

Barrhaven Town Centre Stage 2

Functional Servicing Study



Prepared for:
Minto Communities Ltd.

Prepared by:
Stantec Consulting Ltd.

Date:
September 9, 2026

Project/File:
160402206

Revision Record

Revision	Description	Author	Date	Quality Check	Date	Independent Review	Date
0	Draft Plan of Subdivision	Michael W./Ziyi W.	2026-02-03	Dustin T.	2026-02-03	Karin S.	2026-02-05
1	Revision 1	Michael W./Ziyi W.	2026-09-08	Dustin T.	2026-09-08	Karin S.	2026-09-09

Disclaimer

The conclusions in the Report titled Barrhaven Town Centre Stage 2 are Stantec's professional opinion, as of the time of the Report, and concerning the scope described in the Report. The opinions in the document are based on conditions and information existing at the time the scope of work was conducted and do not take into account any subsequent changes. The Report relates solely to the specific project for which Stantec was retained and the stated purpose for which the Report was prepared. The Report is not to be used or relied on for any variation or extension of the project, or for any other project or purpose, and any unauthorized use or reliance is at the recipient's own risk.


Stantec has assumed all information received from Minto Communities Ltd. (the "Client") and third parties in the preparation of the Report to be correct. While Stantec has exercised a customary level of judgment or due diligence in the use of such information, Stantec assumes no responsibility for the consequences of any error or omission contained therein.

This Report is intended solely for use by the Client in accordance with Stantec's contract with the Client. While the Report may be provided by the Client to applicable authorities having jurisdiction and to other third parties in connection with the project, Stantec disclaims any legal duty based upon warranty, reliance or any other theory to any third party, and will not be liable to such third party for any damages or losses of any kind that may result.

Prepared by:



Michael Wu, P.Eng.



Ziyi Wang, B.Eng.

Reviewed by:



Dustin Thiffault, P.Eng.

Approved by:

Karin Smadella, P.Eng.



Table of Contents

1	Introduction	1.1
1.1	Objective	1.1
2	Background Documents.....	2.2
3	Water Servicing	3.3
3.1	Background	3.3
3.2	Preliminary Watermain Sizing and Layout.....	3.3
3.2.1	Connections to Existing Infrastructure	3.3
3.2.2	Ground Elevations.....	3.4
3.2.3	Servicing Criteria	3.5
3.3	Potable Water Demand.....	3.5
3.3.1	Domestic Water Demand	3.5
3.3.2	Fire Flow	3.6
3.4	Hydraulic Analysis.....	3.6
3.4.1	Model Development	3.7
3.4.2	Hydraulic Modeling Results	3.8
4	Wastewater Servicing	4.14
4.1	Background	4.14
4.2	Design Criteria	4.14
4.3	Preliminary Wastewater Generation	4.15
4.4	Proposed Servicing.....	4.15
5	Stormwater Management	5.17
5.1	Background	5.17
5.2	SWM Criteria and Constraints	5.17
5.3	Stormwater Management.....	5.18
5.3.1	Allowable Release Rate	5.19
5.3.2	Quantity Control	5.19
5.3.3	Quality Control	5.21
5.3.4	Infiltration.....	5.22
5.4	Deviations From Previous Studies	5.22
6	Grading and Drainage.....	6.24
7	Riocan Avenue	7.25
7.1	Roadway Extension	7.25
7.2	Right-of-Way Cross-Section.....	7.25
8	Approvals.....	8.27
9	Erosion Control During Construction.....	9.27
10	Geotechnical Investigation	10.28
11	Closing	11.29
11.1	Potable Water	11.29
11.2	Sanitary Servicing	11.29
11.3	Stormwater Servicing.....	11.29
11.4	Grading.....	11.29

List of Tables

Table 3.1: Domestic Water Demands	3.5
Table 3.2 Fire Flow Calculations Using FUS Methodology	3.6
Table 3.3 Boundary Condition for Connection Points Before SUC Pressure Zone Reconfiguration	3.7
Table 3.4 Boundary Condition for Connection Points After SUC Pressure Zone Reconfiguration	3.7
Table 3.5: C-Factors Applied Based on Watermain Diameter.....	3.7
Table 4.1: Peak Wastewater Flows	4.15
Table 5.1: Summary of Post-Development Drainage Areas	5.18



Barrhaven Town Centre Stage 2

Table of Contents

Table 5.2: Minor System Comparison with 2018 NSCMSWM Report.....	5.21
Table 5.3: 100-Year Major System Comparison with 2018 NSCMSWM Report.....	5.21
Table 10.1 Recommended Pavement Structure.....	10.28

List of Figures

Figure 1.1: Conceptual Development Plan	1.1
Figure 3.1 Proposed Watermain Layout and Pipe Diameters (mm).....	3.4
Figure 3.2 Ground Elevation (m) at Nodes	3.4
Figure 3.3 Maximum Pressures during AVDY Conditions before SUC Pressure Zone Reconfiguration	3.8
Figure 3.4 Maximum Pressures during AVDY Conditions after SUC Pressure Zone Reconfiguration	3.9
Figure 3.5 Minimum Pressures (psi) During PKHR Conditions before SUC Pressure Reconfiguration	3.9
Figure 3.6 Minimum Pressures (psi) During PKHR Conditions after SUC Pressure Zone Reconfiguration	3.10
Figure 3.7 Available Fire Flows (L/s) During MXDY Condition Before SUC Pressure Zone Reconfiguration	3.11
Figure 3.8 Available Fire Flows (L/s) During MXDY Condition After SUC Pressure Zone Reconfiguration	3.11
Figure 3.9: Available Fire Flows (L/s) During MXDY Condition Before SUC Pressure Zone Reconfiguration	3.12
Figure 3.10: Available Fire Flows (L/s) During MXDY Condition after SUC Pressure Zone Reconfiguration	3.13
Figure 7.1: Approved Cross-Section Riocan Avenue Minto BTC Stage 1 Subdivision	7.26
Figure 7.2: Proposed ROW Cross-Section Riocan Avenue Minto BTC Stage 2 Subdivision	7.26

List of Appendices

Appendix A Water Servicing

- A.1 Domestic Water Demands
- A.2 Preliminary Fire Flow Calculations (2020 FUS)
- A.3 Hydraulic Boundary Conditions
- A.4 Preliminary Hydraulic Model Results

Appendix B Wastewater Servicing

- B.1 Conceptual Sanitary Sewer Design Sheet
- B.2 Background Report Excerpts and Correspondence

Appendix C Stormwater Management

- C.1 Storm Sewer Design Sheet
- C.2 Conceptual PCSWMM Model Outputs
- C.3 Background Report Excerpts and Correspondence

Appendix D Geotechnical and Hydrogeology

- D.1 Geotechnical Investigation Excerpts
- D.2 Water Budget Assessment

Appendix E Drawings



Table of Contents

Minto Communities Inc. has commissioned Stantec Consulting Ltd. to prepare the following Functional Servicing Study for Stage 2 of the Barrhaven Town Centre subdivision development in support of a Draft Plan of Subdivision application. The subject property is located southwest of the intersection of Longfields Drive and Chapman Mills Drive within the Barrhaven Downtown Secondary Plan area and the South Nepean Town Centre Community Design Plan (CDP) area. The property is currently zoned Development Reserve (DR) and is bordered by the Southwest Transitway and future Chapman Mills Drive right-of-way to the north, Jockvale Road to the west, vacant land reserved for development to the south, and Longfields Drive to the east. The proposed residential development is approximately 10 ha in area and will contain a mixture of townhomes, medium density blocks, and a neighbourhood park. Minto's conceptual plan for the development is shown in **Figure 1.1**.



The intent of this report is to build on the servicing principals outlined in the background studies to develop a servicing strategy specific to the subject site. The report will establish criteria for future detailed design of the subdivision in accordance with the associated background studies, City of Ottawa design guidelines, and all other relevant regulations.



2 Background Documents

The following documents were referenced in the preparation of this report:

- Sewer Design Guideline (SDG), Fourth Edition, City of Ottawa, December 2025
- Water Distribution Design Guidelines, Second Edition, City of Ottawa, December 2025
- Design Guidelines for Drinking Water Systems, Ministry of the Environment, Conservation, and Parks (MECP), 2008
- Fire Protection Water Supply Guideline for Part 3 in the Ontario Building Code, Office of the Fire Marshal (OFM), October 2020
- Water Supply for Public Fire Protection, Fire Underwriters Survey (FUS), 2020
- Geotechnical Investigation – Proposed Residential Development, 3265 Jockvale Road, Paterson Group, November 25, 2025
- Water Budget Assessment, 3265 Jockvale Road, Paterson Group, February 4, 2026.
- City of Ottawa South Nepean Collector (SNC) Phase 2 Preliminary Design Report, Novatech, March 2, 2016
- Nepean South Chapman Mills Stormwater Management Servicing Fourth Addendum, IBI Group, February 16, 2018
- Draft Kennedy-Burnett Potable Water Master Servicing Study, Stantec Consulting Ltd., March 25, 2014
- Barrhaven Downtown Secondary Plan, City of Ottawa Official Plan
- Greenbank Road and Southwest Transitway Extension Marketplace Avenue to Barnsdale Road, Chapman Mills preliminary design drawings, Stantec Consulting, Revision 4, November 23, 2024
- Design Brief for Minto Communities- Canada and City of Ottawa, 3311 Greenbank Road, August 2018, DSEL
- Detail Subdivision Stormwater Analysis, Riversbend (3311 Greenbank Road), Nepean South Chapman Mills, IBI Group, August 22, 2018

3 Water Servicing

3.1 Background

The proposed development is currently located within Zone 3SW of the City of Ottawa's water distribution system. This zone is fed by the Barrhaven Pump Station and Fallowfield Reservoir and Pump Station, with the Moodie elevated storage tank providing balancing storage for peak flows and demands. Upon completion of the future pressure zone reconfiguration, the development area will be within Zone SUC.

The existing municipal watermain surrounding the site include twin 400 mm diameter watermain in Jockvale Road, a 400 mm diameter watermain in Longfields Drive, and a 200 mm diameter watermain in Riocan Avenue north of Chapman Mills Drive.

The Greenbank Road and South West Transitway Extension Project will include the extension of a new 300mm watermain from Greenbank Road to Longfields Drive with connections to the distribution system at Jockvale Road and existing Riocan Avenue. Timing of the watermain extension in Chapman Mills Drive has not yet been confirmed but is expected to be no earlier than 2028.

Development of the Barrhaven Town Centre Stage 2 lands will include connections to the existing municipal water infrastructure to service the subdivision development.

3.2 Preliminary Watermain Sizing and Layout

The preliminary watermain alignment and sizing for this development is shown on **Drawing WTR-1**. The subdivision is expected to be serviced with a network of 200 mm and 300 mm watermain.

A 300 mm watermain will be extended from Chapman Mills to the limit of Riocan Avenue within the subdivision, with a future extension to Longfields Drive when the lands to the south are developed by others. Watermain within the local streets are expected to be 200 mm in diameter.

Watermain layout and sizing within the development is preliminary and will be confirmed as part of the future detailed design.


3.2.1 Connections to Existing Infrastructure

The subdivision will be fed by connections to the 300 mm watermain in Chapman Mills Drive at each of two proposed roadway intersections. A connection will also be made to the 400 mm watermain in Longfields Drive at the window street to provide a second feed to the eastern portion of the subdivision. Design of the watermain connections to the future watermain in Chapman Mills is being coordinated with the Greenbank Road and Southwest Transitway Extension (GRSTWE) project team.

Figure 3.1 shows functional watermain layout with connections to existing watermain.




Figure 3.1 Proposed Watermain Layout and Pipe Diameters (mm)



3.2.2 Ground Elevations

Proposed ground elevations throughout the site range from approximately 94 m to 100 m at nodes in the watermain network. **Figure 3.2** shows the ground elevation at each node in the watermain network.

Figure 3.2 Ground Elevation (m) at Nodes



3.2.3 Servicing Criteria

The current draft plan for the development calls for a total of 43 blocks, of which three (3) are intended for medium density development and the remainder for townhouses. The estimated water demands for the development were estimated based on the population densities, per capita water demands, and peaking factors established by the City of Ottawa's Water Design Guidelines, and are outlined below.

Residential Population Rate

Medium Density	2.7 persons / unit
Townhouse	2.7 persons / unit

Residential Demand

Average Daily (AVDY)	280 L/cap/day
Maximum Daily (MXDY)	$2.5 \times \text{AVDY}$
Peak Hour (PKHR)	$2.2 \times \text{MXDY}$

Allowable Water Pressure

MXDY Flow	345 kPa (50 psi) to 552 kPa (80 psi)
PKHR Flow Minimum	276 kPa (40 psi)
MXDY + Fire Flow	140 kPa (20 psi)
Maximum Allowable for Occupied Area	552 kPa (80 psi)

3.3 Potable Water Demand

3.3.1 Domestic Water Demand

The domestic water demand is assessed based on the proposed development conditions established in the draft plan and criteria summarized in **Section 3.2.3**.

The assessed domestic water demand for the study area is summarized in **Table 3.1** and detailed in **Appendix A.1**.

Table 3.1: Domestic Water Demands

Population	AVDY (L/s)	MXDY (L/s)	PKHR (L/s)
1,261	4.1	10.2	22.5



3.3.2 Fire Flow

Fire flow calculations were completed using the Fire Underwriters Survey (FUS) methodology. Refer to **Appendix A.2** for detailed FUS calculations. The results of the fire flow calculations for the worst-case townhome blocks and apartment buildings are summarized in **Table 3.2**.

Table 3.2 Fire Flow Calculations Using FUS Methodology

Unit Type	Description	Required Fire Flow (L/min)	Required Fire Flow (L/s)
Medium-Density Blocks	Three-storey wood-frame stacked townhouse with a maximum footprint area of 600m ²	17,000	283.3
Avenue Townhouse Blocks	Three-storey wood-frame back-to-back avenue townhouse unit with a maximum footprint area of 400m ² (worst-case scenario)	14,000	233.3

3.4 Hydraulic Analysis

A hydraulic model of the proposed watermain network was built in PCSWMM using the following boundary conditions provided by the City of Ottawa staff:

1. Boundary condition before and after the SUC Pressure Zone Reconfiguration on the existing 400 mm watermain at the intersection of Jockvale Drive and the reserved ROW for future Chapman Mills Drive
2. Boundary condition before and after the SUC Pressure Zone Reconfiguration on the existing 400 mm watermain along Longfields Drive at the southeastern corner of the proposed site as the second connection point
3. Boundary condition before and after the SUC Pressure Zone Reconfiguration on the existing 300 mm watermain stub at the intersection of Longfields Drive and Chapman Mills Drive

The detailed location of the connections and boundary condition obtained from the City of Ottawa staff is attached in the **Appendix A.3** and boundary conditions used for the hydraulic analysis are summarized in **Table 3.3** and **Table 3.4**.



Table 3.3 Boundary Condition for Connection Points Before SUC Pressure Zone Reconfiguration

Location	Before SUC Pressure Zone Reconfiguration			
	Max. HGL (AVDY), Head (m)	PKHR Head (m)	MXDY+FF (233 L/s), Head (m)	MXDY+FF (283 L/s), Head (m)
1 – Jockvale Drive at future Chapman Mills Drive	155.2	142.0	142.0	141.7
2 – Longfields Drive along eastern frontage	155.1	141.6	141.6	140.5
3 – Longfields Drive at future Chapman Mills Drive	155.1	141.6	141.6	140.8

Table 3.4 Boundary Condition for Connection Points After SUC Pressure Zone Reconfiguration

Location	After SUC Pressure Zone Reconfiguration			
	Max. HGL (AVDY), Head (m)	PKHR, Head (m)	MXDY+FF (233 L/s), Head (m)	MXDY+FF (283 L/s), Head (m)
1 – Jockvale Drive at future Chapman Mills Drive	147.2	144.6	143.6	142.9
2 – Longfields Drive along eastern frontage	147.2	144.2	143.4	142.7
3 – Longfields Drive at future Chapman Mills Drive	147.2	144.2	143.6	143.0

3.4.1 Model Development

New watermains were added to the hydraulic model to simulate the proposed distribution system. Hazen-Williams coefficients (“C-Factors”) were applied to the new watermain in accordance with the City of Ottawa’s Water Distribution Design Guidelines (**Table 3.5**).

Table 3.5: C-Factors Applied Based on Watermain Diameter

Nominal Pipe Diameter (mm)	C-Factor
150	100
200 to 250	110
300 to 600	120
Over 600	130



3.4.2 Hydraulic Modeling Results

3.4.2.1 Average Day & Peak Hour

The hydraulic model results show that the maximum pressures (AVDY condition) are anticipated to be approximately 537.7-596.1 kPa (78.0-86.5 psi) prior to the SUC Pressure Zone Reconfiguration and 460.0-518.6 kPa (66.7-75.2 psi) after the SUC Pressure Zone Reconfiguration within the site. Minimum pressures during PKHR conditions are anticipated to be approximately 406.3-463.9 kPa (58.9-67.3 psi) prior to the SUC Pressure Zone Reconfiguration and 431.8-489.4 kPa (62.6-71.0 psi) after the SUC Pressure Zone Reconfiguration for the site.

Minimum pressures are met in all scenarios, however maximum pressures are exceeded prior to the SUC pressure zone reconfiguration. If the subdivision development proceeds before the SUC pressure zone reconfiguration, pressure reducing valves are expected to be required for the majority of the units. This requirement will be confirmed at the detailed design stage.

Figure 3.3, Figure 3.4, Figure 3.5 and Figure 3.6 identify the minimum (PKHR) and maximum pressure (AVDY) results for the simulation before and after the SUC pressure zone reconfiguration, respectively.

Figure 3.3 Maximum Pressures during AVDY Conditions before SUC Pressure Zone Reconfiguration



Barrhaven Town Centre Stage 2

Table of Contents

Figure 3.4 Maximum Pressures during AVDY Conditions after SUC Pressure Zone Reconfiguration



Figure 3.5 Minimum Pressures (psi) During PKHR Conditions before SUC Pressure Reconfiguration




Figure 3.6 Minimum Pressures (psi) During PKHR Conditions after SUC Pressure Zone Reconfiguration



3.4.2.2 Maximum Day Plus Fire Flow

An analysis was carried out using the hydraulic model to determine if the proposed development, under maximum day demands, can achieve a fire flow of 14,000 L/min (233.3 L/s) for the Avenue townhouse blocks while maintaining a residual pressure of 138 kPa (20 psi) before and after the SUC pressure zone reconfiguration throughout the network. This was accomplished using a steady-state maximum day demand scenario along with the automated fire flow simulation feature of PCSWMM. The available flows before and after the SUC pressure zone reconfiguration are shown in **Figure 3.7** and **Figure 3.8**:

Barrhaven Town Centre Stage 2

Table of Contents

Figure 3.7 Available Fire Flows (L/s) During MXDY Condition Before SUC Pressure Zone Reconfiguration



Figure 3.8 Available Fire Flows (L/s) During MXDY Condition After SUC Pressure Zone Reconfiguration



Barrhaven Town Centre Stage 2

Table of Contents


A separate model was conducted under a more conservative condition, with a fire flow requirement of 17,000 L/min (283.3 L/s), for the medium-density blocks (R14A, R20A, and R23A). The model shows that the proposed watermain network can achieve the target fire flow of 17,000 L/min while maintaining the required pressure of 138 kPa (20 psi) under the existing conditions for the medium-density blocks in both pressure zone configurations.

The available flows and residual pressure under the 283.3 L/s fire flow requirement before and after the SUC Pressure Zone reconfiguration are shown below in **Figure 3.9** and **Figure 3.10**. The full preliminary hydraulic analysis results are shown in **Appendix A.4**.

Figure 3.9: Available Fire Flows (L/s) During MXDY Condition Before SUC Pressure Zone Reconfiguration



Figure 3.10: Available Fire Flows (L/s) During MXDY Condition after SUC Pressure Zone Reconfiguration



4 Wastewater Servicing

4.1 Background

Existing sanitary sewers in proximity of the study area include 200 mm and 250 mm diameter sanitary sewers within the future Chapman Mills right-of-way, a 250 mm diameter sanitary sewer in Longfields Drive, and a 1050 mm diameter sanitary trunk sewer stub at Longfields Drive at Paul Metivier Drive.

The Barrhaven Town Centre (BTC) Stage 2 subdivision lands fall within the drainage area for the South Nepean Collector Sewer (SNC). The 1050 mm diameter sanitary sewer stub was installed at the intersection of Longfields Drive and Paul Metivier Drive to serve as an outlet to for area A8-B as identified in the South Nepean Collector (SNC) Phase 2 Preliminary Design Report, Novatech, March 2, 2026 (SNC design report). A portion of the lands within A8-B have already been developed and provided with a sanitary outlet to Longfields Drive, deviating from the assumptions in the SNC design report due to the phasing of development in the area.

With the diversion of sanitary flow to the Longfields Drive sewer from a portion of the A8-B drainage area, the balance of the area to be serviced by the sanitary stub at Longfields Drive and Paul Metivier Drive is 27.21 ha. The SNC design report assumed a density of 135 persons per hectare for area A8-B. Excerpts from the SNC design report are included in **Appendix B**.

4.2 Design Criteria

Preliminary wastewater servicing has been assessed in accordance with the City of Ottawa Sewer Design Guidelines (2025). The following design parameters were used to calculate estimated wastewater flow rates and to preliminarily size on-site sanitary sewers:

- Minimum Full Flow Velocity – 0.6 m/s
- Maximum Full Flow Velocity – 3.0 m/s
- Manning's roughness coefficient for all smooth walled pipes – 0.013
- Townhouse persons per unit – 2.7
- Apartment persons per unit – 1.8
- Extraneous Flow Allowance – 0.33 L/s/ha
- Residential Average Flows – 280 L/cap/day
- Commercial/Mixed Use Flows – 28,000 L/ha/day
- Harmon Correction Factor – 0.8



- Manhole Spacing – 120 m
- Minimum Cover – 2.5 m
- Density of Future Development Blocks – 135 persons/ha (per City of Ottawa correspondence)

4.3 Preliminary Wastewater Generation

Functional peak wastewater flows for the proposed development were assessed along with the flows from future residential development parcels and roadways (identified as drainage areas R8A, G8A, R8B, G8B, R2A, R2B, G3A, and R4A in the sanitary design sheet and **Drawing SA-1**).

The assessed peak wastewater flow from the subdivision development and external areas that will contribute to the sewer at Longfields Drive and Paul Metivier Drive are summarized in **Table 4.1** with supporting calculations detailed in the sanitary sewer design sheet attached in **Appendix B.1**.

Table 4.1: Peak Wastewater Flows

Area	Residential			Infiltration (L/s)	Total Peak Flow (L/s)
	Population	Peak Factor	Peak Flow (L/s)		
BTC Stage 2 West of Riocan	408	3.41	4.5	1.3	5.8
BTC Stage 2 East of Riocan	835	3.27	9.1	1.9	11.0
Areas External to Subdivision	3,300	varies	28.2	5.8	34.0
Total	4,561	-	41.8	9.0	50.7

This assessment represents a total drainage area of 27.21 ha with a population of 4,561 persons generating a total peak flow of 50.7 L/s, ultimately contributing to the SNC at Node 70 per the SNC design report.

4.4 Proposed Servicing

A sanitary sewer will be extended from the sanitary trunk sewer stub at Longfields Drive at Paul Metivier Drive to service the drainage area. The sanitary trunk sewer will follow the alignment of the existing trunk storm sewer located within the future extension of Riocan Avenue and will extend through the subdivision lands to Chapman Mills. The sewer will be extended west along Chapman Mills to the future development block identified as drainage area R27A. The trunk sanitary sewer is sized to service the ultimate drainage area per the SNC design report which includes the Minto Barrhaven Town Centre Stage 2 lands, as well as future development lands and roadways external to the subdivision. Local sanitary sewers will follow public roadways within the subdivision and discharge to the trunk sewer within Riocan Avenue. The functional sanitary servicing layout is shown on **Drawing SA-1**.



The density assumed for the subdivision development is based on the conceptual subdivision design prepared by Minto Communities (**Figure 1.1**). The residential density assumed for the majority of lands external to the subdivision is 135 persons per hectare per the SNC design report and as directed by the City of Ottawa (see correspondence in **Appendix B.2**). The density assumed for area R27A is based on a conceptual development plan provided by Minto Communities and has been used for conservative flow calculations. Overall average density for the drainage area is 167 persons per hectare.

The design for the SNC assumed a density of 135 persons per hectare, a design flow of 350 l/p/d and an infiltration rate of 0.28 L/s/ha. The functional design for the Riocan sewer extension assumes a density of 167 persons per hectare with a design flow of 280 l/p/d and an infiltration rate of 0.33 L/s/ha. Using the same peaking factors applied to the SNC design, flow contributions to the SNC from the Riocan sewer are estimated to be 6 L/s higher than the flow assumed for the same drainage area as part of the SNC design report. Given that much of the drainage area contributing to the SNC is already developed, the City of Ottawa was consulted about available capacity. The City was able to confirm that the SNC can accommodate the density proposed and the design flows from the Riocan sanitary sewer.

Correspondence with the City of Ottawa is included in **Appendix B**.



