

**GLASTONBURY TOWN COUNCIL  
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES  
TUESDAY, JULY 25, 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 {participated via Zoom video conferencing}

Mr. Kurt P. Cavanaugh

Mr. John Cavanna

Ms. Mary LaChance

Mr. Jacob McChesney

Mr. Whit Osgood

Ms. Jennifer Wang {participated via Zoom video conferencing}

**a. Pledge of Allegiance.           *Led by Don Longtin***

**2. Public Comment.**

***Chris Ackerman of 581 Thompson Street***, stated that his home was burglarized with his 15-year-old child inside. Other homes in his neighborhood have been burglarized, as well. The response from the police has been inadequate. He called on the Council to work together and not play political games because he and his neighbors do not feel safe. He would like the police to patrol his street.

***Don Longtin of 1579 Manchester Road and Brian Suriner of 19 Cranesbill Drive***, spoke together. Mr. Longtin explained that the light fixtures which were installed on Ross Baseball Field thirty years ago have been decaying. The Glastonbury Little League and Amateur Baseball have fundraised enough to replace the lamps with LED bulbs, but need permission from the Town to do so. They also seek to dedicate the field to veterans in military, police, and firefighters with a monument, and to rename the field “Heroes Field.”

***Bethanne Dufford Couture of 593 Tryon Street***, presented the petition results with information on paving Dug Road and linking it to the existing storm drainage. The runoff with these recent rains have caused large wash offs on farms, in addition to the damage on the sides of Dug Road. She hopes that the conversation can be reopened to do the paving and the drainage hookups because the floods were devastating. Pictures do not do justice to the damage to the farms. She asked to support local farmers.

*Anne Bowman of 62 Morgan Drive*, noted that the new pickleball courts opened at the RCC last week, but the Welles Park playground still has old equipment. She has asked the Town to acquire new playground equipment for the past two years. In December 2021, she received an email from staff that a spring 2024 installation of equipment is likely. She asked why it is taking so long for the playground at Welles Park to be updated.

*Charles House of 271 Tryon Street*, spoke on the drainage problem. The Town has already invested millions of dollars to bring the pipe up to the river but has not finished the project. This time, it was just the runoff from Dug Road. Next time, it will come into people's yards and houses.

Public comment made via Zoom:

*Heather Collins of 154 Conestoga Way*, had made an ADA request for closed captioning and she appreciates being able to watch this meeting with it. She thanked Town staff for being responsive and asked to add a link on the agendas noting the closed captioning option.

**3. Special Reports.     None**

**4. Old Business.**

**a. Action on Ground Lease Agreement with the Housing Authority of the Town of Glastonbury – 55 Nye Road. (Tabled from July 11, 2023 Council Meeting).**

Mr. Luiz explained the purpose of this ground lease agreement, which clarifies that the Town will act as the landlord and will take care of the property. They have also taken care of any issues that existed in the past, in terms of tenants who had the option to extend their tenancies. Those rights have been extinguished.

Mr. Osgood asked what the cost is to maintain the building. Mr. Luiz does not yet know. He has asked the sellers to provide him with information so that he can use some projections. Mr. Osgood is against this without that information. It looks like the Town will have a negative operating cost if they sign this ground lease. Mr. Cavanaugh asked when the ground lease will become effective. Mr. Luiz stated that the commencement date takes place upon the actual purchase of the property, which would be August 3. The target is no later than August 8. Mr. Cavanaugh is trying to understand how they can authorize a ground lease before they own a property and if it is effective at the close of the property.

Mr. Luiz explained that the income from both buildings will go into the Special Revenue Fund. He noted that the commencement date is blank because they were not sure what it would be. However, he advised the Council that he would not sign the MOU and Ground Lease until the time of the closing. The MOU is contingent upon the pending transaction, in terms of the sale of land from the Town to the Glastonbury Housing Authority. Mr. Osgood pointed out that the Town will not own this building. The GHA will own it and the Town will subsidize it for a year, so they need to know what it will cost to maintain the building.

**Motion by:** Mr. McChesney

**Seconded by:** Mr. Niland

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby tables action until the August 1, 2023 meeting.

