

Inc. Village of Southampton  
Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation  
February 28, 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, February 28, 2022 at 7pm.

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

MOTION by Chair second by P. DeWitt

To open tonight's meeting.

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

Counsel for the board, Alice Cooley is present.

On the application of **BHNNH, LLC**, there is a written decision to deny the application in the file.  
Motion by Chair second by

To **adopt** the written decision to **deny** the application of **BHNNH, LLC**

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

On the application of **Smithtown Partners, LLC**, the written decision is pending.

On the application of **And By The Way Trust Subtrust A and And By The Way Trust Subtrust B**, this application is adjourned to April 11, 2022

On the application of **Beechwood Latch**, there is a request to adjourn to March 14th

Motion by Chair second by J. Gregory

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

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

On the application of **Post Crossing LLC**, this application is adjourned pending ZBA

On the application of **Tates Bake Shop**, 43 N. Sea Road, Les Wagner is here to represent the application. The trim that is shown in the photograph will be touched up and worked into the new door design. The width of the door will not change. The photograph of existing shows two doors; Chair wonders if both will remain. Mr. Wagner confirms they will. Ms. Latham and Mr. McIntire have no issues with the new design.

Motion by Chair second by P. DeWitt

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

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

On the application of **Park Slope Investment Trust**, 81 Jobs Lane, William Matuska is here to represent the application. Color samples and a new rendering were submitted. The building has

Inc. Village of Southampton  
Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation  
February 28, 2022

been resided and primed. They would like to paint the building Benjamin Moore Wescott Navy - 1624. Ms. Latham thinks the color choice is handsome. Mr. Gregory agrees with the color change, but would like to note that this is a shingled building, he would feel differently if the building was brick.

Motion by Chair Second by P. DeWitt

To **close** the application of **Park Slope Investment Trust**

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

On the application of **Seersucker I, LLC** there is a request to adjourn the application to March 14, 2022

Motion by Chair second by P. DeWitt

To **Adjourn** the application of **Seersucker I, LLC**

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

On the application of **39 Lewis Street I, LLC**, 39 Lewis Street, Jim Hausman is here to represent the application. Photographs of the screened porch were shared, the corridor is rather narrow and the glass causes it to get very warm. Mr. Hausman would like to open the porch back up as it once was. He went to the historical society and found photographs from the 1900s and he was able to explore the history of the property. The gambrel roof was added in the 1920s-1930s. At the last hearing the Board had some concerns about the historic significance. Ms. Latham visited the property over the weekend. It does appear that the windows are hinged and can be hooked up, she had wanted the historic consultants input on whether they should be retained or not. Mr. DeWitt thinks that the bay was added after the windows on the porch. From the look of it, he likes the windows. He wonders if they would make the windows the exterior of the house. Mr. Hausman has thought about it but the structural integrity of was a concern. Mr. Gregory is worried once the windows are removed the columns will stick out too prominently. The entire look will change in his opinion. The two dormers on the front of the house they are proposing to remove are original. Mr. McIntire thinks they add charm to the house and he would like to see them stay. Mr. Hausman is amenable to keeping them. He is not sure if all of the windows are operable. Mr. McIntire points out some patchwork seen in a photograph. It might be indicative of where the front door once was; moving it back may provide balance. Mr. McIntire agrees with Mr. Gregory, the piers will be more prominent once the windows are removed. Chair agrees. Chair and Mr. DeWitt wonder if taking the sitting room out to where those windows are would be a solution. This would require the replacement of the windows, but the right reason with the right windows would be acceptable. Mr. Hausman is in the beginning stages, he can make some changes. Ms. Latham would still suggest that we get the historic preservationists thoughts on this before things get ripped out and replaced in kind. Mr. Gregory agrees. Were the windows added at the same time as the gable? The addition dates back to the 1930s, Mr. Gregory points out. The dormers on the sides of the gambrel roof are also part of the original structure and in his opinion should be retained. There is a 1927 illustration of the house that shows the gambrel roof.

