

BARRINGTON PLANNING BOARD

Regular Business Meeting Minutes

7:00 PM, Tuesday, March 03, 2026

Auditorium – Barrington Middle School

261 Middle Hwy, Barrington, RI

1. Call to Order.

Chair Roni Phipps called the meeting to order at 7:01 PM.

2. Roll Call & Determination of Quorum

Present: Roni Phipps (Chair), Brian Rua (Vice Chair), Heather Kilmartin, Lawrence Bacher, Douglas Caito, Connor O’Neal (1st Alternate), Lili Hermann (2nd Alternate)

Also Present: Herb Durfee, Town Planner; Genevieve Elliot, Planning/Zoning Assistant; Amy Goins, Assistant Town Solicitor; Tracy Shepherd, Stenographer

3. Consent Agenda:

a. Approve Minutes:

i. February 03, 2026 – Regular Meeting

Chair Phipps asked the Board if they had any comments. No comments were made, Chair Phipps asked for a motion.

MOTION: Member O’Neal seconded by Member Caito, moved to approve the minutes from the February 03, 2026 Regular meeting. Motion carried (7/0).

4. Public Hearing – Continuation from February 03, 2026:

a. Discuss and Act:: Procedure for the process of the Belton Court Comprehensive Permit

Chair Phipps explained that the meeting was a continuation of the February session and reminded attendees that the meeting would follow the Board’s Rules of Civility. She also noted that the Board must review the application in accordance with the Rhode Island Low- and Moderate-Income Housing Act, as the proposal includes 25% low- and moderate-income housing.

Town Planner Durfee outlined the meeting procedure, explaining that the applicant would complete its presentation, followed by questions from the Board, public comment, a response from the applicant, and Board deliberation. However, he noted that public comment would likely not begin that evening due to time constraints. The hearing was expected to continue on April 7, with an additional special meeting in April to be scheduled for further discussion and public comment.

b. Discuss and Act: Continuation of Belton Court Village Comprehensive Permit Preliminary Plan Application located at 33 Middle Highway (former Zion Bible College), AP14, Lots 2, 4, 13, 341, 342, and 343, Senior Residential Village (SRV) District. The applicant seeks Preliminary Plan Approval, including relief from provisions of the Zoning Ordinance and the Land Development & Subdivision Regulations, pursuant to the Comprehensive Permit Process. ShineHarmony Holdings, Inc., applicant and owner, with

business address at 650 Pleasant St., Franklin, MA, 02038, proposes the demolition of the existing Belton Court, storage area, gymnasium, residential building and shed buildings to construct a 344-unit residential development containing 220 multi-family units, 66 townhomes, and 58 detached, single-family homes along with common areas and certain off-site public improvements. Of the 344 units, 25% will be designated affordable according to the state's definition of low/moderate income housing.

Requested adjustments/waivers include the following: allowance for single-family, two-family, and multi-family dwellings; allowance for parking pursuant to RIGL Section 45-53-4(2) including one parking space/dwelling up to two bedrooms in size; reduction of width and length of parallel parking spaces each by one foot; reduction of minimum parking aisle width by four feet at 90 degree points; allowance for curb cuts greater than 25 feet wide; partial demolition of Belton Court; and preserve tower and to only be required to retain monumental landscaping including the existing cedar hedge and portions of the stone wall; allow a density of 12 units/acre of developable land; allowance for land within the State Regulatory setback and including approximately 4.5 acres within the Belton Court Historic Register District as developable land; allowance to permit parking between Belton Court structures and Middle Highway; allowance for a diversity of housing types besides senior housing; allowance for maximum building height to be 75 feet; allowance for any new structure with height above 55 feet to have setbacks calculated as three feet for every foot of additional height above 55 feet; allowance for maximum building lot coverage of 35% and maximum impervious surface coverage of 60% across the entire site; waiver of the requirement for streets to have a centerline curve; and allowance for streets to have less than 25 feet at the edge of the paved surface; and waiver of the requirement to have 300 square feet of open space or recreation are per unit.

