

**GLASTONBURY TOWN COUNCIL
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
TUESDAY, JUNE 11, 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 Jon Cavanna

2. Public Comment.

DJ McBride of 263 Spring Street Extension, stated that some properties in town abuse the system by paying lower taxes than they are supposed to. He supports subsidizing open space and farmers, but is against subsidizing investors holding future property, especially when there is a great need for property today. He asked the Council to review the 100 properties in town with the lowest tax rates, to verify if they are valid.

Chris Bassette of 77 Tryon Street, asked to act quickly on the request to extend the state village district designation to South Glastonbury, which is supported by many local residents.

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

Joe Muro of 151 Riverview Road, asked that the Council look into extending the sidewalk from the new crosswalk being created at Red Hill to the start of the existing sidewalk on Chestnut Hill, to complete the beginning of a continuous section of sidewalk on Chestnut Hill. Secondly, he supports the addition of PADs to the Town Center Zone. Thirdly, he asked the Town Manager to provide an update on the grant that the Town received for the Old Cider Mill.

Jane Beaufort of 121 Oak Street, is in disbelief at the overall condition of the current Glastonbury Animal Shelter, which lacks air conditioning. She hopes that Town officials will stop delaying the process for a new animal shelter due to cost before something horrible happens to an animal.

MacKenzie McConville of 94 Chestnut Hill Road, requested that the Town consider extending the new sidewalk at the intersection of Route 17 and Chestnut Hill Road from the new crosswalk to connect with the existing sidewalk further up Chestnut Hill Road. Currently, there are only four houses at the beginning

of their road which lack a sidewalk. Adding a short extension would greatly improve safety, and the connectivity may encourage the state to consider installing a sidewalk along the entire length of Chestnut Hill Road in the future.

3. Special Reports. *None.*

4. Old Business. *None.*

5. New Business.

a. Discussion regarding the process to select and work with a consultant to help the Town update its Building Zone Regulations and Subdivision Regulations.

Mr. Luiz explained that the budget going into effect on July 1 does contain \$75,000 for this project, with the intention that another \$75,000 will be allotted next year, for a total of \$150,000 over two installments. He noted that Shelley Caltagirone, Director of Community Development, has expressed desire to discuss early on how the Council would be a part of the process to select a consultant to help update the Building Zone regulations and Subdivision regulations over the next two years.

Ms. Caltagirone explained that the other upcoming planning projects over the next three years are the Affordable Housing Plan and the POCD updates. She noted that the Building Zone regulations have not been updated comprehensively since 1973, though there have been text amendments, and the Subdivision regulations have not been updated since 1993. She explained that there is a backlog of required updates to bring the codes into compliance with local and regional plans, state statutes, and best practices.

Ms. Caltagirone explained that the Town would publicly advertise the project in an RFQ, and the election committee would choose the best-qualified firm. She stated that the next step is to reach an agreement on the scope of work and approval of the process by which this project will unfold. She would like to better understand how the Council plans to stay engaged with this project from beginning to end. She suggested a few ideas for this, such as the formation of a steering committee, holding workshops, public hearings, and/or informational presentations.

Mr. Cavanaugh asked which groups in town have been underrepresented in this process and what are the barriers. Ms. Caltagirone does not know. Because this would be her first planning project in town, she seeks guidance from the Council, the TPZ, and others to see who has not been represented historically. Mr. Cavanaugh was on the last committee that drafted the design guidelines for the village district, which consisted of council members, TPZ members, and a member from the Chamber of Commerce; he suggested reaching out to the Chamber again or the Rotary Club or the Exchange Club. He likes the idea of a committee being involved in the selection process. He found their previous consultant, Francisco Gomes of FHI, to be very impressive, and assumes that this new consultant will be responsible for organizing community engagement, as well.

