

DIAGNOSTIC REPORT

STOCKBRIDGE ZONING BYLAW



Prepared by Joel Russell, Planning Consultant

October 4, 2019

Diagnostic Report: Stockbridge Zoning Bylaw

October 4, 2019

I. Purpose of this Report

The purpose of this Diagnostic Report is to assist the Town of Stockbridge in reviewing its Zoning Bylaw by identifying key problems that have arisen in using the Bylaw and suggesting options for amending the Bylaw to solve these problems. (Note: as used in this report, the word “Bylaw” refers to both the entire Stockbridge Zoning Bylaw and specific sections of the Bylaw, such as the “Cottage Era Bylaw.”) The observations and recommendations in this analysis are based upon an in-depth review of the Bylaw and related planning documents, as well as stakeholder interview meetings held with a cross-section of residents of Stockbridge between August 12 and August 28 of 2019. Most of these meetings were held in small groups at the Town Hall and some were conducted by telephone. A list of the individuals interviewed is contained in Appendix 1 of this report.

The purpose of these interviews was to provide a full picture of how land use management works in Stockbridge and to highlight issues that would not be readily apparent from reading the documents. The interviews were done in confidence to elicit candid responses, and therefore nothing that was said will be quoted or attributed in this report. Their purpose was to provide context and an understanding of the range of views that residents hold about their Town and its Zoning Bylaw. It is important to note that while all of the opinions expressed in the interviews have been considered, no particular point of view is given any special status, and the recommendations in this report are my own. They are a starting point for discussion and refinement by residents and Town officials. Any proposal for amending the Zoning Bylaw that emerges from this process will only succeed if it is supported by a large majority of residents of the Town and their elected representatives, based upon discussions held in open meetings. The interviews were intended to provide background so that the analysis and recommendations in this report are based on a real world understanding of the views and experiences of Stockbridge residents.

This report is a tool for the Town to use in making its own decisions about its future. Although it contains some specific recommendations, it is intended to frame a discussion process, not to prescribe solutions. My role as a consultant is to provide information, options, and an outside perspective. Only Town residents and their elected representatives can make the important decisions. Some of the content in this report is necessarily technical in nature due to the complexities of zoning and land use law. I have tried to keep the language understandable to a general reader to the extent possible, but there is material that requires some knowledge of Mass. land use laws. It is beyond the scope of this report to provide detailed explanations of that material. However, the public discussion that will follow the release of this report will include opportunities for full explanations and answers to questions that members of the public have about the content of the report.

II. Preliminary Observations

The Town's Select Board appointed the Stockbridge Zoning Review Committee (SZRC) in 2017 to begin the process of reviewing and amending the Zoning Bylaw. In 2018 the Committee recommended retaining a consultant to help guide it through the process of reviewing and recommending amendments. I was retained to work with the Town to accomplish this work in May of 2019. The first step in this process was to hold the interview meetings described above. This Diagnostic Report is the second step. It is intended to provide a framework for public discussion of options for Bylaw amendments. From this public discussion, the SZRC, in cooperation with the Planning Board, will formulate proposed zoning amendments. These amendments will be formally reviewed by the Planning Board, Select Board, and public, for eventual adoption at Town Meeting.

As I met with Stockbridge residents, I was struck by how much people in Stockbridge care about their Town and how much pride they take in its physical beauty, natural assets, rich history, and cultural amenities. I was pleasantly surprised that virtually all of those who agreed to attend an interview meeting did so. The central issue that seems to underlie most land use controversies in Stockbridge relates to attitudes toward change. People love Stockbridge as it is, so there are strong desires among many to see as little change as possible. This sentiment exists in tension with concerns about the affordability of housing, the availability of jobs for local residents, the need to maintain an adequate tax base, the need to protect open space and natural resources, and the need for a more diverse economy. Many fear that change will negatively affect the rural small-town character of the Town, while others see an opportunity for economic improvement and increased vitality if change is managed in the best interests of Town residents. They see positive change as enabling more residents to raise families in Stockbridge, volunteer, and participate meaningfully in Town affairs. The Town now has an opportunity to define what types of development and preservation are most beneficial for the community as a whole, amending local bylaws as needed to bring about the desired future.

