

Inc. Village of Southampton
Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation
March 8, 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, March 8, 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 22, 2021

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

On the application of **Dime Bank**, 243 Windmill Lane, Bianca DiGiamaco of Going Signs is here to represent the applicant. They are proposing to change the BNB signs to Dime Bank. Ms. Latham was concerned with the wall sign. It interferes with the facia of the building. Perhaps they could consider pin-mounted letters. Mr. McIntire would prefer to see the background as white and lettering in blue. Ms. DiGiamaco can see if individual lettering would be possible. Chair notes this is a very vibrant color pallet that tends to be a bit "in your face". Mr. Gregory agrees; more muted, natural colors are preferred. Chair believes the sign can be toned down and more fitting with the property.

MOTION by Chair second by P. DeWitt

To **adjourn** the application of **Dime Bank**

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

On the application of **Dime Bank**, 150 Windmill Lane, Bianca DiGiamaco of Going Signs is here to represent the applicant. They are proposing to change the BNB signs to Dime Bank. They are proposing blue acrylic letters mounted to the facia of the building. The second sign being proposed is a ground-mounted sign in aluminum. The board would like to see a white background with blue lettering. Mr. Gregory notes that the current materials seem to be more substantial. These will be high gloss painted acrylic letters. Chair feels it needs to be more in keeping with the historic street. Ms. Latham doesn't take issue with the blue coloring. Mr. McIntire thinks that reversing the colors would more appropriate. Ms. DiGiamaco will see if they can make the lettering matte for the front entry

Motion by Chair second by J. Gregory

To **adjourn** the application of **Dime Bank**

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

Inc. Village of Southampton
Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation
January 25, 2021

The application of **DeJesus Grocery**, 20 Jagger Lane, Ron Fisher from Fisher Signs and Shirts is here to represent the applicant. The sign requests typically go through Mr. Gregory and Ms. Latham as the sign committee, in this case

Mr. Fisher explains that they have been using PVC as a substraight since he started his business ten years ago. Once the vinyl is laid over the substrate you can't visually tell that it is not wood, but PVC. The PVC lasts longer.

Mr. Gregory worries that using PVC can look impermanent. He wants to move forward an Chair wonders how the sign this sign compares to the signs nearby. This is going be very similar. Mr. Fisher reviewed properties that have used PVC throughout the Village. Ms. Latham wonders if it would be possible to use marine plywood. Mr. Fisher explains that it would not be possible, as the front of the sign would need to be drilled through. Mr. McIntire would like to know if it is glossy. It is, the two flanking stores are also glossy.

MOTION by chair second by P. DeWitt

To **approve** the application of **DeJesus Grocery**

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

Nay: J. Gregory

On the application of **317 Murray Place, LLC**, Ms. Cooley recommends that the board reopen the application and adopt the prepared written decision that addressed the neighbors concern of landscaping.

Motion by Chair second by P. DeWitt

To **open** the application of **317 Murray Place, LLC**

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

There is a written decision in the file.

Motion by Chair second by

To **approve** the written decision for **317 Murray Place, LLC**

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

On the application of **Wooldon Manor LLC**, there is a written decision in the file.

Motion by Chair Second by P. DeWitt

To **approve** the written decision for **Wooldon Manor LLC**

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

On the application of **Outdoor Kitchen Design** there is a written decision in the file

Motion by Chair second by

To **approve** the written decision for **Outdoor Kitchen Design**

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

On the application of **Capcor Inc.**, there is a written decision in the file

Motion by Chair second by P. DeWitt

To **approve** the written decision for **Capcor Inc.**

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

The application of **The Village of Southampton**, there was a request for an adjournment.

Motion by Chair second by

To accept the request for adjournment

Inc. Village of Southampton
Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation
March 8, 2021

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

On the application of **John Church**, 624 Hill Street, affidavits of mailing and posting have been submitted to the file. There is a request for an adjournment in the file.

Motion by Chair second by S. Latham

To **adjourn** the application of **John Church**

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

On the application of **Greg and Susan Danilow**, there was a request for adjournment

Motion by Chair second by P. DeWitt

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

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

On the application of **M950 LLC**, there is a request for an adjournment

Motion by Chair second by P. DeWitt

To **adjourn** the application of **M950 LLC**

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

On the application of **Elisa Fadlun**, there is a request for an adjournment

Motion by Chair second by P. Dewitt

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

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

On the application of **Joseph and Phillipa Colvin** there was a request for an adjournment

