

**GLASTONBURY TOWN COUNCIL  
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES  
TUESDAY, MARCH 12, 2024**

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  
Ms. Jennifer Wang, Vice Chairman  
Ms. Deborah A. Carroll  
Mr. Kurt P. Cavanaugh  
Mr. John Cavanna  
Mr. Larry Niland  
Ms. Mary LaChance  
Mr. Jacob McChesney  
Mr. Whit Osgood {excused}

**a. Pledge of Allegiance.           *Led by Chip Beckett***

**2. Public Comment.**

*Charles Beckius of 31 Spring Street*, is concerned about moving the flood boundary from the 500-year to the 100-year floodplain, especially given that they are in an active flood stage. He noted that part of the South Meadows Trail crosses through Wethersfield because the river has shifted significantly in less than 500 years.

*Gayle Kataja of 5 Fairfield Court*, is the Chair of the Commission on Aging, which supports the retaining of CIP funding to support housing-related zoning regulations. She stated that the Commission on Aging also supports the ARPA funding request for RCC improvements to the lobby, cafe, and fitness center.

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

*Diana Dubois of 287 Thompson Street*, supports spending an additional \$1 million from CIP to fund a new animal shelter in town, which would service the community for the next 50 plus years. She does not support the location near a bus yard, as the diesel fumes will be toxic to the animals, the noise of the buses would scare the dogs, and there is no safe place to walk a shelter dog. She recommended the following locations to consider instead: Old Maids Lane next to the bulky waste facility; the field across from Riverfront Park; or Arbor Acres park.

**3. Special Reports.**

**a. Presentation by the Town Engineer – LOTCIP application for New London Turnpike / Chestnut Hill Intersection Project.**

Mr. Luiz explained that he did not recommend this project for ARPA funding because the Town Engineer did not feel confident in meeting the purchase order deadline, and he finds this project to be a good fit for the LOTCIP grant program.

Town Engineer Dan Pennington explained that prior CIP monies were allocated to replace the traffic signals at this intersection. He noted that the LOTCIP grant would replace all the existing signal equipment with modern safety features. Consideration was made as to whether the geometry of the intersection could be improved, but Mr. Pennington quickly realized that there is a good reason for the slip lane and the island separating it from the rest of the intersection. This is because large vehicles would not be able to make a right-hand turn without encroaching upon opposing traffic. He did not see a way to eliminate that right hand prohibition. Mr. Pennington submitted the grant application in February for a cost estimate just under \$1.3 million. He explained that the grant would pay for 100% of the construction cost, as well as the Town's costs for incidentals, inspection, and contract administration. He expects to hear their determination in early May.

Mr. Niland asked if there has been any significant accident experience at that intersection. Mr. Pennington stated no, there has not, and there have been no traffic/queuing problems either. Mr. Niland asked if the sidewalks connect elsewhere. Mr. Pennington stated that the sidewalks fill in the gaps of existing sidewalks. Mr. Cavanna pointed out that turning with a 53-foot trailer is tough. Mr. Pennington will see if they can widen out that radius. Mr. McChesney asked if it is possible to be on the sidewalk all the way to Hopewell school. Mr. Pennington stated yes, and that is part of what makes this application so strong. Mr. McChesney appreciates that this project would make that path walkable, with safe crossing added in.

Ms. Wang asked if the push buttons would only activate the pedestrian phase if it is pushed. Mr. Pennington replied, yes. Mr. Cavanaugh asked if the video detection equipment is similar to what exists on Main Street. Mr. Pennington stated that is correct. Ms. Carroll asked if any thought was given to installing a roundabout at this intersection instead of redoing the lights. Mr. Pennington explained that putting a roundabout to incorporate those two streets would require acquiring a piece of private property, which is more cumbersome.

