

**GLASTONBURY TOWN COUNCIL
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 24, 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.

Pam Lucas of 145 Moseley Terrace. She stated that the State and the Town remain in the throes of an affordable housing crisis, and she called for developers to play their part for the privilege to develop in town. She supported both the application for a Small Town Economic Assistance Program (STEAP grant) for the Nye Road project, as well as a referral to the Town Plan and Zoning Commission (TPZ) for proposed amendments to the Building Zone Regulations to expand inclusionary zoning controls.

Peggy Schroeder of 151 Barrington Way. She requested forwarding to the TPZ a favorable recommendation to establish a Naubuc School Village District Overlay because the quality of life and home values in North Glastonbury are at stake.

Rob Dakers of 15 Trifiro Circle. He urged forwarding the proposal to expand inclusionary zoning to the TPZ, and support for the STEAP grant application for the Nye Road development, as an investment that will benefit the community for generations to come.

Alex Meade of 41 Glazier Drive. He is pleased that the STEAP grant is back under discussion. He urged support of that, as well as for expanding inclusionary zoning. He advocated for a solid plan to get a moratorium on Connecticut General Statutes (CGS) Section 8-30g affordable housing applications.

Laura Cahill of 17 Montauk Way. She supported the proposal to allocate nearly \$100,000 to install new gates and a camera system at Cotton Hollow Preserve. She stated that, over the past several weeks, there has been a problem in decorum at the Council, which resulted in two Glastonbury Citizen articles. She supported the Council referring this question to the policy and ordinance subcommittee.

DJ McBride of 263 Spring Street Extension. He supported a village district overlay in North Glastonbury, as well as a revision of the Town Charter.

Ryan Bower of 47 Griswold Street. He urged support of a village district overlay in North Glastonbury to preserve the safety, charm, and environment of Glastonbury.

Patrice Ehrhardt of 143 Barrington Way. She stated that the traffic problems at Naubuc School would become even worse with the proposed development. She asked the Council to consider that no other school in Glastonbury has to deal with such health and safety problems, which is unfair.

Inda Watrous of 116 Griswold Street. She supported the village district overlay so that development keeps within scope of the neighborhood. She asked what the long-term development of the town is, and asked to install some traffic calming measures.

Heather Hassan of 404 Addison Road. She supported halting any more commercial buildings in her neighborhood, which has experienced three accidents within one month. She also asked what the Town's vision is going forward, regarding development.

Dr. Steven Becker of 611 Chestnut Hill Road, is a psychologist in town. He stated that he was pleased to see the item on the agenda for decorum and civility. He suggested that if the Council is having difficulty with people who are inconsiderate, then there are training programs to help. He also suggested that the schools integrate this type of "gentle training" into the curriculum.

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

Amanda Casey of 2249 New London Turnpike. She asked to prioritize the construction of a new animal shelter. She stated that the poor conditions of the current animal shelter should be concerning and funding should be allocated for this project sooner rather than later. She urged members to drive to the shelter and take a look at the condition of the building and parking area.

Kelly Mulryan of 45 Lindsay Lane. She stated that North and South Glastonbury should be treated the same, and the integrity of the Town's architecture should be maintained throughout the entire community. She asked that North Glastonbury's guidelines mirror those in South Glastonbury, in order to help maintain its beauty and safety. She urged passing the village district designation for North Glastonbury.

Zbigniew and Lesley Mroz of 121 Heywood Drive. They asked to forward to the TPZ the establishment of the Naubuc School Village District. They stated that this would give the Architectural and Site Design Review Committee (ASDRC) the ability to prevent the architectural and landscaping disasters that for years have occurred in North Glastonbury, and would ensure that Naubuc School remains a desirable school in an attractive and affordable neighborhood. They urged support for the same architectural and landscaping oversight that was previously given to South Glastonbury.

Lisa Mendum of 45 Candlewood Road. She emphasized the urgency of the Village District Designation for the north end of Glastonbury, including Naubuc School. She stated that she has been contacting the police department for years regarding speeding cars on her street and Griswold Street, but no safety improvement has been made. She pointed out that Naubuc School has significant safety issues that other schools in town do not, such as dangerous roads, unfiltered air, and lack of green space. She commented that more commercial and retail without traffic calming measures would exacerbate extant problems.

Brittany Zulick of 423 Main Street. She supported the STEAP grant for the much-needed animal shelter in town.

