

Inc. Village of Southampton
Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation
December 13, 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, December 13, 2021 at 7pm.

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

MOTION by Chair second by P. DeWitt

To open tonight's meeting.

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

Counsel for the board, Alice Cooley is present.

Chair notes that tonight's agenda is expected to be lengthy evening. He proposes the addition of a meeting December 28th and would allow for applicants to volunteer to adjourn their matter to this supplemental meeting. There are no volunteers. A fifteen minute break will be provided at 9pm tonight.

Motion by Chair second by P. DeWitt

To approve the minutes of November 22, 2021

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

On the matter of **David and Holly Sherr** there is a written decision in the file.

Motion by Chair second by M. McIntire

To **approve** the application of **David and Holly Sherr** as written

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

On the application of **And By the Way Trust Subtrust A and And By The Way Trust Subtrust B**, there is a request for an adjournment. This is their third request for an adjournment. They will need to repost and re mail prior to being heard again.

On the application of **Orest Blist**, 88 Meadow Lane, John Bennett is here to represent the applicant. He has invited Valerie Campbell, co counsel and Susan Snyder and George Thomas from Civic Visions to present tonight. Ms. Snyder and Mr. Thomas were retained to review the proposal in front of the board. They previously submitted to the file an extensive report with their findings. They feel as though the board is constrained to the timeline of Village legislation. They state that none of the Norman Jaffe houses in existence were landmarked in 2009. Two other houses designed by Norman Jaffe on the same street have been demolished. Mr. Thomas tells the board that when 88 Meadow Lane was original proposed to the ARB of that time, it was required that it be completely screened from the street due to its modern design. Ms. Snyder explains that their firm found the integrity of the home to have been lost. The subdivision of 88 Meadow Lane in 2000 changed how the house sits on the lot and the entrance to the property. Instead of the original command of the house, it is cramped on its lot with substantially altered views. The 2008 addition was extensive, bastardizing the original design.

Inc. Village of Southampton
Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation
December 13, 2021

There was a massive new roof line added, rivaling the original roof. New materials and shapes have been added. The property has been massively altered since the dwellings construction, the subdivision, alterations to materials and massive additions destroyed the integrity of the house. Mr. Thomas questions Alistair Gordon's report that was previously submitted to the file. Mr. Thomas explains that the design of the house is deficient. The house was built to meet the minimum standards of its time, these standards have change extensively. This is a two story house that is split into seven different levels, while this impracticality was easy to ignore earlier in life, it has become more evident as the homeowner has grown older. In Norman Jaffe's own book, this property is barely mentioned; its notoriety was due to the conflict it presented to the Southampton Village ARB. Ms. Campbell is acting as co counsel with Mr. Bennett. After much research into this matter she feels that this house is appropriate of demolition. She finds it ironic that the owners will have as much difficulty demolishing a house whose design was met with much opposition when first proposed. She notes that this property has not previously been flagged as a landmarked property. It is her professional opinion that 88 Gin Lane is not a significant work of Norman Jaffe. Even if it once had been, the house has been altered in such a way that has greatly diminished its integrity. It is also her opinion that the denial of the Certificate of Appropriateness for demolition would be arbitrary and capricious.

Mr. DeWitt would like to point out that property setting is also within their guidelines, particularly properties along the beachfront. 88 Meadow Lane today conforms to this guideline, Mr. DeWitt would maintain that because of how the building blends in with the landscape it is worthy of preservation. The roofline blends organically with the dunes and its massing has been diminished by the void in the roof. He feels that the large addition could be removed and the original house would be intact. Prior boards have allowed Norman Jaffe designs to be demolished; since then the views of modernism and Jaffe's work have changed. This board finds it worthy of saving.

Ms. Latham points out that when the nation registry nomination took place, this house was only twelve years old - landmarking this house was not on anybody's mind at the time, it simply wasn't old enough then. She noted that 170 Meadow Lane was built in 1985 and was only 18 years old when it was demolished. This mistake should not be repeated. She believes that as an early work of Norman Jaffe, this house should be retained. Mr. McIntire does believe that this house makes a significant impact on the historic district. This was the first Norman Jaffe house built in Southampton. The construction of this new design on Meadow Lane made way for modernism to be considered on Meadow Lane. The controversy that this design caused is a reason for preservation. Mr. Gregory agrees with his fellow board members. Because prior boards made mistakes should not mean that this board can not turn things around now. Mr. Bennett feels that Mr. DeWitt's interpretation of section 8 in this case is not relevant to this application. At this time the only application that is before the board is a demolition. Personnel changes on the board does not change the precedent that has been set by the Architectural Review Board as its own body. He feels that the 2019 demolition of another Norman Jaffe house also located on Meadow Lane has set the precedent to allow for the demolition of 88 Meadow Lane. As somebody who handles a lot of historic projects, Ms. Campbell would like to note that she always takes a look at whether or not a building has been altered, and this one certainly has. She also looks at how the historic districts have been regulated throughout time. She finds it surprising that the board feels that this structure is worthy of historic preservation. The removal of this house would not change the cohesiveness or the character of the historic district in her opinion.

