

Excellence Reliance Inn

Innovation

Beachwood Development

Beachwood Developments Inc.

Functional Servicing & Stormwater Management Report

September 2020

The Jones Consulting Group Ltd. 4-229 Mapleview Drive East, Barrie ON L4N 0W5

ROM-17026 (70)



Distribution List

No. Of Hard Copies	PDF	Email	Organization
2		1	Town of Wasaga Beach
-		1	Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority
1		1	Client

Record of Revisions

Rev. No.	Date	Description				
-	September 2020	FSR/SWMR Submission				
	~					

Report Prepared By:



Joshua Battiston, EIT, CET, rcsi Engineering Designer

Report Approved By:



Duncan Richardson, P. Eng. Partner

Functional Servicing & Stormwater Management Report, September 2020 Beachwood Developments Inc., Beachwood Development, Town of Wasaga Beach ROM-17026(70)



Table of Contents

Page

1.	Introduction	1
1.1. 1.2. 1.3. 1.4. 1.5.	Appointment Property Description Existing and Proposed Land Use Supporting Documents Overview of Municipal Infrastructure	1 2 3 4
2.	Stormwater Management	6
 2.1. 2.2. 2.3. 2.4. 2.5. 2.6. 2.7. 2.8. 2.9. 2.10. 2.11. 2.12. 2.13. 	Introduction & Stormwater Control Criteria. Existing Drainage Conditions. Drainage Background. Proposed Drainage Conditions. Best Management Practices. Hydrology	6678905122556
3.	Water Servicing2	8
3.1. 3.2. 3.3.	External Watermain Network	28 28 29
4.	Sanitary Servicing3	1
4.1. 4.2. 4.3.	External Sanitary Servicing Framework	51 51 52
5.	Transportation	3
5.1. 5.2.	External Road Network	3 3
6.	Site Grading	4
6.1.	Easements and Blocks	4
7.	Utilities	5
8	Conclusions	6



List of Figures

List of Tables

Page

Page

List of Appendices

Appendix A	Supporting Calculations – Stormwater Management & Servicing
Appendix B	Supporting Calculations – Sanitary Servicing
Appendix C	Figures and Engineering Drawings (Reduced, NTS)
Appendix D	External Information



Disclaimer

This Report was prepared by **The Jones Consulting Group Ltd.** for **Beachwood Developments Inc.** The material in the Report reflects **The Jones Consulting Group Ltd.'s** best judgment in light of the information available at the time of the Report preparation. Any use which a third party makes of this Report, or any reliance on or decisions to be made based on it, are the responsibility of such third parties. **The Jones Consulting Group Ltd**. accepts no responsibility for damages, if any, suffered by any third party as a result of decisions made or actions based on this Report.



Functional Servicing & Stormwater Management Report Beachwood Developments Inc. – Beachwood Development Town of Wasaga Beach

1. Introduction

1.1. Appointment

The Jones Consulting Group Ltd. (TJCG) was retained by Beachwood Developments Inc. (Client) to provide engineering services for a proposed residential subdivision development located south of Shore Lane and north of Beachwood Road in the Town of Wasaga Beach (Town). The subdivision is to be known as the Beachwood Development.

This *Functional Servicing & Stormwater Management Report* (FSR/SWMR) has been prepared in support of the proposed *Draft Plan of Vacant Land Condominium* prepared by TJCG, dated July 27, 2020, and demonstrates how the lands will be serviced by the surrounding municipal infrastructure.

In particular, this report examines the property's servicing in relation to:

- Stormwater Servicing
- Stormwater Management
- Water Servicing
- Sanitary Servicing
- Transportation
- Site Grading
- Utility Servicing

1.2. Property Description

The land presents an irregular shape and comprises of approximately 5.88 hectares (ha) of land. The subject property is legally described as Part of Lot 34, Concession 3, in the Town of Wasaga Beach, County of Simcoe. A copy of the subject lands proposed proposed *Draft Plan of Vacant Land Condominium* prepared by The Jones Consulting Group, dated July 27, 2020, has been attached in **Appendix D**.



The site is situated south of Shore Lane, north of Beachwood Road and west of 74th Street North. It is bound to the north by existing residential lots and undeveloped land, to the west and east by existing residential lots, to the south by Beachwood Road. The location of the subject property is shown in **Figure 1**.



Figure 1 - Site Location

The site topography ranges in elevation from a maximum elevation of 184 meters at the southwest corner of the site adjacent to Beachwood Road to a minimum elevation of 178 meters at northern most point of the site adjacent to Shore Lane. The site generally drains from south to north towards Shore Lane. Existing slopes range from 0.7% to 7%.

The soils encountered on the subject lands are predominately an Eastport Sand (Est). These underlying soils belong to *Group* A of the SCS Hydrological Soils Group Classification System. Soil Series are determined from the *Soil Map of Simcoe County, Report No. 29* of the *Ontario Soil Survey* produced by the Canadian Department of Agriculture with the Ontario Department of Agriculture. Further background geotechnical and hydrogeological investigations have been completed by Cambium Inc., dated February 14, 2020 and June 18, 2020 respectively.

1.3. Existing and Proposed Land Use

The lands are comprised of undeveloped land and forested areas. There are currently no dwellings on the site. Lands from the south drain through the subject lands towards Nottawasaga Bay, forming part of Georgian Bay and Lake Huron. Refer to the *West End Drainage Study, Town*



of Wasaga Beach prepared by Ainley Group, dated August 2019, with excerpts provided in **Appendix D** for existing and proposed external drainage details.

The Beachwood Development proposed the development of 82 units based on single family residential units and street townhomes units, as well as two (2) high density blocks consisting of 134 units.

The property is currently zoned primarily as Residential with portions of the property designated for Low and High Density. Low Density is reserved for singles ranging in standard frontage size from 9.0m, 10.0m, 12.0m with frontages up to 32.0m in special cases, as well as townhouse blocks with unit frontages of 6.0m.

There are also land allocations provided for Stormwater Management, Parkland and Municipal Drainage. For further detail, refer to the *Proposed Draft Plan of Subdivision* prepared by TJCG, dated July 27, 2020 which has been included in **Appendix D**.

1.4. Supporting Documents

The following documents have been referenced in the preparation of this report:

- Town of Wasaga Beach Engineering Guidelines, March 2015;
- Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority, Stormwater Technical Guide, 2013;
- Credit Valley Conservation Authority & Toronto Region Conservation Authority, Low Impact Development Stormwater Management Planning and Design Guide, 2010;
- Ministry of the Environment, Stormwater Management Planning and Design Manual, March 2003;
- Ministry of Transportation, Drainage Management Manual, February 2008;
- Ministry of the Environment, Design Guidelines for Drinking-Water Systems, 2008;
- Soil Survey of Simcoe County, Report 29 of the Ontario Soil Survey;
- Simcoe County online Mapping;
- Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority online Mapping;
- West End Drainage Study, Town of Wasaga Beach, prepared by Ainley Group, August 2019;
- Geotechnical Investigation Part Lot 34 & 35, Concession 3, Wasaga Beach, Ontario, prepared by Cambium Inc., February 14, 2020.
- Hydrogeological Assessment Report Shore Lane Development, Wasaga Beach, Ontario, prepared by Cambium Inc., June 18, 2020.



1.5. Overview of Municipal Infrastructure

1.5.1. Stormwater Servicing

Currently, there are no existing storm sewers or existing stormwater management facilities on the subject lands. The lands to the north of the site have existing drainage facilities but provide no stormwater management controls for the subject site. As such, on-site all proposed storm sewer systems and a stormwater management facility are designed to control and convey drainage prior to discharge to the existing downstream infrastructure.

The proposed storm sewer system and stormwater management facilities will be designed and constructed in accordance with the latest standards prepared by the Town of Wasaga Beach, Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority (NVCA), and Ministry of Environment and Conservation and Parks (MOE). In addition to traditional end-of-pipe SWM facilities, Low Impact Development (LID) controls are proposed throughout the site as a means to meet Runoff Volume Control Targets (RVCT) and provide additional quality control through infiltration and filtration of stormwater runoff.

All flows from the proposed stormwater management facility will be discharge to Betty Boulevard; minor flows connecting to the proposed Storm Sewer system and emergency overflows to the roadside ditch. Furthermore, there are two drainage easements, otherwise referred to as the west and east easements, which convey external flows from lands located to the south of Beachwood Road as well as some uncontrolled internal catchments, through the subject lands to the extension of Betty Boulevard and Shore Lane, respectively.

1.5.2. Water Servicing

According to the Chapman Property, Shore Lane Plan and Profile Drawing, prepared by WMI & Associates Ltd., (Drawing P1, included in **Appendix D**), there is an existing 300mm diameter watermain on the north side of Shore Lane. According to the Town of Wasaga Beach's *Record Drawing of Highway No. 26 (Beachwood Road)* prepared by Ainley Group (Drawing 105120-SW10-RD Sta. 2+000 to Sta. 2+275 included in **Appendix D**), there is an existing 300mm diameter watermain located in the south boulevard of Beachwood Road. Connections are proposed to the existing watermain on Shore Lane, which will allow for the development to be adequately serviced with the required domestic and fire flows, and a second connection to the existing watermain within Betty Boulevard to create a looped system and a second feed to the development.



The Town of Wasaga beach will confirm through their consultant that adequate capacity exists within the existing and proposed (water tower and works yard to the south or Beachwood Boulevard) water supply network. Refer to Section 3 of this report for further design details.

1.5.3. Sanitary Servicing

According to the Chapman Property, Shore Lane Plan and Profile Drawing, prepared by WMI & Associates Ltd., (Drawing P1, included in **Appendix D**), there is an existing 450mm diameter sanitary sewer within Shore Lane. According to the Town of Wasaga Beach's *Record Drawing of Highway No. 26 (Beachwood Road)* prepared by Ainley Group (Drawing 105120-SW10-RD Sta. 2+000 to Sta. 2+275 included in **Appendix D**), there is an existing 250mm diameter sanitary sewer located in the south boulevard of Beachwood Road.

Flows generated from the site will be collected by the internal sanitary collection system and will discharge out between Lot 1 and 2199 Shore Lane via a 6.0m servicing easement, connecting to the existing 450mm dia. sanitary sewer on Shore Lane.

The Town of Wasaga beach has confirmed that adequate capacity exists within the existing sanitary sewer network with planned upgrades at SP1. Refer to Section 4 of this report for further design details.

1.5.4. Road Network

The subject property is generally bound by Beachwood Road to the south, existing residential to the east (74th Street North), north (Shore Lane) and west (8884 Beachwood Road). The proposed internal road network consists of private paved roadways with full movement stop controlled connections to Beachwood Road (mid-frontage) and the future extension of Betty Boulevard (northwest frontage).



2. Stormwater Management

2.1. Introduction & Stormwater Control Criteria

The stormwater management plan is intended to provide an environmentally sound approach to stormwater and drainage issues. The issues can be divided generally into five categories: runoff volume control, stormwater quality control, stormwater quantity control, water balance, and erosion & sediment control.

This report outlines a proposed design for the Beachwood Development's stormwater management system to meet the compulsory post-development quantity and quality control requirements of the Town, NVCA, and MECP.

The Town of Wasaga Beach and the NVCA require Enhanced (Level 1) quality control for the stormwater runoff generated from this site. The proposed downstream Stormwater Management Facility (Sand Filter with Forebay) has been sized to provide Level 1 quality control, quantity control up to the 100-year post to pre-development flows and the extended detention (48 hour drawdown) for the 25mm storm event for erosion control. Per the NVCA *Stormwater Technical Guide*, there is an additional requirement to capture and retain the first 5 mm of each and every rainfall event on-site. Consequently, the Beachwood Development is proposed to implement at-source LID's to meet this runoff volume control target, which will also assist in achieving established quality and quantity control targets and site-specific water balance.

The design of the LID's is outlined in **Section 2.5** in this Report, and the design of the SWMF is outlined in **Sections 2.7.1** & **2.7.2**.

2.2. Existing Drainage Conditions

The subject lands consist of approximately 5.88 hectares of land which is primarily unused forested areas. The land's topography contains slopes ranging from 0.7 to 7% with an average slope of 2.0%, generally draining from south to north.

There are significant external areas south of Beachwood Road draining towards the subject lands. The *West End Drainage Study*, prepared by Ainley Group, dated August 2019 provided details of the existing off-site drainage conditions as well as those of the site. A review of the existing site topography confirms that the two (2) catchments identified by Ainley are generally consistent with their modelling and routing identified in the August 2019 report.



There are no existing stormwater management facilities on the subject lands and all flows are released uncontrolled to the Shore Lane, future development lands to the north and Beachwood Road's existing drainage systems. The existing conditions are identified as on drawing **SWM-1** included in **Appendix C** and on Ainley Group drawings **118038-DR1**, **DRAFT-1** and **118038-DR1** included in **Appendix D**.

2.3. Drainage Background

Drainage in the area of, and upstream of the subject lands generally flows from south to north, eventually reaching Georgian Bay. However, over the past two decades the areas built form has changed, primarily with the construction of New Highway 26.

The new 4-lane divided Highway 26 was built in early-mid 2000 to divert traffic travelling between Stayner/Wasaga Beach and Collingwood while allowing local traffic to remain on highway 26former, renamed Beachwood Road.

The construction of new highway 26 included the installation of thirty plus (30+) new culverts upstream of the new roadway. Culverts were designed in accordance with the MTO Drainage Design Standard WC-7 (Jan. 2008) and SD-13 (Jan 2008) which stipulate culvert capacity and free board depth at the new roadway, resulting in backwater effect upstream of the culverts.

The subject, Beachwood Development lands fall within the drainage boundaries of Culverts 11 and 12 (Ainley: culverts #16 & #17, respectively).

Subsequent to the construction of new Highway 26, the Town of Wasaga Beach in January 2017 completed the West End Water Storage Facility and Maintenance Depot Class Environmental Assessment which concluded that the lands located between current Hwy 26 and Beachwood Road, south of the proposed Beachwood Development was the preferred location for the Town's new water storage and maintenance depot.

During the site selection, public concerns were expressed regarding on going drainage issues in the area. As such, Ainley Associates, on behalf of the Town, prepared and issued the August 2019 West End Drainage Study report. The report's recommendations include the construction of a wet stormwater management retention facility upstream of Beachwood Road to provide quality and quantity controls, and channelization of flow to Beachwood Road (culvert #16) and within the lands north of Beachwood Rd., discharging to Georgian Bay via two existing outlets, as drainage paths north or Beachwood Rd. are poorly defined.



The proposed Beachwood Development application makes provision for conveyance of Culvert #17 flows through the site to the extension of Betty Boulevard.

The report also recommends flows from upstream of Culvert #16, located east of Joan Ave be controlled through orifice controlled oversized storm pipes before discharging through the Beachwood Developments lands to Shore Lane and ultimately to Georgian Bay by the second of two existing culvert.

The proposed Beachwood Development application makes provision for conveyance of Culvert #16 flows through the site to Shore Lane.

2.4. Proposed Drainage Conditions

Development of the subject lands will consist of low density residential lots, low density townhouse lots, a Parkland block, a Municipal 6.0m Drainage block, a Stormwater Management block, two (2) high density apartment building blocks and an internal road network. The proposed internal storm sewer system will connect to the proposed stormwater management facility which ultimately discharges to the future Betty Boulevard storm sewer system.

The proposed lots and blocks will be developed with buildings, driveways, parking lots, and landscaped areas. The grading of the lots will direct stormwater runoff to the internal road network, which will contain a proposed storm sewer system to convey minor flow (up to the 5 Year event) to the proposed end-of-pipe Stormwater Management Facilities (SWMF). The internal roads will also be utilized to convey the major overland flow (>5 Year event) within the right-of-way to the proposed SWMF. The proposed end-of-pipe SWMF located along the north boundary of the site is a sand filter complete with a forebay and underdrain system, aiming to provide extended detention and flood control, along with quantity and quality control functions.

The proposed drainage system will also include a suite of lot level Low Impact Development (LID) source and conveyance control measures to provide controls that reduce peak flows and runoff volumes, provide upstream treatment for contaminants, promote groundwater recharge and assist in maintaining water balance to pre-development levels. LIDs proposed for the site include rear yard soakaway pits and rooftop storage on the high-density buildings.

Two drainage easements are provided to convey flows from external lands to the south, further details on the easements and conveyance infrastructure proposed are summarized in **Section 2.12**.



The storm sewer sub-catchment plan drawing, referenced as drawing **STM-1**, is provided in **Appendix C** and the storm sewer design sheet in **Appendix A**.

The Post-Development Storm Drainage Plan, referenced as drawing **SWM-2**, is included in **Appendix C** for reference.

2.5. Best Management Practices

2.5.1. Lot Level Controls

Lot-level LID measures, elsewhere referred to as the Rear Yard Soakaways, are proposed as a subsurface detention and infiltration system within the rear yards of all single detached and townhouse type units. The soakaways will promote infiltration of collected runoff and reduce the overall effective imperviousness of the site. These facilities will be sized to capture and infiltrate the full runoff volume from the 25 mm storm generated from half of the roof area of each dwelling, with full facility drawdown occurring within 24 hours. The infiltration rate as estimated through review of soil mapping was between 70 and 120 mm/hr on average, and a factored infiltration rate of 48 mm/hr will be used in the detailed design.

2.5.2. End-of-Pipe Controls

The proposed end-of-pipe SWMF located in the northwest corner of the site is programmed as a sand filter complete with a forebay in accordance with Section 4.9 of the MECP *Stormwater Management Planning and Design Manual, 2003*. The aim of this facility is to provide extended detention and flood control, along with quantity and quality control functions.

Further details on the SWMF are provided in **Section 2.7.1.** and **2.7.2**.

2.5.3. Enhanced Grass Swales

All proposed swales within the site are designed as water quality swales to promote infiltration of a portion of the captured runoff. The aim of this facility is to provide extended detention and flood control, along with quantity and quality control functions.

Detailed sizing calculations for each of the respective swales will be provided during the detailed design process.

2.5.4. Additional Low Impact Development Practices

It is recommended that all catchments should incorporate an increased depth of absorbent topsoil at least 300mm thick to promote at-source infiltration on pervious surfaces on lots. It is further recommended that any absorbent topsoil be amended with organic content (compost)



as recommended in the CVC Low Impact Development Design Guidelines while scarifying subsoils and remaining as unconsolidated as reasonably possible to maintain void spaces.

A study conducted in BC has asserted reductions in runoff volume and peak flows up to 50% from the placement of 300mm of absorbent landscaping (*British Columbia Ministry of Land, Water and Air Protection, May 2002*). Another study conducted in Ontario through the *Sustainable Technologies Evaluation Program (STEP)* has confirmed similar findings with a reduction in runoff of up to 27% (*STEP, Residential Lot Level SWM Practices, 2013*).

Other recommendations include downspout disconnection (where not connected to a soakaway), where roof leaders are directed away from impervious surfaces. Additionally, it is recommended to incorporate rain barrels at the lot level where possible, to further reduce runoff volumes to downstream systems. The proposed design has accounted no credit for the aforementioned best management practices.

2.6. Hydrology

2.6.1. Model

The development was hydrologically modeled using the latest version of the PCSWMM Professional computer program by Computational Hydraulics Int. PCSWMM is a GIS-based hydrologic model capable of performing both event-based and continuous rainfall simulations for SWM Facility, LID design water balance & erosion threshold calculations, respectively. Furthermore, the PCSWMM model utilizes the Green-Ampt Method for determining infiltration losses, which allows for the direct incorporation of field-tested infiltration rates. Once the field-tested infiltration rates are obtained through geotechnical investigation, the model can be further advanced at the detailed design stage to incorporate the Guelph Permeameter field testing needed for LID design.

The PCSWMM model used for this design is developed based on the existing site topography and proposed site grading designs. The model input parameters (e.g. catchment area, flow lengths, proposed imperviousness) have been updated to reflect the proposed subdivision design.

The hydrologic modeling includes both pre-development and post-development conditions to established target flow rates (m³/s) for each outlet for various return period events.



2.6.2. Design Storms & Climatology

The rainfall events used for the PCSWMM model simulations are based on the requirements of the Town of Wasaga Beach, NVCA and MECP, which include the SCS Type II and Chicago storm distributions. The following events have been modeled:

- 4-hour Chicago rainfall distribution for the 2 through 100-year storm events;
- 6, 12 & 24-hour SCS Type II rainfall distributions for the 2 through 100-year storm events;
- 25 mm 4-hour Chicago rainfall event; and
- Timmins Regional Storm Event.

2.6.3. Soil Type and Land Use

The *Soil Survey of Simcoe County Report No. 29* shows that the lands are comprised of Eastport Sand soils. This soil is well draining and is mostly sand and occurs in the form of dune. The profile is grey calcareous sand. The soils in this area are classified as Group A under the SCS Hydrologic Soils Group Classification. The underlying topography is rough and the slopes are short and steep.

2.6.4. Geotechnical Investigation

The site soils were investigated under a Geotechnical Investigation completed by Cambium Inc., dated February 14, 2020. The investigation included a total of seven (7) boreholes with monitoring wells. Site soils were determined to be topsoil overlying predominantly interbedded sand, silty sand, silt and sand and silty clay.

Grain size analyses were conducted on collected samples and estimated the coefficient of permeability for the subject lands at depth of 2.3m to 2.7m below original ground ranged from 10⁻¹ to 10⁻³ cm/s, which are classified as pervious soils. Samples in the location of proposed SWMF's were in the typical range of 10⁻¹ to 10⁻³ cm/s, indicating soils are pervious in this location.

A Groundwater Monitoring Wells were installed on four (4) of the boreholes. Measurements were taken monthly from December 2019 to May 2020 to better understand the groundwater regime for the subject lands. Findings from the monitoring data indicates a groundwater in each monitoring well throughout the monitoring period. The monthly groundwater measurement program is on-going. Proposed grading for the site has been developed to maintain minimum separation required from underside of structures, and as a result will require an average fill across the subject lands of approximately 1.4m.



2.6.5. Discretization

The hydrologic modeling includes both the pre-development and post-development conditions to established target flow rates (m³/s) for the site.

The pre-development PCSWMM model was derived from a review of topographic survey data and previous studies. As flows generally travel from south to north, the site is split roughly into two halves: Catchment A104-R is a total of 3.39 ha and represents the west half of the development while Catchment A103-R is a total of 2.49 ha and represents the east half of the development. Each catchment area was assigned its own outlet as these flows are directed to different outlets to Georgian Bay.

The post-development PCSWMM model was derived from the grading for the proposed subdivision design. All areas that drain to the SWMF, including the SWMF itself, are included in Catchment 301, a total of 4.01 ha. Uncontrolled catchment areas have been added which generally consists of rear-yards that cannot be graded to drain to the pond. Catchments 302 and 303 are uncontrolled areas that total 0.76 ha and drain to the west outlet at the future Betty Boulevard extension via a series of dedicated swales and channels. Catchments 304 and 305 are uncontrolled areas that total 1.11 ha and drain to the east outlet at Shore Lane via a series of dedicated swales and channels.

The imperviousness of the subdivision catchment areas has been set at 66% to account for a variety of uses within the proposed development blocks. The higher imperviousness is conservative to ensure that the SWM pond block is adequately sized for a traditional end-of-pipe SWM facility which excludes the benefits to quality and quantity control that may be realized from the implementation of upstream LIDs.

The pre-development and post-development catchment areas are illustrated on **Drawings SWM-**1 and **SWM-2** respectively and are provided in **Appendix C**. The PCSWMM model schematic is provided in **Appendix A** along with the model output.

 Table 1 summarizes the hydrologic parameters that were used for the PCSWMM model.



Area ID	Area (ha)	Flow Length (m)	Width (m)	Slope (%)	Zero Imperv. (%)	Imperv. (%)	DS Perv. (mm)	D\$ Imp. (mm)	Routing	Soils
	Pre-Development Model									
A104-R	3.39	227	147	2.0	3	10	8	2	Outlet	Sandy Loam
A103-R	2.49	240	103	2.0	4.2	14	8	2	Outlet	Sandy Loam
					Post-Deve	lopment N	lodel			
301	4.01	200	200	2.0	0	66	5	2	46% Perv.	Sandy Loam
302	0.25	20	123	2.0	0	63	5	2	84% Perv.	Sandy Loam
303	0.51	96	53	2.0	0	9	5	2	100% Perv.	Sandy Loam
304	0.67	90	74	2.0	0	19	5	2	100% Perv.	Sandy Loam
305	0.45	30	148	2.0	0	4	5	2	Outlet	Sandy Loam

Table 1 - Summary of Hydrologic Model Inputs

The infiltration parameters used in the model and summarized in **Table 1** reflect those referenced in the Geotechnical Investigation. Infiltration parameters will be revisited and updated for the detailed design upon completion of additional geotechnical investigations and testing.