5 Stormwater Management

5.1 Background

Per the *Nepean South Chapman Mills Stormwater Management Servicing Fourth Addendum* (IBI Group, 2018) (NSCMSWM), the study area is within the planned catchment of the Chapman Mills Stormwater Management facility, located east of Longfields Drive and south of Paul Metivier Drive (see **Appendix C**). The study area considers portions of drainage areas 'A', 'C', 'C_Road', 'D', 'E', and 'F' within the IBI study totalling approximately 10.02 ha of land. A 1650 mm diameter storm trunk sewer exists located within the future extension of Riocan Avenue, and is part of the Western Trunk collected by the Western Interceptor to the Chapman Mills SWM facility adjacent to the Jock River. The 1650 mm sewer is identified as the sole minor system drainage outlet for the study area. Additionally, the IBI study considers contribution from upstream areas encompassing Chapman Mills Drive ('CMD1A' and '1B'), as well as external development areas 'B' and 'CIVIC' north of Chapman Mills and east of Greenbank Road. Major system flows are identified to ultimately be conveyed southwards through City-owned lands, crossing Jockvale Road, and to the Jock River via previously engineered roadway corridors through Bending Way and Branch Street per the *Design Brief for Minto Communities – Canada and City of Ottawa 3311 Greenbank Road* report (DSEL, 2018).

5.2 SWM Criteria and Constraints

Preliminary stormwater management and storm sewer servicing is assessed based on the stormwater management strategy identified in the IBI Chapman Mills SWM report, various other background documents, the City of Ottawa Sewer Design Guidelines (2025), and through consultation with City of Ottawa staff, and will govern the detailed design of the proposed development. The source of each criterion is indicated in brackets:

General

- Use of the dual drainage principle (City of Ottawa).
- Wherever feasible and practical, site-level measures should be used to reduce and control the volume and rate of runoff. (City of Ottawa).
- Assess impact of 100-year event and climate change event outlined in the City of Ottawa Sewer Design Guidelines on major & minor drainage system (City of Ottawa).

Storm Sewer & Inlet Controls

- Proposed site to discharge the existing storm trunk sewer within the future Riocan Avenue ROW (IBI 2018).
- Boundary conditions for the site outlets per XPSWMM model prepared for the Chapman Mills SWM servicing and Riverbend development (IBI 2018).
- Overall site runoff post-development for all storm events, up to and including the 100-year event, are restricted to 90 L/s/ha (IBI 2018).



Surface Storage & Overland Flow

- Provide adequate emergency overflow conveyance off-site (City of Ottawa).
- Minor flow to be conveyed to the existing Chapman Mills SWM for quality (70% TSS Removal) and quantity control (IBI 2018).
- Major flows to ultimately be conveyed across Jockvale Road to Bending Way, with ultimate discharge to the Jock River (IBI/DSEL 2018).

5.3 Stormwater Management

Based on the draft plan, the drainage areas are defined as illustrated on the storm drainage plan **Drawing SD-1**. Overall, the proposed SWM design intent is to direct storm runoff from the study area to the existing 1650 mm storm trunk sewer in the future Riocan Avenue ROW. Major system flows are routed towards a proposed walkway block and along Riocan Avenue based on grading constraints. Major System flow from these lands will ultimately be directed across Jockvale Road to Bending Way through public roads and blocks within the lands to the south. Given that the lands to the south remain undeveloped, the study area does not encompass the ultimate major system flow path towards Jockvale Road, and is additionally obstructed by the minor system drainage outlet for the subdivision at Bending Way. As such, both major system outlets from the site are proposed to be stored within a singular interim dry pond within City-owned lands south of the site. The dry pond serves to maintain controlled discharge to the Riocan Avenue trunk sewer, with discharge rates to the Riocan sewer set below existing contributions from the lands to the Bending Way outlet channel. Upon development of the City-owned lands to the south, major system flows can be directed overland along internal roadways towards Jockvale Road as envisioned by the NSCMSWM design report

Preliminary runoff coefficient values for storm sewer design calculations have been assigned to each drainage area as noted on the provided storm drainage plan for values typical to the associated land use. Sample calculations determining the runoff coefficients will be provided at detailed design. A summary of drainage areas and runoff coefficients are provided in **Table 5.1**.

Table 5.1: Summary of Post-Development Drainage Areas

Area ID	Area (ha)	C
CT06A	0.44	0.70
CT10A	4.61	0.80
CT10B	1.67	0.80
CT10C	0.49	0.70
C101A	1.10	0.75
C102A	0.28	0.75
C103A	0.61	0.40
C103B	1.10	0.75
C106A	0.69	0.75
C108A	1.18	0.70
C110A	1.50	0.70



C111A	0.81	0.70
C112A	0.63	0.80
C113A	0.49	0.70
C114A	0.40	0.70
C115A	0.79	0.80

The areas 'CT10A', 'CT10B', and 'CT10C' represent the future development lands to the south and the segment of the future Riocan Avenue ROW within the future development lands, and are assumed to contribute to the Riocan Avenue sewer per background studies.

5.3.1 Allowable Release Rate

Based on the NSCMSWM design brief (IBI, 2018) and Section 5.1.4 of the City Sewer Design Guidelines, the peak post-development discharge from the development area (Areas C101A to C115A and CT06A, 10.02 ha total) to the minor system was established based on the unit rate of 90 L/s/ha. Note that area 'C_Road' of 0.25 ha (see Figure 1A, Appendix C-3) was originally assumed to discharge to the minor system at a rate of 122 L/s in consideration of 100-year capture of runoff directed towards Longfields Drive. In consideration of this 0.25 ha area, the area for which the 90 L/s/ha is applicable to is reduced to 9.77 ha, and the overall site release rate effectively set at 1001.1 L/s.

The site is to be designed using the "dual drainage" principle, whereby the minor (pipe) system is designed to convey the peak rate of runoff from the lesser of the 2-year design storm or the unit rate of 90 L/s/ha as noted above, and runoff from larger events is conveyed by major (overland) channels, such as roadways and walkways, safely offsite without impacting proposed or existing downstream properties.

In keeping with the inlet restriction criterion, inlet control devices (ICDs) or orifice plates will be specified during the detailed design stage for all street and rear yard catchbasins to limit the inflow to the minor system. Restricted inlet rates to the sewer are necessary to prevent the hydraulic grade line from surcharging storm sewers into basements during major storms.

Proposed storm sewers have been preliminarily sized based on required capture rates as described above within the storm sewer design sheet included within **Appendix C.1**.

5.3.2 Quantity Control

A preliminary hydrologic modeling exercise was completed with PCSWMM, accounting for the estimated major and minor systems to evaluate major system conveyance of runoff during the design storm event (100-year storm). The use of PCSWMM for modeling of the site hydrology and hydraulics allowed for a preliminary sizing of the interim dry pond in the future development lands to the south to provide quantity control of the 100-year major system overland flow contribution into the existing 1650 mm diameter storm trunk sewer in the future Riocan Avenue ROW.

The runoff flows in the preliminary storm sewers are detailed in the storm sewer design sheet attached in **Appendix C.1**, while the following assumptions were applied to the preliminary model for the major system overland interim storage sizing:



Barrhaven Town Centre Stage 2

Table of Contents

- Hydrologic parameters as per Ottawa Sewer Design Guidelines, including Manning's 'n', and depression storage values.
- Subcatchment infiltration parameters per Horton Infiltration method per Ottawa Sewer Design Guidelines.
- 3-hour Chicago Storm distribution for the 100-year storm event.
- Runoff coefficients based on typical values for proposed land uses.
- The overall site area was divided based on overland flow tributary areas. Based on grading constraints, approximately 1.07 ha at the eastern boundary of the site is expected to maintain an emergency overland flow route to the Longfields Road ROW. It is expected that sufficient road sag storage will be provided within this area to retain major system flows on-site without major system contribution to Longfields Drive per the NSCMSWM design report.
- The balance of the site (8.95 ha) was divided up into two lumped subcatchment areas based on overland major system outlets and delineated by the future Riocan Avenue ROW.
- No mitigating road sag storage has been incorporated within the model to reduce major system runoff given anticipated continuous roadway slopes in general from northwest to southeast across the development.
- Subcatchment widths were determined by dividing the subcatchment areas by the length of the overland drainage path from the anticipated site high points to the major system outlets.
- Minor system capture rates have been assigned based on the 90 L/s/ha unit rate.
- Major system corridors have been modeled as weirs with cross-sections defined based on expected ROW/walkway configurations.

The preliminary outline of the interim storage pond for the major system overland flow is illustrated on **Drawing SD-1**. In coordination with the functional grading plan as illustrated on **Drawing GP-1**, effective overland conveyance and emergency overland escape routes for stormwater management are available, and the interim dry pond is expected to provide in excess of 1,516 m³ of storage for the major system discharge during the 100-year storm event. Discharge from the dry pond is limited to the ultimate minor system contribution from the lands immediately south of the development and including future Riocan Avenue extension of approximately 194L/s (approximately 0.49ha + 1.67ha at 90L/s/ha). The output from the conceptual model is attached in **Appendix C.2**.

The future public roadway corridors in the City-owned lands to the south of the subdivision are to be designed to convey major system flows. Grading of the development area is anticipated to convey major system overland flows away from the future Riocan Avenue extension due to the steep grades and towards the existing major system overland flow route on Bending Way and Branch Street for ultimate discharge to the Jock River, as established in the Bending Way Subdivision Servicing Brief (DSEL, 2018).

For the City park block, located between Jockvale Road and the future Chapman Mills Road extension, minor system flows will be directed to the Riocan Avenue storm sewer with storage provided on site for up to the 100 year event, with controlled release to the minor system. The emergency overland flow path is impacted by the existing elevation of Jockvale Avenue and cannot be directed to the subdivision roadways. Emergency overland flow from the park will be directed to Chapman Mills and Greenbank Road. This has been coordinated with the GRSTWE design team and will be accommodated as part of



the detailed design of Chapman Mills and Greenbank Road (see correspondence attached in **Appendix C.3**).

Tables 5.2 and **5.3** compare the major and minor system design flows from the subdivision to those established in the 2018 NSCMSWM design report.

Table 5.2: Minor System Comparison with 2018 NSCMSWM Report

NSCMSWM Area ID	Area (ha)	A*C	Imp (%)	Minor System Capture (L/s)	Subdivision Area ID	Area (ha)	A*C	Imp (%)	Minor System Capture (L/s)
C, D, E, F	15.6	11.8	80.0	1400	C101A, C102A, C103A, C103B, C106A, C108A, C110A, C111A, C112A, C113A, C114A, C115A, CT06A	10.02	7.13	73.1	1001

Table 5.3: 100-Year Major System Comparison with 2018 NSCMSWM Report

NSCMSWM Area ID	Surface Storage (m³)	Major System Flow (CMS)	Subdivision Area ID	Surface Storage (m³)	Major System Flow (CMS)
C, D, E, F	-	4.96	C101A, C102A, C103A, C103B, C106A, C108A, C110A, C111A, C112A, C113A, C114A, C115A	1555	0.17

5.3.3 Quality Control

The site is to outlet in its entirety to the existing 1650 mm storm sewer tributary to the existing Chapman Mills SWM facility east of Longfields Road and south of Paul Metivier Drive. The SWM facility has been designed to provide quality control based on a weighted average imperviousness of 79.0 % (C=0.75) from the site area as established in the NSCMSWM report.

Based on the preliminary storm catchment areas as established in **Drawing SD-1**, the overall subdivision area and the City-owned lands to the south has an average imperviousness of 77.8 % (C=0.74), which is less than what was established in the NSCMSWM report, therefore the Chapman Mill SWM facility has been sized to provide sufficient end of pipe quality control per the NSCMSWM report and no additional quality control is proposed on site.



5.3.4 Infiltration

The subject lands do not form part of significant groundwater recharge areas as per current Rideau Valley Conservation Authority mapping data. No requirements for water balance have been identified as requirements during development of the overarching master servicing study for the region.

Given the presence of significant subsurface clay and glacial till deposits, infiltration of runoff for water balance is not anticipated to be feasible. As such, the following low impact development techniques are to be implemented during detailed design solely as best management practices:

- Rear yard swales to be constructed at minimum slopes with subsurface perforated pipes per City standard drawing S29 to promote infiltration where possible.
- Eavestroughs are to be directed to landscaped surfaces, and preferentially to rear lots to further promote infiltration of runoff.
- Topsoil amendments in landscaped areas may be explored at detailed design to provide additional attenuation of runoff for eventual infiltration through surrounding soils.

Excerpts from the water budget hydrogeological investigation are attached in **Appendix D.2**.

5.4 Deviations From Previous Studies

The *Nepean South Chapman Mills Stormwater Management Servicing Fourth Addendum* demonstrates a major system contribution from the entirety of catchment areas 'E' and 'F' (refer to Appendix C-3) that also include parcels west of the existing Jockvale Road which do not form part of the plan of subdivision. Based on current topography as well as proposed road profiles for Chapman Mills, by others, these external lands are significantly lower (in some cases as much as 3 m) than southerly elevations of Jockvale Road to which overland flow would have to pass to meet assumptions of the NSCMSWM. As portions of these lands are also currently occupied by rural homes prior to redevelopment, there is no means of providing overland flow for these lands through the subject site without complete reworking of Jockvale Road grades.

Given this existing constraint, it is expected that these areas, external to the plan of subdivision, located within the wedge between Greenbank Road, Jockvale Road, and the future extension of Darjeeling Avenue will be required to contain 100-year major system flows on-site with eventual release to the minor system meeting the minor system contributions outlined in the NSCMSWM report.

Due to the existing elevation of Jockvale Road, it is expected that the proposed park block at the west of the subject site will require an emergency flow outlet towards Chapman Mills. This has been coordinated with the GRSTWE design team, per correspondence attached in **Appendix C.3**. Interim major system storage for the proposed draft plan conservatively considers overland flow contribution from the park block to ensure adequate dry pond sizing.

As described in earlier report sections, a portion of the subject site along the eastern property boundary is anticipated to be too low to contribute to overland flow crossing Jockvale Road given existing grades



Barrhaven Town Centre Stage 2

Table of Contents

along the Longfields Drive boundary. These lands will maintain an emergency overland flow route to Longfields Drive, and are anticipated to provide sufficient road sag storage to ensure full storage of the 100-year storm event runoff to ensure no drainage impacts within the existing Longfields ROW.

Excerpts from the previous studies are attached in **Appendix C.4**.



6 Grading and Drainage

The proposed development area measures approximately 10 ha in area with the majority of the site sheet draining towards the existing storm drainage channel in the future development lands to the south, while the balance of the site in the east drains towards the Longfields Road ROW.

The conceptual grading plan (**Drawing GP-1**) identifies the overall grading strategy, which serves to:

- Match existing grades along adjacent existing property, roadways, and proposed/required development setback boundaries.
- Follow the grade raise restrictions identified in the geotechnical investigation.
- Provide adequate cover conditions for sanitary and storm sewers and watermain servicing.
- Establish effective overland conveyance and emergency overland escape routes for stormwater management and flood protection.

During subsequent stages of the development process, adjustments to grading conditions may be made as required. The associated servicing and stormwater management conditions will be considered and may also be adjusted as needed to maintain consistency with the related design criteria.



7 Riocan Avenue

7.1 Roadway Extension

A 20 m wide City-owned parcel bisects the Minto development lands from future Chapman Mills drive to the southern limit of the subdivision lands. As part of the Minto development, the parcel will be widened to 24 m and will form the future right-of-way (ROW) for an extension of Riocan Avenue. A 24 m ROW is required to accommodate the active transportation infrastructure, municipal servicing, utilities, trees and travel lanes to be constructed as part of the Barrhaven Town Centre Stage 2 subdivision development.

A 1650 mm concrete storm sewer is located within the 20 m City parcel. It will serve as the minor system outlet for the subdivision and must be accommodated in the cross-section for the Riocan Avenue extension.

7.2 Right-of-Way Cross-Section

A 22m right-of-way cross section has been approved and adopted for the segment of Riocan Avenue north of Chapman Mills (see **Figure 7.1** below). The general cross-section layout is proposed to be carried through the Minto Barrhaven Town Centre Stage 2 lands while increasing the width to 24m as directed by the City of Ottawa to provide . As noted above, the future Riocan ROW parcel is constrained by the location of the existing 1650mm municipal storm sewer within the corridor.

The proposed section for Riocan Avenue through Stage 2 of the Minto Barrhaven Town Centre lands is included in **Figure 7.2** below. The location of the existing storm sewer within the section varies due to the curvature of the right of way. The sanitary sewer and watermain within the section have been offset from the storm sewer per design guidelines. Although standard catchbasins form part of the section north of Chapman Mills, curb inlet catchbasins are proposed for the Riocan Avenue south of Chapman Mills per collector road standards and to accommodate the municipal sewer and water within the corridor. All other infrastructure is proposed to match the section approved for Riocan Avenue north of Chapman Mills. The section will be finalised as part of the detailed design of the subdivision.

Barrhaven Town Centre Stage 2 Table of Contents




Figure 7.1: Approved Cross-Section Riocan Avenue Minto BTC Stage 1 Subdivision




Figure 7.2: Proposed ROW Cross-Section Riocan Avenue Minto BTC Stage 2 Subdivision



8 Approvals

Proposed subdivision works include stormwater management, storm sewers and sanitary sewers, that will require an alteration of the City of Ottawa's municipal Consolidated Linear Infrastructure Environmental Compliance Approval (CLI-ECA), from the Ontario Ministry of Environment, Conservation, and Parks (MECP). These requirements will be confirmed at the detailed design stage.

The Rideau Valley Conservation Authority (RVCA) was be circulated with the the draft plan approval application and has confirmed that the drainage feature that traverse the subject lands is not considered a regulated watercourse subject to Section 28 of the Conservation Authorities Act.

An MECP Permit to Take Water (PTTW) or posting on the Environmental Activity and Sector Registry (EASR) may be required for water taking activities. The geotechnical consultant will advise of the applicable requirements.

9 Erosion Control During Construction

To protect downstream water quality and prevent sediment build-up in catch basins and storm sewers, erosion and sediment control measures must be implemented during construction. Erosion and sediment control (ESC) measures are the responsibility of the contractor. Specific recommendations for ESC measures will be identified at the detailed design stage.

10 Geotechnical Investigation

Geotechnical conditions for the site were investigated by Paterson Group with findings presented in the supporting investigation report PG5636-3 dated November 25, 2025. The report summarizes the existing soil conditions within the subject area and construction recommendations. The recommendations from the geotechnical report are intended to be followed as they relate to the proposed servicing strategy for the site. For details which are not summarized below, please see the original Paterson report that was included as part of the application package for Draft Plan of Subdivision.

Subsurface soil conditions within the subject area were determined through field investigations on October 20 and 23, 2025. Subsurface soil conditions within the subject area were determined from 14 boreholes and 12 test pits distributed across the proposed site. In general, soil stratigraphy consisted of a topsoil/organic layer underlain by a silty clay crust and/or silty sand, followed by a glacial till deposit. Bedrock was encountered at borehole BH 1-21 and BH 2-21 to a depth of up to 13.6 m. Based on the geological mapping, the site is in the area where bedrock usually consists of interbedded sandstone and dolomite of the March formation, with an approximate thickness of 5 to 15 m.

Groundwater Levels were estimated to vary in elevation from 0.72 to 6.71m below the original ground surface in the elevation range of 89.4 m to 98.57 m. It is expected that construction will occur below the existing groundwater table and therefore a permit to take water may be required as well as requirements for damp proofing or foundation waterproofing may be required.

A permissible grade raise restriction of 3.0 m has been recommended within the Paterson Group report for the southeastern portion of the property. The grade raise restrictions were accounted for in the conceptual grading design.

The recommended pavement structure for the driveways and roadways is outlined in **Table 10.1**:

Table 10.1 Recommended Pavement Structure

Recommended Pavement Structure for Driveways	Recommended Pavement Structure for Local Residential Roadways	Recommended Pavement Structure for Arterial Roadways with Bus Traffic	Pavement Structure
50 mm	40 mm	40 mm	Superpave 12.5 Asphaltic Concrete or equivalent
-	50 mm	50 mm (Upper Binder) 50 mm (Lower Binder)	Superpave 19.0 Asphaltic Concrete or equivalent
150 mm	150mm	150 mm	OPSS Granular A Crushed Stone
300 mm	450 mm	750 mm	OPSS Granular B Tye II



11 Closing

Based on the preceding information, the following conclusions are summarized below:

11.1 Potable Water

During peak hour conditions, the proposed water distribution system is expected to operate above the minimum pressure objective of 276 kPa (40 psi). The preliminary hydraulic model indicates that the proposed system can provide sufficient fire flow while maintaining a residual pressure of 138 kPa (20 psi) in all areas based on hydraulic analysis done at the draft plan level. A final hydraulic analysis is to be completed at detailed design for plan of subdivision.

The detailed design of the medium density blocks form part of future site plan control applications and redundant feeds will be provided.

11.2 Sanitary Servicing

Stage 2 of the Barrhaven Town Centre development will be serviced by a network of gravity sewers which will direct wastewater flows to a new trunk sanitary sewer in future Riocan Avenue connecting to the existing stub at Longfields Drive and Paul Metivier Drive. Peak flows will be slightly higher than those assumed in the South Nepean Collector sewer design report, however the City of Ottawa has advised that the SNC has capacity to accommodate the additional density.

11.3 Stormwater Servicing

The proposed stormwater management plan is in compliance with the goals specified in the background reports and the 2025 City of Ottawa Sewer Guidelines. Inflow to the minor system will be restricted to 90 L/s/ha for all storm events, up to and including the 100-year event.

Minor system peak flows from the proposed site will be captured and directed to the existing 1650mm storm trunk sewers in Riocan Avenue and will ultimately discharge into the outlet channel of the existing Chapman Mills SWM Facility, which has been sized to provide end-of-pipe quality control.

An interim dry pond has been sized will provide storage for the major system flows until such time that the downstream road network is constructed and major system flows are directed to the Jock River via the Riversbend Subdivision. The interim pond will control flow to the existing storm trunk sewer in future Riocan Avenue.

11.4 Grading

A conceptual grading plan has been prepared accounting for required overland flow conveyance, cover over sewers, hydraulic grade line requirements, and grade raise restrictions as identified in the geotechnical investigation. A detailed grading design will be developed at the time of detailed design and will adhere to all requirements as outlined in the City of Ottawa guidelines.



