

Inc. Village of Southampton  
Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation  
January 10, 2022

Due notice has been given, the public hearing of the Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation for the Village of Southampton was held via video conferencing on Monday, January 10, 2022 at 7pm.

Board members Chair Jeffrey Brodlieb, Sarah Latham, Peter DeWitt, John Gregory and Mark McIntire are present

MOTION by Chair second by J. Gregory

To open tonight's meeting.

On Vote: Chair, S. Latham, P. DeWitt, J. Gregory, M. McIntire

Counsel for the board, Alice Cooley is present.

Motion by Chair second by P. DeWitt

To approve the minutes of December 28, 2021

On Vote: Chair, S. Latham, P. DeWitt, J. Gregory, M. McIntire

On the application of **OREST BLISS**, 88 Meadow Lane. This was an application for a CoA for the demolition of the dwelling, there is a written decision in the file. The board found the views of this property from the beach, the historic significant of Norman Jaffe, the impact the property has on the neighborhood, the board found that this property meets four out of five of the land-marking criteria. The decision is the deny the certificate of appropriateness for demolition.;

Motion by Chair second by S. Latham

To **accept** the written decision to **deny** the application of **Orest Bliss**

On Vote: Chair, S. Latham, P. DeWitt, J. Gregory, M. McIntire

On the application of **252 First Neck Lane, LLC**, there is a written decision in the file.

Motion by Chair second by P. DeWitt

To **approve** the application of **252 First Neck Lane, LLC**

On Vote: Chair, S. Latham, P. DeWitt, J. Gregory, M. McIntire

On the application of **Hamptons Harbor, LLC**, 103 Great Plains Road, there is a written decision in the file.

Motion by Chair second by M. McIntire

To **approve** the application of **252 First Neck Lane** with conditions as outlined in decision

On Vote: Chair, S. Latham, P. DeWitt, J. Gregory, M. McIntire

On the application of **9toCNL LLC**, 92 Coopers Neck Lane, there is a written decision in the file

Motion by Chair second by J. Gregory

To **approve** the application of **9toCNL LLC**

On Vote: Chair, S. Latham, P. DeWitt, J. Gregory, M. McIntire

Inc. Village of Southampton  
Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation  
January 10, 2021

On the application of **The Bathing Corporation of Southampton**, 14 Gin Lane, there is a written decision in the file.

Motion by Chair second by J. Gregory

To **approve** the application of **The Bathing Corporation of Southampton**

On Vote: Chair, S. Latham, P. DeWitt, J. Gregory, M. McIntire

On the application of **Beechwood Latch LLC**, 109 Hill Street, there is a request for an adjournment to January 24, 2022

Motion by Chair second by P. DeWitt

To **adjourn** the application of **Beechwood Latch LLC**

On Vote: Chair, S. Latham, P. DeWitt, J. Gregory, M. McIntire

On the application of **BHNH, LLC**, 109 Hampton Road, John Bennett and John Grew are here to represent the applicant. They had offered their research in regards to the state building code prior to the last hearing and were looking to the Board. Ms. Cooley looked into the building code herself, she feels that this is a matter that needs to be determined by the Building Inspector. She can prepare a memo to the Building Inspector asking that he opine on the issue. Mr. Bennett can understand that and will adjourn the matter. Ms. Latham had thought that the Board was pending a determination from the State Historic Preservation Department. She feels that there are other solutions. Chair notes that the Board has been asked to make a determination based on the interior of the house, this is not what they are charged with; they will look to the Building Inspector for answers. Ms. Latham notes that the plans in the building department call for the retention of the original stair.

Motion by Chair second by M. McIntire

To **adjourn** the application of **BHNH, LLC**

On Vote: Chair, P. DeWitt, J. Gregory, M. McIntire

Nay: S. Latham

On the application of **Alvise Orsini and Geoffroy VanRaemdonck**, 143 Herrick Road, John Bennett and Lisa Zaloga are here to represent the applicant. Mr. Bennett states that they have been listening to the Board's concerns and have made several changes based on their comments. They have moved the stair as requested by Mr. DeWitt and reduced the projection of the addition. Ms. Zaloga explains the changes made; as Mr. Bennett mentioned the projection of the addition was reduced by over four feet. There was concern raised at the last hearing regarding the finish details; she submitted to the file detail sheets with the exiting as well as proposed. She included dimensions for the light cuts, which were based on relationships and sizes taken from the old photographs. It was discussed that this will be a light, glassy structure. The renderings were modified to show the shorter projection. Mr. Bennett likes that not only is there a vertical subservience, but in terms of architectural detail as well. Ms. Latham has asked several times for professional paint analysis be done on the tracery. In photographs provided, it appears to be darker. Grey might appear on other sections of the house and not here. She would ask again that

