
	Provide a check of high pressures. If pressure is found to be high, an assessment is required to confirm the application of pressure reducing valves.	Site Servicing Report (Section 2.0)
	Definition of phasing constraints. Hydraulic modelling is required to confirm servicing for all defined phases of the project, including the ultimate design.	N/A
	Address reliability requirements, such as appropriate location of shutoff valves.	Site Servicing Report (Section 2.0)
	Check on the necessity of a pressure zone boundary modification.	N/A

	-
Reference to water supply analysis to show that major infrastructure can deliver sufficient water for the proposed land use. This includes data that shows that the expected demands under average day, peak hour and fire flow conditions provide water within the required pressure range.	Site Servicing Report (Section 2.0, Appendix D1 to D6)
Description of the proposed water distribution network, including locations of proposed connections to the existing system, provisions for necessary looping, and appurtenances (valves, pressure reducing valves, valve chambers, and fire hydrants), including special metering provisions.	Site Servicing Report (Section 2.0) Overall Servicing (OS)
Description of off-site required feedermains, booster pumping stations, and other water infrastructure that will be ultimately required to service proposed development, including financing, interim facilities, and timing of implementation.	N/A
Confirmation that water demands are calculated based on the City of Ottawa Design Guidelines.	Site Servicing Report (Section 2.0)
Provision of a model schematic showing the boundary conditions locations, streets, parcels, and building locations for reference.	Site Servicing Report (Appendix 'D2')

4.3	SITE SERVICING REPORT: WASTEWATER	REFERENCE
	Summary of proposed design criteria (Note: Wet weather flow criteria should not deviate from the City of Ottawa Sewer Design Guidelines. Monitored flow data from relatively new infrastructure cannot be used to justify capacity requirements for proposed infrastructure).	Site Servicing Report (Section 3.0, Appendix 'E1' & 'E2')
	Confirm consistency with Master Servicing Study and/or justifications for deviations.	Stantec 2005 EUC ISSU
	Consideration of local conditions that may contribute to extraneous flows that are higher than the recommended flows in the Guidelines. This includes groundwater and soil conditions, and age and condition of sewers.	N/A
	Description of existing sanitary sewer available for discharge of wastewater from proposed development.	Site Servicing Report (Section 1.0, 3.0) Overall Servicing (OS)
	Verify available capacity in downstream sanitary sewer and/or identification of upgrades necessary to service the proposed development. (Reference can be made to previously completed Master Servicing Study if applicable.)	Site Servicing Report (Section 3.0, Appendix 'E1' & 'E2')
	Calculations related to dry weather and wet weather flow rates from the development in standard MOE sanitary sewer design table (Appendix 'C') format.	Site Servicing Report (Appendix 'E1', 'E2')
	Description of proposed sewer network, including sewers, pumping stations and forcemains.	Site Servicing Report (Section 3.0) Overall Servicing (OS)

Discussion of previously identified environmental constraints and impact on servicing (environmental constraints are related to limitations imposed on the development in order to preserve the physical condition of watercourses, vegetation, soil cover, as well as protecting against water quantity and quality).	N/A
Pumping stations: impacts of proposed development on existing pumping stations or requirements for new pumping station to service development.	N/A
Forcemain capacity in terms of operational redundancy, surge pressure and maximum flow velocity.	N/A
Identification and implementation of the emergency overflow from sanitary pumping stations in relation to the hydraulic grade line to protect against basement flooding.	N/A
Special considerations, such as contamination, corrosive environment, etc.	N/A

4.4	SITE SERVICING REPORT: STORMWATER	REFERENCE
	Description of drainage outlets and downstream constraints, including legality of outlets (i.e., municipal drain, right-of-way, watercourse, or private property).	Site Servicing Report (Section 1.0, 4.0)
	Analysis of available capacity in existing public infrastructure.	Site Servicing Report (Section 4.0)
	A drawing showing the subject lands, its surroundings, the receiving watercourse, existing drainage patterns, and proposed drainage pattern.	Drawings OS, DST, SWM
	Water quantity control objective (e.g. controlling post-development peak flows to pre-development level for storm events ranging from the 2 or 5 year event (dependent on the receiving sewer design) to 100 year return period); if other objectives are being applied, a rationale must be included with reference to hydrologic analyses of the potentially affected subwatersheds, taking into account long-term cumulative effects.	Site Servicing Report (Section 4.0)
	Water Quality control objective (basic, normal or enhanced level of protection based on the sensitivities of the receiving watercourse) and storage requirements.	Site Servicing Report (Section 4.0)
	Description of the stormwater management concept with facility locations and descriptions with references and supporting information.	Site Servicing Report (Section 4.0) DST, SMW
	Setback from private sewage disposal systems.	N/A
	Watercourse and hazard lands setbacks.	N/A

Record of pre-consultation with the Ontario Ministry of Environment and the Conservation Authority that has jurisdiction on the affected watershed.	Site Servicing Report (Appendix 'A')
Confirm consistency with subwatershed and Master Servicing Study, if applicable study exists.	Stantec 2005 EUC ISSU
Storage requirements (complete with calculations) and conveyance capacity for minor events (1:2 year return period) and major events (1:100 year return period).	Site Servicing Report (Section 4.0)
Identification of watercourses within the proposed development and how watercourses will be protected, or, if necessary, altered by the proposed development with applicable approvals.	N/A
Calculate pre- and post-development peak flow rates, including a description of existing site conditions and proposed impervious areas and drainage catchments in comparison to existing conditions.	Site Servicing Report (Section 4.0)
Any proposed diversion of drainage catchment areas from one outlet to another.	Site Servicing Report (Section 4.0)
Proposed minor and major systems, including locations and sizes of stormwater trunk sewers, and stormwater management facilities.	Drawings OS, DST, SMW
If quantity control is not proposed, demonstration that downstream system has adequate capacity for the post-development flows up to and including the 100-year return period storm event.	Quantity control proposed per Site Servicing Report (Section 4.0)
Identification of potential impacts to receiving watercourses.	N/A
Identification of municipal drains and related approval requirements.	N/A
Description of how the conveyance and storage capacity will be achieved for the development.	Site Servicing Report (Section 4.0)
100 year flood levels and major flow routing to protect proposed development from flooding for establishing minimum building elevations (MBE) and overall grading.	Site Servicing Report (Section 4.0) Drawings OS, DST, SMW
Inclusion of hydraulic analysis, including hydraulic grade line elevations.	Site Servicing Report (Section 4.0)
Description of approach to erosion and sediment control during construction for the protection of receiving watercourse or drainage corridors.	Site Servicing Report (Section 5.0)
Identification of floodplains – proponent to obtain relevant floodplain information from the appropriate Conservation Authority. The proponent may be required to delineate floodplain elevations to the satisfaction of the Conservation Authority if such information is not available or if information does not match current conditions.	N/A

Identification of fill constraints related to floodplain and geotechnical	N/A
investigation.	

4.5	APPROVAL AND PERMIT REQUIREMENTS	REFERENCE
The Site propose include	e Servicing Report shall provide a list of applicable permits and regulatory app d development, as well as the relevant issues affecting such approval. The a but not be limited to the following:	rovals necessary for the pproval and permitting shall
	Conservation Authority as the designated approval agency for modification of floodplain, potential impact on fish habitat, proposed works in or adjacent to a watercourse, cut/fill permits and Approval under Lakes and Rivers Improvement Act. The Conservation Authority is not the approval authority for the Lakes and Rivers Improvement Act. Where there are Conservation Authority regulations in place, approval under the Lakes and Rivers Improvement Act is not required, except in cases of dams, as defined in the Act.	N/A
	Application for Environmental Compliance Approval (ECA) under the Ontario Water Resources Act.	Ongoing
	Changes to Municipal Drains.	N/A
	Other permits (National Capital Commission, Parks Canada, Public Works and Government Services Canada, Ministry of Transportation, etc.).	N/A

4.6	CONCLUSION CHECKLIST	REFERENCE
	Clearly stated conclusions and recommendations.	Site Servicing Report (Section 2.7, 3.6, 4.7)
	Comments received from review agencies, including the City of Ottawa and information on how the comments were addressed. Final sign-off from the responsible reviewing agency.	Comment Response Letter to City of Ottawa
	All draft and final reports shall be signed and stamped by a Professional Engineer registered in Ontario.	Site Servicing Report All Drawings

Appendix B

Concept Plan, Draft Plan of Subdivision and Topographical Survey



LOT NUMBER	AREAS (M2)	LOT NUMBE
B01-1	394	B06-4
B01-2	184	B06-5
B01-3	184	B06-6
B01-4	189	B06-7
B01-5	189	B07
B01-6	184	B08-1
B01-7	184	B08-2
B01-8	299	B08-3
B02-1	281	B08-4
B02-2	176	B08-5
B02-3	184	B08-6
B02-4	184	B08-7
B02-5	174	B09-1
B02-6	233	B09-2
B03-1	250	B09-3
B03-2	182	B09-4
B03-3	182	B09-5
B03-4	182	B09-6
B03-5	182	B10-1
B03-6	182	B10-2
B03-7	250	B10-3
B04-1	233	B10-4
B04-2	174	B10-5
B04-3	184	B10-6
B04-4	174	B11-1
B04-5	184	B11-2
B04-6	174	B11-3
B04-7	278	B11-4
B05-1	368	B11-5
B05-2	154	B11-6
B05-3	163	B11-7
B05-4	163	B12
B05-5	154	B13
B05-6	206	B14
B06-1	206	B16
B06-2	154	B17
B06-3	163	



AREAS (M2)

1,232

5,728

7,811

5,312

E	XISTING BUILDING		LOT LINE		
	IEW BUILDING		SETBACKS		
	IEW BUILDING WITH COMMERCIAL SPACE		NEW TREE		
G	GRASS		FIREWALL		
A	SPHALT		SIDEWALK		
SITE INFOR	MATION & DEVEL	OPMENT ST	ATISTICS		DIN
//5				047	56 - 0303
				047	56 - 0315
				047 047	56 - 0316 56 - 1337
ONING				GM[2546	6] H(14.5)
SITE AREA					
TOTAL SITE AR TOTAL DEVELC NET SITE AREA	EA: DPABLE AREA: :		- - -	~53,441.14 m ² ~45,956.28 m ² ~38,956.28 m ²	(5.34ha) (4.59ha) (3.89ha)
JNITS					
UWNHOUSES MAIN U	o: NIT:				67 UNITS
BASEME				-	67 UNITS
UTAL NUMBE	R OF UNITS:			1	.54 UNITS
1 X RESI	DENTIAL APARTMENT	BUILDING			48 UNITS
1 X MIXI R	ED USE BUILDING ESIDENTIAL:				36 UNITS
SI ОСК 02. С	OMMERCIAL SPACES:				~899 m²
1 X RESI		BUILDING			47 UNITS
1 X MIXI R	ED USE BUILDING ESIDENTIAL:				36 UNITS
C LOCK 03.	OMMERCIAL SPACES:				~899 m²
2 X RESI	DENTIAL APARTMENT	BUILDING			96 UNITS
	R OF UNITS:			3	97 UNITS
			REQUIRED	Ρ	ROVIDED
	NSITY		ΝΟΜΔΧ	י. מיו 102	its/net ba
				102 UII	
			INU IVIIN.		5.8 m
1INIMUM LOT	Γ AREA		NO MIN.		174 m ²
1AXIMUM BU	ILDING HEIGHT		14.5 m		14.5 m
ETBACKS					
/INIMUM FRO	ONT YARD: RNER SIDE YARD:		3 m 3 m		3 m 3 m
	ERIOR SIDE YARD:	-USF	5 m		5 ~~
LOW-RIS	SE RESIDENTIAL :		1.2 m		1.2 m
MID-RIS	E RESIDENTIAL : R YARD:		3 m		3 m
ABUTTI	NG A STREET:		3 m		3 m
FOR A R	ESIDENTIAL ZONE:	i:	7.5 m 7.5 m		7.5 m 7.5 m
PARKING RATE	S				
19 - TOWNHO	USES:	1 p/mai ח	n unit = 67	67 (0 נופת 67	GARAGES) VE AISLES
BLOCK 14:		U			, 11JLLJ
R12 - AF	PARTEMENTS	1.0 p)/unit = 84	84 (UNDER	GROUND)
N79 - RE	ETAIL STORE:	0.2 p 3.4 p/100 m ²	GFA = 30.6	32 (E	XTERIOR)
BLOCK 15:				тс)TAL: 134
R12 - AF VISITOR	PARTEMENTS :	ן 1.0 /a 2.2	o/unit = 83 unit = 16.6	83 (UNDER) 16 (UNDER)	GROUND) GROUND)
N79 - RE	ETAIL STORE:	3.4 p/100 m ²	GFA = 30.6	32 (E	XTERIOR)
BLOCK 17:				Ĩ	7 AL: 131
R12 - AF VISITOR	PARTEMENTS :	1.0 j 0.2 n/	0/unit = 96 unit = 19.2	96 (UNDER) 19 (15 FXT	GROUND) + 4 UNN או
	AREA	۲۹ - ۲۰	=	TC	DTAL: 115
OWNHOUSE	<u>ANEA</u> A:				267 m ²
DWNHOUSE I	B:				239 m ²
OWNHOUSE (OWNHOUSE (C: C (CORNER UNIT):				232 m ² 236 m ²
OWNHOUSE	D:				225 m ²
OTAL MODEL	01 (ABBBBBBA)				1,968 m ²
OTAL MODEL	02 (ABBBBBA)				1,490 m ²
OTAL MODEL	04 (CDCDCDC) 05 (CDCCDC)				1,611 m ² 1,386 m ²
					-,JUU III ⁻
AIXED USE BU	ILDING (TOTAL OF 2 E	BUILDINGS):		TOTAL:	3,926 m ² 3,027 m ²
COMME	ERCIAL:				899 m ²
0011111				ΤΟΤΑΙ·	3.927 m ²
	PARTMENT BUILDING	3 (TOTAL OF 4	BOILDINGSJ.		3 977 m ²

BY DIVIDING BY 0,3048.



GLOBAL SITE PLAN



\bigotimes	5033144.88	381482.57						
B	5032879.91	381255.06						
COORDINATES CANNOT, IN THEMSELVES, BE USED TO RE-ESTABLISH CORNERS								
OR BOUNDARIES SHOWN ON THIS PLAN.								



ELEVATIONS SHOWN HEREON ARE GEODETIC (CGVD-1928:1978) AND ARE DERIVED FROM THE

Appendix C

Background Drawings – Existing Infrastructure



	\wedge					·	
<u>AS-BU</u> This dr	ILT DRAWING RAWING HAS BEEN REVISED T	D INCORPORATE			NO.	REVISIONS	BY
CHANGE: DRAVIN VERIFIE DDES N	s indicated on the contrac GS. Contractor's drawings ED on site by the engineer ot take responsibility for	CTOR'S MARKED UP WERE NOT THE ENGINEER INFORMATION ON			6	AS – CONSTRUCTED	GTP
CONDITI INFORMA	ION DUE TO INACCURATE OR MATION ON THE MARKED UP DRA	VIN EXISTING USSING WINGS PROVIDED.			4	REVISED WATERMAIN	GTP GTP
				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	NOTE: The loc	ation of the utilities is appr	oximate only,
			linl	CONSULTING ENGINEERS DI ANNIERS	location authori The con	should be determined by co ries and utility companies co tractor shall prove the loc	nsulting the n ncerned. ation of utility
	7.				Srutt of	responsive for adequate pr	olection from
	Q-/						
/			C	7	/F 83.68 T	/F 84.38	
o.!	2+15(/ ∠ ∠ /		0		2768 5 2768 5		T/F 83.68
<u>-</u>	FUTURE		•				2760
	CUL-DE-S	SAC 400m	m FORCEMAIN				
ИВН15 /			mm-FORCEMAIN -				
		/_	1	ВНТО			
	250mm	SANITARY SEWER		1		250mm SANITARY S	EWER
						·	
		2781					
	2787	T/F 82.53	2777 T/F 83.01		2767 T/F 83.1	6	2757 T /F 85.01
	T/F 83.15						
2797 T/F 83.22			1				
D				SAN 120	MH Ommø MH		
				(11) T/C	82.55 82.50		
							2757
						2768	
IM IN			705		2768		2760
2797	2787	- EX. WA	305mm TERMAIN		2767		
INV_79.72							
BACKFILL (TYP)					1 29:27 79.28 1 29:22 79.19		
NO 76 74-							
_ 300mm & 400mm FORCEMAINS							
mm p and 400mm	P 70 SUK 32.5 FOR	VEMAINS					
124.5m 120:0m of 250	mm# PVC DR35 SAN	TARY SEWER • 0,80	0.867%		198m 129.0r	n of 250mm∳ PVC	DR35
7	+150	7	+200		\$AN		90% 0.772
ATERM.		J	1 200		JTZ		
≤ س	Rx	B ®	2 N	₽ 4	2 2	ž Ľ	<i>4</i>
	A la			7 9.4	79. 8	20-27 20-27	99 72 7









300

2752

BH17

		<u>SAN_MH</u> 1200mmø N						
	(OPSD 701.0 3+455.5 ୬- T/C 86-06	010 +456.5 86.03				SAN MH	
						(14)	0PSD 701.010 3+559.9 3+5638 T/C 85.05 80.03	
2714		2705	2704	EX. 305				
			2701		2695 2690			
						2687		
		N INV 81.12 S INV 81.07	81.15 81.09				TV 81.80 81.83	
				+				<u></u>
	400							
and 400mm		<u>SDR 32.5 F</u>	ORCEMAINS					
X 0,776%		1	04.4m of 250mm	PVC DR35 SANITARY	SEWER 0 0.65% 0.652%			
	3+450	<u> </u>		3+500		3+550		
						<u></u>		
N.	2		0	o	Q	4		

80%	81.02	81.10	81.19	81.26	81.34	14.18	1 0
 				<u> </u>			<u> </u>







<u>_</u>								
		NO	. REVISIONS	BY	DATE	FOREST	' VALLEV	h
AS-BUILT DRAWING		5	AS – CONSTRUCTED	GTP	FEB/2007	FUNEST		W Htown
CHANGES INDICATED ON THE CONTRACTOR'S MARKED UP		4	ISSUED FOR TENDER	GTP	JUN 9/05	SANITARY	SERVICING	
VERIFIED ON SITE BY THE ENGINEER. THE ENGINEER		3	ISSUED TO CITY FOR REVIE	W GTP	05/03/23			CONTRACT NO.
THIS DRAWING THAT IS IN CONFLICT WITH EXISTING		2	ISSUED TO CITY FOR REVIE	W GTP	05/03/18	DUAL F	FORCEMAIN	
INFORMATION ON THE MARKED UP DRAWINGS PROVIDED.			ISSUED FOR UTILITY CIRCULAT	TION GTP	05/03/15	STA 3+600	- STA 3+900	13415-C8
		NO'	TE:	minato onla	the error			SHEET 10 OF -
		17	cation should be determined by con	suiting the	municipal	W. NEWELL, P.ENG.	W. CLOUTHIER, P.ENG.	DATE MARCH 2005
		authorities and utility companies concerned. The contractor shall prove the location of utilities and			Director Infrastructure Services	Manager Construction Services-Development	t SCALE Hor 0m 5 10m	
	PLANNERS	sł	rall be responsible for adequate pro	lection from	damage	Dwn: AVH Chkd: GTP	Des: GTP Chkd: JM	vert Óm 1m
								,

1

(.	12A) SAN MH 3+734.101 T/C 85.99	5.90	T/C 86	.37						
		MANHOLE CATCHER GRATE OLE 12A DETAILS)								
				EX. SAN MH						
	900 SAN	MM PVC DR35 ITARY SEWER		EXISTING 900mm	CONCRETE SEW	ER			м ч.	
V \ 8 V 0	PLUG/SEAL E	XISTING 200mm IN WEST CATCH BASIN	1 900 1	0mm Ø INV 82,95						
≰8⊅ TCH RET	.09 Existing Te sewer invert									
	45 4									
	+ 468m ▲5m (F 900mm PVC DR35								
-	S	ANITARY SEWER					 			
	<u> </u>	+750	·				 <u></u>			

3+729.1 22.5* BEND 300mm &

 Ψ

750

t n

NEW STORM PIPE BETWEEN CATCH BASINS

--REMOVE 1800mmø MANHOLE

45m OF 900mm CLASS 100D CONCRETE PIPE WITH FACTORY INSTALLED H.D.P.E. PROTECTIVE EMBEDMENT LINING (3mm THICK)


										BUSH	6000 CB				A C.		A CHART AND A CHAR			CLOSER BERN	RAPER ON BARRIER ON	
			с к79.85 -	Radius	130.0 60:14 TS	2		. 80.93,	Juis			<u>TOP 0</u> ; <u>81.57</u> 84.0m-	EBANK 1350mn	HI OR TO SOM	@ 1.15	STATES	THERS)	H	RON H-	The second secon		
				- CE	GAS	Q OF	ASPHAL	T GAS		9 MH2	GAS	 65.5	GAS	0mmø 5		NNECT GAS	to ex S	ISTING	MANNE	ILE G ILE CONCR	H	
3 3 5 86.0 3 3 5 86.0 3 3 5 86.0 3 3 5 86.0 3 3 5 81.0 3 3 5 81.0 3 3 3 82.0 3 3 3 83.0 3 3 3 81.0 3 3 3 81.0 3 3 3 79.0 3 3 3 79.0 3 3 3 70.0 3 3 3 77.0 3 3 3 76.0 3 3 3			×8 0.5ℓ	6 <u>-1515</u> 6	0.59 36.37 94.31	ð		¥79.85	¥80.10			*80.48	ê Or TOP C	F DITCH	***	81:04	HEAD _ WALL) 91.37 - 1	₩L `OP=82.00 VV.=81.42	CUL TOP=83 INV.=XX	5 5.04 (XX) 1E 12	
36	EX. ROAD CENTERLINE																		83.29		83.60	
86.0 85.0 85.0 86.0 <td< td=""><td>TOP OF WATERMAIN</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></td<>	TOP OF WATERMAIN																					
85.0 90.0 <td< td=""><td>86.0</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>(mm</td><td></td><td></td></td<>	86.0																			(mm		
84.0 2	85.0																			1H (1850mm×2400	V MH (3000¢)	L OF NAVIN ROAD
82.0 81.0 80.0 PLTUE 80.0 PLTUE 90.0 PLTUE 90.0 PLTUE 91.0 PLTUE 92.0 PLTUE 93.0 PLTUE 90.0 PLTUE 90	84.0 83.0																			EX.STM M STA=0+C	EX.SAP	
81.0 80.0 Fu TURE 600mm # STM 79.0 S.NV=78.72 S.NV=78.72 S.NV=78.72 78.0 TFF DROP SIGNULINE AS PIRC OPSD 100.61 AND OPSS 407.07 78.0 0 0 0.5.5m - 600mm# SAN SEWER # 0.332% 0.32% 77.0 0 0 0.5.5m - 600mm# SAN SEWER # 0.332% 0.32% 76.0 Storm - 500mm# SAN SEWER # 0.32% 1.150mm# storm - 1.150mm# store stor	82.0																					
80.0 FUTURE 79.0 SINV=78.72 79.0 300mm# STORM. TFE DROP STRUCTURE AS PER OPS 100.6.01 AND OPSS 407.07 AS PER OPS 100.6.01 77.0 65.5m - 600mm# SIN SEWER @ 0.52% 76.0 State of the second se	81.0																					
78.0 AS PER OPSD 1008.01 AND OPSS 407.07 77.0 65.5m - 600mmø SAN SEWER @ 0.52% 76.0 84.0m - 1350mmø STM CONC. CLICO-D SEWER @ 1.15%	80.0 79.0																FI 6 S	TURE Omm NV=7	STM 3.72			
77.0 65.5m - 600mmø SAN SLINLK & CAN 76.0	78.0															TEF I AS P A	BOOMP ROP S ER OPS ND OP	nø STC TRUCT SD 100 SS 40 SS 40	RM. URF 3.01 7.07			R
Z	77.0													65.5m	60	1350	Ommø	STM C	ONC.			
	10.0														84.0m CL11	00-D	SEWER					





Stantec Consulting Ltd. 1505 Laperriere Avenue Ottawa ON Canada K1Z 7T1 Tel. 613.722.4420 Fax. 613.722.2799 www.stantec.com

Stantec

Copyright Reserved The Contractor shall verify and be responsible for all dimensions. DO NOT scale the drawing - any errors or omissions shall be reported to Stantec without delay. The Copyrights to all designs and drawings are the property of Stantec. Reproduction or use for any purpose other than that authorized by Stantec is forbidden.

Notes

- ALL MATERIALS AND CONSTRUCTION METHODS TO BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH OPS AND CITY OF OTTAWA STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS AND DRAWINGS AND OPSD SUPPLEMENT. ONTARIO PROVINCIAL STANDARDS WILL APPLY WHERE NO CITY STANDARDS ARE AVAILABLE.
 THE CONTRACTOR IS RESPONSIBLE FOR OBTAINING ALL PERMITS REQUIRED AND BEAR COST OF SAME INCLUDING WATER PERMIT AND ASSOCIATED COSTS.
 SERVICE AND UTILITY LOCATIONS ARE APPROXIMATE, CONTRACTOR TO VERIFY LOCATION AND ELEVATION OF EXISTING SERVICES AND UTILITIES PRIOR TO ANY CONSTRUCTION. CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR OBTAINING LOCATES FROM ALL UTILITY COMPANIES TO LOCATE EXISTING UTILITIES PRIOR TO EXCAVATION. THE CONTRACTOR IS RESPONSIBLE FOR PROTECTION AND REINSTATEMENT.
 ALL DISTURBED AREAS SHALL BE REINSTATED TO EQUAL OR BETTER CONDITION
- AND REINSTATEMENT.
 ALL DISTURBED AREAS SHALL BE REINSTATED TO EQUAL OR BETTER CONDITION TO THE SATISFACTION OF THE ENGINEER & THE CITY. PAVEMENT REINSTATEMENT FOR SERVICE AND UTILITY CUTS SHALL BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH OPSD 509.010 AND OPSS 310.
 SANITARY SEWERS TO BE PVC SDR35 INSTALLED AS PER CITY OF OTTAWA STANDARD S6 AND S7.
 STORM SEWERS 375mm DIA. OR SMALLER SHALL BE PVC SDR 35. STORM SEWERS LARGER THAN 375mm DIA. OR SMALLER SHALL BE PVC SDR 35. STORM SEWERS LARGER THAN 375mm DIA. SHALL BE CONCRETE CSA A 257 CLASS 100 D.
 THE CONTRACTOR SHALL CONSTRUCT WATERMAIN,WATER SERVICES,CONNECTIONS & APPURTENANCES AS PER CITY OF OTTAWA SPECIFICATIONS & SHALL CO-ORDINATE AND PAY ALL RELATED COSTS INCLUDING THE COST OF CONNECTION, INSPECTION & DISINFECTION BY CITY PERSONNEL.SERVICE CONNECTIONS SHALL BE INSTALLED A MINIMUM OF 2400mm FROM ANY CATCHBASIN, MANHOLE, OR OBJECT THAT MAY CONTRIBUTE TO FREEZING, THERMAL INSULATION SHALL BE INSTALLED ON ALL PROPOSED CB'S ON THE W/M STREET SIDE WHERE 2400mm SEPARATION CANNOT BE ACHIEVED.(AS PER CITY OF OTTAWA W22 & W23)(CATHODIC PROTECTION AS PER CITY OF OTTAWA 440 AND W42). WATERMAIN PIPE IS NOT TO EXCEED 1/2 OF THAT SPECIFIED BY THE MANUFACTURER.
 STREET LIGHTING TO CITY OF OTTAWA STANDARDS.
- 8 STREET LIGHTING TO CITY OF OTTAWA STANDARDS.
- 9 STORM AND SANITARY MANHOLES SHALL BE 1200mm DIAMETER IN ACCORDANCE WITH OPSD-701.01 (UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED) c/w FRAME AND COVER AS PER CITY OF OTTAWA S24 AND S25. ALL STORM MANHOLES WITH SEWERS 900mm DIA SEWERS AND OVER IN SIZE SHALL BE BENCHED. ALL OTHERS SHALL BE COMPLETED WITH 300mm SUMPS AS PER CITY STANDARDS.
- WITH 300mm SUMPS AS PER CITY STANDARDS.
 CATCH BASINS SHALL BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH CITY STANDARDS c/w FRAME AND GRATE AS PER S20 AND S21 FOR REAR YARDS AND S3 FOR STREET CB'S. PROVIDE 150mm ADJUSTED SPACERS. ALL CATCH BASINS SHALL HAVE SUMPS (600mm DEEP). CATCH BASIN LEADS SHALL BE 200mm DIA.(MIN) PVC SDR 35 AT 1.0% GR. ALL STEET CB'S WILL BE INSTALLED WITH 'IPEX' INLET CONTROL DEVICE (ICD)
 EXCESS EXCAVATED MATERIAL SHALL BE REMOVED FROM THE SITE.
 THE CONTRACTOR SHALL IMPLEMENT BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES TO PROVIDE PROTECTION FOR RECEIVING STORM SEWERS OR DRAINAGE DURING CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES. (ie: FILTER CLOTH ON CATCH BASINS, STRAW BALE CHECK DAMS AND SEDIMENT CONTROLS AROUND ALL DISTURBED AREAS). DEWATERING SHALL BE PUMPED INTO SEDIMENT TRAPS. (SEE EROSION CONTROL PLAN).
 GRANULAR "A" SHALL BE PLACED TO A MINIMUM THICKNESS OF 300 mm
- 13 GRANULAR "A" SHALL BE PLACED TO A MINIMUM THICKNESS OF 300 mm AROUND ALL STRUCTURES WITHIN PAVEMENT AREA 14 SEWER TRENCH SHALL CONSIST OF A CLASS "B" BEDDING AS PER CITY OF OTTAWA STANDARDS S6 AND S7. COMPACTION SHALL BE A MINIMUM OF 98% STANDARD PROCTOR DENSITY.
- 97% STANDARD PROCTOR DENSITY.
 15 ALL GRANULAR FOR ROADS SHALL BE COMPACTED TO A MINIMUM OF 98% STANDARD PROCTOR DENSITY.
 16 ALL NECESSARY CLEARING AND GRUBBING SHALL BE COMPLETED BY THE CONTRACTOR. REVIEW WITH ARCHITECT AND THE CITY OF OTTAWA PRIOR TO TREE CUTTING.
 17 CONTRACTOR SHALL PERFORM LEAKAGE TESTING, IN THE PRESENCE OF THE CONSULTANT, FOR SANITARY SEWERS IN ACCORDANCE WITH OPSS 410 AND OPSS 407. CONTRACTOR SHALL PERFORM VIDEO INSPECTION OF ALL STORM AND SANITARY SEWERS. A COPY OF THE VIDEO AND INSPECTION REPORT SHALL BE SUBMITED TO THE CONSULTANT FOR REVIEW.
 18 ASPHALT WEAR COURSE SHALL NOT BE PLACED UNTIL THE VIDEO INSPECTION OF SATISFACTION OF THE CONSULTANT.
 19 SUB-EXCAVATE SOFT AREAS & FILL WITH GRANULAR 'B' COMPACTED IN 0.15m LAYERS.
- 20 FOR ALL LANDSCAPING FEATURES (ie. TREES, WALKWAYS, PARK DETAILS, NOISE BARRIERS, FENCES etc.) REFER TO LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT PLAN
- 21 CONCRETE CURBS SHALL BE CONSTRUCTED AS PER CITY STANDARD
- SC1.1(BARRIER) AND SC1.3(MOUNTABLE) AS NOTE ON DWGS. 22 ALL DIMENSIONS ARE IN METRES UNLESS OTHERWISE STATED. 23 CLAY SEALS TO BE INSTALLED AS PER CITY STANDARD DRAWING S8. THE SEALS SHOULD BE AT LEAST 1.5m LONG (IN THE TRENCH DIRECTION) AND SHOULD EXTEND FROM TRENCH WALL TO TRENCH WALL. GENERALLY, THE SEALS SHOULD EXTEND FROM FROST LINE AND FULLY PENETRATE THE BEDDING, SUBBEDDING AND COVER MATERIAL. THE BARRIERS SHOULD CONSIST OF RELATIVELY DRY AND COMPACTABLE BROWN SILTY CLAY PLACED IN MAXIMUM 225mm THICK LOOSE LAYERS COMPACTED TO A MINIMUM OF 95% OF THE MATERIAL'S SPMDD. THE CLAY SEALS SHOULD BE PLACED AT THE SITE BOUNDARIES AND AT STRATEGIC LOCATIONS AT NO MORE THAN 60m INTERVALS IN THE SERVICE TRENCHES.

5 AS RECORDED		GBU	GT	11.12.12
4 MINOR LOT LINE F	REVISION	MJS	TJW	11.02.17
3 REVISED AS PER	NEW SITE PLAN	MJS	TJW	11.01.12
2 REVISED AS PER	CITY COMMENTS	MJS	TJW	10.06.22
1 ISSUED TO CITY F	OR APPROVAL	MJS	TJW	10.04.20
Revision		Ву	Appd.	YY.MM.DD
File Name: 160400477	D	CT TJW	MJS	08.10.28
	D	wn. Chkd.	Dsgn.	YY.MM.DD



Client/Project **RICHCRAFT HOMES**

Seal

PAGE ROAD DEVELOPMENT

Ottawa ON Canada

Title

RENAUD ROAD STA. 0+000 TO STA. 0+080

Project No. 160400477	Scale 1:500H 0 5 1:50V 0 0.5	15 25m 1.5 2.5m
Drawing No.	Sheet	Revision
PP-9	12 _{of} 18	5





Ч

84.0

83.0

82.0

81.0

80.0

79.0

78.0

77.0

76.0

75.0

74.0

73.0

STORM SEWER INVERT

ANITAR) SEWER INVERT



Stantec Consulting Ltd. 1505 Laperriere Avenue Ottawa ON Canada K1Z 7T1 Tel. 613.722.4420 Fax. 613.722.2799 www.stantec.com

Stante

Copyright Reserved The Contractor shall verify and be responsible for all dimensions. DO NOT scale the drawing - any errors or omissions shall be reported to Stantec without delay. The Copyrights to all designs and drawings are the property of Stantec. Reproduction or use for any purpose other than that authorized by Stantec is forbidden.

