

Inc. Village of Southampton  
Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation  
February 22, 2021

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 22, 2021 at 7:00pm.

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

Counsel for the board Alice Cooley is present.

MOTION by Chair, second by P. DeWitt

To **open** tonight's meeting.

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

MOTION by Chair, second by P. DeWitt

To **approve** the minutes from February 8, 2021

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

On the application of **Maria Janis**, 208 Pond Lane, there is a decision in the file.

MOTION by P. DeWitt, second by J. Gregory

To **accept** the written decision of **Maria Janis**

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

On the application of **Thomas and Meredith Joyce** - 765 Hill Street, John Bennett is here to represent the applicant. A site visit took place. Ms. Latham and Mr. DeWitt went out to the property. They were amazed by the integrity and the carpentry that was displayed at the property. She feels that this is an example of a storefront of it's time, fully intact and worthy of preservation. This is a piece of roadside architecture. She feels that a more detailed plan should be submitted to the file. Mr. Bennett would like to state that the application is to just move the building back and removing the rear addition. Mr. DeWitt states their concern is with the lack of detail on the plan, if it remaining the same it should be documented. Mr. Bennett will provide photographic evidence. The idea is the preserve the front portion of the house, they've been working on this for the last six years or so. There has never been any indication that the rear portion of the structure was to be preserved. They are willing to put conditions in place to limit landscaping that may screen this contributing structure from the street. Mr. DeWitt agrees that the rear addition is not essential. Mr. McIntire agrees, but wishes they could save the hardware. Mr. Bennett states the are willing to keep the hardware. Ms. Latham, after reading the Snodgrass report that was done, she agrees that the rear portion could come down. Mr. Bennett would like to give Ms. Latham the opportunity to tag items in the rear one-story portion that they would like to see saved. If there are items that the owners are not interested in keeping, an effort will be made to donate them to the Southampton Historical Museum.

Motion by Chair second by P. DeWitt

To **close** the application of **Thomas and Meredith Joyce** for written decision

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

On the application of **Wooldon Manor** – 16 Gin Lane, John Bennett and John Rose are here to represent the applicant. Gary Lawrence is also here to speak on this tonight. Chair reviews the history of the application. Mr. Bennett would like to note that this is not the original Wooldon Manor. Mr. Rose explains that every window in the house currently has insulated glass, this material was not available in 1929 when the original portion of the house was constructed. Additions were done in 1960 and 1994. On the 1994 plan of the house, all windows are proposed to be replaced. In photographs from the 1930's you can see that there were no second floor windows. This is all evidence that the windows that are currently in the house are 1994 or newer. They are sensitive to the fact that this is a contributing structure and have changed their proposal to reflect that. All windows on the second floor will remain the same, windows on the first floor that are changing will to match the style of upper divided transom and lower single sash. A sample of the window was dropped off at the building department. It is hurricane rated leaded glass and mahogany. All windows will have lead muttins. Mr. Lawrence, co-author of Houses in the Hamptons is here to speak tonight. The main house of Woldon Manor was demolished, the house that exists now is the pool house. Additions have been added on to the pool house and has become what is now known as Wooldon Manor. With all the research he has done on this property he feels that the windows are an appropriate change and are fitting with the historic nature of the house. Debbie August owns the house now. She would like to say that they are looking to take this dwelling back to what it once was. The windows now don't make sense; they want it to work together. They took the only existing original window and replicated that in this design. Everything that is visible from the street will remain in the same design. P. DeWitt was concerned with the lower sash but the applicant has demonstrated that that is not visible from the street, he wouldn't object., Ms. Latham agrees.

