

**BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW &  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION  
VILLAGE OF SOUTHAMPTON  
JANUARY 28, 2019**

Due notice having been given, the public hearing of the Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation for the Village of Southampton was held in the Board room of the Municipal Building, 23 Main Street, Southampton, NY on Monday, January 28, 2019 at 7:00pm. An executive session was started at 6pm.

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

Counsel for the Board Elbert W. Robinson was absent, but counsel Wayne Bruyn was present. Historic Consultant Zachary Studenroth was present as well.

MOTION by R. Coburn, seconded by J. Brodlieb

**To open for executive session**

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

MOTION by R. Coburn, seconded by J. Brodlieb

**To close the executive session and open the public meeting.**

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

MOTION by R. Coburn, seconded by C. Highsmith

**To open tonight's meeting.**

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

**WRITTEN DECISION**

On the application of **CHRISTOPHER MOORE**, 509 First Neck Lane, there is a written decision in the file.

MOTION by R. Coburn, seconded by C. Highsmith

**To approve the application of CHRISTOPHER MOORE as written.**

On Vote: Chair, J. Brodlieb, C. Redding, C. Highsmith,

**DRIVEWAY GATES-NON-HISTORIC**

On the application of **OCEAN PLAY LLC**, 155 Wyandanch Lane, Paolo Otria is here to represent the applicant. There has been a redesign. There is 90% transparency now. This will be clear cedar painted white. The posts are 6'1". The Board expressed appreciation for the changes made and the attractive design of the gates. There will be lanterns on the posts, they will be under 10 watts, LED this would be 40 watts. The Board would like the wattage reduced. It will shine down according to the applicant. However this isn't possible since it is a candle fixture. A picture of the lantern is needed and an appropriate wattage, the equivalent of a 25 watt incandescent bulb or less, was requested by the Board.

MOTION by R. Coburn, seconded by C. Highsmith

**To approve the applicant's request for adjournment on the application of OCEAN PLAY, LLC.**

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

**BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW &  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION  
VILLAGE OF SOUTHAMPTON  
JANUARY 28, 2019  
PUBLIC HEARINGS - NON-HISTORIC**

On the application of **HENRY & BERNADETTE WATKINS**, 44 Halsey Neck Lane, counsel Wayne Bruyn will be recused from this matter. Diane Herold is here to represent the applicant. A revised plan and revised site plan have been submitted tonight. The garage door was taken off the front of the house. The sides of the garage sits back two feet as well as the other wing of the house. The window layout on the front of the house has changed. The roof will be charcoal asphalt. The board has an issue with the asphalt, however this is a stucco house and a wood roof wouldn't harmonize with the building. A charcoal gray shingle was suggested. The board agrees this would help mediate the issue of aesthetics Mr. Brodlieb would like a 3D color rendering and the roof samples. This is a black and white house so Mrs. Herold is confused by the request. Mr. Brodlieb would like a rendering that is not hand drawn. R. Coburn appreciates the responsiveness to the boards' requests. The ridge line is a true ridge, there is no flat portion of the roof. There is an offset between the pediment and the door, Mr. Coburn suggested a window placed to the right of the door or for the door to be moved. This would be a difficult task according to Ms. Herold. J. Brodlieb likes the scale of the door and in this way it offsets things. C. Highsmith agrees.

MOTION by J. Brodlieb, seconded by R. Coburn

To **approve the applicant's request for adjournment on the application of HENRY & BERNADETTE WATKINS.**

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

On the application of **HERMAN LAMISON**, 44 Hillcrest Ave, Andres Flores is here to represent the applicant. The roof will be raised by 1'2". The window plan is changing. A gable will be added to the front. The board is happy with the simple design. The front pediment was designed to add more focus to the front entrance.

MOTION by R. Coburn, seconded by C. Highsmith

To **approve the application of HERMAN LAMISON.**

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

On the application of **OCEAN PLAY LLC**, 155 Wyandanch Lane, Ron Villano is here to represent the applicant. Photos were submitted. A front covered porch will be added. Renderings were reviewed.

