

**GLASTONBURY TOWN COUNCIL  
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES  
TUESDAY, MARCH 26, 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

**a. Pledge of Allegiance.           *Led by Lilly Torosyan***

**2. Public Comment.**

*Elizabeth Flynn of 30 Brookhaven Drive*, is a board member of the newly-formed Glastonbury Holocaust Memorial Committee. Their first Holocaust Remembrance event will be held on Thursday, May 9 in the First Church of Christ. She invited council members to attend.

**3. Special Reports.           *None.***

**4. Old Business.           *None.***

**5. New Business.**

**a. Discussion concerning bonding for fire department related CIP projects.**

Mr. Luiz explained that he has focused on three vehicles (engine 42, tanker 34, and engine 32), which all need to be replaced soon. He explained that Town Staff has been asked to go over the five outyears in the CIP. Tomorrow, he and the Finance Director will meet with the Superintendent of Schools and the GPS Director of Operations to review their projects. He explained that, once these projects are reviewed, they will then discuss internally moving around items. He has also conducted a review of the last time that the Town bonded and concluded that there is enough time to get things ready for a November bonding referendum.

Mr. Niland is concerned that the three coming fiscal years are close to \$14.5 million over what they would normally spend on capital projects. He wants to ensure that they have this discussion now instead of scrambling later on. He asked if the Town Manager has a plan for the fire truck going forward next year. Mr. Luiz explained that, after reexamining projects internally, they will then look at what they can afford, which is the bonding concept. He noted that the BOF will review this matter at their April meeting.

Mr. Niland asked about the timeline for getting the bonding matter on the ballot for a November referendum. Mr. Luiz has a schedule of events that happened two years ago, when the Town last bonded. He is going through it and will also review the minutes to understand the timeline. Based on that schedule, he thinks that there is enough time to get it onto the schedule for November. He envisions that the bonding exercise would focus on the school roofs and fire apparatus.

Ms. Carroll asked, should the Council decide to send a handful of projects to referendum this November, could they do it this far out. Mr. Luiz has spoken with the Finance Director, who stated that they can send something out to a referendum to get approval, and then exercise that later on. Mr. Gullotta commented that the former Town Manager indicated that it must be exercised within two years of the date that the referendum was held. Mr. Luiz added that the Finance Director also advised going for a higher amount, to factor in for inflationary costs, which could necessitate a second referendum.

Ms. Carroll asked if there is one producer of the apparatus or will many companies bring them options. Fire Chief Mike Thurz stated that there are six or seven vendors out there. Ms. Carroll asked why Fire Tanker 34 was rarely used. Chief Thurz stated that the volume of fires in town has decreased, so the idea was to combine the engine and the tanker into one truck. They are consolidating the number of apparatuses assigned to station 3.

Mr. Cavanna asked how many miles are on Fire Engine 42. Chief Thurz replied, about 23,000 miles. Mr. Cavanna asked about the replacement parts for vehicles 34 and 42. Chief Thurz explained that tanker 34 needed water parts, which took ten days to replace; there are micro-switches which are not available right now. Mr. Cavanna asked how many miles are on engine 34. Chief Thurz will check and report back. From a mechanical standpoint, Mr. Cavanna does not wish to rush out and buy three apparatuses, with so little mileage on them, if they do not need to be replaced.

Mr. Osgood agrees with Mr. Cavanna's approach to view the CIP and bonding program holistically. If the goal is to replace the vehicles by July 2026, then he believes that a 2025 referendum would work, as well. Mr. Gullotta looks forward to what information Mr. Luiz will present when the Council revisits this matter in a few weeks.

## **6. Consent Calendar.**

### **a. Action on an application for Major Amendment to an approved Planned Area Development (PAD) – 330 Naubuc Avenue (set public hearing).**

**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, April 23, 2024 in the Council Chambers of Town Hall, 2155 Main Street, Glastonbury and/or through Zoom Video Conferencing, to consider a Major Amendment to the Somerset Square Planned Area Development for 330 Naubuc Avenue, as described in a report by the Director of Community Development dated March 22, 2024.*

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

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

Mr. Luiz presented the report. Mr. Osgood heard that the high school weight room has gone up about 50% in cost. He asked how the BOE will pay for that. Mr. Luiz will check and report back. Mr. Osgood stated that the BOE's 1% Fund has gone beyond its original purpose. At the Council's next meeting, he would like to discuss reducing the fund. Mr. McChesney thanked library staff for another successful story stroll.

