

**GLASTONBURY TOWN COUNCIL
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 10, 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 Tom Gullotta

2. Public Comment.

Caroline Woodard of 525 Chestnut Hill Road. She stated that the Connecticut General Statutes (CGS) releases the Town from liability regarding reopening Cotton Hollow Preserve. She stressed the importance of having police presence at the Grange parking lot to curb issues.

DJ McBride of 263 Spring Street Extension. He stated that teens are driving motor-driven cycles advertised as electric bicycles around town, which are dangerously fast. He asked Chief Porter to look into this issue, which the Chief told him he would.

Peggy Schroeder of 151 Barrington Way. She urged forwarding the Curtisville village district designation to the Town Plan and Zoning Commission (TPZ) for a favorable recommendation. She also asked to extend the village district to Griswold Street, and immediately implement traffic calming measures on Griswold Street. She asked the Town to discuss possibly rezoning this area and restricting activity on the former Sakon building.

Lesley Mroz of 121 Heywood Drive. She supported the bipartisan motion passed last Wednesday. She urged forwarding the Curtisville village district designation to the TPZ for a favorable recommendation. She also urged a meaningful discussion to address safety issues on North Glastonbury, especially the impact of future development on Naubuc School.

Jared Soper of 39 Fawn Run, is a member of the Board of Finance. He took issue with the comments expressed at the August 6, 2024 Council meeting regarding restructuring the Board of Finance to have an odd number of members. He stated that this would politicize a board that is intended to be non-partisan, which would adversely affect the focus of the board.

Sal Morello of 36 Hopewell Road. He addressed the concerns that have been circulating regarding his construction project on 36 Hopewell Road. He explained that he is a local investor who cares about the community. He stated that he is open to communication with everyone, and looks forward to collaborating with the Town to provide a much-needed project.

Alex Meade of 41 Glazier Drive. He stated that the 36 Hopewell Road project is the result of the Town's inaction on CGS Section 8-30g regarding affordable housing. He asked the Council to support the Nye Road project, which would prevent projects like the one at 36 Hopewell Road. He urged support for the Glastonbury Housing Authority (GHA), and to pass the Curtisville Extended Village District Overlay.

Clarissa Spawn of 41 Glazier Drive. She urged the Council to reject Mr. Morello's development plan for 36 Hopewell Road. She asked the Council to work together towards an 8-30g moratorium.

Gail Larabee of 7 Glazier Drive. She expressed concern about the 36 Hopewell Road development project, which will exacerbate the current traffic conditions. She stated that she is worried that this will further disrupt the quaint village she moved to 30 years ago. She also expressed worry about changes to the local environment and further disruptions to animal life.

Patrice Ehrhardt of 143 Barrington Way. She also spoke to the proposal at 36 Hopewell Road, noting that traffic is already heavy and the environment is unsafe for children to walk. She stated that it is unfair for the south side of town to receive the village protections while all the commercial developments get placed on their side of town.

Caitlin Carbone of 81 Lakewood Road. She stated that she does not care about the beauty of the building at 36 Hopewell Road, but worries about the current traffic conditions worsening with the addition of 84 more cars.

Nicholas Pecsok on 404 Addison Road. He worried about the continued commercialization of Naubuc Street, citing safety concerns, the negative environmental impact, and the long-term implications for the community, which will decrease property values. He asked to ensure thoughtful, holistic development for the future.

Ryan Bower of 47 Griswold Street. He stated that he continues to voice his support for a village district designation in North Glastonbury.

Jenn Jennings of 34 Cranesbill Drive. She asked to consider moving five classroom spaces into Glastonbury high school (GHS), which would save the taxpayers millions from installing modulars at Eastbury School. She asked the Council to collaborate with the Board of Education (BOE) to explore turning the J lot parking lot at GHS into a one-way, to reduce speeding and accidents. She also noted that the towns of Westport and New Canaan put a lot of thought into developing their towns, and Glastonbury deserves the same methodological thought. She agreed with Mr. McBride on having the police department address those under 16 who have been driving scooters and e-bikes without licenses.

