



**Kollaard Associates**

Engineers

210 Prescott Street, Unit 1  
P.O. Box 189  
Kemptville, Ontario K0G 1J0

Civil • Geotechnical •  
Structural • Environmental •  
Hydrogeology

**(613) 860-0923**

FAX: (613) 258-0475

---

**REPORT ON**

**GEOTECHNICAL INVESTIGATION  
PROPOSED 3-STOREY RESIDENTIAL APARTMENT BUILDINGS  
366 WINONA AVENUE  
CITY OF OTTAWA, ONTARIO**

Project # 211282

Submitted to:

Falsetto Homes Inc  
52 Sullivan Avenue  
Ottawa, Ontario  
K2G 1V2

**DISTRIBUTION**

4 copies      City of Ottawa  
2 copies      Falsetto Homes Inc  
1 copy        Kollaard Associates Inc.

May 4, 2022



**Professional Engineers**  
Ontario

Authorized by the Association of Professional Engineers  
of Ontario to offer professional engineering services.



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>1.0</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>2.0</b>	<b>BACKGROUND INFORMATION AND SITE GEOLOGY</b> .....	<b>1</b>
2.1	EXISTING CONDITIONS AND SITE GEOLOGY .....	1
2.2	PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT .....	2
<b>3.0</b>	<b>PROCEDURE</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>4.0</b>	<b>SUBSURFACE CONDITIONS</b> .....	<b>3</b>
4.1	GENERAL .....	3
4.2	FILL.....	4
4.3	BEDROCK .....	4
4.4	GROUNDWATER .....	4
<b>5.0</b>	<b>GEOTECHNICAL GUIDELINES AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b> .....	<b>4</b>
5.1	GENERAL .....	4
5.2	FOUNDATION FOR PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL BUILDINGS .....	5
5.3	FOUNDATION DESIGN AND BEARING CAPACITY .....	5
5.4	ENGINEERED FILL.....	6
5.5	FOUNDATION EXCAVATION.....	7
5.5.1	BEDROCK REMOVAL.....	7
5.5.2	EFFECT OF FOUNDATION EXCAVATION ON ADJACENT STRUCTURES AND CITY OF OTTAWA SERVICES .....	7
5.5.3	GROUND WATER IN EXCAVATION AND CONSTRUCTION DEWATERING.....	8
5.5.4	EFFECT OF DEWATERING OF FOUNDATION OR SITE SERVICES EXCAVATIONS ON ADJACENT STRUCTURES.....	8
5.6	FROST PROTECTION REQUIREMENTS FOR SPREAD FOOTING FOUNDATIONS.....	8
5.7	FOUNDATION WALL BACKFILL.....	9
5.7.1	FOUNDATION AND UNDER SLAB DRAINAGE .....	10
5.8	BASEMENT FLOOR SLAB.....	10
5.9	SEISMIC DESIGN FOR THE PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL BUILDINGS .....	11
5.9.1	SEISMIC SITE CLASSIFICATION.....	11
5.9.2	NATIONAL BUILDING CODE SEISMIC HAZARD CALCULATION.....	11
5.9.3	POTENTIAL FOR SOIL LIQUEFACTION .....	11
<b>6.0</b>	<b>SITE SERVICES</b> .....	<b>12</b>
6.1	EXCAVATION.....	12
6.2	PIPE BEDDING AND COVER MATERIALS.....	12
6.3	TRENCH BACKFILL .....	13
<b>7.0</b>	<b>TREES</b> .....	<b>13</b>
<b>8.0</b>	<b>CONSTRUCTION CONSIDERATIONS</b> .....	<b>14</b>



## **RECORD OF BOREHOLE LOG SHEETS**

List of Abbreviations

## **LIST OF FIGURES**

FIGURE 1 - KEY PLAN

FIGURE 2 - SITE PLAN

## **LIST OF ATTACHMENTS**

ATTACHMENT A - National Building Code Seismic Hazard Calculation



May 4, 2022

211282

Falsetto Homes Inc  
52 Sullivan Avenue  
Ottawa, Ontario  
K2G 1V2

RE: GEOTECHNICAL INVESTIGATION  
PROPOSED 3-STOREY RESIDENTIAL APARTMENTS  
366 WINONA AVENUE  
CITY OF OTTAWA, ONTARIO

## **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

This report presents the results of a geotechnical investigation carried out for the above noted proposed residential development at 366 Winona Avenue, City of Ottawa, Ontario (See Key Plan, Figure 1).

The purpose of the investigation was to:

- Identify the subsurface conditions at the site by means of a limited number of boreholes;
- Based on the factual information obtained, provide recommendations and guidelines on the geotechnical engineering aspects of the project design; including bearing capacity and other construction considerations, which could influence design decisions.

