

**GLASTONBURY TOWN COUNCIL
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
TUESDAY, APRIL 26, 2022**

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 the option for 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 Tom Gullotta*

2. Public Comment.

Kirsten Birish of 415 Dayton Road, spoke in favor of the potential land acquisition of Dayton Road. She supports the Town's continued efforts towards land preservation.

a. Recognition of Town Attorney Bruce Chudwick.

Mr. Niland presented a formal resolution honoring Bruce Chudwick who is retiring as Town Attorney. Mr. Chudwick accepted the resolution on behalf of everyone at Shipman and Goodwin, and thanked Mr. Johnson for his collaborative work with the firm.

b. Resolution – Goodale Ramaker – American Legion.

Ms. Carroll presented a formal resolution honoring Goodale Ramaker Post 56 - American Legion in celebration of their 100th anniversary. A representative from the Legion accepted the proclamation.

c. Resolution – Glastonbury Grange #26.

Mr. Cavanna presented a formal resolution honoring Glastonbury Grange #26. He proclaimed that the Town has recognized the month of April this year as Grange Month.

3. Special Reports.

a. Presentation and action concerning Affordable Housing Plan – 2022-2027 (set public information hearing).

Ms. Augur provided a summary of the Affordable Housing Plan — 2022-2027. She explained that the State of Connecticut passed a law in 2014, requiring communities to increase their 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 (CGS) 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 CGS Section 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 advocates and a developer, and put together a plan. The draft was forwarded to the TPZ who unanimously approved a favorable recommendation to the Council. However, commissioners expressed significant mixed feelings about the plan.

Ms. Augur then reviewed the demographics of town, explaining that Glastonbury's community is aging and has a majority of single and two-person households. Many commuters come in for jobs but cannot 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 1100 applications on the Housing Authority's waiting list for affordable housing.

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. The recommended strategies included in the plan are geared towards providing a regulatory policy and framework for achieving this. She noted that this is a five-year plan, which is a relatively short timeframe to approve something and get it constructed.

Mr. Cavanaugh requested that both the consultant and the Executive Director of the Housing Authority be present at the hearing. He asked if this document is amendable by the Council. Ms. Augur said yes. Mr. Johnson noted that, should the Council vote to extend this discussion with a public information hearing, there would need to be at least 35 days to file the notice with the Town Clerk. The Council agreed to schedule the public information hearing on June 14, 2022, if the request for extension is approved. If the request for extension is not approved, then the hearing will be held on May 31, 2022.

c. Action on Collective Bargaining Agreement July 1, 2021 through June 30, 2024 – Wastewater Treatment and Facilities Maintenance (AFSCME).

Mr. Johnson explained that this collective bargaining agreement extension includes 16 full-time staff members. It is comprised of a general wage adjustment of 2% for July 2021 and 2.25% for July 2022 and July 2023. The employee contribution to the pension fund increases by 0.5% as of July 1, 2023, from 7.5% to 8%.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves the funds necessary to implement the three-year written Agreement between the Town of Glastonbury and Facilities Maintenance and Wastewater Treatment Employee Group (AFSCME) effective July 1, 2021 through June 30, 2024, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated April 22, 2022.

Disc: Mr. Gullotta finds this to be a very fair agreement, and he is appreciative of the work that staff does.

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

d. Action on General Wage Adjustment – non-affiliated, full-time staff – July 1, 2022.

Mr. Johnson explained that this adjustment is for non-affiliated staff, which comprises about 50% of the Town's workforce. The 2.25% wage adjustment in July 2022 is consistent with other bargaining units.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves a 2.25% General Wage Adjustment for non-affiliated, full-time staff effective July 1, 2022, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated April 22, 2022.

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

e. Action on potential land acquisition – Dayton Road (refer to Town Plan and Zoning Commission and Board of Finance; set public hearing).

Mr. Osgood stated that his offices are located on Dayton Road, so he recused himself from the discussion.

