

**GLASTONBURY TOWN COUNCIL  
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES  
TUESDAY, JUNE 14, 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 Mr. Gullotta***

**2. Public Comment.**

***Roger Emerick of 580 Hopewell Road***, offered to give a tour to council members. More details are contained in his email addressed to Town Staff.

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

***Karl Wagener of 588 Neipsic Road***, encouraged the Council to consider an alternative to the P.A. 490 Open Space designation discussed last week by the Policy and Ordinance Review Committee. He encourages adopting an open space designation for undeveloped parcels of any size that provide certified ecological benefits. Under this program, an owner of undeveloped land could apply by agreeing to manage the land according to an approved management plan. To minimize any burden on town departments, this could best be accomplished by third-party certification. Glastonbury should provide an incentive to landowners willing to pay the cost of managing their land for conservation purposes (and having it certified) if property taxes were lowered. Donation of a conservation easement is not always a possibility for a landowner. Any potential grantee (i.e., the town or a land trust) must consider all future costs associated with enforcing an easement and might not wish to accept it. He offered to provide more information if the Council seeks it.

**3. Special Reports.**

**a. Presentation and discussion on Accessory Dwelling Unit, Parking, and Inclusionary Zoning Regulations.**

Ms. Augur explained that the Building Zone Regulations Working Group seeks support from the Council on how to best proceed on two issues. Per Public Act 21-29, state legislation on ADUs and Parking Standards will become municipal law. There is a two-step process to opt out of the new state standards. This would require a two-thirds vote from the TPZ and a two-thirds vote from the Council. Otherwise, the ADU legislation will become municipal law in January 2023. There is no time limit for opting out of parking provisions, but the state law is currently in effect.

Ms. Augur showed examples of both permitted and unpermitted ADUs in Glastonbury. She then reviewed several planning documents which encourage ADUs in Glastonbury. The existing regulations on “parental dwellings” were amended in 1991 to become “accessory apartments,” then twice revised, most recently in 2019. While the local regulations are fairly consistent with the state law, there are some key differences. Glastonbury’s permitting process requires a special permit, whereas the state regulation would make it an as of right use. It also enables detached accessory units, which are not currently allowed in the local regulation. Additionally, state law allows a greater maximum floor area, no maximum occupancy, and no required affidavits or periodic renewal of permits.

Ms. Augur explained that the Town could either opt out and maintain the current regulations; opt out and revise current regulations to be more in keeping with Public Act 21-29; or revise the current regulations to completely comply with the state regulations. The Working Group is leaning towards the second option. There is a mixed opinion among the group on how to revise current Section 6.11. They have attempted a compromise on detached units by enabling accessory attached structures only with specific design standards. Other provisions are to revise the maximum occupancy to one family; to revise the maximum size to 1000 square feet; to prohibit the use of accessory apartments for short-term rentals; and to remove the requirement for biennial affidavit of ownership. The Working Group has maintained the special permit requirement.

Mr. Gullotta observed that Glastonbury is almost fully in accord with the state expectations. Mr. Cavanaugh is concerned about the potential of a detached accessory dwelling being located on a one-acre lot with a single-family home. Ms. Augur explained that no agreement has yet been reached on that provision. Ms. LaChance is also concerned about that possibility. She asked how ADUs would be looked at in terms of CGS Section 8-30g. Ms. Augur stated that Public Act 21-29 prohibits towns from requiring ADUs to be affordable units, nor can the ADUs contribute to the denominator of the ratio of affordable housing stock. Mr. Cavanaugh asked if the Town has ever denied an ADU. Ms. Augur stated possibly, but she has not seen any such cases. Whether or not it was a denial, the applicant withdrew their application. Mr. Niland does not remember the specifics, but he recalls that the TPZ received one such application.

Mr. Osgood asked if the Town would have the ability to determine whether there is adequate water and sewer. Ms. Augur stated that the Town can continue to enforce their health code. Ms. Wang asked what the consequences are for opting out. Ms. Augur stated that there is no consequence as it is written now, but there is an expectation that communities will do this. Mr.

McChesney asked about the process for opting out. Ms. Augur stated that the Town could proceed to opt out without revisions in place and then proceed, but the Working Group has tried to achieve both simultaneously. Mr. Niland asked if this has an effect on existing setbacks. Ms. Augur stated that the Town is still able to enforce existing standards.

Ms. Augur reviewed the state law on parking standards, which requires more than one parking space for each studio or one-bedroom unit, or more than two parking spaces for each two or more-bedroom unit. Glastonbury is compliant with this already, apart from the Town Center Zone and the ARZ. Because the state law is in effect right now, Glastonbury cannot enforce the 1.5 spaces per one-bedroom unit in the Town Center multifamily or 1.5 spaces per unit in the ARZ unless the Town chooses to opt out. The inclination of the Working Group is to opt out. Ms. LaChance asked what the benefit is to opt in. Ms. Augur explained that the state law maintains the regulations that Glastonbury has already established, so they are not one of the targeted communities for enacting such a change. Ms. LaChance agrees with opting out. The Council agreed via consensus.

