

**GLASTONBURY TOWN COUNCIL
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 26, 2023**

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

1. Roll Call.

Council Members

Mr. Thomas P. Gullotta, Chairman
Mr. Lawrence Niland, Vice Chairman
Ms. Deborah A. Carroll
Mr. Kurt P. Cavanaugh
Mr. John Cavanna
Ms. Mary LaChance
Mr. Jacob McChesney
Mr. Whit Osgood
Ms. Jennifer Wang

a. Pledge of Allegiance. *Led by Anne Bowman*

2. Public Communication and Petitions pertaining to the Call.

Bruce Bowman of 62 Morgan Drive, suggested two June events to celebrate annually: Juneteenth and Gay Pride Month. These would go a long way in recognizing diversity, inclusivity, and equity. He also asked that consideration be given to establishing the RJEC as a permanent entity in town.

Lisa Rouleau of 12 Conestoga Way, hopes that the Council will approve the MLK mural project.

Merinissa Bilgrami 179 High Wood Drive, is part of the MLK Mural Board. She believes that the mural would be a powerful symbol of diversity in a town that is majority white.

Christine Bassette of 77 Tryon Street, is the owner of Killam & Bassette Farmstead, which has been in town for over 130 years. She listed some of the many non-farming events that Glastonbury farms do to stay afloat. She is unsure why farms were overlooked for the ARPA Small Business Assistance program, but welcomes the new ARPA assistance program for farms.

Lynne Damon of 55 Rockhaven Drive, is a photographer who supports the mural project.

Amo-Mensah Amofa of 125 Harris Street, moved to Glastonbury as a child. He appreciates all the resources and opportunities that the town provided him, which helped him adjust to the move. He supports the mural project because it will pay homage to prominent figures who helped uplift the Glastonbury community to what it is today.

Trina Williams of 32 Plank Lane, loves Glastonbury's ability to be a community with strong citizens. Art has a unique ability to transcend barriers, and a small historical mural on the face of Town Hall would inspire community and spark conversations.

3. Special Reports. None

4. Old Business.

- a. Discussion and possible action concerning the use of American Rescue Plan Act grant funds to benefit Glastonbury farmers. (Tabled from the September 12, 2023 Council Meeting.)**

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby refers to the Board of Finance a request for determination of sufficient monies in the American Rescue Plan Act (Special Revenue) Fund, and that the proposed appropriation of \$220,000 grant funds for a Farm Assistance Program is a purpose consistent with the US Treasury Guidelines, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated September 22, 2023; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby schedules a public hearing for 8:00 p.m. on Tuesday, October 10, 2023 in the Council Chambers of Town Hall, 2155 Main Street, Glastonbury and/or through Zoom Video Conferencing to consider said appropriation of \$220,000 in ARPA monies in support of the Farm Assistance Program established by the Town Council, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated September 22, 2023.

Discussion: Mr. Cavanna recused himself because he is a farmer in town.

Mr. Luiz explained that, under this program, farm businesses could receive a grant of up to \$10,000. He reviewed the various requirements that an applicant would have to meet and noted that \$40,000 of unused ARPA funding from the Small Business Assistance (SBA) program would transfer into this program.

Mr. McChesney does not think that appointed members of the Agricultural Commission should be excluded from this program. He supports this action as a recognition by the town that farmers have been coping with multiple hard years, not just one. Ms. Carroll agreed to not exclude those members. She also noted that some farms are owned by people who live outside of Glastonbury. She asked if they could still apply. Mr. Luiz replied yes, as long as the farm is located in Glastonbury. Mr. Niland agrees to exclude elected officials and not exclude appointed officials and town employees from this program. Mr. Osgood finds that not consistent with the way that town ordinances have been written. He asked if this is an applicable use for ARPA funding. Mr. Luiz replied, yes.

