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## Disclaimer

Other than by the addressee, copying or distribution of this document, in whole or in part, is not permitted without the express written consent of R.J. Burnside \& Associates Limited.

### 1.0 Introduction

### 1.1 General

R.J. Burnside \& Associates Limited (Burnside) has been retained by Argo Summer Valley Limited (Argo) to prepare a Functional Servicing Report (FSR) in support of an Application for Official Plan Amendment, Zoning By-Law Amendment and Draft Plan of Subdivision for lands which lie within both the City of Brampton (City) and the Town of Caledon (Town). This Functional Servicing and Preliminary Stormwater Management Report is intended to demonstrate that the subject lands can be developed and connect to municipal servicing in accordance with applicable regulatory requirements and site-specific criteria established through the completion of previous servicing studies for the area.

### 1.2 Site Location and Context

The subject site is an approximately 3.62 ha infill area at the south limits of Caledon and the north limits of Brampton, as identified on Figure 1. The site is legally described as Part of Lot 19, Concession 1, E.H.S., Town of Caledon and Part of Lot 18, Concession 1, E.H.S., City of Brampton, Regional Municipality of Peel. The site is bounded by Hurontario Street to the west, the Highway 410 corridor to the north, Highwood Road and The Creek's Edge Subdivision to the south, and Reinhart Estates to the east, both of which are adjacent to the Etobicoke Creek Valley to the east. An overview and context of the area, including an aerial photo, is presented in Figure 2.

### 1.3 Existing Land Use

Currently, the majority of the existing site is disturbed and vacant. Historically, the site was occupied by a number of buildings and a parking area for the Reinhart Auction lands, which have since been demolished / decommissioned. There are no natural features within the property, though there are a number of manmade swales and drains around the perimeter of the site.



### 1.4 Objectives

The purpose of this Functional Servicing and Preliminary Stormwater Management Report is to provide the following context and assessment in support of the proposed Draft Plan of Subdivision(s) (DPOS) and associated applications:

- Calculate proposed sanitary design flows and demonstrate the adequacy of the existing sanitary sewer system to accommodate the proposed development.
- Calculate proposed water demand and demonstrate the adequacy of the existing water distribution system (pressure and flow) to service the proposed development.
- Confirm existing and proposed drainage patterns for the site.
- Develop a stormwater management plan that demonstrates confirmation of capacity and accommodation of the proposed development within the existing drainage system, including any relevant site-specific stormwater management measures.

All the above will be completed in accordance with accepted engineering practices and criteria of the governing approval agencies.

### 2.0 Background Information and Documentation

### 2.1 Previous Studies

The site has been considered for development and accommodated in the design of downstream infrastructure as identified in various studies for developments in both the City and the Town. This FSR has been prepared in accordance with the information and recommendations provided in the following documents:

- Functional Servicing Report, Donal JV Limited (Reinhart Auction Lands) Draft Plan 21T-99002C, Charlton Engineering Limited, Revised September 2001.
- Creek's Edge Subdivision Pond Design Brief, Schaeffers Consulting Engineers, Revised September 1997.
- Town of Caledon, City of Brampton, and Region of Peel Development Design Standards.


### 2.2 Additional Studies

The following studies are being completed in conjunction with, and provide guidance to, this Functional Servicing and Preliminary Stormwater Management Report.

- 12197 Hurontario Street, Brampton and 12211, 12213 \& 12233 Hurontario Street, Caledon, Geotechnical Investigation, Proposed Residential Development (Summer Valley) EXP Services Inc., February 4, 2022 (Revised October 20, 2023).
- 12197 Hurontario Street, Brampton and 12211, 12213 \& 12233 Hurontario Street, Caledon, Hydrogeological Investigation and Water Balance Assessment, EXP Services Inc., November 11, 2023.


### 3.0 Existing Site Conditions

The subject property covers a total area of 3.62 ha, 3.08 ha of which are in the Town, with the remaining 0.54 ha located in the City. The existing site is vacant and largely disturbed by previous land use and remediation works. The site is relatively flat, sloping very gently from an elevated central area to various low-lying areas in the east and west. There is a total of approximately 3 m of fall in each direction from the central high point at an elevation of 259 m above sea level. The east portion of the site drains towards multiple constructed swale / drainage draws and existing storm sewer inlets along the south and east limits of the property. The west portion of the site drains towards an existing storm sewer inlet at the southwest limits of the site adjacent the Hurontario Street and Highwood Road intersection. The existing site conditions are identified on Figure 3.

### 3.1 Soil Conditions

Based on the Ontario Soils Mapping database, the subject property is located within a single soil formation, Chinguacousy Clay Loam. The soil formation is an imperfectly draining soil with smooth, gently sloping surfaces.

A Geotechnical Investigation was completed for the study area by EXP Services Inc. in February 2022, updated in October 2023. Based on the findings of the investigation, the site is covered by a surficial layer of topsoil, asphalt, and granular materials with some pockets of fill. The native materials beneath the surficial cover comprise sandy silt till in portions, to depths ranging from 4.2 to 8.1 m below the surface with clayey silt till below the sand or fill layers. The clayey silt till extends 8.1 m below existing grade where the boreholes were terminated. As a result of the historical land uses and activities, the top layer of soil is defined as reworked / disturbed. The completed geotechnical investigation should be read in conjunction with the FSR.

### 3.2 Groundwater Conditions

As part of the Geotechnical Investigation, monitoring wells were installed in four of the borehole locations. During the completion of the drilling program, groundwater was observed at depths ranging from 7.0 to 8.0 m below the ground surface, except for one borehole that remained dry. Additional measurements in the installed monitoring wells were taken following the initial drilling operation, and groundwater depths were measured at depths ranging from 1.6 to 6.5 m below grade. The completed hydrogeological investigation should be read in conjunction with the FSR.
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### 3.3 Environmental Features

The subject property has been historically used for a variety of purposes, including residential, and a combination of residential and commercial purposes. The site is currently vacant and disturbed with no environmental features present.


### 4.0 Proposed Development

The Summer Valley DPOS has been prepared by Glenn Schnarr and Associates Inc. and is included as Figure 4. The DPOS features a mix of residential areas, buffer (MTO setback), and required road allowances and widenings.

The proposed DPOS connects to the surrounding road network at an intersection with Highwood Road opposing Hillpath Crescent, and through an extension of Lightheart Drive at the east limits of the site, which will provide road and infrastructure connectivity to the adjacent development.

The table below summarizes the proposed land use for the site, including population projections, based on City, Town, and Region design criteria.

Table 1: Argo Summer Valley Land Use and Population Projection

| Land Use | Net Area (ha) | Units | PPU | Population |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| City of Brampton |  |  |  |  |
| Detached - 12.20 m | 0.08 | 2 | 4.202 | 8.40 |
| Detached - 12.80 m | 0.04 | 1 | 4.202 | 4.20 |
| Detached - 15.24 m | 0.26 | 5 | 4.202 | 21.0 |
| Buffer (MTO Setback) | 0.05 |  |  |  |
| Road Widening | 0.04 |  |  |  |
| 17.0 m ROW (length 43 m ) | 0.07 |  |  |  |
| Subtotal | 0.54 | 8 |  | 34 (33.6) |
| Town of Caledon |  |  |  |  |
| Detached - 12.20 m | 0.24 | 7 | 4.202 | 29.41 |
| Detached - 12.80 m | 1.65 | 46 | 4.202 | 193.29 |
| Detached - 15.24 m | 0.15 | 4 | 4.202 | 16.81 |
| Buffer (MTO Setback) | 0.22 |  |  |  |
| 17.0 m ROW (length 426 m ) | 0.82 |  |  |  |
| Subtotal | 3.08 | 57 |  | 239 (239.20) |
| Total | 3.62 | 65 |  | 274 (273.13) |




### 5.0 Roads

The proposed development includes a 17 m Right-of-Way (ROW) cross section, with connection to Highwood Road directly opposing Hillpath Crescent and an extension of Lightheart Drive.
The 17 m ROW proposed throughout the development will be consistent with the City Standard Drawing Std. 200 for a minor local road with 8 m wide pavement on 17 m ROW. A copy of the Std. 200 is included in Appendix B.

The site was historically planned as an extension of the Creek's Edge subdivision to the south, which has been designed and constructed with the City standard roads. The adjacent Donal JV site, including the existing Lightheart Drive, was also constructed with 17 m ROWs with 8 m of pavement. The adoption of the proposed road design standard in both the Town and City portions of the site will be in line with adjacent road design standards and is considered appropriate.

### 6.0 Wastewater Servicing

### 6.1 Existing Municipal System

The proposed DPOS is located within the servicing area of the Etobicoke Creek West Shed trunk sanitary sewer. Based on the As-Constructed drawings for the surrounding subdivision lands, as provided by the Region of Peel, the infrastructure systems of the adjacent subdivisions were designed and constructed with consideration to development of the subject site.

Along the south property frontage, there is an existing 300 mm diameter sanitary sewer extended within Highwood Road, which drains to a 375 mm sanitary sewer immediately downstream of the site, with ultimate discharge point into the 450 mm diameter sanitary trunk sewer on Summer Valley Drive. The As-Constructed Plan and Profile drawing for Highwood Road is included in Appendix A. As identified, EX.MH06A is situated at the intersection of Highwood Road and Hillpath Crescent, which provides connection opportunity for the proposed DPOS. The downstream invert elevation of the sanitary sewer at EX.MH06A is 252.07 m .

At the east limits of the site, there is an existing 250 mm sanitary sewer extended from Lightheart Drive to the site, which also drains to the 450 mm sanitary trunk sewer on Summer Valley Drive. The sanitary sewer is a 250 mm diameter sewer terminating at EX.MH18A, which is located within the subject site. The downstream invert elevation of the existing sanitary sewer is situated at 253.92 m . The As-Constructed Plan and Profile drawing for Lightheart Drive and Highwood Road, including the existing sanitary infrastructure, is included Appendix A.

Appendix A includes a copy of the Creek's Edge Subdivision Sanitary Drainage Plan (Part I) which identifies drainage areas at a density of 50 ppha on the north side of Highwood Road to the City limits as directly tributary to the existing infrastructure (MH7A through 5A). In addition, an external area of 3.0 ha of 50 ppha from the Town is accommodated on Highwood Road in the sanitary plug with connection to MH5A.

As identified on the External Tributary Area inset on the As-Constructed drawing, an area of 88.25 ha to the northwest, in addition to the 3.0 ha noted above, has been accommodated within the sanitary sewer system on Highwood Road. The plan also identifies a drainage area of 12.96 ha immediately to the north of Summer Valley Drive, and an additional area of 80.22 ha to the northeast as accommodated within the Summery Valley Drive trunk sewer. The subject lands within the Town fall within the identified external drainage areas for the existing system.

### 6.2 Design Criteria

The proposed sanitary sewers will be designed and constructed to current Region of Peel and Ministry of Environment Conservation and Parks criteria and specifications. The sanitary design criteria are as follows:

- Residential Flow Rate - 290 L per capita per day
- Infiltration / Inflow
- $0.260 \mathrm{~L} / \mathrm{sec} / \mathrm{ha}$
- Peaking Factor
- Harmon Peaking Factor Formula
- Population Density
- Varies:
- Single Detached
- 4.202 ppu


### 6.3 Proposed Sanitary Servicing

The proposed development will utilize the existing and available connections and Region infrastructure at the east and south limits of the site. The proposed development will drain to the existing sanitary sewer on Highwood Road via direct service connection for the lots fronting Highwood Road and via a sanitary sewer connection to EX.MH06A at the intersection of Highwood and Hillpath Crescent. The remainder of the site will flow to the eastern site limits at the extension of Lightheart Drive and connect to the existing sanitary sewer network at EX.MH18A. Figure 5 identifies the proposed drainage boundaries, the total drainage areas, and the calculated drainage densities for the three connection points. Table 2 summarizes the sanitary drainage area and flow calculation parameters for the proposed DPOS.