Stockbridge has done a great deal of planning over the years, but as in most towns, much of it has not been implemented through zoning and other implementation techniques. Stockbridge's comprehensive plan, adopted in 1996, seems still largely valid as an expression of the Town's goals and objectives. A visioning process completed in 2016 updated some of what was in the comprehensive plan but was also not followed through to implementation. Some residents expressed the desire to see the comprehensive plan updated as a basis for making zoning changes. While this is a good idea in principle, the time that it takes to update an essentially valid plan can have the unintended consequence of further slowing down implementation. It is always a good idea to revisit a plan that is more than 10 years old, but that should not stand in the way of implementing valid recommendations in the plan that have yet to be fulfilled. It is all too common for a master plan to express general goals for a community, but to languish as a set of unfulfilled promises because the task of revising zoning is too complex and politically fraught.

This report aims to help the Town move toward solutions that honor both residents' legitimate desire for desirable development and their equally important desire to keep what is best about Stockbridge intact. It is based on the goals articulated in past planning documents, which have been largely endorsed by the Town's current residents. The Zoning Bylaw is only one tool for

charting the future of the Town, but it is an important one and it has been a focal point for community discussion and conflict, exciting the passions, hopes, and fears of many residents. Town residents largely agree in principle on general goals (“preserve what is best in Stockbridge while allowing change that solves current problems and maintains Town character”), but achieving agreement on the details of implementation often makes this difficult to accomplish.

III. Summary of Key Issues

While Stockbridge residents have a wide variety of concerns, certain issues rose to the forefront in discussions of zoning and land use policy. This Diagnostic Report will not cover all of these issues in detail. Rather, it will highlight several that have stirred the most concern and are most urgent, focusing on a small number of issues for which resolution could be found in a relatively short time. Other issues will be noted but not discussed in detail. The overall goal of this process is to adopt bylaw changes that reconcile apparently conflicting desires for development and preservation.

This section of the report, Summary of Key Issues, identifies seven issues that came up repeatedly in the interviews. Section IV will discuss in more depth three issues that seem ripe for the Town to address through bylaw amendments: the Cottage-Era Estate Bylaw, housing affordability, and downtown Stockbridge. Many of these issues are interrelated and the best solutions will generally be those that address several issues simultaneously. This report touches only lightly on some other matters that may be appropriate for fuller discussion in public forums. It will be up to Town residents and their elected representatives to determine which issues are the ones that deserve the most immediate attention. The first three issues listed below are covered in more detail in Section IV of the report. The other items summarized below may be discussed in public meetings, but they are not analyzed in this report.

1. Cottage Era Estate Bylaw (Section 6.6). This provision of the zoning emerged as a high priority for almost everyone interviewed and was the original impetus for convening the SZRC. It has engendered the most controversy in recent years, primarily because of two specific development proposals that sought to use its provisions. See Section IV (1) for a discussion of this provision and options for revising it.
2. Housing affordability, accessory dwelling units, and use of accessory structures. This is an issue that cuts across the Zoning Bylaw and pervades the entire discussion of Stockbridge’s future as the Town becomes increasingly unaffordable to long-time residents. Restrictive provisions in zoning limit the ability of homeowners to create accessory apartments or operate small businesses in their homes and outbuildings. Creative ways to accommodate these needs without compromising Stockbridge’s cherished historic and residential character can help make housing more affordable and encourage the creation of small business jobs. See Section IV (2) below.
3. Downtown Stockbridge. Restrictions in the zoning have made it difficult for small businesses to locate and succeed in the downtown area. Restrictions in the zoning have also made it difficult to increase the residential population downtown. While there is a shared desire to maintain the charm and character of downtown Stockbridge, there is also

an interest in making it more vibrant and responsive to the needs of local residents. See Section IV (3).