**8. Committee Reports.**

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

Mr. Luiz stated that CRCOG is awaiting word from the state on their regional shared equipment grant.

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

**10. Minutes.**

- a. **Minutes of March 12, 2024 Regular Meeting.**

**Motion by:** Ms. Carroll

**Seconded by:** Mr. Cavanaugh

*BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves the minutes of the March 12, 2024, Regular Meeting.*

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

**11. Appointments and Resignations.** *None.*

**12. Executive Session.**

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

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, the Town Manager, and the Director of Human Resources.

**Motion by:** Ms. Carroll

**Seconded by:** Mr. Cavanaugh

*BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby enters into Executive Session at 7:29 p.m. for the purpose of:*

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

*Following Executive Session, Council will discuss collective bargaining.*

*Attendees to include Council Members and the Town Manager for (a) and (b). Attendees to include Council Members, Town Manager, and Director of Human Resources for collective bargaining.*

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

*The Council came out of Executive Session at 8:00 p.m. and returned to Council Chambers to commence the public hearings.*

## **PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

### **NO. 1 ACTION ON PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION OF SIDEWALKS ALONG MAIN STREET/ROUTE 17 BETWEEN RED HILL DRIVE AND THE CIDER MILL.**

Mr. Luiz suggested holding the public hearing tonight, and then voting to continue the public hearing. Town Engineer Dan Pennington provided an update on the changes since the last hearing. He confirmed that the large hydrangea at the end of Gene Hickey's driveway would not be impacted by this construction. He also spoke with the resident of 1246 Main Street, who had contacted him about extending the grading associated with the project; this request is currently being considered. Another resident had asked about shifting utility poles and wirings. He explained that there is a potential for that, but it is up to Eversource. If they do end up being shifted, he noted that residents will get prior notification several days in advance.

Mr. Pennington also looked into the matter regarding the speed limit, which is 40 mph on this section of Route 17. He spoke with the Police Chief, who notified him of a July 2022 traffic study, which indicated that the average speed traveling down that road is 37 mph, and the 85th percentile of the speed is 46 mph. With these numbers, the Police Chief believes that the posted speed limit is appropriate at this section of roadway. There was discussion about installing machines that flash the driver's speed limit. Mr. Pennington is looking into gaining the necessary permits with the DOT to install those signs.

Mr. Gullotta opened the floor for public comment.

**Gene Hickey of 1200 Main Street**, stated that this is a dangerous road, with many residents reporting damage to their properties, especially on the east side. He supports signs that flash a driver's speed, as well as lights that automatically ticket for speeding. He finds the police department's cited numbers absurd because the people who are speeding are the ones causing problems, not the average driver. He called for collecting data that would support a plan for the legislature to respond to, and asked who would develop that plan.

**Kathleen Housley of 1158 Main Street**, explained that when Red Hill Drive was put in, the decision was made to place the walkway on the north side. That walkway is very much used, and there are no walkways on the Chestnut Hill side. She is concerned about the intent to move the walkway over to her property because she finds it more important to utilize extant walkways rather than create a master plan for a potential one on Chestnut Hill Road. The existing walkway on Red Hill Drive is also much safer than what could ever be at Chestnut Hill Road. She is also concerned about her large tree, which is not an easy fit for a walkway.

**Carolyn Gatesy of 1191 Main Street**, expressed concern about the speed on this road and questioned the traffic study data. She would like to preserve the old stone post and copper beech tree on her property.

**Alex Meade of 41 Glazier Drive**, is also concerned about speeding. While he finds the average speed cited in the traffic study to be interesting, it is the 99th percentile folks who kill people. He thinks that a solution can be reached somehow.

**Andrew Miller of 1245 Hebron Avenue**, also owns 1213 Main Street. His concern was the tree in front of his house, which Mr. Pennington said would not be adversely affected. This is not his preferred plan, but the State insisted on it and the project has garnered a lot of support. He asked the Council to support it.

**Luther Weeks of 334 Hollister Way West**, supports the sidewalks, which will be utilized by more families and children once they are completed. He is also concerned about speeding, but wonders whether a curb will help decrease it. Either way, he believes that this is a reason to get the sidewalk constructed, not to hold it up.

