

**GLASTONBURY TOWN COUNCIL
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
TUESDAY, JANUARY 10, 2023**

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 Dennis McBride*

2. Public Comment.

a. Presentation of Resolution – Melzen’s 102 years of doing business in Glastonbury.

Mr. Gullotta presented a resolution to the Melzen family, who have made a significant and important contribution to Glastonbury.

Tom Metzner of 406 Georgetown Drive, stated that he has picked up 225 nips in just four days from the area around GHS. Nips are a serious litter issue and serve no real social purpose. He asked to have a serious discussion about banning them. He also inquired as to where the Town revenue from nips goes.

William Marut of 264 Carriage Drive, spoke out against the possible installation of artificial turf at GHS. He asked to consider the financial, environmental, and health considerations, and inquired whether there is even a demand for artificial turf in town. He called on the Council to apply the legal principle of reasonable doubt about artificial turf being harmful to children.

Shawnee Baldwin of 57 Nuthatch Knob, is also against artificial turf. Research has revealed its harmfulness, and there is a lack of oversight from the EPA. She asked the Council to look at the impact before installing a toxic time bomb on young people.

DJ McBride of 263 Spring Street Extension, finds the AstroTurf field to be a “want” rather than a “need.” He asked if the Town has any needs to address before getting to the “want to have” items. He suggested the potholes on Spring Street Extension and record inflation as needs to be considered.

Bruce Bowman of 62 Morgan Drive, is in opposition to the CIP project for a new synthetic turf field at the high school. The issue of banning artificial turf has been present in many towns throughout the state. In his 36 years as a physician assistant, he has seen firsthand the orthopedic injuries generated by synthetic surfaces. The NFL, US Women and Men’s National Soccer Teams all want to eliminate artificial turfs. He asked the Council to reject the proposal.

Pamela Lockard of 10 Southgate Drive, spoke out against the artificial turf project. Now that the research results have been revealed, she asked that the Council not repeat the same mistake by adding a second synthetic turf at the high school. She hopes for Glastonbury to join Boston in banning artificial turf.

Peter McCluskey of 113 Sherman Road, also voiced opposition against artificial turf fields. After playing on them, residual microplastics are carried off the field and into the community. Even disinfecting does not take away the sting of plastic pollution. He asked the Council to think hard about the necessity of plastic fields.

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

Anne Bowman of 62 Morgan Drive, does not support another artificial turf field in town. All artificial turf contains PFAS, which are forever chemicals that can migrate into the soil, water and air, and cause cancer.

Denise Weeks of 334 Hollister Way West, expressed concern regarding the proposed CIP plan to move ahead with a new artificial turf field. The proposal should not go forward because of the following reasons: the multitude of environmental impacts that new artificial turf fields present; the Town’s stated commitment to sustainable practices; the adverse impacts of artificial turf on athletes’ health; and the availability of sustainable alternatives.

Pamela Lucas of 145 Moseley Terrace, asked the Town to reconsider any decision that involves the installation of artificial turf fields. Crumb rubber infill utilizes small particles of microplastic that do not biodegrade and are readily released into the environment. Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons and the plasticizers present in crumb rubber increase cancer risk and endocrine system disruption. The European Union and numerous communities in the U.S., based on the strong evidence to-date, have banned, or strictly controlled the use of crumb rubber-based artificial turf fields. Glastonbury should do the same.

Audrey Quinlan of 90 Candlelight Drive, is concerned about the possible installation of an artificial turf field at GHS. AstroTurf does not absorb germ-infested "substances," such as blood, spit, and vomit. Playing fields will have to be vacuumed and washed after each game, and that will likely still not be enough to thoroughly clean them. Additionally, studies indicate that

athletes are far more likely to sustain an injury during athletic activity on artificial turf. Natural playing fields are, by far, safer, and more sanitary for students.

Mr. Niland opened the floor for comments via Zoom:

Lisa Eldridge of 108 South Mill Drive, spoke out against artificial turf fields, which pose many negative ramifications for health, safety, and the environment. Injury rates are higher than on natural grass fields. The best alternative is natural grass. She asked the Council to say no to a new artificial turf field.

