

**JOINT MEETING OF THE GLASTONBURY TOWN COUNCIL,
TOWN PLAN AND ZONING COMMISSION, AND ARCHITECTURAL
AND SITE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE
SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES
TUESDAY, JUNE 25, 2024**

The Glastonbury Town Council with Town Manager, Jonathan Luiz, in attendance, held a Special Meeting — Joint Meeting with the Town Plan and Zoning Commission and Architectural and Site Design Review Committee 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.

Town Council Members: Thomas P. Gullotta (Chairman); Jennifer Wang (Vice Chairman); Deborah A. Carroll; Kurt P. Cavanaugh; John Cavanna; Mary LaChance; Jacob McChesney; Lawrence Niland; Whit Osgood

Town Plan and Zoning Commission Members: Robert Zanlungo, Jr. (Chairman); Sharon H. Purtill (Vice Chairman); Corey Turner; Emilio Fores; Sharon Jagel; Philip Markuszka; Laura Cahill (Alternate); Dennis Desmarais (Alternate); Andy Zlotnick (Alternate)

Architectural and Site Design Review Committee Members: Brian Davis (Chairman); Debra DeVries-Dalton (Vice Chairman); Mark Branse; David Flinchum; Jeff Kamm; Amy Luzi; Michael Stankov

1. Roll Call.

Town Council:

Thomas P. Gullotta, Chairman
Jennifer Wang, Vice Chairman
Deborah A. Carroll {participated via Zoom}
Kurt P. Cavanaugh
John Cavanna
Larry Niland {participated via Zoom}
Mary LaChance {excused}
Jacob McChesney {excused}
Whit Osgood

Town Plan and Zoning Commission:

Robert J. Zanlungo, Jr., Chairman
Sharon Purtill H. Purtill, Vice Chairman
Corey Turner
Emilio Flores {participated via Zoom}
Sharon Jagel {excused}
Philip Markuszka {participated via Zoom}
Andy Zlotnick (Alternate)
Dennis Desmarais (Alternate) {excused}
Laura Cahill (Alternate)

Architectural and Site Design Review Committee

Brian Davis, Chairman
Debra DeVries-Dalton, Vice Chairman
Mark Branse
David Flinchum
Jeff Kamm
Amy Luzi
Michael Stankov {excused}

a. Pledge of Allegiance *Led by Laura Cahill*

2. Public Comment.

Rachel Siporin of 509 Hopewell Road, stated that the Cotton Hollow Preserve has become a site of ordinance violations, including traffic violations, illegal parking, and consumption or possession of alcohol. Yesterday, her husband came across people smoking marijuana and drinking beer cans. She lamented the lack of authority of the park

rangers to hold uncooperative people responsible. She is dismayed by the Town's disregard for the operating policies of the preserve and asked that the parking lot be supervised from 4:00 p.m. until closing time.

Alan Shapiro of 509 Hopewell Road, stated that Town ordinances must be enforced at Cotton Hollow, which is being degraded and putting people at risk.

3. Special Reports. *None.*

4. Old 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. Gullotta explained that the selection committee will consist of the following individuals: 3 from the Town Council (2 Democrats and 1 Republican), 2 from the TPZ (1 Democrat and 1 Republican), and 1 from the ASDRC. The Council members will be Mr. Niland, Mr. Gullotta, and Mr. Cavanaugh. The TPZ and ASDRC will inform the Council of their representatives. Mr. Gullotta noted that there was a discussion that this committee will meet monthly. Mr. Cavanaugh wonders where the draft proposal RFP is. Mr. Luiz explained that they just provided a brief scope of work, which would turn into an RFP. Mr. Cavanaugh asked when this would go out. After this meeting, Mr. Luiz will discuss setting up a timeline with Ms. Caltagirone. Mr. Osgood asked if the meetings of this group will be publicly posted. Mr. Luiz stated yes, once the consultant gets hired. He noted that the official meetings will be a subcommittee and open to the public.

b. Presentation concerning the establishment of a Village District Overlay in South Glastonbury and possible action to refer the matter to the Town Plan and Zoning Commission and set a public hearing.

Motion by: Ms. Wang

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby refers a draft Building-Zone Regulations text amendment that would create a South Glastonbury Village District to the Town Plan and Zoning Commission for a recommendation, and schedules a public hearing for 8:00 p.m. on Tuesday, July 23, 2024 in the Council Chambers of Town Hall, 2155 Main Street, Glastonbury and/or through Zoom Video Conferencing to consider adoption of the draft text amendment, as described in a report by the Director of Community Development dated June 21, 2024.