Jamie Rodriguez of 148 Barrington Way. She expressed vehement opposition to developing the land near Naubuc school, and was against any further commercial development in this area of town. She urged support for the creation of a Village District Designation in the Naubuc school area to preserve its small town feel. She asked to give this area the same designation that South Glastonbury and the Town Center already have.

3. Special Reports. None.

4. Old Business.

- a. Discussion and possible action regarding 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 (set public information hearing for October 8, 2024).**

Mr. Osgood stated that the Town Charter is working well at the moment, so he is not enamored with the idea of a revision. Ms. Carroll commented that the rules were established a long time ago, so she would like to hear what the public has to say. Mr. Gullotta requested the rest of the Council read up on material provided by Mr. Luiz to understand what the last charter commission had reported to the then-council.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby schedules a public information 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 possible changes to the Town Charter, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated September 20, 2024.

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

5. New Business.

- a. Discussion and possible action regarding establishing a new Naubuc School Village District Overlay (refer to Town Plan and Zoning Commission; set public hearing for November 12, 2024).**

Director of Community Development Shelley Caltagirone presented a draft for establishing a new Naubuc School Village District Overlay, which would make design standards required, rather than advisory, within the overlay zone. She reviewed the boundary map, and provided an analysis of the existing property types and uses. She explained that the recommendation is to exempt single-family and two-family residential properties from the design guidelines, just as it is in the South Glastonbury Village District.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby refers to the Town Plan and Zoning Commission proposed amendment to the Building Zone Regulations to create a Naubuc School Village District Overlay and schedules a public hearing for 8:00 p.m. on Tuesday, November 12, 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 20, 2024.

Discussion: Mr. Osgood expressed support for the ASDRC reviewing commercial properties, but he would not support the district until he fully understands the design guidelines. Ms. Caltagirone stated that their consultant is ready to revise the design guidelines whenever Town Staff ask them to. Mr. Osgood clarified that this does not reduce traffic or stop commercial development on the property, but simply calls for better architectural/design guidelines.

Mr. Gullotta noted that the undeveloped parcel has been approved, but asked if the village district designation would give the ASDRC the ability to more strongly influence the architectural and design aspect of that property. Ms. Caltagirone stated yes, the TPZ can use design standards in a more determinative way in a village district overlay. She explained that, outside of a village district, denial of a project based on aesthetics would not be as legally defensible.

Ms. LaChance would like for the overlay to include the area encircling Naubuc School. Mr. Gullotta stated that he is not opposed to that, but he had looked at the areas that needed the most protection. Mr. Cavanna echoed Ms. LaChance's suggestion.

Amendment by: Ms. LaChance

Seconded by: Ms. Carroll

The Council amended the draft proposed village district overlay map to extend south along Bantle Road and then along Spring Street. This enlarged boundary essentially encompasses all properties that front onto Griswold Street, Bantle Road, Spring Street, Wrights Lane, and Cooper Drive, excluding PAD zoned properties, and captures all properties within the Planned Travel zone. It excludes all properties in the Planned Business Development zone fronting Main Street.

Discussion: Mr. Osgood stated that this council appointed the subcommittee, which met and recommended the Curtisville District, but did not recommend this district because of uncertainty over how these design guidelines would apply. Mr. Gullotta pointed out that the subcommittee was abolished. Mr. Cavanna stated that while he understands Mr. Osgood's concern, the residents in town have agreed to extend the boundary a bit, so he will listen to them.

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

Result: Amended motion passed {8-0-1}. Mr. Osgood abstained.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

NO. 1 ACTION ON PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO TOWN CODE, CHAPTER 8 – SOLID WASTE.

Mr. Luiz explained that the code of ordinances talks about the Town's membership in the Central CT Solid Waste Authority (CCSWA). He stated that the Capitol Region Council of Governments (CRCOG) has recommended replacing Article 5 with a new section. He explained that this proposed ordinance would replace Article 5 of Chapter 8. Mr. Osgood asked to confirm that this change would not allow the organization to commit the Town of Glastonbury to any expenditures. Mr. Luiz stated that he has confirmed that.

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

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves the Capitol Region Council of Government's proposed ordinance amendments to Town Code, Chapter 8 – Solid Waste, Article V, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated September 20, 2024 and as recommended by the Policy & Ordinance Review Committee, with said amendments effective October 7, 2024.