**Richard Schlenger of 1197 Main Street**, has been rear-ended going into his own driveway. He is concerned about the speed, noting that in the middle of the night, cars are going 60 mph on that section of the roadway. He supports the project because it will help walkers and bikers but feels bad that it will encroach on some people's properties.

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

**Loren Van Ostrand of 1278 Main Street**, appreciates the Council continuing to explore the addition of much-needed sidewalks. If given the choice of sidewalks or a lowering of the speed limit, she would choose to lower the speed limit because she has witnessed dozens of accidents in front of her house and the Cider Mill. Sidewalks and speed aside, water drainage on the east side of the road, from Chestnut Hill to the Cider Mill, is also a major issue, which was acknowledged by the Town Engineer. With no drain basins along the nearly half-mile long downward stretch, her yard floods with roadway rain water nearly every time it rains, which is now causing meaningful erosion and property damage. She implored the Town (or DOT) to address the drainage and speed issues, regardless of what may happen with the sidewalks.

The following comments were made via Zoom:

**Pamela Lockard of 10 Southgate Drive**, thinks that sidewalks would be much used. She agrees with Ms. Housley that the other side would probably be better for the walkway. She also thinks that speed cameras would be effective, with drivers issued tickets for speeding. She suggested allocating funds for shrubbery to help cut down on the noise and closer curb cuts for the property owners.

**Joe Muro of 151 Riverview Road**, strongly favors incorporating sidewalks onto this final stretch of Main Street. He lives off Red Hill Drive, so he goes by this daily. While overall pedestrian traffic has increased, families cannot use the recently installed sidewalks because it is dangerous to walk this road. He likes the way that the intersection is constructed now and hopes that Chestnut Hill will get more sidewalks at a future date. He agreed with Ms. Lockard's suggestion of a stipend to pay for shrubbery for the affected homeowners.

**Raven Cauthon of 1212 Main Street**, supports anything to lower the speed limit for the safety of walkers and homeowners. She asked for an estimation of the construction length.

Mr. Pennington responded to the questions and concerns raised:

- Regarding the traffic study: He stressed that the traffic study reveals good data. Ms. Gatesy had asked about the time of day in which these counts were taken. He explained that it is a 24-hour count, so everything is compiled accordingly. Mr. Hickey had asked who would prepare a plan to calm traffic. Mr. Pennington explained that the DOT would be the agency to develop a plan, if it were to ever be considered and put forward.
- Regarding a crosswalk at Chestnut Hill Road, Red Hill Drive, and Main Street: Mr. Pennington clarified that they have exercised some professional judgment in choosing the location. In his estimation, if sidewalks were to be constructed on Red Hill Drive in the future, then it would be on the south side.
- Regarding Ms. Gatesy's old stone post: Mr. Pennington explained that it is located just outside of the grading limits associated with the project, so it will not be impacted.
- Regarding the duration of construction: This has not been defined yet. The goal is to complete this in a 2024 construction season, but it could go into the next calendar year. Once the contract documents are put together, then he will have a clearer idea.

Mr. Niland stated that if 85% of the traffic on Main Street is below 46 mph, then 15% of the traffic exceeds 46 mph. He understands that speed is an issue for neighbors, so this will continue to be a discussion for the Council. Mr. Cavanna asked if residents can see the traffic study for themselves. Mr. Pennington replied yes. Ms. LaChance asked why there is a crosswalk at the intersection with Red Hill Drive when there are no sidewalks. Mr. Pennington explained that this is an existing walk. He clarified that there is no existing sidewalk where Ms. Housley indicated there was. Looking towards the future, they might potentially construct sidewalks on Chestnut Hill Road. To this effect, he made a judgment call on which side would most likely be chosen for construction. Mr. McChesney asked how to initiate the conversation on traffic calming measures with the DOT. Mr. Pennington stated that it would be a piece of official correspondence to a particular individual. Mr. McChesney thinks that they should continue to have this conversation about the speeding issue.

Mr. Cavanaugh is not opposed to a sidewalk, but he is opposed to the east side. The DOT informed the Town that they could not proceed with their preferred option on the west side because of a fixed object. He would like their four state representatives to hold a meeting with the DOT Commissioner to discuss why they will not allow a fixed object on this side when they are allowing fixed objects everywhere. Mr. Gullotta iterated that this is a state road. He supports involving their state representatives to place more pressure on the DOT because the Council has not been able to do it thus far.

