

**THE GLASTONBURY TOWN PLAN AND ZONING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES OF TUESDAY, APRIL 21, 2026**

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 via 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, Chair
Ms. Sharon Jagel, Vice Chair
Ms. Laura Cahill, Secretary
Mr. Philip Markuszka
Mr. Dennis Desmarais, Alternate, *seated*
Ms. Pamela Lucas, Alternate, *seated*
Ms. Kadji Anderson, Alternate

Commission Members Absent

Mr. Emilio Flores
Mr. Andy Zlotnick

Chairman Zanolungo called the meeting to order at 7:04 P.M. He seated Mr. Dennis Desmarais and Ms. Pamela Lucas as full voting members.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Informal session for the purpose of hearing from citizens on Regular Meeting agenda or non-agenda items - NONE

PUBLIC HEARINGS

- 1. Application of Peter J. & Kathleen P. Pfeffer for a Section 12 Special Permit with Design Review – tourist home – 127 Neipsic Road - Residence AA Zone CONTINUED**
- 2. Application of North American Builders, LLC for a 4-lot subdivision & Section 6.8 Rear Lot Special Permit for 3 rear lots – construction of 4 single family homes – 575 Neipsic Road – Rural Residence Zone WITHDRAWN**

REGULAR MEETING

- 1. Acceptance of the Minutes of the April 7, 2026 Special Meeting**

Motion by: Secretary Cahill

Seconded by: Vice Chair Jagel

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

2. Application of The Morrissey Family Limited Liability Company for a Section 12.8 Change of Use and a Section 12.9 Minor Change to allow a change of use from daycare to office, together with minor façade improvements – 586 New London Turnpike – Planned Commerce Zone

Attorney Meghan Hope of Alter, Pearson & Hope, presented the application on behalf of the Morrissey family, owners of 586 New London Turnpike, requesting a Section 12.8 Change of Use and a Section 12.9 Minor Change to the existing special permit to convert the former daycare building to office use for J. Morrissey Recruiting and Staffing. She stated that the applicant intends to relocate from Windsor to Glastonbury and is seeking approval in order to complete renovations and occupy the building by August 1.

Ms. Hope described the site as approximately 1.24 acres located along New London Turnpike between the Route 17 overpasses, noting its separation from the roadway due to a wide State-owned right-of-way and existing access easement. She stated that the existing building, constructed in the 1980s and previously used as a daycare, has remained largely unchanged since its original approval, with prior TPZ approvals in 1984 for a Special Permit with Design Review, and minor modifications in 1999 for additional parking and foundation plantings.

Ms. Hope explained that the proposal involves interior renovations to convert the building to office use, with reception, workstation, office, conference, and support spaces on the first floor and storage in the basement. She noted that the existing parking layout of 17 spaces is being maintained and is sufficient for the proposed use under zoning requirements, with no changes proposed to site circulation.

Ms. Hope stated that exterior modifications were developed in response to ASDRC comments, including replacing proposed doghouse dormers with a gable dormer with attic window, adding divided light windows for a more traditional appearance, enhancing the front entry gable, and relocating and lowering the building sign with proposed lighting. She noted additional revisions including corbels at the upper façade projection, updated trim and siding treatment, and a simplified material palette consisting of horizontal vinyl siding, PVC trim, and coordinated roof and accent finishes.

She added that remaining elevations are not materially changing in form but will receive new siding, windows, and roofing, and stated that a foundation planting plan will be submitted at a later date once surveying and design work can be completed.

Gary Haynes stated that following the ASDRC meeting he added notes to the final committee report, which is referenced in the draft motion. He presented the ASDRC report and summarized the recommendations as follows:

1. Adjust the gable ends to use horizontal siding and add a trim piece to accept the corbels.
2. Widen the proposed new gable by one foot on either side of the existing windows and add a frieze board and corbels to mimic the design of the existing gable end.
3. Eliminate J-channels in the siding to provide “stealth reveals”.

4. Applicant will return to ASDRC for review of a revised landscaping plan by no later than Spring 2027.
5. Remove metal railing unnecessary for ADA requirements along front walk.

Mr. Haynes noted that the report will be included in the department memorandum and referenced in the draft motion.

Mr. Zanolungo asked whether any additional information had been received from the State regarding the planned removal of the Route 17 overpass and whether it would be brought down to grade. Ms. Hope responded that she had consulted with the Town Engineering Department and that State plans indicate the existing ramp and bridge structures will be removed, along with adjacent sidewalks, with some grading work proposed; however, the existing berm is expected to remain, meaning a raised landform will likely remain on-site. She further stated that, based on discussions with Engineering staff, long-term disposition of the right-of-way may involve transfer of property from the State to the Town and potentially to adjacent property owners over time, but that such processes typically occur over several years. She noted that more substantial grading or removal of the remaining berm would likely require additional approvals and was not currently planned.

Mr. Zanolungo asked the Commission if there were additional questions, and noted that the application had previously been reviewed at subcommittee, where no significant issues were noted. He stated he was supportive of the application. No further questions or discussion were raised.

Motion by: Secretary Cahill

Seconded by: Commissioner Desmarais

MOVED, that the Town Plan and Zoning Commission approves the application of The Morrissey Family Limited Liability Company for a Section 12.8 Change of Use and a Section 12.9 Minor Change to allow a change of use from daycare to office, together with minor façade improvements – 586 New London Turnpike – Planned Commerce Zone, per plans on file with the Office of Community Development, and in adherence to the following conditions of approval:

1. ASDRC recommendations from their Committee Report dated April 21, 2026.
2. The Health Department Memorandum dated April 10, 2026.
3. The Police Chief's Memorandum dated 04/10/26.
4. The Fire Marshal's Office Memorandum dated April 13, 2026.
5. The Engineering Department Memorandum dated April 14, 2026.

