

**GLASTONBURY TOWN COUNCIL  
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES  
TUESDAY, JUNE 22, 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 through 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 {participated via video conferencing}  
Mr. Kurt P. Cavanaugh  
Mr. Jacob McChesney  
Ms. Lillian Tanski

**a. Pledge of Allegiance** *Led by Police Chief Porter*

**2. Public Comment.**

**a. Recognition of Dr. Michael Lepore – Glastonbury Poet Laureate 2018-2021.**

Chairman Gullotta introduced Dr. Lepore, the Poet Laureate and former Town Councilmember, read and presented the Council Resolution honoring Dr. Lepore. On behalf of the citizens of Glastonbury, the Council thanked Dr. Lepore for his many years of service to the Town, in his many capacities, most notably, as Poet Laureate. Dr. Lepore thanked the Council for the recognition, then read one of his poems.

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

***Stephan Maksymiuk of 245 Forest Lane***, stated that his 10 year old son was harassed by a passing vehicle while on his bicycle. He does not know who the harassers were, but he is not happy with the growing level of crime in town, and he asked that the Council lead the way to curb this problem.

***Jennifer Sanford of 157 Candlelight Drive***, is also concerned about the growth of criminal activity. She was a victim of a car theft on May 25, which is still pending a resolution with her insurance company. She asked the Council to enact a public crime dashboard or website and to

hold public informational meetings for residents. She urged the Council to amend their letter to the Governor to ask for a panel to study the true benefits of criminal reform because they need better metrics.

***Kristin M Bourbeau of 905 Tryon Street***, is extremely concerned about safety, so she supports the effort to improve the situation on car thefts. She proposed that residents get involved by going down to state government offices to make their voices heard. She left a signup sheet for her email, [safestreetsglastonbury@gmail.com](mailto:safestreetsglastonbury@gmail.com), and offered to help in any way that she can. She stated that it seems to be minors who are committing most of these crimes.

***John Cavanna of Cavanna's Farm on 80 Woodland Street***, stated that these crimes are committed by minors who know that they can get away with it because Connecticut laws allow them to. As a former police officer, he stated that he has seen their behavior firsthand and these minors will shoot people if they must. The Police Accountability Act has had a chilling effect throughout the state. He urged people to get involved at the state legislature level.

***Kristine Vitelli at 9 Martin Terrace***, thanked the Council on behalf of TALK (Truth in Action with Love and Kindness) for the last 15 months of volunteering their time and talents to serve Glastonbury.

***Anne Bowman of 62 Morgan Drive***, voiced her support for the community survey of the Commission on Racial Justice and Equity. She encouraged everyone to complete the survey because it will help them gauge what Glastonbury needs to do to become a more affordable, accessible place to live for all.

***Bruce Bowman of 62 Morgan Drive***, thanked the BOE members for their vision, mission statements, strategic goals, and hard work throughout the past 15 months. He also thanked the Commission on Racial Justice and Equity and hopes that it will become a permanent commission. He also supports their survey.

***John Porriello of 567 Main Street***, stated that he was almost hit head-on by some car thieves, and his girlfriend's car was also broken into in December. This situation was created and continues to be enabled by state legislators. He suggested sending out an alert to everybody in the area to get off the road, in the event of a police chase. He also implored Representative Barry to restore the law to where it was years ago when juvenile criminals were put in juvenile detention centers.

***Jennifer Jennings of 34 Cranesbill Drive***, stated that there have been multiple break-ins in garages in her neighborhood over the past few months. She asked the Council to handle this problem of criminal activity at the local level because it is not being addressed at the state level.

***Susan Pearlman of 35 Bunker Hill Road***, is the Chairman of the Welles-Turner Library Board, and she supports the resolution to recognize Dr. Lepore's work and expresses the library board's gratitude for his service as the last Poet Laureate. She also thanked him for his effort to establish the poet laureate position in 2015 and for bringing poetry to their community.

**Deb Murray at 102 Thompson Street**, stated that, several years ago, she was discouraged by police from trying to press charges on the person who broke into her car because the burglar was a single mother. Recently, there was another attempt in her neighborhood. Social media has become very violent, with commentary about the rising number of people going out to get guns. She urged the Council to think about the children in town who are put at risk by this worrisome criminal behavior.

