

**GLASTONBURY TOWN COUNCIL
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
TUESDAY, OCTOBER 10, 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 {excused}
Ms. Jennifer Wang

a. Pledge of Allegiance. *Led by Jill Barry*

2. Public Communication and Petitions pertaining to the Call.

DJ McBride of 263 Spring Street Extension, finds that there are drawbacks with the MLK mural project proposal. Though he believes that using public property is a good idea because it gives the town control, the proposed location is not very visible. He believes that the mural should be in a well-traveled location, not on the side of Town Hall.

Ms. Carroll read the written comments into the record:

Julie Thompson of 252 Bluff Point Road, looks forward to hearing discussions regarding the proposed mural project, its location, and the person(s) represented on the mural. She hopes that the mural will represent Glastonbury's commitment to welcoming and respecting all residents.

Sean Ring of 157 Deerfield Drive, found Councilman Cavanaugh's comments at the last meeting to be incendiary. He believes that Mr. Cavanaugh is not the arbiter of how a person of color feels about being in a majority white town. He suggested that Mr. Cavanaugh listens to the lived experiences of a person speaking before lashing out.

3. Special Reports.

a. Capitol Region Council of Governments (CRCOG) Presentation. *Tabled*

4. Old Business. *None*

5. New Business.

a. Action on a Cooperation Agreement between the Town of Glastonbury, the Glastonbury Housing Authority, and the Glastonbury Assisted Housing, Nonprofit, Inc. – 55 Nye Road.

Mr. Griffin discussed what the cooperation agreement entails. Mr. Cavanaugh asked if the waiving of the building fees is included in the cooperation agreement. Mr. Griffin replied yes, it is included. Mr. Luiz noted that this will be on the Council's next agenda for action with the Town Attorney's opinion.

b. Presentation and review of Police Department preliminary sidewalk design.

Mr. Pennington presented the plan. He explained that there are alternate and disparate uses on the site, which is very busy all the time. There is a safety concern with all the pedestrian traffic. The thought was to provide a dedicated walkway to improve safety for all concerns. The proposal is for a new 700-foot sidewalk walkway from Main Street to the intersection of the fueling island. The estimated project cost is about \$101,000. Of that, the lighting cost is about \$22,000. If the Council favors the proposal, they would bring it before the Historic Commission, then the TPZ for a Section 12.9 minor site change application.

Mr. McChesney finds that this proposed sidewalk is needed from a safety perspective. He also believed that a large fencing station was originally proposed. Mr. Pennington clarified that no fencing is proposed. There is no physical barrier preventing people from walking across the driveway. The hope is that the signage and crosswalk will provide enough information for people to use the crosswalk. Mr. McChesney asked if they will use split rail fencing along the parking lot. Mr. Pennington replied yes, along the edge, because it will create a visual barrier between the parking lot and the sidewalk. Mr. Cavanaugh agreed that the proposal is in this year's CIP budget, but it was \$30,000 for design and review. He continues to be opposed to this because the \$100,000 project cost could be used to combine with other projects, such as the Town Center Green project, which would benefit wider community operations.

Ms. Carroll likes the design and the incorporation of the lighting. Ms. Wang also favors the plan, remarking that it does provide a wide community benefit. Mr. Niland agreed with Ms. Carroll and Ms. Wang, adding that this would get a tremendous amount of use from pedestrians. Mr. Cavanna would like to see some type of signage. Mr. Pennington noted that there are intentions to install signage in the entrance area, but they can look into other areas to supplement that. Mr. Gullotta observed that every walkway with a circuitous route has a path through the grass that is bare, so they might find that people will not use this walkway in the way that it is intended.

c. Discussion and possible action concerning recommendation to State Legislators to establish an affordable insurance program for farmers.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby requests that Glastonbury's State Legislators work to establish an affordable, statewide insurance program that would benefit Glastonbury Farmers, and in doing so, that said Legislators seek the input of the Town's Agricultural Advisory Committee.

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

d. Discussion and possible action concerning use of ARPA funds balance for the 50 Nye Road parking project.

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 reappropriation of \$374,479 for construction of a parking lot to benefit 50 Nye Road is a purpose consistent with the US Treasury Guidelines.

