

**GLASTONBURY TOWN COUNCIL  
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES  
TUESDAY, MAY 23, 2023**

The Glastonbury Town Council with Town Manager, Jonathan Luiz, 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 Neil Griffin

**2. Public Comment**

**Jon Bronzi of 3728 Hebron Avenue** stated that he was here to comment on the inclusionary zoning agenda item.

Chairman Gullotta noted that the agenda item will be discussed at 8:00 p.m. during the public hearing and action on public hearing portion of the meeting.

Ms. Carroll read out the written comments.

**Alan Preli of 641 Woodland St** submitted the following: With my new assessment I'm told that our home is now worth \$385,000. I am a veteran and we've had a home in town since the late 70's. Glad my home is worth a lot now (borrowed \$28,000 for a construction mortgage) but will only leave it in a box. A \$1500 exemption for being a veteran is almost insulting now. Also \$100.00 dollars for being a 20 year resident is ok, but how about \$200.00 for thirty years and \$300.00 for forty, et. A flat \$100.00 veterans exemption would be fair. Thanks for listening.

**Roger Emerick of 580 Hopewell Road** submitted the following: I've suggested this by email, and also in Citizen LTEs regarding preservation of Glastonbury's sustainability, character and

class. Contrary to endlessly promoting development and population increases (like succumbing to the anachronistic CGS 8:30g), I suggest offering elimination of property taxes (home,land,auto) in exchange for a conservation easement of tbd acres or greater. This might/will promote consideration from homeowners (esp aging) with land to preserve it in perpetuity rather than succumb to immediate development wealth which, if they do not preserve it, their children/successors likely will. Public open space would be optional. The municipal tax impact would be miniscule compared to our current preservation procurement costs.

**3. Special Reports.** None

**4. Old Business.** None

**5. New Business**

**(a) Action on Amendment to Purchase and Sale Agreement – 50-55 Nye Road.**

*Motion by:* Ms. Carroll

*Seconded by:* Mr. Osgood

*BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby authorizes the Town Manager to execute the Third Amendment to the Purchase and Sale Agreement dated December 8, 2022 for Town purchase of the land and improvements at 50-55 Nye Road, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated May 19, 2023, with the understanding that the closing date shall be extended to August 8, 2023 and the deposit amount increased by \$100,000.*

**Discussion:**

Mr. Luiz explained that, in addition to the materials provided in the packet, it is his recommendation, as detailed in the third amendment, which was also supplied, to extend the closing date from June 8, 2023 to August 8, 2023 in exchange for the deposit amount to increase by \$100,000. Mr. Luiz noted that this recommendation is based on the conversation he had yesterday with Richard Johnson and the sellers. Mr. Luiz noted that they indicated to the sellers that they need more time to close the deal, a two-month extension, and added that the total deposit will be just a little over \$300,000. Mr. Osgood recapped that the total deposit will increase to approximately \$300,000 and explained that this means that, if they do not close, they lose the \$300,000. Mr. Luiz noted that the exact deposit would be \$302,500.

*Result:* Motion passed unanimously (9-0-0).

**(b) Action to establish a Council Subcommittee regarding the Nation's 250<sup>th</sup> birthday.**

*Motion by:* Ms. Carroll

*Seconded by:* Mr. Cavanaugh

*BE IT RESOLVED, the Glastonbury Town Council hereby establishes a Council Subcommittee to discuss and plan for the upcoming United States Semiquincentennial and appoints following*

*Glastonbury Town Council  
Regular Meeting Minutes of May 23, 2023  
Recording Secretary – NY  
Minutes Page 2 of 14*

*members/designees: Mary LaChance, Thomas P. Gullotta, John Cavanna, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated May 19, 2023.*

**Discussion:**

Ms. LaChance noted that she discussed the planning at the last meeting and suggested for the events celebrating the Nation's 250<sup>th</sup> birthday to take place throughout the year. She also suggested looking into the Town history and people in Town connected with signing the Declaration of Independence and fighting in the Revolutionary War. Ms. LaChance remarked that this year-long event will need a few years to plan out and fundraise for. She noted that she hopes this celebration will make Glastonbury a destination for people to come throughout the year. Ms. LaChance stated that she is happy to have Chairman Gullotta and Mr. Cavanna on the committee.