**b. Presentation by the Town Engineer and Director of Parks and Recreation – Town Center Green project.**

Mr. Pennington does not have a detailed proposal tonight because he would like Council guidance on their preferred approach. He sees three distinct potential approaches:

- The first approach involves the \$135,000 appropriation to be used for maintenance purposes (specifically, spot repairs) on the Town Green and to replace the fountain.
- The second approach would take the first approach and expand upon maintenance, adding modest amenities to the existing space. He explained that some of those ideas could include a permanent performance patio, game tables, a defined entrance condition, increasing the handicapped accessibility to the space, or a food truck. This approach would require a future capital appropriation. He noted that the Recreation Commission favored this second approach by consensus.
- Following that discussion, he explained that they had a subsequent discussion with the ASDRC, who suggested reconfiguration of the space. If the council likes this direction, his recommendation is to retain the services of a professional landscape architect to generate a preliminary plan and budget. While he does not know what that would cost, it would almost certainly be more than the request for the second approach.

Ms. Carroll stated that part of the charm of the Center Green is its simplicity. She does not believe that they need to add more stuff, so the first plan makes the most sense to her. The only exception to this would be to add more ADA onsite. Mr. Cavanaugh agreed. He added that the reason this was sent to the ASDRC was to avoid having the expense of a landscape architect. He asked what is needed to repair the water fountain. Parks and Recreation Director Lisa Zerio explained that the fountain is a confined space. They had to do repairs a couple

years ago to keep it functional. They are starting to see deterioration, so it will need to be patched up. She explained that the electricals are behind the confined space. Mr. Cavanaugh does not support a performance deck there or a food truck, which will be unfair to the restaurants nearby.

Mr. McChesney does not like the idea of the road and parking area shifting to take up current green space. The only thing he would like to see is a permanent evergreen as a potential holiday tree. Otherwise, he supports a simple renovation. Ms. Wang agreed. Her wish list item is a public restroom to be installed onsite in a future phase. She would also like more bike rack accessibility.

Mr. Gullotta stated that the Town Green has served them well as a simple pocket park for over 50 years. He asked about an approach to reduce the possibility of brick heaving. Mr. Pennington stated that they have considered this, but it is expensive. Mr. Gullotta suggested installing a concrete walkway and patterning it, which is a one-time expense. Mr. Gullotta asked if a lot of trees will be moved across the street. Mr. Pennington replied no, the trees will be pruned.

**4. Old Business.           None.**

**5. New Business.**

**a. Action on 2024-2025 General Fund, Special Revenue Funds and Capital Improvement Budgets for presentation at the Final Budget Hearing.**

**1. Recommend General Fund Appropriations and Transfers.**

*Motion by:* Ms. Carroll

*Seconded by:* Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Councils approves an appropriation of \$50,205,500 for the 2024/2025 **Town Operating Budget** for presentation at the Final Budget Hearing.

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council approves an appropriation of \$124,471,745 for the 2024/2025 **Education Budget** for presentation at the Final Budget Hearing.

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council approves an appropriation of \$12,443,300] for the 2024/2025 **Debt & Transfers Budget** for presentation at the Final Budget Hearing.

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

**2. Recommend General Fund Revenues, Transfers and Use of Fund Balance.**

*Motion by:* Ms. Carroll

*Seconded by:* Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council approves the 2024/2025 **General Fund Revenues and Transfers** in the amount of \$187,120,545 for presentation at the Final Budget Hearing.

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

**3. Recommend Capital Improvement Program.**

*Motion by:* Ms. Carroll

*Seconded by:* Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council approves the 2024/2025 **Capital Improvement Program Budget** in the amount of 15,708,141 for presentation at the Final Budget Hearing. Funding will be provided as follows:

<b>Capital Reserve Fund</b>	\$8,114,421
<b>Town Aid Road</b>	\$461,217
<b>American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA)</b>	\$1,832,503
<b>Sewer Sinking Fund</b>	\$5,300,000

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

**4. Recommend Special Revenue Fund – Sewer Operating Fund.**

**Motion by:** Ms. Carroll

**Seconded by:** Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council approves the 2024/2025 **Special Revenue Fund Appropriations, Revenues and Transfers** for presentation at the Final Budget Hearing as follows:

<b>Sewer Operating Fund</b>	\$3,519,400
-----------------------------	-------------

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

**5. Action to schedule Town Council Final Budget Hearing.**

**Motion by:** Ms. Carroll

**Seconded by:** Mr. Cavanaugh

*BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby schedules the Final Budget Hearing and action on the proposed 2024-2025 Town Operating, Education, Debt and Transfer, Revenues and Transfers and Special Revenue Funds for 7:00 p.m. on Wednesday, March 20, 2024 in Council Chambers of the Town Hall, 2155 Main Street, Glastonbury with an option for Zoom Video Conferencing, and the Budget to be presented shall be as approved by the Town Council at its meeting of Tuesday, March 12, 2024.*

