

**THE GLASTONBURY TOWN PLAN AND ZONING COMMISSION
SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES OF TUESDAY, JANUARY 4, 2022**

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

ROLL CALL

Commission Members Present

Mr. Robert Zanlungo, Jr., Chairman
Mr. Michael Botelho, Secretary
Mr. Raymond Hassett
Mr. Christopher Griffin
Mr. Corey Turner
Ms. Alice Sexton, Alternate {assigned as voting member}
Ms. Laura Cahill, Alternate

Commission Members Absent

Ms. Sharon Purtill, Vice Chairman
Vacancy

Chairman Zanlungo called the meeting to order at 7:01 P.M. He seated Commissioner Sexton in the absence of Commissioners Purtill. He also introduced Corey Turner to the commission.

PUBLIC HEARING

Recommendation to the Town Council (Zoning Authority) regarding the application of JS Advisors, LLC for a Change of Zone from Residence A Zone to Adaptive Redevelopment Zone (ARZ) & Approval of a Site Development Plan for Warehouse 38, a proposed residential conversion project involving 30 condominiums w/in the former Consolidated Cigar warehouse — 38 Hubbard Street — Residential A Zone to ARZ & Flood Zone

Attorney Peter Alter presented on behalf of the applicant. He noted that the commission has specifically called out this property for preservation and repurposing through the Adaptive Redevelopment Zone (ARZ). Mr. Alter explained that the applicant has accomplished several identified Plan of Conservation and Development (POCD) goals, including the following: best practices for stormwater management and treatment; adding diversity in housing opportunities in Glastonbury; enhancing the streetscape of Hubbard Street; creating a pedestrian and bicycle-friendly environment; and adding viability to the Town Center. Mr. Alter also explained the history and impetus behind the Council's adoption of the ARZ Zone in 2012, which was to facilitate the use and redevelopment of property containing underutilized and distressed historic buildings that require renovation/redevelopment and/or environmental remediation. He listed the

Tannery as an example of a development project in the ARZ Zone. This application is also consistent with the Town's Comprehensive Zoning Plan.

Tonight's proposal consists of 30, one and two-bedroom condominium units. The units are expected to be offered for sale in the price range of \$300,000 to \$450,000. Twenty-two of the units will have one parking space each, and the remaining 9 units, which are all 2-bedrooms, will be sold a tandem space. There will also be 5 visitor spaces and 6 spaces that will either be sold to unit owners or provided as additional visitor spaces. Three parking spaces will be reserved for handicapped residents. In total, the proposal shows parking for 54 cars, which meets the regulation requirement of 1.5 spaces per unit and does not count any of the tandem spaces as more than one space. By eliminating one residential unit, the applicant was able to accommodate the Council's request to have no parking spaces located toward Hubbard Street.

Mr. Alter found it very troubling to see some of the comments that accompanied a petition in opposition to this project. One person wrote that the proposed condominium units will "end up as a slum, which the neighborhood doesn't need." He finds that comment unfortunate and unnecessary. Another comment expressed a concern about the fact that the people who live in this development will make use of the Hubbard Green, which is somehow a negative quality. He hopes and expects that any taxpaying property owner in Town will make use of any public facilities with their family and friends.

Mr. Alter then presented the particulars of the site, which is about 1.2 acres. There are no residences directly involved to the north of the property. To the east, there are several multi-family houses. The property has a long history that is important to recognize, given the intention of the ARZ and the POCD. He presented maps and photographs of the building structures from 1928 to the present day. The green house has been covered to avoid vandalism. The east side of the building, with the main loading dock, has been used as a warehouse for several businesses. A large garage on the southeast corner of the property needs attention or removal. He noted that they have provided both vegetation and other kinds of screening so that the Knox Lane property on the southern boundary line is well protected.

In 2014, the Commission made a favorable recommendation for the development of 40 residential units and issued a flood zone permit, which remains in effect today. They presented the 40-unit proposal to the Council, and in that process, the project was reduced to 31 units. The WPCA, the CBC, and the CC/IWWA bodies have all approved the plan, and Mr. Mocko has submitted a favorable environmental impact report. The applicant has met twice with the ARZ Subcommittee. To accommodate the need to have parking spaces no closer to Hubbard Street than the north edge of the building, the project has been reduced to 30 units. Also proposed is a 6-foot privacy fence on all sides of the property. Impact to the neighbors and to Hubbard Street will be reduced through the following means: the removal of extraneous parts of the property so that setbacks are increased; about one third of the site will be open space; and the FAR is reduced from the .91 that is permitted by the ARZ zoning regulations to .84 by eliminating several areas that no longer serve a purpose on the property. Mr. Alter also noted that the following structures will be removed: the driveway on the west side, both loading docks, the front addition, the rear addition, the boiler room, the easterly addition, and the detached building.