Mr. Cavanna noted that he is thrilled to be part of the planning for the Nation's 250<sup>th</sup> birthday and added that it is very exciting for the Town. Mr. Cavanaugh commended Ms. LaChance on her brilliant idea and added that he would like to see a year-round celebration, not just limited to the summer months. He thanked Mr. Luiz for introducing the term Semiquincentennial. Mr. Cavanaugh suggested for the events to begin on January 1 and to take place through the whole calendar year. Chairman Gullotta noted that the year-round event can be a mix of education, entertainment, and good old New England get-togethers.

Ms. Wang noted that she thinks it is a fantastic idea and suggested that, in addition to Glastonbury's role in the American Revolution and connection to the Declaration of Independence, it would be great to reflect where Glastonbury has been. She noted that different populations have moved to Glastonbury and contributed to the Town. Ms. Wang remarked that, whether a person has been in Town for one year or one hundred years, everyone's contribution to the Town matters. She suggested for the event to be as inclusive as possible.

Mr. Osgood noted that he appreciates that the resolution for this year-long event includes fundraising and added that he hopes there is no cost to the tax payers. Chairman Gullotta noted that the event will be funded by donations and added that the Connecticut River Book Auction will kick off the fundraising with a \$1,000 donation. Ms. Wang remarked that she just came to know the term Semiquincentennial and shared that there is already a national commission, a state commission, as well as various historical societies that are planning events. She noted that it would be helpful to look into these other resources. Mr. McChesney remarked that the event is exciting and noted that they have successfully raised funds for the Town's anniversary event. He added that he anticipates that they can fundraise for this event and suggested working with organizations in Town, like the Chamber, to create a variety of events to ensure a successful year.

**Result:** Motion passed unanimously (9-0-0).

**6. Consent Calendar**

**(a) Action to transfer uncollected taxes to Suspense List – \$202,205.14.**

**Motion by:** Ms. Carroll

**Seconded by:** Mr. Cavanna

*BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves the transfer of \$202,205.14 of uncollected taxes to the Suspense List, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated May 19, 2023 and as recommended by the Board of Finance.*

**Result:** Motion passed unanimously (9-0-0).

**(b) Action on proposal for the 2023 Neighborhood Assistance Act Program (set public hearing).**

**Motion by:** Ms. Carroll

**Seconded by:** Mr. Cavanna

*BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby schedules a public hearing for 8:00 p.m. on Tuesday, June 13, 2023 in the Council Chambers of Town Hall, 2155 Main Street, Glastonbury and/or through Zoom Video Conferencing on the proposals submitted by The South Glastonbury Public Library Association, Inc. and Town of Glastonbury – Open Space Land Acquisition Fund under the 2023 Neighborhood Assistance Act Program, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated May 19, 2023*

**Result:** Motion passed unanimously (9-0-0).

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

Mr. Luiz provided an update on various topics in Town. The first update was regarding the Police Department sidewalk project. Mr. Luiz noted that the fiscal year 2024 adopted budget contains \$75,000 to install a sidewalk through the Police Department in the area of Main Street to Canione Road. He explained that the preliminary designs have the sidewalk following the outfield fence of the nearby ball field in a northerly direction which then turns left and heads to Main Street on the north side of Police Department parking area. Mr. Luiz added that the preliminary designs have the goal of directing pedestrian traffic away from the areas where police vehicles are most active. He noted that, in the coming weeks, the engineering division surveyors will work to refine the proposed sidewalk alignment and the designers will generate a draft plan for construction.

Mr. Luiz noted that on July 1 the Town will have a total of \$135,000 appropriated for the use of Center Green renovations. He explained that Town staff has already begun gathering background information such as mapping and utility information. Mr. Luiz added that the plan is for staff to formulate a list of necessary repairs and desired improvements. He noted that this information will be reviewed by the Architecture & Site Design Review Committee (ASDRC) and will be submitted to the Town Council for review.