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

- b. Action on a \$1,313,532 appropriation increase and transfer from the Capital Reserve Fund to Capital Improvements Projects Fund – Main Street Reconstruction, funded through the State of Connecticut Local Transportation Capital Improvement Program (LOTICIP) Grant (refer to Board of Finance; set public hearing).**

**Motion by:** Ms. Carroll

**Seconded by:** Mr. Cavanaugh

*BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby refers to the Board of Finance the proposed increase and transfer of \$1,313,532 from the Capital Reserve Fund Balance regarding the LOTICIP funded Main Street Reconstruction project and schedules a public hearing for 8:00 p.m. on Tuesday, March 26, 2024 in the Council Chambers of Town Hall, 2155 Main Street, Glastonbury and/or through Zoom Video Conferencing to consider the proposed appropriation and transfer, as described in a report by the Director of Finance and Administrative Services dated March 8, 2024.*

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

- c. **Discussion and action regarding proposed amendments to Chapters 5, 7 and 15 of the Town Code of Ordinances to update Community Development Department fees (set public hearing).**

Mr. Cavanaugh raised a couple objections to the proposed fees for public hearings and rehearings. Mr. McChesney asked if the objection is to the raised fee entirely. Mr. Cavanaugh replied, yes.

**Motion by:** Ms. Carroll

**Seconded by:** Mr. Cavanaugh

*BE IT RESOLVED, the Glastonbury Town Council hereby schedules a public hearing for 8:00 p.m. on Tuesday, March 26, 2024 in the Council Chambers of Town Hall, 2155 Main Street, Glastonbury and/or through Zoom Video Conferencing, to consider proposed amendments to Chapters 5, 7 and 15 of the Town Code of Ordinances to adopt new Community Development fee schedules, as described in a report by the Director of Community Development dated March 8, 2024.*

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

- d. **Discussion and action on proposed amendments to the Zoning Map and Building Zone Regulations to amend Section 4.19 – Town Center Village District Overlay Zone, to create a new Zone Section 4.20 Main Street Corridor Flood Zone (MSCC), and to amend Section 4.11 – Flood Zone (refer to Town Plan and Zoning Commission; set public hearing).**

Ms. LaChance would like to separate the motions because they are separate items. The Council agreed to make these two separate public hearings.

**Motion by:** Ms. Carroll

**Seconded by:** Mr. Cavanaugh

*BE IT RESOLVED, the Glastonbury Town Council hereby refers to the Town Plan and Zoning Commission proposed amendment to the Building Zone Regulations concerning the Town Center Village District Overlay expansion and schedules a public hearing for 8:00 p.m. on Tuesday, March 26, 2024 in the Council Chambers of Town Hall, 2155 Main Street, Glastonbury and/or through Zoom Video Conferencing, to consider adoption of the TCVD proposed amendment, as described in a report by the Director of Community Development dated March 8, 2024.*

*BE IT RESOLVED, the Glastonbury Town Council hereby schedules a public hearing for 8:00 p.m. on Tuesday, March 26, 2024 in the Council Chambers of Town Hall, 2155 Main Street, Glastonbury and/or through Zoom Video Conferencing, to consider adoption of the Main Street Commercial Corridor Flood Zone proposed amendment, as described in a report by the Director of Community Development dated March 8, 2024.*

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

- e. **Discussion and action concerning ARPA funds from the State of Connecticut Department of Aging and Disability Services to support Connecticut Senior Centers.**

Director of Parks and Recreation Lisa Zerio explained that part of their Age Friendly designation is to ensure that the RCC is more welcoming, so they went through the areas that could be rehabilitated for senior center use. There is no fitness center right now, so part of the funding would go for that. Another part would be to support areas to congregate. The third part would be to upgrade the facility with equipment to offer areas for lunches. She thinks that these improvements will bring more people in to socialize, and it has been well

received by the Commission on Aging. Mr. Cavanaugh asked how the sound panels would work. Ms. Zerio explained that the panels are high up in the ceiling, and they could carpet the area to cut down the noise.