Ms. Augur reviewed the regulations regarding inclusionary zoning. The draft Affordable Housing Plan recommends the following: rental opportunities over ownership opportunities for affordable units; enabling housing choice across the community; and an easier permitting process than the current PAD process. The Working Group has developed subdivision and zoning changes to work within the existing structure of the regulations as a first step to inclusionary zoning. As a potential second step, Town Staff has begun preliminary revisions to incorporate more of the plan's recommendations.

The Working Group draft revisions include the following: defining affordable units with a definition that would comply with CGS Section 8-30g; requiring at least 20% of all units in multi-family development, PAD, or ARZs of 10 or more residential units to be deed-restricted affordable units; and requiring subdivisions of 10 lots or more to have at least 10% of lots restricted for affordable housing.

Ms. Augur reviewed the draft revisions by Town Staff which consist of the following: define multifamily development types from single-family detached to townhomes; enable multifamily development types in zones other than the Town Center, at densities to be determined; establish development standards to ensure adequate parking and buffers; require ASDRC review for specific design features; require a to-be-determined percent of all multifamily developments that include a higher percentage of ADUs; and establish standards for affordability.

Mr. Gullotta stated that they need to move forward on this expeditiously; otherwise, there will continue to be developments throughout town that go against progress on affordable housing. Ms. Wang supports opting out but wants to keep an open mind on parking minimums. She asked what the interactions are between inclusionary zoning and parking minimums. Ms. Augur explained that she is not familiar with inclusionary zoning having specialized parking provisions. Additionally, opting out of the parking standards by the State does not preclude the Town from reassessing their parking regulations at any time. Mr. Osgood pointed out that requiring 20% of units to be affordable might impact the ability of developers to create multi-family dwelling units which are needed in town.

Mr. Gullotta asked how many units are needed to qualify for a moratorium. Ms. Augur explained that the Town would need to increase its affordable housing stock by 2%, which amounts to roughly 180 units, depending on the type of project. She noted that moratoriums last four years.

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

**5. New Business.**

**a. Discussion and possible action on allocation of American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) funds – Small Business Assistance Program.**

Mr. Johnson noted that this grant is generally consistent with other plans in surrounding communities. The amount could be any number, up to \$10,000. Grantees will be required to execute the formal agreement with the Town. Funds will not be forwarded until the Town receives evidence of the investment indicated. An internal group will review and rate the applications. The definition of a small business is difficult to assess. They expect to review applications on a first-come, first-served basis.

Mr. McChesney appreciates Mr. Johnson’s efforts in putting together this program. Part of ARPA funds were meant to be allocated to small businesses, so this is in keeping with its purpose. While he prefers a higher total amount, he will support a total of \$150,000 in grants, with no single grant exceeding \$5,000.

**Motion by:** Mr. McChesney

**Seconded by:** Ms. Carroll

*BE IT RESOLVED, the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves an allocation of \$150,000 of American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) funds to the Small Business Program, with no single grant exceeding \$5,000.*

**Disc:** Mr. Osgood finds that this money could be used instead to reduce taxes by funding projects that the Town will be covering anyway. He would rather give \$20 to each person in town than a program which will only affect potentially 30 businesses. Mr. Niland finds the \$150,000 to be a reasonable starting point which could be increased in the future, if need be. As a small business owner, Mr. Cavanna is pleased that the Council is finally helping some businesses who have been tragically affected by the pandemic.

*Mr. Gullotta pointed out that council members identifying as small business owners cannot apply for this program.*

**Amendment by:** Mr. Cavanaugh

**Seconded by:** Mr. Osgood

To appoint two council members (one from each political party) to the subcommittee reviewing and selecting grant applications.

**Disc:** Mr. Cavanaugh believes that the Council should have a say on who receives the grant. Mr. Gullotta disagreed, stating that the Council should distance themselves on this matter. Mr. Osgood noted that there is not enough money to go around, so he does not want to make that

particular decision. Ms. Carroll is also not in favor of having council members on that subcommittee. Mr. McChesney finds that the less political this decision is, the better. As drafted, it is a very apolitical decision. If the Council gets involved, then it will have the perception of a political decision.

**Result:** Amendment failed {3-6-0}, with Mr. Cavanaugh, Mr. Osgood, and Mr. Cavanna voting for.

**Amendment by:** Mr. Osgood

**Seconded by:** Mr. Cavanaugh

That the small business grants be allotted only for prospective spending and not for prior activities.

**Disc:** Ms. Carroll disagreed, stating that previous investment during the pandemic should also be considered. She would prefer to not limit the use. Mr. McChesney also disagreed because a lot of what they have heard from business owners has been how they have been affected thus far. The aim of this program is to aid businesses who have been negatively impacted by the pandemic.

