

**GLASTONBURY TOWN COUNCIL
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
TUESDAY, DECEMBER 7, 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. Kurt P. Cavanaugh
Mr. John Cavanna
Ms. Mary LaChance
Mr. Jacob McChesney
Mr. Whit Osgood
Ms. Jennifer Wang

a. Pledge of Allegiance

Led by Lillian Tanski

2. Public Comment.

a. Recognition of former Council Members Chip Beckett and Lillian Tanski.

Ms. Carroll presented a formal resolution honoring Ms. Tanski, who has served in various capacities in Town prior to her tenure on the Council. She stated that Ms. Tanski was always deliberate and made space for other viewpoints. Ms. Carroll is grateful to continue working with Ms. Tanski on the Racial Justice and Equity Commission.

Ms. Tanski noted that a lot of important things were accomplished over the past two years and more important decisions will come up this term. She is thankful for the opportunity to have served on the Council. She thanked council members, residents, and the Town Manager for their support and hard work.

Chairman Gullotta presented a formal resolution honoring Dr. Beckett, whom he viewed as a co-chairman. He commended Dr. Beckett for always doing what was best for the Town by acting on his conscience, not partisan politics.

Dr. Beckett stated that serving on the Council was an honor. He thanked residents and the Council, and hoped that all council members, present and future, will keep in mind that their job is to serve the Town, not partisan interests. He also thanked Mr. Johnson for doing a great job and wished everyone luck. Ms. Carroll read the written comment received, as listed on the Town website:

Janet Edmundson, Secretary of the Diamond Lake Property Owners' Association, located at 148 Eastern Boulevard, made a comment regarding the emergency access route at the end of Springside Trail. She thanked the Town for renovating the road, which now allows for emergency vehicular access.

Alison Bliss of 34 Hubbard Run Drive, asked that the Engineering Department review the turning situations at the lights along Main Street heading north into the Chili's/Edge parking lots and heading south into the former Bertucci's shopping center parking lot. She noted that the left-hand turns congest the area, which are not designated turn lanes or turn lights. She also asked to install turn lights on both sides of Oak/Williams Street and New London Turnpike. With the population of Glastonbury growing, it is imperative to address the traffic patterns in Town and reevaluate some of the lights for the safety of residents.

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

Bruce Bowman of 62 Morgan Drive, thanked Ms. Tanski and Dr. Beckett for their service on the Council. He then expressed support for the creation of a Town Center Village District, especially if it includes affordable housing. He expressed concern about the closing of the MIRA plant and suggested that the Town support the DEEP Product Stewardship Program. He is in favor of using ARPA funds to expand affordable housing in Glastonbury and collaborating with Bike Walk Glastonbury to expand multi-use trails within the former MDC land.

Anne Bowman of 62 Morgan Drive, listed her top three projects to support with the ARPA funds: expanding affordable housing through mixed income developments, improving upon public parks such as Welles Park, and reconfiguring the open space classrooms at the Naubuc School. She is in favor of expanding ADA accessibility at the Youth and Family annex and supports the Youth Mentorship Program and the Dial-a-Ride programs. Beyond ARPA, she expressed support for the creation of a village district that does not exclude affordable rental housing. She echoed Mr. Bowman's comments on supporting the DEEP Product Stewardship Program and called for another Town-wide mask mandate for indoor activities. She concluded by also thanking Ms. Tanski and Dr. Beckett for their service to Glastonbury.

3. **Special Reports.** *None*

4. **Old Business.** *None*

5. **New Business.**

a. **Action on leases of Town-owned property – Gideon Welles House.**

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, the Glastonbury Town Council hereby authorizes the Town Manager to extend the lease with Premier Photography Two (formerly EB Taylor Photography) and Emmy Lou's, Ltd. for the one-year period through October 31, 2022, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated December 3, 2021.

