

**GLASTONBURY TOWN COUNCIL  
SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES (AMENDED)  
TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 23, 2021**

The Glastonbury Town Council with Town Manager, Richard J. Johnson, in attendance, held a Special Meeting at 6:00 p.m. in the Community Room of the Riverfront Community Center at 300 Welles 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. Kurt P. Cavanaugh  
Mr. John Cavanna  
Ms. Mary LaChance  
Mr. Jacob McChesney  
Mr. Whit Osgood  
Ms. Jennifer Wang

**a. Pledge of Allegiance** *Led by Alex Wood*

**2. Public Comment.**

Mr. Gullotta opened the floor for public comment:

***Michael Dayton of 599 Hopewell Road***, asked whether the Town has ever considered the designation of open space under Public Act 490, and whether they would be interested in implementing that designation. He noted that he owns a little over 8 acres in various parcels on Hopewell Road.

***Judith Stonger of 30 Woodbridge Road***, is not against affordable housing, but traffic is very congested on Main Street, and it is destroying the character of Glastonbury. She asked the Council to preserve the beauty of this town, and to not let the proposed demolition go through.

***Dr. Seja Joyce Jackson of 95 Woodbridge Road***, also spoke against the proposed demolition on Main Street and asked the Council to preserve the character of Glastonbury. She noted that this issue is not about affordable housing, but about traffic and congestion. She would rather pay more in taxes to keep Glastonbury a beautiful suburban-rural type of town.

3. **Special Reports.** *None*
4. **Old Business.** *None*
5. **New Business.**
  - a. **Action on funding for Design Guideline project (refer to Board of Finance; set public hearing).**

Mr. Johnson explained that this is a proposal for comprehensive design guidelines for the Town Center zone and other zones. They have considered three firms, but FHI in Hartford has a very strong team and are familiar with Glastonbury. There are two proposals under consideration: one is to establish \$100,000 for the comprehensive plan and a complete review of all the planning districts. The other proposal is to allocate \$125,000 instead, in the event that additional funds may need to be allocated accordingly, without a separate approval or review process.

Mr. Niland is in favor of the latter proposal, which saves them time going forward. He noted that this has the potential to affect Glastonbury for 100 years, so they need to do it right. Mr. Cavanaugh is also in favor of the \$125,000 proposal option. He asked about the history of the firm and how they will be paid. Mr. Johnson explained that he has sent out an email listing an example of what a good design guideline will look like, from the FHI firm. Regarding compensation, there are progress payments along the way. He does not have their proposal with him, but he will bring it at a later meeting. Ms. Carroll also supports the \$125,000 option. She asked if the firm has both architects and landscape architects on staff. Mr. Johnson stated that the firm has planners and landscape architects, but what they found particularly significant was their architects. Mr. McChesney likes the idea of a contingency at the outset.

Ms. Wang asked what the added value is in having these design guidelines. Mr. Johnson stated that the proposals which come through the regulations now are more driven by what is a permitted use in a zone. However, there is currently no document that gives an applicant guidance as to the type of architecture or landscape designs that are preferred by the Town. That concern brought on this discussion. Ms. Wang asked to what extent the consultant will consider more functional pieces such as parking, traffic, or renewable energy to the design process, beyond the architecture. Mr. Johnson stated that the sustainability and pedestrian friendly environments would be brought up during the community engagement period. Parking would be a separate review. Mr. Cavanaugh is surprised that this process was not started 10 or 20 years ago.