Motion by Chair second by P. DeWitt

To **adjourn** the application of **Joseph and Phillipa Colvin**

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

On the application of **23 South Street, LLC**, Matt Pantofel is here to represent the applicant. John Gramlich, the architect is also present. Ms. Latham and Mr. DeWitt would like to note that they would like all plans going forward to show cardinal directions and not "Right / Left". Mr. McIntire is happy with the changes that were made from a design point. Mr. DeWitt thinks the front elevation looks a lot better but he doesn't find the right side pleasing. He doesn't feel that he could approve the design as it; it isn't complete. The rooflines are not consistent. Ms. Latham agrees, it creates a peculiar look. Mr. Gramlich explains they are limited with how high they can go. Mr. Gregory doesn't have any issues with the design as is, all of the boards previous concerns have been addressed. Chair is concerned with the blank wall and shallow roof, he believes there can be a better design. Mr. DeWitt wonders if the applicants can do a perspective.

Motion by Chair second by P. DeWitt

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

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

On the application of **Laura Danforth**, 233 Little Plains Road, Thomas Pedrazzi is here to represent the applicant. They took what the board had to say at the last hearing and made many changes. They made the windows six over one, removed the eyebrow window and replaced it

Inc. Village of Southampton
Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation
January 25, 2021

with a dormer. They got rid of the dental detail on the back of the house and flattened the roof a bit to bring down the scale of the house. The standing seam metal roof was removed. Ms. Latham wonders what the siding is going to be, this will be linen white stained lap siding and details will be white. Mr. Gregory would like to know if the shutters are operable, they are. A streetscape was prepared. This does look like two houses stuck together for Mr. McIntire. He is also concerned with potential light pollution with the large bank of windows. There is a ranch house on that side, there should be screening between the two lots. Ms. Latham does not like the width of the house, Mr. DeWitt agrees. Mr. DeWitt does not like the parking area that is being proposed. He also agrees that this looks like two houses put together. Mr. McIntire notes that parking is being proposed on the Village Right of Way. These spaces will be eliminated from the site plan. Joann Johnson submitted a letter to the file expressing concern with the design. Mr. Gregory does like the design of the front, but he does agree with Mr. DeWitt and Ms. Latham that there is a lot of volume to this house. Mr. Pedrazzi explains that this floor plan was tailored to the homeowner and they are not outside of what is permitted by code. Chair explains that the code gives you the envelope in which you can build, it is the purview of the board to make sure that the design of the house is appropriate in terms of mass and scale.

Motion by Chair second by M. McIntire

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

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

On the application of **86 Pine Street, LLC**, Thomas Sternfeldt is here to represent the applicant. Elizabeth Lubina, the homeowner is as well. Ms. Lubina explains that they have taken the comments that the board had at the last hearing to heart and have made some changes. The material will be dutch lap made of boral and cedar roof. The shutters have been removed and the windows changed to six over ones. Mr. McIntire notes that the front door looks like it has windows on the rendering, the it will be a solid door. Ms. Latham is very disappointed that the original German siding can't be salvaged. What is there appears to be a four inch and the dutch siding appears to be a six inch. She wonders if it can be reduced to four inch to match what is being proposed. Mr. Sternfeldt explains this material comes in six, eight and ten inch. Ms. Latham would prefer the window to wall ratio be retained. Mr. DeWitt would also prefer to see the two windows be kept. Mr. DeWitt thinks that using the same cladding throughout is a bit much. There is a house on Walnut Street that has German lap siding on the main portion of the home with cedar on the later additions. He would like to see the columns retained. Ms. Latham agrees. Mr. Sternfeldt explains that this was once a retail store and a dwelling, now it is going to be converted solely to single-family use. They wanted cohesiveness between the different structures on the property and that is why they are using the same siding. They did consider keeping the columns, but with the white and siding in the proposed design, they were out of place. Ms. Latham had hoped they would have proposed an open porch. They were trying to work within the footprint of what is there. Ms. Latham notes this is a reconstruction of what is there, they are not retaining the existing structure. This property was nominated for historic land marking in 1998, however it was never formally adopted. Ms. Lubina will take the board's comments into consideration. She was hoping not to have to keep the columns, while she appreciates the board's desire to keep them, it is not something that she finds aesthetically pleasing. Mr. Gregory feels that they have done a miraculous job in where the property has been to now, he applauds their efforts in that.

Motion by Chair second by S. Latham

Inc. Village of Southampton
Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation
March 8, 2021

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

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

On the application of **61 Pheasant Lane, LLC**, John Laffey is here to represent the applicant. He dropped off a sample of boral to the building department for the board to look at. This is being proposed as an alternative to azek. Mr. DeWitt wants to point out that the swooping gambrels come at the cost of having recessed windows. Mr. McIntire thinks that loosing the dormers has made the design very pleasing, he appreciates the change.