Ms. Wang thinks of this as an investment in their farm way of life. She would like longer term solutions on how to help farms, such as sourcing monies available from the state or federal government. Ms. Carroll agreed with looking at longer term solutions. Mr. Osgood said he has a significant problem with this proposal because it is not the responsibility of Glastonbury taxpayers to support farming businesses. Weather impact on farming is not an anomaly, and farmers learn how to adapt to that. He said this would be using taxpayer dollars to support businesses in town, which he finds inappropriate, and that the

ordinances call for the BOF to approve any off budget appropriation. He is not in favor of the concept or the motion. Mr. Osgood proposed an alternate motion, which was not seconded.

Mr. Gullotta supports the proposed program, which will allow farmers to keep their farms and said that the State of Connecticut needs to come up with a crop insurance program for small farmers, which would be a positive step forward. He said that Rep. Barry supports and suggested she can move legislation into the first step. Mr. McChesney suggested a future meeting to discuss sending letters of support to their legislators.

Amendment by: Mr. Osgood

Seconded by: Ms. LaChance

To exclude elected town officials from participating in the Farm Assistance Program

Discussion: Mr. Niland noted that this will return to the Council at the public hearing, so they can make that determination then. He said the language in what they are sending to the BOF has been spelled out by the Town Attorney and the Town Charter. This is an unnecessary amendment at this point. Mr. Osgood contended that the exclusions are not included in the Town Manager's report, so it is important to include this for the BOF's information.

Result: Amendment passed {7-1}, with Mr. Gullotta dissenting and Mr. Cavanna recused.

Result: Amended motion passed {7-1}, with Mr. Osgood dissenting and Mr. Cavanna recused.

b. Discussion and possible action concerning the MLK39 Racial Equity Mural Tour.

Mr. Luiz stated that Mr. Cavanna and Ms. Wang worked with the Tour to develop a mural. Matt Conway of Rise Up explained that the committee has met to brainstorm ideas on the mural and its location. They considered both public and private property and put together a short list. The committee decided that the Town Hall North Facade would be an ideal location. One negative, however, is that the location is not visible from Main Street head on and some of the angles. Dibond panels will be used to create a movable mural. The committee has also identified potential people from Glastonbury, such as the Smith sisters, to feature on the mural. After picking the location, they will develop the design, then fundraise.

Mr. Gullotta noted that the exact location on Town Hall has yet to be determined. They will seek community input, as well as approval from the Historic Commission and Town Council. Ms. Wang finds this to be a wonderful opportunity to honor Glastonbury's history. Themes of independence, freedom, and justice are reflected in the people they suggested for the mural. Anyone is welcome to join the mural team. Mr. Cavanna is captivated by history, especially this town's history. However, he does not like the location. He was really excited about the Stop and Shop because it was a prominent viewable area. Mr. Gullotta noted that the panels can move, so if this becomes successful, people would want to have it. Ms. Carroll asked if there is a difference in durability. Mr. Conway explained that the mural will last longer on the panels as opposed to being on an actual building. Ms. Carroll likes the idea of the mural being on a town building because it will be theirs, not a private business'. It should be on a historic building. Ms. LaChance commended Micaela, the artist, on her Hartford mural.

Mr. Gullotta noted that the Council had earlier requested that the former Town Manager sign a document to allow the committee to proceed with starting their fundraising. Mr. Cavanaugh does not see

himself voting on a mural on town hall, especially in a historic district. This is a building owned and paid for by taxpayers, and they should not put drawings up on it. He also found it inappropriate that a public commenter called the town 'whitewashed'. Mr. McChesney stated that the comment was shared by a youth, and he hopes that she does not feel attacked by the council. He is unopposed to the idea of a mural celebrating their history being on town hall, especially if it can be moved, if need be.

Motion by: Mr. McChesney

Seconded by: Ms. Carroll

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves the Town Manager to execute an agreement to enable the MLK mural group to fundraise for the design of the mural. At this time, the Town Hall is considered to be the mural location, which is why the Historic Commission must be involved, but there might be another location.

Discussion: Mr. Osgood asked to make this motion at their next meeting, when they may see the document that the Town Manager will sign. He proposed the following motion.

Motion by: Mr. Osgood

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby tables the discussion and possible action to the October 10, 2023 meeting.