MOTION by J. Brodlieb, seconded by R. Coburn

To **approve the application of OCEAN PLAY LLC.**

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

On the application of **LOT 2 OLDE TOWNE LLC**, 2 Old Towne Lane, John Kean is here to represent the applicant. This is for lot #2. This is a shingle style home. Wood roof, shingle siding, TDL windows, copper gutters, brick chimneys will be used. R. Coburn is concerned about the diamond windows and the brackets on the columns and how they are not in any other area of the home. This was chosen for the deeper areas to add detail.

MOTION by R. Coburn, seconded by C. Highsmith

To **approve the application of LOT 2 OLDE TOWNE LLC.**

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

**BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW &  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION  
VILLAGE OF SOUTHAMPTON  
JANUARY 28, 2019**

**PUBLIC HEARINGS - HISTORIC**

On the application of **CAROL WELCH**, 340 Hill Street, this is adjourned to February 11, 2019.

On the application of **ALEXANDER LYNCH**, 391 Hill Street, Jason Poremba is here to represent the applicant. Mr. Poremba stated that he lives here and that his family has been here since the 1840s, he meant no disrespect to the Village or the Board. The building came down due to a human being, this unfortunately happened and his reputation has been jeopardized now according to Mr. Brodlieb. Mr. Brodlieb warned him to know who he is dealing with moving forward. The application has been resolved with the building department, violations and fine have been taken care of. The rafters, front porch and details have been saved. Mr. Poremba went through a presentation of the changes and how the alteration would have affected the structure. The rear was to be changed entirely. There were parts of the structure that were not historic and this was reviewed in the original presentation with the board and the historic counsel. Mr. Poremba thought that he was just saving the top of the structure and really thought that this was possible. The existing dormers were not historic. The dormers and the framing were reviewed in photos. The shingles were supposed to be replicated. The blue highlight on his original plan was not to save the portions, it was to indicate what was being copied. The rafters were to be saved and he was to preserve the top portion of the house. It became obvious as time moved on that this wouldn't be possible. The house was lifted twice. The proximity was too close to the neighbors so it became impossible. Mr. Poremba stated that he should have in hind sight come before the board regarding the rafters and the top part of the building when he realized that it couldn't be done and this he considers the lesson learned. The board only has one set of plans. Mr. Poremba thinks that the building department may have them. The board has no issue with the proposed plan as of now. A clear building permit is needed for the board. The hearing can be closed and decision can be made subject to a new building permit and a new COA to date. A new document is needed to show that this is a new house. R. Coburn stated that the neighbor contacted him and said that they have no issue with the plans and that Mr. Poremba did reach out to them.

MOTION by R. Coburn, seconded by C. Highsmith

**To close the public hearing on the application of ALEXANDER LYNCH subject to a new building permit and a new COA to date for written decision by counsel.**

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

On the application of **SH 24 LLC**, 24 Gin Lane, John Bennett and Tim Haynes are here to represent the applicant. Mr. Bennett asked that chair be recused. Chair read a statement stating that there is no reason to request this. She has no interest in the property materially or otherwise and will not recuse herself. A clarified plan has been in the file for probably about two weeks. The matter has been presented in full and now the board would like to hear the comments of the audience.

Jeff Bregman co-counsel with Mr. Handler for the Manger and Michaelchek neighbors. Mr. Bregman stated he agreed about the refusal of Chair to recuse January 18, 2019 Mr. Robinson gave him a memo regarding a call he made to the court office stating that this would be a new hearing, new start, new testimony, and that doesn't preclude any previous submissions according to Mr. Robinson. Mr. Bregman stated that the part about it not precluding isn't exactly accurate, any parties could reuse but it would be documentary evidence only. It would be an

**BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW &  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION  
VILLAGE OF SOUTHAMPTON  
JANUARY 28, 2019**

error to submit transcripts of testimony. This was verified on a call to the court office and he recorded it and transcribed the call. Mr. Bennett submitted evidence from the previous hearing. Chair asked for the transcript of the phone call. Mr. Bruyn stated to take counsel under advisement and that any testimony that would support the new hearing should be taken. It would be more productive if the board could be addressed by Mr. Bregman to address the standards that the board needs to apply and whether or not this is being met. Mr. Bregman wants to make sure there is no prejudice is made. Mr. Bregmann asked if this hearing can be scheduled in increments of 1.5 hours, without interruption, in order for them to focus at the facts.