**Result:** Amendment failed {2-7-0}, with Mr. Osgood and Mr. Cavanaugh voting for.

Discussion returned to the main motion. There were no additional comments.

**Result:** Motion was approved {7-2-0}, with Mr. Osgood and Mr. Cavanaugh voting against.

## **PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

### **NO 1: PUBLIC INFORMATION HEARING – AFFORDABLE HOUSING PLAN.**

Consultant Glenn Chalder of Planimetrics provided an overview of the Affordable Housing Plan — 2022-2027. He explained that Section 8-30g of the Connecticut General Statutes (CGS) requires that all Connecticut municipalities prepare an affordable housing plan to increase the number of affordable housing developments by June 1, 2022 and update it every five years thereafter. Mr. Johnson noted that Glastonbury received approval from OPM to extend it to June 30, 2022. Mr. Chalder explained that the Affordable Housing Steering Committee conducted a community survey, researched and evaluated options, and prepared a draft plan which was endorsed by the TPZ.

Mr. Chalder reviewed the historical relationship between median income and median housing price in the United States. After about 1970, housing became more expensive relative to income, so the issue of housing affordability has been brewing for some time. Housing is difficult to produce, so to achieve a higher return on investment, developers prefer to build houses on the higher end of the market. This is a challenge because there is high demand to provide housing in the lower price end, which is not as financially lucrative for developers to create and supply. He reviewed the definition of affordable housing, which is households earning less than 80% of area

median income and costs less than 30% of income. CGS Section 8-30g 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.

Mr. Chalder explained that in Glastonbury, 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 units. Many commuters come in for jobs but cannot afford to live in town. 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 strategies recommended in the plan are geared towards providing a regulatory policy and framework for achieving this. The first strategy is elevating housing issues, which could be accomplished by directing Town Staff to promote implementation of the affordable housing plan and report regularly on its process to the Council, while also updating the POCD to include more focus on housing. Another strategy is to increase assisted housing by supporting the Glastonbury Housing Authority in their efforts to create additional units. A third strategy is to increase deed-restricted housing. The plan recommends moving in the direction of preparing inclusionary zoning regulations to encourage or require such units, in both rental and ownership. The fourth strategy of the plan is to expand other housing choices, as well as updating zoning regulations to identify ways and locations to enable "missing middle" housing. The final strategy is pursuing other approaches, such as establishing a housing trust fund to support affordable housing programs and strengthening design guidelines.

Mr. Chalder concluded that the value of this plan is to determine and set the plan specificity moving forward. The real measure of its success is not in its creation, but its implementation.

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

The following comments were made in-person:

**Robert Dakers of 15 Trifiro Circle**, moved to Glastonbury almost 30 years ago to a neighborhood whose zoning allowed for smaller lots and the construction of more affordable homes. Reflected in the plan are ways to further expand those opportunities, as well as the changing demographic needs of the community. Approval of the plan would reflect the vision and good will of Glastonbury residents. He urged its support, while noting his particular support for the implementation of inclusionary housing provisions in local zoning regulations.

**Nicholas Korns of 73 Shagbark Road**, is dismayed that the State of Connecticut is trying to dictate how towns conduct their local zoning. He has reviewed the report extensively and has several comments, questions, and criticisms. Everything in the report has come to fruition in spades now with the proposed multifamily unit on Hebron Avenue and Manchester Road, which most people in Glastonbury oppose. He urged the Council to acquire the resources necessary to

provide countervailing testimony to this application because the Town is responsible to defend the public's position. Above all, he urged the Council to amend the report to prohibit any Town-owned land which was acquired by referenda to be used for affordable housing developments.

***Sara Bass at 5 Knollwood Drive***, expressed several concerns with the proposed Manchester/Hebron Avenue project. She attended the meeting where the affordable housing community survey was presented, and a fair number of participants were not Glastonbury citizens. She does not think that many residents know what the plan is or what it will entail.

***Pamela Lucas of 145 Moseley Terrace***, urged the Council to ensure that the plan is implemented, following adoption. She asked if there is the political will to address the needs expressed in the plan. She likes the idea of designating staff to manage housing issues, but ideally, one single agency should be identified to oversee its implementation. She is disappointed that the specific affordable housing goal is only 6% of housing stock by 2027, which falls short of the 10% requirement set by CGS Section 8-30g. She is also disappointed that the plan does not more firmly request the adoption of an inclusionary housing ordinance. She strongly urged the Town to modernize its zoning and development policies and strategies. She echoed Mark Branse's words that the Manchester Road development is no surprise because the Town did not address the issue of affordable housing for 30 years and is now faced with CGS 8-30g. Now is the time to ensure more affordable housing opportunities in town.

