

# GLASTONBURY TOWN COUNCIL REGULAR MEETING MINUTES TUESDAY, JUNE 27, 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 (via Zoom)  
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 Mr. Osgood

## 2. Public Comment

Chairman Gullotta explained the public comment procedure. He noted that civil discourse is welcome and added that physical threats and obscenities will not be tolerated. The Chairman noted that he is looking forward to a productive civil discourse and added that comment is limited to three minutes.

**DJ McBride of 263 Spring Street Ext** noted that he has an affordable housing solution plan that will take 20 years to implement, which addresses many concerns of democrats and republicans. Mr. McBride noted that he proposes multi-use PAD developments with a commercial first floor consisting of shops and restaurants with residential units on the next 2 floors. He explained that it would be like Center Village, sitting on top of shops. Mr. McBride noted that he proposes non-market units, which are Town owned residential 80 percent AMI units. He explained that the goal would be a 2-bedroom rental for \$2,000 a month in perpetuity. Mr. McBride explained that the commercial space in these PADS could be rented or sold to lower the costs of these non-market units. He noted that the rental space above will generate traffic space and the shops will generate more commercial traffic. Mr. McBride noted that he provided the Chairman with a document that identifies 8 spots in the Town Center where PADs can be built. He explained that this plan preserves the farmland and suburbs and creates a walkable Town center. Mr. McBride noted that proper maintenance is needed, which will preserve the land values.

**Stephanie Johnson of Smithbrook Terrace** noted that, at the last meeting, the nomination was voted down despite many members admitting to not knowing the nominee. Ms. Johnson stated that lies and baseless accusations made by two council members led the other three democrats to vote against the nominee, defying countless years of bipartisan precedent. She noted that she has a candidate in mind and listed the qualifications: life-long resident, military family, mother involved in schools, her family was selected to work alongside Equity Diversity Inclusion Committee as a community connector for Open Choice families. The qualifications also include working in child behavior and children's mental health for over 15 years, research published in her field, and many mothers and people in Town find her balanced, fair and well spoken. Ms. Johnson noted that this candidate has never asked for a book to be removed from a library. She stated that the candidate did not try to remove an app from the Glastonbury Public Schools. Ms. Johnson remarked that this nominee is indeed Heather Simon and added that the Town Council declined meeting her. She noted that the Chairman arranged an opportunity to meet Ms. Simon prior to the meeting, which was declined. Ms. Johnson stated that there was a motion made to postpone the vote which was voted down. She noted that Council members fabricated the narrative to instill fear and mislead the public. Ms. Johnson remarked that the democrat Town Council majority has no interest in hearing from anyone with a different opinion and added that they do not value free speech. She questioned how people can be expected to serve on boards and committees if a partisan agenda is being forced on them. Ms. Johnson asked for the minutes to be redacted and amended and asked the Council to issue a formal apology to Ms. Simon, her family and to the residents.

**Jill Durall of 73 Shagbark Road** noted that the democrats voted down the nomination of Heather Simon based on false premises. Ms. Durall noted that it was falsely stated that Ms. Simon wanted to remove an app from the school. Ms. Durall explained that Ms. Simon had concerns with some of the books on the app that are meant to sexualize very young children. Ms. Durall added that Ms. Simon worked with the teacher and came to an agreed resolution. Ms. Durall stated that she has seen the emails and reiterated that at no point did Ms. Simon suggest for the app to be removed. Ms. Durall stated that Ms. Carroll and Ms. LaChance made this up to cancel Ms. Simon. Ms. Durall noted that her second point is that a false statement was made regarding Ms. Simon requesting to remove books from the school. Ms. Durall explained that there is a Board of Education process in place for the removal of books. She noted that the process requires filing an official request for reconsideration to the school's media specialist. Ms. Durall stated that Ms. Simon has never filed a single request to remove books from the school library. She noted that more lies were told about Ms. Simon. Ms. Durall explained that Ms. Simon's concerns about books for minors resulted in more lies and contorted logic, falsely stating that Ms. Simon would remove books from the public library. Ms. Durall noted that Ms. Simon was slandered and canceled because of her morals. She noted that the intent is to intimidate and prevent people from exercising their right of free speech. Ms. Durall wondered why any citizens would volunteer if lies were told about them. She noted that it was stated that past behavior is an indicator of future behavior and added that the expectation is more dishonesty in the future. Ms. Durall noted that she finds the lies reprehensible, stated that there should be a public apology, and added that they should resign.

**Martin Ethier of 533 Woodland Street** noted that he is a life-long resident and is here to support Heather Simon for the Library Board. Mr. Ethier stated that he has met Ms. Simon briefly, does not know her all that well, and added that he knows that she is a mother who took a stand on books that she deemed inappropriate for a school library. Mr. Ethier noted that he appreciates that Ms. Simon had enough courage to bring up the subject and stand up publicly for her beliefs. He stated that her opportunity to serve on the Library Board was abruptly shut down because she does not agree with the majority council members. Mr. Ethier remarked that it was said that past behavior is an indicator of future behavior and added that it makes it sound like she did something illegal, which she did not. He noted that Ms. Simon took a stand for something she believed in. Mr. Ethier remarked that he believes Ms. Simon's statement that she would not ban books from the public library. He stated that he appreciates Ms. Simon for voicing her concerns and added that he would like to see her on the Library Board.

**Beth Krane of 70 Jonny Cake Lane** noted that she is here as a resident, mother and a friend. Ms. Krane remarked that, as a resident of 20 years, she is deeply disappointed and disturbed by the weaponization of a recent council vote regarding a library board nominee with a history of banning books. She explained that she is a mother of 2 teenagers, a daughter who came out as trans and a son. Ms. Krane noted that the Council members should not be targeted or threatened with violence for calmly, courageously and consistently voting their conscience. She explained that a book helped her daughter come out to her family and the rest of the world. Ms. Krane noted that the book helped her understand what her child was going through. She noted that their family made their home a safe space for their daughter and son and added that they make sure their children feel safe, accepted and loved. Ms. Krane noted that she is speaking out tonight because law makers are banning books, banning bathroom access, and even criminalizing parents. She stated that the threats to our council members must stop and suggested modeling civil discourse. Ms. Krane remarked that she believes in the power of books to shape lives. She added that the Council is committed to democracy and thanked the Council members for their level-headed leadership.

**Mr. Jeffrey Pitler of 56 Douglas Road** noted that he had the good fortune and pleasure of riding his bike for several hours throughout Town. He thanked the Council Members for their time and effort to make Glastonbury a great place to live.

