

**ARCHITECTURAL AND HISTORIC DISTRICT REVIEW BOARD
VILLAGE OF WARWICK
APRIL 7, 2026
Minutes**

**LOCATION:
VILLAGE HALL
77 MAIN STREET, WARWICK, NY
5:00 P.M.**

The Regular Meeting of the Architectural and Historic District Review Board of the Village of Warwick was held on Tuesday, April 7, 2026, at 5:00 p.m. in Village Hall, 77 Main Street, Warwick, NY. Present was Chairman Michael Bertolini, Board Members: Chris DeHaan, Jane Glazman, and Matthew LoPinto. Glen Rhein was absent. Also present was AHDRB Administrator Kristin Bialosky. Other's present: Chris Collins, Samuel Levin, Katie Trainor, Amy Pagan, Dennis Rutherford and Amy Rutherford and Tyler Folino.

Chairman Michael Bertolini called the meeting to order and led in the Pledge of Allegiance. Kristin Bialosky held the roll call.

Acceptance of Minutes

A **MOTION** was made by Chris DeHaan, seconded by Jane Glazeman, and carried for the Acceptance of Minutes: March 3, 2026.

The vote on the foregoing motion was as follows: **APPROVED**

Michael Bertolini Aye Chris DeHaan Aye Jane Glazman Aye

Matthew LoPinto Aye Glen Rhein Absent

1. **30 Brady Rd.; Alice Rutherford ** Should the PB site plans change the applicant must come back the AHDRB****

Seeking approval of Certificate of No Exterior Effect

Discussion:

The Board reviewed the application for 30 Brady Road (Alice Rutherford), which was referred to the AHDRB by the Village Board due to proposed plan changes associated with the demolition of the existing residence and construction of a new building containing four apartments. The discussion centered on refining the proposed building design to better align

with local architectural character and zoning constraints. A key theme was simplification of the building's aesthetic. Base 10 Architects was advised to reduce the number of materials and colors, resulting in a more cohesive and muted palette. The AHDRB ultimately supported a monochromatic approach, specifically an off-white or light façade paired with white windows and trim, as this was seen as more consistent with surrounding residential developments and would present the structure as a unified, single-family-style building rather than giving the appearance of a multi-unit structure. Landscaping and site design were also discussed in detail, particularly the need to incorporate plantings and screening to obscure views of the parking area and garbage enclosures from the roadway. These elements were reflected in both the conceptual site plan and renderings and were considered an important component of improving the project's visual impact from the street. A significant portion of the conversation focused on outdoor living spaces, including patios and porches. AHDRB members expressed concern about how outdoor areas would function in practice, noting that individually claimed patio spaces could lead to disputes among tenants if not clearly defined. While there was interest in providing each unit with some form of private or semi-private outdoor space, the AHDRB acknowledged that the current layout—particularly front-facing access and lack of rear doors—creates challenges for usability and circulation. The idea of incorporating full front porches was discussed primarily as an aesthetic feature to better match the character of nearby homes; however, it was determined that zoning setbacks and the constrained building footprint make this difficult without significantly altering the floor plans or seeking variances. It was also recognized that pursuing such variances could introduce additional costs and delays. As a compromise, the AHDRB suggested enhancing the appearance of a porch through architectural detailing rather than full structural changes. Minor architectural revisions were recommended, including the addition of posts/columns to simulate a porch element and mirror the architectural treatment on the opposite side of the building to improve visual symmetry, while maintaining the existing footprint and avoiding impacts to setbacks. Additionally, it was recommended to improve site connectivity, such as linking walkways more directly to patio areas, to make outdoor spaces more functional. The discussion also emphasized that the project remains in an early stage of the approval process. As such, the current approvals are considered preliminary, and the applicant may be required to return to the AHDRB if further changes are made to the proposal. In summary, the AHDRB reached general consensus on simplifying the design, adopting a cohesive color scheme, incorporating additional landscaping for screening, and making minor architectural adjustments to improve aesthetics. Base 10 Architects will revise the drawings accordingly, with the expectation that the project may return for further review depending on any future changes.

Action: The applicant may be required to return to the AHDRB for further review pending any changes in the site plan resulting from Planning Board comments.

The Board Recommended the following: **APPROVED**

- Creamy white exterior with white windows as presented in updated drawing 4/9/26 and architectural revisions, as shown in drawing of 4/9/26 including the addition of posts/railings to simulate a porch element, matching the posts/railings on the opposite side of the building to improve visual symmetry, while maintaining the existing footprint and avoiding impacts to setbacks.

- Landscaping details.
- Parking screening.
- The location and screening of mechanical equipment.
- Refuse and recycling enclosures.