Disc: Mr. Johnson explained that the two tenants have leased the Gideon Welles House for several years, and they have both been working throughout the pandemic. The motion calls to extend the lease,

which expires this fall, for another year at the current rate; when that expires, they will consider implementing a longer-term lease.

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

b. Action on License Agreement between Town and Goodale-Ramaker Post 56 – American Legion for use of Town-owned building at 1361 Main Street.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, the Glastonbury Town Council hereby authorizes the Town Manager to execute the License Agreement between the Town and Goodale-Ramaker Post 56 – American Legion, Inc. for use of the Town-owned building at 1361 Main Street in accordance with the Agreement for Sale and Purchase of Real Estate dated July 13, 2021, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated December 3, 2021.

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

c. Discussion and possible action to amend Council Meeting Schedule for calendar year 2022.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, the Glastonbury Town Council hereby amends the Schedule of Regular Meetings for Calendar Year 2022 by holding a Regular Meeting on Wednesday, November 9, 2022, in lieu of Tuesday, November 8, 2022, as previously scheduled, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated December 3, 2021.

Disc: Mr. Cavanaugh stated that this is a state election with constitutional offices in the state legislature. He does not see a reason to change the date of the meeting.

Result: Motion passed {7-2-0} with Mr. Cavanaugh and Mr. Osgood voting against.

6. Consent Calendar.

a. Appropriation and transfer – General Fund-Unassigned Fund Balance to Capital Projects-Land Acquisition – \$8,000 (refer to Board of Finance, schedule public hearing).

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby refers to the Board of Finance the request for an \$8,000 appropriation and transfer from the General Fund-Unassigned Fund Balance to Capital Projects-Land Acquisition and schedules a public hearing for 8:00 p.m. on Tuesday, January 11, 2022, in the Council Chambers of Town Hall, 2155 Main Street, Glastonbury and/or through Zoom Video Conferencing, as described by a report from the Town Manager dated December 3, 2021.

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

b. Action to schedule public information hearing – Main Street reconstruction and bike/pedestrian improvements – Gateway area.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby schedules a public information hearing(s) for projects approved through the LOTCIP Grant Program to include Main Street reconstruction (School Street to New London Turnpike/Naubuc Avenue) and construction of new sidewalks within the Gateway area (Eastern and Western Boulevard, National Drive) for 8:00 p.m. on Tuesday, January 11, 2022 in the Council Chambers of Town Hall, 2155 Main Street, Glastonbury and/or through Zoom Video Conferencing, as described by a report from the Town Manager dated December 3, 2021.

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

7. Town Manager’s Report.

Mr. Johnson noted that the Hartford Foundation for Public Giving has awarded a \$35,000 grant for the restoration and ongoing preservation of the Cotton Hollow mill walls. Additional fundraising is underway for that project. The property evaluation process has not yet started, but Ms. Lintereur will provide an update to the Council at a future meeting. Over the years, there has been discussion to renovate the Williams Memorial Building/Academy School to make it a public gathering space. The pandemic has enhanced the need for additional space for Town meetings to ensure that social distancing requirements are met. The Academy building could provide that need. Mr. Gullotta suggested that council members conduct a tour of the space in early 2022.

Mr. Johnson explained that there was a discussion on updating the demolition delay ordinance. A referral to the Policy Ordinance Review would be helpful. He also discussed the Council meeting format, noting that the Town is just above the threshold for the Red Zone. If that number continues to climb, he asked if the Council would want to conduct their meetings via Zoom or continue to conduct them in-person. The Council agreed, via consensus, to continue the guidelines that the previous Council established regarding the meeting format, which was the following: If Glastonbury spends two consecutive weeks in the Red Zone level (which is defined as 15 new cases per 100,000 population), then meetings will be conducted via Zoom only. Anything below that will be a hybrid meeting, conducted in-person, with the option for participation via Zoom.