**Result:** Motion to table was approved {8-1-0}, with Ms. Carroll voting against.

**b. Action on Memorandum of Understanding with the Housing Authority of the Town of Glastonbury – 55 Nye Road. Tabled**

**5. New Business.**

**a. Action to establish Special Revenue Fund – Nye Road.**

**Motion by:** Mr. Niland

**Seconded by:** Mr. Cavanaugh

*BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves establishing a Special Revenue Fund for the 50-55 Nye Road project, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated July 21, 2023 and as recommended by the Board of Finance.*

**Discussion:** Mr. Luiz stated that the BOF unanimously voted in favor of the recommendation to establish a special revenue fund for Nye Road. This would be used to collect the rent payments made from the current tenants and to cover operating expenses related to the facility.

Mr. Cavanaugh noted that when this was presented to the BOF, they referred to it as a deficit. Mr. Luiz explained that the BOF also expressed concern about running this into a deficit. The fund will be better off not making the approximately \$100,000 payment to Solinsky Eye Care. Mr. Cavanaugh remarked that the \$500,000 from the GHA was supposed to offset the over \$3 million that the Town paid for the property. It seems like everything changes in this transaction. He is uncomfortable with the \$500,000 being reduced by \$103,000. He noted that the previous Town Manager informed the Council that the \$500,000 could go back to the ARPA fund.

Mr. Osgood asked if the GHA will increase its contribution from \$500,000 to \$603,000. Mr. Luiz replied no. The discussions he has had with the GHA's Executive Director is for \$500,000. The Town has an obligation to make the payment to Solinsky Eye Care, and Mr. Luiz does not recommend making it from the special revenue fund. He is not aware of the \$500,000 contribution from the GHA being made for land or anything in particular. He thought that it was just a contribution, so it is up to the Town to rationalize how to spend the contribution.

Mr. Osgood stated that, with the reduction of this purchase price, the Town will come up with \$3.15 million. The GHA share should be \$1 million. Now, their contribution will be only \$400,000 to the purchase price and \$100,000 to the special revenue fund. Mr. Luiz clarified that he is not proposing that any payment be made to the special revenue fund. The payment from the GHA would go directly from the GHA to Solinsky Eye Care.

Ms. Carroll commented that this action is primarily to close out that portion of the Town's agreement with that particular tenant. She supports closing out that portion of their obligation now. Mr. Niland agreed. He also clarified that the Town is not buying two buildings. They are

buying highly sought after property and doing a service to the Town because this will become a model for affordable housing in the state. Ms. LaChance noted that other developers sought to put a CGS Section 8-30g on these properties, one of whom is constructing an 80-unit development in South Windsor. The idea that the GHA is not contributing as much is untrue. Mr. Cavanaugh agreed that it is not just land, but an asset that will need to be updated. There are more expenses to this than what is presented currently. Mr. Gullotta noted that the GHA is giving the Town \$500,000. The Council can choose how to use that money. The Town Manager recommends that \$100,000 of it be used to pay off a debt of the Town's, which is a reasonable action.

Mr. McChesney finds it disrespectful to suggest that the GHA is paying very little for this. They are taking on the cost to develop this project, not the Town. At the onset, the Council voted to use ARPA funds to purchase this. What they are discussing now is how best to use the \$500,000 that the GHA has since offered to pay off various things to bring this project to the next step. Mr. Osgood clarified that they are not talking about the landlocked parcel. The \$500,000 is just for the building that is not landlocked.

Mr. Osgood pointed out that for the Town to maintain the existing building, they are required to build a parking lot. He asked if there is an estimate of that cost and how many spaces it will hold. Mr. Luiz explained that the space total is 109 for construction. Town Engineering is working on the estimate, which they will hopefully bring before the Council at their next meeting. Mr. Luiz suggests applying for a STEAP grant to fund that parking lot. Mr. Osgood asked if the grant is not obtained, would that money come out of the special revenue fund. Mr. Luiz suggests using either available ARPA funds or a capital fund, not the special revenue fund. Mr. Osgood would also like to know if they could use ARPA funds to pay for revenue loss.