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

**Maria Taylor of 228 Main Street**, voiced her disgust with all of the car thefts and garage break-ins in town. In August, she was a victim of such a crime during broad daylight while both she and her husband were home. She noted that in a recent incident in Wethersfield, when the homeowners called the police to report the incident, they were told that there was nothing they could do and to call their legislators. She asked what the Council and the Glastonbury Police Department are doing to protect people and property in town. She stated that there needs to be a more visible police presence in town 24/7, and suspicious activity should be investigated and stopped before a crime occurs, or someone is killed.

Mr. Niland opened the floor for comments from Zoom attendees.

**Samantha Lombardo of 17 Lakewood Road**, reiterated the comments made by others on the lack of safety in town. While she felt safe growing up in Glastonbury, she does not feel safe anymore. She stated that this issue of rising car thefts and garage/home break-ins needs to be addressed by the Council and the state legislature.

- 3. **Special Reports.** *None*
- 4. **Old Business.** *None*
- 5. **New Business.**
  - a. **Action to establish Special Revenue Fund – Early Childhood Learning Center.** *Tabled to July 13, 2021.*
  - b. **Action on letter to Governor Lamont and State Legislators concerning car thefts and related issues.**

Mr. Johnson explained that tonight’s letter was drafted at the request of the Council to supplement the letter sent to State Legislators in late January. He explained that Chief Porter will present information incorporating and addressing some of the points brought up during the public comment session.

Police Chief Porter addressed the issue of accessibility of information on crime rates. He explained that the Glastonbury Police Department uses a data mining program. They are working with IT to get it up on their website soon. Motor vehicle thefts have gone up across the board,

with the outlier of 2019. This problem is not unique to Glastonbury; it is happening statewide and nationwide. The potential causes seem to be a combination of the pandemic, the economy, a lack of or loss of juvenile outreach programs, the technology of key FOBs, and budget and resource limitations in public safety. The solvability rate of motor vehicle crimes is very low, so it is difficult to make concrete definitive causations.

Chief Porter explained that a small group of juveniles are responsible for most of these crimes, and they cannot be detained unless the most serious circumstances exist. 58% of those arrested for these crimes are aged 20 or younger. About 90% of the vehicles are recovered out of town. There is no predictability of these crimes by location or hour. The Chief noted that the criminals are not afraid of encountering residents or even police; they stay in the area. State policy prevents chasing them when they have committed only property crimes, such as stealing vehicles. However, Town officers do intercept several crimes before they happen. They also do a lot of community engagement with social media blasts and meeting with concerned residents. Chief Porter explained that they have worked with surrounding towns in setting up bait cars, which met no success.

The state has not put the necessary systems and programs in place for these minors to stop this behavior. Mr. Cavanaugh attributes this rise in crime due to the enactment of the Second Chance Society Act plus the Police Accountability Act. Chief Porter explained that, regardless of state legislature, the Glastonbury Police Department investigates cases fully. While their clearance and arrest rate numbers are low, Glastonbury's numbers are higher than the average. Mr. Cavanaugh asked if they were down any officers. Chief Porter stated that the police department is down one officer and will likely be down three officers very soon.

Ms. Carroll commented that they sent a letter in February, and they have another ready to go. This is not a priority to state legislators, apart from Jilly Barry. She asked what the Council could do to support the police department to keep our community safe. The Chief stated that they should take action as private citizens to protect their private property and to call in suspicious vehicles. They should also report any and all crimes because that data helps the department link information on other cases.

Mr. Niland stated that he has worked in the IT division of the West Hartford Police Department for many years, and he knows that officers are doing the best that they can, given the limitations posed by the state legislature. He asked about other measures such as the Three Strikes Rule that could help address this issue. The Chief explained that the challenge is to get the convictions in the first place. There were four bills that never made it in the state legislature. Ms. LaChance thanked the police department for arresting the five criminals who terrorized the town last week. She asked if they could hold some community meetings to get residents together to talk about this. Chief Porter stated that they have already held one and they will likely hold more.

Dr. Beckett expressed that the way to change this is to send 50,000-100,000 letters to the Governor because, otherwise, the state legislature does not seem to care about Glastonbury. Ms. Tanski asked how sophisticated these crimes are. Chief Porter stated that he has not seen a level of technological sophistication. This is not about chop shops, but about joy rides. What is of great concern to him is the lack of fear of being caught because, absent accountability, they have nothing. Ms. Tanski asked for Town-sponsored crime meetings, not just neighborhood ones, because the more they could do to educate others to be on the lookout, the better.