4. Stockbridge Bowl. Shared concerns about water quality in Stockbridge Bowl have led to questions about how effective the zoning is in regulating development that affects this important town resource.
5. Non-profit organizations. Stockbridge's economic base relies heavily on non-profit organizations, which attract visitors and part-time residents and provide employment to Town residents. At the same time, there are significant concerns about the impacts that these organizations have on tax revenues, traffic, housing demand, and the immediate neighbors of these facilities, many of which are located in residential areas. These impacts can be mitigated if the Town institutes a site plan review process to oversee development conducted by these organizations. State law restricts the role that local zoning can play in regulating educational and religious non-profit organizations. However, towns are permitted to institute a limited form of site plan review. The current zoning provides no formal town review other than by building permit.
6. Historic Preservation Bylaw. This is not part of the zoning, but it affects what happens to many buildings in the Town and the viability of their preservation and reuse. While it serves an important purpose in the fulfillment of Town goals, there are concerns that it sometimes works in ways that are counterproductive, encouraging building owners to let their buildings deteriorate rather than go through what some perceive as an onerous process to restore and reuse them.
7. Nonconformity provisions. A very large proportion of lots and buildings in Stockbridge are "nonconforming," meaning that, although they were in compliance with zoning in the past, due to changes in zoning they no longer comply with one or more zoning requirements relating to lot size, setbacks, road frontage, and/or lot coverage. This has made it difficult to fix up and reuse buildings and lots in some cases. On the other hand, there are also concerns that the Zoning Bylaw allows too much discretion to permit enlargement of nonconformities in ways that are not appropriate to a specific location or neighborhood. Due to a peculiar feature of state law, owners of properties that fully comply with zoning sometimes have more difficulty altering or enlarging buildings than do owners of nonconforming properties.

IV. Discussion of Key Issues

1. Cottage Era Estate Bylaw ("Cottage Bylaw")

Section 6.6 of the Stockbridge Zoning Bylaw, entitled "Cottage Era Estate Adaptive Re-Use or Rehabilitation," emerged as the most contentious and urgent part of the Zoning Bylaw discussion. Both the Planning Board and the SZRC felt that this should be the highest priority for revision. This is largely because two specific development proposals that have made use of the Cottage Bylaw (Elm Court and 37 Interlaken) have been

controversial. While there was no agreement on what to do about that Cottage Bylaw, there was a broad consensus that it needs to be changed to produce better results for the Town.

The basic idea of the Cottage Bylaw is sound in principle. The historic “cottages” that the Bylaw seeks to protect are highly valued and are a distinctive part of the Stockbridge’s history, culture, and physical attractiveness. The notion that these historic houses, no longer viable as large private estates, are worth saving, is widely shared. Many people find undesirable the alternative of demolishing the cottages and replacing their beautiful landscapes with suburban subdivisions, although some individuals said that this would be better than allowing what they perceived as excessive amounts of development proposed by developers who want to use the Cottage Bylaw. The owners of these historic properties have understandable desires and expectations that these valuable properties should be able to be reused in ways that are both good for the community and economically viable for the owners. The Cottage Bylaw is an attempt to find a way to preserve the properties while making them economically productive for their owners. This involves a trade-off in which the zoning requirements are made more flexible in order to encourage results that serve several purposes at once: protection of open space, preservation of historic structures, building of needed housing, and the creation of viable businesses that fit into their surroundings and provide tax base and other benefits to the Town.

My analysis of the Cottage Bylaw found that it lacks a number of safeguards to ensure that the best interests of the Town are protected. At the same time, it also lacks sufficient incentives to induce a landowner to use its provisions as written. In other words, it fails on two counts: (1) it does not protect the Town from inappropriate development; and (2) it does not offer a landowner sufficient economic incentive to comply with its provisions. The result has been that each time it has been invoked, it has also been amended (or sought to be amended) at the request of the developer who wanted to use it. Attempts to use and/or modify Section 6.6 have been largely motivated by developers seeking to make a project profitable, rather than by Town officials asserting the needs and desires of Town residents.