***Pamela Lockard of 10 Southgate Drive***, urged the Council to pass the affordable housing plan. She would like the plan to go further through implementation of practical measures such as housing vouchers.

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

***David O'Connor of 1140 Main Street***, appreciates the significant effort the Town has made in developing this plan. However, he is disappointed that the revised plan does not include one single agency to oversee implementation. He worries that a multiple agency decision-making process may prove too cumbersome for effective implementation. Follow-up will be key to successful outcomes. He applauds the inclusion of an awareness-building program to strengthen public knowledge of increased affordable housing opportunities in Glastonbury. He is disappointed that the plan seeks to maintain the percentage of qualified housing units to 6% of housing stock through 2027. He would like to see this percentage increased to allow for more rapid development of affordable housing opportunities because the current target will not make an appreciable difference. He also believes that the plan should require, not just support, inclusionary zoning regulations as a condition of approval for private medium and large-scale multi-unit developments and include a specific percentage of deed-restricted affordable units.

Mr. Niland opened the floor for comments via Zoom:

***Anne Bowman of 62 Morgan Drive***, finds that the plan takes a small step in the right direction, but it needs to do more to expand housing opportunities for people who cannot afford to live in

town through no fault of their own. She shared that her mother was a WWII nurse who bought their first home with assistance from the GI Bill. Had she been a black veteran, her family would not have qualified for a VA mortgage with no down payment. She wishes that the affordable housing plan took a giant step for the Town to do their fair share.

There were no further comments from the public.

Mr. Cavanaugh asked about other communities for which the consultant has created housing plans and inquired whether this plan is unique to Glastonbury or generic to other communities. Mr. Chalder responded that his works take him around the state to towns such as Newington and Rocky Hill. Many of the strategies in this plan are similar to those of other communities, but the plan was put together by Town Staff, so the language is unique to Glastonbury. Mr. Cavanaugh asked if “qualified” affordable units mean “restricted.” Mr. Chalder explained that there are different ways in which units are “qualified,” such as assisted housing or deed restricted.

Mr. Cavanaugh noted that there are naturally occurring affordable housing units in town. He asked if the Town does indeed have affordable housing, but it does not meet the State’s requirements. Mr. Chalder stated that Glastonbury is not unique in this regard. The State does not consider or count these units because they are not deed-restricted or assisted housing. Mr. Cavanaugh asked if this is specifically for renters. Mr. Chalder stated that the committee had a lengthy discussion about ownership versus rental regarding deed-restricted units. The math on rental units is simpler, so the challenges of an ownership situation merit more discussion and exploration.

Mr. Cavanaugh asked what the Housing Authority’s waiting list of 1100 people actually means. Neil Griffin, Executive Director of the Housing Authority, stated that the number is an estimate of the total from all their waiting lists. They sought to avoid duplicates when tallying up their numbers for the steering committee. Mr. Cavanaugh asked where the people on the waiting list currently live. Mr. Griffin stated that some live in state, some are out of state, but many seem to be people who are trying to get closer to their families.

Ms. Carroll affirmed that this plan is not generic. It was guided by Town Staff and very much tied to Glastonbury. While this action is mandated by the state, philosophically, it feels appropriate to expand affordable housing opportunities throughout town. This is a great starting point to this process. No one loves the CGS 8-30g approach, but this plan gives the Town countless other ways to create much-needed inventory.

Ms. LaChance finds that this plan will help prevent other applications like the Manchester Road/Hebron Avenue development by giving the Town some control over zoning developments. She asked if the housing cost-burdened information is specific to Glastonbury and inquired about how the math was conducted. Mr. Chalder explained that it is specific to Glastonbury. The data looks at the housing cost, which was collected by the American Community Survey. Because it is based on a small population, rather than a census, there is some margin of error, but it is a good indication of the trends in a community.



Ms. Wang believes that the current draft plan is well thought-out. It is tailored to Glastonbury with many tools to explore. More research must be done to answer various questions, but this plan provides a great blueprint to do that. She also likes the accountability on the semi-annual reports to the Council. This plan has undergone several levels of review. Increasing affordable housing leads to changes in other areas and services that may be required. In the implementation, there may need to be linkage with other groups to ensure that these systems run smoothly. She finds that the goal would be much more meaningful if the housing stock were increased from 6%. She inquired why the goal is so low. Ms. Augur stated that there was a lot of back and forth on the committee on how broad versus specific the goal should be. This is a five-year plan, which is very short in the scope of housing construction. The goal is not purely aspirational but achievable in a five-year timespan.

Mr. Osgood stated that 20% of Glastonbury homeowners are cost burdened. The Council has an obligation to consider the impact on taxpayers. The State could provide housing vouchers to solve this problem; instead, they have passed the buck onto local municipalities. The language in the plan to establish a housing trust fund is a good concept, but how it will be funded is still up in the air. He would like to change the language from “establish” to “consider” or “evaluate” the need for a housing trust fund.

