

Memorandum:

RECEIVED

JUL 22 2026

Land Use Department

To: Liz Burdick, Director of Land Use & Planning
From: Steve Masalin, Public Works Director/Town Engineer *SM*
Date: July 22, 2026
Re: 12 Hyde Park Dr/975 Long Cove Rd (Appl. IWWC #26-18RESUB)

I have reviewed the plans and stormwater analysis for the subject application. I have the following comments.

1. The report states that "the proposed development will not have adverse effects on down-gradient properties..." The broader watershed within which this development activity is proposed drains to the bottom of Long Cove Rd into Flat Brook. Properties in the lower reaches of this watershed are subject to flooding in lower frequency storm events.

Recently, the Town converted a detention basin at 62 Eagle Ridge Dr into a retention/leaching basin. This greatly alleviated flooding impacts in vulnerable downstream areas. Any additional development in this watershed is thus subject to particular stormwater impacts scrutiny.

The present proposal does not provide the necessary protections to this end. Though a net zero peak flow increase condition is met for the 10, 25, and 100-year storm events. The peak flows are calculated to increase for the 2-year storm. This is not acceptable.

Additionally, two intervening initiatives have been implemented at the State level relative to stormwater impacts. First, Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) requirements now stipulate a progressive "disconnection" of stormwater systems from the environment to mitigate stormwater impacts. This is what the Eagle Ridge Dr project accomplished.

Also, the most recent revision (2024) of the Connecticut Stormwater Quality Manual, in addition to retention of 100% of the water quality volume, a reduction to 50% of pre-development peak flow rate for the 2-year storm is stipulated (Chapter 4, Standard 2). Though these requirements are not presently dictated by the Town's Drainage Ordinance (300-17), the sensitivities in this area need to be considered, and these constraints should be accommodated to the maximum extent practicable.

Plans

2. Sheet 10
 - a. A drainage manhole is shown receiving stormwater from CB 5 and discharging into the basin. This does not correspond to the components and calculations in the Engineering Report.
 - b. For correspondence to the provided detail, the call-out of a detail for the outlet structures at the basins downstream of CBs 1 and 5 should be "D-Box Outlet Structure."
 - c. The invert for the flared end downstream of CB 3 is not given. Also, the 20' length does not correspond to the 45' length given in the Storm Sewer System Design sheet in the Engineering Report.

- d. Underdrains should be considered in the areas of deep cuts (particularly between stations 14+50 and 16+00.
- e. The depicted invert of the 36" pipe discharge at station 16+80 in the elevation view (about 155.2) is lower than the invert specified in the plan view (157.5).

3. Sheet 12

- a. The elevation given for the basin bottom in the D-Box Outlet detail (266.0) does not correspond to the plans. There are three different proposed D-Box Outlets.
- b. A detail is given for riprap stabilized slope. This area is not specified in the plans, those presumably in the area of the proposed guiderail.
- c. Metal Rail Detail: The end treatment should conform to present DOT standards.