

**BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW &  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION  
VILLAGE OF SOUTHAMPTON  
JANUARY 13, 2020**

Due notice having been given, the public hearing of the Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation for the village of Southampton, NY on January 13, 2020 at 7:00PM.

Board members Madame Chair Susan Stevenson, Jeffrey Brodlieb, Rob Coburn and Curtis Highsmith were present. Susan Latham was absent.

Counsel for the Village Alice Cooley and Historic Consultant Zac Studenroth were present.

MOTION by R. Coburn, second C. Highsmith

To **open tonight's meeting.**

On Vote: Chair Stevenson, J. Brodlieb, R. Coburn and C. Highsmith

**MINUTE APPROVAL**

MOTION by R. Coburn, second S. Stevenson

To **approve the December 9, 2019 minutes as amended.**

On Vote: Chair Stevenson, J. Brodlieb, and R. Coburn

Abstain: C. Highsmith

**SIGNS**

On the application of **WHITE OAK BUILDERS CORP**, this is a contractor sign. Present for the applicant was Chelsea Cooney. The sign is classic blue with white lettering. R. Coburn mentioned once the contractor sign is approved, it can be used repeatedly throughout the Village. It does not need to be heard for use at each location. There is an annual fee due to the Village for use of approved contractor signs.

MOTION by R. Coburn, second S. Stevenson

To **approve the sign of WHITE OAK BUILDERS CORP.**

On Vote: Chair Stevenson, J. Brodlieb, R. Coburn, and C. Highsmith

On the application of **BROWN HARRIS STEVENS**, 31 Main Street, present for the applicant was Elizabeth Vail from Farrell Fritz. This is a replacement sign; it is replacing the Halstead sign. It is grey wood with white lettering in Cadiz font. It is Dark Gray. The Board feels the font is large. J. Brodlieb asked the size of the lettering; the requested large cap is 12" and lower case is 8.6" inches. R. Coburn noted the Village likes to avoid billboard size lettering; he'd like the smaller lettering. J. Brodlieb feels it is bold faced. C. Highsmith asked about lighting, E. Vail stated they will use existing light, there are two. E. Vail asked if it is reduced in font it would be more acceptable? The Board feels it would be better reduced. There are no window decals. They can reduce by 2" the letters and that would make the gray more prominent. E. Vail will mark that it will be 10" cap and appropriate reduction of the lower caps.

MOTION by R. Coburn, second C. Highsmith

To **approve the sign of BROWN HARRIS STEVENS with 10" large caps and proportional small caps .**

On Vote: Chair Stevenson, J. Brodlieb, R. Coburn and C. Highsmith

### **WRITTEN DECISIONS**

On the application of **POFAHL & JIMINEZ**, 471 Hill Street, there is a written decision in the file.

MOTION by R. Coburn, C. Highsmith

To **approve the written decision on the application of POFAHL & JIMINEZ.**

On Vote: Chair Stevenson, J. Brodlieb, R. Coburn and C. Highsmith

On the application of **WHITE FENCE INC**, 409 First Neck Lane, there is a written decision in the file.

MOTION by R. Coburn, second C. Highsmith

To **approve the written decision on the application of WHITE FENCE INC.**

On Vote: Chair Stevenson, J. Brodlieb, R. Coburn and C. Highsmith

On the application of **INNOVENTOR PROPERTIES LLC**, 224 Great Plains Road, there is a written decision in the file.

MOTION by R. Coburn, second C. Highsmith

To **approve the written decision on the application of INNOVENTOR PROPERTIES LLC.**

On Vote: Chair Stevenson, J. Brodlieb, R. Coburn and C. Highsmith

### **PUBLIC HEARINGS - HISTORIC**

On the application of **180 GREAT PLAINS RD LLC**, 55 Coopers Neck Lane, this is an application for two sets of driveway gates. Affidavits of mailing and posting were submitted. Present for the applicant was Lyle Pike. Specs of proposed gates were presented to the Board. The gates are white wood, 6' tall, the spacing is 2" with ¾" spindles. There is no lighting on the posts.