**Mr. John Forrest of 52 Jasmine Lane** remarked that the last comment was nice. Mr. Forrest stated that he is here to support Heather Simon and stated that does not know her. He noted that she has an impressive resume. Mr. Forrest recalled that 3 republicans voted against the Nye Road property, stepped back, paused, heard more input, then voted for it. He explained that partisan politics were pushed aside to move forward with the Nye Road property. Mr. Forrest remarked that he appreciates the perspectives of each of the Town Council members. He noted that Ms. Simon has a different perspective and explained that the Library Board has 10 members: 5 republicans and 5 democrats. Mr. Forrest noted that he wants 10 separate perspectives and explained that one person does not make all the decisions. He stated that each person has 1/10<sup>th</sup> of a vote. Mr. Forrest noted that he has worked for a jet engines company for over ten years and leads his team on major deals. He noted that the people on his team have vastly different

perspectives and noted that he works very well with one of his colleagues. Mr. Forrest remarked that Council member Cavanaugh and Chairman Gullotta are senior Council members, one republican and one democrat, who work well together. Mr. Forrest suggested for the Council to make a motion to have another vote to get Ms. Simon on the Library Board.

**Igor Fuksman of 134 High Wood Drive** stated that he is here to support Ms. Simon and added that he is disappointed and outraged by the vote to reject her nomination. He noted that Ms. Simon has a different view than the progressive values that are pushed down people's throats. Mr. Fuksman stated that some lies were told about Ms. Simon as was mentioned in previous comments. He noted that people in support of Ms. Simon were accused of being hateful, belligerent, and calling for violence. He noted that a respectful post in support of Ms. Simon was met with hate, disdain, and name calling. Mr. Fuksman remarked that the sentiment is that anyone in support of Ms. Simon is a fascist who needs to go to Florida with the other fascists. He noted that Ms. Simon should be allowed to serve on the Library Board, even if she has a different opinion. He inquired why she is being censored, and added that people are allowed to express different opinions. Mr. Fuksman stated that some people tried to donate books to the school library and all the books were rejected. He remarked that there is a circular logic against those people with different opinions than progressives. Mr. Fuksman noted that he seconds the offer of another vote and added that he does not know if it will happen and stated that it would be a good step.

**Julie Thompson of 252 Bluff Point Road** noted that the public library is available to all members of community with different viewpoints, gender, sexualities, ideas, religions, and interests. She stated that libraries should have books that are informative, educational and recreational. Ms. Thompson stated that there should be free access to all books, including LGBTQ books. She remarked that she will not comment on the candidate and added that, a year ago, that person got a book removed from the high school because they found it unacceptable. Ms. Thompson stated that she is disheartened by the vitriol, violent statements against the democratic members and the threats put up on Facebook and social media. She explained that the threats against the democratic members include that they should be arrested for pornography and other crimes and other threats stating they should be shot. Ms. Thompson remarked that she is in disbelief about the calls for violence and thanked the Council members for standing up for the rights of all citizens.

**Linda Vannoni of 3688 Hebron Ave** thanked the Council members for all of their hard work. She noted that she supports the difficult decision not to appoint the nominee to the Library Board. Ms. Vannoni noted that she had been present at the Board of Education meetings and added that she believes those books should be on the shelf. She stated that those books are not pornography and noted that the candidate demonstrated a lack of commitment to the public library mission: books accessible to all. Ms. Vannoni remarked that it was a difficult decision and thanked the Council for having a discussion. She noted that she has faith that all parties can come up with candidates that can be embraced by everyone. Ms. Vannoni noted that she supports the decision made by the Council. She explained that, as a mother with children in the

public schools, she wants books for kids, and books for her friends' kids. Ms. Vannoni reiterated that she supports the fact that the nominee was rejected. She remarked that what kids get from librarians is better than what is on their phones and added that it is a space for constructive sex education and exploration about identity. Ms. Vannoni noted that kids do not always go to their parents with questions about sexual identity and added that those books are targeted.

Ms. Carroll read out the written comments.

**Sarah Dzialo of 363 Main St, South Glastonbury** submitted the following: First off, thank you all for your service to our town. I hope you can bear with me, as I'd like to express concern over an "old" BOE issue that recently made its way over to Town Council, regarding some sexually explicit literature in one of our school libraries. I understand that the book that John Cavanna read from at the last TC meeting (titled *This Book Is Gay*) was reviewed by the school last year, determined to be appropriate for high schoolers and kept in the school library. I saw in the online video of the last TC meeting that it was stated by one of the TC members that the TC was concerned that Heather Simon, being concerned with a few books in the school library, might express concerns over books in the town library. I know that there are detailed processes according to which books are selected for both the school and town libraries. These processes are ongoing and subject to revision. I know that Heather stated publicly that she was not interested in this process for the town library. However, I want to suggest that it is entirely reasonable that ANY citizen, especially a member of a library board, might have interest in this process. The question of which books are selected for school AND town libraries is a fascinating and important one. It makes total sense that any citizen, including a board member of a library, might be interested in this sort of ongoing conversation. No physical library on Earth can hold every book ever written. Every library on the planet can only fit so many books. Therefore, every physical library is inherently a curated, filtered experience. If a town library can only hold, for example, 1000 books, are the library specialists "banning" or "censoring" every other book on Earth that did not make it into one of those thousand spots? Of course not. I know that Town Council is not exactly the place to address concerns over the content of our town library, and that there are other, more appropriate avenues to bring a concern like (*the comment cut off*).

**Denise Weeks of 334 Hollister Way W** submitted the following: I want to thank the majority for rejecting the recent Library Board nomination. As elected officials you are charged with using your best judgement to ensure people serving on boards will support the goals of the boards they serve on, and not succumb to pressure from a small but vocal minority. I think your decision was thoughtful and justified. I'm saddened and alarmed at the reaction of some elected officials, and a minority of town residents, to your decision. Name calling and death threats have no place in town governance. No one who volunteers to serve in town government should be subjected to the abuse you have suffered since your last meeting. I urge minority members to consider ways to represent their supporters without bullying their colleagues. Tonight's agenda includes a presentation on Inclusionary Zoning, a vote to schedule a public hearing on the topic and a vote on the Nye Road purchase agreement. These reflect leadership's steadfast commitment to making incremental progress toward concrete goals that have a positive impact on the town. I urge the council to continue that progress and vote yes on both items.

