

Inc. Village of Southampton
Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation
October 25, 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 Tuesday, October 25th, 2021 at 7pm.

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

MOTION by Chair, second by P. DeWitt
To open tonight's meeting.
On Vote: Chair, S. Latham, P. DeWitt, J. Gregory

Counsel for the board, Alice Cooley is present.

Motion by Chair second by S. Latham
To approve the minutes of October 12, 2021
On Vote: Chair, S. Latham, P. DeWitt, J. Gregory

On the application of **63 Dale Street, LLC**, this is a demolition referral. Monica Klueg is here to represent the applicant. Mr. DeWitt and Mr. McIntire reviewed the Sanborn map in the Building Department and visited the site. The house is in poor condition and being that the house is a standalone in the neighborhood, they have determined it would not be a detriment to the neighborhood to allow for demolition of this dwelling. Ms. Latham wishes that the house had been better cared for but in its current state, she could agree with the demolition. Chair is in agreement, the board does not intend to landmark the property. A memo will be sent to the building department.

On the application of **And By The Way Trust Subtrust A And By The Way Trust Subtrust B**, has been adjourned.

On the application of **Orest Bliss**, this matter has been adjourned

On the application of **Beechwood Latch, LLC**, 101 Hill Street, there is a request for an adjournment to November 8th.

Motion by Chair second By P. DeWitt
To **Adjourn** the application of **Beechwood Latch, LLC**
On Vote: Chair, S. Latham, P. DeWitt, J. Gregory

On the application of **550 Hill Street, LP**, 550 Hill Street, John Bennett is here to represent the applicant. Jeffrey Blinkoff will be counsel for the Board as Ms. Cooley has recused herself from this case. This matter is closed to public comment and open only for board deliberation. Mr. Blinkoff reviews 65-5 of the Southampton Village code as it relates to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness and the points in which the board should consider when making their decision. Ms. Latham does feel that this is a contributing structure. It has been linked to an artist of note. She feels that by loosing these buildings, we are loosing the heart of the

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

Southampton Village. Mr. Gregory agrees. Mr. DeWitt doubts its authenticity when it comes to the Sanborn Map - a different footprint is shown on the map and he also feels that the roofline is indicative of a newer home. He would not be opposed to demolition. Chair is inclined to agree with Mr. DeWitt in the matter. He looks back to a report prepared by Zach Studenroth who indicated that the house was not worthy of preservation.

Motion by Chair second by S. Latham

To hold the matter of **550 Hill Street, LP** open to the next meeting

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

On the application of **BHNH, LLC**, there is a request for an adjournment to November 8, 2021.

Motion by Chair second by S. Latham

To **Adjourn** the application of **BHNH, LLC**

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

On the application of **Post Crossing, LLC**, this matter is adjourned

On the application of **Fairlane Realty Corp.**, affidavits of mailing and posting have been submitted to the file. This is an application for demolition. MaryAnn Horwath is here to represent the applicant. Digital files will need to be submitted to the record to be shared with the public. The house was constructed in 1902, the most recent CO has was issued 1974 and indicates that the home had been significantly altered. It is currently sided in vinyl. The inventory form was provided to the record, this also indicates that the home has been alerted. Ms. Latham agrees that yes, the blue form indicates that the dwelling had been altered, yet it was still landmarked as a contributing structure. The vinyl siding should be stripped down to see what is underneath it. The property is directly across from the Halsey House and is surround by other homes of a similar style; it would be a crime to allow this home to be demolished. Mr. Gregory says this property needs further investigation. The context of this property is important for maintaining the history of the Village; as Ms. Latham pointed out this house is on a historic street surrounded by historic homes. Aside from the cladding on the house, it seems to be a historic home. Mr. DeWitt agrees, it has been altered, but original photos should be found. An effort should be made to save the home and restore it back to its original form. Chair reads an excerpt from *The Southampton Cottages of South Main Street* by Sally Spanburgh, where this property was featured. This house has a lot of history. The board will request a third party historian to examine the house and prepare a report. Chair opened the discussion to the public. Leslie Biddle sent correspondence to the board, she reads this into the record. She expresses her concern for preserving this historic "Southampton Cottage". Joan McGivern is here representing Ms. Biddle, she would like to emphasis that this property is within the historic district. She shares a real estate listing which indicates that the house dates back to 1820. This is also listed on Belcher Hydes list of contributing structures. When the applicant purchased this home, they knew that they were purchasing a historic home in a historic district, the non demolition of this structure would not be a surprise to them.

