

**THE GLASTONBURY TOWN PLAN AND ZONING COMMISSION
AMENDED REGULAR MEETING MINUTES OF TUESDAY, APRIL 19, 2022**

The Glastonbury Town Plan and Zoning Commission with Jonathan E. Mullen, AICP, Planner, and Rebecca Augur, AICP, Director of Planning and Land Use Services, in attendance, held a Regular Meeting at 7:00 PM in the Council Chambers of Town Hall at 2155 Main Street with an option for Zoom video conferencing. The video was broadcast in real time and via a live video stream.

ROLL CALL

Commission Members Present

Ms. Sharon Purtill, Vice Chairman

Mr. Michael Botelho, Secretary {participated via Zoom video conferencing}

Mr. Raymond Hassett {participated via Zoom video conferencing}

Mr. Corey Turner

Ms. Laura Cahill, Alternate {assigned as voting member}

Ms. Alice Sexton, Alternate {assigned as voting member}

Commission Members Absent

Mr. Robert Zanolungo, Jr., Chairman

Vacancy

Vacancy

Vice Chairman Purtill called the meeting to order at 7:02 P.M. In the absence of Chairman Zanolungo and Griffin's resignation, she seated Commissioners Sexton and Cahill.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Applications of TCWC Holding Glastonbury, LLC for a Section 4.11 Flood Zone Special Permit & waiver and a Section 12 Special Permit with Design Review – reconstruction & redevelopment of car wash & associated site improvements – 2756 Main Street – Planned Business & Development & Flood Zones

Attorney Meghan Hope of Alter and Pearson, LLC presented on behalf of the applicant. She presented an aerial view of the site, which is 1.5 acres, stating that the property is located in the flood zone. Properties to the east and the west are Town-owned reserved land which is part of Salmon Brook Park. She explained that the car wash building has stayed essentially in the same state as when it was constructed in 1962, partly because the site is challenged from a flood zone perspective. Town regulations require that the property either be elevated to be out of the 500-year flood zone, or that everything below elevation 500 be flood-proofed. The applicant would need to lift the building from the current 22 foot elevation to a 32 foot elevation to be in regulatory compliance. She noted that FEMA has determined the applicant can flood-proof the car wash tunnels.

Attorney Hope then showed the survey for the site. While the applicant owns the land, the Town has a 3.3-acre recreation easement which was created in the 1970s as part of the Planned Area Development for Salmon Brook Park. The applicant will keep the trees located there and will conduct minor grading. There is also a town sewer easement, which disturbed a lot of the natural vegetation. The applicant's plan is to revegetate the area to return it to a more naturalized state. Ms. Hope noted that she has been in constant communication with a resident in the nearby condominiums about the site plans. Additionally, on March 16, a site walk was conducted with some residents.

The site contains four car wash tunnels, but the proposal is to eliminate the northern and southern tunnels. The long tunnel will be conveyORIZED and the other will be a touchless drive-in wash tunnel. Additionally, they propose reversing how the traffic pattern operates today. There are 13 vacuums and one handicapped spot and two parking spaces for employees. The enclosure on the northern corner is for central vacuum and the southern enclosure is where the dumpster will be located.

David Ziaks, PE at F. A. Hesketh & Associates, Inc. in East Granby, reviewed the floor plan and technical grading plan for the site construction. He noted that the plans contain quarter-foot grade lines because the site had to be thoroughly analyzed in both existing and proposed conditions. They have provided a full report with all grading calculations to Town staff. He explained that there is a small gain in flood storage volume on-site. The building area with the reconfiguration is the same square footage as is there now. A new storm drainage system will be installed on site to meet the new MS4 regulations. There will be no new discharge points off the site to the brook. Instead, it will connect to the existing town storm drainage system on Main Street. He then reviewed the utility plan, noting that a connection point will be installed much closer to Main Street, and there will be a connection to MDC water and Town sewer. They will also install a new wastewater recycling system to reduce water consumption.

Ken LaForge, landscape architect at F. A. Hesketh & Associates, Inc., presented the layout plan. On the southeast corner of the site, the sheds will be removed, and the dumpster will be relocated to the northeast corner, to move it farther away from residents. The vacuums will also be moved there to keep potential noise away. The dryers will be on the inside of the building and on the opposite side of the building from where they are currently. He noted that the applicant is very sensitive to the recreation easement on the east side. The applicant has appeared before the Beautification Committee and the Conservation Commission three times each and received favorable recommendations from both.