**Result:** Motion passed {5-3-1}, with Mr. Cavanna, Mr. Osgood, and Mr. Cavanaugh voting against. Ms. Wang abstained because she was not a part of the full discussion, due to Zoom issues.

**6. Consent Calendar.**  
**a. Action to schedule Joint Town Council/Town Plan and Zoning Commission Preliminary Hearing – Nye Road PAD.**

**Motion by:** Mr. Niland **Seconded by:** Mr. Cavanaugh

*BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby schedules a Joint Council/Town Plan & Zoning Commission public hearing on the Preliminary Development Application by the Glastonbury Housing Authority for a change of zone at 55 Nye Road from Planned Employment to Residence A and Planned Area Development, as described in the Application dated July 14, 2023 for 8:00 p.m. on Tuesday, August 1, 2023 in the Council Chambers of Town Hall, 2155 Main Street, and/or through Zoom Video Conferencing, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated July 21, 2023.*

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

## **PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

### **NO 1: ACTION ON PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO SECTIONS 2, 3, 4, AND 6 OF THE BUILDING ZONE REGULATIONS FOR INCLUSIONARY ZONING. (CONTINUED FROM JULY 11, 2023 COUNCIL MEETING).**

Ms. Caltagirone explained that the only change she made from the text amendment presented at the last hearing was the definition of affordable dwelling unit, from 40 years to in perpetuity. She reviewed the issues to consider, regarding calculation of unit fractions to be affordable and calculating density bonuses. She prepared two alternative motions for the Council to consider.

Mr. Gullotta opened the floor for public comments:

*Anne Bowman of 62 Morgan Drive*, supports increasing affordable housing in Glastonbury. She views inclusionary zoning, defining affordable as deed restricted in perpetuity, rounding up, and density bonuses as great tools to do this. Together, they will do more to increase affordable housing.

*DJ McBride of 263 Spring Street Extension*, is proud of the professionals who work for this town.

*Robert Hale of 832 Hopewell Road*, is generally opposed to increasing density in the town center. He is also generally opposed to putting deed restrictions in perpetuity for affordable units because it disincentivizes people from maintaining their property. Reducing setback lines is a bad idea because Glastonbury already feels claustrophobic. They need space in the center along the street lines.

Comments made via Zoom:

*Heather Collins of 152 Conestoga Way*, moved to town in 2009 and bought a complex in Surrey Hill. She supports expanding affordable housing in Glastonbury.

*Pam Lockard of 10 Southgate Drive*, noted that Mr. Hale was referring to a deed restricted purchase. She asked to clarify that rental is all the Council is discussing now because, otherwise, she agrees with Mr. Hale. She is against deed restricted ownership but supports anything to increase rental housing.

Ms. Caltagirone clarified that the mechanism the Town uses to enforce an affordability program is a deed restriction. It would go with a whole rental property. It is not a deed restriction on an individual condominium unit, but to the landlord. Mr. Cavanaugh asked, if it goes to the apartment complex, does a unit have to be specified in that complex. Ms. Caltagirone stated that they could write a deed restriction which allows a landlord to move affordable units around. Mr. Cavanaugh would like to know which Residence A zone areas would be susceptible to a project like this with both water and sewer. Ms. Caltagirone has created that map in the past. She will

provide that information. Mr. Cavanaugh asked if the annual income of households residing in affordable lots are submitted to the TPZ or the Community and Development office, does that become public information. Ms. Caltagirone would have to consult with the Town Attorneys on the privacy rules.

Ms. Carroll would like to propose alternative motion #1 that involves rounding up their fractional units and makes units affordable in perpetuity but does not include the density bonus piece because she still does not understand density bonuses. Regarding reducing open space and setbacks, they need to figure out what other possibilities are out there. Mr. Osgood also thinks it makes sense to go with this option because this is a new concept for the town, so he would like to keep it as simple as possible and see how it works. He also suggests reverting the language back to affordability for 40 years, to not discourage multifamily development in town.