## **2.0 BACKGROUND INFORMATION AND SITE GEOLOGY**

### **2.1 Existing Conditions and Site Geology**

The subject site for this assessment consists of about a 0.06 hectare (0.15 acres) rectangular shaped property located at 366 Winona Avenue, City of Ottawa, Ontario (see Key Plan, Figure 1).





For the purposes of this assessment, project north lies in a direction parallel to Winona Avenue, located immediately east of the site. The site is currently occupied by a multi-unit residential building, which is to be demolished prior to construction.

Surrounding land use is residential development. The site is bordered to the east by Winona avenue followed by residential development, and to the north, west and south by residential development.

The ground surface at the site is currently graded such that surface water drains to the east.

Based on a review of the surficial geology map for the site area, it is expected that the site is underlain by glacial till and/or shallow bedrock. Bedrock geology maps indicate that the bedrock underlying the site consists of limestone with shaley partings of the Ottawa formation.

Based on a review of available borehole information, the overburden at and near the site likely consists of some 0 to 2 metres of glacial till followed by limestone bedrock.

## **2.2 Proposed Development**

It is understood that preliminary plans are being prepared for the construction of two 3-storey residential apartment buildings. There is proposed parking at the rear of the site. It is understood that the buildings will be wood framed with some brick veneer and conventional concrete spread footing foundations and a proposed basement. The proposed buildings will be serviced by municipal water and sanitary services.

Surface drainage for the proposed buildings will be by means of swales, nearby catch basins and storm sewers.

## **3.0 PROCEDURE**

The field work for this investigation was carried out on April 28, 2022, at which time four boreholes, numbered BH1 to BH4 were put down at the site using a truck mounted drill rig equipped with a hollow stem auger owned and operated by CCC Geotechnical & Environmental Drilling of Ottawa, Ontario. Boreholes BH1 to BH4 were put down to the north of the building, extending from west to east across the property.



The subsurface soil conditions encountered at the boreholes were classified based on visual and tactile examination of the samples recovered (ASTM D2488 - Standard Practice for Description and Identification of Soils (Visual-Manual Procedure) and standard penetration tests (ASTM D-1586). Groundwater conditions at the boreholes were noted at the time of drilling and at a later date. The boreholes were loosely backfilled with the auger cuttings upon completion of drilling.

Sampling of the overburden materials encountered at each borehole location was carried out at regular 0.75 metre depth intervals using a 50 millimetre diameter drive open conventional split spoon sampler in conjunction with standard penetration testing. All of the boreholes were put down to bedrock at the site. The soils were classified using the Unified Soil Classification System.

As native soils were not encountered within the boreholes, laboratory testing of soil samples was not completed for this site.

The field work was supervised throughout by members of our engineering staff who located the boreholes in the field, logged the boreholes and cared for the samples obtained. A description of the subsurface conditions encountered at the boreholes is given in the attached Record of Borehole Sheets. The approximate locations of the boreholes are shown on the attached Site Plan, Figure 2.

## **4.0 SUBSURFACE CONDITIONS**

### **4.1 General**

As previously indicated, a description of the subsurface conditions encountered at the boreholes is provided in the attached Record of Borehole Sheets following the text of this report. The borehole logs indicate the subsurface conditions at the specific drill locations only. Boundaries between zones on the logs are often not distinct, but rather are transitional and have been interpreted. Subsurface conditions at locations other than borehole locations may vary from the conditions encountered at the boreholes.

Classification and identification of soil involves judgement and Kollaard Associates Inc. does not guarantee descriptions as exact, but infers accuracy to the extent that is common in current geotechnical practice.



The groundwater conditions described in this report refer only to those observed at the location and on the date the observations were noted in the report and on the borehole logs. Groundwater conditions may vary seasonally, or may be affected by construction activities on or in the vicinity of the site.

The following is a brief overview of the subsurface conditions encountered at the boreholes.

#### **4.2 Fill**

Fill materials consisting of topsoil mixed with silty sand with trace to some clay, asphalt, brick and wood were encountered in all boreholes. These were encountered from the surface in boreholes BH1, BH2 and BH3 and were overlain by grey crushed granular stone fill with a thickness of about 0.5 metres in borehole BH4. The fill materials were encountered to depths of about 0.8 to 1.0 metres. The fill materials had blow counts from 7 to 8 blows per 0.3 metres, indicating a loose state of packing. The fill materials were fully penetrated at all borehole locations.

#### **4.3 Bedrock**

Beneath the topsoil and fill materials, boreholes BH1, BH2, BH3 and BH4 encountered limestone bedrock at depths of about 0.8, 0.8, 0.9 and 1.0 metres, respectively, below the existing ground surface. Refusal at the bedrock surface was encountered in all boreholes.