Mr. Johnson explained that last Friday, the State Review Board unanimously recognized that the Wright-Gaines building and the workhouse behind it remain as historically significant contributing factors to the National Historic Register. Ms. LaChance thanked Mr. Johnson and Town Staff for all their work in helping to preserve Glastonbury. Mr. McChesney is excited to see the Christmas lights competition come back this year. He also thanked the Parks and Recreation staff for bringing back the Santa Run. He asked if there is a new stop sign at the corner of Western Boulevard and National Drive. Mr. Johnson replied yes, the new stop sign was part of the discussion when the new multi-use trail was

constructed. Additionally, the Town was awarded a grant of about \$940,000 to 960,000 to complete the sidewalk network in National Drive and Eastern and Western Boulevards.

Mr. Cavanaugh's understanding was that once the positive ruling was made by SHPO, then the properties would be safe from demolition. He asked if a petition from residents is necessary to prevent the demolitions. Mr. Johnson stated that SHPO needs an expression of greater objection from the community than what was expressed at last Friday's meeting, to bring the action to the Attorney General's office. A petition could provide that support. Mr. Gullotta stated that if the Attorney General's office is not going to vigorously oppose the demolitions, then this Council is prepared to do so by any legal means.

Motion by: Mr. Cavanaugh

Seconded by: Ms. Carroll

BE IT RESOLVED, the Glastonbury Town Council hereby adds to the agenda the action item to authorize the Town Manager to work with the Town Attorney and take steps necessary to prevent the demolition of the Main Street buildings.

Result: Motion to add item to agenda was passed unanimously {9-0-0}.

- a. Action to authorize the Town Manager to work with the Town Attorney and take steps necessary to prevent the demolition of the Main Street buildings.*

Mr. Cavanaugh asked how the Attorney General gets notified, to which Mr. Johnson replied that if SHPO receives wide-spread community objection to the demolitions of the Main Street properties, they will ask the Attorney General to oppose said demolitions. Mr. Gullotta asked if the Council could develop a petition to gather signatures and host it on the Town website. Mr. Johnson stated that there is nothing preventing the Council from doing that. Mr. McChesney asked why the Council wants to make a separate petition when there is already one in existence. Mr. Gullotta explained that the extant petition is a private one, so broadcasting it on the Town website could set a precedent that he would like to avoid. Two petitions will not do any harm.

Ms. Wang noted that she attended last Friday's meeting, which was held virtually. She believes that the review board was impressed by the amount of public support for the properties, which seemed quite unusual. She would like to know what the added value of the petition is, on top of the public presence at that meeting. She also asked to work with the Historic Commission in co-signing whatever petition the Council drafts up, to maintain the signatures amassed to date. Mr. Gullotta suggested that the Council draft two motions: one directing the Town Manager to work with the Town Attorney and another to refer the demolition delay ordinance to the Policy and Ordinance Review Subcommittee for review.

Motion by: Mr. Cavanaugh

Seconded by: Ms. Carroll

BE IT RESOLVED, the Glastonbury Town Council hereby authorizes the Town Manager to work with the Town Attorney and take steps necessary to prevent the demolition of the Wright Gaines House at 2277-2289 Main Street and the worker house located immediately to the rear of the subject property.

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

Mr. McChesney noted that, per their rules, members of the public can comment on a topic they are discussing. The Council invited the Historical Society to speak on their petition.

Robert Laughlin, Executive Director of the Historical Society, noted that while he does not have the petition with him, he can provide it to the Council after this meeting. Strong community support is needed to save these historical buildings. To this effect, members of the community have started several online petitions to save several buildings throughout town. One online petition has already garnered 1000 signatures thus far.

Discussion was tabled to hear the public hearings.

PUBLIC HEARING NO 1: ACTION ON PROPOSED TEXT AND MAP AMENDMENT TO BUILDING ZONE REGULATIONS – TOWN CENTER VILLAGE DISTRICT (OVERLAY ZONE). CONTINUED FROM NOVEMBER 23, 2021.

