

## Site Servicing and Stormwater Management Report 1869 Maple Grove Road, Ottawa, ON

#### Client:

10886378 Canada Incorporated 190 Lisgar Street Ottawa, ON K2P OCA

#### Submitted for: Zoning By-law Amendment, Plan of Subdivision

**Project Name:** 1869 Maple Grove Road

Project Number: OTT-00254810-A0

#### **Prepared By:**

EXP 2650 Queensview Drive Ottawa, ON K2B 8H8 t: +1.613.688.1899 f: +1.613.225.7337

Date Submitted: September 25, 2020

EXP Services Inc. 1869 Maple Grove Road, Ottawa, ON OTT-00254810-A0 September 25, 2020

## Site Servicing and Stormwater Management Report 1869 Maple Grove Road, Ottawa, ON

**Client:** 10886378 Canada Inc. 190 Lisgar Street Ottawa, ON K2P OCA

Submitted for: Zoning By-law Amendment, Plan of Subdivision

**Project Name:** 1869 Maple Grove Road

Project Number: OTT-00254810-A0

#### Prepared By:

EXP 2650 Queensview Drive Ottawa, ON K2B 8H8 t: +1.613.688.1899 f: +1.613.225.7337

Prepared by:

Approved by:

Jason Fitzpatrick, P.Eng. Project Engineer Bruce Thomas, P.Eng. Senior Project Manager

Date Submitted: September 25, 2020

i

## **Table of Contents**

1	Introduction1		
	1.1	Overview	1
2	Existi	ng Conditions	2
3	Existi	ng Infrastructure	2
4	Wate	r Servicing	4
	4.1	Existing Water Servicing	4
	4.2	Water Servicing Proposal	4
	4.3	Water Servicing Design	4
	4.4	Water Servicing Design Criteria	5
	4.5	Estimated Water Demands	5
	4.6	Boundary Conditions	6
	4.7	Fire Flow Requirements	6
	4.8	Review of Hydrant Spacing	7
5	Sewa	ge Servicing	8
	5.1	Existing Sewage Conditions	8
	5.2	Proposed Sewage Conditions	8
6	Storm	Servicing & Stormwater Management	10
	6.1	Design Criteria	10
	6.2	Minor System Design Criteria	10
	6.3	Major System Design Criteria	11
	6.4	Runoff Coefficients	11
	6.5	Pre-Development Conditions	11
	6.6	Allowable Release Rate	13
	6.7	Proposed Stormwater System	13
	6.8	Flow Attenuation and Storagep	13
	6.9	Water Balance	14
7	Erosic	on & Sediment Control	15
8	Concl	usions and Recommendations	16
9	Legal	Notification	17

## List of Figures

Figure 1-1 - Site Location	1
Figure A1 - Pre-Development Drainage Areas	A
Figure A2 - Post-Development Drainage Areas	A
Figure A3 – Fire Hydrant Locations	A

## List of Tables

Table 4-1 - Summary of Water Supply Design Criteria	5
Table 4-2 : Water Demand Summary	5
Table 4-3 : Boundary Conditions and Pressures Summary	6
Table 4-4 : Summary of Design Parameters Used in Calculating Required Fire Flows (RFF) Using FUS	7
Table 4-5 – Required Fire Flows	7
Table 5-1 – Summary of Wastewater Design Criteria / Parameters	8
Table 5-2 – Summary of Anticipated Sewage Rates	9
Table 6-1 – Summary of Runoff Coefficients	11
Table 6-2 – Summary of Pre-Development Flows	13
Table 6-3 – Summary of Post-Development Flows	13
Table 6-4 – Summary of Post-Development Storage	14
Table B1 – Water Demand Chart	В
Table B2 – Fire Flow Requirements Based on Fire Underwriters Survey (FUS) – Block 1-West	В
Table B3 – Fire Flow Requirements Based on Fire Underwriters Survey (FUS) – Block 1-East	В
Table B4 – Fire Flow Requirements Based on Fire Underwriters Survey (FUS) – Block 2	В
Table B5 – Fire Flow Requirements Based on Fire Underwriters Survey (FUS) – Block 3-West	В
Table B6 – Fire Flow Requirements Based on Fire Underwriters Survey (FUS) – Block 3-East	В
Table B7 – Available Fire Flows Based on Hydrant Spacing	В
Table B8 – Estimated Water Pressure at Proposed Blocks	В
Table C1 – Sanitary Sewer Design Sheet	C
Table D1 – Estimation of Catchment Time of Concentration for Pre-Development Conditions	D
Table D2 – Estimation of Peak Flows (Pre-Development Conditions) Using Calculated Time Of Concentration	D
Table D3 – Estimation of Allowable Minor System Flows to Maple Grove Storm Sewer	D
Table D4 – Average Runoff Coefficients for Post-Development Conditions	D
Table D5 – Summary of Post-Development Peak Flows (Uncontrolled and Controlled)	D
Table D6 – Summary of Post Development Storage	D
Table D7 – Storage Volumes for 2-year, 5-year, 100-year, and 100-year Plus 20% Storms (Based on MRM)	D
Table D8 – 5-Year Storm Sewer Calculation Sheet	D
StormTech Chambers – North (Layout)	D
StormTech Chambers – North	D
StormTech Chambers – South (Layout)	D
StormTech Chambers - South	D

StormTech MC3500 Chambers - Spec Sheet	D
Tempest-Technical-Manual (page 5 only)	D

## List of Appendices

pAppendix A - Figures	A
Appendix B – Water Servicing Tables	B
Appendix C – Sanitary Servicing Tables	C
Appendix D – Stormwater Servicing	D
Appendix E – Consultation / Correspondence	E
Appendix F – Background Information	F
Appendix G – Checklist	G
Appendix H – Drawings	Н

## 1 Introduction

#### 1.1 Overview

EXP Services Inc. (EXP) was retained by 10886378 Canada Incorporated to prepare a Site Servicing and Stormwater Management Report for the proposed redevelopment of 1869 Maple Grove Road in support of a Plan of Subdivision, Zoning By-law Amendment and Part Lot Control applications.

The 0.41-hectare site is situated along Maple Grove Road as illustrated in **Figure 1-1** below. The site is within the City of Ottawa urban boundary, outside the Greenbelt, and situated in Ward 6 (Stitsville-Kanata West). The description of the subject property is noted below:

• Part of Lot 1, Concession 1, Geographic Township of Huntley, City of Ottawa, Part 1, Plan 5R-2908, PIN 044870350

The proposed development will consist of three (3) blocks containing a total of eight (8) townhomes that will face Maple Grove Road, eight (8) townhomes that will face Bensinger Way, and two (2) townhomes that will face Mykonos Crescent.

This report will discuss the adequacy of the adjacent municipal watermain, sanitary sewers and storm sewers to provide the required water supply, convey the sewage and stormwater flows that will result from the proposed development. This report provides a design brief for submission, along with the engineering drawings, for City approval.



Figure 1-1 - Site Location

## 2 Existing Conditions

The existing property is surrounded by the Fairwinds West residential subdivision. Development of the adjacent subdivision began in 2012 and was completed in 2015.

The existing site topography slopes northwest towards Bensinger Way and appears to be self contained with no drainage outlet. A single residential home is situated on the property.

## 3 Existing Infrastructure

The site includes a single-family detached home that will be removed during the redevelopment of the site.

From review of the sewer and watermain mapping, as-built drawings and Utility Central Registry (UCC) plans, the following summarizes the infrastructure within the subject property and the infrastructure on the adjacent streets along the frontage of the property and adjacent offsite infrastructure:

#### Within property

• A well, and septic system within the property that will be abandoned.

#### Maple Grove Road

- 300mm watermain.
- 200mm sanitary sewer.
- 450mm sanitary sewer.
- 525mm storm sewer.
- 2250mm storm sewer.
- Gas / Bell / Streetlighting/ Hydro.

#### **Bensinger Way**

- 200mm watermain.
- 200mm sanitary sewer.
- 600mm storm sewer.
- Gas /Bell / Streetlighting / Hydro.

#### Mykonos Crescent

- 200mm watermain.
- 200mm sanitary sewer.
- 375mm storm sewer.
- 450mm storm sewer.
- Gas / Hydro / Bell / Streetlighting.

As-built drawings for Maple Grove Road, Bensinger Way, and Mykonos Crescent were obtained from the City of Ottawa and are included in **Appendix F** for reference.

### 1.3 Pre-Consultation / Permits / Approvals

A pre-consultation meeting was held with the City prior to design commencement. This meeting outlined the submission requirements and provided information to assist with the development proposal. The proposed site is located within Mississippi Valley Conservation Authority (MVCA) jurisdiction, therefore signoff from the MVCA will be required prior to final approval. The MVCA was contacted to confirm the stormwater management quality control requirements. A copy of the correspondence with the MVCA is attached in **Appendix E**.

It is expected that an Environmental Compliance Approval (ECA) will be required from the Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP), formerly the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change (MOECC), for this onsite private Sewage Works. The onsite Sewage Works will include the onsite stormwater works for flow controls and associated stormwater detention. Further discussions with City of Ottawa staff will be required to confirm the ECA requirements and to determine whether a direct submission or Transfer-of-Review submission will be required.

In addition, various design guidelines were referred to in preparing the current report including:

- Bulletin ISDTB-2012-4 (20 June 2012)
  - Technical Bulletin ISDTB-2014-01 (05 February 2014)
  - Technical Bulletin PIEDTB-2016-01 (September 6, 2016)
  - Technical Bulletin ISDTB-2018-01 (21 March 2018)
  - Technical Bulletin ISDTB-2018-04 (27 June 2018)
- Ottawa Design Guidelines Water Distribution, July 2010 (WDG001), including:
  - Technical Bulletin ISDTB-2014-02 (May 27, 2014)
  - Technical Bulletin ISTB-2018-02 (21 March 2018)
- Stormwater Management Planning and Design Manual, Ontario Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change, March 2003 (SMPDM).
- Design Guidelines for Drinking-Water Systems, Ontario Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change, 2008 (GDWS).
- Fire Underwriters Survey, Water Supply for Public Fire Protection (FUS), 1999.
- Ontario Building Code 2012, Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing.
- Kanata West Master Servicing Study, Stantec, CCL/IBI, June 16, 2020 (Volumes 1 ad 2)
- Deign Brief for Pond 4 Kanata West, Mattamy Homes, DSEL, JFSA, December 10, 2014

## 4 Water Servicing

#### 4.1 Existing Water Servicing

The site is within the City of Ottawa 3W pressure zone and supplied from the Stittsville elevated reservoir. The existing home is serviced by an onsite well which will be abandoned prior to development.

#### 4.2 Water Servicing Proposal

The proposed development will consist of 18-townhome units. An architectural site plan is provided in **Appendix H.** The site will be serviced by the existing 305mm watermain on Maple Grove Road, the 203mm watermain on Bensinger Way, and the 203mm watermain on Mykonos Crescent.

Water supply for each townhome will be provided by individual water services connecting to the existing watermains. The proposed servicing is detailed on Drawing C002.

### 4.3 Water Servicing Design

The water servicing requirements for the proposed development is designed in accordance with the City Design Guidelines (July 2010). The following steps indicate the basic methodology that was used in our analysis:

- Estimated water demands under average day, maximum day and peak hour conditions. As the total population estimate was less than 500, therefore residential peaking factors based on MECP Table 3-3 used.
- Estimated the required fire flow (RFF) based on the Fire Underwriters Survey (FUS).
- Obtained hydraulic boundary conditions (HGL) from the City, based on the above water demands and required fire flows.
- Boundary condition data and water demands were used to estimate the pressure at the proposed blocks, and this was compared to the City's design criteria.

Please refer to Appendix B for detailed calculations of the total water demands.

A review of the estimated watermain pressures at the building connections, based on the boundary conditions provided, were completed based on using a single water service feed to each individual townhome unit. **Table B6** in **Appendix B** provides a comparison of anticipated pressures at the building connection based on using a single 19mm service.

Based on results, a single 19mm service to each unit would result in a pressure of 66.7 psi to 66.9 psi at the buildings under peak hour conditions.

Detailed calculations of the anticipated water pressures, based on City of Ottawa boundary conditions, is provided in Table B6.

No pressure reducing measures are required as operating pressures are within 50 psi and 80 psi. It was estimated that the anticipated pressures under average day demands will range between 72.9 psi and 73.1 psi.

### 4.4 Water Servicing Design Criteria

The design parameters that were used to establish water and fire flow demands are summarized **Table 4-1**.

Table 4-1 - Summary of Water Supply Design Criteria	

Design Parameter	Value	Applies
Population Density – Single-family Home	3.4 persons/unit	
Population Density – Semi-detached Home	2.7 persons/unit	
Population Density – Townhome or Terrace Flat	1.8 persons/unit	✓
Population Density – Bachelor Apartment	1.4 persons/unit	
Population Density – Bachelor + Den Apartment	1.4 persons/unit	
Population Density – One Bedroom Apartment	1.4 persons/unit	
Population Density – One Bedroom plus Den Apartment	1.4 persons/unit	
Population Density – Two Bedroom Apartment	2.1 persons/unit	
Population Density – Two Bedroom plus Den Apartment	2.1 persons/unit	
Average Day Demands – Residential	350 L/person/day	✓
Average Day Demands – Commercial / Institutional	28,000 L/gross ha/day	
Average Day Demands – Light Industrial / Heavy Industrial	35,000 or 55,000 L/gross ha/day	
Maximum Day Demands – Residential	9.5 x Average Day Demands (MECP)	✓
Maximum Day Demands – Commercial / Institutional	1.5 x Average Day Demands	
Peak Hour Demands – Residential	14.3 x Average Day Demands (MECP)	✓
Peak Hour Demands – Commercial / Institutional	2.7 x Average Day Demands	
Fire Flow Requirements Calculation	FUS	✓
Depth of Cover Required	2.4m	✓
Maximum Allowable Pressure	551.6 kPa (80 psi)	✓
Minimum Allowable Pressure	275.8 kPa (40 psi)	~
Minimum Allowable Pressure during fire flow conditions	137.9 kPa (20 psi)	~

### 4.5 Estimated Water Demands

**Table 4-2** below summarizes the anticipated domestic water demands for all residential blocks under average day, maximum day and peak hour conditions.

#### Table 4-2 : Water Demand Summary

	Water D			
Water Demand Conditions	Block 1	Block 2	Block 3	Totals (L/sec)
Average Day	0.09	0.02	0.09	0.20
Max Day	0.83	0.21	0.83	1.87
Peak Hour	1.25	0.31	1.25	2.82

### 4.6 Boundary Conditions

Hydraulic Grade Line (HGL) boundary conditions were obtained from the City for design purposes. A copy of the correspondence received from the City is provided in **Appendix F**.

The following hydraulic grade line (HGL) boundary conditions are summarized in **Table 4-3** below:

Table 4-3 : Boundary Conditions and Pressures Summary

	Demands per Block			
Water Demand Conditions	Block 1	Block 2	Block 3	
Minimum HGL	156.4	156.4	156.4	
Max Day + Fire Flow	154.7	147.0	141.4	
Maximum HGL	160.2	160.2	160.2	
Min Pressure (psi)	69.4	69.4	69.7	
Max Pressure (psi)	74.8	74.8	75.1	

### 4.7 Fire Flow Requirements

Water for fire protection will be available utilizing the proposed fire hydrants located along the adjacent roadways: Maple Grove Road, Bensinger Way, and Mykonos Crescent. The required fire flows for the proposed blocks were calculated based on typical values as established by the Fire Underwriters Survey 1999 (FUS).

The following equation from the Fire Underwriters document "Water Supply for Public Fire Protection", 1991, was used for calculation of the on-site supply rates required to be supplied by the hydrants:

F = 200 \* C \* V (A)

where:

F	=	Required Fire flow in Litres per minute
С	=	Coefficient related to type of Construction
А	=	Total Floor Area in square metres

The proceeding **Table 4-4** summarizes the parameters used for estimating the Required Fire Flows (RFF) based on the Fire Underwriters Survey (FUS) and the latest City of Ottawa Technical Bulletins. The RFFs were estimated in accordance with ISTB-2018-02, and based on floor areas provided by the architect, which are illustrates in **Appendix H**.

The following summarizes the parameters used for both proposed blocks.

- Type of Construction Non-combustible
- Occupancy
   Limited combustible
- Sprinkler Protection no sprinkler system

Blocks 1 and 3 will be divided in half with a firewall to reduce the building area and the required fire flow.

Design Parameter		Block 1		Block 3	
		4 eastern units	Block 2	4 western units	4 eastern units
Coefficient Related to type of Construction., C	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5
Total Floor Area (m2)	673	673	368	673	673
Fire Flow prior to reduction (L/min)	9,000	9,000	6,000	9,000	9,000
Reduction Due to Occupancy Non-combustible (-25%), Limited Combustible (-15%), Combustible (0%), Free Burning (+15%), Rapid Burning (+25%)	-15%	-15%	-15%	-15%	-15%
Reduction due to Sprinkler (Max 50%) Sprinkler Conforming to NFPA 13 (-30%), Standard Water Supply (- 10%), Fully Supervised Sprinkler (-10%)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Increase due to Exposures	+44%	+40%	+39%	+52%	+32%
Can the Total Fire Flow be Capped at 10,000 L/min (167 L/sec) based on "TECHNCAL BULLETIN ISTB-2018-02", (yes/no)	no	yes	yes	yes	yes
Total RFF	183	167	117	167	167

#### Table 4-4 : Summary of Design Parameters Used in Calculating Required Fire Flows (RFF) Using FUS

The estimated required fire flows (RFFs) based on the FUS methods is: 183 L/sec for Block 1 (most critical), 117 L/sec for Block 2, and 167 L/sec for Block 3.

### 4.8 Review of Hydrant Spacing

A review of the hydrant spacing was completed to ensure compliance with Appendix I of Technical Bulletin ISTB-2018-02. As per Section 3 of Appendix I all hydrants within 150 metres were reviewed to assess the total possible contribution of flow from these contributing hydrants. For each hydrant the distance to the proposed block was determined to arrive at the contribution of fire flow from each. All hydrants are expected to be of Class AA as per Section 5.1 of Appendix I. For each hydrant the straight-line distance, distance measured along a fire route or roadway, whether its location is accessible, and its contribution to the required fire flow.

#### Table 4-5 – Required Fire Flows

Block Number	Required Fire Flow (L/min)	Available Fire Flow Based on Hydrant Spacing as per ISTB-2018-02 (L/min)		
Block 1 (4 west units)	11,000 (or 183 L/sec)	±24,700		
Block 1 (4 east units)	10,000 (or 167 L/sec)	±22,800		
Block 2	7,000 (or 117 L/sec)	±13,300		
Block 3 West (4 west units)	10,000 (or 167 L/sec)	±17,100		
Block 3 East (4 east units)	10,000 (or 167 L/sec)	±17,100		

The total minimum available contribution of flow from hydrants was estimated at 22,800 L/min for Block 1, 13,300 L/min for Block 2, and 17,100 L/min for Block 3, whereas the maximum required fire flows (RFF) for each block is 11,000 L/min, 7,000 L/min, and 10,000 L/min respectively. Therefore, the available flows from hydrants exceed each building's fire flow requirements as identified in Appendix I of Technical Bulletin ISTB-2018-02. Additional information on the available flows from hydrants is provided in **Table B5**.

## 5 Sewage Servicing

#### 5.1 Existing Sewage Conditions

Sewage from the existing onsite residential home is discharged into a septic tank and field bed.

### 5.2 Proposed Sewage Conditions

It is proposed to provide single sanitary sewer service connections from each proposed townhome unit to the existing sanitary sewers on Maple Grove Drive, Bensinger Way, and Mykonos Crescent. The sanitary sewer laterals were sized based on a population flow with an area-based infiltration allowance. Individual 135mm diameter sanitary sewer laterals are proposed with a minimum 1.0% slope, having a capacity of 11.5 L/sec based on Manning's Equation under full flow conditions. **Table 5-1** below summarizes the design parameters used.

#### Table 5-1 – Summary of Wastewater Design Criteria / Parameters

Design Parameter	Value	Applies
Population Density – Single-family Home	3.4 persons/unit	
Population Density – Semi-detached Home	2.7 persons/unit	
Population Density – Duplex	2.3 persons/unit	
Population Density – Townhome (row)	2.7 persons/unit	✓
Population Density – Bachelor Apartment	1.4 persons/unit	
Population Density – Bachelor + Den Apartment	1.4 persons/unit	
Population Density – One Bedroom Apartment	1.4 persons/unit	
Population Density – One Bedroom plus Den Apartment	1.4 persons/unit	
Population Density – Two Bedroom Apartment	2.1 persons/unit	
Population Density – Two Bedroom plus Den Apartment	2.1 persons/unit	
Average Daily Residential Sewage Flow	280 L/person/day	✓
Average Daily Commercial / Intuitional Flow	28,000 L/gross ha/day	
Average Light / Heavy Industrial Daily Flow	35,000 / 55,000 L/gross ha/day	
Residential Peaking Factor – Harmon Formula (Min = 2.0, Max =4.0, with K=0.8)	$M = 1 + \frac{14}{4 + P^{0.5}} * k$	~
Commercial Peaking Factor	1.5	
Institutional Peaking Factor	1.5	
Industrial Peaking Factor	As per Table 4-B (SDG002)	
Unit of Peak Extraneous Flow (Dry Weather / Wet Weather)	0.05 or 0.28 L/s/gross ha	
Unit of Peak Extraneous Flow (Total I/I)	0.33 L/s/gross ha	✓

The total estimated peak sanitary flow rate from the proposed property is **0.75 L/sec** (all blocks) based on City Design Guidelines. Sewage rates below include a total infiltration allowance of 0.33 L/ha/sec based on the total gross site area.