Mr. Luiz provided an update on the wellness clinics which will resume at the Riverfront Community Center on Wednesdays between 9 a.m. and noon. He detailed that residents are able to meet with a registered nurse for blood pressure check, oxygen saturation tests and other wellness screenings. Mr. Luiz noted that appointments can be made with Krista Timken of the Health Department by calling 860-652-7534 or emailing at: [krista.timken@glastonbury-ct.gov](mailto:krista.timken@glastonbury-ct.gov).

Mr. Luiz noted that the residential structure on the Cider Mill property, located at 1287 Main Street, was recently demolished in large part by municipal highway staff. He explained that the Town is in the process of reviewing a pavilion that would be constructed on site and added that the process includes engaging with the next-door neighbor. Mr. Luiz noted that the project is funded with the State of Connecticut's Small Town Economic Assistance Program grant (STEAP grant).

Mr. Luiz noted that the Memorial Day Parade will step off on Monday, May 29, 9:00 a.m. on the corner of Main Street and Welles Street. He detailed that the formal program will take place at Hubbard Green immediately following the parade.

Mr. Luiz noted that on Friday, May 19, he met with Housing Authority Executive Director Neil Griffin and State Representatives Jill Barry and Jason Rojas. Mr. Luiz explained that the purpose of the meeting was to provide information on the Town's plan for affordable housing on Nye Road, as well as discussions regarding funding requests for public utility and connection expenses. Mr. Luiz stated that he will keep the Council updated.

### **Discussion:**

Mr. Cavanna noted that he would like to applaud the Town's Highway Public Works. He remarked that they routinely undertake projects that other towns have to outsource, which results in money savings to the Town and tax payers. Mr. Cavanna asked for an update on the police boat and noted that there was a fatality on the river last year. He also asked for an update on the installation of the plate reading cameras that were approved. Mr. Luiz noted that he will research those items and get back to the Council.

Mr. McChesney remarked that he went to the area of the proposed police sidewalk and shared the concern that the plans for fencing might close off and segment the area. He remarked that they need to make sure the new area with the sidewalk is open and safe. Mr. McChesney noted that he was driving back from Portland on Rte. 17 and noticed a fixed wall on the Portland side. He explained that this fixed wall is a safer option and noted that it reminded him of prior discussions on the subject. Mr. McChesney stated that he dislikes that they had to give up on the better compromise, especially with a safer alternative a couple miles away in Portland, which the State had no issues with. Mr. Cavanaugh remarked that he knows the wall on rte. 17. Mr. Cavanaugh thanked Mr. Luiz for ensuring that the flagpole at JB Williams Park was up before Memorial Day.

Chairman Gullotta noted that the Town Manager called him about putting the right-to-farm on the agenda and added that the frost and weather conditions were also discussed. The Chairman

remarked that it is a great idea to have Glastonbury going on the record with the right-to-farm and added that a dozen or more communities in Connecticut passed ordinances in line with the State statute. Chairman Gullotta explained that this would allow neighbors of farmers to understand that farms create dust, make noise, etc, which is all part of farming. He reiterated that the right-to-farm will be put on the next agenda and added that the Town manager noted that the frost conditions created problems for farmers.

Mr. Cavanna thanked the Chairman and Town Manager for bringing up the issue. Mr. Cavanna detailed that this past Thursday farms across Connecticut were hammered with frost. He noted that his own farm dropped down to 21 degrees. Mr. Cavanna stated that they are one of the few farms that pump water from Roaring Brook and remarked that they are fortunate they had water and did not lose the strawberry crops. He stated that they took a 100 percent loss in the orchard. Mr. Cavanna noted that it has been a brutal year with many farms across Glastonbury and the State losing trees and crops. He noted that Mr. Bronzi, one of Glastonbury's farmers, is here tonight and that he also had a terrible loss of trees and crops due to the frost conditions. Mr. Cavanaugh asked Mr. Cavanna if they lost the apple trees. Mr. Cavanna replied yes and noted that farmers are doing everything they can to save their farms. He noted that it has been a brutal year with many farmers struggling and added that, if farmers cannot continue, they have to ask the tax payers to save the land.

