

**THE GLASTONBURY TOWN PLAN AND ZONING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES OF TUESDAY, MAY 4, 2021**

The Glastonbury Town Plan and Zoning Commission with Jonathan E. Mullen, AICP, Planner and Rebecca Augur, AICP, Director of Planning and Land Use Services in attendance, held a Regular Meeting via Zoom video conferencing.

ROLL CALL

Commission Members Present

Mr. Robert Zanolungo, Jr., Chairman
Ms. Sharon Purtill, Vice Chairman
Mr. Michael Botelho, Secretary
Mr. Keith Shaw
Mr. Raymond Hassett
Mr. Christopher Griffin
Ms. Alice Sexton, Alternate
Mr. Scott Miller, Alternate

Commission Members Absent

Vacancy

Chairman Zanolungo called the meeting to order at 7:02 P.M. He introduced Rebecca Augur, the new Director of Planning and Land Use Services.

PUBLIC HEARING

1. Application of WE 35 National Drive LLC, c/o Winstanley Enterprises LLC for a Section 12 Special Permit with Design Review and a Section 20 Groundwater Protection Permit concerning reuse as a motor freight transportation terminal or garage – 107 Eastern Boulevard – Planned Employment Zone & Groundwater Protection Zone 1

Commissioner Hassett stated that he was unable to attend or watch the last meeting, so he defers to his fellow commissioners to make the appropriate decision on how to proceed. Chairman Zanolungo appointed Commissioner Sexton in Commissioner Hassett's place, since she was present at the last meeting, when this application was first presented.

Thomas P. Cody, Attorney at Robinson and Cole, LLC in Hartford, presented on behalf of the applicant and tenant, Amazon.com. He noted that, at the opening meeting two weeks ago, they made a presentation on the complete project. Today, they will make a shorter presentation to follow up on issues identified by staff and the commission.

Adam Winstanley, Principal with Winstanley Enterprises, spoke to the ownership of this particular property. He has been an investor in Connecticut since 1994. Winstanley Enterprises is a family-owned company with offices in Windsor and New Haven and owns and operates a few properties throughout the state. This is their first project in Glastonbury. The company is

considered a best-in-class owner and operator of properties. He explained that this property will be managed out of their Hartford office. The landlord will be committed to resolving problems, and there will be a tremendous amount of investment into the property to make it efficient. They are excited to be a part of the community and to see this project go forward.

Michael Dion, P.E. with BL Companies in Meriden, noted that, last week, they met with Town staff, who requested adding another curb cut for more parking in the back, as well as making the intersection of National Drive a three-way stop. Mr. Dion stated that the applicant is in agreement with both of those comments and will add stop signs and stop bars. A third comment was made regarding the amount of parking on-site being excessive. Mr. Dion explained that they received the hourly shift distribution from the client and came up with a graph to show the net vehicles on site per period of time throughout the day.

Mr. Dion lost internet connection and Matthew Bruton, P.E., also of BL Companies, took over the presentation. He explained that, on an average weekday without flex, the peak is at around 180 vehicles on-site, which then tapers off as the day goes on. In addition, Amazon has very critical peak times throughout the year, which can be hard to predict. Mr. Bruton explained the peak demand chart which showed the holiday schedule, peaking at a little over 300 parking spaces. The applicant proposes 117 associate spaces and 208 van spaces, for a total of 325 spaces, which should cover even their busiest peaks of the year.

Commissioner Sexton asked what is ‘without flex.’ Mr. Dion stated that they did not include the Amazon Flex drivers (who use their personal vehicles) because they do not park on-site at all. Vice Chairman Purtill asked what the “CO shift” [as listed in table] is. Jessica Schumer, an Amazon representative, explained that that is only during holidays. Vice Chairman Purtill noted that the required minimum number of parking spaces here is 22, but the applicant is asking for 325. She pointed out that the site is located in a groundwater protection zone. She has never received an application which asked for this much impervious pavement, so there must be more creative ways to acquire the spaces that the applicant needs without paving over all of that area.