No comments regarding the architecture of the proposed house were received from the public at this time.

Mr. Bennett stated that all that was submitted was a 2.5 page letter that summarizes what was put in the file. There are no changes. There has been no change since December 10, 2018. Mr. Bregman has heard no substantive comment.

Mr. Brodlieb commented that he is looking at a 100 page letter and hasn't had an opportunity to review it and doesn't feel ready to make a decision as of yet. The letter in question regarding 24 Gin Lane is 3 pages long, attached to which were two copies of an aerial photograph showing GRA and principal structure coverage figures for 14 properties, including the subject property, and a copy of a prior decision by the Board with relevant elevations. Chair stated she is not prepared as of yet either. R. Coburn stated that the documents that were attached were previously submitted he is just underscoring them. J. Brodlieb wants to give it consideration regardless of whether it is old or now. Chair stated that they are under court order to review. C. Highsmith feels that this case is being taken way too far. There have been no changes in the design, or alterations from what was originally submitted. The documents that were previously submitted were resubmitted with a cover letter. J. Brodlieb wants to look at it in its entirety. Mr. Bruyn suggested that if the applicant has any further discussion to have it, if not it should be adjourned.

Mr. Scott Schlieffer, owner of the property stated it was originally submitted and hasn't changed in 1.5 years. One of the world's most renowned architects built something historic and great for him and he would like the board to review it and make a decision.

R. Coburn asked when the opposition received the plans for review. Mr. Handler stated that they were delivered in December 2018 before Christmas. Their architect who has studied these plans, Michael Goldblume, is sick couldn't be here tonight. Mr. Goldblume would like to be here to speak about those details. The materials that were filed with the board on Friday were received today about 12:30pm and they haven't been reviewed. There are two aerials that were dated 12.10.18 that were not originally submitted, they are new materials. There are new sq.ft. and comparisons that were submitted and Mr. Handler needs to authenticate them. They are not old documents according to him.

Mr. Schlieffer, he thinks this is just a desire to delay. Mr. Bennett stated that the aerials were from 12.10.18 and were presented at that meeting.

MOTION by J. Brodlieb, seconded by Chair  
To **adjourn the application of SH 24, LLC.**  
On Vote: Chair, J. Brodlieb, R. Coburn

**BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW &  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION  
VILLAGE OF SOUTHAMPTON  
JANUARY 28, 2019  
Nay: C. Highsmith**

R. Coburn stated there hasn't been a discussion about the architecture. He will agree to the adjournment to the next meeting provided that parties will be fully prepared to discuss the architecture. R. Coburn asked for report of the comments from Mr. Goldblume ahead of time. Mr. Handler stated that he will ask him for that.