Discussion: Mr. Luiz stated that Ms. Caltagirone had to step out but the materials she provided discuss the draft text amendment. Mr. Osgood believes that the concept here was to do away with the two separate districts of village residential versus village commercial. Also, he believes that these regulations would apply to residential homes. In which case, he asked whether the Council would like to exclude two-family residential from the required site design review. Mr. Gullotta stated that they had discussed excluding single-family and duplexes.

Amendment by: Mr. Osgood

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanna

To exclude single-family and two-family/duplex residences from the draft Building-Zone Regulations text amendment that would create a South Glastonbury Village District.

Discussion: Mr. Cavanna asked if this would apply to farms. Mr. Gullotta remarked that there are no farms in that area. Mr. Haynes explained that farms are listed as a permitted use under the village center residential. Mr. Osgood stated that there are currently two zones with different uses.

He asked how they would differentiate between them, if they were to be eliminated and replaced by a village district. Mr. Haynes explained that the two underlying zones would remain; it would just be an overlay zone that would follow the current village district boundaries.

Result: Amendment approved unanimously {7-0-0}.

Result: Motion passed unanimously {7-0-0}.

c. Presentation regarding the Open Space Woodland Management Plan.

Suzanne Simone, Environmental Planner, explained that the Town contracted with GZA GeoEnvironmental, Inc. and Connwood Foresters, Inc. to come up with a forested plan for the JB Williams property and the former MDC parcels. The goal of this project was to understand existing conditions in order to come up with best management practices.

Steve Lecco, principal at GZA, explained that this project started in 2022, and these two properties were selected. The goal of this open space management plan was to look at ecological and recreational resources. They conducted desktop and field studies, then solicited feedback from an online survey; after analyzing and discussing the results with Town Staff, they developed recommendations and wrote the report around those particular recommendations.

Cora Ottaviani, ecological scientist at GZA, reviewed the two properties and the public survey results, which ran from July to August of last year, and acquired over 500 online responses. She then provided a brief overview of the recommendations of each of the properties which include a combination of various habitat management/improvements, trails and access, mapping and signage, and water resource improvements.

Regarding JB Williams, Mr. Gullotta asked if the lower pond is man made. Mr. Lecco explained that there is a dam of sorts. Mr. Gullotta stated that, decades ago, one could go swimming in the upper pond, which is impossible now, and noted that the lower pond is going to silt in. Mr. Lecco stated that siltation is there, but a feasibility study is needed. He noted that dredging is one potential way to rehabilitate it. They also recommend water quality testing, because their plan was very general. He recommends that further study be done on the pond.

Mr. Cavanaugh added that, because of the silt, it was decided to no longer have the upper pond, which was too expensive to maintain. He thought that this study was also going to look at some timber clearing. Ms. Ottaviani explained that part of their field assessments looked at where downed trees and dangerous trees were. They specifically focused on what was along trails. Their suggestion is to move any down trees off trails so that they are not in people's way, and to leave them as dead wood because that is used by wildlife. She noted that any dangerous trees should be cut up and used for brush piles.

For the MDC property, Mr. Osgood asked if any thought was given to where access points should be improved. Ms. Ottaviani explained that most of the trails they found were on parcels 1, 2, and 3. The informal parking area is at the cul de sac at the end of Heritage Drive, so to have an access point, it would have to be there, she stated. She noted that the Town acquired an easement at Stallion Ridge which enabled people to access parcel 1, so if the Town decided to formalize any trails, they could access it from there. The current informal pull off areas are between parcels 1 and 2, parcel 2, and the cul de sac.

Mr. Osgood asked if the beech trees will be taken out because they shade new growth. Peter Lesmerises, forester at Connwood Foresters, Inc. explained that the beech trees are being removed because most of them are expected to die. Because DEEP has not found any way to stop or treat their illness, and experimental treatments are expensive, the majority of the beech trees will die. Mr. Osgood asked if harvesting has been considered. Mr. Lesmerises stated that harvesting was not on the table when the plan was done. He noted that TSI offers a more tree-by-tree basis to get rid of garbage trees. Mr. Osgood asked about the trail ranking system. Ms. Ottaviani stated that, right now, one may go online and look at the trails and their mapping system. She explained that the Town could either add onto the trail ranking system or have a separate system that ranks the trails based on difficulty, as well as keeping track of what the current management needs are.