**Elizabeth Welburn of 164 Lexington Rd** submitted the following: On June 13, 2023, members of your council testified untruths against Heather Simon, and voted against her nomination for the voluntary position on the town library Board Committee. Mary Lachance stated that Ms Simon "essentially took away 40,000 books from kids because she objected to two", referring to the EPIC app. Truth is, the app has never been removed. It is unconscionable that any elected town official would spread false information against a town resident and use that false info as a justification to vote against her appointment. As stated by members of your council "the best predictor of future behavior is past behavior". Ms Simon has never voiced opposition to any book at the town public library, despite the same books being on those shelves. The obvious conclusion then, is she would not. Town council members who voted down Heather's nomination did so seemingly simply because she has different values and views than they, and as a concerned parent and taxpayer, she had the courage to inquire and question the material available to children in a school setting. It is apparent that your goal is to silence and intimidate any resident who disagrees with your plans and narrative. The very people who argue relentlessly for "inclusion" seem to actually be the least inclusive to people with opposing views. A healthy community is one in which there can be open dialogue and respect for differing views. Your actions have caused greater division and anger within our community. You have been elected to work for ALL Glastonbury residents and not simply to control based on biases and partisan narratives. I urge you to issue a formal apology and to right this wrong.

**Sean Ring of 157 Deerfield Drive** submitted the following: Does the fire department in Glastonbury hire active arsonists? If not, then why would the council vote to put a book banner on the board for the Wells Turner Library board? Please do not entertain unserious people for important spots which require actual work and not outrage-of-the-day reactionaries.

**Zoom comments:**

**Ms. Heather Collins of Conestoga Way** stated that she has been a resident for 14 years and noted that she supports the democrats' decision to reject the nomination. She noted that the nominee was not a serious candidate for the Library Board. Ms. Collins remarked that she loves Glastonbury and noted that it was just featured in the *New York Times*. She noted that her child has graduated from college and stated that other people should not decide what other kids can read. Ms. Collins explained that kids need a parent's signature to get a library card. She recalled that her grandmother did not approve of her reading *Jaws* and her mother allowed her to read the book. Ms. Collins stated that it was inappropriate for the Council member to read out the material meant for LGBTQ kids. She stated that Council member Cavanna had attacked her in the past and this is why she does not give the number of her home. Ms. Collins noted that the Council member had posted a meme on Facebook which was against transgenderism. She explained that Mr. Cavanna was against the woman of the year who was a trans individual. Ms. Collins stated that there is a trans community in Glastonbury and thanked the Council for rejecting the unfit candidate.

### **3. Special Reports.**

#### **(a) Presentation regarding Inclusionary Zoning.**

Ms. Caltagirone, Director of Community Development, provided a general overview of the inclusionary zoning tools. She noted that the draft inclusionary zoning text amendments to be presented reflect the Council's direction at the last meeting, which was to exclude the subdivisions and the fee-in-lieu from the text amendment. Ms. Caltagirone noted that the slides and accompanying information are included in the Council packet. The first slide details that inclusionary zoning is a municipal-level program in which property owners of proposed multi-family or multi-lot developments are required to preserve a percentage of units or lots for a period of years at a maximum monthly rental payment or maximum sales price. Inclusionary Zoning has been recognized in General Statute §8-21 since 1991, and has been adopted as a voluntary or mandatory program in a handful of Connecticut towns. Inclusionary Zoning is strategy 3.1 of the Glastonbury Affordable Housing Plan. The second slide outlines affordable housing which can be any housing that is priced limited such that a household is not required to pay more than 30% of their income towards housing expenses. Affordable housing as defined in the draft regulations under discussion would be housing that is affordable to households that earn no more than 80% of the State Median Income. A table was provided in the packet that details FY 2022 Low-Income (80% AMI) Limit. Ms. Caltagirone explained that affordable housing in the upper range is referred to by some as workforce housing. She noted that deeply affordable housing developed for low-income households tends to require state or federal subsidy. The third slide details how inclusionary zoning works. Program requirements are placed in the regulations specifying the zoning districts in which the requirements apply, minimum size housing development to which the affordable housing requirements will apply, a percentage of units within a development that will be required to be affordable, standards for maintaining the program, and standards for the quality, distribution, size or bedroom count of affordable units.

The fourth slide details that inclusionary zoning has worked in locations where the demand for housing is so strong that developers and buyers are willing and able to absorb the additional cost of compliance. Because housing markets are cyclical, inclusionary zoning can sometimes be an inflexible tool that is appealing in a rising market, but can handcuff a property owner or landlord in a downturn. Inclusionary programs are also difficult to draft and administer; a well-intended but confusing program can drive development away. If an inclusionary program is mandated, developers should be given flexibility as to how to comply. The fifth slide outlines common inclusionary zoning tools. Incentives can include a density bonus and process streamlining. Development can be incentivized by implementing shorter and a more predictable approval process, as well as a speedier development schedule. Other incentives include a willingness to prioritize affordable housing project reviews over other projects, cut down on the discretion a commission or council uses during their review to make the process more predictable. Some flexibility can include fee-in-lieu payment to be collected in a trust and used for constructing, rehabilitating or repairing affordable housing or construction of affordable housing off site at another property. Streamlined process which cuts the regulatory wait time is also another incentive used. The sixth slide details that 14 Towns in Connecticut currently use inclusionary zoning or similar tools.

- 9 of 14 towns use a density bonus incentive
- 4 of 14 towns have a fee-in-lieu option- fee ranged widely from 50,000 per unit to 300,00 per unit
- unit thresholds for programs ranged from 3-20 units
- inclusionary rates ranged from 5%- 30%
- Some programs require public water and sewer
- Some programs include priority placement for certain residents based on employment type or residency. Most towns are not implementing preferences to avoid any risk of non-compliance with federal fair housing regulations.

The seventh slide outlines the Affordability Program Requirements under consideration: Use regulations of Connecticut State Agencies Section 8-30g-8 to calculate the maximum housing payment for Affordable Dwelling Units, provide an affirmative fair housing marketing plan, identify a person or entity as an Affordable Program Administrator, who shall:

- Annually certify to TPZ the income of households residing in the Affordable housing.
- Maintain a list of eligible households who have applied for the program.
- Annually certify to TPZ that the selected households reside in the Affordable housing lots.
- For rental units, certify to TPZ that the rent does not exceed the affordable maximums.
- For owned units, certify to TPZ that HOA fees do not exceed the affordable maximums.
- Certify that affordable units lots sold do not exceed the maximum affordable purchase price.