On the application of **SH 28 LLC**, 28 Gin Lane, John Bennett and Tim Haynes are here to represent the applicant. Mr. Bennett accepts Chair's statement of her refusal to recuse on this application as well. Turning to architecture, Mr. Haynes referenced Lutyen's the Salutation and Folly Farm as inspirations for the design. Shingle Style, Tudor Revival and the Arts and Crafts Movement are all at play in the design; specifically asymmetrical massing, natural materials, contrasting volumes and varying roof profiles. These style are found in areas of the village such as at Wooldon Manor. This approach meanders through the carriage house and then enters on to the court of the house. White trim and brick chimneys and copper detailing will be used. Half timbers and oyster shells are used in the stucco rendering. After you enter through the carriage house you then see the arched entrance, which cued from Wooldon Manor. Windows have been made in the style of shingle style and Tudor style which again cues off the details of the village and neighboring villages. The pool is on the ocean side of the house. There is a terrace and a pool house. They all follow the same language as the front of the house. This has been reduced from the first design since the original home was read as a single block. It was stronger in terms of volumetrics. The pool was originally on the land side of the house. The house has been moved from 100' from the crest of the dune to 185' from the crest of the dune in response to the neighbors. The house was reduced from 18,000 sq.ft. to 14,500 sq.ft. in response to the neighbors. A balance between the two neighbors is trying to be met in placement of the house. The roof lines of the all the buildings dance across the landscape in the architect's opinion. It is more harmonious in blending than what it was previously presented. The massing and forms have been broken up. The lot due south was purchased for 13 Million dollars and it is now sterile. The house is about 52' about sea level.

Joel Snodgrass, stated that personal opinion has no place in consideration of the plan but only whether or not it meets criteria. Size is calculated into the review but in form and scale. Scale is the comparative relation between mass and size. The height has been reduced. The side wing has been telescoped. The shingle style is being used. There was an intentional process to bring this down and break this up. There is harmony between the other buildings. It made an admirable attempt to comply. The historic maps were submitted and reviewed from the years 1926, 1916 and 1895. If you look you can see the properties were developed as a part of the estate movement. The maps show that this is not a new concept, it was characteristic for this area to have large homes on large properties. The buildings scale to its own property, it reduces itself through its architectural expressions. There is an affording of space with the keeping of the buildings to the west. The building to east are smaller. Fairlea was developed as 5 individual parcels on that lot. It is the only area that is broken up that way. So judging structures from that angle are entirely different discussions. What is to the west is more in keeping with the neighborhood. This proposed home has mediated negatively significant impacts. The scale works for the design of where it is. An effort was made to try to move this to a place of compatibility from the board and from the neighbors and this can be seen in this plan. Mr. Bruyn asked that the maps be labeled.

**BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW &  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION  
VILLAGE OF SOUTHAMPTON  
JANUARY 28, 2019**

Grant Wellman from Araiys showed perspectives from Gin Lane and the beach were reviewed. This view from Gin Lane was superimposed based on measurements from the builder Ed Bulgin and the landscape plan from Ed Hollander. However the Board doesn't want to see it hidden therefore a hedge with the outline of the structure will be put in the file. GFA of principal structures of the neighborhood was reviewed, exhibit I. The mass appraisals that were submitted by the opposition were wrong and this exhibit acts to rectify the numbers.

Mr. Heir and Mr. August submitted letters of support.

Michael Lynch, a report of the appraisal of the property was submitted.

Mr. Handler stated that appraised values are extraneous in a COA. Mr. Bruyn stated we haven't heard from the party and someone should be heard before objecting.

Mr. Lynch stated that there is a staggered roof line to protect views, the owner owns 1/3 of the lot to the east of the property. The parcels on Fair Lea are about 1 acre plus or minus. A GFA of 8.9 is proposed on this property. Buildings on three of the four lots exceed the 52' ridge elevation. The home being moved 93' back also helps protect the view sheds and the value of the immediate neighbors. On 24 Gin Lane the applicant could have built double the size but didn't to protect the views. On 28 Gin Lane, the property was bought for 40 million dollars. The proposal is estimated of investment would be \$57-\$62 million dollars with landscaping. On 24 Gin Lane it would be an investment of \$18-\$20 million, it was purchased at \$13 million. Property values in the area would not be at a threat due to this home being built. The property value would drop by about \$1,500 a sq.ft. if the house was reduced in size. This home is in keeping with the neighboring homes. Mr. Bruyn asked for a memorandum of the relevance of the testimony of real estate appraisal from Mr. Lynch. Mr. Bennett stated that the standard in 116-1 speaks to the values in property. There will be no negative impact as to the surrounding properties.

