

**BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW &
HISTORIC PRESERVATION
VILLAGE OF SOUTHAMPTON
DECEMBER 9, 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 December 9, 2019 at 7:00PM.

Board members Madame Chair Susan Stevenson, Jeffrey Brodlieb, Rob Coburn and Sarah Latham were present. Curtis Highsmith was absent.

Counsel for the Village Alice Cooley and Historic Consultant Zac Studenroth were present.

MOTION by R. Coburn, second S. Latham

To **open tonight's meeting.**

On Vote: Chair Stevenson, J. Brodlieb, R. Coburn and S. Latham

MINUTE APPROVAL

MOTION by R. Coburn, second S. Stevenson

To **approve the November 25, 2019 minutes as amended.**

On Vote: Chair Stevenson, J. Brodlieb, R. Coburn and S. Latham

SIGNS

On the application of **SOUTHAMPTON DAY CARE CENTER**, 100 David Whites Lane, Susan Hovdesven was present. This is a new sign to replace the sign that was damaged. The sign has a blue logo that depicts children in silhouette on a white background with black lettering.

MOTION by R. Coburn, second by S. Latham

To **approve the sign of SOUTHAMPTON DAY CARE CENTER.**

On Vote: Chair Stevenson, J. Brodlieb, R. Coburn and S. Latham

On the application of **SOUTHAMPTON BOOKS**, 16 Hampton Road, present for the applicant was Stacy Menzer, Hampton signs. The proposed sign is the same size, but with a whale and writing in black paint on white PVC.

MOTION by R. Coburn, second by S. Latham

To **approve the sign of SOUTHAMPTON BOOKS.**

On Vote: Chair Stevenson, J. Brodlieb, R. Coburn and S. Latham

On the application of **CHIC BEAUTY**, 22 Nugent Street, present for the applicant was Sandra Corrida, this is gold uppercase writing applied directly on the building, it is flat against the wall with lights.

MOTION by R. Coburn, second S. Latham

To **approve the sign of CHIC BEAUTY.**

On Vote: Chair Stevenson, J. Brodlieb, R. Coburn and S. Latham

WRITTEN DECISIONS

On the application of **EMANON SOUTH CORP**, 276 North Main Street, there is a written decision in the file.

MOTION by R. Coburn, second S. Latham

To approve the written decision on the application of EMANON SOUTH CORP.

On Vote: Chair Stevenson, J. Brodlieb, R. Coburn and S. Latham

On the application of **STEPHANIE HESSLER**, 328 South Main Street, there is a written decision in the file. S. Stevenson is recused from this application. J. Brodlieb asked Counsel if the applicant's signed statement to come before the Board for landscape was to be referenced in the decision. Counsel Cooley noted that being in the file but not referenced is not a problem.

MOTION by R. Coburn, second S. Latham

To approve the written decision on the application of STEPHANIE HESSLER.

On Vote: J. Brodlieb, R. Coburn and S. Latham

Recused: Chair Stevenson

On the application of **199 COOPERS LANE LLC**, there is a written decision in the file. Z. Studenroth desired to make comments regarding this application, Counsel stated for the comments to be made the application would have to be reopened for that purpose.

MOTION by R. Coburn, second by J. Brodlieb

To reopen for comments from Zac Studenroth on the application of **199 COOPERS LANE LLC.**

On Vote: Chair Stevenson, J. Brodlieb, R. Coburn and S. Latham

Z. Studenroth feels that one thing overlooked was lost material, the brick will be lost from elongation of the windows. The bricks can be preserved, and he feels the decision should condition the retention of the material for possible use at another time. J. Brodlieb is concerned about being blasé about the painting of the windowsills, but he doesn't have a problem with the color and Chair brought up it's not at issue.

MOTION by R. Coburn, second S. Stevenson

To close for written decision on the application of 199 COOPERS LANE LLC.

On Vote: Chair Stevenson, J. Brodlieb, R. Coburn and S. Latham

MOTION by R. Coburn, second S. Latham

To approve the written decision on the application of 199 COOPERS LANE LLC subject to the retention of existing brick material that is located beneath the current windows.

On Vote: Chair Stevenson, J. Brodlieb, R. Coburn and S. Latham

On the application of **CASA MEADOW LLC**, 96 Meadow Lane, there is a written decision in the file.

MOTION by R. Coburn, second S. Latham

To approve the written decision on the application of CASA MEADOW LLC.