Tom Edmonds, director of the Southampton History Museum is here tonight to speak on this application. Debbie August has done extraordinary job preserving the spirit of Wooldon Manor. Motion by Chair second by P. DeWitt

To **close** the application of **Wooldon Manor** for written decision

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

On the application of **Outdoor Kitchen Design Store**, 27 W. Main Street, Michael Gotwolla is here to represent the applicant. This is an application for an open-air pergola to the right of the entry. It will not cover the door, and it is display only. This is an automated louver system top, they want the opportunity to provide the public with a sample of this. This will not be attached to the building at all but there will be footings. It will be setback 10' from the private drive and road. They are special ordering the color grey so that it matches. The supports are 6" x 6". Mr. DeWitt asks if we can make it smaller. Mr. Gotowala agrees to make it 10' x 10'

MOTION by Chair Second by P.DeWitt

To **close** the application of **Outdoor Kitchen Design Store** for written decision

On Vote: Chair, P. DeWitt, M. McIntire,

Nay: S. Latham, J. Gregory

On the application of **Capcor, Inc.** - 69 Jobs Lane, Roy Stevenson and Shawn Leonard are here to represent the applicant. This is an application to alter the storefront to become ADA compliant. They will remove the step and replace it with a ramp and change the door to a larger singular door. They are also proposing the change the glass on the storefront and raise the sill to

Inc. Village of Southampton  
Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation  
February 22, 2021

2' from the sidewalk and add paneling below that to grade. The front of the building will remain the same color. Mr. Stevenson would like to point out that the door as it is does not meet current fire code. Chair thinks it looks great, he likes the panels added below the windows.

MOTION by Chair, Second by M. McIntire

To **close** the application of **Capcor Inc.** for written decision.

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

On the application of **The Village of Southampton**, 17 Meeting House Lane, Tom Edmonds and Sean Deneny are here to represent the application. Mr. Deneny is the Chair of the Roger's Mansion committee, this is strictly a landscaping project. They are putting in new walkways on the west side of the property and moving two small structures. They have an opportunity to receive a grant from the Gardener Foundation, this project will be funded in part by that and private money. Mr. McIntire wonders what the pergola will be made of, Mr. Deneny states it will be azek. Mr. DeWitt and Mr. Gregory don't feel that the use of azek would be appropriate to the historical museum. Mr. Gregory would like to see less lighting on the signage. Ms. Latham is disappointed to see the use of plastic on the picket fence. She feels that donors wouldn't mind seeing a traditional material be used on this historic site. Chair states this is more than a concern on the environment, but the more traditional look that wood has. He thinks that the use of azek would not be appropriate here. Mr. Deneny doesn't disagree, they had looked at the use of azek as a material of easier maintenance; they will use wood. Ms. Latham is also concerned with the landscaping shown on the rendering. There are large hedges plopped on top of structures, they would never have foundation planting. Mr. Edmonds explains that these shrubs are there to create a division of the property. These are out buildings that were put together to create a walk through village. Mr. Edmonds invites the board to visit the site and walk it with him. Chair would like to make that arrangement prior to making a decision.

MOTION by Chair second by J. Gregory

To **adjourn** the application of **The Village of Southampton**

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

On the application of **Greg and Susan Danilow**, this application is adjourned to March 22, 2021  
Motion by Chair second by J. Gregory

To **adjourn** the application of **Greg and Susan Danilow**

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

On the application **Chickamapaugee, LLC**, 500 Captains Neck Lane, there is a request in the file for an adjournment to March 8<sup>th</sup>

Motion by Chair second by P. DeWitt

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

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

On the application of **Wooley Street Properties, LLC** – 162 Wooley Street, Lori Fontana is here to represent the applicant. Joe Sbarra is the homeowner; he is also present to speak tonight. They extended the front porch in the front to be more harmonious with the neighborhood and moved the garage 18 feet back. The rendering shows the siding as it would appear once it ages. This is natural cedar and will end up looking exactly like the other houses on the street. There is no stain on the siding; it is red cedar. Trim will be pine painted white, roof will be cedar left

