

THE GLASTONBURY TOWN PLAN AND ZONING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING MINUTES OF TUESDAY, JUNE 4, 2024

The Glastonbury Town Plan and Zoning Commission, with Shelley Caltagirone, Director of Community Development, 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 video 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

Ms. Sharon Purtill, Vice Chair

Mr. Corey Turner, Secretary

Ms. Sharon Jagel

Mr. Dennis Desmarais, Alternate {participated via Zoom video conferencing}, *seated*

Ms. Laura Cahill, Alternate, *seated*

Commission Members Absent

Mr. Philip Marksuzka

Mr. Emilio Flores

Mr. Andy Zlotnick, Alternate

Chairman Zanolungo called the meeting to order at 7:03 P.M. In the absence of Commissioners Markuszka, Flores, and Zlotnick, he seated Commissioners DesMarais and Cahill as full voting members.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Informal session for the purpose of hearing from citizens on Regular Meeting agenda or non-agenda items

Denise Weeks of 334 Hollister Way West, stated that the Main Street/Hebron Avenue project is the most important project that the TPZ will be asked to weigh in on during their tenures. She believes that the PAD structure will encourage all parties to compromise to produce a design that is both economically viable and meets their housing needs downtown. She urged the TPZ to recommend to the Council approval of the Main/Hebron project for redevelopment as a PAD.

REGULAR MEETING

1. Acceptance of the Minutes of the May 21, 2024 Regular Meeting

Chairman Zanolungo stated that Mr. Zlotnick sent in the following comments: Under Roll Call, the minutes should be corrected to add him as an alternate, and Sharon Jagel as a full commission member. Also, Mr. Desmarais and Mr. Zlotnick were seated as full voting members.

Motion by: Secretary Turner

Seconded by: Commissioner DesMarais

Result: Amended minutes were accepted {6-0-0}.

2. Recommendation to the Town Council regarding a Minor Change to a Planned Area Development per Building-Zone Regulation Section 4.12.8 concerning an addition of a 36-foot by 12-foot pool/spa maintenance room off the east side of the building at 330 Naubuc Avenue

Attorney Meghan Hope of Alter & Pearson, LLC explained that their engineers determined that the basement, which was proposed underneath the approved addition, would need to be eliminated. This is because, during a flood, the groundwater would rise and push the addition out of the ground due to its buoyancy. They tried to create the smallest second addition possible to house the mechanical equipment, which is placed on the east side of the property. She showed the new section of sidewalks and noted that the shed has been eliminated. There is no internal access between this newest addition and the main building.

Ms. Hope explained that they took the approved landscaping and wrapped it around the proposed addition. There is a 4.7 percentage increase in the area of the approved building area, which is less than 10% standard applied to minor changes to special permits. All the building materials are the same, and there is no change to the parking count. Commissioner Desmarais asked what is to the right (east) side of the building. Ms. Hope explained that Pratt Street is to the south, Naubuc Avenue is to the west, and to the east is a residential property.

Motion by: Secretary Turner

Seconded by: Commissioner Cahill

MOVED, that the Town Plan and Zoning Commission recommends approval of the proposed revision to the 330 Naubuc Avenue plan of development approved April 23, 2024 to build an approximately 432sf, one-story addition at the east side of the approved building per Building-Zone Regulation Section 4.12.8 for minor changes of a PAD, per plans on file with the Office of Community Development.

Result: Motion passed unanimously {6-0-0}.

3. Statement to Town Council regarding potential text amendment to Town of Glastonbury Building-Zone Regulations to allow Planned Area Developments in the Town Center Zone

Ms. Caltagirone explained that, at the TPZ's last meeting, the Commission requested two items: further information about when the Town Center Zone (TCZ) was adopted and why it was not automatically included in Section 4.12, which regulates PADs; and for the motion which the ASDRC had made that evening. Staff has spoken with the Town's prior planning director, Ken Leslie, who explained there was no discussion at the time of the Town Center Zone adoption whether or not a PAD should be allowed in the district. Therefore, it would be a new topic for the Council to consider.

Vice Chair Purtill was at the subcommittee meeting when this proposal for a PAD in the Town Center came up. She finds it appropriate to allow PADs in the TCZ because it allows for a lot more flexibility. There is more work involved for a developer, but the end product tends to be very good. For example, the Somerset Square PAD eliminated the cookie cutter effect, which allowed for a more cohesive development. She noted that PADs provide an opportunity to make development unique, so she favors it. There is a five-acre minimum requirement for commercial PADs. While she cannot think of any other five-acre parcel in the TCZ, someone could accumulate properties and combine them.

