

**BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW &
HISTORIC PRESERVATION
VILLAGE OF SOUTHAMPTON
FEBRUARY 25, 2019**

Due notice having been given, the public hearing of the Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation for the village of Southampton, NY on Monday, February 25, 2019 at 7:00PM.

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

Counsel for the Village Wayne Bruyn and Historic Consultant Zac Studenroth were present.

MOTION by Redding, seconded by Coburn

To **open tonight's meeting.**

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

MINUTE APPROVAL

MOTION by R. Coburn, seconded by C. Redding

To approve the January 14, 2019 minutes.

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

MOTION by R. Coburn, seconded by C. Redding

To approve the January 28, 2019 minutes.

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

SIGNS

On the application of **HIDDEN GEM**, 47A Jobs Lane, Ron Fisher was present for the applicant, he had submitted a photo of the sign rendering. The sign is black script text on white PVC board in the shape of an oval.

MOTION by Coburn, seconded by Redding

To **approve the application of a sign for HIDDEN GEM.**

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

WRITTEN DECISIONS

On the application of **ANTHONY PUNNETT**, 310 Hill Street, there is a written decision in the file.

MOTION by R. Coburn, seconded by C. Redding

To **approve the written decision on the application of ANTHONY PUNNETT.**

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

On the application of **131 MAIN STREET LLC**, 131 Main Street, there is a written decision in the file.

Motion by R. Coburn, seconded by C. Redding

To **approve the written decision on the application of 131 MAIN STREET LLC.**

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

On the application of **SHANNON & GROSSMAN**, 42 Post Crossing, there is a written decision in the file.

Motion by C. Redding, seconded by C. Highsmith

To **approve the written decision on the application of SHANNON & GROSSMAN.**

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

PUBLIC HEARINGS - NON- HISTORIC

On the application of **MICHAEL & ANNIE FALK**, 12 Squabble Lane, present for the applicant was Mr. Dominguez, the architect. Affidavits of mailing and posting were submitted. This is an existing residence that has a proposed addition consisting of a cabana, gallery, gym, second floor office, terrace and swimming pool. They will demolish the existing pool and garage. The materials used for the addition will be stucco, cedar roof shingles and mahogany windows to match existing. The renderings proposed match with existing architecture and materials. There is a roof terrace on the second-floor roof line. C. Highsmith asked how high the sides of the widow's walk on the terrace; they are 36". Counsel asked about the overall height, it is 37'. Overall the entire addition is stepped down from the original structure. C. Highsmith asked the distance from the nearest neighbor with a view from the terrace; it is 51' from the nearest neighbor. There is an existing hedge that lines the property, the height is approximately 12-15'. R. Coburn asked about the existing pipe railing, it states that it will match existing but there is no existing pipe rail. It will be black to match existing railings. They are adding an office and bathroom; the office could be considered a bedroom. They have sized the septic accordingly so that it is not an issue.

Chair stated that it is a substantial increase. J. Brodlieb feels it is compatible with the neighborhood and there is space around the homes. C. Highsmith feels it is a respectful plan, he feels it is an attractive addition. R. Coburn asked about the roof lines, the ones that stick out are the truncated along the terrace, it appears mansard. He doesn't like all the angles and it has a different angle than the rest of the house. Mr. Dominguez noted that the existing house has many roof angles, this addition was designed to blend with the existing. Chair feels that it is busy, however, there are many styles in the neighborhood.

MOTION by R. Coburn, seconded by C. Redding

To **approve the application of MICHAEL & ANNIE FALK.**

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

PUBLIC HEARINGS – HISTORIC

On the application of **CAROL WELCH**, 340 Hill Street, this application is adjourned to the March 25, 2019 public hearing.