Discussion: Mr. Luiz explained that the parking lot for the Nye Road affordable housing project will cost \$795,700. A \$500,000 STEAP grant has been received. To make up the difference, they should return to the account that was initially established. The Council should also return to the BOF to ask whether this is a legit use of monies and whether the monies are available. Mr. Cavanaugh will vote to send this to the BOF, but if his math is correct, the Town will have spent \$3.6 million on this project, with more costs to come. He believes that this money could have been used to benefit a much larger percentage of the community, through capital improvements throughout town. Ms. Carroll countered that building a strong community with more affordable options is a benefit to the Glastonbury community as a whole.

Ms. Wang noted that millions of the Town's ARPA funds have been spent on capital improvement projects that benefit the community. She explained that this amount towards affordable housing was an intended purpose of ARPA money and puts Glastonbury in a better position to defend against CGS 8-30g projects. Mr. McChesney added that this particular building is also being discussed to house BOE programs and offices, which would save \$200,000 per year over the long-term from their current rental agreements. Mr. Gullotta commented that the Chairman of the BOE has stated, on the record, that the BOE is looking to move their offices there, and the first floor would be used for childcare.

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

6. Consent Calendar. *None*

7. Town Manager's Report.

Mr. Luiz presented his report. Mr. Cavanna provided a crime report received from the Glastonbury Police Chief. By June 30 of this year, he noted that the Town had already surpassed the number of burglaries, identity thefts, motor vehicle thefts, and thefts from motor vehicles in the entirety of 2022. He also pointed out that the cul de sac turnaround located at Crystal Ridge has been a popular location for smoking pot and doing burnouts. He believes that this is due to the fact that there is limited police staffing at midnight and the location's proximity to the outskirts of town. After speaking with officers, Mr. Cavanna discovered that there are no signs to prevent people from parking in the area. He has spoken with every resident on that street who unanimously signed a petition to install No Parking signs. The Police Chief has indicated that he will look into the matter. Mr. Cavanna hopes that this issue will be resolved swiftly.

Mr. McChesney looks forward to hearing Chief Porter's findings. He also thanked the GPD for assisting him with a situation earlier this week involving a strange vehicle parked on his lawn. He also recognized that the apple harvest festival is this weekend and the spooky story stroll is the following week. Mr. Cavanaugh noted that the Main Street development project has been withdrawn but a new project has been proposed with more than enough parking needed. He worries that the applicant will pursue a CGS 8-30g application, as their attorney has threatened they would do. To prevent this from transpiring, he would like the Council to change the zone to an industrial zone. Mr. Gullotta requested providing the Council with a brief report on the condition of the dykes around the sewer treatment plant. Mr. Luiz agreed to provide it.

8. Committee Reports.

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

9. Communications. *None*

10. Minutes.

- a. **Minutes of September 26, 2023 Regular Meeting.**

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

Result: Minutes were accepted unanimously {8-0-0}.

11. Appointments and Resignations.

None

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. (CONTINUED FROM THE SEPTEMBER 26, 2023 TOWN COUNCIL MEETING).

Ms. Caltagirone presented the preliminary project proposal for a mixed income housing project which will provide 174 units in 44 multi-family townhouse buildings; of this, 35 will be affordable dwelling units. She explained that the density of this project is approximately 6 units per acre, factoring in the PAD of 20% set aside for affordable housing and a rezoning from Rural Residence to Residence A. Considerable public comments have been received thus far, of which 18 were opposed and 7 were in support of the proposal. The Town has also received a petition with 90 signatories to reject the proposed zoning change. Because this hearing is not a final adoption, the petition will not apply tonight. However, if this moves forward in the future, the petition would require a two-thirds majority vote in order to adopt the zoning change. The purpose of tonight's hearing is to solicit feedback on the applicant's preliminary development.

Bob Zanolungo of the TPZ noted that commissioners Flores and Jagel are excused this evening.

Meghan Hope, attorney with Alter & Pearson, LLC, represented the preliminary development plan for Elf Way PAD. The project is located on three contiguous parcels. She noted that while the PAD regulation allows for greater flexibility in developing a parcel, it also provides the Council with more control over the proposal. The affordable housing PAD regulation sought for this project provides an additional density bonus from that provided by the PAD regulation. She noted that this is the same portion of the regulation that the Town is utilizing for the Nye Road project. She then reviewed a map of developments in the surrounding area. Ms. Hope also provided additional precedent examples regarding the double zone change process. The most recent one is the proposed Nye Road PAD from Planned Employment to Residence A to PAD.