In order to succeed, this type of bylaw must strike a workable balance between effective economic incentives to restore and maintain historic buildings and the need to preserve the landscapes within which they are situated. The bylaw should not be a blank check that allows developers to do whatever they want to an historic estate, nor should it be so burdensome as to discourage a developer from trying to build a project that is good for the Town.

The Cottage Bylaw provides a special permit process for planning and developing a qualifying property, with specific required findings that must be made by the Select Board in order to approve a project. It contains some important requirements for protecting the historic buildings and protecting views of the property from adjacent roads. However, it lacks some key parameters that are important to maintaining Town character. These include:

- Density parameters setting an upper limit on the number of residential units or bedrooms permitted.

- Minimum open space protection requirements
- A process for determining which portions of the property should be developed and which portions should be preserved as open space
- A mechanism for ensuring that preserved open space is protected in perpetuity
- Design standards for new development on the property

In addition to these missing parameters, the Cottage Bylaw is limited in some of the options it offers. In particular, the only housing type permitted is single-family. While this may be appropriate for rural subdivisions, it is impossible to use zoning to protect significant amounts of open space if the only permitted housing is single-family housing on large lots. One of the trade-offs that make this approach financially feasible for a developer and attractive for the Town is allowing tight clustering of homes on one part of a property in exchange for protecting large expanses of undeveloped land on other parts of the property. As currently written, the Bylaw will not allow that. There is a whole range of housing types that were historically common, such as duplexes, triplexes, town houses, cottage courts, and other types now known as “missing middle housing types.” These make it possible to cluster housing in the most appropriate locations while preserving significant tracts of land that should not be developed.

The requirement in the current Bylaw that a property must have at least 80 acres limits the number of properties that can make use of this Bylaw. If the Bylaw were rewritten to produce better results, it may be appropriate to apply it to smaller properties where the flexibility afforded could help protect open space, preserve historic structures, and meet the Town’s housing needs. Resistance to applying this Bylaw to smaller properties is based upon the understandable concern that its lack of safeguards would open up more of the Town to out-of-scale or otherwise inappropriate development.

There are various options for revising the Cottage Bylaw to better protect the Town and to provide incentives for appropriate reuse of historic properties. Some of the changes to consider include:

- A formula that caps the allowed number of units based on acreage, physical limitations of the site, road frontage, and impacts on the community.
- A minimum percentage of the property that must be preserved as open space, with density bonuses for exceeding the minimum.
- A requirement that the preserved land be protected in perpetuity by a conservation restriction held by the Town or a land trust.
- Criteria for determining which parts of the site should be preserved and which parts can be developed.
- Allowance of a wider range of housing types to increase housing options, permit closer clustering of homes, and preserve more open space
- A requirement that a specified percentage of residential units in a development be restricted as affordable housing, keeping in mind that such a requirement may only be feasible if residential densities are sufficient to offset the extra cost.
- Designation of specific properties that are eligible for the incentives provided by the Bylaw, including appropriate properties that are smaller than 80 acres.

- Design parameters for the development to ensure that it fits the character of Stockbridge.
- Clear criteria for which buildings must be preserved and which can be demolished, based upon their historic and architectural value and physical condition.
- A site planning process in which a prospective developer meets with the community and the neighbors *before* making a development proposal in order to find out what residents of Stockbridge would like to see built and preserved on a historic property. The practice of developers coming up with a development plan in isolation and then trying to sell it to the Town does not work well in communities with a highly engaged citizenry such as Stockbridge. Developers who work with a community from the beginning are more likely to devise plans that the community supports.