Some of the PCSWMM model input parameters (not shown in **Table 1** above) are common among all catchment areas, including the following:

Manning's N for impervious / pervious area	= 0.013 / 0.15
--	----------------

Depth of depression storage on impervious / pervious area (mm) = 2 / 5 or 8

2.6.6. Model Results

The hydrologic modeling results are summarized herein. The pre-development condition was modeled within PCSWMM to establish the allowable rates for the site. The allowable post-development rates and the resulting post-development peak flow rates are summarized in **Table 2** as computed by the PCSWMM model. The PCSWMM model schematics along with the output printout for the 100-year SCS 24-hour storm are provided in **Appendix A**. The model output printouts are provided in PDF format for all storm events on a USB provided with the digital modeling files appended at the back of the report.



Storm Peak Event Flow (m³/s)								
	Area (ha)	Storm Distribution						
Return Period (years)		2	5	10	25	50	100	
Pre-Development Cond	dition – Po	eak Flow	Total (OF	1 – West)				
Chicago - 4 hour	3.39	0.109	0.144	0.172	0.218	0.260	0.307	
SCS Type II - 6 hour	3.39	0.065	0.086	0.102	0.153	0.208	0.272	
SCS Type II - 12 hour	3.39	0.068	0.089	0.124	0.206	0.279	0.356	
SCS Type II - 24 hour	3.39	0.070	0.110	0.203	0.316	0.388	0.466	
25mm Storm	3.39			0.0)84			
Timmins Storm	3.39			0.1	73			
Pre-Developr	nent Cor	dition – P	eak Flow	Total (OF	2 – East)			
Chicago - 4 hour	2.49	0.111	0.148	0.175	0.218	0.255	0.295	
SCS Type II - 6 hour	2.49	0.067	0.089	0.105	0.136	0.177	0.225	
SCS Type II - 12 hour	2.49	0.070	0.092	0.116	0.174	0.228	0.286	
SCS Type II - 24 hour	2.49	0.072	0.103	0.168	0.252	0.306	0.364	
25mm Storm	2.49	0.085						
Timmins Storm	2.49	0.136						

Table 2 - Hydrologic Modelling Results Summary: Pre-Development

Table 3 - Hydrologic Modelling Results Summary: Post-Development

Storm Peak Event Flow (m³/s)								
	Area (ha)	Storm Distribution						
Return Period (years)		2 5 10 25 50 100						
Post Development Con	dition – T	otal Peak	(OF	⁼ 1 – West)				
Chicago - 4 hour	4.77	0.039	0.062	0.082	0.112	0.135	0.161	
SCS Type II - 6 hour	4.77	0.035	0.062	0.086	0.130	0.193	0.262	
SCS Type II - 12 hour	4.77	0.040	0.076	0.113	0.212	0.284	0.362	
SCS Type II - 24 hour	4.77	0.052	0.100	0.179	0.283	0.359	0.427	
25mm Storm	4.77	0.022						
Timmins Storm	4.77			0.3	67			
Post Develop	ment Cor	ndition – 1	lotal Peal	k Flow (Ol	F2 – East)			
Chicago - 4 hour	1.11	0.006	0.017	0.041	0.078	0.112	0.150	
SCS Type II - 6 hour	1.11	0.005	0.042	0.082	0.136	0.178	0.219	
SCS Type II - 12 hour	1.11	0.011	0.067	0.116	0.179	0.224	0.270	
SCS Type II - 24 hour	1.11	0.027	0.121	0.175	0.232	0.270	0.308	
25mm Storm	1.11	0.005						
Timmins Storm	1.11	0.091						



The results demonstrate that the proposed stormwater management facility will provides the required quantity control to reduce post-development peak flows to the respective allowable release rates for the West Outlet. Additional quantity controls are required for frequent return period events within the uncontrolled catchments 304 and 305 that drain to the East Outlet. Details of the additional controls will be provided at the detailed design stage. The function of the proposed SWMF is discussed in further detail in **Section 2.7.1.** and **2.7.2.**

2.7. Proposed Stormwater Management Plan

2.7.1. Quantity Control

As per the Town and NVCA requirements, *Enhanced* (Level 1) stormwater quality control is required for the site. The proposed sand filter will provide the required level of SWM quality control, as the calculations provided below will demonstrate. In addition to the typical quality control requirements, the incorporation of Low Impact Development (LID) measures will provide phosphorus removal benefits to ensure that best efforts are taken to reduce post-development phosphorus loadings to pre-development levels (or a minimum 80% removal of TP from postdevelopment). Phosphorus Loading calculations are provided within **Section 2.9**.

A plan view and section drawing has been provided for the SWMF. Refer to **Drawings PND-1** and **PND-2** in **Appendix C**.

Sand Filter Sizing

The total land draining to the SWMF includes Catchment 301, totaling an area of 4.08 hectares. The total imperviousness used to size the pond is 60% given that catchment 301 is an internal area comprised of a combination of single detached, townhouses and two high density blocks. Based on the MOE requirements (extrapolation of Table 3.2), 31.7 m³/ha of storage is required for enhanced quality control. Furthermore, the required extended detention volume is set at 40 m³/ha to promote good drawdown characteristics.

The extended detention and water quality volumes, as per the MOE guidelines, are calculated as follows:

Enhanced (Level 1) Water Quality Protection Total area draining to pond for quality control = 4.01 ha (66% Net Impervious Area), (33.7 m³/ha) 4.01 ha * 33.7 m³/ha = 135 m³ (water quality storage in filter)



4.01 ha * 40 m³/ha = 160 m³ (extended detention)

However, the extended detention volume must be designed to attenuate the erosion volume from the 4-hour 25 mm Chicago rainfall event. Based on the watershed characteristics and the PCSWMM model, the 25 mm storm event produces a runoff volume of 334 m³ (8.34 mm * 4.01 ha). Therefore, the runoff volume from the 4-hour 25 mm Chicago storm event will govern.

The water quality storage is provided by the filter media in the sand filter as follows:

Layer	Thickness		Void Ratio	Equivalent 1D Thickness			
Sand Layer	0.50 m	١	0.30	0.15 m			
Stone Layer	0.50 m	50 m 0.40		0.20 m			
Total				0.35 m			
Filter Surface Area = 541 m^2							
Filter Volume =			a * 1D Equivale	ent Thickness			
		= 541	m² x 0.35 m				
		= 189	.4 m³				

Extended detention volume is provided as a combination of storage within the filter media and active storage above the surface of the filter.

	Required:	Provided:
Water Quality	160 m ³	189 m³
Extended Detention	334 m³	657 m³

The 24 hour extended detention release rate is the maximum target flow rate to ensure that 24 hour settling occurs in the facility. The extended detention outlet is 80 mm in diameter. The drawdown equation has been used to verify the detention time for the extended detention volume. The equation is given as follows:

$$t = \frac{0.66C_2h\sqrt{h} + 2C_3\sqrt{h}}{2.75A_0}$$

Where:

t = drawdown time (seconds)

 $C_2 =$ slope coefficient from the area-depth linear regression (650.8)



- $C_3 =$ intercept from the area-depth linear regression (773.1)
- $A_0 = cross$ -sectional area of the extended detention orifice (0.0050 m²)
- h = maximum water elevation above the orifice, taken from the maximum extended detention elevation to centroid of orifice (0.46 m)

Given the above information, the actual extended detention storage time was determined to be approximately 23.8 hours, which approaches the MOE minimum criteria. This drawdown time does not account for the attenuation of flows through the filter media which will extend the drawdown time of the facility. When accounting for the flux through the filter media, the drawdown time is estimated to be 47.2 hours, as extracted from the PCSWMM output for the SWMF *Volume vs. Time* plot included in **Appendix A.** The area-depth curve can be found in **Appendix A** to illustrate how the above coefficients were determined.

Forebay Sizing

The forebay must be sized to provide sufficient length from the inlet to the forebay weir. It is recommended that the forebay be sized according to the length required for settlement of larger suspended particles. The forebay for the pond was designed according to the following criteria (MOE, 2003):

Forebay Settling Length

$$Dist = \sqrt{\frac{rQ_p}{V_s}}$$

Where:

Dist = the minimum forebay length (m)

- r = the length to width ratio based on the dimensions at the permanent pool elevation 180.15 m (2.23:1)
- $Q_p =$ the peak flow rate exiting the pond during the 4 hour 25 mm Chicago quality storm event (0.022 m³/s)
- $V_s = the settling velocity.$ It is recommended that a value of 0.0003 m/s be used in most cases.

The required settling lengths of the forebay is 12.8 metres.

Forebay Dispersion Length

$$Dist = \frac{8Q}{dV_f}$$



Where:

- Dist = the minimum forebay length (m)
- Q = the 5-year peak inlet flow capacity (0.594 m³/s)
- d = the depth of the permanent pool in the forebay (1.0 m)
- $V_f =$ the desired velocity at forebay berm (0.5 m/s)

The required dispersion length of the forebay is 9.5 metres.

The proposed forebay accommodates both the settling and dispersion lengths. The shortest length is approximately 21.0 m measured from the inlet headwall to the face of the forebay overflow weir.

2.7.2. Quantity Control

The Stormwater Management Facility is located at the northwestern corner of the Beachwood Development, immediately east of the future Betty Boulevard extension and south of the existing residences fronting onto Shore Lane. The SWMF has been designed in accordance with the Town, NVCA, and MOE guidelines as a sand filter with a traditional wet forebay for pre-treatment.

The bottom elevation of the SWMF's forebay is 179.15 m, the surface elevation of the filter cell is 180.15 m, and the top of pond elevation is 181.71 m at the outer limits of the access road. This provides a total depth of active storage of 1.56 m in the main cell and forebay, and a surface depth equal to 0.35 m in the media filter cell. Sideslopes of 3H:1V are proposed throughout the filter cell and wet forebay, meanwhile 3H:1V slopes are proposed everywhere else in the facility. The backsloping of the pond is proposed to match existing grades within the site boundaries.

An allowance for a 3.0 m wide maintenance access road is provided around the entire perimeter of the SWMF. A total of 1,990 m³ of active storage has been provided with no permanent pool or credit for the void storage in the sand filter. No ramp is provided within the forebay due to its overall geometry and proximity to the maintenance access road. During maintenance, the forebay can be drained by pumping to the control maintenance hole. A 0.15 m high flow spreader has been provided bordering the forebay and filter cell with 3H:1V sideslopes proposed throughout.

A sediment drying area will be provided for the temporary storage of sediment during forebay maintenance in the southwest corner of the SWMF block. The sediment drying area will be bermed and graded towards the forebay cell at positive slope. The sediment drying area will be appropriately sized in accordance with the MOE SWM Planning & Design Manual guidelines.



Minor events are collected through a system of conventional storm sewers and discharge through an inlet into the facility. Flows are then directed through the forebay to the filter cell which is complete with system of 100mm dia. underdrains connecting to a 250 mm dia header and draining to the outlet control structure at the west end of the facility. The sand filter is contained within an impermeable liner, therefore the flow rate through the filter is conservatively assumed to be constant as described by *Equation 4.20* and in *Section 4.9.6*. of the *Stormwater Management Planning and Design Manual, 2003.* The Sand Filter discharge is calculated based on the filter geometry, layer thicknesses and the proposed soils, as shown below.

Sand Filter Discharge

Q =
$$f \times \left(\frac{P}{3,600,000}\right) \times (LW \times n)$$

Where:

$$f = longevity factor (per Table 4.12) \\ P = Percolation Rate for Sand (120 mm/h) \\ L = length of the filter (A = 541 m2) \\ W = width of the filter (A = 541 m2) \\ W = width of the filter (A = 541 m2) \\ W = Width of th$$

N = void ratio for media filter soils (0.30)

As such, the flow rate out of the media filter is calculated as 0.005 m³/s, regardless of the available head on the filter.

Major overland flows are directed into the SWMF through an overland flow route directly into the forebay of the SWMF, acting as a protective measure for the sand filter.

The primary control for the SWMF is a reverse-sloped 450 mm diameter storm pipe directed to a control maintenance hole complete with a 80 mm diameter orifice plate, bolted to the inside of the control structure, with an invert set to the bottom of main cell elevation at 180.15 m. The primary outlet pipe will discharge via a double ditch inlet catchbasin manhole (DDICBMH), with its invert located at the surface of the sand filter. A secondary outlet will discharge via the same DDICBMH connected by a 450 mm diameter storm pipe to the control maintenance hole, with the pipe serving as the orifice inside of the control structure at an invert of 180.65 m.

A 10.0 m wide emergency overflow spill weir is incorporated at an elevation of 181.35 m to ensure safe conveyance of peak flows to the future Betty Boulevard extension during the Regional (Hazel) storm event. A detail of the overflow weir and overflow weir outfall channel are provided on **Drawing PND-1** and **PND-2**.



Key Elevations Table – SWMF					
Location	Elev. (m)				
Bottom of Forebay	179.15				
Underdrain Outlet	179.20				
Sand Filter Surface	180.15				
Top of Flow Spreader	180.30				
Primary Outlet - 80mm dia. Orifice	180.15				
Secondary Outlet - 475mm dia. Orifice	180.65				
Emergency Overflow Weir - 30.0m Wide	181.35				
Top of Pond (Access Road - Exterior)	181.71				

Table 4 - SWMF Facility Design Summary

Based on the results of the *PF-Model*, an abbreviated version of the SWMF1 stage-storagedischarge table is presented in **Table 5** below. The full table is provided in **Appendix A**. The values for maximum required storage and pond outflow result from the proposed geometric configuration of the facility, design height and dimensions for the orifices and overflow weir. The *SCS 24-hour* storm distribution governs the maximum outflow and storage volume requirements. Refer to **Drawings PND-1** to **PND-2** in **Appendix C** for details. Refer to the PCSWMM Pond results in **Appendix A**.

Stage Storage Discharge Table – SWMF							
Return Period (Years)	Q _{PEAK} (m³/s)	Total Storage Vol. (m³)	Total Depth (m)	Active Depth (m)	Water Level (m)		
Bottom of Forebay	0.000	0	0.00	0.00	179.15		
Surface of Filter	0.005	189	1.00	0.00	180.15		
25mm	0.007	304	1.00	0.00	180.15		
2	0.017	835	1.54	0.54	180.69		
5	0.091	1,064	1.73	0.73	180.88		
10	0.155	1,204	1.84	0.84	180.99		
25	0.240	1,385	1.98	0.98	181.13		
50	0.285	1,539	2.09	1.09	181.24		
Regional	0.309	1,693	2.16	1.16	181.31		
100	0.326	1,702	2.20	1.20	181.35		
Top (Interior)	2.895	1,915	2.45	1.45	181.65		
Top (Exterior)	3.818	1,990	2.51	1.51	181.71		

Table 5 - SWMF Performance Summary

*Storage Volume includes 189.4 m³ in filter.



As shown in the table above, the minimum freeboard of 0.30 m is provided under the Regional Storm event.

The results present above demonstrate that the proposed stormwater management facility will provide the required quantity control to reduce post-development peak flows to the allowable release rates for their respective areas.

2.8. Volume Control

Runoff Volume control is provided by a combination of the LID facilities as described in **Section 2.5**. Refer to the above mentioned sections for the corresponding details for the respective facilities.

The NVCA *Stormwater Technical Guidelines* provide guidance on volumetric control, setting an initial target of a volume capture equal to a depth of 5 mm over the total developable area of the site. However, a best efforts approach was undertaken for this site, given the underlying soils and proximity to the groundwater table as outlined in **Section 2.4.** Furthermore, the Town of Wasaga Beach prefers lot-level practices be implemented in an effort to minimize the associated ongoing operations and maintenance costs. Summarized below in **Table 6** are the volumetric control targets for the site, as well as the anticipated overall performance of the rear yard soakaways.

LID Performance: Area 6 - 25mm Event						
Description Total Contributing Area (ha)						
Runoff Volume Control Target (5mm)	5.88	294				
Soakaway Pits – Rooftops	1.30	*299.5				
High Density Blocks	0.22	**11.0				
Best Efforts Sub-Totals		310.5				

Table 6 - Runoff Volume Control: Targets & Performance (25mm Event)

* Infiltration Volume for Singles & Semis calculated as the runoff volume from the 25mm storm (23.04mm per PCSWMM) over the rooftop areas

** Infiltration Volume for High Density Blocks calculated as 5 mm of runoff volume over the entire roof area for each building

The results demonstrate that the proposed LID practices will achieve a volume capture of 310.5 m³, corresponding to an equivalent depth of **5.28 mm over the total developable area**, is captured and infiltrated, achieving the RVC_T volume of 292 m³ as outlined in **Table 6**.



The results provided herein demonstrate that the proposed LID facilities will provide an adequate best efforts approach to achieving the required RVC_{T} .

2.9. Nutrient Management

As required by current NVCA policy, a pre to post development phosphorous balance has been undertaken for the site. The analysis has been completed using the Phosphorous Budget Tool created by Hutchison Environmental Sciences Ltd., and Stoneleigh Associates Inc. Members of The Jones Consulting Group Ltd. have been trained by Hutchinson Environmental Sciences Ltd. to complete a phosphorous analysis within the NVCA watershed using the Phosphorous Budget. Supporting software print-outs are provided in **Appendix A**.

The analysis revealed that in the pre development condition the total phosphorous load exported off site was determined to be 0.35 kg per year. In the post development condition without the considerations of BMP's, the total phosphorous exported off site is 2.62 kg per year. This corresponds to an increase in phosphorus export, but 'Best Management' practices were still applied to help sustain watershed health. With the consideration of the BMP's quality and quantity control features identified in previous sections, the phosphorous export off site will be reduced further to 0.99 kg per year. This amount is a reduction of 62% of the post development phosphorous exports post-development to achieve a balance for the site.

2.10. Water Balance

The primary objective of the NVCA's water balance target is to capture and manage annual rainfall on the development site to preserve pre-development hydrology (water balance) through a combination of infiltration, evapotranspiration, landscaping, rainwater reuse and/or other low impact development practices.

Various site specific characteristics contribute to the ability to achieve water balance. They include, but are not limited to: soil permeability, the ability to collect and direct drainage into the ground, groundwater table elevations and seasonal fluctuations. A site-specific water balance is required, and best efforts will be made via the SWM plan to maintain groundwater recharge while considering site specific characteristics.

Water Balance is an accounting of the available water resources in a given area and can be estimated by the following general equation:



$\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{E}\mathbf{T} + \mathbf{R} + \mathbf{I}$

Where:P = Precipitation (Annual)ET= Evapotranspiration/evaporationR = Surface Water RunoffI = Infiltration

The precise measurement of water balance components is difficult to ascertain. Typically, approximations and simplifications are made after reviewing precipitation and climatic data for a given time series and the annual quantities are estimated using statistical methods.

All water balance component data has been provided by Cambium Inc. in the Hydrogeological Assessment Report, dated June 18, 2020. The Water Balance component values have been summarized below in **Table 7**.

Water Balance Component	Depth	Units					
Weighted Parameters							
Pre-Development							
Precipitation (P)	912	mm/yr					
Evapotranspiration (ET)	545	mm/yr					
Infiltration Factor (MECP Method)	0.55						
Actual Infiltration	202	mm/yr					
P – ET (Runoff for Pervious)	165	mm/yr					
P – ET (Runoff for Impervious @ 90% Surplus)	330	mm/yr					
Post-Development		•					
Precipitation (P)	912	mm/yr					
Evapotranspiration (ET)	545	mm/yr					
Infiltration Factor (MECP Method)	0.55						
Actual Infiltration	202	mm/yr					
P – ET (Runoff for Pervious)	165	mm/yr					
P – ET (Runoff for Impervious @ 90% Surplus)	330	mm/yr					

Table 7 - Water Balance Components



Water balance components for both Pre- and Post- Development Scenarios have been weighted appropriately with respect to soil type (HSG-A) and ground cover (Woods and Urban Lawns) as described in the Hydrogeological Assessment Report prepared by Cambium Inc.

In order to assess the impact the proposed development will have on the subject site's water budget, the pre- and post-development infiltration volumes have been calculated by Cambium Inc. for the subject lands in **Table 8**, and a summary of the surplus runoff and infiltration deficit is provided in **Table 9**. The land areas used for the analysis are based on the *Draft Plan* (5.88 ha total area of developable land). The high density blocks will provide their own water balance subject to Site Plan control.

Land Use	Approx. Land	Estimated Impervious	TOTAL Runoff	TOTAL Infiltration
Description	Area (m²)	Area (%)	Volume (m³/a)	Volume (m³/a)
Mature Forest	58,800	0	9,711	11,869
Totals	58,800	0	9,711	11,869
Residential	58,800	60	31,862	5,050
Totals	58,800	60	31,862	5,050

Table 8 - Water Balance for Pre- & Post-Development Conditions

Table 9 - Water Balance Summary

Total	Pre	Post	Net	Pre-to-Post
Development	Development	Development	Change	Infiltration
Area (m)	Infiltration	Infiltration	(%)	Deficit
	(m³/a)	(m³/a)		(m³/a)
58,800	11,869	5,050	-57	6,819

LID measures for Stormwater Management have been incorporated into the servicing strategy for the subject lands in an effort to offset the infiltration deficit for the post-development condition by promoting groundwater recharge.

In following the NVCA runoff volume target with a best efforts approach, subcatchment areas have been established to be routed to rear yard soakways, each of which have been adequately sized to provide a storage volume to capture the runoff from the 25 mm event over the rear portion of each rooftop. Calculations below will demonstrate how the water balance target has been approached.



LID Annual Infiltration Volume:	4,722 m³
Total Rooftop Area + HD Blks to LID:	1.52 ha
LID Capture:	5.3 mm/Event
Average Annual Rain Events (>2mm):	80.1 Events/Year
Average Annual Rain Events:	161.5 Events/Year
Typical Rooftop Runoff Volume:	2.70 m ³ (90 th Percentile Storm)

The **deficit is therefore reduced to 2,097 m³/a** by introducing rear yard soakaways on each single and townhouse lot as well as future infiltration based LID measures on all high density blocks. Additional LID measures will be explored during the detailed design approval process to reduce the remaining deficit. The Detailed water balance calculations are included in **Appendix A** for reference.

2.11. Overland Flow

All minor stormwater runoff (up to the 5-year event) will be conveyed to the proposed stormwater management facilities via a network of storm sewers. The storm sewer system has been designed for the 5-year event using the Rational Method. A design sheet has been prepared for the 5-Year Storm Sewer. Refer to **Drawings STM-1** as well as **DS-1** for further details.

The major stormwater runoff will be conveyed along the roadway and dedicated drainage channels to the proposed stormwater management facilities and/or designated outlets. All channel sizing calculations have been completed to ensure they are adequately sized to convey the regulatory event. Hydraulic Conveyance Calculations for overland flow channels in drainage blocks, weirs within the SWMF and outfall channels are provided in **Appendix A**.

2.12. External Flow Conveyance

Drainage from lands south of Beachwood Road are collected by a pair of culverts as described in the *West End Drainage Study*, prepared by the Ainley Group, dated August 2019. The external flows which are to be conveyed through the subject lands are directed to one of two (2) easements, elsewhere referred to as the West and East drainage easements. An excerpt from the report prepared by Ainley Group is summarizing the flows to be conveyed is as follows:



Culvert	Area	Design	Flows (m ³ /s)						
		Event	2-Yr	5-Yr	10-Yr	25-Yr	50-Yr	100-Yr	Regional
Culvert #16 (West)	15.80 ha	24h SCS	0.291	0.387	0.445	0.539	0.645	0.779	0.835
Culvert #17 (East)	9.10 ha	24h SCS	0.202	0.267	0.312	0.399	0.501	0.665	0.566

Table 10 – External Flows Summary (Table 8 – Ainley Report)

Major stormwater runoff will be conveyed through a series of dedicated culverts and drainage channels to the proposed outlets at the future Betty Boulevard extension and Shore Lane. All flows generated from Culvert #16 will be conveyed through the west easement via an 900mm x 1800mm concrete box culvert. All flows generated from Culvert #17 will be conveyed through the east easement first via a 750mm dia. concrete storm sewer and then through a 1.0m wide flat bottom drainage channel complete with 3:1 side slopes.

All channel sizing calculations have been completed to ensure they are adequately sized to convey the regulatory event. Hydraulic Conveyance Calculations for culverts and overland flow channels in drainage easements are provided in **Appendix A**.

