

**ARCHITECTURAL AND HISTORIC DISTRICT REVIEW BOARD
VILLAGE OF WARWICK
MARCH 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, March 3, 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, Matthew LoPinto and Glen Rhein. Also present was AHDRB Administrator Kristin Bialosky. Other’s present: Chris Collins, Samuel Levin, Katie Trainor, Amy Pagan, Dennis Rutherford, Nick McElroy and Jason Hartman.

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: February 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 Aye

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 applicant explained that the property has been in the family for approximately 49–50 years and that the existing

house has not been maintained in recent years. The proposal is to remove the existing structure and construct a new two-story building intended to house the applicant's family members along with additional apartment units. The Board discussed the applicable provisions of the Village Code for multiple residences, including noting that the project will also require review and approval of a special use permit by the Village Board. Members discussed several design considerations required under the Code, including parking layout and the need to provide screening to minimize the visibility of parked vehicles from the roadway given the limited lot size, the potential for underground utilities where feasible, and the placement and screening of mechanical equipment such as HVAC units. The Board also discussed the need to provide screening or an enclosure for solid waste and recycling areas. With respect to building design, the Board noted that the Code requires multiple residences to resemble a single-family dwelling and to be consistent with the character and scale of the surrounding neighborhood. While members generally felt the overall size and scale of the building were acceptable in the context of nearby townhouses and apartment buildings, concerns were raised regarding the proposed façade treatment, which included multiple colors and materials that caused the structure to read as several separate buildings rather than a single residence. The Board suggested simplifying the design by reducing the number of materials and considering a more cohesive color palette, such as one primary color or a limited range of tones, while still allowing architectural variation. Additional discussion included maintaining consistent siding materials, reconsidering the stone base treatment, and ensuring that roof materials remain visually cohesive. The Board also requested additional details showing landscaping and screening for parking, the location and screening of mechanical equipment, and the location and screening of refuse and recycling areas.

Action: The Board determined that the applicant should return with revised drawings showing a simplified color scheme and façade treatment, along with additional details for landscaping, parking screening, mechanical equipment, and refuse enclosures, for further review by the AHDRB.

The Board Recommended the following: **NOT APPROVED**

The Board determined that the applicant should return with revised drawings showing:

- A simplified color scheme and façade treatment.
- Landscaping details.
- Parking screening.
- The location and screening of mechanical equipment.
- Refuse and recycling enclosures.

The application will return to the AHDRB for further review once the requested revisions are submitted and will be placed on a future AHDRB agenda upon submission by the applicant’s architects, Base 10 Architecture (Chris Collins, Samuel Levin, and Katie Trainor).

2. 40 High St.; Hartman ** Should the PB site plans change the applicant must come back the AHDRBSecond 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 applicant explained that the building was designed through a historic lens and presented revisions discussed at the prior meeting. The most notable revisions involved the roof dormers and overall roof treatment. The dormers, which had previously been shown in white, were revised so that they match the color of the roof, allowing them to blend in and visually unify the roofline. Board members noted that this change was a significant improvement, commenting that the darker dormers helped solidify the roof visually. The applicant also presented an alternate dormer design for the third floor, replacing the previously proposed round or dome dormers with a simpler gable dormer form. Board members expressed a clear preference for the revised dormer design, noting that it appeared less visually heavy, more appropriate architecturally, and likely less costly to construct. The short elevation was also revised to include a shed dormer rather than multiple round dormers, which the Board agreed worked better with the building layout.

The Board discussed the proposed façade materials, particularly the option showing a brick base with upper siding. Members noted that while the color and appearance of the brick were appealing, it would be important to confirm whether the material would be true brick or brick veneer. If brick veneer is used, proper detailing at the window openings would be necessary to create an authentic appearance, such as brick returns. If such detailing cannot be achieved, members suggested that lap siding may be the preferred option, as it would allow for appropriate trim detailing and would be consistent with historic building practices in the Village. The Board commented positively on the lap siding option shown, noting that the addition of window trim and corner boards strengthened the architectural character of the building.