Inc. Village of Southampton  
Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation  
January 10, 2022

this analysis be done. Mr. DeWitt appreciates the changes, but has a concern with the stair projection. The problem in his opinion, is there is a lot of program for the basement level and not so much for the upper floors, there is a lot of open space. He feels with some interior reconfiguration the addition could be reduced. Mr. Bennett feels that the owners have been extremely accommodating in this application. They have not turned a blind eye to the Board's desire to preserve the house and minimize the projections. He would like to hear how the other board members feel. Mr. DeWitt does appreciate the efforts, he just doesn't think the design is quite there. Mr. McIntire feels that the patio is getting very large to the front of the house, that it looks out of balance. The weight of the patio vs. the weight of the extension doesn't seem to be in balance to him. Ms. Zaloga states that they are trying to preserve 90% of the existing program in the house. They are trying to preserve that historic interior. Mr. Gregory thinks that the architect has done a great job addressing the Board's concerns over the last few weeks. His main concern was the protrusion of the main structure, he felt it looked a little like a box car. He feels this four foot reduction makes it much more reasonable. Loosing the four feet coverage on the patio isn't a big concern of his. He likes what they have done with this latest plan. Chair echoes Mr. Gregory's thoughts. He was concerned with the extension. He doesn't believe the patio area to be an issue as it would be subservient. Mr. McIntire would like to see one more try to accommodate that basement area. He believes they have done a great job thus far and it is so close to being where he would like to see it. The homeowner, according to Ms. Zaloga would like to retain some outdoor area. The patio will be screened from the street. Mr. McIntire wonders what status of the paint analysis is? Mr. Bennett has reached out to the prior owner, Mr. Sofield to see if they could obtain the analysis that he had preformed. Ms. Latham states that the analysis should be done by a professional who can isolate the layers of paint. Mr. Bennett would like to ask for a vote as submitted. He believes there has been a lot of progress made on this application, they were under the impression that they were where they needed to be. Ms. Latham feels that if they are replicating the design of a particular year, the color should match that of the time. Chair wonders if they make the approval conditional upon a paint test and establishment of a color. Mr. Bennett recognizes that the Board has broad discretion over color and would not be opposed to a condition. Mr. Gregory agrees that a color analysis would be appropriate, but doesn't think that it should hold up the approval.

Motion by Chair second by J. Gregory

To **approve** the application of **Alvise Orsini and Geoffroy VanRaemdonck** with the condition that no trim paint color be approved without the submittal of a paint scraping analysis as requested by S. Latham and subsequent approval of such

On Vote: Chair, J. Gregory, M. McIntire

Nay: P. DeWitt, S. Latham

On the application of **Smithtown Partners, LLC**, 40 Meadow Lane, Michael Sendlenski, Ted Fire, Steve Nieroda of Ayrias Design and architects from Austin, Patterson Diston are here to represent the applicant. Mr. Sendlenski notes that they did take a look at the plans after the last comments the Board had made. They looked at moving the elevator into the structure itself and found this to be a very impractical solution from an engineering standpoint. The size of the

Inc. Village of Southampton  
Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation  
January 10, 2021

