

Table 2: Detailed Evaluation Criteria and Scores

Criteria	Description	Scores	Max Score
Engineering (Serviceability)			
<p>1. Water</p> <p>PPS policies (See Appendix 1 policies (1.1.1 e & g) (1.1.3.2 a) 2. (1.1.3.8 b) 1.6.1 & 1.6.3 1.6.6.1 a-d</p>	<p>Water scores will be assigned to individual parcels based on the anticipated scope of servicing requirements determined through high-level servicing strategies formulated for each of the candidate urban expansion areas.</p> <p>Adjustments to the scores indicated below may be justified for a candidate area(s), such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pump station upgrade would only involve addition of new pumping capacity, but upgrade remains within current rated capacity. • Servicing a candidate site could require a new drinking water pumping station and pressure zone but could also provide an opportunity to improve service levels in existing adjacent areas. <p>Scores for each site range from 0 to 8 based on consideration of the factors in the next column.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8 points: Where trunk systems, in proximity, have adequate residual capacity. local conditions that do not require any new pump facilities, or existing facility upgrades, to overcome topographic constraints. No major highway, railway and/or water crossing(s) required • 6 points: Where trunk systems, in proximity, have adequate residual capacity, local conditions that do not require any new pump facilities, or existing facility upgrades, to overcome topographic constraints. Major highway, railway and/or crossing(s) required. • 4 points: Where localized upgrades to off-site trunk facilities required to establish enough capacity; local conditions do not require any new pump facilities, or existing facility upgrades, to overcome topographic constraints. • 2 point: Where topographic conditions require upgraded existing pumping facilities to meet level of service requirements; OR Extensive and major upgrades to off-site trunk facilities required to establish enough capacity. • 0 points: Where extensive and major upgrades to off-site trunk facilities, or new local storage facility required to establish enough capacity; and topographic conditions which require new or upgraded pumping facilities to meet level of 	<p>8</p>



Table 2: Detailed Evaluation Criteria and Scores

Criteria	Description	Scores	Max Score
		service requirements.	
<p>2. Wastewater (Sanitary)</p> <p>PPS (See Appendix 1) policies (1.1.1 e & g) (1.1.3.2 a) 2. (1.1.3.8 b) 1.6.1 & 1.6.3 1.6.6.1 a-d</p>	<p>Wastewater scores will be assigned to individual parcels based on the anticipated scope of servicing requirements determined through high-level servicing strategies formulated for each of the candidate urban expansion areas.</p> <p>Adjustments to the scores indicated below may be justified for a candidate area(s), such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pump station upgrade would only involve addition of new pumping capacity, but upgrade remains within current rated capacity. <p>Scores for each site range from 0 to 8 based on consideration of the factors in the next column.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8 points: Where trunk systems in proximity have adequate residual capacity; local conditions do not require any new pump facilities, or existing facility upgrades, to overcome topographic constraints; and no major highway, railway and/or water crossing(s) or excavations required. • 6 points: Where trunk systems in proximity have adequate residual capacity; local conditions do not require any new pump facilities, or existing facility upgrades are needed to overcome topographic constraints. Major highway, railway and/or water crossing(s) or excavations required. • 4 points: Where localized upgrades to off-site trunk facilities are required to establish sufficient capacity; local conditions do not require any new major pump facilities, or existing facility upgrades, to overcome topographic constraints. • 2 points: Where localized upgrades to off-site trunk facilities are required to establish sufficient capacity and topographic conditions require new major or upgraded pumping facilities to meet the level-of-service requirements; OR Extensive and major upgrades to off-site trunk facilities are required to establish sufficient 	<p>8</p>



Table 2: Detailed Evaluation Criteria and Scores

Criteria	Description	Scores	Max Score
		<p>capacity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 points: Where extensive major upgrades to off-site trunk facilities to establish sufficient capacity, AND topographic conditions which require major new pump facilities, or major upgrades to existing pump facilities to meet level of service requirements. 	
<p>3. Stormwater</p> <p>PPS (See Appendix 1) policies (1.1.1 e & g) (1.1.3.2 a) 2. (1.1.3.8 b) 1.6.1 & 1.6.3 1.6.6.1 a-d</p>	<p>Stormwater scores will be assigned to individual parcels based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • expected grade raise requirements relative to restrictions; and other topographic constraints to drainage • capacity and condition of surface water outlets and resulting storm water management criteria, considering suitability for Low Impact Development (LID); <p>For Potential Urban Expansion Areas Total scores for Stormwater ranged from 0 to 8 based on consideration of the factors listed in a-e below. The maximum possible score 8.</p>		
<p>a) Stormwater-characteristics and availability of surface water outlets</p> <p>PPS (See Appendix 1) policies 2.2.1 a -c & h 1.6.1 & 1.6.3 1.6.6.1 a-d</p>	<p>Scores for each site range from 0 to 2 based on consideration of the factors in the next column</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 points: Major Surface Outlet Available: No issues anticipated with capacity or condition of the receiving watercourse. Standard quantity and quality SWM controls. • 1 point: Minor Surface Outlet Available: Some issues are anticipated with the capacity and/or condition of the receiving watercourse. Requires additional volume/flow controls. • 0 points: Limited Surface Outlet Available: Issues are anticipated or known with the capacity and/or condition of the receiving watercourse. Requires additional volume/flow controls and is not suitable for infiltration-based LID. 	2



