

**GLASTONBURY TOWN COUNCIL  
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES  
TUESDAY, AUGUST 6, 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 {excused}

Ms. Deborah A. Carroll {participated via Zoom video conferencing}

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 Larry Niland***

**2. Public Comment.**

***Peggy Schroeder of 151 Barrington Way***, expressed support for extending the State of CT Village District Designation to North Glastonbury, which has suffered a disproportionate amount of commercialization. She believes that this designation would help to preserve the north side's character while preventing further division in town.

***Lesley Mroz of 121 Heywood Drive***, believes that North Glastonbury should receive the same importance of preservation as other parts of town do. She supports the extension of the State of CT Village District Designation from part of Main Street to Griswold Street because of the safety and health of the children at Naubuc School. She then asked when the Council would extend the village district designation, and what residents should do to accelerate the process.

***Lisa Mendum of 45 Candlewood Road***, also requested that the village district designation be extended to North Glastonbury to prevent undesired development. Without protections, she fears that Naubuc School will be further burdened in the already-overcrowded north. She worries about children's mental health, which is taking a tremendous toll from climate effects. She asked to envision what livelihoods will look like in the future, under the protections of village district designations.

***Michael Heselton of 58 Lancaster Road***, is a police officer who was disappointed in councilwoman Wang's comments regarding police officers and believes that an apology needs to be made.

***Pam Lucas of 145 Moseley Terrace***, supports the extension of the village district designation in the north part of town. She also believes that the Town is wasting time by fighting the Vessel project. She worries that an appeal may not succeed because of the importance of promoting more diverse and affordable housing, which is desperately needed in town. She believes that the fears of the Kreiger Lane

businesses are speculative, and that the project has met the requirements of town agencies. She asked to move forward with the Vessel project.

**Rob Dakers of 15 Trifiro Circle**, believes that the proposal at 51 Kreiger Lane offers a reasonable opportunity to meet affordable housing needs. There do not appear to be any discernible safety impacts to the surrounding area or properties, and he supports working with the developer to further ensure that this is the case. He urged the Council to not appeal the Kreiger Lane decision.

**Mark Schroeder of 151 Barrington Lane**, spoke in favor of extending the village district to include Naubuc School. He believes that developments surrounding schools should be regulated, and the village district is a mechanism that will allow the Town to do just that.

**Ryan Bower of 47 Griswold Street**, supports extending the village designation to the north part of Glastonbury because it will help preserve the area from further development. He believes that this is important, not just for aesthetic purposes, but also to increase safety, as the traffic conditions on Griswold Street are already heavy.

**Jenn Jennings of 34 Cranesbill Drive**, favors a village district overlay extension throughout the north side of town, to preserve its charm. She cited the Town of Westport as a good example to model. She then spoke to the recent comments by a particular council member, who stated that the Glastonbury community are uncomfortable being around police officers. She found these comments to be ugly, nasty, and inappropriate, and believes that youth should be encouraged to approach police officers.

**Niana Bower of 47 Griswold Street**, moved to CT from Brazil in 2019. She chose Glastonbury because she liked the charm of town. She lives on Griswold Street, right in front of Naubuc School. She stated that the street is dangerous, with cars flying by every day, and worries that adding another commercial building there will make things even worse. She is also concerned about air pollution and noise from the highway, and asked to keep the north of town as it is.

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

**Christopher Bird of 24 Twelve Acre Lane**, pointed out that he lives in Glastonbury, not North Glastonbury or north Glastonbury. For as long as he can remember, this portion of town has been treated differently, in terms of development. He urged the Council to extend the village district designation to this area of town, along Main Street to the East Hartford line, including the flood plain and the Griswold Street/Naubuc School area.

**Edyta Orzel of 82 Shelley Lane**, asked to halt the overdevelopment of the Town Center, and to focus instead on improving infrastructure and road repairs. She moved to Glastonbury in 2018 because she loved the rural yet “close to everything” nature of what this town used to be. Now, she laments that the traffic is too heavy and the schools are not large enough.

**Ashley Courtemanche of 40 Madison Road**, favors extending the village district in the north side of Glastonbury, which is very congested. She believes that the Town needs to focus on road upkeep and in ensuring that unoccupied land is being taken care of. She does not support building more shopping centers that will just be an empty eyesore within a year.

