

**FUNCTIONAL SERVICING AND
STORMWATER MANAGEMENT
REPORT**

FOR

**MATTAMY HOMES
WATERIDGE VILLAGE – BLOCK 24**

CITY OF OTTAWA

PROJECT NO.: 17-949

AUGUST 2017 – REV 1
© DSEL

**FUNCTIONAL SERVICING AND STORMWATER MANAGEMENT REPORT
FOR
WATERIDGE VILLAGE – BLOCK 24
MATTAMY HOMES**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	INTRODUCTION	1
1.1	Existing Conditions	2
1.2	Required Permits / Approvals	3
1.3	Pre-consultation.....	3
2.0	GUIDELINES, PREVIOUS STUDIES, AND REPORTS.....	4
2.1	Existing Studies, Guidelines, and Reports.....	4
3.0	WATER SUPPLY SERVICING	5
3.1	Existing Water Supply Services	5
3.2	Water Supply Servicing Design	5
3.3	Watermain Modeling.....	7
3.4	Water Supply Conclusion	8
4.0	WASTEWATER SERVICING.....	9
4.1	Existing Wastewater Services	9
4.2	Wastewater Design	9
4.3	Wastewater Servicing Conclusions	11
5.0	STORMWATER MANAGEMENT	12
5.1	Existing Stormwater Services	12
5.2	Post-development Stormwater Management Target	12
5.3	Proposed Stormwater Management System	12
5.4	Low Impact Development (LID) Practices	13
5.5	Stormwater Servicing Conclusions.....	13
6.0	CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	14

FIGURES

Figure 1 Site Location

TABLES

Table 1 Summary of Water Demand per *MSS*
Table 2 Water Supply Design Criteria
Table 3 Water Demand and Boundary Conditions Proposed Conditions
Table 4 Resulting Pressures Proposed Conditions
Table 5 Wastewater Flow per *MSS* – Total Site Area
Table 6 Wastewater Flow per *MSS* – To Moses Tennisco Street
Table 7 Wastewater Design Criteria
Table 8 Summary of Estimated Peak Wastewater Flow

APPENDICES

Appendix A Pre-consultation Notes
Appendix B Water Supply
Appendix C Wastewater Collection
Appendix D Stormwater Management
Drawings / Figures Site Plan

**FUNCTIONAL SERVICING AND STORMWATER MANAGEMENT REPORT
FOR
WATERIDGE VILLAGE – BLOCK 24
MATTAMY HOMES
AUGUST 2017 – REV 1**

**CITY OF OTTAWA
PROJECT NO.: 17-949**

1.0 INTRODUCTION

David Schaeffer Engineering Limited (DSEL) has been retained to prepare a Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management report in support of the Site Plan Application for Block 24 of the former CFB Rockcliffe lands, which are currently under re-development by the Canada Lands Company.

The subject property is located within the City of Ottawa urban boundary, in the Rideau-Rockcliffe area. As illustrated in **Figure 1**, the subject property is encompassed by Hemlock Road, Mikinak Road and Moses Tennisco Street, all of which are currently under construction. Comprised of a single parcel, it measures approximately **1.61 ha** and is zoned Residential Fifth Density Zone (R5Y[2312]).




Figure 1: Site Location

The proposed development by Mattamy Homes involves the construction of 81 Rear Lane Townhomes and 48 Stacked Townhomes. The development also includes surface parking for the Stacked Townhomes within the site. A copy of the site plan and site statistics are included in ***Drawings/Figures***.

The objective of this report is to provide sufficient detail with respect to the availability of site services, to support the application for site plan control.

1.1 Existing Conditions

The existing lands are vacant, while the construction of the surrounding road network and underground services are currently underway at the time of this publication. Historically, the lands were part of the Canadian Forces Base Rockcliffe (CFB Rockcliffe).

A geotechnical investigation was completed by Paterson Group Inc. in August 2017. Per the geotechnical report, the subject site consists of a layer of existing fill from the previous land use underlain by stiff to very stiff brown silty clay. Practical refusal was encountered between 1.7 to 6.9m below existing grade.

The Canada Lands Company will be delivering the site to a pre-grade condition in accordance with Mattamy Homes requirements.

Hemlock Road

- 300mm diameter PVC watermain
- 600mm diameter storm sewer
- 250mm diameter sanitary sewer

Mikinak Road

- 900mm diameter watermain
- 375mm diameter storm sewer
- 250mm diameter sanitary sewer

Moses Tennisco Street

- 200mm diameter watermain
- 750mm diameter storm sewer
- 250mm diameter sanitary sewer

Infrastructure described above is based on design drawings, not as-built drawings. The design drawings are as per the Wateridge Village at Rockcliffe Phase 1B drawing set prepared by IBI Group (dated February 16, 2017).

1.2 Required Permits / Approvals

The proposed development is subject to the site plan control approval process. The City of Ottawa must approve the engineering design drawings and reports prior to the issuance of site plan control.

1.3 Pre-consultation

Pre-consultation correspondence, along with the servicing guidelines checklist are located in **Appendix A**.

2.0 GUIDELINES, PREVIOUS STUDIES, AND REPORTS

2.1 Existing Studies, Guidelines, and Reports

The following studies were utilized in the preparation of this report.

- **Ottawa Sewer Design Guidelines,**
City of Ottawa, *SDG002*, October 2012
(City Standards)
- **Ottawa Design Guidelines – Water Distribution**
City of Ottawa, July 2010.
(Water Supply Guidelines)
 - **Technical Bulletin ISD-2010-2**
City of Ottawa, December 15, 2010.
(ISD-2010-2)
 - **Technical Bulletin ISDTB-2014-02**
City of Ottawa, May 27, 2014.
(ISDTB-2014-02)
- **Design Guidelines for Sewage Works,**
Ministry of the Environment, 2008.
(MOE Design Guidelines)
- **Stormwater Planning and Design Manual,**
Ministry of the Environment, March 2003.
(SWMP Design Manual)
- **Ontario Building Code Compendium**
Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing Building Development Branch,
January 1, 2010 Update
(OBC)
- **Water Supply for Public Fire Protection**
Fire Underwriters Survey, 1999.
(FUS)
- **Low Impact Development Stormwater Management Planning and Design Guide**
Credit Valley Conservation & Toronto and Region Conservation, 2010.
(LID Guide)
- **Former CFB Rockcliffe Master Servicing Study**
IBI Group, August 2015
(MSS)
- **Low Impact Development (LID) Demonstration Project**
Aquafor Beech Ltd., August 2015
(LID Demonstration Project)

3.0 WATER SUPPLY SERVICING

3.1 Existing Water Supply Services

The subject property lies within the City of Ottawa MONT pressure zone, as shown by the Pressure Zone map in **Appendix B**. Based on the design drawings for the Wateridge Phase 1B subdivision, a local 200 mm diameter watermain is currently being constructed within Moses Tennisco Street right-of-way to service the subject site.

The water servicing for the subject site was accounted for in the design of the water distribution system outlined in the **MSS**. Block 24 described in the MSS is part of a larger parcel known as Block 51. The total units allocated in these blocks per the **MSS** is **158 units** with a population of **2.3 person/unit**. The water demand per the **MSS** was determined assuming a consumption rate of **198 L/person/day**. The total water demand per the **MSS** is summarized in **Table 1** below.

Table 1
Summary of Water Demand per MSS

Design Parameter	Total Demand (L/min)
Average Day	50.1
Max Day	150.2
Max Day + Fire Flow	13,000 + 150.2

Fire flow for the site has been assumed at **12,000 L/min** and all nodes surrounding the site have the ability to provide the required fire flow at greater than 140 kPa (20 PSI).

3.2 Water Supply Servicing Design

It is proposed to provide two connections to the 200mm watermain within Moses Tennisco Street. The site is serviced by surrounding fire hydrants on Hemlock Road, Michael Moses Tennisco Street, Mikinak Road, and internal hydrants proposed on-site.

Due to the width of the right-of-way and the proximity of the Rear Lane Townhomes, it is proposed to provide a watermain 1.5m away from the proposed sanitary sewer. The water and sanitary sewers are designed in accordance with *Procedures to Govern Separation of Sewers and Watermains (Procedure F-6-1)* prepared by the Ministry of the Environment.

Table 2 summarizes the **Water Supply Guidelines** employed in the preparation of the water demand estimate for the proposed development.

Table 2
Water Supply Design Criteria

Design Parameter	Value
Townhouse	2.7 P/unit
Residential Average Daily Demand	350 L/d/P
Residential Maximum Daily Demand	3.0 x avg. day *
Residential Maximum Hourly	4.5 x max. day *
Minimum Watermain Size	150mm diameter
Minimum Depth of Cover	2.4m from top of watermain to finished grade
During normal operating conditions desired operating pressure is within	350kPa and 480kPa
During normal operating conditions pressure must not drop below	275kPa
During normal operating conditions pressure must not exceed	552kPa
During fire flow operating pressure must not drop below	140kPa
<i>*Daily average based on Appendix 4-A from Water Supply Guidelines</i> <i>** Residential Max. Daily and Max. Hourly peaking factors per MOE Guidelines for Drinking-Water Systems Table 3-3 for 0 to 500 persons.</i> <i>-Table updated to reflect ISD-2010-2</i>	

Table 3 summarizes the anticipated water supply demand and proposed boundary conditions. Boundary conditions for the subject site were extracted from the **MSS** for the nodes closest to the proposed connection points on Moses Tennisco Street.

Table 3
Water Demand and Boundary Conditions
Proposed Conditions

Design Parameter	Anticipated Demand ¹ (L/min)	Boundary Condition ² Connection 1 (m H ₂ O / kPa)		Boundary Condition ² Connection 2 (m H ₂ O / kPa)	
Average Daily Demand	84.8	54.0	529.4	52.4	514.1
Max Day	254.5	54.5	534.4	52.9	519.2
Max Day + Fire Flow	12,000 + 254.5	43.0	421.4	41.5	406.9
1) Water demand calculation per Water Supply Guidelines . See Appendix B for detailed calculations. 2) Boundary conditions per the MSS Connection 1 is to Moses Tennisco (Node 24 from MSS), Connection 2 is to Moses Tennisco / Mikinak (Node 10 from MSS)					

The **MSS** described only the Average Daily Demand, Max Day Demand and Max Day + Fire Flow scenarios. There is a proposed water demand increase, as the water demand estimated in the **MSS** was assuming the 2013 Water Master Plan, whereas, the water demand shown in **Table 3** was calculated in accordance with the **Water Supply Guideline**.

The increase in water demand is to be reviewed by IBI to ensure that no negative impacts arise from the additional demand.

Fire flow requirements are to be determined in accordance with Local Guidelines (**FUS**), City of Ottawa **Water Supply Guidelines**, and the Ontario Building Code.

Using the **FUS** method a conservative estimation of fire flow has been established. Based on information received from **Mattamy Homes**, the following assumptions were assumed for both Stacked Townhomes and standard Townhomes:

Type of construction – Non-Combustible Construction

Occupancy type – Non-Combustible

Sprinkler Protection – Non-Sprinklered

The above assumptions resulted in an estimated fire flow of approximately **12,000 L/min**; actual building materials selected will affect the estimated flow; see **Appendix B** for detailed FUS calculations.

3.3 Watermain Modeling

EPANet was utilized to determine pipe sizing and the availability of pressures throughout the system during Average Day demand, Max Day, and Max Day plus Fire Flow. The static model determines pressures based on the available head obtained from the boundary conditions from the **MSS**, as indicated in **Table 3**.