Chairman Gullotta noted that the right-to-farm will be on the next agenda with a wider discussion on helping the agricultural community and a discussion on what actions to take. He stated that they are committed to helping the farmers and thanked Mr. Luiz for bringing the matter to his attention. Mr. Osgood asked Mr. Luiz to look into the State statute regarding the agricultural ordinance. He noted that it might be redundant to have the Town ordinance and remarked that his guess is that the State statute is all that is needed. Mr. Luiz noted that he will research the issue.

## **8. Committee Reports.**

### **(a) Chairman's Report**

The report was given during the Town Manager's report. There was a discussion about adding the right-to-farm on the next agenda.

**(b) MDC.** None

**(c) CRCOG.** None

## **9. Communications.** None

## **10. Minutes**

### **(a) Minutes of May 9, 2023 Regular Meeting.**

**Motion by:** Ms. Carroll

**Seconded by:** Mr. Cavanaugh

**Result:** Minutes were accepted unanimously (9-0-0).

**11. Appointments and Resignations.** None

**12. Executive Session.**

**(a) Discussion of the selection of a site or the lease, sale or purchase of real estate.**

*Motion by:* Ms. Carroll

*Seconded by:* Mr. McChesney

*BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby enters into executive session to discuss the selection of a site or the lease, sale or purchase of real estate.*

*Result:* Motion passed unanimously (9-0-0).

**Went into Executive Session at 7:30 p.m. with Town Manager Jonathan Luiz, Housing Authority Director Neil Griffin and Planning Director Shelley Caltagirone in attendance. Came out of Executive Session at 8:00 p.m. No votes taken following Executive Session.**

**PUBLIC HEARING AND ACTION ON PUBLIC HEARING – 8:00 P.M.**

**NO. 1 ACTION ON PROPOSED DRAFT AMENDMENTS TO SECTIONS 2, 3, 4, AND 12 OF THE BUILDING ZONE REGULATIONS AND SECTIONS 2 AND 3 OF THE SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS FOR INCLUSIONARY ZONING.**

*Motion by:* Ms. Carroll

*Seconded by:* Mr. Niland

BE IT RESOLVED, the Glastonbury Town Council hereby directs the Community Development staff to revise the inclusionary zoning amendments to exclude the following: (1) subdivisions creating single-family residential lots; (2) a fee-in-lieu alternative to construction of affordable dwelling units; and (3) a density bonus for higher percentages of inclusionary dwelling units, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated May 19, 2023.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Luiz noted that the proposed draft motion was recommended by the Town Plan and Zoning Board in an attempt to simplify the complicated zoning issue. Chairman Gullotta asked if it was safe to say that, if the motion passes, they would be looking at condominiums and multifamily dwellings, which are also known as apartment houses. Mr. Luiz replied yes. Chairman Gullotta noted that, if this motion were to go forward, they would have a study area. The Chairman opened the floor for public comment.

**Jon Bronzi of 3738 Hebron Avenue** noted that he and his brother own Deercrest Farm in Glastonbury. He stated that his family also owns Footehills Farm in Hebron, Connecticut. Mr. Bronzi stated that the proposed draft amendment discriminates against those who have larger parcels of property. He explained that, in the case of a 15-acre piece of land, one would get 80 percent, which amounts to 8 or 9 homes. Mr. Bronzi noted that landowners with over 100 acres are set up to take much less money from developers. He explained that lots in Glastonbury are going anywhere from \$160,000 to \$200,000 and added that it would be very difficult for a developer to build an affordable house, factoring in the construction costs, which make a \$300,000 affordable house difficult. He noted that he does not have a problem with the proposal as long as it is not going to negatively affect the value of his land. Mr. Bronzi remarked that there are few farmers left and added that it is not fair to penalize them. He stated that he is not a crier or a victim. Mr. Bronzi noted that it has been a rough year and stated that the fair thing is to allow farmers to be able to sell their land for the actual value.

