

**THE GLASTONBURY TOWN PLAN AND ZONING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES OF TUESDAY, OCTOBER 17, 2023**

The Glastonbury Town Plan and Zoning Commission with Shelley Caltagirone, Director of Community Development, and Gary Haynes, Planner, in attendance, held a Regular Meeting at 7:00 P.M. in the Council Chambers of Town Hall at 2155 Main Street with an option for Zoom conferencing. The video was broadcast in real time and via a live video stream.

ROLL CALL

Commission Members Present

Mr. Robert J. Zanolungo, Jr., Chairman

Mr. Corey Turner, Secretary

Mr. Philip Markuszka

Ms. Laura Cahill, Alternate (participated via Zoom; seated as full voting member)

Mr. Dennis DesMarais, Alternate (seated as full voting member)

Ms. Sharon Jagel, Alternate (seated as full voting member)

Commission Members Absent

Mrs. Sharon Purtill, Vice Chair

Mr. Emilio Flores

Mr. Raymond Hassett

Chairman Zanolungo called the meeting to order at 7:03 P.M. In the absence of Commissioners Purtill, Flores and Hassett, he seated Alternates Cahill, DesMarais and Jagel.

PUBLIC COMMENT - None

PUBLIC HEARING

1. Application of Joseph Lavertu for a Section 6.11 Accessory Apartment Special Permit - 84 Bell Street - Rural Residence Zone

Mr. Lavertu provided an overview of the proposal. He proposes a one-bedroom, 800 square foot accessory apartment to be built above an existing 3-car garage. The garage will be attached to the house by a foyer/mudroom addition. Ingress and egress will be through the shared foyer/mudroom addition. The apartment will consist of a kitchen, office, living area, bedroom, and full bath. House and accessory apartment will be serviced by sanitary sewer; the current septic system will be abandoned. Per Section 6.11, the project would expand the Town's variety of housing types, including efficient and affordable housing for singles, couples, single parents with one child, elderly, and new households. The proposal meets the standards of Section 6.11.3 in terms of size (less than 800 square feet), number of bedrooms (no more than 1), and kitchen facilities. The site provides parking sufficient for the use. The proposal also meets all of the design standards in terms of compatibility and scale. The proposal has been reviewed and approved by the Health Department. The applicant stated that the floor plan is 800 square feet, minus the mechanical room.

Ms. Jagel noted that the mechanical room and laundry were excluded from the calculations and asked Town staff if this was appropriate. Mr. Haynes said that, typically, they give applicants some leniency for storage areas and explained that similar applications were approved. He added that the existing garage is working with the existing footprint, which limits the options. Mr. Haynes noted that the mechanical room storage is 84 square feet. Secretary Turner asked if the laundry room could be moved away from the utility room. Mr. Haynes responded that it is a fair point and added that it could be part of the condition of approval. There was further discussion about the utility room. The applicant said that, because of the building footprint, it made the most sense putting the utility room where it is. Mr. Turner suggested moving the laundry area to a small closet and as he is concerned about setting precedent and did not want to give the impression that 800 square feet is flexible. The applicant said that he discussed this with the builder and the option that makes the most sense is the one that is presented. Mr. Lavertu reiterated that they are working with the existing footprint and it is difficult to change the layout. He further explained that, building-wise, it does not make sense to cut into wall and he does not want a situation where there is water damage. Ms. Jagel asked if it was possible to move the interior wall and make the utility room smaller. She also asked if it was possible to bring the washer and dryer into the living space with bi-fold doors. Ms. Cahill asked the applicant to explain if there is a second egress in case of fire. She noted that she does not see this on the plans. Mr. Lavertu said that the second exit would be through the window and down a ladder. Ms. Cahill asked Town staff if they looked into this. Mr. Haynes replied that it would have to meet the building code requirements and added that the bedroom window would be the egress. He stated that this would meet the building requirements.