**Motion by:** Ms. Carroll

**Seconded by:** Mr. Cavanaugh

*BE IT RESOLVED, the Glastonbury Town Council hereby refers to the Board of Finance the request for a \$125,000 appropriation and transfer from the General Fund-Unassigned Fund Balance for the Design Guideline project and schedules a public hearing for 8 p.m. on Tuesday, December 7, 2021 in the Council Chambers of Town Hall, 2155 Main Street, Glastonbury and/or through Zoom Video Conferencing to consider the proposed appropriation and transfer, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated November 19, 2021.*

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

**b. Action on application for 38 Hubbard Street per the Adaptive Redevelopment Zone (set public hearing).**

**Motion by:** Ms. Carroll

**Seconded by:** Mr. Cavanaugh

*BE IT RESOLVED, the Glastonbury Town Council hereby schedules a public hearing for 8 p.m. on Tuesday, December 7, 2021 in the Council Chambers of Town Hall, 2155 Main Street, Glastonbury and/or through Zoom Video Conferencing on the Application by JS Advisors LLC – Adaptive Redevelopment Zone for the property at 38 Hubbard Street, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated November 19, 2021.*

*BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the public hearing will be opened at the December 7, 2021 meeting to comply with statutory timeframes, however, the presentation by the Applicant, public testimony and Council discussion will not take place until the regular Council meeting of Tuesday, January 11, 2022 with the legal notices for the December 7, 2021 public hearing so noting.*

**Disc:** Mr. Cavanaugh stated that the applicant was asked to come back for PAD review. He asked when that would be. Mr. Johnson explained that the TPZ has scheduled to hear the matter on December 14. The goal is to have a Joint Subcommittee meeting before the TPZ hears the matter. Next week, he will send out potential dates and times for the subcommittee to meet. Mr. Niland asked if there is any provision for the Council to request affordable housing from the applicant in this deal. Mr. Johnson does not recall if that came up at the Joint Subcommittee meeting, but they can let the applicant know that the Council would like to hear about the potential for affordable housing units. Mr. Cavanaugh stated that section 8-2i, “Inclusionary Zoning,” deals with affordable housing. He plans on asking Attorney Alter about it when the applicant comes before the Council.

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

**c. Action on lease of Town-owned property at 35 Bell Street.**

**Motion by:** Ms. Carroll

**Seconded by:** Mr. Cavanaugh

*BE IT RESOLVED, the Glastonbury Town Council hereby authorizes the Town Manager to work with the Housing Authority to transition lease of the Town-owned property at 35 Bell Street to an*

*affordable rental opportunity effective as soon as practical, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated November 19, 2021.*

**Disc:** Mr. Johnson explained that this is a property which the Town owns. The lower level is an active recreation site. The upper level is an apartment that has been leased for residential units. The current tenant has recently purchased their first house. The lease provides an opportunity to cancel with 90 days' notice. The tenant asked to waive part of that time so that they can move into their own home. The Town would then complete painting and cleaning to move to an affordable rental opportunity. The goal is to have that turnover by the beginning of January 2022. Mr. Osgood does not think that the Town should be in the business of subsidizing single-family homes throughout town. He noted that this building was unique in that it was purchased because it abuts a school, like the property abutting Town Hall.

Ms. Carroll stated that much of what falls under the auspices of affordability in Glastonbury is one- or two-bedroom homes, which do not work for most families. She is glad that this will provide another affordable housing opportunity in town. Mr. McChesney also supports this. It is important that the types of housing available for affordable housing are not just single-family units but multi-family and everything in between. He is happy to work with the Housing Authority on this.

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

**d. Discussion and possible action concerning Capital Improvement Criteria.**

Mr. Johnson explained that the Council has required an annual review of the Capital Improvement Criteria by the BOF and the Council. The BOF has reviewed it and recommended no changes. The Council also recommended no changes or action.

**e. Action to reappoint Commission on Racial Justice and Equity.**

**Motion by:** Ms. Carroll

**Seconded by:** Mr. Cavanaugh

*BE IT RESOLVED, the Glastonbury Town Council hereby extends the term of the Commission on Racial Justice and Equity and reappoints the members of the Commission through March 31, 2022, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated November 19, 2021.*

**Disc:** Ms. Carroll explained that, even though the Commission was appointed by the previous Council to do its work for one year, the appointment needs to be reaffirmed by the current Council. The resolution that built the Commission called for one year of work following the appointment of the Commission in January 2021. They are currently finishing up a series of focus groups in collaboration with a local nonprofit to get more data, which they will present to the Council in the new year.