Ms. Carroll likes what Ms. Caltagirone has presented as a starting point but wonders whether there is a way to streamline the process. Ms. Caltagirone noted that staying on schedule is a concern. She proposed holding meetings quarterly with the steering committee instead of once a month because while she liked the Design Guidelines Steering Committee process, she believes that it could have used more structure; hence, the suggestion for a more compacted, but less frequent, meeting schedule. Ms. Carroll asked about the timeline. Ms. Caltagirone optimistically hopes that this is a two-year project. She hopes that the RFQ process could be completed in about two months, though it might take three. She stated that the steering committee's role will be to prioritize ideas and keep them on task and schedule.

Ms. Wang asked why the recommendation for an RFQ versus an RFP. Ms. Caltagirone stated that an RFQ process gives the consultant more flexibility to pitch a scope of work to the Town. She is concerned that she does not have enough knowledge of writing a regulatory update, or on CT planning, to do a great scope of work that would go out to bid. Therefore, she feels more comfortable relying on the experts to pitch different approaches to the Town. Ms. Wang's concern is that, under RFQ requirements, the approach is not listed, so she suggested laying that out in their qualifications statement. Ms. Caltagirone will add that.

Mr. Osgood asked how to gauge whether or not the pricing offered by the candidates is reasonable. Mr. Luiz has reached out to other communities and \$150,000 was suggested for the work that is quoted. He noted that another way to go about this is with an RFP, which would lay out the scope of work and the Town would request firms' prices. However, he noted that the RFQ process has some leeway, after interviewing candidates, to tweak the scope of work. Mr. Osgood asked if it is possible to go through the RFQ process, and after whittling it down to the final three or four firms, to ask them about their pricing. Mr. Gullotta is concerned about that approach because this is a project that the Town will have to live with for decades. He is not looking for the cheapest option here, but the best.

Mr. Gullotta noted that Rebecca Augur, the Town's previous Director of Community Development, had assembled a list of urgent issues, which he encouraged Ms. Caltagirone to review. He is also concerned about the steering committee meeting quarterly because they are going to be intimately involved in the process, so she supports them meeting more frequently. He then noted that this item will be discussed again in two weeks, with Council direction provided to Ms. Caltagirone.

b. Discussion and possible action concerning a proposed minor change per Building Zone Regulation Section 4.12.8a to allow an addition to house mechanical equipment – 330 Naubuc Avenue.

Attorney Meghan Hope of Alter & Pearson, LLC explained that she is presenting on behalf of the Damatos. About three months ago, they asked the Council for a change of use and a 2900-foot addition, which were approved. At the time of approval, they had a basement under the addition, which housed all the mechanicals. Subsequently, their plans were reviewed by a geotechnical engineer who determined that, during a 100-year flood, water would seep into the ground of the building and could potentially pop the addition up. She explained that the applicant sought an alternative, which was to eliminate the basement, and make the mechanical room as small as possible, to be located on the east side of the building.

Ms. Hope explained that the proposed sidewalk will connect to the pool house addition. There will be no access from the pool room into the spa. She reviewed the updated elevations and slight changes made to the landscape plan, which include eliminating the shed, eliminating bulkhead, and wrapping the approved landscaping plan around the building. The ASDRC and TPZ have both approved this request as a minor change, specifically noting that the pool house addition is not more than 10%.

Mr. Osgood asked whether or not this is a minor change. Mr. Gullotta noted that when this came up at agenda setting, they did not believe it was proper to vote on it without the full council. Mr. Osgood stated that the application has already gone before the ASDRC and TPZ, which is generally what is done for a major change. Ms. Caltagirone explained that extra review is required for a minor change if the Town Manager doubts that it is a minor change. The Council can make the determination on whether this is a minor change or a major change.

Mr. Cavanna applauded the applicant for hanging in there and would like to vote on this tonight. Mr. Cavanaugh asked how much closer the addition is to the property on the east. Ms. Hope stated that the Council had approved 32 feet, and now it is 17.2 feet. The applicant has spoken with their most impacted

neighbor, to the east, who has no problems with it. Mr. Osgood's only concern was about the impact on the abutting property, but given that he is fine with it, he will support this motion.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves 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 as a minor change per Building-Zone Regulation Section 4.12.8, in accordance with plans dated May 13, 2024 on file with the Office of Community Development, as described in a report by the Director of Community Development dated June 7, 2024.

