

Inc. Village of Southampton  
Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation  
June 27, 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, June 27, 2022, at 6pm.

Chairman Jeffrey Brodlieb and Members Peter DeWitt and Mark McIntire, Sarah Latham and John Gregory are present.

MOTION by M. McIntire second by S. Latham

To open tonight's meeting.

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

Counsel for the board, Alice Cooley is present. Alex Wallach, Planner Director is present via videoconference.

On the matter of **Steve Madden**, 95 Main Street, Don Herzog and Kurt Straub are here to represent the application. This is a request for a sign. They are proposing an illuminated sign. Because of the lighting the Sign Committee referred this application to the full Board. The lighting will be white, 60 Watt, LED. They will remove the lighting from the sign, this will be approved through the Sign Committee

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

Motion by Chair second by second by J. Gregory

To **approve** the written decision of **Hampton Harbor, LLC**

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

On the application of **EMANON East, LLC** 256 N. Main Street, there is a written decision in the file.

Motion by Chair second by M. McIntire

To **approve** the written decision of **EMANON East, LLC**

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

Motion by Chair second by J. Gregory

To **accept the minutes** of June 13, 2022

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

On the application of **54 Walnut Street LLC**, John Bennett is here to represent the applicant. This is a demolition evaluation. This is not located in the Historic District; it is currently a multi-family residence. A report was prepared by Sally Spanburgh, the Village Historic Consultant. The property is located within the MF-20 zoning district. Mr. Bennett has a rendering of what would be proposed if demolition would be granted. Chair explains that Ms. Spanburgh is currently working on a more comprehensive report. The applicant will be having a report prepared by their own consultant. They will request an adjournment. Ms. Bennett shares the proposed plan. There are currently four units in this house; they will be dropping it to three. The

Inc. Village of Southampton  
Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation  
June 27, 2022

Board agrees that seeing the proposed plan is very helpful in the demolition evaluation process. Mr. Bennett would like time to review the updated report and respond. They will adjourn to July 25<sup>nd</sup>.

Motion by Chair second by

To **adjourn** the application of **54 Walnut Street, LLC to July 25**

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

On the application of **1 Hampton Rd. JNH, LLC**, 1 Hampton Road, no new submissions have been received at this time.

Motion by Chair second by

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

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

On the application of **Chrischar, LLC**, 40 Elm Street, Joel Snodgrass is here to discuss the Historic report he prepared that was presented at the last hearing. He shares with the Board several maps demonstrating the evolution of the property. The house is an American Four Square with double hung windows and a front porch. It is mostly intact; the fenestrations have been almost completely changed and modernized. The house is suffering from tree growth that is causing the house to rot. They are proposing to lift the house and move it away from the trees. An addition is being proposed, Mr. Snodgrass feels that the pop out addition proposed is appropriate for a Four-Square building, he shares photos of other Four-Square homes with similar additions. Ms. Latham explains that they look at these maps, and though the property lines have changed over time, the location of the has not. In the Historic Guidelines discourage the movement of the dwelling, though lifting the house and adding a cellar would remedy the problem. There are many things that can cause water damage.

Mr. Collins agrees, the context of a house on the block is important. The issue to Mr. Collins is that the house is not getting enough circulation and it becomes very damp. He would only suggest moving a structure if it wasn't necessary. The only other way would be to clear cut the vegetation. Mr. Gregory thinks this is a landscaping problem; they have the right to cut the trees back to the property line. He feels that if they allow the house to be moved over four feet, they may be back in this situation in another ten or fifteen years. Lisa Zaloga, architect is here to discuss the addition. The design has not changed, but the site plan has. Dean Gamolka, landscape architect reviews the landscape plan with the Board. They will be removing the front yard parking. They have grass pavers that will lead back to the detached garage and parking area. They will accent the property with boxwood and magnolia. Their intent is to soften the addition and keep the four-square the prime focus. The original proposal was to move the house thirty feet from the property line; they are now requesting a forty-eight-foot setback from the street. A streetscape was provided to show the relationship with the other homes on that side of Elm Street. A conversation has not been had with the neighbor about removing the landscaping; it could be a viable possibility. The Board is concerned with moving the house. Peter Cardel, homeowner is here. Moving historic homes happens; we see them move to different properties. Mr. Cardel feels that they have been painted into a corner; they have complied with the Boards request to move the parking to the back of the house. He wants this house to present beautifully on the street; he appreciates the historic significance of the house. Chair disagrees that the parking in the rear is not linked to the five feet in the front. Mr. DeWitt likes the addition. The

