

**THE GLASTONBURY TOWN PLAN AND ZONING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES OF TUESDAY, OCTOBER 15, 2024**

The Glastonbury Town Plan and Zoning Commission, with Shelley Caltagirone, Director of Community Development, and Gary Haynes, Planner, held a Regular Meeting at 7:00 P.M in the Council Chambers of Town Hall at 2155 Main Street with an option for Zoom video conferencing. The video was broadcast in real time and via a live video stream.

ROLL CALL

Commission Members Present

Mr. Robert J. Zanolungo, Jr., Chairman
Mrs. Sharon Purtill, Vice Chair
Mr. Corey Turner, Secretary
Mr. Emilio Flores
Mr. Philip Markuszka
Ms. Laura Cahill, Alternate,
Mr. Andy Zlotnick, Alternate, *seated*
Mr. Dennis Desmarais, Alternate

Commission Members Absent

Ms. Sharon Jagel

Chairman Zanolungo called the meeting to order at 7:08 P.M. He seated Commissioner Zlotnick as a full voting member.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Informal session for the purpose of hearing from citizens on Regular Meeting agenda or non-agenda items

Pamela Lucas of 145 Moseley Terrace asked for a vote in favor of the proposal to extend the inclusionary zoning ordinance to include condominiums and to expand the requirement of affordable housing from 10% to 12%. She suggested increasing the percentage over time and establishing an affordable housing or inclusionary zoning trust fund.

David O'Connor of 1140 Main Street stated that the Town needs to diversify its population, both racially and economically. To close the gap and qualify for a CGS 8-30g moratorium, he believed that the Town must embark upon a more aggressive approach. He urged the TPZ to support the expansion of inclusionary zoning requirements to all multi-family units of 10 units or more and to increase the percentage of units that are affordable housing from 10% to 12%.

DJ McBride of 263 Spring Street Extension stated that the architecture in town is under-appreciated. He supported the Naubuc Village District Overlay, to protect the town from bad architecture, and wished that it could extend to the East Hartford line.

Lesley Mroz of 121 Heywood Drive asked to favorably recommend the Naubuc Village District Overlay, which would allow the Naubuc School neighborhood to benefit from ASDRC (Architectural and Site Design Review Committee) reviews of commercial and multi-family projects.

Inda Watrous of 116 Griswold Street supported the Naubuc Village District Overlay. She asked what the planning vision and oversight is for the future of Glastonbury.

The following comments were made via Zoom:

Peggy Schroeder of 151 Barrington Way supported extending the village district designation to the Naubuc School district.

Ryan Bower of 47 Griswold Street spoke in favor of the Naubuc School village district overlay, and looked forward to the ASDRC's enactment of mandatory guidelines and stricter guidelines in North Glastonbury.

Heather Hassan of 404 Addison Road supported the extension of the Naubuc Village District Overlay.

REGULAR MEETING

1. Acceptance of the Minutes of the October 1, 2024 Regular Meeting

Motion by: Secretary Turner

Seconded by: Commissioner Flores

Result: Minutes were accepted unanimously {6-0-0}.

2. Application of John G. & Karen L. Bona for final subdivision approval – one lot into two – 1597 New London Turnpike – Rural Residence Zone

Jonathan Sczurek, P.E., of Megson, Heagle, and Friend, LLC, represented the applicant. He explained that the existing house will remain on the property as lot 1. This application has received a positive recommendation from the Conservation Commission.

Motion by: Secretary Turner

Seconded by: Vice Chair Purtill

MOVED, that the Town Plan and Zoning Commission approve the application of Casamell Realty, LLC for final subdivision approval, one lot into two, at 1597 New London Turnpike, within the Rural Residence Zone, in accordance with the plan set entitled "1597 New London Turnpike Subdivision prepared by Megson, Heagle and Friend, revision date 9/12/24" and:

1. In compliance with: The Conservation Commission in their recommendation for approval to the Town Plan and Zoning Commission dated October 11, 2024.