Ms. Horwath has no intention of demolishing the structure at this time. As a realtor, she is asked all the time if a demolition permit would be issued for a property. To find out that answer, she had to come before the board.

Motion by Chair second by P. DeWitt

To adjourn the application of **Fairlane Realty Corp**

Inc. Village of Southampton
Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation
October 25, 2021
On Vote: Chair, S. Latham, P. DeWitt, J. Gregory

The application of **Alvise Orsini & Geoffrey VanRaemdonck**, 143 Herrick Road, Gary Sanders and Bill Sclicht are here to represent the applicant. This is an application for a one story addition and alteration to the dwelling. This is a historic landmarked home, not within the historic district. The addition would be on the west side of the house. It would mimic the style of the house but would be differentiated by a cedar shingle siding. There is evidence that the building had a commercial use in its early life. This may explain the strange layout of the front door. They want to change it from its commercial function, to a family home. A photo was shared that shows that the porch was originally enclosed. They are proposing to replicate this structure, but extend it forward to where the stair ends now. This is currently before the Zoning Board of Appeals, they were advised to come before the Architectural Review Board for their opinions. The ZBA has indicated they have no issue with this. The only portion of this project that requires variance approval would be the very end of the stairs, about 18 feet. Mr. Sclicht would like to reiterate that the history of this building is very interesting. It started as three commercial spaces. Ms. Latham would refer the applicant back to the guidelines of the state of the interior. This is one of five individual landmarked buildings. The addition is 1200 sq. ft.; she does not feel that it is subservient to the principal dwelling, nor does she believe it would be reversible. She wonders if there is a way to repurpose the interior to achieve what they are looking to do? She feels there may be better solutions to this. Mr. DeWitt echoes Ms. Latham's comments. The front entrance revision is not permissible for him. It is a defining characteristic of this house. The stairs should be placed within the existing line. The addition should be lighter. Mr. Gregory agrees, he likes that different materials are being used to distinguish it from the original structure. Like Mr. DeWitt he feels that it is trying too hard to mimic the design of the original house. Chair feels that the addition changes the look of the house. He does not find what is being proposed to fully be subservient. He would like to see an alternative design to the stairs. Mr. Sanders explains the location of the new addition was determined by the current footprint and site layout. This house is a residence, if you go back and look at architecture where there has been a modern design element added on to an existing historic house - he doesn't feel it has been that successful. Mr. DeWitt states that is just one way to look at it; he can look to other contemporary designs. If the addition jutted out less the addition might be better received. Mr. Sclicht notes that the placement for this addition is the most sensitive location. This project would present in a monumental way, because that was the intent of the original building. The choice of shingles was made to make the addition clear to anybody looking at it. They have made an effort in designing this, they felt the most logical way to approach this would be to follow the vocabulary of the existing home. This is for a person's use, they have the right to enjoy their property and to use it to the extent in which properties of the same size are able. Adding to the top of the building would interfere with the pyramid law, they cannot add onto the house on the west side as this would encroach on the setbacks and would disrupt the gardens. Mr. DeWitt wants to see something done representative of this time. He agrees that there is no better placement for the addition - it is the design that he is not in favor of. Chair believes that the board has been consistent in expressing their concerns for this project. Mr. Sanders reiterates that the board would allow an addition, but he wonders the rest of the board members' views on the entryway. Ms. Latham is total against expanding the glass areaway. Mr. Gregory is less concerned with the expansion and more concerned about the design of the stair; he doesn't feel that the flair of the staircase fits the building. Mr. Sclicht

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

wonders if they change the stair design, would they board consider some expansion of the front porch. Ms. Latham is against moving it forward. Mr. Sclight expresses his view that architecture is dynamic, the era in which this building was commercial is gone and now it is a residence. Mr. Orsini is here tonight. He knows that this property worked for the prior owner, however he has two children and needs to make it more of a livable, family house. He is happy to make the addition look lighter. He can find compromises with the board.