MOTION by R. Coburn, second C. Highsmith

To **close for written decision on the application of 180 GREAT PLAINS RD, LLC.**

On Vote: Chair Stevenson, J. Brodlieb, R. Coburn and C. Highsmith

### **PUBLIC HEARINGS – NON-HISTORIC**

On the application of **LISA BASS**, 20 Pelletreau Street, present for the applicant was Robert Bruschetti. At the last meeting the Board felt that this application could be approved with changing the windows, he presented that to his client, and she considered the financial aspects, around \$16,000 to change. She is reluctantly willing to do it. In order to finish the process, she would agree and is asking for a May date.

Chair Stevenson is not bothered by it and would approve as is, this has been a lengthy process and she would like to see it concluded. There was a photo showing that it is a bathroom, the reason for the higher placement of the windows. There is a plan in the file as built.

MOTION by C. Highsmith, second R. Coburn

To **approve the application of LISA BASS.**

On Vote: Chair Stevenson, J. Brodlieb and C. Highsmith  
Nay: R. Coburn

On the application of **67 NORTH CAPTAINS NECK LANE LLC**, 67 North Captains Neck Lane, present for Present for the applicant was Charles Klein, the architect. At the last hearing there was an issue with the tower of windows around the stairwell. The suggestion was to remove one set of windows and have a panel instead. The garage window was too large for the Board. They reduced the size of the window and added a roof and barn panels to take attention away from the window. The other change was that they went away from black window frames and chose white instead, that reduced the intensity of the windows. They would like to do the tower of glass and are hoping the other changes make it more acceptable to the Board. It is not a privacy issue, but it is to bring light into the interior.

The Board likes the change of the color of the windows from black to white. The tower is better than the panel in Chair's opinion. J. Brodlieb doesn't like the floor to roof windows. R. Coburn feels similar to J. Brodlieb, the window wall tower does not fit in the Village, it feels corporate to him. The architect has used a lot of this type of stair well window and he feels it works, R. Coburn feels it is dissimilar to the area and don't fit in. J. Brodlieb doesn't see the need for and open stairway with full windows, it isn't typical. C. Highsmith said to get rid of the panel, the Board doesn't like it. The suggestion was not to have an elongated glass. C. Highsmith doesn't see it as commercial, but the materials soften it, the black frame window removed makes it more compatible. Chair asked if the architect has an idea for softening it up. The architect feels like it works well with homes he has done. C. Highsmith asked if possibly a band of shingles in between the windows could provide relief and break it up. R. Coburn is wondering if getting rid of the basement window may make it feel less commercial.

C. Klein will adjust the plan to reflect the loss of the lower window. J. Brodlieb asked about taking the shingle up to the top of the front door. There is a step back of 10' from garage to the wall of window and step back 5' to the front door. Chair feels the front door seems dinky compared to the window wall, the architect will make noted changes for the Board to review. He will be recalled at the end of the non-historic applications to review his changes for approval.

MOTION by Chair Stevenson, second C. Highsmith  
To **adjourn on the application of 67 NORTH CAPTAINS NECK LANE LLC. for mark up and recall.**  
On Vote: Chair Stevenson, J. Brodlieb, R. Coburn and C. Highsmith

On the application of **27 POST LANE LLC**, 27 Post Lane, there is a letter in the file requesting adjournment to the January 27, 2020 public hearing. .

MOTION by R. Coburn, second C. Highsmith  
To **approve the applicant's request for adjournment on the application of 27 POST LANE LLC to the January 27, 2020 public hearing.**  
On Vote: Chair Stevenson, J. Brodlieb, R. Coburn and C. Highsmith

