

**GLASTONBURY TOWN COUNCIL  
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES  
TUESDAY, MAY 25, 2021**

The Glastonbury Town Council with Town Manager, Richard J. Johnson, in attendance, held a Regular Meeting at 7:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers of Town Hall at 2155 Main Street, with an option for attendance 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  
Ms. Deborah A. Carroll  
Mr. White Osgood  
Dr. Stewart Beckett III  
Ms. Mary LaChance  
Mr. Kurt P. Cavanaugh  
Mr. Jacob McChesney  
Ms. Lillian Tanski

**a. Pledge of Allegiance**

***Led by Dr. Beckett***

Chairman Gullotta called for a moment of silent prayer and reflection for the Connecticut residents lost to COVID-19 this past year and thanked all of the essential workers who enabled society to go on during the pandemic.

**2. Public Comment.**

Mr. Niland opened the floor for in-person attendees to comment.

***Shawnee Baldwin of 57 Nuthatch Knob***, spoke on the Glastonbury Pollinator Pathway program and its importance in creating pollinator-friendly habitats. She asked the Council to support the program's efforts by planting native species in Town-owned properties.

Mr. Niland invited online attendees to comment.

***Lisa Eldridge of 108 South Mill Drive***, is a part of the Pollinator Pathway, which started in September. They are trying to get the word out to as many community members as possible about the importance of native plants and pollinators. They were excited to hear that councilman McChesney wanted to speak with the Council about planting native species on town property. She then identified a few possible areas where that could be done.

Ms. Carroll read the written comments received, as listed on the Town website.

***Raven Cauthon of 1212 Main Street***, stated that her residence is one of the historical homes on the east side of the Route 17 roadway. As she stated at the Council meeting of January 26, she is extremely concerned with the Town's proposal to move the roadway even closer to her and her neighbors' homes, citing concerns about safety, damage to the old oak tree outside her home, and the negative impact on property values. She supports only the option to construct sidewalks on the west side of the roadway, if at all, and asked that the Town consider the same.

***Kristi Vitelli of 9 Martin Terrace***, supports using Town-owned land for planting native plants because they provide food and housing for native pollinators, which are in danger of extinction due to loss of habitat. Native plants are maintenance-free, once established. By replacing areas covered in turf grass, which requires fossil fuels to maintain and is like a dead desert for pollinators, native plants help preserve pollinators, help crops that need pollinating, and use less fossil fuel by mowing less turf.

***Kim McClain of 212 Sunset Drive***, expressed her enthusiastic support for the Town's efforts to adopt a resolution to implement a Pollinator Pathway program. This effort should be promoted in the deliberations of town commissions that affect land use, including Parks & Recreation, the TPZ, the Beautification Committee, and the Conservation Commission. She then cited the Town of Windham's resolution which could serve as a model for Glastonbury.

***Andrew Van Ostrand of 1278 Main Street***, also opposes the construction of sidewalks on the eastern side of the roadway at Route 17 for many of the same reasons Ms. Cauthon voiced. He understands that connecting the sidewalk on the west side will require an expensive retaining wall, but it will increase safety and walkability. He urged the Council to consider this option only.

***Eugene Hickey of 1200 Main Street***, is against the option of moving Route 17 up to 9 feet on the east side because it will bring a busy highway to their homes. Moving the curb line will mean the removal of two trees in front of his historical home, which act as beautiful buffers to the highway. He is also opposed to constructing sidewalks on the eastern side with an additional crosswalk. He noted that at the Council meeting of January 26, it was stated that details regarding locating poles and wires would be provided before a decision is made. He asked if this has been done, and if it entails an expense to homeowners who are generally responsible for electrical work between the street and house.

After technical difficulties, Mr. Niland resumed comments from online attendees.

***Anne Bowman of 62 Morgan Drive***, thanked Mr. McChesney for his interest in native plant landscaping. She supports increasing native plant landscaping on Town-owned mowed lands by planting pollinator pathways. Replacing road lands with native plants provides habitats for bees, butterflies, hummingbirds, and other pollinating insects and wildlife. She would rather see flowers being pollinated than grass being mowed on town property.