The model utilizes the Hazen-Williams equation to determine pressure drops, while the pipe properties, including friction factors, have been selected in accordance with Table 4.4 of the **Water Supply Guidelines**.

A summary of the resulting pressures at all nodes are summarized in **Table 4** below.

Table 4
Resulting Pressures Proposed Conditions

Node ID	Average Day (kPa)	Max Day (kPa)	Max Day + Fire Flow* (kPa)
2	548.1	548.1	422.0
4	534.6	534.6	387.4
6	523.1	525.0	375.1
17	541.6	541.6	392.1
20	539.6	539.6	324.9
21	529.8	529.8	312.6
FH2*	537.3	537.3	309.11
*The fire flow yielding the lowest pressure was found at fire hydrant 2, which was used in this analysis.			

The minimum and maximum pressures shown in **Table 4** fall within the allowable pressures described in **Table 2** during the Average Day and Max Day plus Fire Flow scenarios. Pressures during Average Day are at the high end of the allowable pressure. A pressure test should be conducted at the time of construction to determine if pressure reducing valves are required. Pressures during Max Day exceed the maximum allowable pressure, therefore pressure reducing valves are recommended.

The model predicted that water will flow in all areas of the system and no ‘dead’ zones were found.

3.4 Water Supply Conclusion

The boundary conditions at the site were determined from the **MSS**. As demonstrated by **Table 4**, the municipal system is capable of delivering water within the **Water Supply Guidelines** pressure range. Sufficient flow is available to provide fire protection for the site. Pressure reducing valves are recommended for the Max Day scenario.

The proposed water supply design conforms to all relevant City Guidelines and Policies.

4.0 WASTEWATER SERVICING

4.1 Existing Wastewater Services

The sanitary flow from the subject property has been considered in the wastewater design for the Wateridge Subdivision, outlined in the **MSS**. Block 24 was contemplated to drain a portion of flow to the 250mm sanitary sewer within Moses Tennisco Street and the other portion to drain to the 250mm sanitary sewer within Mikinak Road

The total wastewater flow from the **MSS** is summarized in **Table 5** below.

Table 5
Wastewater Flow per MSS – Total Site Area

Design Parameter	Total Flow (L/s)
Estimated Average Dry Weather Flow	1.47
Estimated Peak Dry Weather Flow	5.90
Estimated Peak Wet Weather Flow	6.35

As discussed above, only a portion of the site was allocated to drain to the Moses Tennisco sanitary sewer, summarized below.

Table 6
Wastewater Flow per MSS – To Moses Tennisco Street

Design Parameter	Total Flow (L/s)
Estimated Average Dry Weather Flow	1.02
Estimated Peak Dry Weather Flow	4.07
Estimated Peak Wet Weather Flow	4.29

Based on the sanitary design sheet prepared by IBI Group (dated January 25, 2017) there is **33.87 L/s** of available capacity within the Moses Tennisco Street sanitary sewer. Please refer to **Appendix C** for reduced copies of the IBI sanitary design sheet and drainage area map.

4.2 Wastewater Design

It is proposed that the development will connect to the 250 mm diameter sewer within the Moses Tennisco Street right-of-way.

Table 7 summarizes the **City Standards** employed in the design of the proposed wastewater sewer system.

Table 7
Wastewater Design Criteria

Design Parameter	Value
Townhouse	2.7 P/unit
Average Daily Demand - Residential	350 L/d/per
Peaking Factor	Harmon's Peaking Factor. 4.0
Infiltration and Inflow Allowance	0.28L/s/ha
Sanitary sewers are to be sized employing the Manning's Equation	$Q = \frac{1}{n} AR^{\frac{2}{3}} S^{\frac{1}{2}}$
Minimum Sewer Size	200mm diameter
Minimum Manning's 'n'	0.013
Minimum Depth of Cover	2.5m from crown of sewer to grade
Minimum Full Flowing Velocity	0.6m/s
Maximum Full Flowing Velocity	3.0m/s
<i>Extracted from Sections 4 and 6 of the City of Ottawa Sewer Design Guidelines, October 2012.</i>	

Table 8 demonstrates the anticipated peak flow from the proposed development. See **Appendix C** for associated calculations.

Table 8
Summary of Estimated Peak Wastewater Flow

Design Parameter	Total Flow (L/s)
Estimated Average Dry Weather Flow	1.41
Estimated Peak Dry Weather Flow	5.66
Estimated Peak Wet Weather Flow	6.11

The estimated sanitary flow, based on the site plan provided in **Drawings/Figures**, anticipates a peak wet weather flow of **6.11 L/s**.

The anticipated peak wastewater flow generated from the proposed development directed to the Moses Tennisco Street sewer has been estimated to be **6.11 L/s**; this results in a **1.82 L/s** increase from the **MSS**. Based on the capacity analysis completed for the downstream section of sanitary sewer, there is sufficient capacity to convey the increase in wastewater flow.

A sanitary calculation sheet was prepared showing the on-site and off-site capacity of the local sanitary sewers, see **Appendix C** for the calculation sheet and **SAN-1** for the sanitary drainage area drawing.

4.3 Wastewater Servicing Conclusions

The sanitary flow from the subject property has been considered in the wastewater design for the Wateridge Subdivision, outlined in the **MSS**.

The proposed development results in an estimated increase in wastewater flow contribution of **1.82 L/s** to the sanitary sewer within the Moses Tennisco right-of-way. Based on a capacity analysis of the sanitary sewer, there is sufficient capacity to convey the increase in sanitary flow.

The proposed wastewater design conforms to all relevant **City Standards**.

5.0 STORMWATER MANAGEMENT

5.1 Existing Stormwater Services

Minor and major flow from the subject site were accounted for in the Wateridge Subdivision, outlined in the **MSS**. It is proposed that minor system flow from the Block will be conveyed directly to the Eastern SWM Facility. Major flow is proposed to be directed to a dry pond to the south of Mikinak Road for quantity control, and will eventually be discharged through the minor system to the Eastern SWM Facility.

The **MSS** contemplated minor and major system drainage from Block 24 be split between Moses Tennisco Street and Mikinak Road. According to storm design sheets and drainage area maps prepared by IBI, there is **92.63 L/s** of available capacity within the Moses Tennisco storm sewer. Refer to **Appendix D** for a reduced copy of the storm design sheet and drainage area figures prepared by IBI for the Wateridge Subdivision.

Flows that influence the watershed in which the subject property is located are further reviewed by the principal authority. The subject property is located within the Ottawa River watershed, and is therefore subject to review by the Rideau Valley Conservation Authority (RVCA).

5.2 Post-development Stormwater Management Target

Stormwater management requirements for the proposed development were reviewed with the City of Ottawa, where the proposed development is required to:

- Follow quantity and quality controls outlined in the **MSS**
- Incorporate Low Impact Development measures in accordance with the **MSS** and **LID Demonstration Project**

5.3 Proposed Stormwater Management System

It is proposed that the stormwater from the development will be directed to the 750mm storm sewer within Michael Stoqua Street.

As discussed in **Section 5.1**, the quantity controls for Block 24 will be provided by the dry pond south of the subject site and through the Eastern SWM Facility outlined in the **MSS**.

The subject site was also accounted for in design of the permanent pool of the Eastern SWM Facility, which provides 80% TSS removal for the subdivision.

A storm design sheet was prepared to support the capacity of the internal and external storm sewers, refer to **Appendix D** for the calculation sheet and **SWM-1** for the drainage area figure. The overall Runoff Coefficient from the site is equal to that allocated in the **MSS** and therefore, no additional quantity or quality controls are required.

As shown in the design sheet, the storm sewer within Moses Tennisco Street has sufficient capacity to convey the 5-year flow from the subject site.

5.4 Low Impact Development (LID) Practices

LID measures are proposed in accordance with the **MSS** and **LID Demonstration Project**. It is proposed to direct all roof flow to side yard and bioswales, eventually draining to area drains. Area drains will collect and discharge clean roof flow to infiltration tanks and oversized perforated pipe systems. Refer to **Appendix D** for summary of the underground storage tanks and refer to drawing **SSP-1** for the location of proposed LID practices.

All LID measures are designed to infiltrate an equivalent of the 4mm event over the site area and each LID measure must treat the minimum of the 15mm event. A total infiltration requirement of 4mm or **64.0m³** and a total treatment volume of the 15mm event, or **111.4m³** is required as per the **LID Demonstration Project**. The current underground storage and perforated pipe system provides **227.3m³** of volume to be infiltrated, exceeding the above noted requirements.

Details of the LID practices are shown on **DS-1**.

5.5 Stormwater Servicing Conclusions

Minor and major system flow from Block 24 were accounted for in the subdivision design. Quantity and quality controls are provided through a dry stormwater pond to the south and the Eastern SWM Facility to the north.

Sufficient capacity is available in the adjacent storm sewers to convey the 5-year storm event from the subject site.

LID practices in the form of underground storage tanks and oversized perforated pipes are proposed to infiltrate roof runoff from the site in accordance with the **LID Demonstration Project**

The proposed stormwater design conforms to all relevant **City Standards** and Policies.

6.0 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

David Schaeffer Engineering Ltd. (DSEL) has been retained to prepare a Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management for the proposed development for Block 24 of the former CFB Rockcliffe lands, which are currently under re-development. The preceding report outlines the following:

- Based on boundary conditions from the **MSS** and a water distribution model completed for the site, sufficient pressure exists to support the development.
- Based on estimated fire flow per the **FUS**, there is sufficient pressure within the local system to provide the required fire flow.
- The proposed development is anticipated to have a peak wet weather flow of **6.11 L/s**; the adjacent sanitary sewer has capacity to convey the increase in flow
- The quantity and quality controls are provided for the site through a dry pond to the south of the site and the Eastern SWM Facility outlined in the **MSS**
- LID practices include underground storage tanks and oversized perforated pipes to infiltrate roof runoff and meet criteria outlined in the **LID Demonstration Project**

Prepared by,
David Schaeffer Engineering Ltd.

Reviewed by,
David Schaeffer Engineering Ltd.



Per: Steven L. Merrick, P.Eng

Per: Adam D. Fobert, P. Eng.