Notes

- 1 ALL MATERIALS AND CONSTRUCTION METHODS TO BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH OPS AND CITY OF OTTAWA STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS AND DRAWINGS AND OPSD SUPPLEMENT. ONTARIO PROVINCIAL STANDARDS WILL APPLY WHERE NO CITY STANDARDS ARE AVAILABLE.
- 2 THE CONTRACTOR IS RESPONSIBLE FOR OBTAINING ALL PERMITS REQUIRED AND BEAR COST OF SAME INCLUDING WATER PERMIT AND ASSOCIATED
- 3 SERVICE AND UTILITY LOCATIONS ARE APPROXIMATE, CONTRACTOR TO VERIFY LOCATION AND ELEVATION OF EXISTING SERVICES AND UTILITIES PRIOR TO ANY CONSTRUCTION. CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR OBTAINING LOCATES FROM ALL UTILITY COMPANIES TO LOCATE EXISTING UTILITIES PRIOR TO EXCAVATION. THE CONTRACTOR IS RESPONSIBLE FOR PROTECTION AND REINSTATEMENT.
- 4 ALL DISTURBED AREAS SHALL BE REINSTATED TO EQUAL OR BETTER CONDITION TO THE SATISFACTION OF THE ENGINEER & THE CITY. PAVEMENT REINSTATEMENT FOR SERVICE AND UTILITY CUTS SHALL BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH OPSD 509.010 AND OPSS 310.
- 5 STORM SEWERS 375mm DIA. OR SMALLER SHALL BE PVC SDR 35. STORM SEWERS LARGER THAN 375mm DIA. SHALL BE CONCRETE CSA A 257 CLASS 100 D.
- 6 STORM MANHOLES SIZE SHALL BE AS INDICATED ON THE
- PROFILES IN ACCORDANCE WITH OPSD c/w FRAME AND COVER AS PER CITY OF OTTAWA S24.1 AND S25. 7 STREET CBs SHALL BE CURB INLET TYPE AS PER CITY STANDARD S3. FRAME AND COVER AS PER CITY STANDARD S22 AND S23, AND PROVIDED WITH 150mmø SPACERS. ALL CBs SHALL HAVE 600mmø SUMPS. CB LEADS SHALL BE 200mmø (MIN.) PVC SDR35 AT 1.0% MIN. ALL STREET CBs WILL BE INTERCONNECTED WITH ICDs. SEE SCHEDULE ON DWG. OSD-1.
- 8 THE CONTRACTOR SHALL IMPLEMENT BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES TO PROVIDE PROTECTION FOR RECEIVING STORM SEWERS OR DRAINAGE DURING CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES. (ie: FILTER CLOTH ON CATCH BASINS, STRAW BALE CHECK DAMS AND SEDIMENT CONTROLS AROUND ALL DISTURBED AREAS), DEWATERING SHALL BE PUMPED INTO SEDIMENT TRAPS. (SEE EROSION CONTROL PLAN).
- 9 GRANULAR "A" SHALL BE PLACED TO A MINIMUM THICKNESS OF 300 mm AROUND ALL STRUCTURES WITHIN PAVEMENT AREA
- 0 SEWER TRENCH SHALL CONSIST OF A CLASS "B" BEDDING AS PER CITY OF OTTAWA STANDARDS S6 AND S7. COMPACTION SHALL BE A MINIMUM OF 98% STANDARD PROCTOR DENSITY.
- 1 ALL GRANULAR FOR ROADS SHALL BE COMPACTED TO A MINIMUM OF 98% STANDARD PROCTOR DENSITY.
- 12 ALL NECESSARY CLEARING AND GRUBBING SHALL BE COMPLETED BY THE CONTRACTOR. REVIEWED BY THE CITY OF OTTAWA PRIOR TO TREE
- 13 CONTRACTOR SHALL PERFORM VIDEO INSPECTION OF ALL STORM SEWERS. A COPY OF THE VIDEO AND INSPECTION REPORT SHALL BE SUBMITTED TO THE CONSULTANT FOR REVIEW.
- 14 ASPHALT WEAR COURSE SHALL NOT BE PLACED UNTIL THE VIDEO INSPECTION OF SEWERS & NECESSARY REPAIRS HAVE BEEN CARRIED OUT TO THE SATISFACTION OF THE CONSULTANT.
- 15 SUB-EXCAVATE SOFT AREAS & FILL WITH GRANULAR 'B' COMPACTED IN 0.15m LAYERS
- 16 CONCRETE CURBS SHALL BE CONSTRUCTED AS PER CITY STANDARD SC1.1
- 17 ALL DIMENSIONS ARE IN METRES UNLESS OTHERWISE STATED. 18 RECONNECT EXISTING SANITARY SERVICE LATERALS FROM EXISTING
- RESIDENTAL UNITS AS REQUIRED AS PER CITY STANDARD S11.
- 19 STORM SERVICE LATERALS TO BE INSTALL FOR THE EXISTING RESIDENTS ALONG RENAUD ROAD TO PROPERTY LINE AS REQUIRED AS PER CITY STANDARD S11. CONNECTION LOCATION AND INV. TO BE DETERMINED IN FIELD. (INVERT AT PROPERTY LINE SHALL BE A MINIMUM OF 3.0m BELOW TOP OF FOUNDATION WALL.)
- 20 150mmø SUBDRAIN TO BE INSTALLED 300mm BELOW SUBGRADE LEVEL CONTINUOUS ALONG BOTH SIDES OF PAVEMENT, CONNECTED TO CATCHBASINS.
- 21 REFER TO GEOTECHNICAL REPORT BY PATERSONGROUP DATED NOVEMBER 17, 2008 FOR TEST PIT INFORMATION AND GEOTECHNICAL RECOMMENDATIONS.

7	AS RECORDED	GBU	GT	11.12.12
6	AS RECORDED	CTL	РМ	11.03.25
5	ISSUED FOR CONSTRUCTION	NI	TJW	10.04.01
4	ISSUED FOR TENDER	NI	TJW	09.04.17
3	ADD FRONT YARD GRADING	NI	TJW	09.02.25
2	REVISED AS PER CITY COMMENTS/ ADD BOREHOLES INFORMATION	NI	TJW	08.12.01
1	REVISED STORM SEWER ALIGNMENT AS PER CITY COMMENTS	NI	TJW	08.10.17
0	1ST SUBMISSION	NI	TJW	08.08.12
Re	vision	By	Appd.	YY.MM.DD
File	Name: 160400704C-SP&PP NI	PM	TJW	08.07.10

Seal

RECORD DRAWING DATE <u>DEC. 12/11</u>

Dwn. Chkd. Dsgn. YY.MM.DD

Client/Project

Title

CLARIDGE HOMES (CARSON) INC.

RENAUD ROAD IMPROVEMENTS

Ottawa ON Canada

RENAUD ROAD STA. 1+775 TO STA. 1+966

Project No. Scale 1:500H 160400704 1:50V Drawing No. Sheet Revision PP-4 6 of 12



ISD14-5104-030-PP-02.dgn 28/05/2018 10:06:48 AM

		100m - 900mm Ø CL 100D STORM SE
+650.0 -	+675.0 -	- 700.0+





20m - 900mm Ø CL 100D STORM SEWER @ 0.10%		83m - 90 STORM S
		<u>88</u> 8
950.0 -	975.0 -	- 0.000
+	+	+



RACT			B N	RIAN COBUR NEW ROAD CO	N BOULEVARD	C) ttc	wa
	4+050		W. R.	GRADING PAGE RO TURNIN	Contract No. Dwg. f ISD14-5104 P2 Sheet of Asset No.			
	600 	RE AL AT COM	ECORE LL NUM DASID	Cure Services Department	Design & Construction - Municipal East	Asset Group Des. C.T Dwn. C.T Utility Circ. I Const. Inspection Scale: 0m	 Ch Ch Ch Ch Ch Ch HORIZON	k'd. R.C. k'd. D.R. ex No.
······		NO	TE: T th of	he location of utilities is ap ne municipal authorities an f utilities and shall be respo I	proximate only, the exact location shoul d utility companies concerned. The cont onsible for adequate protection from dar	d be determine ractor shall pro nage.	ed by consu ove the loca	lting tion Date
			NO.			N	BC	(dd/mm/yy)
	<u>{</u> @.	SNC	2		ISSUED FOR TENDER		R.C.	05.06.15
		EVISI(3	IS	SUED FOR CONSTRUCTION		R.C.	01.03.16
		RE	4	REVISED STORM SEW	ER, PROFILE & CULVERT STATIONS	SCM NO. 33	R.C.	14.07.16
			5	REVISED STOP	RM SEWER CONFIGURATION SCM NO	0.49	R.C.	13.10.16
			6		AS BUILT		R.C.	30.03.18

Appendix D1

Water Demands and FUS Calculations

WATERMAIN DEMAND CALCULATION SHEET

PROJECT :	NAVAN ROAD DEVELOPMENT PROJECT
LOCATION :	CITY OF OTTAWA
DEVELOPER :	12714001 Canada Inc.

		RESIDEN	ΓIAL		NON-RESIDENTIAL	A	VERAGE DAII	LY	М	AXIMUM DAI	LY	PEAK HOUR			
NODE		UNITS			COMM	[DEMAND (I/s	5)	[DEMAND (I/s	s)	[DEMAND (I/s	5)	
	Townhouses (TH)	Apartments	Condo Units (CU)	POPN	(ha.)	Res.	Non-res.	Total	Res.	Non-res.	Total	Res.	Non-res.	Total	
J-1	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
J-2	8	8	0	33	0.00	0.11	0.00	0.11	0.27	0.00	0.27	0.58	0.00	0.58	
J-4	0	0	84	151	0.09	0.49	0.03	0.52	1.23	0.05	1.27	2.70	0.08	2.78	
J-5	0	0	36	65	0.09	0.21	0.03	0.24	0.53	0.05	0.57	1.16	0.08	1.24	
J-6	0	0	47	85	0.00	0.27	0.00	0.27	0.69	0.00	0.69	1.51	0.00	1.51	
J-7	13	13	0	53	0.00	0.17	4.00	4.17	0.43	4.00	4.43	0.95	4.00	4.95	
J-8	26	26	0	107	0.00	0.35	0.00	0.35	0.86	0.00	0.86	1.90	0.00	1.90	
J-9	20	20	0	82	0.00	0.27	0.00	0.27	0.66	0.00	0.66	1.46	0.00	1.46	
J-10	0	0	96	173	0.00	0.56	0.00	0.56	1.40	0.00	1.40	3.08	0.00	3.08	
J-11	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
J-12	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
J-13	0	0	0	0	0.39	0.00	0.12	0.12	0.00	0.19	0.19	0.00	0.34	0.34	
J-14	0	0	0	0	0.39	0.00	0.12	0.12	0.00	0.19	0.19	0.00	0.34	0.34	
J-15	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
J-16	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
TOTALS	67	67	263	748	0.96	2.42	4.31	6.74	6.06	4.46	10.53	13.33	4.84	18.17	

		ASSUMPTIONS			
RESIDENTIAL DENSITIES		AVG. DAILY DEMAND		MAX. HOURLY DEMAND	
- Townhouse (TH)	<u>2.7</u> p/p/u	- Residential	<u>280</u> I / cap / day	- Residential	<u>1,540</u> l / cap / day
		- Institutional	<u>28,000</u> I / ha / day	- Institutional	<u>75,600</u> I / ha / day
- Condo Units (CU)	<u>1.8</u> p/p/u	- Commercial	<u>28,000</u> I / ha / day	- Commercial	<u>75,600</u> I / ha / day
- Apartments (1 Bedroom)	<u>1.4</u> p/p/u	MAX. DAILY DEMAND			
		- Residential	700 l / cap / day		
	p/p/u	- Institutional	<u>42,000</u> I / ha / day		
		- Commercial	<u>42,000</u> I / ha / day		



LDING		LOT LINE		
IG		SETBACKS		
IG WITH L SPACE		NEW TREE		
		FIREWALL		
		SIDEWALK		
	OPMENT STAT	<u>ISTICS</u>		
			047	PIN 256 - 0303
			047 047	256 - 0315 256 - 0316
			047	256 - 1337
			GM[254	6] H(14.5)
			~53.441.14 m ²	(5.34ha)
.:			~45,956.28 m ²	(4.59ha)
			~38,956.28 m²	(3.89na)
				67 UNITS
	BUILDING			48 UNITS
SPACES:				36 UNITS ~929 m ²
RTMENT	BUILDING			47 UNITS
SDACTC				36 UNITS
SPACES:	BUILDING			96 UNITS
			E	330 UNITS
:S:		011122-		~1,858 m ²
	RE	QUIRED	F	PROVIDED
	N	NO MAX.	84.8 un	its/net ha
	I	NO MIN.		5.8 m
		NU MIN.		174 m ²
11		14.5 m		14.5 m
ARD:		3 m 3 m		3 m 3 m
'ARD: R MIXED-I	JSE:	5 m		5 m
AL : AL :		1.2 m 3 m		1.2 m 3 m
		3 m		3 m
L ZONE: BUILDING:		7.5 m 7.5 m		7.5 m 7.5 m
		, is in		
	1 p/u 0	unit = 67	67 (0 67 DRI	GARAGES) VE AISLES
5	1.2 p/ur	nit = 101	101 (UNDER	GROUND)
	0.2 p/u 3.4 p/100 m ² G	nit = 17 FA = 32	17 (UNDER 32 (E	GROUND) EXTERIOR)
			T	OTAL: 150
)	1.2 p/ur 0.2 p/ui	nit = 100 nit = 17	100 (UNDER 17 (UNDER	GROUND) GROUND)
:	3.4 p/100 m ² G	FA = 32	32 (E T(EXTERIOR) OTAL: 150
	1.2 p/ur	nit = 116	145 (UNDER	GROUND)
	0.2 p/u	nıt = 17	17 (8 EXT. + T(12 UND.) OTAL: 162
				267 m ²
NIT).				239 m ² 232 m ² 236 m ²
(NI 1 J.				230 m ² 225 m ²
BA) 4)				1,968 m ²
) ()				1,490 m ²
C))				1,611 m ² 1,386 m ²
AL OF 2 BI	JILDINGS):		TOTAL	4,130 m ²
				3,201 m ²
				929 m

		PROJECT
	NAVAN ROA	D
C	DEVELOPMEN	NT
	2983, Navan Road, Orleans,	
		OWNER
		ey
768, GAT	BOUL. SAINT-JOSEPH, SUI INEAU, QC J8Y 4B8	ITE 100
	ARCH	ITECTURAL
P	ARCHITE	ECTES
(1110)	451-905/	
INFO	@PMAARCHITECTES.COM	
3070 QUÉI	, CHEMIN DES QUATRE-BOU BEC (QC) G1W 2K4	RGEOIS
PMA	ARCHITECTES.COM	
LA	ARCHITECTESI + ASSOCIÉS	ULT
53, E	BOUL. SAINT-RAYMOND,	
GAT	INEAU, QC J8Y 1R8	
	ENGINEERS ,	/ PLANNER
	JĽ	<
	J.L.Richa	rds
ENG	INEERS · ARCHITECTS · PLA	NNERS
1565 OTT	CARLING AVENUE, SUITE AWA, ON K1Z 8R1	700,
(Stant	ec
OTT	AWA, ON K2C 3G4	JU,
		KEY PLAN
/		
Ey		
	ARCH	ITECT SEAL
		REVISIONS
		REVISIONS
		REVISIONS
8		REVISIONS
8 7 6 5	FOR CITY REVIEW FOR COORDINATION FOR COORDINATION FOR COORDINATION FOR COORDINATION	REVISIONS
8 7 6 5 4 3 2	FOR CITY REVIEW FOR COORDINATION FOR COORDINATION FOR COORDINATION FOR COORDINATION FOR COORDINATION FOR COORDINATION FOR COORDINATION FOR COORDINATION	REVISIONS
8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 NO	FOR CITY REVIEW FOR COORDINATION FOR COORDINATION	REVISIONS
8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 NO	FOR CITY REVIEW FOR COORDINATION FOR COORDINATION	REVISIONS
8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 NO	FOR CITY REVIEW FOR COORDINATION FOR COO	REVISIONS 2022-11-28 2022-11-08 2022-11-08 2022-11-08 2022-11-08 2022-11-03 2021-08-26 2021-08-18 DATE DATE NOTE
8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 NO IS THE ONTRAC N THE S MISSIO IUST CC	FOR CITY REVIEW FOR CORDINATION FOR COORDINATION FOR COOR	REVISIONS 2022-11-08 2022-11-08 2022-11-08 2022-11-08 2022-11-08 2022-11-03 2021-08-18 2021-08-18 2021-08-18 2021-08-18 DATE NOTE RIATE DIMENSIONS AND/OR RACTORS ES AND BY-
8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 NO TIS THE ONTRAC N THE S MISSIO IUST CC AWS. DO HIS DOC	FOR CITY REVIEW FOR CORDINATION FOR COORDINATION FOR COOR	REVISIONS 2022-11-28 2022-11-28 2022-11-08 2022-04-14 2022-11-08 2022-04-14 2021-10-03 2021-08-30 2
8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 NO ISTHE ONTRAC N THE S MISSIO IUST CC AWS. DO HIS DOC NY REPF Y THE A	FOR CITY REVIEW FOR CORDINATION FOR COORDINATION FOR COOR	REVISIONS 2022-11-28 2022-11-08 2022-11-08 2022-04-14 2022-04-14 2022-04-14 2021-10-03 2021-08-30 2
8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 NO IS THE ONTRAC N THE S MISSIO IUST CC AWS. DO IUST CC AWS. DO NY REPF Y THE A	FOR CITY REVIEW FOR CORDINATION FOR COORDINATION FOR COOR	REVISIONS 2022-11-28 2022-11-08 2022-11-08 2022-11-01 2022-04-14 2021-10-01 2022-04-14 2021-08-30 2
8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 NO	FOR CITY REVIEW FOR COORDINATION FOR COO	REVISIONS 2022-11-28 2022-11-08 2022-11-08 2022-11-08 2022-11-03 2021-08-30 2
8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 NO VIST CC AWS. DO NY REPH Y THE A	FOR CITY REVIEW FOR COORDINATION FOR COO	REVISIONS 2022-11-08 2022-11-08 2022-11-03 2021-08-18 2022-11-03 2021-08-18 2021-08-18 2021-08-18 2021-08-18 DATE DIMENSIONS AND/OR RACTORS ES AND BY- PYRIGHTED. SS GRANTED RA
8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 NO IUST CC AWS. DO HIS DOC NY REPF Y THE A	FOR CITY REVIEW FOR COORDINATION FOR COO	REVISIONS 2022-11-08 2022-11-08 2022-11-03 2021-08-18 2022-10-11 2022-04-14 2021-10-3 2021-08-18 2021-08-18 DATE NOTE RATE DIMENSIONS AND/OR RACTORS ES AND BY- PYRIGHTED. SS GRANTED
8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 NO IS THE ONTRAC N THE S MISSIO IUST CC AWS. DO IUST CC AWS. DO N THE A	FOR CITY REVIEW FOR COORDINATION FOR COO	REVISIONS 2022-11-28 2022-11-08 2022-11-08 2022-11-08 2022-04-14 2021-103 2021-08-30 202
8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 NO IS THE ONTRAC N THE S MISSIO IUST CC AWS. DO HIS DOC NY REPF Y THE A	FOR CITY REVIEW FOR COORDINATION FOR COO	REVISIONS 2022-11-28 2022-11-01 2022-01-10 2022-01-10 2022-04-14 2021-10-3 2021-08-30 20
8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 NO VISTHE ONTRAC N THE S MISSIO IUST CC AWS. DO UUST CC AWS. DO NY REPF Y THE A	FOR CITY REVIEW FOR COORDINATION FOR COORDINAT	REVISIONS CONTINUES CONTIN
8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 NO UST CC AWS. DO UST CC AWS. DO UST CC AWS. DO UST CC AWS. DO UST CC AWS. DO	FOR CITY REVIEW FOR COORDINATION FOR COORDINATION ON TO CHECK AND VERIFY ALL C TIE AND TO REPORT ALL ERRORS NS TO THE ARCHITECT. ALL CONTI OMPLY WITH ALL PERTINENT CODI O NOT SCALE DRAWINGS. CUMENT AND ITS CONTENT IS COF RODUCTION IS PROHIBITED UNLES RCHITECT.	REVISIONS 2022-11-28 2022-11-03 2022-08-30 2022-08-30 2021-08
8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 NO	FOR CITY REVIEW FOR COORDINATION FOR COORDINATION DESCRIPTION D	REVISIONS 2022-11-08 2022-11-08 2022-11-03 2021-08-26 2021-08-18 2022-104 2021-08-30 202
8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 NO VISTHE ONTRAC N THE S MISSIO IUST CC AWS. DO UUST CC AWS. DO NY REPF Y THE A	FOR CITY REVIEW FOR COORDINATION FOR COORDINATION DESCRIPTION RESPONSIBILITY OF THE APPROPFE TOR TO CHECK AND VERIFY ALL CONTI MALL PERTINENT CODI ON T SCALE DRAWINGS. SUMENT AND ITS CONTENT IS COF CODUCTION IS PROHIBITED UNLES RCHITECT. DO NOT SCALE DRAWINGS. SUMENT AND ITS CONTENT IS COF CODUCTION IS PROHIBITED UNLES RCHITECT. DO NOT SCALE DRAWINGS. SUMENT AND ITS CONTENT IS COF CONSTRUCTION PROJECT NO 20054	REVISIONS 2022-11-28 2022-11-08 2022-11-08 2022-11-03 2021-08-30 2021-08
8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 NO	FOR CITY REVIEW FOR COORDINATION DESCRIPTION	REVISIONS 2022-11-08 2022-11-08 2022-11-03 2021-08-18 2022-11-03 2021-08-18 2

NAVAN ROAD DEVELOPMENT PROJECT - Commercial Building

(JLR 29899-002)

Step	Parameter	Value		Note
Α	Type of Construction	Non-combustible		
	Coefficient (C)	0.8		
в	Ground Floor Area	686	m²	Commercial area consisting of a Gas Retail and Drive Thru
с	Height in storeys	1	storeys	Basements are excluded.
	Total Floor Area	686	m²	—
D	Fire Flow Formula	F=220C√A		
	Fire Flow	4610	L/min	
	Rounded Fire Flow	5000	L/min	Flow rounded to nearest 1000 L/min.
E	Occupancy Class	Combustible		
	Occupancy Charge	0%		
	Occupancy Increase or	0		
	Decrease		<u> </u>	
	Fire Flow	5000	L/min	No rounding applied.
F	Sprinkler Protection	None		
	Sprinkler Credit	0%		
	Decrease for Sprinkler	0	L/min	
G	North Side Exposure			
	Exposing Wall:	Non-combustible		Gas Retail/Drive Thru
	Exposed Wall:	Wood Frame		4 Storey Condo Unit
	Length of Exposed Wall:	32.2	m	
	Height of Exposed Wall:	4	storeys	
	Length-Height Factor	128.6	m-storeys	
	North Side Exposure	38.96	m	—
	Charge	5%		
	East Side Exposure			
	Exposing Wall:	Non-combustible		Gas Retail/Drive Thru
	Exposed Wall:	Wood Frame		
	Length of Exposed Wall:	0.0	m	
	Height of Exposed Wall:	0	storeys	
	Length-Height Factor	0.0	m-storeys	
	Separation Distance	46	m	
	East Side Exposure	0%		—
	Charge	0,0		
	South Side Exposure			
	Exposing Wall:	Non-combustible		
	Exposed Wall:	Wood Frame		
	Length of Exposed Wall:	0.0	m	
	Height of Exposed Wall:	0	storeys	
	Length-Height Factor	0.0	m-storeys	
	Separation Distance	46	m	Over 45 m to next structure
	Charge	0%		
	West Side Exposure			
	Exposing Wall:	Non-combustible		Gas Retail/Drive Thru
	Exposed Wall:	Wood Frame		
	Length of Exposed Wall:	0.0	m	
	Height of Exposed Wall:	0	storeys	
	Length-Height Factor	0.0	m-storeys	
	Separation Distance	46	m	Over 200 m to next structure
	West Side Exposure	0%		
	Charge			The total exposure charge is below the maximum value
	Total Exposure Charge	5%		of 75%.
	Increase for Exposures	250	L/min	
н	Fire Flow	5250	L/min	
	Rounded Fire Flow	5000	L/min	Flow rounded to nearest 1000 L/min.
City Cap	Required Fire Flow (RFF)	5000	L/min	
		83	1/s	

Fire Underwriters Survey (FUS) Fire Flow Calculations

NAVAN ROAD DEVELOPMENT PROJECT - Duplex Townhouse

(JLR 29899-002)

Step	Parameter	Value		Note
Α	Type of Construction	Wood Frame		
	Coefficient (C)	1.5		
В	Ground Floor Area	282.27	m²	Includes 3 TH units in Block 3 (east of firewall)
с	Height in storeys	2	storeys	Basements are excluded.
	Total Floor Area	564.54	m²	—
D	Fire Flow Formula	F=220C√A		
	Fire Flow	7841	L/min	
	Rounded Fire Flow	8000	L/min	Flow rounded to nearest 1000 L/min.
-	Ossupanau Class	Limited Combustible		Residential buildings have a limited combustible
E		Limited Combustible		occupancy.
	Occupancy Charge	-15%		
	Occupancy Increase or	-1200		
	Decrease Fire Flow	6800		No rounding applied
-	FIFE FIOW	6800	L/min	No rounding applied.
F	Sprinkler Protection	None		—
		0%		—
	Decrease for Sprinkler	0	L/min	
G	North Side Exposure			
	Exposing Wall:	Wood Frame		Ched/Corogo on existing projects for the Dec. D.
	Exposed Wall:	wood Frame		Snea/Garage on existing property fronting Page Rd.
	Length of Exposed Wall:	3.2	m	
	Height of Exposed Wall:	1	storeys	
	Length-Height Factor	3.2	m-storeys	
	Separation Distance	12.4	m	
	Charge	10%		
	East Side Exposure			TH Block 4
	Exposing Wall	Wood Frame		
	Exposed Wall:	Wood Frame		
	Length of Exposed Wall	14.2	m	
	Height of Exposed Wall	2	storevs	
	Length-Height Factor	28.4	m-storevs	
	Separation Distance	3 01	m	
	East Side Exposure	0.01		—
	Charge	21%		
	South Side Exposure			TH blocks 6 and 5
	Exposing Wall:	Wood Frame		
	Exposed Wall:	Wood Frame		
	Length of Exposed Wall:	19.2	m	
	Height of Exposed Wall:	2	storeys	
	Length-Height Factor	38.4	m-storeys	
	Separation Distance	27	m	
	South Side Exposure	4%		
	Charge	-70		
	West Side Exposure			
	Exposing Wall:	Wood Frame		Firewall
	Exposed Wall:	Wood Frame		
	Length of Exposed Wall:	14.8	m	
	Height of Exposed Wall:	2	storeys	
	Length-Height Factor	29.6	m-storeys	
	Separation Distance	3.01	m	
	west Side Exposure	0%		
	Charge			The total exposure charge is below the maximum value
	Total Exposure Charge	35%		of 75%.
	Increase for Exposures	2380	L/min	
н	Fire Flow	9180	L/min	
	Rounded Fire Flow	9000	L/min	Flow rounded to nearest 1000 L/min.
City Cap	Required Fire Flow (RFF)	9000	L/min	The City of Ottawa's cap does not apply since duplextownhouse units are being considered.
		150	1/5	

Fire Underwriters Survey (FUS) Fire Flow Calculations

NAVAN ROAD DEVELOPMENT PROJECT - Duplex Townhouse

(JLR 29899-002)

Step	Parameter	Value		Note
Α	Type of Construction	Wood Frame		
	Coefficient (C)	1.5		
В	Ground Floor Area	588	m²	Includes 7 units of Row TH
с	Height in storeys	2	storeys	Basements are excluded.
	Total Floor Area	1176	m²	—
D	Fire Flow Formula	F=220C√A		
	Fire Flow	11317	L/min	
	Rounded Fire Flow	11000	L/min	Flow rounded to nearest 1000 L/min.
-	Oseunaneu Class	Limited Combustible		Residential buildings have a limited combustible
E		Limited Combustible		occupancy.
	Occupancy Charge	-15%		
	Occupancy Increase or	-1650		
	Decrease Fire Flow	0250		No rounding applied
-	FILE FILW	9350	L/min	No rounding applied.
r	Sprinkler Protection	None		_
	Sprinkler Credit	0%	L/min	_
	North Sido Europauro	0	L/min	TU Deales 2 and 2
G	Functional Walls	Mood Fromo		In BIOCKS 2 and 3
	Exposing wall:	Wood Frame		
	Exposed will:			
	Length of Exposed Wall:	39.2	storeus	
	Height of Exposed wall:	2	storeys	
	Length-Height Factor	78.4	m-storeys	
	North Side Exposure	۷/	III	_
	Charge	6%		
	East Side Exposure			TH Block 5
	Exposing Wall:	Wood Frame		
	Exposed Wall:	Wood Frame		
	Length of Exposed Wall:	14.2	m	
	Height of Exposed Wall:	2	storeys	
	Length-Height Factor	28.4	m-storeys	
	Separation Distance	3.01	m	
	East Side Exposure	210/		—
	Charge	21%		
	South Side Exposure			TH Block 11
	Exposing Wall:	Wood Frame		
	Exposed Wall:	Wood Frame		
	Length of Exposed Wall:	40.9	m	
	Height of Exposed Wall:	2	storeys	
	Length-Height Factor	81.7	m-storeys	
	Separation Distance	65	m	
	South Side Exposure	0%		
	Unarge West Side Exposure			Building B (Block 14)
	Exposing Wall	Wood Frame		24.14.15 D (DIOCK 14)
	Exposed Wall	Wood Frame		
	Length of Exposed Walls	1/ 1	m	
	Height of Franced Wall.	4.1	storevs	
	Length-Height Factor	56.4	m-storevs	
	Senaration Distance	29	m	
	West Side Exposure	23		—
	Charge	4%		
	Total Exposure Charge	31%		The total exposure charge is below the maximum value
	Increase for Exposures	2899	L/min	
н	Fire Flow	12249	L/min	
	Rounded Fire Flow	12000	L/min	Flow rounded to nearest 1000 L/min.
City Cap	Required Fire Flow	12000	L/min	The City of Ottawa's cap does not apply since duplex townhouse units are being considered
	<u></u>	200	1/s	considered.

Fire Underwriters Survey (FUS) Fire Flow Calculations

NAVAN ROAD DEVELOPMENT PROJECT - Row Townhouse

(JLR 29899-002)

Step	Parameter	Value		Note
Α	Type of Construction	Wood Frame		
	Coefficient (C)	1.5		
В	Ground Floor Area	506	m²	Includes 7 units of Row TH
с	Height in storeys	2	storeys	Basements are excluded.
	Total Floor Area	1012	m²	
D	Fire Flow Formula	F=220C√A		
	Fire Flow	10498	L/min	
	Rounded Fire Flow	10000	L/min	Flow rounded to nearest 1000 L/min.
-	o ol		,	Residential buildings have a limited combustible
E	Occupancy Class	Limited Combustible		occupancy.
	Occupancy Charge	-15%		
	Occupancy Increase or	-1500		
	Decrease	1300		
	Fire Flow	8500	L/min	No rounding applied.
F	Sprinkler Protection	None		
	Sprinkler Credit	0%		
	Decrease for Sprinkler	0	L/min	
G	North Side Exposure			TH Block 5
	Exposing Wall:	Wood Frame		
	Exposed Wall:	Wood Frame		
	Length of Exposed Wall:	36.5	m	
	Height of Exposed Wall:	2	storeys	
	Length-Height Factor	73.0	m-storeys	
	Separation Distance	27	m	
	North Side Exposure	<u> </u>		—
	Charge	6%		
	East Side Exposure			TH Block 8
	Exposing Wall:	Wood Frame		
	Exposed Wall:	Wood Frame		
	Length of Exposed Wall:	14.2	m	
	Height of Exposed Wall:	2	storeys	
	Length-Height Factor	28.4	m-storeys	
	Separation Distance	3.1	m	
	East Side Exposure	16%		—
	Charge	10%		
	South Side Exposure			Existing Shed at 3021 Navan Road
	Exposing Wall:	Wood Frame		
	Exposed Wall:	Wood Frame		
	Length of Exposed Wall:	2.9	m	
	Height of Exposed Wall:	2	storeys	
	Length-Height Factor	5.9	m-storeys	
	Separation Distance	17.51	m	
	South Side Exposure	10%		
	Charge	1070		—
	West Side Exposure			Building B (Block 14)
	Exposing Wall:	Wood Frame		
	Exposed Wall:	Wood Frame		
	Length of Exposed Wall:	14.2	m	
	Height of Exposed Wall:	2	storeys	
	Length-Height Factor	28.4	m-storeys	
	Separation Distance	3.1	m	
	West Side Exposure	16%		
	Charge	20,0		The total superior shares is below the median
	Total Exposure Charge	48%		of 75%.
	Increase for Exposures	4080	L/min	
н	Fire Flow	12580	L/min	
	Rounded Fire Flow	13000	L/min	Flow rounded to nearest 1000 L/min.
City Can	Required Fire Flow	13000	I/min	The City of Ottawa's cap does not apply since duplex
Sity cap	(RFF)	217	L/s	townhouse units are being considered.
		21/	L/ 3	

Fire Underwriters Survey (FUS) Fire Flow Calculations

NAVAN ROAD DEVELOPMENT PROJECT - Commercial Building

(JLR 29899-002)

Step	Parameter	Value		Note
Α	Type of Construction	Wood Frame		Building A (4 Story Mixed Use Condominium Building)
	Coefficient (C)	1.5		—
В	Ground Floor Area	929	m ²	
с	Height in storeys	4	storeys	Basements are excluded.
	Total Floor Area	3716	m²	
D	Fire Flow Formula	F=220C√A		
	Fire Flow	20116	L/min	
	Rounded Fire Flow	20000	L/min	Flow rounded to nearest 1000 L/min.
E	Occupancy Class	Limited Combustible		Residential buildings have a limited combustible occupancy.
	Occupancy Charge	-15%		
	Occupancy Increase or	-3000		
	Decrease	3000	<u> </u>	
	Fire Flow	17000	L/min	No rounding applied.
F	Sprinkler Protection	Automatic Fully Supervised		
	Sprinkler Credit	-50%		
	Decrease for Sprinkler	-8500	L/min	
G	North Side Exposure			
	Exposing Wall:	Wood Frame		Building A
	Exposed Wall:	Wood Frame		Townhomes
	Length of Exposed Wall:	15.1	m	
	Height of Exposed Wall:	2	storeys	
	Length-Height Factor	30.1	m-storeys	
	Separation Distance	10.41	m	_
	North Side Exposure	12%		
	Charge East Side Exposure			_
	Eust Side Exposure	Wood Frame		Puilding A
	Exposing Wall.	Wood Frame		Tournhamos
	Exposed wall:	wood Frame		Townnomes
	Length of Exposed Wall:	14.4	m	
	Height of Exposed Wall:	0	storeys	
	Length-Height Factor	0.0	m-storeys	
	Separation Distance	25.84	m	—
	Charge	8%		
	South Side Exposure			_
	Exposing Wall:	Wood Frame		Building A
	Exposed Wall:	Wood Frame		Building B
	Length of Exposed Wall	39.2	m	Sanan's S
	Height of Exposed Wall	4	storevs	
	Length-Height Factor	156.8	m-storeys	
	Separation Distance	25.25	m	
	South Side Exposure			—
	Charge	10%		
	West Side Exposure			
	Exposing Wall:	Wood Frame		
	Exposed Wall:	Wood Frame		
	Length of Exposed Wall:	0.0	m	
	Height of Exposed Wall:	0	storeys	
	Length-Height Factor	0.0	m-storeys	
	Separation Distance	50	m	
	West Side Exposure Charge	0%		
	Total Exposure Charge	30%		The total exposure charge is below the maximum value of 75%.
	Increase for Exposures	5100	L/min	
н	Fire Flow	13600	L/min	
	Rounded Fire Flow	14000	L/min	Flow rounded to nearest 1000 L/min.
City Car	Required Fire Flow	14000	L/min	
	(RFF)	222	1/c	_

Fire Underwriters Survey (FUS) Fire Flow Calculations

NAVAN ROAD DEVELOPMENT PROJECT - Commercial Building

(JLR 29899-002)

Step	Parameter	Value		Note
Α	Type of Construction	Wood Frame		Building F (4 Story Mixed Use Condominium Building)
	Coefficient (C)	1.5		
В	Ground Floor Area	1067.84	m ²	
С	Height in storeys	4	storeys	Basements are excluded.
	Total Floor Area	4271.36	m²	
D	Fire Flow Formula	F=220C√A		
	Fire Flow	21567	L/min	
	Rounded Fire Flow	22000	L/min	Flow rounded to nearest 1000 L/min.
E	Occupancy Class	Limited Combustible		Residential buildings have a limited combustible occupancy.
	Occupancy Charge	-15%		
	Occupancy Increase or	-3300		
	Decrease	-3300		
	Fire Flow	18700	L/min	No rounding applied.
F	Sprinkler Protection	Automatic Fully Supervised		
	Sprinkler Credit	-50%		
	Decrease for Sprinkler	-9350	L/min	
G	North Side Exposure			
	Exposing Wall:	Wood Frame		Building F
	Exposed Wall:	Wood Frame		Existing One Storey House
	Length of Exposed Wall:	8.4	m	
	Height of Exposed Wall:	1	storeys	
	Length-Height Factor	8.4	m-storeys	
	Separation Distance	15.03	m	
	North Side Exposure	1.20/		—
	Charge East Side Exposure	1276		_
	Exposing Wall:	Wood Frame		Building F
	Exposed Wall:	Wood Frame		Existing One Storey House
	Length of Exposed Wall:	40.9	m	<u> </u>
	Height of Exposed Wall:	1	storeys	
	Length-Height Factor	40.9	m-storevs	
	Separation Distance	40.14561369	, m	
	East Side Exposure	50/		—
	Charge	5%		
	South Side Exposure			
	Exposing Wall:	Wood Frame		Building F
	Exposed Wall:	Non-combustible		Navan Road R.O.W
	Length of Exposed Wall:		m	
	Height of Exposed Wall:		storeys	
	Length-Height Factor	0.0	m-storeys	
	Separation Distance		m	
	South Side Exposure	0%		
	Charge	0,0		
	west Side Exposure			
	Exposing Wall:	Wood Frame		Building F
	Exposed Wall:	Wood Frame		Building E
	Length of Exposed Wall:	56.0	m	
	Height of Exposed Wall:	4	storeys	
	Length-Height Factor	223.8	m-storeys	
	Separation Distance	14.76	m	
	West Side Exposure Charge	15%		_
	Total Exposure Charge	32%		The total exposure charge is below the maximum value of 75%.
	Increase for Exposures	5984	L/min	
н	Fire Flow	15334	L/min	
	Rounded Fire Flow	15000	L/min	Flow rounded to nearest 1000 L/min.
City Can	Required Fire Flow	15000	L/min	
	(RFF)	250	1/s	
		230	L/ 3	

Fire Underwriters Survey (FUS) Fire Flow Calculations

Appendix D2

WaterCAD Schematics



2983, 3053, and 3079 Navan Road and 2690 Page Road Model Schematic

29899-002 - Navan Subdivision_June2024.wtg 2024-08-15

Bentley Systems, Inc. Haestad Methods Solution Center 76 Watertown Road, Suite 2D Thomaston, CT 06787 USA +1-203-755-1666

2983, 3053, and 3079 Navan Road and 2690 Page Road Model Schematic Elevation Model



29899-002 - Navan Subdivision_June2024.wtg 2024-08-15

Bentley Systems, Inc. Haestad Methods Solution Center 76 Watertown Road, Suite 2D Thomaston, CT 06787 USA +1-203-755-1666

Appendix D3

City Correspondence – Boundary Conditions

Boundary Conditions Navan Subdivision

Provided Information

Seenario	Demand			
Scenario	L/min	L/s		
Average Daily Demand	404	6.74		
Maximum Daily Demand	632	10.53		
Peak Hour	1,090	18.17		
Fire Flow Demand #1	6,000	100.00		
Fire Flow Demand #2	10,000	166.67		
Fire Flow Demand #3	14,000	233.33		
Fire Flow Demand #4	15,000	250.00		

Location



Results

Connection 1 - Page Road

Demand Scenario	Head (m)	Pressure ¹ (psi)
Maximum HGL	130.7	64.0
Peak Hour	127.0	58.6
Max Day plus Fire Flow #1	128.2	60.4
Max Day plus Fire Flow #2	126.8	58.3
Max Day plus Fire Flow #3	124.9	55.7
Max Day plus Fire Flow #4	124.4	55.0
¹ Ground Elevation =	85.7	m

Connection 2 - Navan Road East

Demand Scenario	Head (m)	Pressure ¹ (psi)
Maximum HGL	130.7	71.4
Peak Hour	126.8	65.9
Max Day plus Fire Flow #1	127.7	67.1
Max Day plus Fire Flow #2	125.5	64.1
Max Day plus Fire Flow #3	122.7	60.1
Max Day plus Fire Flow #4	121.9	58.9
¹ Ground Elevation =	80.5	m

Connection 3 - Navan Road West

Demand Scenario	Head (m)	Pressure ¹ (psi)
Maximum HGL	130.7	69.3
Peak Hour	126.8	63.8
Max Day plus Fire Flow #1	127.3	64.5
Max Day plus Fire Flow #2	124.6	60.6
Max Day plus Fire Flow #3	120.9	55.3
Max Day plus Fire Flow #4	119.8	53.8
¹ Ground Elevation =	81.9	m

Disclaimer

The boundary condition information is based on current operation of the city water distribution system. The computer model simulation is based on the best information available at the time. The operation of the water distribution system can change on a regular basis, resulting in a variation in boundary conditions. The physical properties of watermains deteriorate over time, as such must be assumed in the absence of actual field test data. The variation in physical watermain properties can therefore alter the results of the computer model simulation. Fire Flow analysis is a reflection of available flow in the watermain; there may be additional restrictions that occur between the watermain and the hydrant that the model cannot take into account.

