

1 HOUSING & NEIGHBORHOODS

Overview

Barrington is a community of neighborhoods with distinct identities shaped by the town's extensive shoreline and its agricultural and industrial heritage. The impact of the railroad is evident in mix of houses and lot sizes within the early railroad suburb that developed around the former Drownville Station. Land carved into 5,000-square-foot lots and smaller formed the dense development patterns in West Barrington, where houses were built for workers from the former Brickyards and Lace Works.

A majority of the land, though, was divided into large agricultural plats that formed the basis of the primary road system and the pattern of subdivisions that eventually replaced these farmlands. The stone walls on the edges of the

large lots in the upscale Rumstick Road neighborhoods had marked the borders of farm fields years ago. The Roberta, Thurston and Country Club Plats, developed over a relatively short period of time during the 1950s and 1960s, are examples of the suburban model of houses on quarter-acre and half-acre lots.

While each neighborhood in Barrington has maintained a unique scale and character, almost all of them share a common characteristic: most of the land has been developed to the extent allowed by zoning. In other words, built out. With much of Barrington essentially at build-out, the Comprehensive Community Plan examines the following key issues:

- How will Barrington meet future needs for housing, both affordable and market-rate, given the limited supply of developable



Houses (from left to right) in West Barrington and Hampden Meadows and on Rumstick Road and George Street

properties that have access to water and sewer and adequate roads to support this growth?

- What should the Town do to meet the housing needs of the burgeoning retiring Baby Boomer generation?
- To what extent should Barrington encourage development of alternatives to the single-family homes on quarter-acre lots and larger?
- If higher densities and varying housing types are needed to meet housing needs, how can the Town preserve community character?

Existing Conditions

Housing Construction Activity

Data from 1980 through 2013 (See **Table 1**) show a steady drop in the number of housing permits issued per year, with the exception of 2008—when permits for 46 multi-family units, plus one single-family unit, were issued for the Sweetbriar affordable housing development.

Overall, the number of new single-family homes constructed in town has dropped to fewer than 15 per year since 2007. Likely factors for the slowdown in activity are the housing crisis coupled with the increasing scarcity of available land for development. For the 1980s, building permits for new houses (no multifamily) averaged almost 46 per year. The annual average declined to 29.5 for the 1990s, to 19 from 2000 to 2009, and 12 for 2010 to 2013.

In the 1990s, the Town issued permits for one multifamily project, in 1996 for the renovation of the Pilling Chain Building for 60 senior apartments (limited to ages 62 and over). The 126-unit Bay Spring Assisted Living facility, built in 1999, is not included in the housing permit data as it is considered a commercial use.

The Town has issued more permits for multi-family development projects in recent years, in addition to Sweetbriar. These include 12 apart-

ments at 60 Bay Spring Avenue, and ten apartments above storefronts at three mixed-use developments in the Village Center. These units were built under the Town’s mixed-use provisions of the Zoning Ordinance. In addition, 10 townhouse units were built under the comprehensive permit process, replacing a vacant commercial building on Washington Road adjacent to Sweetbriar.

Table 1: Residential Permits 1980-2013

Year	Single-Family	Multi-Family	Total
1980 to 1989	458	0	458
Average/Year: 1980s	45.8	0	45.8
1990 to 1999	295	60	355
Average/Year: 1990s	29.5	6	35.5
2000	19	0	19
2001	14	0	14
2002	16	0	16
2003	27	0	27
2004	31	3	34
2005	24	6	30
2006	23	0	23
2007	16	0	16
2008	11	54	65
2009	7	0	7
2000 to 2009	188	63	251
Average/Year: 2000s	18.8	6.3	25.1
2010	13	7	20
2011	7	0	7
2012	12	0	12
2013	15	4	19
2010-2013	47	11	58
Average/Year: 2010-2013	11.75	2.75	14.5
Total	988	134	1122
Average/Year: 1980-2013	29.9	4.1	34.0

Source: Town of Barrington Building Permit Records

Table 2: Population: 1990-2010 (State, Bristol County, Bristol County Towns)

City/Town	2000	Change	% Change	Pop.	Change	% Change
	Pop.	'90-'00	'90-'00	2010	'00-'10	'00-'10
Rhode Island	1,048,319	44,855	4.47%	1,052,567	4,248	0.41%
Bristol County	50,648	1,789	3.66%	49,875	-773	-1.53%
Barrington	16,819	970	6.12%	16,310	-509	-3.03%
Bristol	22,469	844	3.90%	22,938	469	2.09%
Warren	11,360	-25	-0.22%	10,627	-733	-6.45%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau

Demographic Trends

Population

From 1990 to 2000 Barrington grew by 6 percent, the highest rate of growth among the three Bristol County communities. Since 2000, however, the town's population has slipped, despite an increase in housing units. According to the US Census Bureau the town's population dropped by 3 percent between 2000 and 2010, from 16,819 to 16,310 (see **Table 2**). The picture was mixed in the two other towns in Bristol County. Bristol grew by 469 people (2.1 percent), while Warren's population shrank by 733 people (6.6 percent).

The State projects a continued decline in Barrington's population through 2040, when the town's population is projected to total 15,569 (see **Table 3**) - or 741 fewer people compared to the 2010 census count. While the State's projections are somewhat helpful in planning for the future, they do not necessarily reflect what is actually occurring within an area and do not account for additional housing resulting from this Plan's senior and affordable housing strategies.

Age Characteristics

According to Census data for 2000 and 2010 (see **Table 4** on the following page), Barrington's population is aging. Since 2000, the town has seen the greatest increase in people in the 45-year to 64-year age range — covering the “Baby Boomer” generation. While this age group grew by more than 1,200 during this period, all other

age categories either saw very small increases or shrank. The largest drop since 2000 came in the 35 to 44 age cohort, which decreased by 969 people. Further evidence is in the rise in the median age in Barrington, which in 2010 stood at 44.1 years — up 17 percent since 1990 (37.7 years).

The aging of the Baby Boomers will continue to ripple through the town's oldest age cohorts in the coming years—a phenomenon experienced not only here but across the country.

While the town's population is trending older, census data reveal the population within the youngest age groups has been shrinking or just inching up. For example, the number of children under 5 years old declined by 261 (26 percent) from 2000 to 2010, while those between 5 and 19 grew by only 48.