© DSEL
z:\projects\17-918_mattamy_rockcliffe\b_design\b3_reports\b3-2_servicing (dsel)\949 - block 24\fsr_2017-08-09_949_slm.docx

APPENDIX A

Pre-Consultation

DEVELOPMENT SERVICING STUDY CHECKLIST

17-948

08/08/2017

4.1 General Content		
☐	Executive Summary (for larger reports only).	N/A
☒	Date and revision number of the report.	Report Cover Sheet
☒	Location map and plan showing municipal address, boundary, and layout of proposed development.	Drawings/Figures
☒	Plan showing the site and location of all existing services.	Figure 1
☒	Development statistics, land use, density, adherence to zoning and official plan, and reference to applicable subwatershed and watershed plans that provide context to applicable subwatershed and watershed plans that provide context to which individual developments must adhere.	Section 1.0
☒	Summary of Pre-consultation Meetings with City and other approval agencies.	Section 1.3
☒	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 defensible design criteria.	Section 2.1
☒	Statement of objectives and servicing criteria.	Section 1.0
☒	Identification of existing and proposed infrastructure available in the immediate area.	Sections 3.1, 4.1, 5.1
☐	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.	N/A
☐	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.	Section 1.4
☒	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	N/A
4.2 Development Servicing Report: Water		
☐	Confirm consistency with Master Servicing Study, if available	N/A
☒	Availability of public infrastructure to service proposed development	Section 1.1
☒	Identification of system constraints	Section 3.1
☒	Identify boundary conditions	Section 3.1, 3.2
☒	Confirmation of adequate domestic supply and pressure	Section 3.3

☒	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.	Section 3.2
☐	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.	N/A
☐	Definition of phasing constraints. Hydraulic modeling 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 shut-off valves	N/A
☐	Check on the necessity of a pressure zone boundary modification	N/A
☒	Reference to water supply analysis to show that major infrastructure is capable of delivering 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	Section 3.2, 3.3
☐	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.	N/A
☐	Description of off-site required feeder mains, 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.	Section 3.2
☐	Provision of a model schematic showing the boundary conditions locations, streets, parcels, and building locations for reference.	N/A

4.3 Development Servicing Report: Wastewater

☒	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).	Section 4.2
☐	Confirm consistency with Master Servicing Study and/or justifications for deviations.	N/A
☐	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.	Section 4.1
☒	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)	Section 4.2
☒	Calculations related to dry-weather and wet-weather flow rates from the development in standard MOE sanitary sewer design table (Appendix 'C') format.	Section 4.2, Appendix C
☒	Description of proposed sewer network including sewers, pumping stations, and forcemains.	Section 4.2
☐	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 Development Servicing Report: Stormwater Checklist

☒	Description of drainage outlets and downstream constraints including legality of outlets (i.e. municipal drain, right-of-way, watercourse, or private property)	Section 5.1
☒	Analysis of available capacity in existing public infrastructure.	Section 5.1, Appendix D
☒	A drawing showing the subject lands, its surroundings, the receiving watercourse, existing drainage patterns, and proposed drainage pattern.	Drawings/Figures
☒	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.	Section 5.2
☒	Water Quality control objective (basic, normal or enhanced level of protection based on the sensitivities of the receiving watercourse) and storage requirements.	Section 5.2
☒	Description of the stormwater management concept with facility locations and descriptions with references and supporting information	Section 5.3
☐	Set-back 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.	Appendix A
☐	Confirm consistency with sub-watershed and Master Servicing Study, if applicable study exists.	N/A
☒	Storage requirements (complete with calculations) and conveyance capacity for minor events (1:5 year return period) and major events (1:100 year return period).	Section 5.3
☐	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.	Section 5.1, 5.3
☐	Any proposed diversion of drainage catchment areas from one outlet to another.	N/A
☐	Proposed minor and major systems including locations and sizes of stormwater trunk sewers, and stormwater management facilities.	N/A
☐	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.	N/A
☐	Identification of potential impacts to receiving watercourses	N/A
☐	Identification of municipal drains and related approval requirements.	N/A

☒	Descriptions of how the conveyance and storage capacity will be achieved for the development.	Section 5.3
☐	100 year flood levels and major flow routing to protect proposed development from flooding for establishing minimum building elevations (MBE) and overall grading.	N/A
☐	Inclusion of hydraulic analysis including hydraulic grade line elevations.	N/A
☒	Description of approach to erosion and sediment control during construction for the protection of receiving watercourse or drainage corridors.	N/A
☐	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 investigation.	N/A

4.5 Approval and Permit Requirements: Checklist

☒	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 ct. 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.	Section 1.2
☐	Application for Certificate of Approval (CofA) under the Ontario Water Resources Act.	N/A
☐	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

☒	Clearly stated conclusions and recommendations	Section 7.0
☐	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.	
☐	All draft and final reports shall be signed and stamped by a professional Engineer registered in Ontario	

APPENDIX B

Water Supply

Ogilvie Rd.
Backup P.S.


FOREST RIDGE P.S.

ORLEANS RES.

MONTREAL ROAD P.S.

BRITTANY DRIVE P.S.

REET P.S.



Water Demand Design Flows per Unit Count
City of Ottawa - Water Distribution Guidelines, July 2010



Domestic Demand

Type of Housing	Per / Unit	Units	Pop							
Single Family	3.4		0							
Semi-detached	2.7		0							
Townhouse	2.3	158	364							
Apartment			0							
Bachelor	1.4		0							
1 Bedroom	1.4		0							
2 Bedroom	2.1		0							
3 Bedroom	3.1		0							
Average	1.8		0							
				Pop	Avg. Daily		Max Day		Peak Hour	
					m ³ /d	L/min	m ³ /d	L/min	m ³ /d	L/min
Total Domestic Demand				364	72.1	50.1	216.2	150.2	324.3	225.2

Institutional / Commercial / Industrial Demand

Property Type	Unit Rate	Units	Avg. Daily		Max Day		Peak Hour	
			m ³ /d	L/min	m ³ /d	L/min	m ³ /d	L/min
Commercial floor space	2.5 L/m ² /d		0.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Office	75 L/9.3m ² /d		0.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Industrial - Light	35,000 L/gross ha/d		0.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Industrial - Heavy	55,000 L/gross ha/d		0.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total I/CI Demand			0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Demand			72.1	50.1	216.2	150.2	324.3	225.2

Water Demand Design Flows per Unit Count
City of Ottawa - Water Distribution Guidelines, July 2010



Domestic Demand

Type of Housing	Per / Unit	Units	Pop							
Single Family	3.4		0							
Semi-detached	2.7		0							
Townhouse	2.7	129	349							
Apartment			0							
Bachelor	1.4		0							
1 Bedroom	1.4		0							
2 Bedroom	2.1		0							
3 Bedroom	3.1		0							
Average	1.8		0							
				Pop	Avg. Daily		Max Day		Peak Hour	
					m³/d	L/min	m³/d	L/min	m³/d	L/min
Total Domestic Demand				349	122.2	84.8	366.5	254.5	549.7	381.7

Institutional / Commercial / Industrial Demand

Property Type	Unit Rate	Units	Avg. Daily		Max Day		Peak Hour	
			m ³ /d	L/min	m ³ /d	L/min	m ³ /d	L/min
Commercial floor space	2.5 L/m ² /d		0.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Office	75 L/9.3m ² /d		0.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Industrial - Light	35,000 L/gross ha/d		0.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Industrial - Heavy	55,000 L/gross ha/d		0.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total I/CI Demand			0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Demand			122.2	84.8	366.5	254.5	549.7	381.7

Fire Flow Estimation per Fire Underwriters Survey

Water Supply For Public Fire Protection - 1999



Fire Flow Required

1. Base Requirement

$$F = 220C\sqrt{A} \text{ L/min} \quad \text{Where } F \text{ is the fire flow, } C \text{ is the Type of construction and } A \text{ is the Total floor area}$$

Type of Construction: Ordinary Construction

C 1 Type of Construction Coefficient per FUS Part II, Section 1
A 1683.9 m² Total floor area based on FUS Part II section 1

Fire Flow	9027.8 L/min
	9000.0 L/min rounded to the nearest 1,000 L/min

Adjustments

2. Reduction for Occupancy Type

Limited Combustible -15%

Fire Flow	7650.0 L/min
-----------	--------------

3. Reduction for Sprinkler Protection

Non-Sprinklered 0%

Reduction	0 L/min
-----------	---------

4. Increase for Separation Distance

N 10.1m-20m 15%
S 30.1m-45m 5%
E 10.1m-20m 15%
W 20.1m-30m 10%

% Increase 45% value not to exceed 75% per FUS Part II, Section 4

Increase	3442.5 L/min
----------	--------------

Total Fire Flow

Fire Flow	11092.5 L/min	fire flow not to exceed 45,000 L/min nor be less than 2,000 L/min per FUS Section 4
	11000.0 L/min	rounded to the nearest 1,000 L/min

Notes:

- Type of construction, Occupancy Type and Sprinkler Protection information provided by _____.
- Calculations based on Fire Underwriters Survey - Part II

Fire Flow Estimation per Fire Underwriters Survey

Water Supply For Public Fire Protection - 1999



Fire Flow Required

1. Base Requirement

$$F = 220C\sqrt{A} \text{ L/min} \quad \text{Where } F \text{ is the fire flow, } C \text{ is the Type of construction and } A \text{ is the Total floor area}$$

Type of Construction: Ordinary Construction

C 1 Type of Construction Coefficient per FUS Part II, Section 1
A 1492.2 m² Total floor area based on FUS Part II section 1

Fire Flow	8498.4 L/min
	8000.0 L/min rounded to the nearest 1,000 L/min

Adjustments

2. Reduction for Occupancy Type

Limited Combustible -15%

Fire Flow	6800.0 L/min
-----------	--------------

3. Reduction for Sprinkler Protection

Non-Sprinklered 0%

Reduction	0 L/min
-----------	---------

4. Increase for Separation Distance

N 10.1m-20m 15%
S 3.1m-10m 20%
E 10.1m-20m 15%
W 3.1m-10m 20%

% Increase 70% value not to exceed 75% per FUS Part II, Section 4

Increase	4760.0 L/min
----------	--------------

Total Fire Flow

Fire Flow	11560.0 L/min	fire flow not to exceed 45,000 L/min nor be less than 2,000 L/min per FUS Section 4
	12000.0 L/min	rounded to the nearest 1,000 L/min

Notes:

- Type of construction, Occupancy Type and Sprinkler Protection information provided by _____.
- Calculations based on Fire Underwriters Survey - Part II

Fire Flow Estimation per Fire Underwriters Survey

Water Supply For Public Fire Protection - 1999



Fire Flow Required

1. Base Requirement

$$F = 220C\sqrt{A} \text{ L/min} \quad \text{Where } F \text{ is the fire flow, } C \text{ is the Type of construction and } A \text{ is the Total floor area}$$

Type of Construction: Ordinary Construction

C 1 Type of Construction Coefficient per FUS Part II, Section 1
A 1722.0 m² Total floor area based on FUS Part II section 1

Fire Flow	9129.3 L/min
	9000.0 L/min rounded to the nearest 1,000 L/min

Adjustments

2. Reduction for Occupancy Type

Limited Combustible -15%

Fire Flow	7650.0 L/min
-----------	--------------

3. Reduction for Sprinkler Protection

Non-Sprinklered 0%

Reduction	0 L/min
-----------	---------

4. Increase for Separation Distance

N 10.1m-20m 15%
S 3.1m-10m 20%
E 10.1m-20m 15%
W 30.1m-45m 5%

% Increase 55% value not to exceed 75% per FUS Part II, Section 4

Increase	4207.5 L/min
----------	--------------


Total Fire Flow

Fire Flow	11857.5 L/min	fire flow not to exceed 45,000 L/min nor be less than 2,000 L/min per FUS Section 4
	12000.0 L/min	rounded to the nearest 1,000 L/min

Notes:

- Type of construction, Occupancy Type and Sprinkler Protection information provided by _____.
- Calculations based on Fire Underwriters Survey - Part II


AVERAGE DAY – BLOCK 24



AVG DAY 144.1m
PEAK HOUR 144.6m
MAX DAY PLUS FF 133.1m

MAX DAY = AVG DAY X 3.0

AVG DAY 141.9m
PEAK HOUR 142.4m
MAX DAY PLUS FF 131.0m



```

*****
*                               E P A N E T                               *
*                               Hydraulic and Water Quality                 *
*                               Analysis for Pipe Networks                   *
*                               Version 2.0                                *
*****

```

AVERAGE DAY-BLOCK 24

Link - Node Table:

Link ID	Start Node	End Node	Length m	Diameter mm
5	4	6	45.9	50
6	2	23	31.5	200
8	23	4	21.4	100
9	2	17	85.5	200
10	16	17	27.3	200
11	17	18	33.7	200
12	18	FH2	4.5	200
13	18	20	19.1	100
14	20	21	43.9	50
15	20	4	85.5	100
21	23	FH1	4.7	200
1	1	2	27.3	200