Motion by Chair second by P. DeWitt

Inc. Village of Southampton  
Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation  
February 28, 2022

To **adjourn** the application of **39 Lewis Street I, LLC**

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

On the application of **1 Hampton Rd JNH, LLC**, 1 Hampton Road, affidavits of mailing and posting have been submitted to the file. Joseph Tortorella is here to represent the application. This is an application for exterior alterations to repair the building. The exterior has been damaged by time and wear. They are looking to rehab what is there now. There will be no changes to the details. The patina will be no longer, they will be re-coating it and it will have a different look. This will be done by hand, there will be some variation. This is not going to be done in patches, all sides of the building will be redone. The capital is not part of the proposal at this time. The intent at this time is to keep all details. Ms. Latham believes that every new coating is going to cause the building to lose integrity. Mr. DeWitt is worried about losing the crispness. Mr. Tortorella states that there have been prior repairs to the details, there are many that are cast stone and Styrofoam. Ms. Latham wonders if this will be reversible; it is not. Mr. Gregory wonders if the historic consultant has weighed in on this project. Ms. Latham believes that cast stone can still be historic, this should be looked at by the historic consultant. Chair will reach out and see if Ms. Spanborough can weigh in or point the Board in the right direction

Mr. McIntire asks if the applicant can reach out to the manufacturer and see if they have examples of the product being used in historic restoration. If they can provide before and after photos it may give them a better understanding of the final result.

Motion by Chair second by J. Gregory

To **adjourn** the application of **1 Hampton Rd JNH, LLC**

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

On the application **Daniel Brockett**, 292 Ox Pasture Road, affidavits of mailing and posting have been submitted to the file. Lori Fontana is here to represent the applicant. This is an application for a two-story home. The color will be a light grey. The lot is more or less a flag lot, you cannot see the house from the street. Mr. DeWitt still feels the house needs some work. For one, he is not a fan of the normal size window with the transom on top. The shutters do not run the full height of the window and only accent them. He would like to see a solid door. The windows are more Queen Anne style and do not fit the style of the rest of the house. The garage should be lowered, it would look more like an ancillary wing. He would like to see the picture windows on the garage removed. In his opinion, changing the second floor to a dormer would reduce the scale. Ms. Latham believes the use of too many window styles is not digestible. Mr. Gregory would add that the double wall of windows on the rear (south) elevation is a bit extreme. He understands that this is a flag lot, but the light pollution for the neighbors is still a concern of his. He would like to see where the other houses around this property sit in relation to this proposed house. Mr. McIntire agrees with his fellow board members. Siamak Samii, 269 Great Plains Road, property immediately to the south of this property is here. He has concerns, this property is not a flag lot and is not treated as such. This is a nonconforming lot in this area, this is the R-120 zoning district and this lot is less than two acres. The application is for a house nearly four times the size of the house previously on the lot. This lot is an anomaly. There is basically

Inc. Village of Southampton  
Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation  
February 28, 2022

a transfer of development rights from the front lot to the rear portion of the lot where the house is being proposed. He plans on challenging this with the Zoning Board of Appeals. Mr. Samii is also greatly concerned with the two story windows that are facing his property as well as the second story balconies. There is a large dug out to the basement that is similar to a courtyard. It is laid out as if this house was surrounded by acres of meadow; this is a relatively small lot. Landscape is needed to screen the house once a design is agreed upon. He would ask that there be a condition that landscaping be installed during the construction to mitigate having to deal with this. Nica Strunk is here to represent the neighbor adjoining this parcels, Maryann Tighe. The boundaries of her properties run the east property line. She shares the sentiments of Mr. Samii. The scale of the house is out of line with this parcel. There seem to be some discrepancies between the site plan and the architectural drawing that she believes need to be nailed down. The second floor decks are a privacy issue for her client. She would like to see those eliminated. It is her opinion that this constitutes a flag lot as defined by the Village code and it should be treated as such. She understands this Board is not the ZBA or the Building Inspector, but this interpretation will have a significant impact on what can be built on this property. Ms. Stunk will be appealing this with the ZBA. It is up to this Board to determine if a design is harmonious with the neighborhood. This being a grossly undersized lot for the area is already out of character with the neighborhood. There is a specific section of the code that requires that landscape plans be submitted for flag lots prior to the issuance of a building permit. Clearly landscaping is key for lots of this nature. The site plan indicates that the parking is designed for eleven cars. She wonders why when only eight are required by code. The scale and mass should meet the site conditions which are very unusual for this area. This is an issue that Chair would like to review with council, the planning director and the building inspector. It is clear by the Boards comments that scale and mass are a concern as well as some of the details. Mr. Samii would like to point out that the spirit of the law was to have the size of the house be determined by the size of the lot. Mr. Brockett is here, he is disappointed that people are not happy with the house they have designed. They will make changes according to the boards comments. He is happy to install hedging in as high and as deep as the neighbors would like; that has been their intent. If there are suggestions that the neighbors would like to make for the landscaping plan, he is open to that. There is a legal interpretation that this is not a flag lot and he has made an eight million dollar investment based on that ruling.