Nayana Bower of 47 Griswold Street. She stated that Naubuc is the only elementary school in town to not be surrounded by green space. She expressed worry about the speeding, heavy traffic, and noise in the area, noting that these have been proven scientifically to adversely affect children. She asked how the Town plans to manage the increasing traffic on Hopewell Road, should Mr. Morello's development be approved.

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

Frances and Virginia Pudlo of 33 Worthington Road. They stated that they have witnessed firsthand the increased development and growth of North Glastonbury. They expressed support for designating Curtisville and the area around it a Village District. They also favored having the Council consider a discussion on safety, traffic congestion, and other issues connected to future growth in North Glastonbury.

Lisa Mendum of 45 Candlewood Road. She asked to protect the residents of North Glastonbury equitably, by extending village district designation in a neighborhood which has seen a disproportionate amount of traffic. She asked to consider the health and safety risks posed by traffic and congestion, especially for the children at Naubuc School. She also worried about decreasing property values with the prospect of even more development. She stated that allowing even more, largely unchecked development in 'The North' without protection of Village District Designation would increase the rate of separation in their community.

Heather Hassan of 404 Addison Road. She implored extending the Village District to North Glastonbury. Her children attend Naubuc school, which already suffers from heavy traffic; she cannot imagine adding more stores in the area. She asked the Town to protect their neighborhood from the added air pollution caused by the traffic. She also expressed concern with the proposed development on Main Street next to Daybreak Coffee Roasters. She applauded the Town for buying and preserving land, and would like a moratorium on commercial development.

Jasmine Lodge of 37 Wrights Lane. She expressed concerns regarding the proposed development off Griswold Street. She worried about increased traffic and congestion, an adverse impact on local businesses, and safety regarding the students at Naubuc School. She also noted that it is near to impossible to make a left turn out of Wrights Lane and out of Naubuc school.

Pauline Parrish of 262 Naubuc Avenue. She asked to consider extending the village district zone to include more of Naubuc Avenue and Griswold Street, including Naubuc elementary school, to protect against huge developments, high traffic, and polluted air. She stated that large developments bring large crowds and greater potential for risk, especially on school grounds. If the new development on 36 Hopewell Road cannot be stopped, then she asked to reduce its size, limit the number of stories, and ensure that building materials are sustainable.

The following comment was made via Zoom:

Audrey Yellen Quinlan of 90 Candlelight Drive. She explained that she submitted Zandra Flemister and Kirby Edmonds as candidates for the mural. She stated that one of them made a disparaging remark about Italian Americans, which made her heart sink. She believed that the goal of the community failed with this mural, and expressed regret at becoming involved with the mural project.

Public comments returned to Council Chambers:

Lisa Mendum of 45 Candlewood Road. She stated that about 85 more residents have signed the petition supporting a village district designation in North Glastonbury.

Christopher Deck of 17 Hopewell Road. He stated that there are 88 parking spots at St. Augustine Church, compared to the 84 spots proposed by Mr. Morello for 36 Hopewell Road. He stated that he

cannot see how Mr. Morello will fit all those spaces, as well as 42-unit apartments, onto 2.35 acres. He concluded that he does not support the plan.

Lynne Butcher of 7 Glazier Drive. She stated that this proposed apartment complex will change the nature of the village district of South Glastonbury considerably. She asked to consider that.

3. Special Reports. None.

4. Old Business.

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

Mr. Niland asked to make the plaque bigger for easier readability. Ms. Wang explained that the size will be increased, to 18 inches x 24 inches. Mr. Osgood asked why they propose putting logos on the plaque, which has typically not been done in town. Ms. Wang stated that one of the offers for the sponsorship package was to have the sponsor's name and logo on the plaque, which is why they are there. Ms. Carroll noted that the STEAM lab at the high school has a list of sponsors on it. Mr. Cavanaugh stated that this is a busy-looking plaque which does not add any aesthetic desire to the work that the artist did. He took issue with the fact that there have now been three occasions in which Zandra Flemister is alleged to have called the Italian immigrants in South Glastonbury "racist."