The eighth slide lists program variables for consideration. The ninth slide includes the proposed draft revisions. The information in blue reflects the updated revision for the Council's consideration and is included in the packet. The staff proposed draft revisions include a development size threshold of 10 units, 10 percent of units set aside as affordable, applicable zones: Town Center, Town Center Mixed Use, PAD, ARZ, building type will apply to multi-family zoning, the revision applies to rental and it would slightly modify the existing PAD density bonus. The Staff Proposed Draft Revisions document is included in the Council packet. Ms. Caltagirone also included a comparison of Inclusionary Housing Programs in Connecticut. The presentation was concluded.

Chairman Gullotta thanked Ms. Caltagirone for the overview. Mr. Niland noted that the staff recommendation of 10 percent leaves the Town flat and asked for an explanation. Ms. Caltagirone explained that they wanted to start with the lowest rate and see how it performs. She noted that they do not have specific economic analysis and want to start with a conservative approach and lower rate and proceed from there. Ms. Caltagirone noted that they can do a revision after they assess how the program is performing and once they have the economic analysis. She also noted that they can look into other case studies.

Mr. Cavanaugh remarked that the rigorous process has resulted in good projects and noted that he is concerned about the streamlining process and the reduction of discretion. He asked Ms. Caltagirone to explain the downsides. Ms. Caltagirone noted that they are not proposing any



streamlining and it was an example of a tool that other towns and municipalities use. She stated that it is not included in the revised text amendment. Ms. Caltagirone noted that the downside of streamlining is that it is more complicated to manage, could create a staffing challenge, and that problems can come up if affordable projects are always put ahead of the line. She added that reducing the amount of discretion creates a complex endeavor. She remarked that they are not proposing any streamlining. Mr. Cavanaugh noted that \$300,000 per unit was mentioned as an example of a fee-in-lieu payment. He asked for more information on this. Ms. Caltagirone noted that it is a rough estimate and not a flat fee. She explained that the fee is set relative to the household need and added that she does not know how that town arrived at that formula. Ms. Caltagirone noted that she ran some numbers which came out to \$300,000.

Mr. McChesney asked if the light blue changes are what is included in the proposed draft. Ms. Caltagirone replied correct. Mr. McChesney asked if they were modifying the existing PAD density bonus and not expanding it elsewhere. Ms. Caltagirone replied correct. Mr. McChesney asked for the reasoning behind this. Ms. Caltagirone explained that the PAD regulations define affordable housing differently and they have to do a code cleanup to make sure the term is understood correctly in each section of the code. She noted that the modification is a more technical adjustment. Ms. Caltagirone explained that the other modification, which she will also talk about in the special report on Nye Road, is to create another density bonus with a relatively high set aside rate. She explained that it was put in for the Council to consider and added that she will speak more on this during the next presentation. Mr. McChesney wanted to confirm that there is no fee-in-lieu recommendation. Mr. Caltagirone replied correct. Mr. McChesney remarked that the staff recommendation is 10 percent and asked which percentage was mostly used by other towns. Ms. Caltagirone noted that it is a good question and added that she did not run a formal analysis on that. She noted that, glancing at the table, 10 percent is more consistently called out. Ms. Caltagirone explained that she was looking at towns similar to Glastonbury, such as Rocky Hill and Tolland, and not comparing the Town with West Hartford or Hartford. She explained that towns with similar socioeconomic conditions to Glastonbury were closer to 10 percent than 20 percent. Mr. McChesney thanked Ms. Caltagirone for the informative presentation.

Mr. Osgood thanked Ms. Caltagirone for the presentation. He wanted to confirm that program administrators are selected by the property owners. Ms. Caltagirone replied correct and explained that the administrator needs to be identified by the property owner and approved by the commission. She noted that, in cases of turnover, the replacement will be approved by the commission. Mr. Osgood asked about enforcement. Ms. Caltagirone remarked that she was curious about this as well, and noted that she has spoken to administrators from 3 different towns and found no enforcement challenges in this small sample. She explained that one of the challenges is finding out who the program contact is. Ms. Caltagirone explained that the affordable housing program requirements are on the deed and noted that the Town has the power to enforce deed restrictions. She remarked that she is not a lawyer, but that it should provide solid grounds for enforcement. Mr. Osgood wanted to clarify that this would only apply to rental units. Ms. Caltagirone replied correct.

Ms. Wang thanked Ms. Caltagirone for all of the work and research that went into the presentation. Ms. Wang asked why condos are not being considered in the proposal. Ms.

Caltagirone explained that, in the research they conducted, they heard that the condo model is more financially challenging. She remarked that this deserves more research and she will continue to look into this and added that the Town attorneys will work on drafting the deed restrictions. Ms. Caltagirone noted that condos can be looked at in the future and suggested that the code should anticipate a scenario of a mixed development that can include half condos and half rentals.

**(b) Presentation regarding 50-55 Nye Road Proposed Regulatory Paths for Affordable Housing Development – Planned Area Development vs. CGS Section 8-30g – Affordable Housing.**

Mr. Luiz noted that Ms. Caltagirone included questions to the Town attorney in the Council packet.

Ms. Caltagirone put up the site plan on the screen. She explained that the Town and Housing Authority are pursuing an affordable housing development on approximately 12.37 acres at 55 Nye Road. The existing property lines would be adjusted to separate the commercial building at 50 Nye Road from the proposed affordable housing site at 55 Nye Road. The site plans are attached in the Council packet. The project proposes approximately 60-75 rental dwelling units composed of multi-family structures with 80% or more units priced to be affordable to households earning 80% or less of Area Median Income (AMI).

Ms. Caltagirone explained that **Scenario 1: Rezone parcel to Residence A and pursue 8-30g Site Plan approval** would take advantage of existing regulatory flexibility conveyed to affordable housing projects subject to CGS 8-30g. The path allows for an expedited review and does not require amendment of existing development standards. The final approval rests with TPZ. For 8-30g applications, the Commission does not review a proposal for compliance with the building zone regulations; rather it reviews the project to ensure it does not harm public health and safety. The Town would have less regulatory control over the project. The scenario assumes a zoning change to Residence A, as 8-30g cannot be used for development of housing in industrial zones. An approximate timeline for this scenario is 3-4 months of regulatory review.

Ms. Caltagirone explained that **Scenario 2: Rezone parcel to Residence A and pursue amended PAD approval** is a three-step process with some steps potentially overlapping. This scenario would require the Town to amend existing development definitions and standards for Planned Area Development (PAD) in addition to rezoning the parcel to Residence A. The PAD would be amended to:

- Allow rental affordability housing development in addition to owner-occupied affordable housing.
- Allow density of 8 units per buildable acre for affordable housing developments that set aside 80% of units as affordable.
- Amend the affordable housing standards

Final approval with this project rests with the Town Council and includes a more public process. The approximate timeline is 4-5 months. The presentation was concluded. Ms. Caltagirone noted that more detail is provided in the Council packet.