The Board also discussed the color palette, indicating that the proposed muted historic tones were appropriate. Members referenced the use of neutral or putty-style siding colors with darker roof elements, noting that this approach fits well with the character of the Village.

Members further commented on the placement of the second-floor windows, noting that the windows appeared too close to the bracketed cornice line. The applicant acknowledged the issue and indicated that revisions had already been made to the upper window configuration.

The Board recommended that the second-floor windows be lowered slightly to allow space for a proper trim band or frieze above the windows before the cornice begins, which would improve the overall architectural proportions.

The Board also noted improvements to the site layout, including the relocation of sidewalks away from the building to allow planting areas along the perimeter. Members felt this created better separation between the building and paved areas and allowed space for landscaping. The Board also discussed the location of mechanical equipment and refuse areas, requesting additional details on screening. The applicant indicated that mechanical equipment would be located along the rear of the building, facing away from High Street, which the Board indicated was acceptable provided adequate screening is incorporated.

Additional discussion included the ground-floor commercial façade, where members suggested incorporating wall-mounted lighting fixtures at the commercial entrances to improve nighttime visibility and architectural character. The Board also raised the issue of future commercial signage, recommending that a defined signage band be incorporated above the storefronts to allow for consistent signage for the commercial tenants.

The Board concluded that the project had improved significantly with the revisions presented and requested that the applicant return with updated drawings incorporating the discussed adjustments, including lowering the second-floor windows to allow proper trim spacing, confirming façade materials and detailing, providing lighting at the commercial entrances, clarifying screening for mechanical equipment and refuse areas, and identifying an appropriate signage location above the commercial storefronts. The application will return to the AHDRB for further review once the revisions are submitted by the applicant’s architects, Base 10 (Chris Collins, Samuel Levin, and Katie Trainor).

Action:

The Board requested that the applicant return with revised drawings reflecting the Board’s comments, including lowering the second-floor windows to provide appropriate trim and frieze spacing beneath the cornice, confirming the final façade material and detailing (brick versus lap siding), incorporating wall-mounted lighting at the commercial entrances, providing details for screening of mechanical equipment and refuse areas, and identifying a consistent signage location above the commercial storefronts. The application will return to the AHDRB for further review once the revisions are submitted by the applicant’s architects, Base 10 (Chris Collins, Samuel Levin, and Katie Trainor).

The Board Recommended the following: **NOT APPROVED**

The Board determined that the applicant should return with revised drawings showing:

- The revised third-floor dormer design replacing the previously proposed round dormers.
- Second-floor windows lowered to provide appropriate trim and frieze space beneath the bracketed cornice.
- Confirmation of façade materials and detailing, including clarification of brick veneer or lap siding treatment and window trim details.
- Exterior lighting fixtures at the ground-floor commercial entrances.
- Screening details for mechanical equipment and refuse areas.
- A defined signage location or signage band above the commercial storefronts.

93 Main St. CBC Beer Bar:

Discussion:

The Board reviewed the proposed modification at 93 Main Street (CBC Beer). The applicant had obtained a building permit for the work, which involves removing an existing window and installing a door in its place to serve as a required second means of egress. The applicant explained that the Building Inspector advised that this location was the only feasible location for the required egress door, and that the door being installed is the same style and type previously approved for the building. Because the location of the door was dictated by building code requirements and the door style had already been approved, the applicant did not submit a Certificate of No Exterior Effect and instead the building permit application was brought to the Board for informational purposes.

The Board reviewed the existing and proposed conditions and agreed that the change was appropriate and consistent with the previously approved design elements for the building. The Board also acknowledged that the location of the door was determined by building code requirements.

Action:

The Board determined that the installation of the egress door in place of the existing window at 93 Main Street is acceptable as presented and acknowledged the modification for the historical record of the AHDRB.

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 Aye

Kristin Bialosky
Building, Planning, Zoning & AHDRB Administrator



WATCH THE MEETING ON YOU TUBE: <https://youtube.com/live/G1F9Avn0s-M>