#### Table 5-2 – Summary of Anticipated Sewage Rates

Courses Condition	Sanitary Sewage Flow (L/sec)					
Sewage Condition	Maple Grove Drive	Bensinger Way	Mykonos Cres			
Average Day Sewage Flow	0.070	0.070	0.018			
Infiltration Flow (at 0.33 L/ha/sec)	0.045	0.045	0.045			
Peak Wet Weather Sewage Flow	0.32	0.32	0.11			

The minimum sewer capacity of the 200mm diameter connecting sanitary sewer run on Maple Grove Drive (with a slope of 0.60%) has a calculated full flow capacity of 25.9 L/sec. The 200mm diameter pipe then connects into a 450mm diameter pipe downstream of the sewer run. The total estimated peak sewage flow is 0.75 L/s compared to the existing single home with an estimated peak sewage flow of 0.18 L/sec. It is anticipated that the increase in peak sewage flows can be accommodated in the downstream sanitary sewer system.

## 6 Storm Servicing & Stormwater Management

The stormwater works are subject to both the Mississippi Valley Conservation Authority (MVCA) and City of Ottawa (COO) approval. The MVCA as contacted to clarify the quality control requirements. The MVCA has noted that the original criteria from the Kanata West Master Servicing Plan was normal water quality control or 70% TSS removal. This was upgrades to enhanced protection (80% TSS), so therefore it is understood that quality control is already in place for the development. Correspondence from the MVCA is provided in **Appendix E**, which clarifies that no onsite quality control is required.

Also clarified during the pre-consultation meeting, the requirements related to stormwater quantity control are noted as follows:

- Stormwater quantity control criteria be consistent with the criteria specified in the Pond 4 final report (see attached) and/or in the Kanata west Master servicing Study.
- When using the modified rational method to calculate the storage requirements for the site, the underground storage should not be included in the overall available storage. The modified rational method assumes that the restricted flow rate is constant throughout the storm which, in this case, underestimates the storage requirement prior to the 100-year head elevation being reached. Alternately, if you wish to include the underground storage, you may use an assumed average release rate equal to 50% of the peak allowable rate. Otherwise, disregard the underground storage as available storage or provide modeling to support the design.

### 6.1 Design Criteria

A review of the reports; Kanata West Master Servicing Study (KWMSS), Deign Brief for Pond 4 (DBP4), along with contacting the MVCA was completed to determine the stormwater management quantity and quality control requirements for the site. The following briefly summarizes the SWM requirements

- Minor system flows to discharge to local storm sewer on Maple Grove Road.
- The allowable discharge rate to the local storm sewer to be based on 5-year storm with a time of concentration of (Tc) of 10 minutes and runoff coefficient (C<sub>AVG</sub>) of 0.65. This was established from the storm sewer design for Pond 4.
- Provide quantity control for runoff in excess of the allowable rate for all storms up to the 100-year event.
- No onsite quality control requirements are required, as the site is located within the drainage catchment tributary to the City's Pond 4 which is located approximately 1.6 km east of the site along Maple Grove Road. Pond 4 was designed for an enhanced treatment (80%TSS) as noted in the DBP4.
- An infiltration target range between 70-100 mm/yr is required as noted in Section 5.7 of the Kanata West Mater Servicing Study. A slightly higher infiltration target of 104 mm/yr was established. Developments upstream of Pond 4 are required to provide pre- versus post-development water balance. Infiltration BMPs to be used to meet infiltration targets.

The proposed stormwater system is designed in conformance with the above-noted criteria along with the latest version of the City of Ottawa Design Guidelines (October 2012). Additional design criteria that relates to this design report is provided in the proceeding sections below.

### 6.2 Minor System Design Criteria

- Onsite storm sewer was sized based on the Rational Method and Manning's Equation under free flow conditions for the 5year storm using a 10-minute inlet time.
- Since a detailed site plan was available for the site, including building footprints, calculations of the average runoff coefficients for each drainage area was completed.
- Minimum sewer slopes to be based on minimum velocities for storm sewers of 0.80 m/sec.

• Allowable maximum discharge rate established based on the 5-year storm with a time of concentration of (Tc) of 10 minutes and runoff coefficient (C<sub>AVG</sub>) of 0.65.

### 6.3 Major System Design Criteria

- The major system has been designed to accommodate on-site detention with sufficient capacity to attenuate the 100-year design storm. On-site storage is calculated based on the 100-year design storm with on-site detention storage provided using underground chambers.
- On site storage is provided and calculated for up to the 100-year design storm. There is no surface ponding proposed on the ground surface. Outflow rates from underground storage chamber were set at 50% of the rate to account for head, as per City guidelines.
- Overland flow routes are provided.
- The vertical distance from the spill elevation on the street and the ground elevation at the buildings is at least 150mm.
- The emergency overflow spill elevation is at least 30 cm below the lowest building opening.

### 6.4 Runoff Coefficients

Runoff coefficients used were based on actual areas taken from CAD. Runoff coefficients for impervious surfaces (roofs, asphalt, and concrete) were taken as 0.90, whereas those for pervious surfaces (grass/landscaping) were taken as 0.20. Average runoff coefficients were calculated for catchments (or drainage areas) using the area-weighting routine in PCSWMM.

The runoff coefficients for pre-development and post-development catchments are provided in **Appendix D**, with a summary provided in in **Table 6-1** below.

#### Table 6-1 – Summary of Runoff Coefficients

Location	Area (hectares)	Pre-Deve	lopment	Post-Development		
		Cavg	Imp (%)	Cavg	Imp (%)	
Entire Site	0.4052	0.28	11.9	0.53	47.8	

#### 6.5 Pre-Development Conditions

No specific design requirements were established to meet a pre-development flow rate, rather the stormwater design shall meet the requirements of the master servicing reports. A pre-development time of concentration was calculated for comparison with the standard 10 minutes, set by the SDG002. A time of concentration of 15.8 minutes was calculated based on the slope and length of the site catchment. Under pre-development conditions stormwater runoff from the 0.4052-hectare site is relatively self contained due to the build up of residential homes around it. Prior to development of the adjacent subdivision, runoff from the site was directed in a north easterly direction. **Figure A1** illustrates these pre-development conditions and the following

**Table** 6-2 provides pre-development peak runoff rates using the calculated time of concentration of 15.8 minutes, however it should be noted that the standard time of concentration of 10 minutes was used to estimate peak runoff under post-development conditions.

#### Table 6-2 – Summary of Pre-Development Flows

Return Period Storm	Total Peak Flows (L/sec)
2-year	18.9
5-year	25.6
100-year	54.7

#### 6.6 Allowable Release Rate

The Kanata West Master Servicing Study assigned a runoff coefficient of 0.65 for the subject site based on the 5-year storm with a time of concentration of 10 minutes. Therefore, control of runoff for up to the 100-year storm will be controlled to the 5-year rate. The allowable release rate was calculated at 76.4 L/sec based on a 5-year storm event. **Table D3** provides detailed calculations on the allowable peak flow.

#### 6.7 Proposed Stormwater System

Stormwater runoff from the proposed site will drain from a combination of controlled and uncontrolled areas. As a result of the changes onsite the overall post-development runoff coefficient will increase over pre-development conditions. This increase in runoff is the result of changes due to site development (i.e. additional hard surfaces, roof areas and hard landscaping).

A storm drainage plan is illustrated on **Figure A2**. A total four (4) subcatchments (or drainage areas) within the development site are shown on this drawing with average runoff coefficients calculated for each drainage area. The proposed stormwater works consists of the following elements:

- Underground storage chambers complete with a downstream inlet control device (ICD). This then discharges to the storm sewer on Maple Grove Road.
- Remaining drainage areas along frontage of Maple Grove Road, Bensinger Way and Mykonos Crescent flow uncontrolled to the municipal right-of-way.

Return Period Storm	Peak Flows to Road Storm Se	Maple Grove ewers (L/sec)	Peak Uncontrolled Flows to Bensinger Way	Peak Uncontrolled Flows to Mykonos Cres	Total Peak Flows	Allowable Peak Flows	
	Uncontrolled Controlled		(L/sec)	(L/sec)	(L/sec)	(L/sec)	
2-year	10.4	3.10	10.1	2.6	26.2		
5-year	14.2	4.20	13.7	3.5	35.6	76.4	
100-year	30.3	9.00	29.4	7.5	76.2		

#### Table 6-3 – Summary of Post-Development Flows

#### 6.8 Flow Attenuation and Storagep

As a result of utilizing flow control, attenuation (or storage) of runoff is necessary. This will be achieved utilizing storage in underground chambers. Using the allowable release rates, the Modified Rational Method was used to determine the 2-year, 5-year, 100-year 100-yr + 20% (Climate change) volumes that are necessary for corresponding release rates. It should be noted that the release rates used for the 100-year and Climate Change storm events were set at 50% of the maximum allowable release rate. The maximum release rate of 9.0 L/sec was set, in order to ensure that the summation of all controlled and uncontrolled peak flows discharging (both minor and major system) meet the allowable rate of 76.4 L/sec.

The largest internal drainage area (S01) which is located in the rear-yards of the townhomes is tributary to proposed underground chambers. The chambers were sized to accommodate the 100-yr plus 20% storm within the chambers, without psurface ponding.

**Table 6-4** below provides the volumes necessary to detain the 100-year plus 20\$ storm, based on 50% of the allowable release rate (taking into account uncontrolled runoff). **Table D12** summarizes the combined controlled and uncontrolled flows leaving the subject site. A summary of the 100-year flows, 100-year required storage volumes, with the provided voles in Identified in **Table 6-4** below.

Table 6-4 – Summary of Post-Development Storage

Area No.	Outlet	Rele	ase Rat	e (L/s)	Stora (m	ge Requ 1 <sup>3</sup> ) (MRN	uired ⁄I)	Storage Provided (m <sup>3</sup> )	Control Method	
		2-yr	5-yr	100-yr	2-yr	5-yr	100- yr	Chambers	ICD	
S01	Maple Grove Road Storm Sewer	2.8	3.7	8.0	21.8	29.0	61.2	62.7	TEMPEST Model LMF-75	

#### 6.9 Water Balance

As noted in Design Criteria6.1- Design Criteria an infiltration target of 100 mm/year is required as noted in the Kanata West Master Servicing Study, and 104 mm/year is noted in the Pond 4 Design Brief. Infiltration BMPs to be used to meet infiltration targets as developments upstream of Pond 4 are required to provide pre- versus post-development water balance.

A review of the water balance method, as noted in section 3.2.3 of the MECP's SMPDM was competed to estimate the anticipated change in infiltration that will occur as a result of development of the subject property.

From Table 3.1 of the Ministry's SMPDM the total yearly pre-development and post-development infiltration amounts we estimated based on the site area and corresponding percent pervious. Using an infiltration allowance of 276 mm for fine sand within urban lawns (Table 3.1), the following infiltration amounts were estimated as follows:

- total yearly infiltration = 276 mm x Area(ha) x (100-%IMP)/100 x (1/1000mm/m x 10000 m²/ha)
- total yearly infiltration (pre-dev) =  $276 \text{ mm x } 0.4052 \text{ ha x } (100\%-11.9\%)/100x 10m^3/ha/mm = 985 \text{ m}^3$
- total yearly infiltration (post-dev) = 276 mm x 0.4052 ha x (100%-47.8%)/100x 10m<sup>3</sup>/ha/mm = 584 m<sup>3</sup>

Based on the area of the site and a yearly infiltration target of 104 mm/year, the infiltration requirement would be:  $104 \text{ mm/year} \times 0.4052 \times 10 = 421.4 \text{ m}^3$ . Although there would be a net increase of 401 m3 between pre and post development, the target infiltration rate is 104 mm/year. The total yearly infiltration under post-development conditions is estimated at  $584 \text{ m}^3$ , therefore no additional infiltration practises are necessary, based on the calculated level of imperviousness.

Although the proposed stormwater design already meets the minimum infiltration target of 104 mm/year, additional infiltration will result since underground storage chambers will be used for quantity control. The proposed underground chambers consist of open-bottom pipes (half-arches) with granular bottom areas that will promote infiltration. The following briefly summarizes the additional infiltration practises proposed:

- (35.6m<sup>2</sup> + 51 m<sup>2</sup>) = 86.6 m<sup>2</sup> footprint area of the StormTech Chambers. These chambers are 1.14m in high arch pipes having open bottoms to promote infiltration (230mm bedding).
- 80.8m of 250mm perforated pipes and swales in rear-yard swales. (As per S29, 0.85m bottom width, 75mm bedding)

The following summarizes the additional underground volumes that will be available for infiltration based on a stone void ratio of 0.40.

Infiltration volume below chambers = 86.6 m<sup>2</sup> x 0.23m x 0.40 = 8.0 m<sup>3</sup>
 Infiltration volume below swales = 80.8m x 0.85m x 0.15m x 0.40 = 4.1 m<sup>3</sup>
 = 12.1 m<sup>3</sup>

The post-development yearly infiltration of 584 m3, exceeds the required target of 421.4 m3 based target rate of 104 mm/yr as established in the master studies. An additional 12.1 m3 of underground infiltration will be provided, during storm events.

## 7 Erosion & Sediment Control

During all construction activities, erosion and sedimentation shall be controlled by the following techniques:

- Filter cloth shall be installed between the frame and cover of all adjacent catch basins and catch basin manhole structures.
- Heavy duty silt fencing will be used to control runoff around the construction area. Silt fencing locations are identified on the site grading and erosion control plan.
- A mud mat will be installed at the construction entrance to help avoid mud from being transported to offsite roads.
- Visual inspection shall be completed daily on sediment control barriers and any damage repaired immediately. Care will be taken to prevent damage during construction operations.
- In some cases, barriers may be removed temporarily to accommodate the construction operations. The affected barriers will be reinstated at night when construction is completed.
- Sediment control devices will be cleaned of accumulated silt as required. The deposits will be disposed of as per the requirements of the contract.
- During the course of construction, if the engineer believes that additional prevention methods are required to control
  erosion and sedimentation, the contractor will install additional silt fences or other methods as required to the satisfaction
  of the engineer.
- Construction and maintenance requirements for erosion and sediment controls are to comply with Ontario Provincial Standard Specification (OPSS) OPSS 805 and City of Ottawa specifications.

EXP Services Inc. 1869 Maple Grove Road, Ottawa, ON OTT-00254810-A0 September 25, 2020

## 8 Conclusions and Recommendations

This Functional Servicing & Stormwater Report outlines the rationale which will be used to service the proposed development. The following summarizes the servicing requirements for the site:

#### <u>Water</u>

- Single water services shall connect into each townhome connecting off the facing street.
- The Required Fire Flows (RFFs) were estimated at 11,000 L/min (183 L/sec) and 10,000 L/min (167 L/sec) for Block 1, 7,000 L/min (117 L/sec) for Block 2, and 10,000 L/min (167 L/sec) for Block 3. For Blocks 1 and 3, fire walls will be used to separate the blocks into two areas. The total available flows for firefighting purposes, based on the contribution from hydrants, was estimated at 22,800 L/min for Block 1, 13,300 L/min for Block 2, and 17,100 L/min for Block 3.
- Based on hydraulic boundary conditions (HGL) provided by the City of Ottawa, a system pressure of between 66.7 psi and 66.9 psi under peak hourly demands is anticipated at all three blocks. This exceeds the City's guideline of 20 psi.

#### <u>Sewage</u>

• Estimated peak sewage flows **0.75** L/sec are anticipated. This exceeds current sewage flows of 0.18 L/sec under existing conditions. Although peak sewage rates exceed existing conditions, the receiving sanitary sewers on adjacent streets have adequate capacity to convey sewage flows, as offsite sanitary sewers accounted for the site during their design process.

#### **Stormwater**

- For the stormwater system, the allowable capture rate from the entire site was calculated based on a runoff coefficient of 0.65, time of concentration of 10 minutes for a 5-year storm event. The allowable release rate for the entire site was calculated to be **76.4 L/sec**. Runoff in excess of this will be detained onsite for up to the 100-year storm.
- Two minor surface drainage areas will flow uncontrolled to the right-of-way. The 100-year peak flows from these two areas were accounted for (i.e. subtracted) from the total runoff rate to establish the allowable rate.
- In order to meet the allowable release rate, a total retention volume of ±58.9 m<sup>3</sup> metres is required for the 100-yr storm.
   In addition, the 100-yr +20% volume is 74.8 m<sup>3</sup>.
- Runoff from the surface areas will be collected and detained in an underground stormwater chamber located along the east side of the site and connects into Maple Grove Road storm sewer. The volume necessary to detain the 100-year event, is 58.9 m<sup>3</sup>, based on using 50% of the allowable release rate as required by the City of Ottawa. The underground chambers will be sized to hold a minimum volume of approximately 79.2 m<sup>3</sup>.
- A single inlet control device (**Tempest LMF-90**) within a storm manhole just downstream of the underground chambers will be used to control storm outflow.
- A yearly infiltration target of 104mm/year was taken from the Pond 4 Design Brief. Based on this, the yearly infiltration requirement is **421.4 m<sup>3</sup>**. The total yearly infiltration under post-development conditions was estimated at **584 m<sup>3</sup>**, therefore meeting the target rate.

#### **Erosion & Sediment Control**

• Erosion and sediment control methods will be used during construction to limit erosion potential.

## 9 Legal Notification

This report was prepared by EXP Services Inc. for the account of 10886378 Canada Incorporated.

Any use which a third party makes of this report, or any reliance on or decisions to be made based on it, are the responsibility of such third parties. EXP Services Inc. accepts no responsibility for damages, if any, suffered by any third party as a result of decisions made or actions based on this project.