5. New Business.

- a. Pre-application review of the use of properties at 2277-2289, 2327-2333, 2341-2345, 2377 and 2389 Main Street. (For this agenda item only, the Town Plan and Zoning Commission and Architectural and Site Design Review Committee will participate jointly in the meeting.)**

Attorney Meghan Hope of Alter & Pearson, LLC represented the property owners at 2277-2289, 2327-2333, 2341-2345, 2377 and 2389 Main Street. Tonight, they hope to receive feedback on this project, which can be pursued one of two ways: either a unified mixed-use proposal, which would go through the PAD amendment process, or a parcel-by-parcel development, through the special permitting process. She stated that the applicants hope to proceed with the mixed-use format, and it is critical to move forward for the Doro Restaurant Group, which will operate two of the three commercial properties onsite.

Ms. Hope explained that the site consists of five properties with frontage all along Main Street. She pointed out that the Willard building, the Gatesy building, and the Daybreak building will all remain; the redevelopment will mainly concern the Kamin's building and the building in the hole. They propose to use the drop in topography to their advantage by constructing a podium which would have parking underneath. On top of the podium, they will bring the buildings up. She stated that the podium is critical to the whole project, as it will allow for screening the parking and bringing the buildings closer to Main Street.

Ms. Hope sees three positive components to their preliminary site plan: improved site circulation, with a reduction in the number of curb cuts and an increase in parking from what currently exists; the ability of the podium to shield a large number of parking spaces; and an expansion of the streetscape as it exists on Main Street. She noted that all 172 residential units will be in the rear of the building, of which 10% would be affordable workforce units that would be restricted to 80% of AMI. She stated that the restaurant building is remaining at one story, as well as the lobby. The residential units would be located on the second level above. On the third floor, the architects will pull away some of the units to provide some relief on Main Street. She pointed out that this plan shows an option of apartments on the rear of the fourth floor.

Ms. Hope explained that the plaza level plan continues to change as the programming changes. Currently, the plaza will be located between the restaurant building and the remaining commercial buildings. The intention is to create a pathway between Main Street to the Daybreak side of the building. She noted that this open space park lines up closely with the fountain. This application has been through several ASDRC meetings. She reviewed photos of the Apple Plan, noting that Mr. Davis thought it important to have an iconic focal point on the northeast corner of the site. At this time, the rendering has a small apple weathervane at the top, but this can change.

Ms. Hope is confident that their architect can work with the ASDRC to get to a project that all parties will be comfortable with. She concluded that they have been working on this project for three years, and it has reached a critical junction point. She explained that the PAD process is beneficial because it also allows for flexibility for a parking project. They seek feedback from the Town on how to proceed.

Mr. Gullotta stated that, for council members, the issue is whether or not they have an interest in a PAD. Ms. Cahill asked why the applicants are asking for a waiver for an excess 40 parking spaces to the extant 250 spaces. Ms. Hope stated that their proposed programming does not have sufficient parking for everyone. She explained that, with a PAD, there would not be a parking waiver, but rather, a deviation from the typical parking requirements, with documentation often provided by a traffic engineer on why they need more parking.

Ms. Wang finds the historic element interesting and likes the L-shaped plaza which provides an extension of community space currently provided by the park across the street. She supports outdoor dining as part of this comprehensive plan. She also likes the underground parking, both because it shields from the public view, and because of the environmental benefits of not having that be impervious surface. In the parking consideration, she would like to consider what can be done for biking facilities. She thinks that this collaborative process has been beneficial to the Town and favors the discussion around allowing PADs in the Town Center Zone, if it means pursuing projects like this.

Mr. Cavanaugh asked if the Apple Plan is actually part of the proposal or are they showing what was previously proposed. Ms. Hope clarified that she is showing what was previously proposed because the renderings have not caught up with the site plan. Mr. Cavanaugh asked if they are going to do anything with the Willard building. Ms. Hope stated that they are considering a renovation, but right now, they are just leaving it as is. Mr. Cavanaugh pointed out that Rankin Road was referred to as a full service access, but his understanding is that it is a town road. Ms. Hope clarified that it has both ingress and egress as two-way traffic. There is an existing easement for traffic to get from Main Street

into the Willard property. She thinks that it is more than the Willard building, but the Town may think differently. Mr. Cavanaugh noted that that will have to be settled.