2. In adherence to:
 - a. The Health Department memorandum dated September 23, 2024.
 - b. The Engineering Department to Conservation Commission memorandum dated September 18, 2024.
 - c. The Engineering Department to Town Plan & Zoning Commission memorandum dated October 11, 2024.
 - d. The Police Department memorandum dated 09/24/2024.
 - e. The Fire Marshal memorandum dated September 24, 2024.
3. With the following conditions:
 - a. Prior to the issuance of a Building Permit, the applicant shall file the motion of approval and Subdivision Plan on the land records of the Town Clerk.
 - b. Prior to the issuance of a Building Permit, the applicant shall file one paper copy of the finalized, approved plans with the Office of Community Development.
 - c. Prior to the issuance of a Building Permit, the applicant shall file a .pdf (digital) copy of the finalized, approved plans with the Office of Community Development.
4. If unforeseen conditions are encountered during construction that would cause deviation from the approved plans, the applicant shall consult with the Office of Community Development to determine what further approvals, if any, are required.

Result: Motion passed unanimously {6-0-0}.

3. Request of Rejean Jacques for a modification to the Crosby II Subdivision approval – reduction of cistern from 30,000 to 20,000 gallons – Rural Residence Zone

Jonathan Sczurek, P.E., of Megson, Heagle, and Friend, LLC, represented the applicant. He explained that, a few years ago, the project was approved with a condition of approval for a 30,000-gallon cistern. However, it was determined that a 20,000-gallon tank would be acceptable to the Town of Glastonbury Fire Department. Mr. Haynes added that, originally, there was an engineering specification calling for 30,000 gallons, but the 20,000-gallon tank fits much better, so it was deemed a good compromise from both an installation standpoint and from a fire safety perspective. Ms. Caltagirone noted that the Fire Marshal is available on Zoom for questions.

Ms. Cahill noted that the 30,000-gallon tank is a Glastonbury standard. She asked whether the Town has granted waivers in other instances of this size. Fire Marshal Mike Makuch explained that 30,000 gallons is the national standard, but there have been many waivers granted in the past. He stated that this project initially started out with the standard, but as the design went on, it became apparent that a 30,000-gallon cistern would be a difficult fit.

Ms. Cahill asked if there is any legal liability for the Town if the cistern size is reduced. Ms. Caltagirone replied no. Mr. Turner's recollection is that, at the subcommittee meeting, there was a request for a smaller cistern. Mr. Sczurek explained that, historically, it was a 5,000-gallon tank

spaced out, and there was no provision in the regulations for a waiver. He clarified that they are not asking for a waiver, but rather, a reduction of the cistern size to 20,000 gallons.

Mr. Flores expressed concern regarding a negative impact on the neighbors' insurance. He asked whether there is a history of a smaller cistern resulting in a change in the homeowners' insurance in the area. Mr. Makuch explained that the history is more to alter the Town's ISO (Insurance Services Office) rating; the risk could be that a 30,000-gallon tank might get more favorable points, as opposed to a 20,000-gallon tank, but it is not a penalty. Mr. Flores asked for the current rating in this standard. Mr. Makuch stated that the Fire Chief is an expert on that, but different parts of town have various ISO ratings.

Mr. Markuszka asked whether there could be a 20,000-gallon tank and a 10,000-gallon tank. Mr. Sczurek stated that the issue, operation-wise, is that they have to draw a vacuum to suck up water, so they were comfortable with a 20,000-gallon tank, full stop. Mr. Turner asked if the reason for not doing the extra gallons is because of installation. Mr. Haynes replied yes, and it would change the elevation because it is a massive excavation.

Motion by: Secretary Turner

Seconded by: Vice Chair Purtill

MOVED, that the Town Plan and Zoning Commission approve the request of Rejean Jacques for a modification to the Crosby II Subdivision approval – reduction of cistern from 30,000 to 20,000 gallons – Rural Residence Zone, in accordance with plans filed in the Office of Community Development, and:

1. In adherence to:
 - a. The Town Engineer's memorandum dated October 10, 2024.
 - b. The Health Director's memorandum dated October 9, 2024.
 - c. The Police Chief's memorandum dated 10/07/2024.
 - d. The Fire Marshal's memorandum dated October 2, 2024.
2. The applicant shall file the approval letter and motion on the land records of the Town Clerk to document the modification to the final subdivision approval.
3. If unforeseen conditions are encountered during construction that would cause deviation from the approved plans, the applicant shall consult with the Office of Community Development to determine what further approvals, if any, are required.