Mr. Cavanaugh asked when this information was posted to the Town website. Mr. Luiz explained that the information was never meant to be for a plaque, but rather, to provide basic information for the public, which was gleaned from the minutes. Mr. Cavanaugh stated that the information was to be approved by the Council before it was posted on the Town website, so that was a misstep. He stated that somebody owes the Italian community in Glastonbury an apology. Ms. Wang remarked that words have been put into the mouth of a deceased member of their community. She read an excerpt from Ms. Flemister's memoir into the record, which, she believes, challenge the assertion that this individual referred to any group as racist.

Mr. McChesney stated that it is important to understand the larger context of Ms. Flemister's words, which pointed out the plight of immigrants coming into Glastonbury historically. He asked how the plaque would be affixed to the wall. Mr. Luiz did not know but agreed to consult with the Facilities department and report back. Mr. Niland suggested purchasing a different URL website name, instead of navigating the Town website. Mr. Cavanna did not find the plaque very aesthetic or easy to read. Ms. Carroll agreed on finding a balance between readability and aesthetics. Mr. Luiz suggested that he and Ms. Wang work on mirroring what is out there now. Ms. Wang expressed support for input from a professional graphic designer.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby refers a proposed mural plaque to the Historic District Commission for review and approval, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated September 6, 2024.

Result: Motion passed {7-1-1}. Mr. Cavanaugh voted against. Mr. Gullotta abstained.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

NO. 1 ACTION ON PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO SECTION 4.12 OF THE BUILDING ZONE REGULATIONS TO ALLOW INCLUSION OF PLANNED AREA DEVELOPMENTS (PADs) IN THE TOWN CENTER ZONE.

Director of Community Development Shelley Caltagirone presented the proposed amendments, which the TPZ favorably recommended, with one concern regarding the idea of doubling the Floor Area Ratio (FAR) for affordable housing projects. She explained that the TPZ worried this could lead to a high density development, so they suggested modifying language to make it clear to developers that they would not automatically be approved for doubling the FAR if they proposed 20% set aside affordable housing. She then reviewed other considerations for an affordable housing incentive, such as height limits, building coverage limit, area required for parking, and the Town Center Design Guidelines.

Mr. Gullotta opened the floor for public comment.

Pam Lucas of 145 Moseley Terrace. She stated that PADs would allow customizability and facilitate close approval by various town bodies, based on benefits to the town. She supported allowing PADs in the Town Center Zone because piecemeal development projects do not promote livability.

DJ McBride of 263 Spring Street Extension. He stated that the solution to rising housing prices is to build more housing. Therefore, he supported this PAD regulation.

Ms. Carroll read the written comment:

Denise Weeks of 334 Hollister Way West. She stated that allowing PADs in the Town Center Zone is the right thing to do, and urged adopting the amendments needed to make that happen. She stated that this is the most important project elected officials will weigh in on, and it is important to get it right. She expressed that the structure a PAD provides can encourage all parties to work together to move this project forward and provide commercial and housing opportunities to this section of downtown.

Mr. Gullotta commented that, initially, the inclusionary zoning proposal offered projects setting aside 10% of their units as affordable housing to qualify for a density bonus. At the time, he supported a higher percentage, and now is advocating for something over the 20% which the TPZ recommended. Mr. Osgood asked if 20% is the standard for PADs across the Town's other districts. Ms. Caltagirone replied, yes, but the densities are quite lower. Mr. Osgood asked if, because of the FAR ratio in the Town Center Zone, the units would double from 27 to 54. Ms. Caltagirone replied, roughly, yes. Mr. Osgood expressed issue with 54 units, as that is a large jump from the 11 units allowed in other zones throughout town.