These trends have implications for schools and other community services and facilities (see discussion in the Community Services and Facilities

Table 3: Population Projections to 2040

Year	Population	Change (10-Year Periods)	%Change (10-Year Periods)
1990	15,849	--	--
2000	16,819	970	6.1%
2010	16,310	-509	-3.0%
2020*	15,933	-377	-2.3%
2030*	15,914	-19	-0.1%
2040*	15,569	-345	-2.2%

Source: Statewide Planning : Technical Paper 162, RI Population Projections 2010-2040 (April 2013)

Table 4: Age Distribution, 2000, 2010

Age	2000		2010		2000-2010 Change	
	Persons	% of Total	Persons	% of Total	Number	%Change
Under 5	996	5.9%	735	4.5%	-261	-26.2%
5 to 19	4,105	24.4%	4,153	25.5%	48	1.2%
20 to 34	1,825	10.9%	1,358	8.3%	-467	-25.6%
35 to 44	3,115	18.5%	2,146	13.2%	-969	-31.1%
45 to 54	2,780	16.5%	3,264	20.0%	484	17.4%
55 to 64	1,527	9.1%	2,261	13.9%	734	48.1%
65 to 74	1,264	7.5%	1,159	7.1%	-105	-8.3%
75 & over	1,207	7.2%	1,234	7.6%	27	2.2%
Total	16,819	100%	16,310	100%	-509	-3%

Source: 2000, 2010 census

element), but also the type and amount of housing needed going forward.

Income Characteristics

Census data indicate that the town's median income increased from \$74,591 in 1999, to \$103,211 based on the American Community Survey (ACS) estimate for 2008 through 2012 (see **Table 5**). The number of households earning less than \$100,000 fell by 1,144, while those making more than that amount grew by 1,015. Based on the 2008-12 estimates, there were 1,386 households, or 23.5 percent of all households, with a total income of less than \$50,000—compared to 33 percent in 1999. The median household income in Barrington was 84 percent higher than the state median income (\$56,102),

according to the ACS data. These trends are consistent with past data, as the town's income level historically been much higher than both the county's and the state's.

While the income analysis above can be an indicator of trends in Barrington, it cannot serve to derive the numbers of families that qualify for affordable housing assistance. These figures do not assume that all people living together are related, nor does it break down income levels by family size, both of which are factors to determine eligibility for low- and moderate-income housing.

In order to qualify for low- and moderate-income housing, residents in those units are

Table 5: Income Distribution (Households) - 2000, 5-Year ACS Data (2008-12)

	Barrington				Bristol County		Rhode Island	
	1999	2008-12*	1999	2008-12*	1999	2008-12*	1999	2008-12*
Income	HH's	%	HH's	%	HH's	%	HH's	%
Less than \$15,000	460	7.6%	224	3.8%	13.8%	11.1%	17.7%	13.6%
\$15,000 - \$24,999	377	6.3%	301	5.1%	10.6%	8.0%	12.4%	10.0%
\$25,000 - \$34,999	529	8.8%	401	6.8%	10.6%	8.3%	11.9%	9.0%
\$35,000 - \$49,999	634	10.5%	460	7.8%	14.3%	10.4%	15.7%	12.6%
\$50,000 - \$74,999	1,029	17.1%	660	11.2%	19.1%	15.5%	20.2%	17.4%
\$75,000 - \$99,999	921	15.3%	760	12.9%	12.6%	11.3%	10.7%	13.0%
\$100,000 or more	2,073	34.3%	3,088	52.4%	19.0%	35.5%	11.4%	24.6%
Total	6,023	100.0%	5,894	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Median Household Income (estimate)	\$74,591		\$103,211		\$50,737	\$71,806	\$42,090	\$56,102

Source: U.S. Census Bureau - 2000, 2008-12 American Community Survey estimates

Table 6: HUD Income Limits, FY 2012: Providence-Fall River-Warwick, RI-MA MSA

% of Median HH Income	Income Limits for Household Size							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
30%	\$15,900	\$18,200	\$20,450	\$22,700	\$24,550	\$26,350	\$28,150	\$30,000
50%	\$26,500	\$30,250	\$34,050	\$37,800	\$40,850	\$43,850	\$46,900	\$49,900
80%	\$42,350	\$48,400	\$54,450	\$60,500	\$65,350	\$70,200	\$75,050	\$79,900

Source: US Department of Housing and Urban Development

subject to income limits determined annually for the region by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). Barrington falls within the Providence-Fall River-Warwick, RI-MA Metropolitan Statistical Area. In this area, the median household income for FY2012 was \$75,600, with the corresponding income limits for different household sizes (See **Table 6**). Median household income may be relatively high; yet, per Table 5, 15.7 percent of Barrington households earn less than \$35,000 per year, of which all would easily fall within the HUD income limits based on 80 percent area median income. Additional households, depending on household size, also would fall within the HUD limits, as 23.5 per-

cent of all households earn less than \$50,000, and 34.7 percent earn less than \$75,000.

Build-Out Analysis

Calculations for remaining buildable land have been completed using the 2011 RI Geographic Information System land use data, adjusted to account for new and approved development in town since 2011. As depicted on **Map HN-1**, the remaining vacant buildable parcels—zoned residential or mixed-use commercial—are scattered throughout Barrington, with just a few with more than 5 acres of developable upland that also have access to infrastructure necessary to support new development (water and sewer).

Table 7: Build-Out Analysis—Existing Zoning, 2014

Zoning District	Total Acres	Total Buildable Acres	Developed Acres	Remaining	Housing Units Possible
R10	960.2	937.9	916.5	21.4	86
R25	1853.5	1661.6	1534.1	127.4	222
R25C*	28.3	20.8	19.4	1.4	0
R40	421.7	354.9	310.9	44.0	44
R40-CD	74.5	59.5	12.1	47.4	47
B	56.9	55.6	51.0	4.6	46
NB	78.3	77.1	67.3	9.8	98
LM	4.8	1.7	0.6	1.1	11
EH	8.4	8.2	8.0	0.1	0
RE (Zion)*	37.1	31.9	24.5	7.4	0
Other**	9.7	5.6	0.5	5.2	40
Total	3,533.4	3,214.8	2,945.0	269.9	594

Source: RIGIS, Town GIS data (zoning, parcels), Town land development and subdivision records

* Former Zion Bible Institute currently zoned Recreation and Education; designated on Future Land Use Map for Senior Residential Village. Unit count based on existing zoning.

**Unit count based on Palmer Pointe Neighborhood master plan /comprehensive permit - zoned R25

The build-out analysis shown in **Table 7** (previous page) uses data from Rhode Island GIS mapping data and local GIS data to calculate developed areas, buildable vacant land and undevelopable areas. The total area for each zoning district was calculated and the undevelopable land was subtracted out. For the purposes of this analysis, undevelopable land includes jurisdictional wetlands, floodplain areas (VE and AE zones), and protected open space.