Rick Eldridge of 108 South Mill Drive, stated that artificial turf fields pose many problems. The installation involved removes topsoil to replace it with plastic. The surface is much hotter than the surrounding soil, and maintenance requires snowplowing. Artificial turf also causes more injuries to athletes and cancer. Plastic grass carpet lasts only about 7 years and is then sent to a landfill. The only ones who gain are fossil fuel companies. The Town should not be installing artificial turf fields.

Theresa Velenzas of 91 Grandview Drive, spoke to the detrimental health effects of artificial turf fields. They have high amounts of PFAS, which the EPA has deemed unsafe in any amount, as well as other toxins that are known carcinogens and respiratory irritants. The Connecticut legislature has a proposed bill in the House to ban artificial turf fields statewide. Decades worth of science and data demonstrates that installing artificial turf is a very bad idea.

Lisa Mendum of 45 Candlewood Road, also spoke to the House bill which has been introduced to ban the purchase and installation of new turf fields in Connecticut. Artificial turfs pose significant risks to health and the environment. Children playing on fields that release toxic chemicals is a concern. She asked the Council to carefully consider the information provided.

3. Special Reports. None

4. Old Business. None

5. New Business.

a. Discussion and possible action concerning Capital Improvement Criteria.

Mr. Johnson explained that this is the criteria that guides the CIP. The document went through a major rewrite in 2016 and minor tweaks a couple years ago. Neither the BOF nor Town Staff have recommended any changes.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, the Glastonbury Town Council hereby accepts the Capital Improvement Program criteria, as described in a report from the Town Manager dated January 6, 2023.

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

- b. Amendment to Building Zone Regulations – Section 3.27 to extend Temporary and Limited Moratorium on Cannabis establishments through June 1, 2023 (refer to Town Plan and Zoning Commission; set public hearing).**

Mr. Johnson explained that the TPZ is still considering the matter, so the thought is to extend the moratorium by an additional three months. The TPZ will discuss the matter on January 17. The Council elected to hold a public hearing on January 24. Mr. Cavanaugh asked if an additional extension would be possible. Mr. Johnson stated that they are approaching the State’s deadline, so he recommends completing the review within this additional three-month extension.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, the Glastonbury Town Council hereby refers to the Town Plan and Zoning Commission proposed amendment to Building Zone Regulations Section 3.27, 12(d) to extend the Temporary and Limited Moratorium on Cannabis Establishments through June 1, 2023 and schedules a public hearing for 8:00 p.m. on Tuesday, January 24 in the Council Chambers of Town Hall, 2155 Main Street, Glastonbury and/or through Zoom Video Conferencing to consider the proposed amendment, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated January 6, 2023.

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

- c. Action on potential land acquisition (refer to Town Plan and Zoning Commission and Board of Finance; set public hearing). *No action***

6. Consent Calendar. *None*

7. Town Manager’s Report.

Mr. Johnson stated that Glastonbury has received special recognition as part of the 30th anniversary of the Energy Star Program. They are looking at a 24-month initial contract, for a year-to-year prescription service for the license plate readers. He will advise when a specific operational schedule is determined. The Minnechaug Golf Course had another great year. The CIP workshop is next Thursday at 6:00 P.M. at the RCC. Mr. Gullotta asked to include hard copies on the Friday prior to the meeting. Mr. Cavanaugh asked to also include hard copies of the BOE budget, too. Mr. Johnson agreed to provide them. Mr. Cavanaugh praised the highway department for doing an excellent job on the Williams Park parking lot.

8. Committee Reports.

a. Chairman’s Report. *None*

b. MDC. *None*

c. CRCOG. *None*

9. Communications.

- a. Letter from CT Siting Council regarding notice of intent to modify an existing telecommunications facility located at 175 Dickinson Road.**
- b. Letter from CT Siting Council regarding notice of intent to modify an existing telecommunications facility located at 2108 Main Street.**
- c. Letter from Glastonbury Commission on Aging.**

10. Minutes.

- a. Minutes of December 6, 2022 Regular Meeting.**

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

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

- b. Minutes of December 8, 2022 Special Meeting.**

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

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

11. Appointments and Resignations.

- a. Resignation of James McIntosh from the Board of Finance (D-2023).**

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

Disc: Mr. Gullotta and Mr. Cavanaugh commended Mr. McIntosh for his 50 years of service to the Town. Mr. Cavanaugh stated that the recognition is very well deserved.