Mr. Cavanaugh stated that the Town's current regulations do not allow for residents on the ground level. He asked if this work-live space is an attempt to go around their regulations. Ms. Hope replied no, explaining that, in a PAD, those Town Center regulations would not apply, so they could have residential units on the first floor. However, they still wanted to have that commercial frontage on Main Street. If there is an apprehension to live-work, she suggested looking at making those smaller offices. She will conduct more research on work-live spaces in CT and provide that information to Ms. Caltagirone. Mr. Cavanaugh is not a fan of using Main Street in their parking calculations. While he would like to see this application pursued through the PAD process, he wants to see more renderings.

Mr. Osgood asked if there is a rendering of what is actually being proposed, which is a single-story building where Kamin's currently is. Ms. Hope replied no, they do not have one. If the project is not pursued via the PAD process, Mr. Osgood asked if the number of units would have to be reduced because of parking constraints. Ms. Hope explained that they would pursue their phase 1 plan, which is the commercial portion. Mr. Osgood asked about wetlands. Ms. Hope remarked that there are no direct wetlands impact on this plan. Mr. Osgood has mixed feelings about a PAD. He wants to consider what it would mean for the context of the entire Town Center Zone.

Mr. Cavanna would like to see an updated rendering. He asked if the parking upfront is more in anticipation of people parking for restaurants. Ms. Hope replied yes, customers going to commercial uses would likely use those spaces, and at night, they would be empty. She noted that all the residential spaces would be underground. Mr. Cavanna is in favor of the work-live idea and is open to discussing a PAD moving forward.

Mr. Turner asked about the change in the site plan from the original Apple Plan reviewed at the subcommittee versus this one. He noted that the lobby shown on the first level was not there and it was open to the courtyard area, with a green space for pedestrian traffic. Ms. Hope replied yes, they had that because they were trying to keep the residential units off the first floor, by working within the regulations as much as possible. Mr. Turner disagrees. He liked that open pedestrian area which created a nice open space that could have been used by the public. He would like to return to that original Apple Plan concept. He concluded that this project will hinge a lot on traffic studies and parking studies.

Ms. Purtill agreed with Mr. Turner on the open concept. She still thinks that 172 residential units is a lot and worries about the traffic choking that intersection. She thinks that the fourth floor is too massive in that particular location. She is curious to learn more about the work-live concept but thinks that there will be demand for commercial space, which will naturally spur on commercial activity. She noted that not many parcels in the Town Center Zone meet the five-acre minimum requirement to have a PAD and explained that there has not been a parking waiver since Eric Town Square, which they regretted because it felt like parking wars were created between tenants. She feels like this is public parking and to allocate some to this project would somehow take away that public activity. She believes that this is a more appealing project than simply renovating the old Kamin's building, and in the long run, will give the Town a better project. While she is not a big fan of the design, she will leave that up to the ASDRC.

Mr. Zanolungo asked if the public could park under the podium. Ms. Hope replied, yes. Mr. Zanolungo is not necessarily opposed to the fourth floor but would like to see it in a rendering. If the fourth floor residential units are not pursued, he asked how many units that would be and if it is feasible for the development of this project. He is in favor of the cohesive plan via a PAD versus the piecemeal approach with a special permit.

Mr. Niland agrees with Ms. Purtill regarding the extra traffic generated by this proposal. He asked if anything has been done to counter that. Ms. Hope stated that a full traffic study was conducted, before and after covid. They made all the intersections work. However, she noted that the more they were able to reduce the commercial square footage, the better it made the traffic numbers. This was reviewed with Town Engineer Dan Pennington. Mr. Niland asked how the smoke from the restaurants will affect the residential units. Blake Krevolin of JKRP architects explained that anything they build would be done to meet mechanical codes.

Ms. Carroll favors a conversation about the PAD process but shares concerns about opening that up to be an option throughout the Town Center Zone. The fourth floor worries her. She is in favor of a cohesive plan and not a piecemeal

approach. While she generally favors the design, she does not like the colors. She looks forward to seeing an updated rendering.

Mr. Flinchum had no comments.

