

**THE GLASTONBURY TOWN PLAN AND ZONING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES OF TUESDAY, JULY 5, 2022**

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

ROLL CALL

Commission Members Present

Mr. Robert Zanolungo, Jr., Chairman
Ms. Sharon Purtil, Vice Chairman {participated via Zoom video conferencing}
Mr. Michael Botelho, Secretary {participated via Zoom videoconferencing}
Mr. Corey Turner
Mr. Emilio Flores
Ms. Alice Sexton, Alternate {assigned as voting member}

Commission Members Absent

Mr. Raymond Hassett
Ms. Laura Cahill, Alternate
Alternate Vacancy

Chairman Zanolungo called the meeting to order at 7:01 P.M. He seated Commissioner Sexton in the absence of Commissioner Hassett.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. **Application of Manchester/Hebron Avenue, LLC (Richard Hayes, Jr.) for a “set-aside development” pursuant to CGS Section 8-30g concerning the construction of an apartment building containing 74 units, with parking and other site improvements – 1199 Manchester Road - Planned Business & Development Zone & Rural Residence Zone – Attorneys Timothy Hollister & Andrea Gomes – Wes Wentworth, P.E. – Alan Lamson, AIA AICP – *Continued from June 21, 2022 meeting***

The applicant has requested to continue the hearing to the July 19, 2022 meeting.

2. **Application of H374, LLC for a Section 12 Special Permit with Design Review to construct a delivery area on the west side of the existing building for grocer & to expand employee parking/delivery area utilizing 366 Hebron Avenue & 7 Linden Street – 400 Hebron Avenue – Town Center Zone, Residence A Zone and Town Center Village District Overlay Zone – *Continued from June 21, 2022 meeting***

Attorney Andrea Gomes of Hinckley Allen represented the applicant. She reviewed the revisions that were made since the May hearing. The revised site plan incorporates a pedestrian connection from Linden Street to the store entrance on the south side of the building. This will increase green space, allowing more area for plantings. She noted that these additional plantings are not

reflected in the plans presented tonight. On June 29, the applicant submitted a plan for the proposed Sycamore Street widening, which incorporates the following: consolidation of the existing double sidewalk on the east of the building into a single improved sidewalk; installation of a ramp on Sycamore Street; a wood guiderail along the water quality basins; and relocation of the existing catch basins to the new curb line. Ms. Gomes then reviewed the landscaping plan, noting that existing plants on the east side of the building will be rearranged to fit the new sidewalk. Per Commissioner Hassett's request, a 52-inch-high lattice panel will be incorporated on the east side of the sidewalk to provide screening. Existing cone junipers will be replaced by bayberry shrubs and additional sky pencil holly, and a new shade tree will be added to shade the existing mechanicals.

Ms. Gomes responded to comments made by commissioners at the last public hearing:

- ***The grocer principal entryway:*** The applicant has confirmed with the grocer that a second entryway is not possible for two reasons: Hebron Avenue entrances lead into the grocer's back of the house operations and having two entrances into a retail building poses a security risk. A single entrance is standard for industry retailers. The applicant has proposed the entrance on the south side of the building so that patrons who drive to the site will not have to walk around to enter the site.
- ***Hebron Avenue frontage:*** The applicant proposes two items to liven up the Hebron Avenue frontage: a large patio table and window graphics to honor Glastonbury's history. Additionally, the applicant has just signed a lease with a furniture retailer to occupy the vacant space in the existing Hebron Avenue building.
- ***Drainage concerns:*** The applicant and Mr. Sczurek have met with Mr. Satin to discuss his concerns with drainage. The applicant has agreed to install a yard drain on Mr. Satin's property at his own expense and to protect and preserve the existing lilac bushes.
- ***The ASDRC's advisory report:*** The ASDRC's report fails to recognize that the 400 Hebron Avenue building is an existing-approved part of the Town Center Village District (TCVD). Thus, the proposal is part of the building streetscape and pattern in the area. The ASDRC's report ventures into the Commission's territory by commenting on the approved use being inconsistent with the area. However, many of the ASDRC's concerns were addressed by the applicant, including the small addition proposed on the west side of the building, the landscaping improvements, and the pedestrian improvements on Linden Street. Additionally, the applicant has incorporated almost all Town staff comments into the proposal.