He explained that their landscape plan has four design districts:

- The buffer plantings located in the southeast corner will remain, and understory trees and shrubs will be added to enhance aesthetics. A new vinyl fence will also be added. They have coordinated with the tree warden to provide a small gap near the fence to the dumpster areas.
- The two rain gardens are an important part of stormwater management. They are also used to break up the scale of the building and mitigate views from the south and east.

There will be a mixture of shrubbery, ornamental grasses, and a tree to enhance the streetscape around Main Street.

- While they cannot plant trees on the 25-foot easement along the north side of the property, there will be plantings such as pollinator gardens with perennials. The small pocket of invasive knotweed will be removed by hand. Any disturbed area will have an environmental seeding to rejuvenate the wetlands corridor for animals and aesthetics.
- There is very little existing landscaping on the interior of the site, so they have several small islands with different kinds of trees and shrubs, to create a varied landscape throughout the season. He noted that the landscape list is extensive for a small site like this. There are no plants on the Connecticut invasive species plant list, and where possible, they have used as many Connecticut native plants as they could.

Christian C. Carey, the project architect, explained the architectural design components of the site. Their aim is to create visual interest which depicts a balanced sense of the composition. He showed samples of the materials to be used. Mrs. Purtill asked if the glass overhead doors are see-through. Applicant Frank Carpino of Car Wash Center of Glastonbury, LLC explained that there is a small piece of equipment, but it will not really be seen. After hours, the security lights turn on. During summer months, the doors open normally, but in winter, they close between each car.

Mrs. Purtill asked if the lights need to be on all night. Attorney Hope explained that the Oak Street car wash has colored lights circling all the time. This site does not. Mr. Carpino added that no equipment lights will be on at night, just bay lights. Ms. Cahill asked to define the operating hours. Ms. Hope stated that the hours of operation will be from 6:00 A.M. to 10:00 P.M., after which, everything gets locked up. Mrs. Purtill expressed that the lights left on after operating hours should be simply security lighting.

Attorney Hope explained that the grade between this property and the condominiums changes considerably from elevation 24 to 36. There is a natural berm on that edge to also help buffer views from the windows of the condominiums. Mr. Carey explained that the existing exit will be the proposed entry for the site. Mrs. Purtill asked if there is always an employee present during operating hours. Ms. Hope stated yes, typically 2-3 employees are always present. Mr. Carey stated that the north elevation changes the most. They have eliminated one of the existing bays and kept the same color scheme throughout.

Attorney Hope stated that a couple different wall signs are proposed. The main car wash sign will be 31.77 square feet, in blue illuminated, channel letters. There will also be six non-illuminated signs. Beneath the three canopies on the south side of the building will be the pay stations and the menu boards. There are two on-site and another will be added. As noted earlier, the existing fence will be replaced by a six-foot gray vinyl fence. Ms. Cahill asked why the applicant does not remove the fence from the recreation easement and put it on their property instead. Attorney Hope explained that while they could do that, the grading would be lower, so there would not be as much buffering.

Ms. Hope explained that three types of lighting are proposed on the site. The light poles are 14-foot-high fixtures and dark-sky compliant. There are also some dark-sky compliant wall packs on

the building. She noted that it is critical to have adequate lighting at night to avoid potential break-ins and security issues. She then compared the existing versus proposed car washes, which will go from a 24/7 operation to one limited to 6:00 A.M. to 10:00 P.M. The dryers on the outside and the east side of the building will be moved to the west side and inside the building. Currently, the site has no stormwater treatment or water recycling system. Both are proposed. They have also decreased the number of tunnels from four to two. The total length of all tunnels has been reduced from 172 feet to 158 feet. The number of vacuums is maintained at 13, and the green space is slightly increased from 60.5% to 61.4% of the site.

Attorney Hope summarized that the applicant has submitted two detailed narratives showing compliance for the car wash sections and included a detailed flood zone narrative showing compliance. They will wet flood-proof the tunnels by adding flood vents. The mechanicals and offices will be dry flood-proofed. They request a waiver for the wet flood-proofing and have reached out to FEMA who has agreed to allow it.