Lenox has a bylaw that serves a purpose similar to the Stockbridge Cottage Bylaw. Section 8.9 of the Lenox Zoning Bylaw, entitled “Estate Preservation Area” uses a similar mechanism, a special permit issued by the Zoning Board of Appeals. Unlike Stockbridge, Lenox actually designates specific properties and buildings that qualify under the Bylaw. This helps ensure that the properties that benefit from the Bylaw are in appropriate locations and have sufficient merit to make the flexibility in the Bylaw appropriate. All of the listed properties have access to Town sewer. The Lenox Bylaw has a minimum property size of 25 acres, which makes it useful to a wider range of properties than does the 80-acre minimum in Stockbridge. The fact that the properties must be specifically designated in the Bylaw prevents its misuse on properties that may not have sufficient historic merit. The Lenox Bylaw also has special provisions and incentives for health clinics, inns, and multi-family housing, all of which can be appropriate reuses of these properties if properly located and designed. The multi-family housing provisions have specific density parameters that are based on road frontage and acreage, with greater incentives offered for the preservation of more significant historic structures. There is also an open space density bonus granted to projects that preserve open space by conservation restriction or conveyance to the Town. While the Lenox Bylaw may or may not be right for Stockbridge, it contains some elements that are worth considering if and when the Town seeks to amend the Stockbridge Cottage Bylaw.

A related approach to the same set of issues is the adoption of an “open space residential design” (OSRD) or “natural resource protection zoning” (NRPZ) bylaw. This approach is not limited to historic properties and can be used on any large property. In simplest terms, it allows flexibility in clustering residential development on a portion of a large property while permanently protecting a significant percentage (usually between 50% and 80%) as open space using a conservation restriction. Typically, it allows a variety of housing types to enable the clustering to be fairly tight so that more land can be preserved. It also includes maximum density parameters and mandates minimum amounts of open space, which may be accompanied by density incentives if more than the minimum open space is protected. A good bylaw of this type will also have criteria and a process for determining which land should be developed and which should be preserved. This is important so that the land protected does not end up being only land that is undevelopable because of steep slopes, wetlands, or inaccessibility. This type of bylaw can be part of a bylaw for the reuse of historic estates or it can stand on its own and be used for properties that are not historic. The OSRD/NRPZ approach can be used for a wider variety of properties than an approach that focuses on preserving historic buildings. However, it is a good idea to consider this approach as

one of many tools available for preserving Town character while allowing development that is sensitive to the needs and traditions of the Town.

2. Housing Affordability, Accessory Dwelling Units, and Home Occupations

The cost of housing in Stockbridge was on the minds of many people who spoke to me in the interview sessions. This is a problem that is not unique to Stockbridge and is found in just about every community that is a highly desirable place to live. It is a regional problem that is caused by market forces that drive prices up due to a shortage of supply, increased demand, and an influx of people from other places who can afford to pay more for housing than most local residents.

Stockbridge did not choose to become a town that is unaffordable to local residents, nor did it choose to become a haven for part-time residents. Rather, its attractiveness, due to its location, scenic beauty, and cultural assets, resulted in demand-driven changes in its real estate market that have, in turn, changed the demographic and social complexion of the Town. This has resulted in some long-term residents moving to nearby towns, such as Lee and Great Barrington, where prices are more affordable.

Stockbridge has managed to stay in compliance with the state's 10% threshold for affordable housing under the Chapter 40B of the Mass. General Laws. However, it could lose that status if more market-rate housing is built without adding to the Town's supply of housing that qualifies for the state's Subsidized Housing Inventory (SHI). In order to do this, the Town can encourage the creation of SHI units by adding incentives for the construction of such housing by non-profit developers, by requiring a percentage of housing in new developments to be restricted as affordable, and/or by allowing requirements for affordable housing to be satisfied by restricting existing housing as affordable. This can be accomplished by allowing a developer who would otherwise be required to build new affordable units to buy existing residential units and place affordable housing restrictions on them. This is generally less expensive than building new units.