Result: Motion passed {4-2-0}, with Mr. Flores and Mr. Turner voting against.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

- 1. Application of Kim Crockwell for a Section 6.11 Accessory Apartment Special Permit – 197 Paxton Way – Rural Residence Zone**

Mr. Haynes explained that the applicant was supposed to have tuned in via Zoom, but is not present. Mrs. Purtill would like to review this again with better visuals of the floor plan and the outside details before voting. Ms. Cahill felt uncomfortable voting without the applicant present, as it would set a bad precedent.

Motion by: Vice Chair Purtill

Seconded by: Commissioner Markuszka

To TABLE the application to receive more information.

Result: Motion passed unanimously {6-0-0}.

2. Application of MORELLO REALTY, LLC for site plan approval pursuant to CGS Section 8-30g regarding the construction of a 3.5 story, 42-unit, multi-family building in addition to improvements to the existing 6- unit multi-family building – 36 Hopewell Rd – South Glastonbury Village Residential Zone

Town Attorney Ken Slater joined the commission.

Attorney Meghan Hope of Alter & Pearson, LLC represented the applicant and owner, Sal Morello. She explained that the public hearing will not be closed tonight, as they await both the Town Engineering Department's second memorandum, as well as more feedback from the ASDRC because their meeting tonight was cut short. She explained that 48 units are proposed on-site, of which 33 will be market rate and 15 will be deed-restricted for 40 years. The existing 6-family house is proposed to stay, but two existing accessory structures would be demolished. She noted that the new building will be 42 units.

Ms. Hope explained that they propose a sidewalk along Hopewell Road, which does not have any sidewalks otherwise. They also propose a retaining wall along the back side of the parking area. The ASDRC commented to reduce that from 11 feet to 6 to 8 feet in different portions, which they have accommodated. She explained that both the ASDRC and the Conservation Commission commented that the site is over-parked. Originally, they had proposed 84 parking spaces, but now propose 76 spaces. If the TPZ would like, they can add more spaces.

Manny Silva, licensed Civil Engineer, reviewed the drainage and utility plan, which include a series of catch basins to collect the stormwater from the building and the paved areas. The underground gallery system is a concrete structure with an open bottom and slots on the sides. He noted that their water quality would be higher. The erosion control plan includes a double silt fence.

Biff Schlesinger, Landscape Architect, stated that they worked with the ASDRC to ensure that the vast majority of their plantings are native. They hope to move the electrical system further to the east. There is a fire lane on the western side of the building, buffered with native understory, and an evergreen screen along the east side. Once they receive the full parking count, he hopes to add more landscape islands.

Ms. Hope mentioned the monument sign, which would be down-lit from the top. She stated that the ASDRC would like for the building, which was built in the 1800s, to return to its original, historical and architectural elements. She then showed a letter of support from Stacey Vairo, Circuit Rider from Preservation Connecticut, for the restoration of historical aspects of the estate, particularly the windows and the chimneys. Ms. Hope noted that the existing building floor plan would not change, and the proposed building height is very similar to that of the existing building.

Attorney Hope stated that the ASDRC liked the first iteration of the plans for the proposed building and felt that the revisions were too symmetrical. She noted that they will return to the ASDRC for more feedback before returning to the TPZ. She also noted that the plans have received a certification of compliance with the building and fire codes, and she pointed out several sustainable features. She then reviewed the lighting plan, which includes 14-foot poles, with a mounting height of 15.5 feet. Their plan is consistent with the Town's Plan of Conservation and Development.