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

**6. Consent Calendar.**

**a. Action to schedule continued public information hearing – American Rescue Plan Act.**

*Motion by:* Mr. Cavanaugh

*Seconded by:* Ms. Carroll

*BE IT RESOLVED, the Glastonbury Town Council hereby schedules a public information hearing for 8:00 p.m. on Tuesday, December 7, 2021 in the Council Chambers of Town Hall, 2155 Main Street, Glastonbury and/or through Zoom Video Conferencing to hear public comment on potential uses of monies allocated to Glastonbury through the American Rescue Plan, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated November 19, 2021.*

**Result:** Consent calendar was accepted unanimously {9-0-0}.

**7. Town Manager’s Report.**

Mr. Johnson explained that the Town has received a \$5000 grant to enhance outdoor opportunities at the senior housing development. They will work with the Housing Authority on it. Mr. Johnson then noted that several staff members are being recognized for various awards, which he will send out individually or collectively throughout the year. Ms. Carroll pointed out that there are 14 different awards for acknowledgements. She directed everyone to check out page 39 of the Council packet which lists the departments and individuals recognized.

Mr. Johnson explained that the Wright Gaines House is in the National Historic District. On Friday, December 3, the review board of the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) will comment whether the building is a contributing factor to the National Historic District. He has advised the town’s Historical Society and the Historic Commission to attend the meeting and provide comments on the building’s continued significance. Mr. McChesney asked what the impact of the hearing is so that it is very clear for the public to understand. Mr. Johnson explained that SHPO is aware of the proposal filed back in September for demolition of the Wright Gaines structure. Their review board will consider and make certain that that building remains as a contributing factor to the National Historic District. He has had two staff members from SHPO look at the building.

Ms. Wang asked for clarification on which building is the Wright Gaines Hotel: the blue front building or the green back building. Mr. Johnson confirmed the front building is the Wright Gaines House. Ms. Wang asked if the building to the rear of the Wright Gaines House is also within the Historic District. Mr. Johnson replied he believes so, but that he would double check. Ms. Wang asked why the Wright Gaines is part of the National Historic District but not part of the local historic district. Mr. Johnson explained that, back in the 1980s when the Glastonbury Historic District was created, some property owners were opposed to being in the district. Therefore, the decision was made to exclude them.

Mr. Johnson explained that in spring 2022, the Town's trash energy plant will no longer be functioning, and MIRA will transport solid waste out of state. On January 11, he will present options to the Council on how to move forward. On a preliminary basis, an opt-out option may make sense for Glastonbury. The Recreation Activities Fund is a revenue expenditure neutral fund which was put in place in 2008. This year, it is possible that the expenditure side could exceed \$1.45 million. The BOF approved a \$150,000 add-on which, during the budget process, could be footnoted so that it does not become a challenge down the road. Mr. Johnson then asked if the Council could reaffirm their objection to the demolition of the properties along Main Street.

**Motion by:** Ms. Carroll

**Seconded by:** Mr. Cavanaugh

*BE IT RESOLVED, the Glastonbury Town Council hereby reaffirms its objection to proposed demolition of the residential and commercial buildings at 2277-2289 and 2389 Main Street.*

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

Mr. Cavanaugh noted that various newspaper articles state that the Town will be subjected to an audit for the monies it received under the CARES Act. Mr. Johnson stated that is correct. Last year, they reallocated money to the BOE to reimburse expenses that they made. Some monies were reprogrammed, through the BOF, back to the Health Department which was funding certain positions related to COVID-19. Beyond that, all monies have been deposited to the General Fund. Mr. Cavanaugh asked if any proposals were approved for the Timber Harvest. Mr. Johnson explained that they will conduct an RFQ to look at how selected open space areas could be best managed. Mr. McChesney stated that he has received a lot of concerns that the Town will be using the timber harvest for profit, which is not the case; it is the best way to manage open space.