Developable vacant land zoned for residential use is scarce within Barrington, totaling just 8.3 percent (270 acres) of estimated total buildable acreage (3,215 acres) within those zones. The Residence 25 zone contains the most undeveloped buildable land, with more than 200 units possible based on the analysis.

The analysis includes 40 units for the Sowams Nursery property east of Sowams Road, based on the approved master plan for the Palmer Pointe Neighborhood. The residential districts allow by right one unit per acre in R-40 districts, approximately two units per acre in R-25 and R-25-Cluster districts, and up to four units per acre in the Residence 10 district (R-10). The former Zion Bible Institute campus, designated for Senior Residential Village on the Future Land Use Map (see the Land Use element), is currently zoned Recreation and Education—where residential development is not permitted.

In addition to the traditional single-family residentially zoned districts, several types of housing are permitted either by right or by special permit in the Neighborhood Business District (NB) and Business (B) districts. Multifamily dwellings are allowed only in the Elderly Housing district and as part of a mixed-use commercial development in the NB and B zones. Two-family units and accessory apartments are allowed by special permit in the NB District and, due to Zoning Ordinance Amendments adopted in 2012, in the R-10, R-25 and R-40 districts. Cottage-style senior residential develop-

ment is also allowed by special use permit for parcels of sufficient size in the residential zones and the NB and LM zones. (The unit counts in the build-out analysis for the R10, R25 and R40 zones assumes single-family housing only.)

Housing and Economic Development Goals

The Town has not focused on large-scale commercial or industrial development because it has tried to maintain a character consistent with a residential bedroom community. The central shopping district is located on County Road and adjacent portions of Maple Avenue and Waseca Avenue, where the most concentrated commercial development has occurred.

The Town created the NB district in 1994 to eliminate business zoning from certain areas of town while still allowing smaller offices and retail to serve the local community. The areas impacted by this designation were Maple Avenue, Bay Spring Avenue in West Barrington, and Sowams Road in Hampden Meadows. The Zoning Ordinance, last amended in 2012, permits as of right apartments above street-level commercial space within the Business and Neighborhood Business zones. Mixed-use developments built under these provisions have added 20 apartments to the Town's housing stock since 2000, including three affordable units built after mandatory inclusionary zoning was adopted in 2006.

With little vacant land available for new construction, commercial development, including mixed-use projects, has involved redevelopment of sites with existing uses. One of the town's largest commercially zoned sites, on Washington Road north of Bay Spring Avenue, was developed as housing—the 50-unit Sweetbriar affordable housing development. That project is located on a site zoned Business; the use was permitted under the comprehensive permit process. "Haines Park Village," which abuts Sweetbriar to the south, was completed in 2009, also

Table 8: Future Low- and Moderate-Income Housing Needs, by CHAS data

Household Type	Proportional Need projected by 2000 CHAS	# of LMI Units Needed (**x CHAS %)	Existing Supply	Future Need (=2000 CHAS proportion* - existing supply)
Elderly	49.7%	351	60	291
Family	34.9%	246	65	181
Other	15.3%	108	35	73
Total LMI Units	--	705	160	545

* CHAS proportion is calculated by adding all households <= 80% AMI reporting "any housing problems" and calculating each group as a percentage of the total number of households reporting problems.

** # equals the number of affordable units needed to achieve 10% of projected total housing construction.

under the comprehensive permit process. A large commercial building was removed for the development, which contains 10 apartments (three affordable) in duplex structures.

Barrington does not seek to attract significant commercial and industrial development. As economic development activities are limited, no development is anticipated that will affect the housing needs of employees in the area. One exception, to a limited extent, could be the re-development of the former Zion Bible campus (discussed elsewhere in the plan) as a senior residential development with assisted living and memory care units. The operation of the facilities would require the hiring of nursing care and other support staff.

Housing Needs

The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development's (HUD) Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) database provides a means for a community to examine the housing needs and problems of its residents in all income levels.¹ The most consistent findings in an analysis of CHAS data is that a significant number of households, especially those

below 80 percent area median family income (AMFI), pay too large a percentage of their gross monthly income for housing.

CHAS data from 2000 (most recent dataset with data on needs by household type such as elderly households) show housing costs are a particular burden for the elderly, of whom nearly 45 percent pay more than 30 percent of their income to housing. **Table 8** shows how housing need is broken out according to resident type. Overall, according to 2011 CHAS data², 36.4 percent of Barrington households of all income levels are categorized as having 'housing needs,' which means they pay more than 30 percent of their income to housing.

Extremely Low-Income (0% to 30% of Area Median Income (AMI))

According to 2011 CHAS data, approximately 250 of the 5,805 households³ in Barrington are extremely low-income. This represents 4.3 percent of all households, a decline since 2000 when the approximately 7 percent fell in this income bracket. (Statewide, 14.6 percent of all households were in this income range in 2010. About 72 percent of these households in Barrington own their own home (180), of which

¹ The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) periodically receives "custom tabulations" of data from the U.S. Census Bureau that are largely not available through standard Census products. These data, known as the "CHAS" data (Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy), demonstrate the extent of housing problems and housing needs, particularly for low income households.

² The 2010 data are from the 2007-11 CHAS dataset.

³ This figure is different than the total number of households in the 2010 Census of 5,994.

72.2 percent spend more than 30 percent of their monthly income on housing expenses. The other 70 households are renters, of which 28.6 percent pay over 30 percent of their income on housing. (See **Tables 9A and 9B.**)

Very Low-Income (31% to 50% of AMI)

Six percent, or 345, of all Barrington households are very low-income. The 2011 CHAS database shows that 74 percent (255) of very low-income households own their homes. Of these homeowners, 240 (94 percent) pay over 30 percent of their income on housing costs. Every one of the 90 renter households (100 percent) within this income range spend more than 30 percent of their income on rent.

Low Income (51 to 80% of AMI)

Approximately 11.7 percent, or 605, of Barrington households are low income. In this income

group, about 30 percent are renters and 70 percent are homeowners. The housing cost burden for this group is not as great for this income group, but still accounts for a large portion of the residents. In the low income category, about 70 percent of homeowners and 75 percent of renters spend more than 30 percent of their income on housing costs. These percentages, possibly a result of the housing crisis, have increased significantly since 2000. Then, approximately 53.6 percent of homeowners and 26.2 percent of renters spent more than 30 percent of their income on housing costs.