Mark Vertucci, Traffic Engineer at Fuss and O'Neill, reviewed the findings of a traffic study for this development, which was conducted in October 2023, at two intersections. He noted that the morning peak hour traffic is from 8-9 A.M. and the afternoon peak is from 4:15-5:15 P.M. He explained that the 48 units will generate 9 entering and 29 exiting trips in the morning peak hour, and 26 entering and 15 exiting trips in the afternoon peak hour. Route 17 is the primary artery, so they expect 80% of traffic to come from Main Street and 20% from the east side, on Hopewell Road. He reviewed the crash data and found no identifiable crash patterns in the study area nor any abnormal crash frequencies. The sight distances exceed the DOT (Department of Transportation) criteria for safe egress from the site.

Mr. Vertucci reviewed the intersections level of service summary, noting that the site alternates between a Level A [the lightest level; least delays] and a Level B, and the peak hour queue had almost no increase in length. His conclusion is that the proposed development will not have a significant traffic impact on the adjacent roadway network. He also provided a letter from the Police Chief, which concurred with his findings. He noted that the Engineering Department is still reviewing the study.

Chairman Zanlungo opened the floor for public comment.

Roger Emerick of 580 Hopewell Road stated that there has been tremendous citizen arousal over unsafe traffic in Glastonbury. He stated that CGS Section 8-30g mandates a population increase, which should not be allowed. He believed that affordable housing in this area would lower the value of the homes nearby and pose health and safety risks. He asked to modify the law to only include affordable housing in commercial and industrial areas, as is done in cities.

John Hammer of 136 Hopewell Road is a landscape architect who has been involved on the applicant's side of 8-30g for many years. He advised the Town to not deny this application based on safety issues because doing so would become an expensive, losing endeavor. He would prefer to see infiltration systems instead of vortex units. He stated that A and B traffic service level at

intersections is unheard of. He often deals with D service level with affordable housing applications, so denying this application based on traffic would be a non-starter. He stated that this applicant has gone beyond what a lot of affordable housing parties do.

Barry Abramowitz of 760 Hopewell Road is a proponent of affordable housing, but does not think that this project is in the best interest of South Glastonbury. His concerns are the density. He stated that the TPZ needs to work with the Council to develop an affordable housing plan so that they can stop having these ridiculous meetings.

DJ McBride of 263 Spring Street Extension reviewed two tech cities, San Francisco and Austin, and their diverging actions regarding affordable housing. San Francisco cracked down on building new housing, which created a crisis, while Austin built new houses, lowering rent costs year over year. When it comes to affordability, all housing is good housing. He asked the TPZ to consider this project by weighing the following factors: that it provides affordable housing, the positive attitude of Mr. Morello, and the concerns of citizens.

Deborah Harrod of 211 Country Club Road stated that building more of these high-rise developments will turn the town into a city, with increased traffic, accidents, and crime. Unless the buildings are designated for ages 55+, she stated that more children would be coming into the schools, which could cost taxpayers millions. She finds it disgusting that the Town is being held hostage by 8-30g.

Alex Meade of 41 Glazier Drive expressed that the development is much too cramped and the density needs to be reduced. He challenged the notion that one parking space per bedroom is enough, and asked where the other cars will park. He pointed out that the added sidewalk would not solve anything if no connections are made to it. He questioned the traffic study and asked that the lighting plan be revised to mitigate glares on the abutters. He asked if the soil for the excavation involves the same soil which the DOT deemed unsuitable for retaining walls.

Clarissa Spawn of 41 Glazier Drive remarked that Mr. Morello is increasing the value of his property by decreasing the value of the other properties in the area. Her recommendation is to decrease the footprint and density by 30%. She also asked to improve the lighting plan and landscaping, and to consider negotiating direct payment to abutters.

Paul Galjin of 459 Hopewell Road commented that the lack of diversity in South Glastonbury is no reason to continue the lack of diversity. Beyond the legal and moral obligations to improve access to affordable housing, this project will bring economic development to an area where the retail district is operating under capacity. He supports the project and will support any initiative that connects a sidewalk to Main Street.

Scott McIntosh of 16 Dickinson Road favored the Nye Road project but opposed this development because of the loss of value to the abutting properties, while saddling taxpayers to provide greater services. He also noted that the intersection of Hopewell Road and Main Street is already congested, and this development would increase accidents. Because of safety concerns,

the TPZ has the power to deny this application, which he urged them to do. He also noted that the Yankee Institute Think Tank provides resources that are reasonable alternatives to 8-30g.