Mark Vertucci, Traffic Engineer, explained that additional information was requested by Town Engineering staff to the updated traffic study. He noted that the traffic generation for the site used a 10% multi-modal and internal capture credit to provide for those who walk to the site. Per Town Engineer request, that credit has been eliminated, but they also do not agree that the credit will be zero. Further, the DOT accepts a minimum of 5% credit. Thus, this is a conservative estimate. Per Town Engineering request, the pass-by trips have been reduced from 35% to 20%. The analysis assumed some timing optimizations with intersections at Hebron Avenue and Sycamore Street. The DOT is undergoing a study of all closed-loop signal systems, and they will look at this intersection. For a conservative analysis, they have not assumed that any signal timing changes will be made at all.

Mr. Vertucci addressed comments made by Town Engineering regarding parking. Zoning requires 106 parking spaces on site, but the applicant has provided 131 spaces. Town staff worried that there would not be enough parking to accommodate the Saturday peak hour. Mr. Vertucci noted that the difference between a specialty grocer and a regular supermarket is that the former has a higher turnover. The average amount of time that people spend at this specialty grocer is 15 minutes. Thus, they feel that parking is more than adequate. He reviewed other Trader Joe's locations to determine what type of traffic this store would generate and found that their parking supply is similar to this site. There are also bigger stores with even less parking than what is proposed for this site.

The road widening of Sycamore Street will provide two approach lanes to Hebron Avenue, which will more than double the queue storage. If the DOT permits timing optimization, that would further mitigate traffic. The lane widths are commonly used. Town staff raised a concern about the ability of trucks to make a right turn in and out of Hebron Avenue. Mr. Vertucci showed how two box trucks could simultaneously make the turn onto Hebron Avenue and Sycamore Street without a problem. They also ran a larger semi-trailer truck from the left lane with a box truck in the right lane, and that turn could also be accommodated.

Mr. Vertucci noted that the widening of the road and the addition of a lane will not just help with this development but also the baseline traffic on the road network. He reviewed the simulated traffic numbers for the Hebron Avenue/Sycamore Street intersection at the Friday PM peak and Saturday midday peak hours. The Friday peak hour has a 2-3 car increase in the queue, and the Saturday peak is a 7-9 vehicle increase. Using the simulation to cross-check the analysis, the results are similar. This is the worst-case scenario, based on a conservative analysis. Mr. Vertucci noted that they have also looked at the latest three years of crash data at that intersection, and no crash pattern was identified. There was no indication that any peak hour delays are contributing to an unsafe condition at this intersection. The DOT proposes a roundabout at the intersection of New London Turnpike at Route 17, which will slow down traffic. He noted that the traffic study was submitted to the DOT as a courtesy, and they declined to review it, indicating that there was no significant impact to the state roadway system.

Town Engineer Dan Pennington noted that there has been a lot of interaction between the applicant and Town staff including the Police Department. Mr. Pennington had concerns as to the validity of the numbers Mr. Vertucci used for the trip generators, so he requested real world data, obtained from actual stores. In reviewing this information, they found that the trip generation was almost double what the ITE analysis requested, so the applicant revised the study. He clarified that Town staff is not indicating that the site parking is inadequate, but that there has not been a demonstration that it is adequate. He suggested that the applicant attain real-world data on this specialty grocer who has 530 locations across the country.

Mr. Pennington noted that Hebron Avenue is a state road beginning east of Sycamore Street; west of Sycamore Street is town-owned, so it is a unique situation. The State owns and maintains the signal. The initial traffic impact study did not anticipate any improvements at that intersection. Adjustments were made when that real-world information came back. The road widening does meet Town standards, and while relocating the sidewalk does result in a section of it being on private property, that does not concern him. Instead, Mr. Pennington is concerned that

there will be times within the peak hour where the traffic queue will not dissipate within a signal cycle.

Mr. Pennington disputes Mr. Vertucci's indication that the Town parameters are too conservative. Even if one were to use a less conservative analysis, both the delay and queue factors would increase. There is potential for people queuing up to move into gaps, which can increase the potential of motor vehicle accidents. He noted that the memorandum provided is a joint one between the Engineering Department and the Police Department. The Police Department knows how actual motorists behave, and the Police Chief has agreed that there is a potential for an increase in motor vehicle accidents at that intersection, given the longer delays and queues. While no regulation prohibits nor requires some type of mitigation measure, this is their professional judgment.