Result: Motion failed {2-7-0}, with Mr. Osgood and Mr. Cavanaugh voting for.

Discussion returned to the main motion.

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

JOINT PRELIMINARY PUBLIC HEARING:

NO. 1 ACTION ON A PROPOSED CHANGE OF ZONE FROM RURAL RESIDENCE TO RESIDENCE A AND A PAD FOR 30.32 ACRES AT 1555 NEW LONDON TURNPIKE, LOT S-1A FELDSPAR RIDGE, AND 50 FELDSPAR RIDGE FOR APPROXIMATELY 182 DWELLING UNITS. (JOINT PRELIMINARY PUBLIC HEARING TO BE CONTINUED TO THE OCTOBER 10, 2023 TOWN COUNCIL MEETING).

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby continues the Joint Preliminary Public Hearing concerning a proposed change of zone from Rural Residence to Residence A and a PAD for 30.32 acres at 1555 New London Turnpike, Lot S-1A Feldspar Ridge, and 50 Feldspar Ridge for approximately 182 dwelling units to the October 10, 2023 Town Council meeting, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated September 22, 2023.

Discussion: Mr. Luiz explained that the public hearing has to be delayed because the applicant failed to issue notices in a timely manner to property owners within 500 feet of the proposed PAD.

There were no comments from the public.

Motion by: Mr. Niland

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby continues the public hearing to the October 10, 2023 meeting.

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

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

NO. 1 ACTION ON PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO SECTIONS 2 AND 7 OF THE BUILDING ZONE REGULATIONS TO MODIFY REQUIREMENTS FOR PARKING COMMERCIAL AND RECREATIONAL VEHICLES, BOATS, TRAILERS AND MOBILE HOMES IN RESIDENTIAL ZONES. (CONTINUED FROM THE SEPTEMBER 12, 2023 COUNCIL MEETING.)

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council authorizes the formation of a joint subcommittee with the Town Plan & Zoning Commission for the purpose of developing a draft text amendment concerning Commercial and Recreational Vehicle Parking in Residential Zones, as described in a report by the Director of Community Development dated September 22, 2023, and that the Town Council appoints the following Council members to the committee: John Cavanna and Deb Carroll.

Discussion: Mr. Luiz stated that they are putting together a group to reach a consensus, so there will be no action tonight.

The floor was opened for public comments:

Brian Comerford of 89 Stancliff Road, takes issue with the regulation expanding both the length and height of commercial vehicles while having no weight capacity limit and removing sign placement restrictions. All this would be in view of the neighbors and general public. Screening requirements do not apply to vehicles parked in the driveway, only in the side yard. For every small businessman this regulation is supposed to help, it will hurt at least five property owners. He asked to not turn their residential neighborhoods into mixed use zones. He would like to continue the present ordinance. If someone has a hardship, then they should apply for an ordinance.

Karl Wagener of 588 Neipsic Road, is concerned about the proposed regulations, especially the section that allows parking of an unlimited number of commercial vehicles inside a structure. Such a change would effectively rezone some residential neighborhoods into industrial ones. His concern is not the visibility of parking on a neighbor's driveway, but the noise and dust caused by truck traffic, dust, and maintenance. The size and character of the vehicles should be the decisive factors, not the use. The regulations should provide for town-initiated enforcement of violations because pitting neighbor against neighbor is inappropriate.

Brad Spencer of 520 Bell Street, stated that he drove around just three streets in town and uncovered 18 violations of this ordinance. The town is going to be busy handing out all these violations. He asked to think through what is fair to everybody. The TPZ said that maybe they should not change the law because hardly anyone is complaining about this. It seems that the ordinance should stay the same.

Ms. Carroll feels like they asked for a house cat and ended up with a killer whale. She explained that this request actually started because commercial vehicles are not allowed as of right, nor are RVs. Mr. Cavanna sought to help people who have one commercial vehicle. She and Mr. Cavanna will be on the subcommittee to discuss this. Mr. Osgood noted that the TPZ has not recommended revisions but recommended a subcommittee. He agrees with forming a subcommittee.