Node Results:

Node ID	Demand LPM	Head m	Pressure m	Quality
2	14.13	143.50	55.87	0.00
4	14.13	143.28	54.50	0.00
6	14.13	143.24	53.52	0.00
17	14.13	142.46	55.21	0.00
18	0.00	142.47	55.02	0.00
FH2	0.00	142.47	54.77	0.00
20	14.13	142.60	55.00	0.00
21	14.13	142.56	54.01	0.00
FH1	0.00	143.49	55.37	0.00
23	0.00	143.49	55.87	0.00
1	-2596.38	144.10	0.00	0.00 Reservoir
16	2511.60	141.90	0.00	0.00 Reservoir

Average Day




Page 2

Link Results:

Link ID	Flow LPM	Velocity m/s	Unit Headloss m/km	Status
5	14.13	0.12	0.89	Open
6	308.88	0.16	0.29	Open
8	308.88	0.66	9.88	Open
9	2273.38	1.21	12.19	Open
10	-2511.60	1.33	20.53	Open
11	-252.36	0.13	0.20	Open
12	0.00	0.00	0.00	Open
13	-252.36	0.54	6.84	Open
14	14.13	0.12	0.89	Open
15	-280.62	0.60	8.00	Open
21	0.00	0.00	0.00	Open
1	2596.38	1.38	21.87	Open

Average Day

MAX DAY – BLOCK 24



```

*****
*                               *
*               E P A N E T      *
*      Hydraulic and Water Quality *
*      Analysis for Pipe Networks  *
*               Version 2.0       *
*****

```

MAX DAY-BLOCK 24

Link - Node Table:

Link ID	Start Node	End Node	Length m	Diameter mm
5	4	6	45.9	50
6	2	23	31.5	200
8	23	4	21.4	100
9	2	17	85.5	200
10	16	17	27.3	200
11	17	18	33.7	200
12	18	FH2	4.5	200
13	18	20	19.1	100
14	20	21	43.9	50
15	20	4	85.5	100
21	23	FH1	4.7	200
1	1	2	27.3	200

Node Results:

Node ID	Demand LPM	Head m	Pressure m	Quality
2	42.39	143.97	56.34	0.00
4	42.39	143.67	54.89	0.00
6	42.39	143.36	53.64	0.00
17	42.39	142.92	55.67	0.00
18	0.00	142.93	55.48	0.00
FH2	0.00	142.93	55.23	0.00
20	42.39	143.01	55.41	0.00
21	42.39	142.71	54.16	0.00
FH1	0.00	143.95	55.83	0.00
23	0.00	143.95	56.33	0.00
1	-2677.78	144.60	0.00	0.00 Reservoir
16	2423.44	142.40	0.00	0.00 Reservoir

Average Day




Page 2

Link Results:

Link ID	Flow LPM	VelocityUnit m/s	Headloss m/km	Status
5	42.39	0.36	6.78	Open
6	361.20	0.19	0.39	Open
8	361.20	0.77	13.22	Open
9	2274.19	1.21	12.20	Open
10	-2423.44	1.29	19.18	Open
11	-191.64	0.10	0.12	Open
12	0.00	0.00	0.00	Open
13	-191.64	0.41	4.09	Open
14	42.39	0.36	6.79	Open
15	-276.42	0.59	7.78	Open
21	0.00	0.00	0.00	Open
1	2677.78	1.42	23.20	Open

Average Day


MAX DAY + FIRE FLOW – BLOCK 24



AVG DAY 144.1m
PEAK HOUR 144.6m
MAX DAY PLUS FF 133.1m

MAX DAY = AVG DAY X 3.0

AVG DAY 141.9m
PEAK HOUR 142.4m
MAX DAY PLUS FF 131.0m



 * E P A N E T *
 * Hydraulic and Water Quality *
 * Analysis for Pipe Networks *
 * Version 2.0 *

MAX DAY PLUS FF-BLOCK 24

Link - Node Table:

Link ID	Start Node	End Node	Length m	Diameter mm
5	4	6	45.9	50
6	2	23	31.5	200
8	23	4	21.4	100
9	2	17	85.5	200
10	16	17	27.3	200
11	17	18	33.7	200
12	18	FH2	4.5	200
13	18	20	19.1	100
14	20	21	43.9	50
15	20	4	85.5	100
21	23	FH1	4.7	200
1	1	2	27.3	200

Node Results:

Node ID	Demand LPM	Head m	Pressure m	Quality
2	42.39	130.65	43.02	0.00
4	42.39	128.27	39.49	0.00
6	42.39	127.96	38.24	0.00
17	42.39	127.22	39.97	0.00
18	12000.00	119.21	31.76	0.00
FH2	0.00	119.21	31.51	0.00
20	42.39	120.72	33.12	0.00
21	42.39	120.42	31.87	0.00
FH1	0.00	130.55	42.43	0.00
23	0.00	130.55	42.93	0.00
1	-5437.84	133.10	0.00	0.00 Reservoir
16	-6816.50	131.00	0.00	0.00 Reservoir

Average Day



Page 2

Link Results:

Link ID	Flow LPM	Velocity m/s	Unit Headloss m/km	Status
5	42.39	0.36	6.78	Open
6	1104.77	0.59	3.19	Open
8	1104.77	2.34	106.42	Open
9	4290.69	2.28	40.09	Open
10	6816.50	3.62	138.49	Open
11	11064.80	5.87	237.69	Open
12	0.00	0.00	0.00	Open
13	-935.21	1.98	78.88	Open
14	42.39	0.36	6.79	Open
15	-1019.99	2.16	88.34	Open
21	0.00	0.00	0.00	Open
1	5437.84	2.88	89.86	Open

Average Day

APPENDIX C

Wastewater Collection





Diagram illustrating the components of a catchment area symbol:

- AREA NUMBER (210A)
- POPULATION (0.50/52.5)
- AREA IN HECTARES
- POTENTIAL DRAINAGE DIRECTION (indicated by a blue arrow)



 **CANADA LANDS COMPANY**
SOCIÉTÉ IMMOBILIÈRE DU CANADA

30 Metcalfe Street Suite 601
Ottawa, On K1P 5L4
613 998 7777

Project Title

**WATERIDGE VILLAGE
AT ROCKCLIFFE**

PHASE 1B

Drawing Title

**SANITARY DRAINAGE
AREA PLAN**

Scale 1 : 2000

Design J.I.M.	Date MAY 2016
Drawn M.M.	Checked J.I.M.
Project No. 38298	Drawing No. 501A

D07-16-15-0003



IBI GROUP
400-333 Preston Street
Ottawa, Ontario K1S 5N4 Canada
tel 613 225 1311 fax 613 225 9868
ibigroup.com

SANITARY SEWER DESIGN SHEET

Former CFB Rockcliffe
City of Ottawa
Canada Lands Company

LOCATION				RESIDENTIAL										ICI AREAS								INFILTRATION ALLOWANCE			FIXED FLOW (L/s)	TOTAL FLOW (L/s)	PROPOSED SEWER DESIGN						
STREET	AREA ID	FROM MH	TO MH	AREA Phase 1B (Ha)	UNIT TYPES				AREA EXTERNAL (Ha)	POPULATION		PEAK FACTOR	PEAK FLOW (L/s)	INSTITUTIONAL		AREA (Ha)		INDUSTRIAL	PEAK FLOW (L/s)	AREA (Ha)		FLOW (L/s)	CAPACITY (L/s)	LENGTH (m)			DIA (mm)	SLOPE (%)	VELOCITY (full) (m/s)	AVAILABLE CAPACITY			
					SF	SD	TH	APT		IND	CUM			IND	CUM	IND	CUM			IND	CUM									IND	CUM	L/s	(%)
Phase 1B																																	
Hemlock Road	201A	MH201A	MH202A	0.31						0.0	0.0	4.00	0.00		0.00		0.00		0.00	0.00	0.31	0.31	0.09	0.00	0.09	50.02	87.06	250	0.65	0.987	49.93	99.83%	
Future Street No. 6	EX202A	BULK202AN	MH202A						2.08	358.5	358.5	4.00	5.81		0.00		0.00		0.00	0.00	2.08	2.08	0.58	0.00	6.39	31.02	21.00	250	0.25	0.612	24.63	79.40%	
Hemlock Road	202A	MH202A	MH203A	0.21						0.0	358.5	4.00	5.81		0.00		0.00		0.00	0.00	0.21	2.60	0.73	0.00	6.54	75.98	86.00	250	1.50	1.500	69.44	91.40%	
Future Street No. 5	EX203A	BULK203AN	MH203A						1.40	160.5	160.5	4.00	2.60		0.00		0.00		0.00	0.00	1.40	1.40	0.39	0.00	2.99	83.23	21.00	250	1.80	1.643	80.24	96.40%	
Hemlock Road	203A, EXPARK2	MH203A	MH204A	0.20					0.44	0.0	0.0	4.00	0.00		0.00		0.00		0.00	0.00	0.64	0.64	0.18	0.00	0.18	82.07	86.00	250	1.75	1.620	81.89	99.78%	
rue Moses Tennisco Street	EX204A	BULK204AN	MH204A						1.39	153.5	153.5	4.00	2.49		0.00		0.00		0.00	0.00	1.39	1.39	0.39	0.00	2.88	83.23	21.00	250	1.80	1.643	80.36	96.54%	
Hemlock Road	204A	MH204A	MH205A	0.21						0.0	153.5	4.00	2.49		0.00		0.00		0.00	0.00	0.21	1.60	0.45	0.00	2.94	67.96	90.00	250	1.20	1.341	65.02	95.68%	
rue Michael Stoqua Street	EX205A	BULK205AN	MH205A						1.38	241.5	241.5	4.00	3.91		0.00		0.00		0.00	0.00	1.38	1.38	0.39	0.00	4.30	67.96	21.00	250	1.20	1.341	63.66	93.67%	
Hemlock Road	205A	MH205A	MH206A	0.25						0.0	395.0	4.00	6.40		0.00		0.00		0.00	0.00	0.25	3.23	0.90	0.00	7.30	31.02	112.00	250	0.25	0.612	23.71	76.45%	
rue Bareille-Snow Street	EX206A-B	BULK206AN	MH206A						9.61	1755.0	1755.0	3.63	25.80		0.00		0.00		0.00	0.00	9.61	9.61	2.69	0.00	28.49	87.74	21.00	250	2.00	1.731	59.24	67.52%	
Hemlock Road	206A	MH206A	MH207A	0.20						0.0	2150.0	3.56	31.02		0.00		0.00		0.00	0.00	0.20	13.04	3.65	0.00	34.67	55.26	89.33	300	0.30	0.757	20.59	37.26%	
Block 20	PARK1	MH207AN	MH207A	0.32						0.0	0.0	4.00	0.00		0.00		0.00		0.00	0.00	0.32	0.32	0.09	0.00	0.09	39.24	14.00	250	0.40	0.774	39.15	99.77%	
Hemlock Road	PARK1, 207A	MH207A	BULK176AE	0.12						0.0	2150.0	3.56	31.02		0.00		0.00		0.00	0.00	0.12	13.48	3.77	0.00	34.79	65.38	33.16	300	0.42	0.896	30.59	46.79%	
Phase 1A																																	
Hemlock Road		BULK176AE	MH176A							0.0	2150.0	3.56	31.02		0.00		0.00		0.00	0.00	0.00	13.48	3.77	0.00	34.79	65.38	21.97	300	0.42	0.896	30.59	46.79%	
Phase 1B																																	
chemin Wanaki Road	200A, COM1	MH200A	MH214A	0.25						0.0	0.0	4.00	0.00		0.00	0.90	0.90		0.00	0.78	1.15	1.15	0.32	0.00	1.10	73.41	98.28	250	1.40	1.449	72.30	98.50%	
chemin Wanaki Road	214A, COM2	MH214A	BULK153AN	0.16						0.0	0.0	4.00	0.00		0.00	0.65	1.55		0.00	1.35	0.81	1.96	0.55	0.00	1.89	51.91	44.22	250	0.70	1.024	50.01	96.35%	
Phase 1B																																	
chemin Wanaki Road	143B	BULK143AE	MH143A	0.31						104.0	104.0	4.00	1.69		0.00		0.00		0.00	0.00	0.31	0.31	0.09	0.00	1.77	43.87	21.50	250	0.50	0.866	42.10	95.96%	
chemin Wanaki Road	143A	MH143A	MH144A	0.27						0.0	104.0	4.00	1.69		0.00		0.00		0.00	0.00	0.27	0.58	0.16	0.00	1.85	87.74	47.73	250	2.00	1.731	85.89	97.89%	
chemin Wanaki Road	144A, 144B	MH144A	MH145A	0.72						0.0	104.0	4.00	1.69		0.00		0.00		0.00	0.00	0.72	1.30	0.36	0.00	2.05	87.74	40.57	250	2.00	1.731	85.69	97.66%	
chemin Wanaki Road	145A, 145B, 145C	MH145A	MH146A	2.77						835.6	939.6	3.82	14.53		0.00		0.00		0.00	0.00	2.77	4.07	1.14	0.00	15.67	107.45	53.01	250	3.00	2.121	91.79	85.42%	
chemin Wanaki Road	146A	MH146A	MH147A	0.14						0.0	939.6	3.82	14.53		0.00		0.00		0.00	0.00	0.14	4.21	1.18	0.00	15.71	43.54	37.48	250	1.00	1.224	27.83	63.92%	
chemin Wanaki Road	PARK2	BLK147AE	MH147A	0.55						0.0	0.0	4.00	0.00		0.00		0.00		0.00	0.00	0.55	0.55	0.15	0.00	0.15	39.24	17.66	250	0.40	0.774	39.08	99.61%	
chemin Wanaki Road	147C	BLK147AW	MH147A	0.10						33.6	33.6	4.00	0.54		0.00		0.00		0.00	0.00	0.10	0.10	0.03	0.00	0.57	43.87	17.33	250	0.50	0.866	43.30	98.70%	
chemin Wanaki Road	147A	MH147A	MH170A	0.03						0.0	973.2	3.81	15.01		0.00		0.00		0.00	0.00	0.03	4.89	1.37	0.00	16.38	31.02	10.23	250	0.25	0.612	14.64	47.19%	
chemin Wanaki Road	147B	MH107A	MH147C	0.16						0.0	973.2	3.81	15.01		0.00		0.00		0.00	0.00	0.16	5.05	1.41	0.00	16.42	31.02	39.00	250	0.25	0.612	14.59	47.05%	
chemin Wanaki Road		MH147C	BLK148AW							0.0	973.2	3.81	15.01		0.00		0.00		0.00	0.00	0.00	5.05	1.41	0.00	16.42	31.02	11.77	250	0.25	0.612	14.59	47.05%	
Phase 1B																																	
Block 9	154A	MH158A	MH217A	0.19						0.0	973.2	3.81	15.01		2.62		3.83		0.00	5.60	0.19	12.94	3.62	0.00	24.23	53.37	171.95	250	0.74	1.053	29.13	54.59%	
croissant Squadron Crescent	215Aa-b	MH215A	MH216A	0.79	3	4				117.8	117.8	4.00	1.91		0.00		0.00		0.00	0.00	0.79	0.79	0.22	0.00	2.13	50.02	80.00	250	0.65	0.987	47.89	95.74%	
croissant Squadron Crescent	216Aa-b	MH216A	MH217A	0.67	2	6				94.5	212.3	4.00	3.44																				