Audio and transcript of the full proceedings are available with the application materials in the Planning Building and Resilience Office. Please contact the office to obtain.

Present: Charles Kalocsay, Shineharmony Holdings Inc.

Suane Santos, InSite Engineering

Paul Carlson, InSite Engineering

Bill Landry, Blish & Cavanagh LLP

Ruthzaly Weich, DPZ CoDesign

Paul Bannon, Crossman Engineering

The applicant team from ShineHarmony then continued its presentation. Developer Charles Kalocsay introduced the project planning firm DPZ, which has been working on the project for approximately three years. He explained that Ruthzaly Weich would present the project details because the lead architect, Marina Khoury, was unable to attend due to travel disruptions overseas.

Bill Landry, the applicant's attorney, stated that while most of the presentation would proceed as planned, a portion addressing requested project adjustments was originally intended to be presented by Khoury. That information would instead be provided at a future meeting or through written materials.

Ruthzaly Weich of DPZ continued the applicant's presentation. She introduced herself and stated that she had been with the firm for approximately 20 years. Ms. Weich described her professional background, including service as a planning commissioner and historic district commissioner in Gaithersburg, Maryland, as well as teaching graduate-level planning courses at Andrews University in Southwest Michigan. She then provided an overview of DPZ's planning philosophy and experience.

Ms. Weich explained that DPZ is an urban planning and design firm that has been involved in projects for both public and private sector clients for approximately 40 years. She stated that the firm has been a leader in the development of the SmartCode and the principles of New Urbanism, emphasizing the creation of walkable, economically resilient, and environmentally sustainable communities. She noted that DPZ's work focuses on designing communities that promote social interaction, public health, and long-term value for surrounding neighborhoods.

Ms. Weich reviewed demographic trends and planning considerations relevant to the proposal. She stated that national demographic patterns show an increase in single-person households, a growing aging population, and a demand for walkable neighborhoods with a variety of housing types. She noted that similar trends are present in Barrington, explaining that a majority of local households do not include children under the age of 18. Ms. Weich indicated that these trends suggest a need for smaller housing options and what planners refer to as "missing middle" housing types.

Ms. Weich then described the planning concepts that guided the Belton Court master plan. She stated that the proposal sought to incorporate elements of the historic estate by adaptively reusing portions of the property, including the stables and tower house, and by designing streets that visually terminate at these historic features. She further explained that the plan concentrates higher density toward the center of the property while transitioning to lower density near the edges in order to be sensitive to adjacent neighborhoods.

Ms. Weich explained that the proposal includes a mix of housing types intended to create a range of housing options and distribute density across the site. She noted that density can be achieved in different forms, including townhouses, small multifamily buildings, cottage courts, and other building types. She presented examples from other DPZ-designed communities across the United States to illustrate how similar densities can be achieved through different building forms while maintaining a pedestrian-oriented environment.

Ms. Weich also discussed the role of open space within other DPZ developments. She described that through networks of greens, small parks, and gathering spaces it can serve both residents and the broader community. These spaces could potentially include recreational or social uses such as seating areas, gathering spaces, or small parks. She further stated that stormwater management infrastructure would be integrated into these open spaces and designed as an amenity while exceeding state stormwater management requirements.

Ms. Weich reviewed the proposed street network and circulation plan, noting that the design provides multiple connections and routes through the site rather than relying on a single entrance. She explained that the street layout was designed to encourage slower vehicle speeds and prioritize pedestrians through narrower travel lanes, on-street parking, sidewalks, and landscaping. She referenced national transportation design guidance indicating that narrower lane widths can help calm traffic and improve pedestrian safety.

Ms. Weich also discussed the inclusion of a small neighborhood-scale commercial component intended to serve as a local gathering place for residents and nearby neighborhoods. She stated that the commercial area would be limited in scale and designed to support walkability and social interaction.