Table 2: Proposed Sanitary Drainage Area Details

| Drainage Connection | Drainage <br> Area (ha) | Population | Flow (L/s) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Highwood EX.MH06A | 0.90 | 80 | 1.35 |
| Highwood Direct Service Connection | 0.14 | 9 | 0.15 |
| Lightheart Drive EX.MH18A | 2.28 | 185 | 3.19 |
| Total Area | $\mathbf{3 . 3 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 7 4}$ |  |

As identified on the As-Constructed Drainage Plan, 3.0 ha of external flow, and the direct frontage of the subject property on Highwood Road, were accommodated at 50 ppha in the Creek's Edge Subdivision. Per the summary above, the proposed development will contribute a total of 1.02 ha and 89 people to the existing Highwood Road system, which is less than the design population of 150 people.

The remainder of the subject site will drain to the existing sanitary sewer on Lightheart Drive and the trunk on Summer Valley Drive. The total drainage area falls within the planned capacity of the Summer Valley Drive trunk system with a density of 50 ppha equivalent to 115 people. The proposed catchment to Lightheart Drive and the Summer Valley trunk will contribute a total population of 185 people, in addition to the Highwood Road contribution of 89 people. This total
exceeds the Region planned capacity for the site-specific drainage area of 3.32 ha at 50 ppha, 166. However, the planned capacity of the trunk sewer includes the MTO lands, and the area occupied by Highway 410, immediately to the north of the subject site. As this area will not be developed at the planned population density, there is residual capacity within the trunk sewer, sufficient to accommodate the proposed development at the increased density. Accounting for the MTO lands along the north property boundary and the area of the Highway, there is over 8.6 ha of area that will not contribute flow to the sanitary sewer. This area alone creates additional planned capacity in the trunk, equivalent to 430 people, which is more than sufficient to accommodate the proposed development in the trunk sewer.

As noted in Table 2, the total flow contribution to the Lightheart Drive sanitary sewer is $3.19 \mathrm{~L} / \mathrm{s}$. The existing sanitary sewer is a 250 mm pipe at $0.76 \%$ in Lightheart Drive, which drains approximately 3 ha of existing development. The sewer has a capacity of $51.8 \mathrm{~L} / \mathrm{s}$, sufficient to accommodate more than 30 ha of development at 100 ppha, indicating that there is more than sufficient capacity in the local system to accommodate the proposed development.

Based on the above, the proposed DPOS falls within the available capacity of the existing sanitary system.

The local sewers servicing the development site will follow the alignment of the roads. At the south site boundary, connection to the existing system will be made at EX.MH06A at the intersection of McAlpine Road and Highwood Road. At the east side of the site, the sanitary sewer will follow the proposed extension of Lightheart Drive to provide connection to the existing sanitary EX.MH18A.


### 7.0 Water Servicing

### 7.1 Existing Water Services

Water supply is provided by the Region of Peel water distribution system. The subject site is located within Pressure Zone 7, the southern boundary of which runs along Mayfield Road. Along Highwood Road there is an existing 300 mm diameter watermain on the north side of the road across the frontage of the subject site. Additionally, there is an existing 300 mm diameter watermain on Summer Valley Drive which feeds the 150 mm diameter watermain on Lightheart Drive. A 150 mm watermain with plug and blow off is extended from Lightheart Drive to the east limit of the subject property.

### 7.2 Water Design Criteria

Water servicing for the subject lands will be designed in accordance with the Region of Peel standards and specifications to ensure that adequate pressures and flows are achieved. Watermain design flows will be based on the following criteria:

- Average Day Demand - 280 L per capita per day
- Population Density
- Per 2020 DC By-Law Update (4.202 ppu)
- Peaking Factor
- Per Region of Peel criteria
- Design Flow
- Greater of Max. Day plus Fire or Peak


### 7.3 Proposed Water Servicing

The proposed water servicing of the subject property includes two connections to the existing municipal water system, one to the 300 mm main on Highwood Road and one at the plug of the 150 mm main extended from Lightheart Drive. The proposed connections create a looped system for the proposed development. The connection at Highwood Road is consistent with the location of the proposed intersection identified in the DPOS. Given the proximity of the trunk mains to the subject site, the connections to Highwood Road watermain with the additional connection to the Lightheart Drive watermain is sufficient to provide services to the DPOS.

The proposed fire demand for the development has been calculated based on the Fire Underwriters Survey criteria, while the proposed domestic water demand has been calculated using the Region of Peel's Watermain Design Criteria. Additionally, hydrant flow testing was completed on October 18, 2022, on Highwood Road. Based on this testing, it can be expected that the available fire flow at the sampling location would be approximately $218 \mathrm{~L} / \mathrm{s}$ at a minimum residual pressure of 20 PSI . Table 3 summarizes the results of the completed demand calculations. Refer to Appendix $D$ for detailed calculations as well as the hydrant flow test results.
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Table 3: Domestic Water and Fire Demand Summary

| Average Day Demand | $0.89 \mathrm{~L} / \mathrm{s}$ or $76.48 \mathrm{~m}^{3} /$ day |
| :--- | :--- |
| Maximum Day Demand | $1.77 \mathrm{~L} / \mathrm{s}$ or $152.95 \mathrm{~m}^{3} /$ day |
| Peak Hour Demand | 5.31 L or $458.86 \mathrm{~m}^{3} /$ day |
| Fire Flow Required | $117 \mathrm{~L} / \mathrm{s}$ |

Figure 6 depicts the proposed water servicing distribution network for the DPOS. The internal water main distribution network is proposed to follow the internal road alignments and will be designed in accordance with Municipal standards within the proposed ROW. Based on the Draft Plan configuration, the connection to Lightheart Drive will be accommodated through the ROW connection through the extension of Lightheart Drive to the plug location at the property boundary. The water main is proposed to be a 150 mm diameter main with final sizing to be confirmed through consultation with the Region during the detailed design process.


### 8.0 Grading and Storm Drainage

### 8.1 Existing Municipal System

The proposed DPOS is located within the Etobicoke Creek watershed. Based on the As-Constructed drawings and stormwater management reports for the surrounding subdivision lands, the infrastructure systems of the adjacent subdivisions were designed and constructed with consideration to development of the subject site.

Along the south property limits, there is an existing 375 mm diameter storm sewer on Highwood Road along the frontage of the subject site which drains to a 975 mm storm sewer immediately downstream of the site. The storm sewer on Highwood Road discharges into the $1,350 \mathrm{~mm}$ diameter storm trunk on Summer Valley Drive which conveys drainage to a quality control stormwater management facility located adjacent to Etobicoke Creek, north of Mayfield Road. The As-Constructed Plan and Profile drawing for Highwood Road is included in Appendix A. As identified, EX.MH07 is situated at the intersection of Highwood Road and Hillpath Crescent, which provides connection opportunity for the proposed DPOS. The downstream invert elevation of the storm sewer at EX.MH07 is 253.99 m .

At the east limits of the site there is an existing 750 mm storm sewer extended from Lightheart Drive to an existing ditch inlet catch basin within the subject site as part of the Donal JV Subdivision development. This storm sewer also drains to the $1,350 \mathrm{~mm}$ storm trunk sewer on Summer Valley Drive. The downstream invert elevation of the existing storm sewer at STM DCBMH17 is situated at 254.17 m . The As-Constructed Plan and Profile drawing for Lightheart Drive and Highwood Road, including the existing storm infrastructure, is included Appendix A.

Appendix A includes a copy of the Creek's Edge Subdivision Storm Drainage Plan (Part I) which identifies drainage areas, with a runoff coefficient of 0.50, on the north side of Highwood Road to the City limits as directly tributary to the existing storm infrastructure (EX.MH08 through EX.MH06). In addition, an external future development area of 15.58 ha with a runoff coefficient of 0.50 , from the Town of Caledon, north of Summer Valley Drive is accommodated with the storm infrastructure on Summer Valley Drive. Under existing conditions 7.25 ha, including the subject site, with a runoff coefficient of 0.25 is accommodated within an RLCB between existing lots 151 and 152, with discharge to the storm sewer on Highwood Road at EX.MH04A.

The storm sewer drainage plan for the adjacent Donal JV Subdivision is also included in Appendix A. As identified on that plan, the infrastructure within the Donal JV subdivision has been designed to accommodate 4.48 ha of developed area with a runoff coefficient of 0.75 to the storm sewer on Lightheart Drive and the continued accommodation of 2.76 ha of drainage area at 0.30 runoff coefficient to the RLCB between lots 151 and 152 .

### 8.2 Existing Site Drainage

The existing site is relatively flat, sloping very gently from an elevated central area to various low-lying areas in the east and west. There are a total of six sub-catchment areas within the site with various outlets to the existing surrounding drainage system. Figure 7 identifies the existing sub-catchment drainage areas and sizes and discharge points as summarized in Table 4 below.

Table 4: Existing Storm Drainage Area Details

| Drainage Connection | Catchment <br> ID | Drainage <br> Area (ha) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| MTO Drainage Ditch (North) | PRE1 | 0.26 |
| Hurontario Drainage Ditch / Highwood Road | PRE2 | 1.36 |
| 975 mm Highwood Road Storm via CB | PRE3 | 0.38 |
| 975 mm Highwood Road Storm via RLCB (Lot 144) | PRE4 | 0.06 |
| 975 mm Highwood Road Storm via RLCB (Lot 148) | PRE5 | 0.55 |
| Subtotal to Highwood Road Storm Sewer |  | 2.35 |
| 750 mm Lightheart Drive Storm via DICB | PRE6 | 1.02 |
| Total Area |  | $\mathbf{3 . 6 3}$ |



### 8.3 Grading and Drainage

The proposed grading for the site takes into consideration the following requirements and constraints:

- Conformance to the Town and City's grading and drainage criteria.
- Provision for adequate cover over proposed services.
- Provision for emergency overland flow conveyance to the external ROW while maintaining a maximum ponding depth of 0.30 m .
- Provision for berming along the north and west property boundaries to meet the requirements of the noise study.

It is proposed that pavement grades of $0.5 \%$ be implemented for the subdivision, which is in keeping with the City of Brampton minimum standard but less than the Town of Caledon Standard of $0.75 \%$. The proposed use of $0.5 \%$ centerline road grades results in less fill for the overall development and a better interface between the proposed lots on the east and south side of the development with the existing lots in Caledon and Brampton. In these area split drainage is required, even with $0.5 \%$ road grades. Additional grade would result in a more significant elevation difference between the lots. Detailed design will confirm the minimum gutter grades of $0.75 \%$ along all bends. Additionally, the capacity of the overland flow route will be confirmed, and 100 year capture areas will be identified, as required, to ensure the major system drainage remains within the identified ROW limits.

The general intent of the grading and drainage approach is to direct storm drainage up to the 100-year return storm, to the existing outlets at the south and east limits of the property with discharge to the existing municipal storm sewer and ROWs extended on Highwood Road and Lightheart Drive. Emergency overflows in excess of the 100-year return event will spill to the designated Major System overland flow routes.

The majority of the lots within the development are proposed to be back to front draining lots. In localized areas at the interface with the existing developments to the east and south, Lots 22 through 26 and 37 through 44, within the Town of Caledon, are proposed as split draining lots with the inclusion of RLCBs within the proposed development. The lots along the east property boundary are graded with an internal overland flow route along the rear property line with discharge to Lightheart Drive.

For the lots along the south property boundary, the grade differential between the proposed Lightheart Drive and the existing rear lot lines in the adjacent subdivision eliminates the ability to provide an overland flow route internal to the proposed development site. The natural outlet for these areas is to the south, into the City of Brampton, where there are existing headwalls and RLCBs sized for the capture and conveyance of external flow. For this area, the associated RLCBs in Lots 37,40 and 42 will be sized to capture and convey the 100 year flows such that only emergency overland flow will discharge to the existing infrastructure in the City of

Brampton. Under existing conditions, the existing site drains to these outlets uncontrolled in all storm events. Accordingly, it was felt that it would be acceptable to continue to allow emergency flows to discharge per the existing drainage patterns. The alternative would be the introduction of a significant retaining wall with a typical height of approximately 2.5 m along the entire property line, creating an undesirable situation for both the proposed development and the existing lots. Capture calculations for the RLCBs are included in Appendix C.

The preliminary grading has been identified on Drawing G1, including the identification of the overland flow routes for the site.