Former CFB Rockcliffe
City of Ottawa
Canada Lands Company

1/25/2017 9:11 AM

Wastewater Design Flows per Unit Count
City of Ottawa Sewer Design Guidelines, 2012



Site Area 0.805 ha

Extraneous Flow Allowances

Infiltration / Inflow 0.23 L/s

Domestic Contributions

Unit Type	Unit Rate	Units	Pop
Single Family	3.4		0
Semi-detached and duplex	2.7		0
Townhouse	2.3	109	251
Apartment			
Bachelor	1.4		0
1 Bedroom	1.4		0
2 Bedroom	2.1		0
3 Bedroom	3.1		0
Average	1.8		0

Total Pop 251

Average Domestic Flow 1.02 L/s

Peaking Factor 4.00

Peak Domestic Flow 4.07 L/s

Institutional / Commercial / Industrial Contributions

Property Type	Unit Rate	No. of Units	Avg Wastewater (L/s)
Commercial floor space*	5 L/m ² /d		0.00
Hospitals	900 L/bed/d		0.00
School	70 L/student/d		0.00
Industrial - Light**	35,000 L/gross ha/d		0.00
Industrial - Heavy**	55,000 L/gross ha/d		0.00

Average I/C/I Flow 0.00

Peak Institutional / Commercial Flow 0.00

Peak Industrial Flow** 0.00

Peak I/C/I Flow 0.00

* assuming a 12 hour commercial operation

** peak industrial flow per City of Ottawa Sewer Design Guidelines Appendix 4B

Total Estimated Average Dry Weather Flow Rate	1.02 L/s
Total Estimated Peak Dry Weather Flow Rate	4.07 L/s
Total Estimated Peak Wet Weather Flow Rate	4.29 L/s

Wastewater Design Flows per Unit Count
City of Ottawa Sewer Design Guidelines, 2012



Site Area 1.610 ha

Extraneous Flow Allowances

Infiltration / Inflow 0.45 L/s

Domestic Contributions

Unit Type	Unit Rate	Units	Pop
Single Family	3.4		0
Semi-detached and duplex	2.7		0
Townhouse	2.3	158	364
Apartment			
Bachelor	1.4		0
1 Bedroom	1.4		0
2 Bedroom	2.1		0
3 Bedroom	3.1		0
Average	1.8		0

Total Pop 364

Average Domestic Flow 1.47 L/s

Peaking Factor 4.00

Peak Domestic Flow 5.90 L/s

Institutional / Commercial / Industrial Contributions

Property Type	Unit Rate	No. of Units	Avg Wastewater (L/s)
Commercial floor space*	5 L/m ² /d		0.00
Hospitals	900 L/bed/d		0.00
School	70 L/student/d		0.00
Industrial - Light**	35,000 L/gross ha/d		0.00
Industrial - Heavy**	55,000 L/gross ha/d		0.00

Average I/C/I Flow 0.00

Peak Institutional / Commercial Flow 0.00

Peak Industrial Flow** 0.00

Peak I/C/I Flow 0.00

* assuming a 12 hour commercial operation

** peak industrial flow per City of Ottawa Sewer Design Guidelines Appendix 4B

Total Estimated Average Dry Weather Flow Rate	1.47 L/s
Total Estimated Peak Dry Weather Flow Rate	5.90 L/s
Total Estimated Peak Wet Weather Flow Rate	6.35 L/s

Wastewater Design Flows per Unit Count
City of Ottawa Sewer Design Guidelines, 2012



Site Area 1.610 ha

Extraneous Flow Allowances

Infiltration / Inflow 0.45 L/s

Domestic Contributions

Unit Type	Unit Rate	Units	Pop
Single Family	3.4		0
Semi-detached and duplex	2.7		0
Townhouse	2.7	129	349
Apartment			
Bachelor	1.4		0
1 Bedroom	1.4		0
2 Bedroom	2.1		0
3 Bedroom	3.1		0
Average	1.8		0

Total Pop 349

Average Domestic Flow 1.41 L/s

Peaking Factor 4.00

Peak Domestic Flow 5.66 L/s

Institutional / Commercial / Industrial Contributions

Property Type	Unit Rate	No. of Units	Avg Wastewater (L/s)
Commercial floor space*	5 L/m ² /d		0.00
Hospitals	900 L/bed/d		0.00
School	70 L/student/d		0.00
Industrial - Light**	35,000 L/gross ha/d		0.00
Industrial - Heavy**	55,000 L/gross ha/d		0.00

Average I/C/I Flow 0.00

Peak Institutional / Commercial Flow 0.00

Peak Industrial Flow** 0.00

Peak I/C/I Flow 0.00

* assuming a 12 hour commercial operation

** peak industrial flow per City of Ottawa Sewer Design Guidelines Appendix 4B

Total Estimated Average Dry Weather Flow Rate	1.41 L/s
Total Estimated Peak Dry Weather Flow Rate	5.66 L/s
Total Estimated Peak Wet Weather Flow Rate	6.11 L/s

SANITARY SEWER CALCULATION SHEET

PROJECT: Mattamy - Wateridge
LOCATION: Block 24
FILE REF: 17-949
DATE: 8-Aug-17

DESIGN PARAMETERS

Avg. Daily Flow Res. 350 L/p/d
Avg. Daily Flow Comm. 50,000 L/ha/d
Avg. Daily Flow Instit. 50,000 L/ha/d
Avg. Daily Flow Indust. 35,000 L/ha/d

Peak Fact Res. Per Harmons: Min = 2.0, Max =4.0
Peak Fact. Comm. 1.5
Peak Fact. Instit. 1.5
Peak Fact. Indust. per MOE graph

Infiltration / Inflow 0.28 L/s/ha
Min. Pipe Velocity 0.60 m/s full flowing
Max. Pipe Velocity 3.00 m/s full flowing
Mannings N 0.013