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

- b. Resignation of Forbes Warren from the Board of Assessment Appeals (R-2023).**

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

Disc: Mr. Gullotta has known Mr. Warren since the 1970s. He wishes him the best.

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

- c. Appointment of Jeff Bodeau to the Board of Assessment Appeals (Regular, R-2023).**

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

Result: Appointment accepted unanimously {9-0-0}.

**d. Appointment of Marion Terry to the Board of Assessment Appeals
(Alternate, R-2024).**

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

Result: Appointment accepted unanimously {9-0-0}.

12. Executive Session.

a. Potential land acquisition.

b. Review of Developer Qualifications and proposals.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby enters into executive session to discuss a potential land acquisition and a review of developer qualifications and proposals at 7:50 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, Mr. Kurt Cavanaugh, Ms. Deborah Carroll, Mr. John Cavanna, Ms. Mary LaChance, Mr. Jake McChesney, Mr. Whit Osgood, and Ms. Jennifer Wang, with Town Manager, Richard J. Johnson.

The Council returned at 8:00 P.M. to begin the Public Hearings. No votes were taken following the Executive Session.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

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

Mr. Johnson explained that this is a continuing review for the final phase of the Main Street sidewalk project, which runs between the Cider Mill and Red Hill. Because this is a state road, the Town needed to refer the four options discussed to the State DOT. They have done so twice. On both occasions, the DOT concluded that the only option they will accept is shifting the road to the east without any structures on the west side.

Mr. Pennington reviewed the project, noting that the sidewalk section is about 1300 feet long between the Cider Mill and Red Hill Drive. This is the final length to completing the sidewalk plan because it is the most difficult and has presented several construction challenges. The DOT's preferred alternative shifts the roadway to the east, at a maximum of 9 feet, tapering down to zero on the north and south ends. One of the alternatives that the Town had considered was a fill wall type of construction with an elevated sidewalk and a protection fence or rail. Even though the DOT opposes it, he included it as a reminder that the Town's preferred option included a road shift of a lesser nature.

The DOT has looked at two issues expressed by residents on the east side: the structural integrity of their homes once the curb line moves closer to their homes, and the detriment to homes of historical character. They concluded that a retaining wall on the west side would pose a greater danger to historic properties on the top of the road than the road shift option on the east side. They also concluded that even though the road shifts a maximum of 9 feet, the vibrations would not damage the homes structurally. The only acceptable alternative that they can consider is the road shift option that would shift the curb line by 9 feet.

Mr. Pennington stated that the tapers on the road shift option are governed by the design speed and geometry of the road. There have been questions about whether they can shrink that sliver. They cannot do that. All the options that have been considered are conceptual-type design options. The DOT has allowed for a narrower snow shelf in this scenario, by downsizing from the standard of 3.5 feet to 2 feet. That would have the curb line slide a bit to the west.

Mr. Gullotta opened the floor for public comment:

Jim Mahoney of 1417 Main Street, stated that the crossover between Buttonball Lane to Main Street is supposed to slow down traffic, but it has not. Where he lives, both telephone poles have been replaced. There have been accidents in his front yard and fire hydrants have been hit. Most bad accidents happen late at night, not during rush hour traffic. He is concerned about the speed of the traffic. If the State had approved a roundabout, that would have worked a lot better.

Luther Weeks of 334 Hollister Way West, believes that sidewalks are important for recreation and safety. This option is as good, probably even better, than option 4, which he had supported. It seems like it would not change the driveway. He encouraged the Council to move ahead.

Gene Hickey of 1200 Main Street, asked what would happen to the trees and the relocation of the poles. His house was built in 1770 and his front steps are 5.5 feet from the state right of way. He asked if this option would require a clear zone. If so, a clear zone would be 20 feet wide, so poles would have to be relocated. He also asked who will design it: the state or the town. He would like that answered before anything goes forward.

Carolyn Gatesy of 1191 Main Street, believes that sidewalks are needed because Route 17 is a very dangerous road. In the morning, it is extremely difficult to exit her driveway. As someone who lives on the west side, she is willing to give up part of her property to install a sidewalk, to add to safety.

Raven Cauthon of 1212 Main Street, is the most impacted homeowner. She is very concerned about shifting the road more. Since the last hearing, she has had to replace another mailbox, which is the fifth time she has done so in three years. The quality of life for homeowners on the east side of the road must be considered. She asked to do away with this portion of the sidewalk so that those homeowners can have some piece of mind.

