

Inc. Village of Southampton  
Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation  
April 12, 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, April 12<sup>th</sup>, 2021 at 7pm.

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

MOTION by Chair, second by J. Gregory

To open tonight's meeting.

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

Counsel for the board, Alice Cooley is present

MOTION by Chair, second by J. Gregory

To **approve** the minutes from March 22, 2021

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

On the application of **Thomas and Meredith Joyce**, there is a written decision in the file

Motion by Chair second by P. DeWitt

To **approve** the application of **Thomas and Meredith Joyce** as written

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

On the application of **John Church**, there is a written decision in the file

Motion by Chair second by

To **approve** the application of **John Church** as written J. Gregory

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

On the application of **Greg and Susan Danilow**, this matter has been adjourned

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 **Glenn and Claudine Nussdorf**, 210 Meadow Lane. Affidavits of mailing and posting have been submitted to the file. This is an application for a driveway gate. Lauren Zucker and Chris Coy of Barnes Coy Architect, are here to represent the applicant. The board is in agreement that the gate design looks great. Mr. Gregory wonders if there is away to hide the keypad. Ms. Zucker can look into their ability to do that. Mr. Coy would like to note that the keypad contains a camera and would also need to be accessible to any delivery drivers or others who wouldn't have an app on their phone. Chair would not vote for this as is. Ms. Latham disagrees, she feels the key pad is minimal, Mr. McIntire and Mr. DeWitt agree with Ms. Latham.

Motion by Chair second by S. Latham

To **close** the application of **Glenn and Claudine Nussdorf** for written decision

Inc. Village of Southampton  
Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation  
April 12, 2021  
On Vote: Chair, S. Latham, P. DeWitt, M. McIntire  
Nay: J. Gregory

On the application of **M4950 LLC**, there is a request for an adjournment  
Motion by Chair second by P. DeWitt  
To **adjourn** the application of **M4950 LLC**, with the stipulation that they repost and notice if they adjourn past May 10<sup>th</sup>  
On Vote: Chair, S. Latham, P. DeWitt, M. McIntire, J. Gregory

On the application of **Joseph and Philippa Colvin**, 55 Old Town Crossing, Anastasios Tzakas is here to represent the applicant. The font elevation was changed to address comments made by the board at the last hearing. Mr. Gregory thinks it looks great, he and Mr. McIntire thank him for the changes made.  
Motion by Chair second by M. McIntire  
To **approve** the application of **Joseph and Philippa Colvin**  
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 have reduced the width of the proposed dwelling. Mr. Gregory appreciates the changes made. Ms. Latham and Mr. DeWitt still feel as though the house is too wide for the lot. Mr. McIntire doesn't share that concern, he too appreciates that the house was reduced in width as much as it was. Chair agrees. Mr. DeWitt wonders if the board is happy with the aluminum shutters. Mr. Pedrazzi stated that wood would require too much upkeep in this environment. There are a lot of shutters on this house and he felt that the aluminum was a better option. Ms. Latham would not approve the application with aluminum, but she wouldn't approve the design as is either. Mr. McIntire notes that the issue of the shutter material was not raised in previous meetings, though it has been shown on the plans.  
Motion by Chair second by M. McIntire  
To **approve** the application of **Laura Danforth**  
On Vote: Chair, M. McIntire, J. Gregory  
Nay: S. Latham, P. DeWitt

On the application of **Anderson Benedetti**, 32 Cooper Street, Nicholas Vero is here to represent the applicant. He is having technical difficulties; the board will revisit the application.

On the application of **Polish Political Club**, there is a request for an adjournment  
Motion by Chair Second by M. McIntire  
To **adjourn** the application of **Polish Political Club**  
On Vote: Chair, S. Latham, P. DeWitt, M. McIntire, J. Gregory

On the application of **Kirsten Galef**, 80 Breese Lane, Siamak Samii is here to represent the applicant. The gates have been reduced to 5' in height with the columns standing at 5'6" and the transparency has been increased. The front elevation has been changed to address the board's comments, the side lights have been removed and the window configuration changed. Ms. Latham thanks Mr. Samii for addressing the fenestrations, though she does not agree with the use of the eyebrow window. Mr. DeWitt agrees with Ms. Latham. Mr. Samii did bring this up to the

Inc. Village of Southampton  
Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation  
April 12, 2021

homeowner; she does like the eyebrow window in that place. This is much smaller than the original proposal. Mr. Gregory thinks this is a great improvement over the original design. He does agree with the other board members that the eyebrow window is a little odd. Mr. McIntire and Chair agree. Chair feels that the eyebrow brings a formality to the home. Mr. Samii explains that the eyebrow window is to bring light into the porch area and this is the option that the homeowner would like to go with. Mr. Gregory feels this is a small issue, he personally doesn't like it, but it isn't a roadblock for him.