Mr. McChesney encouraged residents to listen to the Council's discussion with the Chief back in February to learn more information about this issue. He also echoed that continued community conversation and public awareness will be key to push for change at the state level. He does not feel that there is any more that the Glastonbury Police Department can do, but he urged them to let the Council know if they ever do need anything to help address this issue. Mr. Osgood asked if they have a timeline for when reported crimes can go online. The Chief stated that there is a licensing issue, but he hopes it will be up very soon.

Mr. Johnson clarified that the Chief and Mr. Ashton have been working on the website. They will look at the ability to schedule some public forums and get the information out. All the information that the Chief shared tonight will be posted to the website. He also noted that they can pen a draft letter with some talking points that residents can send to the Capitol.

**Motion by:** Ms. Carroll

**Seconded by:** Mr. Osgood

Dear Governor Lamont:

This letter is written on behalf of the Glastonbury Town Council concerning an ongoing issue faced by communities across the state. By action at its Tuesday, June 22, 2021 meeting, the Council voted unanimously to support these comments.

Like many communities in Connecticut, Glastonbury continues to experience thefts of and from motor vehicles at an alarming rate. Since January 1, 2021, Glastonbury residents have reported 17 stolen motor vehicles and 103 thefts from vehicles. Perhaps more concerning is the increase in related residential burglaries and instances where homeowners are confronting these criminals. It is a matter of time before one of these confrontations turns violent or fatal (in January, Glastonbury's state legislators, Senator Cassano and Representatives Barry and Doucette, were advised of a mother and infant shot by a juvenile in a stolen car and a situation where a homeowner was threatened at gun point during an attempted car theft). Property owners are afraid to park in residential driveways or leave their garage doors open, and are now looking to determine how they can best defend their property – e.g. by establishing neighborhood block watch programs or other safety measures.

Those committing these offenses are aware of limitations imposed by policy and law. On Sunday, June 13<sup>th</sup>, five suspects, age 18 and younger, came to Glastonbury in a stolen car, committed several burglaries, were involved in several accidents while trying to escape, fled on foot, stole another car from a Lyft driver they had called for a ride, then crashed that car on Glastonbury High School property before officers were able to take them into custody. Because officers have no viable options for detaining them, the juveniles were promptly released from custody to their parents/guardians (some of whom requested that the police keep the juveniles in custody. This is only one example of what has become nearly a daily occurrence in Town and throughout the state).

Police officers statewide confirm the majority of these crimes are being committed by young people, resulting from continued erosion of laws and policies that remove accountability and give victims, police, and courts little recourse. Members of the Glastonbury community repeatedly express their fear, and police report a several hundred percent increase in gun permit applications over recent years, a potentially dangerous correlation. It seems that every attempt to remedy this problem at the legislative level is met with resistance. Glastonbury Police continue to proactively address this problem through patrols, investigations, collaboration with other police agencies, public information campaigns, and community meetings, but the fact remains that change needs to occur through state legislation.

Change is needed to protect all those involved including young people, property owners, and police. Glastonbury is prepared to participate in any process to reach an appropriate remedy.

**Disc:** Mr. Cavanaugh asked if we ever received acknowledgement to the first letter that was written in January regarding car thefts. Mr. Johnson stated that he believed Rep. Barry responded by note, but did not recall hearing from Sen. Cassano or Rep. Doucette and that he would have to double check.

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

## **PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

### **NO 1: PUBLIC INFORMATION HEARING – PROPOSED PHASE III CONSTRUCTION OF SIDEWALKS ALONG MAIN STREET/ROUTE 17 BETWEEN THE CIDER MILL AND RED HILL DRIVE – REVIEW OF PROJECT CONCEPT DESIGN OPTIONS.**

Mr. Pennington reiterated the fact that these four design concepts are just designs. He assured residents that if they were to move forward on any of these options, they would present all of the details, not just the concepts. All of the options run in the \$800,000-\$1 million cost range. All will require a detailed review with the DOT and possibly also the utility companies.