Homeless and Special Needs Populations

A large portion of Barrington's current Low-Moderate Income (LMI) housing supply supports the special needs population, accounting for approximately 35 units, or 22 percent, of existing LMI units in town. All of these units are

Table 9A: Income by Cost Burden (Renters only)

Income by Cost Burden (Renters only)	Cost Burden 30% to 50% of HH Income	% of Households	Cost Burden > 50%	% of Households	Total HH's: Renters
Household Income <= 30% AMFI	0	0%	20	29%	70
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMFI	40	44%	50	56%	90
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMFI	75	45%	40	24%	165
Household Income >80% to <=100% AMFI	4	27%	0	0%	15
Household Income >100% AMFI	70	23%	10	3%	310
Total	189	29%	120	18%	650

Table 9B: Income by Cost Burden (Owners only)

Income by Cost Burden (Owners only)	Cost Burden 30% to 50% of HH Income	% of Households	Cost Burden > 50%	% of Households	Total HH's: Owners
Household Income <= 30% AMFI	10	6%	120	67%	180
Household Income >30% to <=50% AMFI	85	33%	155	61%	255
Household Income >50% to <=80% AMFI	190	43%	140	32%	440
Household Income >80% to <=100% AMFI	115	41%	65	23%	280
Household Income >100% AMFI	760	19%	155	4%	4,000
Total	1160	23%	635	12%	5,155

Source: 2007-11 American Community Survey/2011 CHAS Database

- NOTES: 1. The four housing problems are: incomplete kitchen facilities; incomplete plumbing facilities more than 1 person per room; and cost burden greater than 30%.
 2. The four severe housing problems are: incomplete kitchen facilities; incomplete plumbing facilities; more than 1 person per room; and cost burden greater than 50%.
 3. Cost burden is the ratio of housing costs to household income. For renters- housing cost is gross rent (contract rent plus utilities). For owners- housing cost is "select monthly owner costs" which includes mortgage payment; utilities; association fees; insurance; and real estate taxes.

group home beds. Only 16 shelter clients, or 0.2 percent of the state’s shelter population, listed Barrington as their last residence in 2008.⁴

According to CHAS data, about 15 percent of low and moderate income housing will need to be dedicated to homeless and special needs persons in order to serve that population properly. Barrington understands the particular issues surrounding this population as well as its role within the region to provide housing opportunities. In particular, the Town has worked closely with East Bay Center, Inc. to ensure that proper accommodations are provided for special needs clients.

Homeownership and Rental Costs


Based on the 2010 Census, 87.3 percent of all occupied housing units in Barrington are owner-occupied. Thirty-four percent of all homeowners, representing almost 1,800 households, are paying more than 30 percent of their income on housing costs, according to 2011 CHAS data. This accounts for 72 percent (130) of extremely low income homeowners, 94 percent (240) of very low-

income homeowners, and 75 percent (330) of low-income homeowners. Also, there are 4,280 homeowner households that earn more than 80 percent of area median family income, of which 1,025 (25.6 percent) experience housing cost burdens of at least 30 percent of their income.

The rental market in Barrington also shows many households that qualify for federal and state housing assistance. According to 2011 CHAS data, approximately 309, or 47.5 percent, of all renter households are paying more than 30 percent of their income on housing costs. This accounts for 28.6 percent (20) of extremely low income renter households, 100 percent (90) of low-income renter households, and 69.7 percent (115) of moderate income renter households. In addition, 26 percent (84) of the renter households earning more than 80 percent of the median income spend more than 30 percent of their income on housing costs.

In total, 2,104, or 36 percent, of the 5,805 households in Barrington (included in the 2011 CHAS data) are cost-burdened, of which 925 qualify for

Figure 1: Annual Median House Sales Price —1979 to 2013



Source: Town of Barrington Tax Assessor records

⁴United Way R.I. Shelter Information Project *Annual Report 2007-2008*.

federal or state housing assistance. In comparison, 37.8 percent of Bristol County households and 39.1 percent of state households are cost-burdened. Although a slightly smaller percentage of Barrington residents are cost-burdened with housing than residents elsewhere in the state or Bristol County, housing affordability remains an important issue to the community.

Despite the correction in the housing market with the housing crisis, the cost of housing in Barrington has continued to outpace the rise in median household income. In Barrington, the median single-family home price increased 68 percent from \$221,000 in 2000 to \$372,000 in 2013 (see **Figure 1**, previous page), while median household income increased by 38 percent (to \$103,211) in roughly the same timeframe.

This mismatch often results in a lack of homeownership opportunities for new, young and elderly homeowners. By comparison, the median sales price for a single family home in Rhode Island increased 51 percent from \$135,976 to \$205,000 in 2013, while median household income has risen approximately 30 percent to \$56,102 (per the ACS data for 2008-12).

Rental housing also faces this disproportionate increase in Barrington. The 2008 to 2012

Table 10: Rental Costs—Barrington

Unit Size	Average Rent		
	1990	2004	2013
1 BR	\$ 613	\$ 588	\$ 973
2 BR	\$ 675	\$ 1,035	\$ 1,273
3 BR	\$ 795	\$ 1,450	\$ 1,654

Source: Rent Survey / RI Housing; 2005 Barrington Affordable Housing Plan

Table 11: Housing Units, 2000-2010

Housing Units	2000 Census	2010 Census	%Change
Barrington	6,199	6,386	3.0%
Bristol County	19,881	20,850	4.9%
Rhode Island	439,837	463,388	5.4%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau - 2000 and 2010 census

American Community Survey estimates the median contract rent for Barrington at \$1,175—almost double the median contract rent of \$650 reported in the 2000 census. **Table 10** shows the distribution of rent price according to unit size (not including utilities).

Housing Inventory

Housing Units

As shown in **Table 11**, there were 6,386 housing units in Barrington based on the 2010 census — an increase of 187 housing units, or 3 percent, from the 2000 census total. During this same time period, the number of housing units grew by 4.9 percent in Bristol County and 5.4 percent statewide.

Housing Stock: Age and Condition

Approximately 27 percent of the town’s housing stock was built prior to 1940 and another 35 percent between 1940 and 1959 (see **Table 12**). Only 38.6 percent (or approximately 2,400 units) has been constructed since 1960. The median age of housing units is 57 years.