dormers have been reduced. They went back and took a look at the existing lighting and worked with the electrician and property owners to reduce the light footprint. Photos have been provided showing the original lighting vs. the changes made now to mitigate the light pollution. Mr. Gregory notes that what they are asking for has a dramatic impact on the massing of the house. He would suggest that if they are looking to mitigate the change to the front of the house, why not put the elevator in the rear of the home. Mr. Sendlenski notes that under ADA laws they are entitled to reasonable accommodations and a mobility elevator would need access from the driveway. Chair notes that it is public knowledge that the applicant has looked at many houses prior to purchasing this one, and there were other options that may have been more accommodating to his particular needs. Now they are before the Board asking them to make accommodations that may have been found in another property. While reduced, the lighting is still an issue for the Chair. He appreciates the reductions made, but it is still what this board would be in objection to. Any further encroachment on the street would not be appropriate in his view. Mr. McIntire wonders if the elevator will be boarded from the ground level or from the basement. This will be a three and a half story elevator. There is a path in the front of the house to board the elevator. Chair notes significant changes are being proposed to the exterior of the house because of their request for an elevator. They have left open the possibility that this could be done differently. Josh from ADP Architecture notes that previously it was discussed that the dormers were too robust. By reducing the height and the width, they were able to create dormers that sat much quieter against the rest of the house. He wonders if the board feels they are headed in the right direction. In Mr. Gregory's opinion, there has not been enough of a change. Mr. DeWitt has reviewed the plans and believes there are alternatives to the elevator location. Some minor floor plan changes would be required but it is possible. The architect shares a photo of the post retention concrete to demonstrate the complexity of the structure. They appreciate the exploration of other ideas. Mr. Gregory states the structure is outside of their purview; the Board is here to approve the design, it is up to the architect to determine how they will make it work structurally. Ms. Latham feels that there is a bias against this project, she would not have approved this house had she been on the board at the time of its construction. She believes that because of this, this application has been overworked. Mr. DeWitt thought there may be another way to do this, but he is not familiar with the engineering for cutting into the post retention concrete that exists. Mr. Sendlenski notes that they are trying to reduce the concern of lighting, there is no additional lighting within the dormers that are being proposed; back painted panels are being proposed that would mitigate further issues. Mr. Fire, owners rep. wonders if it is the lighting that is causing the greatest issues, would dormers ever be permissible here? These are two separate issues at hand.

Motion by Chair second by P. DeWitt

To **adjourn** the application of **Smithtown Partners LLC**

On Vote: Chair, S. Latham, P. DeWitt, J. Gregory, M. McIntire

On the application of **Tates Bake Shop**, 43 N. Sea Road, Lester Wagner is here to represent the applicant. Affidavits of mailing and posting were submitted to the file. This is for exterior alterations to the front door. He would like to make the Board aware that changes have been made to

Inc. Village of Southampton  
Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation  
January 10, 2022

the front of the building that are not popular and did not work out. They will be submitting a new plan. The work was done without any approvals or a building permit. Mr. Bennett is here with public comment, he would ask it be passed on to incorporate that the shrink wrapped vehicle be removed as it is an eyesore. Mr. McIntire points out that there is even a historic photograph of the building on the packaging of the cookies. Chair requests any historic photos they have to be submitted to the file for reference as the applicant no longer has the original door.

Motion by Chair second by M. McIntire

To **adjourn** the application of **Tates Bake Shop**

On Vote: Chair, S. Latham, P. DeWitt, J. Gregory, M. McIntire

On the application of **Margaret Lewis**, 63 Dale Street, James Bennett is here to represent the application. This is an application of a two story dwelling and accessory building. Substantial changes have been made from the original design proposed. He would like to change the roof pitch but believes he is constrained by the code. The windows are Marvin, black trim. The house will be green shingle with white trim. The Board would like to see paint samples and a color rendering. Typically black windows is something the board would not advise but a color sample will help make that determination in this case. The eaves look a little light, Ms. Latham and Mr. McIntire wonder if they can be beefed up a bit. Mr. DeWitt suggests reviewing to the ARB design guidelines.

Motion by Chair second by M. McIntire

To **adjourn** the application of **Margaret Lewis**

On Vote: Chair, S. Latham, P. DeWitt, J. Gregory, M. McIntire

On the application of **Robert Roberts**, 75 Heady Creek Lane there is a request for an adjournment to January 24th.

Motion by Chair second by M. McIntire

To **adjourn** the application of **Robert Roberts**

On Vote: Chair, S. Latham, P. DeWitt, J. Gregory, M. McIntire

On the application of **Kaveh Ansari**, 306 Hill Street, John McNeill is here to represent the applicant. The Board had many concerns that they had expressed at the previous hearing. They have changed the windows to six over one, double hung windows; they kept the fixed panel entry door and mimicked it on west side of the house. They changed from a white cedar shingle to a natural cedar to be in better keeping with the neighborhood. This property is setback off of Hill Street. They have eliminated some of the larger windows and went for a more uniform alignment of windows. Mr. DeWitt would say that the view from the northwest is still a little unresolved. The overhang piece seems out of place. The Board is in agreement that the cantilevered portion does not work for this design. Mr. McIntire suggests the applicant takes a walk through the neighborhood and take notes of the designs in the area. There are details added here and there but it does not pull together a cohesive design. It would be advisable to review the ARB guidelines in this case. Mr. DeWitt thinks the house is very vertical, the second floor does not have to be a full two story expression, dormers could be set into the roof. He is surprised architects don't do that

Inc. Village of Southampton  
Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation  
January 10, 2021

more often. Chair agrees with his fellow board members. Mr. McNeill has reviewed the guidelines but he will revisit as well as review the other homes in the neighborhood.