Chairman Gullotta thanked Ms. Caltagirone for the overview. Mr. Osgood noted that the proposed site plan has 10 buildable acres and asked about the total acreage. Ms. Caltagirone replied 12.37 acres and explained that they arrived at the approximate 10 buildable acres by subtracting the conservation area and some steeply sloped areas. Mr. Osgood asked about the Town owned land acreage. Ms. Caltagirone noted that it is close to 9 and explained that attaching the land to the east adds nearly 3 acres. Mr. Osgood explained that the PAD proposal would require the Town to grant more land to Housing authority, which is necessary under 8-30g. Mr. Osgood asked how much land that would require. Ms. Caltagirone replied correct and added that the additional land is around 2.5 acres. She explained that she can find the precise numbers. Mr. Osgood remarked that the regulations require getting to 10 acres. He asked about the parking information for Nye Road. Ms. Caltagirone noted that she does not have that prepared. Mr. Osgood remarked that it is not a problem and asked for the numbers to be provided when available.

Mr. Cavanaugh noted that, for this particular project, the PAD is the way to go because it gives the Council the final authority. He asked Ms. Caltagirone if there was a way to require that such projects are near public water and sewer. Ms. Caltagirone replied yes. Mr. McChesney remarked that he wanted to echo Mr. Cavanaugh's point that the PAD is the way to go. Mr. McChesney explained that 8-30g is used by private developers to circumvent TPZ and the zoning regulations and reiterated his support for the PAD option.

**4. Old Business. None**

**5. New Business**

**(a) Action on amendment to Parks and Recreation Fee Schedule effective July 1, 2023.**

Mr. Luiz noted that Ms. Zerio is here to answer questions and added that in the future the Parks and Recreation fee schedule can be incorporated into the budget process.

Ms. Zerio explained that increases to the budget are due to the minimum wage increase for different positions, such as life guard position, which has to be a competitive wage. She noted that there have been increased costs for materials and supplies as well as outside contractor and vendor fees. Ms. Zerio explained that they set the enrollment projections and, as a group, work to keep the programs affordable. She noted that they offer fee waivers and do not deny any families from participating in programming. Ms. Zerio noted that the changes were approved by the Recreation Committee on May 22<sup>nd</sup>. She stated that the spreadsheet is attached in the Council packet. Ms. Zerio noted that there were decreases in prices for a few categories like tennis, which have been changed to shorter lessons. She explained that the increases pay for the programs and meet the budget expectations. She remarked that she is happy to answer questions.

Ms. LaChance pointed out a typo in the spreadsheet under the basketball adult league category. She noted that a zero is missing from the fee. Ms. Zerio thanked Ms. LaChance for catching that. Mr. Niland thanked Ms. Zerio for the presentation and asked if, going forward, this presentation can be included during the Council budget discussions. Ms. Zerio noted that she spoke to Mr. Luiz about this and added that it will not be a problem. Ms. Carroll wanted to confirm that the numbers would not change if the presentation was done during the Council budget discussions. Ms. Zerio noted that there would be no changes. Ms. Carroll asked if the programs were fully staffed. Ms. Zerio replied yes and added that they have no shortages. She explained that they have over a thousand children participating in different camp programs and have about 300-part time staff. Ms. Zerio remarked that they are fully staffed. Ms. Carroll remarked that it is a testament to the quality of the programs and added that it is the best job for high school kids with many eagerly awaiting to find out if they got a summer position. Mr. Cavanaugh asked about the indoor pickleball locations. Ms. Zerio noted that the locations are Smith Middle School, Buttonball and the Riverfront Community Center. Mr. Cavanaugh asked if there were fees for outdoor pickleball. Ms. Zerio noted that the new courts are expected to be completed in mid-July and added that it is a first-come, first-serve system. She noted that they run clinics for lessons which include a fee.

Mr. Cavanna noted that there are more rangers in the parks and asked if there are any problems. Ms. Zerio explained that they hired 4 more rangers, and have a total of 8. She explained that some are going through the training process and a member of the police is helping with that. Ms. Zerio noted that the rangers are helping with the trash clean up. Chairman Gullotta asked Ms. Zerio to look into recovering some of the costs associated with lighting the courts. He noted that he spoke with Mr. Johnson about this and the electrical bill is significant. Chairman Gullotta asked Ms. Zerio to think about the lighting costs, work with Mr. Luiz, and report back to the Council next year. Ms. Zerio agreed.

***Motion by:*** Mr. Niland

***Seconded by:*** Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves the Parks & Recreation Department Schedule of Fees and Charges – General Fund and Special Revenue Fund, as amended, for fiscal year 2023-2024, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated June 23, 2023 and as recommended by the Recreation Commission and as amended by Ms. LaChance.

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

### **(b) Executive Session**

Chairman Gullotta informed the public that the Council will enter into Executive Session to have discussion and some understanding before taking action on 5(b) which will become 5(c).

***Motion by:*** Mr. Niland

***Seconded by:*** Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby enters into executive session to discuss the purchase of real estate, Nye Road. In attendance will be members of the Town Council and the Town Manager.

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

*The Council went into Executive Session at 8:28 p.m. and came out of Executive Session at 8:56 p.m.*

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

**Motion by:** Mr. Niland

**Seconded by:** Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby authorizes the Town Manager to execute the Revised 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 June 23, 2023.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Niland noted that he would like to amend the motion.

**Motion by:** Mr. Niland

**Seconded by:** Mr. Cavanaugh

Amendment to the motion to include “pending Council approval of a lease agreement with the existing lessees”.

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

**Discussion:**

Chairman Gullotta directed the Council back to the main motion as amended and asked the Town Manager to provide some background. Mr. Luiz summed up that on May 23<sup>rd</sup> the Council approved the third amendment to the purchase and sale agreement, extending the closing date and clarifying the Town acquisition on the property known as 50 Nye Road and 55 Nye Road. Mr. Luiz explained that the third amendment was not fully executed by the Town Manager. He noted that, since that time, further developments occurred, necessitating a revised third amendment, which has been provided in the packet materials. Mr. Luiz explained that he would only sign the Third Amendment after the Council approved lease agreements with two tenants at 55 Nye Road as negotiations with those tenants are ongoing.