William Rugamba

From: Sent: To: Subject: Attachments: Mahad Musse July 15, 2024 1:21 PM William Rugamba FW: Navan Subdivision - Boundary Condition Request NavanSubdivision_Boundary Condition(4july2024).docx

Mahad Musse, B.Eng., EIT Civil Engineering Graduate Ottawa, ON Work: <u>343-633-1501</u>

From: Polyak, Alex <alex.polyak@ottawa.ca>
Sent: Monday, July 15, 2024 10:12 AM
To: Mahad Musse <mmusse@jlrichards.ca>
Cc: Karla Ferrey <kferrey@jlrichards.ca>; Raad Akrawi <rakrawi@groupeheafey.com>; Carmine Zayoun
<carmine@zayoungroup.com>; Armstrong, Justin <justin.armstrong@ottawa.ca>; Tatyana Roumie
<troumie@jlrichards.ca>
Subject: RE: Navan Subdivision - Boundary Condition Request

[CAUTION] This email originated from outside JLR. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Do not forward suspicious emails, if you are unsure, please send a separate message to Helpdesk.

Good morning Mahad,

Please find the boundary conditions attached.

Regards,

Oleksandr (Alex) Polyak, B.Eng., C.E.T., P.Eng.

Project Manager, Infrastructure Approvals, Development Review East Branch | Gestionnaire de projet, Direction de l'examen des projets d'aménagement – Est.

Planning, Development and Building Services Department (PDBS) | Direction générale des services de la planification, de l'aménagement et du bâtiment (DGSPAB

City of Ottawa | Ville d'Ottawa 110 Laurier Ave., 4th FI East, Ottawa ON K1P 1J1 Email: <u>alex.polyak@ottawa.ca</u> Cell : 613-857-4380 <u>www.Ottawa.ca</u>



From: Mahad Musse <<u>mmusse@jlrichards.ca</u>>
Sent: July 12, 2024 1:31 PM
To: Polyak, Alex <<u>alex.polyak@ottawa.ca</u>>
Cc: Karla Ferrey <<u>kferrey@jlrichards.ca</u>>; Raad Akrawi <<u>rakrawi@groupeheafey.com</u>>; Carmine Zayoun
<<u>carmine@zayoungroup.com</u>>; Armstrong, Justin <<u>justin.armstrong@ottawa.ca</u>>; Tatyana Roumie
<<u>troumie@jlrichards.ca</u>>
Subject: RE: Navan Subdivision - Boundary Condition Request

CAUTION: This email originated from an External Sender. Please do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the source.

ATTENTION : Ce courriel provient d'un expéditeur externe. Ne cliquez sur aucun lien et n'ouvrez pas de pièce jointe, excepté si vous connaissez l'expéditeur.

Hi Alex,

Just wondering if you have a status update for the boundary conditions for Navan.

Thanks Mahad



Mahad Musse, B.Eng., EIT Civil Engineering Graduate

1000-343 Preston Street Ottawa, ON, K1S 1N4

Work: <u>343-633-1501</u> mmusse@jlrichards.ca

From: Mahad Musse <<u>mmusse@jlrichards.ca</u>>
Sent: Wednesday, July 3, 2024 11:02 AM
To: Polyak, Alex <<u>alex.polyak@ottawa.ca</u>>
Cc: Karla Ferrey <<u>kferrey@jlrichards.ca</u>>; Raad Akrawi <<u>rakrawi@groupeheafey.com</u>>; Carmine Zayoun
<<u>carmine@zayoungroup.com</u>>; Armstrong, Justin <<u>justin.armstrong@ottawa.ca</u>>; Tatyana Roumie
<<u>troumie@jlrichards.ca</u>>

Subject: RE: Navan Subdivision - Boundary Condition Request

Good morning Alex,

As we discussed last week our Client is looking into the option of converting the row townhouse units into duplex units (townhouse units with apartments in the basement). As a result, this will increase the total demand on the site and we will therefore require new water boundary conditions. We'd like to note that the footprint of the blocks will not change and neither will their layout or any of the offsets.

As a summary:

- Domestic demands were calculated based on a daily consumption rate of 280 L/cap/day with peaking factors consistent with City of Ottawa Guidelines
- Required Fire Flow (RFF) was calculated in accordance to the Fire Underwriters Survey (FUS) Water Supply for Public Fire Protection and the City of Ottawa FUS protocol (Bulletin ISDTB-2014-02 & Bulletin ISDTB-2018-02), which considers material, expose distance & height. We have attached the calculation spreadsheet and the figure.

We request boundary conditions under high pressure, peak hour, and maximum day + fire flow conditions (for each of the below fire flows). Domestic demand and fire flow calculations are attached. Please provide the boundary conditions at the proposed connection locations as shown in the attached figure.

Average Day Demand: 6.74 L/s Maximum Day Demand: 10.53 L/s Peak Hour Demand: 18.17 L/s Required Fire Flow (per FUS): 6,000 L/min (100 L/s) Required Fire Flow (per FUS): 10,000 L/min (167 L/s) Required Fire Flow (per FUS): 14,000 L/min (233 L/s) Required Fire Flow (per FUS): 15,000 L/min (250 L/s)

For your reference, the previous boundary condition received from the City is attached and below is the email chain.

If you have any questions or comments please let us know.

Thanks Mahad



From: Polyak, Alex <<u>alex.polyak@ottawa.ca</u>>
Sent: Thursday, August 17, 2023 3:01 PM
To: William Rugamba <<u>wrugamba@jlrichards.ca</u>>
Cc: Karla Ferrey <<u>kferrey@jlrichards.ca</u>>; Raad Akrawi <<u>rakrawi@groupeheafey.com</u>>; Carmine Zayoun
<<u>carmine@zayoungroup.com</u>>; Shahira Jalal <<u>sjalal@jlrichards.ca</u>>
Subject: RE: Navan Subdivision - Boundary Condition Request

[CAUTION] This email originated from outside JLR. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Do not forward suspicious emails, if you are unsure, please send a separate message to Helpdesk.

Hello William,

Sorry that I missed your call, I was in a meeting. The boundary conditions are attached.

Regards,

Oleksandr (Alex) Polyak, B.Eng., P.Eng Project Manager, Infrastructure Approvals, Development Review East Branch | Gestionnaire de projet, Direction de l'examen des projets d'aménagement – Est. Planning, Real Estate and Economic Development Department | Direction générale de la planification, des biens immobiliers et du développement économique

City of Ottawa | Ville d'Ottawa 110 Laurier Ave., 4th FI East, Ottawa ON K1P 1J1 Email: <u>alex.polyak@ottawa.ca</u> Cell : 613-857-4380 www.Ottawa.ca



From: William Rugamba <<u>wrugamba@jlrichards.ca</u>>
Sent: August 15, 2023 9:26 AM
To: Polyak, Alex <<u>alex.polyak@ottawa.ca</u>>
Cc: Karla Ferrey <<u>kferrey@jlrichards.ca</u>>; Raad Akrawi <<u>rakrawi@groupeheafey.com</u>>; Carmine Zayoun
<<u>carmine@zayoungroup.com</u>>; Shahira Jalal <<u>sjalal@jlrichards.ca</u>>
Subject: RE: Navan Subdivision - Boundary Condition Request

CAUTION: This email originated from an External Sender. Please do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the source.

ATTENTION : Ce courriel provient d'un expéditeur externe. Ne cliquez sur aucun lien et n'ouvrez pas de pièce jointe, excepté si vous connaissez l'expéditeur.

Good morning Alex,

Just wanted to follow up on the status of this boundary request. Please let me know if you need anything else from us.

Thanks, William

William Rugamba, M.Eng. Civil Engineering Intern

J.L. Richards & Associates Limited 1000-343 Preston Street, Ottawa, ON K1S 1N4 Direct: 343-804-4374





From: Tatyana Roumie
Sent: Tuesday, July 25, 2023 3:53 PM
To: 'alex.polyak@ottawa.ca' <<u>alex.polyak@ottawa.ca</u>>
Cc: Karla Ferrey <<u>kferrey@jlrichards.ca</u>>; Raad Akrawi <<u>rakrawi@groupeheafey.com</u>>; <u>carmine@zayoungroup.com</u>;
Shahira Jalal <<u>sjalal@jlrichards.ca</u>>
Subject: Navan Subdivision - Boundary Condition Request

Hello Alex.

To support our upcoming detailed design for the site, we are requesting updated boundary conditions for the 3079 Navan Road Development.

As a brief history, we received boundary conditions from the City in July 2021 (attached, but with incorrect connection locations) and again in April 2022 (also attached) in support of the functional servicing design. We understand from the April 2022 boundary conditions that the maximum available fire flow for the site is 250 L/s.

We are currently requesting updated boundary conditions for this site as we are commencing the detailed servicing design and this request will accommodate the recent site plan changes and proposed connection points. This request is also applicable to the upcoming site plan designs which will be submitted as separate applications.

We request boundary conditions under high pressure, peak hour, and maximum day + fire flow conditions (for each of the below fire flows). Domestic demand and fire flow calculations are attached. Please provide the boundary conditions at the proposed connection locations as shown in the attached figure.

Average Day Demand: 6.44 L/s Maximum Day Demand: 9.77 L/s Peak Hour Demand: 16.50 L/s Required Fire Flow (per FUS): 6,000 L/min (100 L/s) Required Fire Flow (per FUS): 10,000 L/min (167 L/s) Required Fire Flow (per FUS): 14,000 L/min (233 L/s) Required Fire Flow (per FUS): 15,000 L/min (250 L/s)

Thanks, Tatyana

This e-mail originates from the City of Ottawa e-mail system. Any distribution, use or copying of this e-mail or the information it contains by other than the intended recipient(s) is unauthorized. Thank you.

Le présent courriel a été expédié par le système de courriels de la Ville d'Ottawa. Toute distribution, utilisation ou reproduction du courriel ou des renseignements qui s'y trouvent par une personne autre que son destinataire prévu est interdite. Je vous remercie de votre collaboration.

'

ı

This e-mail originates from the City of Ottawa e-mail system. Any distribution, use or copying of this e-mail or the information it contains by other than the intended recipient(s) is unauthorized. Thank you.

Le présent courriel a été expédié par le système de courriels de la Ville d'Ottawa. Toute distribution, utilisation ou reproduction du courriel ou des renseignements qui s'y trouvent par une personne autre que son destinataire prévu est interdite. Je vous remercie de votre collaboration.

Appendix D4

Simulation Results – Peak Hour



2983, 3053, and 3079 Navan Road and 2690 Page Road Peak Hour Demand

29899-002 - Navan Subdivision_June2024.wtg 2024-08-15

Bentley Systems, Inc. Haestad Methods Solution Center 76 Watertown Road, Suite 2D Thomaston, CT 06787 USA +1-203-755-1666

2983, 3053, and 3079 Navan Road and 2690 Page Road Peak Hour Demand

Junction Table

Label	Elevation (m)	Demand (L/s)	Hydraulic Grade (m)	Pressure (kPa)
J-5	85.80	1	126.78	401
J-16	85.77	0	126.85	402
J-2	85.90	1	127.00	402
J-4	85.17	3	126.77	407
J-1	85.37	0	127.00	407
J-6	85.03	2	126.77	409
J-7	85.00	5	126.77	409
J-8	84.72	2	126.77	412
J-9	84.25	1	126.77	416
J-10	82.58	3	126.78	433

29899-002 - Navan Subdivision_June2024.wtg 2024-08-15

Bentley Systems, Inc. Haestad Methods Solution Center 76 Watertown Road, Suite 2D Thomaston, CT 06787 USA +1-203-755-1666

2983, 3053, and 3079 Navan Road and 2690 Page Road Peak Hour Demand

Pipe Table

Label	Length (Scaled) (m)	Diameter (mm)	Material	Hazen-Williams C	Flow (L/s)	Velocity (m/s)
P-1(2)	19	297	PVC	120.0	-1	0.01
P-2	173	204	PVC	110.0	10	0.32
P-5	31	204	PVC	110.0	-5	0.14
P-6	64	204	PVC	110.0	-10	0.32
P-7	24	204	PVC	110.0	5	0.14
P-8	18	204	PVC	110.0	5	0.14
P-9	49	204	PVC	110.0	3	0.09
P-10	41	204	PVC	110.0	-2	0.06
P-11	40	204	PVC	110.0	-2	0.06
P-12	64	204	PVC	110.0	2	0.06
P-13	11	204	PVC	110.0	2	0.06
P-15	67	204	PVC	110.0	-3	0.10
P-16	23	204	PVC	110.0	-3	0.10
P-17	50	204	PVC	110.0	-7	0.20
P-23	16	204	PVC	110.0	10	0.32
P-24(1)	56	155	PVC	100.0	1	0.03
P-24(2)	18	155	PVC	100.0	1	0.03
P-26	55	204	PVC	110.0	0	0.00

29899-002 - Navan Subdivision_June2024.wtg 2024-08-15

Bentley Systems, Inc. Haestad Methods Solution Center 76 Watertown Road, Suite 2D Thomaston, CT 06787 USA +1-203-755-1666

Appendix D5

Simulation Results – Maximum Day + Fire Flow



2983, 3053, and 3079 Navan Road and 2690 Page Road Max Day + Fire Flow Requirement

29899-002 - Navan Subdivision_June2024.wtg 2024-08-15

Bentley Systems, Inc. Haestad Methods Solution Center 76 Watertown Road, Suite 2D Thomaston, CT 06787 USA +1-203-755-1666

2983, 3053, and 3079 Navan Road and 2690 Page Road

Label	Satisfies Fire Flow Constraints?	Fire Flow (Available) (L/s)	Flow (Total Available) (L/s)	Pressure (Residual Lower Limit) (kPa)	Pressure (Calculated Residual) (kPa)	Pressure (Calculated System Lower Limit) (kPa)	Junction w/ Minimum Pressure (System)
H-12	True	130	130	140	144	140	J-2
H-3	True	248	248	140	140	155	J-8
H-1	True	250	250	140	172	193	J-16
H-2	True	250	250	140	153	161	J-6
H-4	True	250	250	140	156	166	J-7
H-5	True	250	250	140	269	273	H-3

Max Day + Fire Flow Requirement

29899-002 - Navan Subdivision_June2024.wtg 2024-08-15

Bentley Systems, Inc. Haestad Methods Solution Center 76 Watertown Road, Suite 2D Thomaston, CT 06787 USA +1-203-755-1666

Appendix D6

Simulation Results – Maximum HGL



2983, 3053, and 3079 Navan Road and 2690 Page Road Maximum Pressure Analysis

29899-002 - Navan Subdivision_June2024.wtg 2024-08-15 Bentley Systems, Inc. Haestad Methods Solution Center 76 Watertown Road, Suite 2D Thomaston, CT 06787 USA +1-203-755-1666

2983, 3053, and 3079 Navan Road and 2690 Page Road Maximum Pressure Analysis

Junction Table

Label	Elevation (m)	Demand (L/s)	Hydraulic Grade (m)	Pressure (kPa)
J-2	85.90	0	130.70	438
J-5	85.80	0	130.70	439
J-16	85.77	0	130.70	440
J-1	85.37	0	130.70	444
J-4	85.17	0	130.70	446
J-6	85.11	0	130.70	446
J-7	85.00	0	130.70	447
J-8	84.72	0	130.70	450
J-9	84.25	0	130.70	455
J-10	82.58	0	130.70	471

29899-002 - Navan Subdivision_June2024.wtg 2024-08-15

Bentley Systems, Inc. Haestad Methods Solution Center 76 Watertown Road, Suite 2D Thomaston, CT 06787 USA +1-203-755-1666
2983, 3053, and 3079 Navan Road and 2690 Page Road

Maximum Pressure Analysis

Label	Length (Scaled) (m)	Diameter (mm)	Material	Hazen-Williams C	Flow (L/s)	Velocity (m/s)
P-1(2)	19	297	PVC	120.0	0	0.00
P-2	173	204	PVC	110.0	0	0.00
P-5	31	204	PVC	110.0	0	0.00
P-6	64	204	PVC	110.0	0	0.00
P-7	24	204	PVC	110.0	0	0.00
P-8	18	204	PVC	110.0	0	0.00
P-9	49	204	PVC	110.0	0	0.00
P-10	41	204	PVC	110.0	0	0.00
P-11	40	204	PVC	110.0	0	0.00
P-12	64	204	PVC	110.0	0	0.00
P-13	11	204	PVC	110.0	0	0.00
P-15	67	204	PVC	110.0	0	0.00
P-16	23	204	PVC	110.0	0	0.00
P-17	50	204	PVC	110.0	0	0.00
P-23	16	204	PVC	110.0	0	0.00
P-24(1)	56	155	PVC	100.0	0	0.00
P-24(2)	18	155	PVC	100.0	0	0.00
P-26	55	204	PVC	110.0	0	0.00

Pipe Table

29899-002 - Navan Subdivision_June2024.wtg 2024-08-15

Bentley Systems, Inc. Haestad Methods Solution Center 76 Watertown Road, Suite 2D Thomaston, CT 06787 USA +1-203-755-1666 WaterCAD [10.04.00.108] Page 1 of 1

Appendix D7

Water Age Analysis

Watermain Label	Length (m)	Watermain Diameter (mm)	Area of Watermain (m ²)	Volume of watermain (m ³)
P-1(2)	19.00	297	0.0693	1.32
P-2	173.00	204	0.0327	5.65
P-5	31.00	204	0.0327	1.01
P-6	64.00	204	0.0327	2.09
P-7	24.00	204	0.0327	0.78
P-8	18.00	204	0.0327	0.59
P-9	49.00	204	0.0327	1.60
P-10	41.00	204	0.0327	1.34
P-11	40.00	204	0.0327	1.31
P-12	64.00	204	0.0327	2.09
P-13	11.00	204	0.0327	0.36
P-15	67.00	204	0.0327	2.19
P-16	23.00	204	0.0327	0.75
P-17	50.00	204	0.0327	1.63
P-23	16.00	204	0.0327	0.52
P-24(1)	56.00	155	0.0189	1.06
P-24(2)	18.00	155	0.0189	0.34
P-26	55.00	204	0.0327	1.80
Volume of Waterma	ains in Navan Su	bdivision =		26.44

Navan Subdivision - Water Age Analysis

THEORETICAL POP	ULATIONS (Residentia	1)	Theoretical Demand (m ³ /day)
UNIT TYP	ES	POP'N	
TH	Apartment		
17	17	69.7	13.9
34	34	139.4	27.9
67	67	274.7	54.9
	THEORETICAL POP UNIT TYP TH 17 34 67	THEORETICAL POPULATIONS (Residentia UNIT TYPES TH Apartment 17 17 34 34 67 67	THEORETICAL POPULATIONS (Residential) UNIT TYPES POP'N TH Apartment 17 17 69.7 34 34 139.4 67 67 274.7

AVG. DAILY DEMAND		
- Residential	200 L/cap/day	
DENSITIES TH Units 1-Bedroom Apartment	2.7	ppu

Volume of Commissioned Mains = 26.44 m³ Design Criteria = Water Age to be limited to 8 days (total) 3 days Time to travel to Navan Subdivision = 3 days Water Age Maximum within Navan Subdivision = 5 days

	iiiii			.,				
Volume of Commissioned Watermains	=	26.44	m³					
Design Criteria = Water Age to be limite	ed to 8 days (total)						
Time to travel to Navan Subdivision =		3	days					
Water Age Maximum within Navan Sub	division =	5	days					
Therefore, occupants in Navan Sub. to	draw =	5.29	m³/day (26.44 m³	in 5 days)				
TH: Daily demand per unit of:		0.54	m³/day/unit (at 2.	7 ppu and dai	ly demand of	200 L/cap):		
Apartment: Daily demand per unit of:		0.28	m ³ /day/unit (at 1.	4 ppu and dai	ly demand of	200 L/cap):		
Cummulative Number of Occupancies	& Avg Day de	mand per three (3)	phases noted abov	/e:				
					Nater Age (da	ays)	1	
	TH	Apartment	Avg	Internal	From WTP	Total		
Phase 1	17	17	13.9	1.9	3.0	4.9		
	34	34	27.9	0.9	3.0	3.9		
Phase 2	04							

