

**GLASTONBURY TOWN COUNCIL
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
TUESDAY, AUGUST 1, 2023**

The Glastonbury Town Council with Town Manager, Jonathan Luiz, in attendance, held a Regular Meeting at 7:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers of Town Hall at 2155 Main Street, with the option for Zoom video conferencing. The video was broadcast in real time and via a live video stream.

1. Roll Call.

Council Members

Mr. Thomas P. Gullotta, Chairman

Mr. Lawrence Niland, Vice Chairman

Ms. Deborah A. Carroll

Mr. Kurt P. Cavanaugh

Mr. John Cavanna {excused}

Ms. Mary LaChance

Mr. Jacob McChesney {participated via Zoom video conferencing}

Mr. Whit Osgood {participated via Zoom video conferencing}

Ms. Jennifer Wang

a. Pledge of Allegiance. *Led by Laura Cahill*

2. Public Comment.

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

Lisa Mendum of 45 Candlewood Road, asked if adequate bins will be provided for separating recyclables, compostable food scraps, and general waste at town events, such as summer music performances and the upcoming Apple festival. Glastonbury's CT Silver Status is meaningless if they let these events slip under the radar. Farmers are paying the price for their inaction on climate change. She also asked to ensure that vendors only provide compostable plates, utensils, napkins, and zero styrofoam. She then pointed out one student at Buttonball Lane who donates her bottle deposit collection money to various schools, hospitals, and nonprofits in the area.

3. Special Reports.

a. Draft Design Guidelines Informational Presentation.

Ms. Caltagirone explained that the Town began working with FHI Studio last year to prepare the draft design guidelines regulation. Francisco Gomes of FHI Studio explained that this project has its origins in the Town's 2018-2028 POCD, then the recently adopted TCVD Overlay Zone. The purpose of these guidelines is to promote and enhance the historical architecture of Glastonbury's town center. The design guidelines development process started last year with monthly meetings, an online survey, and an in-person workshop in November at the RCC. The goal is to bring forward the guidelines for adoption in the fall. The project study area is the Town

Center area, with the TCVD located at the center. Glastonbury has several zones across this study area. The areas of focus for this project include commercial, mixed-use, and multi-family residential areas. Residential areas have been excluded from consideration. The guidelines were developed in consultation with the Design Guidelines Committee. The draft form is available for review.

The guidelines are tailored to the five project subareas and the TCVD. Guidelines are compulsory only in the TCVD, where they have the same strength as zoning. Outside of the TCVD, they are advisory. Design guidelines also inform developers and applicants of what the Town's expectations are and provide the ASDRC with a guide to use for consistency and ease of reviewing applications. Mr. Gomes explained that they are also currently working on zoning amendment recommendations for consideration. This is partially because the design guidelines do not have a lot of weight outside of the TCVD. These standards would be universal.

Mr. Gullotta asked about next steps. Ms. Caltagirone stated that, as of Friday, the design guidelines are up on the community webpage. For the next 30 days, they would like to have a draft up for public comment. Then, they will hold a second public workshop to present the responses and refined draft. She would like to bring the steering committee again for one final review. The goal is to hold the public workshop at the end of September, allot two weeks to process comments, then finalize the document. The adoption process would likely not start until October. Mr. Gullotta pointed out that this is an election year, so council members could change. There is the possibility that new members would be voting on this. Mr. Cavanaugh would like for this council to make the decision. He asked that this action gets out in the second week of October. The rest of the council agreed.

Ms. Carroll commended the draft guidelines and thanked all those involved in its creation. She found the examples helpful, and noted that it is the most user-friendly document she has seen in all her time on the council. She hopes that it will receive lots of feedback from residents. Ms. Wang concurred. Initially, she was worried that the design guidelines process is concerned solely with aesthetics, but after reviewing this document, she sees the value in it. It provides a common visual aesthetic that everyone can support, while still allowing for design freedom. She likes that FHI incorporated a lot of the comments expressed at the community workshop.

Mr. Cavanaugh thanked Mr. Gomes for working patiently with the Council throughout this process. This is a significant moment for Glastonbury. Some of the destruction in the Town Center will come to an end when these design guidelines come into place. Mr. Gullotta agreed, noting that this is a good example of what can be accomplished when parties set aside politics and do what is good for Glastonbury's future. The benefits of this will be felt in the next 20-30 years, when the community will be more reminiscent of a New England town.