Board is fine with the landscaping being proposed. M. McIntire is still concerned with the addition. He is not in favor of the bump out; he thinks that it will change the view as you come down the street. Chair thinks that the bump out would be more of a concern for him if they move the house. Ms. Cooley notes that this Board has found in the past that moving a landmarked historic building was not something they are in favor of.

The prior historic consultant has noted in the past that the movement of a historic structure negates its status as a landmark. Susan Hovdegsen is here as a neighbor; she was concerned to hear that there was rot on the house. She worries what will happen when it is lifted and moved. She feels that allowing this house to be moved will set a precedent for the rest of the neighborhood. Brian Denahey is here, he reviewed the file earlier today and notes that the documents presented to the Board this evening were not there. He feels that what has been presented was an over exaggeration; the trees are overgrown, but not enough to cause significant damage in his opinion. The examples of pop out additions on four-square style homes that were provided were not located in the historic district as this property is. He feels that the proposed development goes against the intent of the historic district. John Dios, is concerned with the structure being damaged as it is moved. Rosemarie Dios, 38 Elm Street, shared photographs, the trees can be trimmed. Page two of the landscaping plan shows a gate. Counsel read a letter from the Building Inspector into the record. Ms. Zaloga wonders if they leave the house in its location, pick it up and put it on a foundation; would the Board be amenable to that? The Board is concerned with how the addition will be attached to the existing building.

Motion by Chair second by J. Gregory

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

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

On the application of **Anthony and Debra Celebre**, 196 Hill Street, Joseph Payjack is here to represent the applicant. Comments were made about the massing of the front of the house as the last hearing. They moved the house a foot away from the side property line. This allowed them to eliminate the dormer and add a hip roof. There is a shed roof over the front entrance, and they eliminated the railings on the porch. The cupola and trellis on the garage were removed; the stone was removed, and the chimney was changed to brick. They did keep the “lazy rafters”, they felt it was subtle and softened the roof. Mr. DeWitt notes the second floor volume labeled “unfinished 7ft ceiling” makes the link between the main volume and the garage too prominent and overpowers the elevation. That link should be lower and recessive. He also notes that the applicant fixed the “lazy” rafters by limiting the flair of roof to eave. The original gable design with eave at first floor and dormers at the north and south was better scaled to its neighbors. The shed roof over the front porch will be standing seam metal roof. She agrees with Mr. DeWitt on the front elevation. Mr. Gregory thinks the removal of some of the ornamentation makes for a better design. He does agree with the other Board members. He thinks that the transom over the triple window is too much. Mr. McIntire agrees. Chair has the same design concerns. Mr. Wallach requests that GFA calculations be provided to the Building Department.

Motion by Chair second by S. Latham

To **adjourn** the application of **Anthony and Debra Celebre**

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

On the application of **Westlawn, LLC**, 107 Great plains Road, this is a new application; affidavits of mailing and posting have been submitted. John Bennett is here to represent the applicant. This is an application for an accessory structure. This main dwelling is a contributing

structure within the historic district. They structure that they are proposing is much different design than the house. Billie Crowin, landscape architect is here. This is an art studio. It will not be visible from the street. This is a flat roofed structure with north facing sky lights. The building and trellis will be grey. The window frames are black, the skylight will be brushed aluminum. It is subservient to the main structure, and it is a nice addition to the property. A revised set of plans will be submitted to the file indicating the materials.