On the application of **SH 24 LLC**, 24 Gin Lane, this application is closed subject to written comments and written decision. There are many submitted comments. There were petitions submitted by the applicant. J. Brodlieb is not in objection to this application. C. Highsmith and R. Coburn have nothing to add. C. Redding read everything that came in. S. Stevenson has no real misgivings about this, although

the siding was in question. Chair noted that Mr. Ayers home addresses Gin Lane in a less dominant way. She feels if it was situated toward Gin Lane, it would be better. R. Coburn went to neighborhood and there are several houses that are not orthogonal to the street. Fairlea down to Meadow Beach is the area is where she is emphasizing, not the whole of Gin Lane. Chair states you can't make something historic, it is there job to maintain historicity. Fairlea is an important historic part of the Village, she feels they shouldn't fault it for being historic.

R. Coburn asked for one clarification, he saw M. Goldblum submitted comments that referenced SH 28 but not SH 24; M. Goldblum noted that the SH28 reference was an error. J. Bennett responded to the document that was submitted that it was an error, however, J. Bennett waived objection to the late submittal and stated it could be added to the file.

This application was closed for written comment and written decision at the February 11, 2019 public hearing. Counsel will prepare a written decision.

On the application **SH 28 LLC**, 28 Gin Lane, present for the applicant was John Bennett. He is present to hear the neighbors.

Jeff Bragman was present for the Manger's and Michaelchek's. He introduced Michael Goldblum, architect, he noted that he does not have an extensive amount to present. He can address J. Bennett's submissions. He has renderings from Mr. Stott. The rendering from their architect were submitted. They show different angles of the house and visibility. The second page was an aerial view. They compare the bulk and view from different vantage points, Fairlea included. He thinks that both letters from Mr. Snodgrass and Mr. Bennett, they both rely on an argument that because of its density and planning you cannot look at Fairlea in determining the character of the neighborhood. That is not for anyone to say but the Board. He feels you start from the house and radiate out. He feels it needs to be taken in context, this site is between Fairlea's western side and the rest on Gin Lane to the west. It is the job of the person building to grapple with the context of the neighborhood. Fairlea cannot be viewed as an outlier in the context of the neighborhood. The guidelines are that there are not jarring juxtapositions, you need to get a real feel of the site. The Ayer's house, the location and situate were appropriate for the neighborhood. He noted that J. Bennett had noted that they should look at 22 Gin Lane and 16 Gin Lane, but both are strikingly smaller than the proposed. J. Bennett noted that most of the houses are quite long and they agree. M. Goldblum noted that this house is the only one that runs north south, the others run east west. The massing of long houses is almost always east west in access. The house stands out, very large and impacted against smaller and closely spaced houses.

Misha Hunter Burkett, here for Mangers and Michaelchek's. She submitted a packet for the Board. Her analysis is that SH24 is not compatible with character of historic near by properties and even more recently constructed houses. The proposed main house at 28 Gin Lane is not compatible with the historic appropriateness of the Village. She noted Fig-2 in her submittal, the scale of the applicant's house is the primary concern. Scale is very important and even Mr. Snodgrass has noted that it is a large house. The architect may have tried to articulate the 14,000 square foot to human form, but it is much too large. Many neighbors are concerned regarding the size. She takes exception with Mr. Snodgrass' comment regarding architectural details were used to downplay the scale. She also takes exception with using comparable houses in the neighborhood, she feels the context has to do with all the homes neighboring, including Fairlea. She wanted to bring attention to Mr. Goldblum's contextual analysis, it demonstrates that it is 75% larger than homes in Fairlea and 63% larger than the houses on the block. She feels it is mammoth and spread out. It is not in harmony with historic or newly constructed