4. Old Business.

- a. Action on Ground Lease Agreement with the Housing Authority of the Town of Glastonbury – 55 Nye Road. (Tabled from July 25, 2023 Council Meeting).**

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby authorizes the Town Manager to execute the Ground Lease Agreement between the Town of Glastonbury and The Housing Authority of the Town of Glastonbury, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated July 28, 2023.

Discussion: Mr. Osgood explained that if the revenues and expenses are pro-rated, then the ground lease will cost the Town money to support the building, which will be owned by the GHA. He cannot support this ground lease agreement or the MOU because of the process that they went through to get here today, which failed to take significant consideration of alternate sites or the full consideration for taxpayers. This proposal has taken an office building off the tax rolls, created expenses for the town, and put in affordable housing. It is anything but dispersed. He will vote against it in the hope that, in the future, the process is dramatically approved.

Result: Motion passed {6-2-0}, with Mr. Cavanaugh and Mr. Osgood voting against.

b. Action on Memorandum of Understanding with the Housing Authority of the Town of Glastonbury – 55 Nye Road. (Tabled from July 25, 2023 Council Meeting).

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby authorizes the Town Manager to execute the Memorandum of Understanding with the Housing Authority of the Town of Glastonbury regarding 50-55 Nye Road, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated July 28, 2023.

Discussion: Mr. Osgood noted that there has been a suggestion for the GHA to contribute more than \$500,000 towards this project. He asked about the possibility of adding a line item for land in the GHA's application. GHA Director Neil Griffin explained that, right now, there is nothing they can commit to until they get to the financing of the development. Further along the development process, they will know what the application can sustain. Mr. Osgood asked that the MOU include best efforts to come up with market values. Mr. Griffin worries that would complicate their CHFA application for tax credits, as CHFA would see that as a liability. Mr. Osgood asked whether or not an MOU is a legally binding contract. Mr. Luiz stated that the Town Attorney has answered that question in the affirmative.

Result: Motion passed {6-2-0}, with Mr. Osgood and Mr. Cavanaugh voting against.

5. New Business.

a. Discussion and possible action on proposed Bamboo Ordinance (refer to Policy & Ordinance Review Subcommittee).

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, the Glastonbury Town Council hereby refers the proposed ordinance concerning bamboo to the Policy & Ordinance Review Subcommittee for a report and recommendation, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated July 28, 2023.

Discussion: Mr. Luiz explained that bamboo has been encroaching upon Town-owned land, so the Town Attorney has reviewed the status and asked to consider adopting an ordinance.

Result: Motion passed unanimously {8-0-0}.

b. Discussion and possible action on amendment to the Building Zone Regulations – Commercial and Recreational Vehicle Parking in Residential Zones (refer to Town Plan and Zoning Commission; set public hearing).

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, the Glastonbury Town Council hereby refers to the Town Plan and Zoning Commission proposed amendment to the Building Zone Regulations concerning Commercial and Recreational Vehicle Parking in Residential Zones and schedules a public hearing for 8:00 p.m. on Tuesday September 12, 2023, to consider the proposed amendment, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated July 28, 2023.

Discussion: Mr. Luiz explained that the proposed amendment will allow for greater flexibility in the regulations regarding the parking of commercial and recreational vehicles in residential zones. Ms. Caltagirone added that the code currently restricts parking in these residential areas to one commercial vehicle or one boat, trailer, or mobile home to be in a garage, barn, or in the rear yard. Property owners can currently apply to the ZBA for a variance from this restriction. In the past year, they have received only one variance application but about 15 complaints. Ms. Caltagirone noted that all enforcement action has been paused until receiving direction from the Council. She has also included Wethersfield's code regulations as an example to consider working off of. Mr. Gullotta believes that this issue needs to be addressed, so the Council should send it over to the TPZ.