Option 1 is the large 9-foot retaining wall option. There would be a slope above that wall and to one of the homes near it. The construction challenge is the sandy soil conditions. Traditional wall

construction methods here are not safe. They would need to build from the top-down. They could do this by employing either one of two concepts: a soil nail type of wall or a soldier type wall. Mr. McChesney stated that there are safety concerns associated with this type of approach. He asked the Town Engineer to clarify why he does not recommend pursuing this option. Mr. Pennington explained that this is a type of construction that is dependent on a very incremental approach, so it will likely be more expensive than other options, and the potential exists for those soils to present something that they do not anticipate. This is not Mr. Pennington's preferred alternative, and there wasn't enthusiasm from the public on it.

Mr. Pennington discussed Option 2, which is the road shift option. There would be a road shift on the east side of about 9 feet. There would be no wall on the west side, but a sidewalk would still be constructed. Utility pole relocation would be required. The DOT does not object to this concept, but they want to see more details.

Mr. Pennington then reviewed hybrid options, in which they construct a smaller wall and enact a smaller road shift than in Option 2. However, it would be a fill wall not a cut wall, which brings about the requirements of the specialized construction methods. They would fill the wall, blend into the slope behind it, and construct the sidewalk on top of it. The road shift for Option 4 would be about 6 feet, possibly a little less.

Mr. Pennington answered some of the questions posed by residents via email. He noted that Raven Cauthon asked three questions regarding the road shift option:

- would there would be any cost to the homeowner for the service utility
- would the curb shift of 9 feet require a shift in the actual property line
- would it have any impact on her septic system or tank

The answer to all three questions is no.

Mr. Pennington also addressed Mr. Miller's written comment, which expressed concern about the large sugar maple tree on his property. While he cannot say whether the tree will be impacted or not, Mr. Pennington assured that the Town would work very closely with the tree warden to see what impacts will occur and how to mitigate them.

Chairman Gullotta opened the floor for public comment.

**Raven Cauthon of 1212 Main Street**, who is right in the middle of the 9-foot shift, wants to put under consideration that it is not only the houses on the other side of the street that face danger of construction. Her house sits on a completely rock foundation, so any construction on the street shakes her home. She is very apprehensive about the road being shifted at all. It poses a danger to her home and her property value. Her major concern is safety. Her mailbox has been hit a few times. She does not like any of the four options presented and would rather the \$1 million for this project were not used for sidewalks at all, but instead to fund better projects in town.

**Luther Weeks 334 Hollister Way West**, stated that, as a walker, he prefers Option 4. For pedestrian safety, there needs to be a guard rail.

**Eugene Hickey at 1200 Main Street**, was encouraged to see that the Town has investigated other options. He favors the option of the raised sidewalk taking 6 feet or less. He asked a series of questions:

- If the curb is not going to be as severe, could the southern part of the curb start more to the north, after the two historic houses?
- Whose decision is it to decide where the utility poles are located?
- Is there an appeal procedure if they do not like the decided location? He asked that the Town have the information on the poles location before any vote is taken.

**Andrew Miller at 1245 Hebron Avenue**, inquired about the elevated sidewalk option. He asked what the length and height of the smaller retaining wall would be.

Mr. Pennington addressed the comments and questions posed.

Regarding Ms. Cauthon's concerns about vibrations to her home caused by construction, he recommended that, given the number of historic homes in the area, that they conduct pre-blasting surveys, even though there will not be any blasting on site.

Regarding Mr. Hickey's question, Mr. Pennington explained that if the road shift requires something less than 9 feet, then yes, the taper would be lesser in width and length, but he does not know where exactly that will be. The pole relocation question is a joint discussion with the DOT and the utility companies. Mr. Pennington is not aware of any formal appeal policy associated with those discussions. However, they will develop the design details and provide them at a town hearing, so that the Council can decide on whether to proceed with construction or not.

Regarding Mr. Miller's question, there will be a lesser impact with the smaller retaining wall. They would still need to deal with a slope, but he does not know specifics.

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

**Andrew Miller of 1245 Hebron Avenue**, stated that he and his wife have restored the 1796 colonial house at 1213 Main Street, but they have several concerns about the project. They do not want any damage done to the 100+ year old sugar maple tree at the corner of their property. They also have concerns about how a pre-fab stone retaining wall would look. How high would it be, and would a fence be needed? They do not find the completed retaining wall with the top cap overhang very attractive. Mr. Miller predicts that he will be spending about 12-18 hours a year to safely maintain the sidewalk from snow. He still supports the sidewalk project, but he does not think that the owners on the west side should be the only ones making a sacrifice. He also believes that the road should be shifted over, as detailed in Option 2 or 4.