EXP Services Inc. 1869 Maple Grove Road, Ottawa, ON OTT-00254810-A0 September 25, 2020

# **Appendix A - Figures**

Figure A1 - Pre-Development Drainage Areas

Figure A2 - Post-Development Drainage Areas

Figure A3 – Fire Hydrant Locations







EXP Services Inc. 1869 Maple Grove Road, Ottawa, ON OTT-00254810-A0 September 25, 2020

## **Appendix B – Water Servicing Tables**

- Table B1 Water Demand Chart
- Table B2 Fire Flow Requirements Based on Fire Underwriters Survey (FUS) Block 1-West
- Table B3 Fire Flow Requirements Based on Fire Underwriters Survey (FUS) Block 1-East
- Table B4 Fire Flow Requirements Based on Fire Underwriters Survey (FUS) Block 2
- Table B5 Fire Flow Requirements Based on Fire Underwriters Survey (FUS) Block 3-West
- Table B6 Fire Flow Requirements Based on Fire Underwriters Survey (FUS) Block 3-East
- Table B7 Available Fire Flows Based on Hydrant Spacing
- Table B8 Estimated Water Pressure at Proposed Blocks

## TABLE B1: Water Demand Chart

Location: Project No: Designed by: Checked By: Date Revised: <u>Water Consumpr</u> Residential = Commercial =	<u>1869 Maj</u> <u>OTT-0025</u> J.Fitzpatr <u>B. Thoma</u> <u>Sept 2020</u> tion <u>350</u> 5,000	ble Grov 64810 ick is D L/cap/d L/1000r	e Rd ay n²/day									Population Single Fami Semi-Detah Duplex Townhome Bachelor A 1 Bedroom 2 Bedroom 3 Bedroom 4 Bedroom Avg. Apartr	Densiti ily nced (Row) partmen Apartm Apartm Apartm Apartm nent	nt nent nent nent nent		3.4 2.7 2.3 2.7 1.4 1.4 2.1 3.1 4.1 1.8	person/ur person/ur person/ur person/ur person/ur person/ur person/ur person/ur	hit hit hit hit hit hit hit hit					*e	exp	).
				No. of R	esiden	tial Un	its					Re	sidenti	al Dema	nds in (L/s	ec)			Comm	nercial			Total E	emands	(L/sec)
	Sin	gles/Ser	nis/Tow	ns			Apart	ments					Pea Fac (x Avg	king tors <u>g Day)</u>					Pea Fac (x Avg	king tors <u>g Day)</u>					
Proposed Buildings	Single Familty	Semi- Detached	Duplexz	Townhome	Bachelor	1 Bedroom	2 Bedroom	3 Bedroom	4 Bedroom	Avg Apt.	Total Persons (pop)	Avg. Day Demand (L/day)	Max Day	Peak Hour	Max Day Demand (L/day)	Peak Hour Demand (L/day)	Area (m <sup>2</sup> )	Avg Demand (L/day)	Max Day	Peak Hour	Max Day Demand (L/day)	Peak Hour Demand (L/day)	Avg Day (L/s)	Max Day (L/s)	Max Hour (L/s)
Block 1				8							21.6	7 560	9.50	14 30	71 820	108 108							0.09	0.83	1 25
Block 2				2							5.4	1890	9.50	14.30	17,955	27.027							0.03	0.00	0.31
Block 3	1			8							21.6	7,560	9.50	14.30	71,820	108,108							0.09	0.83	1.25
Total =				18							48.6	17,010			161,595	243,243							0.20	1.87	2.82
PEAKING FACTORS Dwelling Units Serviced 10 50 100 150 167	FROM MOE Equiv Pop 30 150 300 450 500	CC TABLE Night Min Factor 0.10 0.10 0.20 0.30 0.40	3-3 (Pea Maxim Day Factor 9.50 4.90 3.60 3.00 2.90	king Factor Peak Hour Factor 14.30 7.40 5.40 4.50 4.30	ors for V	Vater Sy	stems S	ervicing	Fewer T	'han 500	) persons														

#### TABLE B-2 FIRE FLOW REQUIREMENTS BASED ON FIRE UNDERWRITERS SURVEY(FUS) 1999 LOCATION: Block 1 - WEST



An estimate of the Fire Flow required for a given fire area may be estimated by:

F = 220 \* C \* SQRT(A)

where:

F = required fire flow in litres per minute

A = total floor area in  $m^2$  (including all storeys, but excluding basements at least 50% below grade) C = coefficient related to the type of construction

Task	Options	Multiplier			Inpu	t	Value Used	Fire Flow Total (L/min)
	Wood Frame	1.5						
Choose Building	Ordinary Construction	1						
Frame (C)	Non-combustible Construction	0.8			Wood Fr	1.5		
	Fire Resistive Construction	0.6						
Input Building Floor Areas (A)			Area	% Used	Area Used	Fire Wall Used to Split	673 0 m²	
	Floor 2		673	50%	337	Block	01010111	
	Floor 1		673	50%	337			
Fire Flow (F)	F = 220 * C * SQRT(A)							8,561
Fire Flow (F)	Rounded to nearest 1,000							9,000

Task	Options	Multiplier						Input			Value Used	Fire Flow Change (L/min)	Fire Flow Total (L/min)
	Non-combustible		-25%										
Choose	Limited Combustible		-15%										
Combustibility of	Combustible		0%				Limited	l Combustibl	e		-15%	-1,350	7,650
Building Contents	Free Burning		15%										
	Rapid Burning		25%										
	Adequate Sprinkler Conforms to NFPA13		-30%	1			No	Sprinkler			0%	0	7,650
	No Sprinkler		0%										
Choose Reduction Due to Sprinkler	Standard Water Supply for Fire Department Hose Line and for Sprinkler System		-10%			Not Standard Water Supply or Unavailable						0	7,650
System	<b>Not</b> Standard Water Supply or Unavailable		0%										
	Fully Supervised Sprinkler System		-10%			N	ot Fully S		0%	0	7 650		
	Not Fully Supervised or N/A		0%				oc r any o		0,0	Ŭ	1,000		
		-					E	xposed Wall	Length				
Choose Structure Exposure Distance	Exposures	Separ- ation Dist (m)	Cond	Separation Conditon	Exposed Wall type	Length (m)	No of Storeys	Lenth- height Factor	Sub- Conditon	Charge (%)	Total Charge (%)	Total Exposure Charge (L/min)	
Exposure Distance	Side 1 (west)	23	4	20.1 to 30	Type A	14	2	28	4A	8%			
	Side 2 (east)	0	1	0 to 3	21		Fire Wa	all		10%			
	Side 3 (north)	27	4	20.1 to 30	Type A	31	2	62	4C	9%	44%	3,366	11,016
	Side 4 (south)	0	2	3 1 to 10		14	2	28	24	17%			
		3	2	5.1 to 10	Туре А	14	2 	20	ZA Line Fleur Da		a Maasaat (	0001/min -	44.000
							100	ai Required i	-Ire Flow, RC	bunded to tr	e nearest	1,000 L/min =	11,000
Obtain Required										I otal H	Required Fir	e Flow, L/s =	183
Fire Flow			Can the 1	Total Fire Flow	be Capped a	t 10,000 L	/min (167 l	L/sec) based o	on "TECHNCA	L BULLETIN	ISTB-2018-0	02", (yes/no) =	No
								Total Requ	ired Fire Flow	(RFF). If RI	FF < 167 use	RFF (L/sec) =	183
Exposure Charges for	Exposing Walls of Wood Fram	ne Const	ruciton (f	rom Table G5	<u>)</u>								
Type A	Wood-Frame or non-conbustibl	e											
Туре В	Ordinary or fire-resisitve with u	nprotected	openings										
Type C	Oralinary or titre-resistive with semi-protected openings												
Туре D	Ordinary or fire-resisitve with b	ank wali											
Conditons for Separat	ion												
Separation Dist	Condition												
0m to 3m	1												
3.1m to 10m	2												
10.1m to 20m	3												
20.1m to 30m	4												
30.1m to 45m	5												
> 45.1m	6												

#### TABLE B-3 FIRE FLOW REQUIREMENTS BASED ON FIRE UNDERWRITERS SURVEY(FUS) 1999 LOCATION: Block 1 - EAST



2

An estimate of the Fire Flow required for a given fire area may be estimated by:

F = 220 \* C \* SQRT(A)

where:

F = required fire flow in litres per minute

A = total floor area in  $m^2$  (including all storeys, but excluding basements at least 50% below grade) C = coefficient related to the type of construction

Task	Options	Multiplier			Inpu	t	Value Used	Fire Flow Total (L/min)
	Wood Frame	1.5						
Choose Building	Ordinary Construction	1						
Frame (C)	Non-combustible Construction	0.8			Wood Fr	1.5		
	Fire Resistive Construction	0.6						
Input Building Floor Areas (A)			Area	% Used	Area Used	Fire Wall Used to Split	673.0 m²	
	Floor 2		673	50%	337	Block	01010111	
	Floor 1		673	50%	337			
Fire Flow (F)	F = 220 * C * SQRT(A)							8,561
Fire Flow (F)	Rounded to nearest 1,000							9,000

Task	Options	Multiplier				Input Value Used (L/min) (L/)							
	Non-combustible		-25%	1									
Choose	Limited Combustible		-15%										
Combustibility of	Combustible		0%				Limited	l Combustibl	е		-15%	-1,350	7,650
Building Contents	Free Burning		15%										
	Rapid Burning		25%										
	Adequate Sprinkler Conforms to NFPA13		-30%				No		0%	0	7,650		
	No Sprinkler		0%										
Choose Reduction Due to Sprinkler	Standard Water Supply for Fire Department Hose Line and for Sprinkler System		-10%	1		Not Standard Water Supply or Unavailable						0	7,650
System	<b>Not</b> Standard Water Supply or Unavailable		0%										
	Fully Supervised Sprinkler System		-10%			Not Fully Supervised or N/A						0	7,650
	Not Fully Supervised or N/A		0%	1		1		-		,			
		Canan					E	xposed Wall	Length				
Choose Structure Exposure Distance	Exposures	ation Dist (m)	Cond	Separation Conditon	Exposed Wall type	Length (m)	No of Storeys	Lenth- height Factor	Sub- Conditon	Charge (%)	Total Charge (%)	Total Exposure Charge (L/min)	
Exposure Distance	Side 1 (west)	23	4	20.1 to 30	Type A		F	ire Wall		10%			
	Side 2 (east)	9	2	3.1 to 10	Type A	14	2	28	2A	17%	400/	0.000	10 710
	Side 3 (north)	26	4	20.1 to 30	Type A	4.6	2	9.2	4A	8%	40%	3,060	10,710
	Side 4 (south)	34	5	30.1 to 45	Type A	25	2	50	5B	5%	1		
							Tot	al Required	Fire Flow, Ro	ounded to th	ne Nearest	1,000 L/min =	11,000
Obtain Required										Total I	Required Fi	re Flow, L/s =	183
Fire Flow			Can the T	Total Fire Flow	be Capped a	t 10,000 L	/min (167 l	L/sec) based o	on "TECHNCA	L BULLETIN	ISTB-2018-	02", (yes/no) =	Yes
								Total Requ	ired Fire Flow	(RFF). If R	FF < 167 use	RFF (L/sec) =	167
Exposure Charges for	Exposing Walls of Wood Fra	me Const	ruciton (f	rom Table G5	)								
Type A	Wood-Frame or non-conbustib	le											
Type B	Ordinary or fire-resisitve with u	inprotected	l openings										
Type C Tyme D	Ordinary or fire-resisitve with s	emi-protec	ted openii	ngs									
Туре D	Ordinary of fire-resistive with b	iank wan											
Conditons for Separat	ion												
Separation Dist	Condition												
0m to 3m	1												
3.1m to 10m	2												
10.1m to 20m	3												
20.1m to 30m	4												
30.1m to 45m	5												
> 45.1m	6												

#### TABLE B-4 FIRE FLOW REQUIREMENTS BASED ON FIRE UNDERWRITERS SURVEY(FUS) 1999 LOCATION: Block 2



An estimate of the Fire Flow required for a given fire area may be estimated by:

F = 220 \* C \* SQRT(A)

where:

F = required fire flow in litres per minute

A = total floor area in  $m^2$  (including all storeys, but excluding basements at least 50% below grade) C = coefficient related to the type of construction

Task	Options	Multiplier			Input	t in the second s	Value Used	Fire Flow Total (L/min)
	Wood Frame	1.5						
Choose Building	Ordinary Construction	1						
Frame (C)	Non-combustible Construction	0.8			1.5			
	Fire Resistive Construction	0.6						
Input Building Floor Areas (A)			Area	% Used	Area Used		368 0 m²	
	Floor 2		184	100%	184		000.011	
	Floor 1		184	100%	184			
Fire Flow (F)	F = 220 * C * SQRT(A)							6,330
Fire Flow (F)	Rounded to nearest 1,000							6,000

Task	Options		Multipli	ier				Input			Value Used	Fire Flow Change (L/min)	Fire Flow Total (L/min)
	Non-combustible		-25%										
Choose	Limited Combustible		-15%	L. C.									
Combustibility of	Combustible		0%				Limited	Combustibl	e		-15%	-900	5,100
Building Contents	Free Burning		15%										
	Rapid Burning		25%										
	Adequate Sprinkler Conforms to NFPA13		-30%	1			No	Sprinkler			0%	0	5,100
	No Sprinkler		0%										
Choose Reduction Due to Sprinkler	Standard Water Supply for Fire Department Hose Line and for Sprinkler System		-10%			Not Stan	dard Wat		0%	0	5,100		
System	<b>Not</b> Standard Water Supply or Unavailable		0%										
	Fully Supervised Sprinkler System		-10%			N	ot Fully S	upervised or	N/A		0%	0	5,100
	Not Fully Supervised or N/A	0%							-	-	-,		
							E	kposed Wall	Length				
Choose Structure	Exposures	Separ- ation Dist (m)	Cond	Separation Conditon	Exposed Wall type	Length (m)	No of Storeys	Lenth- height Factor	Sub- Conditon	Charge (%)	Total Charge (%)	Total Exposure Charge (L/min)	
Exposure Distance	Side 1 (west)	50	6	> 45.1	Type A	0	0	0	6	0%			
	Side 2 (east)	38	5	30.1 to 45	Type A	14	2	28	5A	5%		1,989	
	Side 3 (north)	9	2	3.1 to 10	Type A	14	2	28	2A	17%	39%		7,089
	Side 4 (south)	10	2	3.1 to 10		1/	2	28	24	17%			
		10	2	5.1 (0 10	Турс А	17	Z	20 al Required [	iro Elow, Bo	unded to th	o Nooroot /	000 L/min =	7 000
							100	ai Requireu r	TITE FIOW, RC			1,000 L/IIIII -	7,000
Obtain Required										Iotal F	kequirea Fir	e Flow, L/s =	117
Fire Flow			Can the T	Total Fire Flow	be Capped a	it 10,000 L	/min (167 l	_/sec) based o	on "TECHNCA	L BULLETIN	ISTB-2018-0	)2", (yes/no) =	Yes
								Total Requ	ired Fire Flow	(RFF). If RI	FF < 167 use	RFF (L/sec) =	117
Exposure Charges for	Exposing Walls of Wood Fran	ne Const	ruciton (fi	rom Table G5	<u>)</u>								
Type A	Wood-Frame or non-conbustibl	le pprotoctad	oponinas										
Туре В Туре С	Ordinary or fire-resisitve with u	nprotected	openings										
Type C Type D	Ordinary or fire regisitive with b	enn-protec	aed openin	igs									
Туре D	Ordinary of me-resistive with b	ank wan											
Conditons for Separat	ion												
Separation Dist	Condition												
0m to 3m	1												
3.1m to 10m	2												
10.1m to 20m	3												
20.1m to 30m	4												
30.1m to 45m	5												
> 45.1m	6												

#### TABLE B-5 FIRE FLOW REQUIREMENTS BASED ON FIRE UNDERWRITERS SURVEY(FUS) 1999 LOCATION: Block 3 - WEST



4

An estimate of the Fire Flow required for a given fire area may be estimated by:

F = 220 \* C \* SQRT(A)

where:

F = required fire flow in litres per minute

A = total floor area in  $m^2$  (including all storeys, but excluding basements at least 50% below grade) C = coefficient related to the type of construction

Task	Options	Multiplier			Inpu	t	Value Used	Fire Flow Total (L/min)
	Wood Frame	1.5						
Choose Building	Ordinary Construction	1						
Frame (C)	Non-combustible Construction	0.8			Wood Fr	1.5		
	Fire Resistive Construction							
Input Building Floor Areas (A)			Area	% Used	Area Used		673 0 m²	
	Floor 2		673	50%	337		01010111	
	Floor 1		673	50%	337			
Fire Flow (F)	F = 220 * C * SQRT(A)							8,561
Fire Flow (F)	Rounded to nearest 1,000							9,000

Task	Options		Multipli	ier				Input			Value Used	Fire Flow Change (L/min)	Fire Flow Total (L/min)	
	Non-combustible		-25%											
Choose	Limited Combustible		-15%											
Combustibility of	Combustible		0%				Limited	l Combustibl	e		-15%	-1,350	7,650	
Combustibility of Building Contents Choose Reduction Due to Sprinkler System	Free Burning		15%											
	Rapid Burning		25%											
	Adequate Sprinkler Conforms to NFPA13		-30%	1			No		0%	0	7,650			
	No Sprinkler		0%											
Choose Reduction Due to Sprinkler	Standard Water Supply for Fire Department Hose Line and for Sprinkler System		-10%			Not Stan	dard Wat		0%	0	7,650			
System	<b>Not</b> Standard Water Supply or Unavailable		0%											
	Fully Supervised Sprinkler System		-10%			N	ot Fully S	upervised or	N/A		0%	0	7 650	
	Not Fully Supervised or N/A	0%					ot runy s	0,0	•	1,000				
						Exposed V			Length					
Choose Structure	Exposures	Separ- ation Dist (m)	Cond	Separation Conditon	Exposed Wall type	Length (m)	No of Storeys	Lenth- height Factor	Sub- Conditon	Charge (%)	Total Charge (%)	Total Exposure Charge (L/min)		
Exposure Distance	Side 1 (west)	6	2	3.1 to 10	Type A	14	2	28	2A	17%				
	Side 2 (east)	0	1	0 to 3	Type A		F	ire Wall		10%				
	Side 3 (north)	10	2	3.1 to 10	Type A	14	2	28	2A	17%	52%	3,978	11,628	
	Side 4 (south)	30	4	20.1 to 20	Type A	15	2	20	4.0	8%				
		30	4	20.1 10 50	Туре А	10	2	30	44	070			40.000	
							101	ai Required i	-Ire Flow, RC	bunded to tr	e nearest	1,000 L/min =	12,000	
Obtain Required	Total Required Fire Flow, L/s =													
Fire Flow			Can the T	Total Fire Flow	be Capped a	t 10,000 L	/min (167 l	L/sec) based c	on "TECHNCA	L BULLETIN	ISTB-2018-0	02", (yes/no) =	Yes	
								Total Requ	ired Fire Flow	(RFF). If RI	FF < 167 use	RFF (L/sec) =	167	
Exposure Charges for	Exposing Walls of Wood Fra	ne Const	ruciton (fi	rom Table G5	<u>)</u>									
Type A	Wood-Frame or non-conbustibl	e												
Туре В	Ordinary or fire-resisitve with u	nprotected	openings											
Type C	Ordinary or fire-resisitve with se	emi-protec	ted openir	ngs										
Туре D	Ordinary or fire-resisitve with b	ank wali												
Conditons for Separat	ion													
Separation Dist	Condition													
0m to 3m	1													
3.1m to 10m	2													
10.1m to 20m	3													
20.1m to 30m	4													
30.1m to 45m	5													
> 45.1m	6													

#### TABLE B-6 FIRE FLOW REQUIREMENTS BASED ON FIRE UNDERWRITERS SURVEY(FUS) 1999 LOCATION: Block 3 - EAST



An estimate of the Fire Flow required for a given fire area may be estimated by:

F = 220 \* C \* SQRT(A)

where:

F = required fire flow in litres per minute

A = total floor area in  $m^2$  (including all storeys, but excluding basements at least 50% below grade) C = coefficient related to the type of construction

Task	Options	Multiplier			Value Used	Fire Flow Total (L/min)		
	Wood Frame	1.5						
Choose Building	Ordinary Construction	1						
Frame (C)	Non-combustible Construction	0.8			Wood Fr	1.5		
	Fire Resistive Construction							
Input Building Floor Areas (A)			Area	% Used	Area Used		673 0 m²	
	Floor 2		673	50%	337		01010111	
	Floor 1		673	50%	337			
Fire Flow (F)	F = 220 * C * SQRT(A)							8,561
Fire Flow (F)	Rounded to nearest 1,000							9,000

Task	Options		Multipli	er				Input			Value Used	Fire Flow Total (L/min)	
	Non-combustible		-25%										
Choose	Limited Combustible		-15%										
Combustibility of	Combustible		0%				Limited	l Combustibl	e		-15%	-1,350	7,650
Task         Choose         Combustibility of         Building Contents         Building Contents         Choose Reduction         Due to Sprinkler         System         Choose Structure         Exposure Distance         Gobtain Required         Fire Flow         Type A         Type B         Type C         Type D         Conditions for Separation Dist         Separation Dist	Free Burning		15%										
	Rapid Burning		25%										
	Adequate Sprinkler Conforms to NFPA13		-30%				No		0%	0	7,650		
	No Sprinkler		0%										
Choose Reduction Due to Sprinkler	Standard Water Supply for Fire Department Hose Line and for Sprinkler System		-10%			Not Stan	dard Wat		0%	0	7,650		
System	<b>Not</b> Standard Water Supply or Unavailable		0%										
	Fully Supervised Sprinkler System		-10%			N	ot Fully S		0%	0	7.650		
	Not Fully Supervised or N/A	0%						0,0	Ŭ	1,000			
							E	xposed Wall	Length				
Choose Structure	Exposures	Separ- ation Dist (m)	Cond	Separation Conditon	Exposed Wall type	Length (m)	No of Storeys	Lenth- height Factor	Sub- Conditon	Charge (%)	Total Charge (%)	Total Exposure Charge (L/min)	
Exposure Distance	Side 1 (west)	0	1	0 to 3	Type A		F	ire Wall		10%			
	Side 2 (east)	10	2	3.1 to 10	Type A	14	2	28	2A	17%		2,448	
	Side 3 (north)	34	5	30.1 to 45	Type A	25	2	50	5B	5%	32%		10,098
	Side 4 (acuth)	50	6	50.1 to 45	Turne A	20		00	00	0%			
	Side 4 (sourr)	50	0	245.1	Type A	Type A 0 0 0 6 0%							40.000
							IOI	al Required i	-Ire Flow, Ro	ounded to th	e Nearest	1,000 L/min =	10,000
Obtain Required										I otal H	Required Fir	e Flow, L/s =	167
Fire Flow			Can the T	otal Fire Flow	be Capped a	it 10,000 L	/min (167 l	L/sec) based o	on "TECHNCA	L BULLETIN	ISTB-2018-0	02", (yes/no) =	Yes
								Total Requ	ired Fire Flow	(RFF). If RI	FF < 167 use	RFF (L/sec) =	167
Exposure Charges for	Exposing Walls of Wood Fran	me Const	ruciton (fi	rom Table G5	<u>)</u>								
Type A	Wood-Frame or non-conbustibl	le norotootod	lononinaa										
туре Б Тура С	Ordinary or fire-resistive with u	nprotected	tod ononings	200									
Туре С Туре D	Ordinary or fire-resisitve with b	lank wall	leu openii	iys									
Conditons for Separat	ation												
Separation Dist	Condition												
3 1m to 10m	2												
10.1m to 20m	∠ 3												
20 1m to 30m	4												
30 1m to 45m	5												
> 45.1m	6												



Hydrant #	Block	1 (West)	Block	1 (East)	BI	ock 2	Block 3	3 (West)	Block 3 (East)		
	<sup>1</sup> Distance (m) <sup>2</sup> Fire Flow Contribution (L/min)		<sup>1</sup> Distance (m)	<sup>2</sup> Fire Flow Contribution (L/min)	Distance (m)	Fire Flow Contribution (L/min)	Distance (m)	Fire Flow Contribution (L/min)	Distance (m)	Fire Flow Contribution (L/min)	
348015H064	NA		NA		NA		83	3,800	104	3,800	
348016H070	NA		NA		NA		29	5,700	36	5,700	
348016H071	NA		NA		NA		118	3,800	94	3,800	
348015H065	59	5,700	127	3,800	50	5,700	NA		NA		
348016H081	50	5,700	73	5,700	79	3,800	NA		NA		
348016H080	63	5,700	63	5,700	132	3,800	NA		NA		
348016H079	136	3,800	119	3,800	NA		NA		NA		
348016H063	107	3,800	83	3,800	NA		147	3,800	125	3,800	
Total Fire Fflow Avail		24,700		22,800		13,300		17,100		17,100	
in L/min (L/sec)		(412)		(380)		(222)		(285)		(285)	
FUS RFF in L/min		11,000		10,020		7,000		10,020		10,020	
(L/sec)		(183)		(167)		(117)		(167)		(167)	
Meets Requreiment (Yes/No)		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes	

# TABLE B7: FIRE FLOW CONTRIBUTIONS BASED ON HYDRANT SPACING

Notes:

<sup>1</sup>Distance is measured along a road or fire route.