Mr. Osgood asked about the major changes proposed in the ordinance regarding the size of vehicles allowed to be parked as of right and mobile homes. Ms. Caltagirone stated that there is a lengthy list of requirements that a commercial vehicle must meet in order to receive a zoning permit. The big change proposed is that, instead of as of right parking in commercial and residential zones, they would require a zoning permit to deter these situations. It is suggested that there would be a special exception process for the ZBA to weigh in on cases where the applicant cannot meet the standards. Mr. Osgood asked if the screening from the zoning official is not a requirement. Ms. Caltagirone explained that the Wethersfield regulations allows for discretion from the zoning officer, but Glastonbury can choose to either increase or reduce that discretion. Mr. Osgood asked how many of the 15 complaints received were from people complaining about these vehicles versus people who seek to put them there. Ms. Caltagirone explained that the complaints have been from neighbors about other properties, and they were split about 50-50 between commercial vehicles and the boats/RVs.

Ms. LaChance supports moving this forward for the TPZ to review, but she finds the allowance of up to 25 feet to be far too long in residential areas. Mr. Gullotta pointed out that this is simply a starting place. Experts will review this and send it back to the Council. Mr. Cavanaugh asked what the remedial steps are, if a neighbor is unlawfully parked in a Rural Residence Zone. Ms. Caltagirone explained that they conduct a site inspection to confirm a zoning violation. Then, they call the property owner. If that is unsuccessful, they send a form letter describing the zoning violation and asking to address it. If there is no response after 30 days, they send it again. If there is still no response, they can escalate the situation.

Mr. Cavanaugh asked if the Town notifies the owner of a relief option. Ms. Caltagirone stated yes, they notify them of the option to apply for a variance. Mr. Cavanaugh asked if September 12 is enough time to review this. Ms. Caltagirone can schedule a public hearing at the TPZ's second August meeting. Mr. Cavanaugh is happy with the way this is currently functioning, so he will not vote to forward it to the TPZ. Mr. McChesney pointed out that the impetus of this was to figure out ways of accommodating individuals who require vehicles that fall within this for their employment. He favors this being sent to the TPZ. It strikes him when he sees a number like 25 feet. He would find it helpful to have an understanding of the subject of prior complaints and to see examples of whatever the TPZ would propose as the ordinance change.

Result: Motion passed unanimously {7-1-0} with Mr. Cavanaugh voting against.

c. Discussion and possible action concerning the use of ARPA funds to support local farmers.

Ms. Carroll attended the roundtable this morning which discussed state support for farmers from this rough season. While the state can offer a lot of macro assistance, not much is offered in the short term. As a town, they need to find a way to help farmers now. She hopes to talk about potentially using ARPA funds to help local farms. A round of grants have already helped small businesses in town. She would like to consider implementing a similar program for farmers. This is not a hand out but a hand up.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby authorizes the Town Manager to explore the use of ARPA funds for a one-time small business grant assistance program for Glastonbury farmers.

Discussion: Ms. Wang noted that the local advisory farmer committee meets on an ad hoc basis. She would like the Town Manager to meet with them to gather information about what farmers need for immediate relief, as well as potential future needs. ARPA was a one-time allocation and severe weather events will continue to devastate farms. She suggests approaching the farming committee to put these two proposals on the table and see whether they make sense. Mr. Niland favors looking at this and making sure that they are able to use ARPA funds. He agrees that

working with the agricultural commission is a necessity. Ms. Carroll concurred, but noted that finding out the ARPA funding eligibility is a first step. Then, they can look at the number of farms in town and figure out the parameters for who will qualify.

Mr. McChesney was not able to attend the roundtable this morning, but he attended the Killam and Bassette press conference and saw first hand the devastation to that farm. He supported the small business relief program and would support a similar program for the town's farms. He has communicated with the Connecticut Chamber of Commerce who has agreed to help. His concern with ARPA is that it is a finite resource, but a lot of farms are dealing with the repercussions of disasters from even a few years back. A long-term way to help is necessary. He would like to see a larger conversation, which would include the agricultural advisory group.

Ms. Carroll was shocked to discover that the state still has not declared the flooding an emergency. This is an emergency for farmers right now, and they need to look at long-term assistance, as well. In the short term, they were able to help bricks and mortar businesses with ARPA funding, and the same must be done for farmers. Mr. Osgood noted that ARPA funds are no different from taxpayer dollars, and the Town is not a farm insurance agency. It makes sense to talk to the agricultural advisory committee and look at alternatives, but he stressed that ARPA money does not come from nowhere. Mr. Gullotta observed that farmers in this community have seen an unprecedented spring into summer. If they can do something through ARPA, he is ready to vote to give them some help.

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

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby authorizes the Town Manager to explore other funding mechanisms that might be available to assist Glastonbury farmers.