**Jeffrey Stein of 142 Olde Stage Road**, stated that Bike Walk Glastonbury reiterates their support for the sidewalk project which will increase safety. While they appreciate that the topography has presented challenges, they hope that the Council will fund a plan to allow for 2022



construction. As an individual citizen, he feels that Option 4 is the best proposal to address stability of the slope and limit the easterly movement of the roadway.

***Kathleen Kaye of 1241 Main Street***, is pleased that the Town is not in favor of cutting into the slope, but she is concerned that it could become a fatal situation to passersby if the trees' roots were compromised, causing the trees to fall. She is also concerned that a raised sidewalk will reduce line of sight when exiting the shared driveway onto the state highway, and traffic could potentially exacerbate the problem. For winter maintenance, there is no direct or easy access from the property to the proposed sidewalk. Having to maintain a sidewalk would cause extreme difficulty as she would have to walk down a five-home shared driveway after it is cleared to get to the street and sidewalk. She will not be able to see the condition of the sidewalk from her house because of the slope angle. She considers this an unreasonable and unsafe situation on an unlit state highway. She requests that the Town continue sidewalk clearing past the properties of Dr. Beckett, as well as 1241, 1225, and 1213 Main Street.

***Mary Reverendo of 1225 Main Street***, is concerned with Option 4. The common driveway is difficult to exit safely. Building a wall puts her and her neighbors' safety at risk. Cars speed up this portion of Main Street. Options 1 and 2 do not seem plausible either, due to the steep slopes on the west side of Main Street. She encouraged the Council to consider Option 3.

Mr. Pennington addressed the common driveway concern of the impact a retaining wall would have on the sightline. They believe that they can improve the sightline somewhat; at the very least, they would not worsen the sightline.

Mr. Niland opened the floor for attendees to comment via Zoom. There were no comments.

Mr. Niland asked if they could move the utilities underground instead of moving the poles. Mr. Pennington stated that they have looked into it before, and it is cost prohibitive. Mr. Niland then asked if Option 4 would be the safest option. Mr. Pennington said yes. Mr. Cavanaugh stated that, even though it is a state easement, he feels for those two homes, 1200 and 1212 Main Street. He asked if there were to be any destabilization of those homes, would the Town be liable. Mr. Pennington explained that the avenue for restitution would be through the contractor and the contractor's insurance company. It would not be through the Town or the Town's insurance carrier.

Ms. Carroll also feels for the homeowners impacted here. Option 4 seems to have the lowest impact on properties. As a runner, she would not want to be trapped between traffic and a wall. Dr. Beckett stated that the project cost is a horrendous amount of money, and it is a shame that they have to spend that much. However, safety has been a concern. There have been two fatalities in the area, so they need to keep that perspective. Mr. Gullotta is not excited about moving the wall up 'more than a little bit.' He wants to keep it simple.

There was a consensus from the Council to look into Option 4. The public hearing was closed.

**NO 2: \$128,205 TRANSFER FROM THE CAPITAL RESERVE-UNASSIGNED FUND BALANCE TO CAPITAL PROJECTS-STREET TREE MANAGEMENT- GRANT FUNDED.**

*Motion by:* Ms. Carroll

*Seconded by:* Mr. Osgood

*BE IT RESOLVED, the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves a \$128,205 appropriation and transfer from the Capital Reserve-Unassigned Fund balance to Capital Projects-Street Tree Management to be reimbursed through an approved state grant, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated June 18, 2021 and as recommended by the Board of Finance.*

*Disc:* Mr. Gullotta opened the floor for public comment. There were no comments. He closed the public hearing.

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

**c. Discussion and possible action concerning process and funding to develop Design Guidelines for selected business districts/zones (possible referral on appropriation and transfer and scheduling of public hearing).**

Mr. Johnson explained that this was a concept discussed at the last meeting. Early March, the Council asked the TPZ to look at the possibility of creating a village district. One of the thoughts was looking at a comprehensive process to implement design guidelines. The RFQ process is a very good learning process and can help fine-tune a potential scope. There could be either funding allocation in place now or the RFQ to determine the preferred scope and cost and consider funding.