### 8.4 Proposed Storm Servicing

The proposed development will utilize the existing and available connections and municipal infrastructure at the east and south limits of the site. The proposed development will drain to the existing storm sewer on Highwood Road via direct service connection for the lots fronting Highwood Road and via a storm sewer connection to EX.MH07 at the intersection of Highwood and Hillpath Crescent. A portion of the subject property, to be conveyed as MTO setback limits, will drain directly to the existing drainage system along Hurontario Street. The remainder of the site will connect to the existing 750 mm diameter storm sewer located at the eastern limits of the site, at the extension of Lightheart Drive. Figure 8 identifies the proposed drainage boundaries, the total drainage areas, and the calculated runoff coefficients for the proposed sub-catchments. Table 5 summarizes the storm sewer drainage area and runoff coefficients for the proposed DPOS.

Table 5: Proposed Storm Sewer Drainage Area Details

| Drainage Connection | Catch. <br> ID | Drainag <br> e Area <br> (ha) | Runoff <br> Coeff. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| MTO Drainage Ditch (North) | N/A |  |  |
| Hurontario Drainage Ditch/Highwood Road | POST1 | 0.269 | 0.25 |
| Highwood Road MH07 | POST2 | 0.524 | 0.62 |
| Highwood Road Storm Sewer direct connection | POST3 | 0.087 | 0.50 |
| Subtotal to Highwood Road Storm Sewer (excl. Hurontario) |  | 0.611 | 0.60 |
| Lightheart Drive Storm Sewer | POST4 | 2.707 | 0.61 |
| Total Area |  | $\mathbf{3 . 5 8 7}$ |  |

As identified on the As-Constructed Drainage Plan, the direct frontage of the subject property on Highwood Road, was accommodated in the Creek's Edge Subdivision as single detached lots, totaling 0.52 ha, excluding the required 0.02 ha conveyance of the Highwood Road ROW. Under proposed conditions, POST2 and POST3 will drain to that designated stretch of storm sewer with a slight increase in area and runoff coefficients from the original design.
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In total, the proposed drainage area from the development site designed to discharge directly to Highwood Road is approximately 0.091 ha larger than the As-Constructed design, with a slightly increased runoff coefficient. To confirm capacity in the existing system, the relevant pipes were included in the storm sewer design sheet for the proposed development (Appendix C). It was identified that the existing 375 mm storm sewer on Highwood Road would require upsizing to a 600 mm storm sewer to accommodate the developed conditions. The remainder of the Highwood Road storm sewer downstream of the 375 mm pipe has more than sufficient capacity to accommodate the proposed increase in drainage area. The downstream pipe is an oversized 975 mm sewer, sized to accommodate a significant external drainage area under predevelopment conditions.

The post development drainage areas to the Hurontario Drainage system and Lightheart Drive are below the accommodated drainage areas per the as constructed information. The confirmation calculations are included in Appendix C. The table below specifically outlines the pre- and post-development discharge rates to the Hurontario catchment area. There is no additional post development flow proposed to the MTO catchment to the north of the site.

Table 6: Hurontario Storm Flows

| Catchment | 2 year | 5 year | 10 year | 25 year | 100 year |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| PRE2 | 74.8 | 98.8 | 114.8 | 143.4 | 173.4 |
| POST1 | 14.8 | 19.6 | 22.7 | 26.7 | 32.7 |

As noted in the table above, the post development flow rates to the MTO / Hurontario lands are significantly less than the predevelopment flow rates as a result of the proposed grading and drainage plan for the development. Detailed calculations are included in Appendix C.

Based on the above and with the proposed upgrade of the noted storm sewer, the proposed DPOS falls within the available capacity of the existing storm drainage system.

The local storm sewers servicing the development site will follow the alignment of the roads for the majority of the sewer lengths. The sewers will be designed to accommodate the 10-year storm flow per the Town and City design criteria. At the east limits of the site, the storm sewer will be extended within the extension of Lightheart Drive, to provide connection to the existing 750 mm sewer. This proposed sewer is designed to convey the minor flows to the existing storm sewer system with some localized 100 year capture points in the RLCBs. The storm sewer depth ranges from 3.9 m to 4.11 m , providing sufficient depth and cover to ensure that the HGL conditions can accommodate gravity connections of the foundation drainage system. The major system flow will be conveyed via the ROW to the designated outlets. The proposed storm sewer drainage areas and identified RLCB areas are outlined on Figure 9 to support the design sheet calculations for the sewer sizing.



### 9.0 Stormwater Management

### 9.1 Existing Stormwater Management System

The surrounding subdivision development areas discharge to the existing stormwater management facility located adjacent to Etobicoke Creek at the south limits of the Creek's Edge subdivision. The existing pond was designed as a quality and erosion control facility with the provision of Level 2 quality control and 25 mm retention for the proposed drainage area. The pond design was established through the Creek's Edge subdivision by Schaeffers Consulting Engineers and further confirmed as part of the Charlton Engineering Limited review for the Donal JV lands immediately to the east of the subject site.

The ultimate drainage area established for the facility in the original design report totaled 39.38 ha comprised of 20 ha of Creeks Edge subdivision, 15.58 ha of external development to the north of Creeks Edge, including the Donal JV lands and the subject site, 1.10 ha of Hurontario Street corridor and 9.70 ha of undeveloped lands west of Hurontario Street. The drainage area is identified below.

The existing stormwater management pond is constructed with a permanent pool volume of $1,594 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ and an active storage of $3,407 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ for the 25 mm extended detention. The As-Constructed information, taken from the above noted reports, is included in Appendix A for reference.

### 9.2 Proposed Stormwater Management

The overall post-development drainage plan for the site is identified on Figure 8. Most of the development site will drain to the proposed storm sewer system on either Highwood Road or Lightheart Drive as outlined above. These sewers are tributary to the existing Creek's Edge stormwater management pond.

### 9.2.1 Stormwater Criteria

The proposed stormwater management design will need to meet the requirements of the Town's Consolidated Linear Infrastructure Environmental Compliance Application (CLI ECA) with respect to the quality control measures as follows:

- Water Quality: Control $90^{\text {th }}$ percentile storm event and if conventional methods are necessary, then enhanced, normal or basic levels of protection ( $80 \%, 70 \%$, or $60 \%$ respectively) for suspended solids removal based on the receiver. Based on consultation with both the Town and City, the site will be required to achieve Level 1 or $80 \%$ TSS removal
- Erosion Control: Detain the 25 mm storm event for over 24 or 48 hours.
- Water Quantity: Per Master Stormwater Management Plan for surrounding areas the site is not subject to water quantity controls.
- Water Balance: Recharge must meet pre-development conditions on property or control the runoff from the $90^{\text {th }}$ percentile storm event.

The proposed approach to meet the above noted criteria has been established with consideration to the design and construction of the subdivision infrastructure in the adjacent Creek's Edge Subdivision (Brampton) and Donal JV Subdivision (Caledon) and in accordance with the approved reports and documents submitted for each.

### 9.2.2 Stormwater Quality Control

The stormwater management facility for the Creek's Edge subdivision was designed with consideration to the development of external area. The stormwater management facility drainage area and the storm sewer drainage plan include the identification of 15.89 ha of external drainage, from the Town of Caledon as contributing to the storm sewer on Summer Valley Drive and an additional 0.54 ha of drainage area fronting Highwood Road in the City of Brampton. The 0.54 ha portion of the site is depicted on the drainage area plans for the existing Creeks Edge storm sewer system below. It includes portions of two sub catchments ( 0.37 ha and 0.47 ha sub catchments) less the existing Highwood Road and development on the south side of Highwood.

The 15.89 ha drainage area in the Town of Caledon includes land, immediately north of the subject site, that has been developed for the Highway 410 extension and Hurontario interchange. These lands were developed with site specific stormwater management controls and will not drain to the existing system. The drainage plans developed for the proposed highway expansion are included in Appendix A for reference.

The proposed 3.32 ha development site, within both the Town and the City, is part of the external drainage areas identified on the drainage maps. Clips from the As-Constructed drainage plans are included for reference below. The full drainage area mapping is included in Appendix A.
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As identified, the proposed development site falls within the drainage area originally anticipated for the stormwater management pond design completed by Schaeffers Consulting Engineers as part of the Creek's Edge Subdivision. This is further confirmed in the subsequent studies for the Donal JV Lands, in the Town of Caledon, completed by Charlton Engineering Limited. The clip below is from the As-Constructed drainage area plan for the adjacent Donal JV Subdivision which includes an allowance for external flows from the subject site:


The Donal JV report confirmed that the stormwater management facility was constructed with $1594 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ of permanent pool with a normal water level of 241.60 m and an active storage volume of $3407 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ to an elevation of 242.20 m . Further, the calculations in the report identify the watershed parameters, draining to the stormwater management facility for both the Creek's Edge and Donal JV subdivisions for assessment of the stormwater management facility capacity.

The site-specific parameters for the proposed Summer Valley development are based on the proposed draft plans as well as a detailed review of the proposed unit types for each lot per the proposed lot coverage depicted on Figure 8. The detailed calculations
for the impervious percentages and runoff coefficients are included in Appendix $C$ and reflective of the specific unit sitings for the lots. The following table identifies the parameters for the existing development, the subject property, and the total pond drainage area to be applied to the capacity review calculations.

Table 7: Pond Drainage Area Parameters

|  | Ex. Creeks Edge <br> plus Donal JV | Proposed <br> Summer Valley | Total |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Drainage Area to Pond <br> (ha) | 27.226 | 3.3191 | 30.0 |
| Runoff Coefficient | 0.5 | 0.62 | 0.51 |
| Total Impervious | $43 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $44.9 \%$ |
| Connected Impervious | $30 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $31.1 \%$ |
| Curve Number | 72 | 72 | 72 |

Note the total is not a direct sum of existing and proposed as 0.54 ha portion of the subject property was included in the original Creek's Edge subdivision drainage area. All other values have been prorated to reflect the proposed development.

Based on the above information the resultant permanent pool requirement for the total drainage area is $59.93 \mathrm{~m}^{3} / \mathrm{ha}$ or $1798 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ for provision of Level 2 ( $70 \%$ TSS removal) quality control. This exceeds the available $1594 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ permanent pool in the facility. However, the pond will still provide a degree of quality control, albeit less than the design requirement of $70 \%$.

With the additional drainage area, the available storage in the permanent pool is $53.13 \mathrm{~m}^{3} / \mathrm{ha}$, resulting in a treatment efficiency of $68.5 \%$ in the facility. With the inclusion of OGS units upstream of the connection points in both the Town of Caledon and the City of Brampton, each providing $50 \%$ TSS removal, the treatment train results in an overall removal of $84 \%$ TSS for the proposed development site, which exceeds the requirement of Level 1 or $80 \%$ TSS removal for the development lands. The detailed calculations are included in Appendix C and the as constructed full scale drainage maps are included in Appendix A.

### 9.2.3 25 mm Extended Detention

The SCS method is an alternative approach for calculating the runoff volumes for the quality design storm in lieu of modelling. For assessment of the subject site, the SCS calculation approach was calibrated through comparison of the SWM Hymo modelling that was completed for the Donal JV subdivision, against an SCS calculation for the same area. With the incorporation of the parameters applied to the Hymo modelling to the SCS calculation, the resultant 25 mm volume for the Donal JV assessment was calculated at $3010 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$, compared to the SWM Hymo runoff volume of $3011 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$,
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confirming the SCS methodology appropriately reflects the previously modelled conditions.

Utilizing the parameters for the overall drainage area to the existing facility, including the proposed development site, the 25 mm runoff volume from the catchment is calculated to be $3411 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$, through the SCS method. This volume is $4 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ higher than the noted active storage capacity in the pond, but well within design tolerances given the depth associated with $4 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ is less than 0.5 mm . Therefore, the pond is sufficiently sized to provide the volume requirements for the extended detention of the 25 mm event.

### 9.2.3.1 Diversion Structure Requirements

The existing pond includes a diversion structure, upstream of the facility, designed to direct the 25 mm storm flows to the facility and bypass the flows exceeding the 25 mm event directly to Etobicoke Creek. The existing diversion structure was sized as a 900 mm pipe, to divert the quality flow generated from the fully developed drainage area, including the subject site, to the stormwater management facility. For the interim conditions associated with the Creeks Edge subdivision development only, the 900 mm pipe was fitted with a 600 mm orifice, at the time of construction, to control the discharge to the pond to the quality control flow rate of 0.84 cm . The remainder of the flow will bypass the facility and discharge directly into Etobicoke Creek.