Mr. Niland expressed a willingness to explore a higher number but finds it important to do that equitably, across all their zones. Mr. Cavanaugh watched the last TPZ meeting, where he thought that the concern expressed by commissioners was less about the density and more regarding the mixed use in the Town Center areas. Ms. Caltagirone explained that she did not hear that specific concern. Mr. Cavanaugh agreed with the TPZ recommendation and did not support a higher percentage. Mr. Gullotta noted examples of other PADs in town, which were built before the Town had inclusionary zoning that set the required 10%. Ms. Caltagirone stated that a few affordable housing units were approved through the PAD process, but she could not recall which ones specifically.

Mr. McChesney explained that it is important to stress that this is discretionary language, with the change from “shall” to “may.” He noted that because the section before this one uses the language “shall,” this change would make it clear that the language is discretionary. He supported adding clarifying language to make it clear to future applicants and bodies that it is subject to consideration of the impact of the property itself and the surrounding area. Mr. Osgood supported that change.

Mr. McChesney asked if there is language in the code that allows the Town discretion to consider multiple factors in an application, not just health and safety risks. Ms. Caltagirone stated that she did not see anything that specific in the code. Ms. Wang asked if the upcoming Building Zone regulations revamp process will do a deep dive on language, to address these kinds of inconsistencies. Ms. Caltagirone replied yes and remarked that that section of the code is a high priority for the Town to rewrite.

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

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby adopts the proposed text amendment to the Building-Zone Regulation Section 4.12 with the Town Plan and Zoning Commission’s recommended Section 4.12.3(2)(b) edits to allow Planned Area Developments in the Town Center zoning district, as described in a report by the Director of Community Development dated September 6, 2024, to be effective October 1, 2024.

Amendment by: Mr. McChesney

Seconded by: Ms. Carroll

To accept the language change from “shall” to “may,” as proposed by the Town Plan and Zoning Commission, as well as adding clarifying language to the end of that section, to read as follows, “such potential variance in the Floor Area Ratio is subject to various considerations, including the proposed variance’s impact on the property and surrounding community.”

Discussion: Mr. McChesney explained that the amendment is to instruct the Director of Community Development and the Town Attorney to explore this clarification language, to be added at a later date.

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

Discussion: Mr. Gullotta stated that the density bonus is too high for just 20%, and would like to see a higher percentage. Mr. Osgood countered that placing it too high would motivate developers to pursue an 8-30g application, so he is against increasing it. Mr. Niland stated that he supports 25%. Ms. Carroll proposed 22%. Mr. McChesney noted that whichever percentage they land on tonight can be changed in the future, so he supports increasing it.

Amendment by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Niland

To change Section 4.12.3(2)(b), requiring that 22% or more of the total proposed units as Affordable Dwelling Units in the underlying Town Center Zone qualify for the density bonus.

Result: Amendment passed {6-3-0}. Mr. Cavanna, Mr. Cavanaugh, and Mr. Osgood voted against.

Result: Motion passed {6-3-0}. Mr. Cavanna, Mr. Cavanaugh, and Mr. Osgood voted against.

NO. 2 ACTION ON A NEW LEASE AGREEMENT FOR TOWN-OWNED PROPERTY AT 1287 MAIN STREET, PARCEL A – OLD CIDER MILL.

Mr. Cavanna stated that he is happy to see the current tenants renewing the property. Mr. Osgood asked whether or not they anticipate the tenants using the facility in November and December. Director of Parks and Recreation Lisa Zerio explained that the use is really in September and October, though there may be a holiday event. Mr. Osgood asked if there are upcoming expenses to maintain that building. Mr. Luiz stated that Town Engineer Dan Pennington will submit a grant for evaluation for historical preservation. Mr. Osgood asked if the Town can get out of the lease, should the maintenance prove too costly. Mr. Luiz clarified that the lessee is responsible for all improvements, as stated in the lease.

There were no public comments. Mr. Gullotta closed the public hearing.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Osgood

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby authorizes the Town Manager to execute a new Lease Agreement between the Town and Riverview Farms LLC for Town-owned property at 1287 Main Street, Parcel A, as described in a report by the Director of Parks & Recreation dated September 6, 2024.

