

**GLASTONBURY TOWN COUNCIL  
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES  
TUESDAY, OCTOBER 22, 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  
Mr. Larry Niland, Majority Leader  
Mr. Kurt P. Cavanaugh, Minority Leader  
Mr. John Cavanna  
Ms. Mary LaChance  
Mr. Jacob McChesney  
Mr. Whit Osgood  
Mr. Corey Turner

**a. Pledge of Allegiance. *Led by Glastonbury Boy Scouts.***

**2. Public Comment.**

Mr. Niland read the written comments received, as listed on the Town website:

***Laura Zeppieri of 8 Tarry Brook Drive.*** She stated her opposition to the proposed building on Griswold Street. She believed that the development would exacerbate the already heavy traffic conditions in the area. She asked that the children at the day care center and Naubuc School be considered, lest their voices go unheard.

***Dave Overstrom of 35 Leigh Gate Road.*** He requested a professional traffic study and safety report for the proposed “Hopewell Crossing” development, which would consider the additional 84 vehicles proposed on the 2.35-acre lot, as well as the traffic impact during the peak times. He also requested a Soil Erosion and Sediment Control Plan and a DEEP Aquifer Protection Area Materials Management Plan before proceeding with the project.

**3. Special Reports.**

**a. Presentation by Connecticut River Conservancy regarding the European Water Chestnut Management in Glastonbury and East Hartford 2024 Season Report.**

Rhea Drozdenko of the Connecticut River Conservancy (CRC) and Awet Tsegai, member of the Town Council of East Hartford, presented on the European Water Chestnut Management at Kenney Cove. Ms. Drozdenko explained that their team has hired four staff members and recruited volunteers to pull the invasive water chestnuts in the cove by hand. She noted that they pulled roughly 82,000 plants in the last season, which is an increase from the prior year. She thanked both Glastonbury and East Hartford for their partnership.

Mr. Cavanna asked if there is a machine to cut the plant on both land and water. Ms. Drozdenko explained that there are various management techniques, including hand-pulling, herbicidal, and mechanical. She noted that while a lot of communities use mechanical management to address their water chestnut problem, the CRC cannot do so because their side of the Connecticut River contains hydrilla, which reproduces via fragmentation.

Mr. Gullotta asked if the Town of Glastonbury assisted the CRC in this effort financially. Mr. Luiz replied yes; \$10,000 was utilized from the Town Manager's budget. Mr. Gullotta suggested budgeting for this item in the next year. He thanked Mr. Tsegai for East Hartford's partnership on this, as well as for bringing it to the Glastonbury Town Council's attention.

**4. Old Business. None.**

**5. New Business.**

**a. Action on a Successor Collective Bargaining Agreement with Local 2946 of Council 4, American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME), AFL-CIO – July 1, 2024 through June 30, 2028.**

Mr. Luiz stated that the union has ratified the agreement, which awaits Council approval. Mr. Osgood commented that the rate increase for salaries is reasonable, but he did not support adding another vacation day to the contract. Mr. McChesney pointed out that the addition of Juneteenth is a floating holiday. Director of Human Resources (HR), Sherri Tanguay, clarified that they swapped the floating holiday with a personal day, and Juneteenth is an addition.

**Motion by:** Mr. Niland

**Seconded by:** Mr. Cavanaugh

*BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby authorizes the Town Manager to sign and approves the funds necessary to implement a four-year Collective Bargaining Agreement between the Town of Glastonbury and Local 3946 of Council 4, AFSCME, AFL-CIO effective July 1, 2024 through June 30, 2028, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated October 18, 2024.*

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

**b. Action on proposed sale of Town-owned land – 280 Western Boulevard (refer to Town Plan and Zoning Commission; set public hearing).**

**Motion by:** Mr. Niland

**Seconded by:** Mr. Cavanaugh

*BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby tables action on the proposed sale of Town-owned land – 280 Western Boulevard.*

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

**6. Consent Calendar. None.**

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

Mr. Luiz presented his report. Mr. McChesney asked if the reason they could not refurbish the current animal shelter was partially related to the conservation area and waste concerns at the facility. Mr. Luiz did not know but agreed to look into it. Mr. Cavanna asked if there is a date set for the barbecue for Public Works. Mr. Luiz stated that he will know tomorrow. Mr. Cavanaugh asked what the hold-up is for the Police App. Mr. Luiz explained that the Town's Human Resources department wanted to ensure that they could have a modified application, which they have received confirmation is possible.