**Motion by:** Mr. Niland

**Seconded by:** Mr. Cavanaugh

*BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves proposed amendments to Sections 2, 3, 4, and 6 of the Building Zone Regulations for Inclusionary Zoning, as described in a report by Community Development dated July 21, 2023 and as recommended by the Town Plan and Zoning Commission, with said amendments effective August 7, 2023.*

*BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves proposed amendments to Sections 2, 3, 4, and 6 of the Building Zone Regulations for Inclusionary Zoning, as described in a report by Community Development dated July 21, 2023 and as recommended by the Town Plan and Zoning Commission, with said amendments effective August 7, 2023 and with the following modified text:*

*Section 6.12.2 regarding fractions of a unit should read “In calculating the number of required Affordable Dwelling Units, all fractions shall be rounded up to the nearest whole number.*

**Discussion:** Mr. McChesney stated that this is the cautious approach. He favors the language of in perpetuity because if they do not have that requirement, then they are setting themselves up for a nasty situation in 40 years. CGS Section 8-30g is out there, and the Town is already under water. Without this 10% requirement, the Town will just get more and more under water. He agrees with the issue of density bonuses. Mr. Osgood asked how they are handling changes to the PAD regulations. Ms. Caltagirone explained that the PAD regulations would be changed to add an additional density bonus for projects setting aside 80% of their units as affordable. The density bonus would allow for 10 units per acre as opposed to 3 units per acre. She summarized that there would be two different density bonuses: one for projects with a 20% set aside and another for projects with an 80% set aside. Mr. Gullotta stated that they knew this change was coming, so it should not be a surprise to anybody who sat in executive sessions.

**Motion by:** Mr. Osgood

**Seconded by:** Mr. Cavanaugh

To change the definition of affordability from perpetuity to 40 years.

**Discussion:** Mr. Osgood explained that perpetuity could create problems for people who want to build multi-family developments in town. Mr. Cavanna thought the purpose of this was to help build generational wealth for families. Mr. Gullotta noted, not for this. This matter is only for rental housing. Ms. Wang understands the rationale for changing it to 40 years. However, she wants developers to be thinking long term. The GHA is faced with the challenge of how to update and upgrade Welles Village which is an aging property. Changing it to perpetuity will set up the expectation for developers to plan for that long-term maintenance.

Ms. Caltagirone noted that the Town's definition of ADUs is silent on whether it is sold or rented. An affordable unit could be condominium or a rental, but the inclusionary requirement would only apply to rental projects. Mr. Gullotta asked, if an apartment complex decides to become a condominium complex, then the affordable unit there would have to either stay an apartment in a condominium complex or become an affordable condominium. Ms. Caltagirone stated that is correct. Mr. Osgood noted that if the apartment unit is affordable in perpetuity, then that would mean that it would have to stay a rental unit. Mr. Gullotta read in the newspaper that, in the next year or two, approximately 5,000 affordable units will become market rate. Therefore, if the Town is serious about increasing affordable housing, then they have to state that a built affordable unit will stay affordable.

**Result of amendment:** Amendment failed {3-6-0}, with Mr. Cavanna, Mr. Cavanaugh, and Mr. Osgood voting for.

**Discussion on main motion:** Mr. Cavanaugh is unable to vote on this motion until he receives answers to the questions he has asked tonight. Mr. McChesney stated that they are not discussing the density bonus tonight. Mr. Cavanaugh explained that PADs are in Residence A zone. Mr. Gullotta stated that, specifically, the 80% density bonus for PADs would be a GHA proposal. He does not know any private developer who would propose affordable housing at 80%. Ms. Caltagirone pointed out that a request for a PAD is not as of right for a developer. She assured the Council that they would have discretion to deny that project, as described in the PAD regulations.

Ms. Wang also would like to know the way that the density bonus is written in other towns. She is uncomfortable with passing an inclusionary zoning ordinance at 10% set aside with a minimum of 10 units and waiting for a future date to discuss the density bonus because those things need to be considered hand in hand. She has looked at the literature extensively and one of the biggest highlights is that the regulation needs to be clearly defined so that it lays out the groundwork for developers to plan and build. This is in everyone's interest. Mr. Cavanaugh's questions would have provided more information to consider. She also finds it important to have some incentive structure for the success of the program, so throwing it out completely is inappropriate.