**Motion by:** Ms. Carroll

**Seconded by:** Mr. Cavanaugh

*BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby supports the proposal submitted by the Director of Parks and Recreation to apply for \$91,967 of ARPA funds available via the State of Connecticut Department of Aging and Disability Services for the benefit of the Glastonbury Senior Center, as described in a report by the Director of Parks and Recreation dated March 8, 2024.*

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

**f. Added to Agenda: Action to appropriate \$10,000 from the Town Manager's budget to removal of the European water chestnut in Keeney Cove.**

**Motion by:** Ms. Carroll

**Seconded by:** Mr. Cavanna

*BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby appropriates \$10,000 from the Town Manager's budget to removal of the European water chestnut in Keeney Cove.*

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

**6. Consent Calendar. None.**

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

Mr. Luiz presented his report. He has met with the East Hartford mayor, who suggested splitting the \$20,000 cleanup cost for the European water chestnut in the Keeney Cove section of the Connecticut River, at \$10,000 per town. Ms. Carroll moved to place the item on the agenda, as Item 5F (New Business): Action to appropriate \$10,000 from the Town Manager's budget to removal of the European water chestnut in Keeney Cove.

**Motion by:** Ms. Carroll

**Seconded by:** Mr. Cavanna

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

*The Council moved to the public hearings, and returned at their conclusion, at 9:40 p.m.*

Mr. Cavanaugh asked where the forest assessment for MDC and JB Williams currently stands. Ms. Caltagirone explained that the study is underway. She has seen the results, but needs to review before speaking on it. They are working with the consultant on the draft recommendations, which will proceed to various town bodies before coming before the Council. She suspects that the draft will be ready for public hearings in another month or two.

Ms. Caltagirone explained that they have received a state grant to pursue a town-wide forest inventory and assessment, which will take nine months. They plan to apply for the next round of grant funding for the management portion of it next year. She clarified that the projects at MDC and JB Williams will act as a pilot for the management plan, which will address all forests throughout town. Mr. Cavanaugh suggested renaming the MDC property because the Town now owns it. Mr. Niland asked if it would make sense to hold a public information hearing about Putnam bridge. Mr. Luiz stated that there is one planned.

## **PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

### **NO. 1 PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING – MAIN STREET/ROUTE 17 SIDEWALKS PHASE III.**

Mr. Pennington stated that this project has been discussed at the council level many times over the last few years, but all those discussions centered on design alternatives. This plan is in accordance with the DOT approved plan. This road shift option was the only one that the DOT determined was acceptable. The LOTCIP grant would cover 100% of the construction costs, as well as the Town's expenses in administering the construction. This is the last gap between South Glastonbury village and the Easy Hartford town line. He stressed that there has been an exhaustive effort to explore design alternatives but they were all dismissed by the DOT.

Mr. Pennington conveyed the concerns made by neighbors to the DOT. In response, the DOT commissioned an internal study on vibration assessment and issued a formal report, which concluded that the likelihood of damage to homes due to the road shift will be remote. There was an additional concern about damage being made to the historical character of the homes, to which the DOT requested a review and concluded that the potential damage would be greater on the west side of the road. He stated that the DOT has been cooperative in addressing these concerns.

Mr. Pennington explained that the design criteria is focused on ensuring that there is no major abrupt shift in the roadway alignment. In the past, concerns were expressed about where the grading would end. There was also concern expressed about the utility pole relocation. He clarified that no exceptions were taken to the relocation of the utility poles, which would be three feet off the new curb line. He explained that new push button pedestals will be installed on either side, and there will be controller modifications, which was not included previously. He stated that all the work is within the state-owned right of way and nothing is proposed to be accomplished on private property.

Mr. Pennington explained that the next steps of the project would be to seek approval from the CC/IWWA commission. Likewise, there is a flood zone associated with Holland Brook, so they would need a special flood zone permit from the TPZ. He explained that the total estimated cost of the project, with the addition of the drainage and crosswalk improvements, is \$1.8 million. Mr. Luiz added that the video to this meeting will be posted online soon to receive more public comments, and this matter would return for a formal public hearing.