Mr. Bruton responded by noting that the area has poor soil, so the potential for groundwater recharge is limited. He also explained that this redevelopment by Amazon is a significant improvement for stormwater management. The problem with reducing parking is that they would need to find an additional lot, which would add more vehicles on the roadway, thereby increasing traffic. What they propose complies with the stormwater regulations. Vice Chairman Purtill asked how many spaces are on the site right now. Mr. Bruton replied, roughly 100 spaces, but there is unstriped pavement, which could accommodate more parking.

Mr. Winstanley noted that grass pavers do not work for this site at all. The tenants cannot tolerate more than 0.5 inch of snow on-site, for safety purposes, and the pavers just do not hold up. They cannot be plowed and sanded carefully. He noted that, while it does seem like a lot of parking, this is a new type of use.

Daniel Pennington, Town Engineer, understands the concern with designing and constructing for a peak period. In this instance, however, he thinks that it is reasonable because there is a fairly dramatic difference between Amazon’s peak holiday demand and their non-peak daily demand.

His fear is that, should the tenant not receive the amount of parking spaces they are asking for, the 140-vehicle differential between the peak and non-peak average might end up being parked on corporate park roads. In other instances, he would not recommend designing or constructing for peak use, but here, it is better than the alternative. He also does not see any particular concern to the state intersections, but he stressed that is the state department's authority, not his.

Commissioner Shaw asked about the tractor trailers. Mr. Pennington stated that the applicant is required to give additional detailed information showing the exact routes that they will take on the site and demonstrating that the routes they propose have the turning radii necessary to accommodate the trucks. He has a fair degree of confidence that it would allow the proper turning radii to accommodate the trailers. Mr. Dion noted that there will be only 7 tractor trailers per day, of which 5 or 6 will be overnight, from about 10:00 P.M. to 6:00 A.M., possibly 7:00 A.M., if there are delays. Hence, only one or two trucks will come during the day. Mr. Winstanley added that, during the pandemic, the former tenant, Mondelez, operated 21 trucks throughout their site over a 24-hour period, which is roughly four times the number of line haul trucks than what Amazon is proposing here.

Commissioner Sexton asked if they have an opinion on the impact on local traffic. Mr. Pennington stated that he does not see anything that gives him reason for concern. The Chief of Police is the Town's legal traffic authority, and he did not express any concerns in his memorandum. Commissioner Griffin asked about the traffic study. Mr. Dion explained that there is no difference between pre and post construction. In the build condition, in the holiday peak, the site is projected to generate 300 trips, which is typical of a McDonald's. There is no change on any of the intersections in all three conditions (AM, MIDDAY, and PM), between build and no build. There should be no level of service concerns above the existing condition.

Chairman Zanlungo asked about the routes that drivers will take. Mr. Pennington spoke to the tractor trailers having to take certain routes. Ms. Schumer explained that the van drivers are required to use specific routing software. Generally, their drives will be 45 minutes, and there will be use of local roads for Glastonbury packages. Vice Chairman Purtill asked for confirmation on the dumpsters being located under the canopy. Mr. Bruton stated that there are no exterior dumpsters. The trash would be stored in the area with the loading dock doors, which exist from Mondelez.

Chairman Zanlungo opened the floor for public comment.

Zbigniew Mroz of 121 Heywood Drive, noted that the traffic study was based on average traffic conditions, but they should be more concerned about the peak conditions. The number of cars during peak are double from average conditions, so one would surmise that the traffic on-site would be double. Two months is a long time for peak conditions.

Mr. Dion responded to Mr. Mroz's comments, stating that, typically, they do not analyze a holiday period because it is a short period of time. It is industry standard to come up with an average for the year in the analysis. He explained that they went farther out than they normally would for this size, just to add a level of comfort. The client has made every effort to take the traffic outside of the peak commuting periods, and they are not impacting the school schedules.

They are very confident in the study which meets industry standards. Mr. Pennington added that the applicant received approval from OSTA on the traffic volume information that they used for the study.

Linda Bialkowski at 26 Heywood Drive, stated that the amount of traffic that goes through the area is already awful. She asked if any of the commissioners would want to be living within half a mile of this facility.