As noted above in connection with the Cottage Bylaw, limitations in the zoning on permitted housing types, together with large lot size and road frontage requirements, have exacerbated the affordability problems caused by market demand. While the Town cannot solve the entire problem by itself, there are many things it can do to make things better. Anything the Town does to address this problem must take into consideration the strong desire of Town residents to maintain the basic small-town rural qualities of the Town so that new housing does not diminish the quality of life in Stockbridge. However, there is no inherent conflict between making less expensive housing available and maintaining the Town's character. Indeed, part of the Town's character is the ongoing presence of the people who have lived here for generations and made the Town what it is today. Doing what is necessary to enable people to afford to remain in Stockbridge is one important way to preserve the Town's character.

Restrictive provisions in the zoning limit the ability of homeowners to create accessory apartments in their homes and outbuildings. Zoning also makes it difficult for residents to put underutilized barns, garages, sheds, and other outbuildings to productive use. Creative ways to accommodate these needs without compromising Stockbridge's cherished historic and residential character can

help make housing more affordable and encourage the creation of small business jobs through more flexible regulation of home-based businesses.

Some of the measures the Town may wish to consider to address the affordability issue include:

- Allowing two-family and other low-impact housing types, in addition to single-family houses, especially in and near downtown Stockbridge, to increase the range of housing types and price points in Stockbridge.
- Allowing and encouraging accessory dwelling units (ADUs) in appropriate locations, both within residences and in detached units located in converted barns, outbuildings, and new structures. This creates affordable housing two ways: the main residence becomes more affordable when its owner can rent out an accessory unit and the accessory unit adds a less expensive housing unit to the market.
- Allowing small business uses in accessory structures. Permitting residents to use outbuildings for economically productive activities enables them to derive income, which in turn makes their living situation more affordable.
- Providing increased incentives or requirements for the inclusion of affordable housing in new developments (and developments done using the Cottage Bylaw).
- Providing incentives for ADUs to be restricted as affordable.
- Encouraging existing housing units to be restricted as affordable. (The current Bylaw has a procedure to do this, but its minimum lot size requirements seem unrealistically high.)

3. Downtown Stockbridge

The village center of Stockbridge is the one place in town where there was general agreement that more vibrancy and activity would be desirable, especially if the activity primarily serves the needs of local residents. A group of residents and business owners came to their interview well-prepared with constructive suggestions for zoning reforms in the downtown. The downtown group expressed a desire for zoning that promotes year-round activity in the village, encourages the creation of various types of market rate housing and business opportunities, and modifies parking requirements so that they do not interfere with the accomplishment of these goals. They also emphasized the need to preserve the unique, historic, small-town, New England character of downtown Stockbridge.

Most residents I spoke with agreed that the downtown is attractive and about the right size, and that any change that occurs should respect and maintain its historic character. Those who live and/or do business downtown had ideas about how to improve it without diminishing its charm, and many of their ideas involved zoning. (Concerns were also raised about traffic congestion and traffic safety and these are legitimate concerns, although they are largely outside the purview of zoning.)

Concerns about the zoning in downtown Stockbridge include the following:

- Use restrictions limit housing options, opportunities for small businesses, and the creation of a mixed-use pedestrian-friendly atmosphere. For example, in the Residence Central (R-

- C) district, residential uses are not permitted in the upper floors of a building whose principal use is commercial.
- There is a need for a variety of housing types not currently permitted by the zoning. For example, multi-family dwellings are prohibited in the B zone, the main mixed-use area downtown.
 - Parking requirements make it difficult for businesses to open, expand, and operate. There are many examples of this problem. To encourage downtown redevelopment, many communities have eliminated off-street parking requirements altogether. This idea was suggested by several residents.
 - Lack of mixed use (both within the boundaries of the Business (B) and Residence Central (R-C) districts and within individual buildings) reduces downtown vitality.
 - The definition of fast food establishments is too broad and does not permit traditional takeout operations that are a good fit for Stockbridge.
 - Lot size, lot coverage, and setback requirements in the downtown do not reflect the actual pattern of development and make it difficult to alter or enlarge existing residential, mixed-use, and business properties.
 - Maximum density limits on multi-family residences make it difficult to fit them onto small village lots.
 - It is difficult to repurpose accessory structures for residential or business uses.