Location			Residential Area and Population							Commercial		Institutional		Industrial		Q _{CHH}	Infiltration			Total Flow	Pipe Data							
Area ID	Up	Down	Area	Proposed Units	Pop.	Cumulative Area	Peak. Pop.	Peak. Fact.	Q _{res}	Area	Accu. Area	Area	Accu. Area	Area	Accu. Area		Total Area	Accu. Area	Infiltration Flow		DIA	Slope	Length	A _{hydraulic}	R	Velocity	Q _{cap}	Q / Q full
			(ha)			(ha)		(-)	(L/s)	(ha)	(ha)	(ha)	(ha)	(ha)	(ha)	(L/s)	(ha)	(ha)	(L/s)	(mm)	(%)	(m)	(m ²)	(m)	(m/s)	(L/s)	(-)	
On site																												
SAN-6	6	7	0.124	8	22.0	0.124	22.0	4.00	0.36		0.00		0.00		0.00	0.0	0.124	0.124	0.035	0.39	250	1.00	44.4	0.049	0.063	1.21	59.5	0.01
SAN-7b	7	4	0.558	61	165.0	0.682	187.0	4.00	3.03		0.00		0.00		0.00	0.0	0.558	0.682	0.191	3.22	250	1.70	88.5	0.049	0.063	1.58	77.5	0.04
SAN-5	5	4	0.127	8	22.0	0.127	22.0	4.00	0.36		0.00		0.00		0.00	0.0	0.127	0.127	0.036	0.39	250	1.00	44.4	0.049	0.063	1.21	59.5	0.01
SAN-4	4	3	0.155	9	25.0	0.964	234.0	4.00	3.79		0.00		0.00		0.00	0.0	0.155	0.964	0.270	4.06	250	1.00	52.8	0.049	0.063	1.21	59.5	0.07
SAN-9	9	8	0.062	3	9.0	0.062	9.0	4.00	0.15		0.00		0.00		0.00	0.0	0.062	0.062	0.017	0.16	250	1.00	16.4	0.049	0.063	1.21	59.5	0.00
SAN-7a	7	8	0.163	10	27.0	0.163	27.0	4.00	0.44		0.00		0.00		0.00	0.0	0.163	0.163	0.046	0.48	250	2.40	52.8	0.049	0.063	1.88	92.1	0.01
SAN-8	8	3	0.350	26	71.0	0.575	107.0	4.00	1.73		0.00		0.00		0.00	0.0	0.350	0.575	0.161	1.89	250	0.90	88.5	0.049	0.063	1.15	56.4	0.03
SAN-3	3	2	0.069	4	11.0	1.608	352.0	4.00	5.70		0.00		0.00		0.00	0.0	0.069	1.608	0.450	6.15	250	1.00	20.7	0.049	0.063	1.21	59.5	0.10
	2	1				1.608	352.0	4.00	5.70		0.00		0.00		0.00	0.0	0.000	1.608	0.450	6.15	250	7.90	11.1	0.049	0.063	3.41	167.1	0.04
Off site - per IBI sanitary sewer design for Former CFB Rockcliffe (January 25, 2017)																												
Moses Tenisco Str.	1	Ex. 165A	0.520		52.5	2.128	404.5	4.00	6.55		0.00		0.00		0.00	0.0	0.520	2.128	0.596	7.15	250	0.40	33.3	0.049	0.063	0.77	37.6	0.19

APPENDIX D

Stormwater Management



Former CFB Rockcliffe
City of Ottawa
Name of Client/Developer

J:\38298-CFBRockville\5.7 Calculations\5.7.1 Sewers & Grading\Phase 1B\38298-1B-CCS_storm_2017-01-20



Former CFB Rockcliffe
City of Ottawa
Name of Client/Developer

J:\38298-CFBRockville\5.7 Calculations\5.7.1 Sewers & Grading\Phase 1B\38298-1B-CCS_storm_2017-01-20

Up	Down	Area	C	2.78 Indiv AxC	2.78 Acc AxC	Sewer Data											
						T _c	I	Q	DIA	Slope	Length	A _{hydraulic}	R	Velocity	Qcap	Time Flow	Q / Q full
		(ha)	(-)			(min)	(mm/hr)	(L/s)	(mm)	(%)	(m)	(m ²)	(m)	(m/s)	(L/s)	(min)	(-)
On site																	
106	104	0.290	0.80	0.64	0.64	10.0	104.2	67.2	300	1.70	91.5	0.071	0.075	1.78	126.1	0.9	0.53
105	104	0.206	0.80	0.46	0.46	10.0	104.2	47.7	300	1.00	40.9	0.071	0.075	1.37	96.7	0.5	0.49
104	103	0.688	0.80	1.53	2.63	10.9	99.9	263.0	450	1.00	52.8	0.159	0.113	1.79	285.1	0.5	0.92
107	103	0.222	0.80	0.49	0.49	10.0	104.2	51.4	300	0.90	91.5	0.071	0.075	1.30	91.7	1.2	0.56
103	102	0.107	0.80	0.24	3.36	11.3	97.6	328.4	525	1.00	20.7	0.216	0.131	1.99	430.1	0.2	0.76
102	101	0.000	0.00	0.00	3.36	11.5	96.8	325.7	525	5.10	15.5	0.216	0.131	4.49	971.2	0.1	0.34
					3.36	11.6											
Off Site - Per IBI storm sewer design sheet for Former CFB Rockcliffe (January 25, 2017)																	
Block 24 Portion of U1		0.022	0.80	0.05	0.05												
MH 212	MH 213	0.150	0.70	0.29	0.34	10.0	104.2	35.5	525	0.65	63.8	0.216	0.131	1.60	346.7	0.7	0.10
MH 213	BULK165N	0.210	0.70	0.41	4.11	11.6	96.5	397.2	750	0.20	55.7	0.442	0.188	1.13	497.9	0.8	0.80



Wateridge - Block 24

Rockcliffe Village

STORMTECH CHAMBER SPECIFICATIONS

1. CHAMBERS SHALL BE STORMTECH SC-740, SC-310, OR APPROVED EQUAL.
2. CHAMBERS SHALL BE MANUFACTURED FROM VIRGIN POLYPROPYLENE OR POLYETHYLENE RESINS.
3. CHAMBER ROWS SHALL PROVIDE CONTINUOUS, UNOBSTRUCTED INTERNAL SPACE WITH NO INTERNAL SUPPORT PANELS THAT WOULD IMPEDE FLOW OR LIMIT ACCESS FOR INSPECTION.
4. THE STRUCTURAL DESIGN OF THE CHAMBERS, THE STRUCTURAL BACKFILL, AND THE INSTALLATION REQUIREMENTS SHALL ENSURE THAT THE LOAD FACTORS SPECIFIED IN THE AASHTO LRFD BRIDGE DESIGN SPECIFICATIONS, SECTION 12.12, ARE MET FOR: 1) LONG-DURATION DEAD LOADS AND 2) SHORT-DURATION LIVE LOADS, BASED ON THE AASHTO DESIGN TRUCK WITH CONSIDERATION FOR IMPACT AND MULTIPLE VEHICLE PRESENCES.
5. CHAMBERS SHALL MEET ASTM F2922 (POLYETHYLENE) OR ASTM F2418 (POLYPROPYLENE), "STANDARD SPECIFICATION FOR THERMOPLASTIC CORRUGATED WALL STORMWATER COLLECTION CHAMBERS".
6. CHAMBERS SHALL BE DESIGNED AND ALLOWABLE LOADS DETERMINED IN ACCORDANCE WITH ASTM F2787, "STANDARD PRACTICE FOR STRUCTURAL DESIGN OF THERMOPLASTIC CORRUGATED WALL STORMWATER COLLECTION CHAMBERS".
7. ONLY CHAMBERS THAT ARE APPROVED BY THE SITE DESIGN ENGINEER WILL BE ALLOWED. THE CHAMBER MANUFACTURER SHALL SUBMIT THE FOLLOWING UPON REQUEST TO THE SITE DESIGN ENGINEER FOR APPROVAL BEFORE DELIVERING CHAMBERS TO THE PROJECT SITE:
 - a. A STRUCTURAL EVALUATION SEALED BY A REGISTERED PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER THAT DEMONSTRATES THAT THE SAFETY FACTORS ARE GREATER THAN OR EQUAL TO 1.95 FOR DEAD LOAD AND 1.75 FOR LIVE LOAD, THE MINIMUM REQUIRED BY ASTM F2787 AND BY AASHTO FOR THERMOPLASTIC PIPE.
 - b. A STRUCTURAL EVALUATION SEALED BY A REGISTERED PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER THAT DEMONSTRATES THAT THE LOAD FACTORS SPECIFIED IN THE AASHTO LRFD BRIDGE DESIGN SPECIFICATIONS, SECTION 12.12, ARE MET. THE 50 YEAR CREEP MODULUS DATA SPECIFIED IN ASTM F2418 OR ASTM F2922 MUST BE USED AS PART OF THE AASHTO STRUCTURAL EVALUATION TO VERIFY LONG-TERM PERFORMANCE.
 - c. STRUCTURAL CROSS SECTION DETAIL ON WHICH THE STRUCTURAL EVALUATION IS BASED.
8. CHAMBERS AND END CAPS SHALL BE PRODUCED AT AN ISO 9001 CERTIFIED MANUFACTURING FACILITY.

IMPORTANT - NOTES FOR THE BIDDING AND INSTALLATION OF THE SC-310/SC-740 SYSTEM

1. STORMTECH SC-310 & SC-740 CHAMBERS SHALL NOT BE INSTALLED UNTIL THE MANUFACTURER'S REPRESENTATIVE HAS COMPLETED A PRE-CONSTRUCTION MEETING WITH THE INSTALLERS.
2. STORMTECH SC-310 & SC-740 CHAMBERS SHALL BE INSTALLED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE "STORMTECH SC-310/SC-740/SC-780 CONSTRUCTION GUIDE".
3. CHAMBERS ARE NOT TO BE BACKFILLED WITH A DOZER OR AN EXCAVATOR SITUATED OVER THE CHAMBERS.

STORMTECH RECOMMENDS 3 BACKFILL METHODS:
 - STONESHOOTER LOCATED OFF THE CHAMBER BED.
 - BACKFILL AS ROWS ARE BUILT USING AN EXCAVATOR ON THE FOUNDATION STONE OR SUBGRADE.
 - BACKFILL FROM OUTSIDE THE EXCAVATION USING A LONG BOOM HOE OR EXCAVATOR.
4. THE FOUNDATION STONE SHALL BE LEVELED AND COMPACTED PRIOR TO PLACING CHAMBERS.
5. JOINTS BETWEEN CHAMBERS SHALL BE PROPERLY SEATED PRIOR TO PLACING STONE.
6. MAINTAIN MINIMUM - 6" (150 mm) SPACING BETWEEN THE CHAMBER ROWS.
7. EMBEDMENT STONE SURROUNDING CHAMBERS MUST BE A CLEAN, CRUSHED, ANGULAR STONE 3/4-2" (20-50 mm).
8. THE CONTRACTOR MUST REPORT ANY DISCREPANCIES WITH CHAMBER FOUNDATION MATERIALS BEARING CAPACITIES TO THE SITE DESIGN ENGINEER.
9. ADS RECOMMENDS THE USE OF "FLEXSTORM CATCH IT" INSERTS DURING CONSTRUCTION FOR ALL INLETS TO PROTECT THE SUBSURFACE STORMWATER MANAGEMENT SYSTEM FROM CONSTRUCTION SITE RUNOFF.

NOTES FOR CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT

1. STORMTECH SC-310 & SC-740 CHAMBERS SHALL BE INSTALLED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE "STORMTECH SC-310/SC-740/DC-780 CONSTRUCTION GUIDE".
2. THE USE OF CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT OVER SC-310 & SC-740 CHAMBERS IS LIMITED:
 - NO EQUIPMENT IS ALLOWED ON BARE CHAMBERS.
 - NO RUBBER Tired LOADERS, DUMP TRUCKS, OR EXCAVATORS ARE ALLOWED UNTIL PROPER FILL DEPTHS ARE REACHED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE "STORMTECH SC-310/SC-740/DC-780 CONSTRUCTION GUIDE".
 - WEIGHT LIMITS FOR CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT CAN BE FOUND IN THE "STORMTECH SC-310/SC-740/DC-780 CONSTRUCTION GUIDE".
3. FULL 36" (900 mm) OF STABILIZED COVER MATERIALS OVER THE CHAMBERS IS REQUIRED FOR DUMP TRUCK TRAVEL OR DUMPING.


USE OF A DOZER TO PUSH EMBEDMENT STONE BETWEEN THE ROWS OF CHAMBERS MAY CAUSE DAMAGE TO THE CHAMBERS AND IS NOT AN ACCEPTABLE BACKFILL METHOD. ANY CHAMBERS DAMAGED BY THE "DUMP AND PUSH" METHOD ARE NOT COVERED UNDER THE STORMTECH STANDARD WARRANTY.

CONTACT STORMTECH AT 1-888-892-2694 WITH ANY QUESTIONS ON INSTALLATION REQUIREMENTS OR WEIGHT LIMITS FOR CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT.