On the application of **NEIL & SARITA JAIRATH**, 72 David Whites Lane, affidavits of mailing and posting were submitted. Present for the applicant were Charles Klein and Anthony Porco. The proposed house is white shingle with black windows and board and batten on the gable ends. The garage had to be brought forward because it is a narrow lot. The entire property has mature screening. The garage is not street facing but is forward. Glass and aluminum garage doors are proposed. The proposed asphalt

shingle roof is charcoal. The rear deck on the back is off the master bedroom. C. Highsmith asked what is the line of sight to the neighbor? A. Porco noted that you cannot see the neighbors because of the mature evergreens. The second-floor deck is 12'x15' on the back. It is the width of the master bedroom. The client requested a large area underneath for shade, so it serves two purposes. Chair Stevenson is not comfortable with the deck, C. Highsmith would have liked a visual of the impact of that deck demonstrated. The screening that is there is mature and will not be added to, the design is not an issue but the privacy to the neighbor could be a problem. The deck is proposed at 10' high, but the trees are 30' high. If the deck is smaller, it would be better, but it is the size of a living room, it is a tight lot. If they brought photos to show there would be no issue, they don't see that right now. J. Brodlieb suggested that they come back with a design that demonstrates that it won't be an issue to a neighbor. Chair Stevenson feels they are tight lots, they can have an overhang without a deck. Adjourn. R. Coburn doesn't like the large two-story garage on the front of the house, he thinks it is an odd form. . Klein felt that would not be an issue, the garage is part of the house and it produces a courtyard effect. C. Klein requested adjournment to consider the concerns of the Board.

MOTION by R. Coburn, second C. Highsmith

To **accept the applicant's request for adjournment on the application of NEIL & SARITA JAIRATH.**

On Vote: Chair Stevenson, J. Brodlieb, R. Coburn and C. Highsmith

On the application of **300 MURRAY PLACE LLC**, 300 Murray Place, affidavits of mailing and posting were submitted. Present for the applicant was Mathias Hoerner and he request adjournment to the next public hearing.

MOTION by C. Highsmith, second R. Coburn

To **approve the applicant's request for adjournment on the application of 300 MURRAY PLACE LLC to the January 27, 2020 public hearing.**

On Vote: Chair Stevenson, J. Brodlieb, R. Coburn and C. Highsmith

On the application of **CRAIG J. GOLDBERG**, 258 Toylesome Lane, affidavits of mailing and posting were submitted. Present for the applicant were Timothy Ganetis and Stuart Disston. They proposed a single-family house that is white with black windows, they want simple and clean design with a European feel. They have a forward garage, it is 17" high two car garage and has breezeway. The back of the house has a rear deck, it is 48' from the back property line and they will screen to assure privacy to neighbors. R. Coburn noted that it is a privacy and annoyance issue, he feels it is public access to the deck and they like to restrict access for private use. Access to the deck is from the master bath and the studio. This is a two-story house and the dormers are for aesthetic. The attic height is 5' and mechanicals and storage will be located there.

R. Coburn likes the materials and feels the casement in the colonial is nice, he likes the chimney, but the garage changes the symmetry of the house. That is challenging for him. The detached garage will be hard for the client, they prefer attached. J. Brodlieb noted that the job of the Board is not to make it easier for the client, the community character is a concern. T. Ganetis noted that if the treatment was different would that make a difference, Chair stated it is the forward garage that's the problem. The Board is not in favor. J. Brodlieb noted it presents as a grand house on a modest lot, its problematic in form of massiveness and scale of the garage is a problem. The placement of the garage and scale is a problem for him. C. Highsmith feels the garage looks like an after- thought. Chair Stevenson noted it needs to be reworked. J. Brodlieb presented an example of a house that they approved with an attached garage, but the house was designed differently and tucked behind the house.

Andy Newman, 101 Hunnting Street, his concern is the pool equipment located next to the pool house, he asked to put in basement in the pool house. The architect can work something out with him.

S. Disston requested adjournment to deal with the concerns of the Board.

MOTION by R. Coburn, second C. Highsmith

To **approve the applicant's request for adjournment on the application of CRAIG J. GOLDBERG to the January 27, 2020 public hearing.**

On Vote: Chair Stevenson, J. Brodlieb, R. Coburn and C. Highsmith

MOTION by R. Coburn, second C. Highsmith

To **reopen 67 CAPTAINS NECK LANE LLC to review marked up changes on the plans.**

On Vote: Chair Stevenson, J. Brodlieb, R. Coburn and C. Highsmith

C. Klein took out the bottom window and will make the window shorter so the window will come to platform of stair. They will remove the barn panels on the garage window but keep the roof. The panel has been removed from stairwell windows and will be shingle. The plans have been amended by the architect.

