

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

The Glastonbury Town Plan and Zoning Commission with Jonathan E. Mullen, AICP, Planner, 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 Purtill, Vice Chairman *{participated via Zoom video conferencing}*

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

Mr. Raymond Hassett

Mr. Corey Turner

Mr. Emilio Flores

Ms. Laura Cahill, Alternate *{participated via Zoom video conferencing}*

Ms. Alice Sexton, Alternate

Commission Members Absent

Alternate Vacancy

Chairman Zanolungo called the meeting to order at 7:05 P.M.

PUBLIC HEARING

Continued 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

Chris Granatini, P.E. at Tighe and Bond, explained the results of their peer review of the traffic impact study. They have concluded that the application does not pose any significant changes in operation at the intersection of Hebron Avenue and Manchester Road. They asked the applicant to provide more information as to how the actual background traffic volumes were calculated. In short, Tighe and Bond found that the proposed development will not have adverse conditions on those roadways.

Jeff Brown, Senior Project Manager at Tighe and Bond, explained the results of their review regarding concerns of uranium and other radionuclides on the property. He noted that the well on site has uranium in the groundwater, which is a common occurrence in Glastonbury. Most of the site is shown to have a moderate occurrence of radon, which is one of the decay products for uranium. One of their recommendations is to put in a radon mitigation system underlying the proposed building. They also recommend that dust controls be used during site development.

Chris Haker, geotechnical engineer at Tighe and Bond, reviewed Dr. Welty's report. Based on his soil borings, the soil perimeters appear appropriate, and the safety standard is appropriate. They conducted an independent analysis of the three cross-sections of the slope behind the building and found the safety standard to be appropriate. In conclusion, the analysis meets the standard of practice, and they agree with Dr. Welty's report.

Chairman Zanolungo opened the floor for commissioners to ask questions of the experts.

Alternate Sexton stated that a letter was received from a state representative who refers to "excessively steep slopes" and the occurrence of blasting. She asked if blasting will be necessary. Mr. Haker replied no, the soil conditions seem consistent with sand and gravel. Secretary Botelho asked if the applicant provided the additional information which was requested by Tighe and Bond. Mr. Granatini stated that they received more information from the applicant last week, which addressed their comment on existing and background traffic. The analysis demonstrates that the applicant revised the results of the analysis for them.

Alternate Cahill asked if the construction truck traffic will pose any negative impact on the safety and welfare of residents on Manchester Road. Mr. Granatini clarified that they were not asked to review the construction traffic. The traffic impact study looks at the development impacts post and pre-development. Commissioner Turner asked about the impact on neighboring properties for the naturally occurring uranium present in the soil and the soil removal process itself. Mr. Brown does not expect significant particulates, but developers should always be mindful of keeping emissions down.

Chairman Zanolungo asked if the 70-foot well on the property is deeper than the material that will be removed. Mr. Haker stated that the well is 10-12 feet below the excavation line. Vice Chairman Purtill asked how many feet of excavation will occur. Mr. Haker stated that the top of the slope will be at elevation 406 and the proposed first floor is at elevation 364.5, so there will be about a 40-foot cut. Commissioner Turner asked if the 10-12 feet is the well depth or the water depth. The applicant, Richard Hayes, explained that there is a 40-foot cut, and the water is at least 12-14 feet below the proposed grade for the first floor of the building. The grade of the water at the top. Thus, 12-14 feet is a conservative number.

Andrea Gomes, Attorney at Hinckley Allen, provided a history on what has been submitted to date. She explained that the application complies with the parking standards of Connecticut General Statutes section 8-2 as amended by Public Act 21-29 and noted that while a CGS Section 8-30g application cannot be denied because it does not comply with local zoning regulations, their application complies with many of the Town's regulations. She provided a list of the revisions made to this plan, and the applicant's response to the Tighe and Bond reports on traffic, uranium, and slope stability, which identified no health and safety issues in those areas. Daniel A. Pennington, Town Engineer submitted a memorandum confirming that his department agreed with Tighe and Bond's assessment of the slope stability report.