***Bruce Bowman of 62 Morgan Drive***, is also in favor of pollinator pathways. This important project reflects climate change and human intervention with use of pesticides and herbicides.

Having a pollinator pathway plan in town is one of the Sustainable CT recommendations. In 2018, Glastonbury achieved the highest status of Solar in this program, and he would like the Town to lead by example in mitigating climate change which is having a significant impact. He welcomes the consideration to support the pollinator pathway project on town properties and encourages the Town to identify a sustainability team and develop the goal of being a greener community.

*Tracy Kavanaugh of 429 Thompson Street*, helped start the Glastonbury Pollinator Pathway Program, which has already garnered over 100 members. She would like the Town to join in on the existing enthusiasm and interest from citizens on creating pollinator habitats. She noted that her organization would be excited to help out with putting in meadows around town that have to do with native plants.

**3. Special Reports.                   None**

**4. Old Business.**

**a. Discussion and possible action concerning new sidewalk construction.  
(Tabled from May 11, 2021 meeting).**

Mr. Johnson explained that, absent the Main Street project for which there is \$750,000, an additional \$495,000 will be available for additional sidewalk construction. The Spring Street project design is underway. They looked to move forward with connecting Spring Street and Bantle Road, with a cost of \$325,000. He asked if the Council would like to continue with that option. He reviewed other options to consider, such as connecting to the trailhead on House Street and Overlook Road up to the intersection of Route 17, Main Street, and Buttonball Lane. This would leave about \$52,000, which could be allocated to Main Street next year, pending a public hearing. In terms of next steps, Mr. Johnson stated that they could get the aforementioned sidewalks to the design level, then schedule a public hearing for construction approval.

Mr. Cavanaugh would like to see a sidewalk on Douglas Road. He asked how an exit ramp and a new sidewalk off Route 17 would impact that option. Mr. Johnson stated that the roundabout will be a little further southeast from this intersection, so they do not see an issue there. Dr. Beckett suggested Ripley Road for consideration instead of Douglas Road because, for the same budget, it would give better utilization as more people would use that sidewalk. Mr. Niland stated that Manchester Road deserves to be high up on the matrix for consideration because it connects to a large tract of land which includes parks, retail, and churches. He then asked if the sidewalks on Bantle Road would become the responsibility of the town to clear because the homeowners do not really have access, even though they abut it. Mr. Johnson explained that there are at least two homes that have no frontage on Bantle Road.

The Council agreed to schedule the public hearing on the Main Street sidewalk on their June 22, 2021 meeting.

**Motion by:** Mr. Osgood

**Seconded by:** Ms. Carroll

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby proceeds with sidewalk construction on Bantle Road, Spring Street, and the connection between Overlook Road and Buttonball Lane and House Street.

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

**5. New Business.**

**a. Review of meeting protocols (follow up to May 11, 2021 discussion).**

**Motion by:** Dr. Beckett

**Seconded by:** Ms. Carroll

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby amends their mask protocol to allow all those in attendance in Council Chambers to take off their masks, if they are fully vaccinated and feel comfortable doing so.

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

Mr. McChesney explained that he and Ms. Tanski met last week as the Rules of Procedure subcommittee to discuss changes to the rules to allow for council members to participate remotely. The public comment format will continue as it has been done for the past year, accepting both written and remote comments, as well as resuming in-person participation. Ms. Tanski thinks it is wonderful that they will be able to keep in place both Zoom and written public comment, which have increased public input, interest, and participation. Mr. McChesney noted that there is additional language regarding behavior during Council meetings, which is a holdover from over a year ago.

Mr. Niland stated that there were discussions on whether or not travel would be accepted as a viable reason for council members to participate remotely. He would like to include it because it is better to have as many council members participating as possible. Mr. McChesney explained that travel was originally a condition, but their understanding was that they are making a substantial change to their procedures because of this public health crisis. Business/personal travel have already been a consideration for council members for decades, so he did not feel it comfortable to include now.