<sup>2</sup>Fire Flow Contribution for Class AA Hydrant from Table 1 of Appendix I, ISTB-2018-02

# TABLE B4ESTIMATED WATER PRESSURE AT PROPOSED BUILDING

Description	From	То	Demand (L/sec)	Pipe Length (m)	Pipe Dia (mm)	Dia (m)	Q (m3/sec)	Area (m2)	с	Vel (m/s)	Slope of HGL (m/m)	Head Loss (m)	Elev From (m)	Elev To (m)	*Elev Diff (m)	Pressui kPa	Pressure From F kPa (psi) k		re To (psi)	Pressure Drop (psi)
Avg Day Conditons																				
Single 19mm service Block 1	Main	Building	0.01	15 m	19	0.019	0.0000	0.000284	110	0.0397	0.00029	0.0044	107.60	108.96	-1.4	516.0	(74.8)	502.6	(72.9)	1.9
Single 19mm service Block 2	Main	Building	0.01	15 m	19	0.019	0.0000	0.000284	110	0.0353	0.00023	0.0035	107.60	108.96	-1.4	516.0	(74.8)	502.6	(72.9)	1.9
Single 19mm service Block 3	Main	Building	0.01	15 m	19	0.019	0.0000	0.000284	110	0.0397	0.00029	0.0044	107.40	108.80	-1.4	518.0	(75.1)	504.2	(73.1)	2.0
	-																	┣──	──	
Max Day Conditions																		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	
Single 19mm service Block 1	Main	Building	0.10	15 m	19	0.019	0.0001	0.000284	110	0.3659	0.01784	0.2676	107.60	108.96	-1.4	516.0	(74.8)	500.0	(72.5)	2.3
Single 19mm service Block 2	Main	Building	0.11	15 m	19	0.019	0.0001	0.000284	110	0.3703	0.01824	0.2736	107.60	108.96	-1.4	516.0	(74.8)	500.0	(72.5)	2.3
Single 19mm service Block 3	Main	Building	0.10	15 m	19	0.019	0.0001	0.000284	110	0.3659	0.01784	0.2676	107.40	108.80	-1.4	518.0	(75.1)	501.6	(72.8)	2.4
Peak Hour Conditons																		┝──	┝───	
Single 19mm service Block 1	Main	Building	0.16	15 m	19	0.019	0 0002	0 000284	110	0 5511	0 03809	0 5713	107 60	108 96	-14	478 7	(69.4)	459.8	(66.7)	27
Single 19mm service Block 2	Main	Building	0.16	15 m	19	0.019	0.0002	0.000284	110	0.5467	0.03753	0.5629	107.60	108.96	-1.4	478.7	(69.4)	459.9	(66.7)	2.7
Single 19mm service Block 3	Main	Building	0.16	15 m	19	0.019	0.0002	0.000284	110	0.5511	0.03809	0.5713	107.40	108.80	-1.4	480.7	(69.7)	461.4	(66.9)	2.8
Water Demand Info         Average Demand (L/sec) =         Max Day Demand (L/sec) =         Peak Hr Deamand (L/sec) =         Fireflow Requriement (L/sec) =         Max Day Plus FF Demand (L/sec) =         From watermain to building =         Connection # (from City)         Connection to         Min HGL (m)         Max Day + FF (167 L/s) HGL (m)         Approx Ground Elev at Conn (m) =         Approx Bldg FF Elev (m) =         Min Pressure (m) =         Max Pressure (m) =	Block 1 0.09 0.83 1.25 183 183.8 15 m #3 Bensinger 156.4 160.2 141.4 107.6 108.96 48.8 52.6	Block 2 0.02 0.21 0.31 117 117.2 15 m #2 Mykonos 156.4 160.2 147.0 107.6 108.96 48.8 52.6	Block 3 0.09 0.83 1.25 167 167.8 15 m #1 Maple Grove 156.4 160.2 154.7 107.4 108.80 49.0 52.8			Hazen V	Villiams C F	actor for Fr	riction L	oss in Pip	ю, С=	110								
Min Pressure (Pa) = Max Pressure (Pa) = Min Pressure (psi) = Max Pressure (psi) =	478,728 516,006 69.4 74.8	478,728 516,006 69.4 74.8	480,690 517,968 69.7 75.1																	

.

EXP Services Inc. 1869 Maple Grove Road, Ottawa, ON OTT-00254810-A0 September 25, 2020

# **Appendix C – Sanitary Servicing Tables**

Table C1 – Sanitary Sewer Design Sheet
\*exp.

#### Table C1: SANITARY SEWER CALCULATION SHEET

	LOCATION	N					RES	SEDENTI	AL AREA	S AND P	OPULAII	rons				CO	OMMERC	IAL	11	IDUSTRI	AL	INSTIT	JTIONAL	IN	FILTRATI	ON					SEWER	DATA		
							NUM	IBER OF	UNITS			POPU	LATION			AREA	A (ha)		ARE	A (ha)	Peak			AREA	A (ha)									
Street				Area											Peak			Peak			Factor		ACCU			INFILT	TOTAL	Nom	Actual	Slope	Length	Capacity	Q/Q <sub>CAP</sub>	Full
Street	0/3 1011		Desc	(ha)	Singles	Semis	Towns	1-Bed	2-Bed	3-Bed	4-Bed			Peak	Flow	INDIV	ACCU	Flow	INDIV	ACCU	(per	AREA	AREA	INDIV	ACCU	FLOW	FLOW	Dia	Dia	(%)	(m)	(L/sec)	(%)	Velocity
								Apt.	Apt.	Apt.	Apt.	INDIV	ACCU	Factor	(L/sec)			(L/sec)			MOE)	(Ha)	(Ha)			(L/s)	(L/s)	(mm)	(mm)					(m/s)
Maple Grove Rd	MHSA65072	MHSA65073		0.1719			8.00					21.6	21.6	3.70	0.26									0.1719	0.17	0.06	0.32	200	201.2	0.58	72.020	25.4	1%	0.92
Mykonos Cres			EXSA1	0.2521			14.00					37.8	37.8																					
Mykonos Cres			EXSA2	0.0512			2.00					5.4	43.2																					
Mykonos Cres	MHSA65629	MHSA65630	SA2	0.0665			2.00					5.4	48.6	3.65	0.57									0.0665	0.3186	0.11	0.68	200	201.2	1.51	10.610	41.0	2%	1.49
Mykonos Cres	MHSA65630	MHSA6526	EXSA3	0.0530									48.6	3.65	0.57									0.0530	0.3716	0.12	0.70	200	201.2	1.00	35.120	33.3	2%	1.21
														3.80																				
Bensinger Way			EXSA4	0.3682			15.00					40.5	89.1	3.61	1.04									0.3682	0.7398	0.24	1.29							
Bensinger Way			EXSA5	0.1883			5.00					13.5	102.6	3.59	1.19									0.1883	0.1883	0.06	1.26							
Bensinger Way	MHSA6526	MHSA6525	SA3	0.1667			8.00					21.6	124.2	3.57	1.44									0.1667	0.5383	0.18	1.61	200	201.2	1.04	50.840	34.0	5%	1.24
							1																											
-				1.32			54					145.8			5.08									1.01										
Desidential Ave. Dell							<b>C</b>					(			De el De	a da da a d	Flann (1. /a		D*-**4	0.0		the state of			(11-14	Designe	ed:			Project:				
Commonsiel Aug. Dali	y Flow, q (L/p/ua	y) = 			280		comme	i ciai Pear	racior =		1.5	(when a	rea <20%)		Peak Pu	pulation	FIOW, (L/S	ec) =	P . q . ivi/	60.4		Cingles	<u>e</u>	Persons/	Unit	LEiter	-trials D	<b>F</b> ==		1000 M				
or L/gross ba/sec =	IV FIOW (L/gross I	id/udy) =			28,000						1.0	(when a	rea < 20%)		PedK EX Residen	tial Poaki	ng Factor	M -	1 + (1/)	(4+PA0 5)	1) * K	Sami-Da	tached	3.4		J. ниzр	aurick, P	.Eng.		1009 101	apie Gro	ve Drive		
Institutianal Avg Da	ily Flow (L/s/ha)	-			28 000		Instituti	onal Peak	Factor =		1 5	(when a	rea >20%)		A. = Cur	nulative A	Area (heci	tares)	1 . (14)	(411 0.5)	// K	Townho	nes	2.7		Checke	d.			Location	n.			
or L/gross ha/sec =	,				0 324						1.0	(when a	rea <20%)		P = Pop	ulation (th	housands	)				Single A	ot. Unit	1.4										
Light Industrial Flow	(L/gross ha/day)	=			35,000						1.0		,					,				2-bed Ap	ot. Unit	2.1		B. Thor	nas. P.E	na.		Ottawa.	Ontario			
or L/gross ha/sec =					0.40509		Residen	tial Corre	ction Fac	tor, K =	0.80				Sewer C	apacity, C	Qcap (L/se	ec) =	1/N S1/	<sup>2</sup> R <sup>2/3</sup> A <sub>c</sub>		3-bed Ap	ot. Unit	3.1				5						
Light Industrial Flow	(L/gross ha/day)	=			55,000		Mannin	g N =			0.013				(Mannir	ig's Equat	tion)					4-bed Ap	ot. Unit	4.1		File Ref	erence:			Page No	):			
or L/gross ha/sec =					0.637		Peak ex	traneous	flow, I (I	/s/ha) =	0.33	(Total I/	)													254810	SAN - S	Sewer De	sign	4 - 5 4				
																										Sheet,	Sept 25,	2020.xls	х	1011				

## **Appendix D – Stormwater Servicing**

- Table D1 Estimation of Catchment Time of Concentration for Pre-Development Conditions
- Table D2 Estimation of Peak Flows (Pre-Development Conditions) Using Calculated Time Of Concentration
- Table D3 Estimation of Allowable Minor System Flows to Maple Grove Storm Sewer
- Table D4 Average Runoff Coefficients for Post-Development Conditions
- Table D5 Summary of Post-Development Peak Flows (Uncontrolled and Controlled)
- Table D6 Summary of Post Development Storage
- Table D7 Storage Volumes for 2-year, 5-year, 100-year, and 100-year Plus 20% Storms (Based on MRM)
- Table D8 5-Year Storm Sewer Calculation Sheet
- StormTech Chambers North (Layout)
- StormTech Chambers North
- StormTech Chambers South (Layout)
- **StormTech Chambers South**
- StormTech MC3500 Chambers Spec Sheet
- Tempest-Technical-Manual (page 5 only)

### TABLE D1

### ESTIMATION OF CATCHMENT TIME OF CONCENTRATION (PRE-DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS)

Catchment No.	Area (ha)	High Elev (m)	Low Elev (m)	Flow Path Length (m)	Indiv Slope	Avg. C	Time of Conc. Tc	Description			
PRE_S01	0.4052	107.5	106.6	51.0	1.8	0.28	15.77	See Note 1			
Total	0.4052										
Notes											
1) For Catchments with Runoff Coefficient less than C=0.40, Time of Concentration Based on Federal Aviation Formula (Airport Method),											
from MTO Drainage Manual Equation 8.16, where: $T_c = 3.26* (1.1-C)* L^{0.5} / S_W^{0.33}$											

### TABLE D2

### ESTIMATION OF PEAK FLOWS (PRE-DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS) USING CALACUTLED TIME OF CONCENTRATIONS

		Time of		Storm = 2 yr			Storm = 5 y	r	S	torm = 100 y	/r
Catchment No.	Area (ha)	Conc, Tc (min)	l₂ (mm/hr)	Cavg	Q <sub>5PRE</sub> (L/sec)	l₅ (mm/hr)	Cavg	Q <sub>5PRE</sub> (L/sec)	l <sub>100</sub> (mm/hr)	Cavg	Q <sub>100PRE</sub> (L/sec)
PRE_S01	0.4052	15.77	60.01	0.28	18.9	81.15	0.28	25.6	138.74	0.35	54.7
Total	0.4052				18.9			25.6			54.7
Notes											
1) Intensity, I = 73	2.951/(Tc+6	.199) <sup>0.810</sup> (2-yea	r, City of Ott	awa)							
2) Intensity, I = 99	8.071/(Tc+6	.035) <sup>0.814</sup> (5-yea	r, City of Ott	awa)							
3) Intensity, I = 17	'35.688/(Tc+	5.014) <sup>0.820</sup> (100	-year, City of	Ottawa)							
4) Cavg for 100-ye	ear is increas	ed by 25% to a	maximum of	1.0							

# TABLE D3ESTIMATION OF ALLOWABLE MINOR SYSTEM FLOWS TO MAPLE GROVE STORM SEWERBased on 5-year Storm Sewer Design with C=0.65 & Tc=10mins (Pond 4 Desing Brief, DSEL)

		Time of		Storm = 5 yr							
Catchment No.	Area (ha)	Conc, Tc	I <sub>5</sub>		Q <sub>ALLOW</sub>						
		(min)	(mm/hr)	Cavg	(L/sec)						
PRE_S01	0.4052	10	104.29	0.65	76.4						
Total			-		76.4						
Notes											
1) Allowable Flow	rs to Storm Se	wer on Maple	Grove Basea	on DSEL Strm S	Sewer						
Desing for Pond 4 with Cavg or C = 0.65, Tc=10 mins, A=0.40 ha											
2) Peak flows in excess of Allowable rate to be discharged downstream, and strored											
in roadway pondr	na areas and	nark storaae a	s ner Pond 4	Desian Brief DS	FI						

### TABLE D4

### AVERAGE RUNOFF COEFFICIENTS (Post-Development)

Runoff Coeffien	ts	C <sub>ASPH/CONC</sub> =	<u>0.90</u>	C <sub>ROOF</sub> =	<u>0.90</u>	C <sub>GRASS</sub> =	<u>0.20</u>			
Area No.	Asphalt & Conc Areas (m <sup>2</sup> )	A * C <sub>asph</sub>	Roof Areas (m <sup>2</sup> )	A * C <sub>ROOF</sub>	Grassed Areas (m <sup>2</sup> )	A * C <sub>GRASS</sub>	Sum AC	Total Area (m²)	C <sub>AVG</sub> (see note)	Comment
S01								2433	0.44	Surface Areas
S02								719	0.68	Surface Areas
S03								696	0.68	Surface Areas
S04								202	0.60	Surface Areas
Totals								4,050	0.53	
Notes 1) Cavg derived w	vith area-wei	ghting comman	d in PCSWM	M						

### TABLE D5 SUMMARY OF POST-DEVELOPMENT PEAK FLOWS (Uncontrolled and Controlled )

		Time of		Storm :	= 2 yr			Storm	= 5 yr			Storm	i = 100 yr		
		Conc, Tc			Q	Q <sub>CAP</sub>			Q	Q <sub>CAP</sub>		I <sub>100</sub>	Q		
Area No	Area (ha)	(min)	C <sub>AVG</sub>	I <sub>2</sub> (mm/hr)	(L/sec)	(L/sec)	C <sub>AVG</sub>	I <sub>5</sub> (mm/hr)	(L/sec)	(L/sec)	C <sub>AVG</sub>	(mm/hr)	(L/sec)	Q <sub>CAP</sub> (L/sec)	Comments
S01	0.2433	10	0.44	76.81	22.9	3.10	0.44	104.19	31.0	4.20	0.55	178.56	66.4	9.00	Controlled - Maple Grove
S02	0.0719	10	0.68	76.81	10.4	(10.4)	0.68	104.19	14.2	(14.2)	0.85	178.56	30.3	(30.3)	Uncontrolled - Maple Grove
Total to Maple	Grove Road	Storm Sewers	(overland+	⊦pipe) =		13.5				18.4				39.3	
S03	0.0696	10	0.68	76.81	10.1	(10.1)	0.68	104.19	13.7	(13.7)	0.85	178.56	29.4	(29.4)	Uncontrolled - Bensinger
Total to Bensing	ger Way Sto	rm Sewers (ov	verland) =			10.1				13.7				29.4	
S04	0.0202	10	0.60	76.81	2.6	2.6	0.60	104.19	3.5	3.5	0.75	178.56	7.5	7.5	Uncontrolled- Mykonos
Total to Mykon	os Crescent	Storm Sewers	(overland)	=		(2.6)				(3.5)				(7.5)	
Totals =	0.4050				46.0	26.2			62.4	35.6			133.6	76.2	
Allowable rates	for compar	ison												76.4	
<u>Notes</u>															
2-yr Storm Inter	nsity, I = 732	.951/(Tc+6.19	99)^0.810 (	City of Ottawa	a)										
5-yr Storm Inter	nsity, I = 998	.071/(Tc+6.03	35)^0.814 (	City of Ottawa	a)										
100-yr Storm In	tensity, I = 1	735.688/(Tc+	6.014)&^0.	820 (City of Oi	ttawa)										
Time of Concen	tration (min	), Tc =	10												
For Flows under	r column Qco	ap which are s	hown in br	ackets <b>(0.0)</b> ,	denotes flov	vs that are	uncontrolled	d							

### TABLE D6

### SUMMARY OF POST DEVELOPMENT STORAGE

		Rel	ease Rate (	L/s)		<sup>1</sup> Storage F	Required (m <sup>8</sup>	3)		Stora	ge Provided	(m <sup>3</sup> )		
Area No.	Area (ha)	2-yr	5-yr	100-yr	2-yr (MRM)	5-yr (MRM)	100-yr (MRM)	100-yr +20 (MRM)	Pipe	Surface Ponding	UG Chambers	UG CB/MHs	Total	Control Method
														ICD - TEMPEST LMF TYPE 90
S01	0.2433	3.10	4.20	9.00	16.0	21.5	58.9	74.8			79.2		79.2	Controlled 9 L/sec @ 1.44m
														(Actual 8.6 L/sec for LMF 90 at 1.44m)
S02	0.0719	10.44	14.16	30.34										None
S03	0.0696	10.11	13.71	29.37										None
S04	0.0202	2.59	3.51	7.52										None
Totals	0.4050	26.23	35.58	76.22	16.0	21.5	58.9	74.8						
<u>Notes</u>														
1) The storage r	required is b	ased on the N	lodified Rat	ional Method	(MRM) for	the relase r	ates noted.							