buildings, she feels it does not comply to Village Code in terms of size and scale. Most building are oriented to the street in this neighborhood. The applicant's main house is oriented to a court. The proposed does not conform with guidelines toward orientation. Siting is also an issue, historic homes were built toward the street, they retain regular setbacks and spacing to retain a visual continuity. This house does not maintain regular setbacks and spacing and will not have continuity within the block. Mr. Snodgrass noted that if you can build something like this you need to have the space, so that things are not jammed in. She feels that is exactly what they are doing. She argued that the massive roof is broken down and fragmented, the proposed roof form does not follow regular pattern in this block. She showed two photos of homes that were built by renowned architect in shingle style Scully that have simple roof lines that define the massing of the house. The lack of hierarchy in the plan causes the problem. She feels the design has a false sense of historic development and she feels that is supported in the Village code. The question is a matter of appropriateness. The house is 216' long, much larger than the homes on Fairlea, and even on the block. She was impressed by the way the proposed house will loom over the neighboring houses. She feels it is inappropriate for new construction by scale, mass, character and construction and does not fit into the guidelines of the Village. New construction must strive to maintain the character of the historic district. If approved, the proposed would erode the established character of the block.

Richard Handler introduced his expert for the Manger's and Michaelchek's. Sarah Kautz, Preservation director at Preservation Long Island, she submitted a letter to the file. She says that the wider picture is sometimes lost in individual development. They want to see some things changed but are not opposed to development. This area is globally famous, and these structures would be highly visible in the view shed. At this point is very oversized and out of scale. She would encourage them to look at how change has been introduced, is it quick and minimal or fast and large.

J. Bragman asked Steve Schneider, engineer, to talk about the issue regarding the 2-4' of fill proposed. They were asked to look if the base and if it was necessary for the proposed sanitary system, they found that it could be placed at ground level and go in at 9' without having to build a retaining wall above ground level. There are other systems, an ADS system, that could be put down at 4' so that nothing near a retaining wall would need to be built, especially with sandy soil. Chair stated that this is different from what they had heard regarding the need for a retaining wall. She asked should there be a wall, S. Schneider noted that a wall is not necessary. J. Brodlieb asked what the concern is and what it the impact of compatibility, it raises the height of the house. What they were told by the Building Department was that the fill had no impact on the height of the house and that it is FEMA regulations.

R. Handler wanted to supplement some of the points. This issue regarding the fill, the primary concern with this Board, the mission is to consider structure and impact on land. The fact is that is an addition to the land, so their responsibility is regulatory review, apart from Board of Health and other agencies. Their charge is to look at land, trees, and other features on the property. He'd like to submit portions of a transcript regarding previous hearings. J. Bennett opposed the submission from past hearings as not appropriate and previously determined not to use testimony from the past hearings. It is testimony from the previous hearing, this submission relates to Mr. Hollander's testimony regarding that there was 400' of wall built based on original house plan. One third of the fill and one third of the wall was unnecessary based on previous plans. Since the plan has changed, one third of the wall and fill is no longer appropriate.

J. Bragman wanted to make a couple of comments on the Snodgrass memo, essentially, he makes an argument that size was made in the last hearings. The letter stated that the Board is to look strictly at

scale, and he mentions it is different from size. He states that that previous decision was correct and only scale need to be looked at. The overall dimensions make up the scale. He feels that they are wrong, they were advised and warned that they couldn't discuss size, height or mass. He feels the analysis from Mr. Goldblum was correct and that Fairlea should not be considered because it is an outlier. He feels that Fairlea is a progenitor and a start of the colony, not an outlier. Fairlea has a suburban feel and it is one context and there are other Gin Lane homes that are larger. These two contexts work together. He feels that calling Fairlea an outlier, he thinks it puts blinders on the Board. Even the large houses have a generous setback from the Fairlea houses. He feels the dimensions of the house and situate house are an enormous imposition. There is no sense of restraint, he feels that the house should demonstrate restraint and respect. He feels it lacks cohesiveness. R. Coburn asked about 216' that is 36' from the property line. The longer wall is on the western side. It seems that there should be a way to get more breathing room.