Table 2: Detailed Evaluation Criteria and Scores

Criteria	Description	Scores	Max Score
<p>b) Stormwater - expected grade raise requirement relative to restrictions and other topographic constraints on drainage.</p>	<p>Scores for each site range from 0 to 6 based on consideration of the factors in the next column</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6 points: No observable grade restrictions and/or topographic constraints anticipated that would result in submerged sewers or alteration of existing watercourses. • 3 points: Some grade restrictions and/or topographic constraints that could potentially result in submerged sewers or alteration of watercourses. • 0 points: Significant grade restrictions and/or topographic constraints that would result in submerged sewers, alteration of watercourses and/or the use of EPS fill. 	<p>6</p>
<p>4. Servicing Integration Factor</p> <p>PPS (See Appendix 1) policies 2.2.1 a -c & h 1.6.1 & 1.6.3</p>	<p>The Servicing Integration Factor represents the lowest common servicing denominator that has the potential to affect the timing of development and the cost of major trunk system upgrades.</p> <p>The Integration Factor will be used to enhance the score of candidate sites with (highly or moderately) favourable water, wastewater, and stormwater conditions. This is to enable a differentiation of such sites from those that that may score well for two services but, have a major deficiency in a third service.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6 points: Scores for water, wastewater and stormwater criteria are 4 or higher. • 4 points: The score for one of the water, wastewater or stormwater criteria is 1 or 2. Remaining scores are 4 or higher. • 2 points: The score for two of the water, wastewater, or stormwater criteria is minimum 2. Remaining score is 4 or higher. • 0 points: The score for one or more of the water, wastewater or stormwater criteria is 0. 	<p>6</p>
<p>5. Servicing Risk Factors (Serviceability Penalty Factors)</p> <p>PPS (See Appendix 1) policies</p>	<p>Penalty factors are proposed to account for potential site-specific development and servicing issues that would not otherwise be accounted for in the water, wastewater or stormwater criteria. Penalty factors are proposed to address the</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • - 2 points: Extensive presence of Grey compressible clays in the area OR • - 1 point: Extensive presence of 	<p>Potential loss of 4 points</p>



Table 2: Detailed Evaluation Criteria and Scores

Criteria	Description	Scores	Max Score
(1.1.1 e & g) 1.6.6.1 a-d	following potential issues: a) Differential settlement risk due to compressible clays, b) Shallow depth to bedrock, c) Parcel includes large depression/hydrologic storage area, d) Risk to private wells due to rock blasting required for servicing.	shallow bedrock (<5m) in the area OR <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 2 points: Parcel abuts country lot subdivision and extensive presence of shallow bedrock (<5m) in the area - 2 points: Depression storage area exceeds 10% of the parcel area. 	
Maximum Engineering Score 30			
Transportation			
6. Availability of Rapid Transit PPS (See Appendix 1) policies 1.1.1 e), 1.1.3.2a) 2, 4 & 5,	Availability of existing or planned rapid transit (LOS A & B) station within 2.5 km (1.9 km radial) The distance threshold of 2.5 km (1.9km radial) is based on a 5-minute local bus ride (at 30 km/hr) and a 10-minute bicycle ride (at 15 km/hr).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18 points: Available now / Stage 2 LRT • 14 points: Shown in current 2031 Affordable Network Plan • 10 points: Shown in current Ultimate Network Plan or EA • 2 points: Shown as a conceptual future transit corridor (grey arrow) • 0 points: No Rapid Transit planned 	18
7. Proximity to nearest Rapid Transit Station PPS (See Appendix 1) policies 1.1.1 e), 1.1.3.2a) 2, 4 & 5,	Distance to nearest rapid transit station (existing or planned) max 2.5 km (1.9 km radial) The distance threshold of 2.5 km (1.9km radial) is based on a 5-minute local bus ride (at 30 km/hr) and a 10-minute bicycle ride (at 15 km/hr).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 12 points: 0 to 0.6 km • 8 points: >0.6 km to 1.1 km • 4 points: >1.1 km to 1.9 km • 0 points: >1.9 km 	12
8. Proximity to Jobs PPS (See Appendix 1)	Urban expansion areas that have a greater number of opportunities for local employment are preferable. The Ottawa median	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8 points: >75% to 100% • 6 points: >50% to 75% • 4 points: >25% to 50% 	8