CONCEPTUAL LAYOUT

(33) STORMTECH SC-740 CHAMBERS
(2) STORMTECH SC-740 END CAPS
INSTALLED WITH 152 mm COVER STONE, 152 mm BASE STONE, 40% STONE VOID
INSTALLED SYSTEM VOLUME: 93 m³
AREA OF SYSTEM: 157 m²
PERIMETER OF SYSTEM: 154 m

COMPUTER GENERATED CONCEPTUAL LAYOUT - NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION




Wateridge - Block 24 Rockcliffe Village		DESCRIPTION		REV	DRW	CHK	Stormtech® Detention - Retention - Water Quality 70 INWOOD ROAD, SUITE 3 ROCKY HILL, CT 06067 860-529-8188 888-892-2694 WWW.STORMTECH.COM		4640 TRUEMAN BLVD HILLIARD, OH 43026 1-800-733-7473 ADVANCED DRAINAGE SYSTEMS, INC.	NOT TO SCALE		SHEET 2 OF 5		
DATE: 08/02/2017														
PROJECT #: Tool														
DRAWN: SM														
CHECKED: ---														

THIS DRAWING HAS BEEN PREPARED BASED ON INFORMATION PROVIDED TO ADS UNDER THE DIRECTION OF THE SITE DESIGN ENGINEER OR OTHER PROJECT REPRESENTATIVE. THE SITE DESIGN ENGINEER SHALL REVIEW THIS DRAWING PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION. IT IS THE ULTIMATE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE SITE DESIGN ENGINEER TO ENSURE THAT THE PRODUCT(S) DEPICTED AND ALL ASSOCIATED DETAILS MEET ALL APPLICABLE LAWS, REGULATIONS, AND PROJECT REQUIREMENTS.

ACCEPTABLE FILL MATERIALS: STORMTECH SC-740 CHAMBER SYSTEMS

MATERIAL LOCATION		DESCRIPTION	AASHTO MATERIAL CLASSIFICATIONS	COMPACTION / DENSITY REQUIREMENT
D	FINAL FILL: FILL MATERIAL FOR LAYER 'D' STARTS FROM THE TOP OF THE 'C' LAYER TO THE BOTTOM OF FLEXIBLE PAVEMENT OR UNPAVED FINISHED GRADE ABOVE. NOTE THAT PAVEMENT SUBBASE MAY BE PART OF THE 'D' LAYER	ANY SOIL/ROCK MATERIALS, NATIVE SOILS, OR PER ENGINEER'S PLANS. CHECK PLANS FOR PAVEMENT SUBGRADE REQUIREMENTS.	N/A	PREPARE PER SITE DESIGN ENGINEER'S PLANS. PAVED INSTALLATIONS MAY HAVE STRINGENT MATERIAL AND PREPARATION REQUIREMENTS.
C	INITIAL FILL: FILL MATERIAL FOR LAYER 'C' STARTS FROM THE TOP OF THE EMBEDMENT STONE ('B' LAYER) TO 18" (450 mm) ABOVE THE TOP OF THE CHAMBER. NOTE THAT PAVEMENT SUBBASE MAY BE A PART OF THE 'C' LAYER.	GRANULAR WELL-GRADED SOIL/AGGREGATE MIXTURES, <35% FINES OR PROCESSED AGGREGATE. MOST PAVEMENT SUBBASE MATERIALS CAN BE USED IN LIEU OF THIS LAYER.	AASHTO M145 ¹ A-1, A-2-4, A-3 OR AASHTO M43 ¹ 3, 357, 4, 467, 5, 56, 57, 6, 67, 68, 7, 78, 8, 89, 9, 10	BEGIN COMPACTIONS AFTER 12" (300 mm) OF MATERIAL OVER THE CHAMBERS IS REACHED. COMPACT ADDITIONAL LAYERS IN 6" (150 mm) MAX LIFTS TO A MIN. 95% PROCTOR DENSITY FOR WELL GRADED MATERIAL AND 95% RELATIVE DENSITY FOR PROCESSED AGGREGATE MATERIALS. ROLLER GROSS VEHICLE WEIGHT NOT TO EXCEED 12,000 lbs (53 kN). DYNAMIC FORCE NOT TO EXCEED 20,000 lbs (89 kN).
B	EMBEDMENT STONE: FILL SURROUNDING THE CHAMBERS FROM THE FOUNDATION STONE ('A' LAYER) TO THE 'C' LAYER ABOVE.	CLEAN, CRUSHED, ANGULAR STONE, NOMINAL SIZE DISTRIBUTION BETWEEN 3/4-2 INCH (20-50 mm)	AASHTO M43 ¹ 3, 357, 4, 467, 5, 56, 57	NO COMPACTION REQUIRED.
A	FOUNDATION STONE: FILL BELOW CHAMBERS FROM THE SUBGRADE UP TO THE FOOT (BOTTOM) OF THE CHAMBER.	CLEAN, CRUSHED, ANGULAR STONE, NOMINAL SIZE DISTRIBUTION BETWEEN 3/4-2 INCH (20-50 mm)	AASHTO M43 ¹ 3, 357, 4, 467, 5, 56, 57	PLATE COMPACT OR ROLL TO ACHIEVE A FLAT SURFACE. ^{2 3}

- PLEASE NOTE:
- THE LISTED AASHTO DESIGNATIONS ARE FOR GRADATIONS ONLY. THE STONE MUST ALSO BE CLEAN, CRUSHED, ANGULAR. FOR EXAMPLE, A SPECIFICATION FOR #4 STONE WOULD STATE: "CLEAN, CRUSHED, ANGULAR NO. 4 (AASHTO M43) STONE".
 - STORMTECH COMPACTION REQUIREMENTS ARE MET FOR 'A' LOCATION MATERIALS WHEN PLACED AND COMPACTED IN 6" (150 mm) (MAX) LIFTS USING TWO FULL COVERAGES WITH A VIBRATORY COMPACTOR.
 - WHERE INFILTRATION SURFACES MAY BE COMPROMISED BY COMPACTION, FOR STANDARD DESIGN LOAD CONDITIONS, A FLAT SURFACE MAY BE ACHIEVED BY RAKING OR DRAGGING WITHOUT COMPACTION EQUIPMENT. FOR SPECIAL LOAD DESIGNS, CONTACT STORMTECH FOR COMPACTION REQUIREMENTS.



NOTES:

- SC-740 CHAMBERS SHALL CONFORM TO THE REQUIREMENTS OF ASTM F2418 "STANDARD SPECIFICATION FOR POLYPROPYLENE (PP) CORRUGATED WALL STORMWATER COLLECTION CHAMBERS", OR ASTM F2922 "STANDARD SPECIFICATION FOR POLYETHYLENE (PE) CORRUGATED WALL STORMWATER COLLECTION CHAMBERS".
- SC-740 CHAMBERS SHALL BE DESIGNED IN ACCORDANCE WITH ASTM F2787 "STANDARD PRACTICE FOR STRUCTURAL DESIGN OF THERMOPLASTIC CORRUGATED WALL STORMWATER COLLECTION CHAMBERS".
- "ACCEPTABLE FILL MATERIALS" TABLE ABOVE PROVIDES MATERIAL LOCATIONS, DESCRIPTIONS, GRADATIONS, AND COMPACTION REQUIREMENTS FOR FOUNDATION, EMBEDMENT, AND FILL MATERIALS.
- THE "SITE DESIGN ENGINEER" REFERS TO THE ENGINEER RESPONSIBLE FOR THE DESIGN AND LAYOUT OF THE STORMTECH CHAMBERS FOR THIS PROJECT.
- THE SITE DESIGN ENGINEER IS RESPONSIBLE FOR ASSESSING THE BEARING RESISTANCE (ALLOWABLE BEARING CAPACITY) OF THE SUBGRADE SOILS AND THE DEPTH OF FOUNDATION STONE WITH CONSIDERATION FOR THE RANGE OF EXPECTED SOIL MOISTURE CONDITIONS.
- PERIMETER STONE MUST BE EXTENDED HORIZONTALLY TO THE EXCAVATION WALL FOR BOTH VERTICAL AND SLOPED EXCAVATION WALLS.
- ONCE LAYER 'C' IS PLACED, ANY SOIL/MATERIAL CAN BE PLACED IN LAYER 'D' UP TO THE FINISHED GRADE. MOST PAVEMENT SUBBASE SOILS CAN BE USED TO REPLACE THE MATERIAL REQUIREMENTS OF LAYER 'C' OR 'D' AT THE SITE DESIGN ENGINEER'S DISCRETION.

Wateridge - Block 24
Rockcliffe Village

DESCRIPTION

CHK

DRW

REV

DATE: 08/02/2017

DRAWN: SM

PROJECT #: Tool

CHECKED: ---

StormTech
Detention/Retention Water Quality

70 INWOOD ROAD, SUITE 3 | ROCKY HILL | CT | 06067
860-529-8188 | 888-892-2694 | WWW.STORMTECH.COM

ADS
ADVANCED DRAINAGE SYSTEMS, INC.

4640 TRUEJMAN BLVD
HILLIARD, OH 43026
1-800-733-7473


THIS DRAWING HAS BEEN PREPARED BASED ON INFORMATION PROVIDED TO ADS UNDER THE DIRECTION OF THE SITE DESIGN ENGINEER OR OTHER PROJECT REPRESENTATIVE. THE SITE DESIGN ENGINEER SHALL REVIEW THIS DRAWING PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION. IT IS THE ULTIMATE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE SITE DESIGN ENGINEER TO ENSURE THAT THE PRODUCT(S) DEPICTED AND ALL ASSOCIATED DETAILS MEET ALL APPLICABLE LAWS, REGULATIONS, AND PROJECT REQUIREMENTS.

SHEET
3 OF 5




UNDERDRAIN DETAIL

NTS



INSERTA TEE DETAIL

NTS



SECTION A-A


SIDE VIEW

CHAMBER	MAX DIAMETER OF INSERTA TEE	HEIGHT FROM BASE OF CHAMBER (X)
SC-310	6" (150 mm)	4" (100 mm)
SC-740	10" (250 mm)	4" (100 mm)
DC-780	10" (250 mm)	4" (100 mm)
MC-3500	12" (300 mm)	6" (150 mm)
MC-4500	12" (300 mm)	8" (200 mm)
INSERTA TEE FITTINGS AVAILABLE FOR SDR 26, SDR 35, SCH 40 IPS GASKETED & SOLVENT WELD, N-12, HP STORM, C-900 OR DUCTILE IRON		

NOTE:
PART NUMBERS WILL VARY BASED ON INLET PIPE MATERIALS.
CONTACT STORMTECH FOR MORE INFORMATION.