Commissioner Shaw asked if there are other uses in the area which generate a lot of truck traffic. Mr. Pennington replied that the analysis includes existing traffic counts and adds in factors for the development and background growth, so it incorporates existing traffic. Mr. Dion agreed, adding that the heavy vehicle percentages are included in their analysis. Mr. Cody stated that there is an additional step of state review and approval: OSTA still has to issue their permit. He then stressed the importance of keeping the parking as proposed, for safety reasons.

With no further comments, Chairman Zanolungo closed the public hearing.

Motion by: Secretary Botelho

Seconded by: Commissioner Sexton

MOVED, that the Town Plan & Zoning Commission approve the application of Application of WE 35 National Drive LLC, c/o Winstanley Enterprises LLC for a Section 12 Special Permit with Design Review and a Section 20 Groundwater Protection Permit concerning reuse as a motor freight transportation terminal or garage – 107 Eastern Boulevard – Planned Employment Zone & Groundwater Protection Zone 1, in accordance with the following plans:

“APPROVAL LETTER PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT 107 EASTERN BOULEVARD TOWN OF GLASTONBURY, CT BL COMPANIES 100 CONSTITUTION PLAZA, 10TH FLOOR HARTFORD, CT 06103 (860) 249-2200 (860) 249-2400 FAX DESIGNED S.E.L. DRAWN S.E.L. SCALE NONE PROJECT NO. 2000669 DATE 09/30/2020 CAD FILE: 200066901 SHEET NO. AP-1 REVISIONS 12/16/2020 REVISED PER TOWN COMMENTS 01/20/2021 REVISED PER TOWN COMMENTS”

“APPROVAL LETTER PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT 107 EASTERN BOULEVARD TOWN OF GLASTONBURY, CT BL COMPANIES 100 CONSTITUTION PLAZA, 10TH FLOOR HARTFORD, CT 06103 (860) 249-2200 (860) 249-2400 FAX DESIGNED S.E.L. DRAWN S.E.L. SCALE NONE PROJECT NO. 2000669 DATE 09/30/2020 CAD FILE: 200066901 SHEET NO. AP-2 REVISIONS 12/16/2020 REVISED PER TOWN COMMENTS 01/20/2021 REVISED PER TOWN COMMENTS”

“ALTA/NSPS LAND TITLE SURVEY PROPERTY AND TOPOGRAPHIC SURVEY 107 EASTERN BOULEVARD GLASTONBURY, HARTFORD COUNTY, CONNECTICUT BL COMPANIES 355 RESEARCH PARKWAY MERIDEN, CT 06450 (203) 630-1406 (203) 630-2615 FAX SURVEYED JA DRAWN JA REVIEWED PJC SCALE 1”=50’ PROJECT NO. 2000669 DATE 05/27/20 CAD FILE: XY200066901 SHEET NO. AL-1 12/15/2020 ADDED COORDINATES OF CORNERS”

“SITE PLAN PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT 107 EASTERN BOULEVARD TOWN OF GLASTONBURY, CT BL COMPANIES 100 CONSTITUTION PLAZA, 10TH FLOOR HARTFORD, CT 06103 (860) 249-2200 (860) 249-2400 FAX DESIGNED S.E.L. DRAWN S.E.L. SCALE 1”=40’ PROJECT NO. 2000669 DATE 09/30/2020

CAD FILE: 200066901 SHEET NO. SP-1 REVISIONS 12/16/2020 REVISED PER TOWN COMMENTS 01/20/2021 REVISED PER TOWN COMMENTS”

“GRADING, DRAINAGE, AND UTILITIES PLAN PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT 107 EASTERN BOULEVARD TOWN OF GLASTONBURY, CT BL COMPANIES 100 CONSTITUTION PLAZA, 10TH FLOOR HARTFORD, CT 06103 (860) 249-2200 (860) 249-2400 FAX DESIGNED S.E.L. DRAWN S.E.L. SCALE 1”=40’ PROJECT NO. 2000669 DATE 09/30/2020 CAD FILE: 200066901 SHEET NO. GU-1 REVISIONS 12/16/2020 REVISED PER TOWN COMMENTS 01/20/2021 REVISED PER TOWN COMMENTS”

