

**THE GLASTONBURY TOWN PLAN AND ZONING COMMISSION (TPZ)
SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES OF TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 2023**

The Glastonbury Town Plan and Zoning Commission with Shelley Caltagirone, Director of Planning and Land Use Services, in attendance, held a Special 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 J. Zanolungo, Jr., Chairman
Ms. Sharon Purtil, Vice Chair
Mr. Corey Turner, Secretary
Mr. Emilio Flores
Mr. Philip Markuszka
Ms. Alice Sexton, Alternate {seated as voting member}

Commission Members Absent

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

Chairman Zanolungo called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M.

Ms. Caltagirone pointed out that there were supposed to be two applications tonight: one for a special permit with design review and another for a special permit for groundwater protection. Since the agenda and notice did not go out for the second application, that will be reviewed at the Commission's next meeting.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Application of 240 Oakwood, LLC for a Section 12 Special Permit with Design Review concerning creation of construction yard with materials processing – 240 Oakwood Drive – Planned Commerce Zone & GWP Zone 1

Attorney Meghan Hope of Alter & Pearson, LLC explained that the site is a little over three acres, located on the east side of Oakwood Drive. A variety of industrial-style uses exist in the area. The east side was excavated some time ago, with minimal regrowth. Employees will move between this site and the one across the street, at 225 Oakwood Drive. There is a very steep change in elevation from the front to the rear of the site. The purpose of the site is to process materials to make other materials. She explained that a figure 8 traffic pattern will limit the need for trucks to back up. The applicant, Thor Norgaard, is in the process of switching to white noise backup alarms. Concrete stackable bins will be located on the northerly portion of the site.

Jim Dutton of Dutton Associates, LLC, explained that there are above-ground fuel tanks. Behind these tanks is the primary sediment collection basin with boulders around it. Accumulated sediment will be removed by an excavator. The system is connected to a catch basin on Oakwood Drive, which is in good working order. To address dust control, they propose drilling a well. The water will not be used for any other purposes. The scale house will not contain sanitary facilities. Minimal lighting is proposed. The light in the southwest corner will be equipped with a shield to eliminate spillage. Photometric calculations do not take into consideration any of the vegetation. Mr. Dutton then explained how water will enter the primary basin and be polished (filtered for organic matter and micro-pollutants) before exiting the site. No parking islands are proposed, but pavement markings will guide vehicles. The back end of the site will be excavated. About 6,500 cubic yards of ledge needs to be removed. The type of rock is Portland Arkose, which is pink in color. A security fence will wrap around the perimeter.

Ms. Hope explained that the Architectural and Site Design Review Committee (ASDRC) had asked to include a height maximum that the stored landscaping materials would never exceed, and the applicant will limit the height of piled materials to 40 feet. Mrs. Purtil asked if the 6,500 cubic yards is all ledge. Mr. Dutton stated that there is some overburden (top layer) that is soil, but not much. Mr. Zanolungo said that the Town Engineer wanted a concrete pad by the fuel tanks. Mr. Dutton stated that the fuel tanks are sitting on a concrete pad, but the details provided by the manufacturer were illegible; he has fixed that in the application materials. Mr. Zanolungo asked about the timeframe for acquiring the permit from the MDC. Mr. Norgaard spoke to MDC early in the design process. They just need a form signed off from the Town. Mr. Dutton added that they have the form completed.

Ms. Hope explained that the ASDRC wanted natural wood for the light poles. There will be six total light heads on four, 16-foot poles. Mrs. Purtil asked about moveable lighting. Ms. Hope stated that, early in the process, they sought lighting at night for a potential night operation, but they have since moved away from that. Mr. Norgaard added that it is not his intent to do a lot of night operations. He is comfortable with the lights on the trucks.

Ms. Hope reviewed the landscape plan, noting that they went before the ASDRC four times. In the first three meetings, they proposed a huge evergreen wall. The ASDRC then went in the opposite direction, asking to move the fence back to the west side of the basin, to create more of an open meadow. They have moved the fence behind the basin and created more space between the plantings. The ASDRC is satisfied with their revisions.