Mrs. Purtill recommended that the Glastonbury Housing Authority (GHA) act as the administrator to oversee the administration of the affordable units for this property. Ms. Gomes does not know if the GHA would want to or can do that, and she does not want to hamstring the applicant. Mrs. Purtill's preference is that the GHA would do this. Ms. Cahill agreed. Ms. Sexton stated that has she spoken with Ms. Augur about this, who informed her that the GHA

would first have to indicate their willingness to take on that role. Ms. Sexton asked if the affordability plan is a requirement of the application now. Ms. Gomes stated yes, the draft affordability plan is part of the application. They have revised the plan to pick an administrator who would be acceptable to the Commission, not just to the Town. The applicant provides yearly reports to the Commission, which can review and request additional information.

Mr. Botelho worries about dividing up the administration of affordable housing in town to third parties. Ms. Gomes stated that it is typical for an administrator to fulfill their duties without issue. They do not know the GHA's capability or willingness to do so. Mrs. Purtill asked to add to the motion a condition stating that the administrator on the affordability plan shall be approved by the Commission, with preference for the GHA. The condition was acceptable to the applicant.

Chairman Zanolungo opened the floor for public comment.

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

Diana Wind of 101 Hurlburt Street, expressed several concerns with the application. Because of the recently approved Trader Joe's, she will no longer get off at Exit 8, but at Exit 9. This will increase traffic to the area which was not accounted for in the original traffic studies. She also worries that blasting will be conducted, since the peer review denoted the presence of "granitic gneiss," which is basically bedrock and granite. A stretch of Hurlburt Street is still on well water. She expressed concern about that being disturbed and uranium ending up in the wells. She asked that, if the application were to be approved, that the Commission do so tightly.

Sandra Davis of 1194 Manchester Road, has a well and her whole backyard is practically rock. She and her husband rejected the previous proposal for the CVS, and for the same reasons, they reject this proposal. The proposed site is a safety issue, with concerns about traffic, noise, and an increased risk of accidents.

Jill Barry of 199 Cavin Lane, State Representative for Glastonbury, does not support this project. It is out of scale for the population. She explained that the reasoning behind CGS 8-30g was to encourage towns to take affordable housing seriously, but this proposal does not do that. The developer is using a loophole to build a luxury complex under the guise of affordable housing. She has been trying to rectify the problems with the statute, which should encourage home ownership to promote investment in the community. She also believes that if the developer were serious about affordable housing, the units would remain affordable in perpetuity, not just for 40 years. She continues to advocate on the state level to increase affordable housing opportunities.

Eric Rousseau of 75 Churchill Road, worries about radon and uranium concerns which were not addressed. He already has radon in his basement. He does not believe that the Town should take on a health and safety risk for the next 150 years, just to place affordable housing in an unsuitable location. He noted that it will become increasingly difficult to meet the 10% threshold for the Town's affordable housing stock. If the affordable housing units were removed from this complex in 40 years, then it would further lower that number. He agreed with Representative Barry to keep the mandate in perpetuity, not just for 40 years. He does not support the proposal.

Steve Bielitz of 80 Newell Lane, is on the board of the Historical Society of Glastonbury but spoke as a private citizen. He is concerned that the scale of the development is too large and jeopardizes the village quality of Glastonbury.

Robert Hale of 832 Hopewell Road, stated that Manchester Road is a narrow, windy road which cannot accommodate a five-story development. He is concerned that this application will open the door to similar proposals in the future. He is also concerned that the developer used a loophole in the statute. He believes that the statute should be overturned because it sets income limits on people. He urged the Commission to reject the application for the following reasons: it is not in keeping with the character of Glastonbury; the density and building height are too great; the number of parking units is insufficient; and the site is too far from a bus line.

Gary Giannelli of 522 Woodland Street, stated that his house, prior to remodeling, had asbestos shingles on it. There are still understated health risks. Neighbors have stated that there is bedrock on site, so there may be the possibility of excavation. He asked if blasting would make the uranium and radon worse. He also asked if the 12,000 trips of removal soil are accounted for in the study and what risks that poses. The proposal does not fit in the neighborhood, nor does it meet the town zoning regulations. He urged rejection of the application.

Amy Dement of 188 Pond Circle, is concerned that the peer review report did not address the possibility of uranium migration in the groundwater. She asked who would pay for that if the uranium were to migrate. She is also concerned about the lack of sufficient parking and wonders where the overflow parking will be. She noted that the prior CVS application was 5,000 square feet less than what is proposed now. She asked how blasting was proposed then but not now.