Mr. DesMarais remarked that he is comfortable with the mechanical/laundry room and suggested labeling it just mechanical room. Mr. Markuszka is fine with it as is and added that the addition would have to be insulated. Ms. Jagel noted that the foyer is a pretty large space and asked if there was a rendering of how the foyer will look. Mr. Haynes said that it was not included in the materials and asked the applicant to explain how the connection would be made. Mr. Haynes added that it is difficult to see because of the grading on-site. He said that, to left of the larger patio, the entrance will be by the 3 windows. Mr. Lavertu added that connected to that will be a mudroom area and a door across. He stated that footing and filling will be involved because of the grades. The applicant said that he tried to make it as visually appealing as possible. Ms. Jagel asked if double doors were on each side. The applicant stated it would be a single door. Ms. Jagel asked if there were any window treatments. The applicant replied that he is considering a patio door.

Chairman Zanolungo noted that he does not have an issue with mechanical/laundry room, and opened the floor for public comments; there were none.

Motion by: Secretary Turner

Seconded by: Ms. Jagel

MOVED, that the Town Plan and Zoning Commission approve the application of Joseph Lavertu for a Section 6.11 Accessory Apartment Special Permit – 84 Bell Street – Rural Residence Zone – in accordance with plans on file with the Office of Community Development, and in compliance with the following conditions:

1. Adherence to:
 - a. The Health Department memorandum dated September 20, 2023.
 - b. The Police Department memorandum dated September 27, 2023.
 - c. The Engineering Department memorandum dated September 27, 2023.
2. If unforeseen conditions are encountered during construction that would cause deviation from the approved plans, the applicant shall consult with the Office of Community Development to determine what further approvals, if any, are required.
3. Prior to issuance of Building Permit, the applicant shall file the motion of approval on the land records and provide proof of such filing to the Office of Community Development.

Result: Motion passed unanimously (6-0-0).

2. Recommendation to Town Council (Zoning Authority) regarding the application of the Glastonbury Housing Authority to re-zone 55 Nye Road from Planned Employment Zone to Residence A Zone & Planned Area Development

and

3. Recommendation to Town Council (Zoning Authority) regarding the application of the Glastonbury Housing Authority for a Final Development Plan regarding 55 Nye Road to allow a 64-unit affordable housing community with 6 duplexes, 10 four-unit and 2 six-unit buildings and a community building

Ms. Caltagirone noted that the project is in the design and development stage and added that it will be continued to the next meeting. She briefed the Commission on the next steps which include a third Architectural and Site Design Review (ASDRC) meeting as well as another subcommittee meeting.

Mr. Tom Arcari of QA+M Architecture introduced himself and the team. He said that Neil Griffin, Director of the Glastonbury Housing Authority, was not available. Mr. Arcari offered to give a brief overview. He said that the project is maturing nicely and added that they submitted plans on Friday. Mr. Arcari recapped that the proposal is for an affordable housing mixed neighborhood with market rate units. He stated that 64 total rental units are proposed, approximately 17 to 20 would be one-bedroom units; the majority would be two-bedroom with about a dozen three-bedroom units, saying that he will get exact numbers shortly. He said that they are proposing a one-way circulation drive around the neighborhood. Mr. Arcari noted that a family community is proposed with a series of duplexes, 4-unit buildings, and a couple of 6-unit buildings. He said that the development will be a walkable community, with sidewalks, front porches, and a series of communal green spaces that can be used as play lawns and activity areas. Mr. Arcari added that they are in the process of incorporating a half-court basketball. He pointed out the proposed green space between the units and said that the site will include an informal access to the nearby trail and nature path located to the east of the site.