Appendices



Appendix A Water Servicing

A.1 Domestic Water Demands



Barrhaven Town Centre Phase 2, Ottawa, ON - Domestic Water Demand Estimates

Concept Plan, Novatech for Minto Communities, August 2026

Project No. 160402206

Designed by: MW

Date: 2026-08-12

Checked by:

Revision: 01

City File No. D07-16-26-0003

Population densities per Table 4.1 City of Ottawa Water Design Guidelines:		
Medium Density	2.7	ppu
Townhome	2.7	ppu
Demand conversion factors per Table 4.2 of the City of Ottawa Water Design Guidelines:		
Residential	280	L/cap/day



Area ID	No. of Units	Population	Avg Day Demand		Max Day Demand ^{1 2}		Peak Hour Demand ^{1 2}	
			(L/min)	(L/s)	(L/min)	(L/s)	(L/min)	(L/s)
R9A	40	108	21.0	0.35	52.5	0.88	115.5	1.93
R11A	7	19	3.7	0.06	9.2	0.15	20.2	0.34
R13A	40	108	21.0	0.35	52.5	0.88	115.5	1.93
R14A	64	173	33.6	0.56	84.0	1.40	184.8	3.08
R16A	50	135	26.3	0.44	65.6	1.09	144.4	2.41
R18A	53	143	27.8	0.46	69.6	1.16	153.0	2.55
R19A	24	65	12.6	0.21	31.5	0.53	69.3	1.16
R20A	64	173	33.6	0.56	84.0	1.40	184.8	3.08
R21A	24	65	12.6	0.21	31.5	0.53	69.3	1.16
R22A	21	57	11.0	0.18	27.6	0.46	60.6	1.01
R23A	80	216	42.0	0.70	105.0	1.75	231.0	3.85
Total Site :	467	1261	245.2	4.09	612.9	10.22	1348.5	22.47

Notes:

- The City of Ottawa water demand criteria used to estimate peak demand rates for residential areas are as follows:
maximum day demand rate = 2.5 × average day demand rate
peak hour demand rate = 2.2 × maximum day demand rate
- Water demand criteria used to estimate peak demand rates for commercial/institutional areas are as follows:
maximum daily demand rate = 1.5 × average day demand rate
peak hour demand rate = 1.8 × maximum day demand rate

A.2 Preliminary Fire Flow Calculations (2020 FUS)



FUS Fire Flow Calculation Sheet - 2020 FUS Guidelines

Stantec Project #: 160402206

Project Name: Barrhaven Town Centre - Phase 2

Date: 2026-02-06

Fire Flow Calculation #: 1

Description: Medium Density Units

Notes: Based on worst-case assumption, 3-storey wood-frame multi-unit building - max. ground floor area of 600m2.(Block 1)

Step	Task	Notes										Value Used	Req'd Fire Flow (L/min)
1	Determine Type of Construction	Type V - Wood Frame / Type IV-D - Mass Timber Construction										1.5	-
2	Determine Effective Floor Area	Sum of All Floor Areas										NO	-
		600	600	600								1800	-
3	Determine Required Fire Flow	(F = 220 x C x A ^{1/2}). Round to nearest 1000 L/min										-	14000
4	Determine Occupancy Charge	Limited Combustible										-15%	11900
5	Determine Sprinkler Reduction	None										0%	0
		Non-Standard Water Supply or N/A										0%	
		Not Fully Supervised or N/A										0%	
		% Coverage of Sprinkler System										0%	
6	Determine Increase for Exposures (Max. 75%)	Direction	Exposure Distance (m)	Exposed Length (m)	Exposed Height (Stories)	Length-Height Factor (m x stories)	Construction of Adjacent Wall	Firewall / Sprinklered ?			-	-	
		North	> 30	20	2	21-49	Type V	NO			0%	4641	
		East	10.1 to 20	30	3	81-100	Type V	NO			14%		
		South	10.1 to 20	20	2	21-49	Type V	NO			11%		
		West	10.1 to 20	30	3	81-100	Type V	NO			14%		
7	Determine Final Required Fire Flow	Total Required Fire Flow in L/min, Rounded to Nearest 1000L/min										17000	
		Total Required Fire Flow in L/s										283.3	
		Required Duration of Fire Flow (hrs)										3.50	
		Required Volume of Fire Flow (m³)										3570	

FUS Fire Flow Calculation Sheet - 2020 FUS Guidelines

Stantec Project #: 160402206

Project Name: Barrhaven Town Centre - Phase 2

Date: 2026-02-06

Fire Flow Calculation #: 2

Description: Executive Towns

Notes: Based on worst-case assumption, 3-storey wood-frame Back-to-Back townhouse - max. For a ground-floor area of 400 m2, firewall can be required for a larger footprint. Minimum rear yard setback 7.5m per Zoning By-law for Development Reserve Zone (DR)

Step	Task	Notes										Value Used	Req'd Fire Flow (L/min)
1	Determine Type of Construction	Type V - Wood Frame / Type IV-D - Mass Timber Construction										1.5	-
2	Determine Effective Floor Area	Sum of All Floor Areas										NO	-
		400	400	400								1200	-
3	Determine Required Fire Flow	(F = 220 x C x A ^{1/2}). Round to nearest 1000 L/min										-	11000
4	Determine Occupancy Charge	Limited Combustible										-15%	9350
5	Determine Sprinkler Reduction	None										0%	0
		Non-Standard Water Supply or N/A										0%	
		Not Fully Supervised or N/A										0%	
		% Coverage of Sprinkler System										0%	
6	Determine Increase for Exposures (Max. 75%)	Direction	Exposure Distance (m)	Exposed Length (m)	Exposed Height (Stories)	Length-Height Factor (m x stories)	Construction of Adjacent Wall	Firewall / Sprinklered ?			-	-	
		North	10.1 to 20	30	2	41-60	Type V	NO			12%	4675	
		East	3.1 to 10	20	3	41-60	Type V	NO			17%		
		South	20.1 to 30	30	2	41-60	Type V	NO			4%		
		West	3.1 to 10	20	3	41-60	Type V	NO			17%		
7	Determine Final Required Fire Flow	Total Required Fire Flow in L/min, Rounded to Nearest 1000L/min										14000	
		Total Required Fire Flow in L/s										233.3	
		Required Duration of Fire Flow (hrs)										3.00	
		Required Volume of Fire Flow (m³)										2520	

A.3 Hydraulic Boundary Conditions




Boundary Conditions Barrhaven Town Center – Phase 2s

Provided Information

Scenario	Demand	
	L/min	L/s
Average Daily Demand	249	4.15
Maximum Daily Demand	622	10.36
Peak Hour	1,369	22.81
Fire Flow Demand #1	10,000	166.67
Fire Flow Demand #2	14,000	233.33
Fire Flow Demand #3	17,000	283.33

Location



Results

Existing Conditions

Connection 1 – Jockvale Road

Demand Scenario	Head (m)	Pressure ¹ (psi)
Maximum HGL	155.2	84.7
Peak Hour	142.0	65.8
Max Day plus Fire Flow #1	142.0	65.8
Max Day plus Fire Flow #2	142.0	65.8
Max Day plus Fire Flow #3	141.7	65.5

¹ Ground Elevation = 95.7 m

Connection 2 – Longfields Drive

Demand Scenario	Head (m)	Pressure ¹ (psi)
Maximum HGL	155.1	87.0
Peak Hour	141.6	67.7
Max Day plus Fire Flow #1	141.6	67.7
Max Day plus Fire Flow #2	141.6	67.7
Max Day plus Fire Flow #3	140.5	66.2

¹ Ground Elevation = 94.0 m

Connection 3 – Chapman Mills Drive

Demand Scenario	Head (m)	Pressure ¹ (psi)
Maximum HGL	155.1	85.9
Peak Hour	141.6	66.6
Max Day plus Fire Flow #1	141.6	66.6
Max Day plus Fire Flow #2	141.6	66.6
Max Day plus Fire Flow #3	140.8	65.5

¹ Ground Elevation = 94.8 m

Future SUC

Connection 1 – Jockvale Road

Demand Scenario	Head (m)	Pressure ¹ (psi)
Maximum HGL	147.2	73.1
Peak Hour	144.6	69.6
Max Day plus Fire Flow #1	144.4	69.2
Max Day plus Fire Flow #2	143.6	68.1
Max Day plus Fire Flow #3	142.9	67.1

¹ Ground Elevation = 95.7 m

Connection 2 – Longfields Drive

Demand Scenario	Head (m)	Pressure ¹ (psi)
Maximum HGL	147.2	75.7
Peak Hour	144.2	71.4
Max Day plus Fire Flow #1	144.2	71.4
Max Day plus Fire Flow #2	143.4	70.3
Max Day plus Fire Flow #3	142.7	69.4

¹ Ground Elevation = 94.0 m

Connection 3 – Chapman Mills Drive

Demand Scenario	Head (m)	Pressure ¹ (psi)
Maximum HGL	147.2	74.6
Peak Hour	144.2	70.3
Max Day plus Fire Flow #1	144.2	70.3
Max Day plus Fire Flow #2	143.6	69.5
Max Day plus Fire Flow #3	143.0	68.6

¹ Ground Elevation = 94.8 m

Notes

1. Any connection to a watermain 400 mm or larger should be approved by DWS as per the *Water Design Guidelines Section 2.4* Review by Drinking Water Services.
2. As per the Ontario Building Code in areas that may be occupied, the static pressure at any fixture shall not exceed 552 kPa (80 psi.) Pressure control measures to be considered are as follows, in order of preference:
 - If possible, systems to be designed to residual pressures of 345 to 552 kPa (50 to 80 psi) in all occupied areas outside of the public right-of-way without special pressure control equipment.
 - Pressure reducing valves to be installed immediately downstream of the isolation valve in the home/ building, located downstream of the meter so it is owner maintained.

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.

A.4 Preliminary Hydraulic Model Results



Pre-SUC Reconfiguration PCSWMM Watermain Hydraulic Analysis Result
Junction Results - Basic Day

ID	Demand (L/s)	Elevation (m)	Head (m)	Pressure (m)	Pressure (psi)2	Pressure (kPa)
0.00	0.00	98.36	155.12	56.76	80.71	556.49
11.00	0.00	97.08	155.12	58.04	82.53	569.03
12.00	0.00	97.05	155.12	58.07	82.57	569.30
13.00	0.00	97.24	155.12	57.87	82.30	567.40
14.00	0.00	98.24	155.12	56.88	80.88	557.67
18.00	0.00	95.76	155.11	59.36	84.41	581.96
19.00	0.00	95.35	155.11	59.76	84.98	585.90
22.00	0.00	94.94	155.10	60.16	85.55	589.85
23.00	0.00	94.30	155.10	60.80	86.46	596.11
24.00	0.00	94.23	155.10	60.87	86.56	596.81
25.00	0.00	94.19	155.10	60.91	86.61	597.17
26.00	0.00	94.35	155.10	60.75	86.39	595.62
27.00	0.00	94.43	155.10	60.67	86.27	594.78
29.00	0.00	95.03	155.10	60.07	85.42	588.93
3.00	0.00	100.19	155.12	54.92	78.10	538.47
30.00	0.00	97.31	155.11	57.80	82.19	566.68
31.00	0.00	97.37	155.11	57.75	82.11	566.15
33.00	0.00	97.03	155.11	58.08	82.59	569.43
34.00	0.00	96.79	155.11	58.32	82.93	571.77
37.00	0.00	95.11	155.10	59.99	85.31	588.19
38.00	0.00	95.13	155.10	59.98	85.28	588.00
4.00	0.00	100.27	155.12	54.84	77.99	537.69
40.00	0.00	95.20	155.10	59.90	85.17	587.25
41.00	0.00	99.72	155.12	55.40	78.78	543.19
42.00	0.00	97.16	155.11	57.95	82.40	568.14
5.00	0.00	100.27	155.12	54.84	77.98	537.68
7.00	0.00	100.14	155.12	54.98	78.18	539.03
9.00	0.00	96.99	155.12	58.13	82.65	569.88
R11A	0.18	100.27	155.12	54.85	77.99	537.72
R13A	0.88	100.20	155.12	54.92	78.09	538.42
R14A-1	0.70	99.79	155.12	55.33	78.68	542.45
R14A-2	0.70	99.45	155.12	55.68	79.17	545.85
R16A	1.09	94.88	155.10	60.22	85.64	590.43
R18A	0.98	94.90	155.10	60.20	85.61	590.23
R19A	0.55	96.93	155.11	58.19	82.74	570.49
R20A-1	0.70	97.22	155.11	57.89	82.32	567.59
OA-2&R23	1.58	96.53	155.11	58.58	83.29	574.29
R21A	0.53	94.81	155.11	60.29	85.74	591.13
R22A	0.46	95.21	155.10	59.89	85.16	587.13
R23A-2	0.88	95.12	155.10	59.98	85.29	588.06
R9A	0.85	100.09	155.12	55.03	78.25	539.51

Link Results - Basic Day

ID	FROM	TO	Length (m)	Diameter (mm)	Roughness	Flow (L/s)	Velocity (m/s)
1000	R14A-1	0	91	204	110	-1.570	0.048
1001	R13A	R14A-1	67	204	110	-0.870	0.027
1002	3	R13A	10	204	110	0.010	0.000
1003	4	3	31	204	110	0.010	0.000
1004	5	4	8	204	110	0.010	0.000
1005	R11A	5	4	204	110	0.010	0.000
1006	7	R11A	28	204	110	0.190	0.006
1007	R9A	7	7	204	110	0.190	0.006
1008	9	R9A	161	204	110	1.040	0.032
1010	12	11	12	297	120	0.000	0.000
1011	9	12	33	297	120	0.000	0.000
1012	13	9	12	297	120	3.339	0.048
1013	14	13	49	297	120	3.339	0.048
1014	0	14	7	297	120	3.339	0.048
1015	R14A-2	0	55	297	120	7.182	0.104
1016	41	R14A-2	35	297	120	7.882	0.114
1017	R19A	0	83	204	110	-2.274	0.070
1018	18	9	63	204	110	-2.299	0.070
1019	19	18	40	204	110	-2.386	0.073
1020	R21A	19	52	204	110	-3.322	0.102
1021	R16A	R21A	46	204	110	-3.549	0.109
1022	22	R16A	40	204	110	-1.331	0.041
1023	23	22	67	204	110	-0.526	0.016
1024	24	23	7	204	110	-0.526	0.016
1025	25	24	8	204	110	-0.526	0.016
1026	26	25	30	204	110	-0.381	0.012
1027	27	26	11	204	110	-0.381	0.012
1028	R18A	27	62	204	110	-0.381	0.012
1029	29	R18A	19	204	110	0.599	0.018
1030	R19A	18	62	204	110	0.088	0.003
1031	30	R19A	20	204	110	-1.636	0.050
1032	31	30	10	204	110	-1.636	0.050
1033	R20A-1	31	13	204	110	-1.636	0.050
1034	33	R20A-1	13	204	110	-0.936	0.029
1035	34	33	10	204	110	-0.936	0.029
1036	19	34	80	204	110	-0.936	0.029
1037	R20A-2&R23A-1	42	34	204	110	-2.332	0.071
1038	R21A	R20A-2&R23A-1	115	204	110	-0.757	0.023
1039	29	22	53	204	110	-0.806	0.025
1040	37	29	20	204	110	-0.207	0.006
1041	38	37	10	204	110	-0.207	0.006
1042	R23A-2	38	13	204	110	-0.207	0.006
1043	40	R23A-2	13	204	110	0.668	0.020
1044	R22A	40	10	204	110	0.668	0.020
1045	R16A	R22A	75	204	110	1.128	0.035
1046	25	Longfields_Drive	39	204	110	0.144	0.004
C1	Jockvale_Road	41	274	297	120	16.459	0.238
C2	41	42	183	297	120	8.577	0.124
C3	42	hapman_Mills_Driv	197	297	120	6.245	0.090

Pre-SUC Reconfiguration PCSWMM Watermain Hydraulic Analysis Result
Junction Results - Peak Hour

ID	Demand (L/s)	Elevation (m)	Head (m)	Pressure (m)	Pressure (psi)2	Pressure (kPa)
0.00	0.00	98.36	141.71	43.36	61.65	425.08
11.00	0.00	97.08	141.71	44.64	63.47	437.61
12.00	0.00	97.05	141.71	44.66	63.51	437.87
13.00	0.00	97.24	141.71	44.47	63.23	435.97
14.00	0.00	98.24	141.71	43.48	61.82	426.25
18.00	0.00	95.76	141.70	45.94	65.33	450.43
19.00	0.00	95.35	141.69	46.33	65.89	454.27
22.00	0.00	94.94	141.62	46.68	66.38	457.67
23.00	0.00	94.30	141.61	47.31	67.28	463.87
24.00	0.00	94.23	141.61	47.38	67.38	464.56
25.00	0.00	94.19	141.61	47.42	67.43	464.91
26.00	0.00	94.35	141.61	47.26	67.21	463.38
27.00	0.00	94.43	141.61	47.18	67.09	462.54
29.00	0.00	95.03	141.62	46.59	66.25	456.75
3.00	0.00	100.19	141.71	41.52	59.04	407.06
30.00	0.00	97.31	141.70	44.38	63.11	435.13
31.00	0.00	97.37	141.70	44.33	63.03	434.60
33.00	0.00	97.03	141.69	44.66	63.51	437.85
34.00	0.00	96.79	141.69	44.90	63.84	440.19
37.00	0.00	95.11	141.62	46.51	66.14	456.01
38.00	0.00	95.13	141.62	46.49	66.11	455.82
4.00	0.00	100.27	141.71	41.44	58.92	406.26
40.00	0.00	95.20	141.62	46.42	66.00	455.08
41.00	0.00	99.72	141.73	42.01	59.74	411.87
42.00	0.00	97.16	141.66	44.50	63.28	436.27
5.00	0.00	100.27	141.71	41.44	58.92	406.25
7.00	0.00	100.14	141.71	41.58	59.12	407.61
9.00	0.00	96.99	141.71	44.72	63.59	438.45
R11A	0.18	100.27	141.71	41.44	58.93	406.29
R13A	0.88	100.20	141.71	41.51	59.03	407.01
R14A-1	0.70	99.79	141.71	41.92	59.61	411.03
R14A-2	0.70	99.45	141.72	42.28	60.12	414.48
R16A	1.09	94.88	141.63	46.75	66.47	458.32
R18A	0.98	94.90	141.62	46.72	66.43	458.02
R19A	0.55	96.93	141.70	44.77	63.67	438.96
R20A-1	0.70	97.22	141.69	44.47	63.24	436.02
OA-2&R23	1.58	96.53	141.66	45.13	64.17	442.42
R21A	0.53	94.81	141.66	46.84	66.61	459.27
R22A	0.46	95.21	141.62	46.41	65.99	454.97
R23A-2	0.88	95.12	141.62	46.50	66.12	455.88
R9A	0.85	100.09	141.71	41.62	59.19	408.09

Link Results - Basic Day

ID	FROM	TO	Length (m)	Diameter (mm)	Roughness	Flow (L/s)	Velocity (m/s)
1000	R14A-1	0	91	204	110	-1.797	0.055
1001	R13A	R14A-1	67	204	110	-1.097	0.034
1002	3	R13A	10	204	110	-0.217	0.007
1003	4	3	31	204	110	-0.217	0.007
1004	5	4	8	204	110	-0.217	0.007
1005	R11A	5	4	204	110	-0.217	0.007
1006	7	R11A	28	204	110	-0.037	0.001
1007	R9A	7	7	204	110	-0.037	0.001
1008	9	R9A	161	204	110	0.813	0.025
1010	12	11	12	297	120	0.000	0.000
1011	9	12	33	297	120	0.000	0.000
1012	13	9	12	297	120	5.819	0.084
1013	14	13	49	297	120	5.819	0.084
1014	0	14	7	297	120	5.819	0.084
1015	R14A-2	0	55	297	120	12.301	0.178
1016	41	R14A-2	35	297	120	13.001	0.188
1017	R19A	0	83	204	110	-4.685	0.143
1018	18	9	63	204	110	-5.007	0.153
1019	19	18	40	204	110	-5.763	0.176
1020	R21A	19	52	204	110	-8.441	0.258
1021	R16A	R21A	46	204	110	-8.853	0.271
1022	22	R16A	40	204	110	-4.749	0.145
1023	23	22	67	204	110	-3.232	0.099
1024	24	23	7	204	110	-3.232	0.099
1025	25	24	8	204	110	-3.232	0.099
1026	26	25	30	204	110	2.216	0.068
1027	27	26	11	204	110	2.216	0.068
1028	R18A	27	62	204	110	2.216	0.068
1029	29	R18A	19	204	110	3.196	0.098
1030	R19A	18	62	204	110	0.756	0.023
1031	30	R19A	20	204	110	-3.378	0.103
1032	31	30	10	204	110	-3.378	0.103
1033	R20A-1	31	13	204	110	-3.378	0.103
1034	33	R20A-1	13	204	110	-2.678	0.082
1035	34	33	10	204	110	-2.678	0.082
1036	19	34	80	204	110	-2.678	0.082
1037	R20A-2&R23A-1	42	34	204	110	-2.517	0.077
1038	R21A	R20A-2&R23A-1	115	204	110	-0.942	0.029
1039	29	22	53	204	110	-1.517	0.046
1040	37	29	20	204	110	1.679	0.051
1041	38	37	10	204	110	1.679	0.051
1042	R23A-2	38	13	204	110	1.679	0.051
1043	40	R23A-2	13	204	110	2.554	0.078
1044	R22A	40	10	204	110	2.554	0.078
1045	R16A	R22A	75	204	110	3.014	0.092
1046	25	Longfields Drive	39	204	110	5.448	0.167
C1	Jockvale_Road	41	274	297	120	32.703	0.472
C2	41	42	183	297	120	19.702	0.284
C3	42	hapman Mills Driv	197	297	120	17.185	0.248

Pre-SUC Reconfiguration PCSWMM Watermain Hydraulic Analysis Result
Fire Flow Results - Max Day + 233 L/s

ID	Static Demand (L/s)	Static Pressure (m)	Static Pressure (psi)	Static Pressure (kPa)	Static Head (m)	Fire Flow Demand (L/s)	Residual Pressure (m)	Residual Pressure (psi)	Available Flow (L/s)	Available Pressure (psi)
0	0.00	43.36	61.66	425.11	141.71	233.33	39.28	55.86	683.84	20
11	0.00	44.63	63.46	437.56	141.71	233.33	37.78	53.73	526.20	20
12	0.00	44.66	63.51	437.85	141.71	233.33	38.25	54.39	545.88	20
13	0.00	44.47	63.24	435.99	141.71	233.33	39.43	56.07	621.37	20
14	0.00	43.48	61.83	426.28	141.71	233.33	39.24	55.79	670.58	20
18	0.00	45.94	65.33	450.40	141.70	233.33	39.46	56.11	554.69	20
19	0.00	46.33	65.88	454.23	141.69	233.33	39.89	56.72	560.29	20
22	0.00	46.68	66.38	457.66	141.62	233.33	39.57	56.27	534.17	20
23	0.00	47.31	67.27	463.83	141.61	233.33	40.46	57.54	549.82	20
24	0.00	47.38	67.37	464.52	141.61	233.33	41.25	58.66	584.53	20
25	0.00	47.42	67.43	464.91	141.61	233.33	42.35	60.22	648.67	20
26	0.00	47.26	67.20	463.34	141.61	233.33	38.71	55.04	486.82	20
27	0.00	47.18	67.09	462.56	141.61	233.33	37.91	53.91	465.57	20
29	0.00	46.59	66.25	456.77	141.62	233.33	38.21	54.34	488.06	20
3	0.00	41.52	59.04	407.07	141.71	233.33	21.96	31.22	280.62	20
30	0.00	44.38	63.11	435.11	141.70	233.33	34.93	49.66	439.42	20
31	0.00	44.33	63.04	434.62	141.70	233.33	34.20	48.63	422.94	20
33	0.00	44.66	63.51	437.85	141.69	233.33	33.62	47.80	405.80	20
34	0.00	44.90	63.85	440.21	141.69	233.33	33.74	47.98	405.20	20
37	0.00	46.51	66.14	455.99	141.62	233.33	36.32	51.64	437.90	20
38	0.00	46.49	66.11	455.79	141.62	233.33	35.69	50.75	424.06	20
4	0.00	41.44	58.93	406.28	141.71	233.33	21.49	30.55	277.18	20
40	0.00	46.42	66.01	455.11	141.62	233.33	34.82	49.51	407.53	20
41	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	233.33	39.57	56.26	878.80	20
42	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	233.33	42.27	60.10	958.92	20
5	0.00	41.44	58.93	406.28	141.71	233.33	21.47	30.53	277.07	20
7	0.00	41.58	59.13	407.66	141.71	233.33	21.93	31.19	280.29	20
9	0.00	44.72	63.59	438.44	141.71	233.33	39.55	56.24	615.27	20
R11A	0.18	41.44	58.93	406.28	141.71	233.33	21.49	30.55	277.15	20
R13A	0.88	41.51	59.03	406.97	141.71	233.33	22.19	31.55	282.47	20
R14A-1	0.70	41.92	59.61	410.99	141.71	233.33	25.97	36.93	316.05	20
R14A-2	0.70	42.28	60.12	414.52	141.72	233.33	39.11	55.61	768.35	20
R16A	1.09	46.75	66.48	458.34	141.63	233.33	39.97	56.83	549.25	20
R18A	0.98	46.72	66.43	458.05	141.62	233.33	37.26	52.98	457.47	20
R19A	0.55	44.77	63.66	438.93	141.70	233.33	37.28	53.01	502.43	20
R20A-1	0.70	44.47	63.24	435.99	141.69	233.33	33.77	48.02	411.38	20
R20A-2&R23A-1	1.58	45.13	64.17	442.46	141.66	233.33	38.94	55.37	559.57	20
R21A	0.53	46.84	66.61	459.23	141.66	233.33	41.45	58.94	623.11	20
R22A	0.46	46.41	65.99	455.01	141.62	233.33	34.75	49.42	406.39	20
R23A-2	0.88	46.50	66.12	455.89	141.62	233.33	35.17	50.01	413.43	20
R9A	0.85	41.62	59.18	408.05	141.71	233.33	22.13	31.47	281.76	20

Pre-SUC Reconfiguration PCSWMM Watermain Hydraulic Analysis Result
Fire Flow Results - Max Day + 283 L/s