Sara Bass of 5 Knollwood Drive, was hoping that the peer reviews would have addressed the traffic issues associated with the excavation. She asked how the excavation will be accomplished. Unless the approvals include a line item explicitly forbidding blasting, she is worried that it will happen.

Ken Dorros of 241 Shoddy Mill Road, opposes the development and finds Tighe and Bond's review to be a disservice to the town. The proposal is in a ridiculous location, which would increase safety, traffic, and parking issues. He reviewed a list of developments across town that were not set-aside developments or five stories in height.

Robert Hale of 832 Hopewell Road, believes that the formulas which the statute uses to determine affordable housing in Glastonbury are not realistic. They are skewed to limit home ownership and people's self-improvement. More people should be included in the count of below median income than are included in the formula.

The following comments were made via Zoom:

Mark Anderson of 2696 Hebron Avenue, is concerned about pedestrian traffic. With that intersection at a standstill, it is frustrating waiting for the cycle to end. He asked if the developer would pay for the road damage or will the taxpayer foot the bill. He finds the location unsuitable for an affordable housing development. He urged the Commission to reject the application.

Meri Miselas of 413 Woodhaven Road, is a native New Yorker who grew up in a large apartment building the same size as this development. She is concerned about the lack of guest parking and the lack of a provision for child recreational space in the complex. While she is not opposed to affordable housing, this proposal will set a dangerous precedent for developers to circumvent zoning through the guise of affordable housing. The state statute needs to be re-written. She urged the Commission to vote down the proposal.

William Macdonald of 219 Hurlburt Street, stated that the Conservation Commission's approval was subject to additional testing for lead. He asked whether this has been done. He also asked whether an environmental impact study has been done on the property, as it abuts an old gas station. He asked if the traffic study has been reviewed to see what the excavation impact will be and inquired as to how trucks will travel down Manchester Road. He urged the Commission to vote against the application, based on extant health and safety issues. If the applicant will litigate, so be it. As a former TPZ member of a different town, he would feel comfortable voting no.

Nancy Lewis of 16 Slater Road, asked if the question of the 10.5-inch roof pitch has been addressed. The Historical Society has noted that there are two stone houses on Cricket Lane which will likely be brought down if blasting were to occur. She asked if they are not learning from the issues posed at the boathouse. She warned that the nearby fuel cell was not placed in the proper location, and it is an eyesore today. This proposal could be another disaster.

Ron DeGray of 120 Cricket Lane, is not clear as to how 'affordable' the affordable housing units will be. Every person living there will require an automobile. The people who need affordable housing will not benefit from the urban sprawl. He is opposed to the proposal.

Colleen Ceplenski of 115 Cricket Lane, stated that this five-story building will destroy her home, which is built on timber. She does not welcome more people roaming freely in her backyard. She also noted that the park nearby would not be able to accommodate an influx of 80 families moving into the area. Crossing the street to get to the park is difficult as is. She does not support a brand-new development across the street from her house.

Peter Depaola of 224 Bell Street, urged residents to reach out to their representatives to revise the statute. He asked how the construction set-up will go. Specifically, he called for a time limit so that trucks will not interfere with schools and rush hour. He asked if the developer would pay for the crosswalk to enter the park. He also asked that a one car per unit mandate be included, in writing, to ensure that there will be appropriate parking on-site. He asked which parameters, in writing, the developer will have to follow.

Lisa Muscanell-Depaola of 224 Bell Street, is concerned about the third-party study from Tighe and Bond. She was expecting more information to be provided. She is concerned that the soil boring logs have not been provided as supplemental material to the application. Tighe and Bond only mentioned one boring but five were done. They should comment on the adequacy of the borings, their locations, and their depths for this development. She also asked if a phase one environmental assessment been done. If it is recommended by Tighe and Bond, then it should be done.

Gina Kopcinski of 702 Neipsic Road, is a Glastonbury school bus driver. She is concerned that bringing more traffic into the area will make it more dangerous to cross streets and conduct pickups. She asked if a traffic study has been done on Neipsic Road, Brook Street, or Strickland Street, to see what kind of traffic the development will bring to those areas. The Trader Joe's congestion will divert a lot of traffic from Exit 8 to Exits 9 or 10. More thought needs to be put into this. She asked to take children's safety into consideration.