Jim Dutton of Dutton Associates, LLC, reviewed the engineering plans. A sidewalk is proposed along Hubbard Street. There are two rain gardens on site which will handle all the water that runs off the roof: one is located on the southwest corner of the building, and the other is north of the building. There is a drainage system in place, but they were unable to determine where the discharge is. The rain gardens will connect into the drainage system. The paved parking area has a high point along the north end of Hubbard Street. There is an underground system of concrete leaching chambers to store the required water quality volume. Gas will be serviced by just one gas meter that is residential in size. There will be no electrical meters visible from the outside. There will also be the option of car charging stations for all parking spaces.

Mr. Dutton explained that there are three entrances to the building. In the basement, there will be bicycle storage. In the front, the grading is a flat 6% slope. The rain garden on the southwest has steeper sides, but it is not in a public area. Along the westerly border, the trees and landscaping that were installed in 2014 will remain. The soil that was placed by the loading dock will be removed, and the grade will be much flatter. Two dumpsters are proposed: one for recycling and one for trash. There is also a concrete pad in front of the dumpster, and they are making provisions to include a foundation drain. Mr. Dutton also reviewed the snow storage plan, noting that they believe there to be plenty of room to store snow. All lighting fixtures will be dark sky compliant and shielded. The lights on the westerly side of the building are for security purposes; overall, the site is not overly lit.

Will Kresic, P.E. from VHB in Wethersfield, reviewed the traffic report. He explained that they calculated the site distance at the driveway to be about 500 feet east of Main Street, which is less than the minimum requirement of 415 feet. Then, they analyzed the traffic generated from the site. Daily traffic on the road was assessed by counting cars during two typical weekdays. The average daily traffic on Hubbard Street was over 3,000 vehicles per day. The peak hour trips from the apartment units total 18 vehicles entering/exiting the site in the AM and 21 vehicles in the PM. The site driveway operates smoothly with virtually no queues and is deemed an A level service. They have received a letter of approval from Town Engineer Dan Pennington and Chief of Police Marshall Porter. Mr. Kresic showed the truck turning templates for large delivery vehicles, noting that the templates are very conservative and account for newer or less-skilled drivers.

Mr. Alter pointed out that the developer has continued the private agreement established in 2014 with Dr. Susat who owns the home to the west of the property, at 24 Hubbard Street. They have a tree buffer between, and they are working to address concerns about the planting of trees and the installation of sewer. The developer is determined to continue the agreement, and requests that it be included as part of the commission's conditions of approval. Mr. Alter also explained that the applicant has worked with another neighbor, the Glastonbury Housing Authority, to create additional screening. Some of the plantings will occur on their property. That will likely result in a license agreement. On the east side of the property line, their proposal is to construct a 6-foot fence to provide privacy.

Robert Schechinger, Landscape Architect, reviewed the comprehensive landscape plan for the site. Ten tree species will be added for a total of 69 plants going on the site. Along the western

property line, they kept the evergreen trees and habitat planting. The Beautification Committee asked to include passive recreation in the area, so they have added benches and foundation planting that is low maintenance. They will accommodate a substantive buffer planting with Dr. Susat.

Hans Winkel of Don Hammerberg Associates Architects in Farmington, showed the material samples board and the colors they have selected. The interior of the site will include typical black frame windows with white plantation style blinds. Typical trim will be dark red. The proposed stucco is very similar to what is used now. The brick will be on the lower fourth of the building, all around the perimeter. For the exterior design, their goal was to preserve as many historically significant features as possible. There will be new plastering and signage to match the originals. There will also be new stucco and the existing cornice will be refurbished. The eastern facade contains the main entrance and two side doors. All are protected with canopies and light underneath. Replacing the single windows will be double windows in the bedrooms and triple windows in the living rooms. All building amenities are located on the first floor. The second and third floors contain the condominium units. All units are handicap accessible.