Ms. Tanski clarified that the public could still participate remotely. This discussion is regarding participation of council members. Dr. Beckett supports the travel addition. Ms. LaChance as well, adding that it is better to have more voices, regardless of whether the reason is illness, injury, or travel. Mr. Osgood supports Mr. Niland's suggestion to add travel to section 3 of the Rules of Procedure. He travels for business often, on relatively short notice, so it would be nice to still be able to participate. There are occasions when he can only communicate via phone, without video access, so he also suggested deleting the provision mandating video conferencing.

Ms. Carroll agreed that including travel is helpful, however, she is against changing the “viewed and heard” language to only “heard” because it is respectful to show the public their faces. She also added that, instead of four members, that the number of council members participating via video conferencing at any point in time be limited to three members. This is to ensure that there is always a supermajority of members in person. Mr. McChesney is not opposed to that change, but he is concerned that, in the event that multiple council members need to be remote, they might encounter a situation where only the first three who got to it first would have the opportunity to participate. Ms. Carroll pointed out that all council members make their best effort to attend meetings. Therefore, the fear that there is going to be an exodus of council members from in-person meetings to remote is misplaced; in the unlikely event that it does happen, they could revisit the parameters at that time. Dr. Beckett does not feel comfortable placing a limitation on remote participation and penalizing people for not coming in. Mr. McChesney agreed, noting that their Rules of Procedure has language denoting the expectation that such participation will be limited in duration and occurrence.

Mr. Niland stated that the world has changed, but the technology has also changed from when the rules were written 40 years ago. As Mr. Johnson pointed out, FOI has not visited this issue since 1980, when the dominant technology was telephone. Because they now have the technology to make remote participation possible, if needed, Mr. Niland believes that they should take advantage of it. To not do so would be short-sighted. He added that, should any technical issues occur, on either the Town or the remote person’s side, it is their risk, and the meeting will proceed as planned. He suggested adding this language to the Rules of Procedure.

Mr. McChesney pointed out that a potential issue would be if there are technical difficulties experienced on the Town’s end which would make it impossible for a citizen to speak remotely during a public hearing. He agreed with Mr. Niland’s suggestion that participation will be at the risk of the remote participant. Regarding video participation, Mr. McChesney wondered whether they would encounter a problem from FOI if they allowed non-video participation by council members. Mr. Johnson explained that the FOI’s last ruling from 1980 requires that the public be able to adequately hear and verify the identity of all participants in procedures. Mr. Osgood asked if, during the public comment session, the public has to be on video. Ms. Tanski stated that the public is not subject to the same FOI requirements as the Council is, as members of a governmental body.

**Motion by:** Ms. Carroll

**Seconded by:** Mr. Osgood

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby accepts the changes in the document regarding meeting guidelines.

**Amendment by:** Mr. Niland

**Seconded by:** Ms. Carroll

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby amends Section 14 of the Rules of Procedure, Under “Remote Participation,” subsection 3, to read as follows: “Remote participation is generally contemplated for illness, injury, public health considerations, **travel**,

and similar reasons. The expectation is that such participation will be limited in duration and occurrence."

**Result:** Motion passed {6-3-0}, with Mr. McChesney, Ms. Tanski, and Mr. Gullotta opposed.

**Amendment by:** Mr. Niland

**Seconded by:** Ms. Carroll

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby amends Section 14 of the Rules of Procedure, Under "Remote Participation," subsection 4, to read as follows: "Absent extenuating circumstances, attendance by video conference shall be limited to **three** members at any in-person meeting."

**Disc:** Mr. McChesney agrees with Mr. Osgood that four members is acceptable, but he will support this change to three members. Mr. Gullotta will vote for this because he feels much more comfortable that 6 council members will face the public on any given night on any given issue.

**Result:** Motion passed {5-4-0}, with Mr. Osgood, Dr. Beckett, Mr. Cavanaugh, and Ms. Tanski voting against.

**Amendment by:** Mr. Niland

**Seconded by:** Ms. Carroll

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby amends Section 14 of the Rules of Procedure, Under "Remote Participation," to add subsection 6, to read as follows: "Regarding technical issues, the Council meeting will go on, regardless of the ability to participate via video conferencing."

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

**Amendment by:** Mr. Osgood

**Seconded by:** Dr. Beckett

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby amends the heading under "Remote Participation" to delete the words "video conferencing," and under section 1, to delete the word "viewed." For verification of identity, council members can provide their driver's license to the Town Manager ahead of the meeting.