Table 2: Detailed Evaluation Criteria and Scores

Criteria	Description	Scores	Max Score
<p>policies 1.1.1 e), 1.1.3.2 a) 2, 4 & 5,</p>	<p>commute to work distance for all modes of travel was used to rank candidate sites by the potential number of jobs within a distance of 11.4 km (8.6 km radial). The parcels capturing the higher number of jobs within this distance achieve the most points.</p> <p>Note: Scores for existing jobs are weighted by 1 while planned jobs are weighted by 0.5. The numbers of jobs in each class are documented.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 points: 0% to 25% 	
<p>9. Proximity to Convenience Retail</p> <p>PPS (See Appendix 1) policies 1.1.3.2a) 2, 4 & 5,</p>	<p>Reflects proximity to convenience retail clustered around a major grocery store. Scores sites that on day one will take advantage of existing and known proposed commercial services. Proximity to convenience retail for all modes has a city median distance of 3.8 km converted to 2.9km radial distance.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 points: 0 to 0.6 km • 3 points: >0.6 km to 1.1 km • 1 point: >1.1km to 2.9 km • 0 points: > 2.9 km 	5
<p>10. Distance to Major City Facilities</p> <p>PPS (See Appendix 1) policies 1.1.3.2a) 2, 4 & 5,</p>	<p>Distance to one or more Major Recreation Facilities</p> <p>Note: Major Recreation Facilities which contain a Pool and 2 or more other indoor and outdoor recreation facility types on one site, such as arena(s), community centre, library, major sports fields, etc.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 points: 0 to 1.5 km • 4 points: >1.5 km to 2.3 km • 3 points: >2.3 km to 3.0 km • 2 points: >3.0 km to 3.8 km • 1 point: >3.8 km to 4.5 km • 0 points: >4.5 km 	5
<p>11. Distance to Emergency Services – Fire</p> <p>PPS (See Appendix 1) Section 1.6.3 & 1.6.5</p>	<p>Emergency Services (Fire) – Estimated response within 5 min and based upon assumed service area information provided by Fire Services.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 points: 2 or more responders within 5 mins • 3 points: 1 responder within 5 mins • 0 points: 1 responder >5 mins 	4



Table 2: Detailed Evaluation Criteria and Scores

Criteria	Description	Scores	Max Score
12. Potential Arterial Road Upgrades	Scoring seeks to reflect the relative cost of possible Arterial Road construction or upgrades required by future development. Potential is assessed based on, the distance travelled over roads that provide the shortest travel distance to an existing urban arterial road system or an existing series 400 Highway Interchange. Each parcel is put into one of four groups (closest to farthest) based on proximity / distance measured.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 points – Frontage on an existing serviced Urban Arterial Road or site is within 1.9 km of planned rapid transit <p>First Group: 0% to 25% (closest distance)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • - 2 point <p>Second Group: >25% to 50%</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • - 4 points <p>Third Group: >50% to 75%</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • - 6 Points <p>Fourth Group: >75% to 100% (furthest distance)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • - 8 Points 	Potential loss of 8 points
Maximum Transportation Score 52			
Community Integration			
13. Connectivity	It is assumed that all candidate lands can be developed with an urban road network including existing and new arterials and collector roads, cycle routes, pathways and greenspaces. This factor recognises that some parcels may have limitations to the provision of road access or integration with urban area lands in some directions, due to barriers or physical obstructions such as landform (ravines, major watercourses, significant natural areas etc.) or man-made	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8 points: good – totally unobstructed in all directions; • 6 points: less than good – full or partial obstruction in one direction; • 4 points: medium – full obstruction in one direction and a partial obstruction in another direction; • 2 points: poor – full obstruction in 2 directions • 0 Points: very poor – full 	8



Table 2: Detailed Evaluation Criteria and Scores			
Criteria	Description	Scores	Max Score
	obstructions such as railways, highways or existing development (e.g. country lot subdivisions, land designated for pits or quarries).	obstructions in 3 directions	
Maximum Integration Score 8			
Conflicting Uses			
14. Conflict with Agricultural Land Uses	Agricultural Resource Area within 250 metres of the parcel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 points: No • - 4 points: Yes 	Potential loss of 4 points
15. Natural Heritage Linkages PPS (See Appendix 1) policies 2.1.2	Presence of features that form part of Natural Heritage Linkages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 points: Natural Heritage Linkage does not impact the parcel • - 2 points: the Natural Heritage Linkage impacts less than 25 % of the parcel • - 4 points: the Natural Heritage Linkage impacts more than 25% of the parcel 	Potential loss of 4 points
Maximum Loss Conflicting Uses - 8			
Maximum Site Score			90