Mr. Cavanaugh asked if the Police App is not as thorough as the Town of Glastonbury in asking questions. Mr. Luiz stated that the Town's questions are different from Police App's questions, so HR sought to tailor the application to include their questions. Mr. Cavanaugh asked why other communities seem to not be as concerned about this as Glastonbury is. Mr. Luiz explained that the HR Director was concerned about whether certain questions that the Police App asks are vetted as scientifically valid. Mr. Cavanaugh asked, when applicants apply, would it be only to the Glastonbury Police Department. Mr. Luiz agreed to find out.

Mr. Cavanaugh noted that, prior to Mr. Luiz's arrival, there was a petition for a crosswalk from Lincoln Road. He asked Mr. Luiz to familiarize himself with that project, to see if the Town could afford to do it. Mr. Luiz agreed to investigate. Mr. Cavanaugh requested that Mr. Luiz ask the Superintendent of Schools that the Council tour the Board of Education's (BOE) current facility, in order to compare with their proposed relocation at 50 Nye Road. Mr. Luiz agreed to ask.

Mr. Osgood expressed shock that the new animal shelter would be costing \$3.5 million. He asked that the Town reevaluate what they are using this facility for and whether or not they are sizing it appropriately. He also stated that they should work out a regional solution. He then asked to find out if the revenue of the daycare facility at Eastbury school covers the cost of the classrooms. Mr. Luiz agreed to ask the BOE.

Mr. Cavanna stated that Glastonbury police officers were sent to drone pilot training. He asked what the drones were for and how many officers were certified in using it. Mr. Luiz agreed to report back. Ms. Wang asked to share the current version of the sidewalk matrix. Mr. Luiz agreed to email it to the Council. Mr. Gullotta asked if all the plate readers they have ordered have been installed, and if so, how many. He also asked whether the State independently decided to start installing plate readers on state roads. Mr. Luiz agreed to research that.

## **8. Committee Reports.**

- a. Chairman's Report. *None.***
- 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 existing telecommunications facility located at 50 (a/k/a 48) Birch Mountain Road.**

**10. Minutes.**

**a. Minutes of October 8, 2024 Regular Meeting.**

**Motion by:** Mr. Niland

**Seconded by:** Mr. Cavanaugh

*BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves the minutes of the October 8, 2024 Regular Meeting.*

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

**11. Appointments and Resignations.**

**a. Resignation of Anthony DiLizia from the Fair Rent Commission (Tenant Member, D-2027).**

**Motion by:** Mr. Niland

**Seconded by:** Mr. Cavanaugh

*BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby accepts with regret the resignation of Anthony DiLizia from the Fair Rent Commission (Tenant Member, D-2027).*

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

**b. Appointment of Manisha Srivastava to the Fair Rent Commission (Landlord Member, D-2027).**

**Motion by:** Mr. Niland

**Seconded by:** Mr. Cavanaugh

*BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves the appointment of Manisha Srivastava to the Fair Rent Commission (Landlord Member, D-2027).*

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

**c. Appointment of Winona Zimmerlin to the Fair Rent Commission (Landlord Member, D-2027).**

**Motion by:** Mr. Niland

**Seconded by:** Mr. Cavanaugh

*BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves the appointment of Winona Zimmerlin to the Fair Rent Commission (Landlord Member, D-2027).*

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

**12. Executive Session.**

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

**Motion by:** Mr. Niland

**Seconded by:** Mr. Cavanna

*BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby enters into Executive Session at 7:43 p.m. for the purpose of:*

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

*Attendees to include Council Members and the Town Manager.*

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

The Council came out of Executive Session at 8:00 p.m. and commenced the public hearings.