Mr. Pennington explained that the DOT does not want new construction creating more fixed objects within the clear zone. Mr. Osgood is not optimistic that they will receive a different response from the DOT, but he supports asking their state representatives to speak with them. However, that should not delay this project, which has already been in the works for five years. Ms. Carroll agreed. She stated that Mr. Pennington has put in a tremendous amount of work, and they cannot delay action for safety reasons.

Mr. McChesney has long been frustrated with the DOT's position on this project. Earlier on in the process, he had suggested reaching out to their state representatives, but the DOT has been steadfast in their refusal to accept any sort of compromise that would have a fixed object. He does not think that the DOT will compromise on this, and it is a significant issue, so they need to proceed. He favors contacting their representatives to have a strong conversation with the DOT on safety measures for this roadway. Mr. Niland agreed, adding that the DOT turned them down twice, so he is also doubtful that they will compromise on this. Mr. Cavanaugh would simply like to ask their state representatives to contact the DOT commissioner, not the engineers. He is asking for dialogue, not to slow down the process.

Ms. Wang supports sending the letter. However, she noted that this public hearing is about the sidewalk, but the concerns expressed by neighbors relate to traffic speed and the overall safety of this stretch, so it does not make sense to look only at fixed objects. She noted that the DOT may ask for the data to corroborate these concerns. Mr. Pennington has stated that he has good data which supports the current speed limit, so she is wondering what they would need for that to go anywhere. Mr. Cavanna requested that the Police Chief add enforcement in that area with a traffic unit to monitor the speeding.

Mr. Gullotta noted that the previous Town Manager had discussed the possibility of the Town removing the snow. He urged Mr. Pennington and Mr. Luiz to discuss the appropriateness of the Town taking care of snow removal on that stretch of sidewalk. Mr. Pennington would find it helpful to identify other unique situations in town with regard to snow removal from sidewalks. He also noted that the piece of formal correspondence he had received from the DOT was signed by the Special Services Section Manager of the Bureau of Highway Operation.

**Motion by:** Ms. Carroll

**Seconded by:** Mr. Cavanaugh

*BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby continues the public hearing concerning proposed construction of new sidewalks along Route 17/Main Street generally extending between the Cider Mill and Red Hill Drive to the Town Council meeting of Tuesday, April 23, 2024, at 8:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers of Town Hall, 2155 Main Street, Glastonbury and/or through Zoom Video Conferencing; and*

*BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby refers the proposed sidewalk project to the Town Plan and Zoning Commission for a report per Connecticut General Statutes Section 8-24, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated March 22, 2024.*

**Amendment by:** Mr. Cavanaugh

**Seconded by:** Ms. Carroll

*BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council requests that Glastonbury's four state representatives at the State Capitol contact the Commissioner of the Department of Transportation to discuss the issues regarding fixed objects on Main Street.*

**Disc:** Mr. Cavanna's concern is that this will bring politics into the fold. Mr. McChesney's understanding is that this is a last attempt by the Town to get the DOT to examine whether they can proceed with the option that the Town wanted previously.

**Result:** Amendment passed unanimously {9-0-0}.

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

*The Council recessed for five minutes, returning at 9:15 p.m.*

**NO. 2 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.**

Mr. Luiz stated that the Town has received the extra money from the State.

Mr. Gullotta opened the floor for public comment:

**Denise Weeks of 334 Hollister Way West**, is pleased with the way that the plan is laid out but is concerned about not marking the increased shoulder width as a bike lane. She worries about drivers taking up that space, which is a safety risk for cyclists.

Mr. Pennington explained that the shoulder width is increasing by a minimum of five feet on both sides of the road. However, he is hesitant to delineate the shoulders as bike lanes and use pavement markings because the length is not enough to meet the design guidelines for a "bike lane." He worries that doing so would become a legal liability. Mr. McChesney asked about the timeline for this project. Mr. Pennington stated that the grant funding has already been received and construction will start on April 8. Mr. Gullotta asked about the trees. Mr. Pennington clarified that the trees will be pruned, not removed. Mr. McChesney noted that Ms. Weeks had suggested painting markings for a cyclist lane. Mr. Pennington explained that that is not expensive, if the Town chooses to do it in the future. Ms. Wang pointed out that studies have shown the ineffectiveness of paint markings for cyclist safety, and what will truly protect them are physical barriers, which is not in the scope of this proposal.

