

**THE GLASTONBURY TOWN PLAN AND ZONING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES OF WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 6, 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

Ms. Sharon Purtill, Vice Chair, *Acting Chair*

Mr. Emilio Flores

Mr. Philip Markuszka {participated via Zoom video conferencing}

Ms. Sharon Jagel

Ms. Laura Cahill, Alternate, *seated, Acting Secretary*

Commission Members Absent

Mr. Robert J. Zanolungo, Jr., Chairman

Mr. Andy Zlotnick, Alternate

Mr. Dennis Desmarais, Alternate

Acting Chair Purtill called the meeting to order at 7:01 P.M. She seated Alternate Cahill as a full voting member and appointed her as Secretary.

PUBLIC COMMENT

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

Lesley Mroz of 121 Heywood Drive hoped that the Town Plan and Zoning Commission (TPZ) would favorably recommend the Naubuc School Village District Designation. She noted that, in 2004, the TPZ had rejected a large development application in the Naubuc area on the basis of it being out of harmony with the existing neighborhood, but later applications were not rejected. She asked to give their neighborhood the same legal protections that the TPZ has given to other neighborhoods in town.

Lisa Mendum of 45 Candlewood Road stated that this is a significant evening for residents of North Glastonbury who have waited to have their concerns addressed. She said that their petition has 104 signatories in support of this district overlay.

Jim Markey of 57 Griswold Street expressed support for extending the Naubuc School district designation and having the Architectural and Site Design Review Committee (ASDRC) provide input on design in the area.

Ryan Bower of 47 Griswold Street supported the extension of the Naubuc School district designation.

Inda Watrous of 116 Griswold Street stated that Griswold Street has changed significantly throughout the years. She asked to move this village district designation forward to protect North Glastonbury in the same way that other areas of town are.

Edyta Orzel of 82 Shelley Lane stated that adding more traffic or development to this area is detrimental to her family and their quality of life. She worried about the safety of her daughter who attends Naubuc School.

Heather Hassan of 404 Addison Road stated that Griswold Street used to be a quiet country road, but has become busy and unsafe. She urged approval of the village district overlay for all the reasons mentioned by her neighbors.

Megan Wert of 125 Heywood Drive asked for approval of the village district overlay, which would help locals to enjoy the area without worrying about more traffic or businesses destroying its charm.

PUBLIC HEARING

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

The applicant Kim Crockwell stated that she would like to build a space within her basement for a family member to use. She said that there is no intention, at this time, to have the space be rented out. Mrs. Purtill asked how one would enter the apartment. Mr. Haynes explained that there is a door from the outside that goes down to the stairway, and the bedroom area is purposely kept open for fire safety egress. Mrs. Purtill asked if the mechanicals are for the entire apartment. Ms. Crockwell clarified that it includes the entire first floor. Mrs. Purtill noted that, in the past, access to mechanical equipment was provided from both the primary and accessory unit.

Ms. Caltagirone clarified that the Town Code does not require that the mechanical spaces be separated. Neither she nor Mr. Haynes have had additional experience with an accessory apartment application like this one. Ms. Caltagirone pointed out that, should the apartment ever be rented to someone other than a family member, then a lease could explicitly state that the property owner has access to that space, as needed.

Ms. Cahill asked if, in order to make a second door into the mechanicals, the applicant would need to incur the expense of digging into the foundation. Ms. Crockwell replied yes. Ms. Cahill agreed with Ms. Caltagirone's suggestion, noting that that resolution already exists under the law. Ms. Caltagirone pointed out that their regulations allow for that specifically internal access, if it is desired by the property owner.

There were no comments from the public. The public hearing was closed.

Motion by: Commissioner Cahill

Seconded by: Commissioner Flores

MOVED, that the Town Plan and Zoning Commission approve the application of Kim Crockwell for a Section 6.11 Special Permit for an Accessory Apartment –197 Paxton Way– Rural Residence Zone – in accordance with plans on file with the Office of Community Development, and the following conditions:

1. Adherence to:
 - a. The Health Department memorandum dated October 9, 2024.
 - b. The Police Department memorandum dated October 7, 2024.
 - c. The Engineering Department memorandum dated October 10, 2024.
 - d. The Fire Marshal’s memorandum dated October 2, 2024.
2. 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.
3. Prior to issuance of the building permit, the applicant shall file the motion of approval on the land records and provide proof of such filing to the Office of Community Development.

Discussion: Commissioner Jagel stated that while this apartment has a lot of storage, it meets their requirements, so she sees no reason to deny the application.

Result: Motion passed unanimously {5-0-0}.

REGULAR MEETING

1. Acceptance of the Minutes of the October 15, 2024 Regular Meeting

Motion by: Commissioner Cahill

Seconded by: Commissioner Jagel

Result: Minutes were accepted unanimously {5-0-0}.

2. Recommendation to the Town Council (Zoning Authority) regarding a text amendment to the Building-Zone Regulations regarding establishment of a Naubuc School Village District Overlay

Ms. Caltagirone explained the draft Naubuc School Village District Overlay. She noted that this draft text amendment would exempt single-family and two-family properties from the design review process, which is what was conducted for the Curtisville Village District Overlay. She pointed out that, unlike the other recently adopted village district overlays, this particular area was not voted on by the Town Center Village District (TCVD) subcommittee. Ms. Caltagirone also pointed out that the Town has received a proposal for an affordable housing project in the

area, and they anticipate that a site application will come before the TPZ in the next few months. She pointed out that local zoning regulations cannot be applied to CGS 8-30g applications.