“GRADING, DRAINAGE, AND UTILITIES NOTES PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT 107 EASTERN BOULEVARD TOWN OF GLASTONBURY, CT BL COMPANIES 100 CONSTITUTION PLAZA, 10TH FLOOR HARTFORD, CT 06103 (860) 249-2200 (860) 249-2400 FAX DESIGNED S.E.L. DRAWN S.E.L. SCALE N.T.S. PROJECT NO. 2000669 DATE 09/30/2020 CAD FILE: 200066901 SHEET NO. GU-2 REVISIONS 12/16/2020 REVISED PER TOWN COMMENTS 01/20/2021 REVISED PER TOWN COMMENTS”

“STORMWATER OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE PLAN PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT 107 EASTERN BOULEVARD TOWN OF GLASTONBURY, CT BL COMPANIES 100 CONSTITUTION PLAZA, 10TH FLOOR HARTFORD, CT 06103 (860) 249-2200 (860) 249-2400 FAX DESIGNED S.E.L. DRAWN S.E.L. SCALE NONE PROJECT NO. 2000669 DATE 09/30/2020 CAD FILE: 200066901 SHEET NO. OM-1 REVISIONS 12/16/2020 REVISED PER TOWN COMMENTS 01/20/2021 REVISED PER TOWN COMMENTS”

“CROSS SECTIONS PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT 107 EASTERN BOULEVARD TOWN OF GLASTONBURY, CT BL COMPANIES 100 CONSTITUTION PLAZA, 10TH FLOOR HARTFORD, CT 06103 (860) 249-2200 (860) 249-2400 FAX DESIGNED S.E.L. DRAWN S.E.L. SCALE 1”=4’ PROJECT NO. 2000669 DATE 09/30/2020 CAD FILE: 200066901 SHEET NO. CS-1 REVISIONS 12/16/2020 REVISED PER TOWN COMMENTS 01/20/2021 REVISED PER TOWN COMMENTS”

“LANDSCAPE PLAN PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT 107 EASTERN BOULEVARD TOWN OF GLASTONBURY, CT BL COMPANIES 100 CONSTITUTION PLAZA, 10TH FLOOR HARTFORD, CT 06103 (860) 249-2200 (860) 249-2400 FAX DESIGNED W.E.V. DRAWN P.G.M. SCALE 1”=40’ PROJECT NO. 2000669 DATE 09/30/2020 CAD FILE: 200066901 SHEET NO. LL-1 REVISIONS 12/16/2020 REVISED PER TOWN COMMENTS 01/20/2021 REVISED PER TOWN COMMENTS 02/24/2021 REVISED PER BEAUTIFICATION COMMITTEE COMMENTS 03/18/2021 REVISED PER BEAUTIFICATION COMMITTEE COMMENTS”

“DETAIL SHEET PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT 107 EASTERN BOULEVARD TOWN OF GLASTONBURY, CT BL COMPANIES 100 CONSTITUTION PLAZA, 10TH FLOOR HARTFORD, CT 06103 (860) 249-2200 (860) 249-2400 FAX DESIGNED S.E.L. DRAWN S.E.L. SCALE AS NOTED PROJECT NO. 2000669 DATE 09/30/2020 CAD FILE: 200066901 SHEET NO. DN-4 REVISIONS 12/16/2020 REVISED PER TOWN COMMENTS 01/20/2021 REVISED PER TOWN COMMENTS 02/24/2021”

“DETAIL SHEET PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT 107 EASTERN BOULEVARD TOWN OF GLASTONBURY, CT BL COMPANIES 100 CONSTITUTION PLAZA, 10TH FLOOR HARTFORD, CT 06103 (860) 249-2200 (860) 249-2400 FAX DESIGNED S.E.L. DRAWN S.E.L. SCALE AS NOTED PROJECT NO. 2000669 DATE 09/30/2020 CAD FILE: 200066901 SHEET NO. DN-5 REVISIONS 12/16/2020 REVISED PER TOWN COMMENTS 01/20/2021 REVISED PER TOWN COMMENTS 02/24/2021”