TABLE	D7	Storage	Volum	es for 2	-year,	5-Year a	nd 100	-Year S	torms	(MRM)										
		601																		
	Area No:	501	-																	
	C <sub>AVG</sub> =	0.44	_(2-yr)																	
	C <sub>AVG</sub> =	0.44	(5-yr)																	
	C <sub>AVG</sub> =	0.55	(100-yr, N	/lax 1.0)					Actu	al Release	Rate (L/sec) =	9.0	-							
Tim	ie Interval =	5.00	(mins)	,		Per	centage o	of Actual Ra	ate (City of	Ottawa re	equirement) =	50%	(Set to 50%	% when U/0	6 storage us	ed)	. (0()	2004		
Drai	nage Area =	0.2433	(hectares	)		Release	Rate Used	for Estim	ation of 10	0-year Sto	orage (L/sec) =	4.5	<u> </u>			Intensity	Incr (%) =	20%	Use 20%	for
													1						Climate	unange
	R	elease Rate =	3.1	(L/sec)		Relea	ase Rate =	4.2	(L/sec)		Rele	ase Rate =	4.5	(L/sec)		Rele	ase Rate =	4.5	(L/sec)	
	Re	turn Period =	2	(years)		Retur	n Period =	5	(years)		Retur	n Period =	100	(years)		Retur	n Period =	100+20%	(years)	
	IDF Par	rameters, A =	733.0	, B =	0.810	IDF Param	eters, A =	998.1	, B =	0.814	IDF Param	neters, A =	1735.7	, B =	0.820	IDF Param	neters, A =	1735.7	, B =	0.820
Duration		( I = A/	(T <sub>c</sub> +C)	, C =	6.199	(1:	= A/(T <sub>c</sub> +C)		, C =	6.053	(1	$= A/(T_c+C)$		, C =	6.014	(1	$= A/(T_c+C)$		, C =	6.014
(mins)	Rainfall		Release	Storage	Channen	Rainfall	Peak	Release	Storage	Charmen	Rainfall	Peak	Release	Storage	Channel	Rainfall	Peak	Release	Storage	Channen
	Intensity, I	Peak Flow	Rate	Rate	Storage	Intensity, I	Flow	Rate	Rate	Storage	Intensity, I	Flow	Rate	Rate	Storage	Intensity, I	Flow	Rate	Rate	Storage
	(mm/hr)	(L/sec)	(L/sec)	(L/sec)	(m <sup>-</sup> )	(mm/hr)	(L/sec)	(L/sec)	(L/sec)	(m <sup>-</sup> )	(mm/hr)	(L/sec)	(L/sec)	(L/sec)	(m <sup>-</sup> )	(mm/hr)	(L/sec)	(L/sec)	(L/sec)	(m <sup>-</sup> )
0	167.2	49.8	3.1	46.7	0.0	230.5	68.6	4.2	64.4	0.0	398.6	148.3	4.5	143.8	0.0	478.3	177.9	4.5	173.4	0.0
5	103.6	30.8	3.1	27.7	8.3	141.2	42.0	4.2	37.8	11.3	242.7	90.3	4.5	85.8	25.7	291.2	108.3	4.5	103.8	31.2
10	76.8	22.9	3.1	19.8	11.9	104.2	31.0	4.2	26.8	16.1	178.6	66.4	4.5	61.9	37.2	214.3	79.7	4.5	75.2	45.1
15	61.8	18.4	3.1	15.3	13.8	83.6	24.9	4.2	20.7	18.6	142.9	53.2	4.5	48.7	43.8	171.5	63.8	4.5	59.3	53.4
20	52.0	15.5	3.1	12.4	14.9	70.3	20.9	4.2	16.7	20.0	120.0	44.6 28.6	4.5	40.1	48.1	143.9	53.5	4.5	49.0	58.9
30	43.2	11.4	3.1	8.8	15.5	53.9	16.1	4.2	11.9	20.9	91.9	34.2	4.5	29.7	53.4	124.0	40.4	4.5	36.5	65.7
35	36.1	10.7	3.1	7.6	16.0	48.5	14.4	4.2	10.2	21.5	82.6	30.7	4.5	26.2	55.1	99.1	36.9	4.5	32.4	68.0
40	32.9	9.8	3.1	6.7	16.0	44.2	13.1	4.2	8.9	21.5	75.1	28.0	4.5	23.5	56.3	90.2	33.5	4.5	29.0	69.7
45	30.2	9.0	3.1	5.9	15.9	40.6	12.1	4.2	7.9	21.3	69.1	25.7	4.5	21.2	57.2	82.9	30.8	4.5	26.3	71.1
50	28.0	8.3	3.1	5.2	15.7	37.7	11.2	4.2	7.0	21.0	64.0	23.8	4.5	19.3	57.9	76.7	28.5	4.5	24.0	72.1
55	26.2	7.8	3.1	4.7	15.5	35.1	10.5	4.2	6.3	20.6	59.6	22.2	4.5	17.7	58.3	71.5	26.6	4.5	22.1	73.0
60 65	24.6	7.3	3.1	4.2	15.2	32.9	9.8	4.2	5.6	20.2	55.9	20.8	4.5	16.3	58.7	67.1	25.0	4.5	20.5	73.6
70	23.2	6.5	3.1	3.8	14.8	31.0 29.4	9.Z	4.2	5.0	19.0	52.0 49.8	19.6	4.5	15.1	58.8 58.9	59.7	23.5	4.5	19.0	74.1
75	20.8	6.2	3.1	3.1	13.9	27.9	8.3	4.2	4.1	18.4	47.3	17.6	4.5	13.1	58.9	56.7	21.1	4.5	16.6	74.7
80	19.8	5.9	3.1	2.8	13.5	26.6	7.9	4.2	3.7	17.8	45.0	16.7	4.5	12.2	58.7	54.0	20.1	4.5	15.6	74.8
85	18.9	5.6	3.1	2.5	13.0	25.4	7.5	4.2	3.3	17.1	43.0	16.0	4.5	11.5	58.5	51.5	19.2	4.5	14.7	74.8
90	18.1	5.4	3.1	2.3	12.4	24.3	7.2	4.2	3.0	16.3	41.1	15.3	4.5	10.8	58.3	49.3	18.4	4.5	13.9	74.8
95	17.4	5.2	3.1	2.1	11.9	23.3	6.9	4.2	2.7	15.6	39.4	14.7	4.5	10.2	58.0	47.3	17.6	4.5	13.1	74.7
100 Max -	16./	5.0	3.1	1.9	11.3	22.4	6.7	4.2	2.5	14.8 21 F	37.9	14.1	4.5	9.6	57.6	45.5	16.9	4.5	12.4	74.5
Notes 1) Peak flor	Mix -     16.0     21.5     36.5     74.6       Interview of the product of 2.78 x C x 1 x A																			
2) Rainfall I 3) Release P	ntensity, I = A	V(Tc+C) <sup>B</sup> elease Rate P	eak Flow)												100 yea	r Intensity =	1735.688 /	(Time in mi	$n + 6.014)^{-0.014}$	.820
4) Storage	Rate = Peak F	low - Release	Rate												50 year	Intensity =	1569.580 /	(Time in mi	$n + 6.014)^{0}$	.820 .819
5) Storage =	Duration x	Storage Rate													25 year 10 year	Intensity = Intensity =	1402.884 / (	(Time in mi	n + 6.018) <sup>6</sup> n + 6.014) <sup>0</sup>	.816
6) Maximiu 7) Paramet	m Storage = I ers a,b,c are f	viax Storage C or City of Otta	iwa Iwa	n											5 year I 2 year I	ntensity = ntensity =	998.071 / (1 732.951 / (1	Гіте in min Гіте in min	$+6.053)^{0.81}$ +6.199) <sup>0.8</sup>	14 10

#### TABLE D8: 5-YEAR STORM SEWER CALCULATION SHEET

Return Period Storm =	5-year	(2-year, 5-year, 100-year)
Default Inlet Time=	10	(minutes)
Manning Coefficient =	0.013	(dimensionless)



			AF	REA INFO					FLOW (	UNRESTRIC	TED)							SE	WER DAT	۹.				
																			Capacity.	Velocit	ty (m/s)	Time in	Hydrau	lic Ratios
From Node	To Node	Street	Area No.	Area (ha)	∑ Area (ha)	Average R	Indiv. 2.78*A*R	Accum. 2.78*A*R	Tc (mins)	l (mm/h)	Indiv. Flow	Return Period	Q (L/s)	Dia (mm) Actual	Dia (mm) Nominal	Туре	Slope (%)	Length (m)	Q <sub>CAP</sub> (L/sec)	Vf	Va	Pipe, Tt (min)	Q/Q <sub>CAP</sub>	Va/Vf
MHST67819	MHST67820	Maple Grove Road	EX Maple Grove	0.9574	0.9574	0.65	1.730	1.730	10.00	104.19	180.25	5-year	180.3											
		Maple Grove Road	S01	0.2433	1.2007	0.46	0.311	2.041	10.00	104.19	32.42	5-year	212.7											
		Maple Grove Road	S02	0.0719	1.2726	0.66	0.132	1.862	10.00	104.19	13.75	5-year	194.0	533.0	525	CONC	0.64	73.55	358.21	1.59	1.12	1.09	0.54	0.71
		Mykonos Cres	EX Mykonos Cres	0.5100	0.5100	0.69	0.978	0.978	10.60	101.13	98.93	5-year	98.9											
MHST68715	MHST68712	Mykonos Cres	S04	0.0202	0.5302	0.52	0.029	1.007	10.60	101.13	2.95	5-year	101.9	447.9	450	PVC	0.92	10.85	270.03	1.72	1.22	0.15	0.38	0.71
		Bensinger Way	EX Bensinger Way	1.1834	1.1830	0.69	2.270	2.270	12.82	91.33	207.33	5-year	207.3											
MHST68712	MHST67058	Bensinger Way	S03	0.0696	1.2526	0.66	0.128	2.398	12.82	91.33	11.66	5-year	219.0	610.0	600	PVC	0.20	10.85	286.97	0.97	0.95	0.19	0.76	0.98
707410																								
TOTALS =														Designed				Draiaatu						
														Designed				Project.						
Q = 2.78*AIR, v	vhere						Ottawa	a Rainfall Inter	a a	b b	r Design Gu C	idelines, SD	G002	J. Fitzpat	rick, P.Eng.			1869 Ha	zeldean Ro	ad				
Q = Peak Flow	in Litres per secon	d (L/s)						2-vear	732.951	6.199	0.810			Checked:				Location	:					
A - Matarsha	·	,						5-year	009.071	6.052	0.814													
A = watershed	Area (neclares)							J-year	558.071	0.055	0.814			B. Thoma	is, P.Eng.			1869 Ha	zeldean Ro	ad, Ottaw	a, ON			
I = Rainfall Int	ensity (mm/n)							100-year	1735.688	6.014	0.820												T.,	
R = Runoff Coe	efficients (dimensio	nless)												Dwg Refe	rence:			File Ref:					Sheet No	<u>:</u>
														C004				254810 : 2020.xls	STM - Sewe x	er Design :	Sheets, Se	ept 25,	1 of 1	



### <u>User Inputs</u>

MC-3500

**Chamber Model:** 

### **Results**

System volume and ded size
----------------------------

Outlet Control Structure:	Yes		0000120
Project Name:	1869 Maple Grove	Installed Storage Volume:	46.91 cubic meters.
Engineer:	jason fitzpatrick	Storage Volume Per Chamber:	3.11 cubic meters.
Project Location:		Number Of Chambers Required:	6
Measurement Type:	Metric	Number Of End Caps Required:	6
Required Storage Volume:	45.00 cubic meters.	Chamber Rows:	3
Stone Porosity:	40%	Maximum Length:	7.32 m.
Stone Foundation Depth:	229 mm.	Maximum Width:	6.96 m.
Stone Above Chambers:	305 mm.	Approx. Bed Size Required:	50.98 square me-
Average Cover Over Chambers:	457 mm.		ters.
Design Constraint Dimensions:	(15.00 m. x 8.50 m.)	System Compor	<u>nents</u>

Amount Of Stone Required: 64.26 cubic meters Volume Of Excavation (Not Including 85.46 cubic meters Fill):



MINMUM COVER TO BOTTOM OF FLBUBLE PAVEMENT. FOR UNPAVED INSTALLATIONS WHERE RUTTING FROM VEHICLES MAY OCCUR, INCREASE COVER TO 24"





### <u>User Inputs</u>

MC-3500

**Chamber Model:** 

### **Results**

Outlet Control Structure:	Yes		0000120
Project Name:	1869 Maple Grove	Installed Storage Volume:	32.32 cubic meters.
Engineer:	jason fitzpatrick	Storage Volume Per Chamber:	3.11 cubic meters.
Project Location:		Number Of Chambers Required:	4
Measurement Type:	Metric	Number Of End Caps Required:	4
Required Storage Volume:	30.00 cubic meters.	Chamber Rows:	2
Stone Porosity:	40%	Maximum Length:	7.32 m.
Stone Foundation Depth:	229 mm.	Maximum Width:	4.86 m.
Stone Above Chambers:	305 mm.	Approx. Bed Size Required:	35.55 square me-
Average Cover Over Chambers:	457 mm.		ters.
Design Constraint Dimensions:	(15.00 m. x 8.50 m.)	<u>System Compor</u>	<u>nents</u>

Amount Of Stone Required: 45.45 cubic meters

Volume Of Excavation (Not Including 59.59 cubic meters Fill):



MINMUM COVER TO BOTTOM OF FLBUBLE PAVEMENT. FOR UNPAVED INSTALLATIONS WHERE RUTTING FROM VEHICLES MAY OCCUR, INCREASE COVER TO 24"





# **STORMTECH MC-3500 CHAMBER**

Designed to meet the most stringent industry performance standards for superior structural integrity while providing designers with a cost-effective method to save valuable land and protect water resources. The StormTech system is designed primarily to be used under parking lots, thus maximizing land usage for private (commercial) and public applications. StormTech chambers can also be used in conjunction with Green Infrastructure, thus enhancing the performance and extending the service life of these practices.

### STORMTECH MC-3500 CHAMBER

(not to scale)

Nominal Chamber Specifications

**Size (L x W x H)** 90" x 77" x 45" 2,286 mm x 1,956 mm x 1,143 mm

**Chamber Storage** 109.9 ft<sup>3</sup> (3.11 m<sup>3</sup>)

Min. Installed Storage\* 178.9 ft<sup>3</sup> (5.06 m<sup>3</sup>)

Weight 134 lbs (60.8 kg)

**Shipping** 15 chambers/pallet 7 end caps/pallet

7 pallets/truck

\*Assumes a minimum of 12" (300 mm) of stone above, 9" (230 mm) of stone below chambers, 9" (230 mm) of stone between chambers/end caps and 40% stone porosity. **STORMTECH MC-3500 END CAP** (not to scale)

**Nominal End Cap Specifications** 

**Size (L x W x H)** 26.5" x 71" x 45.1" 673 mm x 1,803 mm x 1,145 mm

**End Cap Storage** 14.9 ft<sup>3</sup> (1.30 m<sup>3</sup>)

Min. Installed Storage\* 46.0 ft<sup>3</sup> (1.30 m<sup>3</sup>)

Weight 49 lbs (22.2 kg)

\*Assumes a minimum of 12" (300 mm) of stone above, 9" (230 mm) of stone below, 6" (150 mm) of stone perimeter, 9" (230 mm) of stone between chambers/ end caps and 40% stone porosity.





(1956 mm)



\*MINIMUM COVER TO BOTTOM OF FLEXIBLE PAVEMENT. FOR UNPAVED INSTALLATIONS WHERE RUTTING FROM VEHICLES MAY OCCUR, INCREASE COVER TO 30" (750 mm)





### **MC-3500 CHAMBER SPECIFICATION**

#### STORAGE VOLUME PER CHAMBER FT<sup>3</sup> (M<sup>3</sup>)

	Bare Chamber	Chamber and Stone Foundation Depth in. (mm)			Chamber and Stone Foundation Depth in. (mm)		
	Storage ft <sup>3</sup> (m <sup>3</sup> )	9" (230 mm)	12" (300 mm)	15" (375 mm)	18" (450 mm)		
MC-3500 Chamber	109.9 (3.11)	178.9 (5.06)	184.0 (5.21)	189.2 (5.36)	194.3 (5.5)		
MC-3500 End Cap	14.9 (.42)	46.0 (1.33)	47.7 (1.35)	49.4 (1.40)	51.1 (1.45)		

Note: Assumes 9" (230 mm) row spacing, 40% stone porosity, 12" (300 mm) stone above and includes the bare chamber/end cap volume.

### **AMOUNT OF STONE PER CHAMBER**

	Stone Foundation Depth			
ENGLISH TONS (JUS-)	9" 12"		15"	18"
MC-3500 Chamber	9.1 (6.4)	9.7 (6.9)	10.4 (7.3)	11.1 (7.8)
MC-3500 End Cap	4.1 (2.9)	4.3 (3.0)	4.5 (3.2)	4.5 (3.2)
METRIC KILOGRAMS (m <sup>3</sup> )	230 mm	300 mm	375 mm	450 mm
MC-3500 Chamber	8,220 (4.9)	8,831 (5.3)	9,443 (5.6)	10,054 (6.0)
MC-3500 End Cap	3,699 (2.2)	3,900 (2.3)	4,100 (2.5)	4,301 (2.6)

Note: Assumes 12" (300 mm) of stone above and 9" (230 mm) row spacing and 6" (150 mm) of perimeter stone in front of end caps.

#### VOLUME EXCAVATION PER CHAMBER YD<sup>3</sup> (M<sup>3</sup>)

	Stone Foundation Depth			
	9" (230 mm)	12" (300 mm)	15" (375mm)	18" (450 mm)
MC-3500 Chamber	12.4 (9.5)	12.8 (9.8)	13.3 (10.2)	13.8 (10.5)
MC-3500 End Cap	4.1 (3.1)	4.2 (3.2)	4.4. (3.3)	4.5 (3.5)

Note: Assumes 9" (230 mm) of separation between chamber rows and 24" (600 mm) of cover. The volume of excavation will vary as depth of cover increases.



Working on a project? Visit us at www.stormtech.com and utilize the StormTech Design Tool

For more information on the StormTech MC-3500 Chamber and other ADS products, please contact our Customer Service Representatives at 1-800-821-6710

### THE MOST ADVANCED NAME IN WATER MANAGEMENT SOLUTIONS™

ADS "Terms and Conditions of Sale" are available on the ADS website, www.ads-pipe.com The ADS logo and the Green Stripe are registered trademarks of Advanced Drainage Systems, Inc. StormTech\* is a registered trademark of StormTech, Inc. © 2017 Advanced Drainage Systems, Inc. #S150909 09/17 CS Advanced Drainage Systems, Inc. 4640 Trueman Blvd., Hilliard, OH 43026 1-800-821-6710 www.ads-pipe.com



**Chart 1: LMF 14 Preset Flow Curves** 





IPEX

EXP Services Inc. 1869 Maple Grove Road, Ottawa, ON OTT-00254810-A0 September 25, 2020

## **Appendix E – Consultation / Correspondence**

Email Received from City of Ottawa on Water System Boundary Conditions.

Email Received from MCVA on Stormwater Quality Control Requirements

### **Moe Ghadban**

From:	Kuruvilla, Santhosh <santhosh.kuruvilla@ottawa.ca></santhosh.kuruvilla@ottawa.ca>
Sent:	Friday, March 6, 2020 7:51 AM
То:	Moe Ghadban
Cc:	Shen, Stream
Subject:	RE: Request for Boundary Conditions - 1869 Maple Grove Road
Attachments:	1869 Maple Grove _Boundary Conditions_04March2020.docx

Hi Moe,

Please find attached the boundary conditions for the subject application.

Also, a second feed may be required if the number of units fed by the P-loop exceeds 50. A new watermain connecting BC #1 and #3 is preferred.

Thanks,

Santhosh Ext. 27599

From: Moe Ghadban <Moe.Ghadban@exp.com>
Sent: February 28, 2020 2:30 PM
To: Kuruvilla, Santhosh <Santhosh.Kuruvilla@ottawa.ca>
Subject: Request for Boundary Conditions - 1869 Maple Grove Road

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.

We are working on a site plan application for 1869 Maple Grove Rd , and would appreciate if you could arrange for IAD/water Resources to provide hydraulic boundary conditions that we will need for the watermain design. I have attached a sketch of the site and the approximate boundary condition locations.

The following is a summary of the demands and the required fire flows (RFF) we have estimated. We would appreciate the hydraulic boundary conditions based on our estimated water demands and required fire flows as noted below:

There are 3 separate blocks, and they shall all connect into different streets (Maple Grove Rd, Mykonos Cres, and Bensinger Way).

### 1869 Maple Grove Rd (Block 1, Boundary Location #1):

Average Day:0.09L/secMax Day:0.8 L/secPeak Hour:1.3 L/sec

Fire flow (RFF): 167 L/sec (based on FUS method) Max Day + FF: 167.8 L/sec.

### 1869 Maple Grove Rd (Block 2, Boundary Location #2):

Average Day:0.02L/secMax Day:0.2 L/secPeak Hour:0.31 L/secFire flow (RFF):117 L/sec (based on FUS method)Max Day + FF:117.2 L/sec.

### 1869 Maple Grove Rd (Block 3, Boundary Location #3):

Average Day:0.09L/secMax Day:0.8 L/secPeak Hour:1.3 L/secFire flow (RFF):200 L/sec (based on FUS method)Max Day + FF:200.8 L/sec.

Regards,



Moe Ghadban, P.Eng EXP | Engineering Designer t : +1.613.688.1899 | m : +1.613.808.4089 | e : moe.ghadban@exp.com 2650 Queensview Drive Suite 100 Ottawa, ON K2B 8H6 CANADA

<u>exp.com</u> | <u>legal disclaimer</u> keep it green, read from the screen

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.