2.13. Erosion & Sediment Control

The proposed works will require an *Erosion and Sediment Control (ESC) Plan* in order to provide adequate protection of downstream receiver systems throughout construction. The proposed ESC works are to be outlined and submitted during the detailed design approval process. The general approach to managing erosion and sediment control during construction is as follows:

During construction, the majority of the development's natural features will be removed and the topsoil stripped within the development area. The exposed surface will be susceptible to erosion, increasing the potential for sediment runoff. To minimize local and downstream impacts from erosion and sedimentation during construction, the following measures have been recommended:

 Excess earth and topsoil is to be stockpiled away from the creek limits and/or removed from site. Stockpiles shall be seeded or covered with erosion control if left for periods of greater than 30 days.



- Temporary sediment control fencing should be erected around the perimeter of all grading activities, including double silt fence along the north boundary.
- Temporary sediment fabric and stone filters should be installed on catch basins until surface cover has been stabilized.
- Temporary rock flow check dams should be installed within drainage cut-off swales.
- A temporary construction access mud mat should be installed at the construction accesses to reduce the amount of materials that may be transported off site.
- Temporary erosion and sediment control basins are to be constructed, complete with a Hickenbottom outlet control structure and overflow weir. The basins' purpose is to detain runoff long enough to allow the majority of soil particles to settle out of suspension.
- Construction during drier months should be monitored for wind-borne transport of sediments. At the direction of the engineer, the contractor may be directed to water down exposed earth areas with an aqueous solution of calcium chloride.
- All disturbed areas not under immediate construction for 30 days, or not intended for building activities within a 3-month time period, should be stabilized with seeding.
- Phased removal of temporary sediment basins during building phase of the development to coincide with upstream stabilization (established vegetation) of catchment areas.
- A weekly monitoring program to ensure all ESC measures are in place and not damaged by vandalism or a significant storm event.

Through proper implementation of the detailed erosion and sediment control measures, off-site impacts are expected to be minimized during the construction phase of the project.



3. Water Servicing

3.1. External Watermain Network

External to the proposed development and traversing the south property line from 8801 Beachwood Road (J.C. Cycle), continuing eastward there is an existing 300mm diameter watermain within the southern boulevard of Beachwood Road. Along the north limits of the site there is an existing 300mm diameter watermain within the Shore Lane right-of-way. Furthermore, within the future Betty Boulevard extension (by others) right-of-way there is an existing 300mm diameter watermain.

Connections are proposed at two (2) points, Shore Lane and the future extension of Betty Boulevard, with a redundant water supply.

3.2. Proposed Watermain System

The development's projected design population and water supply flow rates are estimated based on the Town of Wasaga Beach *Engineering Standards* (March 2015), and MOE *Design Guidelines for Drinking Water Systems* (2008). The following design criteria have been used for calculating the person per unit (PPU) for the various types of residential lots.

<u>Unit Type</u>	Design Population
Low Density Residential	2.6 persons/unit
High Density Residential	2.6 persons/unit

Based on the above design criteria and the *Proposed Draft Plan of Subdivision* statistics, the total population for the Beachwood Development has been calculated below.

<u>Unit Type</u>	Design Population
81 Low & Medium Density Residential units x 2.6 PPU	211 people
134 High Density Residential units x 2.6 PPU	349 people
Total projected population	560 people

In order to meet the development's potable and fire water demands, it is proposed that the subject lands be connected to the existing municipal system through proposed connections to the existing system at Shore Lane and the future Betty Boulevard extension. Internally, the subject lands will be serviced with watermains of 150mm diameter, including all appropriate appurtenances in accordance with the Town of Wasaga Beach standards. Operating pressures



within the water supply and distribution system must remain a minimum pressure of 50 psi. A summary of the proposed demands for the development and scenarios is provided below.

Design Criteria:

- Average Daily Flow (ADD) = 350 L/d/capita (Town of Wasaga Beach Engineering Standards)
- Peak Hour Demand Factor (PHD) = 4.13 (MOE Drinking Water Guideline, 2008)
- Max. Day Demand Factor (MDD) = 2.75 (MOE Drinking Water Guideline, 2008)
- Min. Hour Demand Factor (MHD) = 0.40 (MOE Drinking Water Guideline, 2008)
- Fire Flow Residential = 8,000 L/min (Fire Underwriters Survey, 1999)

Peak Hour Demand:

Q = Pop. x ADD x PHD

Q = (560 persons x 350 L/d/capita x 4.13)/86,400

Q = 9.37 L/s

Minimum Hour Demand:

Q = Pop. x ADD x MHD
 Q = (560 persons x 350 L/d/capita x 0.40)/86,400
 Q = 0.91 L/s

Max. Day Demand:

Q = Pop. x ADD x MDD + FF

Q = (560 persons x 350 L/d/capita x 2.75)/86,400 + 8,000 L/min / 60

Q = 139.57 L/s

3.3. Water System Analysis

A detailed Water System Analysis (WSA) will be completed by Ainley Group for the development's proposed water distribution system. Ainley has been entrusted with the Town's water model so that they can perform assessments on the watermain sizes for any proposed development within the municipal boundary. The WSA will demonstrate that the proposed water distribution network is capable of achieving the minimum standards in the MOE and Town of Wasaga Beach guidelines for water distribution systems. At the time of preparation of this report it is understood that currently proposed upgrades to the Town's water distribution system through construction of a water tower



and works yard immediately south of Beachwood Road will satisfy the proposed flow demands (volume and pressure) of this development.



4. Sanitary Servicing

4.1. External Sanitary Servicing Framework

There are existing sanitary sewer systems in both Shore Lane and Beachwood Road. There is also a proposed (by others) sanitary system within the future Betty Boulevard extension right-of-way.

There are no external sanitary catchment areas draining into the subject land. Meanwhile, all internal sanitary drainage will be captured and conveyed by the internal system.

Refer to drawing **SAN-1** in **Appendix C** for more details.

4.2. Allocated and Projected Sanitary Flows

The Town of Wasaga Beach *Engineering Standards* (March 2015) provides theoretical design criteria for future developments and their projected sanitary loading demands. Specifically, the guidelines provide design criteria for development based on the proposed land use.

Peak Domestic Sewage Flow Equation:

$$Q_{tot} = Q_p + Q_i = \left[\frac{PQM}{86.4}\right] + [I \times A]$$

Where: $Q_{tot} = Total peak sewage flow (L/s)$

 Q_p = Peak domestic sewage flow (L/s)

- $Q_i = Extraneous$ sewage flow (L/s)
- P = Design population in thousands (560 people = 0.560)
- Q = Average daily flow (350 L/person/day)
- A = Area of Development (ha), 5.88 ha
- I = Units of extraneous flow (0.28 L/ha/s Refer to the Town of Wasaga Beach Engineering Standards (2015))
- M = Harmon Peaking Factor
- M = Harmon Peaking Factor; $M = 1 + \frac{14}{(P)^{0.5}+4}$ $(M \ge 2.0)$

Therefore:
$$M = 1 + \frac{14}{(0.560)^{0.5} + 4}$$

$$M = 3.95$$


$$Q_{tot} = \frac{0.560 \times 350 \times 3.95}{86.4} + 0.28 \times 5.88$$

 $Q_{tot} = 10.61$ L/s (total peak sewage flow)

4.3. Proposed Sanitary Servicing Scenario

The proposed works involve the construction of an internal gravity sanitary collector sewer system that will collect wastewater flows and convey flow to the existing sanitary sewer system within Shore Lane.

The internal sanitary sewers will be constructed in accordance with the Town's engineering standards and the MOE guidelines. The sewers would consist of PVC DR35 pipe with a minimum diameter of 200mm. The design has ensured that the minimum and maximum velocities are maintained under full flow conditions as well as the flushing velocities outlined in the Town of Wasaga Beach standards.

Refer to drawings **SAN-1** in **Appendix C** which illustrate the proposed drainage scenario for the subject lands and delineates the sanitary sewer sub-catchment areas. A copy of the sanitary sewer design sheets is provided in **Appendix B**.

Due to road grading constraints at the future extension of Betty Boulevard and proposed Street 'A', three (3) lots at the north limit of Street 'A' have reduced depth sanitary laterals requiring basement sewage to be pumped and to a gravity lateral. Floors other than the basement will drain by gravity to the developments internal sanitary sewer network.



5. Transportation

5.1. External Road Network

The Town of Wasaga Beach's Official Plan Schedule 'B Transportation System identifies Shore Lane and Betty Boulevard as Local Municipal Roads and Beachwood Road as Provincial Highway/Future Collector Road. A copy of Schedule 'B' has been attached in **Appendix D**.

5.2. Proposed Site Entrance & Internal Road Network

The *Draft Plan of Vacant Land Condominium* proposes that the development be accessed via two (2) entrances. One entrance will be to the future Betty Boulevard extension (by others) to the northwest and the other entrance will be to Beachwood Road, to the south.

The subject lands will consist of an internal road network of private roads, with horizontal and vertical alignments conforming to the Town of Wasaga Beach's current Engineering Standards, Section 2.5. Development Right-of-Way (ROW) cross-sections proposed within the *Draft Plan* consist of only 10.0m widths. All proposed cross sections are in accordance with the Town of Wasaga Beach's current Engineering standards, drawing No. 2F.

Refer to the *Draft Plan Vacant Land Condominium*, dated July 27, 2020 attached in **Appendix D** for the proposed entrance locations and alignment, ROW widths and internal roadway networks.

A Traffic Impact Study has been undertaken by JD Engineering, dated July 10th, 2020, in support of the proposed development.



6. Site Grading

The proposed grading will conform to the Town of Wasaga Beach *Engineering Standards* (March 2015). Road and Lot grading are generally directed towards the proposed end-of-pipe SWM facility and existing roadway right-of-ways.

The lot grading plans (Drawings **SG-1** and **SG-2**) are provided in **Appendix C** for reference. Some of the specific areas of interest are discussed in more detail below.

6.1. Easements and Blocks

Due to the site grading adjacent to existing development and requirement to convey flow through the site from lands to the south, two (2) servicing/drainage corridors are required to be provided, otherwise referred to as the West Block and East Easement.

Blocks/Easements are an essential part of allowing access for future possible maintenance to the proposed culverts and services.

The west block contains an 1800mm x 900mm concrete box culvert which conveys flows generated from south of the subject lands (Culvert #16) to the future Betty Boulevard extension, and ultimately north to Georgian Bay. The east easement contains a 750mm dia. concrete pipe which outlets into a flat bottom open channel to convey flows generated from south of the subject lands (Culvert #17) to Shore Lane. This corridor also contains a 150mm dia. PVC watermain and 200mm dia. PVC sanitary sewer required to service the proposed development.



7. Utilities

The lands will be serviced by secondary utilities including Bell, hydro, gas and cable TV. There are currently existing services on Beachwood Road and Shore Lane.

It is acknowledged that the utility providers for the area are Enbridge Gas, Wasaga Distribution Inc., Bell Canada and Rogers Cable. Each of these utility companies will be contacted in advance of the detailed design to ensure that sufficient capacity exists within the current installations and/or to arrange for future upgrades to support the proposed development.



8. Conclusions

This Functional Servicing & Stormwater Management Report identifies the recommended servicing design for the proposed Beachwood Development. This Report, read in conjunction with the *Civil Engineering Preliminary Design Drawing Set*, outlines the proposed infrastructure required to service the lands in terms of water, wastewater, stormwater management, roads, and grading.

This Report has been prepared based on the Town of Wasaga Beach Engineering Standards. The Report has recommended the proposed development can be adequately serviced based on the following:

- The provision of storm sewers, Low Impact Development measures, and end-of-pipe stormwater management facility as outlined in **Sections 2**.
- The provision of watermains as outlined in **Section 3**.
- The provision of gravity sanitary sewers as outlined in **Section 4**.
- The provision of Transportation Infrastructure as outlined in **Section 5**.
- The provision of Site Grading as outlined in **Section 6**.
- The provision of Utility Infrastructure as outlined in **Section 7**.

In conclusion, it is recommended that the approval authorities support the application for the Proposed Draft Plan of Vacant Land Condominium.

All of which is respectfully submitted, **THE JONES CONSULTING GROUP LTD.**



Appendix A

Supporting Calculations – Stormwater Servicing

- SWMF Volumetric Sizing Calculations
- SWMF Volume Table
- SWMF Stage Storage Discharge Table
- LID Design Notes Sand Filter
- Hydraulic Conveyance Calculations
 - West Drainage Easement Culvert
 - East Drainage Easement Culvert
 - East Drainage Easement Channel
 - o SWMF Overland Flow Channel
 - SWMF Flow Spreader Weir
 - SWMF Emergency Overflow Weir
- NVCA P-Budget Tool Loading Calculations
- Storm Sewer Design Sheet
- PCSWMM Model Outputs

Stormwater Management Facility No. 1 Sand Filter Volumetric Criteria Calculations

CLIENT: Beachwood Developments In	с.				DATE: September	<u>2</u> 02(
PROJECT: Beachwood Development					DESIGN: JB	
FILE: <u>ROM-17026</u>					CHECKED: DR	
	Area (ha)	TIMP(%)				
Total - Area 301	4.012	66.0%	1200.0	DRAV	NDOWN TIME	
Post Development Drainage Area	4.01	66.0%	1000.0			
ent Pool and Extended Detention Volumes: Drainage Area Imperviousness	4.01 66.0%	ha	() 800.0 () 800		y = 650.79x + 773	3.07

200.0

0.00

Source & Notes:

MOE Table 3.2

Drawdown Calculations:

olope of Regression, C2

Drifice Area

Extended Detention Drawdown Intercept of Regression, C3

Secondary Orifice - Inlet Elevation

Drawdown Time - Max Ponding Level

Drawdown Time - 25mm Event Ponding Level

MOE Equation 4.5 - Forebay Settling Length

 Q_{P} from the pond during design quality storm

Depth of the permanent pool in the forebay

MOE Equation 4.6 - Dispersion Length

Forebay Length Required

Settling velocity

Length of dispersion

Water Quality Volume (WQV) provided for Enhanced Level Treatment, Erosion

Length-to-width ratio of forebay

Inlet (Pipe Capacity) flowrate-5 yr

Desired velocity in the forebay

Control provided by using the discharge rates for the sand filter

Depth over Orifice (MAX WL)

25mm Event Water Level

Forebay Calculations:

 $Dist = SQRT((r*Q_p)/V_s)$

 $Dist = (8*Q)/(d*V_r)$

Additional Notes:

Depth over Orifice (WQV WL)

0.10

0.20

Based on Eqn. 4.11 MOE SWM Planning and Design Manual

0.30

773.1

650.8

0.0050

180.650

0.460

85.559

23.8

180.50

0.310

67,642

18.8

Dist

Q

Dist

Q

Ч

m²

m

m²

Sec

m

m

Sec

Hours

12.8

0.023

0.0003

9.5 m 0.594 m³/s

1.00 m

0.50

m³/s

Hours

Depth Above Orifice (m)

0.40

0.50

	Infiltration
Imperviousness	Storage Vol.
35%	25 m³/ha
55%	30 m³/ha
70%	35 m³/ha
85%	40 m³/ha
Excerpt - MOE Table	e 3.2, Enhanced Level

Volumetric Criteria:

Perman

Water Quality Volumetric Criteria

Erosion Control Volumetric Criteria

40 m³/ha

135 m³

160 m³

342 m³

739 m³

Hours

Hours

m

m

33.7 m³/ha

SWMF Volume Requirements:

Water Quality Volume (WQV) Required Erosion Control (EC) Required

25mm Event Runoff Volume Required

Extended Detention Volume Provided

SWMF Drawdown Requirements:

Minimum Drawdown Time, MOE Table 4.8 Preferred Drawdown Time, MOE Table 4.8

SWMF Forebay Requirements:

Forebay Length Provided Forebay Depth Provided Forebay Length : Width Ratio Provided

Minimum Forebay Length, MOE Table 4.8 Minimum Forebay Depth, MOE Table 4.8 Preferred Forebay Depth, MOE Table 4.8 Minimum Forebay L : W, MOE Table 4.8

Preferred Forebay L : W, MOE Table 4.8

Design Criteria Check:

- Is Max. Required WQV Met?
- Is Max. Required ECV Met?
- Is Min. Required Drawdown Time Met?
- Is Preferred Drawdown Time Met?
- Is Required Forebay Length Provided?
- Is Minimum Forebay Depth Provided?
- Is Preferred Forebay Depth Provided?
- Is Minimum L : W Ratio Provided?
- Is Preferred L : W Ratio Provided?

3	12.8	m
	1.00	m
	1.50	m
	2.00	:1
	4.00 - 5.00	:1

21.0

1.00



Stormwater Management Facility No. 1 Storage Basin Volume Table

CLIENT: Beachwood Developments Inc.	DATE:	September 2020	
PROJECT: Beachwood Development	DESIGN:	JB	H
FILE: ROM-17026	CHECKED:	DR	

1

Bottom Elevation Stage 179.15 m 0.05 m

		Accumulated	Incremental				
	Total Volume	Active Storage Volume	Active Storage Volume	Average Area	Total Area	Depth	Elevation
	(m³)	(m³)	(m³)	(m²)	(m²)	(m)	(m)
	0.00	0.00	0.00	94.00	94	0.00	179.15
	4.86	0.00	0.00	97.00	100	0.05	179.20
	10.05	0.00	0.00	103.50	107	0.10	179.25
	15.60	0.00	0.00	110.50	114	0.15	179.30
	21.50	0.00	0.00	118.00	122	0.20	179.35
	27.76	0.00	0.00	125.50	129	0.25	179.40
	34.41	0.00	0.00	133.00	137	0.30	179.45
a L	41.44	0.00	0.00	141.00	145	0.35	179.50
olur	48.87	0.00	0.00	149.00	153	0.40	179.55
Š	56.70	0.00	0.00	157.00	161	0.45	179.60
gg	64.95	0.00	0.00	165.00	169	0.50	179.65
Stol	73.62	0.00	0.00	173.50	178	0.55	179.70
g	82.72	0.00	0.00	182.50	187	0.60	179.75
De	92.27	0.00	0.00	191.00	195	0.65	179.80
	102.28	0.00	0.00	200.00	205	0.70	179.85
	112.74	0.00	0.00	209.50	214	0.75	179.90
	123.68	0.00	0.00	219.00	224	0.80	179.95
	135.10	0.00	0.00	499.00	774	0.85	180.00
	174.45	0.00	0.00	787.00	800	0.90	180.05
	215.09	0.00	0.00	813.00	826	0.95	180.10
	257.04	0.00	0.00	842.00	858	1.00	180.15
	302.74	45.70	45.70	892.00	926	1.05	180.20
	349.69	92.65	46.95	938.50	951	1.10	180.25
	397.89	140.85	48.20	964.00	977	1.15	180.30
	447.35	190.31	49.46	989.50	1002	1.20	180.35
	498.09	241.05	50.74	1015.00	1028	1.25	180.40
	550.11	293.07	52.02	1040.50	1053	1.30	180.45
Шe	603.43	346.39	53.32	1066.00	1079	1.35	180.50
olui	658.04	401.00	54.61	1092.00	1105	1.40	180.55
۵ >	713.97	456.93	55.93	1118.50	1132	1.45	180.60
g	771.21	514.17	57.24	1145.00	1158	1.50	180.65
Sto	829.78	572.74	58.57	1171.50	1185	1.55	180.70
ive	889.69	632.65	59.91	1198.50	1212	1.60	180.75
Act	950.95	693.91	61.26	1225.50	1239	1.65	180.80
	1013.56	756.52	62.61	1252.50	1266	1.70	180.85
	1077.54	820.50	63.98	1279.50	1293	1.75	180.90
	1142.90	885.86	65.36	1307.00	1321	1.80	180.95
	1209.64	952.60	66.74	1335.00	1349	1.85	181.00
	1277.77	1020.73	68.13	1363.00	1377	1.90	181.05
	1347.30	1090.26	69.53	1391.00	1405	1.95	181.10

Stormwater Management Facility No. 1 Storage Basin Volume Table

CLIENT: Beachwood Developments Inc.	DATE:	September 2020	
PROJECT: Beachwood Development	DESIGN:	JB	
FILE: ROM-17026	CHECKED:	DR	

Bottom Elevation Stage 179.15 m 0.05 m

				Incremental	Accumulated		
Elevation	Depth	Total Area	Average Area	Active Storage Volume	Active Storage Volume	Total Volume	
(m)	(m)	(m²)	(m²)	(m³)	(m³)	(m³)	
181.15	2.00	1433	1419.00	70.95	1161.21	1418.25	
181.20	2.05	1462	1447.50	72.36	1233.57	1490.61	
181.25	2.10	1490	1476.00	73.80	1307.37	1564.41	Φ
181.30	2.15	1519	1504.50	75.23	1382.60	1639.64	Ę
181.35	2.20	1548	1533.50	76.68	1459.28	1716.32	Nol
181.40	2.25	1577	1562.50	78.14	1537.42	1794.46	ge
181.45	2.30	1607	1592.00	79.61	1617.03	1874.07	to ro
181.50	2.35	1637	1622.00	81.08	1698.11	1955.15	ο Φ
181.55	2.40	2138	1887.50	94.21	1792.32	2049.36	ctic
181.60	2.45	2243	2190.50	21.91	1814.23	2071.27	Ŕ
181.65	2.50	2310	2276.73	100.89	1915.12	2172.16	
181.70	2.55	2459	2384.58	74.87	1989.99	2247.03	

Stormwater Management Facility No. 1 Infiltration Basin Stage Storage Discharge Details

CLIENT: Beachwood Developments Ltd.

PROJECT: Beachwood Development

FILE: ROM-17026

	Orifi	ce No. 1	Orific	ce No. 2	Orific	∋ No. 3	Emergency Overflow Weir		1		
Elevation (m)	Depth Above Orifice Centroid (m)	Orifice No. 1 Flow (m ³ /s)	Depth Above Orifice Centroid (m)	Orifice No. 2 Flow (m ³ /s)	Depth Above Orifice Centroid (m)	Orifice No. 3 Flow (m ³ /s)	Depth Above Overflow Weir (m)	Overflow Weir Flow (m ³ /s)	Total Active Storage (m ³)	Total Flow (m ³ /s)	Total Storage (m ³)
179.15	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.000	0	0.000	0
179.20	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.000	0	0.000	11
179.25	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.000	0	0.000	22
179.30	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.000	0	0.000	32
179.35	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.000	0	0.000	43
179.40	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.000	0	0.000	54
179.45	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.000	0	0.000	65
179.50	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.000	0	0.000	76
179.55	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.000	0	0.000	87
179.60	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.000	0	0.000	97
179.65	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.000	0	0.000	108
179.70	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.000	0	0.000	118
179.75	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.000	0	0.000	127
179.80	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.000	0	0.000	137
179.85	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.000	0	0.000	146
179.90	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.000	0	0.000	156
179.95	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.000	0	0.000	165
180.00	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.000	0	0.000	174
180.05	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.000	0	0.000	184
180.10	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.000	0	0.000	193
180.15	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.000	0	0.000	203
180.20	0.01	0.001	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.000	46	0.001	303
180.25	0.06	0.003	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.000	93	0.003	350
180.30	0.11	0.005	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.000	141	0.005	398
180.35	0.16	0.006	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.000	190	0.006	447
180.40	0.21	0.006	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.000	241	0.006	498
180.45	0.26	0.007	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.000	293	0.007	550
180.50	0.31	0.008	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.000	346	0.008	603
180.55	0.36	0.008	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.000	401	0.008	658
180.60	0.41	0.009	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.000	457	0.009	714
180.65	0.46	0.010	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.000	514	0.010	771
180.70	0.51	0.010	0.00	0.013	0.05	0.000	0.00	0.000	573	0.023	830
180.75	0.56	0.010	0.00	0.027	0.10	0.000	0.00	0.000	633	0.037	890
180.80	0.61	0.011	0.00	0.040	0.15	0.000	0.00	0.000	694	0.051	951
180.85	0.66	0.011	0.00	0.055	0.20	0.000	0.00	0.000	757	0.066	1014
180.90	0.71	0.012	0.03	0.070	0.25	0.000	0.00	0.000	821	0.082	1078
180.95	0.76	0.012	0.08	0.122	0.30	0.000	0.00	0.000	886	0.134	1143

DATE: September 2020

DESIGN: JB

CHECKED: DR

2 yr

Permanent Pool 25mm

Stormwater Management Facility No. 1 Infiltration Basin Stage Storage Discharge Details

CLIENT: Beachwood Developments Ltd.