Mr. Hassett asked how long construction will take. Ms. Hope replied about four months. The facility would shut down sometime in the summer. Mr. Hassett asked what the lighting will be. Ms. Hope stated that there will be white lights and they do not flash. The lights are similar to those at the Oak Street car wash. Mr. Hassett is pleased that the proposed plan eliminates the car backup on Main Street which causes traffic and safety concerns. By switching the circulation for the site, they have added stacking to the site. They are required to have 4,000 square feet of car storage. Right now, the site only contains about 1,000 square feet. The proposal provides for 7,000 square feet. Secretary Botelho echoed Mr. Hassett's sentiment that this is a huge improvement over what is currently on-site.

Ms. Cahill complimented the applicant for the presentation, finding it to be a substantive improvement over the existing site. She expressed concern about how the snow storage on the landscaped area in the southeast and northwest corner of the site will affect the plantings and may also be unsightly for nearby residents. Attorney Hope explained that the tree warden asked them to leave open two sections of the fence on the east side of the property. They can use that area to store snow. This would be in the back of the property, away from Main Street, and no plants would be harmed. Ms. Cahill asked for a commitment to not store snow in the front of the site. The applicant agreed.

Ms. Cahill questioned the illuminated sign which is larger than others on Main Street. Ms. Hope explained that if they did not need to identify the traffic pattern/location, then their total signage size would be smaller. Ms. Cahill understands the safety considerations with the other signs, but the main sign is larger than the current sign. Vice Chairman Purtill asked if the three menu boards are not also considered signage. Ms. Hope stated that this commission has not historically counted those as signage at other projects. Mrs. Purtill agreed with Ms. Cahill's comments. She would also like the sign to be reduced in size. The applicant agreed to reduce the main car wash sign to 25 square feet. Ms. Cahill asked if the sign is illuminated at night, as well. Ms. Hope replied yes. It will not blink, but the signs will be kept on at night.

Mr. Turner approves of the site improvements. However, his concern is with the added windows and machinery inside the tunnel. He asked if the applicant would be willing to do frosted glass

along the south side to protect the view of the adjacent condominiums. Mr. Carpino stated that frosted glass gives the appearance of looking dirty. It is a small building, so they are trying to get as much light into the bay as possible to not make it feel claustrophobic. Mr. Turner is concerned about the condo unit owners who see nothing but windows and machinery. Mr. Carpino explained that the machinery will not be visible due to the angling from up top. There will also be an increased barrier with additional plantings to supplement the existing trees there.

Peter Meyer of 50 Crossroads Lane, via Zoom, thanked the applicant for their consideration of the environment and for providing a thorough application and a site walk for residents in the area. However, he is concerned about the hours of operation, finding 10:00 P.M. quite late for a quasi-industrial facility such as a car wash.

Jim Porter, one of the applicants, explained that their business falls off by 8:00 P.M., so 10:00 P.M. is not a peak hour. It simply gives their employees time to shut things down and clean up. The car wash will not be busy late at night. Ms. Cahill asked what the operating hours are for the car wash located on Oak Street. Attorney Hope explained that no restrictions on operating hours were placed from this commission. Ms. Sexton asked for a decibel comparison on what the noise level is there now versus what it will be following this proposal. Mr. Porter explained that the noise level will be similar but a little lower than what is there now because the new equipment is more efficient and quieter.

Vice Chairman Purtill thanked the applicant. She is concerned about the lights and the size of the kiosk canopies but finds the design attractive and a big improvement over what has always been there. She noted that the flood zone regulation has discouraged any kind of improvement in that area because it is economically infeasible for property owners. She wished the applicant luck. Ms. Sexton stated that a lot of work and detail went into this plan, and it should pay off. She thanked the applicant and welcomed them to Town.

Vice Chairman Purtill closed the public hearing.

Motion by: Secretary Botelho

Seconded by: Commissioner Hassett

MOVED, that the Town Plan & Zoning Commission approve the applications of TCWC Holding Glastonbury, LLC for a 4.11 Flood Zone Special Permit and a Section 12 Special Permit with Design Review – reconstruction & redevelopment of car wash & associated site improvements – 2756 Main Street – Planned Business & Development & Flood Zones, in accordance with plan set entitled Carwash Center Glastonbury 2576 Main Street, prepared by FA Hesketh & Associates, Inc. and dated April 12, 2022.