On Vote: Chair Stevenson, J. Brodlieb, R. Coburn and S. Latham

DRIVEWAY GATES – NON-HISTORIC

On the application of **LAURA ANDRASSY**, 298 Narrow Lane, present for the applicant was Paulo Chaya and Joseph Rapurto. P. Chaya stated that they made the openings 3” to make them more transparent. This application is for a double set of driveway gates. Joe Rapport began to speak regarding thing not related to the application and Counsel asked him to present the new gates. It is the same gates but with more visibility because of the spacing. He states that there are two sets of gates across the street with less frontage, his client more frontage on their property. They left the driveway as existing previously. He noted there are multiple homes on the street and in the surrounding neighborhood with gates. He stated that this is a busy street.

J. Brodlieb stated that he feels gates in this area not appropriate because it was reminiscent of fields and farms. The sets across the street are wrought iron and very see through. The addition of additional gates on this property are not in keeping with the neighborhood. He stated this is the Boards judgment is considered even when things are allowed. The Code states that they can exercise their judgment to see if compatible with the character of the neighborhood, and he doesn’t feel it is in keeping with the existing character.

J. Rapport stated that he disagrees, because David’s Court, which is directly across the street, has double gates as well as Wickapogue. J. Rapurto polled the audience regarding his contention and Counsel stated that it is his burden to provide proof of his case, he cannot poll the audience. R. Coburn feels this is not visually the same as Wickapogue, however there are two other sets of gates on the street and they are very transparent because of the wrought iron. The spacing change to make the proposed more transparent changes the equation for him and he doesn’t have a problem with the gates.

MOTION by R. Coburn, second S. Latham

To **approve the driveway gates on the application of LAURA ANDRASSY.**

On Vote: Chair Stevenson, R. Coburn and S. Latham

Nay: J. Brodlieb

PUBLIC HEARINGS - NON- HISTORIC

On the application of **LISA BASS**, 20 Pelletreau Street, present for the applicant was Robert Bruschetti. On October 28, 2019 public hearing it was determined that an inspection was not necessary. Chair Stevenson noted that they have examined the house and the approved plans are not showing as built. They did not build the approval, but the addition is to the plans that were never built. He submitted plans. J. Brodlieb noted that they had an approval, the work has not been done on that approval. Does that mean that the old plans are null and void? Counsel stated that if they approve these plans it will null and void the old plans. R. Coburn noted that the garage doors were removed and replaced with shingles, so they acted on part of the approval. The double hung windows were not done, however. R. Coburn noted that an approval cannot be a la carte, it has to be taken as a whole. R. Bruschetti noted that the only thing was done was removal of faux garage. Chair noted that they agreed to a plan and that is what they expected to be built. Moving ahead, R. Bruschetti would like this to be viewed as a new application. The Board does not like the windows, the new windows were not used. The façade was reframed according to R. Coburn, his concern is that the garage looks like an error not related to the house.

He submitted letters of support, the formerly approved plans and survey to the file. This was done by good faith; he feels this applies to the doctrine of muteness. Chair stated that does not apply, the application was not fulfilled. He states that the character of the house fits into the neighborhood. This was done before it was approved. Counsel stated that they are looking at this de novo, it has been established.

J. Brodlieb noted that they cannot get a C of O as it stands right now, the Board is okay with the enclosure, he likes it better. They are confronted by something they approved that they did not do. The Board has a problem with it. The previously approved windows on the garage, the opportunity to abide by the approval was not acted on. It is within their scope; they will be willing to approve if the previous approval is followed through on. This Board is trying to provide find a solution. Chair stated that the windows on the enclosure do not look good. R. Coburn feels that the gabled roof is oversized for the size of the house, once enclosed it becomes an oversized vestibule that is a much bigger impact. But he doesn't think it is so oversized as to be objectional. The garage windows should be changed, that would be more harmonious with house and neighborhood. Windows 2/1 is more acceptable to the Board, R. Bruschetti will present this to his client and he can come back with proposed change. He requests adjournment.