Secretary Turner was also in that subcommittee meeting. He was surprised to learn that the TCZ did not allow for PADs. He asked why PADs were not allowed in the South Glastonbury Village zones. Mrs. Purtill explained that it is a very narrow, distinct area. She does not think that any of the parcels there are five acres. Mr. Turner suggested perhaps allowing a PAD in every zone in town. Ms. Purtill asked when the PAD regulations were updated. Ms. Caltagirone said between 2009 and 2011. The South Glastonbury Village zones were created in 2004.

Mrs. Purtill believes that a PAD in such a small village district might be antithetical to what they are trying to create. Commissioner Jagel agreed. She does not wish to give developers so much flexibility to acquire five acres, which is probably half that district, because that would be counterintuitive to preserving the village. Mr. Turner's only hesitation is in recommending the change of zone for a single project in the Town Center Zone. Ms. Purtill countered that this is not the only project in the TCZ district that could take advantage of the PAD. Mr. Desmarais appreciates the language of the proposed motion, which references the entire district, rather than this specific project.

Ms. Cahill believes that this particular project calls for creative solutions, and the TPZ needs to make a good faith effort for the developer, with the understanding that they will return with a more creative plan. While she has not reviewed the "Apple plan" (Main/Hebron previous plan), she has noted the ASDRC's concerns about it, which she takes very seriously. She agreed that a PAD is a good way to see this historic property developed correctly. Overall, she favors recommending to the Town Council that they apply PAD regulations to the Town Center Zone.

Mrs. Purtill read Mr. Zlotnick's comments into the record. He does not understand why they would pass an ordinance to allow PADs in the entire TCZ when there are plenty of PAD islands/floating zones across the town that were made for specific developments. If they want to consider this, it should be only for the addresses that the developer is interested in. Any deviations should be pointed out for the TPZ. The proposed development needs to outline what the needs are and how it will benefit the community. He asked to be presented with the most recent Main/Hebron plan, which the ASDRC was disappointed with. He asked which specific zoning design issues are currently a problem that cannot be resolved through ZBA review and approval.

Mrs. Purtill countered that they are trying to avoid ZBA review and approval because, then, the TPZ loses all control. She pointed out that PADs have all the design tools on top of everything else, while offering a more cohesive plan, which is the best of both worlds. Mr. Turner pointed

out that they are not approving the PAD for that specific location. If the developer chooses to move forward, and the Council allows the change, then the applicant would still have to present a design and go through a normal review. Mrs. Purtill added that there is an additional step to review the zone change, so it is actually a two-step process.

Ms. Caltagirone explained that she will request that Council leadership place this item on their next regular meeting agenda, so that she can formally present it to them.

Motion by: Secretary Turner

Seconded by: Commissioner Jagel

MOVED, that the Town Plan and Zoning Commission asks the Town Council to consider amending the Building-Zone Regulations in order to allow Planned Area Developments in the Town Center zoning district for the following reasons:

- 1. Large development sites in the Town Center zoning district offer unique opportunities to build projects that better integrate with the historic streetscape along Main Street and encourage a more pedestrian-oriented and vibrant Town Center.*
- 2. Large development sites can pose challenges and opportunities that could be better managed through a Planned Area Development process which offers flexibility in use, design, and lot requirements while adhering to Plan of Conservation and Development policies.*
- 3. The regulations do not currently allow for PADs in the Town Center zone.*
- 4. The change would extend an existing planning tool to the Town Center zone that is used in most of the Town's other residential and commercial zoning districts.*

Result: Motion passed unanimously {6-0-0}.

4. CONSENT CALENDAR – NO ACTION

- a. Scheduling of Public Hearings for the Regular Meeting of June 18, 2024: **to be determined**

5. Chairman's Report *None*

6. Report from Community Development Staff

Ms. Caltagirone received a letter from the Connecticut Chapter of the American Planning Association, who is offering a housing forum in September. They are inviting a commissioner and a member of Town staff to attend. It would count towards their training requirements as commissioners.

Tomorrow, she will also speak with Council leadership to place on their next agenda a presentation on the scope of work for all the planning and zoning updates that were proposed through the Capital Improvement Program this year. She seeks their input on the draft scope of work, which would be presented with a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) and will ask if the Council would like to participate in a selection panel for that RFQ. Mr. Zanolungo asked if a

subcommittee would be formed after. Ms. Caltagirone said that they are leaving that open. The request in the first phase is for consultants to develop a community engagement plan, which would include a steering committee. However, she is unsure as to what the composition would be.

Motion by: Vice Chair Purtill

Seconded by: Commissioner Cahill

The Town Plan and Zoning Commission adjourned their meeting at 7:44 P.M.

Result: Motion passed unanimously {6-0-0}.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lilly Torosyan

Lilly Torosyan

Recording Clerk