MOTION by R. Coburn, second C. Highsmith

To **approve the application of 67 CAPTAINS NECK LANE LLC., with removal of barn door panels and removal of bottom section of stairwell window and redistribution of remaining windows to equal height and shingling below in lieu of panel.**

On Vote: Chair Stevenson, J. Brodlieb, R. Coburn and C. Highsmith

## **PUBLIC HEARINGS – HISTORIC**

On the application of **THOMAS & MEREDITH JOYCE**, 765 Hill Street, this application is adjourned to January 27, 2020 public hearing.

On the application of **LIFTON GREEN LLC**, 270 Ox Pasture Road, this application is adjourned to the January 27, 2020 public hearing.

On the application of **BLC HILLSIDE INVESTMENTS LLC**, 132 South Main Street, present for the applicant was attorney Tiffany Scarlato, and architect Ray Booth. Chair feels that the back yard is crowded, this application should have been under advisement by the ZBA. T. Scarlato stated they did not need ZBA approval regarding lots, the pool house was denied but the barn remaining and being moved was approved. The lot line modification that was granted will allow the pool house. Chair noted that the house and structures need to be dealt with in a reduced setting.

T. Scarlato noted that in the interim, they had a site visit to determine the historic nature of the barn. She obtained records regarding the garage; it doesn't have historic value. R. Booth the architect has changed design elements. They put the previous application labeled A and the changes labeled B. The second packet labeled B will be discussed based on the Board's comments. Last hearing the comment was made that the barn had a gabled structure, they changed from the shed to the gabled end. In the S elevation had shed, the gable was more historic on both S and N, so the change was made. The corner windows in the stairwells have been eliminated. The second floor is a loft space and needs a stair to get

to it. Z. Studenroth noted this is really a one-story building. C. Highsmith summarized that they eliminated the shed dormers and changed to gable and got rid of stair way windows. They are carrying vertical siding all the way up. R. Booth changed windows from casement to double hung. Z. Studenroth noted it is interesting that the reconstruction of the carriage house shows up in the original footprint, they recreated the accessory building. It looks original in placement. R. Coburn picked up that the spatial relationship is historic and there is a visual separation that is 6-8' closer to the house, you lose that historic spatial relationship. R. Booth feels that there is a trad- off because you have garages facing the street. The location is historic, and the spatial relationship is part of the Village. The proposed change changes that relationship in the neighborhood and the Village. R. Booth asked if there is any other historical precedents where it would have been turned the other way. Chair Stevenson noted that it was covenanted to be torn down if it was to be sold.

Z. Studenroth mentioned is that it is remarkable that it was rebuilt in original location. This is a narrow lot and it is a front facing building, because lot has been narrowed by subdivision it is being squeezed in feels like it doesn't fit being moved. The most productive solution is to push it back. R. Booth noted that in the rendering they wanted it to be dark so that it is minimized and quieter in the landscape. Z. Studenroth asked if it could be moved back; there is an existing tennis court that they would like to retain. The lot line modification approval by the Planning Board was submitted to the file. Z. Studenroth said that if you look it there is a lot of structure and no real space around it. It doesn't address the visual impact from the street, in this instance sets itself in behind and reads as extension of the house. The carriage house feel would be there if that happened, it is isn't South Main Street landscape, it is too complicated. R. Booth wondered how far they'd have to move it back. J. Brodlieb cannot get beyond moving from its existing location, he is looking at it as is and the responsibility of the Board to retain the structure. When he looks at the picture there is a spatial separation typical of accessory building and it changes the feel of the neighborhood. The lot line modification makes it necessary to move the barn, the properties are held in separate LLCs. J. Brodlieb noted that same owner different LLC's doesn't change ownership. He is not in favor.

