

**GLASTONBURY TOWN COUNCIL
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
TUESDAY, JUNE 9, 2020**

The Glastonbury Town Council with Town Manager, Richard J. Johnson, in attendance, held a Regular Meeting at 7:00 p.m. via Zoom video conferencing. The video was broadcast in real time and via a live video stream.

1. Roll Call.

Council Members

Mr. Thomas P. Gullotta, Chairman
Mr. Lawrence Niland, Vice Chairman
Dr. Stewart Beckett III
Ms. Deborah A. Carroll
Ms. Mary LaChance
Mr. Jacob McChesney
Mr. Kurt P. Cavanaugh
Mr. Whit C. Osgood
Ms. Lillian Tanski

a. Pledge of Allegiance

Led by Dr. Alan Bookman

2. Public Comment.

Ms. Carroll stated that there are no written comments for the public comment session today. All comments are for the public hearing.

Mr. Niland introduced the public comment session procedure.

Victoria “Tory” McBrien of 4 MacIntosh Lane, asked how the Council intends to address racism and police brutality in Glastonbury. She shared her suggestions, which include defunding the police and continuing to invest and expand low- and mixed-income housing in town. Some residents have expressed to her their experiences of being racially profiled in town by both police as well as residents. Growing up in Glastonbury, Ms. McBrien stated that, once in college, she found herself grossly unequipped to interact with people of other backgrounds. Therefore, it is in Glastonbury’s interests to pursue this cause.

3. Special Reports.

4. Old Business.

- a. Discussion and possible action concerning proposed agreement between Board of Education and Glastonbury Education Association - July 2021 through June 30, 2025.**

BOE Chairman Mr. Foyle stated that they have heard the Council's concerns. They did some research and discovered that the BOE can appoint a Council representative to join the negotiating team before even starting the formal process of the administrator's contract. Superintendent Dr. Bookman explained the document they assembled, which shows the monetary costs/savings from year to year. He noted that this report is based on the number of people in the school system, which changes every year. In general, they will see a savings of around \$500,000 in salary and \$400,000 in healthcare from what is listed in this report.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Dr. Beckett

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby requests that the BOE and the teachers' union withdraw the present contract for consideration at this time; further, the Special Council Meeting for the purpose of possible consideration of the current agreement be scheduled before June 21, in the event that the contract is not withdrawn.

Disc: Ms. Carroll expressed that her primary concern is that they have no idea what the next 6 months will look like. Given the uncertainty in the road ahead, she is not comfortable moving forward with this motion. She stated that the finalized contract does not have to be signed until December, so the Council has some time to wait. Ms. Tanski asked if there is a reasonable expectation that they will get further concessions from the union, and that this contract can be improved upon? Chairman Gullotta stated that it is a very carefully worded, respectful motion. All they are is to take it back and think about it; the Council is not telling them what to do. He agreed with Ms. Carroll, saying that it strikes him as irresponsible to make a decision today, given the financial instability across the country, the state, and the town.

Dr. Beckett noted that the education budget has grown faster than inflation, which it cannot continue to do. They cannot afford 3.5% growth and must get their total expenditure down to 2%. Mr. Niland agreed with Mr. Gullotta, adding that in a normal economy, this might be a normal contract, but it's not a normal economy, so they all have to look at the long-term picture. Mr. Osgood thinks that the contract negotiated during the COVID-19 lockdown was totally tone-deaf. A 4-year contract given the current climate is unacceptable. He noted that if no changes are made to the contract, it could be rejected; at which point, it would go to arbitration. Mr. McChesney stated that they have officially entered a recession and have at least a year or two of tough times ahead of them. Though Glastonbury is okay, the longer this goes on, he is unsure whether the Town can sustain that position. Therefore, this contract is concerning, and it provides an opportunity for the Council and the BOE to think of creative ways to work together.

Ms. LaChance agreed with Mr. Niland about taking a pause and seeing where the economy goes. Ms. Tanski agreed that they have been asking a lot from teachers during this crisis, and her approach is from a place of caution. Ms. Tanski is concerned about what kind of settlement they could end up with if they change their negotiating relationship from cooperative to adversarial. If this contract goes to arbitration, Glastonbury will likely end up paying more. Ms. Carroll followed up that she has no desire to see this go to arbitration. The Council has the flexibility to wait to finalize the contract. Mr. Gullotta asked, if this motion passes, would the Town Manager seek legal counsel so that they could be assured of their dates? Mr. Johnson replied yes.

Result: Motion passed with one vote against {8-1-0}. Ms. Tanski opposed.

b. Status report on Welles-Turner Memorial Library Renovation and Expansion Project.