Lynn Manger, lives in Fairlea and in a historic part of NYC, she would like to preserve the historicity of her neighborhood. They has lived in Fairlea for since 1961. The proposed application must meet the codes regarding historic districts. The features of the properties shall be altered as little as possible, introducing new construction in a historic district is essential. She showed a picture of the great lawn, her house, the McKnight house and the Birdcage house. The rhythm of the housing should be maintained. It is key to the historical design of the land. She showed a house that is part of a historic registry that would be 28 Gin Lane. By constructing the retaining wall and using the fill, this historic setting of the land is altered. She showed the plans with the restraining wall and the elevation of house as raised. She has concerns regarding the drainage especially when tide is high. During hurricane Sandy the water came up to their house. She is concerned with this western property being raised 4', they will feel it will flood their property. In past hearings, she states that a historian noted that a gate house being appropriate and being situated toward the road. The result is that they situated the house in the center of the property. The original proposed was 8800 and the current is 8500, she doesn't see too much different. The massing, size and scales are obvious problems and too big to be in harmony to the houses that surround it. They would be much happier if the house was smaller. It is a contemporary take on a traditional house and not appropriate for the historic area. It doesn't fit any of the criteria for historic design. She urges the Board not to destroy this historic district by allowing this house.

Mark London, 40 Cobblefield Lane, president of Wickapogue Home Association, within in their association they have restrictions on architecture in their bylaws. They want to maintain harmonious architecture in their neighborhood. When they get a proposal, they see how it fits into the overall neighborhood and they try to deal with a person on a one on one basis to rectify a plan that isn't conforming to their bylaws. As a homeowner association they must look at how the houses affect the neighborhood. He wanted to share their experience to a design dilemma.

Charles Manger, 12 Fairlea Road, son of William Manger. The proposed project does not adhere to he current Village code. Chapter 65 is clear on what is expected in the code regarding historic structures. He worked as a realtor and he understands the code regarding historicity very clearly. Point 3 – texture, material, color based on the historic structures. The pergola is not in keeping as well as plexiglass railing. Point 5 – the important features to be changed to the architecture, one main issue is the fill that will raise the level 4'. This will impact drainage during storms. Based on the code the west wall measures 216', there is no home is the historic district that has this massing. The size of the house is larger than any of the neighboring. In April of 2017 he tried to meet with Mr. Schleifer to meet regarding this design. He met with Mr. Schleifer many times and will continue to try to resolve the problems with the architecture, but he is asking the Board to be objective and consider the code. He

would like to help resolve it with Mr. Schleifer, they will try to compromise. R. Coburn asked if in his conversations has the idea been brought up about swapping sides of the property of the main house. He had not, but potentially lot lines could be withdrawn.

J. Bragman, submitted a petition signed by 183 neighbors in opposition to this application. It summarizes that the house is larger than many in the neighborhood. The proposed house will stand out from all its neighbors.

Walter L Deane, 92 Pierpont Street, he had a photo of a NYC block blown up, this was a block front that was 200'. He's lived in the Village from the 1960's but has ancestors buried here. History is very important to him. It is an iconic center of the American summer houses. A doctor was the first time to build a house strictly for summer. Postcards of early Southampton show the houses are always east west, the perspective is essentially the same. Meadow Lane was added afterward. Meadow Lane is not the original road, just the part we are speaking about tonight is the true original ocean front Gin Lane. The Manger house is 90' long, but this house is twice as long. He feels that with the massing, you will be able to see this house on this district and further away and all the houses on the west will see this house. The Presbyterian church on Main Street was placed was overlaid on the NYC streetscape to show scale. Village Hall was overlaid, the old Parrish on Job's Lane, Citarella storefront, and the CVS façade as well. The only building similar in length in the Village was Town Hall in Southampton, it is similar in width from end to end. He feels the forefathers would not have built Town Hall in this location with the vista. He urges that the design of the house be changed so that it is more in keeping with the area.

John Pyne, 449 Hill Street, he read two letters one from him and one from his wife regarding the mockery of this house in mass of scale and doesn't fit in with the surrounding. He feels it surpasses any normal need of a normal family. The design reminds him of a presidential residence in New Delhi. He is bringing a copy of the recent Residence section of the Southampton Press that shows the folly large design.