Ben Ciotti of 731 Hopewell Road stated that, in the time he has lived on Hopewell Road, the Grange Pool and Cotton Hollow Preserve have gone from pleasant to overcrowded and dangerous and needed to be closed down. He is unsure how adding 70 parking spots will mitigate safety concerns. He opposed this project.

Tom Gullotta of 221 Keeney Street thanked Ms. Hope for working with the ASDRC. Much has been said about traffic tonight, but the traffic study indicated that traffic is not an issue. He advised those members of the public who oppose the traffic study to conduct their own traffic study because the TPZ's decisions have to be based on the record placed before them. He then asked whether the project could be downsized. He also requested that the TPZ ask the developer to make 12% of the units affordable in perpetuity.

Ian Michelow of 11 Bittersweet Lane remarked that he supports affordable housing when the motivation is sincere, but the number of units in this development is insincere, so he advocated for fewer units. He asked why the traffic engineer omitted discussion of school buses and the congestion they would add to the area.

Meghan Hayden of 24 Lakewood Road generally supports the development and affordable housing, but would like to find a compromise, to reduce the number of units. She supported Mr. Gullotta's suggestion of keeping these units affordable in perpetuity. She would like for the Town to make a mandatory sidewalk plan so that people can safely get up and down Hopewell Road.

Ed Curley of 22 Glazier Drive expressed that this project will forever change the character of South Glastonbury, which needs to be taken into consideration. He did not believe that the traffic study took into consideration the fact that it is impossible to safely make a left-hand turn out of Glazier Drive. He also called for a provision to preserve the wildlife habitat in the area.

Todd Hallinen of 31 Hopewell Road noted that there is an apartment advertised at 36 Hopewell Road which was quoted lower than what Mr. Morello had expressed previously. Mr. Hallinen felt that this was a bait-and-switch. As a cyclist, he stated that Hopewell Road is the most dangerous road in town. He believed that Glazier Drive should have been monitored in the traffic study, but he is conducting his own traffic study now. If anyone ends up getting hit because of this development, then he puts the blame on the Commission. The following comment was made via Zoom:

Pamela Lockard of 10 Southgate Drive noted that the Town has an affordable housing committee which has been working on addressing the affordable housing crisis. She commented that the traffic study notes 100+ feet of southbound traffic but she thinks that it is more like 2,000+ feet. She also encouraged others to do their own traffic studies because the one presented tonight did not take into account school buses. She asked to install a left arrow or turning lane to lessen the traffic problem. She also believed that more parking is needed, not less.

Attorney Hope, Mr. Silva, and the applicant replied to the questions posed:

- Regarding decreased value to surrounding properties: Ms. Hope included information on myths about affordable housing, and there is no proof to back up this claim.
- Regarding infiltration systems versus vortex units: Mr. Silva explained that they have a belt and suspenders system, with both a vortex unit and an infiltration system. If they seek to get rid of the vortex unit, that is possible.
- Regarding the lighting plan: Ms. Hope noted that the lighting is a classical acorn unit and dark sky compliant, with the full house side shields. She explained that all the light focuses down because the fixture is hidden in the cap unit in the acorn. They have demonstrated zero-foot candle trespass into the wetlands and adjacent property owners.
- Regarding a wall on the uphill side: Ms. Hope stated that they do not propose one there, but they do propose one on the downhill side.
- Regarding a strain on town services: Mr. Silva explained that it is actually the opposite. No town garbage would be utilized, snow removal is by the property manager, and the addition of school children would be very minimal.
- Regarding guest parking versus unit renters: Ms. Hope explained that they were not proposing to assign parking spaces with this development. They feel that 76 spaces are enough, but can go up to 84 spaces, if the TPZ would like.
- Regarding comparison of the sizes of units between the old and new building: Mr. Morello explained that the existing house is an old mansion, so the units are all different sizes, and will differ from the sizes that are proposed in the new building.
- Regarding excavation: Mr. Morello explained that there is a surplus of topsoil. A 3D study was conducted, which he will share at a future meeting.