MOTION by R. Coburn, second S. Stevenson

To **approve the applicant's request for adjournment for all purposes on the application of LISA BASS.**

On Vote: Chair Stevenson, J. Brodlieb, R. Coburn and S. Latham

On the application of **MEADOWMERE PARTNERS LLC**, 66 Meadowmere Lane, present for the applicant was Ilya Mirgorodsky. He submitted a landscape plan, there is a property plan of all three lots with perspectives inside and outside the property. They plan to maintain all perimeter trees, there are new trees with a legend. The existing entrance is on Coopers Neck Lane and that will be maintained. Service entrance is off of Meadowmere Lane. The driveway is approximately 400 yards, its long. He brought a key plan with a number of key views from within the site. There is a representation of the blue stone steps to have the adjacent vegetation to engulf the steps, with a rice paddy terracing of vegetation. The first is an east elevation, the brick pavilion is the front entrance, the dormers that flank are 7' lower than the main gable. There are no hip roofs. There was a Southern perspective and the pavilions around the pool. There are 4 perspectives from street angles, views from street show hedges and existing hedge that provide screening for the house from all the views. Eastern white shingles and white brick are materials.

J. Bennett submitted a handout that demonstrates the character of neighboring properties and other decisions in the Village. Chair asked how many cars for the garage area, it is 8 spaces. Chair noticed a lot of outdoor lights; the south elevation contains a lot of lights. Do they need that many lights? They are working with a lighting designer and it's a large house, it is on the second floor so it's up high, that is the concern. Chair feels there are lots of house that are inappropriately lit. S. Latham thinks it is a clean modern design, she likes the uncluttered look. The landscape appears to be softened it and she's in favor.

J. Brodlieb feels that this house works for this lot. R. Coburn questioned the south elevation, the framing is 27x27, the post are 4x4 and the top is 4x10 and they will have retractable fabric and it is painted steel. The size and whiteness bothers him. It is the one thing that feels slightly out of scale. Chair feels it may be the perspective. The only other thing is that he is not a fan of it the approach to the house, it's not on the front. He hopes that more the applications have approach that is visibly

accessible from the street. Only other question was the Fire Department asked if they can access the house, I. Mirgorodsky stated that yes, they are working with Inter Science.

MOTION by R. Coburn, second J. Brodlieb

To **approve the application of MEADOWMERE PARTNERS LLC.**

On Vote: Chair Stevenson, J. Brodlieb, R. Coburn and S. Latham

On the application of **85 CORRIGAN LLC**, 85 Corrigan Street, present for the applicant was Siyu Liu. She submitted small size copies of the new plans to the Board. She watched the video of the last hearing with her clients and they worked hard to make revisions. The garage has been changed, they took out doors and put in a fireplace since it is a long wall. The roof angles have changed, everything simplified and all 12 over 12 and a little flair at the bottom and the dormer was changed to shed, no hip. To R. Coburn he feels this is an improvement and makes sense of the forms. On A4 he asked about chimney, it is on garage plan, they should imagine a chimney coming up. Chair asked if there is a flat part to the roof. No flat roofs on any part of the house. The lot coverage is no change from last time. Red brick is material on outdoor fireplace. Shingle exposure is 5.5". Is she going to work with the contractor to make sure it is 5.5", she will have a conversation with the contractor regarding the exposure of the shingle.

MOTION by R. Coburn, second S. Latham

To **approve the application of 85 CORRIGAN LLC.**

On Vote: Chair Stevenson, J. Brodlieb, R. Coburn and S. Latham

On the application of **CAPTAINS NECK REALTY LLC**, 509 Captains Neck Lane, present for the applicant was John Kean, contractor, this application is for a yoga studio and children's cabana. This is 200' and 250' from Captain's Neck Lane, the two structures keep in style of the main house. Shingled siding and roof, white windows and trim and stone wall wraps around. This is a 9-acre lot. R. Coburn asked where the stone occurs, it is on the back of the house, there are stone terraces. They are all in keeping with the main house that was approved by the Board. It was approved about two years ago. It cannot be seen from the road. R. Coburn questioned the copper roof portion, there is copper roof on main house, and it is mimicking it. They are 15.5' high.

MOTION by R. Coburn, second S. Latham

To **approve the application of CAPTAINS NECK REALTY LLC.**

On Vote: Chair Stevenson, J. Brodlieb, R. Coburn and S. Latham

On the application of **130 BISHOPS LANE LLC**, 130 Bishops Lane, present for the applicant was Matthew Pantofel, owner and builder. Affidavits of mailing and posting were submitted. The material is white cedar shingle two-story with an attached garage, cedar roof, black windows and white Azek trim. The change in the orientation is because it is a flag lot, now the house is facing the front. R. Coburn asked what the exposure is, it is 6". It is not specified on plans, but it needs to be, in the future he would like N, S, E, W on the plans as well. The windows are double hungs. The perimeter trees are staying, there is screening around and bushes all around the front. There are boxwoods on front and a Maple. J. Brodlieb stated maybe soften it up by landscape.