Mr. Arcari provided information on the topography of the site. He explained that it is almost flat and the grade is 0 to 6 feet from one end of the site to the other. Mr. Arcari noted that the community building is in that area. It will have an entry, lobby, a couple of offices, and a thousand square feet meeting space for the community to utilize. Mr. Arcari stated that the architecture is in keeping with the character of Glastonbury. He noted that they have worked with ASDRC to create a residential community that looks like a suburban neighborhood in Glastonbury. He remarked that ASDRC is happy with the strides that were made. Mr. Arcari went through the proposed building designs and the floor plans. He said that all buildings have an outdoor deck or patio space. Mr. Arcari remarked that they have an aggressive approval schedule for this project. He explained that the funding for this application requires approval prior and they need to submit for funding early to mid-January. Mr. Arcari said that the work they have put in demonstrates that they are on track and added that they will continue to work hand-in-hand with the community and committees. He noted that they will continue to listen to the feedback and incorporate the feedback into the plans. Mr. Arcari then read out the exact unit breakdown: There will be 24 one-bedroom units, 28 two-bedroom units, and 12 three-bedroom units, for a total of 64 units. Mr. Arcari said that many of the units are affordable, are designed to market standards with features like stone countertops, wood cabinets, and in-unit washer and dryer hookups.

Ms. Jagel asked how the application process works for applicants that meet the affordability criteria. Mr. Arcari responded that this question is best answered by Mr. Griffin and added that he has worked for many housing authorities and will provide some information. Mr. Arcari explained that a waiting list is created for applicants who qualify and is usually in a first-come, first-serve order. He said that the Housing Authority has to give public notice when the waiting list will open and added that it is a significant process. Affordability is based on a resident's income with the resident paying a certain percentage. He explained that tax credits would subsidize construction and added that a series of rental subsidies provide the remainder of rental to support the viability of development. Mr. Arcari said that the model is no different than Center Village. Ms. Caltagirone added that there are several tiers of affordability; very low, low, and moderate. Mr. Turner said that he is a member of the PAD subcommittee and had seen the project at different stages. He remarked that he is amazed at how much work went in and added that the changes are dramatic. Mr. Turner said that he did not have a chance to look at the traffic study and asked for an update; he was told the Traffic Engineer will be at the next meeting and can answer in more detail. The Civil Engineer explained that the intersection of House Street and Salmon Brook is currently a side street only and a 4-way stop sign is proposed. A signal re-timing is proposed for the intersection of Griswold and House Street.

Mr. Turner believes that the L-shaped units look better. He asked about the grid patterns on the window, one with a 6-over-1 pattern and 2-over-2. Mr. Turner asked if these were different buildings. Mr. Arcari answered that ASDRC asked to make the building look like a historical add on. There is a red building which looks like a barn that was modified over time; next to it is a grey unit. Mr. Arcari said that ASDRC likes the concept, which breaks up the scale and mass of the 4-unit building, making it look like a 2-unit structure. He noted that they are also exploring different uses of color. The bold red color might be used in another area and they are considering black. Mr. Arcari said that the majority of color is white and muted colors, sage or gray with stone accent, and maybe brick accent in a few places. Mr. Turner remarked that he is

looking forward to seeing the updated renderings and added that he is not sure he agrees with the color palette. Mr. Arcari shared that not everyone on ASDRC agrees. He stated that the concept matured significantly because of feedback. Mr. Arcari remarked that they cannot satisfy every voice and will continue trying to incorporate as many as possible. Mr. Turner agreed and added that a good job was done in making the buildings look individualized. Mr. Zanolungo remarked that he is not a fan of the red and believes that it looks like a movie set. He added that he is looking forward to seeing the project progress. Mr. Arcari remarked that they hope to sell them on one red structure out of fifteen.

Ms. Jagel asked where the mail area would be. Mr. Arcari responded that it is still being discussed, along with the bus drop-off. He explained that the mail area would likely be near the community building. Mr. Arcari added that the post office does not support any more walking routes. Ms. Jagel noted that, in the Tryon Farm development, there is a drive-up to a bank of boxes. She suggested looking into two mail areas, because the development is pretty large. Mr. Arcari said that they will look into this. Mr. Turner asked about the EV car charging location. The Civil Engineer replied that they are still in talks with Mr. Griffin and the location would be near the community building. He explained that the idea is to have them close and grouped together and added that it is costlier to scatter them. Mr. Turner asked if they fixed the turning radius; they demonstrated that they had.

