

PLANNING BOARD

DATE: January 11, 2024

TIME: 6:00 P.M.

PLACE: Large Meeting Room

FOR: Regular Meeting

PRESENT: Brandee Nelson, Chair; Pedro Pachano; Jonathan Hankin; Malcolm Fick
Jeremy Higa

Jackie Kain, Associate Member

Chris Rembold, Assistant Town Manager/Director of Planning and Development

Ms. Nelson called the meeting to order at 6:00 P.M. She read the opening statement. She said the meeting was being recorded. Ms. Nelson also read Section 241-1 of the Town Code.

FORM A PLANS: 453 STOCKBRIDGE ROAD

Mr. Pachano disclosed previous employment dealing with co-housing at the property at 453 Stockbridge Road. He said he is no longer employed nor does he have any financial benefits associated with the property. He said he filed an appearance of conflict of interest form.

David Thorne was present to discuss the Form A plan for his property at 453 Stockbridge Road, The Thornewood Inn. Also present, via Zoom, was Tim Shuipis from Hilltown Land Surveys.

Mr. Shuipis said all of the property lines are being dissolved, then one line will divide the entire property into two parcels of land. Parcel A contains 2.484 acres of land. Parcel B contains 1.500 acres of land.

Mr. Hankin made a motion to endorse the plan, Mr. Fick seconded, all in favor.

MINUTES: DECEMBER 14, 2023

Mr. Hankin made a motion to approve as amended, the minutes of December 14, 2023, Mr. Fick seconded, all in favor.

HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES DISCUSSION:

Mr. Pachano sent out draft language for a proposed Route 7 overlay district bylaw to encourage new housing units and mixed use development for discussion.

Ms. Nelson asked about the general intent of the bylaw. She said she didn't realize the bylaw would be so much mixed use but rather multi-unit housing. She said she thought the focus was on housing.

Mr. Hankin said this is an overlay.

Mr. Rembold asked Mr. Pachano to explain the initial concept.

Mr. Pachano said the bylaw would allow for by-right multi-unit housing. The zone will run from Brookside Road to Maple Avenue. Main Street will be skipped then the zone will run from Belcher Square to the Thornewood Inn. The zone is walkable to social amenities and served by Town infrastructure.

Ms. Nelson said she wants to clarify. She said at the last meeting there was discussion of providing relief for multi-unit housing through a zoning mechanism. She said the proposed text is different.

Mr. Pachano said the general goal is for housing to allowed by-right.

Ms. Nelson said she is not as excited to give a by-right pass to commercial mixed use. She said there needs to be a balance between housing and business. She said the Manville Street project didn't work.

Mr. Hankin said mixed use builds community better than just housing.

Mr. Pachano said the MXD zone already exists and it allows both.

Mr. Fick said the goal was for housing to be allowed by-right. Now the proposal includes commercial uses by-right. He said it has taken a long time to come around to accept there is a housing problem. He said he is not in favor of by-right for commercial uses.

Ms. Nelson said we all need to be on the same page with this proposal. She said she thought the proposal was just residential. She said she didn't think commercial would be part of the discussion. She said we need to look at how this changes the impacted areas. She said SPR is still required.

Mr. Rembold said the use is not allowed by-right in the B-zone unless there is an affordable housing component. He said it is specifically addressed in the zoning.

Ms. Kain said she would like to see an effort to visualize what the zoning would mean. She asked what kind of mixed use would be included. She said she would like to see something to show what the area would look like with infill.

Ms. Nelson asked if Ms. Kain was talking about renderings. She said that would be a big ask to provide. She said we are not near that. Ms. Nelson said she would like to see the zoning map to see what parcels would be available for development.

Mr. Hankin said we can't just look at vacant lots. There are many possible lots that could be redeveloped.

Ms. Nelson said footnote 2 allows by-right multi-unit housing with an affordable housing component. She wondered if expanding footnote 2 would accomplish the goal.

Mr. Pachano said footnote 2 only applies to affordable housing. He said he is proposing any kind of housing.