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 December 3, 2021, and as recommended by the Town Planning & Zoning Commission, with said text and map amendments effective January 7, 2022.

Disc: Via Zoom, **Jennifer Siskind of 101 Fairview Terrace,** thanked the Council for amending the code to include a village district. She also thanked the Council for taking formal action to prevent the destruction of the Gaines building, where she used to work and still has friends who live there.

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

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, the Glastonbury Town Council hereby further amends the text of new Section 4.19 of the Building Zone Regulations with said amendments effective January 7, 2022, as follows:

4.19.2. Definitions

(a) change: “ADRC” – Architectural Design Review Committee to “ASDRC” – Architectural and Site Design Review Committee.

Disc: Mr. Johnson explained that this action will combine the ARDC with the Beautification Committee to create a new group called the ASDRC, which will provide a comprehensive review of architecture,

amenities, and site landscaping. The ASDRC will consist of 7 members, including architects, planners, and landscape architects. The group will review applications in the Town Center Village District (Overlay) Zone. However, they plan on returning to the Council in January to request an amendment that will allow them to review projects outside of that zone. Mr. McChesney noted that this action does not make any changes to the current Beautification Committee. Mr. Johnson stated that is correct; it is a two-step process. Mr. Cavanaugh asked if tonight's Beautification Committee appointments will be tabled. Mr. Gullotta stated that if this motion goes forward, then yes, their appointments will be tabled.

Mr. Johnson explained that not every demolition has an application before the TPZ. If there is a proposal to the TPZ, then the ASDRC will issue a comment. In such a case where there is no proposal for a demolition application, then the ASDRC will issue its comments back to the Building Official. Mr. Cavanaugh has a problem with this language. He would like the TPZ to make a comment on the permits, as well. Ms. Carroll understands Mr. Cavanaugh's concern, but she worries that adding the TPZ to this process while creating a new body in the ASDRC could complicate matters. Attorney Matt Ranelli from Shipman & Goodwin LLP explained that, in the absence of an application before the TPZ, demolition permits will go to the Building Official, not the zoning commission. While nothing prevents the TPZ from making a comment, the commission would not have an official role in granting or denying the demolition permits.

Ms. Wang is confused as to why a demolition on its own would not trigger the applicability of the village district regulation. Mr. Johnson explained that the regulation cannot provide the TPZ with a power that the statute does not enable them to have. Mr. McChesney stated that Ms. Wang is correct in that it is applicable when there is a demolition permit. Currently, there is no one to give the report to because the TPZ does not review a report on its own. The reason this is being offered is because the Building Official is considering a straight demolition permit, not the TPZ. Mr. Osgood asked if the Building Official has any right to deny a demolition permit. Mr. Ranelli stated yes, if the criteria are not met to satisfy approval of the demolition permit. Whether the Building Official has discretion after that point, once all criteria are met, is likely very limited.

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

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

4.19.3 Applicability

Add final paragraph: In the case of demolition permit applications not associated with any zoning, site plan or special permit, the ADRC (or ASDRC) shall provide a report to the Building Official in accordance with the procedures established in Section 4.19.8.

Disc: Mr. Gullotta does not believe that the TPZ needs to be included on everything. He is comfortable with this language.

Result: Motion passed {8-1-0} with voting against.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

4.19.5 TCVD Design Guidelines

First sentence, change: The ADRC to ASDRC or Town Council shall develop Village District Design Guidelines for First sentence, add: review by the Commission ASDRC for and adoption by the Council.

Disc: Mr. Johnson asked the Council to consider which option it prefers: either that this design guideline process be Council-driven, through the creation of a steering committee, or to delegate the process to the ASDRC, who will then bring matters back to the Council for approval.

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

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

4.19.7

Change Title: **Architectural Design Review Committee (ADRC) to Architectural and Site Design Review Committee (ASDRC)**

First sentence, change: All applications subject to the provisions of this Section shall be referred to the Architectural Design Review Committee (ADRC) to Architectural and Site Design Review Committee (ASDRC) upon receipt of a complete application.