Moise Carelus of 457 Stanley Drive, believes that the development is inappropriate for the area. He asked where snow will be placed and how the excavation project will go. He has a radon abatement system in his house, which is about 300 feet away from this development. When issues will come about, he asked what the standards are that the applicant will be held to; standards should be set in writing. He asked the TPZ to consider that this application will set a precedent for other developers to push through a project using a loophole for affordable housing.

Doug Cahill of 2291 Hebron Avenue, is strongly opposed to the application. He reiterated parking concerns and remarked that the development will not add any value to the area.

Attorney Tim Hollister responded to the various comments made:

Regarding blasting, he explained that Mr. Welty conducted five deep borings on the site which, he concluded, was only sandy gravel. The applicant is amenable to a condition requiring him to return to the Commission if any rock is unexpectedly encountered.

Regarding the excavation, Mr. Hollister noted that truck traffic used in excavations is always part of the plan for the excavation itself. The excavation plan is already part of the traffic study and the engineering plan.

Regarding parking, he noted that the applicant complies with the parking regulations set forth by the state mandate last year. He reiterated that no one seeks to develop a site with inadequate parking, least of all, the developer.

Regarding pedestrian traffic, he explained that Mr. Mitchell, their traffic engineer, contacted the State Department of Transportation (DOT) about implementing a pedestrian phase signal. The DOT agreed to install a crosswalk with a signal.

Regarding the lead testing inquiry, Mr. Hollister clarified that a sample showed that the lead was one part per billion above the limit. The Conservation Commission speculated that it may have been the way the water was tested. Thus, they conditioned that the applicant must conduct another round of testing; if it comes back above the recommended surface water criteria, then they will use mitigation measures.

Regarding the environmental impact study, Mr. Hollister stated that yes, it was conducted out of Boston, and there were no issues. Mr. Hassett asked if the study was just a phase one. Mr. Hollister stated no, but they have looked at the environmental conditions on the site, including whether there was leakage from the gas station, and found no evidence of contamination from either on-site or off-site. There has been no disturbance to the ground or the adjacent property. All their reports were in compliance.

Regarding the affordable housing plan, the applicant is amenable to a condition requiring the Commission to approve the administrator of those applications. He noted that, typically, applicants do this at their own cost because they do not seek to shift that cost to a public agency, such as the GHA.

Regarding the timing of trucks, Mr. Hayes explained the calculations for the truckloads. A total of 18,000 cubic yards would be excavated. This would mean about 55 trips per day, so approximately one truck every 9 minutes, for 8 hours a day. Hours of operation for the excavation will be decided by the Commission. He noted that he has moved over 2 million yards of materials over the last 25 years without incident. This is one of the smaller projects he has managed.

Ms. Sexton asked about the issue of blasting in the 2005 CVS application. Mr. Hayes clarified that blasting was never proposed for that application. That was a lot of hype by concerned neighbors. Based on Dr. Welty's report, they are not going to see any rock. Mrs. Purtill was on the commission in 2005 when the CVS application was made. There was discussion about ledge. The appellate court in 2009 stated so. She suspects there is ledge there. There are only 5 borings which go back to 2005. She does not think that there have been additional testings of borings.

Mr. Hollister stated that they have not done more because the borings went down to a sufficient depth and received adequate results. He clarified that the court case to which Mrs. Purtill was referring alleged that the site contained ledge. Attorney Hollister went on to say that, there was no report, in evidence, showing rock. Mrs. Purtill countered that the court, in essence, found these facts. Mr. Hayes commented that the judge made an error. They tried to take it up to the Supreme Court and could not. They do not know how that ever evolved, other than there was a lot of testimony from the neighbors. He also pointed out that the Commission's denial at the time was not based on ledge and blasting. Mrs. Purtill remarked that it should have been addressed at that time.