Mr. Osgood does not find any rush to vote on this. He suggested continuing the public hearing. Mr. Luiz noted that they could add a density bonus later. Ms. Carroll would like to vote this evening. Mr. Osgood stated that the issue is not the density bonus but the language included in the proposal which would give the ability for a 3.5-acre PAD with 10 units per acre in any

Residence A zone with sewer and water a density bonus of 80%. Mr. Cavanaugh has requested to know which areas those would apply to before voting, which he agrees with. Mr. Cavanaugh stated that the Town Center Mixed Use zone is of concern to him. Ms. Caltagirone found the zoning map which identifies all the areas with public water and sewer.

The Council recessed for five minutes, resuming at 9:05 P.M.

Ms. Caltagirone reviewed the map of multifamily development comparison. Most of the northwest corner of town is served by public water and sewer. A developer could either request this proposed density bonus in these areas or propose a rezoning of any zoning district to Residence A, within the marked areas, and request that the Council put in a PAD in those areas. Ms. Carroll asked if the Council always has a right of refusal. Ms. Caltagirone replied yes, a PAD is not as of right, but the Council has discretion to deny that zoning change. Ms. Carroll noted that any developer could come in with an 8-30g, so she would like to move forward on this tonight.

Mr. Osgood asked Mr. Cavanaugh if he is comfortable with the responses he has received. Mr. Cavanaugh asked three questions which he had sent over to the Town Manager before this meeting. Two are still outstanding: in the TCMU (Town Center Mixed Use) zones, which lots were referred to in Ms. Caltagirone’s memorandum are affected or could be affected, and would the annual income of households residing in affordable lots submitted to the Town enter the public record or not. Ms. LaChance asked if the TCMU zone is included in anything they are talking about now. Ms. Caltagirone clarified that the density bonus is not part of option 1, but the inclusionary zoning program would still apply in TCMU, regardless of whether a density bonus is considered.

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

**NO 2: ACTION ON PROPOSED SALE OF TOWN-OWNED LAND AT 277 WESTERN BOULEVARD, A PORTION OF ASSESSOR’S PARCEL W0003, TOTALING 4.16± ACRES.**

Mr. Gullotta noted that because they are increasing land going to the GHA from what was originally contained in the public hearing announced tonight, they will not proceed with this tonight. Instead, they will schedule a new public hearing next week. Mr. Luiz explained that the public hearing scheduled tonight was to discuss 4.16 acres to the parcel at Nye Road, creating a larger parcel of 8.75 acres. Having subsequent conversations with Town Staff and the leadership team of agenda setting, their recommendation is to vote to hold a public hearing to increase the size so that the total acreage would be 11.31 acres for the new combined parcel.

Ms. Caltagirone explained that, earlier tonight, the Council voted on inclusionary zoning regulations. They include a density bonus in PADs, which the affordable project that the GHA is proposing could qualify for. Therefore, they could propose a PAD unit in which they would get 10 units per buildable acre. The Council has a decision to either approve the sale of a larger lot that would equal 11.31 acres or to move forward with the idea of selling the lot of 8.75 acres.



That 8.75 acre lot would still allow the GHA to develop approximately 70 units with the density bonus they approved tonight.

Mr. Osgood inquired why would the Council give any more land to the GHA than they need to. Mr. Luiz clarified that they do not need to add the additional 2.56 acres, but that is up to the Council to decide. Mr. Gullotta stated that he and Mr. Cavanaugh felt that a 10-acre PAD proposal for this particular parcel of land and project was appropriate. Many see this as being an example of what affordable housing could look like. That is why they are interested in going for a larger parcel. He is confident that the GHA would be creative in how to create a housing opportunity that is needed. Mr. Osgood asked if they decide to reduce the acreage at the public hearing next week, that would not preclude them from taking action. Mr. Luiz stated that is correct.