The inclusion of the subject site will result in an increased peak flow for the quality storm which will need to be directed to the control facility. Based on a two-hour Chicago storm, the Donal JV modelling established the quality storm hydrograph duration to be 1 hour and 22 minutes. Applying this duration to the quality control volume for the subject site and existing drainage area, results in a calculated peak flow runoff of 1.04 cms .

With the increase in the 25 mm runoff rate associated with the addition of the development lands, the 600 mm diameter orifice is insufficient to convey the full 25 mm event. The orifice will need to be replaced with a 715 mm diameter orifice to allow for appropriate diversion flow to be conveyed to the pond. This will need to be completed as part of the subdivision infrastructure.

### 9.2.3.2 Outlet Control Structure Requirements

The existing outlet control structure for the stormwater management facility includes a 100 mm diameter orifice sized to provide 48 hour extended detention for the Creeks Edge and Donal JV subdivisions. The calculations for the additional extended detention volume confirm that the 100 mm diameter orifice will continue to provide the control necessary for 48 hours of extended detention. Therefore, no outlet structure updates are required to accommodate the proposed development site.
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The supporting calculations, Donal JV SWM Hymo modelling, Creeks Edge diversion and extended detention calculations are included in Appendix C.

### 9.2.4 Annual Water Balance

A water balance assessment, utilizing the Thornthwaite and Mather method was completed as part of the Hydrogeological study prepared by EXP for the proposed development. As identified in the report and given the historical land use and site coverage, the post development conditions and associated pervious areas, result in an increase in the annual infiltration volume. This is based on the available greenspace and the discharge of roof leaders at grade allowing for greater volumes of water to infiltrate on an annual basis. No further mitigation measures are required or proposed. The details of the calculations are further identified in the EXP report.

### 9.2.5 5 mm Retention

The proposed development includes the implementation of extra depth topsoil in the available greenspace areas within the lots. The additional topsoil will provide full 5 mm retention for the direct rainfall as well as additional 1.5 mm retention of the rooftop runoff to be directed to the rear yards. As identified in the EXP report, the groundwater table elevation is lowest at the southern limits of the site, in the areas of the sandy silt till and in a small band along the north property boundary. It is proposed that roof leader soak away pits be implemented in these areas to promote infiltration of the 5 mm runoff from the proposed rooftop. The soak away pits will be incorporated in lots 15-19, 37-45, 56 and 57 on the Caledon DPOS and lots 1 through 8 on the Brampton DPOS, as identified on Figure 8. With the implementation of the proposed measures, approximately $105 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ of the calculated $165 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ will be retained on site. Detailed calculations are included in Appendix C.

### 10.0 Erosion and Sediment Control

The following general Erosion and Sediment Control (ESC) measures will be implemented as part of the proposed construction works associated with the development of the DPOS. A detailed ESC Plan will be established during the detailed design approvals process. Figure 10 outlines a preliminary ESC Plan for the site. The ESC measures noted below are intended to mitigate the impacts associated with the construction activities on the surrounding environment. The ESC measures listed below are applicable to all construction activities within the subject property:

1. ESC measures will be implemented prior to, and maintained during, the construction phases to prevent entry of sediment into the storm drainage system.
2. Sediment control fence consisting of non-woven material shall be installed and maintained to prevent sediment from leaving the proposed construction areas. Location of fencing will be established based on the site staging and proposed construction work.
3. The Contractor shall maintain a supply of silt fence, clear stone, straw bales, and filter fabric on site for emergency use.
4. No sediment-laden water or deleterious substances will be released to the existing storm sewer system at any time. Dewatering discharge containing sediment-laden water must be discharged to a sediment bag positioned in a vegetated area and allowed to discharge into existing established vegetation at least 30 m from any feature or existing storm catch basin.
5. Removal of vegetative cover will be staged and restricted to a period immediately preceding the commencement of earth works in each stage.
6. Disturbed areas will be temporarily or permanently stabilized or restored as the work progresses.
7. If site construction activities are interrupted, and / or inactivity exceeds 30 days, all stripped and / or bare soil areas are to be stabilized using either erosion control matting (e.g., jute), sodding / seeding / mulching, or other approved methods to the satisfaction of the site inspector.
8. All damaged erosion and sediment control measures should be repaired and / or replaced within 48 hours of the inspection.
9. After hours contact numbers are to be posted on site for emergencies.



### 11.0 Conclusions

This Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report is intended to satisfy Town, City, Region of Peel and Toronto Region Conservation Authority requirements for a review of site servicing and stormwater management in support of the planning applications for the Argo Summer Valley DPOS. Based on a review of all the materials available, the following conclusions and / or recommendations are made:

- The existing 450 mm diameter trunk sewer, located on Summer Valley Drive, is sufficiently sized to accommodate the proposed development.
- Sanitary servicing is available through the existing MHs at the south and east limits of the site via the Highwood Road and Lightheart Drive sanitary system.
- Direct connections will be made to the existing sanitary sewer for the lots fronting Highwood Road, as intended in the Creek's Edge subdivision design.
- The DPOS will be serviced through an internal system of gravity draining sanitary sewers with connection to the existing sanitary system at existing available MHs.
- A 300 mm distribution water main exists along Highwood Road and a 150 mm diameter water main has been extended to the site from Lightheart Drive to service the proposed development.
- Internal distribution mains extended via the local road system within the DPOS will serve the development with connection to the 300 mm main on Highwood Road and extension of the 150 mm main from Lightheart Drive, providing security of service and sufficient flow and pressure for the proposed DPOS.
- The existing $1,350 \mathrm{~mm}$ diameter trunk sewer located on Summer Valley Drive is sufficiently sized to accommodate the proposed development.
- Storm servicing is available through the existing MHs at the south and east limits of the site via the Highwood Road and Lightheart Drive storm drainage system.
- The proposed development requires upsizing of the existing 375 mm storm sewer on Highwood Road to a 600 mm storm sewer.
- Direct connections will be made to the upsized storm sewer for the lots fronting Highwood Road, as intended in the Creek's Edge subdivision design.
- The proposed storm drainage system will be sized in accordance with City and Town Requirements, with the provision of 10-year flow capacity within the storm sewer system. The storm sewers will provide gravity drainage to the existing storm sewer infrastructure on Highwood Road and Lightheart Drive.
- The proposed development will include a treatment train approach to addressing quality control for the site through the installation of OGS units at the connection points to the existing storm sewer system and utilizing the existing treatment efficiency in the existing stormwater management facility in the adjacent subdivision. The proposed measures result in achieving 84\% TSS removal for the subject site.
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- The existing stormwater management pond is sufficiently sized to accommodate the increase in 25 mm runoff generated from the proposed development. The pond will provide sufficient erosion control for the DPOS development.
- The existing 600 mm orifice in the diversion MH at the stormwater management facility will need to be upsized to a 715 mm orifice to convey the additional flow for treatment in the stormwater management pond. The existing extended detention release orifice is sufficiently sized to provide 48 hours of extended detention for the additional volume.
- Details of the stormwater management system will be finalized during the detailed design stage of the subdivision.
- ESC measures will be included in the detailed design, prior to the commencement of any earthworks activity.
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## Appendix A

## As Constructed Drawings
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## Appendix C

## Design Calculations



GTA SINGLE
17.0m DEEP SCHEME A

| MIN FRONT YARD TO HOUSE | 2.5 m |
| :---: | :---: |
| MIN FRONT YARD TO GARAGE | 5.5 m |
| MIN SIDEYARD | $1.2 \mathrm{~m} / 0.6 \mathrm{~m}$ |
| MIN REAR YARD | 4.7 m |
| ONE STOREY REAR YARD PROJECTION | 60\% MAX OF LOT WIDTH, 0.6 m FROM SIDE LOT LINE, 3.5M MAX INTO REQUIRED REAR YARD |
| REQUIRED PARKING MIN | 1 SPACE/ LOT |
| PARKING SPACE SIZES, INTERNAL AND PAD PARKING SPACE SIZES, INTERNAL AND PAD | SINGLE $2.75 \mathrm{~m} \times 5.5 \mathrm{~m}$ DOUBLE $5.5 \mathrm{~m} \times 5.5 \mathrm{~m}$ |
| ONE GARAGE STEP ALLOWED ENCROACHING INTO | MIN PARKING SİE |
| max driveway | $6.0 m$ WIDE MAX |
| REAR COURTYARD AMENITY AREA | 18.0 m 2 MIN |
| MAX HEIGHT | 3 STOREYS, OR 13.0 m TO MIDPOINT OF ROOF AND AVE GRADE AT FRONT OF HOUSE |
| MAX BUILDING COVERAGE | 60\% OF LOT AREA INCLUDING CONC PORCH. DECKS AND LANDSCAPING NOT INCL. |
| ENCROACHMENTS |  |
| WINDOW BAY, FRONT AND REAR(SECOND FLOOR) | $0.6 \mathrm{~m} \times 4.0 \mathrm{~m}$ |
| PORCH | 2.0 m MAX INTO FRONT |
| PORCH AND DECK STEPS | MIN 0.5m FROM LOT LINE |
| DECKS IN REAR YARD | MIN 1.2 m FROM LOT LINE |
| UPPER DECKS, TERRACES AND BALCONIES | EQUAL TO MIN YARDS OF HOUSE AND PORCH IN FRONT YARD |
| FIREPLACES | WITH OR WITHOUT FOUNDATION, MAX 0.6 m INTO 1.2 m SIDE AND REAR YARD. MIN 0.2 m FROM YARD. |



WINDOW BAY, FRONT, FLANKAGE AND REAR(SECOND FLOOR) $0.6 \mathrm{~m} \times 4.0 \mathrm{~m}$
PORCH
PORCH AND DECK STEPS
DECKS IN REAR YARD
UPPER DECKS, TERRACES AND BALCONIES
MIN 0.5 m FROM LOT LIN
MIN 0.5 m FROM LOT LINE
MIN 1.2 m FROM LOT LIN
EQUAL TO MIN YARDS OF HOUSE AND PORCH
HITH OR WITHOU
WITH OR WITHOUT FOUNDATION, MAX 0.6 m
INTO 1.2 m SIDE AND REAR YARD. MIN 0.2 m
FROM YARD.
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## ZONING MATRIX TEMPLATE

COMPILED BY：P．MACDONALD REVIEWED BY：

## PLEASE NOTE：

THIS PRELIMINARY ZONING INFORMATION IS BASED ON PARENT BY－LAW ZONING INFO SENT TO Q4 ARCHITECTS INC．BY KORSIAK ON JULY 22， 2021. AND BRAMPTON MZO ZONING RECEIVED APRIL 14， 2022

| BY－LAW \＃ | MZO＋22－2006 \＆49－2006 |
| :---: | :---: |
| ZONE | R1F \＆（R1F－9．0－2556） |
| MIN．LOT WIDTH | 9．Om INT．＋CORNER MZO＋（R1F－9 |
| MIN．LOT AREA | MzO 215m2，225．0m2（R1F－9．0－2556） |
| MIN．CORNER LOT AREA | 270．0m2（R1F－9．0－2556） |
| MIN．LOT DEPTH | MzO 24．0m，25．0m（R1F－9．0－2556） |
| SETBACKS： |  |
| FRONT YARD |  |
| TO HOUSE | MZO 2．5m，3．0m（R1F－9．0－2556） |
| TO GARAGE | MZO 5．75m，5．5m（R1F－9．0－2556） |
| TO STAGGERED GARAGE | N／A |
| REAR YARD $\quad \begin{aligned} & 0.6 \mathrm{~m} \text { To side of rear garage } \\ & \text { accessed for flankage }\end{aligned}$ | MZO，6．0m（R1F－9．0－2556） |
| INT．SIDE YARD 1 （House） | MZO，1．2m（R1F－9．0－2886 P ${ }^{1 / 10 / 01}$ |
| INT．SIDE YARD 2 （Garage） | MZO，0．6m（R1F－9．0－2556） |
| MIN．BLDG SEPARATION | 1.2 m （R1F－9．0－2556） |
| FLANKAGE TO HOUSE（Ext．） | 3.0 m （R1F－9．0－2556） |
| DAY LIGHT TRIANGLE | 1．0m（R1F－9．0－2556） |