Ms. Weich described the architectural approach for the development. She stated that the design would reflect regional architectural character and emphasize buildings that address the street with front doors and pedestrian-friendly facades rather than garage-dominated fronts. She explained that the proposal aims to create a mix of housing types within blocks to support different market segments and encourage a multi-generational community.

Ms. Weich concluded by stating that the Belton Court proposal was intended to align with the goals of the Town's Comprehensive Plan by providing diverse housing options, creating walkable public spaces, preserving some historic elements of the property, and establishing a model for future development in Barrington. She stated that the project could set a new standard for community design within the Town.

Attorney Landry then introduced Paul Bannon to present the traffic impact study for the residential redevelopment project. Attorney Landry requested Mr. Bannon to provide a summary of his professional background, licensure, and experience with similar projects.

Mr. Bannon stated that he was a licensed traffic engineer with 40 years of experience in Rhode Island, working primarily with Crossman Engineering in Warwick. He noted his experience with the Rhode Island Department of Transportation (RIDOT) on roadway improvements and traffic signal projects, as well as his consulting work for the State Traffic Commission and local municipalities. He explained that his firm had conducted the traffic impact study for the subject residential redevelopment, including site reviews, traffic counts, intersection turning movement studies, land use inventories, accident data review, and trip generation analysis based on Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) standards.

Mr. Bannon described the project site as and gave a brief history of the property. He provided an overview of the roadway infrastructure, noting Middle Highway as a state-maintained roadway classified as an urban major collector north of County Road and a minor arterial to the south, with varying lane widths, shoulders, and sidewalks. Primrose Hill Road was described as a half-mile major collector with limited sidewalks and low to moderate traffic volumes. Mr. Bannon detailed traffic volumes collected during peak and off-peak periods, including morning and afternoon peak traffic counts, and noted that site access would include three driveways with safe sight distances and adequate intersection geometry.

Mr. Bannon reviewed the traffic analysis methodology, including trip generation, peak-hour assessment, and level of service (LOS) calculations using national and international standards. He concluded that both existing and projected traffic conditions would operate at acceptable levels, with minimal delays, and that the site driveways would operate at LOS B. He stated that the study included recommendations for pedestrian safety improvements, including upgrading missing sidewalks, and acknowledged that the project would require RIDOT review and coordination with the town.

Attorney Landry asked several clarifying questions:

- Mr. Bannon confirmed that the trip generation and highway capacity methodologies were standard, nationally recognized practices.
- He explained the focus on morning and afternoon peak hours as representative of the worst-case conditions for traffic operations.
- Mr. Bannon confirmed his residence in Barrington and familiarity with the local roadway network.
- He concurred with the town's Complete Streets recommendation for a sidewalk along Primrose Hill Road.
- Mr. Bannon indicated that intersection improvements, including crosswalks and curbing, would be implemented at the northern leg of Middle Highway at Primrose Hill Road.
- He addressed pedestrian use of County Road by schoolchildren, noting ongoing town and state efforts to complete missing sidewalks.
- Mr. Bannon clarified the no-build and build condition analyses, including LOS comparisons and trip distribution assumptions, and addressed peer review comments from Fuss & O'Neill, confirming he would provide backup data on driveway trip allocations.
- He confirmed that the nonresidential component of the project would generate minimal traffic, intended primarily as a local amenity, and that potential census data discrepancies would not affect the traffic study conclusions.
- Attorney Landry concluded by confirming that Mr. Bannon's opinions were provided within a reasonable degree of certainty in the field of traffic engineering. Mr. Bannon affirmed this.

Attorney Landry stated that the applicant had concluded the presentations for the evening from the two witnesses available to testify. He noted that the applicant had intended for Marina Khoury to address proposed project adjustments; however, she was unavailable to attend that evening. Attorney Landry stated that the applicant intended to present additional information at a future meeting and respond to questions from the Planning Board.