(a)(b)(c)(f)(g), change: ADRC to ASDRC

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

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

4.19.8 Procedure

(a) add: Applications subject to this Section received by the Commission or Building Official, in the case of demolition permit applications not associated with a zoning, site plan or special permit, will (a) change: be referred to the ADRC to ASDRC pursuant to Sections 4.19.3 and 4.19.6 for its review and recommendation in relation to the Design Guidelines of Section 4.19.5 and other requirements of the TCVD.

(b) change: ADRC to ASDRC

(c) change: The ADRC to ASDRC shall review the application and report to the Commission (c) add: Building Official within thirty-five (35) days from receipt of the application. Such report and recommendation shall be entered into the public hearing record and considered by the Commission in making its decision.

(d)(e)(f), change: ADRC to ASDRC

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

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

Disc: Mr. Gullotta noted that Attorney Branse raised the issue of how courts will treat the mandatory “shall” in their regulations. He asked if the Council could change the word “shall” to “may.” Attorney Ranelli’s recommendation is to keep it at “shall” because it is good governance to have statutory education about what the obligations of applicants are. He is not aware of any commission that does not state any reason for their decisions, which Attorney Branse recommends that the Council do. Attorney Ranelli explained that this will not eliminate any risk for an appeal, but he thinks that the risk is small, and he favors a good government approach. Mr. McChesney stated that it was Mr. Branse’s suggestion to remove both sentences entirely, which he was erring on the side of supporting.

Mr. Cavanaugh is confused as to how the court finds the reasons in the record when the commission votes no and does not state its reasons. Mr. Ranelli stated that the answer is twofold: the courts are looking for the reason that the commission gives, not that of any individual member, which is usually given in the Resolution of Decision. If no reason is given at all, the court, with the aid of the Town Attorney, will go back through the transcripts and find areas of when people spoke, which they will deem as the reasons which were not formalized at the end. In his experience, those benefits are very infrequent, and it is better to just state their reasons. Mr. McChesney would rather be in a position where the court is looking to everyone’s comments as the reasoning of the TPZ for their decision. Mr. Cavanaugh agreed with Mr. McChesney to remove both sentences.

Mr. Gullotta highlighted that, should they vote to delete the two sentences, it does not stop the TPZ from continuing their practice of stating their reasons. Ms. Carroll asked Mr. Ranelli to clarify what he means by good governance. Attorney Ranelli clarified that deleting the first sentence does not constitute bad governance. He explained that it is a principle to use the statutory language to educate stakeholders and hold down requirements. By putting it in writing, it would serve as a reminder.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

~~(g), delete: If the Commission grants or denies an application, it shall state upon the record the reasons for its decision. If the Commission denies an application, the reasons for the denial shall cite the specific Regulations under which the application was denied. Notice of the decision shall be published in the newspaper having a substantial circulation in Glastonbury.~~

Disc: Mr. Osgood believes that applicants deserve to know why their application is being denied. Ms. Carroll agrees, stating that she is uncomfortable, even if they leave open the possibility of a protocol for an explanation to be involved. Mr. Niland also expressed discomfort. He noted that, if they are to err on the side of good governance, then they need to give their reasons for denial to the people who come before them. Mr. McChesney does not conceive how anyone who presents an application before the TPZ can listen to the comments of commissioners and not know why they voted the way that they did. Mr. Gullotta agreed, adding that this action does not impede the TPZ from carrying on their practice of listing reasons of denial.

Result: Motion passed {5-4-0} with Mr. Osgood, Ms. Carroll, Mr. Niland, and Mr. Cavanna voting against.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby moves to approve the entirety of the changes to the Town Center Village District Overlay Zone and the areas of definitions, applicability, TCVD guidelines, and procedure.