Inc. Village of Southampton  
Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation  
February 22, 2021

natural. Mr. McIntire feels that a lot of adjustments were made and he appreciates that their comments were taken into consideration. Chair feels they've come up with a better design, one that is more in keeping with the neighborhood. Ms. Latham would like to note that most houses have an east/west orientation while this has a north/south. Mr. DeWitt notes that east/west orientation of houses is typical of Wooley Street, not north/south; Mr. Gregory agrees. He does not feel this home does not fit the character of the street, additional changes need to be done to make it blend in better. Mr. DeWitt thinks it can be made an "L" shape and made narrower in the front. He feels that they've been talking about the orientation of the house for a while and should still be addressed. Chair feels that most of the changes that were requested have been made and they are looking at an overall better design than what was originally presented. The orientation seems to be sticking point for the board, it is still a concern here. Ms. Fontana explains that they have explored many different options with this house, they've addressed the issues presented by the board and they feel that they've made it more in keeping with the neighborhood. Mr. Sbarra states that he's been up and down the block and there are plenty of houses like this. Mr. McIntire states there are three other houses that front this way, he thinks that the applicant has done a good job making changes.

MOTION by Chair , Second M. McIntire

To **approve** the application of **162 Wooley Street, LLC**

On Vote: Chair, M. McIntire

Nay: P. DeWitt, S. Latham, J. Gregory

The application of **M4950 Meadow Lane, LLC** there is a request for an adjournment in the file  
MOTION by Chair P. DeWitt

To **adjourn** the application of **M4950 Meadow Lane, LLC**

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

The application of **Elisa Fadlun** – 60 Cameron Street, Lori Fontana is here to represent the applicant. They will leave all the existing windows in the front, on the right side they will be reconstructing the dormer on the addition, and replacing some of the windows. On the back side they reduced the doors, on the last elevation they are keeping some of the windows and only

changing out a few relocating two, but keeping the same size. Tish Rehill, landscape architect is here. There was a lot of vinyl fencing that will be removed, and added a gate at the front walkway. Two rows of privet were removed and added hombeams. There are arborvitaes on the property and ilex hedge is being added to screen the parking area . Ms.Fadlun would like to say that she made by the board members. Chair is disappointed to see the parking area in the front of the house. They are trying to preserve the historic nature of the house here but it is a disappointment to see this. Mr. Gregory thinks that they've done a good job meeting the boards concerns. He didn't think about the driveway until now, but he does agree that it interrupts the flow of the street. If that could be changed he would like that. Mr. DeWitt thinks the front and side look great. He would ask that on the west side they take the window out where the door used to be. Ms. Fadlun agrees to remove the window. This will maintain the charming look of the house. Ms. Latham thinks the hedge will mitigate the light pollution. She wonders if anything other than asphalt can be used for the driveway. Ms. Rehill explains that this portion of the work was completed in the fall. Mr. DeWitt would like to point out on the west elevation there is a window over the tub, it should be placed on the other side, eliminate the window in the

Inc. Village of Southampton  
Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation  
February 22, 2021

closet. This would eliminate the light pollution concerns the neighbors had and move the window away from the tub. They will make these changes and come back to the board. The railing on the back is glass. Deborah Bates is here to speak on the application. She found the parking area rather alarming. She wonders what the street would look like if properties started paving their front yards to provide parking. This is a big change in the neighborhood and feels it will cause a precedent. Ms. Bates also wonders the height of the screening needed on the west side to protect the privacy of the neighbor. Ms. Rehill explains that a large yellow wood was removed that was deemed hazardous. The arborvitae that are there now will grow much larger now that the tree was removed. Ms. Bates wonders if it would be possible to add taller landscaping now. This would maintain the privacy of the neighborhood. Mr. Gregory notes that two windows were removed from that elevation. Ms. Bates states the dormer is being proposed on the plan again. Ms. Fadlun says that they are proposing this dormer because it is what exists. The parking area is still a concern for Ms. Bates. The Chair will discuss the concern of the driveway with the building department. Ms. Golan is still concerned with the appendage that sticks out on the west side. She feels that her privacy is being infringed upon. By adding this the house loses its four square feel. She listened to the board express their concerns over this in previous meetings. She wonders if there is a way to push this appendage back in. She feels the house looks bulky and that there is not adequate screening on the westside. Ms. Rehill would like to point out that the tree that was removed did not screen the property from the street. Ms. Golan disagrees, these windows are becoming larger and light pollution is a concern of not just her, but other neighbors. Mr. DeWitt points out that they've eliminated quite a few windows already. He thinks the dormer is fine, it is existing already. Kimberly McSparran and Christine Witker are also here tonight to speak. Ms. McSparran has been in her house for 29 years now. That house has gone through many changes some that did not get approval of the ARB. This house has become distorted from the original house. She feels that this parking area is unattractive. She feels that now we're dealing with a butchered house that is getting more