ID	Static Demand (L/s)	Static Pressure (m)	Static Pressure (psi)	Static Pressure (kPa)	Static Head (m)	Fire Flow Demand (L/s)	Residual Pressure (m)	Residual Pressure (psi)	Available Flow (L/s)	Available Pressure (psi)
0	0.00	42.68	60.69	418.44	141.04	283.33	36.88	52.45	675.55	20
11	0.00	43.95	62.50	430.89	141.03	283.33	34.18	48.61	520.03	20
12	0.00	43.98	62.54	431.19	141.03	283.33	34.84	49.54	539.49	20
13	0.00	43.79	62.27	429.32	141.03	283.33	36.62	52.07	614.05	20
14	0.00	42.80	60.86	419.62	141.04	283.33	36.77	52.28	662.47	20
18	0.00	45.23	64.32	443.44	140.99	283.33	35.99	51.17	548.21	20
19	0.00	45.60	64.84	447.07	140.95	283.33	36.41	51.78	553.62	20
22	0.00	45.72	65.01	448.25	140.66	283.33	35.64	50.68	526.34	20
23	0.00	46.31	65.85	454.03	140.60	283.33	36.59	52.03	541.57	20
24	0.00	46.37	65.94	454.62	140.60	283.33	37.68	53.58	575.73	20
25	0.00	46.40	65.98	454.91	140.59	283.33	39.23	55.78	638.84	20
26	0.00	46.26	65.78	453.54	140.61	283.33	34.10	48.49	479.51	20
27	0.00	46.18	65.67	452.76	140.61	283.33	33.00	46.93	458.58	20
29	0.00	45.62	64.87	447.26	140.65	283.33	33.73	47.97	480.83	20
3	0.00	40.84	58.07	400.40	141.03	283.33	12.91	18.36	276.91	20
30	0.00	43.67	62.10	428.15	140.99	283.33	30.18	42.91	434.01	20
31	0.00	43.61	62.01	427.56	140.98	283.33	29.16	41.47	417.71	20
33	0.00	43.94	62.48	430.79	140.98	283.33	28.18	40.07	400.82	20
34	0.00	44.18	62.82	433.15	140.97	283.33	28.25	40.17	400.25	20
37	0.00	45.55	64.77	446.58	140.66	283.33	31.06	44.17	431.43	20
38	0.00	45.54	64.76	446.48	140.66	283.33	30.17	42.90	417.80	20
4	0.00	40.76	57.96	399.62	141.03	283.33	12.28	17.45	273.50	20
40	0.00	45.47	64.66	445.79	140.67	283.33	28.97	41.19	401.53	20
41	0.00	41.35	58.80	405.40	141.07	283.33	37.88	53.87	868.08	20
42	0.00	43.75	62.21	428.93	140.91	283.33	40.59	57.71	947.08	20
5	0.00	40.76	57.96	399.62	141.03	283.33	12.25	17.42	273.39	20
7	0.00	40.89	58.14	400.89	141.03	283.33	12.85	18.28	276.59	20
9	0.00	44.04	62.62	431.77	141.03	283.33	36.68	52.15	608.09	20
R11A	0.18	40.76	57.96	399.62	141.03	283.33	12.27	17.45	273.47	20
R13A	0.88	40.83	58.06	400.30	141.03	283.33	13.25	18.84	278.73	20
R14A-1	0.70	41.24	58.64	404.32	141.03	283.33	18.47	26.27	311.96	20
R14A-2	0.70	41.61	59.17	407.95	141.06	283.33	37.11	52.77	758.89	20
R16A	1.09	45.83	65.17	449.32	140.71	283.33	36.21	51.49	541.50	20
R18A	0.98	45.74	65.04	448.44	140.64	283.33	32.30	45.92	450.64	20
R19A	0.55	44.07	62.67	432.07	140.99	283.33	33.38	47.47	496.37	20
R20A-1	0.70	43.76	62.23	429.03	140.98	283.33	28.48	40.49	406.31	20
R20A-2&R23A-1	1.58	44.36	63.08	434.91	140.89	283.33	35.56	50.57	552.70	20
R21A	0.53	46.04	65.47	451.38	140.86	283.33	38.37	54.57	615.21	20
R22A	0.46	45.46	64.64	445.70	140.68	283.33	28.88	41.06	400.41	20
R23A-2	0.88	45.55	64.77	446.58	140.67	283.33	29.44	41.86	407.35	20
R9A	0.85	40.94	58.22	401.38	141.03	283.33	13.12	18.65	278.04	20

Post-SUC Reconfiguration PCSWMM Watermain Hydraulic Analysis Result
Junction Results - Basic Day

ID	Demand (L/s)	Elevation (m)	Head (m)	Pressure (m)	Pressure (psi)2	Pressure (kPa)
0.00	0.00	98.36	147.19	48.84	69.44	478.80
11.00	0.00	97.08	147.19	50.12	71.26	491.35
12.00	0.00	97.05	147.19	50.14	71.30	491.62
13.00	0.00	97.24	147.19	49.95	71.03	489.72
14.00	0.00	98.24	147.19	48.96	69.62	479.98
18.00	0.00	95.76	147.19	51.44	73.14	504.32
19.00	0.00	95.35	147.19	51.84	73.72	508.27
22.00	0.00	94.94	147.19	52.26	74.31	512.33
23.00	0.00	94.30	147.20	52.90	75.22	518.62
24.00	0.00	94.23	147.20	52.97	75.32	519.32
25.00	0.00	94.19	147.20	53.01	75.37	519.68
26.00	0.00	94.35	147.20	52.85	75.15	518.13
27.00	0.00	94.43	147.20	52.76	75.02	517.28
29.00	0.00	95.03	147.19	52.16	74.18	511.42
3.00	0.00	100.19	147.19	47.00	66.83	460.79
30.00	0.00	97.31	147.19	49.88	70.93	489.03
31.00	0.00	97.37	147.19	49.83	70.85	488.51
33.00	0.00	97.03	147.19	50.16	71.33	491.80
34.00	0.00	96.79	147.19	50.40	71.67	494.13
37.00	0.00	95.11	147.19	52.09	74.07	510.68
38.00	0.00	95.13	147.19	52.07	74.04	510.49
4.00	0.00	100.27	147.19	46.92	66.72	460.01
40.00	0.00	95.20	147.19	51.99	73.93	509.74
41.00	0.00	99.72	147.20	47.48	67.51	465.46
42.00	0.00	97.16	147.20	50.04	71.15	490.57
5.00	0.00	100.27	147.19	46.92	66.72	460.00
7.00	0.00	100.14	147.19	47.06	66.91	461.35
9.00	0.00	96.99	147.19	50.20	71.39	492.20
R11A	0.18	100.27	147.19	46.92	66.72	460.04
R13A	0.88	100.20	147.19	47.00	66.83	460.75
R14A-1	0.70	99.79	147.19	47.41	67.41	464.77
R14A-2	0.70	99.45	147.20	47.75	67.90	468.13
R16A	1.09	94.88	147.19	52.32	74.39	512.91
R18A	0.98	94.90	147.19	52.30	74.36	512.72
R19A	0.55	96.93	147.19	50.27	71.48	492.84
R20A-1	0.70	97.22	147.19	49.97	71.06	489.95
OA-2&R23	1.58	96.53	147.20	50.66	72.04	496.72
R21A	0.53	94.81	147.19	52.38	74.49	513.56
R22A	0.46	95.21	147.19	51.98	73.91	509.62
R23A-2	0.88	95.12	147.19	52.08	74.05	510.55
R9A	0.85	100.09	147.19	47.11	66.98	461.83

Link Results - Basic Day

ID	FROM	TO	Length (m)	Diameter (mm)	Roughness	Flow (L/s)	Velocity (m/s)
1000	R14A-1	0	91	204	110	-1.479	0.045
1001	R13A	R14A-1	67	204	110	-0.779	0.024
1002	3	R13A	10	204	110	0.101	0.003
1003	4	3	31	204	110	0.101	0.003
1004	5	4	8	204	110	0.101	0.003
1005	R11A	5	4	204	110	0.101	0.003
1006	7	R11A	28	204	110	0.281	0.009
1007	R9A	7	7	204	110	0.281	0.009
1008	9	R9A	161	204	110	1.131	0.035
1010	12	11	12	297	120	0.000	0.000
1011	9	12	33	297	120	0.000	0.000
1012	13	9	12	297	120	1.651	0.024
1013	14	13	49	297	120	1.651	0.024
1014	0	14	7	297	120	1.651	0.024
1015	R14A-2	0	55	297	120	3.862	0.056
1016	41	R14A-2	35	297	120	4.562	0.066
1017	R19A	0	83	204	110	-0.732	0.022
1018	18	9	63	204	110	-0.519	0.016
1019	19	18	40	204	110	-0.278	0.009
1020	R21A	19	52	204	110	-0.002	0.000
1021	R16A	R21A	46	204	110	-0.317	0.010
1022	22	R16A	40	204	110	1.111	0.034
1023	23	22	67	204	110	1.617	0.049
1024	24	23	7	204	110	1.617	0.049
1025	25	24	8	204	110	1.617	0.049
1026	26	25	30	204	110	-1.471	0.045
1027	27	26	11	204	110	-1.471	0.045
1028	R18A	27	62	204	110	-1.471	0.045
1029	29	R18A	19	204	110	-0.491	0.015
1030	R19A	18	62	204	110	-0.241	0.007
1031	30	R19A	20	204	110	-0.424	0.013
1032	31	30	10	204	110	-0.424	0.013
1033	R20A-1	31	13	204	110	-0.424	0.013
1034	33	R20A-1	13	204	110	0.276	0.008
1035	34	33	10	204	110	0.276	0.008
1036	19	34	80	204	110	0.276	0.008
1037	R20A-2&R23A-1	42	34	204	110	-2.420	0.074
1038	R21A	R20A-2&R23A-1	115	204	110	-0.845	0.026
1039	29	22	53	204	110	-0.506	0.015
1040	37	29	20	204	110	-0.997	0.030
1041	38	37	10	204	110	-0.997	0.030
1042	R23A-2	38	13	204	110	-0.997	0.030
1043	40	R23A-2	13	204	110	-0.122	0.004
1044	R22A	40	10	204	110	-0.122	0.004
1045	R16A	R22A	75	204	110	0.338	0.010
1046	25	Longfields_Drive	39	204	110	-3.088	0.094
C1	Jockvale_Road	41	274	297	120	3.294	0.048
C2	41	42	183	297	120	-1.268	0.018
C3	42	hapman_Mills_Driv	197	297	120	-3.689	0.053

Post-SUC Reconfiguration PCSWMM Watermain Hydraulic Analysis Result
Junction Results - Peak Hour

ID	Demand (L/s)	Elevation (m)	Head (m)	Pressure (m)	Pressure (psi)2	Pressure (kPa)
0.00	0.00	98.36	144.31	45.96	65.35	450.57
11.00	0.00	97.08	144.31	47.24	67.17	463.10
12.00	0.00	97.05	144.31	47.26	67.21	463.36
13.00	0.00	97.24	144.31	47.07	66.93	461.46
14.00	0.00	98.24	144.31	46.08	65.52	451.75
18.00	0.00	95.76	144.30	48.54	69.03	475.92
19.00	0.00	95.35	144.29	48.93	69.58	479.76
22.00	0.00	94.94	144.22	49.28	70.08	483.16
23.00	0.00	94.30	144.21	49.91	70.98	489.36
24.00	0.00	94.23	144.21	49.98	71.08	490.05
25.00	0.00	94.19	144.21	50.02	71.13	490.40
26.00	0.00	94.35	144.21	49.86	70.91	488.87
27.00	0.00	94.43	144.21	49.78	70.78	488.03
29.00	0.00	95.03	144.22	49.19	69.94	482.24
3.00	0.00	100.19	144.31	44.12	62.74	432.55
30.00	0.00	97.31	144.30	46.98	66.81	460.62
31.00	0.00	97.37	144.30	46.93	66.73	460.09
33.00	0.00	97.03	144.29	47.26	67.20	463.34
34.00	0.00	96.79	144.29	47.50	67.54	465.68
37.00	0.00	95.11	144.22	49.11	69.84	481.50
38.00	0.00	95.13	144.22	49.09	69.81	481.31
4.00	0.00	100.27	144.31	44.04	62.62	431.75
40.00	0.00	95.20	144.22	49.02	69.70	480.57
41.00	0.00	99.72	144.33	44.61	63.43	437.36
42.00	0.00	97.16	144.26	47.10	66.97	461.77
5.00	0.00	100.27	144.31	44.04	62.62	431.74
7.00	0.00	100.14	144.31	44.18	62.82	433.10
9.00	0.00	96.99	144.31	47.32	67.29	463.94
R11A	0.18	100.27	144.31	44.04	62.62	431.78
R13A	0.88	100.20	144.31	44.11	62.73	432.50
R14A-1	0.70	99.79	144.31	44.52	63.31	436.52
R14A-2	0.70	99.45	144.32	44.88	63.81	439.97
R16A	1.09	94.88	144.23	49.35	70.17	483.81
R18A	0.98	94.90	144.22	49.32	70.13	483.51
R19A	0.55	96.93	144.30	47.37	67.36	464.45
R20A-1	0.70	97.22	144.29	47.07	66.94	461.51
OA-2&R23	1.58	96.53	144.26	47.73	67.86	467.91
R21A	0.53	94.81	144.26	49.44	70.31	484.76
R22A	0.46	95.21	144.22	49.01	69.69	480.46
R23A-2	0.88	95.12	144.22	49.10	69.82	481.37
R9A	0.85	100.09	144.31	44.22	62.89	433.58

Link Results - Basic Day

ID	FROM	TO	Length (m)	Diameter (mm)	Roughness	Flow (L/s)	Velocity (m/s)
1000	R14A-1	0	91	204	110	-1.797	0.055
1001	R13A	R14A-1	67	204	110	-1.097	0.034
1002	3	R13A	10	204	110	-0.217	0.007
1003	4	3	31	204	110	-0.217	0.007
1004	5	4	8	204	110	-0.217	0.007
1005	R11A	5	4	204	110	-0.217	0.007
1006	7	R11A	28	204	110	-0.037	0.001
1007	R9A	7	7	204	110	-0.037	0.001
1008	9	R9A	161	204	110	0.813	0.025
1010	12	11	12	297	120	0.000	0.000
1011	9	12	33	297	120	0.000	0.000
1012	13	9	12	297	120	5.819	0.084
1013	14	13	49	297	120	5.819	0.084
1014	0	14	7	297	120	5.819	0.084
1015	R14A-2	0	55	297	120	12.301	0.178
1016	41	R14A-2	35	297	120	13.001	0.188
1017	R19A	0	83	204	110	-4.685	0.143
1018	18	9	63	204	110	-5.007	0.153
1019	19	18	40	204	110	-5.763	0.176
1020	R21A	19	52	204	110	-8.441	0.258
1021	R16A	R21A	46	204	110	-8.853	0.271
1022	22	R16A	40	204	110	-4.749	0.145
1023	23	22	67	204	110	-3.232	0.099
1024	24	23	7	204	110	-3.232	0.099
1025	25	24	8	204	110	-3.232	0.099
1026	26	25	30	204	110	2.216	0.068
1027	27	26	11	204	110	2.216	0.068
1028	R18A	27	62	204	110	2.216	0.068
1029	29	R18A	19	204	110	3.196	0.098
1030	R19A	18	62	204	110	0.756	0.023
1031	30	R19A	20	204	110	-3.378	0.103
1032	31	30	10	204	110	-3.378	0.103
1033	R20A-1	31	13	204	110	-3.378	0.103
1034	33	R20A-1	13	204	110	-2.678	0.082
1035	34	33	10	204	110	-2.678	0.082
1036	19	34	80	204	110	-2.678	0.082
1037	R20A-2&R23A-1	42	34	204	110	-2.517	0.077
1038	R21A	R20A-2&R23A-1	115	204	110	-0.942	0.029
1039	29	22	53	204	110	-1.517	0.046
1040	37	29	20	204	110	1.679	0.051
1041	38	37	10	204	110	1.679	0.051
1042	R23A-2	38	13	204	110	1.679	0.051
1043	40	R23A-2	13	204	110	2.554	0.078
1044	R22A	40	10	204	110	2.554	0.078
1045	R16A	R22A	75	204	110	3.014	0.092
1046	25	Longfields Drive	39	204	110	5.448	0.167
C1	Jockvale_Road	41	274	297	120	32.703	0.472
C2	41	42	183	297	120	19.702	0.284
C3	42	hapman Mills Driv	197	297	120	17.185	0.248

Post-SUC Reconfiguration PCSWMM Watermain Hydraulic Analysis Result
Fire Flow Results - Max Day + 233 L/s

ID	Static Demand (L/s)	Static Pressure (m)	Static Pressure (psi)	Static Pressure (kPa)	Static Head (m)	Fire Flow Demand (L/s)	Residual Pressure (m)	Residual Pressure (psi)	Available Flow (L/s)	Available Pressure (psi)
0	0.00	45.21	64.29	443.25	143.56	233.33	41.08	58.41	706.30	20
11	0.00	46.48	66.09	455.70	143.56	233.33	39.58	56.28	542.76	20
12	0.00	46.51	66.14	455.99	143.56	233.33	40.05	56.95	563.05	20
13	0.00	46.32	65.87	454.13	143.56	233.33	41.23	58.63	641.04	20
14	0.00	45.33	64.46	444.42	143.56	233.33	41.03	58.35	692.51	20
18	0.00	47.80	67.97	468.64	143.55	233.33	41.26	58.67	571.48	20
19	0.00	48.19	68.52	472.46	143.54	233.33	41.70	59.29	577.09	20
22	0.00	48.51	68.98	475.60	143.45	233.33	41.39	58.85	550.04	20
23	0.00	49.13	69.86	481.68	143.43	233.33	42.28	60.12	565.82	20
24	0.00	49.20	69.96	482.36	143.43	233.33	43.06	61.23	601.50	20
25	0.00	49.24	70.02	482.76	143.43	233.33	44.16	62.80	667.48	20
26	0.00	49.08	69.79	481.19	143.43	233.33	40.52	57.62	501.01	20
27	0.00	49.00	69.68	480.40	143.43	233.33	39.72	56.49	479.18	20
29	0.00	48.42	68.85	474.72	143.45	233.33	40.03	56.92	502.61	20
3	0.00	43.37	61.67	425.21	143.56	233.33	23.75	33.78	290.47	20
30	0.00	46.24	65.75	453.34	143.55	233.33	36.73	52.23	453.40	20
31	0.00	46.18	65.67	452.76	143.55	233.33	36.01	51.20	436.42	20
33	0.00	46.52	66.15	456.09	143.55	233.33	35.42	50.37	418.60	20
34	0.00	46.75	66.48	458.34	143.55	233.33	35.55	50.55	417.88	20
37	0.00	48.34	68.74	473.93	143.45	233.33	38.13	54.22	450.99	20
38	0.00	48.32	68.71	473.74	143.45	233.33	37.50	53.32	436.74	20
4	0.00	43.29	61.56	424.42	143.56	233.33	23.29	33.11	286.93	20
40	0.00	48.25	68.61	473.05	143.45	233.33	36.63	52.09	419.75	20
41	0.00	43.86	62.37	430.01	143.58	233.33	41.36	58.81	908.87	20
42	0.00	46.42	66.01	455.11	143.58	233.33	44.11	62.72	989.92	20
5	0.00	43.29	61.56	424.42	143.56	233.33	23.27	33.09	286.82	20
7	0.00	43.42	61.74	425.70	143.56	233.33	23.73	33.74	290.11	20
9	0.00	46.57	66.22	456.58	143.56	233.33	41.35	58.80	634.60	20
R11A	0.18	43.29	61.56	424.42	143.56	233.33	23.28	33.11	286.90	20
R13A	0.88	43.36	61.66	425.11	143.56	233.33	23.99	34.11	292.38	20
R14A-1	0.70	43.77	62.24	429.13	143.56	233.33	27.77	39.48	326.98	20
R14A-2	0.70	44.12	62.74	432.56	143.57	233.33	40.90	58.16	794.47	20
R16A	1.09	48.59	69.09	476.38	143.47	233.33	41.78	59.41	565.56	20
R18A	0.98	48.54	69.02	475.89	143.44	233.33	39.07	55.55	471.05	20
R19A	0.55	46.63	66.31	457.17	143.55	233.33	39.08	55.57	518.21	20
R20A-1	0.70	46.33	65.88	454.23	143.55	233.33	35.57	50.58	424.44	20
R20A-2&R23A-1	1.58	47.03	66.88	461.09	143.56	233.33	40.77	57.97	577.15	20
R21A	0.53	48.71	69.26	477.56	143.52	233.33	43.27	61.53	641.58	20
R22A	0.46	48.24	68.60	472.95	143.45	233.33	36.57	52.00	418.57	20
R23A-2	0.88	48.33	68.72	473.83	143.45	233.33	36.99	52.59	425.80	20
R9A	0.85	43.47	61.81	426.19	143.56	233.33	23.93	34.03	291.60	20

Post-SUC Reconfiguration PCSWMM Watermain Hydraulic Analysis Result
Fire Flow Results - Max Day + 233 L/s

ID	Static Demand (L/s)	Static Pressure (m)	Static Pressure (psi)	Static Pressure (kPa)	Static Head (m)	Fire Flow Demand (L/s)	Residual Pressure (m)	Residual Pressure (psi)	Available Flow (L/s)	Available Pressure (psi)
0	0.00	44.53	63.32	436.58	142.89	283.33	38.68	55.00	698.09	20
11	0.00	45.81	65.14	449.13	142.89	283.33	35.99	51.17	536.72	20
12	0.00	45.84	65.18	449.42	142.89	283.33	36.64	52.10	556.78	20
13	0.00	45.64	64.90	447.46	142.89	283.33	38.42	54.63	633.86	20
14	0.00	44.65	63.49	437.75	142.89	283.33	38.56	54.83	684.50	20
18	0.00	47.12	67.00	461.97	142.88	283.33	37.82	53.78	565.36	20
19	0.00	47.52	67.57	465.89	142.87	283.33	38.27	54.42	570.97	20
22	0.00	47.82	68.00	468.83	142.76	283.33	37.66	53.56	544.15	20
23	0.00	48.44	68.88	474.91	142.74	283.33	38.65	54.96	559.84	20
24	0.00	48.51	68.98	475.60	142.74	283.33	39.74	56.51	595.15	20
25	0.00	48.54	69.02	475.89	142.73	283.33	41.30	58.73	660.43	20
26	0.00	48.39	68.81	474.42	142.74	283.33	36.16	51.42	495.71	20
27	0.00	48.31	68.70	473.64	142.74	283.33	35.06	49.85	474.10	20
29	0.00	47.73	67.87	467.95	142.76	283.33	35.76	50.85	497.21	20
3	0.00	42.69	60.70	418.54	142.88	283.33	14.71	20.92	286.87	20
30	0.00	45.56	64.78	446.68	142.87	283.33	32.01	45.51	448.31	20
31	0.00	45.51	64.71	446.19	142.87	283.33	31.00	44.08	431.51	20
33	0.00	45.84	65.18	449.42	142.87	283.33	30.02	42.68	413.94	20
34	0.00	46.08	65.52	451.77	142.87	283.33	30.09	42.79	413.26	20
37	0.00	47.65	67.76	467.17	142.76	283.33	33.09	47.05	446.13	20
38	0.00	47.64	67.74	467.07	142.76	283.33	32.19	45.77	432.04	20
4	0.00	42.61	60.59	417.75	142.88	283.33	14.07	20.01	283.37	20
40	0.00	47.56	67.63	466.28	142.76	283.33	30.98	44.06	415.22	20
41	0.00	43.18	61.40	423.34	142.90	283.33	39.65	56.38	897.83	20
42	0.00	45.76	65.07	448.64	142.92	283.33	42.49	60.42	979.10	20
5	0.00	42.61	60.59	417.75	142.88	283.33	14.05	19.98	283.26	20
7	0.00	42.75	60.79	419.13	142.88	283.33	14.65	20.83	286.53	20
9	0.00	45.89	65.25	449.91	142.89	283.33	38.48	54.72	627.54	20
R11A	0.18	42.62	60.60	417.85	142.88	283.33	14.07	20.00	283.35	20
R13A	0.88	42.69	60.70	418.54	142.88	283.33	15.05	21.39	288.76	20
R14A-1	0.70	43.10	61.29	422.56	142.89	283.33	20.27	28.82	322.99	20
R14A-2	0.70	43.45	61.78	425.99	142.90	283.33	38.89	55.30	784.91	20
R16A	1.09	47.90	68.11	469.62	142.78	283.33	38.21	54.33	559.54	20
R18A	0.98	47.85	68.04	469.13	142.75	283.33	34.33	48.82	466.00	20
R19A	0.55	45.95	65.34	450.50	142.88	283.33	35.21	50.06	512.46	20
R20A-1	0.70	45.65	64.91	447.56	142.87	283.33	30.31	43.10	419.68	20
R20A-2&R23A-1	1.58	46.37	65.94	454.62	142.90	283.33	37.44	53.24	570.90	20
R21A	0.53	48.04	68.31	470.99	142.85	283.33	40.30	57.30	634.85	20
R22A	0.46	47.55	67.61	466.19	142.77	283.33	30.89	43.93	414.06	20
R23A-2	0.88	47.64	67.74	467.07	142.76	283.33	31.45	44.73	421.22	20
R9A	0.85	42.80	60.86	419.62	142.88	283.33	14.92	21.21	288.01	20

Appendix B Wastewater Servicing

B.1 Conceptual Sanitary Sewer Design Sheet





SUBDIVISION:

Barrhaven Town Centre

DATE: 2026-08-20

REVISION: 1

DESIGNED BY: MJ

CHECKED BY: MV

SANITARY SEWER DESIGN SHEET

(City of Ottawa)

FILE NUMBER: 160402206

DESIGN PARAMETERS

MAX PEAK FACTOR (RES.)=	4.0	AVG. DAILY FLOW / PERSON
-------------------------	-----	--------------------------

MIN PEAK FACTOR (RES.)=	2.0	COMMERCIAL
-------------------------	-----	------------

PEAKING FACTOR (INDUSTRIAL):	2.4	INDUSTRIAL (HEAVY)
------------------------------	-----	--------------------

PEAKING FACTOR (ICI >20%):	1.5	INDUSTRIAL (LIGHT)
----------------------------	-----	--------------------

PERSONS / SINGLE	3.4	INSTITUTIONAL
------------------	-----	---------------

PERSONS / TOWNHOME	2.7	INFILTRATION
--------------------	-----	--------------

PERSONS / APARTMENT	1.8
---------------------	-----

AVG. DAILY FLOW / PERSON

COMMERCIAL

INDUSTRIAL (HEAVY)

INDUSTRIAL (LIGHT)