Motion by Chair second by P. DeWitt

To **adjourn** the application of **Kaveh Ansari**

On Vote: Chair, S. Latham, P. DeWitt, J. Gregory, M. McIntire

On the application of **Apogee Building Co LLC**, 134 Corrigan Street, Brian Glasser and Kevin Wells are here to represent the applicant. They have added a privacy wall to the north and south side of the terrace to reduce any noise. They have also reduced the square footage of the second floor deck area. Mr. Wells agrees with a previous comment made by Mr. Gregory regarding the mass planting of arborvitae as perimeter hedge. Concern was also expressed that the deer do eat the arborvitae in the area. They plan on using privet hedge along the front. In the rear they will be using arborvitae. There are two different arborvitae that can be installed, they would be looking to install Green Giants, as they are the most deer resistant. Mr. Wells believes that the green giants are the best option in this case. They are looking to install cryptomeria, river birch and the green giants to address any privacy issues that the Board had. The second floor deck is off of the master and meant for private use not as a party deck. Mr. Gregory is appreciative of the solutions that the applicant has come up with to address their concerns. Instead of creating a fortress with the screening, they have created an environment.

Motion by Chair second by J. Gregory

To **approve** the application of **Apogee Building Co LLC** with the condition of following the landscaping plan

On the application of **John Browne**, 94 Pelletreau Street, Steve Nieroda of Ayrias Design is here to represent the applicant. The structure was approved previously, this is for the landscaping only. They meet on site with Chair and Ms. Latham to review the existing landscaping on the property. There is an existing 30" caliper Beech Tree that sits within an island, it was asked if it would be feasible to save the tree. After further analysis it is nearly impossible to move the tree and ensure its survival. They are now proposing to remove this tree, but plant a 10 to 12 foot beech tree in another place on the property. The new tree will grow quite large and will crown out nicely. The trees being removed are to allow the existing trees to grow and thrive. Chair appreciates the effort made to preserve as much as possible. Mr. Liu, owner of 96 Pelletreau Street, he would like some clarification on the trees being removed other than the beech tree. Mr. Nieroda explains what trees are being removed, and that their removal is to allow for greater growth in the remaining trees. When Mr. Liu first made public comment, he had expressed desire that all trees be preserved on the property, he wonders why they need to remove. This is a horticultural practice. Ms. Latham explains to Mr. Liu that they had walked the property and took great care in reviewing this and creating a plan. Mr. Liu wonders if an independent study has been done? It has not, there was a lot of discussion, judgement and work put into this plan. Mr. Liu claims the Board made the statement at the first meeting that every effort would be made to save all of the landscaping on this property. He doesn't understand why there is proposal showing so many trees to be removed. The Board has been diligent in their review of the landscaping. Mr. Liu

Inc. Village of Southampton  
Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation  
January 10, 2022

wonders if documentation that these trees need to be removed is available in the file. Chair states that the landscaping plan has been submitted to the file.

Motion by Chair second by J. Gregory

To **approve the landscape plan of John Browne**

On Vote: Chair, S. Latham, P. DeWitt, J. Gregory, M. McIntire

On the application of **Michael Minnich and Anne Mahoney**, 40 Hildreth Street, affidavits of mailing and posting have been submitted to the file. James McChesney is here to represent the applicant. This is a two story dwelling, double hung two over two windows, natural cedar shingles with the trim painted white. Ms. Latham finds the eyebrow window to give it a dated feel. Mr. DeWitt believes this is a street of transition, having newer and older homes. He is not in favor of the twin peaks and he also feels the windows in the front are too large and out of scale. Mr. McIntire, Mr. Gregory and Chair share those sentiments. Chair feels that the entire window to wall ratio needs to be revisited for the entire house. There are a lot of windows being proposed. The client specifically would like a double gable in the front. He will share the Board's comments with the homeowner. Mr. McIntire questions the size of the second floor balcony. Mr. McChesney believes there is adequate screening. Chair suggests revisiting this balcony area when making revisions. Mr. Gregory reminds the applicant that arborvitae plantings would not be adequate when discussing screening. Sheila and Steven Peiffer are here as neighbors, they have some concern about the trees that may need to be removed. The applicant is proposing to move the driveway and there are several trees in that area. The Board would like to see a streetscape, a site line study from the location of the proposed balcony and a landscape plan.