Secretary Botelho asked what his main objection is. Mr. Pennington stated that his main issues are with respect to whether the parking is adequate and concerns about the Sycamore Street/New London Turnpike intersection. Commissioner Sexton noted that the proposal assumed 37 parking spaces for the new furniture store, which is very high. She asked if this changes his thoughts on the parking. Mr. Pennington replied no, because the parking could be used for a different retail use without having to return to this commission. That being the case, he thought it prudent for the applicant to assume a higher trip generation for that space. Ms. Sexton imagines that this retailer will become a part of the equilibrium, like Whole Foods has. She asked if the parking is sufficient. Mr. Pennington has not seen an analysis that would tell him that it is sufficient. Thus, he does not know. Commissioner Turner asked if making a condition of approval that the vacant space will be a furniture store, or something similarly low in traffic, would alleviate some of his concerns. Mr. Pennington stated that it would allow the applicant to revise the analysis in a less conservative manner, but it does not remove the concerns he has previously expressed.

Vice Chair Purtill finds it hard to believe that the average amount of time that customers are in Trader Joe's is 15 minutes. She asked if that factor was taken into consideration to determine adequate parking. Mr. Pennington stated yes, that number is a theoretical determination, which does not demonstrate that the proposed parking is sufficient. Citing parking numbers from other stores without information on what does and does not work is also not a useful methodology. Mrs. Purtill explained that prior to this proposal, when the application was for a restaurant use, the applicant requested a waiver; now, there is a concern of excess parking. She wonders if the use is just too intense for this site. Mr. Pennington agrees that it is unusual. The trip generation rates for a specialty grocer are double the standard ITE generation rates for grocers. Mrs. Purtill asked why the sidewalk is being moved. Mr. Pennington replied due to grade issues. Commissioner Flores asked if using the conservative approach declined the level of service. Mr. Pennington stated that it does have an impact. However, relative to his two primary concerns about the parking and the Sycamore Street/New London Turnpike intersection, even if they went the other way, he would still have the same concerns.

Chairman Zanolungo struggles with the statement that the parking is neither adequate nor inadequate. Mr. Pennington explained that he has not been provided with enough information to determine that there is enough parking to accommodate the use. Mr. Zanolungo asked, if the applicant has provided a comparison of a store which is 20% larger and has 30% less parking than this proposal, and the store is still operating, could one not conclude that the parking is

working. Mr. Pennington stated that they do not know whether patrons are having difficulty finding spots on site and parking elsewhere.

Chairman Zanolungo asked whether any updates have been made to realign Sycamore Street and Douglas Road. Mr. Pennington stated that there are no plans at this time. However, the roundabout was the subject of a DOT informational hearing a few weeks ago. That project is funded on the state level and is proceeding with the design and presumed implementation. Regarding its impact on the Sycamore Street and Douglas Road intersection, the speeds of the vehicles heading northbound will be reduced as compared to the current condition. He does not know if there would necessarily be more gaps because of the roundabout. Secretary Botelho asked if there are any safety concerns with the applicant's improvements to widen the road and add an extra lane. Mr. Pennington stated that it meets minimum standards, so there is no safety concern.

Mr. Turner did some calculations and found that the average amount of time for someone to be in the store would have to be 28 minutes or less. If the applicant receives the 10% multi-modal credit, then it would be up to 32 minutes. Thus, he predicts that the turnover rate will be fast enough. Mr. Pennington noted that that is a theoretical way of looking at it. There is an ability for the applicant to provide real world data that does not utilize theory which could demonstrate, or not, that the parking on-site is suitable for this use.

Chairman Zanolungo opened the floor for comments from the public.

The following comments were made via Zoom:

William Grady of 8 West High Street of East Hampton, is a regional and town planner who has family members who have resided on Linden Street for many years. In this instance, the applicant is trying to place a square peg in a round hole. The most invasive activities are on the west side of the structure facing Linden Street. The main exit for vehicles will be Linden Street. The proposal will be a nuisance and an unreasonable burden on the Linden Street neighbors, who will try to sell their homes. The benefit to the applicant far outweighs the benefit to the neighborhood. The community could benefit from this addition, just not where it is proposed. He requested that the Commission deny this application.