Mr. Osgood noted that he will vote against the extension agreement due to language in section 5, which implies that the Town can take the property by eminent domain. Mr. Osgood stated that they did not get the sale contract and added that he does not believe this will be the case. He stated that he will vote against.

**Result:** Motion passes (6-3; Mr. Cavanna, Mr. Osgood, Mr. Cavanaugh voting no).

**(d) Action on proposed amendments to the Building Zone Regulations – Inclusionary Zoning (set public hearing).**

**Motion by:** Mr. Niland

**Seconded by:** Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby schedules a public hearing on proposed amendments to Sections 2, 3, 4, and 6 of the Building Zone Regulations for Inclusionary Zoning for 8 p.m. on Tuesday, July 11, 2023 in the Council Chambers of Town Hall, 2155 Main Street, Glastonbury and/or through Zoom Video Conferencing, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated June 23, 2023.

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

**(e) Action on proposed amendments to the Building Zone Regulations – Forestry Operations (set public hearing).**

**Motion by:** Mr. Niland

**Seconded by:** Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby schedules a public hearing on a proposed text amendment to the Building Zone Regulations regarding Forestry Operations for 8 p.m. on Tuesday, July 11, 2023 in the Council Chambers of Town Hall, 2155 Main Street, Glastonbury and/or through Zoom Video Conferencing, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated June 23, 2023.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Osgood asked the Town Manager to comment on the forestry operations and asked why this is being done. Mr. Luiz noted that Ms. Caltagirone is still on Zoom and can answer the question. Ms. Caltagirone explained that the forestry regulations are currently out of compliance with the State statutes and added that they are not permitted to require special permits for forestry activity. She explained that, in practice, they have not been enforcing this for several years and noted that there were recommendations from TPZ to change this. Ms. Caltagirone noted that she does not believe this matter was discussed before the Council and added that she will provide more information on the State regulations. She noted that she can also provide information on how the wetlands regulations can be amended in the future. Ms. Caltagirone reiterated that the

proposal brings the Town into compliance with the State regulations. Mr. Osgood thanked Ms. Caltagirone for staying on and answering the question.

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

**(f) Discussion to address the public comments and other remarks that appeared on social media**

**Discussion:**

Mr. Niland noted that, before the Council moves on to the consent calendar, he would like to propose adding an agenda item that would allow the Council to discuss the public comments made tonight and address the other remarks that appeared on social media.

**Motion by:** Mr. Niland

**Seconded by:** Ms. LaChance

Adding a discussion item on the agenda to address the public comments and other remarks that appeared on social media.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Osgood asked for the purpose of adding the agenda item. Mr. Niland explained that there was quite a bit of discussion and a lot of language thrown around and suggested addressing this as a Council while they have an opportunity.

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

**Discussion:**

Chairman Gullotta noted that they are now on item 5(f). He asked the Council members to engage in a civil discussion and asked the Council members not to address another Council person and added that he knows the discussions will be civil.

Ms. LaChance noted that she misstated the outcome of a nominee's concern regarding books available through the Epic app. She apologized and explained it was unintentional and based on bad information she received. Ms. LaChance noted that the nominee's social media posts in June of 2022 support the notion that the nominee wanted books removed. Ms. LaChance read out a portion of the nominee's Facebook page dated June 6, 2022. Ms. LaChance read out the last line of the Facebook post: "a few weeks ago it was a pornographic novel we were able to get removed from our high school and plenty more remain." Ms. LaChance noted that this final sentence was removed the day after the Council vote at the last meeting. Ms. LaChance read out other posts written by the nominee. She noted that she stands by her vote.

Mr. Cavanna noted that a resident called in claiming it was inappropriate for him to read out the material at the Council meeting. Mr. Cavanna remarked that he finds this confusing and stated that he does not have a problem with a child reading that material as long as the parent approves. He reiterated that the issue is that parents should be able to decide what their kids can read. Mr. Cavanna noted that Ms. Simon stated that she was not going to ban books and he remarked that he would like to believe her. He noted that something could have been done and brought up a scenario, if Ms. Simon did in fact try to ban books at the public library, the Council can unappoint her from the Library Board. Mr. Cavanna noted that the same caller took an issue about his stance on the woman of the year being a man. He explained that he has sisters, a mother, and noted that someday he would like to have a daughter. Mr. Cavanna noted that he would hate to see his sibling work hard at a sport and have a man ranked at 554th to come in and beat her. Mr. Cavanna noted that this is not right and added that he stands by what he said.

Mr. McChesney noted that he could not hear the caller who said it was inappropriate to read out the material. He noted that Ms. Simon has said that this is not about banning books. Mr. McChesney pointed out that Ms. Simon did not say that, because she did not speak during the public comment. He remarked that Ms. Simon spoke with one Council member and explained that these conversations should be happening in the public. Mr. McChesney noted that he feels bad for the individual who said he was called a fascist. Mr. McChesney stated that comments like this are inappropriate. He explained that, after the Council vote, he was called several names he never thought he would be called: “pervert”, “pedophile”, “groomer”. Mr. McChesney noted that a fellow Council member’s Facebook page still has the inappropriate posts, which include accusing the democratic members of “safeguarding groomers.” He remarked, if the Council member does not know how to remove the page, he can help. Mr. McChesney explained that he found the comments on the Council member’s page to be hurtful and noted that there were comments calling his democratic colleagues “dykes” and other comments that include “shoot these losers” and “riot”. Mr. McChesney noted that the comments also included suggestions for doxxing him at work and accusing him of ethical violations. He noted that he had nothing to do with this and added that his employment is being dragged into it. Mr. McChesney noted that he is not trying to engage in cancel culture of anyone and added that it is appropriate to consider certain past comments when they are directly related to the board a nominee is being considered for. He explained that, if anything is misinterpreted, he would be happy to hear from them and would welcome them to speak. Mr. McChesney noted that the statement that the democrats voted against the postponement is incorrect. He explained that it was bipartisan with a republican voting against the postponement. Mr. McChesney noted that he, a democrat, voted in favor of postponing the vote. He remarked that he has a 4-year-old and a 1.5-year-old and explained that it is wrong for his children to view such hurtful and inappropriate comments directed at their father and reiterated that this is not an appropriate level of discourse.