butchered. Ms. Witker agrees with Ms. Bates and Ms. Golan. She feels that additional screening should be added on the west side. You can see the roof clearly from her house and thinks that more substantial screening should be added.

MOTION by Chair second by S. Latham

To **adjourn** the application of **Elisa Fadlun**

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

On the application of **Charles Falcao** – 135 Lewis Street, Charles Lembo is here to represent the applicant. There was a request to add additional glazing to the former porch, they added the garage door and they've changed the configuration of the plans to make them easier to read. Mr. DeWitt appreciates the changes made to the plan. The garage doors are shifted to the right since they will not be operational.

MOTION by Chair second by J. Gregory

To **approve** the application of **Charles Falcao**

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

On the application of **Joseph and Philippa Colvin** – 55 Old Town Crossing, nobody is here to represent the applicant.

Will hold until the end of the meeting

On the application of **Craig Goldberg** – 258 Toysome Lane, John Bennett and Tim Ganetis are here to represent the applicant. Changes have been made throughout the process, they tried to come to an agreement with the neighbor in regards to landscaping but were unable to. The neighbor wants to see a continuous row of arborvitae on top of existing heavy vegetation. This does not work. What they are proposing are junipers to close a gap, both of these property lines are heavily screened. The neighbor on the other side did share some concern with the generator, they have added additional screening to mitigate those concerns. Mr. Ganetis explains that the request that came from the neighbor was placed on a survey that does not take in account 45' maple trees that are in existence. You cannot plant on top of the roots without damaging these established trees. Chair wonders the distance from the house to the neighbor's pool. Mr. Bennett estimates the distance to be 80 and 100 feet. The pools are set back further from the side yard than the neighbors. Mr. Gregory and Mr. DeWitt think that the landscaping plan looks fine as is. Chair agrees that the issues of privacy have been well addressed. Ms. McGivern is here to represent the neighbor. The neighbor had requested that 3 juniper trees 14 to 16 feet and some under planting of holly that will thrive in the shade. The biggest concern for them is the balcony. It is only about 38 feet from the property line. Ms. McGivern does not think that the request for taller juniper trees is unreasonable.

MOTION by Chair, second by P. DeWitt

To **approve** the application of **Craig Goldberg**

On Vote: Chair, S. Latham, P. DeWitt

Nay: J. Gregory and M. McIntire

On the application of **Brennan Joint Revocable Trust** – 120 Bishops Lane, Matt Pantofel and John Gramlich are here to represent the applicant. The front elevation was changed to add some more character and charm. They changed the black windows to white, light grey siding and darker grey trim. He has listened to the board's concerns regarding azek, but they are limited on what they can do and the wood rots. They are able to maintain the house longer with the use of azek for the trim. He feels that they are able to make it look nice. They simplified the right elevation. The columns do not have to be azek. The blank roof over the porch will be cedar siding. Ms. Latham thinks that the projection on the one story portion can be eliminated. On the second floor the squared returns should be changed. Mr. DeWitt thinks a single double hung window in the middle would work best. A pediment over the porch should not be higher than the porch roof. Mr. Gramlich likes the projections. Mr. Gregory doesn't like the diamond light windows, they seem out of place. He would do a 2 over 2. Chair believes the diamonds on the door will be an issue as well. Mr. Pantofel says they can keep the windows the same size, just make them 2 over 2, eliminate the diamonds in the door panels and then bring the pediment down. They will keep the projection of the middle piece. Mr. DeWitt thinks that if they want to keep the extension then the pediment should be eliminated. Mr. Gramlich agrees with this. Chair is going to stick with his concern of azek. He would really like to see these columns wood for his vote. He would like to see the use eliminated as much as possible. The Chair feels that the difference between wood and azek is noticeable. Mr. Gregory wonders if it was possible to just use wood on the front of the house and azek on the other elevations. Mr. Pantofel feels this is an agreeable solution. The board