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

**Gene Hickey of 1200 Main Street**, thanked the Town for their responsiveness on this project. After the last meeting, he contacted his senator's office to learn more about the intransigence of the DOT about the sidewalk. Their office confirmed that, on June 7, the Town and the DOT signed the agreement they are discussing tonight. Mr. Hickey explained that the original proposal specified a clear zone, but this current proposal does not have one on the east side. He asked if that has been ruled out completely. He also asked if the plan is binding on all the entities involved, such as MDC and Eversource. Going forward, he asked who has final say on the project. He also asked if the big hydrangea will be removed or was its exclusion an oversight.

**Jeffrey Stein of 142 Olde Stage Road**, is the Vice President of Bike Walk Glastonbury and serves on the Age Friendly Commission, both of which support the project. He emphasized that this is the last part of an important link for pedestrians and cyclists along Main Street, and the signalized intersection would greatly improve safety.

**Beth Hillson of 283 Imperial Drive**, is also a member of the Commission on Aging, but is speaking as an individual. Completing the sidewalk would improve walkability in town, and the current gap presents a danger. She urged approval and swift action.

**Luther Weeks of 334 Hollister Way West**, believes that there is no better plan than the one presented tonight, given the state's restrictions. He has heard various claims against this project, which he finds to be questionable. This current proposal is the best solution, and the sooner it is conducted, the better.

**Alex Meade of 41 Glazier Drive**, stated that he and his wife moved to town last year, partly because of the accessibility. He feels bad for the people on the east side who will have to deal with the construction and the road being closer to their property, but walking the section without a sidewalk is terrifying. He supports this effort.

**Lisa Eldridge of 108 South Mill Drive**, is in favor of the sidewalk project to enhance safety.

**Rick Eldridge of 108 South Mill Drive**, also supports the project. He and his wife walk and ride their bikes to downtown Glastonbury, but it is scary being on the road because drivers speed. He is glad that they are going to keep the sidewalk on the same side of the road.

**Raven Cauthon of 1220 Main Street**, believes that this is the most amenable option so far, but still has safety concerns. She asked if the speed on the street could be reduced, and what other potential barriers could be placed on the east side.

**Andrew Miller of 1245 Hebron Avenue**, also owns a home on Main Street. He supports the proposal but has some concerns. He asked if his sugar maple will be retained. He is also concerned about the sidewalk going over their common driveway, especially as the configuration will go from a slope to a flat area to another slope.

**Christopher Siwy of 51 Washington Street**, was the Town's former Fire Marshal. He is glad that the last gap will have a successful connection from north to south Glastonbury. He echoed Ms. Cauthon's comments. His only recommendation is that the state be amenable to dropping the speed limit on the road from 40 to 30 mph.

Mr. Pennington responded to the various questions asked:

- Regarding the clear zone: yes, it would still apply going forward. He sees no issue with the utility pole relocation as they have depicted it.
- Regarding who would be in charge: the administration of the construction would be the Town.
- Regarding the hydrangea bushes: if it is not possible to maintain it, they can require the contractor to dig up the bush and relocate it to the owner's requested location.
- Regarding reducing the speed: he would like to speak with the Police Chief before approaching the DOT on this matter.
- Regarding barriers: the DOT has specific criteria as to where guide rail is installed on their highways, and the slopes do not necessitate the need for a guide rail. The DOT has investigated it, and they do not want to set a precedent that would be difficult to live with going forward.
- Regarding the sugar maple: it is outside their grading area, so the tree will remain. If it is deemed necessary, it would be treated with a chemical to keep it viable.
- Regarding sidewalk grading: if an individual homeowner believes that they should extend the grading, they can do that.

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



**Roger Emerick of 580 Hopewell Road**, stated that it appears that the sidewalk will continue on the west side, presumably with a wall into the hillside. This is logical, and he approves of it. However, he asked to explain how DEEP's objection to the wall was overcome.

**Chip Geer of 86 Sunset Drive**, believes that the proposed sidewalk extension sounds great in theory. However, in reality, it makes no sense. He does not find it sensible to spend lots of taxpayer dollars and time to build a sidewalk benefiting but just a few in town. He believes that this is a textbook example of “the perfect is the enemy of good.” He opposes the proposal.