**Disc:** Mr. Osgood explained that the effect of his participation is basically the same, whether or not people can see his face. Mr. Cavanaugh stated that he will not give his license number or other personal information to anyone to do this. He likes the ability to be able to phone in. He asked if the identity information that the public needs to provide in order to access the Zoom meetings is not identifiable enough. Mr. Johnson stated that it depends on how the Council chooses to proceed. They could come up with some type of ID or code, which would be unique to each meeting and limited to council members.

Ms. Carroll's objection to this is purely philosophical. There is a humanity to having their faces out there, and she is not comfortable with removing the video provision. Dr. Beckett noted that,

during CRCOG meetings, several members had broadband limitations that did not allow them to both speak and be viewed on Zoom. He also does not anticipate anyone changing their voice and pretending to be someone else while calling in. Ms. Tanski stated that the word “identifiable” should be flagged because it comes from FOI. Members of the public should be able to identify who is participating remotely. Mr. Gullotta responded that they would continue to announce themselves and their title before speaking, as has been the procedure thus far during Zoom meetings. Mr. Johnson pointed out that the Executive Order did not indicate that the meeting had to be held via conference, video, or other technology. His understanding is that a lot of this language is going to be updated and codified by FOI.

Mr. McChesney proposed an amendment to the amendment, to add the following language to the section:

***Amendment by:*** Mr. McChesney

***Seconded by:*** Mr. Osgood

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby amends Section 14 of the Rules of Procedure, Under “Remote Participation,” subsection 3 and subsection 1 to read as follows:

For (part of) subsection 3: "The expectation is that such participation will be limited in duration and occurrence. **Additionally, the expectation is that Council Members participating remotely will, as much as possible, participate via video conferencing.**"

subsection 1: "Members participating by video conference can be **identified** and heard by other Council Members and the public attending in person and by video conference."

***Result:*** Motion passed {7-2-0} with Ms. Carroll and Mr. Gullotta voting against.

***Result of original motion:*** Motion passed {8-1-0}, with Mr. Gullotta voting against.

## **PUBLIC HEARING AND ACTION ON PUBLIC HEARING – 8:00 P.M.**

### **NO 1 ACTION TO CONSIDER FUNDING TO SUPPORT PURCHASE OF THE LOMBARDO FARM BY THE MANCHESTER LAND CONSERVATION TRUST - \$34,000.**

***Motion by:*** Ms. Carroll

***Seconded by:*** Mr. Osgood

*BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves a \$34,000 appropriation and transfer from Capital Projects – Land Acquisition to support purchase by the Manchester Land Conservation Trust of the 102-acre Lombardo Farm located in Manchester and Glastonbury, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated May 21, 2021 and as recommended by the Town Plan and Zoning Commission and Board of Finance.*

*BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, Council approval is subject to the Manchester Land Conservation Trust granting a permanent conservation easement to Glastonbury over the Lombardo Farm and Bush Hill Preserve Open Space located in Glastonbury.*

**Disc:** Mr. Johnson explained that the Manchester Land Trust has asked Glastonbury to contribute the purchase price for the two acres located in Glastonbury of the 102-acre Lombardo Farm to be purchased by the Trust for open space preservation. The contribution would be for \$34,000. The land trust will purchase the entire parcel for \$1.7 million but is currently \$300,000 shy of meeting the total. The deadline to acquire funds is June 30. There was a concern expressed at the last Council meeting on whether the Town could own the two acres, but Mr. Johnson explained that that is not possible, given the timeframe of the closing. However, the Manchester Land Trust is prepared to issue a permanent conservation easement to the Town, with the requirement that the parcels will be preserved as open space. Mr. Johnson has reviewed their draft and thinks it to be well worded to protect open space. The land trust has made a good faith effort to respond to the Town's ownership, and they will make sure that the closing is going forward before the Town contributes the \$34,000.

The Chairman opened the floor. There were no comments from the public.