Appendix E1

Wastewater – EUC ISSU Design Excerpts

SANITARY SEWER CALCULATION SHEET

LOCATE

	FROM	10	ADEA	RESED	ENTIAL ARE	A AND POP	PULATION		CO	MM		INDUST		IN	5T	C+I+I		PFA	K FLOW		T														
	MH	MH.		POP.		ATIVE	PEAK	PEAK	AREA	ACCU.	AREA	ACCU.	PEAK	AREA	ACCU.	PEAK	TOTAL	ACCIL	INC. 7	TOTAL	L CHOTH		PIPE												
			(ha)		(ha)	POP.	FAGT.	FLOW		AREA		AREA	FACTOR		AREA	PLOW	AREA	ADCA	Di Gui	TOTAL	LENGTH	DIAMETER	SLOPE	CAP,	Q/Qcap	VEL	Upstream	Downstream	Upstream	Upstream	Downateam	Downative.org	Deep	112 Front	- Call French
			1 100/		Una)			(U/s)	(ha)	<u>(ha)</u>	(ha)	(ha)	(per MOE)	(ha)	(ha)	(1/s)	(ha)	(he)	14	PLOW (NOM ACT		(FULL)		(TVU)	00	03	Invert	Obvert	Invest	Churt	Church and	Durt	USPICE
			1 1 1 1				<u> </u>									1007		(na)	- 1U8/	(US)	(m)	(mm) (mm) (%)	(Us)	(%)	(m/s)	(m)	(m)	(m)	(m)	(m)	(m)	oucure	Cepen	Depth
	2		5.23	66	3,25	56	4.00	0.91		0.00		0.00			0.00	0.00					L						<u>ې</u>					1114	- 919	(m)	(m)
	3		40.75	101	0.43	Z37	4.00	3,84	1	0.00		0.00			0.00	0.00	5.00	3.23	0.91	1.42	250	200 2	0.2 0.3	19,35	9.4%	0.60	88.25	68.00	84.83	85.03	1 1 M				
			1		20.20	1232	3.74	18.66		0.00		0.00			0.00	0.00	10.75	0.43	2.01	0.41	320	200 20	0.32 0.33	19,35	32.1%	0.60	88.00	67,60	84.03	84.23	83.00	83.24		3.22	
	44		10.60	070														20.20		20.50	320	250 2	54.01 0.24	50.39	87,4%	0.60	87.60	87.50	82.95	83.21	82.18	82.44		4.70	4,39
			1		18.00	979	3,81	15,10		0.00		0.00			0.00	0.00	19.00	40.80					_	<u> </u>										4.38	8.06
	4	5	7 10	185	87.40		<u> </u>											18.00	0.04	29.64	365	250 2	54.0 0.2	30.39	67.9%	0.60	\$8.00	87.50	83,83	84.08	82.95	81 20			
				103		2396	3.62	34,19		0.00		0.00		3,10	3,10	2.69	10.70	ER 30	48.20															3.82	4.30
	54	5	7 00	703														00.20	10.30	23,16	310	375 3	81.0 0.14	68.43	77.7%	0.60	87.50	87.60	82.06	62.44	81.62	82.00		6.00	
					1.30	302	4.00	5.87		0.00		0.00			0.00	0.00	7.0	7.00							1			1.							5.00
	5		2.40	470			<u> </u>											1.30	441	8.98	320	200 2	03.2 0.6	5 27.58	29.3%	0.85	87.40	87.50	84.05	· 84.75	81.97	82.17			
		7	46.00	170	65.40	2928	3,45	40.94		0.00		0.00			3.10	2.60		60 FO				<u> </u>		·		-								3.15	6.43
	7	1 1	6.00	353	01,30	3/15	3.36	50,60	L	0.00		0.00			3,10	2.69	15.00	90.00	19,10	92.81	295	375 3	81.0 0.1	65,43	91,8%	0.60	87,60	67.50	81.62	82.00	81.21	81.50			
			0.00	353	68,10	4068	3.33	54.83		0.00		0,00			3.10	2.69	10.30	04,40	23.63	70.92	115	450 4	57.2 0.1	98.64	78.0%	0.60	87.50	87.50	81.13	81.50	81.01	84.44		5.00	5.91
h j	- 8A	-	11.00		44.95	_												91,29	49.94	63.03	235	450 4	57.2 0.1	98.64	84.2%	0.60	87.50	06.86	81.01	81.46	80.75	81.34			6.04
			11.00	629	11,09	826	3.85	12.89		0.00		0.00			0.00	0.00	11.05	44.85		40.04												01.21			0.69
			2.00	4.9.8	400.00				L									11.00	3.32	16.21	150	200 2	03.2 0.5	24.19	67.0%	0.76	66.50	66.90	81,45	\$1.65	80.70	80.00		4.00	
				124	102.99	\$922	3.24	65.98		0.00		0.00		2.20	5.30	4.60	440	107.45										·						4,05	5.00
	9A		6.45	100	6.16					1.5								191.00		100.78	1/0	525 6	33,4 0.1	2 141.87	71.0%	0.63	- 86.90	87.00	80,37	80.90	80.20	80.73			
1 1	(42)				0.40	300	4.00	4.86	-	0.00		0.00			0.00	0.00	5.45	6.48	100					<u> </u>				·							
b b	9	10	2,70		110 70	£120												4.10		0.20		200 2	03.2 0.3	19,35	33.0%	0.60	87.00	87.00	\$1.42	81.62	81,14	6125		6.38	
						3724		59.42	I	0,00		0.00			8.30	4.60	2,70	116.00	37.48	104 54				<u> </u>											
Image: state Image: state<	10A	10	14,80	731	14.80	711														100.00	2/3	<u> 623 5</u>	<u>33,4 0.14</u>	2 . 141.87	75,1%	0.63	87.00	67.00	80.20	80.73	79.92	60.46		8 27	
1 1						///	3.00	11,50	<u> </u>	0.00		0.00		0.60	0,60	0.52	15,40	15.40	431	18.34	270			<u> </u>				51 L				214	8		9.00
M J	10	11	4.30	117	129.60	6170	3.16	77.00															0.2 0.3	19.35	84,4%	0.60	\$7.50	87.00	83.56	63,76	82.69	82.90		3.74	A 10
1 1								70,90	t	0.00		0.00		2.40	8.30	7,20	6.70	138,10	38.67	124.84	405	- CM - C						<u>10</u>							
Image: bold	11A	11	8,00	393	8.00	393	400	4.16	<u> </u>		· ·											· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	<u></u>	101.07	68.0%	0.63	87.00	85.50	79.92	0.46	79.52	80.05		6.55	6.45
1 1								V.30		0.00		0.00			0.00	0.00	8.00	8.00	2.24	8.60	85	200 ~	m 2												
N J	118	11	6.90	352	6,90	352	4.00	£ 70	tl			<u> </u>						8			1		9.3	19,35	44.4%	0.60	86.00	85,50	80.42	80.62	80.11	80.32	12	5,38	8,18
L L <thl< th=""> L <thl< th=""> <thl< th=""></thl<></thl<></thl<>							1	0.70		0.00		0.00			0.00	0.00	6.90	5.90	1.65	7.34	80	200 2	m 2	1 10.00								<u></u>			
m m m m m m m m m m m m m m m m m m m		12	1.90	16	145.60	6931	2.11	87.14	<u>├</u>	A											1			19,35	38.0%	0.60	86.00	\$5.50	61.69	81.89	81.40	81.60		4,11	3.90
m m				234					t	0.00		0.00			8,30	7.20	1.90	153.90	43.09	137.63	230	800 4	09.6 0.4~		A			100							
N N	250	25C	7.40	48	7.40	48	4.00	0.7=		0.05				I										evi2.95	60.0%	0.69	85,50	63.90	79,44	80,05	79.21	79.82		5.45	4.08
MB MB MB MB MB <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td><u> </u> </td> <td>0.00</td> <td></td> <td>0.00</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>7.40</td> <td>7,40</td> <td>2.07</td> <td>2.85</td> <td>420</td> <td>200 2</td> <td>012 0.2</td> <td>40.76</td> <td></td>									<u> </u>	0.00		0.00			0.00	0.00	7.40	7,40	2.07	2.85	420	200 2	012 0.2	40.76											
m m	LOCAL PS 2	25C	4.65	22	4.55	22	4.00	0.36													1			13.30	14./%	0.60	86,30	86.00	83.02	\$3,22	81.67	81.88		3.08	4,12
1 1						1.2				0.00		0.00			0.00	0.00	4.55	4.55	1.27	1.64	300		00	0.00	#D0/04									10	
No. No. No. No. No.	25G	256	7.40	496	7.40	496	3.98	7,99		0.00															PD/17/01	*017/01	82.00	85.00		79.50	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	83.30		2.50	2.70
····································			+			100	100			0.00		0.00			0.00	0.00	7.40	7.40	2.07	19.06	230	200 2	03.2 0.1	2 10.15	83.04		-								
Mart Mart Mart Mart M	25F	25E	4.60	272	4.60	272	4.00	4.41		0.00							I		<u></u>						02.0 M	0.60	81.50	81,00	76.80		78.06	78.25		2.50	2.74
MB MB MB MB MB <td></td> <td>_</td> <td><u> </u></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>15</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>0.00</td> <td></td> <td>0.00</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>4.60</td> <td>4.60</td> <td>1.29</td> <td>\$.70</td> <td>120</td> <td>200 2</td> <td>03.2 2.5</td> <td>54.10</td> <td>10.5%</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>· •</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>		_	<u> </u>				15			0.00		0.00			0.00	0.00	4.60	4.60	1.29	\$.70	120	200 2	03.2 2.5	54.10	10.5%			· •							
MAD MA MA MA MA MA </td <td></td> <td>LOCAL PS 1</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0</td> <td>12.00</td> <td>768</td> <td>3.87</td> <td>12.04</td> <td>·</td> <td>0.00</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>·</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>19.3 %</td> <td></td> <td>84,00</td> <td>#1.00</td> <td>81.30</td> <td>\$1.50</td> <td>78.30</td> <td>78.50</td> <td></td> <td>2.50</td> <td>2.50</td>		LOCAL PS 1	0.00	0	12.00	768	3.87	12.04	·	0.00					·										19.3 %		84,00	#1.00	81.30	\$1.50	78.30	78.50		2.50	2.50
Image Image <th< td=""><td>LOCAL PS 1</td><td>25C</td><td>0.00</td><td>0</td><td>12.00</td><td>768</td><td>3,67</td><td>12.04</td><td><u> </u></td><td>0.00</td><td></td><td>0.00</td><td></td><td></td><td>0.00</td><td>0.00</td><td>0.00</td><td>12.00</td><td>3,36</td><td>18.40</td><td>70</td><td>200 2</td><td>03.2 0.3</td><td>19.35</td><td>79.6%</td><td>0.60</td><td>84.00</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></th<>	LOCAL PS 1	25C	0.00	0	12.00	768	3,67	12.04	<u> </u>	0.00		0.00			0.00	0.00	0.00	12.00	3,36	18.40	70	200 2	03.2 0.3	19.35	79.6%	0.60	84.00								
m m												0.00			0.00	0.00	0.00	12.00	3.35	15.40	340		0.0	0.00	#DIV/01	100/01	01.00	81.00	78.06	78.26	77.84	78.04		2.74	2.96
n n	230	258	7.00	61	30.95	890	3.83	13.81		0.00		0.00					ł										01.00	00.00		78,60		83.50		2.50	2.50
m d. m	206	25A	11.80	337	42.75	1226	3.74	18,59		0.00		0.00			0.00	0.00	7.00	30.95	8.67	22.48	460	300 3	04.8 0.1	41.97	61.1%	0.60	80.00			<u> </u>					
1 1	234	25	17.00	845	69.75	2071	3.57	29.99		0.00		0.00			0.00	0.00	11.80	42.75	11.97	30.56	295	376 3	81.0 0.1	68,43	44.7%	0.60	86.60	00.50	61.57	81,88	80,70	81.00		4.12	5.50
		_										0.00			0.00	0.00	17.00	69.75	16,73	46.72	405	375 3	81.0 0.1	68.43	65.3%	0.00	90,50	00.50	80,62	81,00	80.21	60.59		5,50	5.91
n n	20	21	8.75	506	8.75	506	3.97	8.13	1	0.00		0.00															00,00	60.50	80.21	80.59	79.64	80.02		5.91	6.48
n n		2	7.00	160	15.75	666	3.91	10.53		0.00	1.00	1.00	6.50	2,55	2.55	2.21	11.30	11.30	3,16	13.51	320	200 21	03.2 0.3	19,35	69.8%	0.60	87.00								
n n		- 23	7.30	440	23.05	- 1106	3.77	16.89		0.00		1.00	0.50	0.30	10.65	12.05	18,30	27.60	7.73	30.31	335	300 3	04.8 0.11	43,97	68.9%	0.60	86.80	187.00	63.91		82.68	83.09		2.89	3.71
m m	210		+		_		8						0.30		10.85	12.05	7.30	· 34.90	9.77	34.71	275	300 3	04.8 0.11	43.97	88.0%	0.00	87.00		82.78	83.09	82.14	82.45		3.71	4.55
D D	235	ZJA	15.70	565	15,70	565	3.95	9.03		0.00		0.00							ľ.		1	20 J		1				00.30	62,14	8Z,45	81,62	81.93		4.55	4.57
0 1 0	200	73	9.40	584	25.10	1149	3,76	17.50		0.00		0.00			0.00	0.00	15.70	15,70	4.40	13.43	325	250 2	54.0 0.4	5 41,38	32.4%	0.82	86.80	84.00							
· · · · · · <	71		+												0.00	0.00	9.40	25.10	7.03	24.53	310	300 30	04.8 0.11	43.97	55.8%	0.60	86.00	88.50	82.52	62.77	81.07	81,32		4.03	4,68
N N		24	2.60	120	50.75	2374	3.53	33.92		0.00		100	6.50				<u> </u>										00.00	00,30	61,02	81.3Z	80,43	80.73		4.68	5.77
m m	244		++			<i>W</i>							0.30	3.30	14.15	14.92	5,90	65.90	18.45	67,29	315	375 3	81.0 0.2	85,79	78.4%	0.75	86.50				<u> </u>				
····································		24	25.10	544	25,10	544	3.96	8.72		0.00		0.00					I		+		-			1 1				00.00	00.35	80,73	79,66	60.04		5.77	6.46
m m	24		·+											(a) -	0.00	0.00	25.10	25.10	7.03	15.74	235	200 2	03.2 0.3	19.35	81,3%	0.60	85 00	88.50	12.00	11.70					
Destrict p dot dot dot </td <td></td> <td></td> <td>0.80</td> <td></td> <td>76.65</td> <td>2918</td> <td>3.45</td> <td>40.82</td> <td></td> <td>0.00</td> <td></td> <td>1.00</td> <td>8.50</td> <td></td> <td>14.45</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td><u> </u></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>63.20</td> <td>52.24</td> <td>82.45</td> <td></td> <td>2.80</td> <td>4.05</td>			0.80		76.65	2918	3.45	40.82		0.00		1.00	8.50		14.45						<u> </u>									63.20	52.24	82.45		2.80	4.05
b 0	LANDERL PS		++			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·										14,92	0.80	91,80	25.70	. 81.44	235	450 4	57.2 0.1	98,64	82.6%	0.60	86.50	86.50	70.58						
A B			0,00		0.00	0	4.00	0.00		0.00	10.40	10.40	4.20		0.00	47.60	40.00												18.30	60.04	(9.33	79.78		8.46	6.72
i i	25	24				8.5									0.00	17.08	10.40	10.40	291		120		0.0	0.00	IVALUEI	#DIV/0I	80.00	86,50	77.50	77.50					
MA M			6.30		144.70	6089	5,24	66,75		0.00		11.40	4,15		14.15	31.45		470.05			<u> </u>						¥2			11.00		64.00		2.50	2.50
Image Image <th< td=""><td>254</td><td>28</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>1/0.25</td><td>41.07</td><td>145.87</td><td>380</td><td>600 6</td><td>09.6 0.10</td><td>202.55</td><td>72.0%</td><td>0.69</td><td>86.50</td><td>86,50</td><td>79.17</td><td>79 78</td><td>78.70</td><td>70.00</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></th<>	254	28																1/0.25	41.07	145.87	380	600 6	09.6 0.10	202.55	72.0%	0.69	86.50	86,50	79.17	79 78	78.70	70.00			
n 9					0.90	360	4.00	5.83		0.00		0.00		1,30	1.30	1.13	8.20	8 20	1 1 2 20													18.00			7.10
i i i i i <	26	12	2.80		184.40		<u>├</u>			L								0.20	2.30	1.21	175	200 20	03.2 0.3	2 19.35	47.8%	0.60	86.00	85.50	81.00	\$1,20	80.44	80.64			
-1 0					154,40	0455	3.21	70.93	·	0.00		11.40	4.15		15.45	32,68	2.00	181 25	50.75	101.00				1										4.60	0.06
I I		13	0.60	- 12	300.60	49.445	1		<u> </u>											194,26	720	000 6	0,10	202.55	76.2%	0,69	86.50	83.90	78,79	79.40	78.07	78.68		7.00	
10 10 10 10 10 <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>444.44</td> <td>12410</td> <td>2.00</td> <td>143.91</td> <td>0.90</td> <td>0.90</td> <td></td> <td>11.40</td> <td>4,15</td> <td></td> <td>23,75</td> <td>40.56</td> <td>1.50</td> <td>336.65</td> <td>84.26</td> <td>776 74</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>* <u> </u></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>0.22</td>					444.44	12410	2.00	143.91	0.90	0.90		11.40	4,15		23,75	40.56	1.50	336.65	84.26	776 74								* <u> </u>							0.22
N V	130	13	5.60	353	5.60	387	400		t	·	(S)	l								A/4,24			0.30	350,83	79.5%	1.20	83.90	82.50	78.07	78.68	77.89	78,50		5.22	4.00
13 14 15 14 15 15 15 15 <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>1.00</td> <td>3./1</td> <td><u> </u></td> <td>0.00</td> <td></td> <td>0.00</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>5.60</td> <td>5.60</td> <td>1.57</td> <td>7.28</td> <td>150</td> <td>200 -</td> <td>01.2</td> <td> </td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>(S)</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>							1.00	3./1	<u> </u>	0.00		0.00			0.00	0.00	5.60	5.60	1.57	7.28	150	200 -	01.2					(S)							
1M 10 60 60 60 60 <td>138</td> <td>13A</td> <td>10.50</td> <td>314</td> <td>10,50</td> <td>314</td> <td>4.01</td> <td>600</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>_</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>1</td> <td></td> <td>0,64</td> <td>21.79</td> <td>25.2%</td> <td>0.86</td> <td>83 50</td> <td>82.50</td> <td>80.80</td> <td>\$1.00</td> <td>79.81</td> <td>80.01</td> <td></td> <td>2,50</td> <td>2.49</td>	138	13A	10.50	314	10,50	314	4.01	600								_					1		0,64	21.79	25.2%	0.86	83 50	82.50	80.80	\$1.00	79.81	80.01		2,50	2.49
1 1	13A	13	6.60	90	17.10	404	4.00	8.54		00.0		0.00	_		0.00	0.00	10.50	10.50	2.94	8.03	160	200 2	03.2 0.9	40.75	44.54										
i i			1				1			0.00		0.00			0.00	0.00	- 6.60	17.10	4.79	11.33	100	200 20	03.2 0.3	10.75	61.076	0.60 1	61.50	01.60	78.80	79.00	78.28	78.49		2.50	3.01
15 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 160 160 160 <	14	14	0.26	0	323.58	13175	2.83	151.30	0.54	1.44		11.40	A 10				<u> </u>		1		1				00.0 %	0.00	e1.50	82.50	78.28	78.49	77.96	78.17		3.01	4.33
N N 102 93 9249 <td>15</td> <td></td> <td>1.40</td> <td>16</td> <td>324,96</td> <td>13191</td> <td>2.83</td> <td>151.46</td> <td></td> <td>1,44</td> <td></td> <td>1140</td> <td>4.10</td> <td></td> <td>23.75</td> <td>41,03</td> <td>0.60</td> <td>360.15</td> <td>100.84</td> <td>293,17</td> <td>100</td> <td>600 60</td> <td>09.6 0.40</td> <td>405.10</td> <td>72.4%</td> <td>1.39</td> <td>82.50</td> <td>80.80</td> <td>78.04</td> <td></td> <td><u> </u></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	15		1.40	16	324,96	13191	2.83	151.46		1,44		1140	4.10		23.75	41,03	0.60	360.15	100.84	293,17	100	600 60	09.6 0.40	405.10	72.4%	1.39	82.50	80.80	78.04		<u> </u>				
1 1.2 <th1.2< th=""> <th1.2< th=""> <th1.2< th=""></th1.2<></th1.2<></th1.2<>	16	16	1.70	63	326.66	13244	2.83	151.97		1.44		1140	4.15 A 16		23.75	41.03	1,40	361,55	101.23	293.72	150	600 60	09.6 0.44	405,10	72.5%	1.39	80 80	72 40	75.91	11.52	76.61	77.12	0.65	4,98	3.68
N 0.9 0.9 2.92 0.9 0.92 0.90<	17		2.30	32	328.96	13276	2.83	152.28		1,44		1140	A 18		23./5	41.03	1,70	363.25	101.71	294.71	150	600 67	0.60	496,14	59.4%	1.70	78.40	77 00	74 74	/6.47	75.26	75.87	0.65	4.33	2.53
9 31 44 75 46 75 </td <td></td> <td></td> <td>0.30</td> <td>0</td> <td>329.26</td> <td>13276</td> <td>2.83</td> <td>152.28</td> <td></td> <td>1.44</td> <td></td> <td>11.40</td> <td>4.16</td> <td></td> <td>23./5</td> <td>41.03</td> <td>2.30</td> <td>365.55</td> <td>102.35</td> <td>295.67</td> <td>250</td> <td>600 60</td> <td>3.0 8.00</td> <td>496,14</td> <td>59.6%</td> <td>1.70</td> <td>77.00</td> <td>26.00</td> <td>71.64</td> <td>79.37</td> <td>73.86</td> <td>74.47</td> <td>0.50</td> <td>3.03</td> <td>2.53</td>			0.30	0	329.26	13276	2.83	152.28		1.44		11.40	4.16		23./5	41.03	2.30	365.55	102.35	295.67	250	600 60	3.0 8.00	496,14	59.6%	1.70	77.00	26.00	71.64	79.37	73.86	74.47	0.50	3.03	2.53
11 12 440 450 12 460 460 600	30		+				×						4.10		43.15	41.03	0.30	365.85	102.44	295.75	100	600 60	09.6 0.80	572.90	51.6%	1.96	76.00	73.00	70.05	74.47	72.36	72.97		2.53	3.03
10 10 24 6.20 24 6.00 1.00 1.00 2.00 4.00 1.00 <td>31</td> <td></td> <td>4.80</td> <td>252</td> <td>4.80</td> <td>252</td> <td>4.00</td> <td>4.08</td> <td></td> <td>0.00</td> <td></td> <td>0.00</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td><u> </u></td> <td></td> <td><u>+</u></td> <td></td> <td><u> </u></td> <td>+</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>10.00</td> <td>00.01</td> <td>/1.2/</td> <td>69.86</td> <td>70,47</td> <td>1.70</td> <td>4,73</td> <td>2.53</td>	31		4.80	252	4.80	252	4.00	4.08		0.00		0.00					<u> </u>		<u>+</u>		<u> </u>	+						10.00	00.01	/1.2/	69.86	70,47	1.70	4,73	2.53
32A 22 6.9 5.0 5.0 5.0 7.0 7.0 7.0 7.0 7.0 7.0 7.0 7.0 7.0 7.0 7.0 7.0 7.0 7.0 7.0 7.0 7.0 7.00 7.00 7.0			1.40	34	6.20	286	4.00	4.63	1.30	1.30		0.00			0.00	0.00	4.80	4.80	1.34	8.43	150	200 21	03.2 2.50	54.10	10,0%	1.67	83.50	79.00	80.24						
1 1	32A		+				L								0,00	1,13	2.70	7.50	2.10	7.86	205	200 2	03.2 3,90	67.57	11.6%	2.08	79.00	71 00	78.30	80.46	76,51	76.71		3.04	2.29
12 33 4.64 34 6.65 35 0.04 120 0.00 0.01 0.00 0.01 0.00 0.01 0.00 0.01 0.00 0.01 <td></td> <td></td> <td>5.50</td> <td>336</td> <td>5.50</td> <td>336</td> <td>4.00</td> <td>5,44</td> <td></td> <td>0.00</td> <td></td> <td>0.00</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td><u> </u> </td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>0.01</td> <td>/0.50</td> <td>67.30</td> <td>68.51</td> <td>0.21</td> <td>2.50</td> <td>2.50</td>			5.50	336	5.50	336	4.00	5,44		0.00		0.00							<u> </u>										0.01	/0.50	67.30	68.51	0.21	2.50	2.50
Image: Note of the state of the st	32		+				ł	L							0.00	0.00	9.30	5,50	1,54	8.98	80	300 30	04.8 0.1	43.97	15.9%	0.60	70.50	71.00	68.24						
23A 13 4.00 5.20 6.00 6.			4.05	38	15.75	659	3.91	10.44		1.30		0.00			0.00	4 47	1				l	+						1000		99,34	00,00	66,39		3.96	4.61
Image: book of the constraint of the constr	AEE		+				ļ					1			0.00	1,13	4.05	17.05	4.77	16.35	160	300 30	04.8 0.11	43.97	37.2%	0.60	71.00	70.80	68.04	EE ***					
33 34 06 42 06 42 06 42 06 70.6			4.00	252	4.00	252	4.00	4.06		0.00		0.00			A		<u> </u>				l								00.08	00.39	65.78	56.08		4,61	4.72
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	33		++												0,00	0,00	4.00	4.00	1.12	5.20	85	200 20	03.2 0.3	19.35	26.9%	0.60	70.50	70.87	68.07	A					
34A 34			0.90	42	20.65	953	3.81	14.73		1,30		0.00							+		l	1	-	1				10.00		55.27	65.79	66.00		4.23	4.80
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	344		1				-					1		2.60	2.60	3.56	3.70	24.75	6.93	25,22	185	300 30	04.8 0.11	43.97	57.3%	0.60	70.80	78 60	46.00		t				
34 35 380 227 24.15 37.17 3.17 20.19 1.00 0.00 1.01 0.00 2.00 3.10 2.00 2.			3.70	178	3.70	176	4.00	2.86		0.00		0.00							l								. 7.07	10.50	69.69	66.00		65.65		4.80	4.85
32 3.60 227 26.15 1357 3.71 20.39 1.00 0.00 2.60 3.10 0.00 2.60 3.10 0.00 2.60 3.21 0.00	34		╆╼╼┥					I	L						0.00	0.00	3,70	3.70	1.04	3,89	60	200 20	03.2 2.00	48.38	8.0%	1.40	71.50	men							
35C 35B 7.30 445 7.30 445 7.30 445 7.30 445 7.30 445 7.30 445 7.30 445 7.30 445 7.30 445 7.30 445 7.30 445 7.30 445 7.30 445 7.30 445 7.30 <			3.80	227	28,15	1357	3.71	20.39		1.30		0.00	i						+		1 ··· ··								05.00	63.00	67.20	67.40		2,50	3,10
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	150											1			2.50	3.56	3.60	32.25	9.03	32,98	160	300 30	04.8 0.11	43.97	75.0%	0.60	70.50	71.00	48.94	48.00					
134 0.99 50 8.28 496 1.98 7.98 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 7.30 2.04 9.26 1.90 4.14 7.50 7.2	358	364	7.30	445	7.30	445	4.00	7.21		0.00		0.00					<u> </u>				L							1	05,34	53.65	65.04	65.34		4.85	5.66
32 270 134 199 530 192 1001 0.00 0.	354	JSA	0.96	50	8.26	496	3.98	7.98		0.00		0.00			0.00	0.00	7.30	7.30	2.04	9.26	160	200 20	03.2 1.90	47.16	19.6%	1.45	75 m	71.00	70.00		<u> </u>]
35 36 0.73 42 39.44 2029 3.56 29.43 1.30 0.00 2.80 3.65 0.73 41.07 70 200 203.2 2.50 54,10 24.2% 1.67 72.00 77.00 70 70.00			2.70	134	10.96	630	3.92	10.01		0.00		000		⊢	0.00	0.00	0.96	8.26	2.31	10.30	85	200 20	03.2 0.3	19.35	53.2%	0.60	72.00	72 00	/2.30	72.50	69 26	69,46		2.50	2,54
x7 0.73 42 39.64 2029 3.56 29.43 1.30 0.00 2.60 3.56 0.73 43.94 12.30 0.16 66.43 0.17 <t< td=""><td>35</td><td>1</td><td>+</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>L</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>1</td><td></td><td></td><td>9.00</td><td>0.00</td><td>2.70</td><td>10.96</td><td>3.07</td><td>13.07</td><td>70</td><td>200 20</td><td>03.2 2.50</td><td>54,10</td><td>24.2%</td><td>1.67</td><td>72 00</td><td>71 00</td><td>67.00</td><td>69.46</td><td>68.98</td><td>69.19</td><td></td><td>2.54</td><td>2.81</td></t<>	35	1	+				L					1			9.00	0.00	2.70	10.96	3.07	13.07	70	200 20	03.2 2.50	54,10	24.2%	1.67	72 00	71 00	67.00	69.46	68.98	69.19		2.54	2.81
7 2,60 538 49,64 2556 3,60 36,38 1,30 0,00 2,00 43,24 110 275 341,0 0,14 68,43 66,28 0,60 71,00 72,00 64,86 65,34 64,81 65,19 5,56 6,81 27 38 3,40 193 53.04 2759 3,41 0,00 2,80 3,56 9,05 57,14 1505 54,88 165 375 341,0 0,14 64,34 63,3% 0,60 72,00 74,00 72,00 64,86 65,19 5,56 6,81 110,0 110,0 14 64,34 63,3% 0,60 72,00 76,00 74,00 72,00 76,00	36		0.73	42	39,84	2029	3,58	29.43		1.30		0.00							╉╼╼┯╼┛										01.33	68.20	66.24	66.45	0.99	3.80	4.55
3.40 193 53.04 2759 3.47 38.82 1.30 0.00 2.80 57.14 15.05 54.98 165 375 31.0 0.14 69.43 60.3% 660 72.00 74.80 68.81 65.19 5.66 6.81 1.30 0.00 2.80 3.66 57.14 16.00 58.34 65.19 64.85 64.96 6.81	37		9.80	538	49,64	2566	3.50	36.38		1.30		0.00			2.80	3.56	0.73	43.94	12.30	45.29	110	375 34	81.0 0.1	68.43	66.2%	0.60	71.00	72.00	64 pr		t				
<u>64.96</u> 57.14 16.00 58.38 95 375 381.0 0.14 65.43 85.3% 0.60 76.00			3.40	193	53.04	2759	3.47	38.82		1.30		0.00			2.60	3.56	9.60	50.74	15.05	54.98	165	375 34	81.0 0.1	61.43	80.3%	0.60	72.00	78.00	04.96	65,34	64.81	65,19		5.66	6.81
															2.00	3.30	1 3.40	57.14	16.00	58,38	95	375 34	81.0 D.14	68,43	85.3%	0.60	76.00	76.00	64 55	64 M	64.58	64.96		6.81	11.04

sanilary_sewer_March 2005.xls/Sanilary Design

LOCATION			RES	IDENTIAL A	EA AND PO	ULATION		1 0	OMM	15	INDUST		· · · · ·	NeT -	CHHI PEAK FLOW									8	10										
FROM	TO	AREA	POP.	CUM	JUATIVE	PEAK	PEAK	AREA	ACCU	ADEA	ACCIL	BEAM	AREA	1 1001	Contra Co		T	AFLOW		<u> </u>	v		PIPE					1.1							
мн	M.H.			AREA	POP.	FACT.	FLOW		ARFA		ADEA	EACTOR	ANEA	1 4054	PEAK	TOTAL	ACCU.	INFILT.	TOTAL	LENGTH	DIAN	IETER	SLOPE	CAP.	O/Qcap	VEL.	Upstream	Downstream	Upstream	Upstream	Doepstream	Downstraam	Dee	US Front	DS Erest
		(ha)		(ha)			(L/s)	(ha)	(ha)	(ba)	(ha)	Iner MOE	1 (1-1)	(10)	A (a)	AREA	AREA	FLOW	FLOW	1	NOM	ACT		(FULL)		(FULL)	00	03	invert	Obvert	Invert	Obvert	Structure	Death	Denth
1.00		T *	1.0		e 6.	1.0		1	1	(ria)	1 (1)07	TOPEI MICE	(ma)	(110)	105	(na)	[(na)	(US)	(L/s)	(m)	<u>(mm)</u>	(mm)	(%)	(Us)	(%)	(m/s)	(m)	(m)	(m)	(m)	(177)	(m)	6m)	(m)	(mb)
36A	38	3.00	17	4 3.0	174	4.00	2.83	-	0.00			<u> </u>				<u> </u>	de la companya de la	'									1.1.1				1	1	-		
			S*6				1	+		- X	0.00		+	0.00	0.00	3.00	3.00	2 0.84	9.6	160	200	203	2 0.32	19,35	18,9%	0.60	72.00	76.00	68.50	68.70	87.9	8 88 10	J	3 30	1 70
38	39	3.40	18	2 59.4	4 3110	2.43	43.2		1.20		0.00		<u> </u>			<u> </u>		- '	I									10					├── ┦	3,30	1.0
39	18	6.20	34	1 65.6	3457	3.39	47.4		1.20	<u>+</u>	0.00		- <u></u>	2.00	3.56	3.40	63,54	17.79	64.62	170	375	381	0 0.22	85.79	75.3%	0.75	76.00	72.00	64.44	64.87		7 84.45	·	41.48	1 70
						1	1		1.00		0.00		+	2.80	3.56	6.20	69.74	4 19.53	70.54	3 105	375	381	.0 0.22	85.79	82.2%	0.75	72.00	73.00	64.07	64.45	1 M A	4 84.77	<u> </u>	744	
50	51	8.20	65	5 82	0 555	3.95	8.6		0.00		0.00					·	╋╾╍┉╝╼╸										l			-			{ <i>!</i>	1.00	
51	52	4.10	23	5 12.3	790	3.64	12.3	1	0.00		0.00	ł	1	0.00	0,00	8,20	8.20	1 2.30	11.17	/60	200	203	.2 0.50	24.19	48.2%	0.75	74.00	74.00	69.00	69.76	88.7			4.00	
<u>62</u>	18	4.70	17	4 17.0	0 964	3.81	14.8	1	0.00		0.00	 		0.00	0.00	4.10	12.30	3.44	15.81	140	200	203	2 0.67	28,00	56,4%	0.86	74.00	72.00	68.55	68.75	5 67 6	47.81	0.15	9.00	4.1
					1						V.00		+	0.00	0.00	4.70	17.00	4.78	19.64	70	250	254	.0 0.33	2 35.09	56.0%	0.69	72.00	73.00	\$7.56	67.81	173	87.50		4 99	
16	19	0.00		0 411.9	0 17696	2.71	192.9	1	174	<u> </u>	11.40	<u> </u>					+				<u> </u>	1	_										<u> </u>		
19	19A	0.00		0 411.9	0 17696	2.71	193.0		2.74	<u> </u>	11.40			20.95	25.43	0.00	412.69	126,73	346.13	110	600	609	.6 0.50	452,92	70.4%	1,65	73.00	71,50	63.61	64 22	810	61.61	<u> </u> /	8.78	
19A	198	0.40		0 412.3	0 17696	2.71	193.9		2.74		11.40	4,10	·	20.00	44,50	0.00	452,59	/ 126.73	345.34	25	000	609	.6 0.50	452.92	80.7%	1.55	71,50	71.00	63.06	63.67	7 67.9	3 63.54	1	7.83	74
						-					11,240	4,13		270.55	44.59	0.40	452.99	126.84	365.41	<u> </u>	600	609	.6 0.50	452.92	80,7%	1.55	71.00	71.00	62.87	63.4	82.6	2 61 21	0.00	7,03	2 77
60	198	5.90	35	6 5.9	0 326	4.00	52	1	0.00		0.00						+		+			<u> </u>	_					1.11	<u>.</u>					1.00	1
							1					<u> </u>		0.00	0,00	5.90	5.90	3 1.65	6.8	3 120	200	203	2 0.3	2 19.35	35.8%	0.60	71,00	71.00	68.30	68.50	879	1 69.12	,/	2.50	1 20
196	FVPS	0.00		0 418,2	0 18022	2.70	196.9	7	2.74	<u> </u>	44.40	A 10				+				<u></u>	Į					E.					1	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	/		
		1				1	1			<u> </u>	1 100	4,14	<u>' </u>		44,59	0.00	498.89	128.49	370.0	24	600	605	.6 0.50	452.92	81.7%	1.55	71.00	71.50	62.56	63,17	7 62.4	4 63.05	0.06	783	1
				DES	IGN PARAM	ETERS		-	_	1		1	Dealerson		L	1000.00					1							1.1.1		1					1
Residential Flow=	150 Lpc	đ		Industrial	Peek Factor	a na per MOE	Graph		Low Density	A.DYEdisting =	12-		Designed			PROJEC	1:	Glouceste	er EUC Infrasi	tructure Serv	licing Study	Update					1				163				
Commerica/Institutional Flow a	50000 L/he	d		Edit	meaus Flow	0.21	L/efte		LowMedum	Density (LMD)	= 32m																1								
Industrial Flow =	: 35000 Uhal	d		Mink	rum Velocity	9.76	i m/a		Medium Den	aty (MD) =	2.4		Charked	E 1A/		100470												· .							
Madmum Residential Peek Factor =	4.00	1			Mannings n	0.01	0.013 High Density (DD) = (1) and (D																												
Minimum Residential Peak Factor =	r 2.00	• ·	Harmo	n Peak Factor	= 1+14/(4+)	P/1000)1/2)%	where K=	1	MUC		10																1	1							
Commerical/Institutional Peak Factor #	r 1.50	2						-	GUA =		1.1 m		Dun Ral		N.	1711 - D.C.	4024 0044		1																
									(Telephone (Conversion w	n Saina Har	an Rent	Ung. rei	elence. SA	DV	File Ref.:	1034-0049	13	Date:	Mar-05)					Sheet No.	1								
1									10/2004 - Ba	eed on develop	ment applicat	ons - 361	1									1													
1									Singles @ 3.	2pen/unit and	164 Singles (3 pers/unit)										1					ł								
L		~~~~~																-12																	
													_		-		and the second s										1								

**...



Appendix E2

JLR Sanitary Design Sheet



	МН М	lo.				Resid	ential					Commer	rcial/Institu	itional		Park/Road	is		Infiltra	tion	Peak Pipe Data							Upstream	n Geometry			Dov	wnstream G	eometry			Self-Clear	nsing Veloci	ies				
Street Name	From	То	Multiples	Apartments	Area (ha)	Pop.	Cum. Pop.	Cum. Area (ha)	Peaking Factor	Residential Flow (L/s)	Area (ha)	Cum. Area (ha)	Peaking Factor	Inst. Flow (L/s)	Plug Flow (L/s)	Area Cu (ha) (h	m. Plug ea Flov a) (L/s	Area (ha)	Cum. Area (ha)	Peak Extr. Flow L/s	Design Flow L/s	Dia	Туре	Actual Diameter	Slope	Q Full (L/s)	V Full	Length	Residual Capacity	% Full	TG From	Obvert	Invert	Cover	тд то	Drop	Obvert	Invert	Cover	Qp/Qf Ratio	Flow Depth (mm)	Actual Velocity (m/s	Flow Depth to Diameter Ratio (d/D)
					_																																						
OUTLET TO PAGE (CUL-DU-SAC @ B	rian Coburn)																																										
STOMPIN' TOM LANE	24	234	8	8	0.25	36	36	0.25	3.67	0.43		0.00	1.50	0.00		0.	0	0.25	0.25	0.08	0.59	200	Circular	203.20	2 00%	48.39	1 49	54.95	47.80	1%	85 698	83 493	83 290	2 205	85 346		82 394	82 191	2 952	0.01	15.65	0.5	0.08
STOMPIN' TOM LANE	23A	23	Ŭ		0.20	0	36	0.25	3.67	0.43		0.00	1.50	0.00		0.	00	0.00	0.25	0.08	0.59	200	Circular	203.20	2.00%	48.39	1.49	11.18	47.80	1%	85.346	82.394	82.191	2.952	85.350	0.300	82.170	81.967	3.179	0.01	15.65	0.5	0.08
Page Road (2690 to Navan Road)	23	EX10			5.94	81	117	6.19	3.58	1.36		0.00	1.50	0.00		0.0	00	5.94	6.19	2.04	3.40																						
OUTLET TO PAGE @ NAVAN																																											
Site Plan - BLOCK 15	SAN STUB 15	13		83	0.45	149	149	0.45	3.55	1.72	0.09	0.09	1.50	0.05		0.	00	0.54	0.54	0.18	1.94	250	Circular	254.00	1.50%	75.98	1.50	13.47	74.04	3%	85.000	82.366	82.112	2.634	85.065	0.259	82.164	81.910	2.901	0.03	27.94	0.6	0.11
PALEO DRIVE	13	12			0.14	0	149	0.59	3.55	1.72		0.09	1.50	0.05		0.	00	0.14	0.68	0.22	1.99	200	Circular	203.20	1.20%	37.48	1.16	5.15	35.50	5%	85.065	81.905	81.702	3.160	84.982		81.843	81.640	3.138	0.05	31.70	0.6	0.16
Easement - BLOCK 12	SAN STUB 16	21			0.04	0	0	0.04	3.80	0.00	0.77	0.77	1.50	0.37	3.60	0.	00	0.81	0.81	0.27	4.24	200	Circular	203.20	0.65%	27.59	0.85	38.75	23.34	15%	85.350	82.574	82.370	2.776	85.041		82.322	82.118	2.719	0.15	53.85	0.6	0.27
Easement- BLOCK 12	21	12			_	0	0	0.00	3.80	0.00		0.77	1.50	0.37	3.60	0.	00	0.00	0.81	0.27	4.24	200	Circular	203.20	0.60%	26.50	0.82	13.09	22.26	16%	85.041	82.322	82.118	2.719	84.982	0.400	82.243	82.040	2.738	0.16	54.86	0.6	0.27
PALEO DRIVE	12	11	6	6	0.23	27	176	0.82	3.53	2.02		0.86	1.50	0.42	3.60	0.	00	0.23	1.72	0.57	6.60	200	Circular	203.20	0.50%	24.19	0.75	37.41	17.59	27%	84.982	81.843	81.640	3.138	84.909		81.656	81.453	3.253	0.27	72.34	0.6	0.36
PALEO DRIVE PALEO DRIVE	11	10	3	3	0.16	14 54	244	0.98	3.52 3.49	2.17		0.86	1.50	0.42	3.60 (0.20 0.3	20	0.16	2.47	0.62	6.81	200	Circular	203.20	0.50%	24.19	0.75	10.53	17.38	28%	84.909 84.935	81.656	81.453	3.253	84.935	0.321	81.603	81.400 80.949	3.332	0.28	73.56	0.6	0.36
Site Plan PLOCK 14	CAN STUD 14	17		0.4	0.49	151	151	0.49	2.55	1 74	0.00	0.00	1.50	0.05		0	20	0.57	0.67	0.10	1.07	200	Circulor	202.20	1.60%	41.01	1 20	0.00	20.04	E0/.	94 600	02 /27	02 224	2 162	94.045	0.060	02 212	92 110	2 622	0.05	20.97	0.0	0.15
Sile Fian - BLOCK 14	3AN 3105 14	17		04	0.48	131	131	0.40	3.55	1.74	0.09	0.09	1.50	0.05		0.1		0.57	0.57	0.15	1.57	200	Circular	203.20	1.30%	41.91	1.25	0.20	39.94	570	04.000	02.437	02.234	2.103	04.545	0.000	02.313	02.110	2.032	0.05	29.07	0.6	0.15
ROSALIA STREET ROSALIA STREET	17	16	31	31	0.95	140	291	1.43	3.47	3.27		0.09	1.50	0.05		0.	00	0.95	1.52	0.50	3.82	200	Circular	203.20	0.86%	31.79	0.98	111.68	27.97	12%	84.945 84.030	82.253	82.050	2.692	84.030 84.248	0.201	81.289	81.086	2.741	0.12	47.35	0.6	0.23
	10		-	-	0.07			1.00	0.10	0.07		0.00	1.00	0.00		0.		0.01	1.00	0.02	0.01			200.20	0.0070	21.00	0.00					01.000		2.012	01.210				0.200				
PALEO DRIVE PALEO DRIVE	09	08	5	5	0.15	23	567	3.01 3.26	3.36	6.17		0.96	1.50	0.46	3.60	0.	20	0.15	4.21	1.39	11.62	200	Circular	203.20	0.35%	20.24	0.62	25.46	7.96	61%	84.248	80.831	80.628	2.625	83.267	0.100	80.742	80.539	2.525	0.57	110.34	0.6	0.54
PALEO DRIVE	07	06			_	0	567	3.26	3.36	6.17		0.96	1.50	0.46	3.60	0.	20	0.00	4.46	1.47	11.70	200	Circular	203.20	0.35%	20.10	0.62	19.95	8.39	58%	82.688	80.591	80.388	2.097	82.496	0.300	80.522	80.319	1.974	0.58	111.35	0.6	0.55
PALEO DRIVE	06	03				0	507	3.20	3.30	0.17		0.96	1.50	0.40	3.00	0	20	0.00	4.40	1.47	11.70	200	Circular	203.20	0.30%	20.39	0.03	22.00	0.00	5776	02.490	00.222	00.019	2.214	02.430	0.404	00.141	79.930	2.315	0.57	110.34	0.6	0.54
Site Plan - BLOCK 17	SAN STUB 17	03		96	0.56	173	173	0.56	3.54	1.98		0.00	1.50	0.00		0.	00	0.56	0.56	0.18	2.17	200	Circular	203.20	1.50%	41.91	1.29	10.30	39.74	5%	82.800	79.952	79.749	2.848	82.456	0.060	79.797	79.594	2.659	0.05	31.29	0.6	0.15
PALEO DRIVE	03	02			0.07	0	740	3.89	3.30	7.92		0.96	1.50	0.46	3.60	0.1	20	0.07	5.09	1.68	13.67	200	Circular	203.20	0.33%	19.75	0.61	57.98	6.08	69%	82.456	79.737	79.534	2.719	81.831	0.070	79.544	79.341	2.287	0.69	124.16	0.6	0.61
NAVAN ROAD	02	01			_	0	740	3.89	3.30	7.92		0.96	1.50	0.46	3.60	0.:	20	0.00	5.09	1.68	13.67	200	Circular	203.20	0.35%	20.24	0.62	114.96	6.57	68%	81.831	79.474	79.271	2.357	81.523		79.072	78.868	2.451	0.68	122.12	0.6	0.60
NAVAN ROAD	01	EX10			5.82	174	914	9.71	3.26	9.66		0.96	1.50	0.46	3.60	0.3	20	5.82	10.91	3.60	17.32	200	Circular	203.20	0.55%	25.38	0.78	45.18	8.05	68%	81.523	79.072	78.868	2.451	81.585		78.823	78.620	2.761	0.68	123.14	0.8	0.61
																			10.07																								
Page Road (Navan to Renaud)	EX10	Renaud					1031	15.90	3.23	10.80		0.96	1.50	0.46	4.00	0.3	20	0.00	17.10 16.86	5.64	20.91	250	Circular	254.00	0.74%	53.19	1.05	106.80	32.28	39%										0.39	110.49	0.9	0.44
			67	330	5.34	776					0.96							17.10)																								
Design Parameters Single Family Population Semi-Detached/Townhouse Population Apartments Population		3.4 2.7 1.8	Cap/Unit Cap/Unit Cap/Unit		PER EUC	Area 13A: Area 13B: Total:	6.60 10.50 17.10		Subdivision A Site Plans A Subdivision + FUC Areas =	Area = reas = ⊦ Site Plan Area =	s =	3.86 ha 1.48 ha 5.34 ha 11.76 ha		Note: 5.34	ha is total di	iraft plan are	ea + additic	nal flows on	stompin' to	om lane													Sar Sar Sanitary Inv	nitary Inv Ex M nitary Inv Ex M at Ex MH 10 F	H 13 Page F H 14 Page F Page @ Nava	td 81.13 td 81.83 in 78.620]						
Residential Flows		280	L/Cap/Day	1					Total Area =			17.10 ha																															