#### **4.4 Groundwater**

All boreholes (BH1 to BH4) were dry at the time of drilling, April 28, 2022. It should be noted that the groundwater levels may be higher during wet periods of the year.

### **5.0 GEOTECHNICAL GUIDELINES AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

#### **5.1 General**

This section of the report provides engineering guidelines on the geotechnical design aspects of the project based on our interpretation of the information from the test holes and the project requirements. It is stressed that the information in the following sections is provided for the guidance



of the designers and is intended for this project only. Contractors bidding on or undertaking the works should examine the factual results of the investigation, satisfy themselves as to the adequacy of the information for construction, and make their own interpretation of the factual data as it affects their construction techniques, schedule, safety and equipment capabilities.

The professional services for this project include only the geotechnical aspects of the subsurface conditions at this site. The presence or implications of possible surface and/or subsurface contamination resulting from previous uses or activities at this site or adjacent properties, and/or resulting from the introduction onto the site of materials from offsite sources are outside the terms of reference for this report.

## **5.2 Foundation for Proposed Residential Buildings**

With the exception of the fill materials, the subsurface conditions encountered within the test holes are suitable for the support of the proposed residential buildings on conventional spread footing foundations. Excavations for the proposed foundations should be taken through the fill materials to expose the bedrock subgrade.

## **5.3 Foundation Design and Bearing Capacity**

It is suggested that the buildings be founded either directly on the underlying bedrock or on engineered fill placed on the underlying bedrock. The underside of footings can be stepped as necessary to facilitate placement on the bedrock.

The foundation of the proposed residential buildings may be placed on conventional pad and strip footings. A maximum allowable bearing pressure of 500 kilopascals using serviceability limit states design and a factored ultimate bearing resistance of 1000 kilopascals using ultimate limit states design may be used for the design of conventional strip or pad footings, a minimum of 0.6 metres in width, founded on relatively sound bedrock. Relatively sound bedrock consists of a hard relatively level bedrock surface free of loose material, rock shatter and loose fractured rock.

The foundation of the proposed residential buildings founded on engineered fill placed on the bedrock may be designed a maximum allowable bearing pressure of 300 kilopascals for serviceability limit states design and a factored ultimate bearing resistance of 600 kilopascals for





ultimate limit states design for the design of convention strip or pad footings, a minimum of 0.5 metres in width.

There is no limit to the allowable landscape grade raise adjacent to the proposed building foundations. Total and differential settlement of the footings for the residential buildings designed and founded based on the above guidelines should be less than 15 millimetres and 10 millimetres, respectively.

The subgrade surfaces should be inspected and approved by geotechnical personnel prior to placement of any engineered fill or concrete.

#### **5.4 Engineered Fill**

It is recommended that the buildings be founded either on relatively sound bedrock or on engineered fill placed on relatively sound bedrock. It is not recommended that the footings be placed on both bedrock and engineered fill at different locations in the building.

Any fill required to raise the footings for the proposed buildings to founding level should consist of imported granular material (engineered fill). The engineered fill should consist of granular material meeting Ontario Provincial Standards Specifications (OPSS) requirements for Granular A or Granular B Type II and should be compacted in maximum 300 millimetre thick loose lifts to at least 100 percent of the standard Proctor maximum dry density. It is considered that the engineered fill should be compacted using dynamic compaction with a large diameter vibratory steel drum roller or diesel plate compactor. If a diesel plate compactor is used, the lift thickness may need to be restricted to less than 300 mm to achieve proper compaction. Compaction should be verified by a suitable field compaction test method.

To allow the spread of load beneath the footings, the engineered fill should extend out 0.5 metres horizontally from the edges of the footing then down and out at 1 horizontal to 1 vertical, or flatter. The excavations for the proposed residential buildings should be sized to accommodate this fill placement.



## **5.5 Foundation Excavation**

Any excavation for the proposed structures will likely be carried out through fill materials (topsoil, some sand, silt, clay, brick, asphalt) to bear upon the limestone bedrock. The sides of the excavations should be sloped in accordance with the requirements of Ontario Regulation 213/91, s. 226 under the Occupational Health and Safety Act. According to the Act, the fill materials at the site can be classified as Type 3 soil above bedrock and Type 1 below the bedrock surface, however this classification should be confirmed by qualified individuals as the site is excavated and if necessary, adjusted.

It is expected that the side slopes of the excavation will be stable in the short term provided the walls are sloped at 1H:1V through the fill materials to 1.2 metres or less from the bottom of the excavation and provided no excavated materials are stockpiled within 3 metres of the top of the excavations.

