

Inc. Village of Southampton
Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation
Monday, March 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 in the municipal board room of Village Hall at 23 Main Street, Southampton, NY and via Videoconference on Monday, March 28, 2022 at 7pm.

Board members Chair Jeffrey Brodlieb, Sarah Latham, Peter DeWitt, John Gregory present.
Board member M. McIntire is participating via videoconference

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. Alex Wallach, Planner Director is present.

Motion by Chair second by J. Gregory

To **approve** the minutes of March 14, 2022

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

On the application of **Brookside Enterprises**, there is a written decision in the file.

Motion by Chair second by P. DeWitt

To **approve** the application of **Brookside Enterprises** as written

On the application of **Tates Bake Shop**, this matter was re-opened at the last hearing to allow for the presentation of landscaping. The intent is to clean up the existing raised beds in the front and add additional plantings.

Motion by Chair second by J. Gregory

To **close** the application of **Tates Bake Shop** for written decision

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

On the application of **And By the Way Trust Subtrust A and And By The Way Trust Subtrust B**, this matter has been adjourned to April 11th

On the application of **Seersucker I, LLC**, 365 S. Main Street, David Gilmartin is here to represent the applicant. Steven Chrisman and Conor Moran are here from Furgeson, Shamami architects. A report was prepared by the Village Historic consultant, Sally Spamborough that was made part of the record. The east facing street façade was constructed between 1938 and 1954, however the property is noted as a contributed structure in the Village of Southampton. The roof shingles are asphalt that they would like to replace with wood shingles. In response to her comments, they added another window and changed the exposed base to be parge on masonry to match the existing. The intent is to bring back the east façade to a more historically accurate period. They would like to remove the existing skylight and replace with an elliptical eyebrow window, remove windows on the second story, and remove inserted French doors to the center

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

and replace the existing front porch, which is not historic in Mr. Chrisman's opinion. They proposed porch will be smaller with Greek revival columns. The proposed front door and transom is more in keeping with historic nature. Regarding the windows themselves, they are proposing to replace them with wood windows to match existing in size, dimension and historical proportions. The second-floor windows will be replaced in 6 over 6 and they would like to put the same 6 over 6 on the first floor. The wall shingles, they have asked Wright and Co. to look at the existing shingles. They have found that they are not original and most likely towards the end of their life. They would like to replace the shingles in kind. They have removed the shutters from the addition per Board comments. Ms. Latham wonders what the height of the portaged area. If the original use was a carriage house, she wants to make certain that it doesn't get jacked up too high that it loses that integrity. They would maintain the height. The interior will be renovated. There is no public comment.

Motion by Chair second by J. Gregory

To close the application for written decision

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

On the application of **39 Lewis Street, LLC**, 39 Lewis Street, this is an application for exterior alterations. Anthony Vermendois is here to represent the applicant. Changes were made to keep the front porch area. They have maintained the post spaces on the front porch to maintain the historic character. The windows will be replaced with the same design; some windows will be operable some will not. Questions were raised at the last hearing regarding the interior of the porch, particularly what would be happening with the original exterior wall. The side entrance and overhang will remain; the door itself will be replaced. There is a second-floor deck being proposed, it is roughly 10x10. Mr. Gregory wonders if the intent for the porch is to remove that original exterior wall? Mr. Vermendois confirms that it would be removed in part. Ms. Latham would like more time to review the application as presented, the Board only just received the plans. Although the doorway on the southern end of the porch is not original, it is her thought that the actual opening should be maintained there. She understands there may be concerns with the width of the interior, but now they will be losing an important historic element of the house. She would not be in favor of the removal of the wall. Mr. Gregory agrees, if this was not a historic house this wouldn't be an issue. On the southern end, Mr. DeWitt would agree on keeping the wall, removing the door and side lights and keep the original opening. On the middle, he is not opposed to the columns, though he wonders if they are necessary as it seems to chop the room in half. The portion of the lights seem to have changed. There were essentially 4 lights per unit, now going to 6 per unit, he would like to see it maintained. The plans will be changed to call out that they will remain. Mr. McIntire shares the concern that right now when you look through those glass panels you will see porch; were as this will change to house. The idiosyncratic manor in which the windows line up should be maintained and reflected in a new drawing. Mr. Vermendois notes that the window gets clipped by the column, the intent was to keep the same layout of window lights as there now. He can investigate working around the