## ENCROACHMENTS： <br> PORCH \＆BALCONY

区 InCLUDING EAVES
凹 covered or uncovered【 WITH OR W／O COLD CELLAR

FRONT YARD
SIDE YARD
FLANKAGE YARD
REAR YARD

2．0m（R1F－9．0－2556）

2．0m（R1F－9．0－2556）
$3.0 \mathrm{~m} \quad$（6．13）

STEPS BEYOND PORCH／DECK
W．O．DECK INTO REAR
MAX．DECK HEIGHT（ 1 Storey ）
BAY／BOX WINDOWS
$\boxtimes$
WITH FOUNDATION
$\square$
no WINDOW SEAT REQUIRED
凹 including eaves
－included in coverage

| REAR | w | Mzo－1．0m×4．5m | （R1F－9．0－2556） |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FRONT | WINDOWS ON THE SIDE．CAN | MzO－1．0m×4．5m | （R1F－9．0－2556） |
| FLANKAGE | HAVE ADOOR IN IT AND CAN BE 2－3 STOREYS IN HEIGHT | MZO－1．0mX4．5m | （R1F－9．0－2556） |

AIR CONDITIONER
FIREPLACE／CHIMNEY
ARCHITECTURAL ORNAMENTS
NUMBER OF PARKING
MIN． 1 CAR GARAGE
MIN． 2 CAR GARAGE
MIN．PARKING SPACE
MIN．DRIVEWAY

MAX．DRIVEWAY
MAX．BUILDING HEIGHT
mEASURED FROM AVERAGE GRADE AROUND ALL 4
SIDES，TO MEAN ROOF（BETWEEN EAVE \＆RIDGE）
MIN．LANDSCAPED AREA
MAX．COVERAGE

## MZO－TO WITHIN 3.5 m OF REAR LOT LINE 3.0 m （6．13）

 4．5m SETBACK（R1F－9．0 2556）【 CANTILEVERED
$\square$ STACKED BAYS PERMITTED
$\square$ DOOR PERMITTED WITHIN BAY $\square$ DEFINITION PROVIDED

## Andrew Finuson

Ju1－11－2022


| APPROX．FIN．BASEMENT | 850 S．F． |
| :--- | :---: |
| GROUND FLOOR AREA | 1258 S．F． |
| SECOND FLOOR AREA | 1658 S．F． |
| （FLUSH W／GARAGE FACE） |  |
| APPROX．THIRD FLOOR AREA | 500 S．F． |
| TOTAL S．F． | 4266 S．F． |
| SECOND FLOOR AREA | $+197 S F$ |
| （FRONT YARD SETBACK） |  |

ARCHITECTURAL CONTROL： Guidelines Not Available
MAX．SETBACK FROM GARAGE TO SECOND FLOOR MAX．GARAGE PROJECTION BEYOND DWELLING FACE／PORCH
1．5m（R1F－9．0－2556）

MAX．RECESSED 2ND FLOOR
FROM GND FLR DWELLING WALL

| MAX．GARAGE DOOR WIDTH | 3．7m MAX．（R3E－6．0 2562） |
| :---: | :---: |
| MAX．CORNER GARAGE WIDTH | 2 CAR PERMITED．（R3E－6．0 2562） |
| MIN．AMENITY AREA <br> ON BALCONY OR IN FRONT YARD | 3.5 m 2 （R3E－6．0－2562） |
| MAX．UNITS PER TOWNHOUSE BLDG | 16 （R3E－6．0－2562） 8 UNIT WIDE |
| TOWNHOUSE REAR YARD ACCESS | N／A |
| The purpose of the ZONING test zoning constraints on the is also used to identify potent required information． | MATRIX TEMPLATE is to proposed lot module．It ial zoning issues and／or |
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## ZONING MATRIX TEMPLATE

COMPILED BY：P．MACDONALD REVIEWED BY：

## PLEASE NOTE：

THIS PRELIMINARY ZONING INFORMATION IS BASED ON PARENT BY－LAW ZONING INFO SENT TO Q4
ARCHITECTS INC．BY KORSIAK ON JULY 22， 2021.
AND BRAMPTON MZO ZONING RECEIVED APRIL 14， 2022

| BY－LAW \＃ | MZO＋22－2006 \＆49－2006 |
| :---: | :---: |
| ZONE | R1F \＆（R1F－9．0－2556） |
| MIN．LOT WIDTH | 9．Om INT．＋CORNER MZO＋（R1F－9 |
| MIN．LOT AREA | MzO 215m2，225．0m2（R1F－9．0－2556） |
| MIN．CORNER LOT AREA | 270．0m2（R1F－9．0－2556） |
| MIN．LOT DEPTH | MzO 24．0m，25．0m（R1F－9．0－2556） |
| SETBACKS： |  |
| FRONT YARD |  |
| TO HOUSE | MZO 2．5m，3．0m（R1F－9．0－2556） |
| TO GARAGE | MZO 5．75m，5．5m（R1F－9．0－2556） |
| TO STAGGERED GARAGE | N／A |
| REAR YARD $\quad \begin{aligned} & 0.6 \mathrm{~m} \text { To side of rear garage } \\ & \text { accessed for flankage }\end{aligned}$ | MZO，6．0m（R1F－9．0－2556） |
| INT．SIDE YARD 1 （House） | MZO，1．2m（R1F－9．0－2886 P ${ }^{1 / 10 / 01}$ |
| INT．SIDE YARD 2 （Garage） | MZO，0．6m（R1F－9．0－2556） |
| MIN．BLDG SEPARATION | 1.2 m （R1F－9．0－2556） |
| FLANKAGE TO HOUSE（Ext．） | 3.0 m （R1F－9．0－2556） |
| DAY LIGHT TRIANGLE | 1．0m（R1F－9．0－2556） |

## ENCROACHMENTS：

PORCH \＆BALCONY
区 InCLUDING EAVES
凹 covered or uncovered
【 WITH OR W／O COLD CELLAR

FRONT YARD
SIDE YARD
FLANKAGE YARD
REAR YARD

2．0m（R1F－9．0－2556）

2．0m（R1F－9．0－2556）
$3.0 \mathrm{~m} \quad$（6．13）

STEPS BEYOND PORCH／DECK
W．O．DECK INTO REAR
MAX．DECK HEIGHT（ 1 Storey ）
BAY／BOX WINDOWS
区 WITH FOUNDATION
ㅁ NO WINDOW SEAT REQUIRED
■ including eaves
$\square$ INCLUDED IN COVERAGE

| REAR | WINDOW BAY PROJECTING |  | MZO－1．0mX4．5m | （R1F－9．0－2556） |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| FRONT | MORE THAN 0．6m MUST HAVE | WINDOWS ON THE SIDE．CAN |  | MZO－1．0mX4．5m |
| （R1F－9．0－2556） |  |  |  |  |
| FLANKAGE | HAVE ADOOR IN IT AND CAN BE |  |  |  |
| 2－3 STOREYS IN HEIGHT |  |  |  |  |

ARCHITECTURAL ORNAMENTS

NUMBER OF PARKING
MIN． 1 CAR GARAGE
MIN． 2 CAR GARAGE
MIN．PARKING SPACE
MIN．DRIVEWAY

MAX．DRIVEWAY
MAX．BUILDING HEIGHT
measured from average grade around all 4
SIDES，TO MEAN ROOF（BETWEEN EAVE \＆RIDGE）
MIN．LANDSCAPED AREA
MAX．COVERAGE

## MZO－TO WITHIN 3.5 m OF REAR LOT LINE 3.0 m （6．13）

 4.5 m SETBACK（R1F－9．0 2556）【 CANTILEVERED
$\square$ STACKED BAYS PERMITTED
$\square$ DOOR PERMITTED WITHIN BAY －DEFINITION PROVIDED

## NOTE：

Land department sign－off on this zoning matrix is to confirm that Architecture can
use these building footprints for design of use these building footprints for design of new TBSD Singles for Brampton and Caledon and inberg．These will be heavily modified versions of the TASDs Creekside and Bronte


| APPROX．FIN．BASEMENT | 850 S．F． |
| :--- | ---: |
| GROUND FLOOR AREA | 1031 S．F． |
| SECOND FLOOR AREA |  |
| （FLUSH W／GARAGE FACE） | 1408 S．F． |
| APPROX．THIRD FLOOR AREA | 500 S．F． |
| TOTAL S．F． | 3789 S．F． |
| SECOND FLOOR AREA <br> （FRONT YARD SETBACK） | +201 SF |


| ARCHITECTURAL CONTROL： | Guidelines Not Available |
| :--- | :--- |
| MAX．SETBACK FROM GARAGE |  |
| TO SECOND FLOOR |  |
| MAX．GARAGE PROJECTION |  |
| BEYOND DWELLING FACE／PORCH | $1.5 m$（R1F－9．0－2556） |
| MAX．RECESSED 2ND FLOOR |  |
| FROM GND FLR DWELLING WALL |  |


| MAX．GARAGE DOOR WIDTH | 3．7m MAX．（R3E－6．0 2562） |
| :---: | :---: |
| MAX．CORNER GARAGE WIDTH | 2 CAR PERMITED．（R3E－6．0 2562） |
| MIN．AMENITY AREA <br> ON BALCONY OR IN FRONT YARD | 3.5 m 2 （R3E－6．0－2562） |
| MAX．UNITS PER TOWNHOUSE BLDG | 16 （R3E－6．0－2562） 8 UNIT WIDE |
| TOWNHOUSE REAR YARD ACCESS | N／A |
| The purpose of the ZONING test zoning constraints on the is also used to identify potent required information． | MATRIX TEMPLATE is to proposed lot module．It tial zoning issues and／or |

ARCHITECTS
BRAMPTON，ONTARIO

## CAIVAN COMMUNITIES

## ZONING MATRIX TEMPLATE

COMPILED BY：P．MACDONALD REVIEWED BY：

## PLEASE NOTE：

THIS PRELIMINARY ZONING INFORMATION IS BASED ON PARENT BY－LAW ZONING INFO SENT TO Q4 ARCHITECTS INC．BY KORSIAK ON JULY 22， 2021. AND BRAMPTON MZO ZONING RECEIVED APRIL 14， 2022

| BY－LAW \＃ | MZO＋22－2006 \＆49－2006 |
| :---: | :---: |
| ZONE | R1F \＆（R1F－9．0－2556） |
| MIN．LOT WIDTH | 9.0 m INT．＋CORNER MZO＋（R1F |
| MIN．LOT AREA | MZO 215m2，225．0m2（R1F－9．0－2556） |
| MIN．CORNER LOT AREA | 270.0 m 2 （R1F－9．0－2556） |
| MIN．LOT DEPTH | MZO 24．0m，25．0m（R1F－9．0－2556） |
| SETBACKS： |  |
| FRONT YARD |  |
| TO HOUSE | MZO 2．5m，3．0m（R1F－9．0－2556） |
| TO GARAGE | MZO 5．75m，5．5m（R1F－9．0－2556） |
| TO STAGGERED GARAGE | N／A |
| REAR YARD 0.6 m To side of rear garage | MZO，6．0m（R1F－9．0－2556） |
| INT．SIDE YARD 1 （House） | MzO，1．2m（R1F－9．0－28566 21／10／01 |
| INT．SIDE YARD 2 （Garage） | MZO，0．6m（R1F－9．0－2556） |
| MIN．BLDG SEPARATION | $\underline{1.2 \mathrm{~m}}$（R1F－9．0－2556） |
| FLANKAGE TO HOUSE（Ext．） | 3.0 m （R1F－9．0－2556） |
| DAY LIGHT TRIANGLE | 1.0 m （R1F－9．0－2556） |

ENCROACHMENTS：
PORCH \＆BALCONY
【 including eaves
凹 covered or uncovered【 WITH OR W／O COLD CELLAR