Ellen Scarborough read a letter that was submitted in opposition to 28 Gin Lane, she feels it is incompatible with the neighborhood in scale, mass and design. It is oversized and starkly visible from Gin Lane. She asks that they deny for a certificate of appropriateness. Mass and scale needs to be further reduced.

Diane Deutschman, Village resident for 80 years and a former member of ARB, is appalled by the size and mass of this home. She noted the difference in sizes between the Fairlea average and this home. The proposed house will stand out sharply from the historic structures. She urges rejection of certificate of appropriateness. When she was on the Board, they spent so much time on Code 65. The applicant can get what he wants with a better design.

J. Bennett, this application was filed in November 2018, the opposition requested time to respond and was adjourned for seven weeks. The opposition was not prepared, and it was adjourned to the January 11th hearing. They have made two submissions a view shed from the ocean and response to comments by Mr. Goldblum. At this time he asked that the matter be closed for written submissions. He did not get a copy of Ms. Burkett's comments, he'd like that to be filed. His request is that it is closed for everyone, two weeks for written submission.

J. Brodlieb feels that there have been a lot of public comment and he would like the Board to share their feelings on this application. Chair is not prepared to close the public hearing. J. Bennett stated that the fill is a "straw issue" because it is taken from the elevation, the wall was built pursuant to a building permit that was never challenged. In the case of an elevated building may require the elevation of natural grade to minimize adverse effects. It was done to minimize pilings like in WHB, the Village does not allow this aesthetic. The Planning Board approved the plan. Bailey Larkin, noted that they have an approved SWIPP that has a grading plan, the planning Board reviewed and approved drainage. NPV noted that the existing hedging will remain, and they will submit the approved the SWIPPP and NPV comments regarding the drainage.

Ed Hollander, landscape architect, the plan that was filed and approved. It has been approved by State, Village and they just conducted a dune restoration. R. Coburn asked is there is anything about the new fill that would cause the adjacent properties to be flooded. E. Hollander answered no, the drainage plan was approved by the Planning Board. C. Redding feels the neighbors need reassurance. The Board the SWIPPP and NPV comments from the Planning Board decision to be submitted to their file.

L. Manger stated that there was no objection to the wall, because it went in and was permitted, and they did not have opportunity to respond to it. They have asked for two years to have an explanation of the earth going nowhere on the architectural plan. She sat through the entire Planning Board meeting and was told there would not be any problem. On the SWIPPP it states that the property will go back to natural grade all around, she has no explanation as to how that is possible. J. Brodlieb stated that there is a mystery to the people that surround, they need it to be explained to them. J. Bennett feels they can do everything in writing. Counsel Bruyn stated to Mrs. Manger that the engineer on retainer should review for you and have the SWIPPP plan explained and then they can present comments. The SWIPPP plan controls. Counsel stated to J. Bennett that the architectural plan should properly reflect the SWIPPP. The written submissions are helpful and once the hearing is closed, they can have deliberation over the materials. J. Brodlieb feels that closing it to written comment stifles discussion of the Board. The purpose of the public hearing is to gather information. J. Bennett asked for the hearing to be closed.

J. Brodlieb's concern is regarding the fill issue. J. Brodlieb asked the Building Inspector regarding the fill, he still is a little bit confused. Counsel Bruyn noted the fill is a technical issue for professionals, the general public will not aid them in figuring out that issue.

J. Bragman, what confused him about the fill, is that they have contradictory reasons. Counsel stated that fill is not for FEMA but for aesthetic per the Village code. In previous encounters it was mentioned that it was FEMA related. He feels the record cannot be closed. He feels they are not ready to deliberate; the public is not finished. There is nothing wrong discussing before the hearing is closed. This is not a technical legal issue that they have no power over. It is within their power to decide it under historic guidelines. J. Bennett wants it closed for written comments only.