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 the proposed appropriation increase and transfer of \$1,313,532 from the Capital Reserve Fund Balance to Capital Projects – Main Street Reconstruction, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated March 22, 2024, and as recommended by the Board of Finance.*

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

**NO. 3 ACTION ON PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO CHAPTERS 5, 7 AND 15 OF THE TOWN CODE OF ORDINANCES TO ADOPT NEW COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FEE SCHEDULES.**

Mr. Luiz explained that these particular community development fees require a public hearing; other fees are proposed, but the Council will vote on those in their regular agenda. Mr. Cavanaugh asked, if the fee for a public hearing is eliminated, then will there still be a fee for noticing a hearing. Mr. Luiz will speak with Ms. Caltagirone about the rationale, but the fees are similar to what exists in other communities. Mr. Gullotta stated that at the agenda setting meeting, they expressed concerns about the public hearing fee. Mr. Luiz read Ms. Caltagirone's memo. Mr. McChesney asked when these fees will go into effect. Mr. Luiz stated that Ms. Caltagirone had proposed May 1, 2024. Mr. McChesney favors tabling this item.

**Motion by:** Mr. McChesney

**Seconded by:** Mr. Cavanaugh

*BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby extends the public hearing concerning proposed amendment to Chapters 5, 7 and 15 of the Town Code of Ordinances to adopt new Community Development Fee Schedules to the Town Council meeting of Tuesday, April 23, 2024, at 8:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers of Town Hall, 2155 Main Street, Glastonbury and/or through Zoom Video Conferencing.*

**Result:** Motion passed {8-1-0}, with Mr. Niland voting against.

**NO. 4 ACTION ON PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE BUILDING ZONE REGULATIONS CONCERNING THE TOWN CENTER VILLAGE DISTRICT OVERLAY EXPANSION. (PUBLIC HEARING NO. 4 WILL BE POSTPONED TO THE APRIL 23, 2024 COUNCIL MEETING).**

**NO. 5 ACTION ON PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE MAIN STREET COMMERCIAL CORRIDOR FLOOD ZONE. (PUBLIC HEARING NO. 5 WILL BE POSTPONED TO THE APRIL 23, 2024 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 proposed amendment to the Building Zone Regulations concerning the Town Center Village District Overlay Expansion to the Town Council meeting of Tuesday, April 23, 2024, at 8:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers of Town Hall, 2155 Main Street, Glastonbury and/or through Zoom Video Conferencing; and*



*BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby postpones the public hearing for action on proposed amendment to the Main Street Commercial Corridor Flood Zone to the Town Council meeting of Tuesday, April 23, 2024, at 8:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers of Town Hall, 2155 Main Street, Glastonbury and/or through Zoom Video Conferencing, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated March 22, 2024.*

**Disc:** Mr. Osgood noted that the state statute regarding village districts is specific in where they are allowed, and he does not think that the expanded area has a unique and consistent characteristic. He would like the Council to have the Town Attorney's legal opinion on this issue prior to the public hearing. Mr. Luiz stated that he and Ms. Caltagirone are reviewing the Town Attorney's opinion. Mr. Cavanaugh does not agree with Mr. Osgood's assessment. His understanding is that they can put an overlay zone anywhere. He finds it is within the Council's purview to do this, and he looks forward to the Town Attorney's opinion.

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

**Motion by:** Ms. Carroll

**Seconded by:** Mr. Cavanaugh

*BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby re-enters into Executive Session at 9:40 p.m. for the purpose of:*

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

*Following Executive Session, Council will discuss collective bargaining.*

*Attendees to include Council Members and the Town Manager for (a) and (b). Attendees to include Council Members, Town Manager, and Director of Human Resources for collective bargaining.*

The Council came out of Executive Session at 9:49 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 26, 2024 at 9:50 p.m.*

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

**Respectfully submitted,**

**Lilly Torosyan**

**Lilly Torosyan  
Recording Clerk**

**Thomas Gullotta  
Chairman**