Mark Branse of 48 Birch Trail, spoke as a member of the ASDRC. He noted that the issue is not whether Trader Joe's is a good store or whether this is a suitable location for the store. The ASDRC's comments were with respect to the fact that this proposal places a loading dock, an employee parking lot, and extends the building westward. The ASDRC's recommendation was for denial of the application. They oppose the demolition of the house on the corner of Linden and Hebron Avenue, which could be viable for retail. There are other ways to provide the necessary loading and storage that the proposal requires. The applicant could demolish the building to the rear to increase parking. This could be the first building one sees when entering the Town Center, so it is a question of preserving the character of the town. The reason for the TCVD is to halt the demolition of existing structures and the replacement of buildings with boxes. He urged the Commission to deny this application.

The following comments were made in-person, in Council Chambers:

Travis Logan, Manager of One Glastonbury Place, likes that his residents would have walkable access to the store. He urged support of the application.

Margaret Wilcox of 8 Aspen Drive, is a realtor who fully supports this project. Everyone she has spoken to also supports it. She likes the aesthetic and welcomes the opportunity to improve the downtown economy. She finds that the retailer, which is a national chain, has sufficient experience with their 530 stores to understand whether there is adequate parking at this site or not. She asked that the project be approved.

Gerry Satin of 101 Clinton Street, also owns 9-11 Linden Street. While he supports Trader Joe's, he is concerned that not enough attention has been made to address safety concerns on Linden Street, which lacks sidewalks. To this effect, he made two suggestions: installing a No Parking sign on Linden Street about 100 yards up from Hebron Avenue, and an ordinance to state that parking could only be for local traffic on Clinton Street.

Kathryn Cross of 17 Linden Street, thanked the Commission and the Schwartzes for considering the neighbors. She looks forward to having Trader Joe's in town, which will bring in valuable tax dollars. She likes the connection of Linden Street to the two shopping areas. Parking will not be a problem for her, and she accepts that people will park behind her house. She looks forward to the building being occupied and asked the Commission to consider approving it.

Attorney Gomes addressed the various comments made during the public comment session:

- **Regarding Mr. Branse and the ASDRC:** The applicant disagrees with the conclusions made by the ASDRC, whose referrals are advisory and not binding. The proposed addition is not flat, and a gate is no longer proposed, allowing for the openness that the ASDRC requested. 366 Hebron Avenue is an outdated building which is not ADA compliant. The applicant has been unable to lease it for 18 months; stating that it is viable is not accurate.
- **Regarding Linden Street:** There is no vehicular cut-through Linden Street. Only employees and deliveries will access it. Trucks will be directed to not use Linden Street but to exit right to Hebron Avenue. There will be appropriate signage directing trucks out of the site. The expansion continues a land use pattern that has been in existence for several years proceeding down the Hebron Avenue corridor, so the impact of this proposal is much less significant than presented.
- **Regarding the Town Engineer's comments:** The proposal exceeds the required parking in the zoning regulations. They have gone even further and provided a mathematical formula. There were questions about whether patrons spend only 15 minutes in the store; no one knows that better than the grocer themselves. The applicant has a legal presumption that it is providing correct information to the commission. The June 29 materials provide several examples of parking that is operated by other stores. They have been told by the grocer that the parking works, and no one has a greater interest in providing adequate parking for their customer base than the grocer.

Mr. Vertucci responded to Mr. Pennington's comments. He explained that he was not able to find a similar site to this specialty grocer because all the examples he came across were located in a plaza combined with other uses. However, he was able to find similar stores of a similar size with similar parking provided, and the grocers have found that those sites are adequate, with no problems reported. He noted that even if the 15-minute turnover were doubled to 30 minutes, that would require 104 spaces on site, which is still below the proposed 131 spaces. He also provided calculations on the New London Turnpike/Sycamore Street intersection, noting that the projected Friday peak hour would still be lower than the existing Saturday midday peak. The queue numbers are 95th percentile queues, which is the worst case one would experience. He sees this as a delay issue, not a safety issue. There is no crash history on the site, so it is not a direct comparison of volume/increase in traffic versus crash rate/safety. The total number of cars entering the intersection from all three approaches outlined reflects about a 9% change in both the Friday and Saturday peak hours.

Mr. Turner asked if the applicant would be willing to reline the compact car spaces. Attorney Gomes explained that eliminating those three parking spots would still be compliant with the regulations; however, it is the applicant's preference to maintain that use for cars that could use it. The applicant, Evan Schwartz, explained that the compact spaces are positioned further away from the building. When the application was originally approved for restaurant use, more parking was required. This explains the high density of the parking for a specialty grocer. He is sensitive to the 20% compact parking approved for the application and would prefer not to reduce parking spaces. However, if it were a condition of approval, he would comply.