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

NO. 2 ACTION ON PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO TOWN CODE, CHAPTER 14, ARTICLE III – RECREATIONAL AREAS USE REGULATIONS.

Mr. Luiz explained that the Policy and Ordinance subcommittee reviewed the policy and made some changes. He then reviewed the highlights of those proposed changes.

Mr. Gullotta opened the floor for comments.

Mark Decapua of 485 Hopewell Road. He read the article in the Glastonbury Citizen, and asked that the park ranger position be reviewed because of its lack of authority to work inside the preserve. He asked what the parking lot attendant's responsibility would be, and how the parking lots would be managed. He questioned the hours of operation being from dawn to dusk, recommending set hours instead. He asked that the illegal activity at Cotton Hollow Preserve be addressed.

Leslie Abrahams of 44 Goodrich Road. She remarked that she is against the proposal to spend \$40,000 for tree work at Cotton Hollow Preserve because the site is meant to preserve nature. She stated that she would rather have that funding go towards policing so that there is a force onsite. She also called for signage denoting walk or hike at your own risk.

Richard Abrahams of 44 Goodrich Road. He stated that he has been going to Cotton Hollow Preserve for years and collecting trash and broken glass. He commented that the Town should issue permits to Glastonbury residents only, and there should be a severe fine for parking illegally. He also expressed support for the funds set aside for tree work to be used instead for police patrolling.

John Langmaid of 2200 Main Street, is the chair of the Recreation Commission. He explained that their commission has been talking for years about the issues at Cotton Hollow Preserve, and their understanding is that swimming is not permitted at the preserve. He noted that problems occur on hot days when people think that the preserve is a swimming hole, so he would like to combat that misinformation. He stated that, until that is corrected, the park would need to be closed on hot days.

Rachel Siporin of 509 Hopewell Road. She recommended opening the preserve in October because she stated that the issues seem to occur only during the hot weather/season. She stated that there has been a misunderstanding about the tree work, which is being done for safety reasons. She noted that it is illegal to restrict entrance to the preserve to just Glastonbury residents, and wondered how the police would maintain parking, once the weather warms up.

Brad Spencer of 520 Bell Street. He asked if a bridle path could be created for horses. Mr. Gullotta responded that it is too steep of a site.

Mr. Luiz explained that Town Staff has long interpreted that the ordinance language does not prohibit swimming at Cotton Hollow. Mr. Gullotta suspected that, for thousands of years, individuals who came across that water swam in it. He remarked that his concern is with people jumping off the cliffs. Mr. Luiz stated that if the Council were to consider the Town Manager closing the preserve when it is hot outside, then he would like to discuss that. Mr. Gullotta asked when the preserve would reopen. Mr. Luiz replied, the target date is October 1.

Leslie Abrahams of 44 Goodrich Road. She would like clarification on whether the use of the preserve could be restricted to town residents.

Richard Abrahams of 44 Goodrich Road. He would like the ordinance language regarding swimming to be crystal clear.

Mr. Luiz explained that the prior Town Attorney reviewed the ordinance language and believed that non-town residents are not allowed to be prohibited from using the preserve, and the current Town Attorney agreed with that language reading. Commissioner Langmaid stated that the Recreation Commission is not in favor of prohibiting non-residents from using town parks and preserves, and they believe that this is more a matter of how the preserve is being used. Ms. Carroll added that the means by which the land was acquired used federal funding, so they cannot limit access to only town residents.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves amendment to Town Code, Chapter 14, Article III – Recreational Areas Use Regulations, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated September 20, 2024 and as recommended by the Policy & Ordinance Review Committee, with said amendments effective October 7, 2024.

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

NO. 3 ACTION ON A \$96,500 APPROPRIATION AND TRANSFER 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.

Director of Parks and Recreation Lisa Zerio described the nature of the tree work, which requires certified tree climbers to clear 15-20 felled trees, located along the walking trails and areas where people may congregate. She explained that the work would take three days to complete. Mr. Cavanaugh stated that when the Council transmitted this to the Board of Finance (BOF), the cost was \$96,500. Mr. Luiz explained that between the Council and BOF meetings, they received news of the reduced cost for the tree work. Mr. Cavanaugh asked what happened to get it reduced by \$20,000. Ms. Zerio explained that a contractor was brought in, who provided a firmer number than the prior estimate.