Mr. Osgood supports the contribution to this very significant land purchase, given that it will preserve open land on the edge of Glastonbury, and he is sure that if they had notified residents of the abutting property, they would have supported it, as well. Mr. McChesney asked what the effect of the easement will be. Mr. Johnson explained that the easement will cover 7 acres: two acres of the Lombardo Farm and the 5 acres that were previously purchased, of Bush Hill Preserve. The easement purpose is to ensure that the property be retained in its forested, natural farm condition. This easement has legal standing that prevents any uses of the property that are inconsistent with open space and preservation. It is permanent and runs with the land.

Mr. Niland agreed with Dr. Beckett and Mr. Osgood that this is a fantastic opportunity for Glastonbury. He supports open space, and he welcomes the opportunity to work in conjunction with Manchester as good neighbors. Ms. Tanski does not support this motion because town dollars should go to town purchases and services. In this case, they are offered an opportunity to make a contribution to a private non-profit effort. It is not a precedent that should be returned to Glastonbury. Mr. McChesney stated that, initially, he felt similarly to Ms. Tanski, but he was comfortable with the easement. He is happy that it will be extended to the five acres, as well. Mr. Gullotta stated that he, too, initially agreed with Ms. Tanski, but now, the easement assures him that the money Glastonbury is contributing is for Glastonbury land and keeping the land available to the public in perpetuity.

**Result:** Motion was passed unanimously {7-2-0} with Ms. Tanski and Mr. Cavanaugh voting against.



**b. Discussion and possible action concerning Main Street sidewalks – Phase III  
– Cider Mill to Red Hill Drive.**

Chairman Gullotta stated that no action is scheduled for tonight. They are still searching for a solution that is acceptable.

Mr. Johnson explained that this is the proposed third phase of the sidewalk construction project. In January, they held a public information hearing and invited property owners along both sides to discuss various options. In February, there was a suggestion to not move the roadway to the east as much as possible. Mr. Johnson noted that he sent a letter to property owners advising them of tonight's discussion on this matter. He also advised that action was not scheduled for the May 25<sup>th</sup> meeting and that he expected the Council to schedule a public information hearing and that construction would not proceed until 2022, subject to approval of the project.

Mr. Pennington, Town Engineer, explained that there are a number of design challenges, with respect to the options presented. In addition to challenging soil conditions, they have had to consider that there are homes located at the top of the slope and there is high traffic on Route 17 at the slope. He presented an overview of the old methods they went over during January's meeting.

The large wall option consists of installing a retaining wall of about 9 feet, which would be constructed on the west side of Main Street. The conventional methodology of bottom-up construction is not possible. They have investigated and identified some top-down methodologies, which are specialized and more expensive. One is a soil nail type of construction. The large wall option presents some challenges, but it is possible.

The other alternative was the road shift option. They would still construct the sidewalk on the west side, but where the gutter line exists right now. The third option they briefly discussed was outright sidewalk construction on the east side, which would involve no road shift. However, it was generally agreed that that was not an advisable option. Two crossing points would be necessary, and it still would not be very safe. Therefore, they have not pursued that option with the Department of Transportation. Primarily for safety reasons, staff is not recommending that that option be pursued.

Mr. Pennington then reviewed new information. He noted that the Council asked to look into a hybrid option, which would consist of constructing a smaller wall on the west side, hopefully bypassing some of the special wall constructions, combined with a road shift that is less than the pure road shift option. His concern was that excavating even two or three feet into the slope might create instability into the entire area. An analysis was conducted that proved that to be true. They do not recommend pursuing that option.

Mr. Pennington explained that they came up with another hybrid option, which would involve the construction of a small fill wall, but they do not need to cut into the slope. They would fill the wall, blend into the slope behind it, and construct the sidewalk on top of it. With an elevated sidewalk, they would need a safety rail. In his configuration, he showed a fence on top of the

wall. With this material, it enhances the stability of the existing slope, and there is no safety risk. The fill wall requires the road being moved, but it pushes the easterly curb line out only 6 feet, possibly a little less, not the 9 feet that is associated with the full road shift option. This option has not yet been discussed with the Department of Transportation.