T. Scarlato stated the garage is over the property line and has to be moved. In 2007 the Planning Board allowed subdivision of a property that made it necessary to take down a barn. The new lot line makes the tennis court does not straddle the new property line. Chair noted it is for the present owner to have a buildable lot in the back. Chair Stevenson noted that it could be pushed back, the setbacks change from 30' to 20' and that's why pool house is acceptable. The NE corner has compliance and it would not need to be turned, R. Coburn noted that the issue is because of extending the house back, that creating part of the crowding problem. This is the problem with piece meal, the reorientation of the building doesn't fit, and his solution is to take it down. There is a choice according to J. Brodlieb, the demolition will allow access to the flag. C. Highsmith noted the garden area can be switched with barn, he can create spacing for the garage and bring the floral presentation around the pool and it could solve most of the problems, without need to turn it. If they can be swapped, they can now discuss access. Z. Studenroth said if they swap it, it will read as the carriage house. It is set toward the back and shouldn't be appear as a parking court, that is the concern of R. Booth.

Chair stated that the variance was sad because this is an important property to the historicity of the Village. R. Coburn noted that the process of approval of the main house pushed the envelope a bit, the compromise was made but without the knowledge of the other structures. They visually maximized what the Board is comfortable with, now it basically makes an L-addition to the house. Their charge is to preserve the historic nature. Chair asked about the color, Z. Studenroth feels it ought to look like the

house and they don't need to hide it. The Board is at an impasse. R. Booth asked if the architectural changes are liked, the Board appreciates the changes made to the barn architecturally.

Blair Dibble, audience member, asked looking at the barn from the street and if it is hidden, maybe if not so far south, that maybe doesn't hide it. The flag lot made it necessary to move it. The setback is 20', Z. Studenroth noted that a compromise may be to move it only to bring it as far as only necessary, just the 12'. C. Highsmith noted it seems more crowded. J. Brodlieb noted to position it at the rear and the garden closer to entertaining area. R. Booth can only come back 20', right now is too close to the house and turning the garage looks like an anonymous section of house, the further pushed from house the more distinction there can be. It will be behind the house, to make it not look like further massing of the house. R. Booth said that in 3D you will perceive it in reality differently, they can remove the pergola. The Board doesn't agree.

Have the doors face that driveway and have it back from the house. They would like NE as far as possible. The building inspector highlighted an area that will work, getting it further away and not changing the orientation would be acceptable. He'd rather see if fully hidden behind the house then on the wrong end.

MOTION by R. Coburn, second C. Highsmith

To **approve the applicant's request for adjournment on BLC HILLSIDE INVESTMENTS LLC. to the January 27, 2020 public hearing.**

On Vote: Chair Stevenson, J. Brodlieb, R. Coburn and C. Highsmith

On the application of **WHITEFENCE INC**, 409 First Neck Lane, affidavits of mailing and posting were submitted. Chair Stevenson is recused from this application. Present for the applicant were Jennifer Gass and Caroline Catalano. They noted and apologized for coming before the Board with changes but as work was done some changes were desired by the client. The existing portion on the back, they propose to remove the garage on S side, what they asked previously requested is highlighted in yellow and the proposed is in blue, they want a detached garage. A carriage house style is proposed. Z. Studenroth clarified it is W side where garage removal will be, not the S. The proposed footprint will act as a sitting room, they will be removing the wood deck that was previously approved. The existing vs. proposed was demonstrated, all changes will match the existing. The existing door changed to window, they discovered that it was a door originally with landing and stairs and they want to restore that original feature. They propose a cobblestone driveway.

The elevation for the proposed garage show dormer and double Dutch doors and is representative of an old English carriage house. R. Coburn asked on A206 they are lowering windows in what will be sitting room. They are raising the floor and lowering the windows. It will be existing sash window sets that will be 8" lower. Those are the changes. Z. Studenroth feels the carriage house is less of an issue than the house itself. J. Brodlieb asked if the carriage house is consistent with Victorian main house, it is late Colonial Revival and the arched configuration is Colonial into Federal. The house isn't Victorian per Z. Studenroth, but its Colonial Revival. The changes don't affect the historic nature, the garage is rather small and will sit behind nicely. C. Highsmith asked about bump out for gas fireplace, he is just trying to grasp the dimensions. R. Coburn noted it looks about 2' and sits behind main form of house, it goes up not quite a full story. It is a traditional vent, no chimney needed and is necessary because of windows above. Z. Studenroth stated that the majority of the historical features are being preserved. C. Highsmith liked the base flare of shingles.