Attorney Landry further explained that the staff report included several recommendations for additional information. He noted that some items were recommended to be submitted prior to the Final Plan stage, while others—such as additional fiscal impact information—could be requested during the current Preliminary Plan review. He stated that the applicant was prepared to discuss the fiscal impact issue and respond to technical comments raised in the peer review by Fuss & O'Neill and during the Technical Review Committee meeting.

Attorney Landry indicated that the applicant had no objection to providing an updated site plan prior to the conclusion of the Preliminary Plan stage. The updated submission would include a modified plan and a written summary identifying changes made in response to staff comments, peer review recommendations, and feedback from the Planning Board and public. He emphasized that the applicant intended to consider comments received during the review process and work toward plan modifications that addressed the concerns raised.

Chair Phipps confirmed that while the applicant had concluded its presentation for the evening, the Board would proceed with questions. She stated that the applicant would have opportunities to respond to Planning Board questions and to public comments at future meetings.

Chair Phipps then introduced the members of the Planning Board and provided context regarding their experience and ties to the Town of Barrington. She noted that the Board members collectively represented more than 200 years of residency in the community. Many members had grown up in Barrington or had raised families there, with children attending Barrington Public Schools. She further stated that several members had previously served on other municipal boards and committees, including the Zoning Board, the Housing Board of Trustees, and the School Committee, and that the Board collectively had more than 30 years of volunteer service to the Town.

Chair Phipps stated that the Board members had invested significant time reviewing the Belton Court proposal and were committed to ensuring a thorough and fair review process. She then outlined the procedure for the remainder of the meeting. Planning Board members would begin by asking clarifying questions of the applicant in order to better understand the proposal. The Board would not deliberate during that portion of the meeting. Following the Board's questions, the meeting would be opened for public comment, during which members of the public would have the opportunity to provide comments, ask questions, and share opinions. After public comment and responses from the applicant, the Planning Board would later deliberate on the proposal at a future stage of the review process.

Chair Phipps stated that the questioning would proceed sequentially, with each Planning Board member asking questions in turn. If additional follow-up questions arose from other members during that process, those questions would be addressed before continuing to the next member.

Chair Phipps then invited Planning Board members to begin their questions.

Member Rua raised concerns about pedestrian safety related to the project's "car-light" concept. He noted that parts of Middle Highway lack sidewalks, particularly between the proposed connection point and Sherwood Lane, and that residents—including students walking or biking to Primrose Hill School—might use that route. Mr. Bannon explained that improvements along Middle Highway would require a Physical Alteration Permit from the state because it is a state-maintained road. He said the applicant would work with the Town and the state to determine where sidewalk connections should be installed.

Member Kilmartin thanked residents who had submitted written comments and asked whether the applicant would provide a revised site plan as the review continues. The applicant confirmed that updated plans responding to feedback would be submitted.

Member Kilmartin also asked Planner Durfee about the status of additional reviews. Planner Durfee explained that Fuss & O'Neill would continue peer review of the project and coordinate with the Fire Department regarding access issues. He also noted that the staff report recommended requesting additional fiscal impact information from the applicant and that the Town intended to hire a separate consultant to peer review that analysis.

Member Kilmartin expressed support for requesting the fiscal impact analysis, stating that current

estimates were speculative because the final housing mix and unit sizes were not yet confirmed. She said more detailed information would help the Board better understand potential impacts on municipal services.

Chair Phipps asked whether the applicant would provide the analysis. Attorney Landry confirmed they would prepare an updated fiscal impact study. He explained that the applicant had previously prepared one in 2023 but that it no longer reflected the current proposal. Attorney Landry acknowledged that fiscal impact is not a legal criterion for approving or denying a comprehensive permit but agreed it could help the Town understand long-term effects. He said the updated analysis would be prepared by a professional and submitted within approximately 30 days, noting that the project would likely be built over a 10–12 year period rather than all at once.