Mr. Johnson presented on the land acquisition which will be dedicated to open space uses. The seller expects to complete an appraisal for a bargain sale. Mr. Gullotta stated that this is a continuation of a 40-year effort to acquire forest and agricultural land to maintain the quality of this community. He hopes that the public will continue to support these efforts.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves the following concerning proposed Town purchase of the 95-acre Beck parcels located off Dayton Road:

- 1. Referral to the Town Plan and Zoning Commission for a report and recommendation under CGS Section 8-24;*
- 2. Referral of a \$350,000 appropriation and transfer per the Reserve for Land Acquisition and Preservation to the Board of Finance for a funding report and recommendation;*
- 3. Schedules a public hearing for 8:00 p.m. on Tuesday, May 24, 2022 to consider proposed Town acquisition of the 95-acre Beck parcels located off Dayton Road and a \$350,000 appropriation per the Reserve for Land Acquisition;*

all as described in a report by the Town Manager dated April 22, 2022.

Result: Motion passed {8-0-0}. Mr. Osgood recused himself from the discussion and vote.

f. Action on proposed new sidewalks – Bell Street (refer to Town Plan and Zoning; set public hearing).

Mr. Johnson explained that an existing home on 520 Bell Street was not included as part of the subdivision. To complete the sidewalk network, separate Council action is required to construct new sidewalks at that section on 520 Bell Street.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby refers construction of new sidewalks at 520 Bell Street to the Town Plan and Zoning Commission for a report and recommendation per CGS Section 8-24 and schedules a public hearing for 8:00 p.m. on Tuesday, May 24, 2022 in the Council Chambers of Town Hall, 2155 Main Street, Glastonbury and/or through Zoom Video Conferencing, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated April 22, 2022.

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

g. Action on protection of property tree – 2389 Main Street (added to agenda)

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

Moved to add Item 5g to the agenda.

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

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby authorizes the Town Attorney to develop an agreement providing for a minimum of 30 days' notice before any actions to demolish are taken on the property at 2389 Main Street, and authorizes an independent report by an arborist selected by the Town for the protection of the copper beech tree located at the front of Welles Turner Library. Absent a written agreement, the Town Attorney will pursue appropriate legal action to prevent the demolition of 2389 Main Street.

Disc: Mr. Cavanaugh is vehemently opposed to tearing down the property located at 2389 Main Street, which has been a structure on Main Street for over 75 years. He is tired of developers tearing down the Town Center and just leaving it with blacktop and pavement. Mr. Gullotta agreed. He hopes that tonight's actions will move the Town towards finding something agreeable to both parties while preserving that building.

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

6. Consent Calendar.

a. Action on appointment of auditors for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2022.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council appoints the firm of RSM US LLP to audit the books and accounts of the Town of Glastonbury for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2022, in accordance with applicable Town policies, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated April 22, 2022 and as recommended by the Board of Finance.

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

7. Town Manager's Report.

Mr. Johnson explained that the COVID-19 case numbers have been increasing again. Mr. Gullotta stated that the Council has discussed how to proceed if the rates get very high again. For the time being, the Council has agreed to continue to meet in-person. If the situation escalates, then they will reassess their protocol. Mr. Johnson noted that there is a typo in Item 2. It should read June 30, not July 30. He stated that Superintendent of Sanitation Mike Bisi will be retiring over the coming months after 49 years of service to the Town. Also retiring is Mary Visone, Purchasing Agent. Ms. Carroll would like both to attend a Council meeting so that they can be publicly thanked.

Mr. Johnson explained that the State DOT has looked at options for a roundabout at New London Turnpike near entrance and exit ramps to Route 17 near the former Glastonbury Funeral Home. DOT concluded that a roundabout is preferred to a signalized intersection. They will hold a public information hearing on Monday, June 3 at 7:00 P.M. He will report back with details on that. He then noted that the State Bond Commission approved a \$2 million grant for conservation open space purposes. Mr. Cavanaugh asked how the Town will access those funds. Mr. Johnson stated that is yet to be determined.