## **JOINT PUBLIC HEARING OF THE TOWN COUNCIL AND TOWN PLAN AND ZONING COMMISSION:**

### **NO. 1 PRELIMINARY REVIEW AND POTENTIAL ACTION, PER BUILDING ZONE-REGULATIONS SECTION 4.12.4A PROCEDURES, OF A PROPOSED CHANGE OF ZONE FROM RURAL RESIDENCE ZONE TO PLANNED AREA DEVELOPMENT (PAD) FOR 16 DETACHED RESIDENTIAL DWELLINGS FOR THE ELDERLY ON A NORTHERLY 6-ACRE PORTION OF THE 31.98 ACRE PARCEL – 17 WICKHAM ROAD; APPLICANT – CATHOLIC CEMETERIES ASSOCIATION OF THE ARCHDIOCESE OF HARTFORD, INC.**

Bob Zanolungo and Dennis DesMarais from the Town Plan and Zoning Commission (TPZ) joined the meeting.

Attorney Meghan Hope of Alter & Pearson, LLC represented the applicant. She explained that the proposal is for a change of zone from current Rural Residence to a Planned Area Development (PAD) and the construction of 16 single-family homes on 17 Wickham Road. She noted that the CT Siting Council approved a solar farm for the southerly portion of the area that was previously farmed, but the 6 acres along Hebron Avenue is where they propose for the PAD. She stated that there are a lot of residential uses in the area but quite a few PADs, as well.

Ms. Hope showed conceptual renderings of what the three types of proposed units would look like. She explained that the development would be a 62+ living facility, and the units would run around 2300-2700 square feet. Jon Sczurek, P.E., of Megson, Heagle, and Friend, LLC noted that there would be just over 15% building coverage on the entire 6-acre site, and the lots would be subdivided and sold individually.

Biff Schechinger, landscape architect, stated that 100% of the basin would be native plantings, and about 85% of the trees would be native. Ms. Hope commented that this project has areas that are consistent with the Town's Plan of Conservation and Development (POCD), which is to provide housing for seniors. She then reviewed the town meeting process which is required by the PAD.

Ms. Hope addressed Mr. Gullotta's comments made in the newspaper, which were to see if the applicant could make 2 of the 16 units affordable. She stated that they cannot do that for this type of housing product because it would not be feasible, unless the density were increased. She stated that her client felt that this type of housing product has a public benefit, but if the Council and TPZ do not agree and would require inclusionary zoning, then she would like to know that from the start. Ms. Hope then reviewed what could be developed as of right in a 6-lot subdivision.

Mr. Gullotta opened the floor for public comment.

**Joe Duva of 86 Glen Place.** He expressed no objection to this type of housing, but asked where the transformers would go.

Mr. Sczurek stated that the transformers would be in the same location, but the access would run along their eastern property line.

Mr. Cavanna clarified that the Council did not approve of the solar farm, and he specifically was against it. Mr. Cavanaugh asked if the applicant would be the developer. Ms. Hope replied, no; her applicant is the Church, and they have not informed her yet of the developer. Mr. Cavanaugh asked to clarify why affordable housing would not be feasible in this development. Ms. Hope stated that it would not be financially feasible because each affordable unit cancels out a market rate unit one, and the only way to make the numbers work is by increasing the density significantly.

Mr. Cavanaugh asked what the difference is between the edge of the back of the proposal to the solar farm. Mr. Sczurek replied, about 25 feet of setback. Mr. Cavanaugh asked for the price range of the units. Ms. Hope stated that there is none yet. Mr. Cavanaugh asked if the desire for this type of housing is from people within Glastonbury or outside. Ms. Hope stated that it is for people within Glastonbury who are seeking to downsize but stay within town.

Mr. Niland agreed that there is a need for more elderly housing, but he did not like that this proposal would not include any affordable units, thereby making the Town even more susceptible to Connecticut General Statute Section 8-30g affordable housing applications. He asked to consider adding two market rate units, which would then make it feasible to add two affordable units. Ms. Hope stated that with this type of single-family detached housing, they cannot do that, but she agreed to look into more dense products.