Mr. Niland stated that he was not at the last meeting because he was supporting his wife. He explained that there is a non-political well-defined process to examine books and, as a result of that process, at least one book was removed from the shelves. Mr. Niland remarked that he trusts the professionals to do their jobs and noted that he fully supports parents who choose not to allow access to certain books they find objectionable. He also noted that he supports parents who choose to ask for a review of a particular book and added that is the reason why the process



is in place. Mr. Niland explained that he does not support taking away access to books and added that he does not support the circus environment in attempt to score political points. He noted that the mission of the library is adding books and not taking away books. Mr. Niland remarked that what compounds the problem is changing a social media post the day after to white wash past statements. He noted that, growing up, he learned about sex from friends, as many kids do, and also from books. Mr. Niland noted that, in his family, they speak to their kids and use books. He remarked that taking the book out of context results in some people calling it pornography. He noted that the books discuss sexual acts and are inclusive and added that parents do not have to give such books to their kids. Mr. Niland noted that one of the Council members spoke about having kids and added that he hopes that he does not have to be in a situation where he has to tell his kids about the threats and name calling. Mr. Niland noted that he was not even at the last meeting. He noted that he had to sit down with his kids and talk to them about the threats and added that the Council members were called “pedophiles”, “groomers”, “perverts”. He noted that he had to explain that there were threats of being shot and added that he had to tell his kids to be vigilant and report anything suspicious. Mr. Niland remarked that, as a parent, it was a sickening moment, and he doubts that his children will ever forget this. He remarked that a Council member’s friend has inflammatory posts with 130,000 followers. Mr. Niland read out some of the posts. Mr. Niland remarked that, as of yesterday, the Council member made a campaign ad out of it. Mr. Niland noted that he is on the Council to give back to the community and work with his colleagues to create the best Glastonbury they can. He remarked that he has remained civil in his tenure and added that Glastonbury deserves no less. Mr. Niland noted that he has no judgement on the candidate, except whether she is fit for the library board. He explained that there are other boards and commissions that are lacking members and remarked that he is sure the nominee would be welcomed to serve the community.

Ms. Carroll noted that civil disagreement is the heart of democracy. She stated that, in Council Chambers and in the community, we all have a voice to protest decisions, support initiatives and elect people who best represent our views. Mr. Carroll noted that she understands the pushback and the support on the Welles Turner Library Board nomination. She remarked that this is the way government and community works and explained that appointments for boards and committees and other decisions are voted by the nine elected Council members. Ms. Carroll noted that the vote on the part of democrats is not as some people asserted, a personal decision, and explained that they do not and should not make appointments based on whether they know or like someone. She noted that the decision was based on the nominee’s public work to remove materials from school libraries. Ms. Carroll noted that she did not say that the nominee requested to remove books and said that the nominee worked to remove materials and pointed out that the nominee’s Facebook post has been edited, which absolutely supports this assertion. Ms. Carroll stated that school libraries have measures in place for parents to refine or restrict what their child has access to and added that it is and should be every parent’s right. She noted that she strongly believes that no parent should restrict what other people’s children have access to in any library, school or public. Ms. Carroll stated that libraries give access to the world at large and the statement that parents can “just buy books for their kids”, as the nominee asserted publicly, undermines the very idea of providing access to all books regardless of income. Ms. Carroll noted that she cannot understand the path of a colleague who promoted himself online on a highly partisan site with national reach, which elicited comments calling the democrat council members “groomers” “pedophiles”, as well as the comment “someone just shoot them”. Ms.

Carroll remarked, imagine calling a stranger a pedophile, the worst kind of criminal, because they disagreed with the decision about a library board appointment, or casually suggesting someone murder them and she added that the Council member has not corrected or condemned the violence, but thanked the commenters for their support. Ms. Carroll noted that she has disagreed with republican and democratic colleagues over countless issues and has never enlisted the help of a slanderous, threatening online mob and added that she will not condone any disgusting and untruthful name calling directed at one of her colleagues. She noted that the Council member engaged with the platform adding new content just yesterday, while her colleagues worked to ensure that their families are safe. Ms. Carroll stated that in no universe is a threatening response acceptable. She remarked that they should lead with civility.

Mr. Cavanna remarked that anyone who understands Facebook knows that they cannot control the comments and added that he has not taken the time to read through the thousands of comments. Mr. Cavanna noted that comments about murdering and shooting should be investigated by the police and, if a crime was committed, the police can make an arrest. He remarked that the comments are the result of the scourge of social media.

Ms. Wang noted that the Council member has unleashed a scourge of social media on his democratic colleagues in response to a difficult decision he did not agree with. Ms. Wang noted that they voted their conscience with the full understanding of the local and political consequences. She remarked that the Council member is provoking widespread ire and anger and added that she does not feel safe. Ms. Wang noted that she did not make any comments at the last meeting because she did not have anything else to add. Ms. Wang stated that June is Pride month, a celebration of LGBTQ culture and embracing the community's dignity and humanity. She remarked that, every day and every month of the year, we must strive to make sure Glastonbury is welcoming to all, regardless of sexual orientation and identity. Ms. Wang stated that she stands with the LGBTQ community and added that they are welcome here and belong here. She noted that she sees their struggle to be accepted by family and community, and sees the vocal objections by neighbors and politicians to ban LGBTQ books. Ms. Wang noted that she has seen people cherry picking excerpts in books while ignoring the major themes which are about acceptance and representation. She remarked that she has seen one elected official, in a video posted on a homophobic and transphobic page, thanking the commenters, many of whom have no connection to Glastonbury. Ms. Wang noted that claims were made that this was all about protecting children and she noted that, in her opinion, it is harming the community, especially the LGBTQ youth. She explained that these posts are making her colleagues and neighbors terrified. Ms. Wang remarked that her voice is trembling and added that there is fear that someone will become a target. She stated that the LGBTQ community deserves love, acceptance and support and added that they deserve to have access to books where they can see themselves represented, have access to information on sexuality and gender identity, because not all parents are accepting. Ms. Wang remarked that there is no doubt there is a wide range of parenting styles and added that no one is taking away a parent's choice. She stated that she affirms the rights and dignity of LGBTQ individuals in the community and stated that supportive parents, schools and community are critical to help children be healthy and happy. Ms. Wang remarked that it is clearly a divisive topic and noted that they must be focused on finding a way forward as a community to protect all children.

Mr. Osgood explained that the motion to add the agenda item was to address the issues raised in the public comment. He remarked that it is fortunate that he spends very little time on social media. Mr. Osgood stated that more than one speaker noted the value of diverse opinions on Town boards, and agreed with this.

Mr. Cavanna stated that he would like to point out two things. He noted that the resident that called in had issues with the book that he read from, calling it inappropriate. Mr. Cavanna remarked that he is interested to know which book Ms. Simon complained about and was removed. He explained that he does not have an issue with parents reading books to their kids and noted that he does not want kids to have access to books parents feel are inappropriate for their children. Mr. Cavanna stated that he will get a copy of the removed book and added that he looks forward to reading it in the Council. Mr. Cavanna questioned the statement that called the vote a difficult decision and added that they knew about it in advance.