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

PUBLIC HEARINGS

NO 1: ACTION ON THE SALE OF TOWN-OWNED LAND AT 277 WESTERN BOULEVARD, A PORTION OF ASSESSOR'S PARCEL W0003, TOTALING 6.72± ACRES, FOR \$1.00 (ONE DOLLAR) TO THE GLASTONBURY HOUSING AUTHORITY

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby authorizes the sale of a 6.72± acre portion of Town-owned land at 277 Western Boulevard, Assessor's Parcel W0003, for \$1.00 (One Dollar) to the Glastonbury Housing Authority as described in a report by the Town Manager dated July 28, 2023.

Discussion: Mr. Luiz explained that if the conveyance occurs for 6.72 acres, it would create a parcel of 11.31 acres. Town Staff had previously recommended that a smaller parcel of 4.16 acres be conveyed to the GHA, which would result in a total parcel being created of 8.75 acres for the affordable housing development site. The approach that staff are now recommending to convey more land would take into consideration the Council's concern that the development would provide substantially more open space for the benefit of future residents at the housing development on Nye Road.

Mr. Luiz explained that the current acreage is approximately 10.72 acres, which includes both 55 and 50 Nye Road. Next to it is the 277 Western Boulevard parcel, which is now 44.1 acres. Tonight, they could end up with the additional acreage being added on to the 55 Nye Road parcel, and ultimately, another parcel would be created, which combines the remainder of land at 277 Western Boulevard with 50 Nye Road. So, they would start with two parcels and end with two parcels. Right now, the question is how much land to add from 277 Western Boulevard.

Mr. Gullotta opened the floor for comments from the public:

Nicholas Korns of 73 Shagbark Road, reiterated a point made in past discussions by Councilman Osgood, which is that the sale agreement for this parcel must include a provision that, in the event of this development not occurring for whatever reason, the Town could get it back.

Brian Ambrose of 344 Spring Street Extension, is concerned about how the wetlands behind his property will be addressed.

Jared Handel of 262 Spring Street Extension, has similar concerns about wetlands and further access to the parcel, as well as how the rest of the parcel will be used, since he uses that access quite often.

Comment made via Zoom:

Barbara Clannin of 308 Spring Street Extension, lives in California, where overdevelopment is causing gridlock, traffic, and other community issues, such as lack of space for community gardens and parks for families. Every time she returns to Glastonbury, she sees the drastic changes on Spring Street Extension and the surrounding area. She has written several letters asking why this area is being developed instead of installing a community garden. She is concerned about the congestion this will cause.

Town Engineer Dan Pennington showed the portion of 277 Western Boulevard which contains the wetlands and conservation easement. The east portion of the site is not encumbered by the easement. If the conveyance takes place, it would be to the edge of the conservation development, beyond which, no development is feasible. There will be no impact to the wetlands behind the properties of Mr. Ambrose and Mr. Handel.

Mr. Luiz noted that the other question was about how the rest of the parcel would be used. Mr. Gullotta stated that the concern was the additional acreage. His understanding was that it was added for recreational purposes or garden plots. Mr. Pennington explained that the most recently added portion, the roughly 2.5 acres, would not be encumbered by building or parking area and circulation space. Mr. Gullotta noted that Mr. Korns asked about the MOU. Mr. Gullotta believes there is language that if the GHA cannot bring this project into fruition, then it would be sold back to the Town at the price it was sold for. Mr. Luiz stated that is correct. Mr. Osgood asked if

the MOU applies to this land or only to the purchase price of the land that is currently owned outside of the town. Mr. Luiz replied, it applies to both.

Mr. Cavanaugh spoke to the portion that was asked to be added on. According to the appraiser, it slopes from north to south. He asked if the slope is significant enough to impede any recreation there. Mr. Pennington stated that there is a grade to deal with, but it is not severe. Mr. Cavanaugh explained that an appraisal was done, marketed at \$29,762 per acre. Mr. Osgood noted that the GHA had initially suggested providing \$500,000 for upfront costs, and the potential to provide another \$500,000, if funding permits. The MOU does not mention that at all. He cannot vote on this until the Council looks at the MOU.

Result: Motion passed {7-1-0}, with Mr. Osgood voting against.