Disc: Mr. Osgood believes that the review criteria established under this ordinance is very arbitrary. He does not believe that it gives a property owner an idea of what is expected of them. Mr. Cavanaugh stated that there has been a lot of public support for this action, which is long overdue. A village district will allow the Town to preserve its New England character. He looks forward to implementing everything agreed upon tonight. Mr. McChesney shares Attorney Branse's indication that there are already people in town who conduct reviews without the benefit of guidelines. The Council should move forward on this action sooner rather than later.

Ms. Wang also had similar concerns about the lack of design guidelines prior to establishing regulations and the ADRC which is now renamed the ASDRC. However, through these deliberations, she agrees that it is wise for the Council to move forward with this action. She encouraged the community to stay as involved as they have been. Only through public engagement will they get what they want from this regulation. Ms. Carroll stated that a great way for the community to get involved is to put their names forward to join the ASDRC because the commission needs qualified architects, planners, and designers. Mr. Gullotta stated that this has been a long process. It is a new beginning where changes will not happen overnight, but over the span of 50 or 75 years. Glastonbury can slowly recapture much of its appearance that was lost and rediscover what New England architecture is.

Result: Motion passed {8-1-0} with Mr. Osgood voting against.

NO 2: PUBLIC INFORMATION HEARING – DISCUSSION AND PUBLIC COMMENT ON POTENTIAL USES OF MONIES ALLOCATED TO GLASTONBURY THROUGH THE AMERICAN RESCUE PLAN ACT (ARPA). CONTINUED FROM OCTOBER 12, 2021.

Mr. Johnson stated that Glastonbury is scheduled to receive \$10.2 million of ARPA funding in two lifts. Monies are to be allocated by December 31, 2024 and spent by December 31, 2026. There are a variety of criteria for what the funds can be allocated towards. An interim final rule by the Treasury is expected by the end of the year. Through the process of winnowing through options, they can conduct research to confirm eligibility on specific projects.

Pamela Lucas of 145 Moseley Terrace, hopes that the Council will allocate funding for land acquisition and affordable housing projects for lower income residents and those disproportionately affected by the pandemic. She noted that Glastonbury has a waiting list for affordable housing units. The Affordable Housing Steering Committee proposes that support be given to create additional units of assisted housing. The Housing Authority has deep success in developing and managing affordable and assisted residential units. The Town can provide land in funds to do more. This will also help the Town meet its obligations under state and federal law. She also asked that some funding be allocated to address child mental health, such as improving the Welles Park playground, improving the Youth and Family Services facility, and helping the agency develop a Youth Mentorship program.

David O'Connor of 1140 Main Street, also supports the use of funds for affordable housing. He appreciates the efforts and attention towards this issue made by the Affordable Housing Steering Committee and the Town Manager.

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

Pamela Lockard of 10 Southgate Drive, supports increasing affordable housing in whatever way is recommended by the Affordable Housing Steering Committee. The committee has been thorough, knowledgeable, and open to explore ideas and concerns raised by citizens. She also encouraged all to attend a presentation by TALK on affordable housing in Glastonbury, which will be held on December 13 at 6:30 P.M. via Zoom.

Mr. Gullotta listed his top four priorities for ARPA funding: to acquire land for affordable housing; to make improvements to public parks, particularly those near Welles Village; to improve internet access at Welles Village; and to renovate the Williams Memorial/Academy School. He would like the public to walk through the building to see its possibilities as future public meeting space for the Town.

Ms. LaChance asked about staffing of therapists. Mr. Johnson stated that there has been an uptick in counseling services, so they are busy, and staffing is behind. The Youth Mentorship Program has been identified on the funding list. Mr. Niland believes that use might be eligible for federal funding. Therefore, there might be better options for ARPA funding. He asked how much revenue was lost at the boathouse. Mr. Johnson stated that, in broad strokes, the losses have been in the \$150,000 to \$200,000 range, but that is a preliminary estimate. Mr. Niland thinks that taxpayers should be reimbursed for lost revenue first. Mr. Osgood and Mr. Cavanaugh agreed.

