

**ARCHITECTURAL AND HISTORIC DISTRICT REVIEW BOARD
VILLAGE OF WARWICK
FEBRUARY 3, 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, February 3, 2026, at 5:00 p.m. in Village Hall, 77 Main Street, Warwick, NY. Present was Board Members: Chris DeHaan, Jane Glazman, Matthew LoPinto and Glen Rhein. Chairman Michael Bertolini was absent. Also present was AHDRB Administrator Kristin Bialosky. Other's present: Chris Collins, Samuel Levin, Katie Trainor, Mr. & Mrs. Ulrich, Christina George, Edwin George, David Kenny, Patty & Charlie Bossolina, Zachery Rumpf, Dennis Rutherford, Nick McElroy, and Larry Fitzkee.

Chris DeHaan 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 Jane Glazman, seconded by Glen Rhein, and carried for the Acceptance of Minutes: January 6, 2025.

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

Michael Bertolini Absent Chris DeHaan Aye Jane Glazman Aye

Matthew LoPinto Aye Glen Rhein Aye

1. T-Mobil; David Kenny, Esq.

Seeking approval of No Exterior Effect

Discussion:

The Board reviewed an application from T-Mobile for modifications to its existing rooftop telecommunications facility at St. Anthony's Community Hospital. T-Mobile's attorney, David Kenny, explained that the equipment is located at the top of the bulkhead and fully concealed behind existing screen walls, which will not be altered. The proposed work involves swapping

antennas and equipment and will not create any visible or aesthetic changes to the site. It was noted that T-Mobile’s special permit renewal was missed in 2020 during the COVID process, requiring the matter to return to the Village Board of Trustees for a new special use permit, which also triggered referral to the AHDRB. As there is no aesthetic impact, the application was approved as presented following with all members in favor.

Action:

The AHDRB approved the T-Mobile rooftop equipment modification as presented. A written letter of approval will be issued for the applicant’s records.

The Board Recommended the following: **APPROVED**

- T-Mobile rooftop equipment modifications as presented.

2. 19 Welling Place; Base 10 Architecture; Chris Collins

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

Color and style of Sign

Decals on Door

Discussion:

The Board reviewed the signage application for 19 Welling Place submitted by Base 10 Architecture. Chris Collins noted the building is nearly complete and a Certificate of Occupancy was recently issued. The applicant proposed a wall-mounted sign with standoffs, a smaller sign above the entry door for visibility, and door/window signage including the firm logo and lettering. The Board discussed concerns that the door/window sign contained more verbiage than permitted by code and that the amount of information on the glass was excessive. After initially recommending removal of both the phone number and website address, the Board later revisited the applicant and agreed that a simplified version would be acceptable. The Board confirmed approval for the applicant to keep the phone number, remove the “.com” website reference, and keep the wording minimal, with the revised layout centered appropriately.

Action:

The AHDRB recommended approval of the signage for Base 10 Architecture with the condition that the door/window sign be revised to remove the website (“.com”) and the address to reduce the overall verbiage, while allowing the Suite 1A and phone number to remain. Suite 1A will be capitalized and centered. All other signage elements were supported as presented, and a written letter reflecting the Board’s recommendation will be issued for the applicant’s records.

The Board Recommended the following: **APPROVED**

- Color and style of Sign over store as presented
- Color and Sign as presented
- Decals on Door as presented omitting 19 Welling Place and base10arch.com, center and capitalize Suite 1a over the phone number

3. 19 Welling Place; Bossolina Construction; Charlie and Patty Bossolina

Seeking approval of Certificate of No Exterior Effect and Alteration/Relocation of Permanent Sign

Color and style of Sign

Decals on Door

Discussion:

The Board reviewed the next signage application for 19 Welling Place, submitted for Charlie and Patty Bossolina’s business, which is located in the same building. The applicant presented proposed door signage with a logo and lettering intended to be consistent with the building’s overall signage style, including die-cut aluminum elements and white lettering on clear glass. The Board discussed the code limitation regarding the number of words permitted on door/window signage and noted that the Building Department comment indicated the proposed glass sign “exceeds five words.” The applicant emphasized that phone numbers are important for their business, as they operate in two states and have used two phone numbers for many years, and they do not have a website. The Board discussed whether “suite” identification should be counted toward the verbiage limit since it is required for addressing purposes and considered whether one phone number could be removed to bring the sign into compliance. Ultimately, the Board determined the signage was not visually overbearing, was placed low on the door, and did not negatively impact the aesthetic appearance. The Board agreed to approve the signage as presented, including both phone numbers.

Action:

The AHDRB approved the 19 Welling Place door/window signage as presented, including the proposed logo and both phone numbers. A written letter of approval will be issued for the applicant’s records.

The Board Recommended the following: **APPROVED**

- Color and style of Sign over store as presented
- Color and Sign as presented

- Decals on Door as presented

4. 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 referral for 30 Brady Road, introduced as an application by property owners Amy and Dennis Rutherford (with Alice also present). Board member Chris DeHaan explained that the proposal is a residential building and not a commercial project, and that it is not located within the Village Historic District. The Board clarified that residential projects outside the Historic District are generally not within the AHDRB's normal scope of review, and that the Planning Board referral was made largely as a courtesy and to maintain consistency with the character of Warwick. The applicant described the design intent as creating a multi-unit building that visually reads as a single-family farmhouse that appears to have evolved over time through additions, consistent with traditional local farmhouses. The Board discussed the building scale and footprint (approximately 4,500 square feet total) and reviewed the general site layout including parking. A member of the public asked where concerns could be raised, and the Board advised that public comment and concerns should be directed to the Planning Board public hearing, where the site plan application will be formally reviewed.