Rohan Freeman, the applicant, lives in Glastonbury. He is a professional engineer and land surveyor who is part of several organizations related to creating affordable housing in Connecticut. He conceived this project in 2018, but it has gone through many iterations. He explained that Connecticut has a housing crisis and not enough workers to fill all the vacancies in the state. He believes that his project is less transient than a rental market environment and will allow people to become investors in Glastonbury. The units will be marketed at 80% of AMI whereas low income housing starts at 20% of AMI. Workforce housing is aimed at a population making 60-120% of AMI. The town currently has less than 6% affordable housing stock. This development, along with the Nye Road project, will bring that up to 6.3%. He believes that this site will preserve the rural aspects of Glastonbury, while helping to keep seniors and graduates in town. It will also increase the range of housing options available in town. He wants the Glastonbury community to know that he is available to discuss this project anytime.

Ms. Hope reviewed the existing aerial view of the surrounding area. She reviewed the other options that were considered before this 174-unit proposal. Two road connections are proposed: one towards the existing right of way, and the other right of way by Feldspar Ridge. She noted that the Conservation Commission seeks to expand on the existing conservation easements in the area. Proposed on the site are 1.27 miles of walking trails, a clubhouse, a pool, two tennis courts, and two pickleball courts. Also proposed is a public road on Feldspar Ridge to connect the two existing town roads in the development; the other roads would be private. She noted that the parking can be calculated in different ways. There are 597 total parking spaces, which amounts to about 3.4 spaces per unit. Without the tandem spaces, there are about 1.9 spaces per unit. Based on the existing regulations, they only need one parking space per unit. Ms. Hope then showed a conceptual townhome building design and the floor plans. She concluded that there is a long process for a PAD application before returning for a final application.

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

The following comments were made in-person, at Council Chambers:

Roger Emerick of 580 Hopewell Road, believes that the proposal for a zone change should be subject to a referendum. He is worried at the large population increases in both the town and the world. He believes that approving a zone change from rural residence to PAD will simply profit a few minor developers while destroying the environment. CGS 8-30g was passed decades before the current climate crisis. However, under subsection (g) of that statute, applications can be denied based on a significant risk to public health and safety. He supports establishing a town entity to purchase farms to prevent development, such as what was done with Rose's Berry Farms.

Jen Jennings of 34 Cranesbill Drive, is a realtor and sits on the BOE. She asked to think about the impact of this proposal on the school system. She requested an analysis of the impact on the cost of creating a new school.

Stephen Michaels of 225 Grandview Drive, asked to pin this until the BOE has come in with a complete plan before moving forward. The Town is over capacity and needs to renovate Gideon Welles. Redistricting again will run in the millions.

Christopher Gulliver of 60 Feldspar Ridge (Glastonbury Heights), spoke on behalf of the opposition who submitted the petition to block the zoning change from Rural Residence. He noted that the woods across the north of the plan were listed as 140 units built there, but only 74 units were constructed. He stated that many moved to this neighborhood under the idea that the zoning will remain. A possible redistricting of schools would likely affect his children. He also takes issue with the fact that a small percentage of the units will be affordable housing, which will only exacerbate the problem it was supposed to solve. Placing 174 units down an unmarked road with no traffic signal is dangerous. Additionally, there is a 200-foot grade from the top of the property to the wetlands, which will be dangerous under inclement weather. He asked for a no blasting policy to be put in place.

Maureen Pickup of 91 Uplands Way, is a retired social worker in north Middletown who understands the issue of housing. However, she does not believe that this proposal will help. So many people will come through a residential neighborhood and down a steep hill which is dangerous in the winter. She opposes the application based on safety and traffic reasons.

Maysa Amed of 92 Uplands Way, is opposed to the proposed zoning changes because rural residence zoning laws reflect community values, which protect open space and natural resources. She believes that the proposal will increase traffic and congestion, increase strains on infrastructures, reduce property values, and harm the environment. Further, she finds that the proposal would be inconsistent with the Town's POCD and incompatible with the existing character of their community. She also believes that it would not address the housing shortage in the community. She asked to focus instead on infill development.

Pam Lucas of 145 Moseley Terrace, finds the project to be well thought out, incorporating open space and providing strongly-needed affordable housing. The Nye Road project makes a small but important dent in the regional need. She believes that the Elf Way plan provides some missing middle housing. She asked Mr. Freeman to consider increasing the percentage of affordable units and to make some of them rental units. She noted that mixed income developments often enhance property values and believes that it is only a matter of time before the land on Feldspar Ridge is developed. She asked to approve the preliminary proposal and refer to the PAD subcommittee for further guidance.