Single Family Population	3.4	Cap/Unit
Semi-Detached/Townhouse Population	2.7	Cap/Unit
Apartments Population	1.8	Cap/Unit
Residential Flows	280	L/Cap/Day
Infiltration Flows	0.33	L/s/ha
Correction Factor	0.8	-
Commercial Peak Factor	1.5	-
Institutional/Commercial Average Flow	28000	L/gross ha/d
Manning Coefficient	0.013	

Appendix F1

Storm – EUC ISSU Design Excerpts

STORM SEWER CALCULATION SHEET (RATIONAL METHOD) - POND 3

Manning's	0.013		F	leturr	<u>ı Fre</u>	que	ncy =	² 5 yea	ars																							(6)
			2- 10	ARE	A (ł	la)	े जिन्ही	7		-1	FI	LOW							SEWER	DATA		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		Г <u> </u>	r				Γ		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
From Node	To Node	0.3	₹≕ R 0.5	≓ ∺ 0.55	a 10.6	R= 0.75	R≐ 0.79	R=	Indiv.	Accum	Time	of R	ainfall F	Peak Flow	DIA. (m)	DIA. (mm)	TYPE	SLOPE	LENGTH	CAPACITY	VELOCITY	TIME OF	RATIO	Upstream	Downstream	Upstream	Upstream	Downstream	Downstream	Drop	US Frost	DS Frost
					0.0	0.10	0.73	1 0.0	22.70 A	2.70 /		<u>. </u>		2 (VS)	(actual)	(nominal)		<u>(m/m)</u>	(m)	(1/s)	(m/s)	FLOW (min.)	Q/Q full	OG	00	Invert	Obvert	Invert	Obvert	Structure	Depth	Depth
601A	601	0.00	4.45	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.50	0.0	0 9.	48 9.4	8 2	1.00	68.13	645.86	0.76	750	CONC	0.0035	90	687 1	1	100	0.00	98.00	05.50	04.07		-		<u></u>		
601	602	0.00	4.91	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.80	0.0	0 10.	78 20.	26 2	2.00	66.15	1340.16	0.91	900	CONC	0.0055	220	1400.6	2.1	1.72	0.94	85.50	83.90	80.80	81.71	79.59	80.50	,	3.97	3.79
	000	0.00	0.00	3.50 0	00.00	0.97	1.43	<u>n 1.7</u>	10.	42 35.0	8 2	3.71	63.03	2248.78	0.99	975	5 CONC	0.01	70	2338.0) 3.(0.38	0.96	83.90	82.50	79.51	80.50	78.81	79.80	2.26	3.40	2.70
603B	603A	0.00	4.42	3.47 (0.00	0.00	1.24	1.8	30 18.	28 18.	8 2	2.00	66.15	1208.89	0.99	975	CONC	0.003	150	1280.5	1	150		81.50	91.50	77.50	70.40	77.05	70.04			0.40
603A	603	0.00	5.58	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.08	8 0.3	38 10.	99 29.	27 2	3.50	63.39	1855.51	1.07	1050	CONC	0.0045	5 110	1911.0	2.4	0.86	0.97	81.50	82.50	76.97	78.04	76.48	77.54	<u>}</u>	3.46	3.40
603	604	0.00	0.66	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.28	3 0.0	0 1.	53 66	18 2	5.96	59.41	3949 46	1 37	135/	CONG	0.006	100	404.0.4							3.5 F.			İ.		
604	605	0.00	1.03	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.52	2 0.0	00 2.	69.	06 2	6.53	58.56	4043.75	1.37	1350	CONC	0.000	5 100	4313.1	2.	0.57	0.92	82.50	80.80	76.17	77.54	75.57	76.94	0.52	4.96	3.86
605	605	0.00	1 66	0.41	0.00	0.00	0.39	0.0	20 2.	72 71.	78 2	7.39	57.33	4115.22	1.37	1350	CONC	0.006	5 150	4313.1	2.1	0.86	0.95	78.40	77.00	73.75	75.12	72.85	74.22	2 0.40	3.28	2.00
607	- 608	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.25	0.0	0 0.	55 76.	26 2	9.67	54.33	4252.25	1.37	1350		0.006	<u>5 250</u>	4313.1	2.	1.43	0.99	77.00	76.00	72.4	73.82	70.95	72.32	1.60	3.18	3.68
6095	6095	0.44	2 70	0.00		0.44										1001		0.000		- 4010.1	<u> </u>	0.51	0.90	70.00	73.00	69.35	70.72	68.81	70.18	1.10	5.28	2.82
608D	608	0.41	0.00	0.001	0.00	0.00	1.58	<u> </u>		<u>36 9.</u>	08 2	0.00	70.25	637.88	0.91	900	CONC	0.0013	3 170	680.9	1.0	2.73	0.94	71.00	71.00	68.59	69.50	68.36	69.28	<u>, </u>	1.50	1.72
												2.73	04.77	043.62	0.91	901	CONC	0.0013	150	680.8	<u>) </u>	2.41	0.95	71.00	73.00	68.36	69.28	68.17	69.08	1	1.72	3.92
608C	608B	0.00	2.57	3.82	0.00	0.00	1.80	0.0	00 13.	37 13.	37 1	9.00	72.53	969.39	0.84	82	5 CONC	0.005	5 60	1058.8	1.0	0.52	2 0.92	74.00	74.00	69.50	70.33	69.20	70.03		3.67	3.97
608A	608	1.26	2.29	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.25		00 <u>6</u> . 00 6.	45 19. 98 26.	<u>79 2</u>	9.52	71.32	1412.95	0.99	97	5 CONC	0.005	5 120	1653.2	2 2.	0.93	0.85	74.00	72.80	69.04	70.03	68.44	69.43	1	3.97	3.37
600				_										1000.02	1.07	100		0.000	<u> </u>	2014.2	4 2.	0.52	2 0.92	72.80	73.00	68.3	69.43	68.02	69.08	<u>با</u>	3.37	3.92
000	008	0.00	2.60	0.001	0.00	0.00	1.11	0.0	00 6.	05 119.	<u>)4 3</u>	0.18	53.70	6392.78	1.98	195		0.002	2 290	6638.8	9 2.	2 2.24	4 0.96	73.00	76.00	67.10	69.08	66.52	68.50	0.46	3.92	7.50
700	701	16.26	2.78	0.00	0.00	1.39	4.09	0.0	00 29.	31 29.	31 2	25.00	60.90	1784.60	0.91	90		0.009	5 170	1840.8	2	8 10	1 0 97	86.00	86.50	91.5	B2 45	70.00	00.00		250	- E 67
701A	701	0.00	6.89	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1 1 2	20 12	52 12	5 4	5 00	92.50	40.45.05									0.01	00.00	00.00	01.0	02.40	19.92	00.00	1.30	3.30	5.07
				0,00		0.00	0.00	1	23 12,	52 12.	2	5.00	03.35	1045.95	0.84	82	5 CONC	0.00	5 330	1058.9	9 1.	9 2.8	7 0.99	86.50	86.50	82.9	6 . 83.80	81.31	82.15	5 2.65	2.70	4.35
701	702	0.00	1.56	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.46	3 · 1.3	30 6.	14 47.	97 2	26.01	59.33	2845.74	0.99	97	5 CONC	0.02	3 210	3545.7	7 4.	6 0.70	6 0.80	86.50	79.00	78.5	79.50	73.68	74.67		7.00	4 33
702A	702	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.11	1.67	7 0.0	00 10.	15 10.	15 2	20.00	70.25	713 19	0.61	60		0.0	1 450	005.0							((4))			1		
702	703	0.00	0.00	0.00					3					1 10.10	0.01			0.0	2 100	905.8	3 3.	1 0.8	0.79	83.50	79.00	78.8	79.50	75.89	76.50	<u>) 1.8</u> ?	4.00	2.50
702	703	5.02	0.00	0.36	0.00	0.00	0.54	4 0.0	00 1.	74 59.	35 2	26.77	58.21	3483.92	1.07	105		0.02	4 210	4413.3	3 4.	9 0.7	1 0.79	79.0	71.00	73.6	D · 74.67	68.56	69.63	3	4.33	1.37
704	705	0.99	0.00	0.55	0.00	3.19	0.45	5 0.0	00 9.	31 74.	37 2	29.17	54.96	4115.38	1.83	180		0.001	2 160	4154.1	<u>1 1.</u> 7 1	6 1.6	9 0.90	71.0	70.80	67.8	0 · 69.63	67.61	69.44	4	1.37	1.36
7054	705	0.00	0.00	2.05	0.00	0.00	4.7													4020,1	1.	<u>්).</u> ම.	2 0.53	70.8	/0.50	07.0	1 09,44	67.38	69.20	<u>) </u>	1.36	1.30
		0.00	0.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	1.14	4 0.0	00 0.	9/ 0.	97 2	23.00	64.29	448.15	0.69	67	5 CONC	0.00	3 80	480.3	3 1.	3 1.0	3 0.93	71.5	0 70.50	68.7	6 69.4 4	68.52	2 69.20	5	2.06	1.30
705	706	0.00	0.00	0.92	0.00	0.00	0.44	4 0.0	00 2.	37 84.	22 3	30.99	52.75	4442.71	1.98	195	0 CONC	0.00	1 160	4694.4	4 1.	5 1.7	5 0.95	70.5	71.00	67.2	· 69.20	67.06	69.0	4	130	1 0
706C	706B	0.00	0.00	5.20	0.00	0.00	200		00 12	34 12	24 2	21.00	69.12	840.04	0.60	67	E CONIO										00.20	07.00			1.00	1.50
706B	706A	0.00	0.00	0.64	0.00	0.00	0.22	2 0.0	00 1.	46 13.	80 2	21.99	66.16	913.32	2 0.76	75	0 CONC	0.00	2 15: 7 80	960.0	6 <u>2.</u> 7 2	6 <u>0.9</u>	9 0.88	75.0	72.00	71.1	3 71.81	69.27	7 69.9	5	3.19	2.0
/06A	706	0.00	0.00	1.74	0.00	0.00	1.16	<u>6 0.0</u>	00 5.	21 19.	01 2	22.62	64.98	1235.49	0.91	90	0 CONC	0.00	5 70	1335.	4 2.	0 0.5	7 0.93	72.0	71.00	68.4	8 69.39	00.63	3 69.0	4	2.05	2.5
706	707	0.00	0.00	0.50	0.00	0.00	0.2	1 0.0	00 1.	23 104	46 3	32.74	50.81	5307.00	198	105		0.001	5 100	5740	6				15		7 5					1
707	708	0.00	0.00	2.66	0.00	0.00	1.20	0 0.0	00 6	70 111	16	33.63	49.87	5543.80	1.98	195	0 CONC	0.001	5 17	5 5749.	5 1.	9 0.8	<u>9 0.92</u> 6 0.96	2 /1.0 5 72.0	72.00	67.0	6 69.04 1 68.89	66.91	1 68.8 5 68.6	9	1.96	3.1
/08	009		0.00	1.38	0.00	0.00	0.6	/ 0.0	00 3.	58 114	74 3	35.20	48.33	5545.19	1.98	195	0 CONC	0.001	5 8	5 5749.	5 1.	9 0.7	6 0.96	5 76.0	0 76.00	66.6	5 68.63	66.52	2 68.5	0 0.4	5 7.37	7.5
609	610	0.00	3.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.2	1 0.0	00 6	83 240	60 3	35.96	47.62	11456.50	1.52	2 1500 x 420	0 CONC	0.00	2 16	14595.	0 2	3 11	5 0.7	76.0	72.0	66.6	69.0		0 07 7			
010	Outlet	0.00	3.98	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.9	6 0.(00 7	64 248	25 3	37.11	46.58	11563.06	5 1.52	2 1500 x 420	0 CONC	0.00	2 10	14595.	0 2	3 0.7	2 0.79	72.0	0 70.00	66.2	0 67.72	2 66.00	0 67.5	2	4.21	<u>4.2</u> 3 2.4
800	801	0.00	0.00	2.51	0.00	0.00	0.7	3 0.0	00 5	44 5	44	18.00	74.97	407.91	0.84	82	5 CONC	0.00	1 14	473	<u> </u>	0 07	2 0.0	70.0	70.0							
801	802	0.00	0.00	1.02	0.00	0.00	0.3	4 0.0	00 2	31 7	75	20.72	68.71	532.33	3 0.91	90	0 CONC	0.00	1 8	597.	2 0	9 1.4	7 0.8	70.0	0 70.0	67.6	0 <u>68.4</u> 8 68.30	67.4	6 68.3 0 68.2	2	1.56	<u>1.7</u>
803	804	0.00	0.00	1.60	0.00	0.00	0.7	5 0	00 4	84 12	59] : 68	22.19	65.79	828.22	2 1.07	105	O CONC	0.00	1 19	5 900.	9 1.	0 3.2	2 0.92	2 70.0	0 70.0	0 67.1	5 68.2	2 66.90	6 68.0	2	1.70	3 1.9
804	805	0.00	0.00	2.76	0.00	0.00	0.8	3 0.	00 6	04 22	72	26.57	58.50	1329.38	3 1.22	2 120		0.001	3 8 2 28	5 1027.	<u>1 1.</u> 0 1	1 1.1	6 0.98	3 70.0	0 70.0	0 66.9	6 68.0	2 66.8	5 67.9	2	1.98	3 2.0
805	806		0.00	1.51	0.00	0.00	0.7	0 0.	00 3	.85 26	57	30.51	53.32	1416.74	4 1.22	2 120	0 CONC	0.001	3 8	0 1466.	5 1	3 1.0	6 0.9	70.0	0 70.0	0 66.3	6 67.5	66.3	6 67.5 6 67.4	8	2.08	<u>3 2.4</u> 2 2.5
807	Outlet	t 0.00	0.00	0.86	0.00	0.00	0.4	4 0.	00 3	.06 32	15	31.57	52.09	1567.14	4 1.2	2 120		0.001	7 7	D 1677.	0 1	4 0.8	1 0.9	3 70.0	0 70.0	0 66.2	6 67.4	7 66.1	4 67.3	6	2.5	3 2.6
Definitions:						Note	s:				De	signe	d:	B.D	PROJE	CT: Glouc	ester EL	IC Infras	structure S	ervicing Stu	idv Update	4 0.9	3 0.9	<u> </u>	0 70.0	0 66,1	4 67.3	6 6.0	0 67.2	2	2.64	4 2.7
Q = 2.78 AI	R, where					1) Ot	tawa	IDF C	Curve			•								or rioning ord	ay opuace			1								
Q = Peak F	low in Litre	es per s	econd	(L/s)		2) Mi	n Vel	ocity	= 0.80 m	/sec			<u> </u>																			
= Rainfall	Intensity /	(na) (mm/h)									Ch	necked	1:	F.W	LOCAT	ION: Storn	nwater N	lanagen	nent Pond	3				1			1					
R = Runoff	Coefficient	t																														
											Dv	vg. :	STM	I / STM P1	1 File Re	f. 1634-004	193	Date'	March-()5	<u></u>		Sheet No	-								
L												-					_			-		Ň	1 of 1	·]								
																				150.							- 2					

ЧY.



Appendix F2

Sample Functional Runoff Coefficients

Runoff Coefficient 2983, 3053, and 3079 Navan Road & 2690 Page Road

The proposed development is comprised of four (4) subject properties under (1) Draft Plan of Subdivision and four (4) Site Plan Applications. In total there are 67 row townhouse units, six (6) condominium units and a gas station and retail establishment.

1. **ROW TOWNHOUSE BLOCK:**

An average run-off coefficient was calculated for front yard and rear yard of the smallest block (Block 4) which contains five (5) townhouse units. The runoff coefficients are based on zoning setbacks and a maximum driveway width of 50% of the area of the front yard as stated in Section 107 (2) in the City of Ottawa Zoning By-Laws. Since this scenario has the highest ratio of house area to greenspace, the resulting run-off coefficient would be the highest of any scenario for a townhouse block.

Unit Information		
Unit Width	5.80	m
Block Depth	29.9	m
Unit Area	97	m²
Total Number of Units	5	units
Number of Interior Units	4	units
Number of End Units	1	units
Corner Unit Width	6.25	m
Min. Corner Yard Setback	3	m
Min. Rear Yard Setback	7.5	m
Min. Front Yard Setback	3	m

Block Area

Total Block Area = $(5.80 \times 4 + 9.25 \times 1) \times 29.9 = 970.26 \text{ m}^2$ (A_T) Zoning Footprint (Internal Unit) = $(29.9 - 7.5 - 3) \text{ m x } 5.80 \text{ m} = 112.52 \text{ m}^2$ (B_T) Zoning Footprint (End Unit) = (29.9 - 7.5 - 3) x 6.25 = 121.25 m² (C_T) Unit Driveway Area (50% of Front Yard Area) = 8.7 m² (D_T)

Assuming each lot has a highpoint at the centre, the unit and lot areas could be divided equally between the front and rear yards.

Rear Area: Block Rear Area = $\frac{AT}{2} = \frac{970.26}{2} = 485.13 \text{ m}^2$ (E_T) 2022-12-01 Our File: 29899-000

Number of Internal Units: 4 Number of End Units: 1 Rear Impervious (House) Footprint: $\frac{4(BT)+1(CT)}{2} = \frac{4(112.52)+1(121.25)}{2} = 285.67 \text{ m}^2 (\textbf{F}_T)$

Front Area: Block Front Area = Block Rear Area = 485.13 m² (G_T) Number of Internal Units: 4 Number of End Units: 1 Front Impervious (House/Driveway) Footprint: $F_T + 6D_T = 285.67 + 5(8.7) = 329.17 \text{ m}^2 (I_T)$

Using a run-off coefficient of 0.2 for grassed areas and 0.9 for impervious areas (houses and driveways) the following weighted averages are calculated:

 $\frac{\text{Run-off Coefficient:}}{\text{Rear Coefficient}} = \frac{0.2(E_T - F_T) + 0.9F_T}{E_T} = \frac{0.2(485.13 - 285.67) + 0.9(285.67)}{485.13} = 0.61 \text{ (C}_{\text{RT}}\text{)}$ Front Coefficient = $\frac{0.2(G_T - I_T) + 0.9(I_T)}{G_T} = \frac{0.2(485.13 - 329.17) + 0.9(329.17)}{485.13} = 0.67 \text{ (C}_{\text{FT}}\text{)}$

Summary: The rear yard runoff coefficient used for design is 0.61

2. <u>18m ROW Road</u>

A similar approach was used for the ROWs, a weighted average was calculated using the total 18m ROW Road.

Asphalt Road and Sidewalk (C=0.9)

There is approximately 585 m of 8.5 m asphalt road and 630 m of 1.8 m sidewalk. These lengths were measured directly from the Concept Plan in Appendix B1 of the Functional Servicing Report. The total area of asphalt road is 585 x 8.5 = 4972.50 m² (J_T) The total area of sidewalk is 630 x 1.8 = 1134.00 m² (K_T)

Driveways (C=0.9)

Within the boulevard there are 27 units which have driveways that do not overlap with sidewalks. For these cases the driveways have a width of 4.75 m within the boulevard span a distance of 2.9 m (50% of unit width).

The total area of driveways not fronting sidewalks can be taken as $27 \times 4.75 \times 2.9 = 371.93 \text{ m}^2$ (L_T)

2022-12-01 Our File: 29899-000

Within the boulevard there are 42 units which have driveways that do overlap sidewalks. For these cases the sidewalk width must be subtracted from the driveway boulevard width since it was already considered in (K_T). Hence, these driveways span 4.75m - 1.8m = 2.95m within the boulevard and span a distance of 2.9m (50% of unit width).

The total area of driveways fronting sidewalks can be taken as $42 \times 2.95 \times 2.9 = 359.31 \text{ m}^2$ (M_T)

Grassed Area (C=0.2)

The total area of grass is equal to the total ROW Area subtracted by area of asphalt road, sidewalks, and driveways. I.e., Grassed Area = $(18 \times 585m - (4972.50 + 1134.00 + 371.93 + 359.31 = 3692.26 m^2 (N_T)$

Table 1 summarizes the total areas within the 18m ROW and their respective c-factors.

Description	Area (m²)	C-Factor
Asphalt Road	4972.50	0.9
Sidewalk	1134.00	0.9
Driveways not fronting sidewalk	371.93	0.9
(26 units)		
Driveways fronting sidewalk	359.31	0.9
(41 units)		
Grass boulevard not fronting	3692.26	0.2
sidewalk		

Table 1: ROW C-factor breakdown

3. FRONT YARD AND ROW C-FACTOR

The front yard and ROWs of the subdivision were grouped into one weighted front yard runoff coefficient. The weighted average is derived from the results front yard co-efficient calculated for the ROW townhouse block and from the results in Table 1 for the 18 m ROW.

```
=\frac{(J_T \ x \ 0.9) + (K_T \ x \ 0.9) + (L_T \ x \ 0.9) + (M_T \ x \ 0.9) + (N_T \ x \ 0.2) + (69 \ x \ 97) \ x \ C_{FT})}{(J_T) + (K_T) + (L_T) + (M_T) + (N_T) + (69 \ x \ 97))}
```

 $=\frac{(4972.50 x 0.9)+(1134x0.9)+(371.93x0.9)+(359.31x0.9)+(3692.26x0.2)+((67 x (97) x$ **0.67)** $}{(4972.50)+(1134)+(371.93)+(359.3)+(3692.26)+(67 x (97))}$

<mark>= 0.66</mark>

2022-12-01 Our File: 29899-000

4. Residential and Commercial Site Plans (Block 14, 15 and 17)

A runoff coefficient was calculated for the residential site plans on Blocks 14, 15 and 17. Block 14 was used for the sample calculations since this block generates the highest ratio of impervious surfaces to grass.

A minimum zoned amenity space of 10% was assumed for the residential site plans. This is more conservative than the City of Ottawa By-Law requirement of 6m² per dwelling unit for low-rise apartment dwellings.

Block 14 Information		
Total Block Area	0.575	ha
Zoning Limit Area	0.494	ha
Zoning Amenity Area (10% Zoning Limit Area)	0.049	ha (О т)
Zoning Impervious Area (90% Zoning Limit Area)	0.445	ha (Р⊤)

The remaining area of the site plan (outside of the zoning area) is 0.069 ha of grass (Q_T) and 0.012 ha of impervious surfaces (R_T).

Given that these are private site plans, a run-off coefficient of 0.25 was used for grassed areas and 0.9 for impervious areas. The following weighted averages are calculated:

$$= \frac{(0.25 (O_T + Q_T)) + 0.9(P_T + R_T)}{(O_T + Q_T) + (P_T + R_T)}$$

=
$$\frac{(0.25 (0.049 + 0.0688)) + 0.9(0.445 + 0.0123)}{(0.049 + 0.0688) + (0.455 + 0.012)}$$

=
$$0.77$$

5. <u>Commercial Site Plan (Gas Bar on Block 16)</u>

Since there is minimal grass and amenity space within the industrial site plan a C-factor of **0.9** was assumed for all of Block 16.

6. Dry Pond (Block 13)

A C-factor of 0.83 was assumed for the Dry Pond because the water surface from large storm events would be considered 90% impermeable.

7. Park (Block 7)

A C-factor of 0.40 was assumed for the park given that this area is mainly grassed with minimal infrastructure.

Abutting Existing Units on Navan and Page that drain into 3079 Navan Road 8.

The C-factor breakdowns based on actual impervious cover within the existing catchment areas are summarized in Table 2 and Table 3. A weighted average was calculated for impervious (C=0.9) and grassed (C=0.2).

Table 2: Existing Units on Navan Road C-factor breakdown							
Description	Area (m ²)	C-Factor					
Description	Area (m²)	C-Fac					

Description	Area (m²)	C-Factor
Impervious	0.169	0.9
Grassed	0.971	0.2
Total	1.14	0.3

Table 3: Existing Units on Page Road C-factor breakdown

Description	Area (m ²)	C-Factor	
Impervious	0.096	0.9	
Grassed	0.598	0.2	
Total	0.694	0.3	

Table 4 below presents a summary of run-off coefficients to be used for functional design.

Scenario	Runoff Coefficient (C)
Rear Yards – Townhouse Units Only	0.61
Front Yards and ROW	0.66
Residential Site Plan	0.77
Industrial Site Plan (Gas Bar)	0.90
Abutting Properties on Navan and Page	0.30
Park	0.40
Dry Pond	0.83

Table 4: Functional Design Run-off Coefficients

SAMPLE C-FACTOR CALCULATION FIGURES

C-FACTOR CALCULATED BASED ON ZONING SET BACKS AND MAXIMUM DRIVEWAY WIDTH OF 50% AREA OF FRONT YARD

ALL AREAS MEASURED DIRECTLY FROM CONCEPT PLAN IN APPENDIX B1 OF THE FUNCTIONAL SERVICING REPORT

Appendix F

Storm Design Sheet

	₽	J.L.Richards
_		,

STORM DESIGN SHEET

Prepared By: TR

ecked	By:	мм	

LL Richar	rds														3101		GIN STI															CI	necked B	/: MM					
																NAVAN SUBI	DIVISION																						
																JLR NO. 29	899-002																						
Location																Peak Fl	ow Estimation	(Rational Met	thod)								S	ewer Data					Upstream Geometry Downstream Geometry					(
				1 1	C-Factor (1:2 Yr)		C-	Total Ar	ea (ha)	Cum. Tota	I Inlat Time	In Pipe Flow			1:2 Year S	torm		ontrolled Flow	<u> </u>	1:10 Yea	storm	-	Diug Total Baak			Nominal	Antuni	Longth	OFWE	VEW	Residual								
	From MH	To MH	0.30 0.40	0.50 0.55	0.61 0.66 0.77	0.79 0.83	0.90 0.82	1:2 Year	1:10 Year (ha)	Area (ha)	(min.)	Time (min)	Total Time 2	.78AR Add	I. Cum. NR 2.78AR	Intensity (mm/hr)	Peak Flow (L/s)	(85 L/s/ha)	2.78AR	Add. Cum. 2.78AR 2.78AR	Intensity (mm/hr)	Peak Flow (L/s)	low (L/s) Flow (L/s)) Type	CAD Dia.	Dia. (mm)	ia. (mm)	pe (m)	(L/s)	(m/s)	Capacity (L/s)	% Full T	From Ob	vert inver	t Cover	TG To	Drop	Obvert In	vert Cover
Paleo Drive	517	516			0.15			0.150	0.00 0.15	0.15	10.00	0.11	10.11	0.28	0.28	76.81	21.14	12.75	0.00	0.00	122.14	0.00	21.14	PVC	0.250	250	254.00 1.5	0% 10.83	81.07	1.60	59.93	26% 8	5.725 83	879 83.62	5 1.85	85.511		83.716 83	3.462 1.79
Paleo Drive	516	514						0.000	0.00 0.00	0.15	10.11	0.36	10.47	0.00	0.28	76.37	21.02	12.75	0.00	0.00	121.44	0.00	21.02	PVC	0.250	250	254.00 1.5	0% 34.15	81.07	1.60	60.05	26% 8	5.511 83	716 83.46	2 1.79	84.931	1.850	83.204 82	:.950 1.73
Res/Comm. Site Plan - Block 15	STM STUB 15	514			0.51			0.510	0.00 0.51	0.51	10.00	0.20	10.20	1.09	1.09	76.81	83.85	43.35	0.00	0.00	122.14	0.00	83.85	CONCRETE	0.450	450	457.20 0.2	5% 10.63	148.72	0.91	64.87	56% 8	4.800 81	381 80.92	3 3.42	84.931		81.354 80	3.897 3.58
Gas Station Site Plan - Block 16	STM STUB 16	514	0.05				0.77	0.820	0.00 0.82	0.82	10.00	0.83	10.83	1.97	1.97	76.81	151.17	69.70	0.00	0.00	122.14	0.00	151.17	CONCRETE	0.525	525	533.40 0.2	5% 50.21	224.33	1.00	73.16	67% 8	5.610 81	479 80.94	6 4.13	84.931		81.354 80	0.821 3.58
Paleo Drive	514	512			0.04 0.28			0.320	0.00 0.32	1.80	10.83	0.55	11.39	0.58	3.92	73.75	288.84	153.00	0.00	0.00	117.19	0.00	288.84	CONCRETE	0.600	600	609.60 0.3	5% 42.98	378.96	1.30	90.12	76% 8	4.931 81	354 80.74	4 3.58	84.879		81.204 80	J.594 3.68
Paleo Drive	512	511	0.04		0.14			0.180	0.00 0.18	1.98	11.39	0.11	11.50	0.27	4.19	71.87	300.94	168.30	0.00	0.00	114.15	0.00	300.94	CONCRETE	0.600	600	609.60 0.3	5% 8.79	3/8.96	1.30	78.02	79% 8	4.879 81	204 80.59	4 3.68	84.899	0.499	81.1/3 8U	.563 3.73 0.612 2.75
Paleo Dine	511	510	0.00 0.20		0.15 0.25			0.740	0.00 0.74	2.12	11.30	0.85	12,40	1.13	0.01	/1.40	375.54	231.20	0.00	0.00	113.00	0.00	375.54	CONCRETE	0.750	700	702.00 0.0	576 85.00	007.10	1.01	307.10	00/6	N.055 00	0/4 /8.81	2 4.20	04.121	0.300	00.374 75	012 3.10
Stompin' Tom Lane (Storage Pipe)	528	527			0.14			0.140	0.00 0.14	0.14	10.00	0.54	10.54	0.26	0.26	76.81	19.73	11.90	0.00	0.00	122.14	0.00	19.73	CONCRETE	0.675	675	685.80 0.5	5% 57.39	650.35	1.76	630.62	3% 8	5.306 82	530 81.84	4 2.78	85.826	0.381	82.214 81	1.528 3.61
Res/Comm. Site Plan - Block 14 (Storage Pipe)	527	526	0.06		0.08			0.140	0.00 0.14	0.28	10.54	1.80	12.34	0.19	0.44	74.78	33.10	23.80	0.00	0.00	118.86	0.00	33.10	PVC	0.300	300	304.80 0.3	6% 89.06	60.19	0.82	27.10	55% 8	5.826 81	833 81.52	B 3.99	85.682		81.516 81	1.211 4.17
Res/Comm. Site Plan - Block 14	526	525	0.16					0.160	0.00 0.16	0.44	12.34	0.65	12.99	0.13	0.58	68.85	39.66	37.40	0.00	0.00	109.27	0.00	39.66	PVC	0.300	300	304.80 0.3	0% 29.56	55.26	0.76	15.60	72% 8	5.682 81	516 81.21	1 4.17	85.745		81.427 81	i.122 4.32
Res/Comm. Site Plan - Block 14	525	524			0.55			0.550	0.00 0.55	0.99	12.99	0.21	13.21	1.18	1.75	66.95	117.38	84.15	0.00	0.00	106.20	0.00	117.38	CONCRETE	0.450	450	457.20 0.2	5% 11.53	148.72	0.91	31.33	79% 8	5.745 81	427 80.97	0 4.32	84.903	0.400	81.398 80	J.941 3.50
Rosalia Street	524	522	_		0.62		_	0.620	0.00 0.62	1.61	13.21	1.80	15.06	1.14	2.69	61.62	191.63	130.00	0.00	0.00	105.25	0.00	191.63	CONCRETE	0.525	525	533.40 0.2	576 111.92	224.33	1.00	32.50	70%	4.903 80	419 70.99	5 3.90	84.121	0.834	80.719 80	0.941 2.75
Rosalia Suber	322	510						0.000	0.00 0.00	1.01	13.06	0.25	10.00	0.00	2.05	01.02	170.13	130.05	0.00	0.00	57.01	0.00	176.13	CONCRETE	0.020	020	000.40 0.2	576 17.55	224.00	1.00	40.20	19/6 0	3.511 80	410 75.00	3 3.00	04.121	0.300	00.374 75	041 3.70
Paleo Drive	510	509						0.000	0.00 0.00	4.33	15.36	0.28	15.64	0.00	8.21	60.94	500.03	368.05	0.00	0.00	96.52	0.00	500.03	CONCRETE	0.750	750	762.00 0.2	5% 21.70	580.71	1.27	80.68	86% 8	4.121 80	074 79.31	2 4.05	83.286		80.020 79	9.258 3.27
Paleo Drive	509	508						0.000	0.00 0.00	4.33	15.64	0.21	15.85	0.00	8.21	60.30	494.76	368.05	0.00	0.00	95.49	0.00	494.76	CONCRETE	0.750	750	762.00 0.2	5% 16.02	580.71	1.27	85.95	85% 8	3.286 80	020 79.25	B 3.27	82.583		79.980 79	3.218 2.60
Paleo Drive	508	507	0.92		0.21 0.18	0.13		1.440	0.00 1.44	5.77	15.85	0.21	16.06	1.75	9.96	59.83	595.87	490.45	0.00	0.00	94.74	0.00	595.87	CONCRETE	0.825	825	838.20 0.2	5% 16.81	748.75	1.36	152.88	80% 8	2.583 79	980 79.14	1 2.60	82.443		79.938 79	J.099 2.51
Paleo Drive	507	504	0.05		0.17			0.220	0.00 0.22	5.99	16.06	0.25	16.31	0.33	10.29	59.38	610.98	509.15	0.00	0.00	94.02	0.00	610.98	CONCRETE	0.825	825	838.20 0.2	5% 20.73	748.75	1.36	137.77	82% 8	2.443 79	938 79.09	9 2.51	82.457	0.798	79.886 79	1.048 2.57
Des Site Dies Black 17	OTM OTHER 17	504			0.56			0.560	0.00 0.58	0.58	10.00	0.24	10.24	1.20	1.20	70.01	02.07	47.60	0.00	0.00	100.14	0.00	92.07	BWC	0.275	275	281.00 0.3	EN 12.04	109.21	0.05	16 14	959/	2 2 70 70	127 79 76	2 2 22	92.457		70.099 79	9 707 2 27
Nes. Sile Fiall - Diock 17	3111 3105 17	304			0.50			0.000	0.00 0.00	0.00	10.00	0.24	10.24	1.20	1.20	70.01	52.07	47.00	0.00	0.00	122.14	0.00	52.07	FVC	0.375	3/3	381.00 0.0	076 13.84	100.21	0.55	10.14	00/0	2.310 15	137 70.75	0 3.23	02.437		19.000 10	.101 3.31
Paleo Drive	504	503						0.000	0.00 0.00	6.55	16.31	0.67	16.98	0.00	11.49	58.84	675.91	556.75	0.00	0.00	93.14	0.00	675.91	CONCRETE	0.900	900	914.40 0.2	5% 57.74	944.29	1.44	268.38	72% 8	2.457 79	088 78.17	3 3.37	81.850	0.073	78.943 78	3.029 2.91
										4																													-
NAVAN	503	503A		0.83 3.47	0.09		1.75	4.390	1.75 6.14	12.69	16.98	1.02	18.00	6.62	18.11	57.46	1040.69	929.90	3.99	3.99	90.92	362.71	1403.40	CONCRETE	1.050	1050	066.80 0.3	8% 120.00	1746.85	1.95	343.45	80% 8	1.850 78	870 77.80	4 2.98	81.366		78.419 77	/.352 2.95
NAVAN	503A	502		0.50	0.00	4.40	0.50	0.000	0.00 0.00	12.69	18.00	0.26	18.27	0.00	18.11	55.48	1004.90	880.60	0.00	0.00	87.75	0.00	1004.90	CONCRETE	1.050	1050	066.80 0.3	8% 30.96	1746.85	1.95	741.95	58% 8	1.366 78	419 77.35	2 2.95	81.628		78.303 77	.236 3.33
NAVAN	502	5014		3.50	0.02	1.10	0.56	4.700	0.00 0.00	17.97	18.42	0.15	18.56	0.00	25.54	54.72	1307.34	1329.40	0.00	1.32	86.52	0.00	1397 34	CONCRETE	1 200	1200	1219.20 0.3	3% 27.30	2109.41	2.94	830.41	63% 8	1.626 77	922 77.23	D 3./1	81 933		77.989 76	6 769 3 94
NAVAN	501A	500A						0.000	0.00 0.00	17.97	18.56	0.86	19.42	0.00	25.54	54.46	1390.85	1329.40	0.00	0.00	86.11	0.00	1390.85	CONCRETE	1.200	1200	219.20 0.3	0% 98.53	2227.75	1.91	836.90	62% 8	1.933 77	989 76.76	9 3.94	82.933		77.693 76	6.474 5.24
NAVAN	500A	500						0.000	0.00 0.00	17.97	19.42	0.15	19.58	0.00	25.54	52.98	1352.89	1329.40	0.00	0.00	83.72	0.00	1352.89	CONCRETE	1.200	1200	219.20 0.3	0% 17.34	2227.75	1.91	874.86	61% 8	2.933 77	693 76.47	4 5.24	83.201	0.305	77.641 76	3.422 5.56
NAVAN	500	EXMH101						0.000	0.00 0.00	17.97	19.58	0.05	19.62	0.00	25.54	52.72	1346.45	1329.40	0.00	0.00	83.32	0.00	1346.45	CONCRETE	1.200	1200	219.20 0.3	0% 5.49	2227.75	1.91	881.30	60% 8	3.201 77	336 76.11	7 5.86	83.237	0.518	77.320 76	3.100 5.92
Report of Noven	EXMINIO						-	15.64	2.33 17.97	-	-	-			_									CONCRETE		1250	271.60		-	_			2 0 27 70	902 75 42	6 44				
Sanitary Crossing - Page @ Navan - (min INV +/-	EXMITTOT																							CONCRETE		675	710.00						1 510 77	838 77 12	3.68				
77.11, max OBV +/- 77.97																								CONTONETE		0.0	10.00						1.515	000	0.00				
Design Parameters (Per OSDG)			Т		Existing Page Rear Yard I	Drainage Area =	1.1	4 ha																															
Manning's Coefficient =	0.013		1		Existing Navan Rear Yard	Drainage Area =	0.2	0 ha /																															
1:2 Year Intensity =	732.951 / (Tc + 6.1	99)^0.810			plan areas) =	exci. uncontrolled a	anu site 2.2	0 ha	1																														
1:5 Year Intensity =	998.071 / (Tc + 6.0	53)^0.814	1		Uncontrolled Areas =		0.1	3 ha 🖊 🗸	/																														
1:10 Year Intensity =	1174.184 / (Tc + 6.	014)^0.816	Ι		Site Plan Areas =		3.0	1 ha 🖌 🔶																															
Note: Tc is the time of concentration in minutes					Total Area Excluding EUC	Areas =	6.5	5 ha																															
Legend 75.43	Existing (As-Built In	formation)			EUC Areas = Total Area Including EUC	Areas =	11.4 17.9	2 🖌 7 ha																															