And

1. In compliance with:
 - a. The recommendations as contained in the minutes of the March 21, 2022 Community Beautification Committee special meeting.
 - b. The standards contained in a report from the Fire Marshal, File 22-006, plans reviewed 04-06-22.

- c. The conditions set forth by the Conservation Commission / Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Agency, in their recommendation for approval to the Town Plan and Zoning Commission and the Wetlands Permit issued at their Regular Meeting of April 14, 2022.
2. In adherence to:
 - a. The Town Engineer's memorandum dated April 13, 2022.
 - b. The Director of Health's memorandum dated April 9, 2022.
 - c. The Police Chief's memorandum dated April 12, 2022.
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 and any additional mitigation measures to protect and/or improve water quality as deemed necessary by the Town.
4. The illuminated wall sign on the west elevation shall not be more than 25 square feet.
5. This is a Section 12 Special Permit with Design Review. If unforeseen conditions are encountered during construction that would cause deviation from the approved plans, the applicant shall consult with the Office of Community Development to determine what further approvals, if any, are required.
6. When feasible, snow storage shall be confined to the southeast and northeast corners of the site.

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

Motion by: Secretary Botelho

Seconded by: Commissioner Hassett

MOVED, that the Town Plan and Zoning Commission approve the request of TCWC Holding Glastonbury, LLC for a waiver from the requirements of Section 4.11.6.b.2.a of the Town of Glastonbury Building-Zone Regulations regarding nonresidential construction in the Flood Zone that requires non-residential construction to be flood-proofed so that below the 500-year recurrence-flood interval flood level the structure is watertight with walls substantially impermeable to the passage of water, for the reason that this allows the property owner to make continued reasonable use of the property as a car wash and it is a minimal effort to afford relief that will not result in any additional threats to public safety or increased public expense.

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

2. Tabled Recommendation to the Town Council regarding the adoption of the Town of Glastonbury 2022-2027 Affordable Housing Plan in accordance with Public Act 17-170 and Public Act 21-29

Ms. Augur explained that the State of Connecticut passed a law in 2017, requiring communities to adopt a plan to increase the number of affordable housing developments. The first plan is to be completed by June 2022, then every five years. Section 8-30g of the Connecticut General Statutes establishes that communities with less than 10% affordable housing stock must allow affordable or mixed-income housing proposals to be constructed unless they can prove to the Superior Court that the rejection is necessary to protect substantial public interests in health, safety, or other similar matters. Less than 6% of Glastonbury's housing stock qualifies as affordable, so the Town is subject to 8-30g applications coming in.

She explained that the Affordable Housing Steering Committee began meeting a year ago. They conducted a community survey and public workshop, listened to housing developers, and put together a plan. Glastonbury's community is aging and has a majority of single and two-person households. Many commuters were coming in for lower-paying jobs and may not be able to afford to live in town. There is a very limited supply of affordable rental units. About 40% of rental households are cost-burdened and 20% of ownership households are cost-burdened. There are over 1,100 applications on the Housing Authority's waiting list for affordable housing.

In the early 2000s, the Town had some deed-restricted units but released the remaining units in the mid-2000s, as the resale values were not working for owners and the community. Since then, the Town has had only two deed-restricted units. The vast majority of the 6% of affordable housing in town is government-assisted units. They project a drop in affordable housing based on preliminary census data from 5.6% to 5.2% next year. Vice Chairman Purtill asked what the area median income for Glastonbury is. Ms. Augur stated that income levels are based on different household sizes, which are listed in the appendix of the draft plan, and that a 4-person household in 2021 earning \$79,900 was low-income at 80% of the median.

Ms. Augur explained that the community survey received about 500 responses. About 64% of respondents felt that more housing choices would make Glastonbury a better place. More than 60% felt that the Town should incentivize affordable housing, 50% believed that it should be required, and 50% know someone who would benefit from affordable housing. The goal of the draft plan is to increase housing options and the number of units under CGS to greater than 6% of housing stock by 2027. This equates to approximately 105 qualified units, which factors in that the overall rate dropping to 5.2% next year. The recommended strategies included in the plan are geared towards providing a regulatory policy and framework for achieving this. She noted that five years is a relatively short timeframe to approve and construct so many units.