Mr. McChesney cautioned that if the Council does not pass a plan tonight, the State will do it for them. Mr. Chalder clarified that there is no statutory penalty at this point in time. The language is not enforcement but close to it. The State will be monitoring this, and there may be more legislation in the future. Mr. Osgood concluded that the Council does not need to adopt a plan tonight because there are issues that need to be further addressed.

Mr. Gullotta remarked that Mark Branse was referenced earlier tonight, specifically his comments that the Town has done nothing over 30 years to address the issue of affordable housing. Mr. Gullotta disagreed, noting that in the late 1980s/early 1990s, the Council passed an incentive providing bonuses to developers to build additional condominiums. It did not work because of the resale issue with the units, but the Town did make an attempt. He also addressed the concern of utilizing land purchased for open space as affordable housing units. The Council has a moral covenant with voters in the community to keep the land purchased by taxpayers for that fund as forest land and farmland. He echoed Mr. McChesney’s statement that if the Town does not proceed in reclaiming their zoning laws, then State law will do it for them.

## **NO 2: ACTION ON POTENTIAL LAND ACQUISITION – BECK PARCELS – DAYTON ROAD (CONTINUED FROM MAY 24, 2022).**

Mr. Johnson stated that they have completed the survey and the environmental analysis. The survey confirms the 95 acres, and no environmental issues were found.

There were no comments from the public.

**Motion by:** Ms. Carroll

**Seconded by:** Mr. Cavanaugh

*BE IT RESOLVED, the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves the purchase of the 95-acre Beck parcels, located off Dayton Road, in accordance with the purchase and sale agreement dated April 19, 2022, and a \$350,000 appropriation and transfer from the Reserve for Land Acquisition and Preservation, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated June 10, 2022 and as recommended by the Town Plan and Zoning Commission and the Board of Finance.*

**Result:** Motion was approved {8-0-1}, with one abstention from Mr. Osgood.

**NO 3: ACTION ON PROPOSALS SUBMITTED BY THE CONNECTICUT RIVER VALLEY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, INTERCOMMUNITY, INC., AND TOWN OF GLASTONBURY – OPEN SPACE LAND ACQUISITION FUND UNDER THE 2022 NEIGHBORHOOD ASSISTANCE ACT PROGRAM.**

Mr. Gullotta asked about the Chamber’s interest in providing scholarships, and whether it is for a particular institution or all institutions. Jay Margnelli of the Chamber of Commerce explained that they facilitate working with corporations to make donations to nonprofits and local youth through scholarships. He indicated that the scholarships are for InterCommunity Health, the Town of Glastonbury, and Stone Academy.

There were no comments from the public.

Mr. Gullotta has historically had serious concerns about the scholarship element. There was a recent report in the Hartford Courant which discussed improper actions taken at Stone Academy, resulting in fines against them. He is uncomfortable with the Academy’s inclusion in this action. Mr. Niland also cannot support the language as it exists right now because it enables bad behavior. He would like to see good auditing on how the money has been used in the past. Mr. McChesney clarified that this is ultimately \$150,000 to low-income students to go to school. He does not want to penalize those individuals because of misconduct at the school. Mr. Niland explained that money was used to prevent students from defaulting on loans, which seems benign, but students form their decisions on where to go to school based on fraudulent information. Mr. Gullotta added that the Academy was fined more than \$1 million and their senior management needed to be replaced.

Mr. Osgood suggested tabling the public hearing to receive more information from the applicant. The Council voted {7-2-0}, with two votes against by Mr. Gullotta and Mr. Cavanna, to continue the public hearing to the meeting of June 28, 2022.

**NO 4: \$102,879 TRANSFER FROM THE GENERAL FUND-UNASSIGNED FUND BALANCE TO EDUCATION (AGRISCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM – VOAG).**

**Motion by:** Ms. Carroll

**Seconded by:** Mr. Cavanaugh

*BE IT RESOLVED, the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves a \$102,879 transfer from the General Fund - Unassigned Fund Balance to Education (Agriscience and Technology Program — VOAG), as described in a report by the Town Manager dated June 10, 2022 and as recommended by the Board of Finance.*

**Disc:** There were no comments from the public or council members.

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

**b. State School Grant Application – Naubuc School Open Space Classroom Alterations and Code Compliance Project.**

Mr. Cavanaugh voted against this when it first came to the Capital Program in March. He does not intend to support it this time either. He asked if the \$3.2 million appropriation is still a good number. Mr. Johnson stated that the BOE has not indicated discomfort with that number. Mr. Osgood read that the BOE is requesting an additional \$1 million to conduct the project downstairs, which would mean that the total project cost will exceed \$3.2 million. He believes that this project should have gone to a referendum. He opposes the proposal and suggests a full plan for Naubuc School to go to referendum, given the large scale of the project. Mr. Niland pointed out that a grant will recover over one-third of the cost, so this is a great opportunity to get some money back.