**Motion by:** Mr. Niland

**Seconded by:** Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby tables action until the August 1, 2023 meeting.

**Result:** Motion to table passed unanimously {9-0-0}.

**NO 3: ACTION ON PROPOSED NEW SIDEWALK CONSTRUCTION ON BELL STREET BETWEEN BELLRIDGE ROAD AND GIDEON LANE AND AT THE CORNER OF BELL STREET AND HEBRON AVENUE.**

Town Engineer Dan Pennington explained the proposal to construct new sidewalks on Bell Street, which is a relatively busy road. Sight lines are difficult, the curvature of the roadway is dangerous, and the paved width is narrow. All those issues combined make this a good candidate for new sidewalk construction. A \$600,000 state connectivity grant has been received. Mr. Pennington showed a map excerpt of the bicycle master plan. In total, the sidewalks on Bell Street are complementary and supplementary to the vision of having a safe pedestrian corridor as an alternative to Hebron Avenue.

He reviewed the crosswalk proposed at the intersection of Gideon Lane and the two proposed sidewalks as a continuation of the sidewalks on the west side of Bell Street. The Bayberry Road intersection is not a safe place to install a crossing point, but there is a short section of sidewalk on the east side to get people from Bayberry Road to cross. Constructing on both sides of the road will result in roughly 19 trees being removed. However, if they were to construct all on the east side, then 48 trees would need to be removed. In several areas, they would have to build another four retaining walls on the east side. Mr. Pennington noted that at least some of the work could be done this construction season and finished in the spring.

Mr. Gullotta opened the floor for public comment:

**Tom O'Keefe of 361 Bell Street** stated that it is the Town's responsibility to clear snow from the sidewalks. The state grant is governed by the ADA, so this project has to be ADA designed.

Property owners dislike being told that their sidewalks must be clear of snow. Accessibility requires snow removal.

**Scott Starr of 325 Bell Street**, has safety concerns about the trees which already hang out over the road. He has spoken with the Tree Warden about dangerous trees and they were removed. It is a challenge to get anybody across Bell Street. The proposal to have people to cross up there is where drivers go the fastest, and the other side of Somerset Road is a death trap. In the Rural Residence Zone, sidewalks seem like an oxymoron. There are no sidewalks on Somerset Street, so the sidewalks will connect to nothing. If they were installed all on the same side of Bell Street, then the sidewalks may be able to connect to something. He asked why they are not putting access to the sidewalks where the people are.

**Brad Spencer of 520 Bell Street**, likes the plan. His only concern was that installing on the west side would yield a pitch of a grade. Installing on the east side would lead to more tree removal, but the sidewalk would be more level.

Ms. Carroll read the written comments:

**Claire Conroy of 458 Bell Street**, strongly favors the proposed sidewalks. Bell Street is a long, twisting road where there have been many accidents due to people speeding. It does not feel safe to have young children taking walks on the parts of the road that do not have sidewalks. A number of new homes were added in the last year (with more to come). They would also benefit from this.

**Jeffrey Stein of 142 Olde Stage Road**, believes that the proposed sidewalk and crosswalk plan provides an important biking and walking route for residents of the Bell Street neighborhood, creating safe links to both Hebron Avenue School and the multi-use path to Smith Middle School. He urged the Council to approve the plan. The Town's Bicycle Master Plan envisions a connection between the cul-de-sac of Harvest Lane and Bell Street as the last link in the east-west route. The area sidewalk map shows a requested sidewalk extension from Harvest Lane to Shagbark Road. He asked the Council's support for Town Staff to investigate these possibilities.

**David Liscinsky of 100 Bellridge Road**, favors the proposed sidewalk extension. As a longtime resident living near this project, Bell Street is a hazard and unfair to drivers and walkers. The new sidewalk along the Stallion Ridge development at the top of Bell Street hill is a wonderful addition. Extending that sidewalk and connecting the lower existing sidewalk will enable safe passage all the way to Hebron Avenue and connect all the neighborhoods along Bell Street. This project complements the Town's vision of Open Space, enables exercise, less car traffic and pollution, and promotes neighbor interaction.

Comments made via Zoom:

**Laura Wildman of 20 Bayberry Road**, lives only ten houses away from the multi-use trail and strongly favors these sidewalks. People drive fast in that blind corner right before Bayberry Road. As a civil engineer, she likes the layout. She agrees that a sidewalk on Bayberry Road

would be crazy, but shifting it to Somerset Road and creating a parallel sidewalk there is safer. She applauds the Town for trying to connect residents to the multi-use trail.