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

column. There are photos that give reference to what the building looked like originally; the board would like to maintain the porch aspect of the house. Ms. Latham notes she does have trouble with the removal of the bay. Mr. Vermindois notes that they had proposed to keep the bay and open the porch completely. He was under the impression that the Board preferred to see a closed porch. It would not be a usable space if they keep the bay. Mr. Hausman, the owner is also present. They are creating a room in the dining room that will have multiple openings. He agrees the front of the house is old, the windows are old. He would like to update that part of the house to last another hundred years. He would like to keep the historic integrity of the house while creating a functional room. Mr. DeWitt does not expect the applicant to keep the windows; the Board asks that they keep the existing light patterns. He wonders if a ten-foot opening would be appropriate there while maintaining the wall on either side.

Motion by Chair second by J. Gregory

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

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

On the application of **1 Hampton Road, LLC**, this matter was adjourned to get another assessment for the methodology being proposed. The question was raised as to who would be paying for this. The Board wants somebody who is knowledgeable about this matter to review. Ms. Latham believes if the applicant can be presented with three or so people who can come up with historic preservation methodology for this project. The application of a three-part stucco was proposed that Ms. Latham believes would trap water behind and cause additional damage.

On the application of **Daniel Brocket**, there is a request for an adjournment in the file

Motion by Chair second by J. Gregory

To **adjourn** the application of **Daniel Brocket**

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

On the application of **DCK Windham, LLC** 35 Herrick Road, this is an application for an “as built” gate. Chair will reach out to the Building Department to take action as the applicant has not been present.

On the application of **Paul Fagan**, this matter will be removed from the agenda.

On the application of **heart of the Hamptons**, 44 Meeting House Lane, this matter is adjourned

On the application of **Alana Serota**, 124 Burnett Street, Eric Peterson is here to represent the applicant. This was held open from the last meeting for written comment, none was received. The applicant did submit revised plans; the deck on the rear has been reduced to six feet. The Board is happy with the changes made.

Motion by Chair second by J. Gregory

To **approve** the application of **Alana Serota**

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

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

On the application of **161 Corrigan, LLC**, 161 Corrigan Street, Brian Glasser is here to represent the applicant. He did look into some of the changes discussed at the last hearing, he was not able to make it work and be code compliant.

Motion by Chair second by J. Gregory

To **approve** the application of **161 Corrigan, LLC**

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

On the application of **Mitchell Kaneff**, 60 Halsey Neck, Lori from BMA Architecture is here to represent the applicant. This was held open for written comment only from the last hearing; none was received.

Motion by Chair second by P. DeWitt

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

On the application of **31 Rosko Developer, LLC**, is here to represent the applicant. Denise Shern from the Adam Miller Group is here to represent the applicant. This application will be reviewed as a blank slate, as if none of this has been constructed already. Ms. Shern understands the issues to be the window replacement as well as the color of the siding on the house. The plans submitted show replacement windows that are four over one. They have brought a sample of the teak siding with the solid white stain applied. Mr. Devito is also here to represent the application. They are proposing the vertical stained shingle. The four over one windows are being proposed because he feels that the architecture requires a larger light pattern. He did explore other options for the windows and feels strongly this is the proper style for the house. The chimney will be a Danish blend for the brick. His goal was to tie everything together in a simple house. Ms. Latham agrees that the four over one is the solution for the windows, similarly the door seems to reflect the four over one. She hates to see the teak be painted over, but she does believe the white stain will be okay. Mr. DeWitt agrees. The window trim will be all white. Mr. Devito marked on the file plans that the trim will be white clad with white framing. The front door and garage door will be white as well.