### **5.5.1 Bedrock Removal**

Small amounts of bedrock removal can most likely be carried out by hoe ramming and heavy excavating equipment. To limit the effects of the bedrock on the adjacent structures and municipal services it is recommended that line drilling be used in conjunction with hoe ramming to reduce the effort required to fracture and remove bedrock. Due to the proximity of adjacent structures and municipal services, blasting is not recommended. It is considered that where large amounts of bedrock are removed by hoe ramming, the hoe ramming could also introduce significant vibrations through the bedrock. As such it is considered that pre-excavation surveys of nearby structures and existing utilities should also be completed before extensive hoe ramming.

### **5.5.2 Effect of Foundation Excavation on Adjacent Structures and City of Ottawa Services**

It is expected that bedrock will be encountered during excavating for the building foundations and site services. It is considered that where large amounts of bedrock are removed by hoe ramming, the hoe ramming could also introduce significant vibrations through the bedrock. The ground induced vibration can be mitigated by the use of line drilling in combination with the hoe ramming and by operating only one piece of equipment at a time during the removal of the bedrock. Line drilling will reduce the effort required to fracture the rock reducing the size of the equipment and hoe ram needed to remove the rock and the duration of the hoe ramming. If the size of the equipment



used is limited to less than 30 tonnes, the level of ground induced vibration is expected to be less than that which would cause damage to the adjacent structures or city municipal services.

### **5.5.3 Ground Water in Excavation and Construction Dewatering**

Boreholes BH1 to BH4 were dry at the time of drilling on April 28, 2022. As the buildings will be founded on shallow bedrock, water intrusion into the excavation is not a concern and dewatering will not be required. As such a permit to take water will not be required prior to excavation. If groundwater is encountered, at minimum registration on the Environmental Activity Sector Registry as per O. Reg 63/15 is expected to be required.

### **5.5.4 Effect of Dewatering of Foundation or Site Services Excavations on Adjacent Structures**

Since the buildings are to be founded on shallow bedrock and all adjacent buildings are also founded on shallow bedrock, dewatering of the foundation will not remove water from any historically saturated soils that are important for the support of any building. As such dewatering of the foundation or site services excavations, if required, will not have a detrimental impact on the adjacent structures.

### **5.6 Frost Protection Requirements for Spread Footing Foundations**

In general, all exterior foundation elements and those in any unheated parts of the proposed buildings should be provided with at least 1.5 metres of earth cover for frost protection purposes. Isolated, unheated foundation elements adjacent to surfaces, which are cleared of snow cover during winter months should be provided with a minimum 1.8 metres of earth cover for frost protection purposes.

Where less than the required depth of soil cover can be provided, the foundation elements should be protected from frost by using a combination of earth cover and extruded polystyrene rigid insulation. A typical frost protection insulation detail could be provided upon request, if required.



Where the proposed building foundations are placed on sound bedrock or on engineered fill over bedrock, the subgrade materials would be considered to be non susceptible to frost action and no frost protection for the foundations is required.

2017 OBC Part 9.12.2.2 provides the following information:

Table 9.12.2.2 - Minimum Depths of Foundation

Type of Soil: Rock, Coarse grained soils with good soil drainage

Minimum Depth of Foundation (Containing No Heated Space): No Limit

## 5.7 Foundation Wall Backfill

To prevent possible foundation frost jacking, the backfill against any unheated or insulated walls or isolated walls or piers should consist of free draining, non-frost susceptible material. If imported material is required, it should consist of sand or sand and gravel meeting OPSS Granular B Type I grading requirements.

Alternatively, foundations could be backfilled on the exterior with native material in conjunction with the use of an approved proprietary drainage layer system (such as Platon System Membrane) against the foundation wall. There is potential for possible frost jacking of the upper portion of some types of these drainage layer systems if frost susceptible material is used as backfill. To mitigate this potential, the upper approximately 0.6 metres of the foundation should be backfilled with non-frost susceptible granular material.

Where the granular backfill will ultimately support a pavement structure or walkway, it is suggested that the wall backfill material be compacted in 250 millimetre thick lifts to 95 percent of the standard Proctor dry density value. In that case any native material proposed for foundation backfill should be inspected and approved by the geotechnical engineer.

The basement foundation walls should be designed to resist the earth pressure,  $P$ , acting against the walls at any depth,  $h$ , calculated using the following equation.



$$P = k_0 (\gamma h + q)$$

Where:

P	=	the pressure, at any depth, h, below the finished ground surface
$k_0$	=	earth pressure at-rest coefficient, 0.5
$\gamma$	=	unit weight of soil to be retained, estimated at 22 kN/m <sup>3</sup>
q	=	surcharge load (kPa) above backfill material
h	=	the depth, in metres, below the finished ground surface at which the pressure, P, is being computed

This expression assumes that the water table would be maintained at the founding level by the foundation perimeter drainage and backfill requirements.