FRONT YARD
SIDE YARD
FLANKAGE YARD
REAR YARD

2．0m（R1F－9．0－2556）

2．0m（R1F－9．0－2556）
$3.0 \mathrm{~m} \quad$（6．13）

STEPS BEYOND PORCH／DECK
W．O．DECK INTO REAR
max．DECK HEIGHT（ 1 Storey ）
BAY／BOX WINDOWS
®
WITH FOUNDATION
n WINDOW SEAT REQUIRED
凹 including eaves
－included in coverage

| REAR | WINDOW BAY PRojecting | MZO－1．0m×4．5m | （R1F－9．0－2556） |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FRONT | MORE THAN 0．6m MUST HAVE | MZO－1．0mX4．5m | （R1F－9．0－2556） |
| FLANKAGE | HAVE ADOOR IN IT AND | MzO－1．0mX4．5m | （R1F－9．0－2556） |

AIR CONDITIONER
FIREPLACE／CHIMNEY
ARCHITECTURAL ORNAMENTS

NUMBER OF PARKING
MIN． 1 CAR GARAGE
MIN． 2 CAR GARAGE
MIN．PARKING SPACE
MIN．DRIVEWAY
MAX．DRIVEWAY
MAX．BUILDING HEIGHT
MEASURED FROM AVERAGE GRADE AROUND ALL 4
SIDES，TO MEAN ROOF（BETWEEN EAVE \＆RIDGE）
MIN．LANDSCAPED AREA
MAX．COVERAGE

MZO－TO WITHIN 3.5 m OF
REAR LOT LINE 3.0 m （6．13） 4.5 m SETBACK（R1F－9．0 2556）
【 cantilevered
－STACKED BAYS PERMITTED
－DOOR PERMITTED WITHIN BAY －DEFINITION PROVIDED

## NOTE： Land de

 Land department sign－off on this zoning matrix is to confirm that Architecture canuse these building footprints for use these building footprints for design of new TBSD Singles for Brampton and Caledon and Kleinberg．These will be heavily modified versions of the TASDs Creekside and Bronte
andrew Finuson
Ju1－11－2022


| APPROX．FIN．BASEMENT | 1050 S．F． |
| :--- | :---: |
| GROUND FLOOR AREA | 1667 S．F． |
| SECOND FLOOR AREA <br> （FLUSH W／GARAGE FACE） | 2066 S．F． |
| APPROX．THIRD FLOOR AREA | 500 S．F． |
| TOTAL S．F． | 5283 S．F． |
| SECOND FLOOR AREA <br> （FRONT YARD SETBACK） | +198 SF |


| ARCHITECTURAL CONTROL： | Guidelines Not Available |
| :--- | :--- |
| MAX．SETBACK FROM GARAGE |  |
| TO SECOND FLOOR |  |
| MAX．GARAGE PROJECTION |  |
| BEYOND DWELLING FACE／PORCH |  |
| MAX．RECES（R1F－9．0－2556） |  |
| FROM GND FLR DWELLING WALL |  |


| MAX．GARAGE DOOR WIDTH | 3．7m MAX．（R3E－6．0 2562） |
| :---: | :---: |
| MAX．CORNER GARAGE WIDTH | 2 CAR PERMITED．（R3E－6．0 2562） |
| MIN．AMENITY AREA <br> ON BALCONY OR IN FRONT YARD | 3.5 m 2 （R3E－6．0－2562） |
| MAX．UNITS PER TOWNHOUSE BLDG | 16 （R3E－6．0－2562） 8 UNIT WIDE |
| TOWNHOUSE REAR YARD ACCESS | N／A |
| The purpose of the ZONING test zoning constraints on the is also used to identify potent required information． | MATRIX TEMPLATE is to proposed lot module．It ial zoning issues and／or |

ARCHITECTS

15．24mX 24．0m

Argo Summer Valley, City of Brampton
[the difference is our People]


| DEscrpprow | ${ }_{\text {reom }}^{\text {n+1 }}$ | ¢\% | $\begin{gathered} \text { AREA } \\ \text { (ha) } \end{gathered}$ | RUNOFF COEFFICIENT "R" | $\underset{\substack{\text { Yearstorn } \\ \text { Capurue }}}{\text { and }}$ | ${ }_{\text {are }}^{\text {are }}$ |  |  |  | (ecaum | $\begin{gathered} \text { cacue } \\ \text { (u0ck } \end{gathered}$ |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 100 \mathrm{YR} \\ \text { RAINFALL } \\ \text { INTENSITY } \\ (\mathrm{mm} / \mathrm{hr}) \end{gathered}$ | FLOW | $\begin{gathered} \text { CONSTANT } \\ \text { FLOW } \\ (\mathrm{m} 3 / \mathrm{s}) \end{gathered}$ |  |  | ${ }_{\text {LeNoth }}^{\text {(m) }}$ | SLOPE <br> (\%) | $\begin{gathered} \text { PIPE } \\ \text { DIAMETER } \\ (\mathrm{mm}) \end{gathered}$ | FULL FLOW CAPACITY $(\mathrm{m} 3 / \mathrm{s})$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { FULL FLOW } \\ \text { VELOCITY } \\ (\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{s}) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { NTrITL } \\ (\text { (min } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EXT AREA + STM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| STM Easement |  | EXXMH32 | 0.10 | 0.50 | 10.00 |  | 0.05 |  |  | 18.14 |  | ${ }_{1} 139.3$ | 91.3 | ${ }_{55.3}^{50.3}$ | 4.601 |  |  | 4.601 | 33.0 | ${ }_{1}^{1.06}$ | 1500 | ${ }_{7}^{7.278}$ | 4.12 | 21.61 | 0.13 | 21.75 | 69\% |
| STM Easement |  | HeAD Wall |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1500 |  |  |  |  |  | 65\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Project: Argo Summer Valley

| Location: | Town of Caledon/City of Brampton |
| :--- | :--- |
| Project \#: | 300054371 |
| Designer: | S. Breen |
| Date: | $20-$ Nov-2023 |

Post-Dev Imperviousness / Runoff Coefficient Calculations

| POST1 - HURONTARIO DRAINAGE SYSTEM |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Area ID | Area (sq.m) | Imperviousness | AxI |
|  | Pervious Vegetated Area | 2692.3 | 7\% | 188.5 |
|  | Impervious Area | 0.0 | 100\% | 0.0 |
|  |  | 2692.3 |  | 7\% = 1 (comp) |
|  |  |  | $\mathrm{RC}=$ | 0.25 |


| POST2 - HIG Total Area $=$ | 6688.8 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Area ID | Area (sq.m) | Imperviousness | AxI |
|  | Pervious Vegetated Area | 2919.6 | 7\% | 204.4 |
|  | Impervious Area: |  |  |  |
|  | Within Lots (incl. driveway) | 2551.4 | 100\% | 2551.4 |
|  | 17.0m ROW (Imperv. Portion) | 1217.8 | 100\% | 1217.8 |
|  | Total Impervious Area | 3769.2 |  | 3769.2 |
|  |  | 6688.8 |  | 59\% = I (comp) |
|  |  |  | $\mathrm{RC}=$ | 0.62 |


| POST3 - HIGHWOOD ROAD DIRECT CONNECTIONSTotal Area $=$1512.3 sq.m |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Area ID | Area (sq.m) | Imperviousness | AxI |
|  | Pervious Vegetated Area | 905.6 | 7\% | 63.4 |
|  | Impervious Area: |  |  |  |
|  | Within Lots (incl. driveway) | 606.6 | 100\% | 606.6 |
|  | 17.0m ROW (Imperv. Portion) | 0.0 | 100\% | 0.0 |
|  | Total Impervious Area | 606.6 | 100\% | 606.6 |
|  |  | 1512.3 |  | 44\% $=1$ (comp) |
|  |  |  | RC = | 0.51 |


| POST4 - LIGHTHEART DRIVE CONNECTION |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Area ID | Area (sq.m) | Imperviousness | AxI |
| Pervious Vegetated Area | 10487.1 | 7\% | 734.1 |
| Impervious Area: |  |  |  |
| Within Lots (incl. driveway) | 8994.4 | 100\% | 8994.4 |
| 17.0m ROW (Imperv. Portion) | 5504.8 | 100\% | 5504.8 |
| Total Impervious Area | 14499.2 |  | 14499.2 |
|  | 24986.3 |  | 61\% $=1(\mathrm{comp})$ |
|  |  | RC = | 0.63 |


| Total Developed Drainage Area to Ex. Creek's Edge SWM Facility | 33187.4 sq.m |
| :--- | ---: |
|  | 3.3187397 ha |
| Average Imperviousness for Drainage to Ex. SWM Facility | $60 \%$ |
| Average Runoff Coefficient for Drainage to Ex. SWM Facility | 0.62 |
|  |  |
| Total Site Area | 35879.74 |
| Total Site Impervious | 0.56 |

Notes:
1 Calculations for ROW imperviousness assume half of a given lot or townhouse boulevard frontage is comprised of driveway.
2 Calculations assume all detached corner lots consist of 12.12 m lot unit type.
3 Calculations assume minimum front-yard setback is used for all units.
4 It has been assumed that all entrances from Hurontario Street will be removed under post-dev. conditions.

| Project: | Argo Summer Valley |
| :--- | :--- |
| File: | 300054371.0000 |
| Designed by: | S.Breen |
| Checked by: | L.Niemi |
| Date: | 20-Nov-23 |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| PROPOSED CONDITIONS TO SWM FACILITY |  |

Total Drainage Area= $\quad 300007.4 \mathrm{~m} 2$ or


| Total Area $=$ | 0 ha |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
|  |  |  |
| TIMP | $65 \%$ | Area <br> XIMP |
|  |  | 0.00 ha |
|  |  | $40 \%$ |
|  |  |  |

Medium Density Residential (m2)


| Total Area | 3.32 ha |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  | Area |  |
| TIMP | $60 \%$ | 1.99 ha |  |
| XIMP | $40 \%$ | 1.33 ha |  |



Total Residential Area(if not able to directly measure)=
Total Area (uncontrolled to pond)
30.00 ha

TOTAL OVERALL DRAINGE AREA
Total TIMP= 13.46 ha Overall TIMP=
Total XIMP= 9.33 ha Overall XIMP=
or

## (1) Burnside

30.00 ha

Commercial Areas(m2)



Single Family

| 0 |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| to Highwood |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |


| Total Area | 0.00 ha |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |
| TIMP | $59 \%$ | Area <br> XIMP |
|  | 40.00 ha |  |
|  |  | 0.00 ha |



| Total Area | 0.00 ha |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  | Area |  |
| TIMP | $10 \%$ | 0.00 ha |  |
| XIMP | $5 \%$ | 0.00 ha |  |

30.00 ha
44.9 \%
31.1 \%
Project: Argo Summer Valley
File: 300054371.0000
Designed by: S.Breen
Checked by: L.Niemi
Date: 20-Nov-23
Wet Pond Permament Pool Requirement
MOE Table 3.2 Water Quality Storage Requirements Based on Receiving Waters.
IMPERVIOUSNESS
Protection Level (1, 2, or 3)

| 44.87 |
| ---: |
| 2 |

NOTE - 40 cu.m/ha has been removed from MOE table values for Ex. Detention Portion

| Enhanced (Level 1) Protection Know (x) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{x}$ | Permanent Pool | Known (x) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Calc (y) } \\ \text { Permanent Pool } \end{gathered}$ | Total Permanent |
| Imperviousness (\%) | StorageVolume (cu.m./ha) | Imperviousness (\%) | StorageVolume (cu.m./ha) | Pool Required (cu.m) |
| 35 | 100 | 44.87 | 124.67 | 3740.25 |
| 55 | 150 |  |  |  |
| 70 | 185 |  |  |  |
| 85 | 210 |  |  |  |
| 95.0 | 236 | Extrapolated |  |  |
| Normal (Level 2) Protection |  |  |  |  |
| $x$ | $\stackrel{y}{\mathbf{y}}$ | Known (x) | Calc (y) <br> Permanent Pool | Total Permanent |
| Imperviousness <br> (\%) | StorageVolume (cu.m./ha) | Imperviousness <br> (\%) | StorageVolume (cu.m./ha) | Pool Required (cu.m) |
| 35 | 50 | 44.87 | 59.87 | 1796.11 |
| 55 | 70 |  |  |  |
| 70 | 90 |  |  |  |
| 85 | 110 |  |  |  |
| 95.0 | 121 | Extrapolated |  |  |
| Basic (Level 3) Protection |  |  |  |  |
| x | Permanent Pool | Known (x) | Calc (y) <br> Permanent Pool | Total Permanent |
| Imperviousness (\%) | StorageVolume (cu.m./ha) | Imperviousness (\%) | StorageVolume (cu.m./ha) | Pool Required (cu.m) |
| 35 | 20 | 44.87 | 27.40 | 822.07 |
| 55 | 35 |  |  |  |
| 70 | 45 |  |  |  |
| 85 | 55 |  |  |  |
| 95.0 | 62 | Extrapolated |  |  |