Housing Stock: Type

Based on the 2008-2012 American Community Survey, 91 percent of Barrington’s housing was single-family, while the remainder consisted of various types of multi-family housing (see **Table 13**, next page). About 4.1 percent of the housing

Table 12: Age of Housing Stock

Year Built	Number	% of Total
1939 or earlier	1,638	26.6%
1940 to 1959	2,148	34.9%
1960 to 1969	774	12.6%
1970 to 1979	397	6.4%
1980 to 1989	542	8.8%
1990 to 2000	464	7.5%
Built 2000 to 2009	200	3.2%
Median Year Built	1955	
Median Age	57 Years	

Source: 2008-2012 American Community Survey

stock consisted of small multi-family structures, including duplexes, triplexes, and four-unit structures. The remaining housing included larger apartment buildings or complexes. **Map HN-2** shows the location of these various housing types in town.

Foreclosure / Blight / Abandonment

The percentage of foreclosures in Barrington, based on the number of mortgaged housing units, has ranged between 0.24 percent and 0.30 percent (see **Table 14**). The rate each year, from 2009 to 2013, has remained below than Warren and Bristol. Overall, Bristol County towns have had a much lower foreclosure rate than the state.

Barrington has no area that could be considered blight. The Building Official reports fewer than five complaints a year throughout town related to unkempt properties, such as overgrown or unmaintained yards. Further, the Town has not condemned any houses in recent years.

Overall Inventory and Occupancy Status

Barrington had 6,386 dwelling units in 2010 (based on 2010 census data) of which 118 were for seasonal, recreational, or occasional use and therefore not subject to the state’s affordable housing requirements. Census data from 2010 counted 392 vacant housing units, or 6.1 percent of the total (see **Table 15**).

Table 13: Housing Unit Types

Units in Structure	Estimate	% of Total
Total:	6,163	100%
1, detached	5,605	90.9%
1, attached	27	0.4%
2	199	3.2%
3 or 4	54	0.9%
5 to 9	11	0.2%
10 to 19	12	0.2%
20 to 49	20	0.3%
50 or more	235	3.8%
Mobile home	0	—
Boat, RV, van, etc.	0	—

Source: 2008-2012 American Community Survey

Affordability of Existing Homes

In order to meet the 10 percent standard (which is based on 2010 U.S. Census figures), 627 units (10 percent of 6,386 less 118 seasonal units) of Barrington’s dwelling units must be “affordable” based on the state’s definition. The current affordable housing inventory of 160 units falls 467 short of the requirement. Factoring in additional growth, Barrington would need to produce approximately 525 more affordable units to meet the 10 percent standard over the next 20 years (see Appendix IV).

Table 16 on the next page provides a summary of the town’s LMI housing inventory as well as inventories for select communities. The table includes a comparison of the unit count, less HUD 202 and Sec. 8 elderly units—federal funding sources currently unavailable for new units. Overall, about 2.5 percent of Barrington’s housing qualify as “affordable” under State law.

Based on assessed values, however, the Town has a healthy supply of existing houses would

Table 14: Foreclosures as Percentage of Mortgaged Housing Units

	Year				
	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Town					
Barrington	0.30%	0.20%	0.20%	0.24%	0.24%
Bristol	0.40%	0.30%	0.50%	0.30%	0.31%
Warren	0.50%	0.50%	0.40%	0.50%	0.35%
Statewide	1.54%	1.02%	1.10%	0.90%	0.80%

Source: Housing Network of Rhode Island

Table 15: Occupancy Status—2010

Occupancy Status	Number	Percent of Total
Occupied Housing Units	5,994	93.9%
Vacant Housing Units	392	6.1%
Total	6,386	

Source: 2010 Census

qualify as affordable on price alone. **Table 17** on the next page shows the distribution of houses based on tax assessment data. Using \$250,000 as the maximum price of an affordable unit (this is somewhat lower than the actual maximum affordable price), 1,051 residential structures — in addition to those that already qualify as low-moderate income housing — fall within the affordable price range. This represents almost 18 percent of the total number of residential structures.

Table 16: Subsidized and Publicly Assisted Housing, 2013

	Barrington	Bristol	East Greenwich
Elderly			
Public Housing	-	195	
RI Housing	60	68	35
HUD 202	-	96	-
HUD Section 8	-	-	106
Subtotal	60	359	141
Family			
Public Housing	-	-	27
RI Housing	64	74	16
HUD Section 8	-	-	-
Other	1	26	7
Subtotal	65	100	50
Special Needs			
Group Home Beds	35	50	41
Transitional Units	-	26	-
HUD 811	-	-	-
Subtotal	35	76	41
TOTAL LMI Units	160	535	232
% Total	2.55%	5.93%	4.34%
TOTAL *	160	439	126
% Total *	2.55%	4.87%	2.36%

*LMI units other than HUD 202 and Sec. 8 units
Source: Rhode Island Housing

The distribution of these units is skewed toward areas with smaller lot size requirements—87 percent of the 209 residential structures valued at less than \$200,000 are in the Neighborhood Business and Residence 10 zones, which have the smallest lot-size requirements. Both zones also have a significant number of lots that are smaller than the minimum area. Another 18 single-family and two-family structures valued at less than \$200,000 are in the Business zone. These units are legal nonconforming uses; housing types other than apartments above retail are not permitted within the Business zone.

Of all residential structures (not including qualified LMI units) in the Business, Neighborhood Business and Residence 10 zones, 6.6 percent (200) are valued at less than \$200,000, while 32 percent (973) are valued at less than \$250,000. In contrast, just nine out of approximately 2,900 residential structures (0.3 percent) in the Residence 25, Residence 40 and Residence 40-CD zones are valued at less than \$200,000. A total of 2.7 percent of residential structures in these zones are valued at less than \$250,000.

Issues and Opportunities

The Planning Board has identified the following key challenges related to the production of housing needed to meet the Town's current and future residential needs.

Housing for Retiring Baby Boomers

The 78 million baby boomers (born between 1946 and 1964) entering retirement age across the United States means that communities are faced with a new set of housing challenges. One issue will be how to meet the spike in demand for housing for retirees. Another question is what will happen when the influx of boomers no longer is driving up demand for purchasing single-family homes, instead becoming sellers of houses that no longer suit family needs.