Ms. Hope then reviewed the scale cottage, which will have a cupola and some windows. The sign will be a granite cube that Mr. Norgaard had brought from another site. The Conservation Commission asked to investigate the types of material brought onto the site, so the applicant hired an outside consultant, who confirmed that everything on-site is clean material. Mrs. Purtil asked if screeners for soils and grinders will be brought onto the site. Mr. Norgaard replied no, there will be no building waste, dirt, or soil, except as it is incidental with the concrete and the asphalt. Machinery would consist of a loader, an excavator, and an impact crusher, which is portable, quiet, and clean.

Ms. Sexton asked if the applicant would agree to keep a log of the material coming in. Mr. Norgaard explained that there will be a log through their paperwork. Mr. Turner asked how often the crusher will be running. Mr. Norgaard said that their plans are to process material between 7:00 A.M. to 5:00 P.M. It is difficult to gauge how much it will be used because he will not know how much business he will get until he starts. Mrs. Purtill noticed that they are limiting the hours of manufacturing and processing, but not delivery. Ms. Hope explained that they want to be able to accept a night delivery in the event of a night job. Mr. Zanolungo asked about the movable lights. Mr. Norgaard said they can strike the night lighting completely and review the night operations in a year. Ms. Hope noted that some neighborhood outreach was done.

Mr. Zanolungo opened the floor for public comments.

Joe Kabara, property owner of 278 Oakwood Drive, believes that this business will be a great asset to Glastonbury.

Motion by: Secretary Turner

Seconded by: Vice Chair Purtill

MOVED, that the Town Plan and Zoning Commission approve the application of 240 Oakwood, LLC, for a Section 12 Special Permit with Design Review regarding creation of a construction year with material processing – 240 Oakwood Drive – Planned Commerce Zone & GWP Zone 1, in accordance with plans on file with the Office of Community Development, and in accordance with the following conditions of approval:

1. Compliance with:
 - a. The recommendations set forth by the Conservation Commission/Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Agency, in their recommendation for approval to the Town Plan and Zoning Commission is issued at their Special Meeting of November 3, 2022.
 - b. The recommendation of the Architectural and Site Design Review Committee (ASDRC) as contained in the ASDRC Report for January 17, 2023.
2. Adherence to:
 - a. The Town Engineer's memorandum dated January 31, 2023.
 - b. The Fire Marshal's memorandum dated January 9, 2023.
 - c. The Director of Health's memorandum dated January 25, 2023.
 - d. The Police Chief's memorandum dated January 24, 2023.
3. After one year of operation, the applicant shall submit documentation of the number of night deliveries, including number of loads and dates of deliveries, and Community Development staff will review Town records for related complaints. Staff will consult with the Chairman of the Town Planning and Zoning Commission to determine if site operations maintain a quality noise environment for nearby residents and recommend modified hours of operation as needed.
4. If blasting is required, proper approval is required by the Fire Marshal.
5. No movable lighting will be used on site without prior approval.
6. Operations to be limited between the hours of 7:00 A.M. to 5:00 P.M. for manufacturing and processing of materials.

7. Restrooms will be required to be added to the site if 225 Oakwood and 240 Oakwood are at any point under separate ownership.
8. Only clean materials to be accepted within the operation and limited to processing by impact crusher only.
9. 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.

Result: Motion passed {5-0-0.} Recognizing that he had not done it earlier, the Chair then seated Commissioner Sexton as a full voting member.

2. Application of Saints Isidore & Maria Parish Corporation for a Section 12 Special Permit with Design Review concerning a building addition and parking lot expansion/reconfiguration – 2533- 2577 & Lot W-38A Main Street – Town Center & Town Center Village District Overlay

Attorney Hope of Alter & Pearson, LLC explained that the site is two parcels, totaling about 7.2 acres. Since 2017, St. Paul's Church has not had a parish hall, so they seek a new addition which would create a modern parish hall, attached to the church. They also seek additional on-site parking, and more handicapped parking closer to the front of the church. Lastly, they propose additional evergreen trees around the site to decorate for Christmas. Two new parking areas are proposed: one in the front and another off the back of the parking lot. A series of wetlands run through the property. Even though these wetlands are degraded, the Conservation Commission would not allow the applicant to pave over the wetland soil.