Attorney Dan Matos, is representing the Mitchells on 1253 Main Street and Bonnie Hale on 1260 Main Street. Due to traffic and safety issues, more detailed engineering work needs to be

done for the Council to make a decision. The Mitchells ask for a deferral of about 12 weeks to employ engineering and lobbying firms to try to convince the DOT to change their minds. They believe that the Town has been receiving inappropriate pushback from the DOT.

Denise Weeks of 334 Hollister Way West, worries when her husband walks. The idea of him crossing the street, with or without sidewalks on either side, frightens her. Because of the speed issues, it is not a viable solution. She wonders whether speed limits can be enforced on a state highway. There is a need to protect both the interests of the homeowners and the safety of pedestrians.

Ms. Carroll read the written comments received:

Matthew Daskal of 200 Windham Road, stated that if the project proceeds with the proposed realignment, the Town should support the DOT's proposed reduction of road width and encourage a further road diet to minimize the impacts to surrounding properties. Additional measures should also be considered, including removal and burial of above ground utility infrastructure. Sidewalk finishes should be considered that are in keeping with the historic nature of the corridor properties impacted. Any crosswalks on Rt. 17 should include rapid rectangular flashing beacons (RRFB) and be inclusive of improved materials (stamped or brick). All signage and associated improvements should be decorative and finished in black to minimize visual impacts. The project should include landscape improvements not just within the strict confines of the roadway. If the DOT is unwilling or unable, the Town should complete this project.

Jeffrey Stein of 142 Olde Stage Road, commented as the vice president of BikeWalk Glastonbury. He supports the proposal of shifting the roadway easterly up to 9 feet with no retaining wall. This section of sidewalk will provide a safe connection between the Cider Mill and Red Hill Drive along Main Street for pedestrians and cyclists. It will also complete the continuous sidewalk from the East Hartford town line to South Glastonbury center. The Town Engineering Department has performed extensive work on alternative solutions and the DOT has repeated their rejection of the alternatives. While the impacted homeowners on the east side are concerned about moving the roadway a little closer to their homes, the proposed roadway remains within the current state right of way. No private property would be taken for this project.

Mr. Pennington replied to the various comments made:

- Constructing sidewalks on the east side: that came up during an earlier public discussion. The ability to safely cross pedestrians at that location was deemed not feasible by both the Town Engineer and the Chief of Police.
- Utility pole relocation: the policy is flexible. The Town will work with both the utility company and the DOT to find a location that makes sense and is not intrusive for property owners.
- The clear zone and its enforcement: the removal of existing features, such as fences, is not a policy to remove everything within that zone.
- Impossible construction: Mr. Pennington clarified that the DOT is not suggesting that construction is impossible. Rather, the construction of the wall on the west side introduces a hazard and exacerbates that concern. Thus, a wall on the west side, of any type, is not acceptable to them.

- Deferral: even if the Council were to direct staff to move forward with the decision tonight, that is not an approval. They still need to come up with a detailed design and return with more information.

Mr. Niland asked if Mr. Hickey's tree would come down if it is in the clear zone. Mr. Pennington replied, not necessarily. They try to preserve as many trees as they can. Mr. Niland asked if it would be possible to construct some type of stone wall or granite post fencing. Mr. Pennington stated that part of their discussions with the DOT included the potential installation of a metal beam guardrail. That consideration would not meet those criteria, so it would not be considered. Someone could construct something on their property, but it would be quite a distance from the road. Mr. Cavanaugh asked if the neighbors on the east side would have to petition the State for that. Mr. Pennington stated that any work within the state right of way would require an encroachment permit. His sense is that it would be a town application and not an individual resident application.

Ms. Carroll asked about the snow shelf. Mr. Pennington explained that the DOT supports a decrease of the standard 3.5 feet to 2 feet, which would allow the curb on the east side to be pulled by 1.5 feet. Mr. Osgood stated that there has been discussion about the Town taking care of snow removal for a couple homes that have no access to a sidewalk. Mr. Pennington stated that this would be a unique circumstance. He does not see why they cannot do that. Mr. Cavanaugh noted that the Town denied the sidewalk on Bantle Road because people could not access it to clear it, so if they do this, then they would be setting a precedent.