PROJECT: Beachwood Development

FILE: ROM-17026

		Orific	ce No. 1	Orific	e No. 2	Orifice	e No. 3	Emergency O	verflow Weir			
	Elevation (m)	Depth Above Orifice Centroid (m)	Orifice No. 1 Flow (m ³ /s)	Depth Above Orifice Centroid (m)	Orifice No. 2 Flow (m ³ /s)	Depth Above Orifice Centroid (m)	Orifice No. 3 Flow (m ³ /s)	Depth Above Overflow Weir (m)	Overflow Weir Flow (m ³ /s)	Total Active Storage (m ³)	Total Flow (m ³ /s)	Total Storage (m³)
10 Yr	181.00	0.81	0.013	0.13	0.157	0.35	0.000	0.00	0.000	953	0.170	1210
	181.05	0.86	0.013	0.18	0.186	0.40	0.000	0.00	0.000	1021	0.199	1278
	181.10	0.91	0.013	0.23	0.211	0.45	0.000	0.00	0.000	1090	0.224	1347
25 Yr	181.15	0.96	0.014	0.28	0.233	0.50	0.000	0.00	0.000	1161	0.246	1418
	181.20	1.01	0.014	0.33	0.253	0.55	0.000	0.00	0.000	1234	0.267	1491
50 Yr	181.25	1.06	0.014	0.38	0.272	0.60	0.000	0.00	0.000	1307	0.286	1564
Timmins	181.30	1.11	0.015	0.43	0.289	0.65	0.000	0.00	0.000	1383	0.304	1640
100 Yr	181.35	1.16	0.015	0.48	0.306	0.70	0.000	0.00	0.000	1459	0.321	1716
	181.40	1.21	0.015	0.53	0.322	0.75	0.000	0.05	0.084	1537	0.421	1794
	181.45	1.26	0.016	0.58	0.337	0.80	0.000	0.10	0.391	1617	0.744	1874
	181.50	1.31	0.016	0.63	0.351	0.85	0.000	0.15	0.835	1698	1.202	1955
	181.55	1.36	0.016	0.68	0.365	0.90	0.000	0.20	1.403	1792	1.784	2049
	181.60	1.41	0.017	0.73	0.378	0.95	0.000	0.25	2.090	1814	2.484	2071
	181.65	1.46	0.017	0.78	0.391	1.00	0.000	0.30	2.895	1915	3.302	2172
Top of Pond	181.70	1.51	0.017	0.83	0.403	1.05	0.000	0.35	3.818	1990	4.238	2247

Top of Pond
Top of Long

		OVER	FLOW WEIR			
Orifice No. 1	Orifice No. 2	Orifice No. 3		Overflow Weir		
- Orifice diameter (m): 0.080	- Orifice diameter (m) 0.450	- Orifice diameter (m) 0.000	- Length of Weir(m)	10		
- Area (m ²) = 0.005026	- Area (m ²) = 0.159038	- Area (m ²) = 0.000000	- Weir Sill(m)	181.35		
- Orifice C = 0.63	- Orifice C = 0.63	- Orifice C = 0.63	- Downstream Length of 'Overflow' Weir (r	r 9	@181.35m	
- Invert (m)= 180.15	- Invert (m)= 180.65	- Invert (m)= 180.65	- Weir Side Slopes (H:V)	10	:1	
- Orifice Centroid (m) = 180.19	- Orifice Centroid (m) 180.88	- Orifice Centroid (m) 180.65				
Submerged Orifice Equation:	Un-Submerged Orifice Equation	n (Flow Below Orifice Centroid):	Broad Cre	ested Weir		
$Q = CxAx(2gH)^{0.5}$	$Q_w = 1.65([(pi^*(D^2)/4)(2^*cos^{-1}[(((D/2)-d)/(D^2)/4))(2^*cos^{-1}))))$)/2))*180/pi)]/360)-((D/2-d)(Dd-d ²) ^{0.5})]/d)d ^{1.5}	- Weir Equation: $Q = (C L (H^{3/2})) +$	(C(H ^{5/2})Tan (α/2))	Rectangular 'C' Equation	Triangular 'C' Equation
where;	where;		where ; $Q = flow rate (cms)$		$y = (a+bx)/(1+cx+dx^{2})$	$y=(a+bx)/(1+cx+dx^{2})$
$Q = flow rate (m^3)$	$Q = flow rate (m^3/s)$		C = constant (refer	to Triangular		
C = constant	D=orifice diameter (m)		and Rectangular 'C	Equations)	a -10383.4898	a -1.0071E-05
A = area of opening(m2)	d=depth of flow above invert (m)		L = length (m)		b 3418997.012	b 143.5986704
H = net head on the orifice			H = head on the we	eir (m)	c 2131595.078	c 114.5046511
g = Acceleration due to gravity			α = angle at apex α	of triangle (radians)	d -235014.247	d -4.76857422
					*x = head divided by downstree	am Length of Weir (H/L)

DATE: September 2020

DESIGN: JB

CHECKED: DR

Project:	Beachwood Development	Date:	Sep-20
File No.:	ROM-17026	Designed:	JB
Subject:	SWMF - Media Filter System designed per TRCA/CVC LID Manual	Checked:	DR
Revisions:			

BMP Type LOT LEVEL / CONVEYANCE CONTROL / END OF PIPE

Bioretention Systems, designed per CVC Section 4.5 - Bioretention, generally involves practices that temporarily store, treat and infiltrate collected runoff. Systems can be constructed with or without underdrains to achieve full or partial infiltration based on native soil characteristics. The primary component of a bioretention system is the Filter Media, generally comprised of a mixture of Sand, fines and organic materials which improves water quality. Typically systems are vegetated and topped with mulch, have pre-treatment devices and a overflow by-pass. These systems are adaptable to sites and can range from simple rain gardens on a Lot Level to Large Cells in End-of-Pipe facilities

Common Concerns

- 1 Risk of Groundwater Contamination
- 2 Risk of Soil Contamination
- 3 Location on Private Property / Enforcement
- 4 Proximity to Foundations & Seepage
- 5 Winter Operation
- 6 Roadway Stability
- 7 Pedestrian Traffic

Physical Suitability and Constraints

1 Proximity to Drinking Water Sources i.e. WHPA's, not within 2yr Travel Time

- 2 Site Topography, locate on slopes 1 5%
- 3 Available Head should be 1.0 1.5m to drive filter
- 4 Water Table, minimum 1.0m separation from Bottom of Facility to SHGWT
- 5 Site Soils & Infiltration Capacity, min 15 mm/hr
- 6 Drainage Area, 5:1 to 20:1 Impervious Drainage Area to BMP Area
- 7 Pollution Hot Spot Runoff
- 8 Setback from Buildings, minimum of 5m from foundations
- 9 Proximity to Underground Utilities
- 10 Overhead Wires, Check Tree Canopies will not interfere with O/H Systems in place

Table 4.5.1 Ability of bioretention to meet SWM objectives

ВМР	Water Balance Benefit	Water Quality Improvement	Stream Channel Erosion Control Benefits
Bioretention with no underdrain	Yes	Yes – size for water quality storage requirement	Partial – based on available storage volume and infiltration rates
Bioretention with underdrain	Partial – based on available storage volume beneath the underdrain and soil infiltration rate	Yes – size for water quality storage requirement	Partial – based on available storage volume beneath the underdrain and soil infiltration rate
Bioretention with underdrain and impermeable liner	Partial – some volume reduction through evapotranspiration	Yes – size for water quality storage requirement	Partial – some volume reduction through evapotranspiration

Table 4.5.2 Volumetric runoff reduction¹ achieved by bioretention

LID Practice	Location	% Runoff Reduction ¹	Reference
Disectoryline with such	Connecticut	99%	Dietz and Clausen (2005)
Bioretention without	Pennsylvania	80%	Ermilio (2005)
underdram	Pennsylvania	70%	Emerson and Traver (2004)
	North Carolina	40 to 60%	Smith and Hunt (2007)
Bioretention with	North Carolina	33 to 50%	Hunt and Lord (2006)
underdrain	Maryland and North Carolina	20 to 50%	Li <i>et al.</i> (2009)
Runoff Reduction Estimate ²		859	% without underdrain 5% with underdrain

BMP Sizing Guidelines

- 1 Commonly located near Impervious Surfaces generating runoff such as around parking lots, traffic islands, near buildings and in boulevards, online or offline config.
- 2 Geometry & Layout, typically linear or rectangular, can be orientated to fit many spaces but should be considered early in site layout & development
- 3 Maximum Recommended Footprint is typically based on Total Impervious Drainage Area, and ranges between 0.01 and 0.5 ha, with a max. of 0.8 ha.

4 Aim to orientate the cell to promote the spread of inflows evenly over the cell with flat slopes, multiple cells can be used in parallel or series

- 5 Pretreatment should be provided to ensure system longevity, forebay/gravel diaphragm, vegetated filter strips/grass swales or filter devices (OGS Units)
- 6 Conveyance by Direct Inlet, 3rd Pipe System, or Storm Sewer, an Overflow should be provided outletting to grade or a nearby Storm Sewer
- 7 Ponding levels are typically 150 250mm to limit length of inundation of planting. Deeper ponding depths may be recognized with a variation in plantings. 8 The infiltration rate of the soil in the pervious area should be at least 15 mm/hr
- 9 Filter Media will vary depending on type of system to be constructed. Typically includes a layer of Mulch (75mm) on Filter Medium (1000 1250mm), followed by a Pea Gravel Choking Layer (100mm) and the Storage Layer of 50mm Clear Stone (300 450mm) which may include an underdrain system.
- 10 Monitoring Wells 100 150mm in dia. should be installed to check for sediment buildup and ensure adequate drawndown times are being recognized

11 Underdrains should be placed a minimum of 100mm above the bottom of the Storage Layer, should be HDPE or equiv. with Smooth Interior Walls, and be a minimum of 200mm in dia, to accommodate freezina. Often a strip of Geotextile is placed between Filter Media and Pea Gravel Layer to prevent the migration of fines.

12 Facilities can be landscaped formally, and include a variety of plantings from low lying herbaceous materials to trees

		1	Project:		Beachwo	od Developm	ent	Date:	Sep-20
	HI	() 	File No.:		R	DM-17026		Designed:	JB
4			Subject:	SWMF	SWMF - Media Filter System designed per TRCA/CVC LID Manual			Checked:	DR
			Revisions:						
BM	P Sizing Calcu	ulations							
1)	Depth of a f	acility is a fur	nction of native soil infilt	ration rate, porosity of	storage media, and to	argeted draw	down time as well full or partial infiltra	tion:	
a)	i) Storage Lay	er Depth w/ I	Underdrain						
		Eq. 1.1	d _{s MAX} = f' x t / 0.4	Where:	d _{s max} = Maximum De f' = Design Infiltra	pth of Storage tion Rate (mm	with Underdrain /hr)		
i	i) Storage Lay	er Depth w/o	Underdrain		t = Infiltration Rat	e for Native So	oils (mm/hr) - Use FS Rate, not actual		
		Eq. 1.2	d _{s MAX} = f' x 48 / 0.4	Where:	d_{s max} = Maximum De f' = Depth of Pone	pth of Storage ding (mm)	without Underdrain		
2)	Remaining f	acility depth	established by ponding	g, layering, and corres	ponding thickness to e	stablish 1D sto	rage volume.		
3)	Determine t	ne total volu	me of runoff (WQV) pro	duced by the Water (Quality Event (WQE) in I	PCSWMM.			
3)	Facility footp	print is then d	letermined based on the	e Water Quality Volun	ne (WQV) to be captur	ed, as well as	the available 1D storage volume in t	he reservoir:	
		Eq. 2	$A_{P} = WQV / (d_{C} * V_{R})$	Where:	A _P = Footprint Area WQV = Water Quality d _{P MAX} = Design Biorete	a of Practice (r Volume (m³), ention Cell De	n ²) Depth of Runoff (mm) * Catchment oth (m)	(m²) OR Runoff Vo	ol. (m ³)
4)	3D facility dr	aw down to	confirm available cape	acity is within inter-eve	ent window:	Eq. 3	$t_{D} = (V_{R} / f') \times (A_{P} / P) \times ln [(d_{P} + (A_{P} / P)) \times ln] $	′ P) / (AP / P)]	
5)	Curb inlet siz	ing to ensure	e full capture of flow for	side inlets (i.e. rainga	rdens)	Eq. 4	$W_{T} = 0.817 \times Q^{0.42} \times S_{O}^{0.3} \times [1 / (n \times S_{X})]$	a)] ^{0.6}	
6)	Check flowr	ate through	media to ensure pondir	ng depth provided is c	adequate:	Eq. 5	$Q_{MAX, M} = (K_M x A_P x (h_{MAX} / d_m)) / 3.6$	x 10 ⁶	
7)	Check unde	rdrain flowrc	ate to ensure ponding d	epth provided is adea	quate:	Eq. 6	$Q_{MAX, P} = L x B x C_d x Ao (2 x g x h_{MA})$	x) ^{0.5}	
8)	Verify limiting	g flow rate is	design peak inflow rate	to mitigate ponding.	, provide additional hy	draulic contro	ls where required.		
Bio	retention Cell	Sizer:		= user input		= calculate	ed / constant = desig	gn parameter	
	1)		d _{S MAX} = f' x t / 0.4 d _{S MAX} = 3240 mm	OR d _{S MAX} = f'	x 48 / 0.4 2160 mm	Where:	f' = 18 mm/hr t = 72 hrs t = 48 hrs		
	2)	Layer Freeboo Ponding Mulch / Filter Me Choker Underdr Storage Total De	Depth (mm) ard 150 ard 500 Jopsoil 100 adda 500 Layer 0 rain Dia. 100 Layer 400 pth 1750	VR 1.0 1.0 0.4 0.3 0.4 0.4 0.4 0.4	1D Storage (mm) 150 40 150 0 40 160 1040		- <u>40</u> 1#3	PCSWMM Catch	ment ID
	3)	Bioreten	ntion Practice Footprint	Where:	$WQV = 345.3 m^3$	Depth	of Runoff: 8.47 mm Recom	imended Area Ch itio):	eck (5:1 -
			$A_{P} = WQV / d_{P}$ $A_{PMIN} = 332 m^{2}$]	-r MAX 1.040	i, s caicinn	XIMP: 30% mp. Area: 1.22 ha Prote	JTION! Consider a ction against sedi	dditional imentation
	4)	3D Facil	ity Drawdown $t_{D} = (V_{R} / f) \times (A_{P} / P) \times I_{D}$ $t_{D} = 18.2$ hrs	In [(d _P + (A _P / P) / (AP	/ P)]	Asp	AP MIN: 332.04 m² Length: 50.0 m AP MIN Width: 10.8 m AP MIN AP Act: 540 m² ect Ratio: 4.62963 :1 I/Per P: 121.6 m (assumed r Vs: 0.35 (weighted	 611.6 m² 2446 m² ov : 22.7 :1 ectangular) average) 	



Project Description Fricton Method Manning Formula Solve For Normal Depth Input Data 0.001 Roughness Coefficient 0.001 Channel Slope 0.00500 Might 0.90 Height 0.90 Bottom Withh 1.80 Discharge 0.78 Results 0.01 Normal Depth 0.06 Flow Area 0.10 Prover 1.91 Hydraulic Radius 0.05 Top Weth 1.80 Critical Depth 0.27 Yearde Tuble 0.83 Ortical Depth 0.27 Top Weth 1.80 Critical Slope 0.0004 Ortical Depth 0.27 Percent Full 6.3 Critical Slope 0.0004 Velocity 7.88 Prode Number 10.32 Discharge Full 12.83903 Slope Full 12.83903 Flow Type 0 Number Of Steps 0 OVER Input		Worksheet for Culver	ť	17 - Box
Friction Method Solve ForManning FormulaNormal DepthInput DataRoughness Coefficient0.001Channel Slope0.00500 m/mHeight0.00Bottom With0.00Discharge0.78Bottom With0.00Presente0.00Flow Area0.00Flow Area0.00Flow Area0.00Top With0.00Top With0.01Top With0.02Top With0.03Mettod Perimeter0.91Top With0.27Top With0.27Top With0.27Top With0.27Top With0.0004Mithod Slope0.0004Velocity7.68Top With0.00Specific Energy3.00Specific Energy3.04Shoap Full12.8303Shoap Full12.8303Shoap Full0.00Longth0.00Number Of Steps0Upsteam Depth0.00Longth0.00Profile Description0Profile Description0Prof	Project Description			
Solve For Normal Depth Input Data 0.001 Roughness Coefficient 0.00500 Channel Slope 0.00500 Height 0.90 Bottom Width 0.80 Discharge 0.78 Bottom Width 0.80 Discharge 0.78 Results	Friction Method	Manning Formula		
Input Data Roughness Coefficient 0.001 Channel Slope 0.00500 Height 0.90 Bottom Width 1.80 Discharge 0.78 Bottom Width 1.80 Discharge 0.78 Results	Solve For	Normal Depth		
Roughness Coefficient0.001Channel Slope0.00500m/mHeight0.90mBottom Width1.80mDischargo0.78m/sNormal Depth0.06Flow Area0.10m²Wetted Perimeter9.11mHydraulic Radius0.05mTop Width1.80mCritical Depth0.27mPercent Full6.3%Critical Slope0.00004m/mVelocity7.68m/sVelocity7.68m/sSpeeffic Energy3.06mFroude Number10.32m/sDischarge Full3.49m/sSlope Full12.83903m/mFlow TypeSuperriticalm/mFourt Data0.00mLength0.00mNumber Of Steps0mProfile Description1mProfile Headloss0.00mNormal Depth Over Rise0.00%Normal Depth Over Rise6.26%	Input Data			
Channel Slope0.00500m/mHeight0.90mBottom Width1.80mDischarge0.78m*/sResultsNormal Depth0.06mFlow Area0.10m²Wetted Perimeter0.11mHydraulic Radius0.05mTop Width1.80mCritical Depth0.27mPercent Full6.3%Critical Stope0.00004m/mVelocity7.68m/sVelocity Test3.00mSpecific Energy3.06mFroude Number10.32m/sDischarge Full3.94m³/sSloep Full12.83903m/mFlow TypeSuperriticalmSuperriticalCVF Input DataLength0.00mNumber Of Steps0mProfile DescriptionmProfile Headloss0.00mAverage End Depth Over Rise0.00%Normal Depth Over Rise6.26%	Roughness Coefficient	0.00	1	
Height0.90mBottom Width1.80mDischarge0.78m/sResultsmNormal Depth0.06mFlow Area0.10m²Wetted Perimeter1.91mHydraulic Radius0.05mTop Width0.80mCritical Depth0.27mPercent Full6.3%Critical Stope0.00004m/mVelocity Head3.00mSpecific Energy3.06mStope Full12.8303m/mStope Full12.8303m/mStope Full12.8303m/mStope Full0.000mTory Top Supercitical0.000Proter Depth0.000mLength0.00mNumber Of Steps0mProfile DescriptionmProfile DescriptionmProfile Pacel SciptionmProfile Pacel SciptionmNormal Depth Over Rise0.00Normal Depth Over Rise0	Channel Slope	0.0050	0	m/m
Bottom Width1.80mDischarge0.78m/sResults0.06mFlow Area0.10m ² Wetted Perimeter1.91mHydraulic Radius0.05mTop Width1.80mCritical Depth0.27mPercent Full6.3%Critical Stope0.00004m/mVelocity7.68m/sVelocity7.68m/sSpecific Energy3.06mFroude Number10.32m/sStope Full12.8303m/sStope Full12.8303m/sStope Full12.8303m/sStope Full12.8304m/sStope Full10.00mLength0.00mNumber Of Steps0mDystream Depth0.00mLength0.00mVettee DescriptionmProfile Headloss0.00%Norral Depth Over Rise0.00%Norral Depth Over Rise0.00%	Height	0.9	0	m
Discharge0.78m³sResultsNormal Depth0.06mFlow Area0.10m²Wetted Perimeter1.91mHydraulic Radius0.05mTop Width1.80mCritical Depth0.27mPercent Full6.3%Critical Slope0.00004m/mVelocity7.88m/sVelocity Head3.00mSperfic Energy3.06mSlope Full12.8300m/mFroude Number10.32mFlow TypeSuperriticalm/mSlope Full2.8300m/mSlope Full12.8300m/mFlow TypeSuperriticalmBornstream Depth0.00mLength0.00mVuber Of Steps0mProfile DescriptionmProfile DescriptionmProfile Description%Normal Depth Over Rise0.00%Normal Depth Over Rise0.00%	Bottom Width	1.8	0	m
Results Normal Depth 0.06 m Flow Area 0.10 m² Wetted Perimeter 1.91 m Hydraulic Radius 0.05 m Top Width 1.80 m Critical Depth 0.27 m Percent Full 6.3 % Critical Slope 0.00004 m/m Velocity 7.68 m/s Velocity Head 3.00 m Specific Energy 3.06 m Froude Number 10.32 m/s Slope Full 12.83903 m/m Flow Type Supercritical m/m Work Pote 0.00 m Length 0.00 m Number Of Steps 0 m Profile Description m m Profile Description 0.00 m Profile Description 0.00 m Profile Depth Over Rise 0.00 %	Discharge	0.7	8	m³/s
Normal Depth 0.06 m Flow Area 0.10 m ² Wetted Perimeter 1.91 m Hydraulic Radius 0.05 m Top Width 1.80 m Critical Depth 0.27 m Percent Full 6.3 % Critical Slope 0.00004 m/m Velocity Head 3.00 m Specific Energy 3.06 m Froude Number 10.32 m Flow Type Supercritical m/m Stope Full 12.83003 m/m Flow Type Supercritical m/m CVF Input Data .000 m Length .000 m Number Of Steps .0 m Profile Description	Results			
Flow Area0.10m²Wetted Perimeter1.91mHydraulic Radius0.05mTop Width1.80mCritical Depth0.27mPercent Full6.3%Critical Slope0.00004m/mVelocity7.68m/sVelocity Head3.00mSpecific Energy3.06mSpecific Energy3.08m/sSlope Full12.8309m/sSlope Full12.8309m/mFroude Number12.8309m/mFlow TypeSupercriticalm/mFor TypeSupercriticalmCVF Input Data0.00mLength0.00mNumber Of Steps0mProfile Description0.00mProfile Description0.00mProfile Description0.00mNormal Depth Over Rise0.00mNormal Depth Over Rise0.20%	Normal Depth	0.0	6	m
Wetted Perimeter1.91nHydraulic Radius0.05mTop Width1.80mCritical Depth0.27mPercent Full6.3%Critical Slope0.00004m/mVelocity7.68m/sVelocity Head3.00mSpecific Energy3.00mFroude Number10.32m/sSlope Full12.8308m/mSlope Full12.8308m/mFlow TypeSupercriticalm/mGVF Input DataDownstream Depth0.00mNumber Of Steps0mGVF Output DataUpstream Depth0.00mProfile DescriptionmmProfile DescriptionmmProfile Leadloss0.00mNormal Depth Over Rise0.00%Normal Depth Over Rise0.00%	Flow Area	0.1	0	m²
Hydraulic Radius 0.05 m Top Width 1.80 m Critical Depth 0.27 m Percent Full 6.3 % Critical Slope 0.00004 m/m Velocity 7.68 m/s Velocity Head 3.00 m Specific Energy 3.06 m Froude Number 10.32 Total 2.8303 Flow Type Supercritical m/m Slope Full 12.8303 m/m Flow Type Supercritical m Downstream Depth 0.00 m Length 0.00 m Number Of Steps 0 m Profile Description 0 m Profile Description 0.00 m Profile Headloss 0.00 m Average End Depth Over Rise 0.00 m Average End Depth Over Rise 0.00 m	Wetted Perimeter	1.9	1	m
Top Width1.80mCritical Depth0.27mPercent Full6.3%Critical Slope0.00004m/mVelocity7.68m/sVelocity Head3.00mSpecific Energy3.06mFroude Number10.32Discharge Full39.49m³/sSlope Full12.83903m/mFlow TypeSuperriticalm/mOwnstream Depth0.00Number Of Steps0mOtype Cuput DataUpstream Depth0.00Number Of Steps0mProfile Description0.00mProfile Headloss0.00mAverage End Depth Over Rise0.00mNormal Depth Over Rise0.00m	Hydraulic Radius	0.0	5	m
Critical Depth 0.27 m Percent Full 6.3 % Critical Slope 0.00004 m/m Velocity 7.68 m/s Velocity Head 3.00 m Specific Energy 3.06 m Froude Number 10.32 m/s Discharge Full 38.49 m/s Slope Full 12.83903 m/m Flow Type Supercritical m/m CVF Input Data Downstream Depth 0.00 Length 0.00 m Number Of Steps 0 m CVF Output Data Profile Description Profile Headloss Average End Depth Over Rise 0.00 m Average End Depth Over Rise 6.26 %	Top Width	1.8	0	m
Percent Full 6.3 % Critical Slope 0.00004 m/m Velocity 7.68 m/s Velocity Head 3.00 m Specific Energy 3.06 m Froude Number 10.32 T Discharge Full 39.49 m³/s Slope Full 12.83903 m/m Flow Type Supercritical m/m GVF Input Data 0.00 m Length 0.00 m Number Of Steps 0 m Profile Description 0.00 m Profile Headloss 0.00 m Average End Depth Over Rise 0.00 m	Critical Depth	0.2	7	m
Critical Slope 0.00004 m/m Velocity 7.68 m/s Velocity Head 3.00 m Specific Energy 3.06 m Froude Number 10.32 - Discharge Full 39.49 m³/s Slope Full 12.8303 m/m Flow Type Supercritical - GVF Input Data Output Data Output Data Number Of Steps Output Data Output O	Percent Full	6.	3	%
Velocity7.68m/sVelocity Head3.00mSpecific Energy3.06mFroude Number10.32m³/sSlope Full39.49m³/sSlope Full12.8303m/mFlow TypeSupercriticalm/mOVF Input DataOVF Output DataNumber Of Steps0OVF Output DataOVF Output DataOUTProfile DescriptionProfile HeadlossNormal Depth Over Rise0.00Normal Depth Over Rise0.00Normal Depth Over Rise0.00Normal Depth Over Rise0.00	Critical Slope	0.0000	4	m/m
Velocity Head3.00mSpecific Energy3.06mFroude Number10.32Discharge Full39.49m³/sSlope Full12.83903m/mFlow TypeSupercriticalGVF Input DataOwnstream Depth0.00Length0.00mNumber Of Steps0GVF Output DataUpstream Depth0.00mProfile DescriptionProfile Headloss0.00Normal Depth Over Rise0.00mNormal Depth Over Rise0.00m	Velocity	7.6	8	m/s
Specific Energy3.06mFroude Number10.32Discharge Full39.49Slope Full12.83903Flow TypeSupercriticalOverstream DepthLength0.00Number Of Steps0OUPSTREAM <td>Velocity Head</td> <td>3.0</td> <td>0</td> <td>m</td>	Velocity Head	3.0	0	m
Froude Number10.32Discharge Full39.49m³/sSlope Full12.83903m/mFlow TypeSupercriticalGVF Input DataDownstream Depth0.00mLength0.00mNumber Of Steps0GVF Output DataUpstream Depth0.00Profile Description0mProfile Description0mAverage End Depth Over Rise0.00mNormal Depth Over Rise0.00%	Specific Energy	3.0	6	m
Discharge Full 39.49 m³/s Slope Full 12.83903 m/m Flow Type Supercritical CVF Input Data Downstream Depth 0.00 m Length 0.00 m Number Of Steps 0 GVF Output Data 0 SQFF Output Data 0 Upstream Depth 0.00 m Profile Description 0 Profile Headloss 0.00 m Average End Depth Over Rise 0.00 %	Froude Number	10.3	2	
Slope Full12.83903m/mFlow TypeSupercriticalmGVF Input DataDownstream Depth0.00mLength0.00mNumber Of Steps00GVF Output DataUpstream Depth0.00Profile Description0.00mProfile Headloss0.00mAverage End Depth Over Rise0.00%Normal Depth Over Rise6.26%	Discharge Full	39.4	9	m³/s
Flow Type Supercritical GVF Input Data 0.00 m Downstream Depth 0.00 m Length 0.00 m Number Of Steps 0 m GVF Output Data 0 m Upstream Depth 0.00 m Profile Description 0.00 m Profile Headloss 0.00 m Average End Depth Over Rise 0.00 % Normal Depth Over Rise 6.26 %	Slope Full	12.8390	3	m/m
GVF Input Data Downstream Depth 0.00 m Length 0.00 m Number Of Steps 0 0 GVF Output Data 0 0 Upstream Depth 0.00 m Profile Description 0.00 m Profile Headloss 0.00 m Average End Depth Over Rise 0.00 % Normal Depth Over Rise 6.26 %	Flow Type	Supercritical		
Downstream Depth0.00mLength0.00mNumber Of Steps00GVF Output DataUpstream Depth0.00mProfile Description0.00mProfile Headloss0.00mAverage End Depth Over Rise0.00%Normal Depth Over Rise6.26%	GVF Input Data			
Length0.00mNumber Of Steps00GVF Output DataUpstream Depth0.00mProfile Description0.00mProfile Headloss0.00mAverage End Depth Over Rise0.00%Normal Depth Over Rise6.26%	Downstream Depth	0.0	0	m
Number Of Steps 0 GVF Output Data 0.00 m Profile Description 0.00 m Profile Headloss 0.00 m Average End Depth Over Rise 0.00 % Normal Depth Over Rise 6.26 %	Length	0.0	0	m
GVF Output Data 0.00 m Upstream Depth 0.00 m Profile Description 0.00 m Profile Headloss 0.00 m Average End Depth Over Rise 0.00 % Normal Depth Over Rise 6.26 %	Number Of Steps		0	
Upstream Depth0.00mProfile Description0.00mProfile Headloss0.00mAverage End Depth Over Rise0.00%Normal Depth Over Rise6.26%	GVF Output Data			
Profile Description 0.00 m Profile Headloss 0.00 % Average End Depth Over Rise 0.20 % Normal Depth Over Rise 6.26 %	Upstream Depth	0.0	0	m
Profile Headloss0.00mAverage End Depth Over Rise0.00%Normal Depth Over Rise6.26%	Profile Description			
Average End Depth Over Rise0.00%Normal Depth Over Rise6.26%	Profile Headloss	0.0	0	m
Normal Depth Over Rise 6.26 %	Average End Depth Over Rise	0.0	0	%
	Normal Depth Over Rise	6.2	6	%
Downstream Velocity Infinity m/s	Downstream Velocity	Infinit	y	m/s