Mr. Osgood believed that there is a public benefit because the proposal provides elderly housing, which is sorely needed, and he did not see how the Council could require affordable units when the Town's regulations do not require it. He supported the concept as presented. Ms. Wang asked if universal design has been considered in the development. Ms. Hope stated that they can incorporate those features into this product. Mr. Zanolungo asked when the current cemetery would be full. John Pinone, Executive Director for the Catholic Cemeteries Association, stated that the existing cemetery would take over 100 years to fill up, and the solar fields would take at least another 100 years.

Ms. LaChance asked if the units have basements. Ms. Hope replied, no. Mr. McChesney commended the 100% native species in the basins, but asked why only 85% natives are proposed for the trees. Mr. Schechinger remarked that there is no requirement for natives, but factoring in all the plant material onsite, the native species are in the mid-90 percentile range. Mr. McChesney asked to see even more native species.

Mr. Turner noted that the development could go up to 11 units per acre with a PAD, but the majority of the developments in the area are around 2 units per acre. He asked if the applicant would consider townhouses instead, which would provide for more density, in order to include affordable units. Ms. Hope stated that they could look into it.

**Tracy Worthington of 499 Bell Street.** She commented that she is a part of the 62+ age group, and would not consider this development at all. She asked to build more places like Fairfield Village, which has smaller units and a more community feel.

Mr. Gullotta closed the public hearing.

Mr. Zanlungo expressed concern that the site would continue to become developed down the line, rather than becoming a cemetery. Mr. Cavanna stated that affordable housing is not the only need they have in town, and he hoped that the elderly in town would like this development. He supported the design. Mr. Osgood agreed with Mr. Cavanna.

Mr. Cavanaugh expressed disappointment that there were only two public comments tonight, as he wanted to hear from more neighbors. He also expressed disappointment in the Catholic Cemeteries Association, which proposed the site as a cemetery then a solar farm and now housing. He agreed with Mr. Zanlungo's question about what the long-term goal is for the site. He questioned the public benefit here, and suggested not proceeding with the proposal. Mr. Niland shared Mr. Zanlungo's concerns. He also believed that the proposed unit sizes are too large for an elderly population looking to downsize, and expressed concern about the lack of affordable housing.

Ms. Wang stated that she is also not convinced about the public benefit to support this proposal as a PAD. She noted that the Town's Age Friendly Community Action Plan and Affordable Housing Plan both include not just a wide array of housing options for the elderly, but also a focus on affordable options. She agreed with Mr. Niland that not including any affordable units would further exacerbate the numbers needed to qualify for a moratorium on 8-30g. She agreed with Ms. Worthington that the units are too large, and based on a quick search on Zillow, would sell for between \$620,000 to \$820,000, which is too expensive. She asked to consider greater density to include some affordable units, as well as incorporation of energy efficiency features.

Ms. LaChance noted that this is how urban sprawl happens. She agreed with Mr. Zanlungo that the endgame here would result in increased density when the solar farms get removed. She stated that she does not see the public benefit here. Mr. DesMarais commented that the units are too large and unaffordable, so he also did not see a public benefit.

Mr. Turner remarked that he is not against a PAD in this area, but would prefer to have some affordable component to the application. To this end, he supported a slightly denser project. He also believed that elderly housing is a public benefit, but agreed with Mr. McChesney and Ms. Wang that universal design and affordability are components of that. He also expressed concerns about increased traffic on Hebron Avenue, and looked forward to the traffic studies on that in the future. He urged the applicant to return with an affordable housing component to the plan.

Mr. McChesney agreed with Ms. Wang that a core component of senior housing is affordable housing options, which this type of development does not offer. If this type of design were to proceed, then he urged the applicant to consider universal design. He stated that he shared the concerns about the public benefit, and urged adding affordable units. Mr. Gullotta stressed the importance of adding affordable units to the project, and asked the applicant to take that feedback seriously.

**NO. 2 ACTION ON PROPOSED APPROPRIATION OF TWO SUPPLEMENTAL AMERICAN RESCUE PLAN ACT GRANTS OF \$450,000 AND \$500,000 TO THE ARPA FUND – 50 NYE ROAD ROOF REPLACEMENT AND IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT.**

Mr. Luiz stated that the Town has the opportunity to accept two ARPA grants to make improvements to the Town property at 50 Nye Road.