Mrs. Purtill asked if the soil systems are suitable for the retaining wall being proposed. Mr. Silva responded that the retaining wall is a Verso lock system and they will have geogrid which will make the soil structural. Mr. Zanolungo asked if there is data about the soil type there. Mr. Silva explained that the test pit data shows that they are well above ledge and static groundwater. They found 12 inches of topsoil, which would be removed. Mr. Zanolungo asked how that compares to the soil on Main Street. Ms. Caltagirone explained that the Engineering Department is still conducting their review, which will address soil stability and structural stability.

Regarding school buses and congestion, Mr. Vertucci stated that they have checked with the latest DOT data, and there is no major change in counts in the past year. As far as the Glazier Drive intersection, he explained that only about 20% of traffic is going east on Hopewell Road, which is why it was not included in the study. He also noted that there will be only a handful of students in the increase, so there should be no major change in the school buses.

Mrs. Purtill noted that, in the evenings, there could be 2 or 3 miles of traffic on Main Street, so that is bound to affect traffic on Hopewell Road and Main Street. He explained that this development will add 20 trips to the typical 1,300 cars, so it is not a noticeable change. Mr. Zanolungo disagreed that there is no issue with vehicles backing up on the weekends.

Mr. Zanolungo asked if the density could be toned down. Ms. Hope stated that they were asked by the ASDRC if a story could be taken down and the answer is no. At the neighborhood meeting last night, they received requests to take it down from 42 to 6 units, which they found to be unreasonable. She noted that the 12% in perpetuity suggestion can be discussed. Mr. Zanolungo asked to speak to the wildlife habitat. Ms. Hope explained that they filed a request for NDDDB Environmental Review, which deemed that there is nothing in the area that is endangered.

Mr. Zlotnick asked to speak to crime. Ms. Hope explained that there has been no evidence of increased crime with affordable housing or just apartment housing projects. Mr. Zlotnick asked how the traffic study looks at the increased potential of pedestrians getting hit. Mr. Vertucci explained that none of the crashes in the study area showed an increase in pedestrian or bicyclist crashes; they were all vehicular-related.

Mr. Zlotnick stated that they should consider that area where people turn left onto Main Street. Ms. Hope pointed out that they are proposing sidewalks, then there would be two lots without sidewalks, then sidewalks again. She explained that Town Engineer Dan Pennington's sidewalk matrix has a different way of elevating certain areas, but she envisions that the priority to close the gap would be high. Mr. Turner asked whether the applicant would be willing to fill the sidewalk connection themselves. Ms. Hope stated that they could look into it and discuss further with Mr. Pennington.

Ken Slater, Town Attorney, explained CGS Section 8-30g, noting that, under this act, it is the Commission's responsibility to show that there is some public health and safety reason that outweighs the need for affordable housing. The plans do not have to comply with local zoning regulations. There needs to be tangible evidence that the added units would cause an adverse impact that will outweigh the need for affordable housing. He agreed to provide specific advice as all the comments and reports come in from town professionals.

Mr. Zlotnick asked if the TPZ could put in a condition to have 12% of the units be affordable in perpetuity. Mr. Slater replied no, because the statute lists the timeframe at 40 years. Mr. Zlotnick stated that the goal is to have communities reach a minimum of 10% affordable housing stock. He asked if they could increase the 30% minimum to something higher locally. Mr. Slater stated that no sane developer would apply under that regulation when they could just apply under 8-30g. If the Town seeks to encourage developers, then he suggested encouraging something less than 30%.

Mr. Zanolungo asked if a Commission has ever been held responsible for deaths resulting from an affordable housing development. Mr. Slater replied no. Mr. Desmarais believed that extending the sidewalk to Main Street would be a priority, because of safety concerns. He asked for an image to show what the site would look like when construction is done. Ms. Hope stated that there is no image because they wanted to finalize what the building plans. They plan to bring renderings.