Bentley Systems, Inc. Haestad Methods Sol BetentlegeFitewMaster V8i (SELECTseries 1) [08.11.01.03] 7/15/2020 5:44:10 PM 27 Siemons Company Drive Suite 200 W Watertown, CT 06795 USA +1-203-755-1666

Worksheet for Culvert 17 - Box

GVF Output Data

Upstream Velocity	Infinity	m/s
Normal Depth	0.06	m
Critical Depth	0.27	m
Channel Slope	0.00500	m/m
Critical Slope	0.00004	m/m

Cross Section for Culvert 17 - Box

Project Description		
Friction Method Solve For	Manning Formula Normal Depth	
Input Data		
Roughness Coefficient	0.001	
Channel Slope	0.00500	m/m
Normal Depth	0.06	m
Height	0.90	m
Bottom Width	1.80	m
Discharge	0.78	m³/s

Cross Section Image



Worksheet for Culvert 16 - D/S Channel

Project Description		
Friction Method	Manning Formula	
Solve For	Normal Depth	
Input Data		
Roughness Coefficient	0.025	
Channel Slope	0.02500	m/m
Left Side Slope	3.00	m/m (H:V)
Right Side Slope	3.00	m/m (H:V)
Bottom Width	1.00	m
Discharge	0.67	m³/s
Results		
Normal Depth	0.22	m
Flow Area	0.37	m²
Wetted Perimeter	2.40	m
Hydraulic Radius	0.15	m
Top Width	2.33	m
Critical Depth	0.27	m
Critical Slope	0.01120	m/m
Velocity	1.81	m/s
Velocity Head	0.17	m
Specific Energy	0.39	m
Froude Number	1.45	
Flow Type	Supercritical	
GVF Input Data		
Downstream Depth	0.00	m
Length	0.00	m
Number Of Steps	0	
GVF Output Data		
Upstream Depth	0.00	m
Profile Description		
Profile Headloss	0.00	m
Downstream Velocity	Infinity	m/s
Upstream Velocity	Infinity	m/s
Normal Depth	0.22	m
Critical Depth	0.27	m
Channel Slope	0.02500	m/m

 Bentley Systems, Inc.
 Haestad Methods Sol Ritem
 Bentley Systems
 108.11.01.03

 27 Siemons Company Drive Suite 200 W Watertown, CT 06795 USA +1-203-755-1666
 Page 1 of 2

Worksheet for Culvert 16 - D/S Channel

GVF Output Data

Critical Slope

0.01120 m/m

Cross Section for Culvert 16 - D/S Channel

Project Description		
Friction Method	Manning Formula	
Solve For	Normal Depth	
Input Data		
Roughness Coefficient	0.025	
Channel Slope	0.02500	m/m
Normal Depth	0.22	m
Left Side Slope	3.00	m/m (H:V)
Right Side Slope	3.00	m/m (H:V)
Bottom Width	1.00	m
Discharge	0.67	m³/s

Cross Section Image



V: 1 | <u>|</u> H: 1

Worksheet for Culvert 16 - U/S Pipe **Project Description** Friction Method Manning Formula Solve For Normal Depth Input Data 0.013 **Roughness Coefficient** 0.00500 Channel Slope m/m 0.75 Diameter m Discharge 0.67 m³/s Results Normal Depth 0.53 m Flow Area 0.33 m² Wetted Perimeter 1.49 m Hydraulic Radius 0.22 m Top Width 0.68 m Critical Depth 0.51 m Percent Full 70.5 % Critical Slope 0.00564 m/m Velocity 2.00 m/s 0.20 Velocity Head m Specific Energy 0.73 m Froude Number 0.91 Maximum Discharge 0.85 m³/s **Discharge Full** 0.79 m³/s Slope Full 0.00357 m/m SubCritical Flow Type **GVF** Input Data Downstream Depth 0.00 m 0.00 Length m 0 Number Of Steps GVF Output Data 0.00 Upstream Depth m **Profile Description Profile Headloss** 0.00 m Average End Depth Over Rise 0.00 % Normal Depth Over Rise 70.49 % Downstream Velocity Infinity m/s

Bentley Systems, Inc. Haestad Methods Sol@cimewMaster V8i (SELECTseries 1) [08.11.01.03] 27 Siemons Company Drive Suite 200 W Watertown, CT 06795 USA +1-203-755-1666 Page 1 of 2

Worksheet for Culvert 16 - U/S Pipe

GVF Output Data

Upstream Velocity	Infinity	m/s
Normal Depth	0.53	m
Critical Depth	0.51	m
Channel Slope	0.00500	m/m
Critical Slope	0.00564	m/m

Cross Section for Culvert 16 - U/S Pipe

Project Description		
Friction Method	Manning Formula	
Solve For	Normal Depth	
Input Data		
Roughness Coefficient	0.013	
Channel Slope	0.00500	m/m
Normal Depth	0.53	m
Diameter	0.75	m
Discharge	0.67	m³/s
Cross Section Image		



Cross Section for SWMF Overland Flow

Project Description			
Friction Method	Manning Formula		
Solve For	Normal Depth		
Input Data			
Roughness Coefficient	0.025		
Channel Slope	0.01000	m/m	
Normal Depth	0.11	m	
Bottom Width	6.00	m	
Discharge	0.59	m³/s	
Cross Section Image			
	∇		
	~		0.11 m

ŀ

-

Cross Section for Flow Spreader Weir

Project Description		
Solve For	Discharge	
Input Data		
Discharge	2.72	m³/s
Headwater Elevation	180.60	m
Crest Elevation	180.30	m
Tailwater Elevation	180.15	m
Weir Coefficient	1.84	SI
Crest Length	9.00	m
Cross Section Image		



V:1 \rightarrow H: 1

Cross Section for SWMF Overflow Weir

Project Description		
Solve For	Discharge	
Input Data		
Discharge	3.97	m³/s
Headwater Elevation	181.71	m
Crest Elevation	181.35	m
Tailwater Elevation	181.15	m
Weir Coefficient	1.84	SI
Crest Length	10.00	m

Cross Section Image



V:1 ______H:1

Development Export Summary

Development :Shore Lane - Wasaga Beach

Updated : Sept 2014

Pre-Development Phosphorus Export

DEVELOPMENT :	Shore Lane - Wasaga Beach			
Landuse		Area (ha)	P coeff (kg/ha)	Pload (kg/yr)
Natural Heritage				
Forest		5.88	0.06	0.35
	Natural Heritage Land use Class Total :	5.88		0.35
	Development Total :	5.88		0.35
9/24/2020				Page 1 of 1

Page 1 of 1

Updated : Sept 2014

Cropland Site Sediment & Phosphorus Pre-Development Export

DEVELOPMENT : Shore Lane - Wasaga Beach	
COLOUR KEY : Site Specific Input	Constant / Lookup Calculation
SubArea :	
Slope Area (ha)	R (rainfall / runoff for Lake Simcoe)
Surface Slope Gradient (%)	K (soil errodability factor)
Length of Slope (m)	NN (determined by slope)
Cropt Type Factor)	LS (slope length gradient factor)
Tillage Type Factor	C (crop management factor)
	P (prevention + capture)
	Soil Loss (kg/year)
	Phosphorus export (kg/ha/yr)
	Phosphorus load (kg/yr)
	PRE Developed Area (ha) :
	Phosphorus export (kg/ha/yr) :

9/24/2020

Page 1 of 1

Phosphorus load (kg/yr) :

Post-Development Phosphorus Export

DEVELOPMENT : Shore La	ane - Wasaga Beach			
Landuse		Area (ha)	P coeff (kg/ha)	Pload (kg/yr)
Natural Heritage				
Forest		0.42	0.06	0.03
	Natural Heritage Land use Class Total :	0.42		0.03
Urban				
Residential		5.46	0.41	2.59
	Urban Land use Class Total :	5.46		2.59
	Development Total :	5.88		2.62
9/24/2020				Page 1 of 1

Page 1 of 1

Updated : Sept 2014

Cropland Site Sediment & Phosphorus Post-Development Export

DEVELOPMENT : Shore Lane - Wasaga Beach								
COLOUR KEY : Site Specific Input	Constant / Lookup Calculation							
SubArea :								
Slope Area (ha)	R (rainfall / runoff for Lake Simcoe)							
Surface Slope Gradient (%)	K (soil errodability factor)							
Length of Slope (m)	NN (determined by slope)							
Cropt Type Factor)	LS (slope length gradient factor)							
Tillage Type Factor	C (crop management factor)							
	P (prevention + capture)							
	Soil Loss (kg/year)							
	Phosphorus export (kg/ha/yr)							
	Phosphorus load (kg/yr)							
	PRE Developed Area (ha) :							
	Phosphorus export (kg/ha/yr) :							
	Phosphorus load (kg/yr) :							

9/24/2020

Page 1 of 1

Updated	: Sept 2014
---------	-------------

Post Dev	BMP				
Area (ha)	Treated Area %	P coefficient	P coefficient	P Load Reduction (kg/yr)	Rationale
Best Manageme	ent Practices (BN	IP) Applied (and	d Rationale)		
Residential					
1.52	100	0.41	100 %	0.62	Rear Yard Soakaways for all rooftops, full
User Entry					
Residential					
2.71	100	0.41	45 %	0.50	Remainder of 301 Catchment to SWMF
Sand or Media F	Filters				
Residential					
1.23	100	0.41	100 %	0.50	Uncontrolled Areas to Grassed Swales, full
Enhanced Grass	s/Water Quality \$	Swales			
Forest					
0.42	100	0.06			Uncontrolled NH Area
User Entry					

9/24/2020

Page 1 of 1

Development Area P and BMP Summary

Total PreDevelopment Area (ha):	5.88
PreDevelopment Area excluding Wetlands (ha):	5.88
Total PostDevelopment Area (ha):	5.88
Total Area treated by BMP's (ha):	5.88
Treated Area total:	5.88
Total PreDevelopment Load (kg/yr):	0.35
Total PostDevelopment Load (kg/yr):	2.62
Total P Load Reduction with BMP's (kg/yr):	1.62
Minimum P Load Reduction Required:	2.27
Total PostDevelopment Load with BMP's (kg/yr)	1.00
Conclusion : No Net Increase in P Load]
Conclusion. INO NEL INCLEASE IN F LOAU.	

9/24/2020

Post Dev Construction

9/24/2020

Page 1 of 1

Updated : Sept 2014

Page 1 of 1

Shore Lane 5yr Storm Sewer Catchment Areas & Sizing

CLIENT: Beachwood Developments

PROJECT: Beachwood Development

FILE: ROM-17026

DATE: September 2020

DESIGN: VS

CHECKED BY: JB / DR

Sto	orm Sewer (Catchment A	Areas & Runo	ff Coefficie	nts		
Catchment Number	Catchment Area (Ha) Number						
	Landscape	Impervious (Roof)	Impervious (Parking, Sidewalk)	Total	Weighted		
201	1,222	1,244	133	2,599	0.59		
202	744	1,109	436	2,289	0.69		
203	799	1,191	447	2,436	0.69		
204	1,006	1,377	861	3,244	0.70		
205	321	425	402	1,148	0.72		
206	443	660	520	1,623	0.72		
207	716	1,066	400	2,182	0.69		
208	449	669	296	1,413	0.69		
209	81	0	297	378	0.76		
210	1,376	1,093	3,743	6,212	0.76		
211	999	1,093	4,338	6,429	0.80		
212	756	318	1,266	2,340	0.69		
213	324	284	469	1,077	0.70		
214	498	527	767	1,792	0.72		
215	3,725	1,128	108	4,961	0.41		
101	913	1,309	246	2,468	0.66		
102	4,395	167	0	4,562	0.27		
103	207	310	0	517	0.64		
104	4,267	0	192	4,459	0.28		
105	2,977	0	0	2,977	0.25		
106	2,020	584	0	2,604	0.40		
107	435	651	0	1,086	0.64		
Total:	28672.81	15204.84	14918.35	58796.00	0.58		

Ru	noff Coeffici	ent
Landscape	Impervious (Roof)	Impervious (Parking, Sidewalk)
0.25	0.90	0.90

Percent Impervious (%)=



5 Year Storm Sewer Sizing																	
STREET	AREAS	MAN	HOLE	LENGTH		INCREMENT		TOTAL	FLOW	V TIME	I	TOTAL	S	D	Q	V	% FULL
				Ĩ					(m	nin)		Q			FULL	FULL	
		FROM	то	(m)	С	А	CA	CA	то	IN	(mm/h)	(cms)	(%)	(mm)	(cms)	(m/s)	
St. 'C'	201	STM 59	STM 58	81.6	0.59	0.26	0.15	0.15	15.00	1.41	74	0.031	0.50	300	0.068	1.0	45.9
St. 'C'	202	STM 58	STM 57	43.3	0.69	0.23	0.16	0.31	16.41	0.75	69	0.060	0.50	300	0.068	1.0	87.6
St. 'C'	203	STM 57	STM 56	16.1	0.69	0.24	0.17	0.48	17.15	0.24	67	0.089	0.50	375	0.124	1.1	71.7
St. 'C'	204	STM 56	STM 55	45.3	0.70	0.32	0.22	0.70	17.39	0.60	66	0.129	0.50	450	0.202	1.3	64.2
St. 'B'	205	DCB	STM 63	36.4	0.72	0.11	0.08	0.08	15.00	0.63	74	0.016	0.50	300	0.068	1.0	23.7
St. 'B'	206	STM 63	STM 64	41.1	0.72	0.16	0.12	0.19	15.63	0.71	72	0.039	0.50	300	0.068	1.0	56.5
St. 'B'	207	STM 64	STM 52	26.4	0.69	0.22	0.15	0.35	16.34	0.39	69	0.067	0.50	375	0.124	1.1	53.8
St. 'B'	208	STM 52	STM 55	44.6	0.69	0.14	0.10	0.44	16.73	0.66	68	0.084	0.50	375	0.124	1.1	67.7
St. 'B'		STM 55	STM 65	23.1				1.14	17.99	0.27	65	0.206	0.50	525	0.304	1.4	67.8
St. 'D'	209	DCB	STM 73	9.0	0.76	0.04	0.03	0.03	15.00	0.16	74	0.006	0.50	300	0.068	1.0	9.1
St. 'D'	210	HD UNIT 82	STM 73	30.4	0.76	0.62	0.47	0.47	15.00	0.45	74	0.096	0.50	375	0.124	1.1	77.7
St. 'D'	211	HD UNIT 83	STM 73	38.4	0.80	0.64	0.51	0.51	15.00	0.57	74	0.105	0.50	375	0.124	1.1	84.4
St. 'D'		STM 73	STM 49	36.3				1.01	15.57	0.43	72	0.202	0.50	525	0.304	1.4	66.4
St. 'B'	212	STM 49	STM 50	58.9	0.69	0.23	0.16	1.17	16.00	0.70	70	0.229	0.50	525	0.304	1.4	75.3
St. 'B'	213	STM 50	STM 65	29.2	0.70	0.11	0.08	1.25	16.70	0.35	68	0.237	0.50	525	0.304	1.4	77.9
	214	STM 65	STM 54	40.5	0.72	0.18	0.13	2.52	18.26	0.41	64	0.450	0.50	675	0.594	1.7	75.6
		STM 54	HEADWALL	6.5				2.52	18.67	0.07	63	0.443	0.50	675	0.594	1.7	74.5
	Total					3.50	2.52										
	Q= 0.0028*C*	I*A (cms);	·	·	C=RUNOFF CC	DEFFICIENT;			I-RAINFALL IN	NTENSITY (5 Y	′ear) =493.013/	(T.C.+0.081)^0	701	·	A=AREA (ha)	·	



ROM-17026 PF-Post, Chicago 4h.rpt

EPA STORM WATER MANAGEMENT MODEL - VERSION 5.1 (Build 5.1.014)

PROJECT NO: ROM-17026 (Beachwood Development, Wasaga Beach) MODEL CREATED BY: The Jones Consulting Group Ltd. DATE COMPLETED: May 2020 - PSWMR Submission

Element Count ***** Number of rain gages 7 Number of subcatchments ... 5 Number of pollutants 0 Number of land uses 0

Raingage Summary ****

Name	Data Source	Data	Recor Type	ding Interval	
100y12h 100y24h 100y4h 100y6h Chicago_4h Timmins WQE	100y12h 100y24h 100y4h 100y6h Chicago_ Timmins WQE	4h I	INTENSI INTENSIT INTENSIT INTENSIT INTENSITY NTENSITY	ITY 6 min. ITY 6 min. Y 5 min. Y 6 min. ENSITY 5 min. Y 60 min. 5 min.	
********	****				
Subcatchmer	nt Summary *******				
Name	Area V	Vidth %l	mperv '	%Slope Rain Gage	Outle

Page 1

Outlet

ROM-17026_PF-Post, Chicago_4h.rpt

301	4.01	200.62	66.00	2.0000 Chicago 4h	SWMF1
302	0.25	123.40	63.00	2.0000 Chicago 4h	OF1
303	0.51	52.91	9.00	2.0000 Chicago_4h	OF1
304	0.67	74.08	19.00	2.0000 Chicago 4h	OF2
305	0.45	148.63	4.00	2.0000 Chicago_4h	OF2

Node Summary

	Invert	Max.	Ponded	External
Name	Type	Elev. De	əpth A	Area Inflow
Cntrl MH	JUNCTION	179.30	2.20	0.0
OF1	OUTFALL	179.00	0.45	0.0
OF2	OUTFALL	180.00	0.00	0.0
SWMF1	STORAGE	179.75	1.95	0.0

Link Summary

Name	From Node	To Node	Type	Lenç	gth %	Slope Roughness
 C1	Cntrl MH	OF1	CONDUIT	61.9	 0.8078	0.0130
OR1	SWMF1	Cntrl_MH	ORIFICE			
OR2	SWMF1	Cntrl_MH	ORIFICE			
EOW	SWMF1	Cntrl_MH	WEIR			
Underdrains	SWMF1	Cntrl_MH	OUTLET			

Cross Section Summary

Conduit	Shape	Full	Full Depth	Hyd. N Area	Max. N Rad.	o. of Width	Full 1 Barrel	ls Flow
C1	CIRCULAR		0.45	0.16	0.11	0.45	1	0.26

ROM-17026_PF-Post, Chicago_4h.rpt

Analysis Options ****** Flow Units CMS Process Models: Rainfall/Runoff YES RDII NO Snowmelt NO Groundwater NO Flow Routing YES Ponding Allowed NO Water Quality NO Infiltration Method GREEN AMPT Flow Routing Method DYNWAVE Surcharge Method EXTRAN Starting Date 04/24/2020 00:00:00 Ending Date 04/27/2020 00:00:00 Antecedent Dry Days 0.0 Report Time Step 00:01:00 Wet Time Step 00:05:00 Dry Time Step 00:05:00 Routing Time Step 5.00 sec Variable Time Step YES Number of Threads 1 Head Tolerance 0.001500 m

******	***	Volume	Depth
Runoff Quantity Continuity	hecta	ıre-m 	mm
Total Precipitation	0.147	25.016	
Evaporation Loss	0.000	0.000	
Infiltration Loss	0.107	18.208	
----------------------	--------	--------	
Surface Runoff	0.035	5.994	
Final Storage	0.006	1.019	
Continuity Error (%)	-0.819		

*****	**** V	'olume	Volume
Flow Routing Continuity	hectare	e-m 10^	`6 ltr
Dry Weather Inflow	0.000	0.000	
Wet Weather Inflow	0.035	0.352	
Groundwater Inflow	0.000	0.000)
RDII Inflow	0.000	0.000	
External Inflow	0.000	0.000	
External Outflow	0.035	0.352	
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	0.000	0.000)
Continuity Error (%)	0.066		

Time-Step Critical Elements

None

Maximum Time Step:5.00 secPercent in Steady State:0.00Average Iterations per Step:2.00Percent Not Converging:0.00

Subcatchment Runoff Summary

	Total	Total 1	Total T	otal In	nperv	Perv T	otal Tc	otal Peo	ak Runc	off	
	Precip	Runon	Evap	Infil	Runoff	Runoff	Runoff	Runoff	Runoff	Coeff	
Subcatchment		mm	mm	mm	mm	mm	mm	mm	10^	6 ltr	CMS
301	25.02	0.00	0.00	15.61	15.44	0.00	8.34	0.33	0.26	0.333	5
302	25.02	0.00	0.00	18.86	5 14.59	9 3.24	5.57	0.01	0.02	0.223	5
303	25.02	0.00	0.00	24.85	5 2.08	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.000	
304	25.02	0.00	0.00	24.67	4.41	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.000	
305	25.02	0.00	0.00	24.02	0.93	0.00	0.93	0.00	0.00	0.037	

Node Depth Summary

	Average Maximum Maximum Time of Max Reported	t
	Depth Depth HGL Occurrence Max Depth	
Node	Type Meters Meters Meters days hr:min Meters	
Cntrl MH	JUNCTION 0.22 0.23 179.53 0 01:16 0.23	
OF1	OUTFALL 0.02 0.03 179.03 0 01:15 0.03	
OF2	OUTFALL 0.00 0.00 180.00 0 00:00 0.00	
SWMF1	STORAGE 0.13 0.39 180.14 0 04:26 0.39	

Node Inflow Summary

ROM-17026_PF-Post, Chicago_4h.rpt

	Maxim	um Max	Lat	ieral Tot	al Flov	w	
	Lateral	Total	Ix Inflov	w Inflow	Balance	∋	
	Inflow	Inflow	Se Volu	ume Vol	ume Ei	rror	
Node	Type	CMS	CMS day	s hr:min	10^6 ltr	10^6 ltr	Percent
Cntrl_MH	JUNCTION	0.000	0 0.002	0 00:51	0	0.335	0.074
OF1	OUTFALL	0.020	0.022 0	01:25	0.0137	0.348	0.000
OF2	OUTFALL	0.005	0.005 0	01:20	0.00413	0.00413	0.000
SWMF1	STORAGE	0.25	7 0.257	0 01:20	0.335	0.335	-0.004

Node Surcharge Summary

No nodes were surcharged.