J. Brodlieb is okay with closing for written comment so that they can deliberate publicly once it is closed. C. Highsmith noted that they have received a ton of information during the process. He wants to have conversation without outside public involvement. He prefers to close for written comment, and it can be deliberated publicly. There is nothing further that can be added to the file, he feels it is complete.

Counsel stated that if they decide to close, they can keep it open for written comment. The Board will review as part of the record. At any point during their deliberation or they need further information

they can reopen the hearing. At some point, they must get to a point they feel that they have enough information to decide.

R. Coburn had questions for Mr. Goldblum, in his written submission dated 2/18/19, he said it was 93% larger than Fairlea and 63% than the block and 40% than non-Fairlea residences. He started thinking about the house to house comparisons. There are 3 houses larger than 14,500. There are 190 home to home comparisons. If you take the most favorable for the applicant that is 40% larger than the proposed. He is struggling with why it is atypical? What he is saying is that one of the characteristics is there is a variation from block to block and it is consistent than why is this house so atypical. Mr. Goldblum feels he will have to think about that further. He presented his impressions, he used the numbers, he may have fallen into the rabbit hole of the numbers, the house seems large and crowded to the site. It was less the raw numbers but the relationship to what those numbers seem to ratify. It wasn't one or the other, size, proximity, orientation all came into play. He feels the siting of the house and its position to Fairlea are important, if it happened on one of the lots further west it would be less imposing, but it seems not to fit here. R. Coburn noted that on the western facade, it was noted that the shingle style always has modulation, but both shingle styles presented from Scully do not have much modulation. R. Coburn asked does he feel that this Board has purview over views from homes? He did not produce them or choose the views, Fairlea is a private road. One final question from R. Coburn, he heard several people allude to comparing to a city block, does he feel that is a fair comparison? Mr. Goldblum stated that no, it is not comparable to a city block, but it feels large. There is a difference between Gin Lane and a city block but it is a common reference that people understand, that is why the comparison was given.

J. Bragman stated that it is not an issue whether Fairlea is public or private, it doesn't affect the Board's decision. Also, the views are an issue and they can be protected.

Regina Grievon, 371 Ox Pasture Road, her suggestion is an adjournment for review of all the material presented.

MOTION by R. Coburn, seconded by C. Redding

To **close the application for SH28 LLC for written comments by March 8, 2019.**

On Vote: J. Brodlieb, R. Coburn, C. Highsmith and C. Redding

Nay: Chair Stevenson

On the application of **THOMAS AND MEREDITH JOYCE**, this application is adjourned to the March 11, 2019 public hearing.

On the application of **JAN SPLIT PURCHASE TRUST and 72 GIN LANE LLC**, 56 Gin Lane and 72 Gin Lane, these applications will be considered together since it is one landscape plan for both, present for the applicant was John Bennett. Affidavits of mailing and posting were submitted. These applications are for a greenhouse on the Jan Split Purchase Trust and a combined landscape plan for 56 & 72 Gin Lane.

The landscape designer, Arne Maynard, was present to explain the garden plan. They want to give the garden a more structured setting. Counsel asked to show the property line, it was pointed out at the dotted line on the plan. The landscape is designed with different areas of garden with different functions. There is a vegetable portion, it is not hard landscape but it is biodiverse. They are not mowing the grass in certain areas, so they will bring in insects and keep it soft. They are making the garden less structured. They are planting Chinese Elms since there is an absence of large shade trees. They have a

courtyard that forms an enclosure; the cars will be tucked under the tree canopy. The purpose is to frame the façade of the house. There will be a bank of trees to provide privacy. Several renderings were presented, they have a cobble courtyard with grass, vegetable cutting garden and the fruit trees in the greenhouse. Finally, one side of the house is a maze and then you get a view to the courtyard, a rose garden and a spring garden. All of ocean side planting will be native. There is a sunken lawn in front, and it creates a more human scale. The swimming pool just sits in grass, it is about soft landscape and no hardscape. There is a small family garden with citrus trees.