INSTITUTIONAL

INFILTRATION

280 l/p/day

3,000 l/ha/day

5,000 l/ha/day

5,000 l/ha/day

3,000 l/ha/day

0.33 l/s/ha

MINIMUM VELOCITY

MAXIMUM VELOCITY

MANNINGS n

BEDDING CLASS

MINIMUM COVER

HARMON CORRECT

0.60 m/s

3.00 m/s

0.013

B

2.50 m

0.8

LOCATION			RESIDENTIAL AREA AND POPULATION								COMMERCIAL		INDUSTRIAL (L)		INDUSTRIAL (H)		INSTITUTIONAL		GREEN / UNUSED		C+H+I	INFILTRATION			TOTAL	PIPE							
AREA/ID NUMBER	FROM M.H.	TO M.H.	AREA (ha)	SINGLE	UNITS TOWN	APT	POP.	CUMULATIVE POP.	PEAK FACT.	PEAK FLOW (l/s)	AREA (ha)	ACCU. AREA (ha)	AREA (ha)	ACCU. AREA (ha)	AREA (ha)	ACCU. AREA (ha)	AREA (ha)	ACCU. AREA (ha)	AREA (ha)	ACCU. AREA (ha)	PEAK FLOW (l/s)	TOTAL AREA (ha)	ACCU. AREA (ha)	INFILT. FLOW (l/s)	FLOW (l/s)	LENGTH (m)	DIA (mm)	MATERIAL	CLASS	SLOPE (%)	CAP. (FULL) (l/s)	CAP. V PEAK FLOW (%)	VEL. (FULL) (m/s)
R27A	27	26	2.48	0	0	834	1501	2.48	1501	3.14	15.3	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.48	2.48	0.8	16.1	15.8	300	PVC	SDR 35	0.50	67.9	23.73%	0.96
G26A	26	25	0.00	0	0	0	0	2.48	1501	3.14	15.3	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.28	2.28	1.6	16.9	78.5	300	PVC	SDR 35	0.40	60.7	27.77%	0.86
R24A	25	24	0.00	0	0	0	0	2.48	1501	3.14	15.3	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.28	0.0	16.9	114.0	300	PVC	SDR 35	0.40	60.7	27.77%	0.86	
G8A	24	8	1.93	0	0	247	445	4.41	1946	3.08	19.4	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.28	0.0	21.6	21.2	300	PVC	SDR 35	0.40	60.7	35.58%	0.86	
	8	7	0.00	0	0	0	0	4.41	1946	3.08	19.4	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.48	2.76	0.0	21.8	118.0	300	PVC	SDR 35	0.40	60.7	35.84%	0.86	
	7	6	0.00	0	0	0	0	4.41	1946	3.08	19.4	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.76	0.0	21.8	48.8	300	PVC	SDR 35	2.40	148.7	14.63%	2.11	
	6	5	0.00	0	0	0	0	4.41	1946	3.08	19.4	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.76	0.0	21.8	16.1	300	PVC	SDR 35	2.40	148.7	14.63%	2.11	
R14A	14	13	0.69	0	64	0	173	0.69	173	3.54	2.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0	2.2	34.0	200	PVC	SDR 35	0.50	23.6	9.34%	0.74	
R13A	13	12	1.10	0	40	0	108	1.79	281	3.47	3.2	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0	3.8	65.7	200	PVC	SDR 35	0.50	23.6	15.87%	0.74	
R11A, G11A	12	11	0.00	0	0	0	0	1.79	281	3.47	3.2	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0	3.8	12.2	200	PVC	SDR 35	0.50	23.6	15.87%	0.74	
	11	10	0.28	0	8	0	22	2.08	302	3.46	3.4	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.61	0.61	0.0	4.3	43.1	200	PVC	SDR 35	0.50	23.6	18.10%	0.74	
R9A	10	9	0.00	0	0	0	0	2.08	302	3.46	3.4	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.61	0.0	4.3	37.0	200	PVC	SDR 35	0.50	23.6	18.10%	0.74		
	9	5	1.10	0	39	0	105	3.17	408	3.41	4.5	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.61	0.0	5.8	171.8	200	PVC	SDR 35	0.50	23.6	24.37%	0.74		
R18A	18	17	1.49	0	45	0	122	1.49	122	3.58	1.4	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0	1.9	110.6	200	PVC	SDR 35	0.40	21.1	8.99%	0.67	
R23A	23	22	0.79	0	80	0	216	0.79	216	3.51	2.5	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0	2.7	31.8	200	PVC	SDR 35	0.50	23.6	11.49%	0.74	
R22A	22	17	0.40	0	21	0	57	1.19	273	3.48	3.1	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0	3.5	79.7	200	PVC	SDR 35	0.50	23.6	14.65%	0.74	
	17	16	0.00	0	0	0	0	2.68	394	3.42	4.4	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0	5.3	45.6	200	PVC	SDR 35	0.40	21.1	24.84%	0.67	
R21A	21	16	0.49	0	24	0	65	0.49	65	3.63	0.8	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0	0.9	98.1	200	PVC	SDR 35	1.00	33.4	2.76%	1.05	
R16A	16	15	1.30	0	50	0	135	4.47	594	3.35	6.4	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0	7.9	91.1	200	PVC	SDR 35	0.40	21.1	37.45%	0.67	
R20A	20	19	0.63	0	64	0	173	0.63	173	3.54	2.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0	2.2	39.3	200	PVC	SDR 35	0.50	23.6	9.26%	0.74	
R19A	19	15	0.69	0	24	0	65	1.33	238	3.50	2.7	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0	3.1	87.5	200	PVC	SDR 35	1.00	33.4	9.36%	1.05	
	15	5	0.00	0	0	0	0	5.80	832	3.28	8.8	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0	10.8	55.5	200	PVC	SDR 35	1.70	43.6	24.66%	1.37	
	5	4	0.00	0	0	0	0	13.38	3185	2.94	30.3	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.37	0.0	35.8	28.2	300	PVC	SDR 35	0.50	67.9	52.78%	0.96	
R4A	4	3	3.71	0	0	0	501	17.08	3686	2.89	34.5	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.37	0.0	41.3	44.5	300	PVC	SDR 35	0.50	67.9	60.83%	0.96	
G3A	3	2	0.00	0	0	0	0	17.08	3686	2.89	34.5	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.49	3.86	0.0	41.5	45.1	300	PVC	SDR 35	0.50	67.9	61.06%	0.96	
R2A, R2B	2	1	6.27	0	0	0	853	23.35	4539	2.83	41.6	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.86	0.0	50.6	114.6	300	PVC	SDR 35	0.50	67.9	74.48%	0.96		
	1	MH EX-1	0.00	0	0	0	0	23.35	4539	2.83	41.6	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.86	0.0	50.6	33.0	1050	1050	PVC	SDR 35	0.10	910.5	5.55%	1.02	

B.2 Background Report Excerpts and Correspondence





Engineers, Planners & Landscape Architects

Engineering

Land / Site
Development
Municipal
Infrastructure
Environmental /
Water Resources
Traffic/
Transportation
Structural
Recreational

Planning

Land/Site
Development
Planning
Application
Management
Municipal
Planning
Documents &
Studies
Expert Witness
(OMB)
Wireless Industry

Landscape Architecture

Urban Design &
Streetscapes
Recreation & Parks
Planning
Environmental
Restoration
Sustainable Design



City of Ottawa

South Nepean Collector (SNC) Phase 2


**Preliminary Design, Detailed Design, Tender, Contract
Administration and Inspection Services**

Preliminary Design Report

Novatech Project No. 115075
Submitted to the City of Ottawa
March 2, 2016

Engineering excellence. Planning precision. Inspired landscapes.

M:\2015\115075\CAD\Design\Figures\DSK\DSK08_SANArea.dwg, DSK08, Aug 20, 2015 - 1:32pm, nsmi



LEGEND		OTHER LANDS (OPEN SPACE, PARKS, AND SWMFS)	
	EXISTING / PROPOSED HIGH DENSITY RESIDENTIAL		SOUTH NEPEAN COLLECTOR PHASE 1
	EXISTING / PROPOSED MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL		SOUTH NEPEAN COLLECTOR PHASE 2
	EXISTING / PROPOSED LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL		SOUTH NEPEAN COLLECTOR PHASE 3
	EXISTING / PROPOSED COMMERCIAL		SOUTH NEPEAN COLLECTOR NODE ID
	EXISTING / PROPOSED INSTITUTIONAL		

NOVATECH
Engineers, Planners & Landscape Architects
Suite 200, 240 Michael Cowpland Drive
Ottawa, Ontario, Canada K2M 1P6

Telephone (613) 254-9643
Facsimile (613) 254-5867
Website www.novatech-eng.com

**SOUTH NEPEAN
COLLECTOR SEWER**
**SANITARY DRAINAGE
AREAS AND LAND USE**

SCALE 1:20 000
DATE AUG 2015 JOB 115075 FIGURE FIG. 1

PROJECT #: 115075
DESIGNED BY: CMS
CHECKED BY: MJP
DATE: August 20, 2015

SANITARY SEWER DESIGN SHEET

South Nepean Collector - Phase 2 & 3

Theoretical Future Full Service Peak Wastewater Flow



Location			Areas				Population				Individual Design Flows			Cumulative Design Flows				
Area I.D.	Existing / Proposed Land Use	Upstream Node	Gross Commercial Area (ha)	Gross Institutional Area (ha)	Gross Residential Area (ha)	Total Gross Area (ha)	Residential Population Density (people / ha)	Individual Residential Population	Cumulative Residential Population	Residential Peaking Factor (Harmon Eqn ¹)	Commercial Peak Flow Rate ² (50,000 L/ha/d) (L/s)	Institutional Peak Flow Rate ² (50,000 L/ha/d) (L/s)	Infiltration / Inflow Rate (0.28 L/s/ha) (L/s)	Commercial (L/s)	Institutional (L/s)	Infiltration / Inflow (L/s)	Residential Peak Flow Rate (350 L/cap/d) (L/s)	Cumulative Peak Design Flow (L/s)
A1	Commercial	130	12.80			12.80					11.1	0.0	3.6	11.1	0.0	3.6	0.0	14.7
A2-A	Commercial	130	85.18			85.18					73.9	0.0	23.9	85.1	0.0	27.4	0.0	112.5
A2-B	Commercial	130	32.46			32.46					28.2	0.0	9.1	113.2	0.0	36.5	0.0	149.8
A3-A	Low Density Residential	130			16.18	16.18	95.2	1540	1540	3.67	0.0	0.0	4.5	113.2	0.0	41.1	22.9	177.2
A3-B	Institutional	130		10.30		10.30			1540	3.67	0.0	8.9	2.9	113.2	8.9	43.9	22.9	189.0
A3-C	Medium Density Residential	130			5.19	5.19	162.0	841	2381	3.53	0.0	0.0	1.5	113.2	8.9	45.4	34.0	201.6
A3-D	Commercial	130	0.58			0.58			2381	3.53	0.5	0.0	0.2	113.7	8.9	45.6	34.0	202.2
A3-E	Low Density Residential	130			35.68	35.68	95.2	3397	5778	3.19	0.0	0.0	10.0	113.7	8.9	55.5	74.6	252.8
A3-F	Medium Density Residential	130			8.26	8.26	162	1338	7116	3.10	0.0	0.0	2.3	113.7	8.9	57.9	89.4	269.9
A3-G	Institutional	130		0.90		0.90			7116	3.10	0.0	0.8	0.3	113.7	9.7	58.1	89.4	270.9
A4	Low Density Residential	130			34.44	34.44	95.2	3279	10395	2.94	0.0	0.0	9.6	113.7	9.7	67.8	123.7	314.9
A2-C	Commercial (ex. snow dump)	120	15.25			15.25			10395	2.94	13.2	0.0	4.3	127.0	9.7	72.0	123.7	332.4
A3-H	Low Density Residential	120			6.09	6.09	95.2	580	10974	2.91	0.0	0.0	1.7	127.0	9.7	73.7	129.6	340.0
A5	Commercial	110	17.72			17.72			10974	2.91	15.4	0.0	5.0	142.4	9.7	78.7	129.6	360.3
A6-A	Commercial	100	15.18			15.18			10974	2.91	13.2	0.0	4.3	155.5	9.7	82.9	129.6	377.8
A6-B	Institutional	100		6.05		6.05			10974	2.91	0.0	5.3	1.7	155.5	15.0	84.6	129.6	384.7
A6-C	Medium Density Residential	90			4.87	4.87	162.0	789	11763	2.88	0.0	0.0	1.4	155.5	15.0	86.0	137.4	393.9
A6-D	Low Density Residential	90			17.56	17.56	95.2	1672	13435	2.83	0.0	0.0	4.9	155.5	15.0	90.9	153.8	415.2
A6-E	Low Density Residential	90			6.94	6.94	95.2	661	14096	2.81	0.0	0.0	1.9	155.5	15.0	92.9	160.2	423.6
A7-A	Commercial	90	13.62			13.62			14096	2.81	11.8	0.0	3.8	167.4	15.0	96.7	160.2	439.2
A7-B	High Density Residential	90			11.01	11.01	135.0	1486	15582	2.76	0.0	0.0	3.1	167.4	15.0	99.8	174.3	456.4
A7-C	Medium Density Residential	90			6.97	6.97	162.0	1129	16711	2.73	0.0	0.0	2.0	167.4	15.0	101.7	184.9	468.9
A7-D	Medium Density Residential	90			11.74	11.74	162.0	1902	18613	2.68	0.0	0.0	3.3	167.4	15.0	105.0	202.4	489.7
A7-E1/E2	Medium Density Residential	90			9.24	9.24	162.0	1497	20110	2.65	0.0	0.0	2.6	167.4	15.0	107.6	215.9	505.8
A8-A	Commercial	80	28.45			28.45			20110	2.65	24.7	0.0	8.0	192.0	15.0	115.5	215.9	538.5
A8-B	High Density Residential	80			39.34	39.34	135.0	5311	25421	2.55	0.0	0.0	11.0	192.0	15.0	126.6	262.4	596.0
A8-C	Institutional	80		10.52		10.52			25421	2.55	0.0	9.1	2.9	192.0	24.1	129.5	262.4	608.1
A8-D	Low Density Residential	80			16.87	16.87	120.9	2040	27461	2.52	0.0	0.0	4.7	192.0	24.1	134.2	279.8	630.2
ROW Along SNC Sewer Alignment	-	80				14.34			27461	2.52	0.0	0.0	4.0	192.0	24.1	138.2	279.8	634.2
TOTAL		80	221.24	27.77	230.38	493.73	-	27461	27461	2.52	192.0	24.1	134.2	192.0	24.1	138.2	279.8	634.2

Residential Land Use	Population Density (Units / ha)	Persons per Unit	Persons per ha
Low Density (singles and semis)	26 – 28 (28 used)	2.7 – 3.4 (3.4 used)	95.2
Medium Density (row/townhouse)	50 – 60 (60 used)	2.7	162.0
High Density (apartments)	60 – 75 (75 used)	1.8	135.0

Notes:

1. Harmon Equation = 1 + [14 / (4+(P/1000)^{1/2})] x K

Where: P = population; K = correction factor = 1.0

2. Institutional / Commercial Peaking Factor = 1.5

Reported Design Flows / Assumptions:

1. Area A4: Existing single family units currently serviced by Jockvale pump station to be redirected to SNC

2. Area A8-D: proposed 600 medium density residential units

From: [Chetrar, Anton](#)
To: [Smadella, Karin](#); [ahilder](#)
Cc: [siobhan.kelly](#); [jleblanc](#); [KHarper](#); [Shillington, Jeffrey](#)
Subject: RE: Riocan Sanitary Sewer Extension
Date: Friday, August 14, 2026 11:43:49 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)
[image005.png](#)
[image006.png](#)

Good morning Karin and Alex,

Given the concerns brought up regarding the depth of the existing sanitary sewer stub, the disruptive and costly impacts on adjacent existing infrastructure, we agree that the decommissioning of the sanitary sewer stub is not a suitable option. Please consider this comment as resolved. We will request that pre-construction CCTV tapes be completed of the 1050mm sanitary sewer stub to determine the condition of the stub before connection.

Additionally, we received confirmation that there are no sanitary capacity concerns on the proposed density increase of the block identified as drainage area R27A on the sanitary drainage area plan (email received July 23, 2026).

Let me know if you have any questions on the above.

Thanks,

Anton Chetrar | P. Eng

Project Manager, Infrastructure - Gestionnaire de projet, Projets d'infrastructure

Development Review – South Services | Direction de l'examen des projets d'aménagement – Service Sud

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

City of Ottawa | Ville d'Ottawa

110 Laurier Avenue West | 110 avenue Laurier Ouest

Ottawa, ON K1P 1J1

Tel./Tél. 613.580.2424 ext.60865

anton.chetrar@ottawa.ca

From: Smadella, Karin <Karin.Smadella@stantec.com>

Sent: August 12, 2026 3:41 PM

To: Chetrar, Anton <anton.chetrar@ottawa.ca>; Alex Ribout-Hilder <AHilder@minto.com>

Cc: Kelly, Siobhan <siobhan.kelly@ottawa.ca>; Jean-Michel Le Blanc <jleblanc@minto.com>; Kevin A. Harper <kharp@anto.com>; Shillington, Jeffrey <jeff.shillington@ottawa.ca>

Subject: RE: Riocan Sanitary Sewer Extension

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.

Thank you, Anton.

Please let us know if it would be beneficial to hold a short meeting to discuss.

Karin

Karin Smadella, P.Eng.
Principal, Operations Leader



From: Chettrar, Anton <anton.chettrar@ottawa.ca>
Sent: Wednesday, August 12, 2026 3:25 PM
To: ahilder <ahilder@minto.com>
Cc: siobhan.kelly <siobhan.kelly@ottawa.ca>; jleblanc <jleblanc@minto.com>; KHarper <KHarper@minto.com>; Shillington, Jeffrey <jeff.shillington@ottawa.ca>; Smadella, Karin <Karin.Smadella@stantec.com>
Subject: RE: Riocan Sanitary Sewer Extension

Hello Alex,

Thank you for your e-mail. We will consider your points below in our discussions and decision. Hope to have an answer by end of the week.

Regards,

Anton Chettrar | P. Eng

Project Manager, Infrastructure - Gestionnaire de projet, Projets d'infrastructure

Development Review – South Services | Direction de l'examen des projets d'aménagement – Service Sud

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

City of Ottawa | Ville d'Ottawa

110 Laurier Avenue West | 110 avenue Laurier Ouest

Ottawa, ON K1P 1J1

Tel./Tél. 613.580.2424 ext.60865

anton.chettrar@ottawa.ca

From: Alex Ribout-Hilder <AHilder@minto.com>
Sent: August 10, 2026 10:26 AM
To: Chettrar, Anton <anton.chettrar@ottawa.ca>
Cc: Kelly, Siobhan <siobhan.kelly@ottawa.ca>; Jean-Michel Le Blanc <jleblanc@minto.com>; Kevin A. Harper <kharper@minto.com>; Shillington, Jeffrey <jeff.shillington@ottawa.ca>; Smadella, Karin <karin.smadella@stantec.com>
Subject: RE: Riocan Sanitary Sewer Extension

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.

Hello Anton,

My name is Alex Ribout-Hilder, and I'm the Land Development Manager with Minto on this file.

Thank you for the update. From our perspective, retaining the existing 1050 mm sanitary sewer stub remains a practical option, as it continues to provide additional capacity, storage, and system redundancy while avoiding the need to decommission relatively new infrastructure. Based on the proposed flow, the sewer is expected to achieve scour velocities, which would minimize sediment accumulation and associated maintenance requirements. Retaining the stub also preserves flexibility for future growth and wet weather flow management and makes use of existing infrastructure that is already in place. In addition, utilizing the existing stub would avoid the potential impacts, construction risks, and disruption to existing infrastructure and nearby residents associated with constructing a new connection to SAN MH EX-1. Overall, we believe there is value in

maintaining a functional asset that can continue to contribute to the performance and resilience of the sanitary network.

Please consider this in your discussions and decision.

Thanks,
Alex



Alex Ribout-Hilder
Land Development Manager
MINTO GROUP
200 - 180 Kent Street, Ottawa, ON, K1P 0B6
T [613.219.1439](tel:613.219.1439)



Follow us on



You are receiving this email because you may have expressly consented to receive commercial electronic messages from Minto Group and affiliates. To unsubscribe, please [click here](#). [Click here](#) to access our privacy policy.
This message is intended only for the named recipients and may contain privileged, confidential or personal information. If you have received this communication in error, please reply by e-mail to the sender and delete or destroy all copies of this message. Any other distribution, disclosure or copying is strictly prohibited.

From: Chetrar, Anton <anton.chetrar@ottawa.ca>

Sent: Monday, August 10, 2026 9:38 AM

To: Smadella, Karin <karin.smadella@stantec.com>

Cc: Kelly, Siobhan <siobhan.kelly@ottawa.ca>; Jean-Michel Le Blanc <JLeBlanc@minto.com>; Kevin A. Harper <KHarper@minto.com>; Alex Ribout-Hilder <ARHilder@minto.com>; Shillington, Jeffrey <jeff.shillington@ottawa.ca>

Subject: RE: Riocan Sanitary Sewer Extension

EXTERNAL EMAIL

Hi Karin,

Having an oversized pipe and the depth at which it is installed does not benefit the City from an operational perspective (future maintenance and repairs). We are having internal discussions later this week on this item (the preferred decommissioning method) and we will bring up the concerns you brought up below for consideration.

I will keep you posted on the outcome of the discussions.

Thanks,

Anton Chetrar | P. Eng

Project Manager, Infrastructure - Gestionnaire de projet, Projets d'infrastructure

Development Review – South Services | Direction de l'examen des projets d'aménagement – Service Sud

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

City of Ottawa | Ville d'Ottawa

110 Laurier Avenue West | 110 avenue Laurier Ouest

Ottawa, ON K1P 1J1

Tel./Tél. 613.580.2424 ext.60865

anton.chetrar@ottawa.ca

From: Smadella, Karin <Karin.Smadella@stantec.com>

Sent: August 06, 2026 2:32 PM

To: Chettrar, Anton <anton.chettrar@ottawa.ca>

Cc: Kelly, Siobhan <siobhan.kelly@ottawa.ca>; Jean-Michel Le Blanc <jleblanc@minto.com>; Kevin A. Harper <kharper@minto.com>; Alex Ribout-Hilder <ARHilder@minto.com>; Shillington, Jeffrey <jeff.shillington@ottawa.ca>

Subject: RE: Riocan Sanitary Sewer Extension

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

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

Hi Anton – Thank you for the comments. We will review and get back to you if we have any questions.

In the short term, can you please clarify the rationale for requesting a connection to San MH EX-1 as opposed to the 1050mm stub? This would be a very disruptive and costly connection impacting the trunk and local storm sewers, watermain and roadway. Note that the sanitary stub is significantly lower than the adjacent infrastructure.



Thanks,

Karin

Karin Smadella, P.Eng.
Principal, Operations Leader



From: Chettrar, Anton <anton.chettrar@ottawa.ca>

Sent: Wednesday, August 5, 2026 9:15 AM

To: Smadella, Karin <Karin.Smadella@stantec.com>

Cc: siobhan.kelly <siobhan.kelly@ottawa.ca>; jleblanc <jleblanc@minto.com>; KHarper <KHarper@minto.com>; ahilder <ahilder@minto.com>; Shillington, Jeffrey <jeff.shillington@ottawa.ca>

Subject: RE: Riocan Sanitary Sewer Extension

Good morning Karin,

Please find link below with comments (marked up) on the provided civil drawings and memo.

Additionally, included in the link is the geotechnical investigation completed as part of the storm trunk sewer project within Riocan Avenue/Chapman Mills.

 [Riocan Sanitary Sewer Extension](#)

We are still waiting on a couple of responses internally (including available sanitary capacity) and will provide those once staff is back from vacation.

Please let me know if you have any questions or if any issues accessing the link.

Regards,

Anton Chetrar | P. Eng

Project Manager, Infrastructure - Gestionnaire de projet, Projets d'infrastructure

Development Review – South Services | Direction de l'examen des projets d'aménagement – Service Sud

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

City of Ottawa | Ville d'Ottawa

110 Laurier Avenue West | 110 avenue Laurier Ouest

Ottawa, ON K1P 1J1

Tel./Tél. 613.580.2424 ext.60865

anton.chetrar@ottawa.ca

From: Shillington, Jeffrey <jeff.shillington@ottawa.ca>

Sent: August 04, 2026 1:52 PM

To: Smadella, Karin <karin.smadella@stantec.com>

Cc: Kelly, Siobhan <siobhan.kelly@ottawa.ca>; Jean-Michel Le Blanc <jleblanc@minto.com>; KHarper <KHarper@minto.com>; Alex Ribout-Hilder <ARHilder@minto.com>; Chetrar, Anton <anton.chetrar@ottawa.ca>

Subject: RE: Riocan Sanitary Sewer Extension

Hi Karin,

Yes we have received everything and it is currently under review. Anton (cc'd) will follow up shortly with comments.

Jeff

From: Smadella, Karin <Karin.Smadella@stantec.com>

Sent: Tuesday, August 4, 2026 1:47 PM

To: Shillington, Jeffrey <jeff.shillington@ottawa.ca>

Cc: Kelly, Siobhan <siobhan.kelly@ottawa.ca>; Jean-Michel Le Blanc <jleblanc@minto.com>; KHarper <KHarper@minto.com>; Alex Ribout-Hilder <ARHilder@minto.com>

Subject: RE: Riocan Sanitary Sewer Extension

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

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

Hi Jeff – Just checking in on this. Are you able to confirm receipt as advise whether the information was circulated to the asset management group who maintain the wastewater model?