Node Flooding Summary

No nodes were flooded.

Storage Volume Summary

	Average	Avg	Eva	p Exf	il	Maximum	n N	Лах	Time c	of Max	Maximum
	Volume	Pcnt	Pcn	t Pci	nt	Volume	Pc	nt	Occurre	ence	Outflow
Storage Unit	1000	m3	Full	Loss	Loss	1000	m3	Full	days	hr:min	CMS
SWMF1	0.10	3 4	4 () ()	0.304	13	0	04:26	0.00	02

Outfall Loading Summary

	Flow Freq F	Avg N How Fl	Max Iow V	íotal olume
Outfall Node	Pcn	t CM	s cn	1S 10^6 ltr
OF1 OF2	64.76 4.58	0.002 0.000	0.022 0.005	0.348 0.004
System	34.67	0.002	0.005	0.352

Link Flow Summary

	Maxir	num Tim	ne of Max I	Maximum	n Max/	Max/
	Flov	v Occi	urrence V	eloc F	ull Full	
Link	Type	CMS da	ys hr:min	m/sec	Flow De	epth
C1	CONDUIT	0.002	0 01:15	0.48	0.01 C	0.06
OR1	ORIFICE	0.000	0 00:00		0.00	
OR2	ORIFICE	0.000	0 00:00		0.00	
EOW	WEIR	0.000	0 00:00		0.00	
Underdrains	DUMM	Y 0.0	0 00:5	51		

Flow Classification Summary

Conduit Surcharge Summary

No conduits were surcharged.

Analysis begun on: Tue Sep 22 16:35:39 2020 Analysis ended on: Tue Sep 22 16:35:46 2020 Total elapsed time: 00:00:07

ROM-17026_PF-Post, 100y24h.rpt

EPA STORM WATER MANAGEMENT MODEL - VERSION 5.1 (Build 5.1.014)

PROJECT NO: ROM-17026 (Beachwood Development, Wasaga Beach) MODEL CREATED BY: The Jones Consulting Group Ltd. DATE COMPLETED: May 2020 - PSWMR Submission

Element Count

Number of rain gages 6 Number of subcatchments ... 5 Number of nodes 4 Number of links 5 Number of pollutants 0 Number of land uses 0

Raingage Summary

		Data	Recording
Name	Data Source		Type Interval
100y12h	100y12h		INTENSITY 6 min.
100y24h	100y24h		INTENSITY 6 min.
100y4h	100y4h		INTENSITY 5 min.
100y6h	100y6h		INTENSITY 6 min.
Timmins	Timmins		INTENSITY 60 min.
WQE	WQE		INTENSITY 5 min.

Subcatchment Summary

Name	Area	Width	%Imperv	ROM %Slope Rain Gaç	l-17026_PF-Post, ge Outlet	100y24h.rpt
301	4.01	200.62	66.00 2	.0000 100y24h	SWMF1	
302	0.25	123.40	63.00 2	.0000 100y24h	OF1	
303	0.51	52.91	9.00 2.0)000 100y24h	OF1	
304	0.67	74.08	19.00 2.	0000 100y24h	OF2	
305	0.45	148.63	4.00 2.	0000 100y24h	OF2	

Node Summa	ſy					
	I	nvert	Max. Por	nded External		
Name	Type	Ele	v. Depti	n Area Inflow		
Cntrl MH	JUNCTIO	N	179.30	2,20 0,0		
OF1	OUTFALL	179	0.00 0.4	5 0.0		
OF2	OUTFALL	180	0.00 0.0	0 0.0		
SWMF1	STORAGE		179.75	1.95 0.0		

Link Summary						

Name	From Node	To Node	Type	Len	gth '	%Slope Roughness
C1 OR1 OR2 EOW Underdrains	Cntrl_MH SWMF1 SWMF1 SWMF1 sWMF1 s SWMF1	OF1 Cntrl_MH Cntrl_MH Cntrl_MH Cntrl_MH	Conduit Orifice Orifice Weir Outlet	61.9	0.80	- 78 0.0130

Cross Section Summary

Full Full Hyd. Max. No. of Full

Conduit	Shape	Depth	Area	Rad.	R Width	OM-1 Barre	7026_PF-Post, 100y24h.rpt s Flow
C1	CIRCULAR	0.45	0.16	0.11	0.45	1	0.26

NOTE: The summary statistics displayed in this report are based on results found at every computational time step, not just on results from each reporting time step.

Analysis Options

Flow Units CMS Process Models: Rainfall/Runoff YES RDII NO Snowmelt NO Groundwater NO Flow Routing YES Ponding Allowed NO Water Quality NO Infiltration Method GREEN AMPT Flow Routing Method DYNWAVE Surcharge Method EXTRAN Starting Date 04/24/2020 00:00:00 Ending Date 04/27/2020 00:00:00 Antecedent Dry Days 0.0 Report Time Step 00:01:00 Wet Time Step 00:05:00 Dry Time Step 00:05:00 Routing Time Step 5.00 sec Variable Time Step YES

Head Tolerance 0.001500 m

*****	***** \	/olume	Depth
Runoff Quantity Continui	ty hecta *****	re-m 	mm
Total Precipitation Evaporation Loss	0.711 0.000	121.000 0.000	
Infiltration Loss	0.323	54.986	
Surface Runoff	0.384	65.360	
Final Storage	0.006	1.019	
Continuity Error (%)	-0.302		

******	**** V	olume	Volume
Flow Routing Continuity	hectare	-m 10^	` 6 ltr
Dry Weather Inflow	0.000	0.000	
Wet Weather Inflow	0.385	3.846	1
Groundwater Inflow	0.000	0.000)
RDII Inflow	0.000	0.000	
External Inflow	0.000	0.000	
External Outflow	0.375	3.751	
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	0.009	0.095)
Continuity Error (%)	0.006		

Time-Step Critical Elements

None

ROM-17026_PF-Post, 100y24h.rpt

Highest Flow Instability Indexes

All links are stable.

Routing Time Step Summary

Minimum Time Step	:	4.50 sec
Average Time Step	:	5.00 sec
Maximum Time Step	:	5.00 sec
Percent in Steady State	:	0.00
Average Iterations per Ste	ep :	2.00
Percent Not Converging	:	0.00

Subcatchment Runoff Summary

	Total Precip	Total To Runon	otal To Evap	ital Im Infil	iperv Runoff	Perv Tot Runoff R	al Toto Runoff I	al Peak Runoff Ri	Runoff unoff Coeff
Subcatchment		mm	mm	mm	mm	mm	mm	mm	10 ⁶ ltr CMS
301	121.00	0.00	0.00	44.48	78.7	7 33.07	75.61	3.03	1.25 0.625
302	121.00	0.00	0.00	56.31	75.02	2 51.65	63.65	0.16	0.10 0.526
303	121.00	0.00	0.00	83.14	10.7	1 37.88	37.88	0.19	0.12 0.313
304	121.00	0.00	0.00	79.63	22.6	3 41.25	41.25	0.28	0.17 0.341
305	121.00	0.00	0.00	79.88	4.76	36.67	41.43	0.18	0.14 0.342

Node Depth Summary

ROM-17026_PF-Post, 100y24h.rpt

	Average Maximum Maximum Time of Max Depth Depth HGL Occurrence Max	Reported Depth
Node	Type Meters Meters Meters days hr:min	Meters
Cntrl_MH OF1 OF2 SWMF1	JUNCTION 0.24 0.88 180.18 0 12:18 OUTFALL 0.05 0.39 179.39 0 12:18 OUTFALL 0.00 0.00 180.00 0 00:00 STORAGE 0.44 1.60 181.35 0 12:17	0.88 0.39 0.00 1.60

Node Inflow Summary

Node	Maxim	um Max	imum	Late	eral Tot	tal Flo	ow
	Lateral	Total 1	lime of Ma	x Inflow	v Inflow	Balano	ce
	Inflow	Inflow	Occurrenc	e Volui	me Vol	ume	Error
	Type	CMS	CMS days	s hr:min	10^6 ltr	10^6 ltr	⁻ Percent
Cntrl_MH	JUNCTION	0.000	0.326	0 12:17	0	2.94	0.016
OF1	OUTFALL	0.209	0.427 0	12:02	0.35	3.29	0.000
OF2	OUTFALL	0.308	0.308 0	12:00	0.461	0.461	0.000
SWMF1	STORAGE	1.252	1.252	0 11:59	3.04	3.04	0.000

Node Surcharge Summary

No nodes were surcharged.

Node Flooding Summary

No nodes were flooded.

Storage Volume Summary

_____ Average Avg Evap Exfil Maximum Max Time of Max Maximum Volume Pcnt Pcnt Pcnt Volume Pcnt Occurrence Outflow 1000 m3 Full Loss Loss 1000 m3 Full days hr:min CMS Storage Unit _____ ----------SWMF1 0.368 16 0 0 1.702 74 0 12:17 0.326

Outfall Loading Summary

	Flow /	Avg N	√ax	Total
	Frea F	Iow FI	Iow \	/olume
Outfall Node	Pcn	t CM	s Ci	VIS 10^6 ltr
OF1	97.78	0.013	0.427	3.290
OF2	31.26	0.006	0.308	0.461
System	64.52	0.019	0.30	B 3.751

Link Flow Summary

Maximum Time of Max Maximum Max/ Max/

ROM-17026 PF-Post, 100y24h.rpt |Flow| Occurrence |Veloc| Full Full CMS days hr:min m/sec Flow Depth Link Type C1 CONDUIT 0.325 0 12:18 2.10 1.27 0.94 OR1 ORIFICE 0.015 0 12:17 1.00 OR2 ORIFICE 0.307 0 12:17 1.00 EOW WEIR 0.002 0 12:17 0.01 0.002 0 01:43 Underdrains DUMMY ***** Flow Classification Summarv , ******************************** Adjusted ------ Fraction of Time in Flow Class ------Up Down Sub Sup Up Down Norm Inlet /Actual Length Dry Dry Dry Crit Crit Crit Ltd Ctrl Conduit _____ _____ C1 1.00 0.02 0.00 0.00 0.01 0.96 0.00 0.00 0.67 0.00 ***** Conduit Surcharge Summary ****** _____ Hours Hours ----- Hours Full ------ Above Full Capacity Conduit Both Ends Upstream Dnstream Normal Flow Limited _____ C1 0.01 0.67 0.01 0.84 0.01

Analysis begun on: Tue Sep 22 16:34:57 2020 Analysis ended on: Tue Sep 22 16:34:58 2020 Total elapsed time: 00:00:01

suime				
OF1 POST-Tir 0.3673 0.3673 0.0208 5390		 		 1 Mon
hicago_4h				
0F1 POST-CH 0.02175 0.001343 348.1				
ST-5y24h				
0.1002 0.1002 0 1675				
POST-50y24H				
24h OF11 0.359 0.011 2920				
DF1 POST-2) 065155 0 0004358 1129				
F-25y24h 0				
OF1 POS1 0.2831 0 0.009864 2556			 	
0ST-10y24h 91				
4h OF1P 0.1792 0 0.0079 2071				
POST-100/2				
OF1 m³/s) 0.42 m³/s) 0.01) 3291				
Fns Total inflow (Total inflow (m ³ /s I inflow (m ³)				
Objective Maximum Minimum Mean Tot				
				 (



	T-Timmins				Aon
	OF2 POST 0.09141 0 0.001984 514				27 N
	OF2 POST-Chicago_4h 0.004598 0 1594E-05 4.132				
	OF2 POST-5y24h 0.1212 0 0.0006323 163.9				
	OF2 POST-50y24h 0.2698 0 0.001533 397.3				
	OF2 POST-2y24h 0.02744 0 0.0001221 31.64				
	OF2 POST-25y24h 0.2318 0.001295 335.6			 	- 26 Sun Timmins
	OF2 POST-10y24h 0.1749 0.00009401 243.6				r-TSO4
	OF2 POST-100y24h 0.3077 0 0.00178 461.1				OST-Chicado 4h
Node OF2	bjective Fns faximum Total inflow (m ³ /s) finimum Total inflow (m ³ /s) diamum total inflow (m ³ /s) otal Total inflow (m ³)				Date/Time DST-5v24h F
	02224				4h
					25 Sat POST-50y2
					POST-2v24h
					24h
					-25yź







Appendix B

Supporting Calculations – Sanitary Servicing

- Sanitary Sewer Design Sheet
- Sanitary Sewer Capacity Analysis (not yet available)

	SANITARY SEWER DESIGN SHEET - BEACHWOOD DEVELOPMENT LTD										
RESIDENTIAL POPULATION DENSITIES				DATE :							
Low Density (Single Family/Semi-Detached)	= 2.6 PEOPLE/UNIT	TOWN O	F WASAGA BEACH	DESIGNED BY :							
MEDIUM DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)	= 2.6 PEOPLE/UNIT			CHECKED BY :							
HIGH DENSITY (APARTMENTS)	= 2.6 PEOPLE/UNIT @65uph			FILE No :							
FIRE/AMBULANCE	= 35 m3/ha/d = 100 PEOPLE/HA										
COMMERCIAL / INSTITUTIONAL	= 35 m3/ha/d = 100 PEOPLE/HA		14								
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	= 400 PEOPLE		$M = 1 + \frac{14}{4 + 1005}$								
SECONDARY SCHOOL	= 1000 PEOPLE		$4 + P^{0.5}$								
SEWAGE = 350 L/DAY/CAP			$V_{ACT} > 0.4m/s$								
INFILTRATION = $0.28I/s/ha$			P= Population in thousands								
PEAKING FACTOR = HARMON FORMULA		PROJECT NAME: BEACHWOOD DEVELOPMENT									
DESIGN VELOCITY (MIN.) = 0.4 m/s (TOWN OF WAS,	AGA BEACH ENGINEERING STANDARDS, MARCI	H 2015)									
LOCATION		BODIII ATION	SEWAGE FLOW								

	LC	OCATION		AREA (HECTARES)						POPUL	ATION				SEWAGE FLOW				PIPE DATA				
STREET	AREA	FROM	TO	NET OR	DIMENSIONS	DELTA	TOTAL	PER	PER	DELTA	Delta	OTHER	TOTAL	М	SEWAGE	INFILT. TOTAL	D	S	Q Full	V Full	V Design	Qfull check	V check
	No.	M.H.	M.H.	GROSS		AREA ha	AREA ha	ha	LOT	LOTS	POP.	POP.	POP.	2 -> 4	l/s	l/s l/s	(mm)	(%)	(L/S)	(m/s)	(m/s)		
St. 'A'	16	SAN MH 42	SAN MH 41			0.12	0.12		2.6	3	8	0	8	4.42	0.14	0.03 0.17	200	3.00	56.81	1.81	0.402	OKAY	OKAY
St. 'C'	14	SAN MH 43	SAN MH 44			0.13	0.13		2.6	4	10	0	10	4.41	0.19	0.04 0.22	200	2.50	51.86	1.65	0.407	OKAY	OKAY
St. 'A'	15	SAN MH 44	SAN MH 41			0.22	0.35		2.6	6	16	0	26	4.36	0.46	0.10 0.56	200	3.70	63.09	2.01	0.618	OKAY	OKAY
St. 'B'	11	SAN MH 41	SAN MH 40			0.10	0.57		2.6	2	5	0	39	4.34	0.69	0.16 0.85	200	0.80	29.34	0.93	0.411	OKAY	OKAY
St. 'B'	10	SAN MH 40	SAN MH 39			0.28	0.85		2.6	7	18	0	57	4.3	1.00	0.24 1.23	200	0.60	25.41	0.81	0.416	OKAY	OKAY
St. 'B'	9	SAN MH 39	SAN MH 38			0.20	1.05		2.6	3	8	0	65	4.29	1.13	0.29 1.42	200	0.50	23.19	0.74	0.409	OKAY	OKAY
St. 'B'	8	SAN MH 38	SAN MH 37			0.10	1.15		2.6	3	8	0	73	4.28	1.26	0.32 1.58	200	0.50	23.19	0.74	0.422	OKAY	OKAY
St. 'C'	13	SAN MH 44	SAN MH 47			0.37	0.37		2.6	14	36	0	36	4.34	0.64	0.10 0.74	200	1.20	35.93	1.14	0.456	OKAY	OKAY
St. 'C'	12	SAN MH 47	SAN MH 46			0.43	0.8		2.6	16	42	0	78	4.27	1.35	0.22 1.57	200	0.90	31.12	0.99	0.516	OKAY	OKAY
St. 'C'	17	SAN MH 46	SAN MH 45			0.07	0.87		2.6	3	8	0	86	4.26	1.48	0.24 1.72	200	0.50	23.19	0.74	0.432	OKAY	OKAY
St. 'C'	7	SAN MH 45	SAN MH 37			0.19	1.06		2.6	4	10	0	96	4.25	1.66	0.30 1.95	200	2.60	52.89	1.68	0.800	OKAY	OKAY
St. 'B'	6	SAN MH 37	SAN MH 36			0.18	2.39		2.6	3	8	0	177	4.17	2.99	0.67 3.66	200	0.50	23.19	0.74	0.538	OKAY	OKAY
St. 'B'	5	SAN MH 36	SAN MH 35			0.26	2.65		2.6	5	13	0	190	4.16	3.20	0.74 3.94	200	0.50	23.19	0.74	0.549	OKAY	OKAY
St. 'D'	1	Block 42	SAN MH 34			0.81	0.81		2.6	67	174	0	174	4.17	2.94	0.23 3.17	200	0.50	23.19	0.74	0.516	OKAY	OKAY
St. 'D'	2	Block 43	SAN MH 34			1.29	1.29		2.6	67	174	0	174	4.17	2.94	0.36 3.30	200	0.50	23.19	0.74	0.522	OKAY	OKAY
St. 'D'	3	SAN MH 34	SAN MH 35			0.15	2.25		2.6	4	10	0	359	4.04	5.87	0.63 6.50	200	5.00	73.34	2.33	1.440	OKAY	OKAY
St. 'D'	4	SAN MH 35	SAN MH 76			0.17	5.07		2.6	4	10	0	559	3.95	8.94	1.42 10.36	200	0.50	23.19	0.74	0.717	OKAY	OKAY
		SAN MH 76	SAN MH 84				5.07						559	3.95	8.94	1.42 10.36	200	0.50	23.19	0.74	0.717	OKAY	OKAY
		SAN MH 84	SAN MH 102				5.07						559	3.95	8.94	1.42 10.36	200	0.50	23.19	0.74	0.717	OKAY	OKAY
Drains to Sh	ore Lane	SAN MH 102	SAN MH 407				5.07						559	3.95	8.94	1.42 10.36	200	0.50	23.19	0.74	0.717	OKAY	OKAY
							Total E	quivalen	t Units	215			215										

August 2020 VS JB ROM-17026



Appendix C

Figures and Engineering Drawings

(Reduced, NTS)

- SS-1 General Servicing Plan
- SS-2 General Servicing Plan
- SG-1 General Grading Plan
- SG-2 General Grading Plan
- STM-1 Storm Sewer Catchment Plan
- STM-2 Storm Sewer Sub-catchment Plan
- SAN-1 Internal Sanitary Drainage Area Plan
- DS-1 Storm Design Sheet
- DS-2 Sanitary Design Sheet
- SWM-1 Stormwater Management Plan Pre-Development Catchment Area
- SWM-2 Stormwater Management Plan Post-Development Catchment Area
- PND-1 Stormwater Management Facility Plan
- PND-2 Stormwater Management Facility Sections & Details

BEACHWOOD DEVELOPMENT TOWN OF WASAGA BEACH

DRAWING LEGEND

TITLE	TITLE PAGE
GS-1	GENERAL SERVICING PLAN
GP-1	GRADING PLAN
GP-2	GRADING PLAN
PP-1	PROFILE - STREETS 'A' & 'D', DRAINAGE EASEMENT
PP-2	PROFILE – STREETS 'B' & 'C'
SAN-1	SANITARY DRAINAGE SUB-CATCHMENT AREAS
STM-1	STORMWATER SUB-CATCHMENT PLAN
DS-1	STORM SEWER DESIGN SHEET
DS-2	SANITARY SEWER DESIGN SHEET
SWM-1	STORMWATER MANAGEMENT PRE-DEVELOPMENT AREAS
SWM-2	OVERALL STORMWATER MANAGEMENT POST-DEVELOPMENT AREAS
WM-1	WATERMAIN SWABBING PLAN
PND-1	SWM FACILITY PLAN VIEW
PND-2	SWM FACILITY SECTIONS & DETAILS
DE-1	WESTERN DRAINAGE EASEMENT
DE-2	EASTERN DRAINAGE EASEMENT





MUNICIPALITY:

TOWN OF WASAGA BEACH **30 LEWIS STREET** WASAGA BEACH, ON L9Z 2K5 PH. 705.429.3844





REVISIONS	DATE	INITIAL		CE OF C	
FSR SUBMISSION	SEP 2020	DR		TO WICE OF ON THE	
				100112707	
				S. (Actorday)	
				PROFESSION 41 FIL	BE
				1000	BEAC