Motion by Chair second by M. McIntire

To **Approve** the application of **61 Pheasant Lane, LLC**

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

Nay: S. Latham

On the application of **SPOD 2007 Family Trust**, 88 Huntting Street, Bruce Sprano is here to represent the applicant. Affidavits of mailing and posting have been submitted. This is an application for additions and alterations. The idea is the carry on the original design and details of the house. Mr. DeWitt and Mr. McIntire feel this is appropriate and in keeping with the neighborhood.

Motion by Chair second by M. McIntire

To **approve** the application of **SPOD 2007 Family Trust**

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

On the application of **Anderson Benedetti**, 32 Cooper Street, Nicholas Vero is here to represent the applicant. Affidavits of mailing and posting were submitted. This is an application for additions and alterations to the dwelling. The addition will match in style and detail. There is azek being used, Mr. Vero is agreeable to changing this to Boral. Ms. Latham notes that this is a Four Square. She thinks that this should be maintained. Mr. Vero thinks he can maintain the existing hip on the house. Mr. Gregory would like to see how this extension lines up with the neighboring properties as there is a concern of light pollution. Mr. Vero will demonstrate this in a site plan. He will also try and maintain the existing cottage feel. Mr. DeWitt thinks that Four Squares are very versatile and he applauds Mr. Vero for keeping the structure. It can be stepped in on both sides to keep the intent of the four square design. Chair would like to see the existing vs proposed on the same page. A letter was submitted to the file by the neighbor, Donald Whitiker.

Motion by chair second by P. DeWitt

To **adjourn** the application of **Anderson Benedetti**

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

On the application of **DMDC Holdings LLC**, 128 Prospect Street, Dorian and Maria Vergos are the property owners, they are here to represent the application. They have listened to the comments made by the board and understand that they would like to see something on a smaller scale and more transparent. Chair thinks that they have done a good job with the issue of transparency. He still feels that the scale is disharmonious with that street; properties of a much larger size can be pointed out with smaller, four-foot gates. Ms. Vergos would like to point out that there is a gate 2 houses to the east that are seven feet tall, five houses to the west there is

Inc. Village of Southampton
Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation
January 25, 2021

another seven foot gate. She provided several examples of gates in the neighborhood. Mr. Vergos feels that these examples demonstrate that gates do fir the area.

Mr. Gregory is also familiar with the area, what they have to do now is decide what is appropriate for the neighborhood. The board does not want to set a precedent. The Vergos are concerned with the increased traffic in the neighborhood, they would like the gate to mitigate that issue. Mr. McIntire agrees with the Chair and Mr. Gregory, these gates are too large for this street. They create a foreboding feel to the property on a generally open street.

Motion by Chair second by M. McIntire

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. Changes have been made to address the materials, they've increased the transparency and reduced the size of the columns. They will now be Mahogany. Mr. DeWitt would like to see the spacing on the bottom reversed. Mr. Gregory asks if the construction gate that is up right now at 18 feet. This area of the street, with the Historical Museum and ambulance barn there is a lot of open area and then you come up to a wall with this gate. Mr. Ospitale explains that the construction fence is only eight to ten feet off of the roadway, this fence will be a minimum of eighteen feet from the edge of pavement. Mr. Gregory would like to see the this gate a foot lower and he would be happy with it. This property already sits a little higher than the surrounding. Chair shares a gate on Little Plains Road that he feels serves its purpose while still being functional.

Motion by Chair second by M. McIntire

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

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

On the application of **Chicamapaugee, LLC**, 500 Captains Neck Lane, Melissa Dedovitch is here to represent the applicant. This is at the end of Captains Neck Lane, which is a dead end. Anybody driving down that far are going somewhere with a purpose. Renderings were done to give perspective. Mr. McIntire loves the transparency. Mr. Gregory notes that it is transparent looking at the gate straight on, but looking at it at any degree to the side, those panels appear more solid. The material is cedar to be left to weather. Mr. McIntire thinks the gate makes sense for the seven acres that it is on. P. DeWitt states that there will be no lateral views through the gates. Ms. Dedovitch explains because of the double row of hedges, you are unable to see the gates until you are in front of them. Mr. DeWitt thinks that this is a dangerous precedent. Ms. Dedovitch disagrees; this is a unique property. The existing gate is very transparent, what is being proposed is virtually a solid wall. Chair believes a one inch picket can be proposed. Ms. Dedovitch will go back to the client, though she believes that setting the gate back forty feet
Motion by Chair second by McIntire

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

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

Motion by Chair, second by S. Latham

To **close** the hearing of March 8, 2021

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

Inc. Village of Southampton
Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation
March 8, 2021
Respectfully submitted by Jacqueline Allen 03-08-2021

Village Clerk

Date