Ms. Sexton asked what the building code requirements are for the radon mitigation system. Architect Alan Lamson clarified that the building code requires a vapor barrier under the slab. The plan is to have that, in addition to a pre-emptive piping system. The piping will be placed with exhaust fans, which will only be turned on if radon is revealed during testing. It is cheaper to put the pipes in before the sub-slab depressurization system, which is one of the remediation methods recommended by Tighe and Bond. Mr. Turner likes that they are doing both at once. Ms. Sexton also supports the belt and suspenders approach. Ms. Cahill asked if the applicant would be amenable to a condition that the fans are installed. Mr. Lamson replied yes, the state requires the fans, so they will put them in.

Ms. Cahill thanked the public for coming out again tonight. She responded to a public comment made that there are apartments in town which could be considered affordable housing. She clarified that the rent charged does not make it 'affordable' housing. One must follow the definition set forth by the state statute. She also responded to the public comment regarding the roof pitch. The ASDRC recommended a different pitch, but the state statute on the building code only allowed the applicant to modify that number to 10.5. She would like conditions of approval for the following: that there be no blasting; that a snow removal plan be submitted; and that the DOT pedestrian traffic signal be installed at the applicant's expense.

Ms. Cahill sees the development as a hotel. However, that is not a valid reason to deny the application. According to the statute, a threat to public health, safety, or welfare must be shown. The public's opinions cannot count as expert testimony. While she is not voting on the application, if she were, she would reluctantly vote yes because it fits within the parameters of a CGS Section 8-30g application. She thinks that the risk of a costly lawsuit is enormous, and the Town would likely lose. She hopes that Glastonbury will work expeditiously to get its housing stock up another 2%, or approximately an additional 18 affordable units, to secure a four-year moratorium on these types of applications.

Mrs. Purtill is concerned that the parcel will be completely stripped, and the developer will not build it. She asked if the developer is planning on building this proposal. Attorney Gomes stated yes, he is. He would not have invested all this time and money if he were not planning on doing so. Mrs. Purtill inquired about the construction timeline. Mr. Hayes explained that the site work/excavation piece is anticipated at about 4-6 months, with a start time in September and end date in March. The actual building start is anticipated in late spring/early summer, to last about 18-24 months. If he were to receive approval tonight, he would move forward expeditiously.

Mr. Turner asked if the applicant would start excavation before getting all the building permits in place. Mr. Hayes replied yes, he has done that numerous times throughout his career. Ms. Gomes noted that the Building Official has conducted a preliminary review of the application and had no issues with it, so their intent is to move forward. Mrs. Purtill does not believe that such a large volume can be excavated without pulling the building permits first. Ms. Gomes stated that they will obtain all necessary permits and approvals. They will check with the Building Official on how to proceed.

Mr. Zanolungo is concerned about potential uranium. Tighe and Bond stated that the site is undeveloped and very little work has been done regarding uranium. He requested further information on groundwater migration. Ms. Gomes stated that, at this point, they have been trying to prove a negative. They are not excavating down to the groundwater level but are simply connecting to public water. There is no indication that uranium will be a problem at this site.

Chairman Zanolungo closed the public hearing and recessed until 10:12 P.M.

Motion by: Secretary Botelho

Seconded by: Commissioner Hassett

MOVED, that the Town Plan & Zoning Commission approves the 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, in accordance with plan set entitled "1199 Manchester Road Prepared for Manchester/Hebron Ave LLC Glastonbury, CT" prepared by Wentworth Engineers LLC, and revised 07-14-2022, and architectural plan set entitled "Hebron Ave Apartment Building, Manchester Hebron Ave LLC" prepared by FLB Architecture & Planning, Inc. and revised through June 2, 2022;