**DJ McBride of 263 Spring Street Ext** noted that he has researched the subject of inclusionary zoning and found that it works well in rapidly growing cities like San Francisco. He noted that, according to the census, Glastonbury's growth has been just over 2 percent since 2010. Mr. McBride explained that applying the growth rate to the total number of homes with a 10 percent IZ policy would amount to 5 units a year. He remarked that 5 is more than zero and added that this is not a great return on investment. Mr. McBride stated that he would like to see developers contribute to another Nye Road project and noted that it is why he is in favor of fee-in-lieu payments. He explained that projects like Nye Road offer a higher return on investments. Mr. McBride stated that he does not support IZ policies for deed restricted units and asked what happens to someone who inherits the home and does not qualify. He also noted that newly married individuals might not be eligible anymore. Mr. McBride stated that deed restricted units caused problems in the past and added that 3 Council members can attest to this. He remarked that he changed his view from last year. Mr. McBride remarked that he believes wealth generation is the key to solving income inequality and added that deed restricted units are not the solution. He stated that he supports mandatory IZ policies as opposed to optional ones. Mr. McBride noted that nearly every instance of optional IZ policies were ignored by developers and had no effect. He noted that he supports providing incentives to developers and added that a concern is that a developer tax will be passed on to the buyers. Mr. McBride noted that, instead of a developer tax, he would much rather see an increase in the mill rate, which is a progressive tax. He explained that those funds would go toward building affordable housing. Mr. McBride stated that he supports reviewing Glastonbury's exclusionary zoning policies. He provided an analogy of the blue recycling bins and stated that only 10 percent of the material is recycled. Mr. McBride noted that the underlying problem is ignored and recommended looking up Jon Stewart on recycling. He reiterated that the Town should look into more projects like Nye Road and consider reforming the exclusionary policies.

**Anne Bowman of 62 Morgan Drive** noted that she would like to have inclusionary zoning policies that increase affordable housing in Glastonbury. She noted that developers would find paying a fee-in-lieu to be more desirable than creating affordable housing in a subdivision. She stated that 20 percent of multifamily units should be affordable. Ms. Bowman explained that requiring subdivisions to set aside 10 percent for affordable housing ensures that developers do



not decrease the amount of new affordable housing. She noted that affordable housing in a subdivision brings diversity to Glastonbury. Ms. Bowman noted that the inclusionary zoning for affordable housing needs to be in perpetuity. She reiterated that multifamily units need 20 percent affordable housing set aside and subdivisions should be required to set aside 10 percent. Ms. Bowman noted that it is the Town's responsibility to provide affordable housing in perpetuity to all ages, household sizes, all neighborhoods, and income levels at or below 80 percent of area medium income equally.

**Rob Dakers of 15 Trifiro Circle** noted that there is a housing crisis in Town and added that the demand for affordable housing is not being met. He noted that developers are seeking approvals for projects under section 8-30g and added that the inclusionary zoning policies must be meaningful. Mr. Dakers noted that meaningful inclusionary zoning policies can restore the loss of the starter home and equivalent and can help families like his and help Town workers, essential workers and long-term residents. He noted that the fee-in-lieu is a missed opportunity to address the present and pressing problem of the severe shortage of affordable housing. Mr. Dakers noted that he is inclined to support a density bonus to help cover the economics costs. He thanked the Board for their consideration and service.

**Pam Lucas of 145 Mosely Terrace** noted that she supports the amendment and stated that developers should be required to construct affordable housing as a condition and privilege for building market rate units in Town. She noted that affordable rentals and affordable housing should not be restricted to certain areas and added that the Town should expand who can live in the community. Ms. Lucas stated that the fee-in-lieu is not workable and explained that it would take the Town ages to buy and develop property and to deal with the opposition of residents. She noted that this approach would not ensure diversity and people of different backgrounds living side by side. She suggested a percentage of affordable units set aside, rather than relying on incentives. Ms. Lucas stated that 20 percent should be set aside for all multifamily and townhouses. She noted that, under section 8-30g, developers are willing to set aside 10 percent and added that this will not enable the Town to make meaningful progress on affordable housing. She noted that developers do not have the same incentive to make sure the IZ policies are in compliance and questioned their role as an administrator. Ms. Lucas stated that there should be no prioritization on who can live in the affordable housing and added that it should include the elderly, the young, workers, as well as people who live outside of the Town. Ms. Lucas stated that the Town is not threatened by requiring developers to include affordable housing.