**Heather Collins of 154 Conestoga Way**, does not understand why the developer of the McMansion community has not committed to cleaning the snow. The Council should reprimand them.

Mr. Pennington responded to the comments that were made:

- Mr. O’Keefe’s contention that the Town is responsible for the snow removal because they receive a state grant is untrue. At no time did the state indicate that the Town is responsible for the snow removal, so they have abided by the Town Ordinance which requires snow removal by the abutting property owner.
- Regarding Mr. Starr’s comments on the crossing points, Mr. Pennington explained that all the crossing points shown on the plan were vetted by the Police Department. He was unaware of a widespread concern of the health of the trees on Bell Street, but the Tree Warden can take a look at unhealthy trees.
- On Mr. Spencer’s concerns, Mr. Pennington has been working on this issue for a while. However, he noted that Mr. Spencer’s property does not front the area they are looking at tonight. It fronts the area that is contiguous with the Stallion Ridge subdivision.
- Ms. Collins’ comments regarding general sidewalk clearing are correct. The Town Ordinance requires abutting property owners to remove snow. If they are not in compliance, then town residents can notify the police department, who will approach the owner about their obligations.

Ms. LaChance likes the plan because it is a dangerous situation right now. Ms. Wang noted that the existing street lights provide visibility for the dark hours but she is concerned about all hours. She also asked if any traffic calming measures could be added, specifically right before those crossings. Mr. Pennington noted that the police department has looked at it, so these are not arbitrary locations for people to cross. He cautioned against the potential unintended consequences of traffic calming measures, which is a bigger issue than just this location and needs to involve the police department.

Mr. Cavanaugh asked if the traffic unit conducted any speed counts. Mr. Pennington replied no, not recently. Mr. Cavanaugh asked if Clove Hill Road was ever proposed to be connected to Bell Street. Mr. Pennington stated that there are no plans to do that in the near future. Mr. Osgood asked if it is possible to put crosswalks so that it flashes. Mr. Pennington replied yes, RRFBs could be installed, but it is expensive. The overall cost of the project is about \$1 million. They have received \$600,000 from the state connectivity grant, and the remaining balance will come from the capital program. That sort of installation would be on the Town’s dime.

**Tracey Worthington of 499 Bell Street**, is the fifth generation living on Bell Street. The traffic numbers say that the average car goes 33 mph on Bell Street, which is false. She has petitioned and called the police department to complain about the street, which has become a raceway. Hillstown Road has a bunch of triangles and flashing beams, which is an expense but worth it for safety.

**Brad Spencer of 520 Bell Street**, stated that the speed limit is 30 mph, then right past his property, it becomes 35 mph. He suggested keeping it 30 mph all throughout Bell Street. He then asked if the construction will be in phases, and how that would obstruct traffic flow on Bell Street.

Mr. Pennington explained that they do not expect to do it in phases, other than if construction starts in the middle of this season and continues into the new season. There will be no complete closures, but there may be situations with alternating one-way traffic, directed by police officers.

**Motion by:** Mr. Niland

**Seconded by:** Mr. Cavanaugh

*BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves construction of new sidewalks along portions of Bell Street between Bellridge Road and Gideon Lane and at the corner of Bell Street and Hebron Avenue, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated July 21, 2023 and as recommended by the Town Plan and Zoning Commission.*

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

#### **NO. 4: ACTION ON PROPOSED ORDINANCE REGARDING RIGHT-TO-FARM.**

**Motion by:** Mr. Niland

**Seconded by:** Mr. Cavanaugh

*BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby enacts new Town Code entitled “Right to Farm Ordinance”, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated July 21, 2023 and as recommended by the Policy & Ordinance Review Committee, with said amendment effective August 11, 2023.*

**Discussion:** Mr. Luiz explained that some Connecticut towns have adopted right-to-farm ordinances. This is a policy ordinance in support of farmers. Mr. Cavanna is happy to see this come back to them because it has been hard to be a farmer in New England this year. This is a good initiative. Ms. LaChance supports having farms in town. This is the least they can do for farmers this year. Mr. Osgood finds that this ordinance is basically virtue signaling. There is already a state law that adds protections for farming. This ordinance adds nothing. Mr. McChesney finds that it does have value because if there is a change in the state law, then they will have this on the books. Additionally, there is value in telling their farming community that they are with them. Mr. Niland is happy to support their farming community.