Mr. McChesney would like to assist small businesses, particularly those that were heavily impacted by the pandemic. He noted that the Director of the Chamber of Commerce sent out a note regarding nonprofit assistance and whether Glastonbury would like to contribute. He also asked how improvements to public parks would be included. Mr. Johnson noted that, on the capital program, he will provide a category that would indicate whether a project was ARPA eligible or not. Funding for nonprofits that are affected by the pandemic is an approved use. For small businesses, there is a formula that they would have to consider for those which have been hit particularly hard by the pandemic. Regarding parks, he noted that they have looked at expanding handicap accessibility. Welles Village is on the list, as is the playground at Addison Park.

Ms. Carroll stated that all these projects are good options. She wants to encourage the public to voice their opinions and preferences. The Council should have at least one more public hearing on this item. Mr. Gullotta agreed. During the CIP process, he would like to make meaningful decisions on what to do with the first lift of \$5.1 million.

Mr. Cavanaugh objects to giving any money to the Chamber of Commerce. The money should go to taxpayers in Glastonbury and invest in Glastonbury projects. Mr. McChesney stated that a community is as strong as its business community, and the Chamber of Commerce supports local businesses in Glastonbury. He felt that the least they could do was discuss whether funds should go to them. Ultimately, he is curious about ways to help the business community. Mr. Cavanaugh asked how the process of acquiring land for affordable housing would work, especially since it limits the Town to consider only areas with water and sewer. Mr. Gullotta noted that, more than 40 years ago, he was a part of the Council which looked at expanding affordable housing, and it did not work. This Council must do

something differently, which is to work with the Housing Authority as their partner in purchasing property and developing low density, high quality, multigenerational affordable units.

Mr. Cavanaugh asked if the criteria would allow the funding of a parking lot at Williams Park. Mr. Johnson stated that that might be difficult to include as a permitted use, since it is not directly related to improving parks. Mr. Osgood stated that the Affordable Housing Steering Committee will issue their report soon. He would like to see what their recommendations are. In that context, he does not think that the Council should put a limit on themselves to decide how they will spend these funds by January 2022.

To narrow down the list of projects, Ms. Wang would like to take a thoughtful approach that builds upon the Town's shared vision. She agreed with council members Niland, Osgood, and Cavanaugh in taking on projects that might have otherwise occurred to reduce the burden on taxpayers. She would also like to think outside the box to assist those who were disproportionately affected by the pandemic. She also supports funding to address clean infrastructure, such as issues around drainage and stormwater usage. She concluded by echoing council members Carroll and Gullotta in their calls for another public information hearing on this item. She hopes that the public continues to reach out and engage in this conversation.

NO 3: ACTION TO OPEN THE PUBLIC HEARING ON THE APPLICATION BY JS ADVISORS LLC – ADAPTIVE REDEVELOPMENT ZONE FOR THE PROPERTY AT 38 HUBBARD STREET AND THEN CONTINUE THE PRESENTATION BY THE APPLICANT, PUBLIC TESTIMONY AND COUNCIL DISCUSSION TO THE MEETING OF TUESDAY, JANUARY 11, 2022.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, the Glastonbury Town Council hereby move to open the public hearing by JS Advisors LLC — Adaptive Redevelopment Zone for the Property at 38 Hubbard Street and then continue the presentation by the applicant, public testimony, and Council discussion to the meeting of Tuesday, January 11, 2022.

Disc: Mr. Cavanaugh would like to be certain that the PAD Review Subcommittee will meet before this public hearing. Mr. Johnson stated that they hope to have a joint meeting next week. The TPZ will not consider the matter until their January 4, 2022 meeting.

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

NO 4: ACTION ON \$125,000 APPROPRIATION AND TRANSFER FROM THE GENERAL FUND-UNASSIGNED FUND BALANCE FOR THE DESIGN GUIDELINES PROJECT.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves a \$125,000 appropriation and transfer from the General Fund-Unassigned Fund Balance to Capital Projects-Design Guidelines for the Design Guidelines project, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated December 3, 2021, and as recommended by the Board of Finance.