Mr. Alter stated that Attorney Branse expressed a concern of the visibility of the electrical units which will be mounted on the roof. Mr. Winkel did a site view to show how it may or may not be visible. Mr. Alter himself also conducted a roof study where he stood on the roof and took photos from various views, showing that he was barely discernible from across the street. He also showed the proposed monument sign, which measures 18 square feet. It is the only signage proposed for the site.

Secretary Botelho asked if there are any deferral of spaces. Mr. Alter replied no. Mr. Botelho asked if somebody could look at the ingress and egress for the site. Mr. Alter stated that there is only one access to the site: a driveway on the easterly side. Commissioner Hassett supports making the Susats agreement a condition for approval. He asked if there has been any direct input from the neighbors regarding this proposal recently. Attorney Meghan Hope stated that she has had extensive conversations with the Housing Authority and the Tree Warden. She has not had any meetings with the neighbors to the east. Commissioner Hassett asked if there are any concerns about headlights of cars coming in at night. Attorney Hope replied that the deciduous tree planting should block the headlights.

Mr. Hassett asked if the plantings eliminate the ability to have snow storage there. Mr. Schechinger stated that there are some ornamental grasses in the front that can take snow loading, but they will not store snow on most of the vegetation along the buffer area. Mr. Hassett asked how they determined that 5 visitor parking spots were sufficient. Attorney Alter explained that they asked their client what standard he typically uses. For 100 units, 10% of the spaces would be allocated as visitor spots. For 30 units, he believes that 3-5 spaces would be more than adequate. In their case, they have an additional 6 spaces which could be allocated to visitors, if need be for a total of 11 spaces.

Commissioner Hassett asked to address the traffic photos which were sent in by Garrett Ludwig. Mr. Kresic noted that the photos seem to indicate the traffic on Hubbard Street during the AM,

which could cause backup, but generally school traffic dissipates quite quickly. School peak hours do not align with the condominium's peak hours of traffic. Commissioner Hassett asked if additional screening has been considered for the purposes of both visibility and noise. Mr. Alter replied yes, but they will not know if that is an issue until the units go up. Mr. Winkel noted that the units are fairly quiet. Once installed, then they can assess whether there are any noise or visibility issues.

Commissioner Turner asked if the developer is open to more visitor spots because there has been a lot of public concern about parking. He also noted that there is an additional space, so 7 total potential visitor spaces, since the math was calculated factoring in the original unit total of 31, not the revised 30. Mr. Alter stated that is correct. They can hold back the additional visitor spaces until residents move in and re-assess at that point.

Commissioner Cahill asked if the monument sign size is compliant with their regulations. Mr. Mullen said that it is. Commissioner Cahill is concerned about the snow removal plan. Extensive plantings have been done on the front, back, and sides of the building, but they would put the snow by the rain garden. She does not believe that 700 square feet is enough to cover over 21,000 square feet of snow. She would feel comfortable with a provision of approval to haul excess snow off-site. Mr. Alter stated that they have no problem with that because the snow will be off-loaded, if need be, regardless.

Commissioner Cahill asked to put the transformer box in the back of the building because she has concerns with the units being on the roof. Attorney Alter explained that, in 2014, the Council required the applicant to place them on the roof because they felt it unsightly to have units on the ground. He noted that the units on the ground at Knox Lane are not attractive. Commissioner Cahill is also concerned about the parking. For the front of the building, the maneuvering lanes are 22 feet, but the regulation calls for 24 feet. Mr. Alter stated that they do not need more pavement. There is no purpose in adding two feet of blacktop. Ms. Augur pointed out that the regulation says 24 feet unless otherwise permitted, so it can be less, and the Town Engineering Department has expressed no concerns with the driveway.

Commissioner Cahill is concerned that this site lacks affordable housing units. She asked what the total estimated cost is to build this project as currently designed. Mr. Alter does not know. Ms. Cahill noted that Councilman Cavanaugh expressed a concern about the lack of affordable housing on this development. In the Glastonbury Citizen, Mr. Alter stated that the project would be economically infeasible to accomplish if it included affordable housing units. Mr. Alter clarified his comments, explaining that if any town seeks to create affordable housing, it is inappropriate to take a project that was 41 units, reduce it to 30 units, and then require that some of those units be affordable housing. Rather than getting a density bonus, this project has surrendered over 25% of its units at the direction of the Town Council. Making affordable housing units in that scenario would render the project unbuildable.