And

1. In compliance with:
 - a. The standards contained in reports from the Fire Marshal, File 22-003, plans reviewed 04-20-22.
 - b. The conditions set forth in the recommendation from the Conservation Commission at their meeting of June 16, 2022.
 - c. The Town Engineer's memoranda dated April 26, 2022 and June 15, 2022.
 - d. The Building Official's memorandum dated April 28, 2022.
 - e. The Police Chief's memorandum dated April 28, 2022.
 - f. The Director of Health's memorandum dated April 26, 2022.
2. The recommendations of the memorandum from Tighe & Bond's peer review on Uranium and Radionuclides dated June 30, 2022, including without limitation the installation of a subslab depressurization system and permanent vapor barrier.
3. The applicant shall cooperate with the Town of Glastonbury and Connecticut Department of Transportation regarding further improvements to the Town's pedestrian network in the area.
4. If requested by the abutting property owners, the applicant shall install a chain link fence along the southerly and westerly property boundaries.
5. 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.
6. The applicant shall comply with the conditions of approval noted in the May 4, 2022 letter of the Water Pollution Control Agency (WPCA).
7. The administrator of the affordability plan must be approved by the Commission. The Commission's preference for the administrator is the Glastonbury Housing Authority.
8. There shall be no blasting at the site.
9. Excavation may commence only once a building permit is issued. Hours of operation shall be restricted to weekdays Monday through Friday between 8:00 A.M. to 4:00 P.M. Excavation operations shall not be allowed on legal state holidays except Columbus Day and Veterans Day. Equipment startup and/or idling, on or adjacent to the site, shall not be permitted prior to the approved hours of operation.
10. The snow removal plan shall be submitted to the Office of Community Development.
11. The applicant shall make an application for the crosswalk and signalization with the Traffic Authority.

Mr. Hassett finds the application troublesome from several perspectives: the density and the height are too great and do not conform to the area, and the site is ill-equipped to the needs of an affordable housing project, with no local bus line and few walkable amenities nearby. However, there are also positives: traffic will not be an issue, the actual site can be excavated, and the applicant has agreed to put in appropriate systems to ensure that the radon concern is addressed. He noted that the Commission is limited by CGS Section 8-30g. He was impressed by Representative Barry stating that she will try to make changes at the legislative level. However, at this moment, it is the law. He will support the application and wished the applicant good luck.

Mr. Botelho agreed that the project is too intense for this site and is troubled by its height. However, none of those concerns override the fact that this is a CGS Section 8-30g application, and denial can only be based on a significant health or safety concern. The record does not reflect those issues, so he cannot deny the application. He will reluctantly vote in favor of it. However, he hopes that the statute will be changed soon to prevent the state legislature from dictating how towns like Glastonbury govern themselves.

Mr. Flores stated that the general sentiment is against the proposal. On a normal application, not subject to CGS Section 8-30g, a lot of valid points were made to deny the application. However, none of the concerns raised rise to the level required by the legislature of a significant health and safety concern. Therefore, he will vote in favor of the application.

Mr. Turner understands the reasoning behind the state statute. He finds that it is a good example of a law which had good intentions but is flawed. There were valid points brought up as far as safety concerns. He does not know whether they rise to a serious level which would hold up in court, but enough were brought up that he will vote against the application.

Mrs. Purtill is not in favor of the proposal in general, finding the use too intense and an extreme environmental disturbance. The Commission voted against the 2005 application which was less intense. However, the application is a Section 8-30g application, and experts have indicated that it poses no significant health and safety issues. While she understands the radon and uranium concerns from neighbors, there is no testimony that would support a denial. She believes that the state statute needs to be changed because it excludes from its definition a lot of affordable housing stock that already exists in Glastonbury. She will approve the application reluctantly.

Mr. Zanolungo stated that there have been over ten hours of public hearings on this application. He thanked all for their input and the applicant for listening to their concerns. He noted that where there is radon, there is probably uranium. He believes that the uranium issue rises to a significant public health issue. The Tighe and Bond report stated that very little work has been done regarding uranium, and they requested more information, which the applicant did not provide. Part of their job as elected/appointed officials is to do no harm, and he does not feel comfortable that this will not do harm to the residents. Thus, he will vote against the application.

Result: Motion passed {4-2-0}, with Mr. Turner and Mr. Zanolungo 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 July 5, 2022 Regular Meeting

Motion by: Commissioner Turner

Seconded by: Commissioner Flores

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

3. CONSENT CALENDAR - NO ACTIONS

a. Scheduling of Public Hearings for the Regular Meeting of August 9, 2022: **to be determined**

4. Chairman's Report *None*

5. Report from Community Development Staff

Mr. Mullen noted that the August 9 meeting is cancelled. The next meeting will be on August 23, 2022.

Motion by: Commissioner Hassett

Seconded by: Commissioner Turner

MOVED, that the Glastonbury Town Plan and Zoning Commission adjourns their regular meeting of July 19, 2022 at 10:45 P.M.

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

Respectfully Submitted,

Lilly Torosyan

Lilly Torosyan

Recording Clerk