Actual Velocities Calculations								
Angle	Depth (m)	Flow Depth to Diameter Ratio	Area	Wetted Perimeter	Flow (L/s)	Design Peak Flow (L/s)	Velocity (m/s)	
149.605	0.09371	0.374827987	0.016446339	0.326386815	21.138	21.138	1.28527	
149.342	0.09343	0.373704268	0.016379651	0.325813583	21.020	21.020	1.28329	
191.809	0.25212	0.560259089	0.089918976	0.753232888	83.848	83.848	0.93248	
207.363	0.32978	0.628155044	0.140527347	0.950032034	151.171	151.171	1.07574	
220.631	0.41062	0.684371494	0.202586271	1.155220331	288.845	288.844	1.42579	
225.762	0.42331	0.70551775	0.209552563	1.182084474	300.940	300.940	1.43611	
190.298	0.41519	0.553590282	0.246099993	1.245496412	379.940	379.940	1.54384	
96.9848	0.11565	0.171338717	0.039874399	0.571287923	38.562	19.729	0.96708	
117.623	0.07348	0.244929576	0.013127531	0.307936347	7.353	32.700	0.5601	
144.145	0.10549	0.351632266	0.021713395	0.377371615	13.635	40.201	0.62795	
227.587	0.32083	0.712948625	0.119233197	0.893732394	119.734	119.733	1.0042	
239.602	0.39925	0.760469121	0.17379417	1.097732394	195.623	195.623	1.1256	
228.136	0.37547	0.71517396	0.162841432	1.045203894	181.343	181.343	1.11362	
240.449	0.57279	0.763723131	0.356241971	1.573737212	508.917	508.917	1.42857	
238.616	0.5675	0.756669307	0.35285197	1.561740046	503.433	503.433	1.42675	
228.348	0.59073	0.716031381	0.402642876	1.643988946	606.216	606.216	1.50559	
231.86	0.60236	0.730135685	0.411202359	1.669274216	621.490	621.490	1.5114	
235.594	0.27934	0.744900848	0.086782238	0.770979532	92.069	92.069	1.06092	
215.352	0.59602	0.662247519	0.439142559	1.691373359	687.400	687.400	1.56532	
229.549	0.75692	0.72087748	0.657001068	2.103355032	1426.655	1426.655	2.17147	
194.674	0.60152	0.572875675	0.503157954	1.783796764	1020.769	1020.769	2.02873	
212.864	0.4399	0.651700594	0.242495969	1.253871046	771.628	771.628	3.18202	
202.076	0.72632	0.605263168	0.702493055	2.116138513	1419.029	1419.029	2.01999	
201.649	0.72408	0.603401155	0.699901868	2.111658773	1412.310	1412.310	2.01787	
199.159	0.71105	0.59254039	0.684752309	2.085590772	1373.052	1373.052	2.00518	
198.739	0.70884	0.590700805	0.682180589	2.081185195	1366.393	1366.393	2.00298	

Modelling Schematics

EAST RIDGE ORLEANS SUBDIVISION

Ottawa, ON

ected and or purposes cribed work sent of J.L.	DESIGN:	ML	JLR NO.: 29899-002				
	DRAWN:	ML	DRAWING NO.:				
mited.	CHECKED:	BP					

EAST RIDGE ORLEANS SUBDIVISION

Ottawa, ON

Minor System Model Schematic

ected and	DESIGN:	ML	^{JLR NO.:} 29899-002					
or purposes cribed work sent of 11	DRAWN:	ML	DRAWING NO.: Figure 2					
mited.	CHECKED:	BP	rigure z					

EAST RIDGE ORLEANS SUBDIVISION

Ottawa, ON

Major System Model Schematic

ected and or purposes cribed work sent of J J	DESIGN:	ML	JLR NO.: 29899-002					
	DRAWN:	ML	DRAWING NO.: Figure 1					
mited.	CHECKED:	BP	i igure i					

LOT DAT

Modeling Parameters

Subcatchment ID	Outlet	Area (ha)	Width (m)	Flow Length (m)	Slope (%)	Imperv. (%)	N Imperv	N Perv	Dstore Imperv (mm)	Dstore Perv (mm)	Percent Routed (%)	Curve Number	Drying (da
502-501_(1)	St_502-501	3.1344	486.497	64.428	2	42.857	0.013	0.25	1.57	4.67	100	80	7
502-501_(2)	St_502-501	1.0991	433.194	25.372	2	84.286	0.013	0.25	1.57	4.67	100	80	7
502-501_(3)	St_502-501	0.0180	20.17	8.924	2	58.571	0.013	0.25	1.57	4.67	100	80	7
502-501_(4)	St_502-501	0.4403	259.076	16.995	2	42.857	0.013	0.25	1.57	4.67	100	80	7
502-501_(5)	St_502-501	0.5784	163.778	35.316	2	88.571	0.013	0.25	1.57	4.67	100	80	1
503-502_(1)	St_503-502	3.4656	451.432	76.769	2	50	0.013	0.25	1.57	4.67	100	80	1
503-502_(2)	St_503-502	1.7457	462.094	37.778	2	88.571	0.013	0.25	1.57	4.67	100	80	1
503-502_(3)	St_503-502	0.7659	217.123	35.275	2	42.857	0.013	0.25	1.57	4.67	100	80	1
503-502_(4)	St_503-502	0.0579	36.811	15.729	2	42.857	0.013	0.25	1.57	4.67	100	80	1
503-502_(5)	St_503-502	0.0573	41.658	13.755	2	65.714	0.013	0.25	1.57	4.67	100	80	1
507-504_(1)	St_503-502	0.0334	54.019	6.183	0.5	14.286	0.013	0.25	1.57	4.67	100	80	7
507504_(1)	CB103B	0.0218	17.28	12.616	1	14.286	0.013	0.25	1.57	4.67	80	80	1
507504_(2)	CB103B	0.0300	21.188	14.159	1	14.286	0.013	0.25	1.57	4.67	80	80	1
507504_(3)	CB103B	0.1679	91.2	18.41	2	58.571	0.013	0.25	1.57	4.67	80	80	1
508-507_(1)	LP1	0.1754	160.022	10.961	2	65.714	0.013	0.25	1.57	4.67	20	80	1
511-510 (1)	2	0.0562	43.482	12.925	1	14.286	0.013	0.25	1.57	4.67	80	80	1
511510_(2)	2	0.0886	45.569	19.443	2	58.571	0.013	0.25	1.57	4.67	80	80	1
511510 (3)	LP3	0.2914	167.712	17.375	2	65.714	0.013	0.25	1.57	4.67	20	80	7
511-510 (4)	PARK_STM_(P-Stm)	0.2002	44.74	44.747	2	28.571	0.013	0.25	1.57	4.67	100	80	7
511510 (5)	CB102B	0.1000	68.639	14.569	2	58.571	0.013	0.25	1.57	4.67	80	80	1
512-511 (1)	CB100B	0.0363	26.31	13.797	1	14.286	0.013	0.25	1.57	4.67	80	80	7
512511 (2)	CB100A	0.1410	53.381	26.414	2	58.571	0.013	0.25	1.57	4.67	80	80	7
513512 (1)	LP6	0.0400	13.12	30.488	2	58.571	0.013	0.25	1.57	4.67	100	80	7
513512_(2)	LP6	0.2800	194.728	14.379	2	65.714	0.013	0.25	1.57	4.67	20	80	7
517516 (1)	LP5	0.1516	133.627	11.345	2	65.714	0.013	0.25	1.57	4.67	20	80	1
524-522 (1)	LP4	0.3100	188.679	16.43	2	65.714	0.013	0.25	1.57	4.67	20	80	-
524-522 (2)	LP2	0.3100	151.449	20.469	2	65.714	0.013	0.25	1.57	4.67	20	80	7
527-526_(1)	CB15	0.0849	50.581	16.785	2	58.571	0.013	0.25	1.57	4.67	80	80	1
527-526 (2)	CB15	0.0582	48.351	12.037	2	14.286	0.013	0.25	1.57	4.67	80	80	1
528-527 (1)	LP7	0.1425	43.093	33.068	2	65.714	0.013	0.25	1.57	4.67	20	80	1
BLK14_RY_2	St_L3	0.2276	76.279	29.838	2	12.064	0.013	0.25	1.57	4.67	90.384	80	7
BLK15 RY	BLOCK15_RY	0.0761	10.74	70.857	2	9.895	0.013	0.25	1.57	4.67	100	80	1
Block14	St_525-524	0.3761	58.258	64.558	2	66.388	0.013	0.25	1.57	4.67	100	80	1
GasBar	St_520-519	0.8249	164.871	50.033	2	94.6	0.013	0.25	1.57	4.67	100	80	1
L1_2	St_L1	0.0681	15.82	43.047	2	10.19	0.013	0.25	1.57	4.67	100	80	1
L1_3	St_L2	0.0324	77.605	4.175	2	8.81	0.013	0.25	1.57	4.67	100	80	1
POND_(1)	POND	0.1324	192.386	6.882	2	90	0.013	0.25	1.57	4.67	100	80	1
STUB15-514 (1)	St_515-514	0.4376	103.645	42.221	2	81.429	0.013	0.25	1.57	4.67	100	80	1
STUB17-504_(1)	St_506-505	0.5609	126.215	44.44	2	81.429	0.013	0.25	1.57	4.67	100	80	1
TO_POND_(1)	CB104C	0.1800	79.1	22.756	2	14.286	0.013	0.25	1.57	4.67	80	80	1
TO POND (2)	CB104B	0.2069	37.617	55.002	2	14.286	0.013	0.25	1.57	4.67	80	80	7
TO_POND_(3)	CB104A	0.1949	56.769	34.332	2	14.286	0.013	0.25	1.57	4.67	80	80	7
TO_POND_(4)	POND	0.3393	80.609	42.092	2	14.286	0.013	0.25	1.57	4.67	80	80	7
TO_POND (5) 1	CB104A	0.0697	43.427	16.05	2	58.571	0.013	0.25	1.57	4.67	80	80	7
TO_POND (5) 3	CB104B	0.0800	49.844	16.05	2	58.571	0.013	0.25	1.57	4.67	80	80	7
TO_POND_(5) 4	CB104C	0.0640	39.875	16.05	2	58.571	0.013	0.25	1.57	4.67	80	80	1
UNCONTROLLED	BrianCoburn	0.0153	13.659	11.201	0.5	65.714	0.013	0.25	1.57	4.67	20	80	

CB Tables

				STRE	ET CA	тснв	ASINS				
Street Name	CB ID Number	T/G	In	let	Ou	tlet	Rational Method Capture Rate	Max Depth (100 yr) (m)	1:100 Yr Restricted Capture Rate	ICD TYPE	
			Pipe Dia. (mm)	Invert	Pipe Dia. (mm)	Invert	(85 L/s/ha)	(Excel)	(L/s)		
	CB01	85.37	-	•	200	84.07	-	-	-	NO ICD	
PALEO DRIVE	CBMH517A	85.37	200	84.00	250	83.94	13.00	1.61	12.00	Vortex_ICD_105	
	CB02	84.58	-		200	83.18	11.00	1.59	11.00	Vortex_ICD_100	
	CB03	84.58	-		200	83.18	16.00	1.59	23.00	MHF_IPEX_TYPE_A	
	CB04	83.87	-	-	200	82.47	12.50	1.64	13.00	Vortex_ICD_105	
	CB05	83.87	-	-	200	82.47	12.50	1.64	13.00	Vortex_ICD_105	
	CB06	82.3	-	-	200	80.90	7.50	1.54	12.00	Vortex_ICD_105	
	CB07	82.3	-	-	200	80.90	7.50	1.54	12.00	Vortex ICD 105	
	CB09	84.82	-	-	200	83.42	13.00	1.63	12.00	Vortex_ICD_105	
ROSALIA	CB10	84.82	-	-	200	83.42	13.00	1.63	12.00	Vortex_ICD_105	
STREET	CB11	83.85	-	-	200	82.45	13.00	1.64	13.00	Vortex_ICD_105	
	CB12	83.85	-	-	200	82.45	13.00	1.64	13.00	Vortex_ICD_105	
STOMPIN' TOM	CB13	85.21	-	-	200	83.81	-	-	-	NO ICD	
LANE	CB14	85.21	200	83.76	250	83.70	20.00*	1.67	23.00	MHF_IPEX_TYPE_A	
EASEMENT	STOMP_TOM_ICD	85.68	675	81.53	300	81.53	22.00	3.89	14.00	Vortex_ICD_95	
*The Rational Meth	od Capture Rate alon	g Stompin'	Tom Lane i	s based or	the 2-yr Flo	ows					

					REAR	YARD	CATC	H BAS	IN TABL	E				
Street Name	CB ID Number	T/G			Inlet	_			Outle	et		Drop (m)	1:100 Yr Restricted Capture Rate	ICD TYPE
			Pipe Dia. (mm)	Pipe Length (m)	Slope	Invert	Cover	Pipe Dia. (mm)	Pipe Length (m)	Invert	COVER (m)		(L/s)	
	CB15B	85.33	-	-	-	-	-	250	30.41	83.880	1.20		-	NO ICD
BLOCK 1	CB15A	85.78	250	30.41	0.5%	83.728	1.80	250	27.48	83.728	1.80		-	NO ICD
	CB15	85.50	250	27.48	0.5%	83.591	1.66	250	40.83	83.591	1.66		14.00	Vortex_ICD_105
	CB100A	86.08	-	-	-	-	-	250	20.91	84.330	1.50		-	NO ICD
	CB100B	85.70	250	20.91	1.0%	84.118	1.33	250	27.56	84.118	1.33		-	NO ICD
BLOCK II	CB100C	85.53	250	27.56	0.8%	83.885	1.40	250	21.46	83.885	1.40		-	NO ICD
	CB100	85.30	250	21.46	1.2%	83.627	1.42	250	5.50	83.627	1.42		47.00	MHF_IPEX_TYPE_C
	CB104C	85.50	-	-	-	-	-	250	40.46	83.650	1.60		-	NO ICD
BLOCK 2, 3, 4	CB104B	85.10	250	40.46	1.0%	83.226	1.62	250	46.92	83.226	1.62		-	NO ICD
	CB104A	84.00	250	46.92	2.0%	82.288	1.46	250	46.44	82.288	1.46		-	NO ICD
	CB104	82.70	250	46.44	1.5%	81.587	0.86	250	10.05	81.587	0.86		-	NO ICD
	CB08A	81.44	-	-	-	-		250	23.18	79.940	1.25		-	NO ICD
POND	CB08B	81.46	-	-	-	-		250	29.52	79.960	1.25		-	NO ICD
I OND	CBMH08	81.32	250 250	23.18 29.52	0.9%	79.728 79.728	1.34 1.34	250	14.99	79.558	1.51	0.17	6.00	Vortex ICD 65
	CB102B	84.62	-	-	-	-		250	31.60	82.970	1.40		-	NO ICD
BLOCK 5	CB102A	84.38	250	31.60	1.0%	82.654	1.48	250	11.77	82.654	1.48		-	NO ICD
	CB102	83.89	250	11.77	2.0%	82.419	1.22	250	4.51	82.419	1.22		8.00	Vortex_ICD_80
	CB101A	85.15	-	-	-	-		900	19.61	81.490	2.76		-	NO ICD
	CB101B	83.86	900	19.61	1.0%	81.294	1.67	900	19.48	81.294	1.67		-	NO ICD
	CB103A	81.90	-	-	-	-		300	17.39	80.650	0.95		-	NO ICD
BLOCK 8 & 9	CB103C	82.08	300	17.39	0.5%	80.563	1.21	300	20.77	80.563	1.21		-	NO ICD
	001000	00.05	900	19.48	1.0%	81.099	0.25	050	00.45	00.000	1.00	0.00		
	CR103R	82.25	300	20.77	0.5%	80.459	1.49	250	33.45	80.399	1.60	0.06	-	NO ICD
	CB103	84.01	250	33.45	1.0%	80.057	3.70	250	1.60	80.057	3.70		59.00	MHF_IPEX_TYPE_D

HGL Analysis

	LICE	1.2 104	Event	1.5 168	II Eveni	1.10 Tea	Event	1.25 Tea	Lvent	1.50 166		1.100 1	ear Evenit	1.100 16	ar Evenit	1.100 16		Climate Cl	ange Event	HISTOLIC	ai Storin	HIStorica		HIStorica	1 3101111		
MULID	- USF	(12 hr	SCS)	(12 hr	SCS)	(12 hr	SCS)	(12 hr	SCS)	(12 hr	SCS)	(12 h	r SCS)	(24 hr	r SCS)	(3hr C	hicago)	(12 h	r SCS)	July	1979	August	t 1988	August	1996	4 Hour Stor	/m (25MM)
IVIH ID	Elevation		Freeboard		Freeboard		Freeboard		Freeboard		Freeboard		Freeboard		Freeboard		Freeboard		Freeboard		Freeboard		Freeboard		Freeboard		Freeboard
	(m)	Max HGL (m)	(m)	Max HGL (m)	(m)	Max HGL (m)	(m)	Max HGL (m)	(m)	Max HGL (m)	(m)	Max HGL (m)	(m)	Max HGL (m)	(m)	Max HGL (m)	(m)	Max HGL (m)	(m)	Max HGL (m)	(m)	Max HGL (m)	(m)	Max HGL (m)	(m)	Max HGL (m)	(m)
500	-	77.51	-	77.51	-	77.51	-	77.51	-	77.51	-	77.51	-	77.51	-	77.51	-	77.51	-	77.56	-	77.56	-	77.56	-	77.51	-
500A	-	77.56	-	77.58	-	77.59	-	77.59	-	77.59	-	77.60	-	77.59	-	77.60	-	77.60	-	77.60	-	77.60	-	77.59	-	77.54	-
501	-	77.69	-	77.75	-	77.76	-	77.78	-	77.78	-	77.79	-	77.79	-	77.79	-	77.79	-	77.79	-	77.79	-	77.77	-	77.63	-
501A	-	77.63	-	77.67	-	77.69	-	77.70	-	77.70	-	77.70	-	77.70	-	77.70	-	77.71	-	77.70	-	77.70	-	77.69	-	77.58	-
502	-	77.72	-	77.81	-	77.83	-	77.86	-	77.87	-	77.87	-	77.87	-	77.88	-	77.88	-	77.88	-	77.87	-	77.84	-	77.62	-
503	-	78.31	-	78.35	-	78.36	-	78.38	-	78.38	-	78.39	-	78.38	-	78.39	-	78.39	-	78.39	-	78.38	-	78.37	-	78.24	-
503A	-	77.86	-	77.91	-	77.93	-	77.95	-	77.96	-	77.97	-	77.97	-	77.97	-	77.97	-	77.97	-	77.97	-	77.94	-	77.79	-
504	-	78.61	-	78.68	-	78.71	-	78.73	-	78.74	-	78.75	-	78.75	-	78.75	-	78.76	-	78.75	-	78.75	-	78.71	-	78.52	-
507	-	79.44	-	79.48	-	79.50	•	79.52	-	79.53	-	79.53	-	79.53	-	79.53	-	79.54	-	79.53	-	79.53	-	79.51	-	79.38	-
508	81.33	79.51	1.82	79.56	1.77	79.58	1.75	79.60	1.73	79.61	1.72	79.61	1.72	79.61	1.72	79.62	1.71	79.62	1.71	79.61	1.72	79.61	1.72	79.58	1.75	79.44	1.89
509	81.33	79.61	1.72	79.65	1.68	79.67	1.66	79.69	1.64	79.70	1.63	79.71	1.62	79.71	1.62	79.71	1.62	79.72	1.61	79.71	1.62	79.71	1.62	79.68	1.65	79.54	1.79
510	81.87	79.69	2.18	79.74	2.13	79.76	2.11	79.78	2.09	79.79	2.08	79.80	2.07	79.80	2.07	79.80	2.07	79.81	2.06	79.80	2.07	79.80	2.07	79.77	2.10	79.61	2.26
511	82.94	80.20	2.74	80.23	2.71	80.25	2.69	80.26	2.68	80.27	2.67	80.27	2.67	80.27	2.67	80.27	2.67	80.28	2.66	80.27	2.67	80.27	2.67	80.25	2.69	80.14	2.80
512	83.16	80.86	2.30	80.89	2.27	80.90	2.26	80.91	2.25	80.92	2.24	80.92	2.24	80.92	2.24	80.93	2.23	80.93	2.23	80.92	2.24	80.92	2.24	80.91	2.25	80.81	2.35
514	83.16	81.01	2.15	81.04	2.12	81.05	2.11	81.06	2.10	81.07	2.09	81.07	2.09	81.07	2.09	81.07	2.09	81.08	2.08	81.07	2.09	81.06	2.10	81.05	2.11	80.95	2.21
516	-	83.53	-	83.53	-	83.53	-	83.53	-	83.53	-	83.53	-	83.53	-	83.53	-	83.53	-	83.53	-	83.53	-	83.53	-	83.53	-
517	-	83.70	-	83.70	-	83.70	-	83.70	-	83.70	-	83.70	-	83.70	-	83.70	-	83.70	-	83.70	-	83.70	-	83.70	-	83.69	-
522	82.03	80.12	1.91	80.15	1.88	80.17	1.86	80.20	1.83	80.21	1.82	80.21	1.82	80.21	1.82	80.21	1.82	80.22	1.81	80.22	1.81	80.22	1.81	80.17	1.86	80.08	1.95
524	83.77	80.67	3.10	80.70	3.07	80.72	3.05	80.74	3.03	80.75	3.02	80.75	3.02	80.75	3.02	80.75	3.02	80.76	3.01	80.76	3.01	80.75	3.02	80.72	3.05	80.64	3.13
525	-	81.07	-	81.11	-	81.14	-	81.16	-	81.17	-	81.18	-	81.17	-	81.17	-	81.18	-	81.18	-	81.18	-	81.14	-	81.05	-
526	-	81.30	-	81.36	-	81.39	-	81.43	-	81.45	-	81.46	-	81.46	-	81.46	-	81.47	-	81.47	-	81.47	-	81.39	-	81.28	
527*	85.83	82.30	3.53	83.33	2.50	83.96	1.87	84.58	1.25	84.90	0.93	85.13	0.70	84.90	0.93	85.11	0.72	85.26	0.57	85.26	0.57	85.11	0.72	84.14	1.69	81.97	3.86
528*	85.31	82.30	3.01	83.33	1.98	83.96	1.35	84.58	0.73	84.90	0.41	85.13	0.18	84.90	0.41	85.11	0.20	85.26	0.05	85.26	0.05	85.11	0.20	84.14	1.17	81.97	3.34
*Manholes locate	d along Stor	npin' Tom Lane	. Freeboard o	calculated from	road surface	rather than USF							1														

Street Ponding Areas

				24-hour SC	S Velocity x Depth (m²/s)	
Street Segment ID	U/S ID	D/S ID	1:2 year	1:5 year	1:100 year	Climate Change
HP1-LP6	HP1	LP6	0	0	0	0
HP1-MP8	HP1	MP8	0	0	0	0
HP10-MP10	HP10	LP5	0	0	0	0
HP12-LP7	HP12	LP7	0	0	0	0
HP13-LP1	HP13	LP1	0	0	0.016	0.023
HP13-LP2	HP13	LP2	0	0	0.005	0.018
HP14-LP3	HP14	LP3	0	0	0	0
HP3-LP5	HP3	LP5	0	0	0	0.002
HP4-HP2	HP4	MajorNavanRd	0	0	0	0
HP4-LP1	HP4	LP1	0	0	0	0
HP6-LP2	HP14	LP2	0	0	0	0
HP6-LP3	HP6	LP3	0	0	0	0
HP6-MP6	HP6	LP1	0	0	0	0
HP7-LP2	HP7	LP2	0	0	0.004	0.007
HP7-LP4	HP7	LP4	0	0	0.006	0.008
HP8-LP6	HP8	LP6	0	0	0	0
HP8-MP7	HP8	LP3	0	0	0	0
HP9-LP5	HP9	LP5	0	0	0	0
HP9-MP8	HP3	MP8	0	0	0	0.001
HP9-MP9	HP9	LP6	0	0	0	0
MP7_2-LP7	HP11	LP7	0	0	0	0
MP8-LP4	MP8	LP4	0	0	0.005	0.007
RYSW1-Swale_1	CB104C	CB104B	0	0	0.063	0.084
RYSW1-Swale_2	CB104B	CB104A	0	0	0.105	0.148
RYSW1-Swale_3	CB104A	CB104	0	0	0.139	0.212
RY34	CB104	POND	0	0	0.012	0.097

				12-hour SC	S Velocity x Depth (m ² /s)	
Street Segment ID	U/S ID	D/S ID	1:2 year	1:5 year	1:100 year	Climate Change
HP1-LP6	HP1	LP6	0	0	0	0
HP1-MP8	HP1	MP8	0	0	0	0
HP10-MP10	HP10	LP5	0	0	0	0
HP12-LP7	HP12	LP7	0	0	0	0
HP13-LP1	HP13	LP1	0	0	0.078	0.026
HP13-LP2	HP13	LP2	0	0	0.024	0.022
HP14-LP3	HP14	LP3	0	0	0	0
HP3-LP5	HP3	LP5	0	0	0	0.003
HP4-HP2	HP4	MajorNavanRd	0	0	0	0
HP4-LP1	HP4	LP1	0	0	0	0
HP6-LP2	HP14	LP2	0	0	0	0
HP6-LP3	HP6	LP3	0	0	0	0.005
HP6-MP6	HP6	LP1	0	0	0	0.006
HP7-LP2	HP7	LP2	0	0	0.018	0.008
HP7-LP4	HP7	LP4	0	0	0.025	0.009
HP8-LP6	HP8	LP6	0	0	0	0
HP8-MP7	HP8	LP3	0	0	0	0
HP9-LP5	HP9	LP5	0	0	0	0
HP9-MP8	HP3	MP8	0	0	0	0.001
HP9-MP9	HP9	LP6	0	0	0	0
MP7_2-LP7	HP11	LP7	0	0	0	0
MP8-LP4	MP8	LP4	0	0.009	0.039	0.007
RYSW1-Swale_1	CB104C	CB104B	0	0	0.143	0.084
RYSW1-Swale_2	CB104B	CB104A	0	0	0.292	0.146
RYSW1-Swale_3	CB104A	CB104	0	0	0.444	0.215
RY34	CB104	POND	0	0	0.065	0.101

			Turnerat			V	elocity (m/s	ocity (m/s)		
Street Segment ID	U/S ID	D/S ID	Depth	1:2 year	1:5 year	1:10 year	1:25 year	1:50 year	1:100 year	Climate Change
HP1-LP6	HP1	LP6	0.17							
HP1-MP8	HP1	MP8	0.17							
HP10-MP10	HP10	LP5	0.175							
HP12-LP7	HP12	LP7	0.23							
HP13-LP1	HP13	LP1	0.17					0.260	0.260	0.310
HP13-LP2	HP13	LP2	0.17					0.040	0.110	0.270
HP14-LP3	HP14	LP3	0.17							0.040
HP3-LP5	HP3	LP5	0.17							0.040
HP4-HP2	HP4	MajorNavanRd	0.175							0.160
HP4-LP1	HP4	LP1	0.175							0.020
HP6-LP2	HP14	LP2	0.17							0.030
HP6-LP3	HP6	LP3	0.17							0.080
HP6-MP6	HP6	LP1	0.17							0.230
HP7-LP2	HP7	LP2	0.175				0.030	0.030	0.040	0.110
HP7-LP4	HP7	LP4	0.175				0.020	0.060	0.080	0.120
HP8-LP6	HP8	LP6	0.175							
HP8-MP7	HP8	LP3	0.175							
HP9-LP5	HP9	LP5	0.17							
HP9-MP8	HP3	MP8	0.17							0.050
HP9-MP9	HP9	LP6	0.17							
MP7_2-LP7	HP11	LP7	0.175							
MP8-LP4	MP8	LP4	0.175		0.040	0.040	0.050	0.060	0.060	0.080
RYSW1-Swale_1	CB104C	CB104B	0.3					0.410	0.500	0.560
RYSW1-Swale_2	CB104B	CB104A	0.3					0.610	0.750	0.890
RYSW1-Swale_3	CB104A	CB104	0.3					0.730	0.920	1.090
 RY34	CB104	POND	0.3						0.810	1.210

STREET PONDING TABLE

			1:2 y	ear	1:5 year D	epth	1:10 y	/ear	1:25 y	/ear	1:50 y	year	1:100	year	Climate 0	Change	Lowest
Ponding Area ID	Top of Grate (m)	Maximum Static Depth (m)	Total Ponding Depth (m)	Max. HGL (m)	Total Ponding Depth (m)	Max. HGL (m)	Total Ponding Depth (m)	Max. HGL (m)	Opening Grade (m)								
1A	85.37	0.09	0.06	85.43	0.1	85.47	0.12	85.49	0.15	85.52	0.17	85.54	0.18	85.55	0.21	85.58	-
1B	85.37	0.09	0.06	85.43	0.10	85.47	0.12	85.49	0.15	85.52	0.17	85.54	0.18	85.55	0.21	85.58	-
2	84.58	0.29	0.04	84.62	0.09	84.67	0.12	84.70	0.15	84.73	0.17	84.75	0.19	84.77	0.24	84.82	85.24
3	83.87	0.25	0.06	83.93	0.11	83.98	0.14	84.01	0.18	84.05	0.21	84.08	0.24	84.11	0.28	84.15	84.55
4	82.30	0.15	0.01	82.31	0.06	82.36	0.09	82.39	0.12	82.42	0.12	82.42	0.13	82.43	0.16	82.46	83.80
5	84.82	0.25	0.09	84.91	0.15	84.97	0.18	85.00	0.21	85.03	0.22	85.04	0.23	85.05	0.25	85.07	85.18
6	83.85	0.14	0.07	83.92	0.13	83.98	0.16	84.01	0.19	84.04	0.22	84.07	0.24	84.09	0.28	84.13	84.32
7	85.21	0.24	0	-	0.04	85.25	0.08	85.29	0.11	85.32	0.14	85.35	0.16	85.37	0.21	85.42	85.92
Appendix G5