**Joshua Orzel of 945 Hebron Avenue**, asked to keep Glastonbury feeling like a small town. He does not support the construction of more apartments.

**Heather Hassan of 404 Addison Road**, was dismayed to see offices built on her quiet residential road in north Glastonbury. She now avoids the center as much as possible, due to traffic. In the past 15 years, she has noticed the Town losing its charm as it becomes more congested. She recently saw the plan for the new project proposed on Main Street. She cannot imagine what the traffic will look like once that building is erected. She implored the Town to curb further commercial development, and to extend the village district designation to North Glastonbury.

**Tina Beckwith of 31 Knollwood Drive**, supports protecting North Glastonbury with a village district designation.

**Sara Beckwith of 31 Knollwood Drive**, supports protecting North Glastonbury with a village district designation.

**Jane Beaufort of 121 Oak Street**, strongly encouraged the Council to not endorse the application for the STEAP grant to the affordable housing project on Nye Road. She believes that the \$1 million grant should be applied for a shovel-ready project that needs more funding, like the animal shelter or improvements to town parks. According to past Town Managers reports, the animal shelter project is short \$1 million, and this grant can help tremendously.

**Wayne Gilbertie of 128 Lexington Road**, supports the extension of the CT State Village District Designation north, to the East Hartford town line. He asked to preserve the historic village character of Glastonbury.

**Kenneth Coyne of 284 Addison Road**, strongly supports the extension of the State of CT Village District Designation to the East Hartford line. Not doing so would put at risk an area of town that holds historic relevance and a large population.

**Erin Beckwith of 31 Knollwood Drive**, supports protecting North Glastonbury with a village district designation.

**Hiroe and Lars Vestergaard of 177 Lancaster Road**, expressed strong support for the extension of the State of CT Village District Designation in the Town Center to the East Hartford line, including Main Street. The Village Districts Act is crucial for maintaining the historic charm and community spirit of town, and including this part of Griswold Street is especially important, requiring enhanced safety protections for the school community, pedestrians, and cyclists.

**Janelle Maginnis of 284 Addison Road**, strongly supports the extension of the State of CT Village District Designation to the East Hartford Line, including Main Street and the Griswold Street areas with Naubuc School. This area is densely populated, and not putting in place this designation would create an almost unlivable situation. She asked the Council to be thoughtful in considering extending this designation up to North Glastonbury.

**Marjoi Fabi of 71 Abbey Road**, asked the Council to extend the village district designation to North Glastonbury. Since Griswold Street currently has an overwhelming amount of traffic, adding more development—especially so close to a school—endangers the health, safety, and general well-being of their area. Air pollution from traffic has a direct impact on the development of childhood asthma and exacerbates symptoms for those who already have it. She is the mother of an asthmatic child who attends Naubuc School, which is perhaps the only elementary school in Glastonbury to be surrounded by fast, crowded roadways with noticeable speeding. The Town should aim to reduce health inequities in the community, not increase them.

*Alexandrina Sergio of 64 Nuthatch Knob*, urged the Council to approve the State of CT Village District Designation, extending from Town Center to the East Hartford town line, including Main Street and Griswold Street areas. South Glastonbury and the Town Center have been so designated, and it is reasonable to allow the northern part of town to enjoy a similar protection. The health, safety, and quality of life for residents, as well as preservation of the town's character, are all affected.

*James Todd of 145 Cedar Ridge Drive*, recommends that the Addison Village District be extended westerly from Addison Road to Main Street and to include Naubuc School. This village designation extension would protect residents living in this area from the negative impacts of development.

The following comment was made via Zoom:

*Luan Bojka of 122 Thompson Street*, stated that law enforcement plays a pivotal role in town. He took offense to comments that were made by a certain council member against police officers.

### **3. Special Reports.**

- a. Report on a possible Town Charter revision with a focus on sections that may be outdated, ambiguous, create conflict with other sections of the Charter, and/or problematic in the ability of staff to effectively transact business.**

Town Attorney Michael Collins of Halloran Sage reviewed the sections of the Town Charter that he believes may have inconsistencies and should be revised. He noted that he also received input on this from both the current and prior Town Managers.