Ms. Hope explained that they had originally proposed removing the Knights of Columbus building, but the ASDRC was against it, so they did a workaround to keep it. Because of the unique circumstances of these constraints, the site plan does not meet the parking requirements. While 288 spaces are required, their plan provides only 257 spaces. Therefore, they request a waiver of 10.76%, which has been reduced from the original 27% sought during subcommittee review. Both the ASDRC and the Conservation Commission support their efforts to attain the waiver. She included a statement from the Conservation Commission expressing their support. She then reviewed the lighting plan, which will consist of 16-foot poles. The lights will match those on the adjacent path to the north. A 1.235-acre conservation easement is included. Their wetlands enhancement plan was approved by the Inland Wetlands & Watercourses Agency.

Mark Friend of Megson, Heagle, & Friend, LLC, reviewed the site plan. In totality, the site is about 15,000 square feet with the addition. The existing entrances from Main Street will stay the same. All construction activities happen from the main entrance on Main Street to the south. Ten bike spaces were installed in that area to add more access. There is a driveway at the south end of the building. They have added to the northwest corner of the parking lot and re-striped it, as well as added some parallel parking spaces. The Engineering Department has approved the design concept. He then explained the stormwater management, noting that 93% of the runoff to the west will be treated.

Tom Graceffa, landscape architect, explained that over 60% of the plant material species on-site are native. The parking lot did not have any islands. A mixture of shade trees and columnar trees are added in several locations. They have also called attention to the Lady of Fatima sculpture and modeled the existing sign for the other entrance.

Mr. Flores asked about the agreement made with the Town for public parking in the lot. Ms. Hope explained that, since the 1970s, St. Paul's Church has been a commuter parking lot for CT Transit. When the lease was up for renewal, the deal fell through, so the church's lot is no longer a commuter parking lot. The Town entered into a licensing agreement with the Church for the parking lot. It is a ten-year term, with the option for renewal. Mr. Flores asked if that was factored in when calculating the parking regulations. Ms. Hope replied no, because parking calculations are based on what the uses are. Because the arrangement is for public parking only during times outside of church uses, they do not anticipate it causing any conflicts. She then reviewed the floor plans. The proposal is to upgrade the existing kitchen on-site with commercial grade appliances to allow for catering use.

Ernest Nepomuceno, project architect, explained that the 1,000 square feet of demolition would occur on the second floor. He then explained the route that most people will take as they park and enter the site. He reviewed the south elevation addition, which will take on the same proportions as the existing structure. They have matched the brick with a hipped roof. Rooftop units will be hidden. The addition by the west elevation would be a two-story space with a curtain wall system. The banquet hall up top has projected bays. The addition on the north elevation is the other entry into the rotunda. He showed a rendering of the west elevation, explaining that the ASDRC had asked to extend the promenade out towards the parking lot. This would give a more celebratory entry into the main vestibule. They have created new landscaping, so there are some granite pavers, as well as a new tree line with granite pavers and benches. He also noted that the ASDRC suggested that the stone wall be brick, so that a new material is not introduced.

Mr. Turner asked how many parking spaces were lost when the promenade was extended out. Ms. Hope stated that three spaces were lost, but they were able to add one space in another area. Mr. Zanolungo asked, why a wedge-shaped path replaced the 3 parking spots. Mr. Nepomuceno said that the ASDRC's comment was to give people a clear point of access to the front doors, which made sense for better accessibility and a more formal entry. Mr. Turner asked how parking was set up in the initial design, which included the demolition of the Knights of Columbus building. Mr. Friend explained that they reconfigured the whole area and moved the curb cut down. Mr. Nepomuceno explained that the ASDRC felt that the procession of the rotunda into the lobby needed to be significant.

Mr. Turner countered that the rotunda is the architectural feature defining the entry and that hardscape features surround the entry outside the parking area. He worries about a parking waiver being requested while a lot of parking was given up to address design concerns. He asked what the Knights of Columbus building is used for currently. Ms. Hope replied that it is mainly for private office space, but those uses will be somewhat obsolete when the addition is built. Mr. Turner asked if this project could have potentially met the parking requirements if all these changes were not made. Mr. Nepomuceno replied yes.