Mr. Gullotta opened the floor for comments.

Rachel Siporin of 509 Hopewell Road. She asked whether the trees that have fallen over with the roots would be removed. Ms. Zerio stated yes, they are assessing risk and will remove hazards, but the tree roots that stabilize the banks will stay.

Richard Abrahams of 44 Goodrich Road. He noted that the preserve is wild, so he would like to minimize the number of trees removed from the brook.

Brad Spencer of 520 Bell Street. He stated that Spencer Farms has a saw mill processing area, so they could repurpose the dead trees for benches for the town.

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

Mr. Cavanna echoed Mr. Abrahams' comment about the trees in the water. He noted that his family has owned acres in Roaring Brook and it self-cleans in the water. He would like to limit as much as possible anything they will cut in the water. Mr. McChesney concurred.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves a transfer of \$76,500 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, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated September 20, 2024.

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

The Council recessed for five minutes, returning at 8:55 p.m.

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

Mr. Luiz explained that there is not a set schedule for the STEAP grant, but the state might announce sometime that the applications are open. He noted that the Glastonbury Housing Authority (GHA) had previously requested that the Council consider submitting a STEAP application for 55 Nye Road, and since then, the Council asked for additional projects to consider, which he provided.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby endorses the application for up to \$1,000,000 of STEAP monies in support of Glastonbury Housing Authority Nye Road project, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated September 23, 2024.

Discussion: Mr. Cavanaugh stated that the Town has already invested over \$3 million in this project, and it is up to the GHA to raise more money themselves, if it is needed. He stated that he has not seen a real benefit to current taxpayers for this project, so he would rather see the STEAP grant go towards the animal shelter project. Mr. Cavanna concurred, noting that, three years ago, the animal shelter was a topic of discussion, and he would like to see that project move along. Mr. Niland favored the STEAP grant being used for the Nye Road project, but agreed that the animal shelter needs to move forward and suggested additional conversation about it at their next meeting.

Mr. McChesney stated that he will support adding more money in their next budget cycle to get the animal shelter constructed. He explained that he would rather fund it as a capital project in their CIP budget. He pointed out that the Town is more likely to have their STEAP grant application accepted if they submit an affordable housing project. Mr. Osgood stated that this application asks the Town's taxpayers to put another \$1 million into Nye Road, which he opposes.

Mr. Gullotta shared that, in his opinion, the GHA is the way to go. He noted that 8-30g applications will continue to come in until the Town reaches the moratorium, so they need to do something. Ms. Wang noted that 80% of these 64 units would be affordable, which would put a significant dent in their affordable housing plan. She pointed out that the GHA has been seeking out funding and would be applying to the low income tax credit through the state.

Mr. Cavanna asked how much they are willing to spend of taxpayer money to chase 8-30g. He would like for Glastonbury to work with other municipalities who are also facing the same problems with the affordable housing statute. Mr. McChesney asked to turn that question around, and ask the neighbors at Hebron Avenue and Main Street what they wished the Town would have paid to combat the 8-30g application that will be developed there.

Mr. McChesney stated that 8-30g is a problem and they can work with other communities to push back on it, but that is not what the legislature wants to do. He remarked that Glastonbury is best served by showing their state legislators that they as a community are not against affordable housing; he believed that this would do more to lessen their perceived need for a law like 8-30g.

Ms. Carroll stated that many residents have come into many public hearings to express distress over 8-30g. She stated that this application is needed to get them over the finish line, so she finds it appropriate to use the STEAP grant money for the Nye Road project.

Ms. LaChance called the question, which Mr. McChesney seconded, and was passed.

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

c. Discussion and possible action on rules of decorum for commission and committee members in a public meeting (refer to Policy & Ordinance Review Committee).

Mr. Cavanaugh stated that this is more about language, not decorum, and he does not wish to stifle speech. Mr. McChesney pointed out that this was not just one comment, but a series of comments, and he has heard concerns about treatment of the public. Ms. Wang added that she has also heard directly from a neighbor who felt similarly insulted by a particular ASDRC member, and even felt discriminated against, so this is a serious matter.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanna

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby refers a matter concerning rules of decorum for commission and committee members in a public meeting to the Policy & Ordinance Review Subcommittee.

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

d. Discussion and possible action regarding expanding inclusionary zoning (refer to Town Plan and Zoning Commission; set public hearing for November 12, 2024).