Greenhouse is mahogany windows with trim bleached that will weather, less white. They want the trim to be natural; they don't want to make it too fancy. They propose on the east elevation taking the double hungs and door out and making it all window. They proposed to extend on the south side of the house to extend the roofline down with one large double hung window. They added 34 square feet. R. Coburn asked about what percentage of proposed landscape is existing, are there photos of the existing? No, they do not have photos of the existing but will add them to the file. R. Coburn wants to see from the record what the view will be since it is in the historic district.

Eric Hollander, landscape architect, noted that many of the trees are in decline, most of the landscape that is there is not in great shape. The goal is to bring it back to a more historic level. J. Bennett noted that they will provide a photo of existing. R. Coburn asked about the hedge, is that existing; it was noted that it is. The clipped hedges are bayberry by the ocean. J. Brodlieb asked to what extent are they salt tolerant; all of them are. All plantings are native on the beach side, closer to the house it becomes more cultivated. Bayberry will be both clipped and natural depending on the area of planting. The Board feels that the plan is beautiful.

MOTION by R. Coburn, seconded by C. Redding

To **close the application for written decision subject to written submission on the application of JAN SPLIT PURCHASE TRUST and 72 GIN LANE LLC.**

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

On the application of **COOPERS NECK LLC**, 65 Coopers Neck Lane, present for the applicant was David Mare and Jason Falcone, architects. Affidavits of mailing and posting were submitted. Proposed is a pool house situated behind the house. It is 794 square feet. It divides itself into two rooms, one is a lounge area overlooking the pool. A second room is studio space for gym/yoga and a bathroom. It will be painted wood trim, shingles with solid stain, windows are metal clad in a tone darker than the trim and an open trellis of wood. A sample board with materials was presented. Landscape wise they plan to plant hedges around the entire property. The height of the hedges are 6' on sides and back and 4' on front. The pool house plan, landscape plan and renderings were shown.

MOTION by R. Coburn, seconded by C. Redding

To **close for written decision on the application of COOPERS NECK LLC.**

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

On the application of **134 MURRAY LANE LLC**, 134 Murray Lane, John Bennett was present for the applicant and affidavits of mailing and posting were submitted. John Clegerman, Drew Davis and Ed Hollander are present for this application. This is the last house on the east side of the historic district. J. Clegerman presented that the house is largely hidden from the street, as you approach you enter the house on the side. It is gabled and shingled and there is beige stone at the base. The gutters will be in copper or zinc and the chimneys will be stone like the base. The windows are double hung and

recessed. There is an existing tennis court. There is a lawn across from the beach. Both 8 and 12 pitch shingled roof are utilized and there is a terrace formed in the U-shape of the house. Since submission, they have reduced the size of chimneys, there are four, but they are lower by about 3'. The angles relate to other forms on house. Several boards showed renderings from all directions.

Ed Hollander, noted that the existing home is from the 70-80's. Existing and proposed views demonstrate a stucco wall that is existing. The house is not highly visible from the road. A view from the beach rendering was shown. They tried to plant indigenous, native, salt tolerant plants. They are keeping it open on one side as it is currently.

Elizabeth Condon, her mother lives in house to the west, she is curious about the lot coverage calculation. She wondered how that was calculated, specifically, if the pool with decking was included in the GFA. Ed Hollander noted that it is stamped by a licensed engineer and surveyor as to GFA, Squires and Holden compiled the calculation. It is higher than the existing house, they must meet the current FEMA requirement. Interior ceiling height is 11.5'. The septic will be replaced by IA low nitrogen system, it must meet Suffolk County Health codes and the new systems are an improvement over the existing.

R. Coburn asked about the north elevation asked about the paneling underneath the windows. It is wood that has traditional detailing that is compatible with the transitional house. They lowered the chimneys and made them smaller. They refiled the plans showing the changes to the chimneys. S. Stevenson feels the chimneys appear excessive and massive. J. Bennett that the chimney detail is the only changes they were made. The Board questioned whether there was a way to revert the mechanicals to vent into another chimney. Do they need to vent through chimneys at all?