Ms. Tanski believes they should move forward with an RFQ and decide funding after that because she does not want the funding to determine the scope of work, rather than the other way around. Mr. Osgood asked which area they will be looking at. It would make sense to delineate the area to be just the Town Center Zone. He likes the Request for Qualifications, and he also asks for an estimate of the cost associated with that, and that they should delineate the area as the Town Center Zone. Mr. Johnson explained that going forward with an RFQ, they would want to speak with a consultant, solicit for respondents, conduct interviews, and then focus on the first phase of this area. Ms. Carroll agrees that it makes sense to start with a larger area than they had originally defined. Speaking with a qualified professional to improve design standards for everything is a good idea.

Mr. Cavanaugh believes that they should extend the design standards up to the East Hartford line, as well as between Naubuc Avenue and Rankin Road. The bigger the area, the better. He thinks that this is a somewhat urgent matter to fund and proceed with. Mr. Johnson explained

that the RFQ avenue could potentially extend the process out by a month or so. Mr. McChesney was leaning towards the RFQ process, but he would rather move forward quicker rather than later.

**Motion by:** Dr. Beckett

**Seconded by:** Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, the Glastonbury Town Council hereby solicits an RFQ for design guidelines for the Glastonbury Town Center District from the East Hartford line to Rankin Road and Route 2 and the Connecticut River.

**Disc:** Mr. Cavanaugh would like to have a number for the appropriation so that they could go to the BOF for approval. Ms. Tanski would like a clearer understanding of the cost before they ask for any money. Mr. Cavanaugh asked that whoever is selected for design consultant also be asked to consult with the Town for a future project on Main Street because the TPZ should have access to that individual as a consultant. Mr. Osgood asked if the TPZ could bring in a consultant to help them evaluate large projects. Mr. Johnson explained that they do this for a traffic study issue or an environmental issue. There are some monies available if a specific project requires it. Ms. Carroll thinks that it muddies the waters to have this person look at another project. It strays from the goal of creating design standards and seeing what they can do with them. Mr. Cavanaugh believes that the TPZ does need help with design guidelines. If they do not want to attach a design consultant for a future project on Main Street, he asked that it become a point of discussion on their next agenda.

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

**Motion by:** Mr. Cavanaugh

**Seconded by:** Ms. Carroll

Resolved, that the Glastonbury Town Council responds to the inquiry from the Town Plan and Zoning Commission as expressed in the memorandum dated June 2, 2021, from Rebecca Augur, Director of Planning and Land Use Services, as follows:

Some members of the Town Council wish to explore the establishment of a Village District in the area along Main Street from Naubuc Avenue to Rankin Road, Hebron Avenue to Route 2 and New London Turnpike from Salmon (Brook?) to Rankin Road. This is because the legislation authorizing Village Districts (Connecticut General Statutes Section 8-2j) allows such zones to provide greater flexibility in use of land and buildings, but with a correspondingly higher level of design review and greater authority to require architectural and site plan compatibility with a town's most cherished and iconic areas. Like Historic Districts, Village District zoning can regulate the demolition of historic and landmark buildings and require an examination of the historic and architectural context when reviewing new proposals. However, unlike Historic Districts, Village Districts can also regulate landscaping and building color and regulate the use

of land and buildings, particularly mixed use. Village Districts can be adopted by the zoning authority of the Town without a referendum of property owners in the proposed District and without creating a new Historic District Commission to oversee it. The area selected reflects the perception by some on the Council that this is the heart of Glastonbury Center and defines the character of the Town for visitors and residents alike. Numerous Connecticut towns have adopted Village District regulations so there are samples that can be consulted. Because the Commission acts as a planning commission under the Town Charter, the Council is required to refer any zoning amendments to the Commission but, in addition, the Council welcomes the Commission's views about the benefits of a Village District and its proposed location. A copy of 8-2j is attached.

This Resolution should not be construed as a unanimous statement of Council support for Village District zoning, but only a clarification of why it was referred to the Commission for comment.

**Disc:** Mr. Cavanaugh explained that this is a response to the TPZ's request. Mr. Osgood stated that what was sent to the TPZ was broader than what they had discussed. Ms. Tanski thinks that a village district enabling legislation is written with the intention of preserving things. She believes that their Town Center needs growth, not preservation. She is highly skeptical of village districts and appreciates that this letter identifies that.