Mrs. Purtill remarked that, as it exists now, there is cooperation amongst the other property owners to allow shared parking. She does not think there is going to be a parking problem because the church is not a traditional commercial use. She supports the waiver. Mr. Flores asked what type of benefit the church is receiving for having such an agreement with the Town. Ms. Hope responded that the Town plows a portion of the parking lot and contributes to some portion of its repaving. Mr. Markuszka commended the applicant for trying to fit as many spaces as possible in the parking lot.

Ms. Hope included seven ways in which their plan complies with the Town's POCD. Mr. Zanolungo asked if they believe that people will park in the back lot more, once this is done. Ms. Hope said yes. While some will still park across the street, their client has been informed by many people that they would like to park on-site.

Chairman Zanolungo opened the floor for public comment:

John Ruggiero of 54 Deerfield Drive, has been a parishioner for over four decades. He explained that the site is not ADA compliant and poses a safety risk in the winter with ice accumulating on the concrete. Right now, the handicap parking in the front is insufficient and meeting space is limited. Their membership has been growing, so on weekends, they reach their parking capacity.

Mary Callan of 56 Montauk Way, is a new parishioner who finds the accessibility on-site to be very prohibitive. These additions are crucial for handicapped people to be able to access the church.

While he loves the aesthetic, Mr. Turner expressed concern with the parking waiver. He considered proposing a condition that the issue be revisited in a year, to assess whether parking is a problem or not; Mr. Flores agreed. Ms. Hope noted that their application is different from others that have been granted a parking waiver in that they can add more spaces if they must. Additionally, this is not a commercial shopping center. Ms. Sexton and Mrs. Purtill find that the site will work with the parking it has. Mrs. Purtill would hate to see compact parking installed here; Mr. Markuszka agreed. Mr. Zanolungo also finds that the parking will be sufficient. He is more concerned about the fact that decisions were made that affected the parking without the TPZ providing input through the process, and that there was an assumption that TPZ would be fine with the parking waiver in front of them today.

Motion by: Secretary Turner

Seconded by: Vice Chair Purtill

MOVED, that the Town Plan & Zoning Commission approve the application of Saints Isidore and Maria Parish Corporation for a Section 12 Special Permit with Design Review regarding a building addition and parking lot expansion/reconfiguration – 2533-77 Main Street and Lot W-38A Main Street (Saints Isidore and Maria Parish) – Town Center and Town Center Village District Overlay, in accordance with plans on file submitted February 2, 2023 with the Office of Community Development, and in accordance with the following conditions of approval:

1. Compliance with:
 - a. The recommendation of the Architectural and Site Design Review Committee (ASDRC) as contained in the ASDRC Report for January 17, 2023.
 - b. The standards contained in a report from the Fire Marshal, Fire 23-003, plans reviewed January 19, 2023.
 - c. The conditions set forth in the Conservation Commission/Inland Wetlands & Watercourses Agency in their recommendation for approval to the Town Plan and Zoning Commission at their Regular Meeting of January 12, 2023 and documented in the Environmental Planner's memorandum dated January 24, 2023.
2. Adherence to:
 - a. The Town Engineer's memoranda dated January 4, 2023 and January 30, 2023.
 - b. The Director of Health's memorandum dated February 3, 2023.
 - c. The Police Chief's memorandum dated January 24, 2023.
3. 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.

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

REGULAR MEETING

1. Informal session for the purpose of hearing from citizens on Regular Meeting agenda or non-agenda items

Geralyn Laut of 126 South Mill Drive, asked to reinforce the prohibition of the sale of retail marijuana in Glastonbury. She worries that bringing marijuana into town will increase impaired driving and allow lower income residents to spend money on a non-essential. Additionally, teens will view it as a social norm, and it will increase the availability of a psychotropic drug. She also read examples of sales pitches from extant marijuana stores in Connecticut, which she found inappropriate.

2. Acceptance of the Minutes of the January 17, 2023 Regular Meeting

Motion by: Vice Chair Purtill

Seconded by: Secretary Turner

Result: Minutes were accepted {5-1-0}, with one abstention from Commissioner Sexton who decided not to vote because she was not present at the meeting.