Mrs. Purtill was on the Affordable Housing Steering Committee. She noted three changes which were proposed by the committee for review by this commission. In Section 3, implementation will be led by another committee. Ms. Augur added that the implementation plan identifies the lead entity responsible. It is a combination, which will take a lot of collaborative effort to implement these strategies. Mrs. Purtill pointed out that the committee proposed language which indicates that the Town will investigate, encourage, and consider strategies, rather than use

mandated language. This will ensure that the Town remains flexible to new information. In Section 4, the steering committee highlighted a change in accessory dwelling unit applications, to move from a special permit to as-of-right.

Vice Chairman Purtill read the letters that were submitted into the record:

David O'Connor of 1140 Main Street, is disappointed that the plan does not include a single agency to oversee implementation because follow-up will be key to successful outcomes. He supports an awareness-building program. He is also disappointed that the affordable housing stock is maintained at 6%.

Pamela Lockard of 10 Southgate Drive, likes the creation of an affordable housing trust fund. She also hoped to see a single agency oversee implementation. She supports removing obstacles to deed-restricted housing for rental units and would like more mixed-income and multi-generational rental units.

Anne Bowman of 62 Morgan Drive, does not understand why the plan is limiting itself to the goal of just 105 additional units when there is a long waiting list for affordable housing from the Housing Authority. She also does not understand why the plan does not include an inclusionary housing ordinance or why it does not identify a single agency to oversee implementation.

Pamela Lucas of 145 Moseley Terrace, is a member of TALK. She likes the idea of designating staff to manage housing issues and plan the implementation and report semi-annually on updates to the Council. However, she is disappointed that the specified goal is only 6% of housing stock or 105 units by 2027. She is also disappointed that the plan does not include an inclusionary housing ordinance.

Vice Chairman Purtill opened the floor for comments from in-person attendees.

Nicholas Korns of 73 Shagbark Road, offered a disclaimer that his views are his own and do not represent the ZBA or the Republican Town Committee. He does not agree with the state mandate for affordable housing, which he finds to be pure social engineering. “Deeply affordable” actually means “barely affordable.” He asked how individuals who meet the criteria for deeply affordable would be able to pay their property taxes and maintenance. He also finds the data on non-residents who work in town to be suspect, as they date before COVID-19. Fulfillment of their wish to live in Glastonbury is not the Town’s responsibility. He believes that the community survey which informed the plan should not be used, as it was limited to just 500 responses. Multi-family housing is currently restricted to certain zones, and most residents support this approach. Increased building heights have already been considered and rejected. He takes issue with the fact that the report does not reference any research about affordable housing in other communities and how it has affected property values.

Robert Dakers of 15 Trifiro Circle, favors the affordable housing plan and noted that a lot of strategies have already been enacted in town. Implementation will help address the downward trend in the proportion of housing that is considered affordable. He strongly supports pursuing inclusionary zoning provisions. He urged support of the plan.

Igor Fuksman of 134 High Wood Drive, raised concern with the whole concept of affordable housing, which he finds a creep into socialism. He warned of a slippery slope. While he understands that the Town must comply with State law, he asked to think carefully about what this will do.

Chip Beckett of 308 Tryon Street, explained that the private ownership model will not solve the affordable housing problem. There is a demand for housing for people who work in town, but it will not work until there is a state program for affordable housing. He asked to look at the rental ability to build multi-family housing and to expand the Glastonbury Housing Authority (GHA), which he finds to be the real solution.

There were no comments via Zoom.

Vice Chairman Purtill stated that the GHA has been successful with senior housing, so they could potentially be a key player here, as well. The committee found that deed-restricted rental units could probably work. Another issue the committee discussed was the Town open space. The idea was to not have it developed. She thinks that most of the parcels are restricted.

Secretary Botelho supports the proposed plan because of its flexibility with identifying objectives, not mandates. It is a good first step, so he will support its recommendation to the Council. He cautioned that properties acquired by the Town through open space initiatives must be ensured that everything is in compliance with directives.