Mr. Johnson noted that Memorial Day Parade will be held this year. He pointed out that the budget was based on the 29 mills cap on motor vehicles which was proposed by the Governor. There are ongoing discussions about that number. Should it differ from 29, there will be notwithstanding language to allow towns to make adjustments. He also provided a note on ARPA. About \$5.7 million has been allocated to the Town's CIP, which leaves about \$4.5 million to be spent. He is prepared to provide an outline of any option the Town would like to consider.

Mr. McChesney thanked the library and parks staff for hosting the Spooky Story Stroll. He would like the Council to hold another public hearing on the ARPA funds. He asked Mr. Johnson to discuss what a potential business assistance plan could look like for Glastonbury. Mr. Osgood would like to see East Hartford's business assistance plan, and to highlight the CIP projects which could be funded via ARPA over the next few years. Ms. Wang requests an updated listing of what has already allocated, which projects remain, and which are still under consideration. One such project to consider is the development of public art projects. She noted that East Hartford has a much bigger population than Glastonbury and received more than double the ARPA allocation of Glastonbury. She asked if Mr. Johnson could research business assistance plans from other communities more similar to Glastonbury.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

NO 1: PUBLIC INFORMATION HEARING – MAIN STREET/ROUTE 17 SIDEWALKS.

Mr. Pennington explained that the goal of the project is to complete the last sidewalk gap from Glastonbury Village to the East Hartford line. Two sections were constructed in 2020, and this 1400-foot section remains. The State DOT favors the option which shifts the roadway east at 9 feet maximum. The State owns and maintains the roadway, and any type of road shift would be contained within the State's right of way. They would need to relocate utility poles, but the exact number has yet to be determined. The next steps would be to refine the design from this concept plan, and to hold another public hearing.

Mr. Gullotta opened the floor for public comment.

Raven Cauthon of 1212 Main Street, expressed safety concerns about the road shift. She and her neighbor at 1200 Main Street live in historic homes which have field stone foundations on sandy soil, so construction poses a threat to the integrity of their houses. Additionally, she and her neighbor sit much closer to the street than their neighbors farther down, so she requests that the road shift starts after their homes. She can provide recent photographs of people driving onto her lawn. A 9-foot road shift will have them in her home. She asked if the Town has considered reducing the speed limit as an option. She also asked if the cost estimate has risen in the past two years. She noted that the road is on the National Register of historic roads. She asked if that has been taken into consideration. She formally requested that the homeowners receive the report from the State as to why the Town's preferred plan was rejected.

Eugene Hickey of 1200 Main Street, asked if this project will be completed on time and on budget because construction costs and delays have soared. He also asked about the National Register designation, and inquired about who will be responsible, if construction damages their historic houses.

Mr. Pennington responded to the various questions and concerns posed:

- He has not been advised of the National Register on historic roads, but he will find out the designation and how that might impact the construction.
- If the grant application is approved, there will be SHPO analysis. Absent grant monies, it would be up to the Town to decide whether to involve SHPO or not.
- The contractor is responsible for any damage incurred to properties during construction.
- The cost estimate is around \$900,000 for this option. However, the grant application asks for about \$1.2 million because the State reimburses for incidentals.
- He has spoken with the State DOT regarding safety concerns. The criteria for installation of guiderails are not met here. However, the DOT will require an agreement with the Town, which could include a section on guiderails. The Town could be responsible for their installation and maintenance.
- He can investigate the road shift request, but is not optimistic, given the constraints on the site.
- He can ask the State to alter the speed limit in the area.
- He will provide the neighbors with a copy of the correspondence from the DOT.

Ms. Carroll is very uncomfortable with shifting the road. She would like to push back on the proposal and ask the DOT to reconsider. Mr. Niland asked what the changes are in distance from the roadway for both Ms. Cauthon and Mr. Hickey's properties. Mr. Pennington replied that Mr. Hickey's property changes by 4 feet and Ms. Cauthon's by 9 feet. He noted that they must maintain a 20-foot clear zone to the area within the right of way. That would not apply to anything on private property. Mr. Niland inquired about the possibility of buffering for the neighbors. Mr. Pennington does not think that the DOT would allow for a stone guiderail. The Merritt Parkway guiderail is an approved guiderail, but it is expensive. There are other options.