Mr. Cavanaugh noted that, at one point, they were told there was no relief for anyone in this situation. Then, they were notified that one can seek a variance from these restrictions. Ms. Caltagirone replied yes, and these restrictions are in all residence zones. Mr. McChesney remarked that the impetus of this was for individuals who have a commercial vehicle to be able to drive to and from work and park in their driveways if they do not have adequate garage space. He has no issues with this matter being settled with their subcommittee.

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

NO 2. ACTION CONCERNING AMENDMENT TO SECTION 4.13 OF THE BUILDING ZONE REGULATIONS REGARDING COMMERCIAL SPACE RETENTION/REPLACEMENT FOR MIXED USE PROJECTS IN THE TOWN CENTER ZONE.

Ms. Caltagirone reviewed the history of this text amendment. She pointed out that there has been a minor change in the draft since March. The requirement for affordable housing set aside is now 10% for any mixed use development proposing 10 units of housing or more. During the leadership meeting last week, the chairman suggested an alternative to this breakdown, which she has provided. They have split the public benefits into two categories. She raised two additional issues for consideration: she kept thinking of this as a demolition of commercial space, but the code only prohibits reduction of commercial space when a mixed use project is proposed; additionally, it is unclear if applicants will find value in the flexibility to reduce commercial space in exchange for providing these public benefits.

Mr. McChesney stated that if they are in the position of tearing down a commercial building and replacing it with a residential building, they could do that. However, tonight, it is mixed use. Ms. Carroll still has concerns about the total percentage. Whether or not it is likely to happen anytime soon, she asked if this ensures that there are guardrails in place. Mr. Gullotta stated that it does, in a very particular, special case. Ms. Caltagirone noted that, this week, they met with the developers of the Hebron Avenue project, who have decided to pull back on their proposed mixed use proposal and return with just a commercial project. Thus, this proposal would not apply to that application. Mr. Gullotta asked to table action. Mr. Osgood finds that they should pass on this and then review the language for the downtown business district concerning commercial properties.

Ms. Caltagirone suggested closing the public hearing but then directing Town Staff to explore a policy direction the Council is headed in, which is a draft regulation that would restrict reduction of commercial space in the Town Center. Mr. McChesney asked, if this became relevant again, what would be necessary. Ms. Caltagirone stated that they might need to refer that question to the Town Attorney. It is possible that they would not have to go through the whole approval process again.

There were no comments from the public.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby directs the Town Manager to work with Town Staff to explore other avenues, and the implications thereof, of restricting reductions in commercial space in the Town Center.

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

NO 3. ACTION ON A PROPOSED ORDINANCE REGARDING BAMBOO.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby enacts a new ordinance in the Town Code Chapter 13, Article VI, entitled “Bamboo Ordinance” as described in a report by the Town Manager dated September 22, 2023 and as recommended by the Policy & Ordinance Review Committee, with said amendment effective October 16, 2023.

Discussion: Mr. Luiz noted that Town Staff has spotted bamboo in at least one location in town. The Town Attorney has advised that an ordinance would be the best way to go about addressing this. The subcommittee voted for the Council to set a public hearing tonight.

There were no comments from the public.

Mr. McChesney mentioned the importance of native plants. At their last meeting, Mr. Cavanna noted that bamboo is a problem because it spreads to other properties around it, affecting farms and residential properties, while also damaging the local ecosystem. If other plants are identified by the town which would benefit from ordinances like this, he would support it. Mr. Osgood asked if the ordinance says anything about the ability to sell this product in Glastonbury. Mr. Luiz replied no, it does not.

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

5. New Business.

a. Discussion and possible action regarding adoption of the Final Design Guidelines for the Town Center Village District (set public hearing).

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby schedules a public hearing for 8:00 p.m. on Tuesday, October 10, 2023 in the Council Chambers of Town Hall with the option for Zoom Video Conferencing to consider adoption of the Town Center Design Guidelines, as described in a report by the Director of Community Development dated September 22, 2023.