Ms. Luzi agrees with Mr. Turner about opening this back up. She supports engaging the street as much as possible. She feels strongly that a PAD provides greater flexibility. She is concerned about the distance between these two buildings because it feels pinched. She also noted that the previous renderings showed light at the end of Main Street, which is not what it looks like. She asked that all renderings, going forward, reflect this more accurately.

Mr. Branse is the one who suggested looking at a fourth story because the site is dropping away from Main Street. He does not think it will have that monolithic look and believes that the roofline will be important for that. He agrees with Mr. Turner about the connected green that they initially saw. Regarding parking, he noted that Eric Town Square was approved with two restaurants but somehow ended up with five restaurants, and an additional two or three on adjacent properties, which the commission never approved. Thus, he believes that the parking issues there are to be expected.

Mr. Branse noted that traffic is an element of successful development, and the advantage of a mixed-use development is that there will be peaks at different times of the day. Additionally, a lot of people will be taking advantage of walking to and from the site. Instead of a work-live space, he clarified that what he had suggested was convertible units from residential to commercial in the interior floor area, but not along Main Street. In his opinion, everything facing Main Street should be commercial. He encouraged pursuit of the PAD route.

If this were an academic exercise on village planning, Mr. Davis believes that they would study the existing conditions as something to not pursue. He stated that, today, the more mixed use there is, the better off they are, which is why parking calculations from decades ago do not apply today. He is not worried about potential traffic because the burden is on the applicant to convince everyone of the science behind their layout. He agrees with Ms. Purtill and Mr. Turner that it was better when the courtyard was connected and carried through. He is not concerned about the width of the public space that comes into the interior off Main Street. He noted that everyone will have different opinions regarding the colors.

Mr. Davis believes that this proposal shows good planning, with the level of detail, the character, the scale of the projects along Main Street, and the residential units in the rear. He thinks that it would be a real asset to the Town, which will fix that hole in the ground. If he is fearful of anything, it is of a piecemeal development. He noted that a PAD allows the ability to present a project's merits to a jury of its peers, and when a special project comes in, a PAD should be considered.

Ms. Dalton supports a cohesive project rather than a piecemeal one. She has no problem with using a PAD to enhance development along Main Street. She also liked the more open plaza before. She asked to make it a little wider, to enforce the feeling they only see at Daybreak Coffee. Regarding the work-live concept, she asked to pursue small commercial spaces because this site should serve as an incubator for commercial space in Glastonbury. If the applicant is facing parking constraints, she suggested lopping off the fourth level apartments because 172 residential units is tremendous.

Mr. Kamm agrees about the courtyard. He stated that the applicants need at least five site sections showing the Council the elevations from street to building to rear building and how that creates this courtyard-like feeling. He noted that the Doro building was a one-story building but it was a two-story tall one-story building. To allow this to proceed, he believes that a PAD makes sense because it provides for control and allows the Town to continue talking about the project.

Mr. Zlotnick stated that a PAD is a special use which can be granted anywhere that a PAD is granted. It does not mean that if a PAD is pursued in the Town Center Zone that they can be done anywhere in the Town Center Zone, so it is not a precedent. He asked if the podium is even with the street all the way across. Ms. Hope explained that the podium would be four stories above Main Street, and measuring from the base of the parking lot, it is five stories. Mr. Zlotnick asked if the Fire Department could handle that fifth floor. Ms. Hope stated yes, they can.

Mr. Flores would prefer to review a comprehensive plan and favors PADs in the Town Center Zone.

Regarding the traffic studies, Mr. Markuszka asked if additional bus routes could be added, to increase public transit. Regarding Rankin Road Extension, he noted that people use the passway to access the Riverfront area. He asked if there would still be public access. Ms. Hope stated that they have not done any study regarding bus routes but can look into it. She explained that they would not touch the existing town parking spaces at the head of that trail. If they proceed down this route, there is a wide right of way there, so if needed, they could potentially add additional public parking. She believes that it might make sense to add additional public parking as part of this project.

Mr. Gullotta thinks that a PAD is the way to go, and everything else is to be determined.

The Council took a five-minute recess, returning at 8:23 p.m. for the public hearings. Afterwards, Items 4a, 4b, and 4c were reviewed. Following the conclusion of Item 4c, this matter was revisited, at 9:03 p.m.