Ms. Nelson said it has already been approved. She asked, why are we going back.

Mr. Pachano said it was pushed through last year because it was better than nothing.

Ms. Nelson said she didn't think the small percentage of affordable units in a development would be an impediment.

Mr. Pachano said city developers say it is difficult.

Ms. Nelson said she needs to read through all the language.

Mr. Pachano said the special permit requirement is a problem.

Mr. Fick asked if people are building in other places because it is easier.

Ms. Nelson said no one is building anywhere.

Mr. Fisk asked what the bylaw will buy us other than lowering our standards.

Mr. Pachano said this not just a problem in Great Barrington. He said it is everyone's issue that needs to be solved. He said what do we gain by the special permit process. He said look at Searles School, no one is happy about that. He said a lot of time and money was spent on that project. He said the only thing we use by removing the special permit process is the ability to say no.

Mr. Fick said we lose the ability for citizens to have input.

Ms. Nelson said 240-1 allows community input.

Mr. Pachano said anyone interested in building should be familiar with the code. He said the special permit process throws the code out.

Mr. Fick said the special permit is what kept Searles from being torn down. He said he thinks the special permit for Searles worked. He said people are unhappy because nothing has been done.

Mr. Pachano said look at the last project that came through. He said what do we gain or lose through the process.

Ms. Nelson said do we need all of this text to provide housing. She said is there a simpler way without all of this. She suggested making changes to the Table of Use.

Mr. Pachano said B-2 is not just a strip up Route 7.

Ms. Nelson suggested allowing the change by adjusting the Table of Use. She said the overlay seems complicated.

Mr. Rembold suggested discussing if it applies where it should be by-right.

Ms. Nelson said she doesn't disagree philosophically. She said the lack of capacity at the Town level to implement through the code would be a tremendous burden on the Building Department.

Mr. Pachano said the process is a problem.

Ms. Nelson said the land development process relies on an army of volunteers. She said it is not a reasonable ask.

Mr. Pachano said SPR requires developments to adhere to the code.

Mr. Hankin said the proposed overlay would only apply to lots that front on Route 7 in the B-2 zone.

Mr. Rembold said the overlay is not a geographic area like the B-2 zone.

Ms. Kain said she shares Ms. Nelson's concerns about the commercial element.

Ms. Nelson said 15.4 deals with mixed use and live work.

Mr. Pachano said the language comes from the B-3 zoning language.

Mr. Hankin suggested just referring to the underlying language of the zone.

Mr. Fick said there is a lot allowed by-right. He asked what are we liberalizing.

Mr. Pachano said housing by-right.

Ms. Nelson said look at the Table of Use. She said she would like to look at the zoning map and the parcels in the MXD and B-2. She asked if we need an overlay or just a change to Row A 7 of the Table of Use to yes.

Mr. Pachano said the overlay is strictly for the lots that front Route 7.

Ms. Nelson said she wanted to look at the map to see what lots would be impacted.

Mr. Hankin said most of the parcels are at the south end of Town.

Mr. Rembold said parcels at the south end of Town could trip flood plain and water quality protection district regulations. He said if a lot already has a building the building could be built up.

Mr. Pachano said there needs to be clarity about what can be done. He said there can be engineering to deal with the WQPOD.

Ms. Nelson said we should be able to adjust the Table of Use. She asked Mr. Pachano what is to be gained in the B-2. She said she is leaning toward putting a Y in the B-2 and B-2A zones.

Mr. Pachano said the only building in the B-2A zone is the Thornewood Inn.

Mr. Hankin asked if the B-2A zone should be done away with because there is only one house in that zone.

Mr. Pachano said he proposed the language to gain clarity.

Mr. Fick said he thinks what Ms. Nelson is proposing would provide clarity.

Mr. Pachano agreed.

Ms. Nelson said she would like to come to an agreement before the joint meeting with the Select Board at the end of the month.

Mr. Pachano said the underlying zone applies to height and bulk.