Mark Pappa of 41 Uplands Way, believes that this is a good proposal for Orlando, Florida, but too dense and large for Glastonbury. The street was never designed for such a heavy flow of traffic. He is embarrassed that the town let the developer acquire this property instead of buying it themselves. Mr. Pappa once served on the conservation commission for the town of Newington, where a development did not go through because the public fought to preserve wildlife. He believes that a vote to change the zoning here will open up every other farm with that label for development.

Denise Weeks of 334 Hollister Way, supports this preliminary proposal which will include necessary units. She applauds including 20% of units with 80% of AMI and encourages including some at even 60% of AMI. She applauds the developer for including universal design. She hopes that the traffic concerns would be addressed.

Lisa Wilcox of 41 Paddock Lane, believes it crucial to support affordable housing, and finds it ideal to have a developer who lives in town to take on that task. She finds that this is an unattractive piece of land surrounded by other housing developments, which makes it a good place to put more residences. She believes that this, in turn, will bring more businesses into town, thereby making the process beneficial all around.

Greg Aster of 41 Haddock Lane, is a mechanical engineer who has known the developer for 25 years. He is disappointed by all the opposition to this proposal. He acknowledged that there are traffic issues, but does not believe that they are that bad. He also noted that low income versus affordable income are two vastly different things. He believes that the developer is trying to come up with a plan that makes sense, and people should open their minds.

David Danenberg of 13 Kinne Road, finds the plan to be efficient. He suggested perhaps dialing back the number of units to reach a happy medium.

Brent Germain of 76 Brookhaven Drive, has known Mr. Freeman for decades. He supports condominiums in Glastonbury and supports this project.

Michael Horne of 502 Tall Timbers Road, is a retired professional engineer who lives right by Smith Brook. He pointed out that the 90 people who signed the petition live within 500 feet of the development. This does not include the people throughout the entire area. He noted that traffic will increase in New London Turnpike and Uplands Way, which will likely cause a traffic light to be installed. He fears that runoff may cause Smith Brook to flood and wastewater systems to become overloaded.

Barb Rubin of 1699 Main Street, has known Mr. Freeman for years. It does not surprise her that he is taking things into account and has included affordable housing, as well.

David O'Connor of 1140 Main Street, spoke in support of the housing development project and the inclusion of affordable units in the plan. He recommended making half the affordable units be available at 60% of AMI, which amounts to \$80,000 per year for a family of four. He also asked to include rental units, not just home ownership. He believes that increased diversity will make Glastonbury a stronger community.

Ken Gordon of 15 Colton Road, has two children who love living in Glastonbury, so he supports increasing opportunities for young and older folks to stay in town. He noted that economic diversity also means having an ethnic diversity and the lack thereof was a deterrent for him as a black man. He would like to see more people who look like him and who have different backgrounds. Therefore, he fully supports this program.

Erin Boggs of 612 Manchester Road, is a civil right lawyer who runs Open Communities Alliance. She noted that Connecticut is one of the most segregated states in the country and is in the midst of a housing crisis. She feels that this proposal offers critically-needed housing in the community. She recommended deeper affordability, with at least 30% affordable units: half at 60% AMI and half at 80% AMI; they could even go higher at 40% AMI. She also recommended that a meaningful percentage be accessible to people with physical and mobility challenges.

Patrick Kinney of 185 Feldspar Ridge, opposes the development, which he heard about just a few days ago. He noted that a lot of homes on Feldspar Ridge are on wells, and construction of this size might be disruptive to those property owners. He also worries about 600 cars on a steep country road in the winter.

Scott Hankard of 17 Kettle Pond Drive, finds the applicant to be a good family man with integrity. He believes that Mr. Freeman is developing the property with a vision to fulfill a much-needed demand. He believes that this location off New London Turnpike is perfect for such a development. He also likes that the proposed development will bring in new taxes, employees, and housing options for homeowners.

Susan Heffernan-Gaieski of 85 Feldspar Ridge, expressed safety concerns related to disrupting groundwater, which could affect property owners on well water. She asked that the Council and TPZ hire independent, third party consultants to study the potential impacts related to excavation and/or blasting, as well as require annual safety inspections thereafter. She also asked to utilize the sustainability report of the POCD. If this site is ultimately deemed unsuitable for this development, she encouraged the Council to purchase it to preserve as open space.

Beata Liss of 17 Paxton Way, made a concerted decision to purchase a home on Paxton Way, partly due to the zoning which provided space and security. She is not concerned about the cost of these proposed homes or the demographics of the proposed owners or renters. However, she is concerned about the zone change.