Mr. Osgood asked how long the detailed design would take. Mr. Pennington stated that the design would be ready by the summer. Mr. McChesney asked if they will not know the impact on telephone poles, trees, and other specifics until that design information is received. Mr. Pennington stated that is correct. Mr. McChesney is concerned that moving the road is going to impact the root systems of the trees that are already close to the road. Mr. Pennington noted that, on a tree-by-tree basis, they contact the tree warden.

Mr. McChesney asked if there is a specific timeline to follow for the funding. Mr. Johnson explained that a grant is pending. It has gone through CRCOG and is predicated on the DOT approved option. The DOT is waiting on the Town to act. Mr. McChesney asked if the Town has explored traffic slowing measures on that road, which requires DOT approval because it is a state road. Mr. Johnson replied no, not to his knowledge. Mr. McChesney is very frustrated with the DOT's position. The DOT's consideration is the maintenance and safety of the road, but their consideration needs to also be the safety of the people who own property there.

Ms. Wang pointed out that the legislature has passed the establishment of the Vision Zero Council to eliminate transportation-related fatalities and injuries. It would be within the DOT and the Town's best interest to have their goal be zero injuries and fatalities. She is very concerned that residents have had close calls and sustained damage to their properties. The concerns about speeding affect quality of life. She asked if there is anything more that the Council can do to express the need for safety measures. Mr. Pennington understands those concerns. He can make an inquiry to the DOT about whether they have a policy that is applicable to this road and what their stance is. Mr. Cavanna asked to get a traffic unit on the road to slow down traffic. Mr.

Johnson will speak to the Police Chief about it. Mr. Gullotta stated that about a year and a half ago, he had asked for a roundabout where Chestnut Hill is. He had also requested a roundabout on Route 17, which the DOT voted down on. However, he believes that they should push back because it is the only way to slow down traffic on Route 17. Any other approach is dressing.

Motion by: Mr. Osgood

Seconded by: Mr. Niland

BE IT RESOLVED, the Glastonbury Town Council hereby authorizes Town Staff to move forward with the final design for the proposed sidewalks.

Disc: Mr. Osgood stated that they need the additional information to make an actual determination as to what the impact will be. There is a real pedestrian safety issue on this section of the road. Having a sidewalk there is very important. It still must come back for detailed design approval. Delay is not a reasonable alternative. Mr. McChesney does not like the idea of directing staff to do work on a project that might not proceed. However, this is their only option to put a sidewalk in, so he is not okay with walking away without seeing the details of what the process will be.

Ms. Wang asked if the DOT grant will reimburse staff on developing the detailed plans. Mr. Johnson explained that those costs are reimbursed only if the Town proceeds with the project. Ms. Carroll asked if there are funds in CIP to cover this if the Town does not proceed and therefore does not get reimbursed. Mr. Johnson replied yes, about \$900,000 is appropriated to the CIP. Ms. Carroll agreed with Mr. Osgood that until they receive the detailed plans, it is impossible to say which direction to go in. Weighing property damage and distress on homeowners versus public safety puts the Council in an unenviable position. Mr. Cavanaugh really feels for the people on the east side of Main Street. He is not in favor of moving forward. Mr. Gullotta stated that they need a sidewalk, but they also need a larger discussion with the DOT about traffic calming measures.

Result: Motion passed {7-2-0}, with Mr. Cavanaugh and Mr. Gullotta voting against.

NO. 2 ACTION ON PROPOSED TOWN ACQUISITION OF THE 23± ACRE ROSE PARCEL - MATSON HILL ROAD AND A \$1.090M APPROPRIATION AND TRANSFER.

Mr. Johnson explained that they still await the full data, so a decision will not be made this evening. Mr. Gullotta opened the floor for public comment:

Karen Roblyer of 74 Blueberry Lane, was dismayed by the Council's scolding of the public at their November 22 meeting. Public comments were based on limited information available at the time. Many were thinking of the Town's planned purchase of the Nye Road property for affordable housing, so they equated the two purchases. She is frustrated by the lack of information on land acquisitions because of the confidentiality of executive sessions. The Town did it right in 2018. The only difference now is that there is a different council. There might be a conflict of interest. She asked that the Town have real plans to continue farming, and to be transparent about those plans with the community.