Mr. Cavanaugh would like to see the same bail out opportunities for farmers as those received by banks. He also requested adding an addition to the Welcome to Glastonbury sign on Glastonbury Boulevard to say, “farming community.” Mr. Cavanna believes this to be a first step, which is identifying a problem. He would like this motion to be sent back to the Town Attorney so that it mirrors the state statute. Mr. Gullotta explained that this is the Town Attorney’s recommended language. He would rather take action on this and then it could be revisited. Mr. Gullotta also pointed out that Glastonbury has development rights. This council goes on record of being in

support of its local farming community. Mr. Osgood stated that this has nothing to do with supporting the farming community. This action is simply not meaningful.

**Result:** Motion passed {8-1-0}, with Mr. Osgood voting against.

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

Mr. Luiz explained that an open space management survey is available to the public through August 13. He has attached quarterly reports from Community Development and the Police Chief. Pickleball courts opened July 25. Chris Liebel has been hired to fill the vacant Controller position. The Town has applied to the state for another community connectivity sidewalk grant just under \$800,000 to construct 2500 linear feet of concrete sidewalk. Mr. Niland asked to add the Dug Road petition as a discussion item and to connect Mr. Ackerman with the Police Chief to address his concerns. Ms. Wang noted that there is unfinished business around topics specifically recommended in their Affordable Housing Plan, such as inclusionary zoning and ADUs. She would like to flag her concern that these were all issues they said would be revisited but they have not been. She would like to get them on the docket. Mr. Luiz will circle back with Ms. Caltagirone and develop short, mid, and long-term plans.

Mr. Cavanaugh agreed with Mr. Niland's request to put Dug Road as a discussion item. He also has questions regarding the Police Chief's report. He would like to know the reasons that officers have left and the reasons for the anticipated vacancies. Mr. Luiz conducted a review with HR on the summary of who left the police department over the last two years. There were generally recruiting challenges, but he did not see anyone who left to another municipal department, apart from one who returned to a previous place of employment. Mr. Cavanaugh asked to confirm the number of officer vacancies. He also asked if Mr. Luiz conducts an exit interview with the officers. Mr. Luiz replied no, he assumes that the exit interview is done by either HR or the police department or a combination of the two. Mr. Cavanaugh asked to find out how many officers are on bicycle patrol and in which areas they patrol.

Mr. Cavanna is stunned at the numbers in the police report. Burglaries, identity thefts, and motor vehicle thefts are all up, which is extremely concerning. They might need to institute a mileage policy to ensure that officers are driving around town at night. He would like to know more about the cryptocurrency training that officers attended in Long Island and how many recovered vehicles were stolen out of Glastonbury. Criminal history checks are extremely time consuming. He asked if the criminal history checks made for the GHA are paid by the police department.

## **8. Committee Reports.**

- a. Chairman's Report.** *None*
- b. MDC.** *None*
- c. CRCOG.** *None*

## **9. Communications.** *None*

**10. Minutes.**

**a. Minutes of July 11, 2023 Regular Meeting.**

*Motion by:* Mr. Niland

*Seconded by:* Mr. Cavanaugh

*Result:* Minutes were approved unanimously {9-0-0}.

**11. Appointments and Resignations.**

**a. Appointment of Anthony DiLizia to the Economic Development Commission (D-2023).**

**b. Appointment of Nicole DiCicco to the Welles Turner Library Board (R-2025).**

*Motion by:* Mr. Niland

*Seconded by:* Mr. Cavanaugh

*Result:* Appointments were approved unanimously {9-0-0}.

**12. Executive Session. None**

*Motion by:* Mr. Niland

*Seconded by:* Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby adjourns their meeting of July 25, 2023 at 10:41 P.M.

*Result:* Motion was approved unanimously {9-0-0}.

Respectfully submitted,

**Lilly Torosyan**

**Lilly Torosyan**

**Recording Clerk**

**Thomas Gullotta**

**Chairman**