Thomas Burr of 33 Mark Drive, is an engineer with 15 years of nonprofit experience working with housing issues. He knows the applicant personally and supports the proposal. He encouraged the Council to move forward on the plan.

Mary Duncan of 60 Feldspar Ridge, stated that she and her husband moved to Glastonbury two years ago. At the time, she was told by the town engineer that she could not put a barn on her property for weddings, but now, this application is proposed with a zone change. She is not against developing the property, but finds the proposal to be outrageous.

Pamela EKOCHA of 209 Feldspar Ridge, just moved to town four weeks ago. She has two young children, with whom she walks around the neighborhood every day. As a minority, she chose this area because it was safe and diverse. She asked to think of the young families moving in, who do not wish to see a rural, safe area become overdeveloped. She opposes the development.

Melissa Miner of 146 Feldspar Ridge, asked the Council not to approve the zoning change. Many safety issues have been raised and the public had only a week to understand what was going on. She seeks the same courtesy of time that was granted to the developer.

Elaine Hawk of 238 Feldspar Ridge, opposes the proposal. After living in NYC and LA, she chose Glastonbury for its schools and charm. She finds Glastonbury Heights to be diverse. However, she expressed safety concerns with the traffic of New London Turnpike and no ability to walk because the sidewalks stop midway. She wants to ensure that there is proper infrastructure before constructing affordable housing. Her family was promised that her children would go to Hopewell School, but then found out about the rezoning, which they fought against. She supports a study by the BOE because it will affect all the children moving into that area.

Katie Roh of 212 Paxton Way, opposes this proposal. As a first generation immigrant, she grew up in a small NYC apartment. Now, she has two children in the Glastonbury school system. She felt safe during the pandemic because of what this town was able to provide. She supports the call for an independent study on all the environmental considerations and the BOE's proposal on the impact on children. She requested more time for the entire town to consider and understand the impact of this proposal.

Melissa Burke of 322 Paxton Way, grew up in Wethersfield but always wanted to move to Glastonbury. She believes that the sense of community and safety fostered by this community would disappear if this proposal were to go through. While she supports affordable housing in Glastonbury, she does not believe that this is the right spot for it. She asked to prevent the change in zoning.

Agnes Gagnon of 20 Olde Village Road, opposes the development which she heard about too late. She can understand why people are afraid about the safety of certain neighborhoods. She feels that perhaps they need to be careful about what their neighborhoods are becoming.

Ms. Carroll noted that 26 written comments were received, of which 7 were in favor and 19 were opposed to the proposal. She did not read them into the record, but they are summarized below. *Note that a few commenters also spoke in person, so their written comments have been omitted.*

Dave Gorman of 25 Smithbrook Terrace, opposes the proposed construction as the area has already been subjected to many accidents caused by excessive vehicles and poor visibility. He believes that adding hundreds more cars to these intersections would greatly increase hazards. He worries about the town losing its charm with these increases in traffic, additional traffic signals, and congestion. Existing intersections will soon be overwhelmed. He would like a traffic study done on New London Turnpike to predict the possible effects of a significant increase in traffic.

Ketki Vahalia of 166 Feldspar Ridge, opposes the zone change because the Feldspar Ridge neighborhood is a Rural Residence zone, with single-family homes, and the addition of a PAD zone will attract renters and temporary residents, which will significantly impact the character of the neighborhood. She also worries about the exacerbated capacity issue at Hopewell, which in turn will impact children's education. She stated that Uplands Way and Feldspar Ridge were not designed to handle such a significant increase in motor vehicle traffic. She also worries about increased emission of noise, light, and smoke, as well as possible issues in the quality and quantity of well water for current residents.

Stewart Everard of 89 Autumn Lane, finds the current zoning of Rural Residence to be correct for the 30 acres in question.

Arielle Riech of 116 Feldspar Ridge, opposes the proposed change of zone. She purchased her home just 18 months ago, with the intention of living in a neighborhood that was safe for her children to play. She asked why there is no process to secure more viable land. She noted that the roads in the area are incapable of handling an additional 180-200 cars a day and also worries about the impact on their well water. She asked not to benefit one project at the cost of many neighbors who oppose it.

Sriharsha Subramanya of 105 Paxton Way, supports the petition against converting farmland into new development lots. She believes that the zoning should remain as is.

James Macchio of 134 Feldspar Ridge, rejects this proposal as it is not the correct location to build a huge new complex of homes. He worries about the adverse effect this would have on the property values of neighboring homes on Feldspar Ridge and Paxton Road. He also worries about disturbing the local wildlife which live in the woods. He is also opposed to any blasting.