MOTION by R. Coburn, second C. Highsmith  
To **close for written decision on WHITEFENCE INC.**  
On Vote: J. Brodlieb, R. Coburn and C. Highsmith  
Recused: S. Stevenson

On the application of **LOVENEST TRUST**, 28 Gin Lane, affidavits of mailing and posting were submitted. Present for the applicant was John David Rose and Scott Rose. There are two letters of support from neighbors submitted to the file. The allowable lot coverage is 24,000 and they are proposing 16,000. The allowable GFA is 17,906, the proposed is 8,400. The sanitary system will be IA, low nitrogen. It will be a 2-story house. The pyramid law is 33 degrees, Alaskan yellow cedar will be used, with 5" butt. Low sloped roof will have copper standing seam roof. The main roof will be cedar. Only on low slope on 16-18% of the roof will be the copper standing seam roof. The gutters and leaders will be copper, soffit and fascia deep green. The space below will be stone, specifically Connecticut field stone, it is a round stone, has depth to it. A photo was submitted of the proposed stone. No mortar will show, will be full stone face. Windows and doors will be Reilly 6/1 and trim with dark green trim. J. Brodlieb asked about the massive windows on the S elevation, it is oceanside. He asked about compatibility on that side, J. Rose stated that the masses on the ends come forward, those windows are recessed in those forms. The E elevation, the steps will be stone and rails dark green. There will not be a contemporary feel, and the doors are operable with no muttons. He thinks the massing of it is a great solution, the narrowness of the lot and its juxtaposition to the Atlantic, doesn't read as massive, just large. He likes the stone and feels it is quieting effect. The shingle arch feature is appropriate here. This is not a replica house. They demonstrated the feature of the house in a photo. J. Brodlieb asked about landscape plan.

Ed Hollander, landscape architect, noted they are trying to create a soft easy landscape, big trees but simple. They demonstrated the plan for the Board. R. Coburn asked if there was any way to avoid the well effect under the seamed roof, J. Rose stated that they'd have to flatten it to 1 ¼ and bend them and solder but it doesn't look good so they don't like to do it, it also weathers differently. R. Coburn likes the Alaskan yellow cedar, the W elevation has a skylight, he feels it will be visible from the Bathing Corp. J. Rose stated it is in a room that they cannot have a window, although in this elevation it feels flat, on A19, you see the angle of this roof. It is at a 33-degree angle, it will be bronze which will be matching roof. The sight lines were a concern previously. R. Coburn asked on the S elevation he likes the window well, he thinks it will be ok, the Western form is a sleeping porch, it was designed to look like a porch form. The Eastern edge has a sickle curve on the roof and that is aesthetic.

MOTION by R. Coburn, second S. Stevenson  
To **close for written decision on LOVENEST TRUST.**  
On Vote: Chair Stevenson, J. Brodlieb, R. Coburn and C. Highsmith

## **ADVISORY CASES FROM ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS**

On the application of **LIFTON GREEN LLC**, 270 Ox Pasture Road, this application is adjourned to the January 27, 2020 public hearing.

## **DISCUSSION**

1. Sign Committee - A. Cooley has written a thorough procedure for the Sign Committee. Chair stated the purpose is to speed up the process. There will be two stamps on each sign application and two people have to sign them and if there is a problem the applicants are

contacted, and it will be put on the agenda. The point is not to have signs on the agenda if they are acceptable. S. Latham and R. Coburn will be assigned the responsibility. As a practical matter, they can come in by noon on Monday and get into a rhythm that they will approve or notify to be on next agenda. All Board members are all designated as alternates to cover in the absence of S. Latham or R Coburn.

MOTION by C. Highsmith, second R. Coburn

To **accept the resolution to adopt procedure for Sign Committee as prepared by Counsel.**

On Vote: Chair Stevenson, J. Brodlieb, R. Coburn and C. Highsmith

2. The meetings of Monday, May 25, 2020, October 12, 2020, November 23, 2020 and December 28, 2020 need to be cancelled for holidays. R. Coburn's concern is that there are three cancelled in consecutive months, Chair felt it worked out well last year. If it doesn't go well this year, they can revisit it for next year.