## Pond Efficiency <br> Wet Pond - As Constructed

Project:
File:
Designed by:
Checked by:
Date:

Argo Summer Valley
300054371.0000
S.Breen
L.Niemi

20-Nov-23

## CALCULATED POND REQUIREMENTS WITH INCLUSION OF SUMMER VALLEY DISCHARGE

Imperviousness
Level 2 Quality Volume Required:
which includes:

Site Contributing Drainage Area

As Constructed Permanent Pool Details:
Permanent Pool Required (per MOE)
Permanent Pool Provided

Pond Permanent Pool Deficiency
44.87 \%

2996 cum/ha
1796 cum for Perm. Pool
40 cum/ha for Ext. Det.
30.00 ha

1796 cu.m
1594 cu.m (per Donal JV Report)

202 cu.m

MECP Pond Efficiency (Table 4-Quality Control)

| Wet Pond Design Parameters | Volume <br> (cum/ha) | Treatment Efficiency <br> $(\%)$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Enhanced Permanent Pool Volume | 120 | 80 |
| Normal Permanent Pool Volume | 58 | 70 |
| Basic Permanent Pool Volume | 26 | 60 |


| Project: <br> Project \#: <br> Designed By: <br> Date: | Argo Summer Valley <br> 300054371 <br> L.Niemi <br> 20-Nov-2023 |  |  | BURNSIDE |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | TSS Removal Efficiency - Treatment Train |  |  |  |  |
| POST 4 to Caledon (Lightheart) |  | Control |  |  |  |  |
| Area Description | Drainage area (ha) | Infiltration | CB Shield | OGS | SWM Pond | Total Efficiency |
| Post 4 Drainage Area (to pond) | 2.50 | 0\% | 0\% | 50\% | 68\% | 84\% |
| Subtotal Total Caledon Drainage Area | 2.50 | Overall TSS Removal to Lightheart Drive: |  |  |  | 84\% |
| Post 2 Drainage Area (to pond) | 0.67 | 0\% | 0\% | 50\% | 68\% | 84\% |
| Post 3 Drainage Area (to pond) | 0.15 | 0\% | 0\% | 50\% | 68\% | 84\% |
| Subtotal Total Brampton Drainage Are | 0.82 | Overall TSS Removal to Highwood Drive: |  |  |  | 84\% |
| TOTAL SITE | 3.32 | Overall TSS Removal FOR SITE: |  |  |  | 84\% |

Note - existing SWM pond as constructed conditions will provide 68\% TSS with addition of development area

| Project: | Argo Summer Valley |
| :--- | :--- |
| File: | 300054371.0000 |
| Designed by: | S.Breen |
| Checked by: | L.Niemi |
| Date: | 20-Nov-23 |

## Extended Detention Volume (as Constructed)

3407 cu.m

| Ex. Extended Detention Volume req. (per Donal JV) - using SCS Method |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Existing Total Drainage to Pond (per Donal JV Report) | 27.23 ha |
| Existing Total Imperviousness of Drainage to Pond (per Donal JV) | $43 \%$ |
| Existing CN for Drainage Area | 72 |

25 mm Runoff total Contributing Area (SCS Method)

| $Q=$ | $(P-I A)^{\wedge} 2 / P-(I A-S)$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| $S=$ | $-254+25400 / C N$ |
| $T$ IMP $=$ | $43.0 \%$ |


| Pervious Area |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{P}=$ | 25 mm |
| $\mathrm{IA}=$ | 3 mm |
| $\mathrm{CN}=$ | 72 |
| $\mathrm{S}=$ | 98.8 |
| Q = | 4.0 mm |


| Impervious Area |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{P}=$ |  | 25 mm |
| $1 \mathrm{~A}=$ |  | 2.3 mm |
| $\mathrm{CN}=$ |  | 99 |
| S = |  | 2.6 |
| $\mathrm{Q}=$ |  | 20.4 mm |
| imp | total |  |
| 20.4 | 11.05 | mm |
| 11.7 | 27.23 | ha |
| 2388 | 3010 | cu.m |


| SCS Runoff Volume | 4.0 | 20.4 | 11.05 | mm |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| Drainage Area | 15.5 | 11.7 | 27.23 | ha |
| Runoff Volume | 622 | 2388 | 3010 | cu.m |

Proposed Post Development Drainage to Pond - Updated to Include Summer Valley:

Total Drainage to Pond (with Summer Valley)
Total Imperviousness of Drainage to Pond (with Summer Valley)
CN for Total Drainage Area

25 mm Runoff total Contributing Area (SCS Method)
Q $=\quad(P-I A)^{\wedge} 2 / P-(I A-S)$
$S=\quad-254+25400 / C N$
T IMP = 44.9 \%

| Pervious Area |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{P}=$ | 25 |
| $\mathrm{IA}=$ | 3 |
| $\mathrm{CN}=$ | 72 |
| $\mathrm{S}=$ | 98.8 |
| $Q=$ | 4.0 |

SCS Runoff Volume
Drainage Area
Runoff Volume


Extended Detention Provided
Extended Detention Deficit SCS Method

Orifice Sizing Calculations
Existing Structures
Project: Argo Summer Valley
File: 300054371.0000
Designed by: S.Breen
Checked by: L.Niemi
Date: 20-Nov-23

Diversion Orifice Calculations - to convey quality peak flow to the pond Extended Detention Volume Required

3408 cu.m
Qin $=\quad 1.5^{*}$ Runoff Volume/hydrograph duration
duration $=82$ mins
Calcualted 25 mm Runoff Peak Flow

| $\mathrm{A}=$ | $\mathrm{Q} / \mathrm{C}^{*}\left(2^{*} \mathrm{~g}^{*} \mathrm{~h}\right)^{\wedge} 0.5$ |
| :---: | ---: |
| $\mathrm{~h}=$ | 0.54 m |
| $\mathrm{C}=$ | 0.8 |

Peak 25 mm runoff flow rate Duration (from hymo modelling)
1.04 cms

Orifice Area head (per Creek's Edge HGL) due to benching in MH
0.40 sq.m

Calcualted Diversion Orifice Area
Calculated Minimum Orifice Diameter
Proposed Diversion Orifice Diameter
0.713 m

715 mm

Extended Detention Orifice Calculations - to provide 48 hrs detention
Minimum Detention Time
48 hours
Q out ave = ED volume/detention time
Q out peak 1.5*Q out ave
Calcualted 25 mm Average discharge
0.0197 cms

Calcualted 25 mm peak discharge

| $\mathrm{A}=$ | $\mathrm{Q} / \mathrm{C}^{*}\left(2^{*} \mathrm{~g}^{*} \mathrm{~h}\right)^{\wedge} 0.5$ |
| ---: | ---: |
| $\mathrm{~h}=$ | 1.6 m |
| $\mathrm{C}=$ | 0.625 |

C =
0.625

Calcualted Outlet Orifice Area
Calculated Maximum Orifice Diameter
Proposed OUtlet Orifice Diameter
Orifice Area
Extended Detention Depth
submerged orifice
0.0084 sq.m
0.1037 m

100 mm


## 5 mm Runoff Control/Retention

Project: Argo Summer Valley
File:
Designed by: S.Breen
Checked by: L.Niemi
Date:
20-Nov-23

5mm Retention achieved through Initial Abstration on all surfaces, accounting for ponding, infiltration evaporation and direction of flow to pervious surfaces as follows:

| Grassed Area | 5.0 mm |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Paved Surface | 1.5 mm |  |
| Roof tops | 0.75 mm | * based on minimum of $50 \%$ of roof discharge to grass (rear only) |
|  |  | and 1.5 mm retention available in topsoil for roof discharge |

Secondary measures are introduced to enhance 5 mm retention including soakaway pits where feasible Calculated secondary retention is based on the soakway pit design in relevant lots

## Post2 - Rooftop Runoff Secondary Retention

Total Roof Area in Catchment
Roof Area to Soakaway in Rear Yard
Volume to Soakaway (Area to Soakaway*depth)
Prorated Secondary Retention of Rooftop Runoff (Vol/Total Area)

Post3 - Rooftop Runoff Secondary Retention

| Total Roof Area in Catchment | $559 \mathrm{sq} . \mathrm{m}$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| Roof Area to Soakaway in Rear Yard | $279 \mathrm{sq} . \mathrm{m}$ |
| Volume to Soakaway (Area to Soakaway*depth) | 6.07 mm |
| Prorated Secondary Retention of Rooftop Runoff (Vol/Total Area) | $\mathbf{1 . 6 9} \mathbf{~ c u} . \mathrm{m}$ |
| $\mathbf{3 . 0 3 ~ \mathbf { ~ m m }}$ |  |

## Post4 - Rooftop Runoff Secondary Retention

| Total Roof Area in Catchment | $8994 \mathrm{sq} \cdot \mathrm{m}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Roof Area to Soakaway in Rear Yard | $1239 \mathrm{sq} . \mathrm{m}$ |
| Volume to Soakaway (Area to Soakaway*depth) | $7.52 \mathrm{cu} . \mathrm{m}$ |
| Prorated Secondary Retention of Rooftop Runoff (Vol/Total Area) | $\mathbf{0 . 8 4} \mathbf{~ m m}$ |

## Site 5mm Volume Retention

|  |  | Site Area | Required 5mm Volume Retention | Initial Abstraction | Secondary Retention | Total Provided Volume |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| POST1 | Grassed Area | 2692 m ${ }^{2}$ | $13.46 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ | 5.0 mm |  | $13.46 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ |
|  | Paved Surface | $0 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | $0.00 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ | 1.5 mm |  | $0.00 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ |
|  | Roof Area | $0 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | $0.00 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ | 0.75 mm |  | $0.00 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ |
| POST2 | Grassed Area | $2920 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | $14.60 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ | 5.0 mm |  | $14.60 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ |
|  | Paved Surface | $1218 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | $6.09 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ | 1.5 mm |  | $1.83 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ |
|  | Roof Area | $2551 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | $12.76 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ | 0.75 mm | 2.04 mm | $7.11 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ |
| POST3 | Grassed Area | $906 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | $4.53 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ | 5.0 mm |  | $4.53 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ |
|  | Paved Surface | $26 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | $0.13 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ | 1.5 mm |  | $0.04 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ |
|  | Roof Area | $581 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | $2.90 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ | 0.75 mm | 3.0 mm | $2.20 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ |
| POST4 | Grassed Area | $10487 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | $52.44 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ | 5.0 mm |  | $52.44 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ |
|  | Paved Surface | $5652 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | $28.26 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ | 1.5 mm |  | $8.48 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ |
|  | Roof Area | $8847 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | $44.24 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ | 0.75 mm | 0.84 mm | $14.03 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ |
|  |  | $33187 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | $165.94 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ |  |  | $105.24 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ |

Project Name: Argo Summer Valley
Job Number: 300054371
Designer: LN
Date: 20-Nov-23
Capture Calculations for RLCB - Capacity confirmtion
RLCB to capture 100 year flow (from design sheet) with 50\% blockage
Flow Range $\quad 0.013 \mathrm{cms}$ min 0.037 cms max

Note: The capacity is based on a "sag" location assumption

| Catchbasin Capacity |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: |
| Average Depth above grate | 0.100 | m |
| Area of Orifice | $=0.0036$ | $\mathrm{~m}^{2}$ |
| Orifice Coefficient | $=0.6$ |  |
| Total Discharge, $\mathrm{Q}=$ | 0.003 | $\mathrm{~m}^{3} / \mathrm{sec}$ |
| Discharge Vel., $\mathrm{V}=$ | 0.840 | $\mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{sec}$ |


| Honeycomb Grating |  |  |
| ---: | :--- | :---: |
| Grating Length $=$ | 0.762 |  |
| Grating Width | $=0.768$ |  |
|  | m |  |


| Catchbasin Opening |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Length = | 0.616 |
| Width = | 0.622 |
| Area $=$ | 0.383 |
| Area Lost to Grating/Opening $=$ | 0.0006 |
| Orifice Opening Area $=$ | 0.0036 |
| Effective number of Openings = | 91 |
| Grating Open Area = | 0.328 |
| Assumed Blockage $=$ | 50.0 |
| Effective Grating Open Area $=$ | 0.164 |
| Effective flow Capacity = | 0.1377 |
| Number of Catchbasins = | 1 |
| Catchbasin Capacity $=$ | 0.138 |
| Total Inlet Capacity = | 0.138 |