Commissioner Sexton stated that the ARZ is great to use for historical buildings in town. She asked about other opportunities to accomplish goals of the POCD, such as lead design construction, energy efficiency, or material selection. She was hoping to see solar panels on the

roof. Mr. Winkel explained that the building will be very energy efficient and highly insulated. They considered using solar on the roof, but according to their calculations, it did not make sense for what they were doing mechanically. Commissioner Sexton then asked how many electric vehicle chargers will be installed initially. Mr. Alter explained that all the infrastructure will be done now. There is a contract with a private company to work with residents who want electric vehicle charging stations.

Commissioner Sexton noted that cell phone reception is very bad in the area. She asked if it were possible, as a tradeoff, to include a tower in this building to make one of the units economically feasible for affordable housing. Attorney Alter stated that they can inquire about it, but he is skeptical that the public will be in favor of a tall, ugly tower in that area. Commissioner Sexton asked if the 22-foot driveway meets the emergency services requirement. Mr. Alter replied yes.

Chairman Zanlungo opened the floor for public comment.

Dana Ierardi of 50A Hubbard Street, stated that his property abuts the southeast side of the project. He asked if there were other condominium developments in Glastonbury with this kind of tight parking area. He is concerned about truck deliveries and the noise and safety issues that will be generated by the trucks. He installs HVAC units for a living, so he knows about the fan condensers. The roof is the best place to have them because the fans can be noisy. He also noted that the measurements for the condensing units will be a little taller than what was shown on the plans because they will have to sit on a stand. He is also concerned about lighting coming onto his property, as well as the snow removal. Considering the amount of pavement, he is not convinced that there is enough area there is to dump snow. He is also against including affordable housing units in the project, believing that it is not the right area for it.

Pam Lucas of 145 Moseley Terrace, urged the commission to approve the application only on the condition that the project include at least two affordable housing units. She noted that Attorney Alter stated at the December 13 meeting that the Town does not have an affordable housing plan from which to make affordable units. The Council and Town zoning officials do not need the plan to recognize that Glastonbury has a dire shortage of affordable housing and falls short of the state's requirements. She noted that Commissioners Purtill and Botelho have indicated that deed-restricted occupied units have been difficult to implement in Glastonbury. She asked the commission to explore further what happened last time, what went wrong, and address steps going forward.

Leonard Factor of 52 Hubbard Street, and also owner of 54 Hubbard Street, is astonished that a project of this density would be granted by the Town of Glastonbury. He is in favor of development but the number of units, parking spaces, and people entering and exiting the site is just too much. Having developed similar buildings in New Jersey, he believes that the total cost for constructing 30 units here would run in the range of \$6-6.5 million, and the revenue in the \$11-12 million range. He also has a concern about the fact that there is no noise, sound, or light buffering. He finds the amount of visitor spaces to be half of what it should be. He is also concerned about the number of cars that are parked on the Hubbard Green and believes that snow removal will be a concern.

Mark Berthiaume of 70 Hubbard Street, stated that he and his wife moved to Glastonbury in large part because of the Hubbard Green. While he was excited to hear about the development, he was also concerned about how that could potentially affect Hubbard Green. He is not supportive of this plan. The density is too high, and the driveway is narrow, with only one turnaround opportunity, which would pose a safety concern for emergency vehicular access. No matter what the traffic study says, Hubbard Green is a traffic-heavy road. He noted that no one wants to deny residents use of the Hubbard Green; they simply worry about parking. He worries that what happens inside this parcel will leak out onto the street.

Chuck Kelsey of 94 Hubbard Street, was surprised to hear about the loss of direction of zoning officials with respect to this unit. The density far exceeds his comfort level. He noted that he and wife recently left a condominium unit in Nashville, Tenn. where people parked everywhere. The proposed parking for this site will not be enough and will result in people parking anywhere they can. He wondered if people would resort to overnight parking at the Historical Society. Hubbard Street is a busy street, and the temporary parking for delivery trucks will be a main issue. He also asked what guarantees the Town has that, should the project not sell all its units, that it will not become insolvent.

Ilene Grueneberg of 86 Hubbard Street, is very concerned about the density, which would be 3 times that of anything found anywhere in Glastonbury. She noted that there should be no interference in the driveway, which per the regulations, should measure 24 feet, not 22 feet. There should also be 4 loading zones, not just one. There is no on-street parking on Hubbard Street or Main Street, and no accessible parking lot, so the overage parking can only go on the Hubbard Green, which has no parking after dark. She has lots of safety concerns and practical concerns which should be the driving force to zoning decisions. She would love to see this building developed, but only as 10 or 15 units which could enhance the neighborhood.