Mr. Luiz stated that no motion would be made tonight. He explained that, at the Council's July 9 meeting, Ms. Caltagirone will review the PAD text amendment, which the Council would refer to the TPZ, and set a public hearing for August 6. Mr. Cavanaugh is concerned that a lot of people will be on summer vacation who may otherwise want to comment on this. Mr. Gullotta stated that the August 6 date will not be set until the Council's next meeting, and at that point, they may choose to hold off until September. By consensus, the Council agreed to wait until their next meeting to receive the text amendment language from Ms. Caltagirone.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

NO. 1 ACTION CONCERNING A NEW LEASE AGREEMENT AT 2112 MAIN STREET BETWEEN THE TOWN OF GLASTONBURY AND GLASTONBURY EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES.

Mr. Luiz explained that this building has been leased for several years to GEMS. This is a one-year extension at a 2% increase. He noted that the payment that GEMS makes every year to the North Central CT EMS Council, on the Town's behalf, will increase from \$35,054 this year to \$35,199 next year; this gets credited against the lease. He stated that the TPZ has issued a favorable report on this lease.

With no comments from the public, Mr. Gullotta closed the public hearing.

Motion by: Ms. Wang

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby authorizes the Town Manager to execute a lease between the Town of Glastonbury and Glastonbury Emergency Medical Services (GEMS) for the Town-owned building at 2112 Main Street for the term of July 1, 2024 through June 30, 2025, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated June 21, 2024.

Result: Motion passed unanimously {7-0-0}.

NO. 2 ACTION REGARDING ALLOCATIONS/TRANSFERS TOTALING \$3,268,906, WHICH INCLUDE THREE AMERICAN RESCUE PLAN ACT (ARPA) FUND TRANSFERS (\$1,634,453) AND SIX CAPITAL PROJECT ACCOUNT FUND TRANSFERS (\$1,634,453).

Mr. Luiz clarified that this is not adding new spending, but simply taking already approved spending for projects and delineating whatever was funded for ARPA funds to now be funded by Capital Project Funds, and vice versa; this is to ensure that they meet the ARPA spending deadlines. Ms. Wang asked to ensure that all the proposed transfers into ARPA funds are allowable under the Treasury rules. Mr. Luiz stated yes, they are.

With no comments from the public, Mr. Gullotta closed the public hearing.

Motion by: Ms. Wang

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves the following appropriation transfers:

From ARPA Funds to the Capital Project Funds:

- *\$1,404,453 for the Williams Memorial & Academy Building Improvements Project;*
- *\$80,000 for the Clean Renewable Energy Project;*
- *\$150,000 for the Riverfront Park and Boathouse Project;*

From the Capital Project Funds to ARPA Funds

- *\$650,000 for the Public Safety Communication System;*
- *\$200,000 for the Pedestrian Bridge Repair Project;*
- *\$421,497 for the Road Overlay Program Project;*
- *\$89,000 for the Grange Pool Project;*
- *\$23,956 for the Animal Control Project;*
- *\$250,000 transfer for the Sidewalk Maintenance Project;*

all as described in a report by the Director of Finance and Administrative Services dated June 21, 2024, and as recommended by the Board of Finance.

Result: Motion passed unanimously {7-0-0}.

b. Action to approve a resolution regarding a \$325,000 State of Connecticut Grant for Addison Park renovations and improvements.

Mr. Luiz stated that they have money budgeted in the CIP to work on the basketball and tennis courts. If there is any money left over, it would go towards the Bond Commission to take care of the pool, the bathhouse, and the upper restroom facility. He stated that \$325,000 will not cover everything, so they will do as much as they can.

Ms. Wang raised the issue of the splash pad access, asking if it is feasible to consider outside public access, separate from the pool. Lisa Zerio, Director of Parks and Recreation, explained that when they were researching the splash pads, they made an effort to be as sustainable as possible. As per code, they have to provide restroom facilities, which is currently not possible at the current location. She explained that they have purchased a portable fence so that when the weather is cooperative, the public will not be charged for the splash pad.

Mr. Cavanna asked why the park rangers do not patrol the trails at Cotton Hollow. Ms. Zerio clarified that the rangers are really there to protect the parking lot. They are not trained to patrol the preserve because they do not have enforcement rights. Mr. Cavanna asked if their positions are fully staffed. Ms. Zerio stated that there are currently 7 park rangers, who patrol all the parks. However, these are part-time positions, so they would not be able to patrol the sites at all times.