Ms. Cahill asked what the developer's experience is in affordable housing and who would be the manager. Mr. Morello stated that he has extensive experience in construction, but has not done

an affordable housing-deemed project. Ms. Hope explained that, in the affordability plan, she has listed Mr. Morello's entity as the reporting authority. Ms. Caltagirone added that the Glastonbury Housing Authority (GHA) is limited by its funding basis, so they cannot just deem the GHA to be the administrator.

Ms. Cahill asked whether the applicant would consider the GHA being the administrator of the program. She also asked the applicant to consider making 12% of the units affordable in perpetuity, and would personally like to see that percentage as high as 30%. She would also like to make the development less dense, in consideration of the neighbors. She believed that the traffic study understated the backed-up traffic. Between the first and second designs, she preferred the first design. She also encouraged the public to bring in their own experts, and asked to incorporate more architectural features to capture the historical nature of the old home. Mrs. Purtill would not like to see the sign on Hopewell Road lit up and believed that it ought to be screened. She asked how emergency vehicles would get in and out of the driveway, since there is only one ingress. Mr. Makuch stated that there is no fire code requirement for a dual entrance. Mr. Silva explained that the reason for that is because the entrance is so close to the road, so the firefighters would be able to fight the fire from Hopewell Road. Mrs. Purtill would like more information.

Mr. Zanolungo asked if there is an opportunity to make this an 8-30g condominium complex with 20 instead of 40 units. Ms. Hope thinks that it is possible, but she has not seen anybody do it because of feasibility. She explained that the reason for so much density is for the developer to break even on cost. Mr. Flores believed that the greater goal here is getting Glastonbury out of this cycle to satisfy its affordability goal, and a larger development with greater density would do just that. Reducing the density is not in the best interest of the town, so he appreciates the large number of units that the applicant is bringing into town.

Mr. Markuszka asked about ADA accessibility. Architect Pat Rose explained that 10% of the units must be accessible Type A units, and all the units have to be Type B so that they could be adaptable in the future, if necessary. Mr. Markuszka asked about EV charging stations. Mr. Morello stated that 10% of the parking must have electric car chargers. A lot of the time, they have a sign with timing on it. He noted that there will be cameras, so if hogging becomes a consistent problem, then they will take care of it.

Mr. Zanolungo asked how the public meeting went last night. Mr. Morello stated that he sent out invites to 40 neighbors and wrote an article in the Citizen with his number on the cover. He explained that it got heated at times, and he was unable to present his slides because the group was reactionary. He is not opposed to holding another meeting. Mr. Zanolungo stated that while he does not have to hold another meeting, it would be good to keep talking to the neighbors, as it would benefit the project in the long-run.

Ms. Hope asked whether to grant the Commission an extension for this application through the end of the year or in increments. Ms. Caltagirone noted that the ASDRC does not meet before November 6, and it would be good for them to review this again before it returns to the TPZ. Mr. Zanolungo asked for an extension until the November 19 meeting. Ms. Hope agreed to provide it.

Motion by: Vice Chair Purtill

Seconded by: Secretary Turner

To keep the public hearing OPEN until the meeting of November 19, 2024.

Result: Motion passed unanimously {6-0-0}.

REGULAR MEETING

- 4. Recommendation to the Town Council (Zoning Authority) regarding a text amendment to the BuildingZone Regulations regarding establishment of a Naubuc School Village District Overlay**
- 5. Recommendation to the Town Council (Zoning Authority) regarding a text amendment to the BuildingZone Regulations regarding the expansion of inclusionary zoning**

Motion by: Vice Chair Purtill

Seconded by: Commissioner Markuszka

To table items 4 and 5 to the meeting of November 6, 2024.

Result: Motion passed unanimously {6-0-0}.

5. CONSENT CALENDAR

- a. Scheduling of Public Hearings for the Regular Meeting of November 6, 2024: **to be determined**

6. Chairman's Report - None

7. Report from Community Development Staff

Ms. Caltagirone explained that next Tuesday, there will be a joint hearing with the Council on the planned area development (PAD) for 17 Wickham Road.

Chairman Zanolungo adjourned the meeting at 11:25 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lilly Torosyan

Lilly Torosyan

Recording Clerk