JOINT PRELIMINARY PUBLIC HEARING:

NO 1: APPLICATION OF GLASTONBURY HOUSING AUTHORITY FOR A PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN TO RE-ZONE 55 NYE ROAD FROM PLANNED EMPLOYMENT TO RESIDENCE A AND PLANNED AREA DEVELOPMENT.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council and Town Plan and Zoning Commission approve the Preliminary Development Plan for 55 Nye Road as proposed by the Glastonbury Housing Authority and refer the project to the Planned Area Development Subcommittee for further guidance in preparation of the Final Development Plan.

Discussion: Mr. Luiz explained that a joint Town Council/Town Plan and Zoning Commission has been scheduled tonight on the preliminary development application by the GHA of a change of zone from Planned Employment to Residence A and PAD for the affordable housing development at 55 Nye Road. After the joint public hearing, the matter can be referred to the PAD subcommittee for further guidance to the applicant in preparation of the final development plan.

Members of the TPZ joined the meeting.

Ms. Caltagirone noted that this is the first step in the process of reviewing the application for a preliminary development plan for the site. Anything said tonight is non-binding. Ms. Purtill of the TPZ added that this is for informational purposes, to acquire feedback on what they would like to see before the applicant makes a formal application. The GHA Executive Director Neil Griffin explained that this is a preliminary design plan, identified as 64 units on the resulting 11.31 acres on Nye Road.

Tom R. Carey, the principal at QA+M Malek Architects, reviewed the preliminary design elements. Their firm has worked with the GHA for many years, most recently, on the Center Village project. The proposed development would be a walkable neighborhood. The existing office building will be removed and the lower office building will remain. A circular drive-

through will be created. Proposed are two, four, and six-unit buildings, and in the back of the development, on the northeast corner of the site, there would be two 8-unit buildings. They envision the structures to be residential in scale, with a maximum of 2.5 stories. There would be defensible space between the sidewalk and unit itself and outdoor space, such as porches. The development would end at the easement. The wooded northwest edge of the site would also remain undeveloped. They seek to maintain the buffers to the adjacent neighborhoods and property lines. Those areas would stay fully wooded. The existing office building to the south and the existing conservation easement would remain untouched.

Mr. Carey reviewed the proposed circulation on site, which would come in through Nye Road, travel counterclockwise, and egress out. The drives will be one-way. He reiterated that the current proposal is 64 units. Their directive was to develop between 60-70 units, which is the sweet spot for submitting a CHFA funding application. The proposed density is about 6 units per acre. This scheme shows about 2.4 cars per residential unit, which is overparked. Ideally, for market rate developments, they target about 1.5 cars per unit. That will also depend upon what the total mix of units are. Right now, the total proposed mix of units is roughly 25% one bedrooms, 50% two bedrooms, and 25% three bedrooms. More than 50% must be one-bedroom apartments. The center of the quads would hold communal green spaces. There could be garden spaces, an activity lawn, and a communal building with an office and a gathering room.

Mr. Carey showed renderings of the preliminary structures. He noted that they have not yet received community feedback, but they envision a more traditional architectural style, with gable roofs, front porches, and relatively low scale structures. All structures will have a certain amount of individuality. In most of these developments, they use stone materials, not vinyl and PVC.

Mr. Gullotta opened the floor for comments from the public.

Peter Perrotta, Manager of Nye Road Duplexes on Nye Road, likes the plan. The GHA does a great job, but he also does a great job on their properties. As a fiduciary, he has to protect his residents and family assets. In this proposal, access is indicated to be only from Nye Road, which has been a quiet little street. He asked to consider creating a secondary access point, which would mitigate safety issues. Also, he would like to increase the buffer. This would both protect his residents and potentially decrease density, allowing for more open space.

Jared Handel of 262 Spring Street Extension, asked why the extra piece is being purchased if they are not going to build beyond the easement where the power lines go. He asked if the Old Trail Road piece be left alone or will that extra trail be developed, as well.

Comment made via Zoom:

Barbara Clannin of 308 Spring Street Extension, asked if the Town has considered other areas that are not so densely populated already. This development would impact local streets as a traffic nightmare. She would hate to see an area with constant gridlock, like in California, be created in Glastonbury.