Motion by Chair second by J. Gregory

To **approve** the application of **Kirsten Galef**

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

Nay: P. DeWitt, S. Latham

On the application of **GC Southampton, LLC**, 84 Fordham Road, Jeffrey Flanigan and Phil Watson are here to represent the applicant. Mr. DeWitt thinks this is a nice redesign of a ranch. Mr. Gregory loves the design. Mr. McIntire would like to confirm that the bedroom windows are two smaller windows as shown on the line drawings as opposed to the picture window on the rendering. This is correct. Sherry Fenster, neighbor is here tonight. At the last hearing they had asked for additional screening. Mr. Flanigan thought they had agreed to put a double hedgerow around the property to conceal the pool fence. Chair does not feel that a landscape plan is not necessary in this case, but would like Mr. Watson to describe what it is that they are planning on doing. Mr. Watson explains that from the northeast corner there will be new privet added along the pool fence line, up to where it meets the property line, from that point, any gaps in the existing hedge will be filled in.

Motion by Chair second by M. McIntire

To **approve** the application of **GC Southampton LLC**

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

On the application of **White Easel Realty LLC**, 224 North Sea Road, Jozef and Tamera Debiec are here as the property owners. The footprint has not changed at all, two dormers were added, one on the front and one on the north side. Chair feels that the elevations submitted are not complete. They need to be re-labeled to callout the cardinal directions and not "front, left, etc" Chair also notes that the front elevation submitted does not match what is there. The windows on the front elevations do not match. Mr. Debiec explains this is because the contractor put them in and they had a stop work order placed. They are asking for the approval for the windows as s

shown in the plans. They will be white trim windows to match the exterior of the house, which will also be white. A dormer was added on the north elevation while also raising the roof. The south elevation is mainly untouched, Mr. DeWitt explains they want to see the existing elevation prior to the work being down, directly below that he would like to see what is being proposed – full elevations, not any partial and the cardinal directions called out on the plans. Mr. DeWitt feels that the dormer is typically an extension of a shallower roof, he thinks a gambrel dormer would be more appropriate to the house. The second floor dormer looks like a tower; he thinks the north dormer wall can be extended westward into the rake of the gambrel. Ms Latham agrees, this would also create more space inside. Mr. McIntire notes that the plans shown to the public by the applicant are different than those that the board has. Mr. Debiec will have the correct plans to present at the next hearing.

Inc. Village of Southampton  
Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation  
April 12, 2021

Motion by Chair second by P. DeWitt

To **adjourn** the application of **White Easel Realty LLC**

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

On the application of **Emily Chien and Thomas Mahoney**, there is a request for an adjournment

Motion by Chair second by P. DeWitt

To **adjourn** the application of **Chien and Thomas Mahoney**

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

On the application of **Anderson Benedetti**, Nick Vero is here to represent the applicant. Mr. DeWitt is pleased with the changes made. Mr. McIntire agrees; this is a pretty house. Chair is appreciative that the house is not getting any wider.

Motion by Chair second by P. DeWitt

To **approve** the application of **Anderson Benedetti**

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

Nay: S. Latham

On the application of **Colbey Arden**, 66 Halsey Street, Lisa Zaloga and Colbey Arden are here to represent the applicant. Affidavits of mailing and posting have been submitted to the file. This is a one and a half story house with alterations to the existing accessory structure. The windows will be white Andersons and the trim will be white Boral. Mr. Gregory is concerned with light pollution. Ms. Zaloga states that the property is screened in with 18-20' hedges. This would still be a concern as the plantings lose their leaves throughout the winter. Mr. Arden explains that capturing the sunlight on the south side is important to them. They have received two letters of support from neighbors. Ms. Latham wishes they could see this house retained. She wonders why they are choosing to paint the cedar shingle. Ms. Zaloga explains that there is a mold problem in the existing house, and cannot be kept. The homeowners are also keen on having a white house, it was a big part of the design. Mr. Gregory and Mr. DeWitt feel that the windows should be reduced, they could not approve the design as is. Mr. DeWitt agrees with Mr. Gregory that they should match the windows on the other side of the door. Mr. McIntire notes that the

drawings are inconsistent. Ms. Zaloga wonders if pulling the windows up six inches would alleviate their concern. It would for both Mr. DeWitt and Mr. Gregory.