Mr. Niland asks to put on the next meeting agenda the recognition of Dr. Beckett and Ms. Tanski for their service to the town. Mr. Osgood recommended that they extend the reduced rent for six months instead of a year, since brick and mortar business sales are up. Mr. Gullotta suggested putting that on a future agenda item. Mr. Gullotta worries about sending garbage out of state. He asked if the Town has any possibility of handling it in state. Mr. Johnson will return with information on that.

## **8. Committee Reports.**

### **a. Chairman's Report.**

- **Appointments to Council Subcommittees.**

Mr. Gullotta stated that on Saturday, November 27 from 9:00 A.M. to 12:00 P.M. at South Church, Santa is coming. Mr. Cavanna added that at his family farm, on Saturdays and Sundays, the North Pole Express is open.

Ms. Carroll read the following appointments:

*Town Leadership Committee: Tom Gullotta, Larry Niland, Kurt Cavanaugh, and Deb Carroll*

*Town Policy and Ordinance Review Committee: Tom Gullotta, Deb Carroll, and to be determined*

*Town Services and Land Appraisal Committee: Tom Gullotta, Larry Niland, and Kurt Cavanaugh*

*The CRCOG Housing Committee: Deb Carroll*

*The CRCOG Policy Board: Larry Niland*

*The CRCOG Transportation Committee: Jake McChesney*

*The Chamber of Commerce Liaison: Jake McChesney and to be determined*

*The PAD Review Committee: Larry Niland, Mary LaChance, Kurt Cavanaugh, and Whit Osgood*

*The Committee to name a public facility, as needed, ad hoc: none*

*The Great Pond Stewardship Commission: Tom Gullotta, Jen Wang, and Whit Osgood*

*The Rules of Procedure Subcommittee: Jake McChesney and John Cavanna*

*The GCAP: Deb Carroll and to be determined*

*The Private Wells and Public Water Working Group, as needed: Tom Gullotta and Whit Osgood*

*The Education Foundation: Larry Niland*

*The MDC non-voting member: Mary LaChance*

**b. MDC.**

Ms. LaChance explained that the final budget vote will be held on December 6 at 5:30 P.M. Members of the public may attend and make comments. As of right now, the water usage rate for Glastonbury will go up by 1%, while the surcharge for capital improvements will go down by a couple of percentage points.

**c. CRCOG.**

Mr. Niland explained that two meetings were held by the Regional Policy Board. CRCOG has completed their affordable housing study, which he sent to Mr. Johnson. The document is also available on the CRCOG website. There was also a discussion on cannabis sales in various towns. He listed several towns in the region who have currently said yes and another which has taken no action. There are also three grant funding opportunities regarding urban forestry. Mr. Johnson has indicated that the Town is already working on one of them.

**9. Communications.**

- a. Letter from CT Siting Council regarding modifications to existing telecommunications facility located at Birch Mountain Road**
- b. Letter from CT Siting Council regarding modifications to existing telecommunications facility located at 374 Three Mile Road.**
- c. Letter from Crown Castle regarding modifications to existing telecommunications facility located at 299 Paxton Way.**
- d. Letter from NB&C regarding shared use of an existing telecommunications facility located at 577 Bell Street.**

**10. Minutes.**

- a. Minutes of November 9, 2021 Regular & Organizational Meeting.**

*Motion by:* Ms. Carroll

*Seconded by:* Mr. Cavanaugh

*BE IT RESOLVED, the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves the minutes of the November 9, 2021 Regular and Organizational Meeting.*

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

**11. Appointments and Resignations.**

- a. Appointment of John “Jay” Cofiell to the Fire Commission (D-2025).**

*Motion by:* Ms. Carroll

*Seconded by:* Mr. Cavanaugh

*Result:* Appointment was accepted unanimously {9-0-0}.