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

- c. Discussion concerning possible amendment to the Building Zone Regulations, Section 4.12 Planned Area Development Zone (PAD) to permit PADs in the Town Center Zone and action to set a joint Town Council and Town Plan and Zoning meeting on June 25, 2024.**

Ms. Caltagirone explained that, at their last meetings, both the TPZ and ASDRC passed motions, recommending that the Council consider allowing PADs in the Town Center Zone. She stated that when this zone was developed, the PAD regulations were not modified to include the Town Center. She also noted that earlier today, the Main/Hebron applicant requested a preliminary joint review of a comprehensive development plan for this site, which could be scheduled at the June 25 joint meeting as a separate item from the PAD in the Town Center zoning discussion.

Mr. Gullotta suggested holding off on this issue for another meeting or two. Mr. Osgood wonders whether this topic could be better handled in a more informal workshop with the TPZ as opposed to a regular council meeting. Ms. Caltagirone suggested setting it up as a special meeting, with the sole topic of the possible text amendment, and inviting both bodies to attend. Mr. Niland is not opposed to tabling this but asked for the reasoning why. Mr. Gullotta explained that he would like more information, as well as time to digest what they heard tonight, before moving forward. Mr. Osgood asked how many sites in the Town Center zoning district would even qualify for a PAD, based on their size. He also requested a summary of the differences that a PAD allows which cannot be accomplished during regular zoning. Ms. Caltagirone will prepare both documents for the next time this is agendized.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby tables Item 5c to a future meeting.

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

- d. Discussion and action to establish a Village District Overlay in South Glastonbury (refer to Town Plan and Zoning Commission; set public hearing).**

Ms. Caltagirone explained that, last week, Council leadership asked the Town Manager about creating a village district overlay in South Glastonbury. She noted that Glastonbury currently has one village district in the Town Center. The existing South Glastonbury zoning was established in 2004 and is composed of a village residential and a village commercial zone. Advisory design review is currently required for multi-family, commercial, and office projects in these zones. If adopted, she explained that design review would be compulsory for new construction, substantial reconstruction, and rehabilitation of property within the

district. She noted that, currently, single-family and two-family residences are exempt from design review in South Glastonbury; however, these building types are not exempt from design review in the Town Center Village District Overlay.

Mr. Gullotta asked whether this resolution considers both the residential and commercial zones. Ms. Caltagirone stated yes, she will present a draft with both zones shown in the text amendments. She asked whether the Council would prefer to have design review for both single-family and multi-family properties or just multi-family properties. Ms. Wang asked whether multi-family homes are currently included in the Town Center Village District Overlay. Ms. Caltagirone replied yes; though, there are only a handful of them. Mr. Niland favors exploring this but wonders how much of a burden the extra workload will be on the ASDRC. Ms. Caltagirone noted that it will increase their workload, but she cannot say exactly by how much before receiving more information on the details.

Mr. Osgood pointed out that being in a village district means that the ASDRC's design review is compulsory versus an advisory. He asked whether an applicant can turn down a project from being reviewed by the ASDRC. Ms. Caltagirone clarified that the ASDRC does not have the ability to approve or reject a project; all their opinions are advisory to the TPZ, who then has the authority to approve or deny a project. She noted that if the ASDRC's review is advisory, then the applicant could request to proceed on a project without ASDRC review, but most choose not to do that.

Mr. Osgood noted that before the ASDRC came into existence, applicants went before the Beautification Commission. He asked whether applicants could decide to forgo review by the Beautification Commission. Ms. Caltagirone noted that that commission had been disbanded by the time she joined the town. However, her understanding is that while it was advisory, applicants chose to go through the process, perhaps out of tradition, or to appease the TPZ. At this time, she does not know the answer. Mr. Osgood asked to confirm that information.