### 5.7.1 Foundation and Under Slab Drainage

A conventional, perforated perimeter drain should be provided at founding level, leading by gravity flow to a sump. The drain should be installed at footing level and provided with a 150 millimetre thick surround of 20 millimetre minus crushed stone. It is considered that in view of the groundwater conditions observed at the boreholes, for foundations founded at or above the existing bedrock surface, the above perimeter drainage system should adequately handle any groundwater seepage to the basement.

### 5.8 Basement Floor Slab

As stated above, it is expected that the proposed buildings will be founded on bedrock or on an engineered pad placed on bedrock. For predictable performance of the proposed concrete basement floor slab all existing fill material and any otherwise deleterious material should be removed from below the proposed floor slab areas. The exposed bedrock surface should then be inspected and approved by geotechnical personnel.

The fill materials beneath the proposed concrete floor slab on grade should consist of a minimum of 150 millimetre thickness of crushed stone meeting OPSS Granular A immediately beneath the concrete floor slab followed by sand, or sand and gravel meeting the OPSS for Granular B Type I or crushed stone meeting OPSS grading requirements for Granular B Type II. The fill materials should be compacted in maximum 300 millimetre thick lifts to at least 95 percent of the standard Proctor maximum dry density.



The concrete floor slab should be saw-cut at regular intervals to minimize random cracking of the slab due to shrinkage of the concrete. The saw cut depth should be about one quarter of the thickness of the slab. The crack control cuts should be placed at a grid spacing not exceeding the lesser of 25 times the slab thickness or 4.5 metres. The slab should be cut as soon as it is possible to work on the slab without damaging the surface of the slab.

## **5.9 Seismic Design for the Proposed Residential Buildings**

### **5.9.1 Seismic Site Classification**

Based on the limited information from the boreholes, for seismic design purposes, in accordance with the 2012 OBC Section 4.1.8.4, Table 4.1.8.4.A., the site classification for seismic site response for the bedrock is Site Class B. The proposed building will be founded on sound limestone bedrock.

### **5.9.2 National Building Code Seismic Hazard Calculation**

The design Peak Ground Acceleration (PGA) for the site was calculated as 0.273 with a 2% probability of exceedance in 50 years based on the interpolation of the 2015 National Building Code Seismic Hazard calculation. The results of the test are attached following the text of this report.

### **5.9.3 Potential for Soil Liquefaction**

As indicated above, the results of the boreholes indicate that the subsurface conditions consist of a thin layer of fill materials followed by bedrock. The proposed buildings will be founded on the bedrock or on engineered fill placed on the bedrock.

The bedrock is not considered to be liquefiable under seismic conditions.

Therefore, it is considered that no damage to the proposed residential buildings will occur due to liquefaction of the native subgrade under seismic conditions.



## **6.0 SITE SERVICES**

### **6.1 Excavation**

The excavations for the site services will be carried out through fill materials (topsoil, some sand, silt, clay, brick, asphalt) and potentially bedrock. For the purposes of Ontario Regulation 213/91 the soils at the site can be considered to be Type 3 soil above bedrock, and Type 1 below the bedrock surface. Work within an excavation in the bedrock should follow the requirements of Ontario Regulation 213/91 in particular O.Reg 213/91 S230 – S233. Excavation walls within bedrock may be made near vertical. The sides of the excavations in overburden materials should be sloped in accordance with the requirements in Ontario Regulation 213/91 under the Ontario Occupational Health and Safety Act.

It is expected that bedrock will be encountered during excavating for site services. It is considered that where large amounts of bedrock are removed by hoe ramming, the hoe ramming could also introduce significant vibrations through the bedrock. It is recommended that where large amounts of bedrock are to be removed by hoe ramming, line drilling techniques be combined with the hoe ramming. As such it is considered that pre-excavation surveys of nearby structures and existing utilities should also be completed before extensive hoe ramming.

Groundwater was not encountered in the test holes above bedrock. The test holes, however, were not advanced into the bedrock to the expected depth of the services. As such it is uncertain where the groundwater elevation is with respect to the service elevations. Based on available information it is unlikely that a permit to take water will be required to dewater the service trench. It is considered however that an application to the Environmental Site Registry may be required.