**12. Executive Session.**

- a. Potential land acquisition.**

*Motion by:* Ms. Carroll

*Seconded by:* Mr. Cavanaugh

*BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby enters into executive session to discuss a potential land acquisition at 7:25 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, Ms. Deb Carroll, Mr. Kurt Cavanaugh, Mr. John Cavanna, Ms. Mary LaChance, Mr. Jake McChesney, Ms. Whit Osgood, and Ms. Jennifer Wang, with Town Manager, Richard J. Johnson.*

No votes were taken during the Executive Session, which ended at 7:50 P.M.

**PUBLIC HEARING NO 1: ACTION TO CONSIDER PROPOSED NEW SIDEWALK CONSTRUCTION INCLUDING: SPRING STREET, BANTLE ROAD, HOUSE STREET (COMPLETE SECTIONS LINKING TO MULTI-USE TRAILHEAD), MAIN STREET/ROUTE 17 (OVERLOOK ROAD TO ROUTE 17/MAIN/BUTTONBALL). CONTINUED FROM OCTOBER 26, 2021.**

*Motion by:* Ms. Carroll

*Seconded by:* Mr. Cavanaugh

*BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves construction of new sidewalks as follows:*

- *Spring Street*
- *Bantle Road*
- *House Street (complete sections linking to multi-use trailhead)*
- *Main Street/Route 17 (Overlook Road to Route 17/Main/Buttonball)*

*as described in a report by the Town Manager dated November 19, 2021 and as recommended by the Town Plan and Zoning Commission.*

**Disc:** Mr. Johnson explained that the hearing was continued because the TPZ did not yet have an opportunity to review the proposal. They have since reviewed the proposal and accepted the plans. There were no comments from the public.

Mr. Niland is in favor of sidewalk construction; however, there are two properties that have no access to the sidewalk even though they abut Bantle Road. He suggests either removing Bantle Road from consideration or moving it to the other side of the street where the Town would be responsible for their maintenance. Mr. Pennington agreed that it is an inconvenience for those property owners. He explained that the other choice is to put the sidewalk on the east side of Bantle Road, where there is a state right of way, which would necessitate the Town cleaning the roads. Ms. LaChance shares Mr. Niland's concerns. Ms. Carroll agreed, asking if it makes more sense to put the sidewalks on the east side or to not create sidewalks on Bantle Road at all. Mr. Cavanna agreed that he does not want to burden a resident to create a sidewalk if they cannot access it. Mr. McChesney asked if there is any problem to create the sidewalk on the other side of the street. Mr. Pennington explained that there is no construction issue there. The main concern is just the maintenance. Mr. McChesney is in favor of putting the sidewalk on the east side.

Mr. Osgood asked what would happen, should the Town agree to accept maintenance of those two lots. Mr. Pennington stated that option comes with a difficult precedent. Mr. Johnson cautioned that the public hearing did not notice moving the sidewalk to the east side of the road.

Mr. Niland proposed a motion to temporarily remove Bantle Road from consideration this evening and address it on a different date.

**Motion by:** Mr. Niland

**Seconded by:** Ms. Carroll

*BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby removes Bantle Road from the sidewalks to be done.*

**Disc:** Mr. Cavanaugh does not want to create a situation where the Town is burdened with cleaning the sidewalk. It is easier to keep what the Council had originally planned, which was to complete that continuous loop.

**Result:** Motion to remove Bantle Road passed {7-2-0}, with Mr. Cavanaugh and Mr. Gullotta voting against.

**Result:** Motion to create sidewalks on Spring Street, House Street, Main Street/Route 17 passed unanimously {9-0-0}.

## **PUBLIC HEARING NO 2: ACTION ON PROPOSED TEXT AND MAP AMENDMENT TO BUILDING ZONE REGULATIONS – TOWN CENTER VILLAGE DISTRICT (OVERLAY ZONE).**

**Motion by:** Ms. Carroll

**Seconded by:** Mr. Cavanaugh

*BE IT RESOLVED, the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves amendment to the Building Zone Regulations to add section 4.19 – Town Center Village District (Overlay Zone) and related Text and Map (as amended) Amendments, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated November 19, 2021 and as recommended by the Town Planning & Zoning Commission, with said text and map amendments effective December 17, 2021.*