Thanks,

Karin

Karin Smadella, P.Eng.

Principal, Operations Leader



From: Smadella, Karin

Sent: Thursday, July 23, 2026 5:14 PM

To: 'Shillington, Jeffrey' <jeff.shillington@ottawa.ca>

Cc: 'Kelly, Siobhan' <siobhan.kelly@ottawa.ca>; 'Jean-Michel Le Blanc' <jleblanc@minto.com>; 'Kevin A. Harper' <KHarper@minto.com>; Alex Ribout-Hilder <ahilder@minto.com>

Subject: RE: Riocan Sanitary Sewer Extension

Hi Jeff

We have been informed that there is interest in increasing the residential density of the block identified as drainage area R27A on the sanitary drainage area plan shared with you on Friday (available at the link below).

To demonstrate the impact of the proposed increase in density, we have prepared the attached design sheet with a population of 1,500 people for area R27A. There is no concern with sewer capacity, however this population increase would result in a flow from the Riocan sewer drainage area that is higher than that assumed in the South Nepean Collector Sewer (SNC) design report.

The increased density for R27A would result in an increase in flow of approximately 6 L/s over that assumed for the Riocan sewer drainage area (part of area A8-B per the SNC design). The SNC design was based on large, lumped drainage areas with a peaking factor of 2.55 applied to the combined area of A8-A and A8-B. Given that the drainage area contributing to the Riocan sewer forms only a portion of the overall drainage area contributing at Node 70 of the SNC and much of the area is already developed, it is unclear whether this increase in density would result in an increase in flow to the SNC from the overall drainage area.

We have prepared the table below to compare the flow from the 23.44ha drainage area to the Riocan sewer per the SNC report to the design flow for the same drainage area using proposed densities (including a population of 1500 for R27A) and current design criteria. As demonstrated, the difference is approximately 6 L/s. Note that we have used the peaking factor (PF) applied to the drainage area in the SNC report to be able to demonstrate the impact. The peaking factors applied in the attached design sheet are based on the smaller drainage area contributing to the Riocan sewer whereas the SNC report lumped much larger drainage areas to reflect the peak flow to the SNC.

**Design Flow to Riocan Sewer (part of area A8-B) SNC vs
BTC Ph2 w Population of 1500 for R27A**

		Residential Peak Flow (L/s)	I/I (L/s)	Peak Design Flow (L/s)
SNC Report A8-B				
Residential flowrate	350 L/p/d	32.7	6.6	39.3
Infiltration allowance	0.28 L/ha			
Residential PF for drainage area*	2.55			
Density	135 p/ha			
BTC PH2 w 1500 pop for R27A				
Residential flowrate	280 L/p/d	37.6	7.7	45.3
Infiltration allowance	0.33 L/ha			
Residential PF for drainage area*	2.55			
Density = 4541 people/23.44 ha	194 p/ha			

Riocan Sewer Drainage Area 23.44 ha

*PF used in SNC report applied to permit comparison

Are you able to consult with the wastewater modeling group to ask if there is a concern with the proposed design flow

contribution to the 1,350mm trunk in Longfields and the SNC given existing flows and capacity of the downstream system?

We would be happy to meet to discuss. Please reach out if you have any questions.

Karin

Karin Smadella, P.Eng.
Principal, Operations Leader



From: Smadella, Karin

Sent: Friday, July 17, 2026 5:19 PM

To: Shillington, Jeffrey <jeff.shillington@ottawa.ca>

Cc: Kelly, Siobhan <siobhan.kelly@ottawa.ca>; Jean-Michel Le Blanc <jleblanc@minto.com>; Kevin A. Harper <KHarp@mino.com>

Subject: Riocan Sanitary Sewer Extension

Hi Jeff,

Further to our meeting in June, I have included a link below to a copy of the initial detailed design for the sanitary sewer extension along future Riocan Avenue and Chapman Mills Drive. As requested, the design drawings are accompanied by a technical memorandum.

We would appreciate the City's input on future sewer connection locations within the City parcel south of Minto's BTC Phase 2 lands.

We have not yet received geotechnical information for the Chapman Mills portion of the GRSTWE project or for the lands south of Minto's BTC subdivision associated with the trunk storm sewer construction. We may need to request your assistance in gaining access to that information.

 [2026-07-17 Riocan Sewer Extension to City of Ottawa](#)

Please review and reach out if you have any questions.

Thank you,

Karin

Karin Smadella, P.Eng.
Principal, Operations Leader

Direct: (613) 724-4371

Mobile: 613-698-8088

karin.smadella@stantec.com



With every community, we redefine what's possible.

The content of this email is the confidential property of Stantec and should not be copied, modified, retransmitted, or used for any purpose except with Stantec's written authorization. If you are not the intended recipient, please delete all copies and notify us immediately. For a list of Stantec's operating entities with associated license and registration information, please visit stantec.com.

,

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

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

est interdite. Je vous remercie de votre collaboration.

Caution: This email originated from outside of Stantec. Please take extra precaution.

Attention: Ce courriel provient de l'extérieur de Stantec. Veuillez prendre des précautions supplémentaires.

Atención: Este correo electrónico proviene de fuera de Stantec. Por favor, tome precauciones adicionales.

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

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

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

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

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

Caution: This email originated from outside of Stantec. Please take extra precaution.

Attention: Ce courriel provient de l'extérieur de Stantec. Veuillez prendre des précautions supplémentaires.

Atención: Este correo electrónico proviene de fuera de Stantec. Por favor, tome precauciones adicionales.

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

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

Caution: This email originated from outside of Stantec. Please take extra precaution.

Attention: Ce courriel provient de l'extérieur de Stantec. Veuillez prendre des précautions supplémentaires.

Atención: Este correo electrónico proviene de fuera de Stantec. Por favor, tome precauciones adicionales.

Wu, Michael

From: Smadella, Karin
Sent: January 16, 2026 16:25
To: 'Cassidy, Tyler'; Shillington, Jeffrey
Cc: Kevin A. Harper; Thiffault, Dustin
Subject: RE: Barrhaven Town Centre Phase 2

Hi Tyler

Thank you for this information.

We will assume a density of 135 persons/ha lands external to the subdivision as directed below. Given the extent of lands diverted from the Riocan trunk through the Minto subdivision, flows contributing at Node 70 will be less than assumed as part of the South Nepean Collector (SNC) sewer design. How the functional design flows compare with the flows assumed as part of the SNC design will be addressed as part of the functional design report for the plan of subdivision.

Have a good weekend.

Karin

Karin Smadella, P.Eng.
Principal, Operations Leader



From: Cassidy, Tyler <tyler.cassidy@ottawa.ca>
Sent: Tuesday, January 13, 2026 4:39 PM
To: Smadella, Karin <Karin.Smadella@stantec.com>; Shillington, Jeffrey <jeff.shillington@ottawa.ca>
Cc: Kevin A. Harper <KHarper@minto.com>; Thiffault, Dustin <Dustin.Thiffault@stantec.com>
Subject: RE: Barrhaven Town Centre Phase 2

Hi Karin,

I have provided the answers I could to your inquiry below. The information we have in the South Nepean Collector : Phase 2 Hydraulics Review/Assessment is the best we have to go off.

- What use/density is to be considered for lands that do not form part of the BTC Ph 2 subdivision?
[The density identified in the SNC study \(high-density residential\).](#)
- Should the portions of A8-A and B that have been diverted to Longfields be considered in the Riocan sewer sizing? Note that there was no sanitary sewer considered in the upstream segments of Riocan.
[Any portion of A8-A and A8-B that have been permanently diverted to Longfields sanitary system do not need to be considered in the Riocan sanitary sewer study.](#)

I've met with our IWSD and Trunk Sewer Planning departments to discuss this portion of the South Nepean Collector. Both groups would like more information on your proposal before signing off on the design concept. If you could please provide a memo that addresses the following items for their review:

- Are any flows to the SNC from this application greater than what is identified in the SNC study?
- An updated design sheet for the SNC which incorporates the flows from this application and any other known future development (acknowledging Minto owns the majority of this area). The density provided in the SNC study can be used for any areas where the information may be missing.
- Sanitary drainage map that identifies the contributing flows from this area (A8-B) and how it meets or deviates from the SNC study.

If you would like to have a discussion regarding the above, I'm happy to set up a meeting. Please let me know and I can coordinate.

Thank you,

Tyler Cassidy, P.Eng

Infrastructure Project Manager,

Planning, Development and Building Services department (PDBS)/ Direction générale des services de la planification, de l'aménagement et du bâtiment (DGSPAB) - South Branch

City of Ottawa | Ville d'Ottawa

110 Laurier Avenue West Ottawa, ON | 110, avenue. Laurier Ouest. Ottawa (Ontario) K1P 1J1

613.580.2424 ext./poste 12977, Tyler.Cassidy@ottawa.ca

Classified as City of Ottawa - Internal / Ville d'Ottawa - classé interne

From: Smadella, Karin <Karin.Smadella@stantec.com>

Sent: January 07, 2026 11:07 AM

To: Cassidy, Tyler <tyler.cassidy@ottawa.ca>; Shillington, Jeffrey <jeff.shillington@ottawa.ca>

Cc: Kevin A. Harper <KHarper@minto.com>; Thiffault, Dustin <dustin.thiffault@stantec.com>; Bougadis, John <John.Bougadis@ottawa.ca>

Subject: RE: Barrhaven Town Centre Phase 2

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

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

Hi all – Hope everyone had a nice time over the holidays.

I am following up on this item. Would it be helpful if I set up a short mtg to discuss?

Thanks,

Karin

Karin Smadella, P.Eng.

Principal, Operations Leader



From: Smadella, Karin

Sent: Wednesday, December 17, 2025 2:31 PM

To: Cassidy, Tyler <tyler.cassidy@ottawa.ca>; Shillington, Jeffrey <jeff.shillington@ottawa.ca>

Cc: Kevin A. Harper <KHarper@minto.com>; Thiffault, Dustin <Dustin.Thiffault@stantec.com>; Bougadis, John <john.bougadis@ottawa.ca>

Subject: Barrhaven Town Centre Phase 2

Hi Tyler/Jeff

At the September 25th preconsultation meeting for Minto's Barrhaven Town Centre (BTC) Phase 2 development, we requested confirmation of the drainage area to be considered for the design of the sanitary sewer in Riocan to connect to the stub at Longfields opposite Paul Metivier. The following comment was included with the preconsultation notes provided by the file lead.

- c. Sanitary: Connect to the existing 1050mm dia. Stub at the intersection of Riocan and Paul Metivier Drive. Note that the 250 mm dia. sewer on Longfields Drive does not have the capacity to support this application. At this time we have not located a sanitary drainage area plan or design sheet to confirm flows on the proposed sanitary sewer on Riocan. If and when we are able to locate any information on the Riocan sanitary sewer we will provide this information to the applicant and their consultant.

Can you please advise if you now have the requested information?

I have attached the drainage area plan and design assumptions for the South Nepean Collector Sewer (March 2016 Report). As noted, areas A8-A and A8-B would have potentially contributed to the sanitary stub at Longfields and Paul Metivier. A8-A (Commercial) is currently developed and is directed to Longfields upstream. A portion of A8-B has also been developed and is also directed to Longfields upstream. That leaves an area of approximately 33 ha undeveloped/to be redeveloped which will be accounted for as part of Minto's BTC Phase 2 development and design of the sanitary sewer outlet.

Can you please confirm:

- Is this the entire drainage area to be considered?
- What use/density is to be considered for lands that do not form part of the BTC Ph 2 subdivision?
- Should the portions of A8-A and B that have been diverted to Longfields be considered in the Riocan sewer sizing? Note that there was no sanitary sewer considered in the upstream segments of Riocan.

I have copied John Bougadis as he may be able to help with clarifying the design requirements. We are hoping to have this item resolved as soon as possible to be able to proceed further with the functional design.

Happy to have a quick meeting to discuss.

Thank you,

Karin

Karin Smadella, P.Eng.
Principal, Operations Leader

Direct: (613) 724-4371
Mobile: 613-698-8088
karin.smadella@stantec.com



With every community, we redefine what's possible.

The content of this email is the confidential property of Stantec and should not be copied, modified, retransmitted, or used for any purpose except with Stantec's written authorization. If you are not the intended recipient, please delete all copies and notify us immediately. For a list of Stantec's operating entities with associated license and registration information, please visit stantec.com.

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

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

Caution: This email originated from outside of Stantec. Please take extra precaution.

Attention: Ce courriel provient de l'extérieur de Stantec. Veuillez prendre des précautions supplémentaires.

Atención: Este correo electrónico proviene de fuera de Stantec. Por favor, tome precauciones adicionales.

Appendix C Stormwater Management

C.1 Storm Sewer Design Sheet



C.2 Conceptual PCSWMM Model Outputs



EPA STORM WATER MANAGEMENT MODEL - VERSION 5.2 (Build 5.2.4)

Element Count

Number of rain gages 4
 Number of subcatchments ... 2
 Number of nodes 6
 Number of links 6
 Number of pollutants 0
 Number of land uses 0

Raingage Summary

Name	Data Source	Data Type	Recording Interval
CHI_002	CHI_002	INTENSITY	10 min.
CHI_005	CHI_005	INTENSITY	10 min.
CHI_100	CHI_100	INTENSITY	10 min.
CHI_120	CHI_120	INTENSITY	10 min.

Subcatchment Summary

Name Outlet	Area	Width	%Imperv	%Slope	Rain Gage
----------------	------	-------	---------	--------	-----------

C100A_1 SU1	4.74	179.39	72.86	1.5000	CHI_100
C100A_2 SU3	4.21	169.12	72.86	1.5000	CHI_100

Node Summary

Name	Type	Invert Elev.	Max. Depth	Ponded Area	External Inflow
T07	JUNCTION	88.89	8.71	0.0	
OF1	OUTFALL	89.18	0.00	0.0	

T08	OUTFALL	88.75	1.65	0.0
SU1	STORAGE	93.42	1.73	0.0
SU2	STORAGE	92.00	1.00	0.0
SU3	STORAGE	94.49	1.68	0.0

Link Summary

Name	From Node	To Node	Type	Length
------	-----------	---------	------	--------

C1	T07	T08	CONDUIT	44.6
0.3139	0.0130			
OR1	SU2	OF1	ORIFICE	
W1	SU1	SU2	WEIR	
W2	SU3	SU2	WEIR	
OL1	SU1	T07	OUTLET	
OL2	SU3	T07	OUTLET	

Cross Section Summary

Full		Full	Hyd.	Max.	No. of
Conduit	Shape	Depth	Area	Rad.	Width
Flow					Barrels

C1	CIRCULAR	1.65	2.14	0.41	1.65	1
5106.86						

Analysis Options

Flow Units LPS

Process Models:

Rainfall/Runoff YES

RDII NO

Snowmelt NO

Groundwater NO

Flow Routing YES

Ponding Allowed YES

Water Quality NO

Infiltration Method HORTON

Flow Routing Method DYNWAVE
 Surge Method EXTRAN
 Starting Date 01/23/2026 00:00:00
 Ending Date 01/23/2026 03:00:00
 Antecedent Dry Days 0.0
 Report Time Step 00:01:00
 Wet Time Step 00:01:00
 Dry Time Step 00:05:00
 Routing Time Step 1.00 sec
 Variable Time Step NO
 Maximum Trials 8
 Number of Threads 1
 Head Tolerance 0.001500 m

*****	Volume	Depth
Runoff Quantity Continuity	hectare-m	mm
*****	-----	-----
Total Precipitation	0.634	70.853
Evaporation Loss	0.000	0.000
Infiltration Loss	0.109	12.205
Surface Runoff	0.480	53.606
Final Storage	0.046	5.104
Continuity Error (%)	-0.087	

*****	Volume	Volume
Flow Routing Continuity	hectare-m	10^6 ltr
*****	-----	-----
Dry Weather Inflow	0.000	0.000
Wet Weather Inflow	0.480	4.796
Groundwater Inflow	0.000	0.000
RDII Inflow	0.000	0.000
External Inflow	0.000	0.000
External Outflow	0.437	4.367
Flooding Loss	0.000	0.000
Evaporation Loss	0.000	0.000
Exfiltration Loss	0.000	0.000
Initial Stored Volume	0.000	0.000
Final Stored Volume	0.074	0.737
Continuity Error (%)	-6.429	

 Highest Flow Instability Indexes

 Link OL2 (42)
 Link OL1 (40)
 Link W2 (18)
 Link C1 (14)

Link W1 (6)

Most Frequent Nonconverging Nodes

Node OF1 (18.09%)

Node T08 (18.09%)

Node SU1 (14.09%)

Node SU3 (12.34%)

Node T07 (1.12%)

Routing Time Step Summary

Minimum Time Step : 1.00 sec

Average Time Step : 1.00 sec

Maximum Time Step : 1.00 sec

% of Time in Steady State : 0.00

Average Iterations per Step : 3.80

% of Steps Not Converging : 18.09

Subcatchment Runoff Summary

Perv	Total	Total	Total	Total	Total	Total	Imperv
Runoff	Runoff	Runoff	Precip	Runoff	Evap	Infil	Runoff
Subcatchment	Runoff	Runoff	Runoff	Runoff	Coeff		
mm	mm	10^6 ltr	mm	mm	mm	mm	mm

C100A_1			70.85	0.00	0.00	12.21	46.80
6.74	53.54	2.54	1748.95	0.756			
C100A_2			70.85	0.00	0.00	12.21	46.86
6.82	53.67	2.26	1569.60	0.758			

Node Depth Summary

Node	Type	Average Depth Meters	Maximum Depth Meters	Maximum HGL Meters	Time of Max Occurrence days hr:min	Reported Max Depth Meters
T07	JUNCTION	0.23	0.47	89.36	0 01:00	0.46
OF1	OUTFALL	0.00	0.00	89.18	0 00:00	0.00
T08	OUTFALL	0.23	0.45	89.20	0 01:01	0.45
SU1	STORAGE	0.26	1.73	95.15	0 01:10	1.73
SU2	STORAGE	0.46	0.98	92.98	0 01:24	0.98
SU3	STORAGE	0.24	1.57	96.06	0 01:10	1.57

Node Inflow Summary

Total Inflow Volume Node ltr	Flow Balance Error Percent	Type	Maximum Lateral Inflow LPS	Maximum Total Inflow LPS	Time of Max Occurrence days hr:min	Lateral Inflow Volume 10^6 ltr	10^6
T07		JUNCTION	0.00	805.50	0 01:00	0	
3.4	0.146						
OF1		OUTFALL	0.00	173.55	0 01:24	0	
0.973	0.000						
T08		OUTFALL	0.00	852.23	0 01:01	0	
3.39	0.000						
SU1		STORAGE	1748.95	1748.95	0 01:10	2.54	
2.54	-5.775						
SU2		STORAGE	0.00	2553.67	0 01:10	0	
1.7	0.005						
SU3		STORAGE	1569.60	1569.60	0 01:10	2.26	
2.26	-6.240						

Node Surcharge Summary

No nodes were surcharged.

Node Flooding Summary

No nodes were flooded.

Storage Volume Summary

Max		Average	Avg	Evap	Exfil	Maximum	Max	Time of
Maximum		Volume	Pcnt	Pcnt	Pcnt	Volume	Pcnt	
Occurrence	Outflow	1000 m	Full	Loss	Loss	1000 m	Full	days
Storage Unit								
hr:min	LPS							
SU1		0.000	14.8	0.0	0.0	0.002	99.8	0
01:10	1758.78							
SU2		0.708	45.7	0.0	0.0	1.516	97.8	0
01:24	173.55							
SU3		0.000	14.4	0.0	0.0	0.002	93.4	0
01:10	1600.39							

Outfall Loading Summary

Outfall Node	Flow Freq Pcnt	Avg Flow LPS	Max Flow LPS	Total Volume 10^6 ltr
OF1	65.96	136.58	173.55	0.973
T08	76.63	410.12	852.23	3.394
System	71.30	546.70	979.05	4.367

Link Flow Summary

Link	Type	Maximum Flow LPS	Time of Max Occurrence days hr:min	Maximum Veloc m/sec	Max/ Full Flow	Max/ Full Depth
C1	CONDUIT	852.23	0 01:01	1.78	0.17	0.28
OR1	ORIFICE	173.55	0 01:24			1.00
W1	WEIR	1332.18	0 01:10			0.99
W2	WEIR	1221.49	0 01:10			0.63
OL1	DUMMY	426.60	0 00:59			
OL2	DUMMY	378.90	0 00:59			

Flow Classification Summary

	Adjusted	Fraction of Time in Flow Class							
	/Actual	Up	Down	Sub	Sup	Up	Down	Norm	
Inlet									
Conduit	Length	Dry	Dry	Dry	Crit	Crit	Crit	Crit	Ltd
Ctrl									
C1	1.00	0.23	0.00	0.00	0.73	0.04	0.00	0.00	0.00
0.00									

Conduit Surcharge Summary

No conduits were surcharged.

Analysis begun on: Tue Sep 8 15:39:56 2026
Analysis ended on: Tue Sep 8 15:39:56 2026
Total elapsed time: < 1 sec

C.3 Background Report Excerpts and Correspondence





Report

Nepean South Chapman Mills Stormwater Management Servicing Fourth Addendum



Prepared for Minto Communities – Canada
by IBI Group
February 16, 2018

2006				UPDATED			
DRAINAGE AREA		WEIGHTED IMP (%) [TIME OF CONC. (H)]		DRAINAGE AREA		WEIGHTED IMP (%) [TIME OF CONC. (H)]	
ID	AREA (HA)	TOTAL	DIRECTLY CONNECTED	ID	AREA (HA)	TOTAL	DIRECTLY CONNECTED
H1	3.2	80	80	H1	3.52	74	74
I1	5.5	[0.25]	N/A	I1	6.0	[0.25]	[N/A]
	196.7 ha				199.1 ha		

(1) Superseded by EXP detailed design, refer to servicing brief (minor flow tributary to Temagami Drive trunk sewer)

(2) Superseded by EXP detailed design, refer to servicing brief (minor flow tributary to Leamington Way trunk sewer)

Due to the expansion of the drainage area to the south to accommodate the future east-west road between future Greenbank Road and Longfields Drive, as well as the discretization associated with detailed design, the total drainage area has increased by approximately 2.4 ha. Although the overall area remains consistent with the 2006 Servicing Report, the drainage areas tributary to each trunk storm sewer and interceptor manhole have been revised and are presented in the below table. **Figures 3A** and **3B** present the drainage areas to each trunk storm sewer in the original and updated scenarios.

Table 2.2 Drainage areas to interceptor manholes

INTERCEPTOR	AREA (HA)	
	2006	UPDATED
Eastern MH 110	30.2	50.8
Central MH 101	57.0	35.6
Western MH 9077	104.0	103.9
	191.2 ha	190.3 ha

2.2 Major System

Major flow from Chapman Mills is tributary to the Jock River, via multiple outlets.

The changes within the development area that have represented the most significant adjustment to major flow since the 2006 Servicing Report are related to the increase in drainage area towards Temagami Drive (refer to **Section 2.4.1**), and those currently proposed for the undeveloped lands west of Longfields Drive (refer to **Sections 2.5.2** and **2.5.3**).

Major flow is evaluated with the 100 year 3 hour Chicago storm. **Figure 2A** presents the revised maximum cumulative major flow values, as well as delineates the areas to each major system outlet. The figure from the 2006 Servicing Report summarizing the original flows is also enclosed (**Figure 2B**).

A summary of the maximum cumulative major flow values at each major flow outlet is presented in the below table (refer to **Figure 2A** for a depiction of the areas contributing to each outlet).

Table 2.3 Maximum cumulative major flow at each outlet

MAJOR FLOW OUTLET		FLOW (CMS) 100 YEAR 3 HOUR CHICAGO STORM
Woodlot (Area B2_B)		<i>Refer to DME's Stage 6 and 7 Detailed Design</i>
Eastern (Ravine 2)	Surface Flow on Temagami Dr.	0.9
	Captured by Minor System (U/S of Interceptor MH)	0.9
	Captured by Minor System (D/S of Interceptor MH)	1.2
	To Existing Culvert	0.2
Jock River, East of SWM Facility		0.5
SWM Facility via Longfields Dr.		0
SWM Facility via Paul Métivier Dr.		1.7
Proposed Outlet West of Longfields Dr.		8.6

It should be noted that major system flow from residential development northeast of Chapman Mills Drive and Longfields Drive (identified as Area E2), is directed to Longfields Drive. Area E2 itself receives cascading flow from a small portion of the woodlot (Area B2_Bii). Major flow from Chapman Mills Drive east of Longfields Drive (Areas E4_Cii and DME-9071) also cascades to Longfields Drive. No other drainage areas contribute major system flow to Longfields Drive; the surface flow on the road cascades downstream and the 100 year flow generated on the road at the downstream low point (in the vicinity of the SWM facility) is captured by the minor system.

Major flow for the undeveloped lands west of Longfields Drive is discussed in detail in **Sections 2.5.2 and 2.5.3**.

2.3 Minor System

The trunk storm system is presented on **Figure 3A** and the figure from the 2006 Servicing Report showing the original minor system configuration is included as **Figure 3B**.