Motion by: Ms. Wang

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED that the Town of Glastonbury may enter into with and deliver to the State of Connecticut Department of Energy and Environmental Protection, any and all documents which it deems to be necessary or appropriate for a grant of \$325,000 for renovations and improvements to Addison Park; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that Jonathan Luiz, as the Town Manager of the Town of Glastonbury, is authorized and directed to execute and deliver any and all documents on behalf of the Town of Glastonbury, and to do and perform all acts and things which he deems to be necessary or appropriate to carry out the terms of such documents;

all as described in a report by the Town Manager dated June 21, 2024.

Result: Motion passed unanimously {7-0-0}.

c. Action on a \$10,000 transfer from the General Fund to Capital Projects – Open Space Woodland Management Plan to support a Forest Inventory Project.

Mr. Luiz stated that they initially asked for \$65,000, knowing there would be a match of \$65,000, to get a town-wide forest action plan. Because they received only \$30,000, the proposal is for a narrow forest inventory project. He explained that, if they were to receive the full funding at a later stage, then there would be more detailed actions. Mr. Cavanna will not support this until he has a clearer idea of the scope and purpose. Mr. Osgood has no problem with this being the first step. Ms. Wang is in support of the work but struggles with the language of the motion. To avoid confusion, she would like to amend it to call it the Forest Inventory Project. Mr. Luiz noted that while that makes sense, this name was chosen because it is the name of the capital project.

Mr. Luiz added that the cost is \$40,000, which the Town will have to expend completely and then the state will provide a \$30,000 reimbursement. He noted that Ms. Caltagirone has \$10,000 in this fiscal year dedicated to planning. The thought is to transfer that to the capital project, and next year, it would be a total of \$40,000 spent. Mr. Cavanaugh asked if this is a one-time grant opportunity or could it be applied at a later date. Mr. Luiz clarified that the land use planning is a separate account, and the \$30,000 spent out of the Town Manager's budget will be reimbursed. He noted that the hope is to apply for this in the future, if there is another round of funding.

Mr. Cavanna asked if they spend \$10,000 now, how much they will spend afterwards. Mr. Luiz explained that in October 2023, he sent the Council an email about this grant opportunity. He outlined what the grand plan would get them. Because they did not receive that total amount, this proposal would get them halfway, by providing the analysis, the research, and the documentation. He explained that, in the future, they would ask the state for another \$35,000 or \$40,000 to finish up. The highest number that he estimates this would cost the taxpayers is another \$40,000, so a total of \$50,000.

Motion by: Ms. Wang

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves a Fiscal Year 2023-2024 transfer of \$10,000 from Community Development – Professional Services to Capital Projects – Open Space Woodland Management Plan, as described in a report by the Director of Community Development dated June 21, 2024 and as recommended by the Board of Finance.

Result: Motion passed {5-2-0}, with Mr. Cavanna and Mr. Cavanaugh voting against.

d. Discussion and possible action concerning the future of 50 Nye Road.

Mr. Luiz stated that there are two major things that must be addressed in the near future, regardless of what the use is: the parking lot work and roof replacement. The parking lot work is in the design phase, which he expects to be completed by next summer. The roof replacement has yet to be funded. He stated that the anchor tenant on 50 Nye Road is moving out at the end of September. After that, the building will be, by and large, vacant. Mr. Osgood favors the concept but noted that a preliminary space plan is needed, in order to price what the building will cost to convert for use by the BOE.

Motion by: Ms. Wang

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby directs the Town Manager to work with the Glastonbury Superintendent of Schools to develop a plan for 50 Nye Road as the future location of the Glastonbury School District Administrative Offices, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated June 21, 2024.

Result: Motion passed unanimously {7-0-0}.

e. Action concerning amendment to the Town Manager Employment Agreement.

Motion by: Ms. Wang

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby tables the amendment to the Town Manager Employment Agreement.

Result: Motion passed unanimously {7-0-0}.

6. Consent Calendar.

a. Action to approve investment pools – Town Funds.

Motion by: Ms. Wang

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves the State of Connecticut Short-Term Investment Fund, Northern Capital Investments, and LPL Financial for the deposit and investment of Town funds, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated June 21, 2024 and as recommended by the Board of Finance.