Mr. Gullotta asked about the process to make these revisions. Mr. Collins explained that the first step would be for the Council to consider a resolution as to whether the Charter should be revised at all. If that passes, then the Council would appoint a charter revision commission, who would return with a report. The Council would then hold a public hearing. If they reject the report, then it would return to the commission for further discussion. The commission may choose to either amend the report or reject the changes and send it back to the council, who may either approve or reject the proposed amendments. Once approved, the changes shall be published at least once in a newspaper, and then submitted to electors for approval or rejection.

Mr. Cavanaugh asked if there is a set timeline that the commission has to return to the council with their recommendations. Mr. Collins explained that the maximum is 16 months, but the Council may set a sooner deadline. Mr. Cavanaugh asked about the number of members who can be on the commission. Mr. Collins explained that the commission may consist of no fewer than 5 but no more than 15 members, of whom no more than one third may hold other public office.

### **PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

#### **NO 1. ACTION ON A \$30,000 APPROPRIATION TRANSFER FROM THE AMERICAN RESCUE PLAN ACT (ARPA) – FARM ASSISTANCE PROGRAM TO THE AMERICAN RESCUE PLAN ACT (ARPA) – PUBLIC SAFETY COMMUNICATION SYSTEMS PROJECT.**

Keri Rowley, Director of Finance and Administrative Services, stated that this action is for a \$30,000 appropriation to fund a land use consultant. She explained that it would take the leftover balance of the

farm assistance grant program and swap it with the public safety communications systems project, which is currently funded in ARPA.

Ms. Rowley explained that the second public hearing proposes to use the public safety communications system, which is located in the capital projects fund, to fund the planned use consultant project. She noted that it is not recommended to use a bid waiver with ARPA, which is why the two transfers are recommended.

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

**Motion by:** Mr. Niland

**Seconded by:** Mr. Cavanaugh

*BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves an appropriation transfer of \$30,000 from the American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) – Farm Assistance Program to the American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) – Public Safety Communication Systems Project, as described in a report by the Director of Finance and Administrative Services dated August 2, 2024, and as recommended by the Board of Finance.*

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

**NO 2. ACTION ON A \$30,000 APPROPRIATION TRANSFER FROM THE CAPITAL PROJECTS ACCOUNT FUND – PUBLIC SAFETY COMMUNICATION SYSTEM TO THE NEW CAPITAL PROJECT ACCOUNT FUND – LAND USE CONSULTING PROJECT.**

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

**Motion by:** Mr. Niland

**Seconded by:** Mr. Cavanaugh

*BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves an appropriation transfer of \$30,000 from the Capital Projects Account Fund – Public Safety Communication System to the new Capital Project Account Fund – Land Use Consulting Project, as described in a report by the Director of Finance and Administrative Services dated August 2, 2024, and as recommended by the Board of Finance.*

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

**NO 3. ACTION ON A \$212,000 APPROPRIATION TRANSFER, WHICH INCLUDES TWO AMERICAN RESCUE PLAN ACT (ARPA) FUND TRANSFERS TOTALING \$106,006 AND THREE CAPITAL PROJECT ACCOUNT FUND TRANSFERS TOTALING \$106,006.**

Ms. Rowley explained that this is a two part proposal. The original budget was expected to be \$625,000, of which \$500,000 would be covered by the STEAP grant and \$125,000 would be matched by the Town using local funds. She noted that costs have increased since that original plan was made, so the new proposal is for \$648,000. Therefore, the new total to be matched is \$148,000. She explained that they have \$122,000, so the request is for an additional \$26,006. Ms. Rowley explained that because the Town's match cannot be ARPA funding, they propose making swaps with three Capital Project account funds to cover that remaining amount.

Mr. Osgood asked to confirm that they are not appropriating more money. Ms. Rowley explained that they are appropriating \$26,006 in additional funding, which is being taken from the remaining balance of the ARPA farm assistance grant program.

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

**Motion by:** Mr. Niland

**Seconded by:** Mr. Cavanaugh

*BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves an appropriation transfer totaling \$212,012 which includes two American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) Fund transfers (\$106,006) and three Capital Project Account Fund transfers (\$106,006), as described in a report by the Director of Finance and Administrative Services dated August 2, 2024, and as recommended by the Board of Finance.*

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

**NO 4. ACTION ON A \$84,846.39 INCREASE AND TRANSFER FROM THE CAPITAL RESERVE FUND BALANCE TO THE CAPITAL PROJECTS FUND – LOTCIP FUNDED GATEWAY CORPORATE PARK BICYCLE PEDESTRIAN PROJECT.**

Ms. Rowley explained that this is a 100% grant funded project. She stated that the project came in more than expected, but the full reimbursement has been received. The motion is to increase the appropriation to match the full grant amount.