“DETAIL SHEET PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT 107 EASTERN BOULEVARD TOWN OF GLASTONBURY, CT BL COMPANIES 100 CONSTITUTION PLAZA, 10TH FLOOR HARTFORD, CT 06103 (860) 249-2200 (860) 249-2400 FAX DESIGNED S.E.L. DRAWN S.E.L. SCALE AS NOTED PROJECT NO. 2000669 DATE 09/30/2020 CAD FILE: 200066901 SHEET NO. DN-8 REVISIONS 12/16/2020 REVISED PER TOWN COMMENTS 01/20/2021 REVISED PER TOWN COMMENTS 02/24/2021”

“DETAIL SHEET PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT 107 EASTERN BOULEVARD TOWN OF GLASTONBURY, CT BL COMPANIES 100 CONSTITUTION PLAZA, 10TH FLOOR HARTFORD, CT 06103 (860) 249-2200 (860) 249-2400 FAX DESIGNED S.E.L. DRAWN S.E.L. SCALE AS NOTED PROJECT NO. 2000669 DATE 09/30/2020 CAD FILE: 200066901 SHEET NO. DN-9 REVISIONS 12/16/2020 REVISED PER TOWN COMMENTS 01/20/2021 REVISED PER TOWN COMMENTS 02/24/2021”

“DETAIL SHEET PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT 107 EASTERN BOULEVARD TOWN OF GLASTONBURY, CT BL COMPANIES 100 CONSTITUTION PLAZA, 10TH FLOOR HARTFORD, CT 06103 (860) 249-2200 (860) 249-2400 FAX DESIGNED S.E.L. DRAWN S.E.L. SCALE AS NOTED PROJECT NO. 2000669 DATE 09/30/2020 CAD FILE: 200066901 SHEET NO. DN-11 REVISIONS 12/16/2020 REVISED PER TOWN COMMENTS 01/20/2021 REVISED PER TOWN COMMENTS 02/24/2021”

And

1. In compliance with:
 - a. The conditions set forth by the Conservation Commission in their recommendation for approval to the Town Plan and Zoning Commission and in the Wetlands Permit issued by the Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Agency at their Regular Meeting of February 11, 2021.
 - b. The recommendations as contained in the minutes of the March 10, 2021 Community Beautification Committee meeting.
 - c. The standards contained in a report from the Fire Marshal, File # 21-0543, plans reviewed 04-14-2021.

2. In adherence to:
 - a. The Town Engineer's memorandum dated April 15, 2021.
 - b. The Health Director's memorandum dated April 12, 2021.
 - c. The Police Chief's memorandum dated April 16, 2021.
3. In compliance with the conditions and requirements of the Office of the State Traffic Administration (OSTA) permit, if issued.
4. This is a Section 12 Special Permit with Design Review. If unforeseen conditions are encountered during construction that would cause deviation from the approved plans, the applicant shall consult with the Office of Community Development to determine what further approvals, if any, are required.

Disc: Vice Chairman Purtill clarified that the additional curb cut will be included as part of Mr. Pennington's recommendations, as listed in his April 15 memorandum. Mr. Griffin supports this application and wishes the applicant the best of luck. Secretary Botelho explained that, based on the materials provided from the applicant and Mr. Pennington's memorandum, he believes that the applicant has asked for acceptable parking spaces. He drives by the site frequently, and he thinks that it is a good location for the site. Commissioner Sexton will also support the application. She is mindful that the site is located in an industrial park and this use mirrors the use of the previous tenant. She shares Vice Chairman Purtill's concern about over-paving, but under the circumstances, with peak times during the winter, she does not think that the grass paving suggestion is possible. The applicant has demonstrated that they need this parking during the peak time.

Vice Chairman Purtill thinks that the pavement is excessive, so she cannot support the application. Commissioner Shaw appreciates the additional information that the Commission received tonight, but he is still uncomfortable with the tractor trailer traffic. Even if the state is okay with it, as a resident of Glastonbury, he is not, so he will vote against the application. Chairman Zanolungo will vote in favor of the application because he believes that it is a reinvestment in the site. The traffic by the prior use was heavy and Ms. Schumer's comments about the calculating software for drivers should help assuage that concern. He appreciates Mr. Pennington's questions and the applicant's clarifications. He then noted that the applicant still has to receive the OSTA permit, which will serve as a final check on this project.