Motion by Chair second by P. DeWitt

To **approve** 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, James Bennett is here to represent the applicant. New plans have been submitted. The roof was changed to meet Board comments. Mr. DeWitt thinks it is a nice-looking house. Ms. Latham agrees, it is greatly improved. Mr. Gregory agrees. The door will be three feet wide.

Motion by Chair second by J. Gregory

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

To **approve** the application of **Margaret Lewis**

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

On the application of **SKV Wickapogue Road, LLC**, 508 Wickapogue Road, Siyu Liu, architect, is here to represent the applicant. The northeast elevation is where the garage is, a suggestion was made at the last hearing to line the two rooflines up. The roofline on the northwest side was also squared off. Plans were submitted reflecting these changes.

Motion by Chair second by J. Gregory

To **approve** 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 Road, Mike Mandracina is here to represent the applicant. Thomas Volpus is the architect of record. New drawings were provided to the file based on a report prepared by Sally Spanbourgh. They changed the elevations to match photos provided. They are proposing cedar shake on the east side of the barn. The north elevation there are two double hung windows on the first floor with a nine of six window above those. This design is in keeping with the historic photos provided in the report prepared. The roof will be cedar shingles. Ms. Latham notes it appears to meet the criteria noted by the historic consultant. She thinks the carriage style lights added are out of place here. She and Mr. Gregory note a goose neck would be more appropriate with the building. The applicant would like to do one gooseneck over the barn door. Mr. DeWitt thinks the design looks very nice. The gooseneck should be a matte paint finish. Mr. McIntire wonders if the eight-inch single exposure is appropriate. It is not called out clearly on Ms. Spanbourgh's report. The Board finds it to be appropriate as submitted.

Motion by Chair second by J. Gregory

To **approve** the application of **Nicole Gallagher**, with the condition that a single gooseneck light painted a matte finish be added over the barn door and eliminating the other lighting fixtures.

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

On the application of **Anthony and Elizabeth Signore**, 117 Wickapogue Road, Guisepe Adrana, architect is here to represent the applicant. The garage gambrel roof has been changed to line up with the main roofline. The porch columns have been changed to an 8" square posts. The applicants were asked at the last meeting to review how this house would fit into the neighborhood. A streetscape was submitted to the file showing three houses to either side. He feels that this house does not stand out and will fit right in with the neighborhood. Mr. Gregory would agree; it's an interesting addition to the street and it doesn't depart too much from the typical designs of the area. Mr. McIntire feels that the window to wall ratio on the side elevations are light, but overall does not object to the design. Mr. DeWitt would like to see the eave lines line up a little more. The dormer on the east side of the front facing gambrel is odd

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

looking to him. Perhaps if the gable was removed it wouldn't be as much of an issue. Mr. Adrana notes that to line up the eaves they would need to raise the roof line eight to ten inches;

he felt it lined up a little too much. Mr. DeWitt can appreciate that. He still not in favor of the dormer over the garage. There was a conversation at the last meeting regarding straightening out the roof line on the rear. The clients really do not want to concede to this point; they would like to keep the bell-shaped turret. It is not Ms. Latham's favorite element but given it's massing it is relatively minor. Chair agrees. The dormer on the east side can be changed to mirror the other side. New plans will be submitted to reflect this change.

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

On the application of **Patrice Magee and John Cuzzocrea**, there is a request for an adjournment to April 25, 2022

Motion by Chair second by S. Latham

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

On the application of **Charles Falcao**, there is a request for an adjournment to April 11, 2022.

Chair and Mr. McIntire have brought this property to the attention of the building inspector as it is in violation of the original approval

Motion by Chair second by J. Gregory

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

On the application of **Steven Boyd**, 104 Foster Crossing, Raymond Renault is here to represent the applicant. Affidavits of mailing and posting have been submitted to the file. This is an application for a pool cabana. The materials and colors will match the existing dwelling: cedar shingle, vertical cedar siding to be stained white, shutters will be grey, roof will be cedar. Mr. DeWitt feels this is too formal. The Tuscan columns are too fancy for the house that exists. The applicant can look at other designs.