Wendy Anderson of 811 Hopewell Road, hopes to be the realtor who markets and sells this project. There is a great need for housing in Glastonbury, affordable and otherwise. This project is a beautiful asset for the town. Regarding the parking concerns, she pointed out that the units are only about 900 square feet, which does not leave much room to entertain guests, so there should not be too many visitors on the site at any time. There is also a drop-off for UPS, who will be required to drive in and drop off in that area. They have worked hard to make this a great property for the town.

Anne Bowman of 62 Morgan Drive, is concerned about the lack of affordable housing units in Glastonbury. The waiting list for the Glastonbury Housing Authority is over 1,100. Adding just one affordable housing unit in this project would be great. She also asked for solar canopies over the parking areas which would help eliminate the heat sink from the paving.

Attorney Alter answered many of the questions posed by the public. He believes that there have been other developments in town with this kind of parking. There are a variety of parking requirements in Glastonbury, depending on which zone the development is in. He listed a condominium project on Naubuc Avenue which has no visitor spaces. It also does not have a 24-foot driveway. The Conservation Commission repeatedly asks them to limit pavement as much

as possible, so they have been adhering to that direction. He also noted that all the multi-family housing they have constructed have been overparked, with more parking than they need. He listed the Tannery as an example, where the average is about one car per unit. Therefore, the 1.5 spaces per unit in this proposal should be more than enough. While the density may be perceived as too large for some, the regulations allow it. If the Town is unhappy, he suggested they change the regulations, not punish an applicant for meeting all the listed requirements. Traffic engineer from VHB Joseph Balskus added that they conducted a parking generation using a nationwide manual. Running the analysis, they found that 48 spaces are needed, according to similar developments across the country. Therefore, there is more than enough parking on-site.

Garrett Ludwig of 117 Hubbard Street, finds the influx of additional traffic at the peak hour to be oppressive. He showed pictures depicting the heavy traffic. He is also concerned about delivery trucks coming within 300 yards of his home and does not know where cars will be parked during the snow removal process. He views this application as unreasonable and chaotic. He then provided some calculations for the conservative potential of 7 cars increasing traffic.

Betsy Thompson of 70 Hubbard Street, has concerns about the financial viability of the project. There is inadequate visitor parking. She does not find the density to be the greater issue; it is the size of the lot, which is far too small to accommodate so many people and cars. She is also concerned about the traffic off Route 2. People will need to turn left on that driveway, which is hard and could potentially be a big issue.

Attorney Alter addressed the question regarding taller condensing units. He noted that they received the specification of a 28-inch unit on a 4 x 4-inch standoff from the engineer. He also addressed the concern of light spilling out onto Hubbard Street. Their lighting plan depicts that all the fixtures are dark sky compliant and full cutoff fixtures. Analysis shows that there is 0.0 light spillage over the property line. Mr. Alter addressed the comment of this project being three times as dense as other developments in town. He stated that that is an inaccurate statement. Glastonbury One is just over 20 units to the acre. This property calculates out to 25 units to acre, which is certainly not 3 times as dense. Mr. Dutton added that there is another project on Naubuc Avenue that is also 20 units to the acre.

Mr. Alter spoke to the question of installing solar panels over the parking. He noted that Commissioner Purtill had asked a similar question at the last subcommittee review meeting. The applicant proposed a cardboard structure in 2014, but the Council rejected it. It was clear that the Council does not want such structures, so they are not proposing it again. Mr. Alter noted that he does not know how much construction costs are, but all his clients inform him that prices are skyrocketing. The financial profit of developers has never been a critical part of this commission's efforts, and he does not feel that it should be now, but he can get that information.

Chairman Zanolungo asked Ms. Augur to expand upon why this commission cannot require affordable housing units in this project. Ms. Augur explained that there are no regulations providing for affordable housing anywhere. Mr. Alter added that this site would be perfect for a Connecticut General Statutes Section 8-30G application. He suspects that the people who have

spoken out against this application tonight would also be against an 8-30G application, which would add far more density than the proposed project.