### Boundary Conditions 1869 Maple Grove

### Provided Information

O annu attion 4	Demand		
Connection 1	L/min	L/s	
Average Daily Demand	5	0.09	
Maximum Daily Demand	48	0.80	
Peak Hour	78	1.30	
Fire Flow Demand #1	10,020	167.00	

Opennestion 0	Demand		
Connection 2	L/min	L/s	
Average Daily Demand	1	0.02	
Maximum Daily Demand	12	0.20	
Peak Hour	19	0.31	
Fire Flow Demand #1	7,020	117.00	

	Demand		
Connection 3	L/min	L/s	
Average Daily Demand	5	0.09	
Maximum Daily Demand	48	0.80	
Peak Hour	78	1.30	
Fire Flow Demand #1	12,000	200.00	

### Location



### <u>Results</u>

### Connection 1 - Maple Grove Rd.

Demand Scenario	Head (m)	Pressure <sup>1</sup> (psi)
Maximum HGL	160.2	75.1
Peak Hour	156.4	69.7
Max Day plus Fire 1	154.7	67.2

<sup>1</sup> Ground Elevation = 107.4 m

### Connection 2 - Mykonos Cres.

Demand Scenario	Head (m)	Pressure <sup>1</sup> (psi)
Maximum HGL	160.2	74.7
Peak Hour	156.4	69.3
Max Day plus Fire 1	147.0	55.9

<sup>1</sup> Ground Elevation = 107.6 m

### **Connection 3 - Bensinger Way**

Demand Scenario	Head (m)	Pressure <sup>1</sup> (psi)
Maximum HGL	160.2	74.8
Peak Hour	156.4	69.4
Max Day plus Fire 1	141.4	48.0

<sup>1</sup> Ground Elevation = 107.6 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.

### **Moe Ghadban**

From:	Matt Craig <mcraig@mvc.on.ca></mcraig@mvc.on.ca>
Sent:	Wednesday, January 15, 2020 10:05 AM
То:	Moe Ghadban
Cc:	Jason Fitzpatrick; Bruce Thomas
Subject:	RE: Request for SWM Criteria for 1869 Maple Grove

Hi Moe,

The original criteria in the Kanata West Mater Servicing Study is normal water quality control. Recent SWM facility (e.g. Arcadia ponds) have been designed for enhanced water quality control. This increase in criteria is at the request of the City Ottawa.

MVCA issued a permit for Pond 4 (Permit No. W14-126) so it is understood that water quality control criteria is already set for this specific subdivision.

Regards

Matt Craig | Manager of Planning and Regulations | Mississippi Valley Conservation Authority

### www.mvc.on.ca |t. 613 253 0006 ext. 226| f. 613 253 0122 | mcraig@mvc.on.ca

This e-mail originates from the Mississippi Valley Conservation 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. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify me at the telephone number shown above or by return e-mail and delete this communication and any copy immediately. Thank you.

From: Moe Ghadban <Moe.Ghadban@exp.com>
Sent: January 13, 2020 4:36 PM
To: Matt Craig <mcraig@mvc.on.ca>
Cc: Jason Fitzpatrick <jason.fitzpatrick@exp.com>; Bruce Thomas <bruce.thomas@exp.com>
Subject: FW: Request for SWM Criteria for 1869 Maple Grove

Hi Matt,

We are preparing a site servicing and stormwater report for a proposed 18 unit townhome development, located at 1869 Maple Grove Road in the City of Kanata. As the site is within the MVCA's jurisdiction we are requesting CA's clarification on the stormwater management requirements. The project will require Major Zoning By-law Amendment, Plan of Subdivision and Lifting of Part Lot Control Applications.

The subject property is within the Kanata west – Pond 4 subcatchment, which was designed for normal level of protection (70%TSS). In addition the storm water quantity control requirements were established at a 5 year capture with the minor system flows to the local 525mm on Maple Grove Dr with major system flows routed to maple grove drive. It is our intent to provide a storm connection from the interior rear yard areas, with the remaining drainage from the front yards to discharge directly to Maple Grove Dr, Bensinger Way, and Mykonos Cres.

Please see the attached site plan. Thank you for your review and input.

Regards,



Moe Ghadban EXP | Engineering Designer t : +1.613.688.1899 | m : +1.613.808.4089 | e : moe.ghadban@exp.com 2650 Queensview Drive Suite 100 Ottawa, ON K2B 8H6 CANADA

<u>exp.com</u> | <u>legal disclaimer</u> keep it green, read from the screen

EXP Services Inc. 1869 Maple Grove Road, Ottawa, ON OTT-00254810-A0 September 25, 2020

## **Appendix F – Background Information**

City of Ottawa Vault Drawings (10 Plans)

Excerpt pages from "Design Brief for the Reconstruction of Maple Grove Road", Mattamy Homes, by DSEL, dated May 31, 2012 (total 3 pages).

Excerpt pages from "Design Brief for Fairwinds North, Phase 2B and 4" Mattamy Homes, by DSEL/JFSA, dated August 02, 2012 (total 3 pages).

Excerpt pages from "Design Brief for Pond 4, Kanata North" Mattamy Homes, by DSEL/JFSA, dated May 31, 2012 (total 10 pages).

Excerpt pages from "Kanata West, Master Servicing Study", Volume 1 of 2, by Stantec / CCL-IBI, dated June 16, 2006 (total 5 pages).















Ţ

DO7 - 16 - 06 - 0014



nases28\_3\_4(Subm7\_Ph3(Grading\03\_04\_309grad.dwg, 02/04/2013 1:04:03 PM, hpan, 1:2!







PAVEMEN 40mm SUPERF 50mm SUPERF 50mm SUPERF 150mm GRANU 600mm GRANU	NT DESIGN PAVE 12.5 ASPHALTIC CONCRETE WEAR COURSE PAVE 19.0 ASPHALTIC CONCRETE UPPER BINDER COURSE UNER <sup>7</sup> AC RUSHED STONE OPSS ULURA <sup>7</sup> B' TYPE II OPSS	MAIN / WATER SERVICE RED FOR WATERNAIN / WATER HE SEPARATION BETWEEN ITS SERVICE NO OTHER SERVICES IS LESS THAN 1.5m AND THE HAVING JURISDICTION	E FOR WORK ON ADJACENT LANDS	FAIRWINDS NORTH SU DAVID SCHAEPERTNOUSE PROJECT No.05-	IDIVISION IRING LIMITED IRING LIMIT	TION REET No.35	REVIEWED BY DEVELOP SIGNED DATE PLAN NUMBER
	223 FOR DETAIL     2. FOR DETAIL     2. FOR DETAIL     2. FOR SERVICE INST     WTH GRATE (OPED-443.0102)      WTH GRATE (		EXISTING RESIDENTIAL	3 2 1 4 3 2 BLOCK 19 BLOCK 20 (TOWNHOUSE) 10 COWCOSE) 4 5 6 5 6 6 - 21000 ICONC STM 92.4 9 0.10% (LOWER) 7 4500 PVC STM 92.4 9 0.10% (LOWER) 7 4500 PVC STM 92.4 9 0.10% (LOWER) 7	3         2         1         E           BLOCK 21         E         (TOWNHOUSE)         E           8         4         5         6	EXISTING SESIDENTIAL 22500 COVC STM 2550 COVC STM 2550 COVC STM 2550 COVC STM	NOTE RE: MH 10 A 0.85m DIAMETER C INSTALLED AT THE O THE DOWNSTREAM OF THE COMPLETION OF CONNECTED TO INTER THE DEVELOPMENT O INDE CODEC CODEC AND
		UT 1800 € CONC 2103 € CONC 5TU 94.0 @ 0.1181 (LOMER) UN ( <u>BY OTHERS)</u> 7325 € 240 5 5 M 94.0 @ 0.558 ( <u>LOMER)</u> <u>BUIL</u> 2105 5 M 94.0 @ 0.558 ( <u>LOMER)</u> <u>BUIL</u> 2105 5 M 100 0 0.268 § § § § § § § § § § § § § § § § § § §	International         International           idiability         idiability	BLOCK 31 BLOCK 31 BLO		ШШШ         1           105m 0*         1           105m 0*         1           105m 0*         1           105m 0*         1           450# CORC SAN /8.5 /# 0.208         1           450# CORC SAN /8.5 /# 0.208         1	SATISFACTION OF CIT
	250 PVC SAN 100 Q (703) 300 PC MARKAN 300 PC MARKAN 1000		и лал к. 221 РНАSE 1		APPLICATION	COLOS UNIC PROVED WITH DOMENT OPENNING 0.102 UNICE TEXTING COLOS UNICE	' <sup>©</sup> <sup>v</sup> <sub>0</sub> <sub>90</sub>
BF		To be RHIDGATED         (ROAD           To be RHIDGATED         3           To be RHIDGATED         4           To be RHIDGATED         3           To be RHIDGATED         1           4         3           To be RHIDGATED         1           BLOCK 229         (TOWNHOUSE)           RYCB         RYCB           OPED - 705,010)         17/5 107785           TO TO TO COL PROPORTION         17/6 107785           TO TO TO COL PROPORTION         17/6 107785	WILENNES 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	5 4 3 2 1 BLOCK 206 (TOWNHOUSE) 06,010) RYCB RYCB RYCB RYCB CHI STA CHI STA			
NOTE I ACOUSTIC JOHNWOC ROSEHILL REQUIRCE	ANGIONE MICALLA & ASSOCIATES LTD. PROJECT No. 88-8867 RE: ACOUSTIC/FENCE C FENCE ALONG ONS STREET NORTH OF L AVENUE IS NOT D F JOHNWOODS STREET	NINK, 106.64 STORE CHART STOUCHOP BET CHART IN NY, 106.64 UT INK, 106.54 DEF 1003	PHASE 2	Tote 10 2500 PEEFFOR ATED HOPE SIM	REFERENCE SAN A STATE OF THE SAN A STATE OF THE SAN A STATE OF THE SAN SAN TO LINA SAN TO L		
RE-PURP LINEAR P 111.00	POSING IS APPROVED AS A PARK BY CITY OF OTTAWA	61.401 @ 0.500%		11 @ 0 500% 28.135 @ 0.500%		64 913 9 0.500%	11
110.00	244 244 2010				Cless)-701.010, 12 Cless)-701.010, 12 Cless)-701.010, 12 Cless)-701.010, 12 Cless)-701.010, 12	2000	
108.00					1 100 113 113 113 113 113 113 113 113 11	0000 000 000 000	102
106.00							10
105.00 104.00	Ex. 305# PIC #VIERUAN EX. 455# PIC 5/M 21:5 @ MIL 350m V 5/M 21:5	Син, 100, 100, 100 100, 2000 10,	L 105.00 HAL 194.301	с. 300 РИС ИКТИНИИ С. 300 РИС ИКТИНИИ С. 500 РИС ИКТИНИИ С. 500 РИС ЗАИ 84.0 Ф.0.50% SDR-3.	SUTT PATIBAT	99 Ex. 2006 PVC SAN 68.5 66 0.707 Ex.	10
103.00	Cr. 20de Drog- April	29 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 50 50 40 30 30 40 30 40 30 40 30 40 30 40 30 40 30 40 30 40 40 50 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40	State         State <td< td=""><td></td><td>x. 2009 PVC SAN</td><td>ран 0) вин (рар ре 5-14 ис.)</td><td>10</td></td<>		x. 2009 PVC SAN	ран 0) вин (рар ре 5-14 ис.)	10
102.00	CONTRACTOR TO VERIFY THE PRECISE LOCATIONS AND INVERT LEVATIONS OF EX. UNDERGROUND SERVICES AND EX. UTLIFES PRIDE TO STARTING CONSTRUCTION				AUC DIT \$2.07.04(05) RVL T0650 1/6:107.660 1/6:107.660 1/6:107.660 4.00.050 4.00		102
100.00 9 <b>9</b> .00	NOTE RE: 100YR HGL Cx 378 MICHAE GPF MPE THE: 100YR HGL SHOWN ION THE DR: 100YR HGL SHOWN ION THE CONDITIONS, FOR THE ULTIMATE CONDITIONS, FOR THE OUT OF THE OUT VERIFIED IN THAT TIME.				€x. 2250		10
	25 110 25 2000 25 2000 25 2000 26 4490 26 4490 26 4490 26 4490 27 27 27 27 27 2000 28 4490 28 4490 28 4490 28 4490 29 4490 29 4490 20 4490 29 4490 20 4490	4.470	4 650 4 6 50 4 7 60 4 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	4 200 4 200	4 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2		
SANITARY	21 21 21 21 21 22 21 22 21 22 21 22 21 22 21 22 21 21	2 2 2 2 2 375# CONC SAN 100.0 @ 0.26% 140-D	10 101.660 10 10 10	22 22 375¢ CONC SAN 92.0 @ 0.25% 140-D	01 101.350 101.560 101.001 101.300 101.300 101.300 101.300 101.300 101.300 101.101 101.101 101.101 101.101 101 1	450# CONC SAN 78.5 # 0.20%	S
STORM	- 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1	375# PVC STM 94.0 @ 0.50% SDR-35 (UPPER PIPE) 2100# CONC STM 94.0 @ 0.11% 140-D (LOWER PIPE)	# 103.800 NE # <u>98.500</u> 1.03.600 NE	450# PVC STM 92.4 @ 0.30% SDR-35 (UPPER 2100# CONC STM 92.4 @ 0.10% 140-D (LOMER	PIPE) // 1000	525# CONC STM 78.6 @ 0.67% 65-D (UPPER PIPE) 2250# CONC STM 78.6 @	
PROPOSED GRADES	- 107.644 - 107.636 - 107.574 - 107.574 - 107.572 - 107.572 - 107.572	N 2517 107,5357 107,617	107.643 - 107.570 - 107.510 - 107.549	- 107.649 107.710 - 107.671	- 192,527 - 192,527 - 102,668 - 51 - 102,668	0.14% 140-D (LUMER HIPE) 89 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20	PR
CENTERLINE CHAINAGE	BC 0+9284200 BC 0+928428 0+960,000 0+940,000 0+922,574 EC 0+922,357 BC 0+922,357	0+916.057 0+900.000 0+880.000	0+854.657 0+840.000 0+827.911 0+820.000	0+800.000 0+787.800	84,759,888 0+ 740,000	0+720.000 0+720.000 0+700.000	CE

![](_page_67_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_68_Picture_0.jpeg)

120 Iber Road, Unit 203 Stittsville, Ontario K2S 1E9 Tel. (613) 836-0856 Fax (613) 836-7183 www.DSEL.ca

# **DESIGN BRIEF**

### FOR THE

# RECONSTRUCTION OF MAPLE GROVE ROAD MATTAMY HOMES

## CITY OF OTTAWA

**PROJECT NO.: 10-451** 

MAY 31, 2012 REVISION 4, 4<sup>TH</sup> SUBMISSION © DSEL

![](_page_69_Figure_0.jpeg)

### STORM SEWER CALCULATION SHEET (RATIONAL METHOD)

![](_page_70_Picture_1.jpeg)

Manning	0.013	1		Return Frequency														παννα								
	ARE/					EA (Ha) FLOW							ī						SEWER	ER DATA		6				
	LUCA		R=	0.38	R=	= 0.45	R=	0.60	R=	0.61	R=	0.65	Indiv.	Accum.	Time of	Rainfall	Peak Flow	DIA. (mm)	DIA. (mm)	TYPE	SLOPE	LENGTH	CAPACITY	VELOCITY	TIME OF	RATIO
Location	From Node	To Node	A	No.	A	No.	A	No.	A	No.	A	No.	2.78 AC	2.78 AC	Conc.	Intensity	Q (l/s)	(actual)	(nominal)		(%)	(m)	(l/s)	(m/s)	FLOW (min.)	Q/Q full
					ļ															<u> </u>				ļ	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
MAPLE GRU		<u>г</u>	<u> </u>	1							0.10		0.22	0.22										·	<u> </u>	
	101	102		-	1	- · · · ·	0.38				0.10		0.33	0.33	10.00	104.10	100	375	375	PVC	0.50	94.0	124	1 12	1 40	0.91
	101	102	<u> </u>				0.00						0.00	0.30	10.00	104.13	100		0,0		0.00	54.0	124	1.12	1.40	0.01
	102	103									0.49		0.89	0.89	10.00	104 19	92	450	450	PVC	0.30	99.0	156	0.98	1.68	0.59
						+							0.00					1								
											0.40		0.72	0.72					1	1				-	· · · ·	1
											0.40		0.72	1.45												
	103	104									0.16		0.29	1.73	10.00	104.19	181	525	525	CONC	0.60	70.0	333	1.54	0.76	0.54
	104	105									0.22		0.40	0.40	10.00	104.19	41	300	300	PVC	0.30	63.0	53	0.75	1.40	0.78
											L															
											0.95		1.72	1.72										ļ		
	105	106		<u> </u>			0.52						0.87	2.58	10.00	104.19	269	525	525	CONC	0.60	120.0	333	1.54	1.30	0.81
																				L					<b></b>	
	- 400				h			<u> </u>			0.79		1.43	1.43		1 1 0 1 1 0				DV/O	0.00					<u> </u>
	106	1060					0.32						0.53	1.96	10.00	104.19	204	375	3/5	PVC	3.20	80.0	314	2.84	0.47	0.65
	1060	107				-	0.14	<u> </u>				· · · ·	0.00	0.02	10.00	104.10	24	275	275	DVC	2.50	42.0	977	2.51	0.00	- 0.00
	- 1000	107		+		-	0.14						0.23	0.23	10.00	104.19	24	3/5	3/5	PVC	2.50	43.0	2//	2.01	0.29	0.09
						+							····					+	+						<u> </u>	
									+·					-							• · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
				1	<u> </u>	+												State of the second sec			<u> </u>				<u> </u>	-
												<u> </u>					POLESSIC	Wa,							<u>                                      </u>	<u> </u>
																1.0		1.81						-		
							1	1								191		101								
																181			1							<u> </u>
																1 2	7 11	1								
																			1							
																I	A11.12	12/012	4							
																	2 [ VIV	0/								
		•															4	TAR								
																	"VCE OF	que la companya de la							ļ	
							-										A CONTRACTOR OF THE OWNER	and the second se								L
		ļ		<u> </u>	ļ			ļ												ļ						<u> </u>
								I																	·	┢────
							<u> </u>							<u> </u>				-							<b></b>	
D. C. W.																										
Q = 2.78 AIR, where														Designed:		K.M.		PROJECT. RECONSTRUCTION OF MAPLE GROVE ROAD								
Q = Peak Flor	w in Litres per	s per second (L/s)										Checked				LOCATION:										
A = Areas in hectares (ha)																		Z.L.					City of Ottawa			
I = Rainfall Intensity (mm/h)															Dwg. Ref	erence:			File Ref:			Date:		Sheet No.		
R = Runoff Coefficient							1	1 <u>t</u>							Local	Local Storm Drainage Plan, Dwg No.7A				10-451		May,	2012	1 of	: 1	

![](_page_71_Picture_0.jpeg)