Mr. Gullotta asked about the cost differences of all of the options. Mr. Pennington stated that they are all design concepts, but all of them run in the \$800,000 to \$1 million range. The Council agreed to forgo discussion of the east side construction option, which Town staff does not recommend. Ms. LaChance asked how high the walkway would go. Mr. Pennington stated that it is roughly 3.5 feet above the roadway, and there would be handrails. Mr. McChesney asked if there is any way to not do a road shift. Mr. Pennington stated that any construction on the west side gets into the slope. Mr. McChesney asked how far the proposed wall is from the existing curb. Mr. Pennington stated that the face of it would be about 5 or 6 feet, hence the need for the 6-foot shift. It could slide a little bit to the west, but they need to have those discussions with the Department of Transportation.

Dr. Beckett appreciates the concern for safety and finds this to be a great solution. He asked what the preferred methodology would be for removing snow. Mr. Pennington stated that that is something they will have to consider. Ms. Carroll thanked Mr. Pennington for returning again and doing a deep dive on what their options are. She also finds this option to be flexible and very promising. They are finally heading in the right direction. Mr. Osgood asked if there is a way to start construction this year. Mr. Pennington stated that it is not a realistic possibility, but they hope to move along as quickly as possible to start in 2022.

Mr. Cavanaugh would like to consider all three options presented at another public information hearing. He finds it important to include discussion of the top-down option because it is the only one that does not involve shifting the roadway. Mr. Pennington clarified that under any option which includes a road shift, there are no takings of private property proposed. Any road shift and expansion to the east would be within the existing state roadway. Ms. Tanski would like more information on the risk posed by soils on the slope of the easterly side. Mr. McChesney favors taking out the top-down option, but he noted that there is always a third option, which is that the Council does not vote on it.

**Motion by:** Ms. Carroll

**Seconded by:** Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby present all three options recommended for discussion by the Town Engineer concerning the Main Street sidewalks in a public hearing.

**Disc:** Ms. Carroll stated that, even if one of these is patently unviable because of safety, it is appropriate to look at all of the options as a point of comparison. Ms. Tanski agreed and requested more detailed information about the soils and possible risks for the edification of the community. Mr. Cavanaugh asked for pictures/videos of the top-down construction. Mr. Pennington agreed to provide them at the next hearing.

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

**c. Action on Town Attorney and Alternate Town Attorney – extend term of appointment.**

**Motion by:** Ms. Carroll

**Seconded by:** Mr. Osgood

*BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby extends the current term for Town Attorney - Shipman & Goodwin and Alternate Town Attorney - Murtha Cullina through June 30, 2022, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated May 21, 2021.*

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

**d. Action on residential lease renewal of town-owned property at 35 Bell Street (lease expires June 21, 2021).**

**Motion by:** Ms. Carroll

**Seconded by:** Mr. Osgood

*BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves a one (1) year extension in the residential lease for town-owned property at 35 Bell Street, effective June 22, 2021 through June 21, 2022, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated May 21, 2021.*

**Disc:** Chairman Gullotta asked what the square footage is on the second floor. Mr. Johnson replied, approximately 2,000 square feet.

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

**6. Consent Calendar.**

**a. Action to transfer uncollected taxes to Suspense List - \$170,877.73.**

**Motion by:** Ms. Carroll

**Seconded by:** Mr. Osgood

*BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves the transfer of \$170,877.73 of uncollected taxes to the Suspense List, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated May 21, 2021 and recommended by the Board of Finance.*

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

**b. Action on proposal for the 2021 Neighborhood Assistance Act Program (set public hearing).**

**Motion by:** Ms. Carroll

**Seconded by:** Mr. Osgood

*BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby schedules a public hearing for 8:00 p.m. on Tuesday, June 8, 2021 on the proposals submitted by The Maffe Foundation, Connecticut River Valley Chamber of Commerce and Town of Glastonbury – Open Space Land*

*Acquisition Fund under the 2021 Neighborhood Assistance Act Program, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated May 21, 2021.*

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

## **7. Town Manager's Report.**

Mr. Johnson received notice of a timber harvest. The state has scheduled a public walk on Friday, June 4 from 4:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. He has suggested that that might not be the best time, but he awaits a response. They have posted the walk information on the Town website. Town offices will reopen on June 1, with some limits on attendance, particularly at certain locations, like the community center. He noted that there was a discussion to hold a capital improvement planning workshop in the fall. At J. B. Williams Park, they have plans to upgrade the appearance this fall by regrading and resurfacing the parking lot. The Memorial Day Parade will be held next Monday at 9:00 a.m. Mr. Johnson provided the Council with a copy of the American Rescue Plan Act. Next meeting, they will discuss how those monies will be allocated. He also provided a report on the tailgating issue.