Mr. Gullotta noted that the Council wanted to give the GHA enough land to build a great development, which is why they added land to the original proposal. Mr. Griffin explained that the extra land is needed to meet the PAD zoning requirements on building acreage, per the most

recent zoning requirements. Mr. Cavanaugh added that the development could have been constructed without the additional acreage added tonight. However, some council members wanted the 10 acres to be used for some sort of recreational purposes. Mr. Carey envisions making a few other changes before the next iteration. They have heard comments about the buffer, and in the north portion of the property, there is a building. They will remove the building to the right of it, and shift that building over towards the east, to create more space for the buffer and will reallocate those units.

Ms. Wang asked if QA+M Malek Architects has other affordable housing experience. Mr. Carey explained that their firm specializes in affordable housing projects throughout the state. He has been practicing in the affordable housing industry for over 20 years, helping to develop and/or renovate over 2500 affordable units in Connecticut. Ms. Wang asked how this proposal's density compares to the density of Welles Village. Mr. Griffin stated that Welles Village is 6.22 units per acre; Center Village has 19.35 units per acre; the Village Green/Knox Lane property is 6.42 units per acre; and the Herbert T. Clarke House is 14 units per acre. This property is currently proposed to be 5.66 units per acre, which would make it the GHA's least dense development. Ms. Wang likes that there is an existing nature trail on the property. She would like to keep an open mind about potential partnerships for recreation services and amenities. She would also like to see top of the line energy efficient features.

Mr. Turner stated that the scale and/or the placement is off, so based on the topography lines, it looks like the whole complex should be shifted. He noted that the northwest building shows a retaining wall. Mr. Griffin confirmed that there is a retaining wall there. Mr. Turner stated that in the diagram, it looks like the retaining wall is right where the dumpster is. Mr. Griffin does not recall if there is an existing dumpster there. Mr. Turner asked if the recreation area in the northeast will remain wooded. Mr. Griffin stated that, right now, it is envisioned to remain as it is, so the existing trees and trail will remain.

Ms. LaChance likes the quad area inside of the buildings. She asked why the route will be counterclockwise. Mr. Griffin explained that it is just the flow of the driveway. Mr. Niland finds this to be an attractive model. He asked that the community room be appropriately sized for the number of units onsite. He also favors the reduction in parking and suggested opportunities for covered parking, as there is no garage. Ms. Carroll finds this to be a phenomenal start. While the designs are preliminary, they reflect the best of what workforce housing can be. It feels very respectful, and incorporating green space in many ways speaks volumes to the spirit of this project.

Mr. McChesney highlighted that he too had envisioned some recreational aspects and likes that there is an existing trail through that portion. He would like to have recreational activities that connect residents to the larger Glastonbury community. He also suggested that the sidewalk continues all the way. He would like to ensure that forested areas are not cut down to become grass areas which will never be used. Mr. Osgood asked if all the units will be townhouses or will some be single. Mr. Griffin explained that there will be flat units, in addition to the townhome style units, particularly for the ADA units. Mr. Osgood commented that the remaining building will require a parking lot of about 109 spaces, whereas the two buildings on the eastern side have existing parking. He asked if any thought was given to keeping those parking lots for the building that will remain, to not have to create a new parking lot. Mr. Griffin stated that would not be possible with the changing property lines.

Mr. Cavanaugh asked to bring sample materials to the PAD review meeting, such as for the lighting fixtures and dumpster enclosures. He inquired where the GHA stands with the financing

of this project. Mr. Griffin explained that the CHFA's 9% low income tax credit application is due in January. Typically, CHFA announces the award in April. If the project is awarded and they secure all of their other financing, then the GHA might be able to close on the CHFA by December, perhaps into the new year, with construction beginning in the spring of 2024. Mr. Cavanaugh asked if this has to be approved. Mr. Griffin stated that they need full zoning approval for the project as a threshold for the CHFA application.

Mr. Zanolungo agrees that the site might be overparked. He noted that, soon, they will consider the lighting, dumpsters, bike racks, EV chargers, sidewalks, and utility locations. He suggested an athletic field onsite, especially if parking is available. Ms. Purtill likes the layout, the transitional style, and the fact that there is open space. She noted that while people are asking for more recreation onsite, that means dollars not going towards affordable housing. She suggested instead that the GHA partners with the Town on that. She agrees about the overparking and asked for the real numbers with visitor parking. She also suggested considering covered parking, perhaps even carports converted to solar panels. She likes the idea of the benches and noted that the applicant will need to buffer between the existing neighbors and this commercial space.