Member Kilmartin raised concerns about the scope of the project’s traffic impact analysis. She asked whether the study could be expanded to evaluate broader traffic conditions, particularly the traffic flow and U-turn areas along Wampanoag Trail (RI-114) near the RI-103/RI-114 interchange. Member Kilmartin noted that she drives through that area daily and considers the merges and U-turn movements dangerous given the traffic volume. She said she would like analysis beyond the two intersections already studied—County Road and Middle Highway and Primrose Hill Road and Middle Highway—to provide a more complete picture of potential traffic impacts.

Mr. Bannon responded that he had reviewed traffic conditions in the broader area and did not believe expanding the operational analysis would change the conclusions about level of service. He acknowledged that the U-turn and merging conditions along Wampanoag Trail (RI-114) can be problematic but said those issues are part of a larger regional traffic pattern rather than being caused by the proposed development. He suggested that improvements—such as better intersection design or signage—would ultimately need to be addressed by the state and could be requested by the Town. Mr. Bannon added that the most challenging local movement is vehicles entering the trail from County Road, where crash patterns and turning movements already present difficulties.

Member Kilmartin said she believed the community wanted a broader understanding of traffic impacts and indicated she would later raise additional questions related to traffic along Middle Highway, especially considering possible traffic pattern changes near Primrose Hill School.

Member Kilmartin then shifted to a question about the completeness of the record related to public safety review. She referenced a memo summarizing a February 11 public safety meeting but said the Fire Chief’s written comments mentioned in that memo were not clearly included in the Board’s packet.

Planner Durfee explained that the Fire Chief’s concerns were summarized in a bullet-point list that was included in the staff recommendations and that discussions were ongoing with the applicant and the Town’s peer review engineer. He said the primary issues currently being evaluated include:

- Adequacy of domestic water supply and fire flow capacity for the development
- Emergency vehicle access and maneuverability within the site
- Space for fire trucks and ladder vehicles, including stabilizer clearance when parked near buildings

- Potential design adjustments, such as slightly separating two central buildings to improve emergency access
- Possible additional emergency access from Middle Highway at the northern edge of the site
- Use of reinforced paths or paved areas that could support the weight of emergency vehicles without building additional full roadways

Member Bacher said that while the discussion was helpful, the Board needed clearer documentation in the official record. He stated that the Fire Department’s feedback should be provided in writing—ideally as a marked-up site plan showing requested changes—so the Board could properly review and discuss potential modifications with the applicant.

Planner Durfee agreed that more formal documentation was needed and said the Town was working to compile it as quickly as possible. He also explained that some issues, such as detailed fire flow and building water demand, are typically finalized later in the process when building design details are available and reviewed during the building permit stage to ensure compliance with NFPA fire safety requirements.

Member Kilmartin explained that under the Rhode Island Low- and Moderate-Income Housing Act, the Planning Board must make specific findings of fact to approve or deny a comprehensive permit. She noted that this creates challenges at the preliminary stage because the Board needs information—such as a schedule of affordable units, a site plan showing their locations, and sample unit designs—that the applicant may not yet have finalized. However, she said the Board still needs enough detail in the record to confirm the project meets the statute’s affordable housing requirements.

Attorney Landry said the applicant could provide a preliminary framework showing how affordable units would be distributed. He explained that projects often use the required ratio—roughly one affordable unit for every four total units—and later “true up” the final distribution through conditions in the approval.

Member Kilmartin asked whether all unit types would include affordable units. Attorney Landry said most likely would, though some of the most expensive unit types might not. He explained that requiring affordable versions of the largest market-rate units may not always be the most efficient way to produce affordable housing.

Member Kilmartin emphasized that the community would likely want a range of affordable unit types, not just smaller units, so different household types could access them. She also noted concerns that the proposal currently targets affordability at 120% of Area Median Income (AMI) and encouraged the applicant to consider including some units at lower income levels if possible.

Chair Phipps said those policy questions would be discussed during Planning Board deliberations.

Member Kilmartin also asked whether any units would be rentals. Attorney Landry said the project is currently planned as ownership units, though rentals could be considered later with approval from Rhode Island Housing. He added that producing units affordable at 60% AMI is difficult for private developers without public subsidies, but the applicant intends to explore ways to serve households below the 120% AMI level where feasible.