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

**Motion by:** Mr. Niland

**Seconded by:** Mr. Cavanaugh

*BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves the proposed increase and transfer of \$84,846.39 from the Capital Reserve Fund Balance to the Capital Projects Fund – LOTCIP funded Gateway Corporate Park Bicycle Pedestrian project, as described in a report by the Director of Finance and Administrative Services dated August 2, 2024, and as recommended by the Board of Finance.*

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

**NO. 5 ACTION ON A PROPOSED NEW ORDINANCE CONCERNING AUTHORITY TO DECLARE THAT A FIREFIGHTER, POLICE OFFICER OR EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICE PERSONNEL DIED IN THE LINE OF DUTY. (PUBLIC HEARING NO. 5 WILL BE POSTPONED TO THE SEPTEMBER 10, 2024 COUNCIL MEETING).**

**Motion by:** Mr. Niland

**Seconded by:** Mr. Cavanaugh

*BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby postpones the public hearing for action on a proposed new Ordinance Concerning Authority to Declare That a Firefighter, Police Officer or Emergency Medical Service Personnel Died in the Line of Duty, to the Town Council meeting of Tuesday, September 10, 2024, at 8:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers of Town Hall, 2155 Main Street, Glastonbury and/or through Zoom Video Conferencing.*

**Discussion:** Mr. Cavanaugh stated that when this was discussed at the policy and ordinance review subcommittee, the Personnel Director provided percentages for different types of scenarios and what the financial implications would be for those various examples. He asked Mr. Luiz to provide something similar, denoting the financial implications for an unidentified, hypothetical police officer over ten years. Mr. Luiz agreed to work on that.

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

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

**4. Old Business.**

**a. Discussion and action on waiver of competitive bid process – Land Use Consulting Project.**

Mr. Luiz stated that funding is now in place to hire a land use consultant. He and the Director of Community Development recommend FHI Studios, given their excellent track record of working with the Town. They also found FHI's price tag of about \$28,000 to be reasonable, so the request is for a bid waiver for consulting services.

**Motion by:** Mr. Niland

**Seconded by:** Mr. Cavanaugh

*BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves a waiver of the competitive bid process for consulting services for the Land Use Consulting Project, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated August 2, 2024, and as recommended by the Board of Finance.*

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

**5. New Business.**

**a. Discussion and action concerning an appeal – Vessel RE Holdings, LLC vs. Glastonbury Town Plan and Zoning Commission.**

**Motion by:** Mr. Niland

**Seconded by:** Mr. Cavanaugh

*BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby directs the Town Attorney to take any actions necessary to appeal the decision of the State Superior Court in the case of Vessel RE Holdings, LLC vs. Town Plan and Zoning Commission of the Town of Glastonbury.*

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

**b. Action on lease of the Town-owned property at 1287 Main Street – Old Cider Mill (refer to Town Plan and Zoning Commission; set public hearing).**

Mr. Luiz explained that this property has been leased by the town for 20 years; they went out for an RFP to allow the public to submit a proposal, and the only proposal that came in was Riverview Farms LLC, who has leased the property in the past. He explained that the option is to renew the lease for another five-year term. The next step is a referral to the TPZ, and then this will return to the Council for a public hearing.

Mr. Osgood noted that the exhibit with the rent just notes the months of September and October. However, he believes that the tenant uses the facility around Christmastime, which is outside of those months. Because the lease is on a per month basis, he would like to ensure that they are paying for that December usage, as well. Mr. Luiz will get clarification from the Parks and Recreation Director on this.