6. Prior to the issuance of a Building Permit, the applicant shall file the approval letter, TPZ motion of approval, and department memoranda on the land records in the Town Clerk's Office.
7. 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.
8. The applicant will return with revised landscape plan by the Spring of 2027.

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

3. Discussion and possible action to recommend amendment of the Building-Zone Regulations Section 2.52 Tourist Home definition to the Town Council (Zoning Authority)

Ms. Caltagirone stated that, based on prior Commission discussion, staff returned with a proposed revised definition of "Tourist Home" intended to provide greater specificity regarding permanent residency requirements for property owners while allowing flexibility for properties with multiple dwelling units, including multi-unit dwellings, detached existing accessory dwellings, or farm properties with multiple structures. She noted that the proposed definition would be forwarded to the Town Council for consideration and public hearing as a text amendment, as well as to CRCOG for review, if supported.

Mr. Markuszka questioned why the definition was limited to "two or more" individuals and suggested it should instead allow "one or more" occupants. Ms. Caltagirone responded that the draft was intended to remain close to the existing definition to minimize variables but acknowledged that occupancy thresholds could be adjusted, including use of the existing maximum occupancy standard. Ms. Jagel and Mr. Markuszka expressed support for allowing "one or more" occupants, with Mr. Markuszka noting a maximum of six per building or unit as appropriate. Ms. Cahill agreed with this approach.

Ms. Lucas raised a question regarding the "183-day" residency threshold. Ms. Cahill explained that the standard aligns with common tax residency definitions and reflects six months plus a few days, and Ms. Caltagirone added that it approximates half of a 365-day year.

Ms. Cahill raised the issue of whether tourist home approvals should include a one-year permit term similar to prior approvals, noting concerns about grandfathering if the definition changes in the future. Ms. Caltagirone responded that such time limitations are more appropriately addressed through permitting standards rather than within the definition itself, and Mr. Haynes noted that time limits could still be applied as conditions of approval through the special permit process.

Ms. Jagel requested clarification on the requirement that the owner reside on the property or adjacent property, noting concern about limiting eligibility to contiguous parcels versus broader

proximity. Ms. Caltagirone stated that the draft currently reflects a contiguous property requirement but that alternative proximity-based language could be considered if the Commission preferred a different standard. Ms. Jagel stated she preferred a stricter contiguous requirement for enforceability, while noting interest in hearing additional Commission feedback.

Ms. Lucas raised a question regarding the Preli proposal and asked whether the owner's residence was contiguous to the property proposed for overnight accommodations, or whether another parcel between the properties could create a situation where the "contiguous" requirement would not apply.

Mr. Zanolungo responded that, in the Preli proposal, the parcels were generally contiguous and noted that while he would not support situations where properties were located across town, he did not object to allowing tourist homes where the owner resides on an adjacent or directly connected parcel. He confirmed support for maintaining a contiguous property requirement.

Ms. Jagel stated she was not opposed to the concept but wanted to ensure the definition allowed appropriate flexibility for real-world scenarios, including cases where parcels may be separated by a street or minor gap but still functionally adjacent. She referenced prior examples discussed by the Commission and noted that while she generally supported the contiguous approach for now, she was open to further refinement.

Ms. Hope clarified that in the Preli proposal, the subject properties did in fact touch at a point along their boundaries and would therefore qualify as contiguous under the proposed definition, even if not fully adjoining along the entire boundary line. Ms. Caltagirone further clarified that properties across the street could be considered contiguous for purposes of the definition, noting that the street right-of-way is typically discounted when evaluating contiguity. She added that if the Commission preferred, the definition could alternatively be expanded to include a proximity-based standard, though she cautioned that doing so could introduce additional complexity.

Ms. Jagel stated that the intent was to ensure the owner is sufficiently proximate to the property and noted that while she remained comfortable with the definition as drafted, she acknowledged that additional refinement could be considered in the future.

Mr. Zanolungo suggested that attempting to further define proximity beyond contiguity could complicate the definition and stated a preference to retain the current contiguous standard and address unique situations through individual applications if needed.

Mr. Desmarais stated that the proposed definition would have addressed concerns raised in prior approvals and expressed support for the draft as presented.

Ms. Cahill stated that she supported the inclusion of a residency requirement, noting it would help prevent investor-driven short-term rental operations in residential neighborhoods and ensure owner presence. Ms. Lucas and Mr. Markuszka expressed agreement.

Mr. Markuszka raised a question regarding the use of the term “transient” and whether it could create ambiguity in application. Ms. Jagel responded that the term was intended to distinguish temporary occupancy from tenancy under landlord-tenant law and that it appropriately reflected short-term stays such as temporary housing during renovations, concluding that the term did not require further revision at this time.

No further questions or discussion was raised regarding the proposed definition of “Tourist Home.”

Motion by: Secretary Cahill

Seconded by: Commissioner Desmarais

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Town Plan & Zoning Commission hereby recommends to the Town Council an amendment of the Building Zone Regulation Section 2.52 Tourist Home definition to read as follows:

A dwelling used for overnight accommodations for compensation to one or more transient persons up to a maximum of six persons, which is located on a parcel or contiguous property that is occupied by the owner for a minimum of 183 days per calendar year.

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

4. CONSENT CALENDAR – NO ACTION

- a. Scheduling of Public Hearings for the Regular Meeting of May 5, 2026: **to be determined**

5. Chairman’s Report - NONE

6. Report from Community Development Staff – NONE

Chairman Zanolungo adjourned the meeting at 7:45 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jessica Suwala

Jessica Suwala

Recording Clerk