In order to maintain the first flush diversion (equivalent to the 25 mm 4 hour Chicago storm event) following the 2009 updates to the minor system configuration, a secondary interceptor was incorporated into the stormwater management system. Specifically, a local sewer was adjusted and extends from the Eastern Interceptor MH 110 along Haileybury Street and Bren Maur Road to the Central Interceptor MH 101 (refer to **Figure 3A**). With this revised arrangement, the first flush diversion to the SWM facility is maintained during the 25 mm storm event. As further updates to the modeling have been completed, the first flush diversion to the pond has been evaluated.

Table 2.4 Intercepted flow during first flush conditions

INTERCEPTOR MH	INTERCEPTED FLOW (CMS) 25 MM 4 HOUR CHICAGO STORM	
	2006	UPDATED
Eastern MH 110 ⁽¹⁾	1.48	1.34 + 0.77 = 2.11
Central MH 101 ⁽²⁾	3.50	3.22
Western MH 9077 ⁽³⁾	8.40	7.89

(1) Combined intercepted flow in two interceptor sewers from Eastern Interceptor MH; sum of XPSWMM Link65 and Link157

(2) Combined intercepted flow from Eastern and Central Interceptor MH; XPSWMM Link EAST IN

(3) XPSWMM Link WEST IN

The system was evaluated during the 100 year 24 hour SCS Type II storm event for the purposes of surcharge analysis, and at the City's request for this current addendum, for the 100 year 3 hour Chicago storm. The results of the hydraulic grade line analysis are summarized below.

Table 2.5 Hydraulic grade line elevations

TRUNK	MH	HGL (M)		
		100 YEAR 24 HOUR SCS TYPE II STORM		100 YEAR 3 HOUR CHICAGO STORM
		2012	UPDATED	
Eastern (Temagami)	233	92.76	92.75	92.52
	205	92.62	92.62	92.40
	204	92.39	92.39	92.21
	203	92.05	92.06	91.92
	202	91.63	91.64	91.54
	201/9009	91.11	91.14	91.08
	213	90.65	90.68	90.64
	228	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Eastern Interceptor MH 110	N/A	N/A	N/A
	112	N/A	N/A	N/A
	111	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Eastern Overflow	N/A	N/A	N/A
Central (Leamington)	236	N/A	N/A	N/A
	228	N/A	N/A	N/A
	227	90.89	90.93	90.90
	226A	90.38	90.42	90.35
	225/9047	90.04	90.07	89.98
Interceptor Sewer (Paul Métivier)	212	90.33	90.36	90.31
	211	90.14	90.17	90.11
	210	89.98	90.01	89.93
	209	89.85	89.88	89.79
	208	89.78	89.81	89.71
	207	90.04	90.07	89.98
	206	89.65	89.68	89.56
	205	88.93	88.96	88.79
	204	N/A	N/A	N/A
	100	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Central Interceptor MH 101	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Central Overflow	86.78	86.78	85.03
Interceptor Sewer (Haileybury to Bren Maur)	266	89.73	89.74	89.70
	226	89.58	89.59	89.53
	225	89.38	89.40	89.30
	224	89.22	89.24	89.12
	254	89.00	89.02	88.86
	253	88.75	88.77	88.57
	252	88.67	88.70	88.49

TRUNK	MH	HGL (M)		
		100 YEAR 24 HOUR SCS TYPE II STORM		100 YEAR 3 HOUR CHICAGO STORM
		2012	UPDATED	
	252A	88.61	88.64	88.42
Western (Longfields)	9074	N/A	N/A	90.58
	9054	N/A	N/A	90.07
	9053	89.77	89.65	89.77
	TO11/9076	90.04	89.90	90.02
	1	89.08	88.92	88.96
	Western Interceptor MH 9077	N/A	N/A	N/A
	9078	N/A	N/A	N/A
	9079	N/A	N/A	N/A
	9080	N/A	N/A	N/A
	9081	N/A	N/A	N/A
	9082	N/A	N/A	N/A
	9083	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Western Overflow	N/A	N/A	N/A
SWM Facility		88.53	88.47	88.22

Note: N/A indicates free flow conditions

The HGL was established in the 2006 Servicing Report and has been evaluated at critical locations to reflect subsequent changes in design. Previous to the preparation of this addendum, the most recent HGL evaluation had been submitted to the City as part of the 2012 Addendum. At the time, the HGL was reviewed by the engineer consultants conducting the detailed design. Overall, it was confirmed that the 0.3 m clearance between the HGL and underside of footings is maintained along the trunk sewers at relevant locations. The exception was at MH 9053, located on Longfields Drive at Paul Métivier Drive. The HGL at this location was 89.77 m, resulting in a 0.27 m clearance between HGL and USF at one townhouse unit on Paul Métivier Drive. It is IBI's understanding that the 2012 HGL values were acceptable. The aim of the present analysis was to not exceed those values.

The current updates to the modeling are tributary to the western trunk storm sewer. HGL values are generally consistent with those of 2012 with slight increases in the sewers east of Longfields Drive in the order of 1 and 2 cm. The critical HGL location in the western trunk remains MH 9053. The resulting HGL at this location during the more critical of the 100 year events (at this location the 100 year 3 hour Chicago storm) is 89.77 m, consistent with the June 2012 submission. There are free flow conditions at all other locations along the Longfields Drive trunk storm sewer.

As-built information for the Riocan Avenue sewer was received and the model was updated. Based on the 100 year events, there are free flow conditions at the two upstream manholes of the modeled Riocan Avenue sewer. The remainder of the sewer is surcharged to where it joins the Longfield Drive trunk storm sewer. It is concluded that the hydraulic grade line is maintained at acceptable levels during the 100 year storm event.

For local sewers at a conceptual level of design, the design engineers must confirm the grading versus HGL to ensure the 0.3 m clearance is maintained.

Table 2.9 Revised drainage areas

2006					UPDATED				
DRAINAGE AREA ID	AREA (HA)	TIMP (%)	SURFACE STORAGE (CU-M)	MINOR SYSTEM CAPTURE (L/S)	DRAINAGE AREA ID	AREA (HA)	TIMP (%)	SURFACE STORAGE (CU-M)	MINOR SYSTEM CAPTURE (L/S)
F2	14.4	85	3012 ⁽¹⁾	1575	DME-9063A (DME3)	1.82	66	252	435 ⁽²⁾
					Block A	5.21	74 ⁽³⁾	750	784 ⁽⁴⁾⁽⁵⁾⁽⁶⁾
					R-9066	0.54	71	0	211
F3	9.4	85	2057 ⁽¹⁾	956	Riocan Avenue	0.33	99	0	28 ⁽⁷⁾
					CMD1B	1.50	90 ⁽³⁾	0	752 ⁽⁴⁾⁽⁷⁾
					CMD2	0.71	90 ⁽³⁾	0	457 ⁽⁴⁾⁽⁵⁾
					Block B	2.89	93 ⁽³⁾	0	1331 ⁽⁴⁾
					Block H Civic	1.96	93 ⁽³⁾	0	900 ⁽⁴⁾
					CMD1A	0.86	90 ⁽³⁾	0	383 ⁽⁴⁾
					E	3.11 ⁽⁹⁾	86	0	280 ⁽¹⁰⁾
F4	31.6	85	5814 ⁽¹⁾	3750	F	4.72 ⁽⁹⁾	86	0	425 ⁽¹⁰⁾
					C	3.40	74 ⁽¹³⁾	0	306 ⁽¹⁰⁾
					C ROAD	0.25	99	0	122 ⁽⁴⁾
					D	4.33	74 ⁽¹³⁾	0	389 ⁽¹⁰⁾
					D ROAD	0.13	99	0	66 ⁽⁴⁾
					Parcel A	5.17	74 ⁽¹³⁾	0	465 ⁽¹⁰⁾
					A ROAD	0.13	99	0	65 ⁽⁴⁾
					105W	2.10	79 ⁽³⁾	0	189 ⁽¹⁰⁾
					105WA ⁽¹⁶⁾	0.70	71 ⁽¹⁵⁾	0	63 ⁽¹⁰⁾
					105S	0.85	71 ⁽³⁾	0	77 ⁽¹⁰⁾
					103	1.30	71 ⁽³⁾	0	117 ⁽¹⁰⁾
					101	2.48	76 ⁽³⁾	0	223 ⁽¹⁰⁾
F6	7.37	37	863 ⁽¹⁾	627	F6 ⁽¹⁴⁾	7.84	39	680	831 ⁽⁴⁾
H1	3.2	80	392	530	H1	3.67	74	1056	556
G1	10.40	78	0	1544	G1	10.06	78	0	1869 ⁽⁸⁾
G2	1.08	85	0	268	G2 ⁽¹¹⁾	1.06	85	0	268 ⁽¹²⁾
G3	1.88	87	0	478	G3 ⁽¹¹⁾	1.88	87	0	478 ⁽¹²⁾

(1) 100 year on-site storage

(2) Based on rational method for Ampersand Stage I

(3) Weighted c value (from which imperviousness was calculated) established by engineering consultant completing conceptual design

(4) 100 year flow capture (based on 100 year 3 hour Chicago storm)

(5) 100 year flow from a 0.358 ha portion of Block A flow cascades to Chapman Mills Drive (CMD2)

(6) Minor flow from a 0.915 ha portion of Block A drains via the storm sewer on Glenroy Gilbert Drive (via Ampersand Stage I); minor flow from a 3.936 ha portion and 100 year flow from a 0.358 ha portion drains via the storm sewer on Chapman Mills Drive

(7) Major flow from Riocan Avenue cascades to Chapman Mills Drive (CMD1B)

(8) Minor system capture per Stantec/AECOM July 2009

(9) Drainage area extended west to Greenbank Road

(10) Minor system capture increased to 90 l/s/ha from 85 l/s/ha

(11) Water quality treatment for areas G2, G3 to be provided by an independent BMP

(12) Minor system capture per TSH May 2006

(13) Imperviousness consistent with that of Block A

(14) Per detailed design of site

(15) Per email from DSEL November 6, 2017

(16) Major flow conveyed toward Greenbank Road

The proposed internal routing of major flow south of Chapman Mills Drive has been evaluated with the 100 year 3 hour Chicago storm, considered the critical storm event for surface routing. The below table summarizes major flow at critical locations and corresponding depth and velocity for the 100 year event and the stress test (considered the 100 year 3 hour Chicago storm with 20% increase in intensity).

Table 2.10 Summary of major flow on streets southwest of Chapman Mills Dr. and Longfields Dr. at critical locations

DRAINAGE AREA ID	D/S STREET SEGMENT	D/S ROW (M)	D/S LONG. SLOPE (%)	100 YEAR 3 HOUR CHICAGO				100 YEAR 3 HOUR CHICAGO + 20%			
				MAJOR FLOW (CMS)	DEPTH (M)	VELOCITY (M/S)	VXD (M ² /S)	MAJOR FLOW (CMS)	DEPTH (M)	VELOCITY (M/S)	VXD (M ² /S)
E	F	18	1.0	1.026	0.15	1.4	0.2	1.326	0.16	1.6	0.3
C	D	18	0.5	1.073	0.17	1.2	0.2	1.401	0.19	1.2	0.2
E, F, C, and D	Parcel A	18	0.5	4.958	0.31	1.6	0.5	6.437	0.34	1.6	0.6
Parcel A	Parcel B (Street 1)	20	0.6	6.296	0.33	1.7	0.6	8.238	0.36	1.8	0.7
E, F, C, D, and Parcel A	Parcel B (Eastern-most N-S street)	18	0.6	6.338	0.33	1.8	0.6	8.257	0.37	1.9	0.7
105W, 105S, 103	Parcel B (Southern-most E-W street)	20	0.2	1.417	0.22	0.9	0.2	1.835	0.25	0.9	0.2

During the 100 year event, the maximum depth of major flow on the street is less than the maximum allowable 350 mm, and the velocity by depth product is equivalent or less than the maximum allowable 0.6 m²/s.

During the stress test, the maximum depth of cascading flow is less than 350 mm at all but two of the critical locations. At the two locations the maximum depth of flow is 360 mm and 370 mm, estimated to be below the future building envelope opening. The product of velocity by depth slightly exceeds the City guideline of 0.6 m²/s at these two locations.

Downstream of the development, it is proposed to convey major flow to the Jock River via a new overland outlet. The outlet is discussed in **Section 2.5.6**. The Chapman Mills stormwater management system currently has four outlets to the Jock River. The total flow to the Jock River at each outlet during the 100 year 24 hour SCS Type II storm event is summarized in the below table.

Table 2.11 Total flow to Jock River from Chapman Mills development

OUTLET TO JOCK RIVER	FLOW (CMS)					
	100 YEAR 24 HOUR SCS TYPE II STORM					
	2006			UPDATED		
	TRUNK	OVERLAND	TOTAL	TRUNK	OVERLAND	TOTAL
Existing Eastern	1.3	2.3	3.6	3.2	0.8	4.0
Existing Central	0	2.5	2.5	0	0.4	0.4
Existing Central	7.8 ⁽¹⁾	0	7.8	5.3 ⁽²⁾	0	5.3
Existing Western	6.9	0.1	7.0	4.5	0.0	4.5
Proposed	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.0	5.3	5.3
	Total:		20.9	Total:		19.5

(1) Includes SWM Facility outflow

(2) Includes SWM Facility outflow and major system flow that discharges to the SWM Facility

Table 2.12 Summary of major flow channel flows, depths and velocity for various storm events

STORM EVENT	DISCHARGE (CMS)	DEPTH (M)	VELOCITY (M/S)
25 year 24 hour SCS Type II	3.7	0.50	2.6
50 year 24 hour SCS Type II	4.5	0.55	2.7
100 year 24 hour SCS Type II	5.3	0.60	2.9
100 year 3 hour Chicago	8.4	0.77	3.3

The following table provides a comparison of stormwater discharge at the proposed storm outlet versus flow in the Jock River and applicable hydraulic conditions in the river such as depth and velocity.

Table 2.13 Comparison of Jock River conditions and proposed outlet

		24 HOUR SCS TYPE II STORM	
		25 YEAR	100 YEAR
Jock River ⁽¹⁾	Flood Elevation (m)	88.78	89.07
	Depth of Water (m)	2.44	2.73
	Velocity (m/s)	2.70	2.81
	Total River Discharge (cms)	167	205
Storm Outlet ⁽²⁾	Discharge Flowrate (cms)	3.7	5.3
	Outlet Conditions	Free flow	Free flow

(1) Jock River Subwatershed HEC-RAS model, cross-section 2672 (RVCA, 2005)

(2) Chapman Mills SWMHYMO model

The above table indicates that the major flow being discharged at the proposed outlet is significantly lower than the total discharge in the river under both the 25 year and 100 year storm conditions. It is concluded that under proposed conditions impacts of storm discharge on the littoral zone are beyond the threshold of recognition.

2.5.7 Proposed BMP

As noted in **Section 2.5.2**, it is proposed that an independent BMP provide water quality treatment for the southern portion of Greenbank Road. The BMP could be a small pond or an infiltration measure located in close vicinity to the new Greenbank Road alignment and the Jock River.


Flow would be conveyed via storm pipe and discharge to the BMP via a headwall. Conceptual sizing of an infiltration measure is presented below.

Table 2.14 MOE Water quality volume requirement for conceptual BMP


ENHANCED PROTECTION LEVEL (80% TSS REMOVAL)				
TRIBUTARY URBAN AREA (HA)	IMP (%)	REQUIRED STORAGE VOLUME (CU-M)		
	POND TYPE			
	UNIT STORAGE (CU-M/HA)	PERMANENT	EXTENDED	TOTAL
3.33	85 Infiltration 40	N/A	133	133

An infiltration BMP could be designed as a shallow depression provided with a clear stone layer extending below the BMP invert to promote infiltration and prevent permanent storage. Flow would be conveyed to the BMP, where frequent flows would infiltrate, and during less frequent events, flow will discharge to the Jock River via a berm and swale.

J:\BI Engineering\CCL\0-CAD\cad\Water\3771 Nepean South\5.0\5.9\5.9.1\Design files\CH-MILLS SWM Addendum-2017\Figure 1A.dwg Plotted At: 2/15/2018 11:56 AM Last Saved By: svukic Last Saved At: Dec. 20, 17



J:\IBI Engineering\COL 10-CAD\cad Water\3771 Nepean South\5.0\5.9\5.9.1\Design files\CH-MILLS SWM Addendum-2017\Figure 2A.dwg Layout Name: Figure 2A Plot Style: ----- Plot Scale: 1:2,5849 Plotted At: 2/15/2018 11:55 AM Last Saved By: svukic last saved At: Feb. 15, 18



Scale
N.T.S.

Project Title
NEPEAN SOUTH-CHAPMAN MILLS
SWM SERVICING ADDENDUM

Drawing Title
MAXIMUM CUMULATIVE
MAJOR SYSTEM FLOW

Sheet No.
FIGURE 2A

From: [Chamberlain, Gordon](#)
To: [Smadella, Karin](#)
Cc: [Thiffault, Dustin](#); [Boulet, Jessie](#)
Subject: RE: GRSTWE SWM Coordination with Minto BTC Ph2
Date: Wednesday, September 2, 2026 3:22:29 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image005.png](#)
[image006.png](#)
[image007.png](#)
[image008.png](#)

Hi Karin:

Based on our discussions with the Stormwater team previously and areas of flow, we can confirm there is an emergency overland flow route for stormwater.

Generally, I understand it to be: West along south curblin on Chapman, through planned right turn channel, then south along east curb line spilling across GRSWTE to the road profile low point in GRSWTE on west curblin, then spills out to Jock River along toe of bridge approach fill.

Thanks,


Gordon Chamberlain, P. Eng.
Principal, Transportation



From: Smadella, Karin <Karin.Smadella@stantec.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 26, 2026 3:59 PM
To: Chamberlain, Gordon <gordon.chamberlain@stantec.com>
Cc: Thiffault, Dustin <Dustin.Thiffault@stantec.com>; Boulet, Jessie <Jessie.Boulet@stantec.com>
Subject: GRSTWE SWM Coordination with Minto BTC Ph2

Hi Gord,

Further to our discussion, can you please confirm by response to this email that an emergency overland flow outlet for stormwater from the future City park, identified in green in the concept plan below, will be accommodated as part of the detailed design for Chapman Mills Drive (part of the GRSTWE project)? The park will have a minor system outlet to the subdivision and will be designed to control flows for all events up to the 100 year event.



Thank you,

Karin

Karin Smadella, P.Eng.
Principal, Operations Leader

Direct: (613) 724-4371
Mobile: 613-698-8088
karin.smadella@stantec.com



With every community, we redefine what's possible.

The content of this email is the confidential property of Stantec and should not be copied, modified, retransmitted, or used for any purpose except with Stantec's written authorization. If you are not the intended recipient, please delete all copies and notify us immediately. For a list of Stantec's operating entities with associated license and registration information, please visit stantec.com.

Appendix D Geotechnical and Hydrogeology

D.1 Geotechnical Investigation Excerpts



Geotechnical Investigation

Proposed Residential Development

3265 Jockvale Road
Barrhaven Town Center Stage 2
Ottawa, Ontario

Prepared for Minto Communities

Report PG5636-3 dated November 25, 2025

4.0 Observations

4.1 Surface Conditions

The subject site consists of undeveloped, primarily vacant land with scattered forested areas. An access road traverses the central portion of the property. The site is bordered by Longfields Drive to the east, Jockvale Road to the west, vacant lands and construction sites to the north, and vacant lands to the south. In addition, a temporary office building and a gravel-surfaced parking area were observed in the northeast corner of the subject site.

The ground surface elevation across the subject site is relatively flat, and slightly sloped upward from east to west, ranging between an approximate geodetic elevation of 92.4 m to 101.0 m. The subject site is relatively at grade with surrounding roadways and properties.

Reference should be made to Drawing PG5636-15 – Test Hole Location Plan included in Appendix 2.

4.2 Subsurface Profile

Overburden

Generally, the subsurface profile encountered at the test hole locations consists of either fill or topsoil underlain by a silty clay crust and/or silty sand and/or a glacial till deposit. Where encountered, the existing fill layer was observed to range between 0.4 to 2.2 m in depth.

The surficial layer of topsoil and/or fill was observed to be underlain by an undisturbed, hard to stiff and weathered crust layer of silty clay at BH 1-25, BH 3-25, BH4-25, BH 5-25 of the current investigation and BH 1-21, BH 6-21, BH 7-21 of the 2021 investigation. This crust layer was observed to range between 0.5 and 3.3 m in thickness. The crust layer was observed to be underlain by a layer of unweathered grey silty clay extending up to a depth of 6.5 m below the existing ground surface at BH 7-21.

Glacial till was observed underlying the above-noted deposits at all test hole locations. The glacial till generally consisted of silty sand and/or silty clay with varying amounts of clay. A significant amount of cobbles and boulders is also present throughout the glacial till deposit encountered throughout the subject site.

Practical refusal to augering was encountered at all borehole locations except BH 7-25, BH 8-25, BH 9-25, and BH 12A-25 at approximate depths ranging from 0.6 m to 6.7 m below existing grade, respectively, in the current investigation.

Reference should be made to the Soil Profile and Test Data sheets in Appendix 1 for specific details of the soil profiles encountered at each borehole location.

Bedrock

Bedrock was cored at BH 1-21 and BH 2-21 to depths of up to 13.6 m and was observed to consist of limestone with interbedded shale in the 2021 investigation. Based on the RQD values, the bedrock core was noted to be in good to excellent condition.

Based on available geological mapping, the subject site is located in an area where the bedrock consists of interbedded sandstone and dolomite of the March formation with a drift thickness between 5 to 15 m.

Grain Size Distribution Testing

The results of the soil samples submitted for grain size analysis from the test holes from the current investigation are summarized in Table 1, on the next page, and are also presented on the grain size distribution testing results sheets in Appendix 1.

Table 1 – Summary of Grain Size Distribution Analysis				
Test Hole	Sample Depth	Gravel (%)	Sand (%)	Silt and Clay (%)
BH 3-25	SS6	22.3	50.9	26.8
BH 4-25	SS8	19.5	52.3	28.2
BH 11-25	SS7	22.4	46.5	31.1
BH 12A-25	SS3	41.4	39.9	18.7

Atterberg Limits Testing

Atterberg limits testing, as well as associated moisture content testing, was completed on the recovered silty clay samples at selected locations throughout the subject site. The results are summarized in Table 2 and presented on the Atterberg limits tests sheet in Appendix 1.

Table 2 – Summary of Atterberg Limits Tests					
Sample	Depth (m)	Liquid Limit %	Plastic Limit %	Plasticity Index %	Classification
BH 1-25	1.83	70	34	36	MH
BH 4-25	1.83	45	22	23	CL
BH 6-21	2.59	51	29	22	MH
BH 7-21	2.59	72	35	37	MH
Notes: MH: Inorganic Silt of High Plasticity, CL: Inorganic Clay of Low Plasticity					

Shrinkage Testing

The shrinkage limit and ratio of the tested soil sample (BH 3-25-SS2) are 20.67 percent and 1.755, respectively. The results are presented on the shrinkage testing sheet in Appendix 1.

4.3 Groundwater

Groundwater levels were measured in the installed piezometers and monitoring well on November 3, 2025, and January 8, 11, and 20, 2021.

The manual groundwater level (GWL) readings are presented in Table 3, in the following, and are shown on the Soil Profile and Test Data sheets in Appendix 1.

The long term groundwater level can also be estimated based on the recovered soil samples, moisture levels, and consistency. It is important to note that groundwater readings at piezometers can be influenced by surface water perched within the borehole backfill material.

It should be noted that groundwater levels are subject to seasonal fluctuations. Therefore, the groundwater level could vary at the time of construction.

5.0 Discussion

5.1 Geotechnical Assessment

From a geotechnical perspective, the subject site is considered suitable for the proposed development. It is expected that the proposed residential dwellings will be founded on conventional spread footings placed on an undisturbed, hard to stiff silty clay, and/or undisturbed, compact silty sand, and/or undisturbed, compact to very dense glacial till deposit.

Furthermore, it is anticipated that cobbles and boulders will be encountered frequently throughout servicing trenches and building excavations. All contractors should be prepared for boulder, including oversized boulders, removal throughout the subject site.

Due to the presence of a silty clay deposit within a portion of the subject site, recommendations have been provided for permissible grade raise restrictions and tree planting setbacks in this area in Sections 5.3 and 6.8, respectively.

The above and other considerations are further discussed in the following sections.

5.2 Site Grading and Preparation

Stripping Depth

Topsoil, and any deleterious fill, such as those containing organic materials, should be stripped from under any buildings and other settlement sensitive structures. Care should be taken not to disturb adequate bearing soils below the founding level during site preparation activities. Disturbance of the subgrade may result in having to sub- excavate the disturbed material and the placement of additional suitable fill material.

The existing fill, where free of organics and deleterious materials, can be left in place below the proposed floor slab and beyond the lateral support zones for footings. If considered to be left in place as subgrade, it is recommended that the existing fill be proof-rolled under dry conditions and above freezing temperatures by an adequately sized vibratory roller, making several passes to achieve optimum compaction levels. The compaction program should be reviewed and approved by Paterson personnel at the time of construction. In poor performing areas, be removed and reinstated with an approved engineered fill, such as OPSS Granular B Type II.

5.7 Pavement Design

For design purposes, the pavement structure presented in the following tables could be used for the design of driveways, local residential streets, and roadways with bus traffic. It should be noted that for residential driveways and car only parking areas, Ontario Traffic Category A is applicable. For local roadways, Ontario Traffic Category B should be used for design purposes.