Eileen Mooney commented that it is a mistake to assume that any board would always have intelligent concerned members. She said without the special permit process abutters could not go to court to stop a project. She asked if a zoning bylaw could protect the rights of abutters.

Mr. Pachano said the Land Court allows anything to be challenged even by-right uses.

Mr. Fick said he is on the fence. He asked if the discussion could continue at the next meeting. He said he thinks the legislature has passed a law about challenging housing.

Mr. Rembold said yes. He said the Court can require a bond be put up by the appellant to cover the fees.

Mr. Fick asked what special permits have been challenged.

Ms. Nelson said Manville Street was challenged.

Mr. Hankin said the Doyle SPR was challenged.

Mr. Fick said he thought housing would be less likely to have a frivolous law suit.

Ms. Nelson said the Table of Use A Row 7 allows by-right up to 8 units in the B-2 and by special permit with 9 or more and mixed use. She said we should discuss changing from SP to Y.

Mr. Hankin said we should remove the B-2A zone.

Ms. Nelson said we can discuss with the Selectboard.

Mr. Fick said he would rather discuss more at the next meeting before discussing with the Selectboard. He said he would like to go through the process to make sure there are not conflicting notations in the zoning districts.

Ms. Nelson asked Mr. Rembold if anything jumps out at him.

Mr. Rembold said no. He said several years ago there was a recommendation to change the zoning map to make some zones by-right. He said it got changed back. He thought was the ATM of 2017 or 2018.

Ms. Nelson asked that the Table of Uses be reviewed to identify any inconsistencies.

Mr. Pachano suggested collaborative housing as an alternate term for co-housing.

Mr. Rembold said the Board had draft language for shared co-housing/congregate living. He said there were comments from Construct and the CDC. He said he condensed the language as the Board requested. He provided the draft with Mr. Hankin's prior edits. *Draft 1 for PB 1/11/24*

Mr. Pachano asked to clarify "one or two rooms per unit". He asked if it is co-housing if there are 2 rooms per unit.

Mr. Fick said it would still be co-housing if there is no kitchen.

Mr. Rembold said a single kitchen makes co-housing.

The Board discussed a couple of edits:

8.11.1 Take out the word unit replace with development

8.11.3 2 Take out Building Inspector with Planning Board at the time of SPR application

Mr. Rembold asked when the management plan has to be filed and with whom.

Mr. Hankin said it should be filed with the SPR with the Planning Board.

Mr. Pachano said the physical person manager is not as important as the plan.

Mr. Fick suggested some minimum standards for a management plan.

Mr. Pachano said it can be addressed with SPR.

Mr. Fick said if there is a standard.

Mr. Hankin said he thinks each management plan will be different. He suggested letting each management plan be addressed by the applicant.

Ms. Nelson said she doesn't like the section about common bathrooms.

Mr. Pachano asked if everyone agrees there needs to be some privacy.

Ms. Nelson said there could be some provisions for where common bathrooms have to be provided.

Mr. Hankin asked if the kitchen would have to comply with commercial kitchen requirements.

Mr. Pachano said it is not a commercial kitchen. He said he can check with the Board of Health. Ms. Nelson suggested a parking requirement for only one maintenance/employee parking space. She said she doesn't want to over park.

One space per every 3 co-housing units was suggested.

Mr. Fick said he didn't think 1 for 1 parking was too much but there doesn't need to be employee parking or non-resident parking.

Mr. Higa suggested bike parking if it isn't problematic to require.

Mr. Pachano said it wouldn't be a problem.

Mr. Higa said to do it.

Mr. Pachano said if it is optional it won't be put in.

Mr. Fick said he didn't think there should be a specific number.

Mr. Pachano suggested having a cover could be enough. He suggested there would be coverage for the equivalent of 25% of the units.

Mr. Fick said that is establishing a minimum standard.

Mr. Pachano said he has a problem with a laundry requirement.

Mr. Fick suggested one washer and dryer for every ten units.

Mr. Pachano said that doesn't seem like enough.