Mr. Johnson explained that this is the project that was approved at referendum in November 2018 for an addition and renovations to the library. The project was last reviewed with the Council in October, and it has not changed much since that time. It has gone through design and review by various town agencies, and the next phase is to go to bid and begin the construction process. Mr. Johnson attached a document showing the few modest changes proposed, such as tweaking the front door and the access to the Maker's Space, and the finalized landscape plan. The expectation is that they will proceed to bid late June/early July.

Mr. McChesney asked what the change is to the front door. Mr. Johnson stated that the design will be revised to better match that of the original building. Dave Sacchitella of the Facilities Department and co-project manager explained that it improves the accessibility and reverts it to the previous aesthetic. Mr. Osgood asked about the roof. Mr. Sacchitella explained that the roof on the addition is a metal roof, which is a good sustainable solution to the original roof, which is faux slate.

5. New Business.

6. Consent Calendar.

7. Town Manager's Report.

Mr. Johnson gave an update on COVID-19. This past week, they did not experience any additional residents passing on. Testing increased with only 5 additional positive results from May 31-June 7. Regular hours for the transfer station will resume next week. There is a pickup service available at the Wells Turner library, where residents can reserve up to 5 books and take them out with their car. Mr. Johnson explained that the land that the Town purchased from the pension fund is now open space, so people are uncertain whether they can walk on the property or not. They are in the process of taking down the No Access signs.

Mr. Osgood asked for an update on the subdivision and new residential building permits in Town. Mr. Johnson agreed to provide that update during the next meeting. Ms. LaChance asked to get the curbing fixed by Woodhaven Road. Mr. Johnson stated that he thought that was taken care of, but he will follow up. Mr. Cavanaugh asked when Town operations will actually be reopened. Mr. Johnson stated that, at Town Hall, they will likely go to appointments first for the next month or two, but all services are available either online or by mail. Dr. Beckett asked for an update on Cotton Hollow at the next meeting. Mr. Johnson agreed. Mr. Gullotta asked about the prospects of getting a swimming pool open for the summer. Mr. Johnson stated that the pools will be opened, but there will be some protocols for separation.

8. Committee Reports.

a. Chairman's Report.

Drive to Cider Mill Road portion is estimated at about \$250,000. Therefore, both sections would be completed for a total net cost of \$250,000.

Mr. Niland opened up the floor for public comment.

Tom Yandow of 1099 Main Street, explained that he is a part of that common driveway. It takes them a long time to get out of the driveway, which is a hazard. While he supports the sidewalk project, he has a concern about impeded visibility when cars come over the hill. He asked if the Town will address the sight line with the trees there. He also explained that they are concerned about people getting hurt on that driveway, which is state-owned land. Will they be responsible for that, and for cleaning the snow?

Ben Cunningham of 1305 Main Street, expressed support for this addition. He asked if there will be any expense to the property owners for the replacement of the driveway. He also asked if the cluster of mailboxes will have to be permanently replaced and inquired as to where the retaining wall will be installed.

Julie Pierro of 45 Overshot Drive, stated that she and her family are very supportive of this initiative.

Carolyn Gatesy of 1191 Main Street, explained that she is a runner and a biker, and she currently has to drive to a safer area for both of her sports because she gets scared on Route 17, due to the speeding cars and trucks, which are a major hazard. She is in favor of the sidewalks because it is a safety issue, and also because it will be an attractive move for Glastonbury and South Glastonbury.

Alex Rodriguez of 1083 Main Street, is supportive of the sidewalk construction but has a couple of concerns: he plans on expanding his apron because it is unsafe to get out the way it is. Will the plans be modified? Like Mr. Yandow, his common driveway is in a very poor condition, and he is afraid that it will be very dangerous once that asphalt is loosened. Once they sawcut the road, will it be replaced?

Mr. Pennington replied to the questions and comments posed by the public:

- To Mr. Yandow: Yes, they have identified some trees on the plans to remove in order to improve those sight plans. Residents would not be responsible for any accidents on that sidewalk.
- To Mr. Cunningham: Would the aprons be replaced on the driveways? Yes, and there will be no expense to any individual homeowner for that apron replacement. Will the mailboxes be relocated? No, the sidewalk is well behind the mailbox locations, and they will not be impacted at all. The retaining walls are located at 1137 and 1143 Main Street. On average, they are about 2-3 feet in height. So, they are not a major structure, but necessary to grade.
- To Mr. Rodriguez: He will look at the condition of the driveway, but he believes that the budget would be enough to replace the pavement in that area.