Some possible solutions to explore include:

- Allowing a wider variety of uses in the downtown Business (B) and Residence Central (R-C) districts, including multi-family residences and residential uses on upper floors.
- Allowing more variety of residential building types, at higher densities.
- Modifying dimensional requirements to fit the actual character of the downtown.
- Reducing or eliminating off-street parking requirements.
- Revising the definition of “fast food establishment.”

V. **Recommended Next Steps**

The observations and recommendations in this report are intended to help focus discussion on key issues and to lead to specific zoning amendment proposals. Public discussion will provide a forum to correct any errors in this report. This report is the beginning of a process of setting priorities and drafting bylaw amendments designed to resolve the most immediate and solvable problems. It will be up to Town officials to guide the process going forward so that all residents have an opportunity to participate in the discussions and in shaping bylaw amendments.

The Town’s Zoning Review Committee and Planning Board should determine, with public input, which of the issues identified in this report (or other issues not identified) should be the focus of zoning reform. Facilitated discussions of those issues can then lead to concrete suggestions for specific bylaw amendments. The recommendations in this report offer a starting point for discussion. It will be up to the Town leaders to shape a constructive dialogue and decision process. Whichever issues become the focus of the zoning reform effort, it may be appropriate to form

small working groups to help develop bylaw amendments focused on each issue identified as priorities by Town officials.

As an immediate next step, I recommend that the SZRC hold a meeting and invite both the Planning Board and Board of Selectmen (and other interested Town boards) to discuss this report and determine specific next steps, with public input. Some specific follow-ups might include proposing zoning amendments to:

- Revise the cottage bylaw
- Allow more flexible uses for outbuildings, both for residential use (Accessory Dwelling Units) and for small businesses, with appropriate safeguards
- Allow more flexibility for uses in the downtown so that low-impact businesses can locate there
- Allow more flexibility for home occupations
- Make downtown use and dimensional regulations more hospitable to small-scale residential and business uses
- Reduce or eliminate downtown parking requirements
- Implement many other ideas that will emerge from public discussion

VI. Conclusion

This report offers specific suggestions for moving forward with a process, as well as providing substantive suggestions to consider for possible zoning amendments. It will be up to Town leaders and residents to set priorities and determine which issues are addressed. Limitations of time and budget require that the number of issues be small and manageable. By working together to formulate recommendations and review proposed bylaw amendments, the Town can enable its Zoning Bylaw to better serve the interests of the Town as a whole, to “keep Stockbridge Stockbridge” while coming to terms with the challenges of the 21st Century.

Appendix 1: List of interviewees

Henry Kirchdorfer
Rebecca Weinman
Pam Sandler
Teresa O'Brient
Laura Beasley
Rajeev Verma
Judy Abdullah
Margaret Kerswill
Ned Baldwin
Laura Dubester
Barney Edmonds
Patrick White
Stu Hirshfield
Doug Goudey
Tom Schuler
Buck Smith
Terry Flynn
Mark Webber
Jay Bikovsky
Charles Kenny
Clover Swann
Robin Birnhak
Sherry Wolf
Michael Goodman
Eric Tarlow
Mary Boyce
Jorja Marsden
Josh Peyron
Gail Shaw
Lillian Bender
George Manly
Terry Shea
Anita Schwerner
Tim Minkler

Chuck Gillett
Roberto Lauren
Peter Williams
Donna Hassler
Nick Paleologos
Raymond Miyares
Patrick Sheehan
Roxanne McCaffrey
Beth McCormick
Terry Wise
Claire Williams
Holly Rhind
Rosemary and Don Schneyer
Peter and Nancy Socha
Dianne Reuss
Jim Balfanz
Eric Plakun
Gary Johnston

Stockbridge Planning Board
Marie Raftery, Chair
Christine Rasmussen
Kate Fletcher
William Vogt
Gary Pitney
Nancy Socha
Wayne Slosek

Stockbridge Zoning Review
Committee
Kate Fletcher, Chair
Jim Murray
Roxanne McCaffrey
Carl Sprague