**Jill Grieveson of 3 Tryon Farm Road** noted that she cannot claim to have read or studied multiple inclusionary zoning policies. She shared that, based on the documents submitted by Town staff, the fee-in-lieu is an incentive to avoid setting aside affordable housing. Ms. Grieveson commented on the length of deed restrictions and noted that it is unfair for people who initially owned the property to not be able to share in the equity. She stated that deed restriction in perpetuity is the fairer way to go.

Ms. Carroll read out the written comments:

**Denise Weeks of 334 Hollister Way W** submitted the following: My name is Denise Weeks and I live at 334 Hollister Way West in Glastonbury. I want to register my support for an inclusionary zoning ordinance as an important part of the town's broader Affordable Housing Plan. As such, the ordinance should ensure sustained progress toward providing our fair share of AH, while fostering a diverse and inclusive community. To that end, I make the following recommendations: • Affordable Housing (AH) units should remain affordable in perpetuity otherwise we will not make lasting progress toward our AH goals. • Developers should not be allowed to pay fees into an Affordable Housing Trust Fund in lieu of including affordable units in their developments. Doing so would provide a way for developers to avoid the ordinance and would lead to fewer AH units being built. • The ordinance should not be used as a means of keeping out non-residents of Glastonbury. o Who is eligible to live in the units should not be based on who works in or has ties to Glastonbury. The eligibility process must be open and fair. o Income limits should not exclude CT residents whose income level is below 60% of AMI. Limits should include incomes of 80% of AMI (Area Median Income) and below. • The inclusionary zoning should apply to both multi-family and single-family units. This would allow affordable housing to be built in all parts of town rather than concentrate affordable housing only in areas zoned for multi-family units. Adoption of an Inclusionary Zoning ordinance will provide an important tool in our efforts to meet our AH goals – but it is only one tool. We need to move forward with other recommendations in our Affordable Housing Plan to build the structures that will ensure access and availability of AH going forward.

**William Marut of 264 Carriage Drive** submitted the following: With affordable housing, the Town Council is being called upon to deal with financial and quality-of-life issues. In addition, affordable housing is also a moral issue. With that in mind: (1) Glastonbury should adopt inclusionary zoning regulations, but should also recognize that inclusionary zoning is not the entire remedy for the affordable housing shortage. Glastonbury should work on many fronts to expand affordable housing, and this includes moving forward with the various recommendations of the Affordable Housing Plan. (2) Glastonbury should establish an Affordable Housing Trust Fund as a repository for funds to be used for affordable housing, including to help low-income home buyers with down payments. (3) Glastonbury should not allow developers to pay fees to an Affordable Housing Trust Fund in-lieu of including affordable units in their developments, because this is unlikely to result in more affordable units being built in Glastonbury. (4) The inclusionary zoning provisions should apply to both multi-family and single-family units. This allows affordable housing to be built in all parts of town, rather than concentrated in areas zoned for multi-family units. (5) The provision should not prioritize who is eligible to live in the units based on their work in or ties to Glastonbury, or should do so in a fair manner. (6) The provisions should require the affordable units to remain affordable in perpetuity. If they are deed restricted for only a certain number of years, they eventually will become market rate housing with no provision for replacement by new affordable housing. (7) The provisions should require income limits of 80% of AMI (Area Median Income) and below. In other words, the provisions should NOT require income limits of between 60% and 80% of AMI. Thank you.

**Laura Cahill of 17 Montauk Way** submitted the following: My name is Laura Cahill and I reside at 17 Montauk Way. I respectfully submit comments in strong support for the Town Council to adopt an inclusionary zoning ordinance. • Our town should adopt inclusionary zoning

*Glastonbury Town Council  
Regular Meeting Minutes of May 23, 2023  
Recording Secretary – NY  
Minutes Page 10 of 14*

regulations, but also must recognize that inclusionary zoning is not the entire remedy for the affordable housing shortage. We should work on many fronts to expand affordable housing, and this includes moving forward with the various recommendations of the Affordable Housing Plan.