Mr. Cavanaugh does not favor a metal guiderail but favors a Merritt Parkway guiderail. He asked if the DOT rejected the Town's plan. Mr. Pennington stated that their language was fairly firm. Mr. Cavanaugh asked if there is any benefit to contacting State representatives or senators to appeal the DOT's decision. Mr. Pennington would prefer to hold a discussion first between Town staff and DOT staff, but it is the Council's decision. Mr. Cavanaugh does not like this plan. If it were his property, he would not want 9 feet of highway coming onto his front yard. He thinks they are asking too much of the people on the east side to construct the sidewalk.

Mr. McChesney also does not like this plan of shifting the road and supports pushing back on it as much as possible. Mr. Osgood agreed on pushing back with the DOT, but he also thinks they should move ahead on the design plan. That way, they will learn the specifications of what will be moved for construction, such as the utility poles. Ms. LaChance supports pushing back on the DOT and does not support moving ahead with this design plan.

Mr. Niland read a comment from the Zoom chat from a homeowner who is directly affected by the proposal:

Christopher Kirby from 1246 Main Street, is not in favor of the road shift. He is concerned with the grade increasing, as his property would be impacted by the maximum of 9 feet. Additionally, his septic system may be affected by this plan. He would like to know how these issues will be addressed.

Mr. Pennington stated that the septic system should be on private property, not within the State's right of way, where all construction activity will be located. He noted that it is possible for homeowners to grant them grading rights. This would involve construction moving onto private property, to grade to a manner more suitable to the homeowners.

Nancy Caruso of 1238 Main Street, lives directly across from the highest part of the bank. She is concerned about the traffic and asked how close the sidewalk will be to the roadway.

Mr. Pennington noted that, under this proposal, the sidewalks will be located on the west side of the road, so they will not be fronting Ms. Caruso's property. The sidewalks will be approximately five feet from the roadway, but they will work with the State DOT to gather their opinions, as well as with the homeowners, who will be responsible for the snow and ice removal.

Mr. Johnson suggested that the Town Manager and Staff revisit the matter with the DOT with the goal of achieving Option 4. He would not move forward with the design presented until returning from discussions. There was consensus from the Council to proceed in this manner. Mr. Cavanaugh asked that the traffic units spend a couple days patrolling on Main Street.

NO 2: ACTION ON PROPOSED SALE OF TOWN-OWNED LAND AT 280 WESTERN BOULEVARD, PARCEL E7.

Mr. Johnson explained that this is a proposal to sell a 4.3-acre site located at 280 Western Boulevard for a purchase price of \$1.71 million. There is a due diligence period and approval contingency, with all closing in about 9 months. Previously, the site was approved for two buildings. The buyer's goal is to build 45,000 square feet, either with one building or two buildings. The deposit is received, and the agreement will be fully executed, subject to tonight's approval.

There were no comments from the public.

Mr. Cavanaugh asked if the buyer could get the 45,000 square feet going out. Mr. Johnson stated that the two buildings are single story structures, so the buyer may look for one that is multiple stories.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves sale of the Town-owned land at 280 Western Boulevard, Parcel E7, in accordance with the Purchase and Sale Agreement dated March 17, 2022, and as described in a report by the Town Manager dated April 22, 2022.

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

NO 3: PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE BUILDING ZONE REGULATIONS – SECTIONS 4.17 – ADAPTIVE REDEVELOPMENT ZONE AND 4.12 – PLANNED AREA DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Johnson stated that this matter was previously approved by the Council years ago. There was a question about the specificity of the effective date. This action will readopt those amendments with a very specific effective date. The TPZ has provided a favorable recommendation with no changes.