Table 4 – Recommended Pavement Structure - Driveways	
Thickness (mm)	Material Description
50	Wear Course – HL-3 or Superpave 12.5 Asphaltic Concrete
150	BASE – OPSS Granular A Crushed Stone
300	SUBBASE – OPSS Granular B Type II
Notes: 1 - SUBGRADE - Either in situ soils or OPSS Granular B Type I or II material placed over in situ soil 2 - Minimum Performance Graded (PG) 58-34 asphalt cement should be used for this Pavement Structure.	

Table 5 – Recommended Pavement Structure – Local Residential Roadways	
Thickness (mm)	Material Description
40	Wear Course – HL-3 or Superpave 12.5 Asphaltic Concrete
50	Binder Course – HL-8 or Superpave 19.0 Asphaltic Concrete
150	BASE – OPSS Granular A Crushed Stone
450	SUBBASE – OPSS Granular B Type II
Notes: 1 - SUBGRADE - Either in situ soils or OPSS Granular B Type I or II material placed over in situ soil 2 - Minimum Performance Graded (PG) 58-34 asphalt cement should be used for this Pavement Structure.	

Table 6 – Recommended Pavement Structure – Arterial Roadways with Bus Traffic	
Thickness (mm)	Material Description
40	Wear Course - Superpave 12.5 Asphaltic Concrete
50	Upper Binder Course - Superpave 19.0 Asphaltic Concrete
50	Lower Binder Course - Superpave 19.0 Asphaltic Concrete
150	BASE - OPSS Granular A Crushed Stone
600	SUBBASE - OPSS Granular B Type II
Notes: 1 - SUBGRADE - Either in situ soils or OPSS Granular B Type I or II material placed over in situ soil 2 - Minimum Performance Graded (PG) 64-34 asphalt cement should be used for this Pavement Structure.	

7.0 Recommendations

It is recommended that the following be carried out by Paterson once design details of the proposed development have been prepared:

- ☐ Review preliminary and detailed grading, servicing plan(s) from a geotechnical perspective.

It is a requirement for the foundation design data provided herein to be applicable that a material testing and observation program be performed by the geotechnical consultant. The following aspects of the program should be performed by Paterson:

- ☐ Review and inspection of the installation of the foundation drainage systems.
- ☐ Observation of all bearing surfaces prior to the placement of concrete.
- ☐ Sampling and testing of the concrete and fill materials.
- ☐ Periodic observation of the condition of unsupported excavation side slopes in excess of 3 m in height, if applicable.
- ☐ Observation of all subgrades prior to backfilling and follow-up field density tests to determine the level of compaction achieved.
- ☐ Field density tests to determine the level of compaction achieved.
- ☐ Sampling and testing of the bituminous concrete including mix design reviews.

A report confirming that these works have been conducted in general accordance with our recommendations could be issued upon the completion of a satisfactory inspection program by Paterson.

All excess soil must be handled as per *Ontario Regulation 406/19: On-Site and Excess Soil Management*.

8.0 Statement of Limitations

The recommendations provided in this report are in accordance with our present understanding of the project. We request permission to review our recommendations when the drawings and specifications are completed.

A geotechnical investigation of this nature is a limited sampling of a site. Should any conditions at the site be encountered which differ from those at the test locations, we request immediate notification to permit reassessment of our recommendations.

The recommendations provided herein should only be used by the design professionals associated with this project. They are not intended for contractors bidding on or undertaking the work. The latter should evaluate the factual information provided in this report and determine its suitability and completeness for their intended construction schedule and methods. Additional testing may be required for their purposes.

The present report applies only to the project described in this document. Use of this report for purposes other than those described herein or by person(s) other than Minto Communities or their agents is not authorized without review by Paterson Group for the applicability of our recommendations to the altered use of the report.

Paterson Group Inc.




Yashar Ziaeimehr, M.A.Sc., P.Eng.



Drew Petahtegoose, P.Eng.

Report Distribution:

- ☐ Minto Communities (1 digital copy)
- ☐ Paterson Group (1 copy)





9 AURIGA DRIVE
OTTAWA, ON
K2E 7T9
TEL: (613) 226-7381

NO.	REVISIONS	DATE	INITIAL

MINTO COMMUNITIES
GEOTECHNICAL INVESTIGATION
PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT
OTTAWA, 3265 JOCKVALE ROAD - BARRHAVEN TOWN CENTRE STAGE 2 ONTARIO

Title:

PERMISSIBLE GRADE RAISE PLAN

Scale:	1:2000	Date:	11/2025
Drawn by:	GK	Report No.:	PG5636-3
Checked by:	YZ	Dwg. No.:	PG5636-16
Approved by:	DP	Revision No.:	

D.2 Water Budget Assessment





PATERSON GROUP

February 4, 2026

PH5176-LET.01

Minto Communities

180 Kent Street – Suite 200
Ottawa, Ontario
K1P 0B6

Attention: **Kevin Harper**

Subject: **Water Budget Assessment**
Proposed Residential Development
3265 Jockvale Road, Ottawa, Ontario

Consulting Engineers

9 Auriga Drive
Ottawa, Ontario
K2E 7T9
Tel: (613) 226-7381

Geotechnical Engineering
Environmental Engineering
Hydrogeology
Materials Testing
Building Science
Rural Development Design
Temporary Shoring Design
Retaining Wall Design
Noise and Vibration Studies
Energy and Sustainability
Temporary Shoring Design
Pile Dynamic Analysis and Testing

patersongroup.ca

INTRODUCTION

Further to your request, Paterson Group (Paterson) has completed a Water Budget Assessment in support of the stormwater management strategy for the proposed residential development located at 3265 Jockvale Road, in the City of Ottawa, Ontario (hereinafter referred to as the “subject site”). Please refer to Drawing PH5176-1 - Site Plan for the approximate site location.

The area that was considered for the water budget assessment has a footprint of approximately 101,239 m². The majority of the subject site is currently vacant and covered with shrubs or mature trees. The northeast corner of the subject site consists of an industrial building with paved/gravel parking areas. A paved/gravel road runs through the center of the subject site.

The shallow subsoils within the western and northern portions of the subject site generally consisted of topsoil overlying a glacial till deposit with a silty sand matrix. The shallow subsoils within the southeastern portion of the subject site generally consisted of a hard to very stiff silty clay.

During the most recent field investigation completed at the subject site by Paterson, groundwater levels were measured between 0.72 and 6.71 m below ground surface (bgs).

A detailed description of the subject site can be found in the most recent PG5636-3 Paterson Group Report which should be read in conjunction with this report.



WATER BUDGET ASSESMENT

The Thornthwaite and Mather (1957) method was used to assess pre and post-development site conditions based on Table 3.1 of the Ministry of the Environment's (MOE) 2003 Stormwater Management Planning and Design Manual and hydrologic/climatic data provided by Environment Canada's Engineering Climate Services Unit (EC-ECS).

Shallow unsaturated soils within the study area generally consisted of topsoil overlying a glacial till deposit with a silty sand matrix or a hard to very stiff silty clay, dependent on the location across the subject site. The above noted calculations were carried out for a fine sandy loam, clay loam or silt loam soil, dependent on the location across the subject site and pre or post development conditions.

Given that the location of the subject site is within the City of Ottawa, climatic data was obtained from the climate station located at the McDonald-Cartier International Airport covering the period of January 1939 to December 2022. The information was provided by EC-ECS and is attached to this report.

Table 1, below, displays the soil types present within the study area and their associated water holding capacities (WHC) as well as the actual evapotranspiration (AE) and surplus data. The EC-ECS monthly/annual water budget data used in this assessment is attached to this report.

Table 1 - Site Specific Water Surplus Information			
Land Use Unit	Water Holding Capacity (mm)	Actual Evapotranspiration (mm/year)	Surplus Water (mm/year)
Impervious Surfaces	N/A	*144	759
Urban Lawns / Shallow Rooted Crops (Fine Sandy Loam)	75	525	378
Urban Lawns / Shallow Rooted Crops (Silt Loam)	125	562	341
Pasture and Shrubs (Fine Sandy Loam)	150	574	329
Pasture and Shrubs (Clay Loam)	250	600	304
Mature Forests (Fine Sandy Loam)	300	605	298
Mature Forests (Clay Loam)	400	609	292
Table reproduced using WHC values from the MOE 2003 Stormwater Management Planning and Design Manual and modelling data from Environment Canada's Engineering Climate Services Unit. *Value based on evaporation information for urban areas (16% of precipitation) included in the Eastern Ontario Water Resources Management Study prepared by CH2M HILL Canada Limited (March 30, 2001).			



Infiltration Factors

In order to partition the surplus water values for the various materials into infiltration and runoff, various factors must be considered. The MOE 2003 Stormwater Management Planning and Design Manual lists three main factors that contribute to surface water infiltration rates.

The first factor is topography, which is broken down further into three sections: flat and average slope, rolling land and hilly land. Flat and average slope provides the greatest potential for infiltration and has the largest infiltration factor applied to it (0.3), while the other two have progressively lower infiltration factors (rolling land is 0.2 and hilly land is 0.1).

The second factor is soil, which is also broken down further into three sections: tight impervious clay, medium combinations of clay and loam and open sandy loam. Open sandy loam provides the greatest potential for infiltration (infiltration factor of 0.4) while the other two have progressively lower potential for infiltration to occur (infiltration factor for medium combinations of clay and loam is 0.2 and for tight impervious clay is 0.1).

The final factor the MOE manual uses to partition infiltration from runoff is land cover. It is broken down into two sections: open fields/cultivated lands and woodlands. Woodlands have greater infiltration potential and an infiltration factor of 0.2. Open fields and cultivated lands have lower potential with an infiltration factor of 0.1. A summary of the MOE manual's descriptors and their associated infiltration factors is shown below in Table 2.

Table 2 - MOE (2003) Infiltration Factors	
Description of Area/Development Site	Value of Infiltration Factor
Topography	
Flat and average slope (<0.6 m/km)	0.30
Rolling land (slope of 2.8-3.8 m/km)	0.20
Hilly land (slope of 28-47 m/km)	0.10
Soil	
Tight impervious clay	0.10
Medium combinations of clay and loam	0.20
Open sandy loam	0.40
Cover	
Open fields/cultivated lands	0.10
Woodlands	0.20
Table reproduced from MOE (2003) - Stormwater Management Planning and Design Manual.	

The topography of the subject site was classified as being between hilly land and rolling land and was assigned a pre-development topography infiltration factor of 0.15 for the fine sandy loam and clay loam soils. Under post-development conditions without mitigation, the topography infiltration factor of 0.15 was assigned to the Urban Lawns (Silt Loam). Under post-development conditions with mitigation, the slope of the site is anticipated to be reduced to promote additional infiltration. Therefore, a post-development



topography infiltration factor of 0.2 was assigned. An infiltration factor of 0 was assigned to the impervious surfaces due to its negligible infiltration capacity.

The soils within the study area generally consisted of topsoil overlying a glacial till deposit with a silty sand matrix or a hard to very stiff silty clay. Therefore, a pre-development soil infiltration factor of 0.3 and 0.15 was given for the fine sandy loam and clay loam materials analysed on the property, respectively. Under post-development conditions without mitigation, a soil infiltration factor of 0.25 was given for Urban Lawns (Silt Loam). Under post-development conditions with mitigation, soils with higher infiltration potential are anticipated to be used and were assigned a soil Infiltration factor of 0.3 for the Urban Lawns (Fine Sandy Loam). An infiltration factor of 0 was assigned to the impervious surfaces due to its negligible infiltration capacity.

The vegetation cover at the subject site generally consisted of pasture and shrubs or mature trees. Under post-development conditions (with and without mitigation), the land cover will largely change to landscaped areas (Urban Lawns) or impervious surfaces. A vegetation infiltration factor of 0.1 was assigned to all pre- and post-development materials and 0 for the impervious surfaces, with the exception of the pre-development tree covered areas which were assigned a vegetation infiltration factor of 0.2.

It is important to note that the water budget analysis for the subject site does not consider any potential infiltration of impervious surfaces (100% runoff was taken as a conservative approach). In reality, some portion of surface water that lands on impervious surfaces infiltrates (asphalt is not 100% impervious) or is diverted to grassed areas where additional infiltration may occur. As such, the impervious surface runoff volumes should be considered a conservative estimate and not expected to definitively represent existing conditions.

The infiltration factors noted above are displayed within the water budget calculations in Tables 3-5 attached to this report.

Pre-Development Water Budget

The pre-development water budget analysis conducted for the study area determined that an estimated 15,186,064 L/year of surplus water currently infiltrates the surface soils. The remaining estimated 21,511,585 L/year of surplus leaves the site as runoff.

Details of the pre-development water budget analyses are presented in Table 3 attached to this report.

Post-Development Water Budget Assessment - No Mitigation

The post-development water budget analysis without mitigation determined that an estimated 5,389,658 L/year of surplus water will infiltrate the surface soils and approximately 58,237,390 L/year will leave the site as runoff. These values equate to an



approximate 65% decrease in infiltration and 171% increase in runoff when compared to the pre-development water budget.

Post-Development Water Budget Assessment - Mitigation

The post-development water budget analysis with mitigation determined that an estimated 8,983,751 L/year of surplus water will infiltrate the surface soils and approximately 52,764,899 L/year will leave the site as runoff. These values equate to an approximate 41% decrease in infiltration and 145% increase in runoff when compared to the pre-development water budget.

Below are the assumptions used in the assessment based on discussions with the design team.

- ☐ The medium density blocks were considered to be 15% pervious areas classified as Urban Lawns / Shallow Rooted Crops (Silt Loam or Fine Sandy Loam) and 85% impervious areas.
- ☐ The residential housing blocks were considered to be 30% pervious areas classified as Urban Lawns / Shallow Rooted Crops (Silt Loam or Fine Sandy Loam) and 70% impervious areas.
- ☐ An estimated 8,000 m² of roofs for the non-back-to-back townhouses will be directed to rear yards. This area (8,000 m²) is subtracted from the Impervious Surfaces footprint and added to the Urban Lawns footprint for the mitigation calculations.
- ☐ The soil infiltration factor increased from 0.25 (Silt Loam) to 0.3 (Fine Sandy Loam) for Urban Lawns as the result of using topsoil with higher infiltration potential for the mitigation calculations.
- ☐ Topography Infiltration factor increased from 0.15 to 0.2 for Urban Lawns as the result of reduced grading for the mitigation calculations.

Details of the post-development water budget analyses are presented in Tables 4 and 5 attached to this report.



CONCLUSIONS

As previously discussed, surficial soils at the subject site generally consisted of topsoil overlying a glacial till deposit with a silty sand matrix or a hard to very stiff silty clay.

As noted above, the results of the water budget analyses completed at the subject site indicated that an estimated 15,186,064 L/year of infiltration and 21,511,585 L/year of surface runoff are occurring under pre-development conditions. Under post-development conditions, it is expected that there will be an approximate 65% infiltration deficit and a 171% increase in runoff prior to implementing mitigation measures.

As discussed above, the stormwater management design team is anticipated to implement mitigation measures to address post-development changes to the site's water budget. These mitigation measures include reduced lot grading, using topsoil with higher infiltration potential and connecting roof leads to lawns. By implementing these measures, the post development infiltration deficit and runoff increase will be reduced from 65 to 41% and 171 to 145%, respectively.

The information presented in this report is intended to support the stormwater management strategy while aligning with the Consolidated Linear Infrastructure Environmental Compliance Approval (CLI ECA) framework and City of Ottawa Technical Bulletin IWSTB-2024-04. Based on discussions with the design team, it is Paterson's understanding that the City's standard right-of-way (ROW) cross sections for local roads do not accommodate infiltration/exfiltration Low Impact Development (LID) systems and that the proposed 22 m collector road cannot accommodate LIDs in addition to the other infrastructure requirements. Therefore, based on the current concept plans available at the time of report preparation, it is anticipated that stormwater will be managed by implementing the mitigation measures noted above while tying into the existing stormwater management infrastructure for the surrounding area.



STATEMENT OF LIMITATIONS

The client should be aware that any information pertaining to soils and all test hole logs are furnished as a matter of general information only, and test hole descriptions or logs are not to be interpreted as descriptive of conditions at locations other than those of the test holes.

A review of this nature is a limited sampling of a site. The recommendations are based on information gathered at the specific test locations and can only be extrapolated to an undefined limited area around the test locations. Should any conditions at the site be encountered which differ from those at the test locations, we request notification immediately in order to permit reassessment of our recommendations.

The present report applies only to the project described in this document. Use of this report for purposes other than those described herein or by person(s) other than Minto Communities or their agent(s) is not authorized without review by Paterson Group for the applicability of our recommendations to the altered use of the report.

We trust that the current submission satisfies your immediate requirements.

Best Regards,

Paterson Group Inc.

Oliver Blume, P.Geo.



Attachments:

- ☐ Drawing PH5176 - Site Plan
- ☐ Drawing PH5176 - Pre-Development Terrain Composition Plan
- ☐ Drawing PH5176 - Post-Development Terrain Composition Plan
- ☐ Table 3 - Pre-Development Annual Water Budget Calculations
- ☐ Table 4 - Post-Development Annual Water Budget Calculations
- ☐ Table 5 - Post-Development Annual Water Budget Calculations with Mitigation
- ☐ Environment Canada's Engineering Climate Services Water Budget Data
- ☐ Soil Profile and Test Data Sheets
- ☐ Drawing PG5636-15 Test Hole Location Plan




Appendix E Drawings




Copyright Reserved

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

Legend



Notes



3	REVISED DRAFT PLAN AND CITY COMMENTS	AR	KS	26.09.09	
2	REVISED SANITARY SEWER EXTENSION	MJS	KS	26.05.04	
1	REVISED DRAFT PLAN	KV	KS	26.02.20	
0	ISSUED FOR COMMENT	MJS	KS	26.02.05	
Revision		By	Appd.	YY.MM.DD	
File Name: 160402206.D8.dwg		MJS	DT	26.01.19	
		Dwn.	Chkd.	Dsgn.	YY.MM.DD

Permit-Seal


Client/Project
MINTO

BARRHAVEN TOWN CENTRE
PHASE 2
OTTAWA, ON, CANADA

Title
CONCEPTUAL STORM SEWER NETWORK

Project No.	Scale	0	12.5	37.5	62.5m
160402206	1:1250				
Drawing No.	Sheet	Revision			


SD-1 1 of 4 3
PLAN # XXXXX



Copyright Reserved

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

Legend



R1A	SANITARY DRAINAGE AREA ID#
10.04 100	POPULATION COUNTS
	SANITARY DRAINAGE AREA HQ.
G1A	SANITARY DRAINAGE AREA ID#
10.04 INF	INFILTRATION RATES
	SANITARY DRAINAGE AREA HQ.

Notes



3	REVISED DRAFT PLAN AND CITY COMMENTS	AR	KS	26.09.09
2	REVISED SANITARY SEWER EXTENSION	MJS	KS	26.05.04
1	REVISED DRAFT PLAN	KV	KS	26.02.20
0	ISSUED FOR COMMENT	MJS	KS	26.02.05
Revision		By	Appd.	YY.MM.DD
File Name: 160402206.DB.dwg		MJS	DT	26.01.15
		Dwn.	Chkd.	Dsgn.
				YY.MM.DD

File Name: 160402206 DB.dwg

Down. Chkd. Dsgn. YY.MM.DD

Permit-Seal

Client/Project

MINTO

BARRHAVEN TOWN CENTRE
PHASE 2
OTTAWA, ON, CANADA

Title


CONCEPTUAL SANITARY SEWER NETWORK

Project No. 160402206

Scale 0 12.5 37.5 62.5m
1:1250

Drawing No. Sheet Revision


SA-1 2 of 4 3
PLAN # XXXXX




Copyright Reserved

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

Legend

	600mmØ WATERMAIN
	400mmØ WATERMAIN
	300mmØ WATERMAIN
	250mmØ WATERMAIN
	200mmØ WATERMAIN
	150mmØ WATERMAIN
	25mm TO 100mmØ WATERMAIN
	EX. 600mmØ WATERMAIN
	EX./FUT. 400mmØ WATERMAIN (BY OTHERS)
	EX./FUT. 300mmØ WATERMAIN (BY OTHERS)
	EX. 250mmØ WATERMAIN
	EX. 200mmØ WATERMAIN
	EX. 150mmØ WATERMAIN
	EX. 25mm TO 100mmØ WATERMAIN

Notes



3	REVISED DRAFT PLAN AND CITY COMMENTS	AR	KS	26.09.09		
2	REVISED SANITARY SEWER EXTENSION	MJS	KS	26.05.04		
1	REVISED DRAFT PLAN	KV	KS	26.02.20		
0	ISSUED FOR COMMENT	MJS	KS	26.02.05		
Revision		By	Appd.	YY.MM.DD		
File Name: 160402206 DB.dwg		MJS	DT	MJS	26.01.19	
		Dwn.	Chkd.	Dsgn.	YY.MM.DD	

Permit-Seal

Client/Project

MINTO

BARRHAVEN TOWN CENTRE

PHASE 2

OTTAWA, ON, CANADA

Title

CONCEPTUAL WATER LAYOUT PLAN

Project No. 160402206

Scale 1:1250 0 12.5 37.5 62.5m


Drawing No. Sheet Revision

WTR-1

3 of 4

3

PLAN # XXXXX



Copyright Reserved

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

Legend

- × 87.65 EXISTING ELEVATION
89.40 PROPOSED ELEVATION
← MAJOR OVERLAND FLOW ROUTE
← EMERGENCY OVERLAND FLOW ROUTE
← ULTIMATE MAJOR OVERLAND FLOW ROUTE
--- MAJOR SYSTEM DIVIDE

PROPOSED GRADE RAISE PROVIDED BY PATERSON GROUP. REPORT TITLED GEOTECHNICAL INVESTIGATION - PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT - 3265 JOCKVALE ROAD, BARRHAVEN TOWN CENTER STAGE 2, OTTAWA, ON. REPORT DATED NOVEMBER 25, 2025. REPORT No. PG5636-3.

- AREAS WHERE NO GRADE RAISE RESTRICTIONS
AREAS WHERE GRADE RAISES UP TO 3.0m ARE PERMITTED.

Notes

- CHAPMAN MILLS CENTERLINE GRADES FROM GREENBANK ROAD AND SOUTH WEST TRAMWAY EXTENSION MARKETPLACE AVENUE TO BARNSDALE ROAD, STANTEC CONSULTING FOR CITY OF OTTAWA. REVISION 4 ISSUED FOR PRELIMINARY DESIGN.
- TOPOGRAPHIC SURVEY PREPARED BY STANTEC CONSULTING. PART OF LOTS 13 & 14, CONCESSION 2 (RIDEAU FRONT) GEOGRAPHIC TOWNSHIP OF NEPEAN, CITY OF OTTAWA.

METRIC CONVERSION
DISTANCES AND COORDINATES SHOWN ON THIS PLAN ARE IN METRES AND CAN BE CONVERTED TO FEET BY DIVIDING BY 0.3048

HORIZONTAL DATUM NOTE
PROJECTION: UNIVERSAL TRANSVERSE MERCATOR
(MTM, ZONE 9, CM7630'W)
DATUM: NAD 83 (ORIGINAL)

DISTANCES ON THIS PLAN MAY BE CONVERTED TO GROUND DISTANCES BY DIVIDING BY A COMBINED SCALE FACTOR OF 0.999930.

VERTICAL DATUM NOTE
ELEVATIONS ARE REFERRED TO THE CANADIAN GEODETIC VERTICAL DATUM (CGVD-1928/1978) AND ARE DERIVED FROM BENCHMARK MONUMENT NO. 19A6330711, HAVING A PUBLISHED ELEVATION OF 99.742 METRES.

3	REVISED DRAFT PLAN AND CITY COMMENTS	AR	KS	26.09.09	
2	REVISED SANITARY SEWER EXTENSION	MJS	KS	26.05.04	
1	REVISED DRAFT PLAN	KV	KS	26.02.20	
0	ISSUED FOR COMMENT	MJS	KS	26.02.05	
Revision		By	Appd.	YY.MM.DD	
File Name: 160402206 DB.dwg		MJS	DT	26.01.19	
		Dwn.	Chkd.	Dsgn.	YY.MM.DD

Permit-Seal

Client/Project

MINTO

BARRHAVEN TOWN CENTRE
PHASE 2
OTTAWA, ON, CANADA

Title

CONCEPTUAL GRADING PLAN

Project No. 160402206	Scale 1:1250	Sheet 62.5m	Revision
Drawing No.	Sheet	Revision	

GP-1

4 of 4

3

PLAN # XXXXX

\\02501\proj\01\160402206\160402206.dwg
2025/09/25 10:27 PM by 160402206.dwg
ORIGINAL SHEET - ARCH D

With every community, we redefine what's possible.

Stantec is a global leader in sustainable engineering, architecture, and environmental consulting. The diverse perspectives of our partners and interested parties drive us to think beyond what's previously been done on critical issues like climate change, digital transformation, and future-proofing our cities and infrastructure. We innovate at the intersection of community, creativity, and client relationships to advance communities everywhere, so that together we can redefine what's possible.



Stantec Consulting Ltd.

300 - 1331 Clyde Avenue

Ottawa ON K2C 3G4

stantec.com