**Disc:** Mr. Johnson explained that this is a proposed amendment to the building zone regulations to establish a new Town Center Village District (Overlay Zone). The primary purpose is to protect, promote, and enhance unique historic patterns, architecture, landscape, and other features of the Town Center Village District. He noted that the TPZ unanimously reported favorably on the proposed recommendation, but they cited design guidelines, and the consideration of potential subdistricts within the Town Center Village District. The group they are looking to work with has identified three potential subdistricts. The regulation establishes an ADRC (Architectural Design Review Committee) which would be required to have members with background and qualifications in architecture, planning, and landscape architecture. The next step would be to establish the design guidelines which would form part of the regulations for other commercial zones, as well.

Mr. Johnson noted two questions for the Council: the first is whether the ADRC should supplement the activities that are now handled by the Beautification Committee or should a

single entity be established that looks at site, landscaping, and architecture. The second question is how the Council would like to proceed with the design guidelines: either the Council could be responsible through a steering committee and the TPZ, or the ADRC could lead that process and make a proposal to the Council.

Mr. Gullotta opened the floor for comments from the public:

***Denise Weeks of 334 Hollister Way West***, is in favor of preserving structures in the Town Center that have true historical significance. However, she is concerned that several of the structures that fall within the proposed district are examples of strip mall development of the 1970s, which should not be treated as historic. Strip malls have been responsible for turning vibrant downtowns into ghost towns while putting pedestrians at risk and discouraging pedestrian traffic essential to a vibrant and connected downtown center. They are not worthy of preservation and would benefit from redevelopment, such as what happened with Eric Town Square. She is also concerned about the lack of areas in the designated district identified as suitable for mixed use development. She cited the newly completed Center Green project as an example of good design. She urged the Council to include form-based design principles, rather than their separate individual uses, into design objectives and to include mixed use development and prioritize pedestrian safety over vehicular access.

***Donna Hendrickson of 1751 Main Street, and President of the Glastonbury Historical Society***, stated that the Society is very concerned about development in town. She noted that even business owners have asked for guidelines. Glastonbury needs to have comprehensive design guidelines which fit with the character of the town that everyone loves so much.

***Christopher Siwy of 51 Washington Street, and Fire Marshal for the Town***, believes that there may be a need for additional language in the guidelines, especially in terms of street scaping, which should stay consistent throughout future planning projects. Sidewalk elements should be included. While al fresco dining is great to have, the elements for that should be standardized. Regarding parking elements, he likes tree planting islands. Crosswalks are important too, even though they are not traditionally historic. He also suggested incorporating some modern-day parking elements, such as EV charging stations and implementing parking kiosks as a way to generate money for the town. They should also consider what rooftops are used for and encourage standardized lighting elements, which could enhance the area. ADA access is also very important.

***Marshall S. Berdan of 2015 Main Street***, trusts that a workable set of guidelines will be drafted. They must do everything they can to reduce the footprint of the Nitkin project into something more manageable. He exhorts the creation of a village district, which can hopefully prevent future developments from coming in and destroying Glastonbury's livable, lovable town center.

**Mark Branse of 48 Birch Trail**, endorsed Mr. Siwy's comments. He listed a few examples of good design guideline models to follow in Connecticut, such as Old Saybrook, Fairfield, and Newtown. He noted that the village district is an overlay for the design only; it does not dictate use. There is also some overlap between the Historic District and the Village District. He called attention to a provision in the East Haddam village district regulation, which he drafted, which has an express provision that avoids inconsistent requirements between the two types of districts. Mr. Branse pointed out that saying it is too late to address the Nitkin project assumes that the project will be approved, and he believes that the proposal should be denied. He also called the Council's attention to section 14.19.8g, which states that the Commission should state its reasons for denial of an application. He urged the Council to remove those two sentences from their regulations because Connecticut case law states that the directive is directory rather than mandatory. Unless the Council knows every single possible reason for denial, they should not indicate any reason for denial.