Susan Dzialo of 363 Main Street, opposes the application. She laments the erosion of Glastonbury's rural charm over the generations. She asked to halt this trend of overdevelopment and not ruin the town any further.

Jenny and Nate Rickles of 229 Feldspar Ridge, oppose the proposal because it would adversely impact the residential nature of the area, would overburden the school system and the roadways, and likely require blasting which would generate noise and pollution during construction. They also worry about the negative impact on the market value of their homes.

Thomas Burke of 322 Paxton Way, opposes the proposal because it will negatively impact the character of his neighborhood and the evaluation of home properties throughout the neighborhood. He finds the plan of 182 units to be excessive for the neighborhood, and the emission of light, noise, smoke, and traffic will impact the quality and safety of the current residents of the two streets.

Uday Patel of 22 Paxton Way, rejects this development because it will cause tons of problems on top of overdeveloped areas for nearby existing residents.

Jill Durall of 73 Shagbark Road, asked to stop the development which will ruin their community. She finds the traffic to already be horrendous.

Chris Balfanz of 199 Stockade Road, is a realtor in town who supports the proposed zone change. He also supports increasing the amount of affordable units in the development from 20% to 30% or 40% to better meet the need for affordable housing. He also suggested designating some or all of the affordable units as rental units.

Pilar Botero of 14 Uplands Way, opposes the proposal because it will add more traffic to the area which is already excessive and dangerous.

Evan Lyle of 37 Uplands Way, opposes the proposal because it will increase the amount of traffic on Uplands Way, which is a narrow road with no center line divider. He finds that the amount of traffic and the narrowness of the area does not lend itself to being the only access into this proposed large development. He asked the Council to reject the proposal.

Russell Brown of 90 Uplands Way, believes that approval of this application will destroy one of the most beautiful and visible spots in town. He noted that Uplands Way is not meant for the kind of traffic that will be generated by the development. He asked to reject the proposal.

Donna Kidwell of 22 Williams Glen Way, believes that affordable housing in Glastonbury is critical. She finds that this proposal will work towards that goal. She supports increasing the affordable units to 30%, with half at 60% AMI and half at 80% AMI. She asked that affordable units be rentals and not homeownership and to develop an affirmative marketing plan so the units will be marketed regionally. She also requested including a meaningful number of units which will be accessible for those with mobility challenges.

William Marut of 264 Carriage Drive, advocates for additional affordable housing in Glastonbury. He requests that 30% to 40% of units be affordable. Of the affordable units, he requests that one half be affordable at 60% AMI and the other half at 80% AMI. He asked that the affordable units be rental, rather than homeownership, and would like to require an affirmative marketing plan to ensure that the units are marketed regionally. He also requests inclusion of a meaningful number of units accessible for those with mobility challenges.

Robert Dakers of 15 Trifiro Circle, supports the proposal, which could help respond to the need for more multi-unit housing options in Glastonbury. He supports further strengthening the proposal's affordable unit provisions. He also believes that the multi-unit developments could be developed in a manner that complements surrounding areas while meeting vital community needs.

Amol Luktuke of 16 Derby Way, does not support the proposed zone change.

Joseph Pawelek of 60 Wagon Road, supports the development but would like to see more affordable units for middle and lower income families, as well as more accessible to elders and people with disabilities. He requests that at least 30% of the units be designated as affordable, with half of those affordable at 60% AMI and half at 80% AMI. He also requests that the affordable units be designated as rental housing and asks that the town require an affirmative marketing plan to ensure that the units are marketed regionally. He also asked the town to work with the developer to establish a plan for a meaningful percentage of units to be accessible to people with disabilities.

David Liscinsky of 100 Bellridge Road, supports the proposal and any modifications that would increase affordability for those below the local median income of \$106,000 for a family of four. He asked to consider increasing the current 20% allowance.

The following comment was received via Zoom:

John Solan of 163 Feldspar Ridge, is a mechanical engineer. He asked the developer to correctly show the amount of vegetation that would exist between the existing and new properties because there is not enough buffer. He believes that the proposal will negatively impact all his neighbors. He is also opposed to having a trail in their backyard. While he opposes the proposal as it exists, he would like to see an alternative proposal that wraps the new traffic onto New London Turnpike.