Ms. Cahill said that she appreciates seeing the revised plans and asked how many units are handicap-accessible. She also asked if there are affordable and market rate units that are handicap accessible. Mr. Arcari replied that 10 percent of units are handicap accessible and added that all units are type A adaptable, which is required. He said that there are a mix of 1, 2, and 3-bedroom units that are handicap accessible. Ms. Cahill was pleased with this and asked if the site is still over the parking space number. Mr. Arcari replied that they reduced the amount of parking spaces and they are still over. He said that this will be presented at the next meeting and added that it was reduced by a pretty good chunk based on comments from other boards and committees. Ms. Cahill said that the ASDRC guidelines try not to have front parking and prefer more side and back parking. She noted that it looks like all the parking is in front of the building and asked if they have looked into moving the parking so it is less visible. Mr. Arcari replied that ASDRC likes the concept of parking on the drive and added that the concept is walkable to the street and buildings. He explained that there are topography issues north of the access drive which prevent putting in parking in the back. Mr. Arcari explained that there are a series of pedestrian walkways that connect to the activity lawns. Ms. Cahill asked for the updated plans to be delivered to her. She remarked that she likes the red building and added that it looks like a quintessential New England barn. Ms. Cahill likes the color scheme and would encourage two red buildings. Mr. Arcari thanked Ms. Cahill for her comments.

Ms. Jagel wanted to follow up on the parking and added that she supports two red buildings as well. She asked if the current parking count is 109 spaces. Mr. Arcari responded that it was initially close to 150 parking spots. Ms. Jagel said that the 64 units do not take into account visitor parking and added that it tends to be a problem in other developments. Mr. Arcari remarked that it is a complicated question and said that he would like Mr. Griffin to chime in on that. Mr. Arcari explained that there are 24 one-bedroom apartments and added that a high percentage of those units are projected to have one car. He said that the planning ordinances

recommend a formula of about 1.5 parking spots per unit in developments. Mr. Arcari added that the data indicates that affordable housing developments tend to have fewer cars than market rate housing. He remarked that they are at a good number right now and have room to move and they are willing to listen. Ms. Jagel said that one-bedroom units tend to have couples and added that almost everyone has a car. She explained that Glastonbury is not a mass transportation community like some developments. Mr. Arcari suggested for this issue to be discussed at the next presentation when Mr. Griffin is available. He explained that Mr. Griffin is in a better position to speak on this. There was continued discussion on the number of parking spaces that were exchanged for green space. Mr. Haynes asked the Commission to keep the drawings to compare the changes. There was a discussion on when the next reviews would take place.

Mr. Zanolungo opened the floor for public comments; there were none. He thanked the applicants and closed the public hearing.

Ms. Cahill left the meeting.

REGULAR MEETING

1. Acceptance of the Minutes of the October 3, 2023 Regular Meeting

Motion by: Mr. Markuszka

Seconded by: Mr. DesMarais

Result: Minutes were accepted (4-0-1), with Ms. Jagel abstaining.

2. CONSENT CALENDAR – NO ACTION

- a. Scheduling of Public Hearings for the Regular Meeting of November 21, 2023 - to be determined**

3. Chairman's Report

Mr. Zanolungo noted that the Commission has continuing education to do. He remarked that he has not done it and asked Ms. Caltagirone to go over the options to complete the requirements. Ms. Caltagirone said that she will resend the links for the Commission to watch. There was a brief discussion on logging in the hours. Ms. Caltagirone asked Commission members to email her.

4. Report from Community Development Staff - none

The Town Plan and Zoning Commission adjourned their meeting at 8:10 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,

Nadya Yuskaev
Recording Secretary