Motion by Chair second by S. Latham

To adjourn the application of **Alvise Orsini and Geoffrey VanRaemdonck**

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

On the application of **DCK Wyndham LLC**, 35 Herrick Road, this is an application for driveway gates. Lauro Santanna is here to represent the applicant. They are 14 feet wide and 6 feet in height. The gate proposed is mostly solid. Chair explains that the board has shown consistency in asking for 50% transparency in driveway gates. Mr. DeWitt would also ask to see an elevation set to scale. There weren't any dimensions or site plans provided to the file.

Motion by Chair second by P. DeWitt

To **adjourn** the application of **DCK Wyndham LLC**

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

On the application of **Michael and Nina Whitman**, 36 First Neck Lane, this is an application for driveway gates. Mark Cirillo is here to represent the applicant. Increased spaces was requested by the board. They have done this - the spaces will be 2 1/16" and a material sample was dropped off at the Building Department. As Mr. Cirillo stated at this last meeting, it is a treated wood and not a composite material. Chair notes that this new drawing includes lanterns that were not shown before. Mr. Cirillo explains that there are existing pillars with lights on them now, the homeowners have decided they would like to put lanterns on the new Pilars. Mr. DeWitt thinks the design looks great, he agrees that lanterns are all over First Neck Lane.

Motion by Chair second by P. DeWitt

To Close the application of **Michael and Nina Whitman** for written decision

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

On the application of **Paul Fagan**, affidavits of mailing and posting were not submitted to the file, therefore the Board does not have jurisdiction. They will need to re-advertise.

On the application of **Heart of the Hamptons**, 44 Meeting House Lane, this application has been adjourned.

On the application of **Leland Abrams**, 187 Meeting House Lane, Brian Glasser is here to represent the applicant. Changes were made to the windows on the south side and the roof line was altered slightly in response to the board's comments from the last hearing. The board is happy with the changes made. There is no public comment.

Motion by Chair second by P. DeWitt

To approve the application of **Leland Abrams**

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

The application of **31 Rosko Drive** there was a request for an adjournment.

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

Motion by Chair second by P. DeWitt

To adjourn the application of **31 Rosko Drive**

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

On the application of **Taylor First LLC**, 55 Toylsome Lane, this is an application for new construction. Greg Tankersley is here to represent the applicant. At the last hearing there was some concern regarding the materials being proposed. Mr. Tankersley will address the architectural elements. They have reduced the size of the window in the tower portion of the design. The brick will be lime washed in dove white and a bronze color is being proposed for the windows and doors. Perry Guillot is here to discuss the concerns the board had with the parking area. He has prepared a drawing of their intent of the application. They have reduced the parking area from four cars to three. Due to the narrowness of the east passageway to the garage, he has also prepared an alternate plan which provides for a circular parking area. This would move one of the maple trees to the center of the round about. He does not feel the this proposal is not the most viable of the two. Mr. DeWitt feels that architecturally everything is perfect. He agrees with Mr. Guillot that option A is much more pleasing than option B - however, he feels there could be an option C. Chair had wondered about a circular driveway, but after seeing it proposed he sees that is a less desirable design. Mr. Guillot feels that the symmetry that plan A provides is most in keeping with the spirit of the property and the design of the house. Mr. DeWitt would like to see the gates moved forward to the street and that would provide ample room for a car to turn left or right. Ms. Latham and Mr. Gregory are comfortable with plan A.

Motion by Chair second by S. Latham

To **approve** the application of **Taylor First LLC**

On Vote: Chair, S. Latham, J. Gregory

Nay: P. DeWitt

On the application of **Ronald Diamond**, 98 Pheasant Close East, this is an application for a second story addition. Jakes Vanderwatt is here to represent the applicant. This is a small 15 x 7' second story deck. There is an existing Juliette balcony that they would like to extend. They are mimicking the handrails and columns. The board is comfortable with the design.