Mr. Pennington clarified that they do not have a wall. The sidewalk would be constructed on what is the gutter side of the roadway.

**Gene Hickey of 1200 Main Street**, asked for clarification about the clear zone. His question was whether the site would be cleared literally to accommodate roadway vehicles. Mr. Pennington replied no, there are no plans or requirements to have wholesale tree clearing within 15 or 20 feet of the roadway.

The following comment was made via Zoom:

**Mary Reverendo of 1225 Main Street**, asked who is in charge of plowing the sidewalks. Mr. Pennington stated that the town ordinance requires the abutting homeowner to clean the snow and ice off the sidewalk abutting that property. This is a difficult situation, but he does not have the authority to waive an ordinance. Mr. Gullotta remarked that the former Town Manager noted that an exception could be made because of the location of the sidewalk. He had recommended that the Town be in charge of the clearing. Mr. Pennington clarified that, absent a Council directive, he does not have the authority to waive an ordinance. Mr. Cavanna would support the Town plowing the sidewalk.

Mr. Niland stated that, absent Ms. Cauthon and Mr. Hickey's properties, this project would have been done a long time ago. He understands that this is a difficult situation, but he wants the public to recognize that their concerns have been taken seriously and the Council is doing their best to address them. Mr. McChesney thinks that adjustments have been made throughout this 2.5-year process that he hopes will be workable. He appreciates the public coming out tonight. Mr. Cavanaugh does not support this project. He likes that they have a sidewalk matrix, but this sidewalk construction is intrusive. Mr. Gullotta identifies with the pain people are feeling on old Main Street. He strongly believes that they need to do something about slowing down the traffic on that street. He urged the public to contact their state representatives because the Town has reached out several times and gotten nowhere.

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 schedules a public hearing for 8:00 p.m. on Tuesday, March 26, 2024 in the Council Chambers of Town Hall, 2155 Main Street, Glastonbury and/or through Zoom Video Conferencing, to consider proposed construction of new sidewalks along Route 17/Main Street generally extending between the Cider Mill and Red Hill Drive, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated March 8, 2024.*

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

*The Council recessed for five minutes, and returned at 9:00 p.m.*

## **NO 2. 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.**

Director of Community Development Shelley Caltagirone explained that she started a conversation with the previous Town Manager on this 1.5 years ago. At the time, about ten residents were in violation of the code. She was asked to see how other towns handle this issue, and to consider alternatives to the existing code. She explained that the Council referred the draft amendment to the TPZ in August, which met and discussed this issue four times. They also formed a subcommittee with two council members and two TPZ members, which met twice. She explained that the TPZ found it easier to break down the regulations into its components. She summarized each of the votes they took.

Ms. Caltagirone stated that the subcommittee was largely in agreement with the TPZ's comments, but made a couple comments on the draft: they would like to allow on-call emergency vehicles to be parked on residential properties; they did not think that screening should be required for parking vehicles in the rear yard; and they felt that the operators of commercial vehicles should be permitted to park on residential properties.

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

**Stephen Silvestro of 115 Hubbard Drive**, is a self-described blue collar worker who is against the proposed amendments. He does not wish to wake up and see a tow truck in the yard with logos, or hear a diesel truck starting up. Once this is opened up, he fears that residents will not adhere to the ordinance. He believes that they will bring home dirty vehicles with big sheet rocks and ladders. Vehicles for work should be at work.

**Brian Comerford of 89 Stancliff Road**, believes that this will open up a Pandora's box. Glastonbury is primarily a residential community and this ordinance would rezone residential neighborhoods to mixed residential. The hardship will fall mostly on the middle class, with smaller homes on smaller lots. He takes issue with many features of the proposed ordinance, such as allowing full signage on trucks and allowing noisy diesel trucks. When the ordinance first came out in September, it had a 22-foot length x 8-foot height limitation, but two days before the hearing, that draft was changed to 23 feet x 9 feet. Afterwards, he heard that a member of the council has a 22.5-foot truck and that person is involved in the drafting of this ordinance. If that is true, he asked whether that is a good look for the council.