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

NO. 3 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. (POSTPONED FROM THE AUGUST 6, 2024 TOWN COUNCIL MEETING.)

Mr. Gullotta opened the floor for public comment.

Kevin Nursick of 33 Douglas Road, is a commissioner on the Board of Fire Commissioners. He explained that their Board unanimously opined that the Fire Chief should be the final determining authority if a firefighter died in the line of duty. He stated that removing that authority from the Fire Chief and giving it to the Town Manager is something that few towns have done across Connecticut. He remarked that portions of the proposed guidelines concerned him, such as the Town Manager cooperating with the Director of Human Resources and Labor Relations, which he found to be bureaucratic and distasteful.

Jenn Jennings of 34 Cranesbill Drive, is the wife of a local police officer. She agreed with Mr. Nursick that the initial legislation was a fair process, and believed that the final authority should rest with the chiefs.

Rep. Jill Barry of 199 Caven Lane. She shared the origin of Public Act 24-16, explaining that the legislative intent was to properly honor their first responders.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Ms. LaChance

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby tables action to the meeting of September 24, 2024.

Result: Motion passed {6-3-0}. Mr. Cavanna, Mr. Cavanaugh, and Mr. Osgood voted against.

5. New Business.

- a. Discussion and action regarding an appropriation and transfer of \$96,500 from the available balance in the Fiscal Year 2024 General Fund – Town Manager Operating Supplies to the Capital Projects Fund – Cotton Hollow Preserve for enhancements at Cotton Hollow Preserve (refer to Board of Finance; set public hearing).**

Ms. Carroll reviewed the recommendations from the subcommittee meeting. Mr. Luiz stated that he is uncomfortable with reopening the preserve until the liabilities are addressed, specifically regarding tree work and signage. Mr. Cavanna took issue with the \$40,000 cost for the tree work, explaining that preserves are meant to be kept in a natural state. He stated that he would rather see the money proposed for more park rangers to be allocated towards police enforcement at the preserve.

Mr. McChesney stated that he is okay with spending money to remove trees that are an active risk, but not for anything beyond that. Mr. Niland noted that one lawsuit would cost the Town a lot more than some tree work would. Mr. Luiz clarified that the trees he focused on are located next to walking paths and near swimming areas and waiting areas. Mr. Cavanaugh asked whether or not the Town has to do an RFP. Ms. Zerio explained that they use a firm, so they would not have to go through that process. She reiterated that there will be no clear-cutting of trees and the consideration is only for the trees over walking paths. She explained that the tree work would take less than a week to do.

Mr. Gullotta agreed with Mr. Cavanna that this might open up a Pandora's box of ongoing expenses for tree work. He also noted that the park rangers are not allowed into the preserve. Therefore, he advocated terming them park staff instead of park rangers. Mr. Cavanaugh noted that while the park rangers may be restricted at Cotton Hollow Preserve, they serve a purpose in other town parks. Mr. Osgood observed that the park ranger budget for the overtime is not part of tonight's motion.

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 an appropriation and transfer of \$96,500 from the available balance in the FY 2024 General Fund – Town Manager Operating Supplies to the Capital Projects Fund – Cotton Hollow Preserve, for enhancements at Cotton Hollow Preserve and schedules a public hearing for 8:00 p.m. on Tuesday, September 24, 2024 in the in the Council Chambers of Town Hall, 2155 Main Street, Glastonbury and/or through Zoom Video Conferencing to consider the proposed appropriation and transfer, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated September 6, 2024.

Result: Motion passed {8-1-0}. Mr. Cavanna voted against.