Result: Motion passed unanimously {7-0-0}.

b. Action on residential lease renewal of Town-owned property at 2157 Main Street (lease expires August 1, 2024) (refer to Town Plan and Zoning Commission; set public hearing).

Motion by: Ms. Wang

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby refers a proposed one (1) year residential lease for Town-owned property at 2157 Main Street to the Town Plan and Zoning Commission for a report, and schedules a public hearing for 8:00 p.m. on Tuesday, July 9, 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 21, 2024.

Result: Motion passed unanimously {7-0-0}.

7. Town Manager's Report.

Mr. Luiz presented his report. Mr. Cavanna would like a game plan on what to do at Cotton Hollow to prevent a nightmarish event for the residents nearby. Mr. Gullotta noted that this deals with the Town's ownership of Cotton Hollow, which is complicated. He asked, if there is an issue with lots of drinking, drug use, and fires, would the Town be able to close the site. Mr. Luiz will look into it. Mr. Osgood asked the Chief of Police to stop by there when the park is closed to enforce the laws that currently exist. Mr. Luiz has been doing that and will continue to do so. If the site cannot get under control, Mr. Cavanna would like to figure out how to gift the land to a conservator group who can administer control in that area. Mr. Gullotta suggested letting Mr. Luiz look into it because it is a complicated ownership issue. Mr. Cavanaugh agrees that there needs to be more of a police presence there, not just at closing.

Mr. Cavanaugh stated that Mr. Luiz waived a conflict with their Alternate Town Attorney who is representing Somerset Square over an issue. He asked what authority Mr. Luiz had to waive that conflict and what were his reasons. Mr. Luiz felt like the other party would get another attorney, and he did not feel like this would be a detriment to the Town. His justification is that he assumed that this was something that the previous Town Manager would have done, but he is happy to have the Council take over such matters in the future. Mr. Cavanaugh noted that the Town Attorney is appointed by the Council, so if any issues should arise, he believes that the matter should go to them. Mr. Gullotta pointed out that Mr. Luiz just indicated that, going forward, he would be willing to have that be a council decision. Mr. Cavanaugh asked if there will be a National Night Out this year. Mr. Luiz will check and report back.

8. Committee Reports.

a. **Chairman's Report.** *None.*

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

c. **CRCOG.**

Mr. Luiz stated that the Town made the cut for the transportation alternative grant, so there will be more information on that in the next Town Manager's report.

d. Board of Education Facilities Committee Report.

Ms. Wang stated that the committee met on June 17 and was reported at the BOE's June 24 meeting. The discussion centered on long range facilities planning versus shorter term needs. The longer term facilities study is kicking off now. After the enrollment study is completed, she explained that they will likely move on to a comprehensive facilities assessment. She noted that one of their shorter-term needs is administrative offices. BOE members have expressed enthusiasm for the possibility of moving administrative offices to Nye Road. She noted that the BOE voted to approve a lease of four modulars at Eastbury, and they will likely discuss modulars elsewhere over the next couple of years.

Mr. Osgood stated that the BOE is discussing putting in four modulars for the LINKS program at Eastbury where they already have classrooms that were designed for childcare. Ms. Wang cannot comment on that; however, regarding the spending, she noted that the cost of the modulars will be more than offset by the avoided cost of outplacement of Glastonbury students who are in need of LINKS classroom space, as well as the tuition from out of district students.

9. Communications. *None.*

10. Appointments and Resignations.

a. **Appointment of Victoria Nordlund as Poet Laureate (July 1, 2024 – June 30, 2027).**

Motion by: Ms. Wang

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby appoints Victoria Nordlund as Glastonbury's Poet Laureate for the three-year term of July 1, 2024 through June 30, 2027.

Result: Motion passed unanimously {7-0-0}.

11. Executive Session.

a. **Discussion of the selection of a site or the lease, sale or purchase of real estate.**

Motion by: Ms. Wang

Seconded by: Mr. 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 the selection of a site or the lease, sale or purchase of real estate.*

Attendees to include Council Members and the Town Manager.

Result: Motion passed unanimously {7-0-0}.

The Council came out of Executive Session at 10:05 p.m.

Motion by: Ms. Wang

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby adjourns the Town Council meeting of June 25, 2024 at 10:06 p.m.

Result: Motion passed unanimously {7-0-0}.

Respectfully submitted,

Lilly Torosyan

Lilly Torosyan
Recording Clerk

Thomas Gullotta
Chairman