Motion by Chair second by J. Gregory

To **adjourn** the application of **Daniel Brockett**

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

On the application of **DCK Windham, LLC**, nobody is here to represent the applicant.

Motion by Chair second by S. Latham

To **adjourn** the application of **DCK Windham, LLC** with the condition that an additional adjournment would require re-noticing of the application

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

On the application of **Paul Fagan**, nobody is here to represent the applicant

Inc. Village of Southampton  
Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation  
February 28, 2022

Motion by Chair second by P. Dewitt

To **adjourn** the application of **Paul Fagan** with the condition that an additional adjournment would require re-noticing of the application

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

On the application of **31 Rosko Developer LLC**, 31 Rosko Drive, Haley Willis is here to represent the applicant. Ms. Willis walks the board through the changes: the front door is more solid; they bulked up the columns adding some detailing and connecting them to the roof line. They are proposing to keep the vertical siding. Ms. Willis found several examples of vertical siding throughout the neighborhood. Photos of the house currently with the vertical siding show that it is difficult to see. Mr. DeVito is here to represent the application as well. These are made to order windows that they are using. They are high end windows. Their original proposal were six over one and they are now proposing nine over one. Mr. DeVito explains the detail is there, the previous drawings did not show them. If you look at the original drawings, they have the same amount of columns in this proposal. Chair notes that these are amendments to a prior approval. The Board has to consider this project as if the construction has not occurred already. The fact that the windows have been purchased already cannot be a factor in their decision. Ms. Latham thinks the columns are an improvement. She is still not convinced about the vertical siding and wonders if it can be painted. She thinks a paler color would satisfy some of her hesitation. It was represented at a previous meeting these windows were sent in error and could be replaced. Mr McIntire does not believe that they work with this design. Mr. DeWitt agrees with Ms. Latham that painting the vertical siding white would be an improvement. Mr. Gregory believes the only improvement here is the columns. The windows and color are wrong and this is not a house that they would approve. Mr. DeVito explains that they could have changed the windows back in September, now it would take twenty six weeks to have those made. The siding can be painted, but this is teak, it would be a travesty to paint over it. It will blonde out as time goes on and blend in. The Board is not convinced that the teak will fade out the way described. Ms. Willis understands the Boards comments and the direction they need to go to get approvals. Mr. DeVito will submit samples to the building department showing different stains. Mr. DeWitt would like to see a whitewash.

Motion by Chair Second by S. Latham

To **adjourn** the application of **31 Rosko Developer LLC**

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

On the application of **Margaret Lewis**, 63 Dale Street, there is a request for an adjournment to March 14, 2022.

Motion by Chair Second by J. Gregory

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

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

On the application of **John Ansari**, 306 Hill Street, John McNeill is here to represent the applicant. Previously they proposed a second floor addition. They have scaled this back to an exteri-

Inc. Village of Southampton  
Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation  
February 28, 2022

or alteration to the existing dwelling. On the front elevation they are eliminating one window and adding an egress window on the left side. They added a couple of windows to match the existing kitchen window. On the west elevation they have increased the window size to accommodate egress. They would like to replace the current siding with clapboard siding in the same color as well as change the roof to a cedar shingle roof. The volume of the house has not changed, just some material and facade changes. Mr. Gregory likes the proposal, it looks like a nice little cottage. Ms. Latham wonders about the port hole. This is an existing window so the architect kept it.