- b. Discussion and possible action concerning proposed Amendment to Building Zone Regulations regarding Group Child Care Homes as required by State Statute (refer to Town Plan and Zoning Commission; set public hearing for October 8, 2024).**

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby forwards the draft text amendment of the Building-Zone Regulations regarding child care homes to the Town Plan & Zoning Commission for a recommendation and schedules a public hearing for 8:00 p.m. on Tuesday, October 8, 2024 in the Council Chambers of Town Hall, 2155 Main Street, Glastonbury and/or through Zoom Video Conferencing, to consider adoption of the proposed amendment, as described in a report by the Director of Community Development dated September 6, 2024.

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

c. Discussion and possible action regarding establishing a new Curtisville Extended Village District Overlay Zone (refer to Town Plan and Zoning Commission; set public hearing for October 8, 2024).

Ms. Caltagirone explained that this concept was discussed by the subcommittee, which showed bipartisan agreement on moving it forward. She also requested to change the scheduled public hearing date from October 8, 2024 to October 22, 2024, in order to have enough time to present this before CRCOG. Mr. Niland asked if it is possible to amend their recommendation to include the lower Griswold Street area. Mr. Cavanaugh agreed, and hoped to see that come up after this. Mr. Gullotta concurred, but pointed out that it is important to get this through tonight.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, the Glastonbury Town Council hereby refers to the Town Plan and Zoning Commission proposed amendment to the Building Zone Regulations to create a Curtisville Extended Village District Overlay and schedules a public hearing for 8:00 p.m. on Tuesday, October 22, 2024 in the Council Chambers of Town Hall, 2155 Main Street, Glastonbury and/or through Zoom Video Conferencing, to consider adoption of the proposed amendment, as described in a report by the Director of Community Development dated September 6, 2024.

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

d. Added to agenda: Appointments to the Regulations Review Steering Review

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby appoints Tom Gullotta, Larry Niland, Kurt Cavanaugh, Sharon Purtil, Laura Cahill, and Brian Davis to the Regulations Review Steering Committee.

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

6. Consent Calendar. None.

7. Town Manager's Report.

Mr. Luiz presented his report. Mr. Cavanna requested an update on the status of the Public Works ' annual party. Mr. Luiz agreed to report back on that.

8. Committee Reports.

- a. **Chairman's Report. *None.***
- b. **MDC. *None.***
- c. **CRCOG. *None.***
- d. **Board of Education Facilities Committee Report. *None.***
- e. **Policy & Ordinance Review Committee – report and recommendation – proposed amendment to Town Code, Chapter 8 – Solid Waste.**

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby schedules a public hearing for 8:00 p.m. on Tuesday, September 24, 2024, in the Council Chambers of Town Hall at 2155 Main Street, Glastonbury and/or through Zoom Video Conferencing to consider amendment to Town Code, Chapter 8 – Solid Waste.

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

- f. **Policy & Ordinance Review Committee – report and recommendation – proposed amendment to Town Code, Chapter 14, Article III – Recreational Areas Use Regulations.**

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby schedules a public hearing for 8:00 p.m. on Tuesday, September 24, 2024, in the Council Chambers of Town Hall at 2155 Main Street, Glastonbury and/or through Zoom Video Conferencing to consider amendment to Town Code, Chapter 14, Article III – Recreational Areas Use Regulations.

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

9. Communications.

- a. **Letter from CT Public Utilities Regulatory Authority regarding Application of Celco Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless for Approval of a Construction Plan to Install Wireless Facilities Within Certain Public Rights-of-Way – Glastonbury SC12 CT.**

10. Minutes.

- a. **Minutes of August 6, 2024 Special Meeting.**

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves the minutes of the August 6, 2024 Special Meeting.

Result: Motion passed {8-0-1}. Ms. Wang abstained.

b. Minutes of August 6, 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 August 6, 2024 Regular Meeting.

Result: Motion passed unanimously {8-0-1}. Ms. Wang abstained.

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.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby enters into Executive Session at 10:33 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 {9-0-0}.

The Council came out of Executive Session at 10:45 p.m.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby adjourns the Town Council meeting of September 10, 2024 at 10:46 p.m.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Lilly Torosyan

**Lilly Torosyan
Recording Clerk**

**Thomas Gullotta
Chairman**