**Motion by:** Mr. Niland

**Seconded by:** Mr. Cavanaugh

*BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby refers a proposed new Lease Agreement between the Town and Riverview Farms LLC at 1287 Main Street, Parcel A, to the Town Plan and Zoning Commission for a report, and schedules a public hearing for 8:00 p.m. on Tuesday, September 10, 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 Director of Parks & Recreation dated August 2, 2024.*

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

**c. Discussion and possible action on enhancements to public safety at Cotton Hollow Preserve including proposed amendment to Town Code, Chapter 14, Article III – Recreational Areas Use Regulations (refer to Policy & Ordinance Review Subcommittee).**

Mr. Luiz explained that the Cotton Hollow Preserve has been closed since July 16, due to public safety concerns. Since then, Town Staff have developed a list of five types of proposals, as well as a list of infrastructure improvements, which he estimates will cost around \$100,000. He explained that there would be various signs, paving and line stripping of the main lot on Hopewell Road, and new gates provided at different locations; and additional funding would ensure that a park ranger is stationed at the parking lot for eight hours during the day in the summertime.

Mr. Luiz noted that another consideration is to have more dedicated police enforcement. However, they would have to start with their own officers, since they cannot hire seasonal officers from the outside, at this time. He noted that the preserve would close one hour before sunset, and swimming would be prohibited, as well as outside food and fires. Mr. Luiz noted that the next step is to have the policy ordinance and review subcommittee review these proposed ordinance changes.

Mr. Cavanna is concerned about the clean up along the trails. Mr. Luiz stated that some things must be dealt with, for safety purposes, such as the removal of broken treetops near the water. Mr. Cavanna asked if this is a one-time action and how often have they done this in the past. Mr. Luiz explained that the last time that Cotton Hollow was shut down, there was a deep clean. He noted that this would be a one-time clean up, to remedy safety hazards along the trail and the areas close to the trail.

Mr. McChesney will vote to send this to the policy and ordinance review subcommittee. However, he cautioned against some of the language, which is not very clear on what they are prohibiting. Mr. Luiz clarified that this has not yet been reviewed by the Town Attorney. Mr. Cavanaugh thinks that an officer should be onsite, regardless of what their contract negotiation schedule is, because enforcement cannot be done by a civilian. Mr. Cavanna stated that if there is no police presence during a time of a lot of activity, then he would like to close the preserve.

Mr. Gullotta responded that, right now, there are no parking attendants or gates, so moving forward, he hopes that will change. He shared that this is a conceptual proposal and will change over time. He would like to discuss with the Town Attorney a process to either lock or tow unregistered vehicles, or



vehicles with plates that do not belong. This is because he does not believe that state law should be endangering the lives of their officers unnecessarily.

**Motion by:** Mr. Niland

**Seconded by:** Mr. Cavanaugh

*BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby refers proposed edits to Town Code, Chapter 14, Article III – Recreation Areas Use Regulations, to the Policy & Ordinance Review Subcommittee for a report and recommendation, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated August 2, 2024.*

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

**d. Action on a resolution in support of a Small Town Economic Assistance Program (STEAP) grant application.**

Mr. Luiz stated that there is no set schedule for the STEAP grant, so it may soon be announced that it is available. He explained that the award is usually capped at \$500,000, but this year, the maximum is \$1 million. Towns were asked to provide a minimum match of 20%. He explained that the thought is to use the STEAP grant towards the Town's affordable housing project on Nye Road. Mr. Luiz noted that the Glastonbury Housing Authority (GHA) Director, Neil Griffin, has provided an update on where the project currently stands.

Mr. Cavanaugh was opposed to this project but agreed to support an attractive and well-developed housing project. However, he did not agree to throwing every red cent from the town into this project. He noted that there is a list of enhancements for 50 Nye Road which still need to be paid for. In his view, the Town jumped through hoops to get this project approved by the end of last year so that the GHA could apply for the funding; however, that did not happen because the project came in at a higher cost than what was expected. If more money is needed, then he believes that the GHA should be seeking it out, not the Town, which has already put several million into this project.

Mr. Cavanaugh also asked why the Town Manager recommended only one project for this application when, typically, the Council receives two or three options. Mr. Luiz thinks that they spent a lot of time during the budget season discussing the capital projects; if the majority of the council does not wish to move forward on this project, then he can suggest any of those other options for this grant opportunity. Mr. Osgood echoed that STEAP grants are small town economic assistance programs. He believes that there are a lot of town projects which this money could be spent on. He objects to moving forward with the resolution as currently stated.