120 Iber Road, Unit 203 Stittsville, Ontario K2S 1E9 Tel. (613) 836-0856 Fax (613) 836-7183 www.DSEL.ca

# **DESIGN BRIEF**

FOR

# FAIRWINDS NORTH PHASE 2B AND 4

# **MATTAMY HOMES**

CITY OF OTTAWA

**PROJECT NO.: 07-309** 

AUGUST 2, 2012 REVISION 5, 5<sup>TH</sup> SUBMISSION © DSEL


#### STORM SEWER CALCULATION SHEET (RATIONAL METHOD)



Manning	0.013			Retu	rn Fre	quenc	;y				= 5 yea	ars																					((VI)	VUL.
	CATION							AREA (Ha) FLOW										1						SEWER	DATA									
		CATION	R=	0.25	R=	0.27	R=	0.50	R=	0.64	R=	0.90	R=	0.57	R=	0.69	R=	0.80	R=	0.84	Indiv.	Accum.	Time of	Rainfall	Peak Flow	DIA. (mm	DIA. (mm	TYPE	SLOPE	LENGTH	CAPACITY	VELOCITY	TIME OF	RATIC
Location	From Node	To Node	A	No.	A	No.	A	No.	Α	No.	A	No.	Α	No.	Α	No.	A	No.	A	No.	2.78 AC	2.78 AC	Conc.	Intensity	Q (I/s)	(actual)	(nominal)		(%)	(m)	(I/s)	(m/s)	FLOW (min.	) Q/Q fu
Phase 3																																		
Bensing	er Way												-																					
	4B	5B													0.14	5			0.14	4	0.60	0.60	10.00	104.19	62	366.42	375	PVC	0.60	63.5	128	1.21	0.87	0.49
To Bensi	nger Way, F	Pipe 5B-15B																		-		0.60	10.87											
Madana	Creation							_								-		-	-	-														
мукопо	4D	20	-	1	I	-	T	-										+	0.00	1	0.61	0.61	10.00	104 10	62	200.26	200	DVC	0.60	24.5	74	1.00	0.20	0.05
	10	20		-						-								+	0.20		0.01	0.01	10.00	104.19	76	299.30	275	PVC	0.00	11.0	00	0.96	0.39	0.85
	38	58		-		-	-											-	0.00	2	0.14	0.75	10.59	102.20	87	447.87	450	PVC	0.30	32.5	154	0.00	0.21	0.65
To Bensi	nger Way F	Pine 5B-15B							-	-	-								0.00	, ,	0.12	0.00	11 15	101.15	0/	447.07	400	1.00	0.00	02.0	104	0.30	0.55	0.57
TO Densi	liger vvay, r		-	1	1	T	T					-								-		0.00	11.15											
Bensing	er Wav			-	I					-										-									-					
Contribut	ion From Be	ensinger Way F	ipe 4-5		1	T	T	-		-		-			_	-		+	-	-	0.60	0.60	10.87											
Contribut	ion From M	konos Crescer	t. Pipe	3-5														+	-	-	0.86	1.46	11.15											+
	5B	15B	0.40	7											0.28	6					0.82	2.27	11.15	98.47	224	610.00	600	CONC	0.20	98.0	287	0.98	1.66	0.78
To Grena	dine Street,	Pipe 15B-16B																				2.27	12.82											
												-																						
Maestro	Avenue							-	CHEN'S VIAN	No. of Concession, Name																								
	6B	7B						10	FESS	OAL					0.50	34	0.14	35			1.27	1.27	10.00	104.19	132	686.00	675	CONC	0.30	85.5	481	1.30	1.10	0.28
	7B	8B				-		Ster	CONTRACTOR		4				0.12	33	0.08	32			0.41	1.68	11.10	98.74	166	686.00	675	CONC	0.20	52.0	392	1.06	0.82	0.42
	8B	9B					14			2	N				0.05	24					0.10	1.77	11.91	95.07	169	686.00	675	CONC	0.20	10.0	392	1.06	0.16	0.43
	9B	10B					12	1	2	$ \rightarrow $	10	1			0.15	25	0.10	26			0.51	2.28	12.07	94.40	216	686.00	675	CONC	0.20	76.5	392	1.06	1.20	0.55
To Maloj	a Way, Pipe	10B-12B					1 mg	and a	Stockings	and Good States		i I										2.28	13.27											
							4		Z.		1																							
								-	-	-	-										_							-						
							V	M	11	2	121	-2/							_	_														
			-	_		-			NO	- 4	10	X				-		_	_	_			a descentra de				_							
				-		-		ph	and the second	-	R.	-				_		_		_														
								1	CEO	FON.	1	_								-														
								-	- MALLAR	Constant of the second	1																							-
								+				-																						
			-				-	-	-	-		-				-		-		+														
										-		-				-										-			-					
								-		-	+		-			-				-								-		-				
			-					-				-								+														
Definition	¢.							+				_												Designer	4.			PROJE	CT		Fairwin	ds North Su	hdivision	
O = 2.78	AIR where										Notes													Designed		КM		I ROOL	.01.		P	HASES 2B	3 4	
Q = Peak	Flow in Litr	es per second (	L/s)					1	1) Off	awa R	ainfall-	Intensi	v Curv	e										Checked				LOCAT	ION:				., .	
A = Area	s in hectares	s (ha)	_ 0)					1	2) 1	Min. Ve	elocity =	= 0.76	m/sec	-												Z.L.		1.00.0			Citv	of Ottawa		
I = Rainfa	Il Intensity (	mm/h)						1	-/ ·															Dwg, Re	ference:			File Re	f:		Date:		Sheet No	
R = Rund	ff Coefficier	nt																Storm Drainage Plan, Dwg No. 7, 7A			A 07-309 /			Augus	st, 2012	1 of	i 4							





## **DESIGN BRIEF**

FOR

## POND 4 KANATA WEST

## **MATTAMY HOMES**

CITY OF OTTAWA

**PROJECT NO.: 12-644** 

AUGUST 9, 2013

**REVISED DECEMBER 10, 2014** 

4<sup>TH</sup> SUBMISSION

© DSEL

Note that while a normal level of protection will be provided by Pond 4 prior to discharge to the Carp River in accordance with the *KWMSS*, enhanced protection (80% TSS removal) is required for those flows discharging to Poole Creek via the diversion pipe. This is provided by a weir control installed at the diversion pipe outlet to direct the full "first flush" flows - in this case, the 25 mm storm flows - to Pond 4 for treatment. This approach is supported by MVCA as per the correspondence presented in *Appendix H*.

Additionally, as requested by MVCA and in accordance with *KWMSS* requirements, baseflow augmentation will be provided by a 200 mm diameter circular vertical orifice controlling the first 0.2 m of active storage volume (greater than or equal to 10% of the 100-year active storage). A summary of the required Pond 4 characteristics is provided in *Table 2*.

#### 2.3 Proposed Deviations from the Master Servicing Study

The Pond 4 design contains deviations from the *KWMSS*. Firstly, an interim (partiallyconstructed) pond was introduced to support the development of the drainage areas to the south trunk sewer, prior to construction of the north trunk sewer and developments. The size of the ultimate conditions (fully constructed) pond, servicing the north and south developments, was increased to account for the recently updated October 2012 *City of Ottawa Sewer Design Guidelines*, wherein those development lands serviced by the north trunk under ultimate conditions are to have 5-year minor system capture rates, and 10-year capture rates on arterial roads (contrary to the more restrictive capture rates specified in the *KWMSS*). A summary of deviations in both interim and ultimate conditions inlet pipe dimensions and flows is presented in *Table 1A*.

KWW35 Deviations – Intel Fipe Dimensions and Flows						
Item	KWMSS	Current Design Interim	Current Design Ultimate			
South Trunk Inlet Pipe	2550 mm @	2550 mm @	2550 mm @			
Dimensions	0.3% slope	0.3% slope	0.3% slope			
North Trunk Inlet Pipe	2250 mm @	NI/A	To be resized at a			
Dimensions	0.4% slope	IN/A	future design stage			
South Trunk Inlet Pipe	01.26 m	01 502 m	01 777 m			
Downstream Invert	91.20 11	91.505 11	91.777 111			
North Trunk Inlet Pipe	01 22 m	Ν/Λ	To be resized at a			
Downstream Invert	91.22 111	IN/A	future design stage			
10-Year, 12-hour SCS						
South Trunk Inflow to Pond	12.372 m <sup>3</sup> /s	11.804 m³/s	11.804 m³/s			
North Trunk Inflow to Pond	7.337 m <sup>3</sup> /s	N/A	10.734 m <sup>3</sup> /s			
Major Inflow to Pond	1.682 m³/s	4.965 m³/s	0.520 m³/s			
100-Year, 12-hour SCS						
South Trunk Inflow to Pond	14.320 m³/s	15.245 m³/s	15.245 m³/s			
North Trunk Inflow to Pond	7.680 m³/s	N/A	16.631 m³/s			
Major Inflow to Pond	3.570 m <sup>3</sup> /s	8.424 m <sup>3</sup> /s	0.760 m <sup>3</sup> /s			

 Table 1A

 KWMSS Deviations – Inlet Pipe Dimensions and Flows

The *KWMSS* Pond 4 outlet controls consist of a 350 mm diameter quality control orifice at an invert of 93.20 m, and a 30 m long broad-crested quantity control weir at an invert of 94.20 m. Although the *KWMSS* specifies a requirement for a baseflow augmentation volume equal to or

**4**, **Proposed Fairwinds Residential Development – Maple Grove Road - Ottawa** (Paterson Group, August 2014) provided in **Appendix J**. Summary sheets for borehole and test pit investigations are also included in **Appendix J**.

The conclusion of the geotechnical review is that the proposed stormwater management pond is acceptable from a geotechnical perspective. Specifically:

- The natural undisturbed clay deposit will serve as a clay liner for the pond. Where silty sand or sandy silt is encountered along the pond side walls or bottom, consideration should be given to subexcavating the pervious soil and replacing it with suitable clay from the pond excavation.
- The proposed excavation side slopes, varying between 5H:1V and 3H:1V, are considered to be stable in the long term.
- The proposed concrete structures (e.g. headwalls, outlet structures, etc.) can be founded within the firm silty clay, but geotechnical field confirmation must be completed before pouring concrete footings or placing granular materials for these structures.
- The interim conditions east forebay inlet will be removed during construction of the ultimate pond, and should be backfilled with a workable, brown silty clay fill placed in maximum 300 mm loose lifts and compacted using several passes of a sheepsfoot roller. The pond sidewall should be reinstated in the same manner. It is further recommended that the granular thickness below the proposed access pathway be thickened to 500 mm of a Granular A or Granular B Type II, compacted to at least 98% of its SPMDD.
- Portions of the proposed storm sewer will require 50 mm to 100 mm thick rigid insulation in order to provide sufficient frost protections.

#### 12.0 THERMAL MITIGATION

Thermal mitigation is not a concern for the proposed SWM facility, given that the allowable outflow temperature for the Carp River is 30° Celsius. Nonetheless, thermal mitigation measures will be provided at the SWM facility by the application of effective shading with landscape material and increased riparian vegetation along the permanent pool.

#### **13.0 WATER BALANCE**

In accordance with the *KWMSS*, post-development infiltration on the pond block is not intended to compensate for decreases in infiltration on upstream areas; each development is required to provide its own pre- versus post-development water balance.

#### 14.0 EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL

An erosion and sediment control strategy will be implemented at the detailed design stage. The erosion and sediment control strategy will include the following:

(Z:\.	US100C.dat)		P63	1: Design B	rief for Pon	d 4, Kanata	West, Mattamy Hom	nes
013365	0 'AHS1'	'M104SW'	66 9	2 1	12	'MC103'	0	
01337>	* Maple Grove Road	l Extension	00 9	2 1	12	110105	0	
01338>	0 'M101NE'	'LM101NW'	59 22	0 1	0	'X'	0	
01339>	1 'M101NW'	'LM101NW'	27 22	0 1	0	'X'	0	
01340>	1 'LM101NW'	'LM101SW'	10 22	2 1	140.5	'MG101a'	0	
01341>	0 'MIUISE'	'LMI01SW'	59 22 27 22	0 1	0	'X'	0	
01343>	1 'LM101SW'	'MLPovf'	10 22	2 1	140.5	'MG101a'	0	
01344>	0 'M101W1'	'LM101W1'	440 24	0 1	0	'X'	0	
01345>	0 'M101W2'	'LM101W1'	440 24	0 1	0	'X'	0	
01346>	* Existing Maple (	Frove Road, with roa	dside ditch stor	age accounted	d for	IMC1011	0	
01348>	0 'M102N1'	'LM102N1'	27 22	0 1	0	'X'	0	
01349>	1 'LM102N1'	'LM102S1'	10 22	2 1	97.5	'MG102a'	0	
01350>	0 'M102N2'	'LM102N1'	62 22	0 1	0	'X'	0	
01351>	0 'M102NE'	'LM102NW'	41 22	0 1	0	'X'	0	
01352>	0 'MIUZNW' 1 'T.M102NW'	'LMLUZNW'	29 22 10 22	2 1	U 97 5	'X' 'MC102a'	0	
01354>	0 'M102S1'	'LM102S1'	45 22	0 1	0	'X'	0	
01355>	1 'LM102S1'	'MLPovf'	10 22	2 1	97.5	'MG102a'	0	
01356>	0 'M102S2'	'LM102S1'	44 22	0 1	0	'X'	0	
01357>	0 'M102SE'	'LM102SW'	41 22	0 1	0	'X'	0	
01358>	1 'MIUZSW'	'LMLUZSW'	29 22 10 22	2 1	97 5	'A' 'MG102a'	0	
01360>	0 'M104E1'	'M104NE'	75 22	2 4	97.5	'MG104a'	0	
01361>	0 'M104E2'	'M104SE'	35 22	2 4	97.5	'MG104a'	0	
01362>	1 'M104NE'	'LM104NW'	21 22	0 1	0	' X '	0	
01363>	U 'M104NW'	'LM104NW'	41 22	0 1	0	'X'	0	
01364>	⊥ 'LM⊥U4NW' 0 יм1∩4с₽י	'LM104SW' 'T.M104CW'	10 22 41 22	2 1	97.5	'MG104a' 'X'	0	
01366>	0 'M104SW'	'LM104SW'	38 22	0 1	0	'X'	0	
01367>	* Assume 30 cm max	<pre>     ponding (1.5 m head </pre>	ad over lead pipe	e) to capture	100-year flow	at low point		
01368>	1 'LM104SW'	'MLPovf'	10 22	2 1	109	'MG104a'	0	
01369>	0 'M105NE'	'M104E1'	54 22	2 4	97.5	'MG105a'	0	
01370>	0 'M105SE' 0 'M1060NE'	'M104E2'	76 22	2 4	97.5	'MG105a'	0	
01372>	0 'M1060SE'	'M174K-S'	79 23	2 5	97.5	'MG1060a'	0	
01373>	0 'M106NW'	'M1060NE'	76 23	2 5	97.5	'MG106a'	0	
01374>	0 'M106SW'	'M1060SE'	71 23	2 5	97.5	'MG106a'	0	
01375>	0 'M174H-N'	'74A1N'	86 22	2 4	97.5	'174H'	0	
01376>	0 'M174H-S'	'52-B1S'	70 22	2 4	97.5	'174H'	0	
013785	0 'M1741-E' 0 'M1741-N'	'M174H-N'	70 25 59 22	2 5 0 1	97.5	· 1 / 41 ·	0	
01379>	0 'M174I-S'	'M174I-W'	65 22	0 1	0	'X'	0	
01380>	0 'M174I-W'	'M174H-S'	74 25	2 5	97.5	'174I'	0	
01381>	0 'M174J-N'	'M174I-N'	59 22	2 4	97.5	'174J'	0	
01382>	0 'M174J-S'	'M174I-S'	73 22	2 4	97.5	'174J'	0	
01383>	0 'M174K-N'	'M174J-N'	94 25	2 5	97.5	'174K'	0	
01385>	* No major system	overflow from low i	oints on Maple G	rove Road	97.5	1/4K	0	
01386>	1 'MLPovf'	'PCreekli'	10 1	0 1	0	'X'	0	
01387>	* Tartan Lands rea	aryards draining in	o Fairwinds Sout	h				
01388>	0 'T116R1'	'A116R1'	33 12	0 1	0	'X'	0	
01389>	0 'T116R2'	'A116R2'	46 12	0 1	0	'X'	0	
01390>	0 'T128R4'	ALZOR4	45 12	1				
01392>	0 'T128R6'	Downstream	4	1	Max	Receiving	Inlet	
01393>	Major 44R1'	Maior	2 Section S	Section 1	Inlet	'1	iniot	
01394>	Wajui ******	Suctor	Length T	vpe	Conceity	· · · · · ·		
01395>	System CONDIT:	to System *	Longin	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	Capacity			
01397>	Segment ture of	Segment	rom			/		
01398>	I BGout'	'M101W2'	10 1	2 1	0	'N4A02i	1	
01399>	* Ultimate Condit:	ions - Replace inte:	rim pon <mark>d block wi</mark>	th residentia	al development			
01400>	* Assume 5-year ca	apture (per DDSWMM)	and 50 cu.m./ha	storage (as p	per MSS)			
01401>	0 PND-1R'	'PCreek2A'	200 15	1 46			0	
01402>	0 'WEXT1'	M102N2	75 9	2 1	32	'MG103'	(J-yr DD Capt.)	
01404>	* Existing resider	ntial lots to be de	veloped at 64% im	perviousnes	under ultimate	e conditions	(5-yr DD Capt.)	
01405>	0 'WEXT2'	'M105NE'	100 9	2 1	73.5	'MG105'	0	
01406>	* Existing resider	ntial lots to be de	veloped at 64% im	pervidusness	under ultimate	e conditions	(5-yr DD Capt.)	
01407>	U 'WEXT3'	'M106NW'	95 9	$\frac{2}{1}$	61	'MGI06'	U	
01409>	ENDMJR							
01410>	ENDMJRS			Number	Inlet			
01411>	*			Inlete	Type			
01412>	* Infiltration Pa	arameters		mets	.,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,			
U1413>	*							
01415>	* Maximum	Minimum						
01416>	* Infiltration	Infiltration Decay	7					
01417>	* Rate	Rate Rate						
01418>	* (mm/hr)	(mm/hr) (s^-	)					
01419>	* INFMAX	INFMIN DECA	1 5					
01421>	/0.∠ *	13.2 0.00	CT3					
01422>	* Unit Area Flow	Data						
01423>	* (None)							
01424>	ENDUAH							

JFSAinc.



## FIGURE A-1: ULTIMATE CONDITIONS XPSWMM MODEL SCHEMATIC







## FIGURE A-1: ULTIMATE CONDITIONS XPSWMM MODEL SCHEMATIC













#### **KANATA WEST**

MASTER SERVICING STUDY Volume 1 of 2

JUNE 16, 2006

Reference # 1604-00406

Stantec Consulting Ltd. 1505 Laperriere Ave. Suite 100 Ottawa, Ontario KIZ 7T1

Cumming Cockburn Limited/IBI 1770 Woodward Drive Ottawa, Ontario K2C 0P8





#### Natural Environment (NE) 20%

All three alternatives will have essentially the same impact on the natural environment. Alternative I has a minor increased impact due to the number of ponds (8) and there location within the KWCP.

#### 5.5.2 Selection of Stormwater Management Alternatives

Based on the above evaluation, Alternative III is selected as the preferred stormwater management alternative. This option offers the greatest amount of flexibility for phasing opportunities while providing an economical servicing solution that meets the objectives of the Carp River Watershed/Subwatershed Study.

#### 5.6 Best Management Practices

The Carp River Watershed/Subwatershed Study (Robinson Consultants, November 2004) proposes target infiltration rates of 104 mm/yr and 73 mm/yr for areas of moderate and low recharge, respectively, within the KWCP. To meet the identified infiltration targets suggested the following best management practices (BMP's) were recommended and are shown on Figures 7.3.3 through 7.3.7 in Appendix 3.4.

- Subsurface Infiltration;
- Biofilters;
- Wet ponds; and
- Dry ponds.

A water balance and subsurface hydrogeological investigation at the detailed design stage will dictate which of the proposed BMPs will be selected for specific developments.

Given the establishment of the dominant soil associations that exist in the Study area (see Figure 5.4), and considering the extent of the poorly draining soils within the nearly flat topography, it is apparent that drainage in the Study area is primarily governed by the characteristics of the poorly draining silty clay to clay soils underlying all but a small percentage of the Study area. As a result, the establishment of the infiltration rates of the soils can be simplified to reflect the silty clay to clay soils and the till material over bedrock. Table 5.6 below summarizes the anticipated infiltration rates of these two principal soil groups, based on soil characteristics and borehole data regarding degree of compaction.

Soil Groups	Estimated Infiltration Rates <sup>1</sup> (mm/yr)	Percent of Annual Rainfall Infiltrated
Castor, Dalhousie, North Gower (silty clay to clay)	50-70 mm/yr	5-7
Anstruther, Farmington, Nepean (sandy loams to till)	70-100 mm/yr	7-11

#### Table 5.6 -Summary of Infiltration Rates of Principal Soil Groups



area of extensive employment between Feedmill Creek and Campeau Drive. Normal and 100yr water levels in the pond are 92.70 and 93.96, respectively.

- Pond 2 is proposed just upstream of the confluence of Feedmill Creek and the Carp River on the south bank and will service future extensive employment and high profile employment lands between Feedmill Creek and Highway 417. Normal and 100yr water levels in the pond are 93.25 and 94.23, respectively.
- Pond 3 is proposed on the north bank or the Carp River between the future transitway and Highway 417. It will service low density business park and community retail lands between Didsbury Road and the Carp River. Normal and 100yr water levels in the pond are 92.90 and 94.20, respectively.
- Pond 4 adjacent to the Carp River is proposed just upstream of Palladium Drive and downstream of the Poole Creek confluence with the Carp River and will service a mixed use area bound by Pool Creek, Palladium Drive and the Kanata West Community Boundary. Normal and 100yr water levels in the pond are 93.25 and 94.74, respectively.
- Pond 5 is proposed upstream of the confluence of Poole Creek and the Carp River along the south-west bank of the Carp River. Pond 5 will service residential and retail developments between Poole Creek, the Carp River and Hazeldean Road. Normal and 100yr water levels in the pond are 93.44 and 94.94, respectively.
- Pond 6 is to be located north-east of Feedmill Creek at the intersection with Huntmar Road and will service business park and extensive employment developments. Normal and 100yr water levels in the pond are 98.00 and 98.94, respectively.
- Pond 7 is proposed south of Highway 417 and west of the future north-south arterial and will service business park and extensive employment lands. Normal and 100yr water levels in the pond are 102.20 and 102.92, respectively.

It is noted that additional post development modeling was completed with CH2MHill in order to create an overall post development model. For this separate analysis, a dynamic downstream water level was used and iterated until convergence was observed. In order to maintain the conservative nature of the HGL assessment, the results above reflect a static downstream water level equal in elevation to the 100yr MVC floodplain obtained from the 1983 analysis.