### **6.2 Pipe Bedding and Cover Materials**

It is suggested that the service pipe bedding material consist of at least 150 millimetres of granular material meeting OPSS requirements for Granular A. A provisional allowance should, however, be made for sub-excavation of any existing fill or disturbed material encountered at sub-grade level. Granular material meeting OPSS specifications for Granular B Type II could be used as a sub-bedding material. The use of clear crushed stone as bedding or sub-bedding material should not be permitted.



Cover material, from pipe spring line to at least 300 millimetres above the top of the pipe, should consist of granular material, such as OPSS Granular A.

The sub-bedding, bedding and cover materials should be compacted in maximum 200 millimetre thick lifts to at least 95 percent of the standard Proctor maximum dry density using suitable vibratory compaction equipment.

### **6.3 Trench Backfill**

The general backfilling procedures should be carried out in a manner that is compatible with the future use of the area above the service trenches.

In areas where the service trench will be located below or in close proximity to existing or future roadway areas, granular fill material should be used as backfill between the roadway sub-grade level and the depth of seasonal frost penetrations (i.e. 1.8 metres below finished grade) in order to reduce the potential for differential frost heaving between the area over the trench and the adjacent section of roadway.

As there is limited native material expected to exist onsite, imported granular material will likely have to be used. Where imported granular materials are used, suitable frost tapers should be used OPSS 802.013. Frost tapers are not required below the bedrock surface.

To minimize future settlement of the backfill and achieve an acceptable sub-grade for the roadways, sidewalks, etc., the trench should be compacted in maximum 300 millimetre thick lifts to at least 95 percent of the standard Proctor maximum dry density. The specified density may be reduced where the trench backfill is not located or in close proximity to existing or future roadways, driveways, sidewalks, or any other type of permanent structure.

## **7.0 TREES**

The site is underlain by a thin layer of fill materials over bedrock, which is not considered to be susceptible to shrinkage caused by changes to moisture content. As such, it is considered that there are not any increased separation distances or limitations to the type of trees planted onsite.





The effects of existing and future trees on the adjacent buildings, services and other ground supported structures should be considered in the landscaping design.

## **8.0 CONSTRUCTION CONSIDERATIONS**

The engagement of the services of the geotechnical consultant during construction is recommended to confirm that the subsurface conditions throughout the proposed development do not materially differ from those given in the report and that the construction activities do not adversely affect the intent of the design.

All foundation areas and any engineered fill areas for the proposed residential buildings should be inspected by Kollaard Associates Inc. to ensure that a suitable sub-grade has been reached and properly prepared. The placing and compaction of any granular materials beneath the foundations should be inspected to ensure that the materials used conform to the grading and compaction specifications.

The subgrade for the site services should be inspected and approved by geotechnical personnel. In situ density testing should be carried out on the service pipe bedding and backfill and the pavement granular materials to ensure the materials meet the specifications from a compaction point of view.

Any native topsoil and fill materials at this site will be sensitive to disturbance from construction operations, from rainwater or snow melt, and frost. In order to minimize disturbance, construction traffic operating directly on the subgrade should be kept to an absolute minimum and the subgrade should be protected from below freezing temperatures.



We trust this report provides sufficient information for your present purposes. If you have any questions concerning this report or if we may be of further services to you, please do not hesitate to contact our office.

Regards,  
Kollaard Associates Inc.

---

Dean Tataryn, B.E.S., EP.



---

Steve DeWit, P.Eng.

# BOREHOLE BH1

**PROJECT:** Proposed Residential Development  
**CLIENT:** Falso Homes Inc.  
**LOCATION:** 366 Winona Avenue  
**PENETRATION TEST HAMMER:** 63.5 kg, Drop, 0.76 mm

**PROJECT NUMBER:** 211282  
**DATE OF BORING:** 22-4-28  
**SHEET** 1 of 1  
**DATUM:**

DEPTH SCALE (meters)	SOIL PROFILE			SAMPLES			UNDIST SHEAR STRENGTH					DYNAMIC CONE PENETRATION TEST					MOISTURE CONTENT (%)	PIEZOMETER OR STANDPIPE INSTALLATION		
	DESCRIPTION	DEPTH (m)	STRATA PLOT	ELEV. (m)	NUMBER	TYPE	BLOWS/0.3m	Cu. kPa					blows/300 mm							
								x	o	x	o	x	o	x	o	x			o	
0.5	Topsoil, some sand, silt, clay, brick, asphalt (FILL)	0.00			1	SS	7	0	20	40	60	80	100	0	20	40	60	80	100	Borehole dry at time of drilling, April 28, 2022.
	Refusal on BEDROCK	0.76																		