Motion by Chair second by J. Gregory

To **approve** the application of **John Ansari**

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

On the application of **SKV Wickapogue Road, LLC**, 508 Wickapogue Road, Siyu Lu is here to represent the applicant. The barn doors have been removed and they eliminated the glass on the side on the west side. They have reduced the size of the actual glass that is on the staircase by 86.5 sq. ft. - roughly a 60% reduction. They replaced the front door so it is now solid. The rear elevation they have reduced the glass by eliminating a panel in the sunroom and the amount of glass used in the doors. The material has changed to board and baton to match the front door on the gable. She feels the rear elevation now better matches the front of the house. On the east elevation the porch column has been brought forward making the connection of the roof lines smoother. In terms of the roof design, Ms. Lu has spent a considerable amount of time looking at the gable roof vs. a hip roof. She has come up with two solutions, one gable design and one with a hip roof. They prefer the gable roof. The siding is cedar with board and baton. Mr. DeWitt thinks the middle gable looks very nice, the back looks good. The side elevations could be improved in his opinion. He feels there is an awkward transition between the garage and shed roof. They can be connected with a hip and lose the garage gable; mirror the south east corner. This, in Mr. DeWitt's opinion will make it more cohesive. He would prefer a design without a gable roof. Mr. Gregory wonders if samples of the gun metal grey color have been submitted. He wants to confirm that this will be a lighter grey and not cause the windows to look black, a photo was shared. This will be on the lighter side. Trim color aside, he thinks the design has come a long way. While not a deal breaker, he would take Mr. DeWitt's suggestions into consideration. Mr. McIntire agrees that he would prefer to see the roof line changes on the garage suggested. Ms. Latham agrees and also agrees with Mr. DeWitt's concern with the roofline on the west elevation. Mr. McIntire agrees. Ms. Latham thinks the amount of swoop of the driveway is a bit overkill. Mr. Gregory can see what she's saying, but the landscaping plan mitigates that issue for him. Mr. McIntire thinks the drawing is more stark than it would look in person.

Motion by Chair second by P. DeWitt

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

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

On the application of **Nicole Gallagher**, 145 Wickapogue Rd, nobody is here to represent the applicant.

On the application of **100 Halsey Lane, LLC**, 144 Pulaski Street, Mehran Tahle is here to represent the applicant. The fascia in the middle was pulled forward; the windows were changed from grey to white; the louvers were removed; the front door has been changed to a more solid door. A small high hat is being proposed under the soffit for porch lighting. Mr. DeWitt likes the changes. He would like to see the lower fascia align with the face of the columns. He thinks this is a charming proposal. Mr. Gregory likes the changes, the front door has made this look more residential. Mr. McIntire agrees, this is a crisp design. New plans will be submitted showing the low fascia be flush with the columns.

Motion by Chair Second by P. DeWitt

To **approve** the application of **100 Halsey Lane, LLC** with the condition that the lower fascia be changed to run flush with the columns

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

On the application of **Anthony and Elizabeth Signore**, 117 Wickapogue Road, affidavits of mailing and posting have been submitted to the file. Giuseppe Adragna, architect is here to represent the applicant. This is a proposal for a two-story single-family dwelling. It will be painted white cedar siding with white brick chimney. The roof will be a synthetic cedar. There is a wrap around porch with a circular element. Ms. Latham feels there is too much going on in the design, the rear elevation in particular. The circular tower is an inappropriate design element for what was farmland. The window to wall ratio is out of scale to her and the brick chimney causes concern. Mr. Gregory agrees with Ms. Latham that the window on the rear elevation is too big. The houses on either side of this property are pretty traditional in style and the design of this house doesn't fit in for him. The transoms are overwhelming and he is not in favor of the side entry. He does not feel it is fitting of the Village. Mr. McIntire agrees with most of the comments. The east elevation, in his opinion is under fenestrated; it is out of balance. Mr. DeWitt agrees that the design is too busy. Mr. Gregory notes that the location of the garage causes the need for additional paving than what would normally be required. Chair has seen the turrets executed in a few cases and has not seen an example where it works. The chimney caps are also a concern of his. Mr. Gregory notes he is in agreement with Ms. Latham that the painted white brick is a concern here. Mr. Adragna doesn't think there is way too much going on, but will take the Boards comments and tone it down appropriately. The roofing material is a synthetic cedar, it is made from a composite material; Chair would like to see either natural cedar or a different material. Ms. Karen Williams, neighbor to this property is here, she has a few questions about the zoning of the property. She agrees with the Board member's comments regarding the design. The applicant has reviewed the zoning requirements with the building inspector and it was determined that this proposal does meet those codes.