Ms. Caltagirone explained that the purpose of the design guidelines was set with the Town's 2018 POCD. The TCVD was adopted in January 2022. The consultant worked with the steering committee on the draft, which was presented on August 1. The ASDRC recommended adoption of these design guidelines, which will be presented to the TPZ on October 3, who will then make their recommendation to the Council.

Mr. Cavanaugh stated that the consultant mentioned that some of the changes they make might require a change in their zoning regulations. Ms. Caltagirone explained that it would be a separate action, not on October 10. Mr. Cavanaugh just wants to ensure that that discussion is followed up. Mr. Gullotta noted that this was an intensive process. Historically, Glastonbury did not have zoning. It emerged as a reaction to the state's policies to create highways in the 1950s. Mr. McChesney asked what will go to the public. Ms. Caltagirone stated that recommendations from the TPZ and the ASDRC will be included.

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

b. Discussion and possible action on year-end transfer to Capital Reserve Fund - \$629,000.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves a Fiscal Year 2022-2023 transfer of \$567,000 from Employee Health Insurance, and \$62,000 from Debt – Temporary Notes to the Capital Reserve Fund for a total of \$629,000, ” as recommended by the Town Manager and the Board of Finance.

Mr. Luiz explained that there is an estimated surplus of \$4.9 million from the last fiscal year. One proposal, which was already approved by the BOF, is to take money that is unspent in employee health insurance of \$567,000 and money that is unspent of \$62,000 from debt service and transfer both to the Capital Reserve Fund, where there is a funding gap of \$812,000. Mr. Niland clarified that the health insurance money is budgeted and does not come from employee premiums. Mr. Luiz stated that is correct. Ms. Carroll asked for information about possibilities regarding the bonds. Mr. Luiz explained that, at the recent BOF meeting, he and Ms. Rowley pitched calling some bonds, but the action did not pass. The Board discussed putting some portion of money into the pension fund. Mr. Gullotta asked how much money will end up in their savings account. Mr. Luiz stated \$4.9 million, including the transfer being made tonight.

Mr. Gullotta asked about the current amount in the Capital Reserve Fund. Ms. Rowley explained that they are ending FY23 with a deficit of \$3 million, but that is due to timing. They expect to end at a zero balance because of grants which will soon be received. The recommended level is \$1 million in that fund, per their capital program policy. The FY24 budget was budgeted with project expenditures equaling about \$7.8 million, but they anticipate revenues at only \$7 million, thereby creating an \$800,000 gap. This would result in a total Unassigned Fund Balance gain of \$3.8 million. The BOF has talked about three different options: either calling the bonds for \$2.7 million; putting money in the pension, which would yield \$110,000 per million per year in perpetuity; or putting additional funding into the capital reserve fund.

Mr. Osgood clarified that there is no \$900,000 per year savings from calling the bonds. What they would save is the difference in the interest payments on the bond. However, he believes that they could make more money by investing it today, rather than paying off the bonds. Mr. Niland supports calling the bond, which, over the next three fiscal years, would have a direct impact on lowering the tax burden.

Mr. Gullotta asked what guidance the Council would like to provide the BOF. Mr. Cavanaugh asked about the minimum fund balance policy. Ms. Rowley stated that the minimum is 16%, which would be about \$8 million above that number of \$29 million. She also noted that a November interest payment is

due on these bonds. Mr. Osgood asked what the capital reserve funds are used for generally. Ms. Rowley stated that it can only be used for CIP projects. Mr. Osgood favors moving the \$629,000, which has already been approved by the BOF.

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

c. Added to New Business: Discussion and possible action on the \$3.8M surplus in the Unassigned Fund Balance

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Niland

To add Item 5c: **Discussion and possible action on the \$3.8M surplus in the Unassigned Fund Balance** to the agenda.

Discussion: Mr. McChesney is fine with asking the BOF to take a matter back up. Mr. Osgood asked why this issue cannot wait until their next meeting. Mr. Cavanaugh does not have a complete understanding of this issue himself, so he will vote against it.