Mr. Hankin said the question is if it is necessary to require anywhere by special permit when including affordable housing. He said putting up hurdles doesn't make sense.

Mr. Fick said in a residential zone there is a concentration of people who could be protective. He said he is in favor of the idea but he said he would need to consider potential opposition.

Mr. Hankin said he thinks we should go with it.

Mr. Pachano said we can consider how to apply to existing buildings. He said the language doesn't address existing building. He said the majority of projects would be in existing buildings.

Mr. Hankin suggested talking to the Building Inspector to see what type of permit would be required given that the use will be transient. He said we don't want to be in conflict with the Building Code.

Mr. Pachano said he would ask the Building Inspector.

Mr. Higa asked about the downtown area. He asked how a downtown development would meet the outside requirement. He asked how the parking requirement would be met. He asked if there would need to be parking downtown.

Ms. Nelson said she would need to think about it to vet it.

Mr. Fick said we can't think of every issue that could come up. He said we would need the special permit process.

Mr. Pachano said parking relief doesn't require a special permit.

Mr. Fick asked if there is a way to grant parking relief with SPR.

Mr. Pachano said deviations can seek relief from the Planning Board.

Ms. Nelson suggested continuing this discussion to the next meeting,

Mr. Rembold said he found a conflict in the lighting code, 6.4.6 (4). He said the lighting code requires that pole lights be no higher than 15 feet above grade. He said this conflicts with 7.9.5 that allows for 17 feet in height in the front of a building and 25 feet in height elsewhere. He said the Board needs to figure out how to address the conflict.

Mr. Rembold said the Town is considering renovating the Town Hall campus. He said the height of the lights is an issue because so many lights are needed to illuminate the site. He said the Senior Center parking lot was paved this past year. More lighting in the parking lot was needed but it required too many lights so it wasn't done.

Ms. Nelson said the source of the conflict is the bottom of the light source.

Mr. Rembold said maybe 6.4.6 could apply to commercial sites. He said he will work on it. He said he was struck by how beautiful the holiday lights looked this year. He said there was well

focused up lighting on St. James Place that looked really nice. He suggested the Board might consider allowing up lighting on historic buildings.

Ms. Nelson said may a provision could be added to address maintaining historic features. She said we can work on the language.

Mr. Rembold suggested there can be a special standard to address buildings in the Historic District or on the National Register of Historic Buildings. He said there can be language to avoid up lighting in the downtown area.

Mr. Pachano said he didn't think there needs to be a requirement to be registered. He said a minimum foot candle can be required.

Ms. Nelson said there is no question that we want to address the conflict. We can provide some room for historic buildings. She said Housatonic needs to be included.

Mr. Fick said people who want up lighting can apply for a special permit.

Mr. Pachano said he thinks up lighting of buildings would look fantastic. He said there can be limits on foot candles and time lights are on.

MASTER PLAN REVIEW:

Ms. Kain asked to revisit the time line for projects. She said we discussed community meetings. She said the reports from the board/committee meetings need to be submitted. She said she will send out the outline document for the reports. She asked when the reports need to be in.

Ms. Nelson said there has been a verbal report at previous meetings that are in the minutes from those meetings.

Ms. Kain asked Ms. Nelson if she attended the meetings for the Agricultural Commission, Selectboard and Park and Rec.

Ms. Nelson said yes.

Mr. Rembold said he hadn't gotten through his list yet.

Ms. Kain she was getting through an anecdotal statement from the Planning Board and the Cultural Council. She said the Cultural Council didn't know they had any responsibility. Ms. Kain said it is nice to have the story behind the conversation. She said the more information

provided to her the better. She said she would like to capture as much information as possible to put together a couple of graphs.

Mr. Hankin said he hadn't met with the Council on Aging. He said he would continue to try. Mr. Fick said he plans to attend a Historic Commission meeting soon. He said he had met with the Historic District Commission.

Mr. Pachano said he planned to meet with the Conservation Commission in January. He said he planned to meet directly with Shep Evans who is the agent of the Conservation Commission.