The following comment was made via Zoom:

**Karl Wagener of 588 Neipsic Road**, stated that the original intent of these amendments was to get a handle on outdoor parking. He takes issue with subsection 2c, which lists no size limits, and focuses only on the visible impact to neighbors. What he is most concerned about is the intense noise and exhaust fumes from large trucks. The amendment also does not anticipate future consequences, which would incentivize purchasing a barn property to store vehicles there legally. He is concerned about the impact of the trucks themselves. Additionally, subsection 2c targets only certain neighborhoods. Because he lives near a barn, it appears that he is expected to endure what the vast majority of people do not have to think about. He asked to delete subsection 2c.

Ms. Caltagirone responded to the questions asked:

- Regarding size restrictions on vehicles: the restrictions for parking of vehicles outdoors is 9 feet in height x 23 feet in length. These specific sizes changed a lot over the four TPZ meetings; they did not specify a width restriction. There is no current size restriction in the code for parking a commercial vehicle. The restriction is on capacity.

- Regarding whether or not the Town could regulate the signage location or size: it can and it does. She explained that the subcommittee understood that they could regulate it, but they decided not to.

Mr. Cavanaugh agrees with Mr. Wagener. If they have unrestricted vehicles in a barn, that will create an international incident. He does not like changing the ordinance, and that is still his position. He asked how the zoning enforcement officer is going to determine if a vehicle obstructs the view of traffic. Ms. Caltagirone stated that the ordinance is not specific as to how to determine sight lines. Other sections of the code are specific. This is something in their current code that they can amend this draft with. Mr. Cavanaugh believes that the sight line issue has to be more specific. He prefers to keep the ordinance the way it is because people have come to speak out against this proposal, not to support it. Mr. McChesney asked if the draft amendment is widening the restrictions under their current rules. Ms. Caltagirone cannot answer that because the variance decision is left to the ZBA, who have a lot of discretion.

**Stephen Silvestro of 115 Hubbard Drive**, asked what the difference of parking is in the backyard. Ms. Caltagirone explained that, currently, one commercial vehicle is allowed to be parked in the rear yard. They would need to have driveway access. Currently, the code does not require any screening of the vehicle. The draft requires some type of screening or landscape features that would screen that view from neighbors and from the street.

Ms. Carroll served on the subcommittee. Her instinct is to not support having commercial vehicles in residential neighborhoods. However, people who have business-related trucks have told her that the cost for commercial parking is prohibitively expensive because most of that parking is designed for much larger vehicles. That said, she noted that the Town does have a variance process. The only thing she is sure of is that they should not be voting on this today because there are too many details to work out.

Mr. Cavanna thinks that one of the public comments was directed at him. He wants to make it clear that he owns a farm, so he is exempt from all these restrictions. Somebody made a statement that the neighbor is the most important part of this equation and he disagrees. He thinks that the resident is the most important part of this equation. A comment was made about tow trucks, which was untrue. He has driven a tow truck for Glastonbury Automotive, and he took his truck home. His biggest issue is that somebody who serves in an emergency capacity cannot take their vehicle home because of the extant ordinance. He reiterated that this ordinance will not benefit him at all. He is simply looking out for the blue collar worker in town.

Mr. Gullotta’s suggestion is to continue the public hearing.

**Motion by:** Ms. Carroll

**Seconded by:** Mr. McChesney

*BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby continues the public hearing.*

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

**8. Committee Reports.**

a. **Chairman’s Report.** *None.*

b. **MDC.** *None.*

c. **CRCOG.** *None.*

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

**10. Minutes.**

**a. Minutes of February 27, 2024 Budget Workshop (Town Operations) and Regular Meeting.**

**Motion by:** Ms. Carroll

**Seconded by:** Mr. Cavanaugh

*BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves the minutes of the February 27, 2024 Budget Workshop (Town Operations) and Regular Meeting.*

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

**b. Minutes of February 28, 2024 Special Meeting (Budget Workshop – Board of Education).**

**Motion by:** Ms. Carroll

**Seconded by:** Mr. Cavanaugh

*BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves the minutes of the February 28, 2024 Special Meeting (Budget Workshop – Board of Education).*

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

**c. Minutes of February 29, 2024 Special Meeting (Budget Workshop – Town Operations).**

**Motion by:** Ms. Carroll

**Seconded by:** Mr. Cavanaugh

*BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves the minutes of the February 29, 2024 Special Meeting (Budget Workshop – Town Operations).*