MOTION by R. Coburn, second S. Latham

To **approve the application of 130 BISHOPS LANE LLC. with the condition that the architect specify the exposure of 5.5" and add compass directions to the plans.**

On Vote: Chair Stevenson, J. Brodlieb, R. Coburn and S. Latham

On the application of **67 NORTH CAPTAINS NECK LANE LLC**, 67 North Captains Neck Lane, present for the applicant was Charles Klein. Affidavits of mailing and posting were submitted. There is a site plan that was submitted late, it was stamped. Seacast dipped cedar shingle, shingle roof, ebony window and doors will be used. It is a .5-acre lot, the property has established privet and there are arborvitae to the west. Copper gutters will be used, they plan to add arborvitae on the garage side as well. The garage is to the left, there is a setback to the front form. The windows on the garage are for symmetry but will be tinted. The elongated window is the stairwell. S. Latham noted the lack of wall ratio in the stair well bothers her, it is not a design element she is familiar with. Chair doesn't like that design element. The property is well screened, but the large garage windows bother Chair. J. Brodlieb feels it is compatible with the neighborhood. J. Brodlieb feels that if they shingle off the bottom third of the elongated window that it will change the design for the better, Chair feels it is a good suggestion. Roof material is cedar shingle 5.5" exposure and Azek trim will be used. R. Coburn noted no survey in the file. It needs to be added to the file. He will need to return to show the exposure of the shingles, the compass directions need to be on there and a new survey for the file. C. Klein requested an adjournment.

MOTION by R. Coburn, second Chair

To **approve the applicant's request for adjournment on the application of 67 NORTH CAPTAINS NECK LANE LLC.**

On Vote: Chair Stevenson, J. Brodlieb, R. Coburn and S. Latham

On the application of **ALEXANDER ROBERTSON**, 270 Toylesome Lane, present for the applicant was Zac Villano. Affidavits of mailing and posting were submitted. They plan to use cedar shingle for siding and roof with 6" exposure. Chair likes this house for the neighborhood. The garage is on the east side, which pulls it further from the street. The material specs need to be added to the plan. S. Latham asked if the shutters were operable, they are, and they double on each other. Brick to be used is Danish blend. R. Coburn asked for rationale for box bay window. It provides for a better use of the room on the inside. There is a similar one on porch, he stated in person it makes more sense. It reads late Victorian touch on Colonial. The raked sunlight and shading on the plan accentuates not in a good way. R. Coburn asked about the shed dormer, it gives it more definition and shadow line.

MOTION by J. Brodlieb, second Chair Stevenson

To **approve the application of ALEXANDER ROBERTSON subject to approved material specs added on the plans.**

On Vote: Chair Stevenson, J. Brodlieb and S. Latham

Nay: R. Coburn

On the application of **27 POST LANE LLC**, 27 Post Lane, present for the applicant was Jeffrey Gibbons, Chair stated that the Board will not hear because of late submission of plans. He stated that it is not that different before. The Board will not hear the application when they have not had time to review the submissions.

MOTION by Chair Stevenson, second S. Latham

To **adjourn for all purposes the application of 27 POST LANE LLC to the January 13, 2020 public hearing because of late submission of materials.**

On Vote: Chair Stevenson, J. Brodlieb, R. Coburn and S. Latham

On the application of **LILLIAN FERNANDEZ**, 67 Captains Neck Lane, Lisa Zaloga was present, affidavits of mailing and posting. This is a dormer expansion, there is a dormer that is being extended to a larger roof form. It is a small dormer addition. The Board liked the change to the roofline with the addition of the dormer.

MOTION by R. Coburn, second S. Latham

To **approve the application of LILLIAN FERNANDEZ.**

On Vote: Chair Stevenson, J. Brodlieb, R. Coburn and S. Latham

PUBLIC HEARINGS – HISTORIC

On the application of **THOMAS & MEREDITH JOYCE**, 765 Hill Street, this application is adjourned to January 27, 2020 public hearing.

MOTION by R. Coburn, second S. Latham

To **approve the applicant's request for adjournment on the application of THOMAS & MEREDITH JOYCE to the January 27, 2020 public hearing.**

On Vote: Chair Stevenson, J. Brodlieb, R. Coburn and S. Latham

On the application of **LIFTON GREEN LLC**, 270 Ox Pasture Road, there is a letter requesting adjournment to the January 27, 2020 public hearing.