Attorney Hope responded to the public comments. Regarding the potential impact on the groundwater, she explained that they typically submit a geological report with their applications. They will not know whether there will be a need for blasting until then. Another option, if the Council chooses, is to have the applicant pay for the third party review. Regarding the suggestion for the road on New London Turnpike, she explained that they have looked into this, but there is a wetlands system which would be directly impacted. Even if the road were to change, there will be a requirement to have two access points for this development. They are open to feedback on different buffering or space. She noted that it was important for the applicant to bring forward an application that included economic diversity with affordable components. The traffic report will be filed as part of their PAD application.

Mr. Niland thanked everyone for their civility. He noted that the Council has been vocal about affordable housing in this location, but the applicant is asking them to make two big jumps, from Rural Residence A to a PAD. He finds the size too massive in this area. He is also concerned about the prospective need to add a new school in town. What he finds most concerning is the proximity to the other homes that were purchased in rural residence areas. He is also concerned about the lack of

recreational space, noting that conservation easements are not recreational space for children. He also suggested working with town staff to find names of a couple traffic engineers to conduct the traffic study; this transparent process would help the applicant gain the trust of the community.

Mr. Cavanaugh asked who granted the two right of ways and who they were granted to. Ms. Hope explained that when the proposal was done for Uplands Way in 1984, the town looked to provide the developer with extra land. Two stubs were deeded to the town for future roads. Mr. Cavanaugh is unclear on where the cutouts for the roads are. Daniel Jameson, Project Manager at Freeman Companies, LLC, pointed out the right of ways. Mr. Cavanaugh asked to clarify the comments about the parking. Ms. Hope explained that there is some parking inside the garage, some tandem, and some are open to the air, spread throughout the site. Mr. Cavanaugh asked what is the benefit to the community for increased density, absent the affordable housing component. Ms. Hope explained that, typically, PADs are pursued because they are concentrating in a certain area and leaving other areas open to protect things like wetlands.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby extends the meeting until 12:00 a.m.

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

Mr. Cavanaugh believes that the proposal is too intense for the area. He would like the applicant to hold neighborhood meetings. Commissioner Purtill of the TPZ agrees that this is a density issue. To her, this is dropping down three levels. She noted that if this were a single family subdivision, only 22 houses would be allowed. This means that the applicant proposes more than 8 times the density of that. She does not see any open space that is not undevelopable land. She is also concerned about the well water and blasting issues. She does not favor the proposal as it currently stands.

Commissioner Cahill noted that the applicant expressed that if this were to be approved, Glastonbury's affordable housing percentage would go up to 6.3% from the current 5.9%. She asked to explain the legal basis for that. Ms. Hope stated that the affordable units would be deed restricted in perpetuity. Ms. Cahill is deeply concerned that the Town can actually get up to the 10% needed to qualify for an exemption from CGS 8-30g applications. She then asked about the differences in the average market rate versus affordable rate. Attorney Peter Alter of Alter & Pearson, LLC explained that there is a basic standard for the affordability measure, whether for rent or for sale. Right now, the maximum permissible sales price for an affordable home is \$313,505 versus about \$500,000 for the market rate. Ms. Hope noted that they submit an affordability plan as part of the application.

Ms. Cahill would like to see a fully independent traffic analysis, as well as a full environmental analysis. She also supports calls for the BOE to review possible school changes. She does not support blasting and is disappointed that the project does not contain any provisions for disability units. She is not a fan of tandem parking and believes that close to 600 parking spots are too many additional cars. She finds that the site, as proposed, is too dense and needs to be reworked. She agreed with Mr. Cavanaugh on the need for the applicant to hold neighborhood meetings. She noted that neighbors may want to hire their own counsel. She supports pushing this application to another public hearing.

Commissioner Hassett supports sustainability and would like the site to meet LEED certification. He noted that this is still a \$7 million project, so there is a lot of money to be made with a project of this density. He is concerned about the density. Commissioner Markuszka asked if the EV space will be an

EV charging station. Ms. Hope replied yes. Mr. Markuszka also supports scaling down the project. He supports creating a playground and a dog park, as well as traffic calming measures such as speed bumps. Commissioner Turner explained that in order for a PAD to be viable, it has to have a benefit to the town. He suggested reducing the density in Rural Residence A, while still retaining the affordable housing component. He also recommends an independent third party analysis, as well as collecting information from the BOE.