SC-740 TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION

NTS



NOMINAL CHAMBER SPECIFICATIONS

SIZE (W X H X INSTALLED LENGTH)	51.0" X 30.0" X 85.4"	(1295 mm X 762 mm X 2169 mm)
CHAMBER STORAGE	45.9 CUBIC FEET	(1.30 m³)
MINIMUM INSTALLED STORAGE*	74.9 CUBIC FEET	(2.12 m³)
WEIGHT	75.0 lbs.	(33.6 kg)

*ASSUMES 6" (152 mm) STONE ABOVE, BELOW, AND BETWEEN CHAMBERS

STUBS AT BOTTOM OF END CAP FOR PART NUMBERS ENDING WITH "B"
STUBS AT TOP OF END CAP FOR PART NUMBERS ENDING WITH "T"

PART #	STUB	A	B	C
SC740EPE06T / SC740EPE06TPC	6" (150 mm)	10.9" (277 mm)	18.5" (470 mm)	---
SC740EPE06B / SC740EPE06BPC			---	0.5" (13 mm)
SC740EPE08T / SC740EPE08TPC	8" (200 mm)	12.2" (310 mm)	16.5" (419 mm)	---
SC740EPE08B / SC740EPE08BPC			---	0.6" (15 mm)
SC740EPE10T / SC740EPE10TPC	10" (250 mm)	13.4" (340 mm)	14.5" (368 mm)	---
SC740EPE10B / SC740EPE10BPC			---	0.7" (18 mm)
SC740EPE12T / SC740EPE12TPC	12" (300 mm)	14.7" (373 mm)	12.5" (318 mm)	---
SC740EPE12B / SC740EPE12BPC			---	1.2" (30 mm)
SC740EPE15T / SC740EPE15TPC	15" (375 mm)	18.4" (467 mm)	9.0" (229 mm)	---
SC740EPE15B / SC740EPE15BPC			---	1.3" (33 mm)
SC740EPE18T / SC740EPE18TPC	18" (450 mm)	19.7" (500 mm)	5.0" (127 mm)	---
SC740EPE18B / SC740EPE18BPC			---	1.6" (41 mm)
SC740EPE24B*	24" (600 mm)	18.5" (470 mm)	---	0.1" (3 mm)

ALL STUBS, EXCEPT FOR THE SC740EPE24B ARE PLACED AT BOTTOM OF END CAP SUCH THAT THE OUTSIDE DIAMETER OF THE STUB IS FLUSH WITH THE BOTTOM OF THE END CAP. FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION CONTACT STORMTECH AT 1-888-892-2694.

* FOR THE SC740EPE24B THE 24" (600 mm) STUB LIES BELOW THE BOTTOM OF THE END CAP APPROXIMATELY 1.75" (44 mm). BACKFILL MATERIAL SHOULD BE REMOVED FROM BELOW THE N-12 STUB SO THAT THE FITTING SITS LEVEL.

NOTE: ALL DIMENSIONS ARE NOMINAL

Wateridge - Block 24
Rockcliffe Village

DESCRIPTION

CHK

DRW

REV

DATE: 08/02/2017

DRAWN: SM

PROJECT #: Tool

CHECKED: ---

StormTech
Detention/Retention Water Quality

4640 TRUEJMAN BLVD
HILLIARD, OH 43026
1-800-733-7473

70 INWOOD ROAD, SUITE 3 | ROCKY HILL | CT | 06067
860-529-8188 | 888-892-2694 | WWW.STORMTECH.COM


ADVANCED DRAINAGE SYSTEMS, INC.

THIS DRAWING HAS BEEN PREPARED BASED ON INFORMATION PROVIDED TO ADS UNDER THE DIRECTION OF THE SITE DESIGN ENGINEER OR OTHER PROJECT REPRESENTATIVE. THE SITE DESIGN ENGINEER SHALL REVIEW THIS DRAWING PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION. IT IS THE ULTIMATE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE SITE DESIGN ENGINEER TO ENSURE THAT THE PRODUCT(S) DEPICTED AND ALL ASSOCIATED DETAILS MEET ALL APPLICABLE LAWS, REGULATIONS, AND PROJECT REQUIREMENTS.

SHEET

5 OF 5

DRAWINGS / FIGURES



SITE STATISTICS AND DEVELOPMENT DATA


SITE AREA	16,075.91 m ²
PAVED AREA	5,632.24 m ² (35%)
LANDSCAPED AREA	3,621.33 m ² (22%)
TOTAL BUILDING COVERAGE	6,822.34 m ² (42%)
TOTAL GROSS FLOOR AREA	20,312.40 m ²
TOWNHOUSE TYPE A (27 @ 241.8m ²)	6,528.60 m ²
TOWNHOUSE TYPE B (54 @ 191.7m ²)	10,351.80 m ²
STACKED (24 @ 69 m ²)	1,656 m ²
STACKED (24 @ 74 m ²)	1,776 m ²
DENSITY (UPH)	80.1
ZONE CATEGORY	R5Y[2312]

DWELLING BLOCK	DWELLING TYPE	GROUND FLOOR AREA (m ²)	UNITS
BLOCK 1	REAR LANE TOWNS	567.04	8
BLOCK 2	REAR LANE TOWNS	436.36	6
BLOCK 3	REAR LANE TOWNS	501.71	7
BLOCK 4	REAR LANE TOWNS	501.71	7
BLOCK 5	REAR LANE TOWNS	436.38	6
BLOCK 6	REAR LANE TOWNS	523.90	7
BLOCK 7	REAR LANE TOWNS	458.56	6
BLOCK 8	REAR LANE TOWNS	501.71	7
BLOCK 9	REAR LANE TOWNS	436.38	6
BLOCK 10	STACKED TOWNS	465.64	24
BLOCK 11	STACKED TOWNS	465.64	24
BLOCK 12	REAR LANE TOWNS	589.23	8
BLOCK 13	REAR LANE TOWNS	414.18	6
BLOCK 14	REAR LANE TOWNS	523.90	7
		TOTAL	129

SECTION	ZONE PROVISION - PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT	REQUIRED	PROPOSED
162A (Table) (iv)	MIN. LOT WIDTH (m)	N/A	N/A
162A (Table) (v)	MIN. LOT AREA (m ²)	1,400 m ²	16,075 m ²
162A (Table) (vi)	MAX. BUILDING HEIGHT (m)	11 m	14.3 m
162A (Table) (vii)	MIN. FRONT YARD SETBACK (m)	3 m	3.07 m
162A (Table) (viii)	MIN. CORNER SIDE YARD SETBACK (m)	3 m	3.04 m
162A (Table) (ix)	MIN. REAR YARD SETBACK (m)	6 m	3.07 m
162A (Table) (x)	MIN. INTERIOR YARD SETBACK (m)	1.2 m	6.45 m
101 (Table)	RESIDENT PARKING - TYPE A (27 @ 0.75/unit)	20.25	54
	TYPE B (54 @ 0.75/unit)	40.5	54
	STACKED (48 @ 0.5/unit)	24	47
102 (Table)	VISITOR PARKING (129 @ 0.1/unit)	12.9	0
131 (Table) (1)	MIN. WIDTH OF PRIVATE WAY	6 m	6.5 m
131 (Table) (2)	SETBACK OF ANY WALL OF A MIN.RES.	1.8 m	0.25 m
131 (Table) (3)	BUILDING TO PRIVATE WAY	5.2	0.25 m
	MIN. SETBACK OF GARAGE DOOR TO PRIVATE WAY		

SECTION	ZONE PROVISION - TOWNHOUSE	REQUIRED	PROPOSED
164(1)	MIN. LOT WIDTH (m) - TYPE A TOWNHOUSE	6 m	6.05 m
	TYPE B TOWNHOUSE	6 m	4.42 m
164(1)	MIN. LOT AREA (m ²) - TYPE A	150 m ²	111.93 m ²
	TYPE B	150 m ²	81.76 m ²
164(1)	MAX. BUILDING HEIGHT (m)	11 m	14.05 m
164(1)	MIN. FRONT YARD SETBACK (m)	3 m	2.58 m
164(1)	MIN. CORNER SIDE YARD SETBACK (m)	3 m	4 m
164(1)	MIN. REAR YARD SETBACK (m)	6 m	0.25 m
164(1)	MIN. INTERIOR YARD SETBACK (m)	1.2 m	1.2 m
101 (Table)	RESIDENT PARKING - TYPE A	0.75/unit	2/unit
	TYPE B	0.75/unit	1/unit
102 (Table)	VISITOR PARKING	0.1/unit	0

SECTION	ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS	REQUIRED	PROPOSED
57(2)	Corner sight triangle	TBD	5 x 5m
	Permitted projections into req. yards		
65(2)	Eaves, eave-troughs, gutters	1 m	TBD
65(3)	Sills, belt courses, cornices, parapets, pilasters	0.6 m	TBD
65(4)	Canopies, awnings	1.8 m	TBD
65(5)	Fire escapes, open stairways, stoop	>0.6m to lot line	TBD
65(6)	Covered or uncovered balcony, porch, deck	2 m	2 m
65(7)	Bay window	1 m	TBD
65(8)	Air conditioner condenser, heat pump	1 m	TBD
100(3)(b)	Min. shared driveway width	3 m	N/A
106(1)(a)	Min. perpendicular parking space size	2.6 x 5.2 m	2.6 x 5.2 m
106(1)(b)	Min. parallel parking space size	2.6 x 6.7 m	2.6 x 6.7 m
107(1)(a)(i)	Min. driveway width to parking lot	6.7 m	6.7 m
107 (Table)	Min. aisle width to spaces	6.7 m	6.7 m
107(2)	Min. driveway width to garage	2.6 m	2.6 m
109(3)(b)	Max. walkway width permitted in yard	1.8 m	1.8 m
110(1)	Min. % of parking lot area landscaped	15%	TBD
110 (Table)	Min. landscape buffer width parking lot to lot line	1.5 m	0 m
110(3)(b)	Min. waste collection setback to lot line	3 m	3 m



SCALE 1:300

LEGEND	
	CONCRETE SIDEWALK
	CROSSWALK
	RIVERSTONE
	CURB
	DEPRESSED CURB
	PATHWAY
	PROJECTION (BALCONY)
	PROJECTION (STAIRS)
	MOLOK WASTE STORAGE
	FIRE HYDRANT
	BICYCLE PARKING
	BARRIER FREE PARKING
	DWELLING ENTRANCE
	UNIT NUMBER
	LANDSCAPED AREA
	RAISED CONCRETE DECK
	PAINTED LINES
	TYPE A TOWNHOUSE (6.05m)
	TYPE B TOWNHOUSE (4.42m)
	STACKED DWELLING
	PROPOSED LOT BOUNDARY
	BLOCK BOUNDARY
	BLOCK (Mew) BOUNDARY

JULY 28, 2017	DRAFT FOR REVIEW	SP
DATE (D.M.Y)	REVISION	BY

GENERAL NOTES
1. DO NOT SCALE DRAWINGS.
2. THIS DRAWING IS THE EXCLUSIVE PROPERTY OF KORSIAK URBAN PLANNING. COPYRIGHT RESERVED.
3. SITE PLAN PREPARED IN ACCORDANCE WITH PLAN 4M-1581 AND PLAN 48-30196, PREPARED BY ANNIS O'SULLIVAN, VOLLEBEK LTD.
4. TOWNHOUSE DWELLING UNITS ARE DESIGNED TO ACCOMMODATE CURBSIDE GARBAGE PICK-UP.
5. NEWS ARE INTENDED FOR PUBLIC ACCESS.

PROJECT TEAM	SITE PLAN DESIGN:	LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT:
ARCHITECT:		
CIVIL ENGINEER:		

mattamyHOMES

WATERIDGE VILLAGE: PHASE 113
335 ST. LAURENT BLVD.

PART OF LOTS 21, 22 AND 23
CONCESSION 1 (OTTAWA FRONT)
GEOGRAPHIC TOWNSHIP OF GLOUCESTER
AND BLOCKS 118-124, 126 AND 127
REGISTERED PLAN 4M-1559
CITY OF OTTAWA

TITLE:	BLOCK 24 SITE PLAN	
DATE:	August 1, 2017	DRAWN BY: SP
JOB NO.:	Mattamy - Wateridge	CHECKED BY: CR
		DRAWING NO. A1