**Motion by:** Ms. Carroll

**Seconded by:** Mr. Cavanaugh

*BE IT RESOLVED, the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves and authorizes the following actions for the project to reconfigure open space classrooms at Naubuc School with related improvements and updates:*

- 1. Approves a \$3.2M appropriation through the Capital Improvement Program effective July 1, 2022;*
- 2. Authorizes the Board of Education to submit a grant application for the subject project with the State DAS/Office of School Construction and Grants;*
- 3. Authorizes the Town and Board of Education to proceed with design and construction documents for the project;*
- 4. Refers the project to the Public Building Commission to approve the final design of the project;*

*all as described in a report by the Town Manager dated June 10, 2022.*

**Result:** Motion was approved {6-3-0}, with Mr. Osgood, Mr. Cavanaugh, and Mr. Cavanna voting against.

**c. Discussion and possible action concerning November 2022 Referendum – Reserve for Land Acquisition and Preservation.**

**Motion by:** Ms. Carroll

**Seconded by:** Mr. Cavanaugh

*BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby authorizes the Town Manager to work with Bond Counsel to prepare the bond resolution and related documents for a potential appropriation and bond authorization to be presented at referendum in November 2022 per the Reserve for Land Acquisition and Preservation, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated June 10, 2022.*

**Disc:** Mr. Johnson noted that once the Council introduces the bond resolution, the number can only be brought down, not up. Mr. Cavanaugh stated that in 2020, the Town went for a \$3 million referendum for land acquisition which passed overwhelmingly. The program has always been supported by the community. He asked council members to consider going up to \$5 million this November. Mr. Gullotta agreed with that number. Mr. Osgood noted that a \$2 million grant is available from the State for land acquisition, as well as a potential excess of \$1 million from the land sale. While he supports going to referendum again, he finds \$5 million excessive this year.

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

**d. Discussion and possible action concerning agreement with Murphy Road Recycling – term.**

Mr. Johnson stated that it seems unlikely that there will be a long-term solution to municipal solid waste in Connecticut within the next five years. While they cannot predict what tip fees will be in five years, it may be in the Town's best interests to have predictability by locking in a rate for five years.

**Motion by:** Mr. Cavanaugh

**Seconded by:** Ms. Carroll

*BE IT RESOLVED, the Glastonbury Town Council hereby authorizes the Town Manager to execute a five-year agreement with Murphy Road Recycling for solid waste and recycling services in lieu of a four-year agreement previously authorized, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated June 10, 2022.*

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

**e. Discussion and possible action on Glastonbury Affordable Housing Plan 2022-2027.**

**Motion by:** Ms. Carroll

**Seconded by:** Mr. Cavanaugh

*BE IT RESOLVED, the Glastonbury Town Council hereby adopts the Glastonbury Affordable Housing Plan 2022-2027 dated March 29, 2022, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated June 10, 2022, and as recommended by the Affordable Housing Steering Committee and Town Plan and Zoning Commission, and authorizes the Town Manager to forward the adopted Plan to the Office of Policy and Management in accordance with applicable General Statutes.*

**Disc:** Mr. Gullotta asked if other council members will agree that, going forward, land acquired through the Open Space Land Acquisition Fund will not be developed and will stay as open space. Mr. Osgood pointed out a site located across the community center, which was acquired through the fund, and is being used for non-open space purposes. Ms. Carroll noted that the ordinance language indicates that the land be either open space or public use. Mr. Cavanaugh thinks that the language is a significant sticking point which needs to be corrected before asking the public for money for land acquisition.

Ms. LaChance agrees with the notion that open space funds will not be used to create affordable housing throughout town. To her, municipal uses mean town buildings used for purposes in support of the town. Mr. McChesney agreed. The only sticking point, he finds, is the idea that the land could potentially be a municipal facility if it is a Housing Authority development. He is comfortable with the Council proceeding with what the public views these funds are for. He would be comfortable with a one-word change.

Mr. Gullotta asked if this would preclude the Town from using the land. Ms. Augur replied no, this is a strategic plan. The Town would not be precluded from purchasing land specifically for affordable housing. Mr. Gullotta stated that none of this is binding. Mr. Johnson stated that the Council will determine whether the use is appropriate or not. He wonders whether the language needs to be amended at all. Ms. LaChance countered that not every council member here tonight will still be on the Council in five years, so it is important to state their intent in the document.

Mr. McChesney stated that a driving issue is the perception from the public. He thinks that this can be solved by a suggestion with a footnote, indicating that Town-owned land used for this purpose would not be land exclusively purchased with Land Conservation Fund funds. This would memorialize what their understanding is while making it clear to the public that they will not use those funds to do that. Mr. Gullotta supports the suggestion to leave the language unchanged, as Mr. Johnson suggested, while adding a footnote. Mr. Osgood brought up the issue of the land located across the community center. Mr. Cavanaugh countered that the land in question is in the 500-year flood zone, so building houses there would be a challenge. Mr. Johnson stated that it is correct.