Motion by Chair second by P. DeWitt

To **adjourn** the application of **Brennan Joint Revocable Trust**

Inc. Village of Southampton  
Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation  
February 22, 2021

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

On the application of **23 South Street LLC** – 23 South Street, Matt Pantofel and John Gramlich are here to represent the applicant. The front elevation was changed to have a little more character. They went with diamond pattern windows but they can eliminate that if the board is not favorable. There is a more historic finish on the eaves. This will be natural cedar with painted white trim and white windows. Mr. Gregory thinks other than the diamond windows it's fine if they can consider using wood on the front elevation. Mr. DeWitt likes the eaves, thinks that they can lose the hood over the double window. Mr. McIntire agrees it is much improved. Sara thinks if they lose the diamonds and agree to the use of wood on the front elevation she is okay with the design. They will make the changes for the next meeting.

MOTION by Chair second by

To **adjourn** the application of **23 South Street LLC**

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

On the application of **317 Murray Place LLC** – 317 Murray Place, John Bennett is here to represent the applicant. They have come to an agreement with neighbor regarding the

landscaping. Ms. McGivern is here, they asked that a \$30,000 bond be placed with the Village of Southampton. This will be a condition of the board's approval.

MOTION by Chair second by

To **approve** the application of **317 Murray Place LLC**, with the landscaping plan and the posting of a \$30,000 bond be placed to ensure the survivability of the plantings

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

The application of **Laura Danforth** – 233 Little Plains Road, Thomas Pedrazzi is here to represent the applicant. This is an application for a two story single family residence. A two story portion and a perpendicular one story portion, there is an existing garage to remain. It is a contemporary style that will be all white. The Roof will be white standing seam. Mr De Witt does not feel that it is harmonious with the neighborhood. Mr. Pedrazzi explains that they wanted to keep the house all white; this was their best option. The inverted bay on the entrance is something he is uncertain of. Ms. Latham does not like the use of the eyebrow window. The entrance with the almost blank window is concerning. The north elevation has a window in the stair that she feels is disharmonious. Mr. DeWitt doesn't think that the dental molding works here. Mr. Gregory agrees with everything that has been said. The windows being proposed are way too large. The front of the house is awkward, the windows are blank and the design is not in keeping with the neighborhood. Mr. McIntire is concerned about light pollution from the rear elevation. This does not feel as though it fits the neighborhood. Chair agrees with the comments made by the other board members. Harmony is a great concern of the board. Mr. Pedrazzi said they can remove the large two-story window; they will look at another roofing material to address the board's concern. Chair would like to see a color rendering streetscape showing three houses on either side. There are too many concerns that the board has; the applicant should consider a redesign. Color, materials, fenestrations, light pollution, window configurations are all items that need to be addressed. The applicant will come back with a new design. The board would like to see a streetscape in that presentation. A letter was submitted to the file.

Inc. Village of Southampton  
Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation  
February 22, 2021

MOTION by Chair second by P. DeWitt

To **adjourn** the application of **Laura Danforth**

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

On the application of **26 Hampton Road Realty, LLC** – 30 Hampton Road, Shawn Leonard is here to represent the applicant. This is an application for a new retail space, they are proposing to lift the glass off the sidewalk and add panels below. The front door will be staying the same and the panels will be painted white to match the building. The material will be wood trim. Mr. Gregory thinks altering one side of the building and not the other is unattractive. Chair agrees that this does not make sense. He feels that it is within the board's purview to ask them to do it correctly and make the application for the whole house. Mr. DeWitt and Ms. Latham disagree, this is a retail space – store fronts vary from shop to shop. Mr. McIntire can appreciate both views.