Ms. Carroll stated that, right now, the Town has a South Glastonbury village district, but asked whether turning it into a village district overlay would align it with the parameters set forth by the Town Center village district and state guidelines. Ms. Caltagirone explained that it gives the Town the option to create a more expansive design review in the village which, right now, is a village district in name only. Mr. Gullotta does not think that single-family homes should go to the ASDRC for review, but a duplex and greater should. Mr. Cavanaugh disagreed, noting that there are some historic single-family homes which could benefit from ASDRC review.

Mr. Gullotta asked, if the ASDRC made a recommendation and the developer chose not to follow it, then the TPZ can use their failure as a grounds for denial, and should the developer decide to sue the Town, those grounds would have greater strength for the Town in court. Ms. Caltagirone stated that is correct. Mr. Cavanaugh asked about the timeline. Ms. Caltagirone will start drafting and refer this matter back to the Council in the coming weeks.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, the Glastonbury Town Council hereby directs the Town Manager to have staff prepare a presentation on a possible text amendment to the Building-Zone Regulations that would create a South Glastonbury Village District, as described in a report by the Director of Community Development dated June 7, 2024.

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

- e. **Discussion and action on use of Opioid settlement funds to support a full-time Youth & Family Services position.**

THIS ITEM WILL BE TABLED TO AN UNSPECIFIED FUTURE MEETING DATE.

- f. **Action on a \$3,268,906 transfer of ARPA Funds to meet obligation deadline requirements (refer to Board of Finance; set public hearing).**

Mr. Luiz explained that out of all the ARPA funded projects, these three are unlikely to meet the December 31 obligation to have at least purchase orders cut, so this action is a swap of money to ensure that they will meet these deadlines. Mr. Niland asked if these are all separate public hearings, or could the Council hold them all at once. Mr. Luiz stated that Keri Rowley, the Finance Director, recommended that the Council do them all individually.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby refers to the Board of Finance a request for determination of sufficient monies in the proposed American Rescue Plan Act (Special Revenue) Fund projects and the Capital Projects Fund projects and that the proposed appropriation transfer of funds is consistent with the US Treasury Guidelines, as described in a report by the Director of Finance and Administrative Services dated June 7, 2024; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby schedules a public hearing for 8:00 pm on Tuesday, June 25, 2024 in the Council Chambers of Town Hall, 2155 Main Street, Glastonbury and /or through Zoom Video Conferencing to consider an appropriation transfer for the Williams Memorial & Academy Building Improvements Project of \$1,404,453 from ARPA monies to Capital Projects Fund monies; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby schedules a public hearing for 8:00 pm on Tuesday, June 25, 2024 in the Council Chambers of Town Hall, 2155 Main Street, Glastonbury and /or through Zoom Video Conferencing to consider an appropriation transfer for the Clean Renewable Energy Project of \$80,000 from ARPA monies to Capital Project Fund monies; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby schedules a public hearing for 8:00 pm on Tuesday, June 25, 2024 in the Council Chambers of Town Hall, 2155 Main Street, Glastonbury and /or through Zoom Video Conferencing to consider an appropriation transfer for the Riverfront Park and Boathouse Project of \$150,000 from ARPA monies to Capital Project Fund monies; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby schedules a public hearing for 8:00 pm on Tuesday, June 25, 2024 in the Council Chambers of Town Hall, 2155 Main Street, Glastonbury and /or through Zoom Video Conferencing to consider an appropriation transfer for the Public Safety Communication System of \$650,000 from Capital Project Fund monies to ARPA monies; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby schedules a public hearing for 8:00 pm on Tuesday, June 25, 2024 in the Council Chambers of Town Hall, 2155 Main Street, Glastonbury and /or through Zoom Video Conferencing to consider an appropriation transfer for the Pedestrian Bridge Repair Project of \$200,000 from Capital Project Fund monies to ARPA monies; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby schedules a public hearing for 8:00 pm on Tuesday, June 25, 2024 in the Council Chambers of Town Hall, 2155 Main Street, Glastonbury