Ms. Kain said it would be great to flag any major concerns of each committee. She said priorities for each group can be part of our purview. She asked do we amend the Master Plan or not. She said your notes will feed community conversation. She asked when there will be community conversation.

Ms. Nelson said those meetings are way out there. She said the goal is to have a rough outline for the Town Report and Annual Town Meeting. She said maybe a report can be ready by March. She said we have to focus on the interim deliverable.

Ms. Kain asked the Board members to provide notes to her by February 5.

Ms. Nelson said reports need to be done by mid February.

TOWN PLANNER'S REPORT:

Mr. Rembold said he didn't have a report.

BOARD & COMMITTEE ISSUES & CONCERNS:

Mr. Fick asked why the Planning Board hadn't see any plans for a change of use for Berkshire Money Management on Stockbridge Road.

Mr. Hankin said it is a by right commercial use.

Mr. Fick said it went from a boxing studio to an office. He asked who decides if SPR is required.

Mr. Rembold said the Building Inspector would decide.

Mr. Pachano said he attended the Tree Committee meeting in December. He said the Tree Committee wants to change the language for the Route 7 landscaping. He said they want language to require replacement of trees that die.

CITIZEN'S SPEAK TIME:

Claudia Shapiro read a statement regarding the airport. The statement was provided to the Board and Ms. Shaw. The statement is attached to these minutes.

Having concluded its business, Ms. Nelson adjourned without objection at 8:25 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Kimberly L. Shaw

Kimberly L. Shaw
Planning Board Secretary



K. Shaw

Provided to Board
1/11/24

Elementary

1 message

Claudia Trucks <claudiatrucks@gmail.com>
To: letters@thebershireedge.com

Fri, Oct 20, 2023 at 11:38 AM

The 8 Town Regional School merger agreement is just a draft. Despite, the majority of the 8 Town Regional District School Planning Board agreed to this draft. Now voters are being asked to approve this draft that is to be determined after their approval leaving for an open book.

We do not need an 8 Town Regional School merger or a KGBR, Koladza Great Barrington Regional Airport and Flight School that requires the region abutting the Town of Great Barrington's approval.

This is one piece of a comprehensive plan that includes the Berkshire Regional Planning Commission Regional Transportation Plan final Draft, also approved, effective October 1, 2023.

The Berkshire Regional Planning Commission hosts 1Berkshire formed in 2010, and Berkshire Funding Focus, established to support Berkshire County entities seeking federal and state funds. The initiative is focused on 4 key audience groups, non-profits, municipalities, school districts and small businesses.

Between 1Berkshire listed in the 2013 Great Barrington Master Plan as an organization to work with, now incorporated into Great Barrington Town government as Doing Business, the 2007 Great Barrington Economic Development Review Team, the creation of the 2019 Great Barrington Economic Development Review Committee coupled by the permitting of a GBR, Great Barrington Regional Airport Sunday April 9, 2023 documented in the Plaintiff's Land Court case, by a Select Board, one can only wonder who, and how many members of the region are involved, their role, and lack of transparency.

Claudia Shapiro

Adams, and Walter J. Koladza Airport in Great Barrington. The municipalities that host these airports are continuing to leverage them as a resource for economic development and tourism potential.

Herriman-and-West Airport (KAQW)

This airport straddles the city line between North Adams and Williamstown, and is overseen by the North Adams Airport Commission. It features a single 4,300-foot tarmac runway and parking for several dozen small aircraft. As of 2021, the airport tarmac has a Pavement Condition Index (PCI) of 83 out of 100, which is a good condition. Recommended work from the MassDOT Aeronautics Division includes localized preventative maintenance through FY2025 with anticipated major rehabilitation of the runway between FY25 and 27.

The airport facilities are nearing completion of a renovation project which includes new pilot lounge facilities, facade improvements, and updated parking and circulation. The city is also seeking interested applicants to fill a restaurant space on the airport property. North Adams' Vision 2030 Comprehensive Plan lists the airport as an essential component of its economic development strategy.