Member Kilmartin asked how the project would maintain long-term affordability given the significant private infrastructure proposed—such as internal roads, landscaping, private trash service, and a complex stormwater system—all of which would require ongoing maintenance funded by homeowner association (HOA) fees.

Attorney Landry explained that Rhode Island Housing sets the maximum price for affordable units by factoring in interest rates and HOA fees. If HOA fees are higher due to infrastructure costs, the sale price of the affordable unit is reduced so that the total housing cost remains within affordability standards (generally no more than about 30% of household income).

Member Bacher clarified that if HOA fees increased significantly—for example from about \$250 per month to \$700 or more—the sale price of the affordable unit would be lowered to maintain affordability. Attorney Landry confirmed that this adjustment process occurs through a monitoring agent approved by Rhode Island Housing.

Attorney Landry also explained that the monitoring agent certifies that: Each buyer qualifies as a low- or moderate-income household and the sale price and carrying costs meet affordability requirements. This certification occurs at every resale, not just the initial purchase. Affordability restrictions remain in place for at least 30 years, and every resale must be approved by the monitoring agent before the deed can be recorded.

Member Kilmartin asked the applicant to clarify the actual proposed density of the project compared to the underlying zoning. She noted that the Senior Residence Village (SRV) zoning allows 6–8 units per acre, and under the Rhode Island Low- and Moderate-Income Housing Act the project could receive a density bonus of five additional units per acre, resulting in a possible 11–13 units per acre.

Attorney Landry responded that the exact density calculation was still being refined because wetlands, roadways, easements, and similar constraints must be removed from the buildable acreage. Based on current estimates, the project would likely fall around 12–13 units per acre. He explained that with the density bonus applied to the higher base range (8 units per acre), the minimum allowable total would be approximately 321 units, while the current proposal includes 344 units, which he described as close to the minimum density allowed under the statute. Attorney Landry also noted that other affordable housing developments in Rhode Island have received significantly larger density bonuses when communities lacked other sites capable of producing affordable housing.

Chair Phipps asked that the applicant provide a detailed calculation showing how acreage was determined, including how roads, open space, and other excluded areas were subtracted.

Member Kilmartin also questioned whether the applicant was seeking zoning waivers related to historic preservation provisions tied to the site's historic district. Attorney Landry clarified that the project was seeking an adjustment/waiver to demolish the Belton Court mansion, although certain historic elements—such as the tower and landscaping—would be retained.

The discussion then shifted to building height and scale. Member Kilmartin noted that the SRV zoning allows a maximum height of 35 feet, with a possible increase to 50 feet, but the application requested heights up to 75 feet. She asked how this translated into building stories.

Mr. Kalocsay stated that the maximum number of stories proposed is four, primarily for the multifamily buildings. He explained that additional height was requested to allow architectural roof features, such as pitched roofs, rather than additional living space. According to Mr. Kalocsay, typical residential floors would have approximately 10-foot ceilings, with a slightly taller ground floor (around 14 feet) to accommodate parking or garages.

Board members, including Member Bacher, questioned how those dimensions could approach 75 feet, expressing difficulty reconciling the requested height with a four-story building. Kilmartin noted that a building of that height would likely be unprecedented in Barrington, as other zoning districts generally limit buildings to 35 feet.

Chair Phipps suggested that the applicant provide visual examples or design standards showing what a four-story, 75-foot-tall building would look like to help the Board and the public better understand the scale being proposed.

Member Kilmartin asked about buildings shown within the 100-foot wetland jurisdictional area on the plans. Engineer Suanne Santos confirmed that some buildings on the southern portion of the site fall within that jurisdictional area and would require approval from the Rhode Island Department of Environmental Management, though no work is proposed within the stricter 50-foot or 25-foot wetland setbacks.

Member Kilmartin also asked whether the proposed alleys function as parking areas for zoning purposes. Ms. Santos clarified that the alleys would be used only for vehicle access to garages, with no parking allowed, and that parking would occur in driveways and garages, effectively functioning like common driveways.

