

**PLANNING BOARD  
VILLAGE OF WARWICK**

**July 8, 2025**

**Minutes**

**LOCATION:**

**VILLAGE HALL**

**77 MAIN STREET, WARWICK, NY**

**7:30 P.M.**

**MAXIMUM OCCUPANCY- 40**

The Regular Meeting of the Planning Board of the Village of Warwick was held on Tuesday, July 8, 2025, at 7:30 p.m. in Village Hall, 77 Main Street, Warwick, NY. Present was Board Members: Kerry Boland, Scot Brown, Bill Olsen, Bryan Barber and Alternate Vanessa Holland. Chairman Jesse Gallo, was absent. Also, present was the Planning Board Administrator, Kristin Bialosky and Alternate Planning Board Engineer Jane Samulson and Planning Board Attorney Elizabeth Cassidy. Amy and Tim Smith were also present.

Acting Chairperson, Bill Olsen called the meeting to order and led in the Pledge of Allegiance. Kristin Bialosky held the roll.

**Designating Chairperson in Chairperson Jesse Gallo's absence**

A **MOTION** was made by Scot Brown, seconded by Vanessa Holland to designate the most senior member of the Planning Board, Bill Olsen, as acting Chairperson for the July 8, 2025, meeting.

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

Bryan Barber Aye      Kerry Boland Aye      Scot Brown Aye

Vanessa Holland Aye   Bill Olsen Aye      Jesse Gallo Abstain

**Acceptance of Planning Board Minutes**

A **MOTION** was made by Scot Brown, seconded by Kerry Boland and carried for the Acceptance of Planning Board Minutes: June 10, 2025.

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

Bryan Barber Abstain      Kerry Boland Aye      Scot Brown Aye

Vanessa Holland Abstain   Bill Olsen Aye      Jesse Gallo Absent

## **Applications**

### **25 Park Ave – Site Plan – Amy and Tim Smith**

<https://villageofwarwick.org/25-park-ave-one-story-addition/>  
**Site Plan Application for One Story Addition**

## **Discussion:**

The applicant, Mr. and Mrs. Smith, appeared before the Planning Board to discuss the proposed one story addition to their home. The acting Chairperson Bill Olsen asked the attorney to read her comments for the project.

I have reviewed the application of Tim and Amy Smith to permit construction of a single-story addition. In preparation of this memorandum, I have reviewed:

- Application, signed May 20, 2025
- Survey prepared by John McGloin, dated June 14, 1990, last revised May 5, 2025

I offer the following comments:

| <b>Comment</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            | <b>Status</b>   |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|
| 1. The Property is located in the R zoning district. Single-family homes are a permitted use and fall under use group “b”.                                                                                                                                | For Information |
| 2. I note and concur with the comments of Keith Woodruff, dated June 6, 2025.                                                                                                                                                                             |                 |
| 3. The proposed addition requires site plan approval because it does not comply with the bulk table. See § 145-90 (1). The proposed addition will require an area variance reducing the side yard set back from 20 feet to 7.4 (a variance of 12.6 feet). | For Information |
| 4. A public hearing is required (See § 145-93). Applicant shall mail notice of public hearing at least ten days before the public hearing to property owners within 300 feet of the site.                                                                 | For Information |
| 5. SEQR: This action is a Type II (See 6 NYCRR 617.5 (c) (11) and no further environmental review is required                                                                                                                                             | For Information |

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |                 |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|
| 6. The application is not subject to GML 239 review                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      | For Information |
| 7. The subject site is a corner lot pursuant to § 145-54. Applicant to designate which yard is the side yard and rear yard and note such designation on the site plan. At present, it appears it is the intention that the addition be located in the side yard.                                                         |                 |
| 8. Building Inspector confirmed garage is pre-existing non-conformity. 145-62 requires a separation of 15 feet between principal and accessory structures. Provided the proposed addition does not increase the existing non-conformity, a variance from 145-62 will not be required. Applicant and engineer to confirm. |                 |

Next action: Recommend referring to Zoning Board of Appeals subject to confirmation that proposed development coverage does not exceed 35%

Acting Chairperson Bill Olsen asked if there were any questions and Alternate Planning Board Engineer Jane Samulson read her comments -The applicant is proposing to construct a single-story, 12 by 30 foot addition on the southern side of an existing one-family dwelling. The proposed addition would be located just 7.4 feet from the southerly property line. The property is located in the R zoning district and is not within the Historic District, nor within any FEMA-designated floodway or floodplain. One-family residences are a permitted use in the R zone, and Group B bulk requirements apply to this property. During the discussion, it was noted that the site plan must include a bulk table that outlines both existing and proposed conditions to demonstrate conformity with zoning requirements. The plan should also clearly label and dimension the front, rear, and side yard setbacks around the entire property. While the length of the addition is shown, the depth is missing and must be added. Development coverage for both the current and proposed conditions must also be included on the plan, as coverage is limited to 35% of the lot. If the proposed addition causes this threshold to be exceeded, an area variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) will be required. The applicant was asked to confirm that the proposed addition would not interfere with any underground utilities, including water, gas, or sewer, and to add a note to the plan stating whether or not any are present. An existing fence currently terminates at the south side of the dwelling where the addition is planned; any modifications or removal of this fence should be shown on the revised site plan. Additionally, an approval box for official signatures must be added to the plans. A small location map identifying the property's location within the Village should also be included, preferably as an inset at the top of the plan. The applicant is working with surveyor John McGloin, who performed the previous survey, to update the site plan with these changes. The Board discussed whether to require the applicant to return with the revised plans before referring them to the ZBA, or to refer the application now, pending receipt of an updated plan. It was agreed that, as in recent similar cases, the most efficient approach would be to refer the application to the ZBA subject to receipt of the revised plans. This avoids requiring the applicant to attend two separate Planning Board meetings and helps minimize the need for multiple public hearings, which are often required due to the structure of the Village's code.