**Amendment by:** Mr. McChesney

**Seconded by:** Ms. Carroll

To add a footnote to read, “Town-owned land does not include land purchased through the Land Acquisition and Preservation Fund.”

**Result:** Amendment was approved (7-2-0), with Mr. Cavanaugh and Mr. Osgood voting against.

**Amendment by:** Mr. Osgood

**Seconded by:** Ms. Carroll

To amend section 5.1, which reads “to establish a housing trust fund,” to be changed to “**to consider establishing** a housing trust fund.”

**Disc:** Ms. Carroll countered that this is not a binding action, but a consideration. Ms. Augur concurred, explaining that the plan is a strategic one, not a binding one. The Committee went

back and forth on this strategy and felt that it was a good tool. Mr. Osgood is not yet ready to establish a housing trust fund. Mr. Niland disagreed, stating that establishing a fund does the Town no harm. Ms. Wang stated that a lot of the strategies in the plan use affirmative verbs, and it is up to the Council to implement the recommendations. Because they are recommendations, she is fine with the language. Mr. McChesney does not see a difference either way. He is fine with adding the word “consider.”

**Result:** Amendment was approved (5-4-0), with Mr. Gullotta, Ms. LaChance, Mr. Cavanaugh, and Ms. Carroll voting against.

Ms. Wang would like to address the overarching objective statement. She would like it to be clearer that this is an affordable housing plan.

**Amendment by:** Ms. Wang

**Seconded by:** Mr. Osgood

On page 9, to change the language from, “to increase housing choice throughout Glastonbury through expanding housing options to help meet the housing needs of households of all ages, sizes, incomes, and characteristics” to read, “**to increase housing diversity and affordability throughout Glastonbury to help meet the housing needs households of all ages, sizes, incomes, and characteristics.**”

**Disc:** Ms. Wang explained that this language further clarifies the goal so that it looks like an affordable housing plan, not just a housing plan.

**Result:** Amendment was approved unanimously {9-0-0}.

**Discussion returned to the original motion.**

Mr. Cavanaugh stated that the TPZ voted to send this to the Council in a very tepid referral. A couple years ago, there was another issue that the State sent to Glastonbury. The political courage is to deny this plan, not support it. The plan does not address homeownership, which is one of two ways (the other being income) to build wealth. This only goes to people looking to rent, not build income. He does not know what a “fair share” is. Glastonbury has done a great job with local zoning over the past few decades and continues to be a targeted community by the State. He is concerned about the state of home rule, with the State continuing to encroach on municipalities. He will vote against this plan.

Mr. McChesney cautioned that if the Town does not pass a plan by the deadline, then that will reflect poorly on them if/when the Town applies for a moratorium. He hopes that the plan will receive bipartisan support to deal with the cards that they have been dealt by the State. Mr. Cavanna also does not support the State encroaching on Glastonbury’s zoning, but he will support the plan. Ms. Carroll stated that her father has built over 100 houses on Cape Cod as a Habitat for Humanity volunteer post-retirement. Cape Cod is a community which is vehemently opposed to affordable housing, so these nonprofit efforts are crucial to increasing affordable stock in that area. Regardless of the State mandate, this plan is a good action to ensure that people who cannot afford to live in Glastonbury will have an opportunity to do so. Ms.

LaChance is not a fan of CGS 8-30g, but affordable housing in a community is a good thing. She urged the public to contact their state representatives to vocalize the pitfalls of this statute. Ms. Wang pointed out the CRCOG report (attached to this plan), which stresses the goal of providing “equal patterns of opportunity,” to recenter why they are pursuing this plan. She disagreed with the notion that this plan does not allow for building wealth through home ownership. There are many strategies embedded within the plan that do address home ownership. She supports the plan.

**Result:** Motion was approved {8-1-0}, with Mr. Cavanaugh voting against.

**f. Action on potential land acquisition(s) (refer to Town Plan and Zoning Commission, refer to Board of Finance, set public hearing(s)).**

**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 2 8± acre parcels located off Meadow Road:*

- 1. Referral to the Town Plan and Zoning Commission for a report and recommendation under CGS Section 8-24;*
- 2. Referral of a \$25,600 appropriation and transfer per the Capital Projects – Land Acquisition Fund to the Board of Finance for a funding report and recommendation;*
- 3. Schedules a public hearing for 8:00 p.m. on Tuesday, June 28, 2022 to consider proposed Town acquisition of the 8± Botticello Acres parcels located off Meadow Road and a \$25,600 appropriation per the Capital Projects – Land Acquisition Fund;*

*all as described in a report by the Town Manager dated June 14, 2022.*

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

**Motion by:** Ms. Carroll

**Seconded by:** Mr. Cavanaugh

Motion to add to the agenda Item 5g: “Action to establish a personnel search committee for an executive level position – Town Manager.”