GEOTECH BH KOLLAARD 211282 - BOREHOLES.GPJ GINT STD CANADA, GDT 22-5-2

**DEPTH SCALE:** 1 to 10

**LOGGED:** CI

**BORING METHOD:** Power Auger

**AUGER TYPE:** 200 mm Hollow Stem

**CHECKED:** SD

# BOREHOLE BH2

**PROJECT:** Proposed Residential Development  
**CLIENT:** Falso Homes Inc.  
**LOCATION:** 366 Winona Avenue  
**PENETRATION TEST HAMMER:** 63.5 kg, Drop, 0.76 mm

**PROJECT NUMBER:** 211282  
**DATE OF BORING:** 22-4-28  
**SHEET** 1 of 1  
**DATUM:**

DEPTH SCALE (meters)	SOIL PROFILE			SAMPLES			UNDIST SHEAR STRENGTH					DYNAMIC CONE PENETRATION TEST					MOISTURE CONTENT (%)	PIEZOMETER OR STANDPIPE INSTALLATION	
	DESCRIPTION	DEPTH (m)	STRATA PLOT	ELEV. (m)	NUMBER	TYPE	BLOWS/0.3m	x Cu. kPa x					blows/300 mm						
								o Cu. kPa o											
0.5	Topsoil, some sand, silt, clay, brick, asphalt (FILL)	0.00																	
	Refusal on BEDROCK	0.76																	

Borehole dry at time of drilling, April 28, 2022.

GEOTECH BH KOLLAARD 211282 - BOREHOLES.GPJ GINT STD CANADA, GDT 22-5-2

**DEPTH SCALE:** 1 to 10 **LOGGED:** CI  
**BORING METHOD:** Power Auger **AUGER TYPE:** 200 mm Hollow Stem **CHECKED:** SD



# BOREHOLE BH4

**PROJECT:** Proposed Residential Development  
**CLIENT:** Falsoetto Homes Inc.  
**LOCATION:** 366 Winona Avenue  
**PENETRATION TEST HAMMER:** 63.5 kg, Drop, 0.76 mm

**PROJECT NUMBER:** 211282  
**DATE OF BORING:** 22-4-28  
**SHEET** 1 of 1  
**DATUM:**

DEPTH SCALE (meters)	SOIL PROFILE			SAMPLES			UNDIST SHEAR STRENGTH					DYNAMIC CONE PENETRATION TEST					MOISTURE CONTENT (%)	PIEZOMETER OR STANDPIPE INSTALLATION	
	DESCRIPTION	DEPTH (m)	STRATA PLOT	ELEV. (m)	NUMBER	TYPE	BLOWS/0.3m	x Cu. kPa x					blows/300 mm						
								o Cu. kPa o											
0.5	Grey crushed granular stone, topsoil, some sand, silt, clay, brick, wood (FILL)	0.00																	Borehole dry at time of drilling, April 28, 2022.
	Refusal on BEDROCK	0.97																	

GEOTECH BH KOLLAARD 211282 - BOREHOLES.GPJ GINT STD CANADA, GDT 22-5-2

**DEPTH SCALE:** 1 to 10

**LOGGED:** CI

**BORING METHOD:** Power Auger

**AUGER TYPE:** 200 mm Hollow Stem

**CHECKED:** SD



---

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND TERMINOLOGY

### SAMPLE TYPES

AS auger sample  
CS chunk sample  
DO drive open  
MS manual sample  
RC rock core  
ST slotted tube  
TO thin-walled open Shelby tube  
TP thin-walled piston Shelby tube  
WS wash sample

### PENETRATION RESISTANCE

Standard Penetration Resistance, N  
The number of blows by a 63.5 kg hammer dropped 760 millimeter required to drive a 50 mm drive open sampler for a distance of 300 mm. For split spoon samples where less than 300 mm of penetration was achieved, the number of blows is reported over the sampler penetration in mm.

### Dynamic Penetration Resistance

The number of blows by a 63.5 kg hammer dropped 760 mm to drive a 50 mm diameter, 60° cone attached to 'A' size drill rods for a distance of 300 mm.

### WH

Sampler advanced by static weight of hammer and drill rods.

### WR

Sampler advanced by static weight of drill rods.

### PH

Sampler advanced by hydraulic pressure from drill rig.

### PM

Sampler advanced by manual pressure.