Ms. Carroll asked if there is a short-term deadline. Mr. Luiz replied, no. While Ms. Carroll thinks this is an appropriate use of the STEAP grant funds, she does not object to having other options put forward, in order to hold more public conversations. Mr. Gullotta disagreed, stating that there is an obligation to provide affordable housing options. He does not fault the GHA for the inflationary factors which resulted in a higher than anticipated cost for their housing project. He is disappointed that the State cannot use its surplus to make more housing money available. This is a quality proposal put forward by the GHA, which he does not wish to see lowered in quality, should they be forced to cut corners due to lack of adequate funding.

Mr. Osgood thinks that this council has an obligation to be responsible with how they spend taxpayers' money. He believes that they should evaluate other projects against this one because to not consider the alternatives would be inappropriate. Ms. Carroll agreed with Mr. Gullotta regarding giving as much

support as possible to the GHA. However, she noted that, historically, the prior Town Manager would provide the Council with a few choices to discuss. Therefore, she moved to table action, to an unspecified date.

**Motion by:** Ms. Carroll

**Seconded by:** Mr. Cavanaugh

*BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council tables action.*

**Result:** Motion passed {5-3-0}, with Mr. Cavanna, Mr. Osgood, Mr. Cavanaugh, Ms. LaChance, and Ms. Carroll voting for.

**e. Discussion and possible action concerning the MLK mural project proposal for plaque design.**

Mr. Luiz stated that Ms. Wang provided a draft plaque proposal for the MLK mural. He explained that the next step is for the Council to either make the changes and move this along to the Historic District Commission, or to reject the proposal. Mr. Cavanna asked to confirm if the rendering is exactly how it will look on the plaque. Mr. Luiz does not know. Ms. Carroll believes that what is shown will go on the plaque, which the historical society will determine is appropriate or not. She also noted that information about the design would be listed with a QR code, as is done with other murals throughout town. She asked that if the Council has suggestions or concerns, to make them known before this goes before the historical society.

Mr. Cavanna does not support this. Neither does Mr. Cavanaugh, who is thankful that Mr. Preli came in two weeks ago to inform the Council that one of the people on the mural referred to Glastonbury's Italian-Americans as racist. He then asked about the language in the QR code, and why only two names are specified as donors. Mr. Luiz will inquire about the donors. He explained that if the language is not approved at the Council's September 10 meeting, then it will not be listed at the event on September 14. Mr. Cavanaugh does not feel it appropriate to rely on Mr. Luiz for this matter, as Ms. Wang has led the charge on this and should be providing the answers. Ms. LaChance also laments that Ms. Wang is excused tonight, so she made a motion to table action to the Council's next meeting.

**Motion by:** Ms. LaChance

**Seconded by:** Mr. Cavanaugh

*BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council tables discussion and possible action to the Council meeting of September 10, 2024.*

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

**6. Consent Calendar. None.**

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

Mr. Luiz presented his report. Mr. Cavanaugh asked why the fire marshal inspector recruitment has been bifurcated into an inspector and an investigator role. Mr. Luiz explained that an existing part-timer that performs both inspection and investigation duties will transition to performing only inspections. The Town will backfill his position and also hire another inspector. The plan outlined during budget season will be followed. Mr. Osgood asked to provide an update on the final design for the Main Street sidewalk. Mr. Luiz clarified that it has been submitted to the DOT for review. Mr. Cavanna asked about

the upgrades to the animal shelter. Mr. Luiz stated that they have received one quote to put in a coil in the AC. He has also asked for two others, which are being worked on.

**8. Committee Reports.**

**a. Chairman’s Report.**

Mr. Gullotta announced that this is IT staffer Nick Davis’s last meeting. Mr. Cavanaugh remarked that Nick has been very gracious and kind. The Council wished him well.

**b. MDC.           None.**

**c. CRCOG.       None.**

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

**9. Communications.   None.**

**10. Minutes.**

**a. Minutes of July 23, 2024 Regular Meeting.**

**Motion by:** Mr. Niland

**Seconded by:** Mr. Cavanaugh

*BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves the minutes of the July 23, 2024 Regular Meeting.*

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

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

**12. Executive Session   None.**

**Motion by:** Mr. Niland

**Seconded by:** Mr. Cavanaugh

*BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby adjourns the Town Council meeting of August 6, 2024 at 9:09 p.m.*

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

**Respectfully submitted,**

**Lilly Torosyan**

**Lilly Torosyan  
Recording Clerk**

**Thomas Gullotta  
Chairman**