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

Discussion returned to the Town Manager's Report:

Mr. Cavanaugh indicated he had heard a report that a school bus driver was threatened with a knife. Mr. Johnson does not know the details of the incident, but he will report back. Mr. Cavanaugh asked about the Cotton Hall mill walls. Mr. Johnson explained that the process will begin by stabilizing the mill walls, which a local mason is prepared to do. After that, they hope to keep raising money to continue the effort of preservation and restoration.

Mr. Cavanaugh proposed a motion to revisit the demolition delay ordinance, with the hopes of extending the timeframe from 90 days to 120 days, and to place signage on all properties listed to be demolished.

Motion by: Mr. Cavanaugh

Seconded by: Ms. Carroll

BE IT RESOLVED, the Glastonbury Town Council hereby refers the Demolition Delay Ordinance and Public Act 490 for Open Space to the Policy and Ordinance Review Committee.

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

Ms. Carroll asked who is responsible for site maintenance at Minnechaug Golf Course. Mr. Johnson stated that it is the company with which they have the lease. Ms. Carroll thanked them for doing a fantastic job of removing dead trees and conducting preventative work. Mr. Niland noted that during the public comment session, Ms. Bliss commented on the left turns on Main Street. He noted that West Hartford has recently worked with the State to implement a road diet on their Main Street. It was an experimental move, which has been successful in moving traffic along the artery. He suggested that the Town explore that option for part of Glastonbury's Main Street. Mr. Johnson stated that they can look into that.

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

Mr. Gullotta would like to have a public walkthrough of the Academy building for consideration of use as additional meeting room space for the Town. He also wished everyone a happy and safe holiday season.

b. MDC.

Ms. LaChance stated that the budget vote was last night. There were minor increases.

c. **CRCOG.** *None*

d. Rules of Procedure.

Mr. McChesney noted that the subcommittee met and decided that the current language is satisfactory, barring one item: to change the language of the public comment session, where it reads as “should provide an opportunity,” to “shall provide an opportunity”.

He also addressed a question made by Mr. Cavanaugh at a previous meeting regarding council members responding to public comments. He read the piece of legislation which speaks to that:

“No debate or dialogue between members of the public and the councilors will be permitted. However, during the time set aside for council business, a councilor may ask questions to citizens concerning particular business items.”

Mr. Osgood asked if council members do not respond to the public comment session. Mr. Cavanaugh stated that a follow up to the public comment session may be discussed as part of the section on Special Reports. Mr. Johnson clarified that that was added so that the Chair might allow for a speedy clarification, earlier in the meeting.

Motion by: Mr. McChesney

Seconded by: Ms. Carroll

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby moves the Rules of Procedure, with the change of the word “should” to “shall” in the public comment session.

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

9. Communications.

- a. **Thank you letter from MARC, Inc. of Manchester regarding Youth and Family Services grant.**
- b. **Letter from CT Siting Council regarding shared use of an existing telecommunications facility located at 115 Birch Mountain Road.**

10. Minutes.

- a. **Minutes of November 23, 2021 Special Meeting.**

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves the minutes of the November 23, 2021 Special Meeting.

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

11. Appointments and Resignations.

- a. **Appointments to various boards, commissions, and committees as available (Democratic).**

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

Result: Appointments were accepted unanimously {9-0-0}, apart from the Beautification Commission, which was tabled to the next meeting.

12. Executive Session. None

13. Adjournment.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Ms. LaChance

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby adjourn the December 7, 2021 Regular Meeting at 10:07 P.M.

Result: Meeting was adjourned unanimously {9-0-0}.

Respectfully submitted,

Lilly Torosyan

Lilly Torosyan
Recording Clerk

Thomas Gullotta
Chairman