Motion by Chair second by P. DeWitt

To **close** the application of **Westlawn, LLC** for written decision

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

On the application of **Circles East End, LLC**, 41 Gin Lane, this is a new application; affidavits of mailing and posting have been submitted. John Rose, architect is here to represent the applicant. This is an application for two shed dormers on the south elevation and alterations to the dwelling, including moving the front porch steps. They are proposing to expand the porch by 52 square feet. Ms. Latham thinks that adding dormers to the roof detracts from the house. Mr. DeWitt thinks that the dormers are too closed to the east wall. Mr. Rose explains that the dormer location was determined by lining them up with the first-floor windows. Mr. DeWitt thinks the dormer is too large. Ms. Latham prefers the house without it. Chair agrees. Mr. DeWitt is not against a dormer, just the size. The original location of the front porch steps is in question. Mr. McIntire doesn't have a big issue with the dormer, he does feel that the window weight of the dormer is heavier than that of the windows below. The dormer windows are egress windows, and as the original author of the addition, Mr. Rose feels that the dormer does work here. He will explore other window options that meet code. They are moving the location of a bedroom. Mr. Wallach asked that clarity be provided on the floor plan as to which bedroom is moving.

Motion by Chair second by J. Gregory

To **adjourn** the application of **Circles East End, LLC**

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

On the application of **Lee Wesley, LLC**, 284 Coopers Neck Lane, Joseph Payjack is here to represent the applicant. This is an application for a driveway gate. At the last hearing the Board requested greater transparency and for the columns to be natural brick. These changes have been made. They lowered the horizontal rail of the gate to achieve the transparency. Chair asks that the gooseneck keypad be removed. Mr. Payjack can add that gooseneck onto the pier. He has those drawings with him today to submit to the file.

Motion by Chair second by M. McIntire

To **close** the application of **Lee Wesley, LLC** for written decision

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

On the application of **Patrice Magee and John Cuzzocrea**, 90 Foxhollow Lane, Phil Wells, architect, is here to represent the applicant. The transom over the front door was removed and they reverted to the previous dormer design on the west elevation. Mr. Gregory notes that the house number on the rendering is very large – they will change this.

Motion by Chair second by M. McIntire

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

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

On the application of **Andrew Spreitzer**, 85 Hildreth Street, Siyu Liu, architect, is here to represent the applicant. This application has been re-noticed for tonight's meeting; affidavits of mailing and posting have been submitted to the file. Chair states that this matter is currently before the Zoning Board of Appeals to appeal the issuance of a building permit on this property for the replacement of the windows. A site plan was previously submitted to the file, the updated survey was just received and submitted to the file today. The front door has been changed from a glass door to a more solid door. The sliding door on the rear elevation has been reduced to mitigate potential light pollution; they have worked with the colors and are proposing a new color scheme. They are proposing to lighten the windows, to almost match the color of the house and the darkest color will be used only for the front door. Mr. McIntire wonders if they have considered going back to the original windows with divided light, more fitting to the neighborhood. Chair notes these windows are more contemporary than fits with the neighborhood. Mr. McIntire thinks that Ms. Liu has done a great job configuring where things go on the property, but the windows themselves, despite their color, are too contemporary for this house; Mr. Gregory agrees. He also believes that there is a potential light pollution issue on the rear façade. Mr. DeWitt does not think that six over six windows must be done here. He likes the casements done in the dormers and he likes the horizontal mullions. The windows in the dormer are too large, he thinks that the door on the side elevation should be changed to windows. The homeowner really loves the horizontal bars in the windows; they would like to keep them. Ms. Liu will remove the shrub from the rendering.

John Bennett, 60 Hildreth Street is here to represent the applicant. In his opinion, this will have a negative effect on the neighborhood. This is an area of modest pride. His biggest gripe with the application is with the fenestrations; the architect has been asked to design based on inventory. Mr. Bennett shared photographs of the neighborhood, demonstrating that white framed, double hung windows are the norm. He would ask that the Board require that the applicant put double hung, white windows back in place.

Motion by Chair second by M. McIntire

To **adjourn** the application of **Andy Sprietzer**

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

On the application of **Ring of Fire, LLC**, 191 Bishops Lane, nobody is here to represent the applicant and submissions have not yet been received.