Mr. Niland thanked Mr. Pennington and expressed full support for this project. The \$300,000 grant makes this a no-brainer. Mr. Osgood stated that this is a long time coming, and he is happy to see it come to fruition. Mr. McChesney remarked that he is looking forward to seeing it completed, but he is interested in hearing more about the traffic area. Mr. Gullotta suggested they install two rotaries: one on Route 17 by the stop light on Buttonball Lane, and the other at the traffic light on Red Hill Drive. He explained that they would slow things down and let folks know that they are not on a highway. Mr. Pennington stated that there is a potential to include a pedestrian signal by Red Hill Drive, but they can talk more about putting in a roundabout by Buttonball Lane. Dr. Beckett echoed both of Mr. Gullotta's roundabout solutions.

Result: Motion passed unanimously {9-0-0}.

NO 2: ACTION ON PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE XVIII OF TOWN CODE NOW ENTITLED "APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL MEMBERS TO THE BOARD OF ASSESSMENT APPEAL".

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Dr. Beckett

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves amendment to Article XVIII of the Town Code now entitled "Appointment of Additional Members to the Board of Assessment Appeal" to read "Appointment of Alternate and Additional Members to the Board of Assessment Appeals" and further amends Section 2-322 "Appointment of Alternate Members" and Section 2-323 "Appointment of Additional Members", as described in a report by the Town Manager dated June 5, 2020 and attached hereto. This amendment to the Town Code to be effective July 6, 2020.

Result: Motion passed unanimously {9-0-0}.

NO 3: ACTION ON PROPOSED TEXT AMENDMENTS TO THE BUILDING-ZONE REGULATIONS REGARDING BUILDING HEIGHTS IN COMMERCIAL ZONES AND PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE OFFICIAL ZONING MAP. (CONTINUED FROM MAY 26, 2020 COUNCIL MEETING).

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Dr. Beckett

BE IT RESOLVED, the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves amendments to the Building Zone Regulations as follows:

Text Amendments: Sections of the Building-Zone Regulations regarding building heights: 4.1.9, 4.2.9, 4.3.9, 4.4.9, 4.5.9, 4.6.10, 4.7.10, 4.8.10, 4.13.6e, 4.14.10, 4.15.10, 4.16.3b-3, 4.16.4.c, 4.17.2 (d) and 4.18.4e. These amendments also include addition of a new section, 4.19 - Planned Business and Development Overlay Zone:

- 1) Establish 14.25 feet per floor throughout all zones;

- 2) Increase permitted floors from 2.5 to 3 floors in Planned Travel Zone;
- 3) Increase the permitted number of floors from 2.5 stories to 4 stories for all permitted uses in the Planned Employment and Planned Commerce zones;
- 4) Establish Overlay Zone in the Planned Business and Development Zone (North Main Street area) and increase the number of permitted floors in the PBD Overlay Zone from 2.5 to 3;

Zoning Map: Amend Zoning Map to establish a Planned Business Development Overlay Zone to include the following Main Street properties: 3039, 3040, 3041, 3025, Lot W-2, 3017, 3011, 2997, 3000, 2963, Lot W-10A, 2955, 2941, 2915, Lot W-14, 2952, 2944, 2928, 2934, 2900, 2875, 2865, 2855, 2851, 2847, 2839, 2833-2837, 2831 and 2838-2868;

as described in a report by the Town Manager dated June 5, 2020 and as recommended by the Ad Hoc Working Group and Town Plan and Zoning Commission. Said amendments shall be effective July 6, 2020.”

Disc: Ms. Carroll read the written comments received prior to the start of the meeting:

Emily Weil, PO Box 233 in South Glastonbury, stated that she does not want taller buildings approved in Town.

Heather Hassan of 404 Addison Road, remarked that Glastonbury is becoming another city. They need to protect the Town to preserve its quaintness. At the very least, she suggested the Council postpone this decision until an in-person hearing can be held.

Deborah Bolnick of 57 Stanley Drive, is in opposition to this motion because she moved to Glastonbury for the character of the town, and constructing taller buildings would alter its image and feel.

Mr. Johnson explained that this topic has been under review since the summer 2018 and has gone through a number of iterations. This is language that would allow greater building regulations in the PBD zone, but it wouldn't require said changes.

Mr. Niland opened the public comment session. There were no attendees, so he closed the session.

Dr. Beckett noted that he introduced this proposal two years ago, with the idea that they could have mixed use housing and development, not to make land developers money.

Amendment by: Ms. LaChance

Seconded by: Ms. Carroll

MOVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby strike all parts of the aforementioned motion, with the exception of standardizing the floor height.