- Our town should establish an Affordable Housing Trust Fund as a repository for funds to be used for affordable housing, including to help low-income home buyers with down payments.
- We should not allow developers to pay fees to an Affordable Housing Trust Fund in-lieu of including affordable units in their developments because this is unlikely to result in more affordable units being built in our town.
- The inclusionary zoning provisions should apply to both multi-family and single-family units. This allows affordable housing to be built in all parts of town rather than concentrated in areas zoned for multi-family units.
- Single-family housing inclusionary zoning should be set at 10%.
- Multi-family housing inclusionary zoning should be set at 15%.
- The purchase and sale of all housing units should be assessed a town-wide 1% conveyance fee to be deposited in an Affordable Housing Trust Fund.
- The provision should not prioritize who are eligible based on their work in or ties to Glastonbury or should do so in a fair manner. Inclusionary zoning should not be a means of keeping out non-residents of Glastonbury.
- The provisions should require the affordable units to remain affordable in perpetuity. If they are deed restricted only for a certain number of years, they eventually will become market rate housing with no provision for replacement by new affordable housing. Affordable housing in perpetuity will always be affordable housing.

### **Discussion:**

Chairman Gullotta asked Mr. Luiz if the density bonus was still included in the motion. Mr. Luiz replied that the information has not been determined. Chairman Gullotta asked if someone was willing to make a motion to include the density bonus. He explained that such a rule is currently in effect at Tryon Farm, South Mill, and other locations, and added that they are looking at apartments and condominiums. Chairman Gullotta noted that taking away the density bonus from the discussion is problematic. Mr. Niland asked if they should strike number 3 from the motion. Chairman Gullotta replied yes and reiterated that they should look at the existing density bonus. Mr. Cavanaugh asked if they should wait for a determination from the Town Manager. Chairman Gullotta explained that it would be included in the discussion and noted that the density bonus may already be in place and would just be factored into the discussion on apartments and condominiums. Mr. Luiz noted that that Ms. Caltagirone, Director of Planning and Land Use Services, is present via Zoom and can answer the question on the density bonus.

Ms. Caltagirone noted that there is a density bonus in the PAD regulations, which allows for up to 6 dwelling units in residential zone A per acre. She noted that there is a table with information on the AA zone and offered to look up the precise numbers. Mr. Osgood noted that this only applies to owner occupied units if it is in a PAD. Ms. Caltagirone replied correct and explained that the proposed amendment will broaden the definition of affordable units in a PAD to include rental occupancy. Mr. Osgood noted that the motion to address residential rental units becomes a moot point and explained that they do not have a density bonus for rental properties. Chairman Gullotta remarked that one can see that point and explained that the larger issue is having considered density bonuses in one area and examining it in a new area. He asked if they should take density bonuses off the table immediately or discuss the issue, considering the

potential advantages and disadvantages of density bonuses going forward. Chairman Gullotta noted that the density bonus is at least worthy of considerations in discussing apartment buildings and condominiums. Ms. Wang noted that she completely agrees to continuing to consider the density bonus and added that it is critical for making the regulation work. She remarked that she was surprised to see provision number 3 in the motion and asked what prompted this. Mr. Luiz noted that the language in the draft motion was based on the direction of the Leadership Team meeting. Ms. Wang stated that she supports continuing the discussion on the density bonus motion.

**Motion by:** Mr. Niland

**Seconded by:** Ms. Carroll

Motion to strike number 3 from the resolution.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Osgood explained that the motion is asking the Planner to provide another draft, and the Council will continue to discuss it. Mr. Cavanaugh noted that he wanted to further answer Ms. Wang's question and explained that it was Mr. Osgood's suggestion to deal with apartments and rentals first. Mr. Osgood stated that he is not saying he agrees with the amendment or the concept of it and explained that the Council will just vote on further discussing it. Mr. Gullotta agreed.