**Result:** Motion was passed {8-1-0} with one abstention from Mr. Osgood.

**d. Action on General Wage Adjustment – non-affiliated full-time staff – July 1, 2021.**

**Motion by:** Ms. Carroll

**Seconded by:** Mr. Osgood

*BE IT RESOLVED, the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves a 2% General Wage Adjustment for non-affiliated, full-time staff effective July 1, 2021 (and a .25% increase in the employee contribution of the Legacy Defined Pension Plan effective January 1, 2022) as described in a report by the Town Manager dated June 18, 2021.*

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

**6. Consent Calendar.**

**a. Action to approve investment pools – Town Funds.**

**Motion by:** Ms. Carroll

**Seconded by:** Mr. Osgood

*BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves the State of CT Short-Term Investment Fund (STIF) and Northern Capital Investments for the deposit and investment of Town funds, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated June 18, 2021 and as recommended by the Board of Finance.*

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

**b. Action on transfer from Debt Service to Capital Reserve Fund – \$179,500.**

**Motion by:** Ms. Carroll

**Seconded by:** Mr. Osgood

*BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves the transfer of \$179,500 from Debt Service to the Capital Reserve-Unassigned Fund Balance, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated June 18, 2021 and as recommended by the Board of Finance.*

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

**c. Action to schedule joint Council/Town Plan & Zoning Commission preliminary hearing – Wintergreen Glen PAD Phase III.**

*Tabled to July 13, 2021.*

**7. Town Manager’s Report.**

Mr. Johnson explained that they have worked with Thriving Earth Exchange on the topic of uranium. This was a no-cost project to the Town. The state budget sustains both operating and capital state grants consistent with the adopted budget, and they have put in place a new pilot grant. The Rotary Club is still committed to the \$250,000 contribution for the splash pad, but COVID-19 put their fundraising efforts behind schedule. The equipment would see a minimum 5% price increase effective January 1, so they bought it early and went to bid. They need an additional \$44,000 to award the bid. They have a transfer in place between Capital Project accounts. The schedule is to complete the work this calendar year and have it out for 2022. The Council approved the transfer for the splash pad via consensus.

Mr. Johnson explained that there is an initial fundraising goal of \$125,000 for the Cotton Hollow mill. A group is working on this, but in the meantime, the Land Heritage Coalition is assisting. Mr. Johnson provided a copy of the elderly tax relief program. He also noted that they continue to recruit park rangers, but there is a shortage of qualified candidates for a lot of municipal positions right now.

Mr. Cavanaugh followed up on Ms. Vitelli’s comment, thanking Town staff for all their hard work. He also stated that state restrictions on normal business operations have been removed, so temporary signs need to be removed. He then asked for updates on the boat house because there was a posting online with children on the roof. Mr. Johnson explained that they had a discussion with the individuals on the roof and their parents. They have a design, and the money is available as of July 1, so they expect to complete it very shortly.

**8. Committee Reports.**

- a. **Chairman's Report.** *None*
- b. **MDC.** *None*
- c. **CRCOG.** *None*

**9. Communications.**

- a. **Correspondence concerning uranium test results.**

**10. Minutes.**

- a. **Minutes of June 8, 2021 Regular Meeting.**

*Motion by:* Ms. Carroll

*Seconded by:* Mr. Osgood

*Result:* Minutes were accepted {8-1-0} with one abstention from Ms. Tanski because she was not present at the meeting.

**11. Appointments and Resignations.** *None.*

**12. Executive Session.**

- a. **Potential land acquisition.**

*Motion by:* Ms. Carroll

*Seconded by:* Mr. Osgood

*BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby enters into executive session to discuss a potential land acquisition at 10:45 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. 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 10:50 P.M.

Following the Executive Session, the Council with Town Manager, Richard J. Johnson in attendance, entered a non-meeting format discussion to discuss, 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).

The Council then reconvened in the regular meeting format to take action on Agenda Item 5(d).

**13. Adjournment.**

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

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

*BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby adjourns their regular meeting of June 22, 2021 at 11:05 P.M.*

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

Respectfully submitted,

**Lilly Torosyan**

Lilly Torosyan

Recording Clerk

**Thomas Gullotta**

Chairman