In regard to some of the public comments made tonight, Mr. Johnson stated that they are looking into pursuing the pollinator pathways and native plantings initiative in town-owned properties. Native plantings are relatively common for town projects, and both the Conservation Commission and the Beautification Committee emphasize it. Mr. McChesney stated that he has spoken to a number of people in town who are interested in the pollinator issue. He has done work to bring more native plants to his property and thinks that the Town would benefit from doing the same. Helping to maintain Glastonbury's ecosystem is also part of the Town's POCD goals. He hopes that a public-private partnership on this will be pursued.

Mr. Cavanaugh believes that there needs to be a review of their zoning regulations, as it applies to design standards. Coventry has a very specific design standard. He asked Mr. Johnson to provide that to the Council at the next meeting. He also noted that the hallway in Town Hall this evening looks great. Mr. Cavanaugh then asked if the intersection of Wickham Road and Neipsic Road could be cleaned out as part of the J.B. Williams Park project. Mr. Johnson stated that it should be on the list already, but they will take a look at. Mr. Cavanaugh noted that they have received a letter from Mr. Geer regarding the water situation in the Chestnut Hill area. He asked if they are certain that the information from the state is not disclosed to the public. Mr. Johnson stated that is correct, the statute states that it is not disclosable. However, he does not recall seeing the letter, but he will take a look.

Mr. Gullotta asked if there is any update on the restoration of the Cotton Hollow mill walls. Mr. Johnson has reached out to the fundraisers with a request to get together to talk about where they are. He has also met the new owners of the residential property on Cotton Hollow, and they were very supportive of what the Town is doing to preserve the walls. Mr. McChesney pointed out that, on the homepage of the Town website, pictures always look fuzzy. Mr. Johnson will check on that.

**8. Committee Reports.**  
**a. Chairman's Report.**

Chairman Gullotta stated that each council member tonight received a box of strawberries from Dr. Beckett's farm, which are available for purchase at the self-service stand.

**b. MDC.**            *None*

**c. CRCOG.**

Dr. Beckett discussed the inland rail improvement study that CRCOG sponsored to connect rail lines across the state. Part of it entails a push to finish construction of the Hartford Line. They project an added 80,000 to 100,000 jobs to construct these rail lines, which would benefit both commuters and professionals looking to move into the area.

**d. Rules of Procedure Subcommittee.**

- **Action on amendments to Council Rules of Procedure.**

*Motion by:* Ms. Carroll

*Seconded by:* Mr. Osgood

*BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves amendments to the Council Rules of Procedure as recommended by the Rules of Procedure Subcommittee, as described in the Subcommittee Report dated May 21, 2021.*

**Result:** Motion was passed {8-1-0} with Mr. Gullotta voting against. Discussion and actions were taken during Item 5A.

**9. Communications.**            *None*

**10. Minutes.**

**a. Minutes of May 11, 2021 Regular Meeting.**

*Motion by:* Ms. Carroll

*Seconded by:* Mr. Osgood

**Result:** Minutes were accepted unanimously {9-0-0}.

**11. Appointments and Resignations.**

**a. Resignation of Gilbert Spencer from the Fire Commission (R-2021).**

*Motion by:* Ms. Carroll

*Seconded by:* Mr. Osgood

**Disc:** Dr. Beckett noted that the resignation is effective as of June 25, 2021.

**Result:** The resignation was unanimously accepted with regret {9-0-0}.

**12. Executive Session.** *None*

**13. Adjournment**

Meeting adjourned at 9:50 p.m.

**Respectfully submitted,**

**Lilly Torosyan**

**Lilly Torosyan**

**Recording Clerk**

**Thomas Gullotta**

**Chairman**