The Planning Board Engineer, Keith Woodruff will review the revised plans to confirm all required updates have been made and determine the extent of any variances needed. Specifically, the side yard setback variance is anticipated to be 12.6 feet (from the required 20 feet down to 7.4 feet). A variance for development coverage may also be required if the revised calculations show that the proposed addition exceeds the 35% coverage limit. As the changes are technical in nature and do not alter the physical layout of the proposed addition, the Board agreed there was no need to review the revised plans again before referring the application to the ZBA. A motion was made to refer the applicant to the Zoning Board of Appeals pending receipt of the updated site plan addressing all points raised by the engineer.

**Refer application of 25 Park Ave to the ZBA subject to confirmation of dimensions by Planning Board Engineer Keith Woodruff.**

A **MOTION** was made by Scot Brown, seconded by Bryan Barber and carried for the Village of Warwick Planning Board to declare referral of application of 25 Park Ave. to the ZBA subject to confirmation of dimensions by Planning Board Engineer Keith Woodruff.

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

Bryan Barber Aye      Kerry Boland Aye      Scot Brown Aye

Vanessa Holland Aye   Bill Olsen Aye      Jesse Gallo Absent

The Board discussed the procedural steps required for the applicant to move forward with their proposed addition, specifically in relation to the necessary Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) variances. It was confirmed that the ZBA process must occur before the Planning Board can finalize the site plan. Ms. Cassidy, Esq. clarified this application qualifies as a Type II action under SEQR, which simplifies the process by eliminating the need for coordinated environmental review. As a result, the Planning Board is not required to await SEQR completion from the ZBA before proceeding. The applicant will need to have the revised site plan completed by their surveyor, Mr. McGloin, and submitted to the Planning Board Engineer, Keith Woodruff. Once Mr. Woodruff identifies and confirms the required variances, the applicant can then apply to the ZBA. The ZBA process may involve multiple meetings, including an initial presentation and a separate public hearing, depending on scheduling. Ms. Cassidy said should the ZBA grant the necessary variances, the applicant would then return to the Planning Board to finalize the site plan. There was a discussion about potentially streamlining the process to avoid multiple appearances before the Planning Board, but it was decided that any premature scheduling could result in complications if the ZBA denies relief or requests modifications. It was emphasized the applicants should wait to see the outcome of the ZBA process before proceeding further. Photos of the house were reviewed to give the Board a visual understanding of the existing conditions, including the location of a fence and several large rhododendron bushes that the applicant is trying to preserve. The addition will be placed near the property line, but existing trees, fences, and shrubbery on the neighboring property are expected to mitigate visual impact. The applicant

shared that they have already spoken to the adjacent neighbor and believe there is a general comfort level with the project. If the ZBA grants the requested variances, the Planning Board does not anticipate a complicated final review. No formal action or motion was taken at this time, as the next step rests with the ZBA. Ms. Cassidy clarified for the applicants the next steps in the application process, that the applicant will work with their surveyor, John McGloin, to revise the site plan in accordance with the comments from both the Planning Board Engineer and the Planning Board attorney memo. Once the revisions are completed, the updated plan will be submitted to the Planning Board Engineer, Mr. Woodruff, who will confirm and identify the required variances. Only after Mr. Woodruff has signed off and provided a list of the necessary variances should the applicants proceed to submit their application to the Zoning Board of Appeals through Kristin at Village Hall. The ZBA will then process the application in the normal course. If the requested relief is granted, the applicant will return to the Planning Board for final site plan approval. If relief is not granted, the applicant may need to revise or reconsider the proposed plan. The applicant was advised to reach out to Kristin with any questions but to wait until Mr. Woodruff confirmed the specific variances needed before initiating the ZBA application.

### **Adjournment**

A **MOTION** was made by Vanessa Holland, seconded by Scot Brown, and carried to adjourn the regular meeting at approximately 8:10 p.m.

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

|                            |                         |                            |
|----------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| Bryan Barber <u>Aye</u>    | Kerry Boland <u>Aye</u> | Scot Brown <u>Aye</u>      |
| Vanessa Holland <u>Aye</u> | Bill Olsen <u>Aye</u>   | Jesse Gallo <u>Abstain</u> |

---

Kristin Bialosky, Planning Board Administrator

Please go to the link to watch the Planning Board Meeting:

<https://www.youtube.com/live/uIGwbbe8LHg>