**Robert Laughlin, Director of the Historical Society of Glastonbury**, favors the village district. He noted that the public is in favor of both saving historic buildings downtown and the creation of this village district. The Historical Society will pass on all the signatures they have received on their petition, both in person and online. While they encourage online petition support, it is better that people come down to sign up in person.

**Susan Modickya of 24 Fairfield Lane**, explained that she grew up in town when the freight trolley still went by. At the Historical Society, she recently encountered a document from 1985 which stated that the Town was considering making a village district. It is high time to do it.

**Evan Schwartz of 370 Thompson Street**, stated that he grew up in town and owns a business here. He is in favor of the overlay village district but urges the creation of subdistricts because Main Street has a specific architecture and character that is quite different from other areas of the Town Center. As someone who has presented in front of the TPZ, he believes that a lack of comprehensive design review guidelines in place has been very difficult for applicants. He stressed that whatever guidelines they enact are for the long term, not just for this one application on Main Street.

**Kate Morgan of 36 Tanglewood Drive**, is on the Beautification Committee but is speaking as an individual tonight. She noted that current zoning regulations make it hard to ensure that greenery and native plantings are in place. She would like to hear more about devising a way of planning which would include real thought as to how things look and how the environment would fit in. To this end, she inquired about the option of blending the Beautification Committee with Architectural Design so that it takes on a more holistic view of a project, as opposed to looking at parts of a project.

**Jeffrey Dellenbaugh of 2030 Main Street**, stated that he and his wife moved to Glastonbury in 2008 because of its village vibe. He urged the Council to approve the village district and set in place rules to govern not just historic structures but also the look and feel of the village.

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

**Richard Gutt of 155 Addison Road**, asked to consider the Town Center Village District Zone for the community of Addison. He asked to remove the Planned Employment Zone on the Gutt and Flanagan properties, apart from the property on Eastern Boulevard. This leaves 35 acres with access from Addison Road and Mill Street. The current zone leaves it destined for warehouses, which does not do much for the residents of Addison nor do they create jobs.

**John Larson of 32 Evergreen Lane**, opposes the creation of the proposed village district because it bogs down development in an area that is substantially commercial and already reflects a diversity of design. Businesses should be encouraged to contribute their vision to the fabric of town, rather than be confined to whatever crowdsourced design requirements come out of the proposed district. He believes that requiring new projects to pass through the ARDC will serve to discourage vibrant and diverse development. Buildings that reflect contemporary construction in 2022 will be no less significant or reflective of the town's historic character than those required to conform to a contrived "universal architectural theme" that was adopted instead. He asked to focus design and planning on livability, not colors and roof treatments.

Mr. Niland opened the floor for comments via Zoom:

**Kathryn Cross of 17 Linden Street**, has lived in town for 50 years. Throughout the years, the town has changed considerably. There are now parking lots both in front of and behind her property. She supports the village district concept and an architectural review body. Glastonbury is historical and needs to maintain its colonial heritage. It would be a shame to lose that little bit of history.

Mr. Johnson addressed Ms. Morgan's comments. Because the site, landscaping, and building architecture create the whole of a project, the thought was to have the architectural and site design review group look at all factors of a project. Mr. Niland asked if the action to merge the two bodies into one would require action tonight. Mr. Johnson stated that they would need a separate amendment to accomplish that. He noted that the design guidelines are proposed to include both the Town Center Village District and other commercial zones, and they expect to have subdistricts.

Mr. Cavanaugh asked about Mr. Siwy's comments regarding outdoor dining. Mr. Johnson stated that the standards will come out of the design guidelines. Mr. Cavanaugh asked about Mr.

Branse's comments about eliminating those two sentences under section 14.19.8g of the regulations. Ms. Augur explained that the language was directly drawn from section 8-2J of the statutes, so they should consult with the Town Attorney to make sure that it does not cause more potential harm than good. Mr. Cavanaugh asked Mr. Branse for clarification of his comments. Mr. Branse explained that the courts have said that the statutory language in section 14.19.8g is directory, not mandatory. Although the statutes say 'shall,' that word could mean either 'must' or 'should,' depending on how the courts have determined its meaning. Here, it is the latter. He stated that if the Council puts it in their local regulations, then it becomes mandatory. That is why he feels that it should be deleted.