Mrs. Purtill stated that there was no support at the TCVD subcommittee for this village district because village districts in Glastonbury have a focus on businesses, whereas this district is residential. She said that very few non-residential uses are allowed in this area anyway, and those uses would mainly be in the Planned Travel Zone. Most of the comments expressed tonight centered on the heavy traffic on Griswold Street and discontent with the amount of development off Main Street. She had previously asked to look at traffic calming measures to slow down traffic there. She struggled with how to make this a village district when it poses basically no impact.

Mr. Haynes noted that one of the other suggestions brought up was to look at potentially re-zoning the area, to help with traffic calming. Ms. Cahill said that 104 signatories on the petition is significant. Even if this action only affects a couple of buildings, she believed that it is progress, from a holistic perspective, to redevelop Main Street in a way that remedies past mistakes.

Motion by: Commissioner Cahill

Seconded by: Commissioner Jagel

BE IT RESOLVED, the Glastonbury Town Plan & Zoning Commission hereby recommends adoption of the proposed amendment to the Building Zone Regulations to create a Naubuc School Village District Overlay, as described in a report by the Director of Community Development dated October 11, 2024.

Result: Motion passed {4-1-0}. Mrs. Purtill voted against.

3. Recommendation to the Town Council (Zoning Authority) regarding a text amendment to the Building-Zone Regulations regarding the expansion of inclusionary zoning

Ms. Caltagirone said that the Council is planning to expand their existing inclusionary zoning controls. The text changes are minimal but two changes are proposed: the amendment would extend inclusionary zoning requirements to all multi-family developments of two units or more, regardless of their ownership versus rental structure; and to increase the required set aside amount from 10% to 12%.

Mrs. Purtill said that, in 2023, the TPZ made a recommendation to the Council that was not completely incorporated into what the Council finally passed. Ms. Caltagirone pointed out that when the TPZ reviewed the draft text amendment last year for inclusionary zoning, it did apply to rental units and all multi-family units, so the commission did not comment on whether they supported an inclusionary requirement for proposed for-sale units.

Mrs. Purtill said that, 30 years ago, the Town encountered problems with the ownership model, where recipients were asked to be released from the program because they could not sell their properties due to various restrictions. That is why she was against that model and supported a fee

in lieu option. She noted that this proposal is in keeping with what the TPZ had recommended over a year ago to the Council.

Ms. Caltagirone remarked that an affordable housing model for a project with an ownership structure is very difficult to do. Most affordable projects are rental, so there is a concern that it may not be financially feasible and would place the developer in a difficult position. Having a fee in lieu option may be a way to make it more feasible. Ms. Cahill strongly opposed a fee in lieu because she believed that it is a get out of jail free card for developers and does not bump up the funding needed to make a substantive impact.

Commissioner Markuszka asked if they could advocate for a higher set aside percentage. Ms. Caltagirone explained that council members were trying to make an incremental change; if they approach 30%, then developers would find it more lucrative to just submit an 8-30g application instead. Without a housing economic study, she stated that it is hard to set that number. Mr. Markuszka asked what the percentages are in larger towns or cities. Ms. Caltagirone explained that there is a broad range, from 5% to 20%. Mr. Markuszka believed 12% to be a nominal increase from 10%, so he wondered how much of a beneficial change it would be. Mr. Haynes said that this is a work in progress and can be revisited during the regulation rewrite process.

Ms. Cahill favored a much higher percentage than 10% because, otherwise, the Town will be kept in the cycle of not building upon their affordable housing unit number. She stated that if they do not expand the definition of multi-family housing to include ownership and rentals, then the Town's housing denominator will go up again, which would eat at the 65 affordable units in the Nye Road proposal. She favored moving forward rather than continuing on an incremental path, and proposed increasing the required set aside from 10% to 15%.

Commissioner Flores agreed with Ms. Cahill, and supported the increase to 15%. Mr. Markuszka concurred. Ms. Jagel said that 12% may not be as much as what they favor, but because the Council has not gone higher in the past, she does not expect them to now. Ms. Cahill noted that three commissioners support the recommendation to go up to 15%, which would be in perpetuity.

Motion by: Acting Chair Purtill

Seconded by: Commissioner Flores

BE IT RESOLVED, the Glastonbury Town Plan & Zoning Commission hereby recommends adoption of the proposed amendment to the Building Zone Regulations to expand inclusionary zoning controls, as described in a report by the Director of Community Development dated October 11, 2024, as it will further the goals of the Town's Affordable Housing Plan. In addition, a majority of the commissioners present support increasing the required set aside rate for affordable units from 12% to 15%,

Result: Motion passed unanimously {5-0-0}.

4. CONSENT CALENDAR

a. Scheduling of Public Hearings for the Regular Meeting of November 19, 2024:

- i. 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

Motion by: Commissioner Cahill

Seconded by: Commissioner Flores

Result: Consent calendar was accepted unanimously {5-0-0}.

5. Chairman's Report - None

6. Report from Community Development Staff - None

Acting Chair Purtill adjourned the meeting at 8:22 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lilly Torosyan

Lilly Torosyan

Recording Clerk