2. **40 High St.; Hartman ** Should the PB site plans change the applicant must come back the AHDRB**Second Updated Submission**

Seeking approval of Certificate of No Exterior Effect

Discussion:

The Board reviewed the revised proposal for 40 High Street, which involves replacing the existing small utility/block building on the site with a new mixed-use structure containing three commercial units on the first floor and ten residential apartments above. The Board continued its discussion from the prior meeting, noting that the project was nearing approval pending several outstanding items. Base 10 Architects confirmed that previously requested revisions had been addressed, including the incorporation of lighting, signage, and screening for mechanical equipment and refuse enclosures, as well as adjustments to window proportions. The primary focus of the discussion centered on final color selections, specifically the treatment of the dormers on the upper level. The AHDRB evaluated whether the dormers should match the roof color in a darker “gun metal” tone or be presented in a lighter cream color to better integrate with the overall façade. Members discussed the visual impact of each option, with some expressing concern that darker dormers would create a top-heavy appearance, while others noted that lighter tones would better align with the simpler architectural character of surrounding buildings along High Street. It was also acknowledged that earlier concerns regarding window design had been resolved, and that the revised windows were now considered an improvement and no longer required visual suppression through darker colors. Additional clarification was provided regarding materials and detailing, with the applicant indicating that dormer side panels would be constructed with a simple, flat or tight shiplap-style treatment to maintain a clean and historically appropriate appearance. The AHDRB emphasized the importance of maintaining a cohesive and simplified design consistent with the character of the Village. Following discussion, the Board reached consensus to approve the lighter, cream-colored treatment for the dormers while retaining the proposed roof color. The Board further confirmed that all other previously discussed elements, including lighting, signage, and screening, were acceptable. The application was approved as discussed, with the understanding that any future changes to materials or colors would require the applicant to return to the AHDRB for further review.

Action:

The Board determined that the application for 40 High Street is approved as discussed, reflecting the agreed-upon revisions and final design details. Any future changes to materials or colors will require the applicant to return to the AHDRB for further review.

The Board Recommended the following: **APPROVED**

- Finalized color selection, including the lighter, cream-colored treatment for the dormers.
- A cohesive exterior design consistent with the architectural character of High Street.
- Revised window design as previously discussed and accepted.
- Incorporated lighting, signage, and screening for mechanical equipment and refuse enclosures.
- Simplified dormer detailing, utilizing a flat or tight shiplap-style treatment for a clean appearance.

3. 19 Welling Place; Base 10 Architecture; Chris Collins

Seeking approval of Certificate of No Exterior Effect; New Permanent Sign

Increasing Size of Previously approved Sign

Discussion:

The Board reviewed the proposed signage modification and discussed whether the change would impact the overall size and appearance of the sign. The applicant clarified that there would be no increase in the overall size; rather, the modification involves replacing a larger flat panel with a more refined design that emphasizes only the logo, thereby reducing unnecessary negative space. Although the configuration changes slightly, the proportions of the upper and lower signage elements would match those on the opposite side of the building, creating greater uniformity across the façade while still allowing for distinct branding. The AHDRB acknowledged that the revised approach improves visual clarity and consistency, noting that the updated signage would better reflect the architectural intent and be more easily understood by the public. The Board expressed support for the revised design, concluding that it enhances the overall appearance of the building without increasing visual impact.

Action: The Board determined that the proposed signage modification is acceptable as presented, as it does not increase the overall size and improves the visual clarity and uniformity of the building façade.

The Board Recommended the following: **APPROVED**

- Sign approved as presented and modified

Discussion:

44 Colonial Ave

The Board reviewed the application for 44 Colonial Avenue, which involved a proposed change in exterior siding color due to the original pre-finished material no longer being available. The applicant indicated that while the siding color would change, the existing trim color—a natural cream—would remain. The proposed replacement color was presented as a historically appropriate tone with brown and reddish-burgundy undertones, called Townsend Harbor Brown, intended to complement the architectural style of the home and surrounding context. Board members discussed the color in relation to nearby properties and seasonal landscaping, noting that the contrast with the light trim and surrounding greenery would enhance the overall appearance. While some initial hesitation was expressed regarding brown tones, the consensus was that the selected color is sophisticated, appropriate for the style of the house, and visually appealing. The Board ultimately supported the proposed color change, finding it consistent with the character of the structure and the neighborhood.

Adjournment

A **MOTION** was made by Matthew LoPinto, seconded by Chris DeHaan and carried to adjourn the regular meeting at approximately 5:45 p.m.

The vote on the foregoing **motion** was as follows: **APPROVED:**

Michael Bertolini Aye Chris DeHaan Aye Jane Glazman Aye

Matthew LoPinto Aye Glen Rhein Absent

Kristin Bialosky
Building, Planning, Zoning & AHDRB Administrator



WATCH THE MEETING ON YOUTUBE: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_z7R7I7CSdQ