Mr. Turner is concerned that because the compact spaces are in the rear of the site, a driver of a compact car might simply take the spot closest to the front. This would fill up the front and leave regular vehicles with only compact spots to park in. He is not particularly supportive of the idea to re-stripe the spaces but would like to hear feedback from fellow commissioners. Ms. Gomes stated that the applicant can accept a condition of approval that there be no fine dining restaurant or athletic facility in the third retail space in the building. Secretary Botelho generally does not like compact spaces, but he would rather have more parking than less, so he is inclined to keep the compact spaces.

Mrs. Purtill noted that there are trees in the swales, but the landscaping plan does not show them. She asked if they will be removed. Ms. Gomes stated that the trees will not be removed. The plantings will not decrease; they are simply being redistributed for the sidewalk and supplemented with new plantings. Mrs. Purtill would like an expert to review the plan. Ms. Augur remarked that the ASDRC has seen the landscaping plan but not the additional changes on the Sycamore Street side. Mrs. Purtill asked why the two patios are being reduced by 800 square feet. Ms. Gomes replied that it is to provide for additional green area because the site will no longer be used as a dining area. Mrs. Purtill asked how the ASDRC felt about that. Mr. Schwartz stated that there was an interest to increase the greenspace, and the design was well received by the ASDRC. Mrs. Purtill does not like the look of the wooden picnic table. She thinks that the plan would need to return to the ASDRC to come up with a schematic, consistent look for the tables.

Mrs. Purtill finds that the window designs on Hebron Avenue look odd. She does not like the opaque windows, the elimination of the front door, or the red awnings. The use is too intense for

the site. Trader Joe's will have to work with the Town to make this proposal work. Mr. Schwartz responded that the specialty grocer has made several visits to the site and is very interested in being in Glastonbury. They feel that the red awnings complement the streetscape. They had to pivot due to the pandemic, but the proposed improvements will ensure that the grocer fits in well with the neighborhood and the community.

Mr. Schwartz clarified the sidewalk modification on Sycamore Street. The current sidewalk only allows 2.5 feet between the building and the existing sidewalk, and about 8 feet down is another sidewalk. Both Mr. Sczurek and Mr. Pennington felt that the two sidewalks were redundant. The solution was to replace the existing sidewalk with a new one and to widen Sycamore Street to address traffic concerns and increase pedestrian safety. This is a great improvement on a very difficult intersection.

Ms. Sexton asked if the applicant would be willing to provide real life examples of parking in other stores. Ms. Gomes stated that the information provided is more than sufficient to conclude that there is sufficient parking on site. They are under pressure to construct the improvement and open the store. Not receiving an approval tonight will put certain deadlines in jeopardy. Mr. Schwartz added that similar grocers, such as Whole Foods, Highland Park Market, and Stop & Shop are all under-parked. The specialty grocer provided them with the sizes of the three stores they found to be the most compatible. If parking were inadequate, they would address it. Ms. Sexton noted that there are memes on the internet about how difficult it is to find parking at Trader Joe's. She asked the question in light of Mrs. Purtill's comments.

Mrs. Purtill does not ever recall a time when the Commission approved a project that the Town Engineer did not favorably approve. She also does not recall the Police Chief ever stating that a proposal will increase accidents. This is an unusual situation which the applicant must address. The applicant must convince Town staff that the parking is adequate. Ms. Gomes reiterated that there is an abundance of information in the record to prove that parking is sufficient, and she finds the safety concern to be speculative.

Mrs. Purtill noted that Commissioner Cahill is excused tonight, but she requested that her comments and questions be read into the record:

- Town staff recommended that proposed plantings be removed for the snow shelf. She asked if that would happen. Ms. Gomes explained that the plantings proposed in the Linden Street area can handle the snow load. If that is proven to not be the case, then they have an obligation to replace them with hardier plantings.
- The applicant does not include a signage plan. Ms. Gomes explained that the grocer's sign consultant will return to the Commission with an application for the requested signage.
- She does not like eliminating the opaque windows, removing the door, or the red awning.
- She asked if the garbage area will be enclosed. Mr. Schwartz replied yes, the dumpster and the pallets are all enclosed and only accessed from inside the building.
- She finds that tearing down the house (366 Hebron Avenue) takes away from the TCVD objectives.

Chairman Zanolungo does not have an issue with the opaque windows, noting that both CVS and Walgreens have them. He asked if the window graphics would be a Glastonbury historical mural.