Mr. Alter agreed with Commissioner Cahill's comment that Glastonbury is not meeting its requirements for affordable housing. He also agreed with Commissioner Purtill's earlier comments that affordable housing efforts have failed in the past. The most successful affordable housing opportunity in Town will be the two units for Habitat for Humanity. As excellent as the Glastonbury Housing Authority is at running its properties, it is not equipped to run at market units. That would require a whole new infrastructure in the community. He resists the idea that a developer should be willing to throw in two affordable units when there is no reciprocity. Doing it ad hoc has not worked in the past, and it will not work now. Instead, affordable housing should be incorporated into the regulations.

Chairman Zanolungo read the following letters received from the public:

Lynn Powell and Henry Conway of 1945 Main Street, find the application too dense, which will worsen traffic. They instead suggest a project with a maximum of 10-12 units.

Ilene Grueneberg of 86 Hubbard Street, is not in favor of the application because she does not find it to be congruent with the ARZ. She also believes that the Hubbard Green is a historical site which needs to be preserved. The area does not need more condominiums.

Another letter was sent from the email address JWBJR312@outlook.com and signed by various residents on Hubbard Street and a couple side streets, who were not in favor of the application.

Commissioner Sexton asked if there is any outside location where a bicycle rack could be installed for visitor use. Attorney Alter stated yes, that is not a problem.

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

Motion by: Commissioner Hassett

Seconded by: Commissioner Griffin

MOVED, that the Town Plan and Zoning Commission forwards a favorable recommendation to the Town Council Zoning Authority for approval of the application of JS Advisors, LLC for a Change of Zone from Residence A Zone to Adaptive Redevelopment Zone (ARZ) & Approval of a Site Development Plan for Warehouse 38, a proposed residential conversion project involving 30 condominiums w/in the former Consolidated Cigar warehouse — 38 Hubbard Street — Residential A Zone to ARZ & Flood Zone, in accordance with the cited plans:

And

1. In compliance with:
 - a. The conditions set forth by the Conservation Commission, in their special recommendations for approval to the Town Plan and Zoning Commission, and the Inland

Wetlands and Watercourses Agency Permit issued at their regular meeting of September 16, 2021.

- b. The recommendations as contained in the August 12, 2021 and September 8, 2021 Community Beautification Committee meetings.
 - c. The standards contained in a report from the Fire Marshal, File 21-044, plans reviewed December 21, 2021.
2. In adherence to:
 - a. The Town Engineer's memorandum dated December 28, 2021.
 - b. The Police Chief's memorandum dated December 27, 2021.
 - c. The Sanitarium's memorandum dated December 30, 2021.
 3. All construction shall be performed in accordance with the following:
 - a. 2002 Connecticut Guidelines for Soil Erosion and Sedimentation Control, as amended.
 - b. The Connecticut Stormwater Quality Manual, as amended.
 - c. All stormwater discharge permits required by the Connecticut Department of Energy and Environmental Protection (DEEP) pursuant to CGS 22a-430 and 22a-430b.
 - d. Section 19 of the Town of Glastonbury Building-Zone Regulations, as amended, the Town of Glastonbury Subdivision and Resubdivision Regulations, as amended, and any additional mitigation measures to protect and/or improve water quality as deemed necessary by the Town.
 4. Each property owner shall comply with the long-term maintenance plan and schedule depicted on the approved plans to ensure the performance and pollutant removal efficiency of all privately-owned stormwater management systems.
 5. The applicant is hereby notified of their potential obligation to obtain authorization under the DEEP's General Permit for the Discharge of Stormwater and Dewatering Wastewaters Associated with Construction Activities ("construction general permit") for any project that disturbs one or more acres of land, either individually or collectively, as part of a larger common plan, and results in a point source discharge to the surface waters of the state either directly or through a stormwater conveyance system. The applicant shall provide a copy of the Storm Water Pollution Control Plan required by the construction general permit to the Town upon request.
 6. A snow removal plan shall be submitted prior to final approval.
 7. In adherence to the agreement with the property owners of 24 Hubbard Street.
 8. That no more than 30 parking spaces, including 9 tandem spaces, are sold to condominium owners for at least one year from issuances of Certificate of Occupancy. After one year, the property owner shall submit data and plans to the Office of

Community Development and the Town Council to determine the adequacy of existing visitor parking spaces.

9. The applicant agrees to the screening of the HVAC units on the roof following the installation of such units as determined by the Office of Community Development staff.