### SOIL TESTS

C consolidation test  
H hydrometer analysis  
M sieve analysis  
MH sieve and hydrometer analysis  
U unconfined compression test  
Q undrained triaxial test  
V field vane, undisturbed and remolded shear strength

### SOIL DESCRIPTIONS

Relative Density      'N' Value

Very Loose	0 to 4
Loose	4 to 10
Compact	10 to 30
Dense	30 to 50
Very Dense	over 50

Consistency      Undrained Shear Strength (kPa)

Very soft	0 to 12
Soft	12 to 25
Firm	25 to 50
Stiff	50 to 100
Very Stiff	over 100

### LIST OF COMMON SYMBOLS

$c_u$  undrained shear strength  
 $e$  void ratio  
 $C_c$  compression index  
 $C_v$  coefficient of consolidation  
 $k$  coefficient of permeability  
 $I_p$  plasticity index  
 $n$  porosity  
 $u$  pore pressure  
 $w$  moisture content  
 $w_L$  liquid limit  
 $w_p$  plastic limit  
 $\phi^1$  effective angle of friction  
 $\gamma$  unit weight of soil  
 $\gamma^1$  unit weight of submerged soil  
 $\sigma$  normal stress







DRAWING NUMBER:  
SITE PLAN, FIGURE 2

LEGEND:

 APPROXIMATE BOREHOLE LOCATION

REFERENCE: PLAN SUPPLIED BY  
CITY OF OTTAWA EMAPS

SPECIAL NOTE: THIS DRAWING TO  
BE READ IN CONJUNCTION WITH  
THE ACCOMPANYING REPORT.

REV.	NAME	DATE	DESCRIPTION

 **Kollaard Associates**  
Engineers

P.O. BOX 189, 210, PRESCOTT ST (613) 860-0923  
KEWATVILLE ONTARIO info@kollaard.ca  
K0G 1J0 FAX: (613) 258-0475  
<http://www.kollaard.ca>

CLIENT: FALSETTO HOMES INC

PROJECT:  
GEOTECHNICAL INVESTIGATION  
FOR  
PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL  
DEVELOPMENT

LOCATION:  
366 WINONA AVENUE  
CITY OF OTTAWA, ON

DESIGNED BY: DATE: MAY 4, 2022

DRAWN BY: DT SCALE: N.T.S

KOLLAARD FILE NUMBER:  
211282





Falso Homes Inc  
May 4, 2022

Geotechnical Investigation  
Proposed Residential Development  
366 Winona Avenue  
City of Ottawa, Ontario  
211282

---

## National Building Code Seismic Hazard Calculation

# 2015 National Building Code Seismic Hazard Calculation

INFORMATION: Eastern Canada English (613) 995-5548 français (613) 995-0600 Facsimile (613) 992-8836  
Western Canada English (250) 363-6500 Facsimile (250) 363-6565

Site: 45.393N 75.754W

User File Reference: 366 Winona Avenue

2022-04-28 18:42 UT

Probability of exceedance per annum	0.000404	0.001	0.0021	0.01
Probability of exceedance in 50 years	2 %	5 %	10 %	40 %
Sa (0.05)	0.434	0.238	0.143	0.043
Sa (0.1)	0.508	0.290	0.180	0.059
Sa (0.2)	0.427	0.247	0.156	0.054
Sa (0.3)	0.325	0.190	0.121	0.043
Sa (0.5)	0.231	0.135	0.086	0.030
Sa (1.0)	0.115	0.068	0.044	0.015
Sa (2.0)	0.055	0.032	0.020	0.006
Sa (5.0)	0.015	0.008	0.005	0.001
Sa (10.0)	0.005	0.003	0.002	0.001
PGA (g)	0.273	0.158	0.098	0.032
PGV (m/s)	0.192	0.108	0.066	0.021

**Notes:** Spectral ( $S_a(T)$ , where  $T$  is the period in seconds) and peak ground acceleration (PGA) values are given in units of  $g$  ( $9.81 \text{ m/s}^2$ ). Peak ground velocity is given in  $\text{m/s}$ . Values are for "firm ground" (NBCC2015 Site Class C, average shear wave velocity  $450 \text{ m/s}$ ). NBCC2015 and CSAS6-14 values are highlighted in yellow. Three additional periods are provided - their use is discussed in the NBCC2015 Commentary. Only 2 significant figures are to be used. **These values have been interpolated from a 10-km-spaced grid of points. Depending on the gradient of the nearby points, values at this location calculated directly from the hazard program may vary. More than 95 percent of interpolated values are within 2 percent of the directly calculated values.**

## References

**National Building Code of Canada 2015 NRCC no. 56190;** Appendix C: Table C-3, Seismic Design Data for Selected Locations in Canada

**Structural Commentaries (User's Guide - NBC 2015: Part 4 of Division B)**  
**Commentary J:** Design for Seismic Effects

**Geological Survey of Canada Open File 7893** Fifth Generation Seismic Hazard Model for Canada: Grid values of mean hazard to be used with the 2015 National Building Code of Canada

See the websites [www.EarthquakesCanada.ca](http://www.EarthquakesCanada.ca) and [www.nationalcodes.ca](http://www.nationalcodes.ca) for more information