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

Betsy Thompson of 70 Hubbard Street, asked why the language of the purpose statement from the TPZ in 2015 was not adopted. That language stated that parcel size can affect density and parking, whereas the 2017 language was concerned solely with parking and tandem.

Ilene Grueneberg of 86 Hubbard Street, asked what happened to the 2015 recommendation on changing the purpose statement of the ARZ. It was not discussed in any open way with the public, which could have possibly made some difference to what happened with the proposal of 38 Hubbard Street.

Mr. Johnson explained that, in 2015, the TPZ provided a recommendation in the purpose section which read that parcel size and minimum parking requirements may dictate and restrict the intensity of a proposed development. However, in reviewing with the Town Attorney, there was a concern with a case in the Town of Monroe, whose recommendation was that the regulation should provide greater specificity. Therefore, the TPZ decided to forgo that language in the purpose statement to instead develop a specific change to the regulations, which were proposed and approved in 2017.

Mr. Gullotta stated that the 38 Hubbard Street proposal did not use tandem parking to count for their parking spaces, so this issue of language would not have led to a different outcome, vis-a-vis parking. Ms. Thompson disagreed that the issues are one and the same. She also does not feel comfortable that there was no public record at all. Ms. Grueneberg attended the public hearing in 2017, and no records were made as to the change in language from 2015, so there was no opportunity to comment on it.

Mr. Johnson reiterated that the 2015 purpose statement from the TPZ was not presented to the Council because it was not specific enough. The Town Attorney believed that the Town could not provide a great deal of latitude because the applicant would not be able to determine what is needed. Ms. Augur concurred and added that when the proposal returned to the plans review

subcommittee, they worked through the entirety of 2016 to arrive at the amendments which were adopted in 2017.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby readopts amendment to the Building Zone Regulations Sections 4.17 – Adaptive Redevelopment Zone and 4.12 – Planned Area Development, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated April 22, 2022 and as recommended by the Town Plan and Zoning Commission, with said amendments effective May 20, 2022.

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

8. Committee Reports.

a. Chairman’s Report. *None*

b. MDC.

Ms. LaChance stated that MDC is considering allowing non-member towns (which includes Glastonbury) the ability to vote only on discussions regarding the water rate. Mr. Gullotta asked about the sign on Keeney Street which is advertising sale of MDC land on the Manchester side. Ms. LaChance stated that Manchester has no interest in buying that property. Mr. Johnson has reached out to the Manchester Land Trust who is taking a look at it.

c. CRCOG. *None*

9. Communications.

- a. Letter from CT Siting Council regarding modifications to existing telecommunications facility located at 374 Three Mile Road.**
- b. Letter from CT Siting Council regarding modifications to an existing telecommunications facility located at 63 Woodland Street.**
- c. Letter from ARX Wireless regarding start of construction of a telecommunications facility located at Lot N-4, Sequin Drive.**

10. Minutes.

a. Minutes of March 16, 2022 Special Meeting – Final Budget Hearing.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves the minutes of the March 16, 2022 Special Meeting – Final Budget Hearing.

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

b. Minutes of March 22, 2022 Regular Meeting.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves the minutes of the March 22, 2022 Regular Meeting.

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

c. Minutes of April 12, 2022 Special Meeting – Executive Session.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves the minutes of the April 12, 2022 Special Meeting – Executive Session.

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

11. Appointments and Resignations.

a. Resignation of Christopher Griffin from the Town Plan and Zoning Commission (D-2023) and the Insurance Advisory Committee (D-2023) effective April 13, 2022.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

Disc: Mr. McChesney congratulated Mr. Griffin on his appointment as a Superior Court Judge.

Result: Resignation was accepted unanimously with regret {9-0-0}.

12. Executive Session. None

13. Adjournment.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby adjourn the April 26, 2022 Regular Meeting at 9:20 P.M.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Lilly Torosyan

Lilly Torosyan

Recording Clerk

Thomas Gullotta

Chairman