The discussion returned to building height and fire safety. Member Kilmartin noted that if the Board approves a maximum height of 75 feet, it must ensure that the town's fire department has equipment capable of responding to fires at that height. Ms. Santos stated that the development team had met with the fire chief and discussed four-story buildings, but the 75-foot height specifically had not yet been reviewed, and she agreed to follow up for clarification.

Member Kilmartin then reviewed requested setback adjustments, noting that the existing Senior Residence Village (SRV) zoning requires larger setbacks as buildings increase in height. She pointed out that the applicant's request would allow taller buildings with smaller setbacks than the original zoning intended, and asked how flexible the applicant might be on height versus setbacks.

The Board discussed lot coverage and impervious surface limits. Ms. Santos explained that the applicant was not asking to change the 35% building coverage or 60% impervious surface limits, but rather to clarify that those percentages apply to the entire 36.9-acre site, not individual lots. She provided calculations showing the current proposal is well below those limits, with approximately 15.23% building coverage and 26.4% impervious surface coverage.

Member Kilmartin responded that the wording of the request had caused confusion and concern because it appeared to allow far more impervious surface than the project actually proposes. Chair Phipps agreed that the language in the application was unclear and potentially alarming, suggesting it should be clarified to better reflect the actual proposal.

Chair Phipps announced that due to the approaching 10:00 PM close time, the Board would need to

adjourn and continue the Belton Court Village public hearing at a future meeting. The Board discussed scheduling and procedural considerations for ongoing review and community input.

Solicitor Goins confirmed that the public hearing would be continued to April 7, at the same time and location. She noted that, as the Board had not yet fully reviewed the applicant's presentation and public comments had not been addressed, additional time would be required. The applicant, Attorney Landry, consented to a 30-day extension, acknowledging the need for continued deliberation.

The Board then discussed the possibility of scheduling a separate meeting specifically dedicated to public comment. Tentatively, April 28 was selected for this purpose. Chair Phipps noted that, if necessary, further extensions could be considered to ensure all interested parties have an opportunity to be heard.

MOTION: Member Rua seconded by Member Kilmartin, moved to continue the Public Hearing of Belton Court Village Comprehensive Permit Preliminary Plan Application to the April 7, 2026 Planning Board meeting. Motion carried (7,0)

5. Other Business:

a. Directors Report

b. Future meeting: Draft Barrington Signage diagnostic and design study 02/23/2026

Scheduling of Special Planning Board Meetings:

The Board also confirmed a Special Meeting on March 31 to continue work on the Comprehensive Plan and signage study; the Belton Court Village application will not be discussed at that meeting. They also discussed April 28 as a potential date for a Special Meeting to continue the public hearing, focusing specifically on public comments for Belton Court.

MOTION: Member Kilmartin, seconded by Member Caito, moved to approve scheduling the following Special Meetings:

- **March 31, 2026 – to continue work on the Comprehensive Plan and non-Belton Court related items.**
- **April 28, 2026 – to continue the public hearing, focusing on public comment for Belton Court.**

Motion carried (7–0).

Planner Durfee noted that there was no formal director's report for this meeting. He reminded the Board that at a future meeting, discussion would be needed regarding the Barrington Signage Diagnostic and Design Study. A preliminary draft of the study had been released, and input from the Board would be requested to provide guidance to the project consultant.

Planner Durfee indicated that the review and discussion of the signage study would take place at the March meeting. He encouraged Board members to review the preliminary draft and provide

feedback as appropriate, noting that while submitting comments was not mandatory, any input would assist in consolidating and organizing the recommendations for the consultant.

6. Adjournment

Chair Phipps called for a motion to adjourn.

MOTION: Member O’Neal, seconded by Member Rua, made a motion to adjourn at 9:52PM and the meeting was adjourned.

Audio and transcript of the full proceedings are available with the application materials in the Building/ Zoning Office.