SUFFICIENT CAPACITY FOR FLOW RANGE yes

| Project: | Argo Summer Valley |
| :--- | :--- |
| Location: | City of Brampton/Town of Caledon |
| Project \#: | 300054371 |
| Designer: | S. Breen |
| Date: | $20-$ Nov-2023 |

Project \#: 300054371

Date: 20-Nov-2023

Storm Flow Calculations

Pre Develpoment Flow to Hurontario Drainage system

| Area ID | Existing Conditions |  |
| :---: | ---: | :--- |
| PRE2 | $13600 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | Pre-Development 'C' |
| TOTAL | $1876800 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | 0.25 |

Post Develpoment Flow to Hurontario Drainage system

| Area ID | Proposed Conditions | Post-Development 'C' |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| POST1 | $2692 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | 0.25 |
| TOTAL | $2692 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | 0.25 |

Runoff Equation

$$
\mathrm{Q}=2.78 \mathrm{ClA}(\mathrm{~L} / \mathrm{s})
$$

where,

$$
\begin{aligned}
C & =\text { runoff coefficient } \\
I & =\text { rainfall intensity ( } \mathrm{mm} / \mathrm{hr)} \\
\mathrm{~A} & =\text { area (ha) } \\
2.78 & =\text { conversion factor }
\end{aligned}
$$

Intensity Equation
$I=A T^{C}$
I= Rainfall Intensity ( $\mathrm{mm} / \mathrm{hr}$ )
$\mathrm{T}=$ Time of concentration (hours)

Pre-Development Stormwater Flows (Tc=10 min)

| Return <br> Period | A | C | T | Q (L/s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | PRE2 | POST1 | Increase |  |  |  |  |
| 2 year | 22.1 | -0.714 | 0.17 | $79.43 \mathrm{~mm} / \mathrm{hr}$ | 74.8 | 14.8 | -60.0 |  |  |  |  |
| 5 year | 29.9 | -0.701 | 0.17 | $104.99 \mathrm{~mm} / \mathrm{hr}$ | 98.8 | 19.6 | -79.3 |  |  |  |  |
| 10 year | 35.1 | -0.695 | 0.17 | $121.93 \mathrm{~mm} / \mathrm{hr}$ | 114.8 | 22.7 | -92.1 |  |  |  |  |
| 25 year | 41.6 | -0.691 | 0.17 | $143.48 \mathrm{~mm} / \mathrm{hr}$ | 135.1 | 26.7 | -108.3 |  |  |  |  |
| 50 year | 46.5 | -0.688 | 0.17 | $159.52 \mathrm{~mm} / \mathrm{hr}$ | 150.2 | 29.7 | -120.4 |  |  |  |  |
| 100 year | 51.3 | -0.686 | 0.17 | $175.36 \mathrm{~mm} / \mathrm{hr}$ | 165.1 | 32.7 | -132.4 |  |  |  |  |



Intemin Condition: $A=22 h a$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& Q_{25 \mathrm{~m}}=\frac{d i A}{360} \text { whac } \quad=43 \mathrm{c}+5.9 \mathrm{wm} / \mathrm{h} \\
& C=0.5 \\
& A=22 \mathrm{ha} \\
& =\frac{0.5(27.4)(122)}{360} \\
& =0.84 \mathrm{~m}^{3} / \mathrm{s}
\end{aligned}
$$

Ubing aifice urneticn: Sóuc lor dia.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
0=0.8 \sqrt{2 g h} A & \text { Che } 0.0 \text { due to } \\
\therefore=600 \mathrm{~mm} & \text { bencheng }
\end{array}
$$

Utimate Conalifion

$$
\begin{aligned}
Q_{25 \mathrm{~mm}} & =\frac{C_{1} A}{360}=A=3912 \\
& =1.5 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}
\end{aligned}
$$



Orifice Solver
This orifice solver uses the Orifice Equation: Q $=\mathrm{C} \times \mathrm{A} \times(2 \times \mathrm{g} \times \mathrm{H}) \wedge(0.5)$ to solve for an unknown variable. Enter 2 known variables, and press the solve button of the unknown variable.


Diam. (mm)
856.

$C \mathrm{C}=0.625$ (Submerged)
$6 \mathrm{C}=0.8$ [unSubmerged]


Orifice Solver
This orifice solver uses the Orifice Equation: $\mathrm{Q}=\mathrm{C} \times \mathrm{A} \times\{2 \times \mathrm{g} \times \mathrm{H}\}^{\wedge}[0.5]$ to solve for an unknown variable. Enter 2 known variables, and press the solve button of the unknown variable.


Flow (cms)
0.84
7. Diam. (mm)

602

$\Gamma \mathrm{C}=0.625$ (Submerged)
$\sigma: C=0.8$ (unSubmerged)




This orifice solver uses the Orifice Equation: $Q=C \times A \times(2 \times g \times H\}^{\wedge}[0.5]$ to solve for an unknown variable. Enter 2 known variables, and press the solve button of the unknown variable.

.026

Diam. [mm]
98.0
F. $\mathrm{C}=0.625$ (Submerged)

CC = 0.8 (unSubmerged)
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II: $1 \ldots$
 BURNsIDE
[The Difference is our People]

# Appendix D 

## Water Demand Calculations and Hydrant Flow Testing

BURNSIDE
Argo Summer Valley Limited
Argo Summer Valley

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Date: } 5-\text { May-2023 } \\
& \text { Revision: } 1 \\
& \text { Completed By: EDT / MR } \\
& \text { Checked By: LN }
\end{aligned}
$$






| Fire Flow Required = Fire Flow Required = Average Area per hydrant = Required Duration $=$ |  | $\begin{array}{r} 7,000 \\ 117 \\ 13,500 \\ 2.00 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{L} / \mathrm{min} \\ & \mathrm{~L} / \mathrm{s} \\ & \mathrm{~m}^{2} \\ & \text { hours } \end{aligned}$ | (Rounded to the <br> (Interpolated from (Interpolated from | arest $1,000 \mathrm{~L} / \mathrm{min}$ ) <br> chart below) chart below) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Standard Hydrant Distribution |  |  |  | Required Dura | ion of Fire Flow |
| Fire Flow <br> required (L/min) | Average Area per Hydrant ( $\mathrm{m}^{2}$ ) |  |  | Fire Flow <br> required (L/min) | Duration (hours) |
| 2,000 | 16,000 |  |  | 2,000 | 1.00 |
| 4,000 | 15,000 |  |  | 3,000 | 1.25 |
| 6,000 | 14,000 |  |  | 4,000 | 1.50 |
| 8,000 | 13,000 |  |  | 5,000 | 1.75 |
| 10,000 | 12,000 |  |  | 6,000 | 2.00 |
| 12,000 | 11,000 |  |  | 8,000 | 2.00 |
| 14,000 | 10,000 |  |  | 10,000 | 2.00 |
| 16,000 | 9,500 |  |  | 12,000 | 2.50 |
| 18,000 | 9,000 |  |  | 14,000 | 3.00 |
| 20,000 | 8,500 |  |  | 16,000 | 3.50 |
| 22,000 | 8,000 |  |  | 18,000 | 4.00 |
| 24,000 | 7,500 |  |  | 20,000 | 4.50 |
| 26,000 | 7,000 |  |  | 22,000 | 5.00 |
| 28,000 | 6,500 |  |  | 24,000 | 5.50 |
| 30,000 | 6,000 |  |  | 26,000 | 6.00 |
| 32,000 | 5,500 |  |  | 28,000 | 6.50 |
| 34,000 | 5,250 |  |  | 30,000 | 7.00 |
| 36,000 | 5,000 |  |  | 32,000 | 7.50 |
| 40,000 | 4,500 |  |  | 34,000 | 8.50 |
| 42,000 | 4,250 |  |  | 38,000 | 9.00 |
| 44,000 | 4,000 |  |  | 40,000 | 9.50 |
| 46,000 | 3,750 |  |  |  |  |

Argo Summer Valley Water Demand Calculations

| Prepared by:EDT / MR |
| :---: | :---: |
| Checked by:LN |
| Project No: 300054371 |
| Date: $5 / 8 / 2023$ |

## (4) Burnside

## Assumptions

| Average Per Capita Water Consumption | 280 | L/cap/day | Region of Peel Public Work Watermain Design Criteria (June 2010) |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| Maximum Day Factor | 2 |  | Region of Peel Public Work Watermain Design Criteria (June 2010) |
| Peak Hour Factor | 3 | Region of Peel Public Work Watermain Design Criteria (June 2010) |  |


| Housing Summary | $\#$ | Persons Per Unit | Population |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Single Detached | 65 | 4.202 | 273 |
| TOTAL | 65 |  | 273 |


| Average Day Demand | $0.89 \mathrm{~L} / \mathrm{s}$ | $76.48 \mathrm{~m} 3 / \mathrm{day}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Maximum Day Demand | $1.77 \mathrm{~L} / \mathrm{s}$ | $152.95 \mathrm{~m} 3 / \mathrm{day}$ |
| Peak Hour Demand | $5.31 \mathrm{~L} / \mathrm{s}$ | $458.86 \mathrm{~m} 3 / \mathrm{day}$ |

October 27, 2022
sam.breen@rjburnside.com
R.J. Burnside \& Associates Limited

3 Ronell Crescent
Collingwood, Ontario L9Y 4J6
Attention: Mr. Sam Breed, Engineering Assistant

## RE: HYDRANT FLOW TEST HIGHWOOD ROAD AND DONHERB CRESCENT BRAMPTON, ONTARIO OUR PROJECT NO.: 22-370

As requested, hydrant water flow tests were performed at Highwood Road and Hurontario Street, Brampton by our Mr. P. Galsim on October 18 ${ }^{\text {th }}, 2022$ at 2:00 p.m. and the following results were recorded. See attached.

Yours truly,
NOVUS FIRE PROTECTION CONSULTING INC.

Y.R. Chan, P. Eng.

YC:tc


Attach (s).

c.c.: Ms. Lorena Niemi

Mr. Edward Tjeerdsma
Mr. Aniceto Raposo
Mr. Dominic Avers
Mr. Pedro Galsim
(Lorena.Niemi@rjburnside.com)
(Edward.Tjeerdsma@rjburnside.com)
(aniceto@novusfire.com)
(aversa@novusfire.com)
(pgalsim@novusfire.com)


Fire Protection Consulting Inc.

JOB NO: 22-370

| MAP PAGE: 574 | LOC: B-2 | MAPART EDITION: 2007 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| STREET: HIGHWOOD | ROAD | NO: 26 |

CROSS STREET:HURONTARIO STREET
CITY: BRAMPTON
TEST BY: NOVUS TIME: 2:00 PM DATE: OCT. 18/22

STATIC PRESSURE: 86 psi

| TEST <br> $\#$ | No. OF <br> OUTLETS | ORIFICE <br> SIZE | PITOT <br> READING | FLOW <br> (USGPM) | TOTAL FLOW <br> (USGPM) | RESIDUAL <br> PRESSURE <br> (PSI) | HYDRANT <br> TYPE | HYDRANT <br> COEFF. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 1 | $21 / 2$ | 50 | 1186 | 1186 | 65 |  | - |
| 2 | 2 | $21 / 2$ | $32+33$ | $949+964$ | 1913 | 64 |  | - |
| 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## WATER MAIN DATA:-

DIAMETER: $\qquad$
TEST HYDRANT LOCATION
FLOW: 3HIGHWOOD ROAD
FLOW: $\qquad$
RESIDUAL: 26 HIGHWOOD ROAD
COMMENTS: SPECIAL CONDITIONS $\qquad$