Mr. Flores asked how the 20% market rate is derived and if it is firmly established. Mr. Griffin explained that it is derived from the CHFA's 9% tax credit applications. They need to achieve as many points as possible, and those market rate points are very important to the application. Otherwise, the GHA typically does 100% affordable housing developments. Mr. Flores asked what experience the GHA has in attracting and maintaining market rate units. Mr. Griffin explained that they do not own any market rate units, but a lot of market rate people are moving into their Center Village property. There is the opportunity to mirror that example.

Mr. Flores is concerned that if prospective market rate tenants see "Housing Authority," they might be less likely to apply or it might lead to a different pool of applicants. The stigma that goes into living in units run by a housing authority is important to address. It is important that they do not have signage that reflects any type of low income or housing authority-run development. It is also important that the development does not look like a cookie cutter image. They need to consider the experience of the children coming through this development and how they will be integrated into the community.

Mr. Carey stated that it is very difficult to incorporate market rate units into these developments because they are mostly unsubsidized. However, planning in affordable housing philosophy has changed dramatically in the last 20 years. Communities are more successful as mixed developments, not as fully affordable developments. This is why their affordable units are no longer designed as traditional low income units, but rather, as market style units.

Mr. Markuszka asked if there is a plan for the units to have their own washer and dryer units and basements. Mr. Griffin explained that washer-dryers are built into their units now. These will truly be stand alone units with no common elements shared. They are exploring basements as a storage option. Mr. Carey added that the plans will include storage for outdoor amenities. They insist that every unit has significant amounts of storage, with 7 types of storage closets. Sustainability is a part of the CHFA process, which requires their application to pursue the most energy efficient units possible. At the bare minimum, this would meet silver LED standards, but

they will strive to meet national green building standards. Mr. Markuszka suggested that the passive recreation area have an area designated for a dog park.

Ms. Cahill finds the plan to be a good starting point. She particularly likes the fact that it includes two and three bedrooms. She asked about the narrow roads. Mr. Carey explained that school buses could traverse the roads. Because it is one-way traffic, there will not be a full 24-foot drive aisle. Instead, it would be 16 feet, but one lane of traffic, so the actual drive aisle would be wider than that of a two-way drive aisle. Ms. Cahill requested putting in as many of the preferred ideas into the project from the adopted affordable housing plan. She agreed that the proposed development is overparked. In the ASDRC's proposed guidelines, it notes the parking being to the rear. However, here, the parking is in the front. She agrees with sentiments expressed about playgrounds, fields, and EV charging stations, and advocates for trails to connect to other areas of the community. Although this is an affordable housing project, she would like the amenity part to be considered as much as the inner construction of the project, especially the idea of a playground. She asked how this will affect the GHA waitlist process. Mr. Griffin stated that they are working through this process.

Ms. Jagel reiterated about looking more closely at the parking in terms of location and number of spaces. After that, she asked to look at the landscaping around the parking spaces, and implementing ancillary features, such as storage areas and receptacles for garbage, bicycle racks, and marking the location of the utilities. She likes the architecture but would rather see smaller buildings. She suggested breaking up the three larger buildings to keep the scale smaller. She would also like to maximize recreational space to maintain its multi-use but be able to be used by the community. Mr. Gullotta echoed the call for smaller buildings. He agreed with Mr. Niland on a larger community room. The community room at Welles Village is too small. He loves the porches and the idea of a modern farmhouse. He pointed out that this is the only new affordable housing project for families in town since Welles Village, so it is very important.

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

The Council recessed for five minutes, resuming the meeting at 9:45 p.m.

d. Action on resolution in support of Small Town Economic Assistance Program (STEAP) grant application.

Mr. Luiz explained that two options have been submitted because they did not know what would happen with Nye Road tonight. One option is to submit a STEAP grant to fund the creation of 109 parking spaces, which will cost roughly \$700,000. The maximum award they could receive from the state is \$500,000. The other option is the geometric remodification and replacement of equipment in the Neipsic Road/New London Turnpike/Hubbard Street area. The rough cost projection for this project is \$625,000. Mr. Niland asked, given the connection with the affordable housing project, would that option increase their likelihood of receiving this grant. Mr. Luiz looks at the list of awards that the state gives out for STEAP grants. Based on his experience, his feeling is that the Nye Road project would score very well because of the stated need for affordable housing in Connecticut.