3. Applications of SHOPS ON MAIN, LLC for a Section 12.9 Minor Change for Elimination of Parking Spaces and Confirmation of Parking Chart and a Section 12.8 Change of Use for Buildings 2, 3 and 4 – 2941-2945, 2951 and 2955 Main Street – Planned Business & Development Zone

Attorney Hope of Alter & Pearson, LLC explained that, at the TPZ's November 15 meeting, the applicant requested a minor change in the architectural elevations at Building 3. There was a slight change in the location of the walls between the tenants. Three parking spaces have been

removed from the original plans and certain uses for the project were not approved, so the original parking plan does not match. In 2016, different restaurant and retail uses were approved. In 2019, 210 spaces were required, and the site provided 216 spaces. Since then, Buildings 2 and 3 needed a sewer ejector pump, so a pad was installed, thereby eliminating two spaces. Then, another space was eliminated to accommodate a generator for the Puppy Palace. Now, they are required to have 199 spaces, but there are 213 spaces. Because there is a surplus, the ASDRC asked to eliminate the three radial spaces. However, if one of the tenants were ever to change to a restaurant, then that surplus would go away. Therefore, they do not propose eliminating any spaces.

Ms. Hope explained that their landscaping plan has not yet been installed, but it will adequately screen the generator. They intended to screen the meters on Building 4 but were unsuccessful. The Town Manager has received complaints about it from the public, so the applicant has agreed to rescreen the area, likely with a metal fence and some landscaping. Ms. Hope has filed an application to approve all the uses there now and is seeking confirmation of the parking chart. Thirty-three spaces are still going to get installed. Their engineer noticed flood lights outside the drive-through at Chick-fil-A, of which her client did not approve. Ms. Caltagirone explained that the tenant will work on the drive-through feature to make it safer in a more aesthetic way. Therefore, the Town is not requiring them to take down those unpermitted lights until they apply for something more appropriate.

There were no comments from the public.

Motion by: Secretary Turner

Seconded by: Vice Chair Purtill

MOVED, that the Town Plan & Zoning Commission approve the application of Shops on Main, LLC for a Section 12.8 Change of Use to track and update the record of tenant uses at the site and for a Section 12.9 Minor Change to eliminate 2 parking spaces to accommodate installation of a generator behind Building 2 – 2941-2945, 2951 and 2955 Main Street (Shops on Main) – Planned Business and Development Zone, in accordance with plans on file with the Office of Community Development, and in accordance with the following conditions of approval:

1. Prior to the issuance of the final Certificate of Occupancy for Building 3, the Applicant shall have the screening plan for the generator reviewed by the Chairman of the Architectural and Site Design Review Committee (ASDRC) to determine what, if any, additional screening needs to be added to the approved landscape plan to screen the generator.
2. Prior to the issuance of the final Certificate of Occupancy for Building 3, the Applicant shall screen the meters located on the east side of Building 4 with a metal screen and shall relocate the approved landscaping intended to screen the meters into a more effective pattern as directed by the Chairman of the Architectural and Site Design Review Committee (ASDRC).
3. The applicant and tenant shall continue working with Community Development staff, Architectural and Site Design Review Committee (ASDRC), and the Town Plan and Zoning Commission (TPZ) to refine the site design related to the Chick-fil-A drive-thru feature and improve its safety and function.

4. The applicant and tenant shall have a plan to resolve site design issues submitted to Community Development staff within 60 days.
5. The applicant shall confirm with Community Development staff that plantings were completed in accordance with the approval prior to final inspection of the generator installation.
6. 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.

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

4. CONSENT CALENDAR – NO ACTION

- a. Scheduling of Public Hearings for the Regular Meeting of February 21, 2023: **to be determined**

5. Chairman’s Report *None*

6. Report from Community Development Staff

Ms. Caltagirone said that the Design Guidelines Steering Committee will meet tomorrow over Zoom. Last Thursday, the ASDRC informally reviewed the proposal at Main Street and Hebron Avenue. They came to a consensus on several design directions and will return to the TPZ with more details within the next month or two. She also assured the Commission that efforts are underway to hire a new Planner.

Motion by: Secretary Turner

Seconded by: Vice Chair Purtill

MOVED, that the Glastonbury Town Plan and Zoning Commission adjourns their regular meeting of February 7, 2023 at 10:06 P.M.

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

Respectfully Submitted,

Lilly Torosyan

Lilly Torosyan

Recording Clerk