The airport itself is set back a quarter-mile south from Route 2 and reached by an access road. The intersection of this access road with Route 2 could be further enhanced to complement the other retail and hospitality businesses in the immediate area. A sidewalk along the south side of Route 2 currently connects to a grocery store and urgent care facility, along with residential side streets, the Greylock Works mill complex, and the Appalachian Trail. A sidewalk on the northern side of Route 2 terminates in grass approximately 250 west of the Access Road intersection. Wayfinding guide signs for travelers going to and from the airport could help complement these nearby facilities. A sidewalk along the airport access road would better integrate the sidewalk and bike lanes along Route 2 and better connect the TOURISTS hotel and trail system across the street. The city should consider extending the northern sidewalk to meet with the

Pittsfield Municipal Airport (KPSF)

Pittsfield's airport is the largest general aviation facility in western Massachusetts between Springfield and Albany. It is situated about 4.5 miles southwest of downtown Pittsfield, and only accessible by local roads. The surrounding land is of low-density residential and warehousing use. Originally built in the 1940s, the airport supports two runways, and there are 9 hangars listed on the airport property, mainly for conventional aircraft storage.

The longer of the two runways (the primary runway) was extended by 1,000 feet in 2013. The primary runway is the only runway eligible for federal Airport Improvement Program (AIP) funding. According to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), the airport was entitled to \$150,000 in apportionment funding through the AIP in FY2022.

The overall PCI score for the Pittsfield airport's tarmac is 72 out of 100, which is a generally good condition. Taxiways are generally in poor condition and the MassDOT Aeronautics Division recommends major rehabilitation of the taxiway tarmac through FY2027.

Walter J. Koladza Airport (KGBR)

Koladza Airport is based in Great Barrington, and is privately owned by Berkshire Aviation Holdings, Inc. Its facilities consist of one 2,500-foot asphalt runway, along with maintenance hangars and an administrative building. The airport has been in operation for nearly 90 years. The current PCI rating from 2021 lists the runway tarmac at 31 out of 100, which is a generally poor condition. The work plan recommended by inspectors with the MassDOT Aeronautics Division would reconstruct the main runway tarmac.

The airport contributes to region's economy by providing aircraft service, sales, flight instruction, along with recreational and charter flights.

At the time of writing, the town of Great Barrington is undergoing a special permit review for the

airport's continued operation and construction of an additional hangar, with conditions currently being considered that would provide for enhanced soil and water quality monitoring, flight school operations hours and general airport operations hours, among other things.

The airport is based about two miles southwest of the Great Barrington downtown business district, and is accessible via Egremont Plain Road. There are no other commercial, retail, or hospitality-based businesses in the immediate area surrounding the airport, and the abutting land is zoned residential.

RECOMMENDED PROJECTS:

- + Pittsfield: Reconstruction of Hubbard Avenue rail overpass. Estimated cost: \$16.20 million



January 8, 2024 citizen speak time Claudia Shapiro 78 Egremont Plain Road for the Record,

I am adding to my concerns voiced at the December 12, 2023 Selectboard meeting the Town of Great Barrington has no secondary water source despite the Fire Districts 21 year ongoing search. I am concerned of a Town claim to the EPA and DEP its drinking water source is the Housatonic Water Works and not the upperwell head public recharge area of the Towns sole source aquifer encompassing my property, the airport property and entire neighborhood upstream of the infiltration gallery located on Hurlburt Road to enable industrialization of this critically sensitive area for airport industrial park/expansion/waste facility from R-4 Residential District to Industrial that would also be voted on at the upcoming 2024 Annual Town meeting enabling that by right hazardous waste combustion facility.

I asked the Planning Board December 12, to please not consider airport zone change from what it has always been, R-4 Residential to Industrial and I am asking the Selectboard not to approve a Planning Board recommendation of a zone change for the aforementioned reasons. I am concerned the Koladza Great Barrington Regional, KGBR permitted in April cannot legally be in a residential zone.