Mr. Cavanaugh would like to make a plea for the Neipsic Road/New London Turnpike/Hubbard Street area project. Years ago, his colleague was killed at that intersection. He has been waiting for the Town to do something since then. Mr. Osgood pointed out that the \$700,000 for Nye Road is something that they are going to have to do. Capital costs are associated with this affordable housing project that they were unaware of, such as this. He favors the STEAP grant for the Nye Road project. Mr. McChesney noted that repaving is necessary because they are using the building for town purposes not because of affordable housing. While he supports both proposals, the Nye Road project is more likely to receive this grant, so he will favor that. Mr. Niland remarked that there will be the opportunity to fund the traffic light project through the capital program. If there is a better chance of acquiring grant funds for the Nye Road project, then he will support that.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby endorses the application for STEAP monies in support of the construction of a parking lot at 50 Nye Road, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated July 28, 2023.

Result: Motion passed {7-1-0}, with Mr. Cavanaugh voting against.

e. Action to consolidate the remainder of 277 Western Boulevard with and into 50 Nye Road.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby authorizes a boundary line modification pursuant to which the 37.38 acre remainder of 277 Western Boulevard, which is not being sold to the Glastonbury Housing Authority, shall be consolidated with and into the 6.13 acre portion of the 50 Nye Road property being purchased and retained by the Town, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated July 28, 2023.

Discussion: Mr. Luiz explained that this action would sever the parcel in half and add to the bottom portion of 277 Western Boulevard. Mr. Osgood asked why they do not keep that building as a separate parcel, in the event there is no use for it and would like to sell it. Ms. Caltagirone explained that they propose the lot line adjustment because it streamlines the process of conveying the property to the housing authority. If they were to propose a subdivision of the existing lot, that would trigger the need for a public hearing before the TPZ. In order to break off a piece of land for the GHA, they need to ensure the same number of lots at the beginning of the transaction as at the end of the transaction. Mr. Cavanaugh asked if increasing the lot size would make 50 Nye Road any more developable beyond what is already there. Ms. Caltagirone stated, marginally. Most of it is conservation easement or wetlands.

Result: Motion passed unanimously {8-0-0}.

Mr. Osgood left the meeting at 10:10 p.m.

6. Consent Calendar. None

7. Town Manager's Report.

Mr. Luiz explained that there has been outreach to Glastonbury farmers to ensure that they know about available financial assistance resources. The boat launch has been reopened and International Overdose Awareness Day is coming up. There will be a memorial gathering and walk on August 31. The Town has hired Structures North of Salem, Mass. to conduct a conditions assessment of the Cotton Hollow mill walls. The Town has also authorized three days of tree removal work and the purchase and installation of a fence.

Mr. Cavanaugh commented that the first annual National Night Out was very well attended, and he hopes that the event will be repeated in the future. Mr. Gullotta asked to take a look at the dike around the sewage plant because he worries that it is not high enough to withstand further rains. Mr. Luiz has spoken with the Sanitation Director, who has been keeping a close eye on it. Will the height be enough depends on a number of factors. They know the high water mark. After the last raising of the dike, Mr. Manfre has been monitoring it with an extra staff member. Mr. Gullotta noted that the concern is not just whether the dike is high enough, but that it was built when the sewage treatment plant was built. Mr. Luiz stated that, after a flood, they did a project to increase the height of the dike to prevent it from being flooded again.

8. Committee Reports.

a. Chairman's Report. None

b. MDC. None

c. CRCOG. None

9. Communications.

a. Letter from CT Siting Council regarding notice of intent to modify an existing telecommunications facility located at 58 Montano Road.

10. Minutes.

a. Minutes of July 25, 2023 Regular Meeting.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

Discussion: Regarding Item 4a, Ms. Wang stated that the motion to table was approved {8-1-0}. However, she did not join the meeting until after that vote took place, so it should read {7-1-0}, with Ms. Wang absent.

Result: Minutes were approved as amended {7-0-0}.

11. Appointments and Resignations. None

12. Executive Session. None

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

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby adjourns their meeting of August 1, 2023 at 10:15 p.m.

Result: Motion was approved unanimously {7-0-0}.

Respectfully submitted,

Lilly Torosyan

Lilly Torosyan

Recording Clerk

Thomas Gullotta

Chairman