and /or through Zoom Video Conferencing to consider an appropriation transfer for the Road Overlay Program Project of \$421,497 from Capital Project Fund monies to ARPA Fund monies; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby schedules a public hearing for 8:00 pm on Tuesday, June 25, 2024 in the Council Chambers of Town Hall, 2155 Main Street, Glastonbury and /or through Zoom Video Conferencing to consider an appropriation transfer for the Grange Pool Project of \$89,000 from the Capital Project Fund monies to ARPA Fund monies; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby schedules a public hearing for 8:00 pm on Tuesday, June 25, 2024 in the Council Chambers of Town Hall, 2155 Main Street, Glastonbury and /or through Zoom Video Conferencing to consider an appropriation transfer for the Animal Control Project of \$23,956 from the Capital Project Fund monies to ARPA Fund monies; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby schedules a public hearing for 8:00 pm on Tuesday, June 25, 2024 in the Council Chambers of Town Hall, 2155 Main Street, Glastonbury and /or through Zoom Video Conferencing to consider an appropriation transfer for the Sidewalk Maintenance Project of \$250,000 from the Capital Project Fund monies to ARPA Fund monies;

all as described in a report by the Director of Finance and Administrative Services dated June 7, 2024.

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

6. Consent Calendar.

- a. Action on lease renewal of Town-owned building at 2112 Main Street with Glastonbury Emergency Medical Services (lease expires June 30, 2024) (refer to Town Plan and Zoning Commission; set public hearing).**

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby refers a proposed new Lease Agreement between the Town and Glastonbury Emergency Medical Services to the Town Plan and Zoning Commission for a report, and schedules a public hearing for 8:00 p.m. on Tuesday, June 25, 2024 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 June 7, 2024.

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

7. Town Manager's Report.

Mr. Luiz presented his report. He noted that he is meeting with the Wethersfield Town Manager to discuss the possibility of advancing a regional town shelter. He has also received word that the Town has received a grant of about \$300,000 through the State Bond Commission for improvements to Addison Park. Regarding the MLK mural, Ms. Wang asked what the consideration is for the painting surface and when they will be able to proceed with that. This morning, Mr. Luiz met with an architect who recommended painting directly on the surface because it would be hard to figure out the logistics of fixing those panels. Mr. Luiz also spoke with the artist today, who painted a sample patch on the panels and was pleased with that sample painting.

Ms. Wang commented that last week's farmer's market was well received and is a good use of the space by Town Hall. She also noted that she was at the Pride event and was pleased with the public engagement with

the Fire Department. She asked about ideas to push their recruiting and marketing efforts. Mr. Luiz stated that they will come up with a more creative, elaborate marketing plan, in addition to instituting the new compensation structure. Ms. LaChance commented that they need to start planning the 250th anniversary of the founding of this country. She is not going to be able to chair that committee, so someone else will have to take over.

8. Committee Reports.

a. Chairman's Report. *None.*

b. MDC. *None.*

c. CRCOG.

Mr. Luiz stated that Mr. Pennington presented on the Transportation Alternatives grant.

d. Board of Education Facilities Committee Report. *None.*

9. Communications.

a. Letter from CT Siting Council regarding modifications to existing telecommunications facility located at 175 Dickinson Road. *Received.*

b. Letter from CT Siting Council regarding modifications to existing telecommunications facility located at 577 Bell Street. *Received.*

c. Letter from CT Siting Council regarding modifications to an existing telecommunications facility located at 374 Three Mile Road. *Received.*

10. Minutes.

a. Minutes of May 28, 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 May 28, 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 concerning appointment of an Assessor.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby enters into Executive Session at 8:46 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 concerning appointment of an Assessor.

Attendees to include Council Members and the Town Manager.

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

The Council came out of Executive Session at 8:51 p.m.

Following the Executive Session, the Council discussed, 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 included Town Council members and the Town Manager.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby adjourns the Town Council meeting of June 11, 2024 at 8:53 p.m.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Lilly Torosyan

**Lilly Torosyan
Recording Clerk**

**Thomas Gullotta
Chairman**