Table 17: Assessed Value of Residential Structures by Zoning District

Assessed Value	B Zone			NB Zone			R10 Zone			R25/R25C Zones			R40 Zone			R40CD Zone			Total Units
	SF	2F	Other	SF	2F	Oth-er	SF	2F	Other	SF	2F	Other	SF	2F	Other	SF	2F	Other	
\$200,000 and less	9	9	-	15	17	12	128	10	-	7	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	209
\$200,001 to \$250,000	7	1	1	47	4	1	673	35	4	68	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	842
\$250,001 to \$300,000	-	-	-	23	-	-	863	9	4	246	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,147
\$300,001 to \$350,000	-	-	-	8	-	-	523	2	-	398	3	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	935
\$350,001 to \$400,000	-	-	-	9	-	1	276	4	-	357	-	1	2	-	-	-	-	-	650
\$400,001 to \$450,000	-	-	-	3	-	-	137	-	1	336	1	-	2	-	-	3	-	-	483
\$450,001 to \$500,000	-	-	-	1	-	-	74	1	-	283	1	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	362
\$500,000+	-	-	-	1	-	-	104	-	1	952	2	-	237	-	-	7	-	-	1,304
Total	16	10	1	107	21	14	2,778	61	10	2,647	11	2	243	-	-	11	-	-	5,932

Source: Barrington Tax Assessor database

The State's projections for Rhode Island show the 65-and-over population growing by nearly 75 percent from 2010 to 2040.⁵ If projections are accurate, the 65+ age group state-wide will total approximately 264,000 people, or more than 25 percent of the state's population, up from 14 percent today.⁶

The predominant housing type, the single-family detached house, represents one housing preference for some but certainly not all households of retirement age. A study published in the *Journal of the American Planning Association* examined issues related to the demand for "senior" housing created as boomers retire, and the family housing units that become available as boomers sell their homes. The study

acknowledged that most people will remain in the same state as they age, but not necessarily the same community or house.

The challenge is for communities to "retain their elderly residents as long as possible to slow the flow of houses for sale." The study continued: "This makes it imperative to develop elderly friendly, vital communities (Achenbaum, 2005). Rather than encouraging segregation of the elderly in separate retirement institutions, urban designers should foster their social integration into more lively communities...."⁷

What makes a lively community that is appealing to retiring boomers? The authors cite the following: community activity centers for sen-

⁵ Technical Paper 162, RI Population Projections: 2010-2040 (Statewide Planning)

⁶ The most recent projections by age for Barrington are in Statewide Planning Technical Paper 154 (August 2004): *RI Population Projections 2000-30*, showing Barrington's 65+ population growing by 40% from 2000 to 2030.

⁷ *Aging Baby Boomers and the Generational Housing Bubble: Foresight and Mitigation of an Epic Transition*. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, Vol. 74, Issue 1 December 2008, pp 17 - 33

iors, close-by retail services, and small, easy-access parks for midday socializing.

The Town in 2012 took steps toward addressing these concerns through zoning amendments allowing cottage-style “Senior Residential Communities” as a special use in all residential zones and in the Neighborhood Business, Business and Limited Manufacturing zones. To date, no cottage developments have been proposed.

A larger opportunity to meet the growing need for senior housing is the former Zion Bible Institute campus – a redevelopment site identified in a 2008 study completed for the Town and in the 2009 Comprehensive Plan as appropriate for higher density housing. Appendix III outlines the Developer Guidance for the future rezoning of the property. Given the need for senior housing, the guidance has been revised to allow for the establishment of a “Senior

Residential Village.” The guidance sets goals for issues such as density, historic preservation, affordability, housing type, uses, recreational space, circulation and buffers.

Neighborhood Character

As developable land becomes more scarce, Barrington may see increased pressure on existing neighborhoods, including:

- Demolition of smaller houses for larger homes, where a larger, new house would sell for much more than the existing house.
- Demolition of a house where rebuilding makes economic sense in cases where houses are in the flood zone and need to be elevated to avoid high flood insurance premiums.
- Development of higher density development than permitted by zoning, under the comprehensive permit affordable housing option.

Figure 2: House Demolitions (examples)



Demolitions, 2012 and 2013: Top left—7 Court Avenue; top right—50 Ferry Lane; bottom left—7 Bourne Lane; bottom right—7 Richard Street

Residential Demolitions

From 1999 through 2013, at least 105 houses were demolished across Barrington, ranging from two to 12 tear-downs per year, for an overall average of seven annually. The demolitions have occurred within all residential and mixed-use zones (see **Map HN-3**). The replacement of smaller houses with larger, much more expensive homes impacts the overall affordability of housing in town. The loss of any existing house within an established neighborhood can impact the character of a residential street if the new house overwhelms its neighbors. (See **Figure 2** on the previous page for images of four houses torn down in 2012 and 2013.)

Due to concern regarding an increasing number of tear-downs, a zoning re-write committee was formed in 2004. No action was taken at the time. However, in 2010, the Town Council adopted an ordinance requiring a notification process that must be followed before the Town can issue a permit for demolition. No additional measures have been taken to further address concerns related to the demolition issue.

Floodplain Mitigation

Another issue with the potential to affect neighborhood character is the impact of rising flood insurance premiums as well as the new flood maps of July 2014. The new maps reclassified flood zones in some areas, and changed the applicable elevation datum used to determine base flood elevations, placing houses at a lower elevation. These changes are pressuring owners of property in low-lying areas to elevate homes out of the flood zone—which could require raising a structure as much as eight or more feet. (See also the Natural Hazards element.)

These projects are important for reducing flood risk and preserving individual house values, but they also have the potential to alter the character of an area dramatically, and require relief from the Zoning Board for exceeding height limits and setbacks. These impacts will require evaluation to determine whether new standards are needed.

Density

Developers have sought significantly higher density for residential development by providing at least 25 percent of the units as affordable—the comprehensive permit option available under state law. Higher density can, if managed properly, can produce more affordable units, reduce infrastructure costs, and allow for more efficient and sustainable use of land. However, the projects also put pressure on the surrounding neighborhood—for example introducing many more units per acre within developed residential areas zoned for half-acre or quarter-acre lots. Concerns raised include impacts on the community character, as well as traffic, infrastructure, and the Town and school budget.

Multifamily / Infill Housing

The town's housing stock is becoming more diverse. Since 2005, the Town has approved 20 apartments built under the mixed-use commercial provisions of the Zoning Ordinance enacted in the early 2000's. Another 57 two-family, townhouse and multifamily units have been built under the comprehensive permit process since 2008, with another 40 units to be built as part of the Palmer Pointe development. None of the units are age-restricted; all are rental—helping meet the need for family rental housing units.

All of these developments are fully occupied (as of November 2014)—pointing to demand for this type of housing in town. To meet this demand, the Town anticipates continued construction of apartments on redevelopment sites within the Neighborhood Business and Business zones, where they are a “permitted” use. These areas are most suitable for multifamily development, in particular within the Village Center due to its proximity to goods and services and the main RIPTA bus routes on County Road.