Motion by Chair second by S. Latham

To **adjourn** the application of **Ring of Fire, LLC**

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

On the application of **Sterling Home Developers Corp.**, 73 Pleasant Lane, Brian Glasser, Architect, is representing the applicant. No changes have been made to the plan since it was last presented. A full Board was not present at the last hearing, Mr. Glasser wanted the opportunity to present. Mr. Gregory had concerns about the double height window in the stairwell as well as the second-floor deck on the rear. Chair agrees that the stairwell windows are too much. Mr. DeWitt is less concerned with the windows on the front; to address the comments of the other Board members, he would suggest that the western wall of those windows be changed to

shingles. If that change is made, the Board would be able to approve the plan. Mr. Glasser will submit revised plans.

Motion by Chair second by M. McIntire

To **adjourn** the application of **Sterling Home Developers Corp.**

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

On the application of **Andrea Jolles**, 384 Little Plains Road, Pamela Pospisil, architect, is here to represent the applicant. The roof line on the western elevation was thought to be a little commercial at the last hearing. They have added a dormer to mitigate that concern.

Motion by Chair second by S. Latham

To **approve** the application of **Andrea Jolles**

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

On the application of **68 Pelham Street, LLC**, 68 Pelham Street, Joseph and Chase Andreassi are here to represent the applicant. The “lazy rafters” have been removed, the size of the reverse gables have been increased; the columns in the front have been enlarged; the picture window was changed to a double hung and the front door has been changed. The window trim is now white, and the metal roof has been removed. The rear second floor deck has been reduced in size. Mr. DeWitt notes the pockets where the shed roof comes forward looks busy and unresolved; the front door is too short. He finds the details over the rear door undesirable. Mr. Gregory likes the use of materials; he agrees with Mr. DeWitt that an alternative to the pockets on the front elevation should be explored. Ms. Latham agrees that the front door is too short and that the columns should line up with the corners of the fascia board. She does not understand how the eaves come down and then return with the shingle, it’s an unnecessary detail. It would be cleaner to have a simple return. The fenestration pattern on the rear elevation is peculiar in her opinion; there are three different types of double-hung windows and casement windows. The north elevation is of particular concern for her as well, the rooflines drawn are not possible. Mr. McIntire agrees with everything that has been said. If any lighting is to be proposed, it needs to be shown on the plan. Chair finds very little in this design that is representative of Southampton Village. There is a lack of verticality, it is clear to Chair that the architect designed a house to fit exactly within the building envelope. This does not only need to fit within code, but it needs to fit within the neighborhood. There is a lot in this design that needs to be reconsidered before this becomes a plan that he would consider.

Motion by Chair second by J. Gregory

To **adjourn** the application of **68 Pelham Street, LLC** to July 25, 2022

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

On the application of **Daniel and Eliza Savage**, 105 Corrigan Street, Siyu and Spring Liu are here to represent the applicant. This is a new application; affidavits of mailing and posting have been submitted to the file. They will be keeping the existing driveway, pool and shed, they are proposing to construct a two-story dwelling with an attached garage. There is one single central hip roof with a gable centered in the front. The front door is glass with side lights. There is a smaller second floor deck on the rear. The siding will be natural cedar shingle, with painted trim and front door. Ms. Latham does not find the design inspiring, but there is nothing egregious about it. Mr. McIntire agrees, he wonders if there will be any light fixtures? Any proposed

Inc. Village of Southampton  
Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation  
June 27, 2022

exterior lighting needs to be included on the plan. There will be a recessed light over the door next to the garage.

Motion by Chair second by M. McIntire

To **approve** the application of **Daniel and Eliza Savage**

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

On the application of **SL II 405, LLC**, 405 Captains Neck Lane, Ramon Chavez is here to represent the applicant. The spacing has been increased and the keypad removed.

Motion by Chair second by

To **approve** the application of **SL II 405, LLC**

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

Motion by Chair second by P. DeWitt

To enter executive session

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

Motion by Chair second by M. McIntire

To reopen the public meeting

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

Motion by Chair second by J. Gregory

To close the meeting of June 27, 2022

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