Motion by Chair second by J. Gregory

To **adjourn** the application of **Michael Minnich and Anne Mahoney**

On the application of **SKV Wickapogue Road, LLC**, 508 Wickapogue Road, affidavits of mailing and posting have been submitted to the file. Lucy Siyu Liu and Dean Gamolka are here to represent the applicant. This is an application for a new single family dwelling. There is a lot of undeveloped farm land in the surrounding area, they drew inspiration from the farm buildings. There are three structured gables. They are proposing cedar roofing with white clapboard siding, the trim will be white and the windows will be gun metal grey. Mr. Gamolka prepared a landscape plan for this property. They are keeping it well landscaped but simple to take advantage of the surrounding farmland. Mr. Gregory feels the windows are going to cause a problem from a light solution standpoint given the height of the house and the volume of glass in the design. Mr. McIntire feels the glass exposure, especially on the back of the house is excessive and doesn't feel right for the neighborhood. Ms. Latham would object to the circular driveway, she feels that it is a very urban approach. The applicant discussed the openness of the site and this entry is in juxtaposition to that idea. This is an amazing site, Ms. Latham is of the opinion that something better could be proposed. Ms. Liu explains that wind walls have been added to mitigate the issue of light projection. Chair believes the design to be more contemporary and not fitting to this area. This property is just within the bounds of the Village, there is a property nearby that is

Inc. Village of Southampton  
Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation  
January 10, 2021

nearly identical to this proposal. Mr. McIntire feels that the window the wall ratio of that house is no where near that of this proposal.

Motion by Chair second by J. Gregory

To **adjourn** the application of **SKV Wickapogue Road, LLC**

On Vote: Chair, S. Latham, P. DeWitt, J. Gregory, M. McIntire

On the application of **Martha McGuinness**, 210 Toylsome Lane, affidavits of mailing and posting have been submitted to the file. Lisa Zaloga is here to represent the applicant. This is an existing house with a small covered porch. They are proposing to take that porch down and construct a larger one. All materials would match the existing house. The porch to be removed is currently a gable roof, they are now proposing a flat roof will columns to mirror that of the front. There will not be any second floor access to the porch roof, it will not be a deck. Mr. McIntire doesn't have any issues with the proposal.

Motion by Chair second by P. DeWitt

To **approve** the application of **Martha McGuinness**

On Vote: Chair, S. Latham, P. DeWitt, J. Gregory, M. McIntire

On the application of **John Kuitward**, 102 White Street, Ramon Chavez Martinez is here to represent the applicant. The board had requested greater transparency, carrying the spindles down to the bottom. A submittal has not been made to the file.

Motion by Chair second by P. DeWitt

To **adjourn** the application of **John Kuitward**

On Vote: Chair, S. Latham, P. DeWitt, J. Gregory, M. McIntire

On the application of **Karen Williams**, 127 Wickapogue Road, Ramon Chavez Martinez is here to represent the applicant. They are proposing white Azek gates. They are duplicating the design the neighbor has. It will be setback 33 feet off of the street. The board is happy with the design. This will be an automatic gate, they can put the key pad on the column. No lighting is being proposed at this time.

Motion by Chair second by P. DeWitt

To **approve** the application of **Karen Williams**

On Vote: Chair, S. Latham, P. DeWitt, J. Gregory, M. McIntire

### **Discussion :**

There has been conversation about moving the public hearings to another day to allow for an earlier start time. Wednesday would be available. There is a conflict with most board members mid-week. The Board will see how the next few minutes go and revisit the issue.

Motion by Chair second by J. Gregory

To **close** the meeting of January 10, 2022

On Vote: Chair, S. Latham, P. DeWitt, J. Gregory, M. McIntire

Inc. Village of Southampton  
Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation  
January 10, 2022  
Respectfully submitted by Jacqueline Allen 01/10/2022