Mr. Schwartz explained that they sought to embrace the new TCVD regulations by using town landmarks in the design of the graphics. Secretary Botelho is not thrilled with the design. He does not remember the rocks being a part of the plan. Ms. Gomes explained that the rocks were primarily there to provide protection for people sitting on the dining patios. While the dining use is no longer relevant, the rocks will still function because there are two tables on the easternmost and westernmost patios. They have tried to beautify the frontage by masking the existence of the rocks with plantings.

Ms. Gomes made her closing remarks, reviewing the history of the application and the changes made by the applicant after receiving feedback from various town bodies. She noted that there is overwhelming support from the public for this application, and the applicant will continue to be a good neighbor.

Chairman Zanolungo closed the public hearing at 9:55 P.M. and the Commission recessed until 10:06 P.M.

Motion by: Secretary Botelho

Seconded by: Commissioner Sexton

MOVED, that the Town Plan & Zoning Commission approve the application of H374, LLC for a Section 12 Special Permit with Design Review to construct a delivery area on the west side of the existing building for grocer & to expand employee parking/delivery area utilizing 366 Hebron Avenue & 7 Linden Street – 400 Hebron Avenue, 366 Hebron Avenue and 7 Linden Street – Town Center Zone, Residence A Zone and Town Center Village District Overlay Zone, in accordance with plan set entitled “Site Plan Modification Proposed Delivery Area #400 Hebron Avenue”, prepared by Megson, Heagle & Friend C.E. & L.S., LLC and dated March 30, 2022 with revisions to June 29, 2022;

And

1. In compliance with:
 - a. The standards contained in a report from the Fire Marshal, File 22-007 R, plans reviewed 05-16-22.
 - b. The Environmental Planner’s memorandum dated April 28, 2022.
 - c. The Director of Health’s memorandum dated June 16, 2022.
 - d. The letter from the applicant to 7 Linden Street property owner, Gerald Satin, dated June 1, 2022.
 - e. The following conditions:
 - i. Additional notes shall be added to the final site plan indicating that private hardscape and landscaping improvements installed within the Town right-of-way are subject to a maintenance agreement with the Town of Glastonbury and shall be maintained by the property owner. A draft agreement shall be provided by the applicant for review and approval by the Town Engineer.
 - ii. A detail for the proposed hardscape in the Linden Street right-of-way shall be provided by the applicant for review and approval by the Town Engineer.
 - iii. If the plantings in the snow shelf on Linden Street directly adjacent to the curb do not survive – whether due to snow load, or for any other reason – the applicant shall replace the plants as soon as practicable.

- iv. While the grocer is operating in the building, additional retail tenants in the building shall not include a sit-down restaurant or athletic club.
 - v. Patio seating shall be provided and maintained in good condition on the Hebron Avenue-facing side of the building, subject to review and approval by Community Development staff.
 - vi. Truck traffic for the specialty grocer shall be directed not to use Linden Street beyond the driveway entrance off of Linden Street.
 - vii. Employees and customers shall be directed not to park on Linden or Sycamore Streets.
 - viii. Windows on the Hebron Avenue-facing side of the building shall consist of opaque glass.
2. 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.
 3. 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.

Disc: Ms. Sexton does not see any reason why the Commission should turn down this application which is welcomed by many people. There is adequate parking on-site. While she is concerned about the intersection of New London Turnpike and Sycamore Street, some of those concerns will be addressed by the new roundabout. She is also hopeful that the traffic studies are overly conservative to what the reality will be once the store opens. She welcomed the applicant into town and thanked them for working with the neighbors.

Mrs. Purtill finds that there are two big hurdles here: the lack of effort by the applicant to compromise and address the ASDRC's outright denial, and the fact that the Town Engineer cannot give a favorable recommendation for the proposal. The Town Engineer and the Police Chief both state that the site will be a traffic nightmare. To not provide them with the information they seek is the applicant's burden, so she will not support the application.

Mr. Turner finds that this application comes down to three factors: the ASDRC's report, traffic concerns, and parking concerns.

- Regarding traffic: The Hebron Avenue/Sycamore Street intersection is already a nightmare. He thanked the applicant for the improvements they are trying to make there. While the calculations are all theoretical, they do show that these changes will improve the site, even using the most conservative calculations possible.