There has been no discussion regarding the village of Housatonic's drinking water Haloacetic Acid concerns? I am concerned there will be no Housatonic Water Works resolution publicized anyway until the ongoing strategic airport planning is secured after the upcoming Annual Town Meeting.

The March 21, 2020 airport special permit applications submitted by Jim Scalise S-K Design Group is in compliance for such a facility with the numerous M.G. L. and CMR site specific to my 78 Egremont Plain Road property. The applications abutters list from the Assessors office dated March 6, 2020 states "the abutters to the subject property is correct according to the latest records of this office," has my name on 78 Egremont Plain Road. Yet despite my pleadings since, Town officials and parties involved have refused to acknowledge, accept, or honor 78 as mine during the April airport permitting.

The last page 167 of the Berkshire Regional Planning Commission Regional Transportation Plan final Draft effective October 1, 2023 Appendix 7, is just a picture of a train and railroad tracks. Great Barrington did not and is not supporting Lee to stop the Upland Disposal Facility, as we should, but rails for rail and I am concerned as to the North Plain Road site with railroad tracks that has been in airport special permit applications The PCB's need to be transported out of State at GE's expense and not used as a tool to generate revenue, and winning approval.

I am giving you each, and the Town Manager a copy of the letter I sent the Berkshire Edge regarding the 8 Town School merger David Scribner would not to print and am adding my concerns the October 28, Special Town meeting voter approval of the draft merger finalized will include the Flight School permitted in April?

A copy of my statement read for the record at the Planning Board December 14, meeting.

And I am giving you page 81 and 82 from the Berkshire Regional Transportation plan and "the Municipalities that host these airports," coming around full circle for me to the 2008 legally binding contract between Berkshire Aviation Enterprises, Great Barrington, Massachusetts Aeronautics Division, and the FAA, a crux of my struggle.

Claudia Shapiro



BP

1 message

Claudia Trucks <claudiatrucks@gmail.com>

Thu, Dec 28, 2023 at 2:22 PM

~~Draft~~

Claudia Shapiro 78 E.P. R. for the Record

At the March 24, 2022 Planning Board meeting I stated for the record I owned, maintained, and controlled the end of runway. The Planning Board minutes say I stated my property begins 20 feet from the end of the runway.

At the December 7, joint Selectboard Board of Health meeting a citizen said Padro Pachano at two separate Planning Board meetings said hazardous waste facilities are by right in Industrial zones. I said M.G.L. Chapter 40A Section 9 Special Permits states a town or city cannot deny a developers special permit application for a hazardous waste facility in a public recharge area zoned Industrial unless a zoning bylaw prohibition prevented such. Unfortunately in 2010 the Town of Great Barrington zoning bylaw added provisions for a hazardous waste combustion facility to the Water Quality Protection Overlay District. That my property, airport property and the entire neighborhood upstream of the infiltration gallery located on Hurlburt Road are in the upperwell head public recharge of the Towns sole source aquifer. I elaborated at the December 12, Selectboard meeting that my property is in state and federal compliance with including but not limited too the 2010 bylaw provisions for a hazardous waste combustion facility in the Water Quality Protection Overlay District. Unfortunately this enables the skirting of the Hazardous Waste difficult public permitting process.

Mr. Rembold, Mr. Fick, and Mr. Pachano represent the Berkshire Economic Development Strategy and the Berkshire Regional Planning Commission Regional Transportation Plan final draft effective October 1, 2023 states at the time of the writing the Town of Great Barrington was reviewing a Koladza Great Barrington Regional Airport special permit with a recommendation of 3.2 million dollar runway rehabilitation, and the abutting land as residential.

Please do not consider changing the airport property from what it is has always been, R-4 Residential to Industrial for the aforementioned reasons.

I am giving you each a copy of my December 12, Selectboard citizen speak, a picture of my end of runway, and 40A Section 9 hazardous waste.

Claudia Shapiro