Commissioner DesMarais agreed that the density is a concern. He lives nearby and sees the traffic already there with cars speeding down the hill. He noted that the sidewalks connecting to the community do not exist. Commissioner Zanolungo reiterated many of the concerns expressed, but reminded everyone that this is the start of the process. He agreed that the proposal is very dense. Mr. Cavanna believes it is a privilege to live in this town, not a right. He opposes the proposal. Ms. Carroll appreciates that the developer is a Glastonbury resident. Her concern is not the density per se because it is roughly the same as that of the Nye Road project. What concerns her is the scope, which is three times the size of the Nye Road project. At its current state, she is not on board because the scope is far beyond what fits in that space.

Mr. Niland asked about fire truck access. Mr. Jameson explained that they designed the site with cut throughs so that fire trucks will be able to get through. There would be multiple curbs to allow a safe maneuver. Ms. LaChance believes that the proposal is far too dense. She pointed out that the Nye Road project will be providing far more affordable housing in perpetuity than this proposal. She also noted that the proposed units are three stories, which will prevent seniors and those with mobility issues from access. She does not approve the proposal as it stands.

Ms. Wang agreed with Ms. Purtill that this proposal will jump three levels of zone. She believes that the need for affordable housing will require some multi-family units, but what is unclear is how to go about doing that. She also spoke to the concern that was expressed by public commenters regarding the process, noting that the Council also just received this information very recently. She appreciates that Mr. Freeman is a member of this community and hopes that everyone can work together to find a solution that works for all.

Mr. McChesney finds the project far too dense. He agreed with some of the neighbors that it is out of line with the developments around it. As someone who grew up on government assisted housing, he believes that many people deserve the opportunity to live in this town. He supports affordable housing, not just for outsiders coming in, but also for seniors and youths to be able to stay in town. He supported the Nye Road affordable housing project because it was a unique opportunity for the town to use government funding to purchase a desirable piece of land, thereby also preventing developers from constructing something massive. He hopes to see a plan that will be supported by the community at large, as well as the developer.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

NO. 1 ACTION ON AN APPROPRIATION OF \$220,000 IN ARPA MONIES IN SUPPORT OF THE FARM ASSISTANCE PROGRAM. (PUBLIC HEARING NO. 1 TO BE POSTPONED TO THE OCTOBER 24, 2023 COUNCIL MEETING.)

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby postpones the public hearing for action on an appropriation of \$220,000 in ARPA monies in support of the Farm Assistance Program to the Tuesday, October 24, 2023 Council meeting, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated October 6, 2023.

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

NO. 2 ACTION ON PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO TOWN CODE OF ORDINANCES, CHAPTER 18, ARTICLE III "TAX ABATEMENTS FOR DAIRY FARMS, SECTION 18-31 "REGULATIONS GENERALLY".

Mr. Gullotta opened the floor for public comments.

Matthew Staebner of 529 Hopewell Road, used to be a full-time farmer. He is in favor of the tax abatements because they will allow farmers to invest in new equipment. He believes that Glastonbury should lead the way in supporting farms.

With no further comments, Mr. Gullotta closed the public hearing.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves amendments to the Town Code Chapter 18, Article III, Section 18-31, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated October 6, 2023 and as recommended by the Policy & Ordinance Review Committee, with said amendments effective October 24, 2023.

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

NO. 3 ACTION CONCERNING ADOPTION OF THE TOWN CENTER DESIGN GUIDELINES.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby continues the public hearing to the October 24, 2023 meeting, to gather more public input.

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

NO. 4 ACTION ON TRANSFER FROM THE GENERAL FUND-UNASSIGNED FUND BALANCE FOR \$349,931 FOR GOODS AND SERVICES ORDERED BUT NOT YET RECEIVED AS OF JUNE 30, 2023.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves a \$349,931 transfer from the General Fund-Unassigned Fund Balance for goods and services ordered but not yet received as of June 30, 2023, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated October 6, 2023 and as recommended by the Board of Finance.

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

12. Executive Session.

- a. Discussion of the selection of a site or the lease, sale or purchase of real estate.**
- b. Discussion of records exempt from FOIA (attorney client privilege)**
- c. Personnel matter – Town Manager.**

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby enters into Executive Session at 11:56 p.m. for the purpose of:

- a. Discussion of the selection of a site or the lease, sale or purchase of real estate.*
- b. Discussion of records exempt from FOIA (attorney client privilege)*
- c. Personnel matter – Town Manager.*

Attendees to include Council Members. Town Manager did not participate in Executive Session.

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

The Council came out of Executive Session at 11:58 p.m.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby adjourns the Town Council meeting of October 10, 2023 at 11:59 p.m.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Lilly Torosyan

Lilly Torosyan

Recording Clerk

Thomas Gullotta

Chairman