FSR SUBMISSION	SEP 2020	DR
REVISIONS	DATE	INITIAL



G: \Eng_3D\ROM-17026\Source Dwgs\Pipe Networks\ROM-17029-Pipes option 2.dwg Layout:PP-1 Plotted Sep 17, 2020 @ 4:04pm by vsperandum The Jones Consulting Grou







95		GEORGIAN BAY			
T 4 AN 34095					
PART 3 PLAN		NG RESIDENTIAL			
PART 2	1 407	LOT 36	32 33 34		
51R-34095	×		LOT 4	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	
PART 1 EXISTING PLAN 51R-39265 RESIDENTIAL	At the second se	EX. SAN MH EX. 450mm# SAN	MH 407	101 53 FO	1 101
PART 2 PLAN 51R-39265	PART 3 PLAN	Other Lands Owned	(B) OTHERS (SDR-35) (SDR-35) (SDR-35) (SDR-35) (SHOR SHOR	ουπηφρίς SAN 0-0.50% Ε LANE	
BLOCK 6 SWMF (0.31 ha.)	1R-39265 PART 4 P PLAN 51R-39265 51	ART 8 PLAN R-662 S1R-662 PLAN 51R-662		EX. SAN MAY (BY OTHERS)	SAN
0.20 2.6	EXISTING RE	SIDENTIAL 33.8m-200mm#PVC R-35) SAN 9 0.50%	48.7m-200mmø PVC (SDR-35) SAN ● 0.50% PART 1 PLAN 51R-662	PART 2 PLAN PART 3 51R-662 PLAN	4 525
28.2m-200mm#PVC SDR-35; SAN © 0.50% 0.50\%	0.25 2.6	ин (76)	EXISTING	SIR-662 RESIDENTIAL	LOT
11 9 8 7 38.3m-200mmøPVC MH (37)	6 5 5 5 22.5m-2 (SDR-35) S	200mm¢PVC AN ● 0.50%		inter interior	LO
AH (38) 41.7m=200mme PVC 31 (SIR-35) SAN • 2.60% 30	SDR-35) SAN € (SDR-35) SAN € 0.50% 37.4m-20 COPE SAN	0.50%	6 FUTORE		
71 72 73 4 7 4 7	2.6 1 FUTURE SITE PLAN 26 7m-200r			b Unit 83 High Density	
MH (45) 27 (SDR-35) SAN • C (SDR-35) SAN • C	C High Density	0.50% MH (34)	200mmøPVG (5) SAN @ 0.507		
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$					
				Block 10 m Reserve BEACHWOOD ROAL 0.01 ha.)	D / OLD
BEACHWOOD ROAD	/ OLD HIGHWAY 26	EDGE OF PAVEMENT			
			EXIST	ING RESIDENTIAL	
					RF /
				30 PESSIONAL SHA	Ē
				<u>∃</u> U.E. HICHAHUSUN <u>∃</u> 100112707 <u>3</u> 20-09-24 3	
REVISIONS	DATE INITIAL			WCE OF ONTITIE	





							5 Year St	torm Sewe	r Sizing								-
STREET	AREAS	MANH	IOLE	LENGTH				TOTAL	FLOW	TIME	l I	TOTAL	S	D	Q FULL	V FULL	% FULI
		FROM	то	(m)	С	Α	CA	CA	(m) TO	n) IN	(mm/h)	(cms)	(%)	(mm)	(cms)	(m/s)	
an in a suite ann an suite an stàitean an																	-
St. 'C'	201	STM 59	STM 58	81.6	0.59	0.26	0.15	0.15	15.00	1.41	74	0.031	0.50	300	0.068	1.0	45.9
St. 'C'	202	STM 58	STM 57	43.3	0.69	0.23	0.16	0.31	16.41	0.75	69	0.060	0.50	300	0.068	1.0	87.6
St. 'C'	203	STM 57	STM 56	16.1	0.69	0.24	0.17	0.48	17.15	0.24	67	0.089	0.50	375	0.124	1.1	71.7
St. 'C'	204	STM 56	STM 55	45.3	0.70	0.32	0.22	0.70	17.39	0.60	66	0.129	0.50	450	0.202	1.3	- 64.2
	205	DCD		26.4	0.72	0.11	0.08	0.08	15.00	0.63	74	0.016	0.50	300	0.068	1.0	23.7
	205			<u> </u>	0.72	0.16	0.00	0.19	15.63	0.71	72	0.039	0.50	300	0.068	1.0	56.5
	206			41.1 26.4	0.69	0.22	0.12	0.35	16.34	0.39	69	0.067	0.50	375	0.124	1.1	53.8
	207			20.4	0.69	0.14	0.10	0.44	16.73	0.66	68	0.084	0.50	375	0.124	1.1	67.7
	208		STIVISS	44.0	0.00		0.10	1 14	17.99	0.27	65	0.206	0.50	525	0.304	1.4	67.8
SI. D		5110155	51105	25.1													
St IDI	200		CTNA 72	9.0	0.76	0.04	0.03	0.03	15.00	0.16	74	0.006	0.50	300	0.068	1.0	9.1
	209		STIVE 73	3.0	0.76	0.62	0.47	0.47	15.00	0.45	74	0.096	0.50	375	0.124	1.1	77.7
	210	HD UNIT 82	STIVE 73	20.4	0.80	0.64	0.1	0.51	15.00	0.57	74	0.105	0.50	375	0.124	1.1	84.4
	211	HD UNIT 83	STIVE 73	26.2			0.51	1.01	15.57	0.43	72	0.202	0.50	525	0.304	1.4	66.4
	240	STIVI 73	STIVI 49	50.5	0.69	0.23	0.16	1 17	16.00	0.70	70	0.229	0.50	525	0.304	1.4	75.3
	212		STIVI SU	20.2	0.00	0.11	0.08	1 25	16.70	0.35	68	0.237	0.50	525	0.304	1.4	77.9
Ο Ι. D	213			29.2 40 E	0.70	0.18	0.00	2 52	18.26	0.41	64	0.450	0.50	675	0.594	1.7	75.6
	214			40.5	0.12		0.13	2.52	18.67	0.07	63	0.443	0.50	675	0.594	1.7	74.5
an a		STM 54	HEADWALL	6.5				2.52	10.07								
	Total					3.50	2.52									Ļ	
	Q= 0.0028*C*I*A (cms); C=RUNOFF COEFFICIENT;								FRAINFALL I	NTENSITY (5	Year) =493.01	3/(T.C.+0.081)	°0.701		A=AREA (ha)	

 BENCHMARK:

 BENCHMARK NO. 0011971U190 LOCATED AT WASAGA BEACH DEEP BENCH MARK IN

 MANHOLE IN GROUND OF BYRNES AVENUE PUBLIC SCHOOL, 0.7 KM NORTHEAST OF

 JUNCTION OF HIGHWAY NO. 26 AND SIMCOE ROAD NO. 7, IN LAWN, 28.3 M NORTHEAST

 OF NORTHEAST CORNER OF SCHOOL, 22.2M SOUTH OF CENTRE LINE OF SIMCOE ROAD

 NO. 7, 10.4 M EAST OF EAST LANEWAY TO SCHOOL, 5.8 M NORTH OF A PINE TREE.

 N4924007.xxx E571589.xxx ELEV 180.020

 BENCHMARK NO. 00819880756. MONUMENT LOCATED ON THE SOUTH SIDE OF HIGHWAY

 26, 0.5 KM WEST FROM 74TH STREET NORTH ALSO 0.8 KM EAST FROM MARILYN LANE.

 N4924207.508 E569777.320 ELEV 184

 BENCHMARK NO. 0011971U183. COLLINGWOOD SMALL CONCRETE CULVERT UNDER

 HIGHWAY NO. 26, 1.3 KM NORTHWEST OF JUNCTION OF HIGHWAY NO. 26 AND SINCOE

 ROAD NO. 7, TABLET IN TOP OF CULVERT, 24 CM FROM SOUTHWEST END AND 18 CM

 FROM SOUTHEAST EDGE OF CULVERT, 24 M BELOW ROAD LEVEL.

 N4923771.xxx E569779.xxx ELEV. 183.592

- Zavission Discrimination Discrimination Description DRAINAGE PLAN-STM-1.dwg Lavout: DS-1 Plotted Sep 17, 2020 @ 4:06pm by vsperandum The Jones Consulting Group Ltd.

		· · · ·		
			SPOFESSIONAL SP	BE
			S D. F. RICHARDSON	
			20-07-24	S
FSR SUBMISSION	SEP 2020	DR	OLIVCE OF ONTATION	Ŭ
REVISIONS	DATE	INITIAL		

PRELIMINARY DESIGN NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

EACHWOOD DEVELOPMENT INC. BEACHWOOD DEVELOPMENT TOWN OF WASAGA BEACH STORM SEWER DESIGN SHEET STORM SEWER DESIGN SHEET EACHWOOD DEVELOPMENT INC. DESIGN VS DESIGN VS DESIGN VS SCALE: DATE APR 2020 DRAWN KC/VS CHECKED JB DROM-17026 DS-1

RESIDENTIAL POPULATION DENSITIES LOW DENSITY (SINGLE FAMILY/SEMI-DE MEDIUM DENSITY (TOWNHOUSES)

	HIGH DENS	ITY (APARTME	NTS)		= 2.6 PEOPLE/	UNIT @6	5uph												FILE No :		ROM-1702	6			
	FIRE/AMBU	LANCE			= 35 m3/ha/d =	100 PEO	PLE/HA																		
	COMMERCI	IAL / INSTITUTIO	ONAL		= 35 m3/ha/d =	100 PEO	PLE/HA									11.									
	ELEMENTA	RY SCHOOL			= 400 PEOPLE									M =	$1 + \frac{1}{4}$	<u>17</u> <u>005</u>									
	SECONDAF	RY SCHOOL			= 1000 PEOPLI	E									4 1	- <i>P</i>									
	SEWAGE =	350 L/DAY/CA	Ρ											VAC	r > 0.4	m/s									
	INFILTRATIC	ON = 0.28l/s/ha														P= Populatio	n in tho	usands							
	PEAKING F	ACTOR = HARI	MON FORMUL	A					PROJEC	T NAME:	BEACH	VOOD D	EVELOP	MENT											
	DESIGN VE	LOCITY (MIN.) :	= 0.4 m/s (TO)	WN OF W	ASAGA BEACH	ENGINEE	RING STA	NDARD	S, MARC	H 2015)						는 것이 가지 않는 것이다. 이 가지 않는 것이 같은 것이 같은 것이 같이									
	LO	CATION			AREA (HECTA	RES)				POPUL	ATION					SEWAGE	FLOW				PIPE DATA				
STREET	AREA	FROM	то	NET OF	DIMENSIONS	DELTA	TOTAL	PER	PER	DELTA	DELTA	OTHER	TOTAL		Μ	SEWAGE	INFILT	TOTAL	D	S	Q Full	VFull	V Design	Qfull check	V check
	No.	M.H.	M.H.	GROSS		AREA ha	AREA ha	ha	LOT	LOTS	POP.	POP.	POP.		2 -> 4	l/s	l/s	l/s	(mm)	(%)	(L/S)	(m/s)	(m/s)		
St. 'A'	16	SAN MH 42	SAN MH 41			0.12	0.12		2.6	3 [.]	8	0	8		4.42	0.14	0.03	0.17	200	3.00	56.81	1.81	0.402	OKAY	OKAY
St. 'C'	14	SAN MH 43	SAN MH 44		-	0.13	0.13		2.6	4	10	0	10		4.41	0.19	0.04	0.22	200	2.50	51.86	1.65	0.407	OKAY	OKAY
St. 'A'	15	SAN MH 44	SAN MH 41			0.22	0.35		2.6	6	16	0	26		4.36	0.46	0.10	0.56	200	3.70	63.09	2.01	0.618	OKAY	OKAY
St. 'B'	11	SAN MH 41	SAN MH 40		-	0.10	0.57		2.6	2	5	0	39		4.34	0.69	0.16	0.85	200	0.80	29.34	0.93	0.411	OKAY	OKAY
St. 'B'	10	SAN MH 40	SAN MH 39			0.28	0.85		2.6	7	18	0	57		4.3	1.00	0.24	1.23	200	0.60	25.41	0.81	0.416	OKAY	OKAY
St. 'B'	9	SAN MH 39	SAN MH 38			0.20	1.05		2.6	3	8	0	65		4.29	1.13	0.29	1.42	200	0.50	23.19	0.74	0.409	OKAY	OKAY
St. 'B'	8	SAN MH 38	SAN MH 37			0.10	1.15		2.6	3	8	0	73		4.28	1.26	0.32	1.58	200	0.50	23.19	0.74	0.422	OKAY	OKAY
St. 'C'	13	SAN MH 44	SAN MH 47			0.37	0.37		2.6	14	36	0	36		4.34	0.64	0.10	0.74	200	1.20	35.93	1.14	0.456	OKAY	OKAY
St. 'C'	12	SAN MH 47	SAN MH 46			0.41	0.78		2.6	16	42	0	18		4.27	1.35	0.22	1.57	200	0.90	31.12	0.99	0.516	OKAY	OKAY
St. C		SAN MH 46	SAN MH 45			0.09	0.87		2.6	3	8	0	86		4.26	1.48	0.24	1.72	200	0.50	23.19	0.74	0.432	OKAY	OKAY
St. 'C'	1	SAN IVIH 45	SAN MH 37			0.19	1.06		2.6	4	10	0	96		4.25	1.66	0.30	1.95	200	2.60	52.89	1.68	0.800	OKAY	OKAY
	<u> </u>	CANLALLOZ	CANINALIOC			0.10	2.20		26	0	0	0	177		4.17	2.00	0.07	2.00	200	0.50	00.40	0.74	0.500		OKAN
	0 E	SAN MILSO	SAN MH 30			0.18	2.39		2.0	5	0 10	0	1//		4.17	2.99	0.07	3.00	200	0.50	23.19	0.74	0.538	OKAY	OKAY
SI. D	3	SAN IVIH 30	SAIN IVIH 35			0.25	2.04		2.0	0	13	0	190		4.10	3.20	0.74	3.94	200	0.50	23.19	0.74	0.549	UKAY	UKAY
St. 'D'	1	HD UNIT 82	SAN MH 34			0.82	0.82		2.6	67	174	0	174		4.17	2.94	0.23	3.17	200	0.50	23.19	0.74	0.516	OKAY	OKAY
St. 'D'	2	HD UNIT 83	SAN MH 34			1.29	1.29		2.6	67	174	0	174		4.17	2.94	0.36	3.30	200	0.50	23.19	0.74	0.522	OKAY	OKAY
St. 'D'	3	SAN MH 34	SAN MH 35			0.15	2.26		2.6	4	10	0	359		4.04	5.87	0.63	6.50	200	5.00	73.34	2.33	1.440	OKAY	OKAY
St. 'D'	4	SAN MH 35	SAN MH 76			0.19	5.09		2.6	4	10	0	559		3.95	8.94	1.43	10.37	200	0.50	23.19	0.74	0.717	OKAY	OKAY
		SAN MH 76	SAN MH 84				5.09	1		1			559		3.95	8.94	1.43	10.37	200	0.50	23.19	0.74	0.717	OKAY	OKAY
		SAN MH 84	SAN MH 102				5.09						559		3.95	8.94	1.43	10.37	200	0.50	23.19	0.74	0.717	OKAY	OKAY
Drains to S	Shore Lane	SAN MH 102	SAN MH 407				5.09						559		3.95	8.94	1.43	10.37	200	0.50	23.19	0.74	0.717	OKAY	OKAY
	[Total E		nt Units	215			215												
								1														1			

BENCHMARK: BENCHMARK NO. 0011971U190 LOCATED AT WASAGA BEACH DEEP BENCH MARK IN MANHOLE IN GROUND OF BYRNES AVENUE PUBLIC SCHOOL, 0.7 KM NORTHEAST OF JUNCTION OF HIGHWAY NO. 26 AND SIMCOE ROAD NO. 7, IN LAWN, 28.3 M NORTHEAST OF NORTHEAST CORNER OF SCHOOL, 22.2M SOUTH OF CENTRE LINE OF SIMCOE ROAD NO. 7, 10.4 M EAST OF EAST LANEWAY TO SCHOOL, 5.8 M NORTH OF A PINE TREE. N4924007.xxx E571589.xxx ELEV 180.020 BENCHMARK NO. 00819880756. MONUMENT LOCATED ON THE SOUTH SIDE OF HIGHWAY	IN OF ST AD					D. F. RICHARDSON S 1001 12707	BEACHWOOD DEVELOPMENT INC. BEACHWOOD DEVELOPMENT TOWN OF WASAGA BEACH		JONES CONSULTING GROUP LTD PLANNERS & ENGINEER	229 Mapleview Dr. E, Unit 1 Barrie, ON L4N 0W5 P. 705.734.2538 S. F. 705.734.1056
26, 0.5 KM WEST FROM 74TH STREET NORTH ALSO 0.8 KM EAST FROM MARILYN LANE. N4924207.508 E569777.320 ELEV 184						320-09-24		DESIGN VS	SCALE: 1:1000	DATE APRIL 2020
HIGHWAY NO. 26, 1.3 KM NORTHWEST OF JUNCTION OF HIGHWAY NO. 26 AND SIMCOE ROAD NO. 7, TABLET IN TOP OF CULVERT, 24 CM FROM SOUTHWEST END AND 18 CM FROM SOUTHEAST EDGE OF CULVERT, 2 M BELOW ROAD LEVEL.	1 FSR	SUBMISSION	SEP 2020	DR		OLINCE OF ONTAT	SANITARY SEWER DESIGN SHEET	DRAWN KC/VS	PROJECT	DWG. Nº
N4923771.xxx E569779.xxx ELEV. 183.592	NO.	REVISIONS	DATE	INITIAL				CHECKED JB	ROM-17026	DS-2

	SANITAR	Y SEW	ER DES	IGN S	HEET	- BEAC	HWOO	D DEV	ELOPN	IEN ⁻	T LTD							
E S ETACH	ED) = 2.6 PEOPLE/ = 2.6 PEOPLE/ = 2.6 PEOPLE/	UNIT UNIT UNIT @65	iuph						TOWN	OF W	ASAGA	BEACH			DATE : DESIGNED CHECKED FILE № :	BY : BY :	August 2020 VS JB ROM-17026)
_A WN OF	= 35 m3/ha/d = = 35 m3/ha/d = = 400 PEOPLE = 1000 PEOPLI	100 PEOI 100 PEOI E ENGINEEI	PLE/HA PLE/HA RING STAI	NDARD	PROJEC S. MARC	CT NAME: H 2015)	BEACHV	VOOD D	EVELOPI	M = V _A MENT	$= 1 + \frac{1}{4 + 1}$	<u>14</u> - ₽ ^{0.5} m/s P= Populatio	on in tho	usands				
				Γ		POPIII	ATION				Г	SEWAGE						
NET	OR DIMENSIONS	DELTA	TOTAL	PER	PER	DELTA	DELTA	OTHER	TOTAL		M	SEWAGE	INFILT.	TOTAL	D	S		
GRO	SS	AREA ha	AREA ha	ha	LOT	LOTS	POP.	POP.	POP.		2 -> 4	I/s	l/s	l/s	(mm)	(%)	(L/S)	
		0.12	0.12		2.6	3.	8	0	8		4.42	0.14	0.03	0.17	200	3.00	56.81	
		0.13	0.13		2.6	4	10	0	10		4.41	0.19	0.04	0.22	200	2.50	51.86	
		0.22	0.35		2.6	6	16	0	26		4.36	0.46	0.10	0.56	200	3.70	63.09	
		0.10	0.57		26	2	5	0	39		4 34	0.69	0.16	0.85	200	0.80	29 34	

PRELIMINARY DESIGN NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION



• . .

and the stands D. F. RICHARDSON

NO.

					BEA
				SPROFESSIONAL ST	B
				D. F. RICHARDSON 5 100112707	
FSR SUBMISSION	SEP 2020	DR		ROUNCE OF ONTARIO	WES
REVISIONS	DATE	INITIAL		CE OF CARACTER	

. . 8

FG		
/		
	3.1	
X	0G 1.80m 1.00m 1.80m	

SR SUBMISSION	SEP 2020	DR	
REVISIONS	DATE	INITIAL	

		JOINES CONSULTING GROUP LTD. PLANNERS & ENGINEERS	229 Mapleview Dr. E, Unit 1 Barrie, ON L4N 0W5 P. 705.734.2538 F. 705.734.1056
DESIGN	JT/VS	SCALE: AS NOTED	DATE JULY 2020
DRAWN	JT/VS	PROJECT	DWG. Nº
CHECKED	JB	ROM-17026	DE-2


Appendix D

External Information

Planning and External Reference Information

- Proposed Draft Plan of Vacant Land Condominium by TJCG July 27, 2020
- Town of Wasaga Beach Comprehensive Zoning By-law 2003-60 excerpts
- Town of Wasaga Beach Official Plan Schedules B, C, D and H
- Chapman Property Shore Lane Plan and Profile PP1
- Town of Wasaga Beach Record Drawing 105120-SW10-RD
- Soils Map Excerpt
- Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority online Mappings
- County of Simcoe Online Mapping
- Excepts from West End Drainage Study, Town of Wasaga Beach, Ainley August 2019



G: \Planning Drawings\ROM-17026\Submitted\July2020\ROM-17026-DP-VLC-20-07-27.dwg Layout:DPVLC Plotted Aug 19, 2020 @ 9:52am by marichards The Jones Consulting

SECTION 4 - RESIDENTIAL TYPE 1 (R1) ZONE

4.1 No person shall within any Residential Type 1 (R1) Zone use any lot or erect, alter, enlarge, maintain or use any building or structure for any purpose or use other than as permitted for one or more of the following uses and in accordance with the following provisions or requirements as set out herein:

4.2 **PERMITTED USES**

4.2.1 **Residential Uses:**

- a) single detached dwelling unit
- one (1) attached accessory dwelling unit, subject to Subsection 3.28 b)

4.2.2 **Non-Residential Uses:**

- a) accessory use directly related to the uses permitted in the R1 Zone
- home occupation b)
- public use c)
- bed and breakfast d)

4.3 **ZONE PROVISIONS**

4.3.1 Lot Area (minimum):

a)	lot served by a	public water	system a	and a sanitary	sewer systen	า 464.5sq.m
	,		,	,	,	

- b) lot served by a public water system 1,400 sq.m 1,860 sq.m
- other lots c)

4.3.2 Lot Frontage (minimum):

	a)	lot served by a public water system and a sanitary	sewer system	12 m
	b)	lot served by a public water system	22m	1
	c)	other lots	30m	1
4.3.3	Fro	nt Yard Depth (minimum):	6m	1
4.3.4	Exte	erior Side Yard Width (minimum):	4.5m	I
4.3.5	Inte	rior Side Yard Width (minimum):	1.8m	1
4.3.6	Rea	r Yard Depth (minimum):	7.6m	1
4.3.7	Dwe	elling Unit Area (minimum):	93 sq.m	1

37

Town of Wasaga Beach Comprehensive Zoning By-law 2003-60 Office Consolidation February 2016

4.3.8	Landscaped Open Space (minimum): 309						
4.3.9	Lot Coverage (maximum):						
4.3.10	Heigl	Height of Building (maximum): 10m					
4.3.10.1 (2007-17)	A single detached dwelling will be restricted to two storeys but may have a loft or living space located within the pitched roof area/attic of the said dwelling.						
4.3.11	Dwel	ling Units per Lot (maximum):					
	a) b)	single-detached dwelling attached accessory dwelling unit	1 1				
4.3.12	Acce	ssory Uses see Section 3.1					
4.3.13	Parking Provisions see Section 3.38						
4.3.14	Attached Accessory Dwelling in Residential Dwellings, see Subsection 3.28						

4.4 ZONE EXCEPTIONS

The following Zone categories shall have the same permitted uses and zone provisions as the regular R1 Zone except as noted.

4.4.1 R1-1 Zone

4.4.2 R1-2 Zone Schedule "B"

The front yard depth minimum shall be 5.7 m.

4.4.3 R1-3 Zone

A home medical office shall also be permitted.

4.4.4 R1-4 Zone Schedule "H"

The front yard depth minimum shall be 1.2 m; the north interior side yard width minimum shall be 0.6 m; the rear yard depth minimum shall be 1.2 m.

4.4.5 R1-5 Zone Schedule "H"

The rear yard depth minimum shall be 10.6 m.