MOTION by Chair Stevenson, second R. Coburn

To **approve the applicant's request for adjournment on the application of LIFTON GREEN LLC to the January 27, 2020 public hearing.**

On Vote: Chair Stevenson, J. Brodlieb, R. Coburn and S. Latham

On the application of **POFAHL & JIMINEZ**, 471 Hill Street, present for the applicant was Brian Brady. Affidavits of mailing and posting have been submitted. R. Coburn declared that he is a friend but can be objective, he does not feel the need to recuse himself on this application. They are adding windows and changing roof line on the back. The front elevation is south, the existing was approved but the front is unchanged. On A-7 will give the major change, there is an existing lean-to addition, they are changing the roof line to be more in keeping of the architecture of the house. It gives opportunity to see through the house as you walk in. Also they are adding more transom windows that match the front because same room interior and more balanced. A5 has not changed on the portion of right of way. On the west elevation there is a fireplace and the existing windows butt up against it and they are being separated to balance it and they have added transoms. There is a letter of support from the neighbor.

J. Brodlieb noted that he feels that Ann Pine has concern that the artist studio and changing the lean to, it changes the nature of original purpose of the house. Z. Studenroth states a use, it is not architectural meaning wise. The front façade on the south is a defining statement and it is unchanged, by modifying rear façade is not a major departure. The original use is not architectural. The fenestration and centered door still looks the same, hers is a theoretical concern. S. Latham feels the four light lantern changes the look; the cupola adds light. The skylight that are being removed were put in the 70's, so not original to the house. If the form on the back was original then it would be preserved, but it is not. The addition date is not known.

MOTION by Chair, second S. Stevenson

To close for written decision on the application of POFAHL & JIMINEZ.

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

Nay: S. Latham

On the application of **WHITE FENCE INC**, 409 First Neck Lane, affidavits of mailing and posting were submitted but they were the Planning Board form, since they are essentially the same form with all the same information, she will revise the affidavit per Counsel and be recalled to present later.

On the application of **BLC HILLSIDE INVESTMENTS LLC**, 132 South Main Street, present for the applicant was attorney Tiffany Scarlatto, and architect Ray Booth. Affidavits of mailing and posting were submitted. The pool cabana was not approved by the ZBA, but barn was approved by the ZBA. This house is before the Planning Board as well. The garage will be in more conformance once moved, lot line mod from the Planning Board will make all conforming. Chair was concerned about the lot coverage; it is very confusing. These approvals are not part of the file but need to be. The barn has approval to be moved and changed. They will only deal with barn.

R. Booth noted that the barn was constructed in 1972. Existing barn is not original to the property. It exists in a non-conforming location. On the north elevation at the top the goal is to keep exposed cedar shake on roof, removing 3 skylights and replacing with three shed dormers and they will do vertical cedar plank and add two garage doors and cedar shingle in the middle. Larger shed dormer over two sliding barn doors will be added. The cupola stays on the house, since it exists. The pergola is proposed to provide a walk from house to garage structure. The back or east elevation has three windows above and a door and two windows flanking. Dark cedar shake with white windows are the materials, a sample was shown, and it is black. R. Booth stated that in the landscape it falls into shadow and doesn't stand out. There is not landscape plan, but the perspectives demonstrate their goals to get mature specimen trees. J. Brodlieb noted that if it falls into the landscape plan then it should be part of the submission. He feels the two elements have to be there; they can provide that to the Board. Chair doesn't like the black shingles or the pergola.

Z. Studenroth referred to the page with color aerial views, the building labeled 5. The façade gable is not the same architectural feature that is being represented now. It looks like a building built in the 1880's. They will provide proof it was built in 1972. The orientation will change, and the façade will not be seen when that is done. There will be a reduction of what is seen. Z. Studenroth noted that the carriage barn is where it is supposed to be for this property to the house of that period. It is in the position it is supposed to be for the time period of the history. J. Brodlieb is concerned how is it going to present from the street, does it lose the character, it gives the impression of a period house. Z. Studenroth asked about the variance received, they got approval to move the barn. The flag lot adjoins the Presbyterian church, they can see it from the street according to Chair. T. Scarlatto will get the history of the building. The Board doesn't like the plan. Most of the properties have lost carriage barns, so the character preservation is important. Z. Studenroth is wondering if they can visit the building. The Board feels this is getting bigger and bigger with more construction. It is not being presented all at the same time, the bigger context is necessary. Connecting accessory building is not an architectural thing. Chair feels this lot is extremely busy, if it wasn't existing it wouldn't be available. T. Scarlatto will get survey with lot coverage. R. Coburn is struggling with windows in stair well up to second floor and dormer on south side is a funny angle when seen from west which is what will be seen from street. What he likes is the current symmetry and separation between the two. What is proposed is quirky in his opinion. The barn is 24.3' tall. They request adjournment to provide more barn information.