Motion by Chair second by P. DeWitt

To **approve** the application of **Ronald Diamond**

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

On the application of **Ronald Diamond**, 98 Pheasant Close East, this is an application for an accessory building. Bill Sclight is here to represent the applicant. This building we be used primarily for a gym and meditation space. The building is going to be cut into the land, this makes more of a sculptural feature. There is a small reflecting pool at the foot of the building crossed by a small glass bridge. The building will be wood clad and painted a dark color. Ms. Latham notes its way back on the property and it serves its function, she has no issues with it. Fellow board members are in agreement.

Motion by Chair second by S. Latham

To approve the application of **Ronald Diamond**

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

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

On the application of **Amanda Holmen**, 17 Bishops Court, Jim McChesney is here to represent the applicant. This is an application for a one story dwelling. It will be a two bedroom cottage. They own the house next-door and this will be more of a guest house. It is cedar shingle and trim, they would like this to look more like a garden structure. Mr. Gregory likes the design. Fellow board members agree.

Motion by Chair second by P. DeWitt

To approve the application of **Amanda Holmen**

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

On the application of **Southampton Shopping Center LLC**, 111 Main Street, this is an application for exterior alterations. Shawn Leonard is here to represent the applicant. This is the old HSBC bank. They are looking to convert this from a bank to retail space. The building will be white and with gray trim and windows. Ms. Latham feels the design is soulless. Mr. Gregory agrees, the current building has a bit more character. This could be a strip center in Anywhere, USA. Mr. DeWitt is agreement there. He thinks that removing the gable is a good thing, maybe bring the face of the building out? Mr. Gregory feels it is the part that juts out that gives it the "strip center" feeling. Mr. Gregory wonders if the roof in the center can be sloped as opposed to flat; perhaps a shed dormer would work. Mr. DeWitt does like the color pallet being proposed.

Motion by Chair second by J. Gregory

To adjourn the application of **Southampton Shopping Center LLC**

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

On the application of **Peter Culver**, 49 Corrigan Street, this is an application for additions and a pool house. Affidavits of mailing and posting were submitted to the file. Michael McCrum is here to represent the applicant. This is an 18 x 32 addition to the north side of the house. They are also proposing a swimming pool with a 12x16 pool house. The house was built in 1957 by Mr. Culver's father. The intent is to blend in with what is there now. The addition will be of the same materials and style. Mr. DeWitt thinks it is fine, it is in keeping with the neighborhood. His only thought would be changing the windows to match the size of the windows below. Ms. Latham agrees. Keep the same size dormer, but make the window larger.

Motion by Chair second by P. DeWitt

To adjourn the application of **Peter Culver**

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

On the application of **SHRE, LLC**, 161 Downs Path, this is an application for a new house with attached garage and pool house. John Laffey is here to represent the applicant. Affidavits of mailing and posting were submitted to the file. There will be red cedar siding and roof with white windows. The front of the house has a dormer with a standing seam copper roof with copper gutters. Mr. DeWitt finds the pop up between the gables to be excessive and he thinks that the gables are "fussy" in detail. Mr. Gregory's only concern is the double height windows. Ms. Latham does not care for the double height windows either. Chair agrees with Mr. Gregory and Ms. Latham, he is not in favor of the windows. Ms. Latham would eliminate the shed dormer.

Motion by Chair second by P. DeWitt

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

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

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

On the application of **Hampton Monkey Business, LLC**, application has been adjourned.

The trustees have expressed concern regarding historic properties falling into disrepair. Chair will be speaking with the board regarding several properties, one on Hill Street, Jobs Lane and Windmill Lane. Mr. Gregory wonders if Chair can also express concern for Gideon Hall.

Motion by Chair second by S. Latham

To Close the Meeting of the Architectural Review Board and Historic Preservation of October 25, 2021

Chair, S. Latham, P. DeWitt, J. Gregory

Respectfully submitted by: Jacqueline Allen 10/25/2021

Village Clerk

Date