Result: Motion passed unanimously {4-2-0}, with Commissioners Shaw and Purtill opposing. Commissioner Sexton voted in place of Commissioner Hassett.

2. Request of William M. Dufford for modification to condition #4 of the River Road Subdivision Phase 3 approval to allow screening on-site – 107 Dufford's Landing – Rural Residence Zone POSTPONED

REGULAR MEETING

1. Informal session for the purpose of hearing from citizens on Regular Meeting agenda or non-agenda

There were no comments.

Chairman Zanolungo stated that they have received additional emails from citizens on the Town Center project. He summarized them into the record as follows:

Virginia Shepard of 46 Tall Timbers Lane, sent her letter to Commissioner Purtill, which stated that the number of proposed parking spaces is about 100 too short. She asked if children will be living at the site, and if so, where the playground is in the plans. She is worried about parking and raised the question of what would happen if there were a flood and parking would be underwater.

Pat Heiss (no address reported), believes that the building is too large and hideous. She also has traffic concerns and stated that a lot of commercial real estate in Town is currently empty.

Casey Petruzzi of 56 Shipman Drive, is in favor of the project. She thinks that it will fit the aesthetic of the region and will help grow the economy, but the Town should offer affordable housing for younger and more diverse residents. She also suggested adding commuter bus options.

Gloria Jainchill of 650 Neipsic Road, is opposed to such a dense proposal in a quaint area of Town.

Bette Pisarski of 270 Overlook Road, spoke about the historic significance of the area. She believes that traffic will be a nightmare, as parking is already hard to find. She called Somerset Square an ugly skeleton and a commercial disaster. Any decision on this proposal should be widely debated.

2. Acceptance of Minutes of the April 20, 2021 Regular Meeting

Motion by: Commissioner Griffin

Seconded by: Commissioner Sexton

Result: Minutes were accepted unanimously {6-0-0}. Commissioner Sexton voted in Commissioner Hassett's place, since she was present at the meeting and he was not.

3. Section 8-24 Connecticut General Statutes Referral from the Town Council regarding the potential purchase of a 0.2-acre State-owned parcel to create a gravel parking area for access to the Town's former Wright parcel and the Shenipsit Trail

Mr. Mullen explained that the site is currently owned by the State of Connecticut, surrounded by telecommunications carriers. The proposal is to purchase the lot and to support the newly acquired open space across the road. It is compliant with the POCD goals.

Motion by: Secretary Botelho

Seconded by: Commissioner Griffin

RESOLVED, that the Plan and Zoning Commission of the Town of Glastonbury forwards a favorable recommendation, pursuant to Section 8-24 of the General Statutes of Connecticut, regarding the following: Purchase of a 0.2-acre site owned by the State of Connecticut located on the east side of Birch Mountain Road approximately 920 feet south of the intersection of Birch Mountain Road and Horizon Lane. This action is pursuant to Section 8-24 of the General Statutes of Connecticut as the purchase of this parcel is consistent with the policies of the Town of Glastonbury Plan of Conservation and Development.

Result: Motion passed unanimously {6-0-0}.

4. CONSENT CALENDAR

a. Scheduling of Public Hearings for Regular Meeting of May 18, 2021:

- i. Request of William M. Dufford for modification to condition #4 of the River Road Subdivision Phase 3 approval to allow screening on-site – 107 Dufford’s Landing – Rural Residence Zone

Motion by: Chairman Zanolungo

Seconded by: Commissioner Griffin

Result: Consent calendar was approved unanimously {6-0-0}.

5. Chairman’s Report None

6. Report from Community Development Staff

Ms. Augur stated that she and Mr. Mullen will soon present to the Commission some information regarding the Town Council’s referral for village district regulations in the area of the Town Center.

Motion by: Vice Chairman Purtill

Seconded by: Commissioner Griffin

MOVED, that the Glastonbury Town Plan and Zoning Commission adjourn their regular meeting of May 4, 2021 at 8:46 P.M.

Result: Motion was passed unanimously {6-0-0}.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lilly Torosyan

Lilly Torosyan

Recording Clerk