4.4.6 R1-6 Zone Schedule "H"

A bed and breakfast shall also be permitted and the exterior side yard width minimum shall be 1.8 m.

4.4.7 R1-7 Zone Schedule "I"

The front lot line shall be the north lot line for the purpose of yards only and the Rear Yard Depth (minimum), as it applies to the south rear yard, shall be 12 m.

4.4.8 R1-8 Zone Schedule "P"

The minimum lot frontage shall be 15.2 m.

4.4.9 R1-9 Zone Schedule "P"

The minimum lot frontage shall be 18.2 m.

4.4.10 R1-10 Zone Schedule "I"

The minimum lot area shall be 380 square metres.

4.4.11 R1-11 Zone Schedule "I"

The minimum lot frontage shall be 7.6 metres; the minimum interior side yard depth, as it relates to the north and south interior side yards only, shall be 7.6 metres; and, the minimum rear yard depth shall be 1.8 metres.

4.4.12 R1-12 Zone Schedule "I"

The minimum front yard depth shall be 2.4, the minimum interior side yard depth, as it relates to the north and south interior side yards only, shall be 7.6 metres; and, the minimum rear yard depth shall be 1.8 metres.

4.4.13 R1-13 Zone Schedule "A"

The lot area minimum shall be 410 square metres; the lot frontage minimum shall be 15 metres; the front yard depth minimum shall be 4.5 metres and 6 metres from any attached garage; the exterior side yard width minimum shall be 3 metres and lot coverage maximum shall be

39 Town of Wasaga Beach Comprehensive Zoning By-law 2003-60 Office Consolidation February 2016 43%. For the purpose of this section a private street shall be deemed to be a public street. For those lots with two side lot lines backing onto the shoreline of Nottawasaga Bay, no buildings or structures shall be located within 7.6 metres of a rear lot line; no fence shall be permitted along a rear lot line and no fence shall encroach within 6 metres of a rear lot line. In addition to the list of permitted Non-Residential Uses, a private clubhouse shall be permitted.

4.4.14 R1-14 Zone Schedule "H"

A Bed and Breakfast use and an accessory building with the installation of plumbing shall be permitted. Such accessory building shall not exceed 28 square metres in area and shall not be used or human habitation.

4.4.15 R1-15 Zone Schedule "T"

The front yard depth minimum shall be 12.0 metres.

4.4.16 R1-16 Zone Schedule "C"

The minimum front yard depth shall be 10 m and the front wall of an attached garage shall project no more than 1m beyond the front wall of the habitable area of the dwelling.

4.4.17 R1-17 Zone Schedule "E"

A rest home shall also be permitted. The maximum number of residents shall be eight (8).

4.4.18 R1-18 Zone Schedule

A bed and breakfast use shall also be permitted and the maximum driveway width shall be 8.4 metres.

4.4.19 R1-19 Zone Schedule "T"

The minimum separation requirement of Zoning By-law 2003-60 for a driveway setback from a street line shall be 7.0 metres.

4.4.20 R1-20 Zone Schedule "T"

The minimum interior side yard width shall be 1.35 metres.

4.4.21 R1-21 Zone

The use permitted shall be non-residential and shall be restricted to a

40 Town of Wasaga Beach Comprehensive Zoning By-law 2003-60 Office Consolidation February 2016 Private Community Centre.

4.4.22 R1-22 Zone Schedule "F"

The minimum lot area shall be 585 sq.m. The Minimum Lot Frontage shall be 18 metres. The minimum Exterior Side Yard shall be 4.0 metres, except where the front elevation of a garage faces a street-line, in which case the Exterior Side Yard to the garage shall be 6 metres. The maximum distance from the main wall of the dwelling unit to the front elevation of a garage shall be 1.5 metres. The minimum Interior Side Yard shall be 1.5 metres. The maximum Lot Coverage shall be 40%.

4.4.23 R1-23 Zone Schedule "T"

The minimum front yard setback requirement shall be 5.3 metres, the minimum exterior side yard setback requirement shall be 2.1 metres, the minimum interior side yard setback shall be .8 metres.

4.4.24 R1-24 Zone Schedule "S"

A 2.0 metre wide planting strip consisting of existing vegetation shall be required along the east interior side lot line.

4.4.25 R1-25 Zone Schedule "R"

Permitted residential uses shall be limited to single-detached dwelling units;

Section 4.3, Zone Provisions, applies to the lands zoned R1-25, except where specifically identified below:

Minimum lot depth shall be 30 metres; Minimum lot area shall be 360 square metres; Minimum front yard depth shall be 4.0 metres to the building face and side of an attached garage and 6.0 metres to the front of an attached garage; Where a garage is attached to a residential dwelling unit, the maximum projection of the face of the attached garage from the building face shall be 2.4 metres; Minimum exterior side yard width shall be 4.0 metres to the building face and 6.0 metres to the front of an attached garage; Minimum interior side yard width shall be 4.0 metres to the building face and 6.0 metres to the front of an attached garage; Minimum interior side yard width shall be 1.2 metres to the building face and to the rear or side of an attached garage and 8.0 metres to the front of an attached garage when garage is facing the side yard; Minimum rear yard depth shall be 7.5 metres to the building face and 0.6 metres to the garage wall of a detached garage in the rear lot; Minimum landscaped open space shall be 30%;Maximum lot coverage shall be 55%; Maximum driveway width for single-detached dwelling units shall be 6.0 metres; Maximum height of building for single-detached

dwelling units shall be 11.0 metres; Minimum outdoor amenity space excluding the driveway for single-detached dwelling units shall be 90 square metres per unit and having no dimension less than 6.0 metres; and one (1) attached accessory dwelling unit per lot, subject to Subsection 3.28.

Notwithstanding the General Provisions, Section 3.3.4 and 3.3.6 to the contrary, the following provisions shall apply: porches/verandas shall be permitted to encroach by sixty (60%) percent and steps by eighty (80%) percent into any required front or exterior side yard setback depth. Porch/verandas shall not be subject to nor restricted to a maximum area size. Maximum height of porch/verandas and steps within permitted encroachment shall be 1.6 metres.

4.4.26 R1-26 Zone Schedule "O"

Notwithstanding Subsection 3.18 of the Zoning By-law, the existing single detached dwelling may be enlarged.

4.4.27 R1-27 Zone Schedule "G"

Notwithstanding Sections 3.1.2 and 3.18, the maximum lot area that shall be used by detached accessory buildings is 98 square metres , and the maximum horizontal dimension of a detached accessory building shall be 9.2 metres. A building or structure may be constructed on a lot which does not have frontage on a municipal street.

4.4.28 R1-28 Zone Schedule "F"

The minimum lot area shall be 585 square metres; the minimum lot frontage shall be 18 metres; the minimum exterior side yard shall be 4 metres, except where the front elevation of a garage faces a street-line, in which case the exterior side yard to the garage shall be 6 metres; the maximum distance from the main wall of the dwelling unit to the front elevation of a garage shall be 1.5 metres; the minimum interior side yard shall be 1.5 metres; the maximum lot coverage shall be 40%; notwithstanding General Provision 3.9.1 and the exterior side yard provisions of the R1.28 Zone, for corner lots at the intersection of a collector road and a local road where the conveyance of a 10 metre by 4 metre daylighting triangle affects the proposed building envelope, the exterior side yard setback shall be measured from a line created by projecting the lot line to the point of intersection of the daylighting triangle.

4.4.29 R1-29 Zone Schedule "F"

The minimum lot area shall be 585 square metres; the minimum lot frontage shall be 18 metres; the minimum exterior side yard shall be 4 metres, except where the front elevation of a garage faces a street-line, in which case the exterior side yard to the garage shall be 6 metres; the maximum distance from the main wall of the dwelling unit to the front elevation of a garage shall be 1.5 metres; the minimum interior side yard shall be 1.5 metres; the maximum lot coverage shall be 40%.

4.4.30 R1-30 Zone Schedule "G"

In addition to Section 4.3, Zone Provisions, the following applies to the lands zoned R1-30:

A maximum of four existing accessory structures are permitted; the minimum side yard setback from the north interior lot line for existing accessory structures shall be .44 metres and the minimum interior side yard setback from the southern interior lot line for existing accessory structures shall be .9 metres; the minimum rear yard setback for existing accessory structures shall be .86 metres; the accessory structures shall not be connected to any private or municipal water and sewer services, shall not contain plumbing fixtures, may be used for storage or sleeping quarters only and shall not be used as a tourist establishment.

4.4.31 R1-31 Zone Schedule "H"

Notwithstanding Subsection 3.18 Street Requirements of the Zoning Bylaw, buildings and structures may be erected on lands that do not front onto a municipal street.

- 4.4.32
- 4.4.33

4.4.34 R1-34 Zone Schedule "T"

Notwithstanding the provisions of Section 4 the minimum lot area requirement shall be 400 square metres. Notwithstanding the provisions of Section 3.3 steps may project a maximum distance of 2.4 meres into a required front yard and a deck greater than 0.6 meres in height may project 1.2 metres into a required front yard.









ORATE



NOTE: The lot lines depicted on this map are for reference only and may not reflect accurately property boundaries in all instances. 1.200 3.000 1.800 2.400 300

Mosley Village Community Improvement Project Study Area West End Community Improvement Project Study Area



Official Plan for the Town of Wasaga Beach



			RECORD DRAWING	SCALE: VE	DRIZ. 1=500 RT. 1=50	TOWN OF W
			NOTICE TO USERS	DESIGN:	D.B.E.	WEST END
			the completion of construction. Further, this drawing may contain information provided by others. While Ainley & Associates Limited believes this information to be reliable and correct as of the	DRAWN:	P.C.S.	
REVISED AS RECORD DRAWING	MAY 2010	D.B.E.	completion of construction, no warranty is provided as to its accuracy and/or completeness. As such, Ainley & Associates Limited shall not be responsible for any errors or omissions which may result from incorporation of the information herein.	CHECKED:	D.B.E.	PLAN 8 HIGHWA
REVISIONS	DATE	INITIAL		DATE: AU	UG. 2007	STA. 2+000

Bottom Land

Low lying soils adjoining stream courses and subject to flooding are designated as Bottom Land. These soils occupy 4,900 acres in the County. They are immature soils showing none of the horizon differentiation common to other mineral soils. The profile commonly consists of layers of sand, silt or gravel which are grey in colour except when organic material has been mixed with them, in which case, the layer is dark in colour. The drainage varies from imperfect to poor but is usually poor.

Bottom Land is used largely for pasture.

Marsh

Areas that are covered by water for the entire year are mapped and designated as Marsh. These areas, occupying 2,800 acres, are covered by water-loving plants such as cattails and sedges and by scrub vegetation, the chief of which is willow. The soil surface may consist of sand, clay or thin muck deposits. These areas are unsuitable for agricultural purposes.

Eastport Series

The Eastport series consists of one type, the sand, and it occurs along parts of the shore of Nottawasaga Bay. Here it occurs in the form of dunes and the topography is rough and slopes are often short and steep. The soil is rapidly drained, with small depressional areas of poor drainage being present. Vegetative cover is scanty but where it is present, it consists mainly of pine, poplar and some white birch.

There is practically no horizon development in the profile. In most cases, the profile consists simply of a grey calcareous sand. Where the sand has been stabilized by vegetation, the profile has a thin organic layer underlain by a pale yellow horizon which in turn rests on the grey sand.

This sand is subject to wind erosion and has no value as agricultural land. It is used for recreational purposes and as building sites for summer cottages.

Rock

Areas of bare rock with little or no soil cover have been designated as Rock. Rock occupies 1,100 acres and most of it is found in Matchedash Township. It has no agricultural value.

Soil Complexes

Soil complexes are mapping units that represent a combination of two or more soil types that cannot be separated individually on a soil map. In naming each complexed area, the names of the two dominant types are used. Thus, an area in which Simcoe silty clay loam and Berrien sandy loam were dominant would be called Simcoe silty clay loam — Berrien sandy loam. In each case, the soil mentioned first occupies the largest acreage. Soils other than those mentioned in the soil complex may occur. These are com-



a variety of sources and may not be current or accurate. Produced (in part) under license from: © Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Canada, Department of Natural Resources:

April 17, 2020

Shore Lane - Site Location



Resources:

Shore Lane - Forested Area





© Teranet Enterprises Inc. and its suppliers:

© Members of the Ontario Geospatial Data Exchange. All rights reserved. THIS IS NOT A PLAN OF SURVEY.



Shore Lane - Site Location Image





0

0.05

0.1



This map, either in whole or in part, may not be reproduced without the written authority from This map, tother in which is in part, may not be reproduced without the written authority non © The Corporation of the Country of Simcoe. This map is intended for personal use, has been produced using data from a variety of sources and may not be current or accurate.

Produced (in part) under license from:
 Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Canada, Department of Natural Resources:
 Queens Printer, Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources:

© Teranet Enterprises Inc. and its suppliers: © Members of the Ontario Geospatial Data Exchange. All rights reserved. THIS IS NOT A PLAN OF SURVEY.

1:4,477

0.2 km



Shore Lane - Soil Class



This map, either in whole or in part, may not be reproduced without the written authority from This map, tother in which is in part, may not be reproduced without the written authority non © The Corporation of the Country of Simcoe. This map is intended for personal use, has been produced using data from a variety of sources and may not be current or accurate.

Produced (in part) under license from:
 Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Canada, Department of Natural Resources:
 Queens Printer, Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources:

© Teranet Enterprises Inc. and its suppliers: © Members of the Ontario Geospatial Data Exchange. All rights reserved. THIS IS NOT A PLAN OF SURVEY.

1:8,953

0.5 km

0.25

0

0.125



April 17, 2020





Notes:	Benchmark: 180.36m		No.	Issue / Revision	Date
1. Unless noted otherwise, the measurements and distances shown on this drawing are shown in meters.	Temporary benchmark is the top nut of the		1	MOE Submission	Nov. 25, 2013
2. Do not scale drawings.	existing fire hydrant on the north side of Shore Lane west of Part 1		2	First Submission	Feb. 24, 2014
3. It is the contractor's responsibility to verify all dimensions, levels and datums on site and report any discrepancies or			3 4	Second Submission Record Information (Storm System)	March 19, 2014 Oct. 14, 2014
omissions to WMI & Associates Ltd. prior to construction.			5	Record Information (Storm System)	Jan. 11, 2016
4. This drawing is to be read and understood in conjunction with all other relevant documents applicable to this project.					
5. This drawing is the exclusive property of WMI & Associates Ltd. and the reproduction of any part of this document without prior written consent is strictly prohibited.					

\WMI-SERVER\wmi-server\Data\Projects\2013\13-232\CAD\WMI\Record\160111-baseplan-lssue5_Record.dwg, 2016-01-27 3:22:25 PM, 1:24.9999



BASELINE CHAINAGE	000+0	0+010	0+020	0+030	0+040	0+050	0+000
PROPOSED GROUND ELEVATION		179.70	179.60	179.51	179.42	179.30	179.16
183.0		B 0+014.00					
182.0		EX. SI					
181.0							
180.0				OFF ROAD CB1 T/G (<u>179.15</u>) INV (<u>178.53</u>)		GROUND (SWALE IN	VERT) OFF_ROAD /T/G78.8
179.0							INV (178.2)
178.0							
177.0							
176.0							
175.0		CONCRETE HEADWALL (MODIFIED)	38.0m – 400m (c/w 50mm Rig	mø CSP STM SWR(1.45% gid Board Insulation)	CBMH STA 0-	36.0m – 52 (c/w 50mm 2 (1500mmø) +046.78	25mmø PVC STM SW Rigid Board Insulat
174.0		STA 0+009.89 OPSD 804.030 INVERT = (178.78)			T/G (17 E INV. W INV. S INV.	79.50 (178.21) (178.23) (178.41)	
173.0							
BASELINE CHAINAGE	000+0	0+010	0+020	0+030	0+040	0+050	0+060

Project No. 13-232 Scale H 1:250 V 1:50

Simcoe County Soils mapping, soils in the area are characterized as good drainage soil, represented by Gravelly Sandy Loam (Sargent); however; the area along Georgian Bay contains an excessive drainage soil which is Eastport Sand based on Simcoe County soils Mapping. Land use in the area is dominated by woodland with the present of community along Shore Lane land and 75th Street South. A listing of the information sources for the current study is provided in *Table 1*.

Date	Sources
Soil	Simcoe County Soils Mapping
Land Use	GIS Simcoe map
Topography	Topographic survey conducted Aug,2018 and (1m)
	contour map from the county of Wasaga Beach

Table 1: Data and sources used for the model preparation

A site investigation of the subject property and surrounding drainage areas was conducted on June 29th, 2018 to gain an understanding of the available drainage pathways required to accommodate the development of the proposed site, and provide a cursory assessment of the existing infrastructure. This investigation was also beneficial to identify key elements to be captured in the topographic survey of the area. Culverts, outlets and drainage pathways were identified and confirmed as required to be surveyed where suitable access could be obtained to update our existing condition model. Photos for each culvert and ditches were taken and appended in Appendix A.

A topographic survey of the area was undertaken from June 11 to October 31, 2018 on the subject property as well as adjacent lands. Additional survey was obtained within the Municipal right- of- ways, and select private properties along Ayling Reid Court, 75th Street South, Beachwood Road, 74th Street North, and Shore Lane as shown in Figure 1. Base plans were created from this topographic data and utilized as the basis for the development of a PC-SWMM model of existing conditions. The model was used to establish the expected flows from the tributary areas and provide a preliminary assessment of the available drainage outlets. It is noted that, due to the extensive wood cover on the private properties north of Beachwood Road, the area could not be fully surveyed without extensive clearing of the area. It was agreed with the Nottawsaga Conservation Authority that small portions of the lands could be cleared to establish the key areas such that the existing conditions model can be completed and drainage solutions to accommodate development can be investigated, with supplementary data obtained from the Town's GIS database.

Drainage for this area is directed towards two main outlets. The area draining to Outlet 1, located at the end of the cul-de-sac of Shore Lane, as shown on **Figure 1**, consists of a mix of open field, woodland, and small portion of low to medium intensity development. The total drainage area to Outlet 1 is approximately 26.3 ha. Outlet 2 is located at 2222 Shore Lane, and consists of an 800mm diameter CSP storm sewer and a designed overland flow route constructed in 2013. The total drainage area to outlet 2 is 15.3 ha and the outlet 2 configuration was obtained from **2222 Shore Lane Overland Drainage Route** As-Built Drawing #C1 prepared by RJ Burnside & Associates Ltd., Revision 6 on November 27, 2013, and sealed on December 18, 2013, which is scheduled in Appendix B.



Figure 1: PC-SWMM Model map and elements

Table 3: Peak flows (m³/s) at Outlets - Scenario 3

Storms	Outlets	Area (ha)	2 year	5 year	10 year	25 year	50 year	100 year
	OUTLET# 1	26.3	0.266	0.382	0.460	0.562	0.657	0.762
12-hr-SCS	OUTLET# 2	15.3	0.322	0.399	0.504	0.667	0.787	0.908
4-hr Chicago	OUTLET# 1	26.3	0.26	0.372	0.449	0.553	0.636	0.715
	OUTLET# 2	15.3	0.333	0.413	0.486	0.656	0.776	0.884
	OUTLET# 1	26.3	0.276	0.400	0.485	0.626	0.770	0.936
24-hr-SCS	OUTLET# 2	15.3	0.346	0.430	0.575	0.782	0.95	1.154

the impact of improvements at each outlet since the 2009 and to account for any reported issues within these two watersheds. Culvert crossings in the model are numbered C16 and C17 as shown in *Figure 1*. Three scenarios were considered in the PC-SWMM model as follows:

- For Option 1, the hydraulic characteristics of the ditches and culverts on public lands were determined based on the results of the topographic survey, Record Drawings, where available, and field observations. Cross-Section drawing provides a comparison of the cross sections generated through a combination of GIS data with local topographic survey and the sections as modelled in the PC-SWMM simulation.
- 2. As per Option 1, but with the assumption that Culverts #16 and #17, under Beachwood Road, are 50% blocked; and
- 3. The same as Option 1 with an assumed cross section of adequate capacity (0.6 m deep V-ditches at most locations, and a 1m wide flat bottom ditch through one section) was utilized to establish the expected flow depths throughout each watershed and establish the capacity of the downstream infrastructure to accommodate a range of expected flows.

2.2 Existing Conditions Assessment

The purpose of the current study is two-fold: to evaluate any existing drainage issues within the drainage areas which could be impacted by the future development of the Public Works property and Joan Avenue; and to identify the drainage strategy to provide the requisite controls for the proposed development while determining an appropriate route for conveyance of surface flows from the site to the Nottawasaga Bay.

As identified in Section 2, there are two main drainage pathways which are investigated under this drainage study. In order to provide a summary of the existing issues along these routes and to provide a basis for comparison for post development scenarios, the following subsections provide a summary of the results at each location with a summary of the existing conditions or potential implications in the post development scenario. The results of the PC-SWMM model are included in Appendix C.

2.2.1 Outlet 1 – 8801 Beachwood Road (Conduit C16)

Under existing conditions, frequent ponding of this property and the low-lying area to the west occurs annually during the spring thaw in the area and in flash flood conditions during the midwinter or spring thaw conditions water levels can increase to a point affecting the residential structures. The model results under Scenario 1 indicate that the reported ponding at 8801 Beachwood Road occur during events of the 10-year magnitude or greater. During the 100-year event, ponding in this area rises to approximately 184.72m, about 5cm above the finished floor elevation at this location. The results indicate that the ditch at this location is operating under surcharge conditions during the 2-year event. However, given that this scenario has been completed under the assumption that no flows leave the system, even in the event of ponding, the results indicate that if this issue can be resolved locally, then there is no indication that flooding would occur downstream, subject to confirmation of the flow pathway through the properties north of Beachwood Road. Due to the overgrown conditions at Culvert #16 as observed during the field visits, Scenario 2 was developed to assess the potential impact of significant blockage of these culverts. For the purpose of this assessment, it was assumed that 50% of the total culvert area was blocked from the invert upwards. This change had no impact on the ponding results at 8801 Beachwood Road. The blockage of Culvert 17 as assumed in this scenario will result in lack of capacity at the driveway culvert on the ditch south of Beachwood Road upstream of the culvert and the results shows concerns along the east side of this ditch.

Scenario 3 demonstrates that if sufficient capacity can be achieved through the private properties to the north, then both Outlets can convey the expected flows at each location and also demonstrate the potential to accommodate additional flow for the return period events. It is suggested that while deriving design options for the proposed works that the Regional event be simulated to assess the performance of these outlets under extreme conditions before additional flow is directed to these areas, since the model results indicate surcharging conditions at each outlet.

2.2.2 Outlet 1 – Culvert #16 (Conduit C16) Outlet 2 0- Culvert #17 (Conduit C17)

These two culverts crossing Beachwood Road, operated and maintained by MTO, are key components for each outlet. Culvert #16 is a 1220mmx1220mm concrete box culvert which is located east of Robert Street South, and conveys drainage from a 15.8 ha area, which includes the subject property of the future location of the Works Depot. The drainage area to this structure was significantly reduced as a result of the realignment of Highway 26 in accordance with the *"New Construction Detailed Design Drawings"* for Highway 26 prepared by Delcan in March 2010. As a result the existing flows at this culvert are significantly below the capacity of the crossing. Culvert #17 is a 1220mmx910mm concrete box culvert which is located west of 75th Street conveys drainage from a 9.10 ha area, which includes the area where Joan Avenue will be constructed. Expected flows at each of these culverts, along with a comparison to their full capacity based on MTO Highway Drainage Design Standards are summarized in Table **7 and Table 8.**

Culvert #	Shape	Size	Size Material		D/S Invert (m)	10-yr HGL (m)	100 yr HGL (m)	Edge of pavement (m)	
16	Вох	1220mmx1220mm	Concrete	182.47	182.24	182.64	182.75	185.12	
17	Вох	1220mmx910mm	Concrete	181.84	181.80	182.08	182.27	183.44	

Table 7: WIO Crossing Culvert Descriptions and Key water Leve

Table 8: Flows and Capacity for MTO Culverts

	Culvert #		2-yr	5-yr	10- yr	25- yr	50- yr	100- yr	Regional
	10	Flow (m ³ /s)	0.291	0.387	0.445	0.539	0.645	0.776	0.835
24-hr-SCS	16	% of Capacity	5%	7%	8%	10%	12%	14%	15%
	17	Flow (m ³ /s)	0.202	0.267	0.312	0.399	0.501	0.665	0.566
		% of Capacity	16%	21%	24%	31%	39%	51%	44%