## **6. Consent Calendar**

### **(a) Action to approve investment pools – Town Funds.**

**Motion by:** Mr. Niland

**Seconded by:** Mr. Cavanaugh

“BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves the State of CT Short-Term Investment Fund (STIF), Northern Capital Investments, and LPL Financial for the deposit and investment of Town funds, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated June 23, 2023 and as recommended by the Board of Finance.”

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

## **7. Town Manager’s Report.**

Mr. Luiz provided an update on the Elderly Homeowners Tax Credit. He noted that the Assessor’s office handled over 410 applications of the State and Local Option programs for the elderly homeowners. The income limit for the State program was \$49,100 while the income limit for Glastonbury’s Local program was \$64,090. Mr. Luiz explained that those who qualify for the elderly state tax credit automatically qualify for the local tax credit. A chart detailing the tax credit benefits was provided in the packet. Mr. Luiz noted that the Town also gave a residency bonus tax credit of \$100 to 258 applicants that qualified for the local program and have been residents for at least 20 years, resulting in a cost of \$25,059. Mr. Luiz explained that the State no longer provides any grant funding to the Town for implementing the State Program which costs the taxpayers a total of \$598,707.78. Mr. Luiz noted that the cost will be spread out and will be reflected in the mill rate.

Mr. Luiz noted that the July edition of the “Glastonbury At a Glance” newsletter was included in the packet.

Mr. Luiz provided an update on Glastonbury's Triple A bond rating. He explained that the Town's Triple A rating was affirmed by Moody's (Aaa) as well as S&P Global Ratings (AAA). Mr. Luiz noted that these are the highest ratings available. Mr. Luiz noted that Moody's report referenced the Town's "robust reserves and liquidity supported by stable property tax revenues." A copy of the report was included in the Council packet.

Mr. Luiz provided updates on the recent bond sale. He noted that the Town experienced excellent results from a recent \$2.155 million bond sale. Mr. Luiz explained that the debt issuance supports the purchase of four properties: 95 acres on Dayton Road, nearly 30 acres on Overlook Road, 11.3 acres on Wood Pond Road, and just under 23.2 acres on Matson Hill Road (Rose's Berry Farm.) Mr. Luiz noted that nine bidders participated in the bid, with Fidelity Capital Markets submitting the winning bid. The overall interest rate bid or "True Interest Cost" on the bonds, ranged from a winning bid of 2.74% to a high bid of 2.91%. Mr. Luiz noted that the settlement date for the sale is June 29<sup>th</sup>, after which the funds become available to the Town.

Mr. Luiz provided an update on the preservation of the Cotton Hollow Mill walls. He explained that the Town is in the process of receiving three proposals from structural engineers with relevant historic preservation experience. Mr. Luiz noted that they received one proposal and added that the turnaround time is in August. He explained that the homeowner is building new home and wants the grass planted by August.

Mr. Luiz noted that attached in the Council packet is the Connecticut Council of Small Town's 2023 Legislative Wrap-Up. The written report provides municipal officials with information on new state laws affecting municipalities. Mr. Luiz explained outlined that the report is compiled from public act summaries and reports prepared by the Office of Legislative Research and the Office of Fiscal Analysis.

Mr. Luiz provided an update on the Parks & Recreation Department programming. The highlights include:

- Splashpad opened on Memorial Day weekend (free of charge until the pool opened on 6/12/23).
- Summer Men's Basketball League began 6/4/23. There are 120 participants across 12 teams.
- The Gymnastics Club hosted the 2023 Northeast Regional Gymnastic Championship at Glastonbury High School on 5/20/23 and 5/21/23, with over 800 gymnasts competing.
- Riverfront Music Series commenced on Wednesday, 6/21/23.
- Starting in July, the skatepark will be open 7 days a week.
- Farm Fresh Kids Camp (a collaboration with Wind Hill Farm) began 6/19/23 with maximum enrollment reached for all sessions.
- 94 people signed up for spring and summer pickleball lessons.
- 175 are participating in tennis lessons.
- 744 children are registered for swimming lessons (not including camp lessons.)
- Swim Team Programs feature 107 participants.

- 523 pool passes have been sold as of 6/22/23.

Mr. Luiz noted that several Town employees were recently given outstanding achievement awards in recognition of their service to the Town. The award recipients were Jeanne Theleen (Youth and Family Services); Police Sgt. Brandon Ritchie; Kristen Smith (Library); Tonia Branson (Library); and Dave Burr (WPC). The recognition award letters are attached in the Council packet.

Mr. McChesney noted that he appreciates the work Ms. Zerio has done and added that his family is one of the 523 people who bought a pool pass. Mr. Cavanaugh asked about the status of the Cotton Hollow Mills fundraising. Mr. Luiz noted that he will look into it. Mr. Cavanna asked Mr. Luiz to discuss the bids and asked about some of the methods to save Cotton Hollow. Mr. Luiz noted that he has been on site with Town staff and the homeowner and has met with the contractor. He noted that it was determined that the walls were unsafe, the concern is that some of the masonry could fall. Mr. Luiz noted that they discussed bringing down upper portions of the wall and decided to enlist a professional structural engineer to evaluate the site. Mr. Luiz explained that the Town Engineer reached out to contractors who have done extensive historic preservation work. Mr. Luiz noted that they received a list of names, reached out to them, asked them to submit a proposal. He noted that the scope of the work was put together by the Town Engineer. Mr. Cavanna suggested looking into backfilling and anchoring, which would allow the façade to stay up.

## **8. Committee Reports.**

**(a) Chairman's Report.** None

**(b) MDC**

Ms. LaChance remarked that there is not much to report. She noted that there has been some flooding in Hartford and added that the Governor allocated some money. Ms. LaChance remarked that there is nothing to report on Glastonbury.

**(c) CRCOG.** None

**9. Communications.** None

**10. Minutes.**

**(a) Minutes of June 13, 2023 Regular Meeting.**

**Motion by:** Mr. Niland

**Seconded by:** Mr. Cavanaugh

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

**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.**

*(The Council went into Executive Session at 8:28 p.m. and came out of Executive Session at 8:56 p.m.)*

The meeting adjourned at 9:48 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

*Nadya Yuskaev*

Nadya Yuskaev

Recording Secretary

Thomas Gullotta

Chairman