#### 5.13 Stormwater Implementation

• All developments are to be designed in accordance with the City of Ottawa Sewer Design Guidelines, First Edition, November 2004.

Ipex inlet control devices, or an equivalent restrictor which reproduces the same stagestorage-discharge curve, shall be used to restrict runoff to 85L/s/ha and provide 50m<sup>3</sup>/ha of major system storage, with the exception of arterial roadways where inlets shall be sized for the peak 10 yr release rate.





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

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

## 

Copyright Reserved



Notes

KANATA-WEST CONCEPT PLAN BOUNDARY POND DRAINAGE BOUNDARY STORM SEWER DRAINAGE LIMIT

DRAINAGE AREA IDENTIFICATION AREA IN HECTARES RUNOFF COEFFICIENT 100yr. INLET CAPACITY (L/s) MINOR SYSTEM NODE NUMBER MAJOR SYSTEM SEGMENT NUMBER INFILTRATION

\* REFER TO FIGURE 3.2 IN KANATA WEST MASTER SERVICING STUDY FOR FURTHER INFILTRATION DETAILS

1. THOSE AREAS WHICH ARE COMPLETELY SURROUNDED BY ARTERIAL ROADWAYS (SPECIFICALLY AREAS A-9, C-9, C-12, C-15, C-17, C-18) MUST PROVIDE SURFACE STORAGE IN THE AMOUNT OF 360m<sup>3</sup>/ha, OR IN SUFFICIENT QUANTITY TO DEMONSTRATE COMPLETE CONTAINMENT OF THE 100yr EVENT. (i.e. NO MAJOR SYSTEM FLOW IN THE 1:100yr EVENT)

> Comming Cockburn Limited / IBBI 1770 WOODWARD DR., OTTAWA (613)225-1311

		Aineinean Aiteon ein teanaisean an san an a
	ana para manana ing kanya taka kanya ka	
and an an advance of the second s	An again a san ann an t-an an san a' dhaol an t-a	
GBU	SJP	DEC.21/05
GBU	MAF	OCT.28/05
Ву	Appd.	Date
MAF	MAF	AUG./05
Chkd.	Dsgn.	Date
	GBU GBU By MAF Chkd.	GBU     SJP       GBU     MAF       By     Appd.       MAF     MAF       Chkd.     Dsgn.

· · ·

Client/Project

Title

Kanata West Concept Plan Master Servicing Study

Ottawa, Ontario

STORM DRAINAGE AREA PLAN SOUTH PONDS

Project No. 60400406	Scale 1:30	0 00	30	90 150m	
Drawing No.	Sheet			Revision	in
ST-PS		3 of	7	2	
to a manufacture of the second s	,				

EXP Services Inc. 1869 Maple Grove Road, Ottawa, ON OTT-00254810-A0 September 25, 2020

**Appendix G – Checklist** 

GEN	ERAL CONTENT	RESPONSE
	Executive Summary (for larger reports only).	Not included
$\boxtimes$	Date and revision number of the report.	Date of report provided
$\boxtimes$	Location map and plan showing municipal address, boundary, and layout of proposed development.	Page 1, and Appendix A
	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.	Section 2 of report
$\boxtimes$	Summary of Pre-consultation Meetings with City and other approval agencies.	In Appendix E
	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.	No Master Servicing Studies.
$\boxtimes$	Statement of objectives and servicing criteria.	Section 1 of report
$\boxtimes$	Identification of existing and proposed infrastructure available in the immediate area.	Section 2 & 3 of report
	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).	Not applicable
	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.	Not applicable
	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.	Not applicable
	Proposed phasing of the development, if applicable.	Not applicable
	Reference to geotechnical studies and recommendations concerning servicing.	Not applicable
	All preliminary and formal site plan submissions should have the following information: Metric scale North arrow (including construction North) Key plan	Functional Report, Civil and Architectural Plans provided all this information.
	name and contact information of applicant and property owner	
	Property limits including bearings and dimensions	
	Existing and proposed structures and parking areas	
	Adjacent street names	
DEVE	LOPMENT SERVICING REPORT: WATER	RESPONSE
	Confirm consistency with Master Servicing Study, if available Availability of public infrastructure to service proposed development Identification of system constraints	Not applicable
$\boxtimes$	Identify boundary conditions	Section 4.5
$\boxtimes$	Confirmation of adequate domestic supply and pressure	Section 4.2
	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 4.2
$\boxtimes$	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.	Section 4.2 & Table B-5 Appendix B
	Definition of phasing constraints. Hydraulic modeling is required to confirm servicing for all defined phases of the project including the ultimate design	Not applicable
$\boxtimes$	Address reliability requirements such as appropriate location of shut-off valves Check on the necessity of a pressure zone boundary modification.	Section 4.2, Drawing C100
	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 4.4 & Table B-1, Table B-2, Appendix B
	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.	Section 4.2

	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.	Not applicable
$\boxtimes$	Confirmation that water demands are calculated based on the City of Ottawa Design Guidelines.	Table B-1 Appendix B
	Provision of a model schematic showing the boundary conditions locations, streets, parcels, and building locations for reference.	Not applicable
DEVE	LOPMENT SERVICING REPORT: WASTEWATER	RESPONSE
	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 5.1
	Confirm consistency with Master Servicing Study and/or justifications for deviations.	Not applicable
	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.	Section 5.2
$\square$	Description of existing sanitary sewer available for discharge of wastewater from proposed development.	Section 5.2
	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)	Not applicable
$\boxtimes$	Calculations related to dry-weather and wet-weather flow rates from the development in standard MOE sanitary sewer design table (Appendix 'C') format.	Table C-1 in Appendix C
$\boxtimes$	Description of proposed sewer network including sewers, pumping stations, and forcemains.	Section 5.2
	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).	Not applicable
	Pumping stations: impacts of proposed development on existing pumping stations or requirements for new pumping station to service development.	Not applicable
	Forcemain capacity in terms of operational redundancy, surge pressure and maximum flow velocity.	Not applicable
	Forcemain capacity in terms of operational redundancy, surge pressure and maximum flow velocity. Identification and implementation of the emergency overflow from sanitary pumping stations in relation to the hydraulic grade line to protect against basement flooding.	Not applicable Not applicable
	Forcemain capacity in terms of operational redundancy, surge pressure and maximum flow velocity. Identification and implementation of the emergency overflow from sanitary pumping stations in relation to the hydraulic grade line to protect against basement flooding. Special considerations such as contamination, corrosive environment etc.	Not applicable Not applicable Not applicable
	Forcemain capacity in terms of operational redundancy, surge pressure and maximum flow velocity. Identification and implementation of the emergency overflow from sanitary pumping stations in relation to the hydraulic grade line to protect against basement flooding. Special considerations such as contamination, corrosive environment etc. <b>LOPMENT SERVICING REPORT: STORMWATER CHECKLIST</b>	Not applicable Not applicable Not applicable RESPONSE
	Forcemain capacity in terms of operational redundancy, surge pressure and maximum flow velocity. Identification and implementation of the emergency overflow from sanitary pumping stations in relation to the hydraulic grade line to protect against basement flooding. Special considerations such as contamination, corrosive environment etc. <b>ELOPMENT SERVICING REPORT: STORMWATER CHECKLIST</b> Description of drainage outlets and downstream constraints including legality of outlets (i.e. municipal drain, right-of-way, watercourse, or private property)	Not applicable Not applicable Not applicable RESPONSE Section 6
	Forcemain capacity in terms of operational redundancy, surge pressure and maximum flow velocity. Identification and implementation of the emergency overflow from sanitary pumping stations in relation to the hydraulic grade line to protect against basement flooding. Special considerations such as contamination, corrosive environment etc. <b>ELOPMENT SERVICING REPORT: STORMWATER CHECKLIST</b> Description of drainage outlets and downstream constraints including legality of outlets (i.e. municipal drain, right-of-way, watercourse, or private property) Analysis of available capacity in existing public infrastructure.	Not applicable Not applicable Not applicable RESPONSE Section 6 Not applicable
	<ul> <li>Forcemain capacity in terms of operational redundancy, surge pressure and maximum flow velocity.</li> <li>Identification and implementation of the emergency overflow from sanitary pumping stations in relation to the hydraulic grade line to protect against basement flooding.</li> <li>Special considerations such as contamination, corrosive environment etc.</li> <li><b>LOPMENT SERVICING REPORT: STORMWATER CHECKLIST</b></li> <li>Description of drainage outlets and downstream constraints including legality of outlets (i.e. municipal drain, right-of-way, watercourse, or private property)</li> <li>Analysis of available capacity in existing public infrastructure.</li> <li>A drawing showing the subject lands, its surroundings, the receiving watercourse, existing drainage patterns, and proposed drainage pattern.</li> </ul>	Not applicable         Not applicable         RESPONSE         Section 6         Not applicable         Site is too small to be considered
	Forcemain capacity in terms of operational redundancy, surge pressure and maximum flow velocity. Identification and implementation of the emergency overflow from sanitary pumping stations in relation to the hydraulic grade line to protect against basement flooding. Special considerations such as contamination, corrosive environment etc. <b>ELOPMENT SERVICING REPORT: STORMWATER CHECKLIST</b> Description of drainage outlets and downstream constraints including legality of outlets (i.e. municipal drain, right-of-way, watercourse, or private property) Analysis of available capacity in existing public infrastructure. A drawing showing the subject lands, its surroundings, the receiving watercourse, existing drainage patterns, and proposed drainage pattern. 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.	Not applicableNot applicableNot applicable <b>RESPONSE</b> Section 6Not applicableSite is too small to be consideredNot Applicable
	<ul> <li>Forcemain capacity in terms of operational redundancy, surge pressure and maximum flow velocity.</li> <li>Identification and implementation of the emergency overflow from sanitary pumping stations in relation to the hydraulic grade line to protect against basement flooding.</li> <li>Special considerations such as contamination, corrosive environment etc.</li> <li>ELOPMENT SERVICING REPORT: STORMWATER CHECKLIST</li> <li>Description of drainage outlets and downstream constraints including legality of outlets (i.e. municipal drain, right-of-way, watercourse, or private property)</li> <li>Analysis of available capacity in existing public infrastructure.</li> <li>A drawing showing the subject lands, its surroundings, the receiving watercourse, existing drainage patterns, and proposed drainage pattern.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>Water Quality control objective (basic, normal or enhanced level of protection based on the sensitivities of the receiving watercourse) and storage requirements.</li> </ul>	Not applicableNot applicableNot applicable <b>RESPONSE</b> Section 6Not applicableSite is too small to be consideredNot ApplicableNot ApplicableNot Applicable
	Forcemain capacity in terms of operational redundancy, surge pressure and maximum flow velocity. Identification and implementation of the emergency overflow from sanitary pumping stations in relation to the hydraulic grade line to protect against basement flooding. Special considerations such as contamination, corrosive environment etc. <b>ELOPMENT SERVICING REPORT: STORMWATER CHECKLIST</b> Description of drainage outlets and downstream constraints including legality of outlets (i.e. municipal drain, right-of-way, watercourse, or private property) Analysis of available capacity in existing public infrastructure. A drawing showing the subject lands, its surroundings, the receiving watercourse, existing drainage patterns, and proposed drainage pattern. 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. Water Quality control objective (basic, normal or enhanced level of protection based on the sensitivities of the receiving watercourse) and storage requirements. Description of the stormwater management concept with facility locations and descriptions with references and supporting information.	Not applicable         Not applicable         RESPONSE         Section 6         Not applicable         Site is too small to be considered         Not Applicable         Not Applicable         Section 6.2 & 6.3
	Forcemain capacity in terms of operational redundancy, surge pressure and maximum flow velocity. Identification and implementation of the emergency overflow from sanitary pumping stations in relation to the hydraulic grade line to protect against basement flooding. Special considerations such as contamination, corrosive environment etc. <b>EOPMENT SERVICING REPORT: STORMWATER CHECKLIST</b> Description of drainage outlets and downstream constraints including legality of outlets (i.e. municipal drain, right-of-way, watercourse, or private property) Analysis of available capacity in existing public infrastructure. A drawing showing the subject lands, its surroundings, the receiving watercourse, existing drainage patterns, and proposed drainage pattern. 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. Water Quality control objective (basic, normal or enhanced level of protection based on the sensitivities of the receiving watercourse) and storage requirements. Description of the stormwater management concept with facility locations and descriptions with references and supporting information. Set-back from private sewage disposal systems. Watercourse and hazard lands setbacks.	Not applicableNot applicableNot applicable <b>RESPONSE</b> Section 6Not applicableSite is too small to be consideredNot ApplicableNot ApplicableSection 6.2 & 6.3Not Applicable
	Forcemain capacity in terms of operational redundancy, surge pressure and maximum flow velocity. Identification and implementation of the emergency overflow from sanitary pumping stations in relation to the hydraulic grade line to protect against basement flooding. Special considerations such as contamination, corrosive environment etc. <b>ELOPMENT SERVICING REPORT: STORMWATER CHECKLIST</b> Description of drainage outlets and downstream constraints including legality of outlets (i.e. municipal drain, right-of-way, watercourse, or private property) Analysis of available capacity in existing public infrastructure. A drawing showing the subject lands, its surroundings, the receiving watercourse, existing drainage patterns, and proposed drainage pattern. 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. Water Quality control objective (basic, normal or enhanced level of protection based on the sensitivities of the receiving watercourse) and storage requirements. Description of the stormwater management concept with facility locations and descriptions with references and supporting information. Set-back from private sewage disposal systems. Watercourse and hazard lands setbacks. Record of pre-consultation with the Ontario Ministry of Environment and the Conservation Authority that has jurisdiction on the affected watershed.	Not applicable         Not applicable         RESPONSE         Section 6         Not applicable         Site is too small to be considered         Not Applicable         Soction 6.2 & 6.3         Not Applicable         Appendix E
	Forcemain capacity in terms of operational redundancy, surge pressure and maximum flow velocity. Identification and implementation of the emergency overflow from sanitary pumping stations in relation to the hydraulic grade line to protect against basement flooding. Special considerations such as contamination, corrosive environment etc. ELOPMENT 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) Analysis of available capacity in existing public infrastructure. A drawing showing the subject lands, its surroundings, the receiving watercourse, existing drainage patterns, and proposed drainage pattern. 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. Water Quality control objective (basic, normal or enhanced level of protection based on the sensitivities of the receiving watercourse) and storage requirements. Description of the stormwater management concept with facility locations and descriptions with references and supporting information. Set-back from private sewage disposal systems. Watercourse and hazard lands setbacks. Record of pre-consultation with the Ontario Ministry of Environment and the Conservation Authority that has jurisdiction on the affected watershed. Confirm consistency with sub-watershed and Master Servicing Study, if applicable study exists.	Not applicableNot applicableNot applicable <b>RESPONSE</b> Section 6Not applicableSite is too small to be consideredNot ApplicableNot ApplicableSection 6.2 & 6.3Not ApplicableAppendix ENot Applicable

	Identification of watercourses within the proposed development and how watercourses will be protected, or, if necessary, altered by the proposed development with applicable approvals.	Not Applicable
$\boxtimes$	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 6.6, 6.8 & Table D- 1 & D-4 of Appendix D
	Any proposed diversion of drainage catchment areas from one outlet to another.	Not Applicable
	Proposed minor and major systems including locations and sizes of stormwater trunk sewers, and stormwater management facilities.	Section 6.8
	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.	Not Applicable
	Identification of potential impacts to receiving watercourses Identification of municipal drains and related approval requirements.	Not Applicable
$\boxtimes$	Descriptions of how the conveyance and storage capacity will be achieved for the development.	Section 6.9
$\boxtimes$	100-year flood levels and major flow routing to protect proposed development from flooding for establishing minimum building elevations (MBE) and overall grading.	Site Grading and Erosion and Sediment Plan
	Inclusion of hydraulic analysis including hydraulic grade line elevations.	Not Applicable
$\boxtimes$	Description of approach to erosion and sediment control during construction for the protection of receiving watercourse or drainage corridors.	Section 7
	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.	Not Applicable – No requirements from Conservation Authority
	Identification of fill constraints related to floodplain and geotechnical investigation.	See geotechnical report
$\boxtimes$	The Servicing Study shall provide a list of applicable permits and regulatory approvals necessary for the proposed development as well as the relevant issues affecting each approval. The approval and permitting shall include but not be limited to the following:	Appendix E
	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 theAct.	Not Applicable
	Application for Certificate of Approval (CofA) under the Ontario Water Resources Act.	Not Applicable
	Changes to Municipal Drains.	Not Applicable
	Other permits (National Capital Commission, Parks Canada, Public Works and Government Services Canada, Ministry of Transportation etc.)	Not Applicable
CON	CLUSION CHECKLIST	RESPONSE
$\boxtimes$	Clearly stated conclusions and recommendations	In Section 8
	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.	Appendix E
$\boxtimes$	All draft and final reports shall be signed and stamped by a professional Engineer registered in Ontario	Signed and stamped

EXP Services Inc. 1869 Maple Grove Road, Ottawa, ON OTT-00254810-A0 September 25, 2020

### **Appendix H – Drawings**

#### **Architectural Site Plan Drawings**

- Site Plan, SP-00
- Topo Survey

#### **Engineering Drawings (included separately)**

- Notes and Legend, C001
- Site Servicing Plan, C002
- Site Grading Plan, C003
- Storm Drainage Plan, C004.
- Sanitary Drainage Plan, C005
- Erosion and Sediment Control Plan, C006
- Details Page, C007



Þ

ф



# SURVEYOR'S REAL PROPERTY REPORT PART 1 Plan of PART OF LOT 1 CONCESSION 1 GEOGRAPHIC TOWNSHIP OF HUNTLEY CITY OF OTTAWA Surveyed by Annis, O'Sullivan, Vollebekk Ltd.

Scale 1:200

## Metric DISTANCES AND COORDINATES SHOWN ON THIS PLAN ARE IN METRES AND CAN BE CONVERTED TO FEET BY DIVIDING BY 0.3048.

Surveyor's Certificate

LCERTIFY THAT :
 LCERTIFY THAT :
 LThis survey and plan are correct and in accordance with the Surve
 Act and the Surveyors Act and the regulations made under them.
 The survey was completed on the 20th day of December, 2019.

Date 24/19

T. Hartwick Ontario Land Survey

#### PART 2 THIS PLAN MUST BE READ IN CONJUNCTION WITH SURVEY REPORT DATED: December 24th, 2019

#### Notes & Legend

	Denotes	
-0-	• .	Survey Monument Planted
		Survey Monument Found
SIB		Standard Iron Bar
(WIT)		Witness
(OU)	× .	Origin Unknown
Meas.		Measured
(AOG)	•	Annis, O'Sullivan, Vollebekk Ltd.
(PL)	•	Registered Plan 4M-1505
(P)	•	Registered Plan 4M-1478
(PI)		Plan 4R-22948
(P2)		Plan 4R-27913
(P3)		Plan 4R-27016
$\odot$	•	Deciduous Tree
We		
*	÷	Coniferous Tree
O.	÷.	Fire Hydrant
e wv		Water Valve
O MH-ST		Maintenance Hole (Storm Sewer)
OMHS		Maintenance Hole (Sanitary)
OMH		Maintenance Hole (Unidentified)
— они —		Overhead Wires
CB		Catch Basin
🗣 ВН	-	Borehole
to GN		Gas Meter
a 18-8	н.	Bell Terminal Box
∆ \$		Sign
CLF		Chain Link Fence
BF		Board Fence
		Gate
0.08		I Itility Pole
	- C	Anabar
		Linkt Chandard
U LS		Light Standard
AC		Air Conditioner
C/L		Centreline
ø	•	Diameter
RWS		Stone Retaining Wall
RWC	• .	Concrete Retaining Wall
SWC		Concrete Sidewalk
+ 65.00		Location of Elevations
+ 65.00*		Top of Concrete Curb and Retaining V
ви В		Mail Box

ASSOCIATION OF ONTA LAND SURVEYORS PLAN SUBMISSION FOR 2104127 



Bearings are grid, derived from Can-Net 2016 Real Time Network GPS observations, MTM Zone 9 (76°30' West Longitude ) NAD-83 (original).

#### ELEVATION NOTES

Lieuvations shown are geodetic and are referred to the CGVD28 geode
 It is the responsibility of the user of this information to verify that the jol has not been altered or disturbed and that it's relative elevation and de agrees with the information shown on this drawing.

- UTILITY NOTES 1. This strawing cannot be accepted as acknowledging all of the utilities and it will be the responsibility of the user to contact the respective utility authorities for confirmation. rface utilities were located
- the pertinent utility authority is eaking ground, probing, excavat
- CARINE, O'Sulvan, Volebaki Ld, 2019. "THIS PLAN IS PROTECTED BY COPYRIGHT" ANNIS, O'SULLIVAN, VOLLEBEKK LTD. 14 Concourse Guide, Sale 500 Phone: (61) 327-4950 / Fax: (61) 3727-4079 Earch Ignardgemetics