Motion by Chair Second by J. Gregory

To **adjourn** the application of **Anthony and Elizabeth Signore**

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

Inc. Village of Southampton  
Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation  
February 28, 2022

On the application of **Alana Serota**, 124 Burnett Street, affidavits of mailing and posting have been submitted to the file. Eric Peterson is here to represent the applicant. This is a proposal for exterior alterations and the construction of a pergola. They are looking to add a balcony to the front of the house, on the rear they would like to convert the rear roofline to a deck area. They will be adding a basement with egress windows as well as replace the pool. The existing pool house will remain. The height will not be affected by the addition of the basement. Mr. DeWitt likes the changes other than the roof deck and balcony. He likes the redesigned front porch. Ms. Latham lives next door, the idea of a balcony facing Burnett Street does not make a whole lot of sense to her; there's nothing to see. Mr. Gregory agrees, he would not be in favor of the balconies. The lots are narrow in this neighborhood and this is a large area. Mr. McIntire concurs. Chair notes the Board has been consistent with their concern over balconies. He would suggest making changes. Mr. Wallach would like to know what variance was granted on this property previously. The front porch area encroaches into the front setback. Mr. Peterson was attempting to lighten up front elevation as it feels top heavy currently. Chair suggests making the balcony non operable. The Board agrees that the design is a good design. Ms. Latham notes this is the only house on the street with Belgium block curbing; she wonders if this could be eliminated or softened. Mr. Peterson notes that they are working with the landscape architect in a design.

Motion by Chair Second by J. Gregory

To **adjourn** the application of **Alana Serota**

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

On the application of **Patrice Magee and John Cuzzocrea**, 90 Fox Hollow Lane, affidavits of mailing and posting have been submitted to the file. Phil Wells, architect is here to represent the applicant. This is a new two-story single-family dwelling. They are proposing asphalt shingle roof and standing seam roof in some areas. The siding will be Hardy plank painted white with white Azek windows and trim. The chimney and edging will be stone. Mr. McIntire feels the design is a bit inconsistent, there are a lot of designs going on. Mr. Gregory likes the accent color, but the roof lines don't make sense to him. Standing seam is not something that the Board is typically in favor of. The stone work is not fitting with the Village, brick maybe, but stone is not appropriate. Ms. Latham agrees. Mr. DeWitt echos his fellow board members; he thinks the design should go back to the drawing board; it is not a Southampton Village design. There are "pork chops" on the rear elevation. There are only a handful of appropriate was that eaves turn the corner in the Village. The Chair would like to see a streetscape.

Motion by Chair Second by S. Latham

To **adjourn** the application of **Patrice Magee and John Cuzzocrea**

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

On the application of **161 Corrigan LLC**, 161 Corrigan Street, affidavits of mailing and posting have been submitted to the file. Brian Glasser, architect and Kevin Wells are here to represent the applicant. This property was not posted on both street fronts, the Board cannot take jurisdiction. They Board will addressed as a pre-submission conference, the matter will be re-advertised. This is on the corner of Bernadine and Corrigan Street. This is a proposal for a new two-

Inc. Village of Southampton  
Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation  
February 28, 2022

story single-family dwelling. The roof will be eastern white cedar left natural, the siding will also be eastern white cedar stained natural Beachwood Grey. The windows will be aluminum clad window in Timber Wolf Grey, the trim and columns will match. The driveway will be pea gravel. The windows are six over one. Ms. Latham thinks the north elevation is lacking in windows. Mr. DeWitt does not like the gable in the foreground, in his opinion this should be a shed roof and then the design would be perfect. He would suggest this change on the rear as well. Mr. Glasser wonders if he would be amenable to a hip roof. The design otherwise is good looking. Mr. McIntire agrees, this is a handsome house. He does think that the widow in the stair well is too large. Mr. Gregory thinks the stair window ruins the symmetry of the house. He is also opposed to the stone around the fireplace. He thinks a whitewash brick would be more appropriate here. Mr. Wells agrees, he thinks that would look better. Chair wonders if the swooping is adding or removing from the design. Mr. Gregory and Ms. Latham like it.

On the application of **Thomas Appio**, 160 Breese Lane, Brad Grossman is here to represent the applicant. He is having technical difficulties. Two options were provided to the Board, they like option 2 that provides a straight across gate. The posts are five feet tall, there are no lights. The gate is 50% transparent and the gate is four feet tall. The key pad is located on the column. The gate will be made of cedar. The gate will be setback 18' from the street.

Motion by Chair Second by M. McIntire

To **approve option 2** for the application of **Thomas Appio**

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

Motion by Chair second by J. Gregory

To close the hearing of February 28, 2022

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

Respectfully Submitted by Jacqueline Allen, February 28, 2022

---

Village Clerk

---

Date