In order to limit impacts on abutters as more infill sites are developed, the Town will need to evaluate existing standards, including buffers, lighting and parking design.

Existing “Affordable” Houses

Technically the number of units that count as “affordable” based on State law amount to 2.6 percent of Barrington’s housing stock. Hundreds of qualified affordable units are needed to reach 10 percent. The build-out analysis reveals that it is highly unlikely Barrington can reach the 10 percent LMI housing goal through new construction alone.

Based on median sales prices, the housing market in Barrington is among the most expensive in Rhode Island. The median sales price in 2013 totaled \$372,000. However, as Table 17 on Page 17 illustrates, Barrington has approximately 1,050 residential structures valued at less than \$250,000, or roughly one out of every six dwellings.

These modestly priced homes represent an opportunity to “produce” LMI units utilizing housing that already exists, reducing the need to identify vacant parcels—which are expensive due to the limited supply of vacant land.

The Town’s Housing Board of Trustees could play a critical role in “capturing” existing houses and qualifying them as affordable under State law—which requires a municipal subsidy, as well as a deed restriction and monitoring agreement to preserve long-term affordability. Such a program would require sufficient funding to acquire, renovate and re-sell (through a revolving fund) or to create effective voluntary incentives. The program also would require an administrator to be effective.

A 2014 report⁸ by Barbara Sokoloff Associates, developed in consultation with the Housing Board of Trustees and the Town, recommends the creation of a Revolving Loan Fund to implement this strategy. It would require a one-time appropriation of “at least” \$750,000 to capitalize the program. The Revolving Loan Fund could be supplemented with annual funding from sources such as the federal Com-

munity Development Block Program. Administration could be handled by a contracted consultant or an outside agency. A monitoring agency would also be required to ensure long-term affordability.

Another potential funding source could be available should the Town adopt a fee-in-lieu where applicants proposing projects subject to mandatory inclusionary zoning are able to pay a fee rather than build the required affordable units. Legislation adopted in 2014, which modified the inclusionary zoning law, provides the Town the option to establish a fee-in-lieu. Further evaluation of this option is needed. One concern is the fee established by the law, \$67,000 per unit, given the high land costs in Barrington.

Affordable Housing Plan Progress

Currently Barrington is 467 units short of the 10 percent affordable housing goal established by State law. In 2007, Barrington had one family housing unit and 60 elderly housing units—in Barrington Cove Apartments—that qualified as affordable under the state’s guidelines. The remaining affordable units consisted of 35 group home beds in various locations throughout town.

Since that time, the Town has made considerable progress toward achieving the 10 percent goal, despite the limited amount of land suitable for development. New affordable units built since 2008 have increased the number of LMI units by 68 percent, and include:

- Sweetbriar on Washington Road: 47 units have been built out of 50 approved (all affordable). Three house lots are vacant.
- Haines Park Village on Washington Road and Bay Spring Avenue: 3 out of 10 total units qualify as affordable.
- Twelve units at “Walker Farm Lane” on County Road and Eleanor Drive (all af-

⁸ Capture Existing Affordable Housing Study, 9/30/14, by Barbara Sokoloff Associates, Inc.

fordable). The Town acquired the site for the development of the units, in partnership with a non-profit housing developer.

In 2013, the Planning Board approved the master plan for “Palmer Pointe,” an affordable rental housing development. The Board, citing concerns related to density and abutter impacts, reduced the number of new units by eight to 40. Palmer Pointe is east of Sowams Road, on property used by Sowams Nursery that has been identified in the Comprehensive Plan as suitable for higher density under the “Village” zoning concept (see Appendix III). The completion of Palmer Pointe and other

approved and pending developments with affordable units would bring the Town’s affordable percentage to 3.34 percent of year-round housing units (see **Table 18**) - an increase of 121 percent in total LMI units since 2008.

Barrington also has made significant progress toward implementing almost all of the Affordable Housing Plan strategies, as proposed in the 2010 Comprehensive Plan. **Table 19** on the next page summarizes the Town’s efforts to implement the Affordable Housing Plan. All of the changes related to Zoning Ordinance revisions have been completed.

Table 18: Low-Moderate Income Housing by Location and Status, 2014

Description	Address	School District	Single-Family	Two-Family	Multi-family	Group Home	# LMI Units	Total Units	Town LMI %
BUILT - Included in 2010 Census									
Sweetbriar	Sweetbriar Road	Primrose	1	38	8		47	47	
Mixed Use	Bay Spring Ave.	Primrose			1		1	12	
Haines Park Village	Washington Road	Primrose		3			3	10	
Barrington Cove	Bay Spring Ave.	Primrose			60		60	60	
Family housing unit	Western Ave	Primrose	1				1	1	
Group Home Beds	Various locations	various				35	35	35	
Subtotal			2	41	69	35	147	165	2.35%
BUILT - After 2010 Census									
Anoka Mixed-Use	Anoka/Wood Ave.	Nayatt			1		1	4	
Walker Farm Lane	County Road	Primrose	10	2			12	12	
Dziuba Subdivision	South St/Maple	Nayatt		2			2	3	
Subtotal			2	41	69	35	15	19	0.24%
Final Plan Approval									
Lavin's Subd.	Narragansett Ave	Primrose	2				2	10	
Sweetbriar	Sweetbriar Road	Primrose	3				3	3	
Bluemead Farm	Chachapacasset	Nayatt	1	2			3	11	
Subtotal			5	0	0	0	8	24	0.13%
Master Plan Approval									
Palmer Pointe	Sowams Road	Sowams		6	34		40	40	
Subtotal			0	6	34	0	40	40	0.63%
TOTAL			9	88	172	70	210	248	3.34%

Source: Barrington Planning Department

Goals, Objectives, Policies and Actions

Goal HN-1: Expand supply of senior housing to meet growing demand of retiring Baby Boomers and the needs of residents with disabilities.

Objective HN-1.1: Completion of at least 50 units within a senior residential community or communities by 2020.

Policy HN-1.1.1: Identify sites that are appropriate for a variety of housing types for seniors.

Policy HN-1.1.2: Reduce barriers to senior housing through amendments to the Zoning Ordinance and related regulations.

Policy HN-1.1.3: Support the development of housing for residents with physical and mental disabilities that encourage independent living, and support alterations of current housing stock to achieve compliance with the RI Civil Rights of Individuals with Handicaps Act and the American with Disabilities Act of 1990.