MOTION by Chair second by P. DeWitt

To **approve** the application of **26 Hampton Road Realty LLC**

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

Nay: J. Gregory

On the application of **86 Pine, LLC** – 86 Pine Street, Thomas Sternfeldt is here to represent the applicant. The stucco is in the process of being removed and replaced with grey cedar siding. The storefront front elevation will be remaining the same aside from the siding material. There are window configuration changes on the main house. A garage was added to the rear elevation of the dwelling where an old workshop was. Ms. Latham walks the neighborhood frequently. She has seen the stucco come down and reveal a German siding, they should considering keeping this or using at a spring board in their design. The shutters added are not in keeping with the building in her opinion. Mr. Sterfeldt states that the shutters are made to be operable. The siding that Ms. Latham is referring to is only on the original portion of the structure, so they decided to go with something more uniform. MR. DeWitt does not agree with the front elevation, he thinks a bank of windows, with infill panels between, would make the first-floor extension look like the enclosed porch it probably was. This should be looked at as a restoration. By shifting the door to the right, Mr. McIntire feels it caused the house to be unbalanced. Mr. Gregory thinks this is a vast improvement and is an attractive renovation. The shutters will be painted timber. Ms. Latham feels strongly that the architectural integrity that was uncovered should be carried through in the new design. There is something distinctive here and it should be highlighted. Chair agrees with Ms. Latham. This a street with charm and character. Mr. DeWitt doesn't think it's necessary to do the German siding on the smaller structure.

MOTION by Chair second by S. Latham

To **adjourn** the application of **86 Pine LLC**

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

On the application of **61 Pheasant Lane, LLC** – 61 Pheasant Lane, Brian Albrecht is here to represent the applicant. This is an application for a two story dwelling and pool house. Natural cedar siding and cedar roof with white trim and white columns are being proposed. There are three roof decks on the rear elevation. Mr. DeWitt notes that the plan states architectural roof,

Inc. Village of Southampton  
Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation  
February 22, 2021

Mr. Albrecht confirms this will be cedar. Chair states that azek is called out. Mr. Albrecht would like to use boral. It is a recycled material that comes primed and they will paint it white. The board would like to see a sample. Ms. Latham wonders if the gambrel design has run its course. Mr. McIntire thinks the gable over the four windows can be removed on both the front and rear elevations. Chair and Mr. Gregory think that the design is fine as is. A copper roof is being proposed on the front porch.

MOTION by Chair second by S. Latham

To **adjourn** the application of **61 Pheasant Lane LLC**

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

On the Application of **DMDC Holdings LLC**, there is a request for adjournment in the file  
MOTION by Chair second by S. Latham

To **adjourn** the application of **DMDC Holdings LLC**

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

On the application of **Rose Stewart** – 54 Meeting House Lane, Steve Ospitale is here to represent the applicant. This is an application for a driveway gate. They will change the material to painted mahogany. The columns will be natural grey stone with a bluestone cap. The stone will match the house. The height to the top of the cap is 7'. The spindles and spacing are equal at 2". Chair feels that smaller lots and smaller homes characterize Meeting House Lane. He does not feel that gates are appropriate to this street as this is an area with traditionally no gates. Mr. McIntire agrees, these gates are too substantial for where they are located and for the size of the lot. Ms. Latham echoes these thoughts. There is a wood pedestrian gate across the street, but other than that no other gates are on the street. Mr. Gregory personally doesn't like gates but they are entitled to it by the code. The fact that this area is near a commercial district he is okay with the gates here. Mr. DeWitt does not like the stone pillar, he thinks a wooden post would be better and would like to see more transparency.

MOTION by Chair second by P. DeWitt

To **adjourn** the application of **Rose Stewart**

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

Motion by Chair, second by S. Latham

To close the hearing of February 22, 2021

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

Respectfully submitted by Jacqueline Allen 02-22-2021

---

Village Clerk

---

Date