Motion by Chair second by J. Gregory

To **adjourn** the application of **Steven Boyd**

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

On the application of **Andrew Spreitzer**, 85 Hildreth Street, affidavits of mailing and posting have been submitted to the file. Siyu Liu and Josh Sancho are here to represent the applicant. This is an application for a one-story addition, covered front porch an addition to the garage. Sliding doors are being proposed on the rear to provide access to the backyard. The roof will be cedar shingle, the trim will be a green color and the covered porch will be natural wood. Mr. Gregory likes the fact that the windows are being unified, however he feels they are the wrong windows. The core of the house is very traditional. These are Anderson A series; they will be matching existing windows on the house. Chair feels this design will stand out on the street. The treatments are making it less compatible with the rest of the neighborhood. Permits were

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

given for the replacement of windows. Mr. McIntire feels that the sliding front door is not appropriate for the front of the house. Ms. Liu explains that this was put in under the building permit issued. Mr. DeWitt agrees with Ms. Latham, a sliding glass door is meant to be a patio

door, it is not appropriate for the front. He does not agree with the bronze color of the windows, Mr. Gregory agrees. Mr. Gregory is also concerned with the weight of the new porch. Mr. DeWitt agrees, it is too heavy. If they can line it up with the edge of the eave, that would be an improvement. The west side of the house is more than twenty feet from the property line. Mr. Gregory is concerned with light pollution caused by the changes to the rear elevation. It might look better if the door was three panes high as opposed to four. Ms. Latham feels that the porch doesn't look resolved as it meets the garage. A single fascia could solve this problem. The east elevation shows a series of tall narrow windows, then you have a triple set of windows. It seems to Ms. Latham that once the front door issue is resolved, it may be a better design to take the set of three and pair them together. Mr. Bennett and Mrs. Read are here as owners of the neighboring property. He feels the large size of the windows is out of character with the house. Photos were shared with the Board. Two double hung windows existed flanking the chimney on the south elevation. There were no prior approvals given by the Architectural Review Board for the metal doors and windows that were installed. Mr. Bennett believes these should be double hung windows like those in the surrounding neighborhood. The homes in this area do not call attention to themselves; they are simple traditional designs. He feels these fenestrations are like a thumb in the eye here. The extension of the garage required ZBA approval. Mr. Bennett appeared before that board. It was originally an extensive application that was paired down. The extension of the garage was to be just that – a garage. Looking at the site plan, it is only nine feet deep; this cannot be a garage. Mr. Bennett feels this is in violation of the ZBA approval, which granted approval under the understanding that it would be used for parking. The pool does not meet code, nor does the interior courtyard that is proposed. Mr. Wallach will review the application. Ms. Liu wanted to note that a building permit was issued April of 2021 to change the doors. She will investigate the ZBA issue. The GFA is approximately 300 sq. ft. under according to Ms. Liu.

Motion by Chair second by J. Gregory

To **adjourn** the application of **Andrew Spreitzer**

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

On the application of **980 Meadow Lane Trust**, 980 Meadow Lane, Ashley Brooks is here to represent the applicant. This is an application for driveway gates. The material will be wood painted dove white to match the trim of the house. The gate will be 50.4% transparent. Ms. Latham thinks the hinges are elegant. There are no lights proposed and there will not be an external mechanism. The gate will be setback 18 feet from the road. There is no public comment.

Motion by Chair second by J. Gregory

To **approve** the application with the condition that there will be no external keypad

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

Inc. Village of Southampton

Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation

Monday, March 28, 2022

Motion by Chair second by M. McIntire

To **close** the meeting of March 28, 2022

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

Respectfully submitted by Jacqueline Allen 3/28/2022