Ms. Caltagirone explained that the proposal's purpose is to expand the inclusionary zoning regulations. She noted that the Town's definition of affordable housing is the same as the State's 8-30g definition, with the exception that their Residence A units are affordable in perpetuity versus 8-30g, which require deed-restrictions for only 40 years, at minimum. Mr. Osgood asked at how many affordable housing units does it become cost prohibitive for a developer to make a development. Ms. Caltagirone did not know but stated that she would conduct research before bringing this back to the Council.

Mr. Osgood noted that, last year, the Council voted that 10% was the right percentage for inclusionary zoning, and he sees no reason to change it. He also remarked that he would not support this applying to condominiums until fully understanding the issue. Mr. Gullotta stated that he understands the concern about increasing the percentage from 10% to 12%, but believed that this change is crucial to moving the needle on affordable housing. He urged his colleagues to send this on to the TPZ.

Mr. Cavanaugh stated that even if and when Glastonbury hits the 10% target for exemption from 8-30g applications, the legislature would still be at their heels. Ms. Wang noted that there are other models out there for shared equity. She pointed out that condominium ownership would allow the homeowner to build some equity but not at the market rate. She noted that a TPZ commissioner has looked into this, and the Council would have more opportunity to do research on this before voting.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby refers to the Town Plan and Zoning Commission proposed amendment to the Building Zone Regulations to expand inclusionary zoning controls and schedules a public hearing for 8:00 p.m. on Tuesday, November 12, 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 20, 2024.

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

e. Action to adopt Affirmative Action Goals for fiscal year 2024-2025.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby adopts 2024-2025 Affirmative Action Goals, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated September 20, 2024, and as recommended by the Human Relations Commission.

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

6. Consent Calendar.

a. General Fund Transfer – Goods and Services (set public hearing for October 8, 2024).

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, October 8, 2024 in the Council Chambers of Town Hall, 2155 Main Street, Glastonbury and/or through Zoom Video Conferencing to consider a transfer from the General Fund-Unassigned Fund Balance of \$597,384 for goods and services ordered but not yet received as of June 30, 2024, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated September 20, 2024.

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

b. Action to schedule joint Town Council/Town Plan & Zoning Commission preliminary hearing – 17 Wickham Road Planned Area Development (PAD) (set public hearing for October 22, 2024).

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby schedules a Joint Town Council/Town Plan & Zoning Commission public hearing to review a Preliminary Development Plan for proposed change of zone from Rural Residence to Planned Area Development to construct sixteen (16) detached units for elderly housing on six (6) acres at 17 Wickham Road for 8:00 p.m. on Tuesday, October 22, 2024 in the Council Chambers of Town Hall, 2155 Main Street, and/or through Zoom Video Conferencing, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated September 20, 2024.

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

7. Town Manager's Report.

Mr. Luiz presented his report. Ms. LaChance stated that the Council should take up the matter of naming the former MDC property. Mr. Osgood agreed, and added that they should also discuss installing public access to that property, as well as parking.

8. Committee Reports.

a. Chairman's Report.

In honor of Banned Book Month, Mr. Gullotta recommended reading Huckleberry Finn and To Kill a Mockingbird.

b. MDC. None.

c. CRCOG. None.

d. Board of Education Facilities Committee Report. None.

9. Communications.

a. Letter from CT Siting Council regarding modifications to an existing telecommunications facility located at 50 (a/k/a 48) Birch Mountain Road.

10. Minutes.

a. Amended Minutes of September 10, 2024 Regular Meeting.

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

Seconded by: Mr. Cavanaugh

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves the amended minutes of the September 10, 2024 Regular Meeting.

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

11. Appointments and Resignations. None.

12. Executive Session.

- a. Discussion of the selection of a site or the lease, sale or purchase of real estate.**
- b. Matter concerning security strategy.**
- c. Pending litigation – tax foreclosure at 520 Ash Swamp Road.**

Motion by: Ms. Carroll

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.*
- (b) Matter concerning security strategy.*
- (c) Pending litigation – tax foreclosure at 520 Ash Swamp Road.*

Attendees to include Council Members and the Town Manager.

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

The Council came out of Executive Session at 10:05 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 24, 2024 at 10:06 p.m.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Lilly Torosyan

**Lilly Torosyan
Recording Clerk**

**Thomas Gullotta
Chairman**