FINDING OF FACT

The Town Plan and Zoning Commission finds the fact established that the proposed project complies with the following standards, of section 4.17.4.

- a. All standards and requirements of this regulation, section 4.17, as well as all applicable standards and requirements of section 12.4, have been met.
- b. Not applicable.
- c. Utilities, drainage, and other infrastructure have been designed in a manner that ensures satisfactory operation for the life of the project, and components that have a shorter useful life have been designed in accordance with sound engineering practice, state and local requirements and guidance documents to ensure satisfactory operation.
- d. Streets and drives will be suitable to carry anticipated traffic and increased densities will not generate traffic in such amounts as to overload the street network in the area.
- e. The development is consistent with the adopted Plan of Conservation and Development and is in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan Building Zone regulations.
- f. The development protects public health, safety, welfare, commerce, and property values.
- g. The development preserves and substantially reuses historic buildings located on the site and retains historic structural elements, exterior appearance, and visual setting as seen from surrounding public viewpoints.

Disc: Commissioner Hassett commended the applicant for providing a comprehensive application and for making concessions this evening while answering several questions. The commission received questions tonight about matters that are not within their authority to address. They are voting on the ARZ. He finds that the density of this application conforms with the ARZ requirements. By requesting to include continued adherence to the private agreement with one of the neighbors, the applicant has shown that they intend to continue being a good neighbor. His major concern about this project has been the screening, both from a noise and visual perspective. He believes that the applicant has addressed his concerns, so he is in favor of the application.

Secretary Botelho agreed that this commission is bound by their regulations and guided by the reports from Town Staff. The Town Engineer's memorandum saw no issue with respect to the parking, density, and traffic that would be generated by this project. He agrees that Hubbard Street is a nightmare during the times of day when the high school begins and ends, but he does not think that this project will exacerbate that issue. The applicant first presented the proposal in

2014. There have been numerous meetings since in front of the subcommittee, and the applicant has always been responsive. He supports the application as well.

Commissioner Sexton also agrees that this application complies with their ARZ regulations. For future regulations, she would like to see an imposition of affordable housing, but it does not exist now. She finds the project aesthetically pleasing. She is happy to hear that some of the materials will be reused. She lives in the area and travels along Hubbard Street often. She does not think that this project will exacerbate the traffic issues on that road. The area is also located on a bus line, and it is walkable. She is in favor of recommending the project to the Council.

Commissioner Griffin agreed with his fellow commissioners. Even though he is sensitive to the comments on affordable housing, this commission does not have the power to require it from the developer. The accommodations that the developer has agreed to make alleviated his concerns about the parking, so he will also vote in favor of the application.

Commissioner Turner agrees that this application meets the requirements of the ARZ Zone. The property in question has been in a dilapidated condition for a long time and needs to be revitalized, which he believes that this project will accomplish. He understands the density and traffic concerns, but he finds it to be a fine balance. He appreciates the concessions in holding the 7 spots to alleviate any parking issues. He supports the project as well.

Chairman Zanolungo is also in favor of sending a favorable recommendation to the Council. He then reminded the public to share their concerns with the Town Council at their meeting next Tuesday evening.

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

REGULAR MEETING

1. **Informal session for the purpose of hearing from citizens on Regular Meeting agenda or non-agenda** *None*
2. **Acceptance of Minutes of the December 14, 2021 Regular Meeting**

Motion by: Commissioner Griffin

Seconded by: Secretary Botelho

Result: Minutes were accepted {4-2-0} with two abstentions from Commissioners Hassett and Turner because they were not present at the meeting.

3. CONSENT CALENDAR

- a. **Scheduling of Public Hearings for the Regular Meeting of January 18, 2022: to be determined**

4. Revision to Meeting Schedule

Motion by: Commissioner Hassett

Seconded by: Commissioner Sexton

MOVED, that the Glastonbury Town Plan and Zoning Commission hereby remove the listed January 3, 2023 meeting date and replace it with the following meeting dates: January 17, 2023 and January 31, 2023.

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

5. Chairman's Report *None*

6. Report from Community Development Staff *None*

Motion by: Secretary Botelho

Seconded by: Commissioner Griffin

MOVED, that the Glastonbury Town Plan and Zoning Commission adjourns their special meeting of January 4, 2022 at 10:59 P.M.

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

Respectfully Submitted,

Lilly Torosyan

Lilly Torosyan

Recording Clerk