MOTION by C. Highsmith, second S. Stevenson

To **cancel the meetings of May 25, 2020, October 12, 2020, November 23, 2020 and December 28, 2020.**

On Vote: Chair Stevenson, J. Brodlieb, R. Coburn and C. Highsmith

3. R. Coburn raised issue of landmarking, there has been public concern. He thinks there may be some historic now, but also over time there may be some historic needed to be added. Right now it is the 1926 date, many have floating dates, he isn't sure of the solution. Section 65-3 states the Board may deem a property landmarked even if it isn't in the register and for different reasons in the code. Any of those reasons in the code can be considered by the Board for landmarking. A grant was given for an inventory, but nothing was really done with the information. His concern and community concern is that many homes are being demolished and they regret the fact that the community cannot be involved. Do we want to start a process to have a more formal active role in preservation or landmarking? J. Brodlieb noted that there are two issues, demolition and renovation, same logic anything older than 50 years would be considered for demolition and renovation. R. Coburn would like to have a handle on the current inventory of homes that could be considered to have historic value.

Z. Studenroth feels that it is either in the district or out right now, the code change that buildings before 1926 no matter where they are deserving a second look, those need to be individually landmarked. Contributing is different than landmarking. An overlay district could widen the field. Any building that falls into that area of interest would fall into a second review, but it wouldn't have to be worthy of landmarking. It is about wanting to provide protection to buildings that are presently not protected. C. Highsmith noted they have to have parameters but still has barriers of a district. A line drawn includes buildings not of any historical significance, but you have an area of protections. The updates are done, it is a moving and changing area. C. Highsmith feels the survey was at the time not well received politically, he doesn't think we have that same environment now, he feels they put a stronger foundation and enlarge the district and the process. He thinks they should move forward and do it rather than roundabout way. Z. Studenroth stated when proposing a district, people living in houses that are not historic don't understand why they are part of it. So, you are not asking people to agree in the abstract. Chair stated that in her discussions with the previous Mayor, they need to put money into historical consultant for an update for the code. It is not a secret that others have a

tighter code. R. Coburn noted they need data and input from the Board. He would also say that being CLG is not one-time basis and never revisit it, it lives and breathes and grows. Consulting with SHPO staff is essential, they are a very good resource. Chair stated that they need actually some change in the code. J. Brodlieb noted that's why he stated they treat as different elements. He feels that authorizing demolitions is more of an administrative issue to present to Trustees to have all buildings 50 years or older come before the Board. C. Highsmith stated you need the tools to have the designation or code change. R. Coburn noted that it has to be proactive, it can't be that owner find out after the fact.

Z. Studenroth noted that they can have 50 years or older for demolition to come in. C. Highsmith stated that it can't be spot zoning, that's a problem. Building Inspector should not have to make the decision of historicity. SHPO would know if that is permissible. S. Latham is supportive of this noted R. Coburn. R. Coburn noted that getting the data and summarizing the 2005 register would be necessary. Board members could then reflect on the issue. Chair stated it shouldn't be piece meal. R. Coburn proposes to have Z. Studenroth do that summarization and maybe go to the Trustees meeting to recommend the hiring of a historical person. They have the data, but it shows that there is compelling evidence, it doubles what is existing. The current Mayor may be wanting to preserve more historicity. Chair stated that they can hire a consultant to handle the change, that is the job to get it done and do it efficiently. They can send a letter or go to Trustee meeting to discuss on Friday. C. Highsmith asked if Z. Studenroth can vet a person to handle this project. Does that have to be bid out? They need to find out from Village Attorney. R. Coburn noted they can speak with Linda Mackey; a suggestion doesn't mean they have to utilize the person but they can get a suggestion.

MOTION by C. Highsmith, second R. Coburn

To **close tonight's meeting.**

On Vote: Chair Stevenson, J. Brodlieb, R. Coburn and C. Highsmith

Respectfully Submitted by:

---

JoLee Sanchez

File Date:

---

Village Clerk