George Cavallis, contractor, there is a cavity space above the garage where the mechanical vent. Chair asked do the chimneys have to be so aggressive. The architect noted that the chimneys are essential to the architecture because they break up the linear look of the house.

J. Brodlieb views them as integral to the design. He has less of an issue with the chimneys, the rendering shows the reduced chimneys. They are not square, they are diamond shape, this shape makes them appear less massive.

Chair Stevenson would not want to be a neighbor of this house since it appears industrial to her because of the chimneys. R. Coburn feels if one can be reduced or eliminated it would help. C. Highsmith noted that it will disappear at certain angles. The SE can be lowered? It cannot or it won't conform to code. C. Redding thinks lower would be better, however, that is not an option.

R. Coburn asked if there can be direct venting out. The direct venting will have three vents out the front, not an option. The architect stated that they will try to get the client to get rid of a fireplace to get rid of one of the chimneys. They can remove the SE chimney. J. Brodlieb stated taking away one is a good solution.

MOTION by R. Coburn, seconded by C. Highsmith

To close on the application of 134 MURRAY LANE LLC, subject to written submission showing removal of south ridge chimney.

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

On the application of **TOWN & VILLAGE OF SOUTHAMPTON – AFRICAN AMERICAN MUSEUM**, 245 North Sea Road, this application is to amend a prior ARB decision. Siamek Samii, architect, was present for the applicant. They request amendment to the ARB decision dated 8/6/16, the reason is because of the findings during construction. The Village advertised the change. Counsel added that the Village owns the property of either side and his office is across the street and was noticed.

The ARB approval was for restoration, they proposed to lift and install a new foundation and move the existing building. They knew there was going to be lots of rot, and they intended to frame within the existing frame structure. Once they built the foundation and moved the building, they did not remove the sheathing and finishes because they were holding together existing framing. There was live termite infestation and powder post beetle's infestation; at that time they realized how bad the situation was. The chief building inspector looked at it and they submitted the report in the file that contained the plan of action. They would go element by element to check the building. They went through six-stages; however, the building was completely rotted away. They had 8 or 9 members left on site even though they are not historic. The Board landmarked the building, the reason for designation was it's use in the neighborhood. This falls under the guideline of reconstruction, the Department of Interior has a definition regarding reconstruction, that definition is used by the Village. It remains unchanged from its original appearance. They are keeping all the architectural features and they are requesting an amendment to the prior decision. Matt Jedlicka was present and works with the Town regarding CPF projects and attests to the truth of the condition of the structure. This is a change from restoration to reconstruction.

Z. Studenroth noted that this should no longer be considered a landmark, they can't cloak that in the guidelines. He would question the process. What is the design that was presented and approved? The current building is exactly what was approved, it was a replication of the existing structure according to S. Samii. Z. Studenroth's question is regarding the current siding, the ARB approved the revision on the siding? S. Samii stated that was always going to be a combination of yellow cedar and red cedar, this was always part of the plan and was approved by the ARB. Basically, it is a new use, so they added the change of the siding. They got landmark status for funding for the restoration. Counsel noted that Z. Studenroth noted that they needed an engineering report because of structural issues, certainly the Town has been on top of this.

R. Coburn's only concern regarding this is that through the construction process, he does not understand why they are hearing this now, it should have been presented to the Board earlier.

MOTION by R. Coburn, seconded by Chair Stevenson

To amend the current ARB decision from restoration to construction of a new museum building on the application of TOWN & VILLAGE OF SOUTHAMPTON – AFRICAN AMERICAN MUSEUM.

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

MOTION by C. Redding, seconded by Chair Stevenson

To close tonight's meeting.

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

Respectfully Submitted by:

JoLee Sanchez

File Date:

Village Clerk