Result: Motion passed {5-4-0}, with Mr. Niland, Mr. Cavanaugh, Mr. Cavanna, and Mr. Osgood voting against.

Mr. Gullotta would like to find out the process because the BOF took it up and it went nowhere. Ms. Rowley explained that the BOF put it back on their agenda for further discussion at their October meeting. Mr. Luiz noted that there needs to be impetus for Town Staff to ask the BOF to reconsider a matter which they have already reviewed. Mr. Osgood would like to hear from the BOF on what the options are. Mr. McChesney agreed. He would like the BOF to have a fuller conversation on what their options are. If not, they will address this at budget time. Ms. Carroll requested to receive the outline of the three options at their next Council meeting. Mr. Osgood asked if the surplus is already in the Unassigned Fund Balance. Ms. Rowley replied, yes.

6. Consent Calendar.

a. General Fund Transfer – Goods and Services (set public hearing).

b. Between department transfers – 2023 year-end close out.

c. Action on road acceptance – Abbey Road from Station 19+78 to Station 35+42.29.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby schedules a public hearing for 8:00 p.m. on Tuesday, October 10, 2023 in the Council Chambers of Town Hall, 2155 Main Street, Glastonbury and/or through Zoom Video Conferencing to consider a transfer from the General Fund-Unassigned Fund Balance \$349,931 for goods and services ordered but not yet received as of June 30, 2023, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated September 22, 2023.

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves a \$183,460 between department transfer from Highway (\$116,740) and Police (\$66,720) to Refuse Disposal (\$37,055), Human Resources (\$55,260), Town Attorney (\$73,099), and Welles Turner Library (\$18,046) to close out fiscal year 2023,

as described in a report by the Town Manager dated September 22, 2023 and as recommended by the Board of Finance.

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council (Zoning Authority) approves the following as a Town road: Abbey Road from Station 19+78 to Station 35+42.29, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated September 22, 2023 and as recommended by the Town Plan and Zoning Commission at its September 25, 2023 meeting.

Result: Consent calendar was accepted unanimously {9-0-0}.

7. Town Manager’s Report.

Mr. Luiz presented his report. Ms. Wang noted that one public commenter asked about the RJEC. She would like to receive a brief update on the recommendations of that commission. She also noted that she attended the Sustainable CT summer equity training. From that, there came the suggestion to have citizen involvement as part of the sustainability process. Mr. Cavanaugh noted that the town clock at the corner of Hebron Avenue and Main Street is off. Mr. Luiz stated that he instructed the Facilities Director to fix it a week ago. They are working on it.

8. Committee Reports.

- a. **Chairman’s Report.** *None*
- b. **MDC.** *None*
- c. **CRCOG.** *None*
- d. **Policy & Ordinance Review Committee report and recommendation – revisions to Ordinance 18-31 concerning farmers.**

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby schedules a public hearing for 8:00 p.m. on Tuesday, October 10, 2023, in the Council Chambers of Town Hall at 2155 Main Street, Glastonbury and/or through Zoom Video Conferencing to consider proposed amendment to Town Code of Ordinances, Chapter 18, Article III, “Tax Abatements for Dairy Farms,” Section 18-31.

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

9. Communications. *None*

10. Minutes.

- a. **Minutes of September 12, 2023 Regular Meeting.**

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

Result: Minutes were accepted unanimously {9-0-0}.

11. Appointments and Resignations. *None*

12. Executive Session.

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

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council adds the following item to Executive Session:

b. Personnel matter – Town Manager.

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

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby enters into Executive Session for the purpose of:

- a. Discussion of the selection of a site or the lease, sale or purchase of real estate.*
- b. Personnel matter – Town Manager.*

Attendees to include Council Members and Town Manager.

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

The Town Manager left Executive Session at 9:57 p.m.

Council came out of Executive Session at 10:02 p.m. and returned to Council Chambers.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby adjourns the Town Council meeting of September 26, 2023 at 10:03 p.m.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Lilly Torosyan

**Lilly Torosyan
Recording Clerk**

**Thomas Gullotta
Chairman**