Historical References

STORM SEWER CALCULATION SHEET (RATIONAL METHOD) - POND 3

Manning's	0.013		F	leturr	<u>ı Fre</u>	que	ncy =	² 5 yea	ars																							(6)
			2- 10	ARE	A (ł	la)	े जिन्ही	7		-1	FI	LOW							SEWER	DATA		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		Г <u> </u>	r				Γ		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
From Node	To Node	0.3	₹≕ R 0.5	≓ ∺ 0.55	e 0.6	R= 0.75	R≐ 0.79	R=	Indiv.	Accum	Time	e of R	ainfall F	Peak Flow	DIA. (m)	DIA. (mm)	TYPE	SLOPE	LENGTH	CAPACITY	VELOCITY	TIME OF	RATIO	Upstream	Downstream	Upstream	Upstream	Downstream	Downstream	Drop	US Frost	DS Frost
					0.0	0.10	0.73	1 0.0	22.70 A	2.70 /		<u>. </u>		2 (VS)	(actual)	(nominal)		<u>((m/m)</u>	(m)	(1/s)	(m/s)	FLOW (min.)	Q/Q full	OG	00	Invert	Obvert	Invert	Obvert	Structure	Depth	Depth
601A	601	0.00	4.45	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.50	0.0	0 9.	48 9.4	8 2	1.00	68.13	645.86	0.76	750	CONC	0.0035	90	687 1	1	100	0.00	98.00	05.50	04.07		-		<u></u>		
601	602	0.00	4.91	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.80	0.0	0 10.	78 20.	26 2	2.00	66.15	1340.16	0.91	900	CONC	0.0055	220	1400.6	2.1	1.72	0.94	85.50	83.90	80.80	81.71	79.59	80.50	,	3.97	3.79
	000	0.00	0.00	3.50 0	00.00	0.97	1.43	<u>n 1.7</u>	10.	42 35.0	8 2	3.71	63.03	2248.78	0.99	975	5 CONC	0.01	70	2338.0) 3.(0.38	0.96	83.90	82.50	79.51	80.50	78.81	79.80	2.26	3.40	2.70
603B	603A	0.00	4.42	3.47 (0.00	0.00	1.24	1.8	30 18.	28 18.	8 2	2.00	66.15	1208.89	0.99	975	CONC	0.003	150	1280.5	1	150		81.50	91.50	77.50	70.40	77.05	70.04			0.40
603A	603	0.00	5.58	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.08	8 0.3	38 10.	99 29.	27 2	3.50	63.39	1855.51	1.07	1050	CONC	0.0045	5 110	1911.0	2.4	0.86	0.97	81.50	82.50	76.97	78.04	76.48	77.54	<u>}</u>	3.46	3.40
603	604	0.00	0.66	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.28	3 0.0	0 1.	53 66	18 2	5.96	59.41	3949 46	1 37	135/	CONG	0.006	100	404.0.4							3.5 F.			İ.		
604	605	0.00	1.03	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.52	2 0.0	00 2.	69.	06 2	6.53	58.56	4043.75	1.37	1350	CONC	0.000	5 100	4313.1		0.57	0.92	82.50	80.80	76.17	77.54	75.57	76.94	0.52	4.96	3.86
605	605	0.00	1 66	0.41	0.00	0.00	0.39	0.0	20 2.	72 71.	78 2	7.39	57.33	4115.22	1.37	1350	CONC	0.006	5 150	4313.1	2.1	0.86	0.95	78.40	77.00	73.75	75.12	72.85	74.22	2 0.40	3.28	2.00
607	- 608	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.25	0.0	0 0.	55 76.	26 2	9.67	54.33	4252.25	1.37	1350		0.006	<u>5 250</u>	4313.1	2.	1.43	0.99	77.00	76.00	72.4	73.82	70.95	72.32	1.60	3.18	3.68
6095	6095	0.44	2 70	0.00		0.44										1001		0.000	/	- 4010.1	<u> </u>	0.51	0.90	70.00	73.00	69.35	70.72	68.81	70.18	1.10	5.28	2.82
608D	608	0.41	0.00	0.001	0.00	0.00	1.58	<u> </u>		<u>36 9.</u>	08 2	0.00	70.25	637.88	0.91	900	CONC	0.0013	3 170	680.9	1.0	2.73	0.94	71.00	71.00	68.59	69.50	68.36	69.28	<u>, </u>	1.50	1.72
												2.73	04.77	043.62	0.91	901	CONC	0.0013	150	680.8	<u>) </u>	2.41	0.95	71.00	73.00	68.36	69.28	68.17	69.08	1	1.72	3.92
608C	608B	0.00	2.57	3.82	0.00	0.00	1.80	0.0	00 13.	37 13.	37 1	9.00	72.53	969.39	0.84	82	5 CONC	0.005	5 60	1058.8	1.	0.52	2 0.92	74.00	74.00	69.50	70.33	69.20	70.03		3.67	3.97
608A	608	1.26	2.29	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.25		00 <u>6</u> . 00 6.	45 19. 98 26.	<u>79 2</u>	9.52	71.32	1412.95	0.99	97	5 CONC	0.005	5 120	1653.2	2 2.	0.93	0.85	74.00	72.80	69.04	70.03	68.44	69.43	1	3.97	3.37
600				_										1000.02	1.07	100		0.000	<u> </u>	2014.2	4 <u>2.</u>	0.52	2 0.92	72.80	73.00	68.3	69.43	68.02	69.08	<u>با</u>	3.37	3.92
000	008	0.00	2.60	0.001	0.00	0.00	1.11	0.0	00 6.	05 119.	<u>)4 3</u>	0.18	53.70	6392.78	1.98	195		0.002	2 290	6638.8	9 2.	2 2.24	4 0.96	73.00	76.00	67.10	69.08	66.52	68.50	0.46	3.92	7.50
700	701	16.26	2.78	0.00	0.00	1.39	4.09	0.0	00 29.	31 29.	31 2	25.00	60.90	1784.60	0.91	90		0.009	5 170	1840.8	2	8 10	1 0 97	86.00	86.50	91.5	B2 45	70.00	00.00		250	- E C 7
701A	701	0.00	6.89	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1 1 2	20 12	52 12	5 4	5 00	92.50	40.45.05									0.01	00.00	00.00	01.0	02.40	19.92	00.00	1.30	3.30	5.07
				0,00		0.00	0.00	1	23 12,	52 12.	2	5.00	03.35	1045.95	0.84	82	5 CONC	0.00	5 330	1058.9	9 1.	9 2.8	7 0.99	86.50	86.50	82.9	6 . 83.80	81.31	82.15	5 2.65	2.70	4.35
701	702	0.00	1.56	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.46	<u>3 · 1.3</u>	30 6.	14 47.	97 2	26.01	59.33	2845.74	0.99	97	5 CONC	0.02	3 210	3545.7	7 4.	6 0.70	6 0.80	86.50	79.00	78.5	79.50	73.68	74.67		7.00	4 33
702A	702	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.11	1.67	7 0.0	00 10.	15 10.	15 2	20.00	70.25	713 19	0.61	60		0.0	1 450	005.0							((4))			<u> </u>		
702	703	0.00	0.00	0.00					3					1 10.10	0.01			0.0	2 100	905.8	3 3.	1 0.8	0.79	83.50	79.00	78.8	79.50	75.89	76.50	<u>) 1.8</u> ?	4.00	2.50
702	703	5.02	0.00	0.36	0.00	0.00	0.54	4 0.0	00 1.	74 59.	35 2	26.77	58.21	3483.92	1.07	105		0.02	4 210	4413.3	3 4.	9 0.7	1 0.79	79.0	71.00	73.6	D · 74.67	68.56	69.63	3	4.33	1.37
704	705	0.99	0.00	0.55	0.00	3.19	0.45	5 0.0	00 9.	31 74.	37 2	29.17	54.96	4115.38	1.83	180		0.001	2 160	4154.1	<u>1 1.</u> 7 1	6 1.6	9 0.90	71.0	70.80	67.8	0 · 69.63	67.61	69.44	4	1.37	1.36
7054	705	0.00	0.00	2.05	0.00	0.00	4.7													4020,1	1.	<u>් 1.0.</u>	2 0.53	70.8	/0.50	07.0	1 09,44	67.38	69.20	<u>) </u>	1.36	1.30
		0.00	0.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	1.14	4 0.0	00 0.	9/ 0.	97 2	23.00	64.29	448.15	0.69	67	5 CONC	0.00	3 80	480.3	3 1.	3 1.0	3 0.93	71.5	0 70.50	68.7	6 69.4 4	68.52	2 69.20	5	2.06	1.30
705	706	0.00	0.00	0.92	0.00	0.00	0.44	4 0.0	00 2.	37 84.	22 3	30.99	52.75	4442.71	1.98	195	0 CONC	0.00	1 160	4694.4	4 1.	5 1.7	5 0.95	70.5	71.00	67.2	· 69.20	67.06	5 69 0	4	130	1 0
706C	706B	0.00	0.00	5.20	0.00	0.00	200		00 12	34 12	24 2	21.00	69.12	840.04	0.60	67	E CONIO										00.20	07.00			1.00	1.50
706B	706A	0.00	0.00	0.64	0.00	0.00	0.22	2 0.0	00 1.	46 13.	80 2	21.99	66.16	913.32	2 0.76	75	0 CONC	0.00	2 15: 7 80	960.0	6 <u>2.</u> 7 2	6 <u>0.9</u>	9 0.88	75.0	72.00	71.1	3 71.81	69.27	7 69.9	5	3.19	2.0
/06A	706	0.00	0.00	1.74	0.00	0.00	1.16	<u>6 0.0</u>	00 5.	21 19.	01 2	22.62	64.98	1235.49	0.91	90	0 CONC	0.00	5 70	1335.	4 2.	0 0.5	7 0.93	72.0	71.00	68.4	8 69.39	00.63	3 69.0	4	2.05	2.5
706	707	0.00	0.00	0.50	0.00	0.00	0.2	1 0.0	00 1.	23 104	46 3	32.74	50.81	5307.00	198	105		0.001	5 100	5740	6				15		7 5					1
707	708	0.00	0.00	2.66	0.00	0.00	1.20	0 0.0	00 6	70 111	16	33.63	49.87	5543.80	1.98	195	0 CONC	0.001	5 17	5 5749.	5 1.	9 0.8	<u>9 0.92</u> 6 0.96	2 /1.0 5 72.0	72.00	67.0	6 69.04 1 68.89	66.91	1 68.8 5 68.6	9	1.96	3.1
/08	009		0.00	1.38	0.00	0.00	0.6	/ 0.0	00 3.	58 114	74 3	35.20	48.33	5545.19	1.98	195	0 CONC	0.001	5 8	5 5749.	5 1.	9 0.7	6 0.96	5 76.0	0 76.00	66.6	5 68.63	66.52	2 68.5	0 0.4	5 7.37	7.5
609	610	0.00	3.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.2	1 0.0	00 6	83 240	60 3	35.96	47.62	11456.50	1.52	2 1500 x 420	0 CONC	0.00	2 16	14595.	0 2	3 11	5 0.7	76.0	72.0	66.6	69.0		0 07 7			
010	Outlet	0.00	3.98	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.9	6 0.(00 7	64 248	25 3	37.11	46.58	11563.06	5 1.52	2 1500 x 420	0 CONC	0.00	2 10	14595.	0 2	3 0.7	2 0.79	72.0	0 70.00	66.2	0 67.72	2 66.00	0 67.5	2	4.21	<u>4.2</u> 3 2.4
800	801	0.00	0.00	2.51	0.00	0.00	0.7	3 0.0	00 5	44 5	44	18.00	74.97	407.91	0.84	82	5 CONC	0.00	1 14	473	<u> </u>	0 07	2 0.0	70.0	70.0							
801	802	0.00	0.00	1.02	0.00	0.00	0.3	4 0.0	00 2	31 7	75	20.72	68.71	532.33	3 0.91	90	0 CONC	0.00	1 8	597.	2 0	9 1.4	7 0.8	70.0	0 70.0	67.6	0 <u>68.44</u> 8 68.30	67.4	6 68.3 0 68.2	2	1.56	<u>1.7</u>
803	804	0.00	0.00	1.60	0.00	0.00	0.7	5 0	00 4	84 12	59] : 68	22.19	65.79	828.22	2 1.07	105	O CONC	0.00	1 19	5 900.	9 1.	0 3.2	2 0.92	2 70.0	0 70.0	0 67.1	5 68.2	2 66.90	6 68.0	2	1.70	3 1.9
804	805	0.00	0.00	2.76	0.00	0.00	0.8	3 0.	00 6	04 22	72	26.57	58.50	1329.38	3 1.22	2 120		0.001	3 8 2 28	5 1027.	<u>1 1.</u> 0 1	1 1.1	6 0.98	3 70.0	0 70.0	0 66.9	6 68.0	2 66.8	5 67.9	2	1.98	3 2.0
805	806		0.00	1.51	0.00	0.00	0.7	0 0.	00 3	.85 26	57	30.51	53.32	1416.74	4 1.22	2 120	0 CONC	0.001	3 8	0 1466.	5 1	3 1.0	6 0.9	70.0	0 70.0	0 66.3	6 67.5	66.3	6 67.5 6 67.4	8	2.08	<u>3 2.4</u> 2 2.5
807	Outlet	t 0.00	0.00	0.86	0.00	0.00	0.4	4 0.	00 3	.06 32	15	31.57	52.09	1567.14	4 1.2	2 120		0.001	7 7	D 1677.	0 1	4 0.8	1 0.9	3 70.0	0 70.0	0 66.2	6 67.4	7 66.1	4 67.3	6	2.5	3 2.6
Definitions:						Note	s:				De	signe	d:	B.D	PROJE	CT: Glouc	ester EL	IC Infras	structure S	ervicing Stu	idv Update	4 0.9	3 0.9	<u> </u>	0 70.0	0 66,1	4 67.3	6 6.0	0 67.2	2	2.64	4 2.7
Q = 2.78 AI	R, where					1) Ot	tawa	IDF C	Curve			•								or rioning ord	ay opuace			1								
Q = Peak F	low in Litre	es per s	econd	(L/s)		2) Mi	n Vel	ocity	= 0.80 m	/sec			<u> </u>																			
= Rainfall	Intensity /	(na) (mm/h)									Ch	necked	1:	F.W	LOCAT	ION: Storn	nwater N	lanagen	nent Pond	3				1			÷.					
R = Runoff	Coefficient	t																														
											Dv	vg. :	STM	I / STM P1	1 File Re	f. 1634-004	193	Date'	March-()5	<u></u>		Sheet No	-								
L												-					_			-		Ň	1 of 1	·]								
																				150.							- 2					

ЧY.



Appendix G6

Runoff Coefficients

Runoff Coefficient 2983, 3053, and 3079 Navan Road & 2690 Page Road



The proposed development is comprised of four (4) subject properties under (1) Draft Plan of Subdivision and four (4) Site Plan Applications. In total there are 67 row townhouse units, six (6) condominium units and a gas station and retail establishment.

1. **ROW TOWNHOUSE BLOCK:**

An average run-off coefficient was calculated for front yard and rear yard of the smallest block (Block 4) which contains five (5) townhouse units. The runoff coefficients are based on zoning setbacks and a maximum driveway width of 50% of the area of the front yard as stated in Section 107 (2) in the City of Ottawa Zoning By-Laws. Since this scenario has the highest ratio of house area to greenspace, the resulting run-off coefficient would be the highest of any scenario for a townhouse block.

Unit Information		
Unit Width	5.80	m
Block Depth	29.9	m
Unit Area	97	m²
Total Number of Units	5	units
Number of Interior Units	4	units
Number of End Units	1	units
Corner Unit Width	6.25	m
Min. Corner Yard Setback	3	m
Min. Rear Yard Setback	7.5	m
Min. Front Yard Setback	3	m

Block Area

Total Block Area = $(5.80 \times 4 + 9.25 \times 1) \times 29.9 = 970.26 \text{ m}^2$ (A_T) Zoning Footprint (Internal Unit) = (29.9 - 7.5 - 3) m x 5.80m = 112.52 m² (B_T) Zoning Footprint (End Unit) = (29.9 - 7.5 - 3) x 6.25 = 121.25 m² (C_T) Unit Driveway Area (50% of Front Yard Area) = 8.7 m² (D_T)

Assuming each lot has a highpoint at the centre, the unit and lot areas could be divided equally between the front and rear yards.

Rear Area: Block Rear Area = $\frac{AT}{2} = \frac{970.26}{2} = 485.13 \text{ m}^2$ (E_T) 2022-12-01 Our File: 29899-000

Number of Internal Units: 4 Number of End Units: 1 Rear Impervious (House) Footprint: $\frac{4(BT)+1(CT)}{2} = \frac{4(112.52)+1(121.25)}{2} = 285.67 \text{ m}^2 (\textbf{F}_T)$

Front Area: Block Front Area = Block Rear Area = 485.13 m² (G_T) Number of Internal Units: 4 Number of End Units: 1 Front Impervious (House/Driveway) Footprint: $F_T + 6D_T = 285.67 + 5(8.7) = 329.17 \text{ m}^2 (I_T)$

Using a run-off coefficient of 0.2 for grassed areas and 0.9 for impervious areas (houses and driveways) the following weighted averages are calculated:

 $\frac{\text{Run-off Coefficient:}}{\text{Rear Coefficient}} = \frac{0.2(E_T - F_T) + 0.9F_T}{E_T} = \frac{0.2(485.13 - 285.67) + 0.9(285.67)}{485.13} = 0.61 \text{ (C}_{\text{RT}}\text{)}$ Front Coefficient = $\frac{0.2(G_T - I_T) + 0.9(I_T)}{G_T} = \frac{0.2(485.13 - 329.17) + 0.9(329.17)}{485.13} = 0.67 \text{ (C}_{\text{FT}}\text{)}$

Summary: The rear yard runoff coefficient used for design is 0.61

2. <u>18m ROW Road</u>

A similar approach was used for the ROWs, a weighted average was calculated using the total 18m ROW Road.

Asphalt Road and Sidewalk (C=0.9)

There is approximately 585 m of 8.5 m asphalt road and 630 m of 1.8 m sidewalk. These lengths were measured directly from the Concept Plan in Appendix B1 of the Functional Servicing Report. The total area of asphalt road is 585 x 8.5 = 4972.50 m² (J_T) The total area of sidewalk is 630 x 1.8 = 1134.00 m² (K_T)

Driveways (C=0.9)

Within the boulevard there are 27 units which have driveways that do not overlap with sidewalks. For these cases the driveways have a width of 4.75 m within the boulevard span a distance of 2.9 m (50% of unit width).

The total area of driveways not fronting sidewalks can be taken as $27 \times 4.75 \times 2.9 = 371.93 \text{ m}^2$ (L_T)

2022-12-01 Our File: 29899-000

Within the boulevard there are 42 units which have driveways that do overlap sidewalks. For these cases the sidewalk width must be subtracted from the driveway boulevard width since it was already considered in (K_T). Hence, these driveways span 4.75m - 1.8m = 2.95m within the boulevard and span a distance of 2.9m (50% of unit width).

The total area of driveways fronting sidewalks can be taken as $42 \times 2.95 \times 2.9 = 359.31 \text{ m}^2$ (M_T)

Grassed Area (C=0.2)

The total area of grass is equal to the total ROW Area subtracted by area of asphalt road, sidewalks, and driveways. I.e., Grassed Area = $(18 \times 585m - (4972.50 + 1134.00 + 371.93 + 359.31 = 3692.26 m^2 (N_T)$

Table 1 summarizes the total areas within the 18m ROW and their respective c-factors.

Description	Area (m²)	C-Factor
Asphalt Road	4972.50	0.9
Sidewalk	1134.00	0.9
Driveways not fronting sidewalk	371.93	0.9
(26 units)		
Driveways fronting sidewalk	359.31	0.9
(41 units)		
Grass boulevard not fronting	3692.26	0.2
sidewalk		

Table 1: ROW C-factor breakdown

3. FRONT YARD AND ROW C-FACTOR

The front yard and ROWs of the subdivision were grouped into one weighted front yard runoff coefficient. The weighted average is derived from the results front yard co-efficient calculated for the ROW townhouse block and from the results in Table 1 for the 18 m ROW.

```
=\frac{(J_T \times 0.9) + (K_T \times 0.9) + (L_T \times 0.9) + (M_T \times 0.9) + (N_T \times 0.2) + (69 \times 97) \times C_{FT})}{(J_T) + (K_T) + (L_T) + (M_T) + (N_T) + (69 \times (97))}
```

 $=\frac{(4972.50 x 0.9)+(1134x0.9)+(371.93x0.9)+(359.31x0.9)+(3692.26x0.2)+((67 x (97) x$ **0.67)** $}{(4972.50)+(1134)+(371.93)+(359.3)+(3692.26)+(67 x (97))}$

<mark>= 0.66</mark>

2022-12-01 Our File: 29899-000

4. Residential and Commercial Site Plans (Block 14, 15 and 17)

A runoff coefficient was calculated for the residential site plans on Blocks 14, 15 and 17. Block 14 was used for the sample calculations since this block generates the highest ratio of impervious surfaces to grass.

A minimum zoned amenity space of 10% was assumed for the residential site plans. This is more conservative than the City of Ottawa By-Law requirement of 6m² per dwelling unit for low-rise apartment dwellings.

Block 14 Information		
Total Block Area	0.575	ha
Zoning Limit Area	0.494	ha
Zoning Amenity Area (10% Zoning Limit Area)	0.049	ha (О т)
Zoning Impervious Area (90% Zoning Limit Area)	0.445	ha (Р⊤)

The remaining area of the site plan (outside of the zoning area) is 0.069 ha of grass (Q_T) and 0.012 ha of impervious surfaces (R_T).

Given that these are private site plans, a run-off coefficient of 0.25 was used for grassed areas and 0.9 for impervious areas. The following weighted averages are calculated:

$$= \frac{(0.25 (O_T + Q_T)) + 0.9(P_T + R_T)}{(O_T + Q_T) + (P_T + R_T)}$$

=
$$\frac{(0.25 (0.049 + 0.0688)) + 0.9(0.445 + 0.0123)}{(0.049 + 0.0688) + (0.455 + 0.012)}$$

=
$$0.77$$

5. <u>Commercial Site Plan (Gas Bar on Block 16)</u>

Since there is minimal grass and amenity space within the industrial site plan a C-factor of **0.9** was assumed for all of Block 16.

6. Dry Pond (Block 13)

A C-factor of 0.83 was assumed for the Dry Pond because the water surface from large storm events would be considered 90% impermeable.

7. Park (Block 7)

A C-factor of 0.40 was assumed for the park given that this area is mainly grassed with minimal infrastructure.

Abutting Existing Units on Navan and Page that drain into 3079 Navan Road 8.

The C-factor breakdowns based on actual impervious cover within the existing catchment areas are summarized in Table 2 and Table 3. A weighted average was calculated for impervious (C=0.9) and grassed (C=0.2).

Γable 2: Existing Units on Navan Road C-factor breakdown						
Description	Area (m ²)	C-Factor				

Description	Area (m²)	C-Factor
Impervious	0.169	0.9
Grassed	0.971	0.2
Total	1.14	0.3

Table 3: Existing Units on Page Road C-factor breakdown

Description	Area (m ²)	C-Factor	
Impervious	0.096	0.9	
Grassed	0.598	0.2	
Total	0.694	0.3	

Table 4 below presents a summary of run-off coefficients to be used for functional design.

Scenario	Runoff Coefficient (C)
Rear Yards – Townhouse Units Only	0.61
Front Yards and ROW	0.66
Residential Site Plan	0.77
Industrial Site Plan (Gas Bar)	0.90
Abutting Properties on Navan and Page	0.30
Park	0.40
Dry Pond	0.83

Table 4: Functional Design Run-off Coefficients

SAMPLE C-FACTOR CALCULATION FIGURES



C-FACTOR CALCULATED BASED ON ZONING SET BACKS AND MAXIMUM DRIVEWAY WIDTH OF 50% AREA OF FRONT YARD

ALL AREAS MEASURED DIRECTLY FROM CONCEPT PLAN IN APPENDIX B1 OF THE FUNCTIONAL SERVICING REPORT



Appendix G7

Water Quality Excerpts

Stantec

EAST URBAN COMMUNITY, CITY OF OTTAWA (GLOUCESTER) STORMWATER MANAGEMENT FACILITY #3 DESIGN BRIEF UPDATE Pond Detailed Design Components August 22, 2005

4.3 POND GRADING AND STORAGE DESIGN

Mild side slopes for safety (average 4:1) have been provided throughout the facility, 5:1 slopes extend 3 m below the permanent water level, and 3:1 within the bottom 0.6 m of the forebay, and along the forebay berms. These slopes have been varied throughout to promote a more natural aesthetic. A 2.0 m wide flat aquatic shelf that will also act as a safety bench has been provided in the grading design below the permanent pool (@ 66.80 m) to enhance the perimeter vegetation for additional shading and quality control functions.

4.3.1 Water Quality and Erosion Control

Maximum permanent water depths within the forebay and wet pond components of the facility are 1.5 m and 1.2 m respectively. Water quality control will be provided to a Normal Protection Level (70% TSS removal efficiency), which is equivalent to former Level 2 as described in the Stormwater Management Planning and Design Manual (MOE, 2003). This is in keeping with the background documentation. The required storage volume is generated from Table 3.1 of the MOE manual, which is based on the percent imperviousness of the tributary drainage area. The total area to Pond 3 is 180.66 ha (including the pond block area), with a weighted percent imperviousness of 45.3%. Therefore, the required total volume is as described in **Table 4.2**. The extended detention volume is defined by the overflow weir (67.90 m), which is constrained by the receiving ditch elevation (67.45 m). As a result, over-control is provided. This configuration contains the 4-hr, 25-mm Chicago storm runoff volume and discharges over the prescribed 36 hours.

Total Contributing Area	180.66 ha
Imperviousness of Contributing Area	45.3 %
Unit Area Storage Volume Requirements as per SWMPD	100.3 m ³ /ha
Required Total Water Quality Volume	18,113 m ³
Required Permanent Pool Volume	10,887 m ³
Permanent Pool Volume Provided (Total above sediment)	18,986 m ³
Required Extended Detention Volume (40 m ³ /ha)	7,226 m ³
Extended Detention Volume Provided	22,873 m ³

Table 4.2: SWM Facility Water Quality Volumes

4.3.2 Water Quantity Control

Due to the limitations of the surface outlet elevation and pipe capacity (0.19 m^3 /s), a degree of over-control above the 25 mm storm is provided in the facility before discharge to the VIA Rail ditch. As a result, the pond outflows are maintained well below the target rates. The secondary pond outlet occurs via a 15.0 m wide weir that discharges to the VIA ditch. The weir will be constructed of concrete to provide a 'sharp-crest' at elevation 67.90 m. The remainder of the channel between the pond and the ditch will be lined with 500 mm diameter rock protection over geotextile.

604-00293: Gloucester East Urban Community, Pond 3 Redesign Model Input DDSWMM Input Parameter Summary - EUC

	,			Post De	velopment \$	Subcatchm	ent Parame	ters					
Model Catchment ID	Downstream Segment	Area (ha)	Imp. (%)	Mannings n (Imp.)	Mannings n (Perv.)	Slope (m/m)	Width (m)	la Imp. (mm)	la Perv. (mm)	Infiltration Method	fo (mm)	fc (mm)	k (s ⁻¹)
NW	NSD	ASW	PIMP	CNIMP	CNP	s	WLAT	DETIMP	DETP	1	MAX	MIN	DECA
Trunk No. 4			1					ļ 1					
'A601A'	'601AR'	5.95	38	0.013	0.2	0.02	310	1.57	4.67	Hortons	76.2	13.2	0.0011
'A601'	'601R'	6.71	39	0.013	0.2	0.02	1000	1.57	4.67	Hortons	76.2	13.2	0.0011
'A602'	'602R'	6.56	47	0.013	0.2	0.0	295	1.57	4.67	Hortons	76.2	13.2	0.0011
'A602_COL'	'602R'	1.75	87	0.013	0.2	0.02	900	1.57	4.67	Hortons	76.2	13.7	0.0011
A603B*	'603BR'	9.13	34	Quar				· ,	4.67	Hortons	76.2	13.2	0.0011
'A6038_COL'	'603BR'	1.80	87	Overa	an imper	viousi	less is	,	4.67	Hortons	76,2	13.2	0.0011
'A603A'	'603AR'	6.66	33	40% a	across 1	l7.97 h	a	•	4.67	Hortons	76.2	13.2	ຸ່ 0.0011
'A603A_COL'	'603AR'	0.38	87					,	4.67	Hortons	76.2	13.2	j 0.0011
'A603'	'603R'	0.94	41	0.013	0.2	0.02	200	1.57	4.67	Hortons	76.2	13.2	0.0011
'A604'	604R'	1.55	43	0.013	0.2	0.02	300	1.57	4.67	Hortons	76.2	13.2	0.0011
'A605'	'605R'	1.69	39	0.013	0.2	0.02	300	1.57	4.67	Hortons	76.2	13.2	0.0011
'A606'	'606R'	2.4	41	0.013	0.2	0.02	500	1.57	4.67	Hortons	76.2	13.2	0.0011
'A607'	'607R'	0.25	82	0.013	0.2	0.02	180	1.57	4.67	Hortons	76.2	13.2	0.0011
'A608E'	'608ER'	5.78	38	0.013	0.2	0.02	425	1.57	4.67	Hortons	76.2	13.2	0.0011
'A608D'	'608DR'	0.39	82	0.013	0.2	0.02	300	1.57	4.67	Hortons	76.2	13.2	0.0011
'A608C'	'608CR'	8.19	40	0.013	0.2	0.02	310	1.57	4.67	Hortons	76.2	13.2	0.0011
'A608B'	'608BR'	4.08	37	0.013	0.2	0.02	870	1.57	4.67	Hortons	76.2	13.2	0.0011
'A608A'	'608AR'	4.8	32	0.013	0.2	0.02	715	1.57	4.67	Hortons	78.2	13.2	0.0011
'A608'	'608R'	3.71	41	0.013	0.2	0.02	580	1.57	4.67	Hortons	76.2	13.2	0.0011
Trunk No. 5							1					1	
'A700'	'700R'	24.52	20	0.013	0.2	0.02	800	1.57	4.67	Hortons	76.2	13.2	0.0011
'A701A'	'701AR'	6.89	23	0.013	0.2	0.02	660	1.57	4,67	Hortons	76.2	13.2	0.0011
'A701A COL'	'701AR'	1.29	87	0.013	0.2	0.0	660	1.57	4.67	Hortons	76.2	13.2	0.0011
'A701'	'701R'	2.02	37	0.013	0.2	0.02	180	1.57	4.67	Hortons	76.2	13.2	0.0011
'A701 COL'	'701R'	1.30	87	0.013	0.2	0.02	630	1,57	4.67	Hortons	76.2	13.2	0.0011
'A702A'	'702AR'	4.78	74	0.013	0.2	0.02	330	1.57	4.67	Hortons	76.2	13.2	0.0011
'A702'	7028	0.90	62	0.013	0.2	0.0	210	1.57	4.67	Hartons	76.2	13.2	0.0011
'A703'	'703R'	5.84	8	0.013	02	0.02	160	1.57	4.67	Hortons	76.2	13.2	0.0011
'A704'	'704R'	5.18	54	0.013	02	0.02	180	1.57	4.67	Hortons	76.2	13.2	0.0011
'A705A'	705AR	3.8	55	0.013	0.2	0.02	470	1.57	4 67	Hortons	76.2	13.2	0.0011
'A705'	7058'	1.36	48	0.013	0.2	0.02	320	1.57	4 67	Hortons	76.2	13.2	0.0011
14706C1	'706CB'	7.2	46	0.013	0.2	0.02	450	1.57	4 67	Hortons	76.2	13.2	0.0011
'A706B'	7068R'	0.86	44	0.013	0.2	0.02	180	1.57	4 67	Hortons	76.2	13.2	0.0011
'A706A'	706AR	29	52	0.013	0.2	0.02	540	1.57	4.67	Hortons	76.2	13.2	0.0011
'A706'	'706R'	0.71	46	0.013	0.2	0.02	160	1.57	4.67	Hortons	76.2	13.2	0.0011
'A707'	'707R'	3.86	47	0.013	0.2	0.02	350	1.57	4.67	Hortons	76.2	13.2	0.0011
4708	708R'	2.05	48	0.013	0.2	0.02	360	1.57	4.67	Hortons	76.2	13.2	0.0011
'4609'	1809B	4.21	40	0.013	0.2	0.02	470	1.57	4.67	Hortons	76.2	13.2	0.0011
'4810'	1 'B10P'	4 94	35	0.013	0.2	0.02	920	1.57	4.67	Hortons	76.2	13.2	0.001
Trunk No. 6				0.010) 0.2	0.02	320		4.01]	
'A800'	18000	3.24	42	0.013	0.2	0.02	730	1.57	4.67	Hortons	76.2	13.2	0.0011
' <u>\</u> 801'	1 1801 01	1 26	44	0.013	0.2	0.02	270	1.57	4.67	Hortons	76.2	13.2	0.0011
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1 180201	2.30	45	0.013	n2	0.02	300	1.57	4.67	Hortons	76.2	13.2	0.0011
108031	1 180201	2.00	49	0.013	0.2	0.0	460	1.57	4.67	Hortons	76.2	13.2	0.0011
1000	10001	2.50	42	0.013	0.2	0.02	570	1.57	4.67	Hortons	76.2	13.2	0.001
1004	18050	2.09	48	0.013	0.2	0.02	690	1.57	4.67	Hortons	76.2	13.2	0.001
1000	190601	2.21	20	0.013	0.2	0.02	145	1.57	4.07	Hortone	76.2	13.7	0.001
10.000	18070	1.5	28 AG	0.013		0.0	100	1.57	4.67	Hortone	76.2	13.2	0.0011
A007		1.2	40	0.013	Ų.Z	0.02	190	1.51	4.07		10.2		
	<u> </u>	1 170 10	<u> </u>		1 <u></u>	<u> </u>		Ι			<u> </u>		<u> </u>
Iotal		1/6,62	1										

1) Standard City of Ottawa Data for Initial Abstraction Parameters, Infiltration values, and width

2) Width based on 225m/ha

3) See Drainage Area Plan

4) Assumed that 100 m³/ha is available per catchment for storage; excess flow (spill) assumed to enter pond without routing effects



Ministère de l'Environnement CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL MUNICIPAL AND PRIVATE SEWAGE WORKS NUMBER 7367-4SUGSG

City of Ottawa 1595 Telesat Court, P.O. Box 8333, Gloucester, Ontario K1G 3V5

Site Location: Fourth Line Road Pond No. 3 Pt. Lot 7, Conc. 4, O.F., Plan 4R-7806 City of Ottawa (former City of Gloucester)

You have applied in accordance with Section 53 of the Ontario Water Resources Act for approval of:

a stormwater management facility and associated appurtenances to be constructed to service the East Urban Community, located in the former City of Gloucester, now in the City of Ottawa, as follows:

Stormwater Management Facility (Pond No. 3)

A stormwater management facility located on a site on the north side of the Via Rail R.O.W. approx. 1000 m east of Fourth Line and Via Rail R.O.W. intersection, consisting of a stormwater extended detention wet pond with quality/erosion and an adjacent stormwater detention dry cell with quantity control functions. The stormwater management facility has an available storage volume of approx. 18,018 m³ of detention storage in the dry pond cell, 16,700 m³ of extended detention (quality/erosion) storage in the main wet pond and 10,467 m³ of permanent pool storage (including forebay). An inlet forebay is provided to enhance sediment removal. Discharge from the forebay to the main wet pond is provided over the forebay berm. Piping through the forebay berm is provided to empty the forebay for maintenance purposes together with a maintenance hole structure equipped with a sluice gate. Discharge control downstream of the main wet pond is provided via an outlet control structure consisting of a reverse slope sewer pipe and orifice created by a sluice gate, designed to provide quality control by detaining the runoff from the 25 mm - 4 hr design storm event prior to discharge over a 36 hour period to the existing ditch along the north side of Via Rail R.O.W.. Quantity control in the dry cell is provided by attenuating the catchment area post-development flows to the allowable discharge rates of 1.0 m³/s, 2.3 m³/s, 4.3 m³/s and 6.0 m^3/s during the 2, 5, 25 and 100 year design storm events respectively prior to discharging to the existing ditch along the north side of Via Rail R.O.W. and including inlet and outlet piping and control structures, weirs, low flow channel, emergency spillway and fencing and provisions for emptying the pond cells for maintenance and sediment removal;

together with storm sewer outlet piping along the north side of the Via Rail R.O.W. from the stormwater management facility to approximately 210 m east of Fourth Line and Via Rail R.O.W. intersection;

including temporary erosion/sedimentation stormwater management measures during construction, all in accordance with the stormwater management report and final drawings prepared by Stantec Consulting Ltd., Consulting Engineers.