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

**Motion by:** Mr. Niland

**Seconded by:** Mr. Cavanaugh

*BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby approves the appropriation of two supplemental American Rescue Plan Act Grants in the amounts of \$450,000 and \$500,000 to the ARPA Fund – Nye Road Roof Replacement and Improvements Project, as described in a report by the Town Manager dated October 18, 2024 and as recommended by the Board of Finance.*

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

### **NO. 3 ACTION ON PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE BUILDING ZONE REGULATIONS REGARDING GROUP CHILD CARE HOMES.**

Ms. Caltagirone explained that this is a minor text amendment to bring the Town to conformance with state regulations. She explained that the code has been updated to provide definitions for a daycare center versus a family daycare home versus a group daycare home; also clarified is the fact that neither a family daycare home nor a group daycare home should be treated differently from a single family home. She noted that the Town Attorney has reviewed this and saw no issues.

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

Mr. Turner stated that he will abstain from this hearing because he has already voted on it in his capacity on the TPZ.

**Motion by:** Mr. Niland

**Seconded by:** Mr. Cavanaugh

*BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby amends Sections 2 and 4 of the Building-Zone Regulations regarding child care homes, as described in a report by the Director of Community Development dated October 18, 2024, and as recommended by the Town Plan and Zoning Commission, with said amendments effective November 19, 2024.*

**Result:** Motion passed {8-0-1}. Mr. Turner abstained.

### **NO. 4 ACTION ON PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE BUILDING ZONE REGULATIONS TO ESTABLISH A NEW CURTISVILLE EXTENDED VILLAGE DISTRICT OVERLAY ZONE.**

Shelley Caltagirone, Director of Community Development, presented an overview of the Curtisville Extended Village District Overlay.

Mr. Gullotta opened the floor for public comment.

**Lesley Mroz of 121 Heywood Drive.** She stated that this designation would provide Town bodies with greater legal authority over architecture and landscaping matters of a development. She urged the Council to support it.



Mr. Osgood asked, if the Council approves this and there are no design guidelines in place, would a decision by the Architectural and Site Design Review Committee (ASDRC) be binding. Ms. Caltagirone explained that the ASDRC's recommendation has the same weight, whether the application is in the village district or not. She clarified that it is the TPZ's decision that would be strengthened, since they have the power to approve or disapprove of an application. Mr. Osgood asked if the state statute requires design standards. Ms. Caltagirone replied yes, and the Town has guidelines that provide a structure for review which is specific to this area.

Mr. Gullotta closed the public hearing. Mr. Turner stated that he will abstain from this hearing because he has already voted on it in his capacity on the TPZ.

Mr. Osgood remarked that he would vote against this and asked that it return to the Council once design guidelines are in place. Mr. Cavanaugh pointed out that there were no design guidelines in place when the Council established the ASDRC. He believed that the process has worked out well and that this would be another avenue to preserve their historic community, particularly in the downtown area. He remarked that there is ample opportunity for an applicant to be told by Town Staff what to expect from the application process.

Mr. Niland commented that because Ms. Caltagirone is comfortable with this, he would support it. Ms. Wang noted that one village district was already approved with design guidelines on the way, and she looks forward to this one. She pointed out that there are a number of design themes in the area that have been helping to guide the ASDRC in their deliberations. Mr. Gullotta expressed excitement that this is going forward.

**Motion by:** Mr. Niland

**Seconded by:** Mr. Cavanaugh

*BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby amends the Building Zone Regulations to create a Curtisville Extended Village District Overlay, as described in a report by the Director of Community Development dated October 18, 2024, and as recommended by the Town Plan and Zoning Commission, with said amendments effective November 19, 2024.*

**Result:** Motion passed {7-1-1}. Mr. Osgood voted against and Mr. Turner abstained.

**Motion by:** Mr. Niland

**Seconded by:** Mr. Cavanaugh

*BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Town Council hereby adjourns the Town Council meeting of October 22, 2024 at 9:26 p.m.*

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

**Respectfully submitted,**

**Lilly Torosyan**

**Lilly Torosyan**  
Recording Clerk

**Thomas Gullotta**  
Chairman