MOTION by R. Coburn, second Chair Stevenson

To approve the applicant's request for adjournment on the application of BLC HILLSIDE INVESTMENTS LLC to the January 13, 2020 public hearing.

On Vote: Chair Stevenson, J. Brodlieb, R. Coburn and S. Latham

On the application of **WHITE FENCE INC**, present for the applicant was Caroline Catalano. Corrected affidavits of mailing and posting were submitted. They are restoring the house back to its original state. They want to remove wood deck that was built in 1981, on the rear west they will bring doors back to windows and remove deck. They will be converting an existing window into a door. They will match the proposed to the house. The exterior door will be storm door with double Dutch door. There is a photo that shows what is existing on the house. There is an existing door that will have an extended landing with stairs to grade and pavers with grass in between. The other change requested is a sunroom door that will be removed and replaced with window. The corner wrapping around has 3 bay by 3 bay windows, but they will not add a column. They want to restore the porch. There is one non-functioning chimney that they are proposing to remove. It goes up through the garage and the roof. It is the kitchen chimney but can't be seen from the front of the house according to Z. Studenroth, he is curious about the condition of the chimney, it is occupying space that they would like to claim but they can leave it, it was original to the house. The other mods are not problematic to Z. Studenroth. Chair asked if they were to approve, they would make it conditional on not taking chimney out. Donald Wilson, the builder, stated it is not the kitchen chimney. This chimney was never used, it is completely clean. The actual flue is on the side deck. Z. Studenroth stands corrected, the larger chimney is for the kitchen, the smaller secondary could have been for servants, they'd like it left in place though.

MOTION by R. Coburn, second S. Latham

To close for written decision on the application of WHITE FENCE INC subject to the condition that the chimney remain.

On Vote: Chair Stevenson, J. Brodlieb, R. Coburn and S. Latham

On the application of **INNOVENTOR PROPERTIES LLC**, 224 Great Plains Road, present for the applicant was Lisa Zaloga. Affidavits of mailing and posting were submitted. This is for an amendment to a January approval to build two 65 square foot pavilions on the south side of pool. The new proposal is to reduce to one on west side. The look and form will stay the same, but roof pitch will be lower to 10' tall, it is 250' off of road squarely behind the building.

MOTION by R. Coburn, second Chair Stevenson

To close for written decision on the application of INNOVENTOR PROPERTIES LLC.

On Vote: Chair Stevenson, J. Brodlieb, R. Coburn and S. Latham

REQUEST FOR LANDMARKING

On the application of **OUR LADY OF POLAND RC CHURCH**, 35 Maple Street, there is a letter in the file requesting adjournment. R. Coburn asked to make them aware of SHIPO trust for landmarking, Z. Studenroth will let them know.

MOTION by Chair Stevenson, second R. Coburn

To approve the applicant's request for adjournment for all purposes on the application of OUR LADY OF POLAND RC CHURCH.

On Vote: Chair Stevenson, J. Brodlieb, R. Coburn and S. Latham

ADVISORY CASES FROM ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

On the application of **LIFTON GREEN LLC**, 270 Ox Pasture Road, there is a letter in the file requesting adjournment to the January 27, 2020 public hearing.

MOTION by Chair Stevenson, second R. Coburn

To **approve the applicant's request for adjournment on the application of LIFTON GREEN LLC to the January 27, 2020 public hearing.**

On Vote: Chair Stevenson, J. Brodlieb, R. Coburn and S. Latham

R. Coburn mentioned that next public hearing will be a discussion to address new procedures for signage by the Board to be more efficient and user friendly for applicants.

MOTION by R. Coburn, second Chair Stevenson

To **close tonight's meeting.**

On Vote: Chair Stevenson, J. Brodlieb, R. Coburn and S. Latham

Respectfully Submitted by:

JoLee Sanchez

File Date:

Village Clerk