**Result:** Motion passed (8-1-0), with Mr. Cavanaugh voting against.

**Discussion:**

Chairman Gullotta returned to the main motion and noted that they are asking Town staff to prepare a presentation that would look at apartments and condominiums and how they might develop a set of rules around inclusionary zoning that applies to them. Mr. Osgood noted that he made the point at the previous discussions that there are complications involved with deed restrictions and owners that would be required in condominiums. He explained that condominiums are basically single-family homes that are side by side. Mr. Osgood remarked that he is surprised condominiums are included. He suggested keeping it simple, removing the condo component and deal with rental units at this point. Chairman Gullotta remarked that it is a suggestion and asked if it has any mileage. Mr. Osgood noted that he does not see anything on condominiums in the motion. Mr. Cavanaugh explained that these are exclusionary motions and noted that Mr. Osgood wants to exclude condominiums.

**Motion by:** Mr. Osgood

**Seconded by:** Mr. Cavanaugh

Amend the motion to exclude condominiums.

## **Discussion:**

Mr. Osgood noted that the point he made was to simplify the process. He explained that one of the benefits to homeownership is the ability to create equity and added that a condominium does not provide the ability to create equity in a residential unit. Mr. Osgood noted that this runs into the same problems they saw in other projects. He noted that they should focus on apartments and rental units and, after a thorough analysis, revisit the condominium question if it makes sense. Ms. LaChance noted that she agrees with Mr. Osgood and added that they should focus on non-owning properties first. She explained that they do not want to get caught up in the muck of deed restrictions and added that she is not saying she would not agree with this in the future. Mr. Niland asked if keeping condominiums in the draft motion would unnecessarily complicate the process. Ms. Caltagirone noted that Mr. Osgood's suggestion narrows the focus and simplifies the discussion. She noted that there are further complications with the subdivision regulations. Ms. Caltagirone explained that subdivisions involve larger single-family homes, higher cost of construction and added that including them in inclusionary zoning is more challenging. She noted that there are differences with a condo and a single-family home within the regulations and added that subdivisions are more layered.

Chairman Gullotta explained that they have dealt with condominiums in terms of Georgetown, South Mill and other PADS and have a bit of a track record knowing where they have been successful. He added that knowing the challenges of individuals coming back, receiving the benefits of a price reduction only to come back to the Council and say they would like the benefit of equity. He asked the Council if they think it is within their ability to combine the two things. Chairman Gullotta noted that the apartment issue is easier and added that he would not want to lose the condominium discussion. He suggested dealing with the two issues sequentially. Chairman Gullotta noted that they are behind the curve in terms of the State expectations and added that the State expectations are very wrong. He noted that taking condominiums off the table will hurt the Town.

Mr. McChesney noted that the economic analysis was discussed and asked if this referred to condominiums as well. Ms. Caltagirone noted that she did not distinguish between owner occupied and rental units and added that it should be included in the scope of work. She explained that only applying inclusionary zoning to rental properties might incentivize developers to only build condominiums. Ms. Caltagirone remarked that she is not sure what the profit margins are for rental vs condominium and added that this question needs to be researched. Mr. McChesney noted that he agrees and added that he does not want to make the process needlessly complicated. He explained that ultimately all they are doing is asking the Town to redraft documents to look at later. Mr. McChesney noted that he is fine with having the conversation continued. Chairman Gullotta noted that a vote in favor is to remove condominiums from consideration.

**Result:** Motion failed (4-5-0), with Ms. Carroll, Mr. Gullotta, Mr. Niland, Ms. Wang and Mr. McChesney voting against.

Chairman Gullotta directed the Council back to the main motion.

**Result:** Motion passed (6-3-0), with Mr. Cavanaugh, Mr. Cavanna, and Mr. Osgood voting against.

**Re-entered Executive Session at 8:48 p.m. with Town Manager Jonathan Luiz, Housing Authority Director Neil Griffin and Planning Director Shelley Caltagirone in attendance. Came out of Executive Session at 9:00 p.m. No votes taken following Executive Session.**

**Meeting adjourned at 9:01 p.m.**

Respectfully submitted,

*Nadya Yuskaev*

Nadya Yuskaev  
Recording Secretary

Thomas Gullotta  
Chairman