Action:

The AHDRB noted that 30 Brady Road is outside the Historic District and not within the Board's required jurisdiction, and therefore the Board offered no formal comments or recommendations on the application. The applicant and public were directed to continue the review process through the Planning Board, where public hearing comments may be made.

The Board Recommended the following: **No formal Comments on this project as it is outside the Historic District.**

5. 40 High St.; Nick McElroy ** 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 40 High Street, commonly referred to as the former telephone company lot, which currently contains a one-story cinder block building that is proposed to be removed. The applicant presented plans for a new mixed-use building with three commercial units on the first floor along with the main residential entry, and ten apartments on the upper levels. Renderings were shown with two exterior material concepts,

including a brick option and a clapboard-style option, and the Board noted that either material could be acceptable from an aesthetic standpoint. The Board's primary concern focused on the third-floor roofline and dormer layout, which was described as appearing visually busy and top-heavy, particularly on the street-facing elevations. Members discussed that the first and second floors were generally well received, but that the upper portion of the building would benefit from simplification, such as reducing the number of dormers, adjusting their spacing, changing dormer styles or sizes, and potentially using color or other design modifications to make the top floor feel lighter and better balanced. The Board also discussed that the rear elevation would be less visible due to the proximity of neighboring structures but emphasized that the street-facing side should be refined to improve overall rhythm and appearance. The applicant acknowledged the feedback and agreed to return with multiple revised options for the third-floor roofline and dormer configuration for further review at a future meeting.

Action:

The Board requested that the applicant revise the third-floor roofline and dormer design to reduce visual heaviness and return with updated renderings for continued review at the next meeting.

The Board Recommended the following: **Applicant to revise the third – floor roofline and dormer design to reduce visual heaviness and return with updated renderings for continued review.**

6. 67 Colonial Ave; Larry Fitzkee

Seeking approval of No Exterior Effect

The Board reviewed the application for 67 Colonial Avenue, presented by Larry, with the project prepared by Base 10 Architecture. The applicant provided existing photographs, proposed elevations, and material/color information for review. The overall intent of the project was to make exterior improvements that would be respectful to the original 1905 house, maintain the architectural vocabulary of the residence, and ensure the final result appears as though it has always been part of the home. The Board noted that when comparing the existing and proposed street-facing views, the changes appear minimal and would have very limited visual impact from the road, which was viewed positively. The applicant explained that an existing rear/side addition was poorly constructed, had long-term issues including water infiltration, and would be removed and rebuilt. The new work is intended to better match the main house and improve function, including creating a more usable porch area and protecting entry doors from weather exposure. The Board discussed the proposed siding approach and confirmed the intent is to maintain the look of the original clapboard siding, even though the exact existing material is no longer available. The architect described efforts to source a composite material that closely replicates the original profile and detailing so the new construction blends seamlessly with the existing structure, including matching trim, casings, and overall proportions. The Board also reviewed roof considerations and noted that due to the low-slope roof areas, a dark membrane roof system such as TPO was being shown as a placeholder, with final roofing material still to be determined based on technical requirements. While the overall design was well received, the Board offered specific aesthetic comments,

including that the proposed chimney on the addition appeared too short or “squat” and would look better if it were taller and more consistent with the proportions of the existing chimneys on the home. The Board also suggested that the street-facing doors and window proportions on the addition should closely match or replicate the existing configuration to maintain consistency with the original design and detailing. The applicant and design team acknowledged these comments, and the Board expressed general support for the project moving forward.

Action:

The AHDRB expressed support for the proposed exterior renovation and addition at 67 Colonial Avenue and recommended approval with the following conditions: the chimney on the addition should be revised to a taller proportion, and the street-facing door/window configuration should be adjusted to more closely match the original design. A written letter reflecting the Board’s recommendation will be issued for the applicant’s records.

The Board Recommended the following: **APPROVED as presented with the following conditions:**

Chimney on addition should be revised to taller proportion

The street-facing door and window configuration shall be adjusted to match, or be similar in design to, the existing front doors.

Roof TPO.

Discussion:

- **Review letter Mr. Tein – 48 Main Street to put up a fence to block out garbage area**

The Board discussed the area located between the buildings on Main Street, specifically the space between the Fetch business and the adjacent CBD storefront. Photographs of the area were reviewed, and ownership of the subject property was clarified. It was determined that Mr. Tein owns the building at 48 Main Street as well as the land located between the two flanking buildings, though he does not own the neighboring structures. The Board discussed the condition of the space, including the presence of refuse. After discussion, the Board agreed to send a letter to Mr. Tein recommending that the area be screened with a fence and gate, similar to the neighboring business. The Board reviewed the draft letter and agreed it should be sent as written. The Chair was authorized to sign the letter.

Adjournment

A **MOTION** was made by Matthew LoPinto, seconded by Jane Glazman 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 Absent Chris DeHaan Aye Jane Glazman Aye

Matthew LoPinto Aye Glen Rhein Aye

Kristin Bialosky
Building, Planning, Zoning & AHDRB Administrator

WATCH THE MEETING ON YOU TUBE: <https://www.youtube.com/live/aSxxrsGvgww>