Actions

- A. Establish new senior residential community zoning at the former Zion Bible Institute site consistent with the Comprehensive Community Plan – Appendix III.
- B. Complete a study of the market viability of the existing Zoning Ordinance Article XXX: Senior Residential Communities, and revise to enable cottage-style developments consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

Table 19: Low- and Moderate-Income Housing Action Table

Strategy	Responsible Party	Resource	Timeframe
Create a Housing Trust Fund	Town Council	Town Council, Planning Board, Housing Board	In progress
Establish a Housing Trust	Town Council	Initially volunteers, transition to full-time administrator	In progress
Pursue Public/ Private/ Nonprofit Housing Alliances	Town Council, Planning Board, Town Planner	Planning Board, Town Manager, Town Planner	Ongoing
Tax Credit Program	Town Council, Town Planner, Housing Trust	Town Staff, Planning Board, Housing Trust	Within 5 years
Evaluate Town, Tax Title Property for Use as LMI Housing Development	Town Council, Planning Board, Town Planner	Planning Board and Town Manager	Ongoing
Zoning Changes:			
1. Mandate Inclusionary Zoning			Adopted (2006)
2. Senior Residential Community (SRC)			Adopted (2012)
3. Apartments Above Comm. Uses			Adopted (2012)
4. Allow Accessory Apartments			Adopted (2012)
5. Allow Affordable Housing Development on Substandard Lots	Planning Board, Council		Adopted (2012)
6. Identify Areas that Could Support a Mix of Housing Types			Adopted (2012)
7. Allow “Village,” “Mixed-Use Village” development.		Town staff, Housing Board, other Boards and Commissions	Subject to developer application)
Strongly Negotiate Comprehensive Permits	Planning Board, Town Council	Town staff, consultants	Ongoing
Capture Existing “Affordable Homes”	Town Council, Housing Trust	Town Planner, Finance Director	Ongoing

Source: Barrington Planning Department

C. Revise Zoning Ordinances to allow for “senior-friendly” attached and detached accessory apartments on single-family lots.

Goal HN-2: Ensure that future development is compatible with the character of Barrington in general and that of individual neighborhoods.

Objective HN-2.1: Revise Zoning Ordinance and Map by 2017 to establish standards that protect or enhance the character of Barrington’s neighborhoods through building and site design.

Policy HN-2.1.1: Pursue Zoning Ordinance amendments and other strategies that encourage compatible scale and building massing.

Policy HN-2.1.2: Encourage scattered-site affordable housing involving new construction and qualification of existing homes as affordable.

Policy HN-2.1.3: Allow well-designed, compatible mixed-use development in commercial areas, while enhancing the pedestrian environment.

Actions

- A. Adopt flexible zoning standards to allow architectural encroachments and encourage greater variety, such as architectural encroachments (porches, stoops, bay windows, etc.) into the minimum front-yard setback.
- B. Consider adjusting the setback averaging dimensional standards, where appropriate, to allow reduced front-yard setbacks consistent with the surrounding historic neighborhood development pattern.
- C. Adopt Village Center Design Guidelines and formally incorporate in the Town’s review process for commercial, mixed-use and multi-family development proposals.
- D. Strengthen or establish new standards for buffers, site lighting, location of parking and placement of buildings within land development projects, including mixed-use and multi-family developments.

See the Implementation element for information on implementation schedule, priorities, estimated costs, responsibilities and action types.

E. Conduct parcel study to:

- Evaluate compatibility of R10 and R25 zoning with existing neighborhoods to determine whether zoning should be adjusted or new zones established to better reflect the area’s character.
- Recommend zoning standards that would require homes on “teardown” lots to better reflect neighborhood character.

F. Create a Neighborhoods Map based on original plats and evolution of neighborhoods over time, as means of identifying historic boundaries of neighborhoods.

Goal HN-3: Continue to comply with the State’s 10 percent affordable housing goal through provision of well-integrated and compatible affordable housing.

Objective HN-3.1: Qualify as affordable at least three existing housing units on scattered sites per year by 2020.

Policy HN-3.1.1: Provide financial and administrative support required to implement the “capture existing affordable housing” program.

Policy HN-3.1.2: Engage the Housing Board of Trustees in order to use available funds in the most cost-effective, productive manner.

Actions

- A. Fund a revolving fund to support a Housing Trust program to acquire and rehabilitate existing houses in order to qualify the homes as affordable.
- B. Formally adopt incentives to capture existing houses affordable to LMI households, such as property tax abatements and funding from the Home Repair Program.

- C. Establish specific guidelines for acquiring / qualifying existing houses by Planning Board applicants subject to provisions of mandatory inclusionary zoning, as permitted an “off-site” alternative.
- D. Engage a consultant, contract with an outside agency, or establish a part-time position to administer the program. Provide an annual report, from the Housing Board of Trustees, on the status of the program, including the number of LMI houses qualified each year and an analysis of the need for housing programs, such as applications for heating assistance and weatherization.

Objective HN-3.2: Produce affordable housing units at a rate that keeps Barrington on the path toward achieving the 10 percent affordable housing goal by 2035.

Policy HN-3.2.1: Implement actions through study and revisions to land use regulations to achieve the affordable housing goal.

Policy HN-3.2.2: Monitor effectiveness of regulations in producing affordable housing units.

Policy HN-3.2.3: Allow comprehensive permit proposals that provide 50 percent or more affordable housing units to be granted density increases of up to “one step” in the underlying zoning district, provided that the affordable units are deed-restricted for more than thirty (30) years, and the site has adequate infrastructure, including water, sewer, storm-water management and roadways.

Actions

- A. Revise Zoning Ordinance to establish one-step density increase for comprehensive permit applications, per Policy HN-3.2.3, above.
- B. Work with the State to provide more flexibility in achieving the 10 percent LMI goal, such as:

See Appendix IV for estimated number of LMI units to be produced by each of the proposed actions below and previously adopted strategies.

- Allowing for more flexibility to qualify accessory apartments as affordable, such as by eliminating the monitoring requirements, in line with federal Fair Housing laws.
- Establishing a realistic inclusionary zoning fee in lieu amount sufficient to create units in Barrington.
- Providing more credit for rental units in calculating a municipality’s LMI percentage.
- Enabling a local rent subsidy program to make rents more affordable for income-qualified households, provided that each household with a subsidy count toward the LMI unit percentage.

- C. Create an illustrated guide illustrating best practices for designing cottage-style housing, accessory apartments and two-family structures.
- D. Hold workshops and conduct other public outreach on affordable housing options available in the Zoning Ordinance and Subdivision Regulations.