Mr. Schlieffer stated that they have tried really hard to propose something that reflects significant compromise in the size, the location and the compatibility. He hopes that the board makes the right decision and thanked the board for their time.

R. Coburn questioned the windows on the second floor that are 4'x5', they appear to stick out to Mr. Coburn and he doesn't see them in any other part of the house. This was done for light and view. The windows are to be centered on the house. They will take a look at this. The window over the tower, is 1.5 stories, the size of the panes are a concern for Mr. Coburn. There are different sizes throughout. It's designed that way for decorativeness. The dormers on the driveway as you come through are coming off the Lutyens example, it was questioned if they are dormers and they are. The arch on the south side are designed with a band that runs through it like a trim board. The roof lines have flares in them at the bottom, the flare occurs at the top in a spot, it was questioned by R. Coburn is that the same height as the bottom of the others and that is why it ends at the top. They are occurring at the same level. The architect is trying to have it appear that the house has been added onto so that there is a dance across of your eye, it gives it a "fake history". R. Coburn asked if on the northern side since there is no chimney is there a way to add in one of make it more decorative on that side. There was no need for a fireplace on this side. This was done to keep it simple in a way, it already has plenty going on in the architect's opinion. Ship lap was used to keep it light as opposed to dark and dank. Mr. Hayes will take a look at all these comments.

**BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW &  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION  
VILLAGE OF SOUTHAMPTON  
JANUARY 28, 2019**

Mr. Handler questioned if the judge's decision is in the file. It is. Mr. Handler stated that due to 116 of the zoning code was a factor according to Mr. Bennett he would like to read from the decision of the Ferrara case. The finding stating that code 116 should not be a factor. Based on the judge's decision 116 is not a factor with respect to the application. There has been a lot of new information tonight. Mr. Handler asked that in order for all these material to be reviewed he would like to have this adjourned for a month.

J. Brodlieb, feels that two weeks is enough time. Mr. Brodlieb would like the gap between the neighbor and the applicant be bridged. Mr. Brodlieb stated if they are 99.9 percent there in making the neighbors happy how is there this much opposition.

Mr. Schlieffer stated that the current proposal is as far away from the main houses. The optimal compromise was to position the house as far from the two opposing neighbors as he can. This design reflects this. It is zoned for 18,000 sq.ft. and he is proposing 14,500 sq.ft. He views this as an enormous compromise. Then he ensured that the parcel he bought to the east would not have another home built on it. Mr. Brodlieb understands now that this is how he feels not the neighbors' feelings. The neighbors were met with on numerous occasions, even up to last week.

Mr. Bregman, he would like a commitment from the other side to get them copies. Mr. Schlieffer stated that he will have them by 5 pm tomorrow. Mr. Bregman would like a proper analysis to be done. The comparison given by the applicant in his opinion is slanted to favor the applicant. Mr. Bregman feels that these are misrepresentations. The standard of chapter 65 should be applied.

Charles Manger, spoke to give his word to the board that he will try to work with the neighbor on this.

No comments regarding the architecture of the proposed house were received from the public at this time.

MOTION by R. Coburn, seconded by C. Highsmith

**To approve the applicant's request for adjournment on the application of SH 28 LLC to the next meeting.**

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

On the application of **THOMAS & MEREDITH JOYCE**, this is adjourned to February 11, 2019.

On the application of **ANTHONY PUNNETT**, 310 Hill Street, there is a letter requesting an adjournment to February 11, 2019.

MOTION by R. Coburn, seconded by C. Highsmith

**To approve the applicant's request for adjournment to February 11, 2019 on the application of ANTHONY PUNNETT.**

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

MOTION by R. Coburn, seconded by Chair

**BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW &  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION  
VILLAGE OF SOUTHAMPTON  
JANUARY 28, 2019**

To adjourn tonight's meeting.

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

Respectfully submitted by: Antoinette Edwards 1-28-19

---

Village Clerk