Motion by Chair second by M. McIntire

To **adjourn** the application of **Colbey Arden**

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

On the application of **Edmund Lo**, 144 Pulaski Street, Spring Yu and Siyu Lu are here to represent the applicant. Affidavits of mailing and posting have been submitted to the file. This is an application for additions; the siding will be natural cedar and the trim white. The windows are 2 over 2 painted white. The pool house and detached garage will match the house in materials. Ms. Latham would like to see the cupola on the pool house removed. Mr. DeWitt thinks it looks fine, he doesn't mind the cupola. Mr. Gregory wonders if there is any screening on the back of the property to mitigate light pollution from the large windows on the rear

Inc. Village of Southampton  
Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation  
April 12, 2021

elevation. Ms. Yu explains that there is mature landscaping that exists. Chair thinks this is an improvement to the existing house. He agrees with Ms. Latham that the accessory structure could do without the cupola. Mr. Gregory agrees, especially considering the design is pretty contemporary. Ms. Lu explains that the cupola is an element that is important to the homeowner. She asks that considering that this is on the back of the property that they be able to keep it. Mr. Gregory states he would prefer it not, but it isn't a deal breaker for him.

Motion by Chair second by P. DeWitt

To **approve** the application of **Edmund Lo**

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

On the application of **DMDC Holdings, LLC**, 128 Prospect Street, Maria Vergos is here to represent the applicant. They've increased the transparency and slimmed down the columns. The gates will be azek painted white with no lighting. They will be setback in from the street, Ms. Vergos is unsure as to how far back. The keypad will either be on the column or close to it. No lighting is being proposed. Mr. Gregory notes that there are two different properties that have gates, one of which are set very far back. He feels that they are still too big of scale for the street frontage of the property. Mr. DeWitt agrees, it's too estate like. Mr. McIntire would also like to see it lowered. Ms. Latham and Chair are in agreement with the rest of the board. The height, the materials, the keypad and overall placement need to be addressed. Michael Marran from East Hampton Fence and Gate is also here. Mr. Marran explains that they will not be able to tell the material is azek as it will be painted white. There was a survey that was submitted to the file, the gate would be setback twenty feet from the street. This is the same design that has been approved by the board at a different property. Chair explains that it is the scale of this gate on this property that the board does not agree with. Mr. Marran states there are 15-20 foot tall hedges around the entire property. The board has requested that the gates and the columns be lowered, they have done that twice now. The board does not feel that a driveway gate of this scale is appropriate to this street. Chair demonstrates this by sharing a video of the neighborhood. Mr. Marran asks what they would like to see the gates scaled down to? Four-foot gates and five-foot columns would be more appropriate.

Motion by Chair second by J. Gregory

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

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

On the application of **James Mulholland**, 5 David Court, Peter Cook is here to represent the applicant. Affidavits of Mailing and Posting have been submitted. This is an application for a driveway gate. It is setback 20' from the street, just inside the hedge line. It is a powder coated aluminum gate, with white with cedar shingle columns with blue and white details to match the existing house. Mr. Gregory feels this gate is appropriate to the property; this is a perfect gate that makes sense. Chair states he generally objects to call boxes separate to the columns, he's comfortable with them as they are aligned with the hedge, and this is on a dead end street.

Motion by Chair second by P. DeWitt

To **approve** the application of **James Mulholland**

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

Motion by Chair, second by J. Gregory

Inc. Village of Southampton  
Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation  
April 12, 2021  
To **close** the hearing of April 12, 2021  
On Vote: Chair, S. Latham, P. DeWitt, M. McIntire, J. Gregory

Respectfully submitted by Jacqueline Allen 04-12-21

---

Village Clerk

---

Date