Mr. Osgood asked if this new commission would review projects before the design guidelines are drafted. Mr. Johnson explained that the design guidelines are a 10-month process. If the design guidelines are drafted, the group could then be created. Ms. Carroll noted that, originally, she was against combining the Beautification Commission and the ADRC. However, streamlining the process and adding the expertise of architects and landscape architects makes sense to her. The goal is not to make this easier for applicants, though that is a bonus. The Town has the chance now to expand beyond just permitted use(s) to also pursue what the community would like to see from future developments in town.

Mr. McChesney initially shared the same concern as Ms. Carroll but is now on board with the idea. He wants to understand where the Beautification Committee comes into the process and what the vision is for what this new group is going to do. Mr. Johnson explained that they will review the site in the Town Center Village District zone and look at plans and design guidelines in other mixed use and commercial use building zones. Mr. McChesney wonders whether it will be an issue to get experts to volunteer more of their time to this new group. He also agrees with Mr. Branse in taking out the 'shall' language.

Mr. Osgood asked when this new committee will start reviewing projects. He is concerned that if they start immediately, then the review process will be very arbitrary because comparing a project to the existing buildings surrounding it will end up with the scenario of preserving more single-story strip mall establishments. Mr. Gullotta does not think that they will be able to move on this item this evening because additional language needs to be worked on. However, he also believes that there is enough language in the village district material to enable the group that will be established to be able to use their good judgment. His suspicion is that they will not endorse single story strip malls. Most buildings have a lifespan of over 100 years, so this will be a gradual transformation of the Town Center, not a radical one. They need to drift back to an environment of structures that are pedestrian friendly, handicap accessible, and that bring back the beauty of trees.

Ms. LaChance is also not concerned that this committee will endorse strip malls. She believes that they need to start where they are and move along as they go. Ms. Wang asked what the process would be for establishing the subdistricts and for potentially expanding the overlay zone. Ms. Augur stated that the subdistricts will come out through the process of developing the design guidelines. The overall success of these regulations will arise as a result of projects coming through to the town, so it will take time. Looking further out from what they have drawn on the map now will come from further planning.

Ms. Wang asked about section 4.19.6d, where the language says ‘shall’. This is a tool which is supposed to minimize the demolition of historically significant structures. Ms. Augur explained that the language is modeled after the statute. It is not interpreted as a direct prohibition, but it sends a signal that they seek to preserve historical architectural features. Mr. Johnson added that they will take another look at whether the regulation can absolutely prohibit the demolition of a historic structure. Mr. Osgood pointed out that the ADRC only makes a recommendation to the TPZ, which is not binding. Mr. Branse stated that section 14.4.19.3 is about applicability, so it does not prohibit demolition, but a demolition would trigger an application under this regulation that the TPZ would have to approve that demolition, partial or full, on the Council’s recommendation on the ADRC.

**Motion by:** Mr. Niland

**Seconded by:** Ms. Carroll

*BE IT RESOLVED, the Glastonbury Town Council hereby continues the public hearing to December 7, 2021 Regular Meeting.*

**Disc:** Mr. Gullotta encouraged members of the public to attend that meeting. He noted that there is support for the blending of the Beautification Committee and this design review, rather than two separate groups.

**Result:** Motion to continue the public hearing was passed unanimously {9-0-0}.

### **13. Adjournment.**

**Motion by:** Mr. Cavanaugh

**Seconded by:** Ms. Carroll

*BE IT RESOLVED, the Glastonbury Town Council hereby adjourns their Special Meeting of November 23, 2021 at 9:39 P.M.*

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

**Respectfully submitted,**

# **Lilly Torosyan**

**Lilly Torosyan**  
**Recording Clerk**

**Thomas Gullotta**  
**Chairman**