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

**g. Action to establish a personnel search committee for an executive level position – Town Manager (added to agenda)**

**Motion by:** Ms. Carroll

**Seconded by:** Mr. Cavanaugh

*BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby establishes a personnel search committee for an executive level position – Town Manager, by appointing the Council to serve in this capacity including members Gullotta, Niland, Carroll, Cavanaugh, Cavanna, LaChance, McChesney, Osgood and Wang, in accordance with CGS Section 1-200.*

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

**6. Consent Calendar. None**

**7. Town Manager's Report.**

Mr. Johnson highlighted the COVID-19 report, where Glastonbury case numbers continue to decline. He also provided a list of pending development projects throughout town. He noted that chip seal has been used for many years for road maintenance. Last year, the application washed off. They should receive what the Town paid for. He provided a status on the capital projects. Under Item 5, the full-time position has been filled and the other part-time position will be transitioned to a full-time position. Glastonbury is now a formal member of the Connecticut Coalition for Sustainable Materials and Management. Last night, there was a DOT hearing on the roundabout. Under Item 8, there is a recognition for Vietnam War veterans at the RCC next week.

Regarding traffic calming, Mr. Cavanaugh is surprised that there is interest to paint the shoulder lines on Ripley Road. He also inquired about the GHS Field House. Mr. Johnson stated that the project is over budget. There was a lot of unsuitable material which delayed the project by over a month. He cannot speak to the final number tonight, but he should know within the next week. Mr. Osgood stated that the Rotary Club had their splash pad initiation last week which was a great project. The recognition they bestowed Mr. Johnson with the Club's Distinguished Service Award was very well deserved.

**8. Committee Reports.**

**a. Chairman's Report. None**

**b. MDC. None**

**c. CRCOG.**

Mr. Niland acknowledged the passing of former East Hartford mayor and CRCOG Chair, Melody Currey.

**d. Policy & Ordinance Review Committee – report and recommendation – PA 490 – Open Space.**

Ms. Carroll stated that the committee met last week to discuss the potential implementation of PA 490 on Open Space. Currently, property owners have the option of a conservation easement. There is no minimum acreage for that. The general opinion was that PA 490 will not offer more substantive benefit for homeowners than the conservation easement does. Additionally, there was a concern that the PA is revocable and places a sheer volume of work on staff. Thus, it is the opinion of the committee to continue to encourage homeowners to apply for a conservation easement rather than trying to implement PA 490. No changes are proposed.

**9. Communications.**



- a. Letter from CT Siting Council regarding notice of intent to modify an existing telecommunications facility located at 63 Woodland Street.
- b. Letter from CT Siting Council regarding request for an order to approve tower sharing at an existing telecommunications facility located at 374 Three Mile Road.
- c. Letter from Tom Scarduzio – request for permit.

**10. Minutes.**

- a. Minutes of May 24, 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 May 24, 2022 Special Meeting.*

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

- b. Minutes of May 24, 2022 Special Meeting.

*Motion by:* Ms. Carroll

*Seconded by:* Mr. Cavanaugh

*BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves the minutes of the May 24, 2022 Special Meeting.*

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

**11. Appointments and Resignations.**

- a. Appointment of Al Herzog to the Ethics Commission (D-2025).
- b. Appointment of Nancy Thomas to the Ethics Commission (Alternate, D-2025).
- c. Appointment of Aaron White to the Zoning Board of Appeals (Alternate, D-2023).
- d. Appointment of Ginny Kim to the Insurance Advisory Committee (D-2023).

*Motion by:* Ms. Carroll

*Seconded by:* Mr. Cavanaugh

*Result:* Appointments were approved unanimously {9-0-0}.

**12. Executive Session.**

- a. Potential land acquisition. (*discussed at the Special Meeting — Executive Session held at 6:15 P.M.*)
- b. Personnel matter – Town Manager.

*Motion by:* Ms. Carroll

*Seconded by:* Mr. Cavanaugh

*BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby enters into executive session to discuss a personnel matter — Town Manager at 10:40 P.M.*

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

*Present for the Executive Session item were council members, Mr. Tom Gullotta, Chairman, Mr. Lawrence Niland, Vice Chairman, Ms. Deb Carroll, Mr. Kurt Cavanaugh, Mr. John Cavanna, Ms. Mary LaChance, Mr. Jake McChesney, Mr. Whit Osgood, and Ms. Jennifer Wang, with Town Manager, Richard J. Johnson.*

No votes were taken during the Executive Session, which ended at 10:50 P.M.

Meeting adjourned at 10:51 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

**Lilly Torosyan**

**Lilly Torosyan**

**Recording Clerk**

**Thomas Gullotta**

**Chairman**