- Regarding parking: Based off the calculations, parking is more than sufficient and surpasses the regulations. He feels that the applicant has supplied enough information as far as the parking is concerned.
- Regarding the ASDRC: There are no guidelines for the ASDRC, and some of the comments they raised were outside of their purview. Attorney Branse mentioned that the TCVD was created to stop demolition of buildings, which is inaccurate; it reiterates the status on general design requirements and discourages, but cannot prevent, demolition or removal of structures. The applicant has taken the ASDRC's comments to heart and made a lot of design changes. This is only a 750 square foot addition on a 19,000 square foot building, and most of that addition is to hide the refuse and shield the loading dock from Hebron Avenue. By comparison, Highland Park Market's loading dock is not hidden.

Under these conditions, he think that the applicant has done everything to make the site as good as possible. Public comment has been overwhelmingly positive. He will support the application.

Mr. Flores thinks that the site would be a welcome addition to town. The building already exists and there is no change in the level of service, so the traffic impact is minimal. He will also support the application.

Secretary Botelho believes that this is one of the most difficult applications he has had to address on the commission. He commended the applicant for responding to their comments and concerns. He does not share some of the ASDRC's concerns as to the use of the site, and agreed with Mr. Turner that, in some instances, the ASDRC overstepped its authority. Adequate parking has been a critical objective for him. While he typically defers to the applicant on matters of business applications, he is uncomfortable that Town staff does not have sufficient information to conclude that there is sufficient parking. He will not support the application.

Mr. Zanlungo thanked Town staff for their efforts and thanked the public for their input and active engagement. He pointed out that some of the most ardent people in favor of this application are the neighbors, which is unusual. The applicant has done a great job at community outreach. The potential tenant knows their business and what they need. He welcomes the opportunity to bring more tax revenue into town. He also thanked the applicant for returning to the Commission to request a special permit. He looks forward to having design guidelines in place to establish a smooth working relationship with the ASDRC. He thinks that the applicant addressed some of the ASDRC's concerns. He will support the application.

Result: Motion passed {4-2-0}, with Vice Chair Purtill and Secretary Botelho voting against.

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 June 21, 2022 Regular Meeting

Motion by: Commissioner Turner

Seconded by: Commissioner Sexton

Result: Minutes were accepted unanimously {6-0-0}.

3. Section 8-24 Connecticut General Statutes Referral from the Town Council regarding the Reserve for Land Acquisition & Preservation Ordinance

Ms. Augur explained that the Town Council is seeking to go to referendum this fall for a \$3 million bond authorization and appropriation for land acquisition and preservation. The motion provided is the same one which has been used in the past by the Commission. Mr. Botelho asked if they are voting on a Section 8-24 with respect to replenishment of the land acquisition fund. Ms. Augur stated that is correct. Mr. Botelho asked if the Bond Counsel determined that this referral was necessary. Ms. Augur stated yes, it is part of the bonding process. Mrs. Purtill pointed out a typo in the second sentence of the motion: “*of* the Town Plan and Zoning Commission” should be “*to* the Town Plan and Zoning Commission.” Mr. Botelho noted that there is no particular site in mind. Ms. Augur stated that is correct. This will return to the Commission when a site is identified.

Motion by: Secretary Botelho

Seconded by: Commissioner Turner

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Plan and Zoning Commission of the Town of Glastonbury forwards a favorable recommendation, pursuant to Section 8-24 of the General Statutes of Connecticut, regarding the following:

Purchase of development rights and acquisition of land pursuant to the Town’s ordinance establishing a Reserve for Land Acquisition, as it may hereafter be amended from time to time. Such funds shall be used for the purchase of development rights and/or the acquisition of land but only after referral of the proposed purchase or acquisition to the Town Plan and Zoning Commission and after public hearing as required by said ordinance and approval by the Town Council.

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

4. CONSENT CALENDAR

- a. Scheduling of Public Hearings for the Regular Meeting of July 19, 2022: **to be determined**

5. Chairman’s Report

Mr. Zanolungo noted that this is Ms. Augur’s last TPZ meeting. After Friday, she will work for the State of Connecticut. The Commission thanked her for her efforts and wished her luck.

6. Report from Community Development Staff

None

Motion by: Commissioner Sexton

Seconded by: Commissioner Turner

MOVED, that the Glastonbury Town Plan and Zoning Commission adjourns their regular meeting of July 5, 2022 at 10:48 P.M.

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

Respectfully Submitted,

Lilly Torosyan

Lilly Torosyan

Recording Clerk