**Result:** Minutes accepted {7-1-0}, with Ms. Carroll abstaining.

**d. Minutes of March 4, 2024 Special Meeting (Budget Workshop – Town Operations).**

**Motion by:** Ms. Carroll

**Seconded by:** Mr. Cavanaugh

*BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves the minutes of the March 4, 2024 Special Meeting (Budget Workshop – Town Operations).*

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

**11. Appointments and Resignations.**

**a. Reappointment of Debra DeVries-Dalton (Special Landscape Architect) to the Architectural and Site Design Review Committee (4-year term).**

**Motion by:** Ms. Carroll

**Seconded by:** Mr. Cavanaugh

*BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves the reappointment of Debra DeVries-Dalton (Special Landscape Architect) to the Architectural and Site Design Review Committee (4-year term).*

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

**b. Reappointment of David Flinchum (Landscape Architect) to the Architectural and Site Design Review Committee (4-year term).**

**Motion by:** Ms. Carroll

**Seconded by:** Mr. Cavanaugh

*BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves the reappointment of David Flinchum (Landscape Architect) to the Architectural and Site Design Review Committee (4-year term).*

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

**c. Reappointment of Jeff Kamm (Architect) to the Architectural and Site Design Review Committee (4-year term).**

**Motion by:** Ms. Carroll

**Seconded by:** Mr. Cavanaugh

*BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves the reappointment of Jeff Kamm (Architect) to the Architectural and Site Design Review Committee (4-year term).*

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

**d. Resignation of Raymond Hassett from the Town Plan and Zoning Commission (R-2027).**

**Motion by:** Ms. Carroll

**Seconded by:** Mr. Cavanaugh

*BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby accepts with regret the resignation of Raymond Hassett from the Town Plan and Zoning Commission (R-2027).*

**Disc:** Mr. Cavanaugh stated that Mr. Hassett has served on the TPZ for 20 years, and this will be a big loss. Mr. Niland echoed. He served with Mr. Hassett on the TPZ and will miss his service. Mr. McChesney also served with Mr. Hassett, whom he called a tremendous asset to the town.

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

**e. Appointment of Sharon Jagel to the Capitol Region Council of Governments (CRCOG) Regional Planning Commission (Alternate – through December 31, 2025).**

**Motion by:** Ms. Carroll

**Seconded by:** Mr. Cavanaugh

*BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves the appointment of Sharon Jagel to the Capitol Region Council of Governments (CRCOG) Regional Planning Commission (Alternate Member) through December 31, 2025.*

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

**f. Extension of current appointment of Corey Turner to the CRCOG Regional Planning Commission (Regular – through December 31, 2025).**

**Motion by:** Ms. Carroll

**Seconded by:** Mr. Cavanaugh

*BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves the extension of the current appointment of Corey Turner to the Capitol Region Council of Governments (CRCOG) Regional Planning Commission (Regular Member) through December 31, 2025.*

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

**12. Executive Session.**

- a. Discussion of confidential attorney-client communication concerning compensation to firefighters.**
- b. Discussion of the selection of a site or the lease, sale or purchase of real estate.**

Following the Executive Session, the Council will discuss, in private, collective bargaining negotiations and such discussions are not treated as a meeting under the applicable sections of the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). Attendees for the private session include the Town Council members and the Town Manager.

**Motion by:** Ms. Carroll

**Seconded by:** Ms. Cavanaugh

*BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby enters into Executive Session at 9:55 p.m. for the purpose of:*

- a. Discussion of confidential attorney-client communication concerning compensation to firefighters.*
- b. Discussion of the selection of a site or the lease, sale or purchase of real estate.*

*Attendees to include Council Members, Town Manager, Fire Chief, and Director of Finance and Administrative Services for Item A, and Council Members and Town Manager for Item B.*

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

The Council came out of Executive Session at 10:15 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 March 12, 2024 at 10:16 p.m.*

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

Respectfully submitted,

**Lilly Torosyan**

**Lilly Torosyan**  
Recording Clerk

**Thomas Gullotta**  
Chairman