Disc: Ms. Tanski will not support this motion but would support extending this discussion until they can hold in-person public hearings. Mr. Osgood stated that they are not increasing the square footage of the traffic from those uses, just allowing for greater flexibility and design. They have had hearings to support this motion without the amendment. Mr. Niland explained that he was part of that committee with Mr. Osgood, but he has heard not a single person from the public say that

this is a good idea. He also supports Ms. Tanski's idea to extend the discussion on this. Ms. LaChance stated that she is in favor of extending this discussion. They do need mixed use buildings and more affordable housing, but she does not want to put them on the edges of town; rather, they should be integrated in the community. Mr. McChesney stated that he was ready to vote on Ms. LaChance's amendment, but he is fine with tabling this, as he has not heard anyone from the public come in and say that they want this to happen.

Ms. Tanski remarked that land is too expensive in Glastonbury so, at some point, they will have to embrace increased density in redevelopment, if they would like to provide more affordable housing. She understands the fear of a slippery slope on the building heights, but as a reminder, every action taken by the Town Plan and Zoning Commission is governed by the Plan of Conservation and Development. She encouraged residents to look at that document. Mr. Osgood also expressed support for tabling the motion. Ms. LaChance agreed with Ms. Tanski's comments on affordable housing, but stated that, right now, this is about building heights. She knows that those concepts could be related, but she would like to extend this out to get more comments.

Mr. Gullotta explained that, about 40 years ago, the Council at the time was also very concerned about affordable housing. They built at a higher density and later could not sell at an affordable price because of the conditions attached to the market. After a couple of years, they voted to remove the affordable value and make it market rate to sell. Mr. Gullotta concluded that the only way to get affordable housing is if you are willing to subsidize it because any hope that a developer would want to sell it below market value would be foolish. Mr. Osgood countered that it does not have to be subsidized, and the majority of affordable housing built in this country works this way.

Mr. Johnson recommended that, rather than tabling it, the Council continue the public hearing, which is more formal, and it will be continued for up to 155 days.

Ms. LaChance withdrew her amendment and Ms. Carroll withdrew her second.

Ms. Carroll withdrew her original motion and Dr. Beckett withdrew his second.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Dr. Beckett

BE IT RESOLVED, the Glastonbury Town Council hereby continues the public hearing concerning proposed text amendments to the Building Zone Regulations - Building Heights and Zoning Map to establish a Planned Business Development Overlay Zone, for up to 155 days (65 days per CGS and 90 days per Executive Order) subject to Council action to determine the specific time and date of the reconvened public hearing with appropriate notices of such reconvened hearing, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated June 5, 2020.

Note: Per the background report forwarded for this topic, Council could continue the public hearing to late June or early July or close the public hearing with no action and reconvene a new public hearing at a subsequent date.

Result: Motion passed with one opposed {8-1-0}. Mr. Gullotta voted against the motion.

NO 4: **POSTPONED** - ACTION ON PROPOSALS SUBMITTED BY THE MAFFE FOUNDATION, CONNECTICUT RIVER VALLEY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE AND EXCHANGE CLUB CENTER FOR THE PREVENTION OF CHILD ABUSE OF CT, INC. D/B/A KIDSAFE CT UNDER THE 2020 NEIGHBORHOOD ASSISTANCE ACT PROGRAM.

9. Communications.

10. Minutes.

a. Minutes of May 26, 2020 Regular Meeting.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Dr. Beckett

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves the minutes as submitted for the meeting held May 26, 2020.

Result: Motion passed unanimously {9-0-0}.

11. Appointments and Resignations. None

12. Executive Session.

a. Potential land acquisition.

b. Potential sale of Town-owned land – draft terms and conditions.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Dr. Beckett

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby enters into executive session to discuss a potential land acquisition and potential sale of Town-owned land at 9:10 P.M.

Result: Motion passed unanimously {9-0-0}.

Present for the Executive Session item were council members, Mr. Tom Gullotta, Chairman, Mr. Lawrence Niland, Vice Chairman, Dr. Chip Beckett, Ms. Deb Carroll, Ms. Mary LaChance, Mr. Jake McChesney, Mr. Kurt Cavanaugh, Ms. Lillian Tanski, and Mr. Whit Osgood with Town Manager, Richard J. Johnson.

No votes were taken during the Executive Session, which ended at 9:45 P.M.

Following the Executive Session, The Council discussed, in private, collective bargaining negotiations and such discussions are not treated as a meeting under the applicable sections of the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). Attendees for the private session included the Town Council members and the Town Manager.

c. Personnel Matter – Town Manager.

The Town Manager was not in attendance for this matter.

The meeting adjourned at 9:46 P.M.

Following the Executive Session and Meeting Adjournment, the Council entered a non-meeting format discussion. They came out of the non-meeting format discussion at 10:00 P.M. The Town Manager was not in attendance for the non-meeting format discussion.

Respectfully submitted,

Lilly Torosyan

Lilly Torosyan
Recording Clerk

Thomas Gullotta / sac

Thomas Gullotta
Chairman