For the purpose of this Certificate of Approval and the terms and conditions specified below, the following definitions apply:

(1) "Owner" means the Corporation of the City of Ottawa and includes its successors and assignees;

(2) "Environmental Appeal Board" means the Environmental Review Tribunal, as defined in the Environmental Review Tribunal Act, as amended from time to time.

You are hereby notified that this approval is issued to you subject to the terms and conditions outlined below:

TERMS AND CONDITIONS

1. The Owner shall make all necessary investigations, take all necessary steps and obtain all necessary approvals so as to ensure that the physical structure, siting and operations of the stormwater works do not constitute a safety or health hazard to the general public.

2. The Owner shall ensure that sediment and excessive decaying vegetation are removed from the above noted stormwater management system at such a frequency as to prevent the excessive buildup and potential overflow of sediment and/or decaying vegetation into the receiving watercourse.

3. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

(1) The Owner shall ensure that at all times, the sewage works and the related equipment and appurtenances which are installed or used to achieve compliance with this certificate are properly operated and maintained.

(2) The Owner shall prepare an operations manual for the operation of the sewage works and retain a copy of the manual at the Transportation Utilities and Public Works Department. Upon request, the Owner shall make the manual available for inspection and copying by the Ministry personnel.

(3) The Owner shall ensure that the manual includes the following information:

(a) inspection program including frequency of inspection of the forebay, wet pond, catch basins and manholes for sediment accumulation and method for removal of sediment; and

(b) maintenance program for all the components of the sewage works which need maintenance.

4. WATER QUALITY MONITORING

(1) Composite samples consisting of four (4) grab samples of the effluent shall be collected at the outlet from the wet detention pond at approximately 7, 18, 27 and 35 hours after each of four (4) rainfall events per year (May to September inclusive), and analyzed for the following parameters:

Total Suspended Solids, Total Phosphorus, Oil and Grease (total), Ammonia plus Ammonium, pH and temperature.

(2) In addition to the monitoring requirements specified in sub-section (1), the Owner shall measure the Dissolved Oxygen in the pond at the end of sample collection for each of the four (4) rainfall events noted in sub-section (1).

(3) Pursuant to subsections (1) and (2) the Owner shall prepare and submit in writing a monitoring report to the District Manager by the 31st day of October immediately following the monitoring period;

(4) The monitoring program described in subsections (1), (2) and (3) shall begin when 30% and again at 80% of the lands tributary to the pond being developed. After its inception, the said monitoring program is to span a period of no less than four (4) years in total, not necessarily in succession.

5. RECORD KEEPING AND RETENTION

(1) The Owner shall retain for a minimum of three (3) years or longer if requested in writing by the District Manager, all records and information related to or resulting from the monitoring activities required by this certificate or proposed by the Owner.

The reasons for the imposition of these terms and conditions are as follows:

1. Condition 1 is imposed because it is not in the public interest for the Director to approve facilities which, by reason of potential health and safety hazards do not generally comply with legal standards or approval requirements falling outside the purview of this Ministry.

2. Condition 2 is included as regular removal of sediment and excessive decaying vegetation from this approved stormwater management system are required to mitigate the impact of sediment and/or decaying vegetation on the downstream receiving watercourse. It is also required to ensure that adequate storage is maintained in the stormwater management facilities at all times as required by the design.

3. Condition 3 is included to ensure that the sewage works are properly operated and maintained such that the environment is protected and deterioration, loss, injury or damage to any person or property is prevented.

4. Conditions 4 and 5 are included to ensure that various water quality parameters of the effluent discharged from the stormwater management pond are monitored and the sewage works is performing as designed.

In accordance with Section 100 of the <u>Ontario Water Resources Act</u>, R.S.O. 1990, Chapter 0.40, as amended, you may by written notice served upon me and the Environmental Appeal Board within 15 days after receipt of this Notice, require a hearing by the Board. Section 101 of the <u>Ontario Water Resources Act</u>, R.S.O. 1990, Chapter 0.40, provides that the Notice requiring the hearing shall state:

1. The portions of the approval or each term or condition in the approval in respect of which the hearing is required, and;

2. The grounds on which you intend to rely at the hearing in relation to each portion appealed.

The Notice should also include:

- 3. The name of the appellant;
- 4. The address of the appellant;
- 5. The Certificate of Approval number;
- 6. The date of the Certificate of Approval;
- 7. The name of the Director;
- 8. The municipality within which the works are located;

And the Notice should be signed and dated by the appellant.

This Notice must be served upon:

The Secretary* Environmental Appeal Board 2300 Yonge St., 12th Floor P.O. Box 2382 Toronto, Ontario M4P 1E4 AND

The Director Section 53, *Ontario Water Resources Act* Ministry of the Environment 2 St. Clair Avenue West, Floor 12A Toronto, Ontario M4V 1L5

* Further information on the Environmental Appeal Board's requirements for an appeal can be obtained directly from the Board at: Tel: (416) 314-4600, Fax: (416) 314-4506 or www.ert.gov.on.ca

The above noted sewage works are approved under Section 53 of the Ontario Water Resources Act.

DATED AT TORONTO this 7th day of March, 2001

Mohamed Dhalla, P.Eng. Director Section 53, *Ontario Water Resources Act*

JC/ c: District Manager, MOE Ottawa Clerk, City of Ottawa Curtis Rampersad, Stantec Consulting Limited

L07-03-COFA

Lone 9

Ministry of the Environment

Ministère de l'Environnement

BURGAU UU AMENDMENT TO CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL MUNICIPAL AND PRIVATE SEWAGE WORKS NUMBER 7226-6GLJQM

Safe D

NOMBER /226-6GLJQM Notice No. 1 Issue Date: June 24, 2011

Ashcroft Homes - Eastboro Inc. 18 Antares Dr, No. Suite 102 Nepean, Ontario, K2E 1A9 NOTICE -1

Site Location: Eastboro Phase 1A-SWMF WORKS W/ EUC POND #3 Renaud Road, Lot Part Lot 4, Concession 4, City of Ottawa.

You are hereby notified that I have amended Certificate of Approval No. 7226-6GLJQM issued on November 8, 2005 for a Stormwater Management Works, namely EUC Pond #3, as follows:

na chi

11.03

City Clerk's Office

addition of private stormwater quantity control facilities as follows:

1. a super-pipe stormsewer system to receive, store and attenuate upto 100-year return storm surface drainage from an approximately 0.80ha rear yard and parking areas consisting of 74m long 1350mm diameter and 67m long 1200mm diameter storm sewers; finally to discharge into a 450mm diameter pipe upstream of manhole MH #117A at a flow rate of not over 8.8L/s via a flow restricter located at manhole MH #122 (Model Hydrovex 75HV-1 or approved equivalent).

2. a temporary/interim swale located along the north-east corner of the site to receive, store and attenuate upto 100-year return storm surface drainage from an approximately 1.40ha rear yard and parking areas consisting of 150m long, trapezoidal section with bottom width of 2m, side slopes of 3:1, a minimum top width of 8m and a minimum depth of 1m; having a minimum volume of 545cu.m.; finally to discharge into a 375mm diameter pipe downstream of manhole MH #100 at a flow rate not over 6.8L/s, via a flow restricter located at manhole MH #100 (Model Hydrovex 100VHV-1 or approved equivalent);

all flows are to discharge into the existing stormsewer system to be finally collected for quality control in the existing EUC Pond #3 prior discharge into Mud Creek via the existing ditch along north side of the Via Rail right-of-way (ROW).

The reason(s) for this amendment to the Certificate of Approval is (are) as follows: the existing storm sewers downstream of the MH #122 and MH #100 are conceived to be surcharging and the Municipality required flow control as stipulated in the EUC Master Servicing Study.

all in accordance with the Application for Approval of Municipal and Private Sewage Works, Stormwater Management facilities for Eastboro Subdivision Phase 1A, City of Ottawa, dated February 08, 2011 and supporting information and documentation prepared by Kris Kilborn and Neal Cody, P.Eng., Stantec Consulting Ltd, Consulting Engineers.

This Notice shall constitute part of the approval issued under Certificate of Approval No. 7226-6GLJQM dated November 8, 2005

In accordance with Section 100 of the Ontario Water Resources Act, R.S.O. 1990, Chapter 0.40, as amended, you may by written notice served upon me and the Environmental Review Tribunal within 15 days after receipt of this Notice, require a hearing by the Tribunal. Section 101 of the Ontario Water Resources Act, R.S.O. 1990, Chapter 0.40, provides that the Notice requiring the hearing shall state:

The portions of the approval or each term or condition in the approval in respect of which the hearing is required, and;
 The grounds on which you intend to rely at the hearing in relation to each portion appealed.

The Notice should also include:

- 3. The name of the appellant;
- 4. The address of the appellant;
- 5. The Certificate of Approval number;
- 6. The date of the Certificate of Approval;
- 7. The name of the Director;
- 8. The municipality within which the works are located;

And the Notice should be signed and dated by the appellant.

This Notice must be served upon:

The Secretary* Environmental Review Tribunal 655 Bay Street, 15th Floor Toronto, Ontario M5G 1E5

<u>AND</u>

The Director Section 53, *Ontario Water Resources Act* Ministry of the Environment 2 St. Clair Avenue West, Floor 12A Toronto, Ontario M4V 1L5

* Further information on the Environmental Review Tribunal's requirements for an appeal can be obtained directly from the

Tribunal at: Tel: (416) 314-4600, Fax: (416) 314-4506 or www.ert.gov.on.ca

The above noted sewage works are approved under Section 53 of the Ontario Water Resources Act.

DATED AT TORONTO this 24th day of June, 2011

THIS	NOTICE WAS MAILED	
ON_	June 30, 2011	
	SP	-
energi tara da anti	(Signed)	12:0

Ian Parrott, P.Eng.

Page 2 - NUMBER 7226-6GLJQM

Director Section 53, *Ontario Water Resources Act*

MN/

c: District Manager, MOE Ottawa
Clerk, the City of Ottawa. ⁷
Kris Kilborn / Neal Cody, P.Eng,, Stantec Consulting Ltd.



Ministère de l'Environnement AMENDED CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL MUNICIPAL AND PRIVATE SEWAGE WORKS NUMBER 7226-6GLJQM Issue Date: November 8, 2005

City of Ottawa 110 Laurier Avenue West Ottawa, Ontario K1P 1J1

Site Location: East Urban Community Lot Part of 7, Concession 4 Ottawa City

You have applied in accordance with Section 53 of the Ontario Water Resources Act for approval of:

a stormwater management *Works* to be established in the City of Ottawa (former City of Gloucester) to service the East Urban Community, located on a site on the north side of the Via Rail R.O.W. approx. 1000 m east of Fourth Line and Via Rail R.O.W. intersection, comprised of an elongated stormwater extended detention wet pond with quality/erosion and quantity control functions and including the following:

Stormwater Management Works (Pond No. 3)

-an onsite stormwater management *Works* having a minimum permanent pool liquid volume of 10,887 m³ plus a combined minimum detention storage volume of approx. 33,450 m³ including a minimum extended detention volume of 19,194 m³. An inlet forebay is provided to enhance sediment removal for runoff generated by storm events less than or equal to the 4 hr - 25 mm design storm event. Discharge from the forebay to the main wet pond is provided over a weir located on top of an impermeable berm. The forebay weir crest is set at the lowest gravity outlet elevation to empty the forebay for maintenance purposes. Discharge control downstream of the main wet pond is provided via an outlet control structure consisting of a reverse slope sewer pipe and orifice created by a sluice gate, designed to provide quality/erosion control by detaining the extended detention runoff prior to discharge over a 50 hour period to the existing ditch along the north side of Via Rail R.O.W.. Quantity control is provided by attenuating the catchment area post-development flows to below the allowable discharge rates of 1.0 m³/s, 2.3 m³/s, 4.3 m³/s and 6.0 m³/s during the 2, 5, 25 and 100 year design storm events respectively prior to discharging to the existing ditch along the north side of Via Rail R.O.W. and including inlet control flow-splitter control structure to bypass runoff generated by storm events greater than the 4 hr - 25 mm design storm event directly to the main wet pond, outlet piping and control structures, weirs, emergency overflow spillway and fencing and provisions for emptying the pond cells for maintenance and sediment removal;

together with storm sewer outlet piping along the north side of the Via Rail R.O.W. from the stormwater management pond to approximately 210 m east of Fourth Line and Via Rail R.O.W. intersection;

including erosion/sedimentation stormwater management measures during construction, all in accordance with the following submitted supporting documents:

1. Application for Approval of Municipal and Private Sewage Works date stamped received August 26, 2005; and

2. Stormwater management design brief update dated August 22, 2005 and enclosed drawings, prepared by Stantec Consulting Ltd., Consulting Engineers.

For the purpose of this Certificate of Approval and the terms and conditions specified below, the following definitions apply:

"*Certificate*" means this entire certificate of approval document, issued in accordance with Section 53 of the <u>Ontario Water</u> <u>Resources Act</u>, and includes any schedules;

"Director" means any Ministry employee appointed by the Minister pursuant to section 5 of the Ontario Water Resources

<u>Act;</u>

"*discharge event*" means the period of time during which the discharge flow from the facility is greater than the normal dry-weather discharge flow;

"District Manager" means the District Manager of the Ottawa District Office of the Ministry;

"*effluent composite sample*" means a composite sample consisting of a number of sample aliquots collected during an entire "discharge event" by means of grab sampling or an automated sampling device.

"*influent composite sample*" means a composite sample consisting of a number of sample aliquots collected during an entire "storm event" by means of grab sampling or an automated sampling device.

"Ministry" means the Ontario Ministry of the Environment;

"Owner" means the Corporation of the City of Ottawa and includes its successors and assignees;

"*storm event*" means the period of time during which the rain storm generated influent flow to the facility is greater than the normal dry-weather influent flow;

"*Works*" means the sewage works described in the *Owner*'s application, this *Certificate* and in the supporting documentation referred to herein, to the extent approved by this *Certificate*.

You are hereby notified that this approval is issued to you subject to the terms and conditions outlined below:

TERMS AND CONDITIONS

1. GENERAL PROVISIONS

(1) Except as otherwise provided by these Conditions, the *Owner* shall design, build, install, operate and maintain the *Works* in accordance with the description given in this *Certificate*, the application for approval of the works and the submitted supporting documents and plans and specifications as listed in this *Certificate*.

(2) Where there is a conflict between a provision of any submitted document referred to in this *Certificate* and the Conditions of this *Certificate*, the Conditions in this *Certificate* shall take precedence, and where there is a conflict between the listed submitted documents, the document bearing the most recent date shall prevail.

(3) Where there is a conflict between the listed submitted documents, and the application, the application shall take precedence unless it is clear that the purpose of the document was to amend the application.

2. EXPIRY OF APPROVAL

The approval issued by this *Certificate* will cease to apply to those parts of the *Works* which have not been constructed within five (5) years of the date of this *Certificate*.

3. CHANGE OF OWNER

The *Owner* shall notify the *District Manager* and the *Director*, in writing, of any of the following changes within thirty (30) days of the change occurring:

- (a) change of Owner;
- (b) change of address of the Owner;

(c) change of partners where the *Owner* is or at any time becomes a partnership, and a copy of the most recent declaration filed under the <u>Business Names Act</u>, R.S.O. 1990, c.B17 shall be included in the notification to the *District Manager*; and

(d) change of name of the corporation where the *Owner* is or at any time becomes a corporation, and a copy of the most current information filed under the <u>Corporations Information Act</u>, R.S.O. 1990, c. C39 shall be included in the notification to the *District Manager*.

4. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.

(1) The Owner shall ensure that the design minimum liquid retention volume is maintained at all times.

(2) The *Owner* shall inspect the *Works* at least once a year and, if necessary, clean and maintain the *Works* to prevent the excessive buildup of sediments, oil and/or vegetation.

(3) The *Owner* shall maintain a logbook to record the results of these inspections and any cleaning and maintenance operations undertaken, and shall keep the logbook for inspection by the *Ministry*. The logbook shall include the following:

(a) the name of the Works; and

(b) the date and results of each inspection, maintenance and cleaning, including an estimate of the quantity of any materials removed.

(4) The Owner shall ensure that at all times, the sewage works and the related equipment and appurtenances which are installed or used to achieve compliance with this certificate are properly operated and maintained.

(5) The Owner shall prepare an operations manual for the operation of the *Works* and retain a copy of the manual at the Transportation Utilities and Public Works Department. Upon request, the Owner shall make the manual available for inspection and copying by the Ministry personnel.

(6) The Owner shall ensure that the manual includes the following information:

(a) inspection program including frequency of inspection of the forebay, wet pond, catch basins and manholes for sediment accumulation and method for removal of sediment; and

(b) maintenance program for all the components of the sewage works which need maintenance.

5. WATER QUALITY MONITORING

(1) Composite samples from the influent and effluent of the wet detention pond shall be collected on an approximately monthly basis for five (5) rainfall events per year (May to September inclusive) with a rainfall depth between 7 mm and 20 mm. The *influent composite samples* shall consist of at least four (4) aliquots distributed throughout the duration of the *storm event*. *Effluent composite samples* shall be collected throughout the *discharge event* and consist of at least four (4) aliquots distributed at approximately 7, 18, 27, and 35 hours from the start of the rainfall event. Samples to be analyzed for the following parameters:

Total Suspended Solids, Total Phosphorus.

(2) Pursuant to subsections (1) the Owner shall prepare and submit in writing a monitoring report on an annual basis to the District Manager, by the 31 st day of March of the following year of operation.

(3) The monitoring program described in subsections (1) and (2) shall begin when 30% of the lands tributary to the pond has been developed. After its inception, the said monitoring program is to span a period of no less than four (4) years in total, not necessarily in succession.

6. RECORD KEEPING

The *Owner* shall retain for a minimum of five (5) years from the date of their creation, all records and information related to or resulting from the operation and maintenance activities required by this *Certificate*, or longer if requested in writing by the District Manager.

7. GENERAL CONDITION

The Owner shall make all necessary investigations, take all necessary steps and obtain all necessary approvals so as to ensure that the physical structure, siting and operations of the stormwater works do not constitute a safety or health hazard to the general public.

The reasons for the imposition of these terms and conditions are as follows:

1. Condition 1 is imposed to ensure that the *Works* are built and operated in the manner in which they were described for review and upon which approval was granted. This condition is also included to emphasize the precedence of Conditions in the *Certificate* and the practice that the Approval is based on the most current document, if several conflicting documents are submitted for review.

2. Condition 2 is included to ensure that, when the *Works* are constructed, the *Works* will meet the standards that apply at the time of construction to ensure the ongoing protection of the environment.

3. Condition 3 is included to ensure that the Ministry records are kept accurate and current with respect to approved works and to ensure that subsequent owners of the works are made aware of the certificate and continue to operate the works in compliance with it.

4. Condition 4 is included to require that the *Works* be properly operated and maintained such that the environment is protected. Regular removal of sediment, oil and excessive decaying vegetation from this approved stormwater management system are required to mitigate the impact of sediment, oil and/or decaying vegetation on the downstream receiving watercourse. It is also required to ensure that adequate storage is maintained in the stormwater management facilities at all times as required by the design.

5. Condition 5 is included to ensure that various water quality parameters of the effluent discharged from the stormwater management pond are monitored and the sewage works is performing as designed.

6. Condition 6 is included to require that all records are retained for a sufficient time period to adequately evaluate the long-term operation and maintenance of the *Works*.

7. Condition 7 is imposed because it is not in the public interest for the Director to approve facilities which, by reason of potential health and safety hazards do not generally comply with legal standards or approval requirements falling outside the purview of this Ministry.

This Certificate of Approval revokes and replaces Certificate(s) of Approval No. 7367-4SUGSG issued on March 7, 2001.

In accordance with Section 100 of the Ontario Water Resources Act, R.S.O. 1990, Chapter 0.40, as amended, you may by written notice served upon me and the Environmental Review Tribunal within 15 days after receipt of this Notice, require a hearing by the Tribunal. Section 101 of the Ontario Water Resources Act, R.S.O. 1990, Chapter 0.40, provides that the Notice requiring the hearing shall state:

1. The portions of the approval or each term or condition in the approval in respect of which the hearing is required, and;

2. The grounds on which you intend to rely at the hearing in relation to each portion appealed.

The Notice should also include:

- 3. The name of the appellant;
- 4. The address of the appellant;
- 5. The Certificate of Approval number;
- 6. The date of the Certificate of Approval;
- 7. The name of the Director;
- 8. The municipality within which the works are located;

And the Notice should be signed and dated by the appellant.

This Notice must be served upon:

The Secretary* Environmental Review Tribunal 2300 Yonge St., 12th Floor P.O. Box 2382 Toronto, Ontario M4P 1E4 AND

The Director Section 53, *Ontario Water Resources Act* Ministry of the Environment 2 St. Clair Avenue West, Floor 12A Toronto, Ontario M4V 1L5

* Further information on the Environmental Review Tribunal's requirements for an appeal can be obtained directly from the Tribunal at: Tel: (416) 314-4600, Fax: (416) 314-4506 or www.ert.gov.on.ca

The above noted sewage works are approved under Section 53 of the Ontario Water Resources Act.

DATED AT TORONTO this 8th day of November, 2005

Mohamed Dhalla, P.Eng. Director Section 53, *Ontario Water Resources Act*

JC/ c: District Manager, MOE Ottawa Clerk, City of Ottawa Dave Eadie, P.Eng., Stantec Consulting Ltd.

Baseline Conditions

May 5, 2020

	Pollutant									
Land Use	Total Suspended Solids (mg/L)	Total Phosphorus (mg/L)	Copper (mg/L)	Zinc (mg/L)	E. Coli (#/100mL)					
Agriculture	400	0.35	0.002	0.018	30,000					
Commercial	150	0.20	0.020	0.030	30,000					
Forest	50	0.12	0.001	0.011	100					
Industrial	100	0.35	0.025	0.200	2,000					
Institutional	50	0.18	0.015	0.113	8,500					
Open Space	70	0.10	0.010	0.020	5,000					
Residential	150	0.20	0.025	0.080	40,000					
Street	150	0.20	0.020	0.030	40,000					

Table 4-2: Land Use Pollutant Wash-off Parameters

Table 4-3: SWM Facility Pollutant Removal Parameters

	Pollutant Removal (%)							
SWM Facility	Total Suspended Solids	Total Phosphorus	Copper	Zinc	E. Coli			
Pond 1	80	52	57	64	70			
Pond 2	50	13	33	41	48			
Pond 3	80	52	57	64	70			

The model was run using rainfall data from the Avalon rain gauge for the period of May 2011 to November 2011. This aligned with the period of water quality monitoring data presented in the Eastern Subwatersheds report to which the modelled Mud Creek results were compared. Pollutant concentrations at seven (7) locations are summarized in **Table 4-4**. The modelled existing conditions pollutant concentrations along Mud Creek generally are comparable to those observed in the surrounding creeks during wet weather flow periods. The E. Coli concentrations presented in the Pinecrest Creek CIS report are approximately one order of magnitude higher than those presented in the Eastern Subwatersheds report which may be indicative of more conservative water quality parameters used in the Pinecrest study and this study. Therefore, modelled E. Coli concentrations in Mud Creek may be overestimated. However, the EMC approach and modelling parameters used in the model are overall considered to provide acceptable estimates of wet weather pollutant concentrations in Mud Creek.





May 11, 2018 Laurent Jolliet, P.Eng. Page 7 of 15

Reference: Mud Creek PCSWMM Future Conditions Model Build and Results

Catchment Unique ID	Associated 2014 Existing Conditions Model Catchment Imp. (%)	Total Future Conditions Catchment Area (ha)	Total Roadway Area to be Developed (100% Imp.) (ha)	Total VURLS Area to be Developed (65% Imp.) (ha)	Total Existing Maintained Impervious Area (100% Imp.) (ha)	Future Conditions Model Catchment Imp. (%)
0	11.1	2.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	3.3
1	44.3	6.7	0.0	0.1	3.0**	45.6
2	32.5	8.0	0.6	0.0	2.4	38.2
3	22.2	10.0	0.2	6.6	1.4	58.3
6	13.1	15.9	0.0	13.6	2.1**	65.0
8	3.9	35.8	1.4	3.9	1.2	14.3
34	49.5	39.3	0.0	4.3	19.5**	56.6
35	11.1	2.4	0.3	1.2	0.3	55.2
36*	13.1	13.6	0.0	12.4	1.8**	65.0
37	13.1	4.6	0.0	3.8	0.6**	65.0
38	13.1	8.9	0.0	5.5	2.1***	63.8
39	13.1	11.7	1.0	1.7	2.4	38.6
40	13.1	4.4	0.0	2.5	0.4	45.9
107	42.1	109.3	0.0	1.1	49.1	45.6
108	55.6	20.6	0.2	1.8	11.4**	62.5
110	32.5	4.5	0.0	4.5	0.0	100.0

Table 4: Future Development Catchment Imperviousness

* This catchment was mostly developed in 2011, therefore all parameters except for imperviousness were maintained per the 2011 existing conditions model.

** Existing maintained imperviousness calculated using associated existing conditions model catchment imperviousness.

*** Existing maintained imperviousness calculated manually using measurements from aerial photography.

CONVEYANCECONTROLS

Major and minor system components from the 2014 existing conditions model were revised in areas where development wasproposed to occur to reflect the build-out conveyance methods. All major and minor system components used to convey flow from existing conditions catchments were maintained per the existing conditions model. All culvert and creek components were derived from the existing HECRAS model of the area.

All minor system and major system components in the Ashcroft Subdivision model and Chapel Hill Park and Ride model were imported into the Mud Creek future conditions model. This ensured any minor or major system flow from these developments was represented as accurately as possible.





Future Conditions Model Catchments (varying colours), Labelled by Unique ID

Snow Disposal Facility

Future Conditions Model Catchments

0.3 — Kilometers



Snow Disposal Facility

Ashcroft Subdivision

CDP Development

Chapel Hill Park and Ride

Future Development

Undeveloped Existing

* Catchment 34 was mostly developed in 2011, therefore all parameters except for imperviousness were maintained per the 2011 existing conditions model

Future Conditions Model Catchment Types

0

1 ⊐Kilometers

Appendix A: Catchment Land Use Categorization

Name	Description	Agricultural	Commercial	Forest	Industrial	Institutional	OpenSpace	Residential	Street	Total
0	Future Development	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	87.1%	3.2%	9.7%	100.0%
1	Future Development	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.0%	58.0%	26.0%	100.0%
10	CDP Development	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.0%	58.0%	26.0%	100.0%
100	Future Development	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
101	Future Development	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.0%	58.0%	26.0%	100.0%
102	Future Development	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.0%	58.0%	26.0%	100.0%
103	CDP Development	0.0%	0.0%	1.5%	0.0%	0.2%	15.7%	57.0%	25.6%	100.0%
104	CDP Development	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.0%	58.0%	26.0%	100.0%
105	CDP Development	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.0%	58.0%	26.0%	100.0%
106	CDP Development	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.0%	58.0%	26.0%	100.0%
107	Existing Developed	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.9%	10.8%	58.7%	28.9%	100.0%
108	Existing Developed	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	16.8%	60.9%	21.5%	100.0%
109	CDP Development	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.0%	58.0%	26.0%	100.0%
11	CDP Development	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
110	Future Development	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
12	CDP Development	0.0%	25.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	14.1%	41.5%	18.6%	100.0%
13	CDP Development	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.0%	58.0%	26.0%	100.0%
14	CDP Development	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	44.3%	38.5%	17.2%	100.0%
15	CDP Development	0.0%	6.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	14.9%	54.0%	24.2%	100.0%
16	CDP Development	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.0%	58.0%	26.0%	100.0%
17	CDP Development	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.0%	58.0%	26.0%	100.0%
18	CDP Development	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	19.8%	54.8%	24.6%	100.0%
19	Future Development	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
2	Future Development	0.0%	13.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	57.0%	29.7%	100.0%
20	CDP Development	0.0%	0.0%	8.9%	0.0%	0.0%	18.8%	49.9%	22.4%	100.0%
21	Future Development	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	69.3%	17.4%	13.3%	100.0%
22	CDP Development	0.0%	0.0%	90.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
23	CDP Development	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.0%	58.0%	26.0%	100.0%
24	CDP Development	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	62.5%	25.9%	11.6%	100.0%
25	CDP Development	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	24.2%	52.3%	23.4%	100.0%
26	CDP Development	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.0%	58.0%	26.0%	100.0%
27	CDP Development	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	16.0%	58.0%	26.0%	100.0%
28	CDP Development	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
29	CDP Development	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.9%	15.2%	55.1%	24.7%	100.0%
3	Future Development	0.0%	16.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.3%	54.6%	22.5%	100.0%
30	CDP Development	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	92.2%	5.4%	2.4%	100.0%
31	Existing Developed	0.0%	19.5%	0.0%	0.5%	0.0%	6.5%	52.1%	21.4%	100.0%
32	Existing Developed	0.0%	1.5%	0.0%	0.0%	5.3%	10.6%	61.0%	21.6%	100.0%
33		0.0%	0.0%	79.8%	0.0%	0.0%	19.3%	0.6%	0.3%	100.0%
34	Existing Developed	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.6%	0.0%	20.0%	50.7%	26.7%	100.0%
35	Future Development	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	20.0% 75.4%	11 3%	13.4%	100.0%
36	Future Development	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.0%	58.0%	26.0%	100.0%
37	Future Development	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.0%	58.0%	26.0%	100.0%
38	Future Development	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.0%	58.0%	26.0%	100.0%
39	Future Development	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	18.4%	13.1%	7 7%	27.4%	33.4%	100.0%
4		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	16.0%	57.8%	25.9%	100.0%
40		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	16.0%	58.0%	25.5%	100.0%
40		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.0%	58.0%	26.0%	100.0%
41_1 41_2		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.0%	58.0%	26.0%	100.0%
42 1		0.0%	98.1%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.5%	0.2%	100.0%
42_1		0.0%	98.1%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.5%	0.2%	100.0%
12_2		0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	21.6%	5/ 1%	24.2%	100.0%
45		0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	24.2%	100.0%
44		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.0%	58.0%	26.0%	100.0%
45		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.2%	20.0%	100.0%
40	Euture Development	0.0%	99.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	100.0%	0.1%	100.0%
48	CDP Development	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	U.U% 16.0%	TOO'O%	0.0%	100.0%
19	CDP Development	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.U% 7 E0/	JO.U%	20.0% 0.00/	100.0%
5	CDP Development	0.0%	37.3% 0.00/	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.3% 16.0%	U.U%	0.0%	100.0%
50	CDP Development	0.0%	0.0% Q 5%	0.0% QN 5%	0.0%	0.0%	10.0%	0.0%	20.0% 0.0%	100.0%
51	CDP Development	0.0%	9.5% 0.0%	90.3 <i>%</i>	0.0%	0.0%	26 0%	12 60/	10 5%	100.0%
52	CDP Development	0.0%	0.0%	0.0% 0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	15 0%	43.0%	19.3% 75 Q0/	100.0%
53	CDP Development	0.0% 0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	20.2%	AD 00/	۰/۵.د∠ 12 ۵/	100.0%
54	CDP Development	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	53.270	42.070	1/ 0º/	100.0%
55	CDP Development	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.0%	53.270 52.0%	26 0%	100.0%
56	CDP Development	0.0%		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	LO.O /0	JU.U/0 J2 E0/	20.0%	100.0%
57	CDP Development	0.0%	0.4% 0.0%	0.0% 0.0%	0.0% 0.0%	0.0%	0.3% 16.0%	23.0% 52 0%	10.0% 26 0%	100.0%
58	Existing Developed	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1 =0/	50.U% 77 £0/	20.0%	100.0%
59	CDP Development	0.0%	0.0%	0.0% 0.0%	0.0%	0.0% 76 E%	1.3%	12.0%	20.9% 6 10/	100.0%
6	Future Development	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	3.0/0 16 00/	T2'1 \0	0.1% 76 00/	100.0%
60	CDP Development	0.0%	0.0%	0.0% 0.0%	0.0%	0.U% 02 /0/	TO'O%	JO.U%	20.0% 0 40/	100.0%
61	CDP Development	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	12 20 <u>/</u>	25 7%	0.970 0.10/	0.4% 0.1%	100.0%
62	CDP Development	0.0%	0.0%	JU.0%	0.0%	U E0/	0.20/	U.170 1 10/	0.1%	100.0%
63	CDP Development	0.0%	0.0%	0 O V	0.0%	0.5%	0.3% 16 7%	1.170 57 50/	0.5% 7E 00/	100.0%
64	CDP Development	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10./%	57.5% E0 00/	23.8% 26.0%	100.0%
65	CDP Development	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.U% 20.0%	30.U% 10 30/	20.U%	100.0%
66	CDP Development	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3U.U%	40.3%	21./%	100.0%
67		0.0%	0.0%	91.9%	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%	4./%	2.1%	100.0%
68		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.0%	58.U%	20.0%	100.0%
60		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.0%	58.U%	20.0%	100.0%
7	Existing Developed		0.0%	0.0%	U.U%	0.0%	10.U%	J0.U%	20.0%	100.0%
70		15.8%	0.0%	0.4%	5.4%	0.0%	/1.8%	U.2%	0.4%	100.0%
70	Evicting Dovelaged		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	11.0%	58.0%	20.0%	100.0%
	Existing Developed	50.2%	0.0%	33.6%	0.2%	0.0%	11.0%	0.4%	4.6%	100.0%
72		43.3%	0.7%	b.b%	U.6%	1.0%	35.9%	4.0%	7.9%	100.0%
13	CUP Development	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.0%	58.0%	20.0%	100.0%

Appendix G8 ICD Curves

Volume III: TEMPEST INLET CONTROL DEVICES

Municipal Technical Manual Series



SECOND EDITION

LMF (Low to Medium Flow) ICD HF (High Flow) ICD MHF (Medium to High Flow) ICD







Water Flow Rate (Lps)

TEMPEST LMF ICD



Chart 3: HF & MHF Preset Flow Curves



www.jlrichards.ca

Ottawa

343 Preston Street Tower II, Suite 1000 Ottawa ON Canada K1S 1N4 Tel: 613 728-3571 ottawa@jlrichards.ca

North Bay

501-555 Oak Street E North Bay ON Canada P1B 8E3 Tel: 705 495-7597

northbay@jlrichards.ca

Kingston

203-863 Princess Street Kingston ON Canada K7L 5N4 Tel: 613 544-1424

kingston@jlrichards.ca

Hawkesbury

326 Bertha Street Hawkesbury ON Canada K6A 2A8 Tel: 613 632-0287

hawkesbury@jlrichards.ca

Sudbury

314 Countryside Drive Sudbury ON Canada P3E 6G2 Tel: 705 522-8174

sudbury@jlrichards.ca

Guelph

107-450 Speedvale Ave. West Guelph ON Canada N1H 7Y6 Tel: 519 763-0713



834 Mountjoy Street S

Timmins ON Canada

timmins@jlrichards.ca

Tel: 705 360-1899

Timmins

P4N 7C5

guelph@jlrichards.ca