Mr. Hassett struggles with the plan because the mandatory inclusionary zoning requirements appear to be counter-intuitive and counter-productive. There cannot be a universal application of a plan throughout Glastonbury. For affordable housing to work, it must be amenable to people who need and want affordable housing. They do not want to set parameters that are unreasonable. He finds the GHA to be the mechanism to do this. He agreed with Secretary Botelho that they must exercise caution regarding open space land. He would also like to evaluate how much this will impact the citizens of Glastonbury from a financial standpoint. He asked if there are other incentives to fund affordable housing. He is disappointed in the plan they were provided. The plan they send to Council has to be general, not specific, somewhat similar to the Plan of Conservation & Development. There are several potential strategies which have not been considered.

Ms. Sexton clarified that the plan does not suggest using Town-owned open space to build affordable housing. She agreed with Secretary Botelho that there are not a lot of mandates in the plan. However, she finds that the plan lacks ambition. This is an affordable housing plan, not a housing plan. She does not think that they should limit the Town to just 105 affordable housing units. She also pointed out a typo in the report: “these” should read as “this,” and asked to replace the word “incrementally” with “to advance.” She reiterated that she would like the goals to be more ambitious. She would also like to see more in terms of inclusionary zoning. She does not think that the GHA should shoulder the brunt of the work as the single entity to lead this. It is incumbent on the Town to do this work. She would like to see new staff take the charge on this plan.

Mr. Turner has concerns about this report. Deed-restricted purchases do not work, though deed-restricted rental units may be a feasible option. Regarding inclusionary zoning, he would rather see more encouragement of the zoning regulations rather than actual requirements. He is also concerned about the increased traffic and parking issues that come with increasing density sizes to build multi-family units. He would like to maintain the feel of a small town. He finds the GHA to be the best route to add additional units under their veil. He disagreed with Ms. Sexton's comment about 105 units not being enough. He works in construction, and five years is a very short amount of time to build houses. Additionally, there has been a decrease of developments in Glastonbury and a stagnation in population. Therefore, he finds the 105 units to be a lofty goal. However, despite his concerns, he will support the plan because it accomplishes its main task, which is to deepen the discussion regarding affordable housing over the next several years.

Ms. Cahill stated that Glastonbury has a difficult history on affordable housing. The requirement for this plan was enacted in 2017, and the Town waited until the last year to put it together. She commended the plan for setting the table for Glastonbury's housing issues, for designating Town staff and semiannual reports to the Council on progress, as well as including time frames for objectives. The report includes a broad range of strategies and takes active steps to increase affordable housing options in Town. However, she agreed with Ms. Sexton that the plan is not ambitious enough. An increase of 105 units over five years falls short of the demonstrable need for affordable housing in Glastonbury. It lacks a sense of urgency and commitment. An inclusionary zoning regulation must be adopted as a mechanism to ensure that affordable housing opportunities increase over the next five years. She also shares some of the concerns on using open space. However, federal recovery funds could be used for the acquisition of an affordable housing land trust fund. This is a compromised plan, so she will support it, with the hopes of a more aggressive plan over the next five years.

With no further comments, Vice Chairman Purtill closed the public hearing.

Motion by: Secretary Botelho

Seconded by: Vice Chairman Purtill

MOVED, that the Town Plan and Zoning Commission favorably recommends to the Town Council the adoption of the Glastonbury Affordable Housing Plan 2022-2027, dated March 29, 2022.

Vice Chairman Purtill asked to pass along the minutes of tonight's meeting, so that the Council could be informed about the various reservations expressed by council members on this plan. Ms. Augur agreed to do so.

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 items** *None*
- 2. Acceptance of the Minutes of the April 5, 2022 Regular Meeting**

Motion by: Vice Chairman Purtill

Seconded by: Commissioner Turner

Result: Minutes were accepted {5-1-0}, with one abstention from Commissioner Sexton since she was not present at the meeting.

3. CONSENT CALENDAR

Scheduling of Public Hearings for the Regular Meeting of May 3, 2022: To Be Determined

4. Chairman's Report *None*

5. Report from Community Development Staff *None*

Motion by: Commissioner Purtill

Seconded by: Commissioner Cahill

MOVED, that the Glastonbury Town Plan and Zoning Commission adjourns their regular meeting of April 19, 2022 at 9:50 P.M.

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

Respectfully Submitted,

Lilly Torosyan

Lilly Torosyan

Recording Clerk