The public hearing will be continued on January 24, 2022.

NO. 3 ACTION ON PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO SECTION 4.13 OF THE BUILDING ZONE REGULATIONS REGARDING COMMERCIAL SPACE RETENTION/REPLACEMENT FOR MIXED USE PROJECTS IN THE TOWN CENTER ZONE (CONTINUED FROM DECEMBER 6, 2022).

Mr. Johnson explained that this is the amendment to the building zone regulations that might provide a waiver to the public benefit of the 1:1 requirement for a residential component to a commercial property. The TPZ has provided a waiver. Mr. Johnson explained that he tried to simplify their regulations by reducing some of the very limited reductions, such as a 2.5% reduction for constructions having EV charging stations and universal design. His reasoning is that these will likely become the norm in construction. He also tried to group together those limited reductions to add some flexibility for the TPZ.

Ms. Carroll finds that bundling the smaller pieces makes sense. She also appreciates the way the reductions work, as they speak to things that the Council has flagged, such as preservation of historic character and affordable housing. However, she worries what this will do to local businesses in the Town Center. She would like to be cautious in how aggressively they reduce commercial space. Mr. Niland also likes the bundling. He thinks that streetscape is important enough to either carve out on its own or to be a requirement within the bundle. Mr. Osgood echoed Ms. Carroll's comments. Glastonbury has a vibrant downtown business section which should not be threatened.

Mr. McChesney also shares the concern of preservation of commercial space. It is their job to prevent Main Street storefronts from becoming apartments. He then asked about the affordable housing component. Mr. Johnson explained that affordable housing was not really mentioned in the TPZ recommendation. Inclusionary zoning will be coming down the road for Council action. Mr. Johnson tried to distinguish that, for affordable housing, it exceeds the 40-year threshold that is typically used. He asked if there should be consideration for affordable housing that will be longer than 40 years. He then reiterated that EV charging stations and universal design will become the norm, so it does not make sense to give a significant reduction for items that are going to become standard fare.

Mr. Cavanaugh asked what the definition of historical preservation is, and if it must be defined. Mr. Johnson stated that they will work with the Historic Commission to have them identify properties. The streetscape is a challenge because there are the pieces that have been part of Glastonbury's streetscape for many years, but they may not meet the definition of a historical structure. Ms. Wang supports the Exhibit 2 overall approach. She fully supports the 25% reduction for historic preservation. However, based on what they have learned about the Nye Road property developers and inclusionary zoning, she feels like they are muddying the waters. There are also legal concerns about how the Town could guarantee affordable housing in perpetuity. Thus, she does not support that proportion of the package, as part of this incentive. Mr. Johnson explained that he thought that 50 years might be a better guide than perpetuity. He asked, if there is inclusionary zoning that requires 10%, should the applicant get a benefit if they

exceed that threshold? He thought that it might be a way to encourage affordable housing that is beyond what a basic new regulation might require. He used the 50 years because it is more than the 40 years of typical affordable housing developments.

Mr. Gullotta stated that this is just a draft document, so it can be molded. He finds the affordable housing piece in this to be very important. Historic preservation is what the whole village center is about. Streetscape design has interesting architectural features. The building adjacent to St. Paul's Church is a great test. There are other examples on Main Street that would probably not pass the muster of historically significant, and they could be reconfigured to allow businesses that will not be able to afford the rents that these new developments will be charging. Ms. Wang reiterated the importance of affordable housing as much as possible. Inclusionary zoning will go to the Town Attorney review. Similarly, she would like to get legal guidance on this, to understand what it would mean to require affordable housing for 50 years in perpetuity.

The public hearing will be continued.

The meeting adjourned at 9:55 P.M. The Council then reentered into executive session.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby reenters into executive session to discuss a personnel issue at 9:55 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, Mr. Kurt Cavanaugh, Ms. Deborah Carroll, Mr. John Cavanna, Ms. Mary LaChance, Mr. Jake McChesney, Mr. Whit Osgood, and Ms. Jennifer Wang, with Town Manager, Richard J. Johnson.

The Executive Session ended at 10:35 P.M. No votes were taken.

Respectfully submitted,

Lilly Torosyan

Lilly Torosyan

Recording Clerk

Thomas Gullotta

Chairman