Inc. Village of Southampton
Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation
December 13, 2021

Ms. Cooley has requested an interpretation from NYSHPO as to how the ARB should handle an application like this one. She received a letter back noting that the board should refer to chapter 65-5 when considering a certificate of appropriateness and is not bound by the National Register 50 year rule. Local historic preservation is local - it can designate properties. She would like to note that 210 Meadow Lane was marked by an error of law. The board at the time believed they were bound by law to allow for the demolition. The written decision expressed the boards wish for preservation and the Board believed they had no jurisdiction, which is incorrect. The Board also found 210 Meadow Lane to be structurally unsound. Ms. Cooley would also like to note that a letter submitted to 210 Meadow Lane file by Alistair Gordon stated that the house was built as a spec house and made of cheap materials and was not Jaffe's best work. She feels that this only speaks to Mr. Gordon's impartiality that the applicant had questioned. With regard to 170 Meadow lane there is very little in the file, a written decision was not included in the file. However, if the board feels that the Certificate of Appropriateness for demolition granted in 2003 was a mistake, the board is not bound by a decision that was made twenty years ago. She also notes that the board is not bound to repeat past mistakes, the needs of the municipality may change, the board can reach a different result based on slightly discernible differences and does not have to allow the demolition of this structure because 210 Meadow Lane was granted a demolition permit some years ago. The Board may defer to its own expert in a battle of the experts and the Board's expert concluded that the addition did not make the house lack integrity because the essential forms that gave the house its identity, remained intact. According to Chair, Southampton is known for its beach and the beach is very much a part of the public way. He shares photographs from the public beach which shows 88 Meadow Lane very much visible. He notes how the roofline flows into the dune, become part of the natural landscape. The code allows the board to preserve works of prominent architects. He feels, that like many artists, recognition often comes after time; this is a prime example of that. While this may not have been a structure of note thirty, forty years ago, things have changed. We are looking at this property at this time. Chair agrees that with his fellow board members that the request for Certificate of Appropriateness should be denied.

Motion by Chair second by J. Gregory

To **close** the application of **Orest Bliss** with the intent of denying the application

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

On the application of **27 Gin Lane**, affidavits of mailing and posting have been submitted to the file. The applicant requests an adjournment to the additional meeting of December 28th, 2021.

Motion by Chair second by M. McIntire

To **adjourn** the application of **27 Gin Lane**

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

On the Application of **Beechwood Latch, LLC**, 109 Hill Street, Steven Dubb and David Gilmartin are here to represent the applicant. They are here to discuss changes to the landscape plan and the construction of a pergola. They are proposing 6-7 ft. Laurel and Cyprus trees. The pergola will be 17' x 17'. Chair feels that these properties are of deep historic context. When the application was first heard, there was a lot of conversation that took place around the historic integrity of structures that were on the property. Now he feels that the applicant is presenting a structure that counter acts the extensive work that was done to preserve the historic integrity of the property. Mr. Gregory is concerned with the large trees that have been planted. He wonders

Inc. Village of Southampton
Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation
December 13, 2021

if it was the intent of the original application to to preserve the view of these historic structures, why are we blocking it? Chair confirms that the landscaping that is planted was on the previously approved plan. Mr. Gregory notes that landscaping that would further screen the views would be a concern to him. Ms. Latham is not in agreement with the pergola, she would even go as far to say that she would not agree with the barbecue area. She feels the it is inappropriate for this historic site. Mr. Dubb clarifies that there will not be a fireplace. Mr. DeWitt would rather not see a pergola on this site. He wonders if the plantings around the pool are meant to grow tall or will they be maintained at the size planted? Mr. Dubb confirms the intent is to maintain them at 7'. Mr. McIntire finds it odd that you need to go to the opposite side of the pool to get to the pergola, this chops the property up. Mr. DeWitt and Ms. Latham agree. Mr. Gilmartin points out that it has been suggested that the Board has control over the pool, he would like to note that the code specifically states that the pool is not under this boards jurisdiction. This application was subject to extensive review by all of the Village's land use boards, in this process it was determined that the Terry Cottage property and the Village Latch properties are two separate lots. Pools and pool enclosures are a big health and safety component of all municipalities. The plantings that are in the middle of the yard are there to screen the pool safety fence that is required. Chair does not feel that there is board support for the pergola. When the project was first presented to the Architectural Review Board it was presented as one cohesive project. Mr. Gilmartin states that he was not misspeaking, he clarifies that it was the Zoning Board of Appeals determination that the properties be two separate properties. The original landscape plan did not have a pool and one has now been added, this has created in the Chairs opinion, a situation which changed the landscaping before them. Ms. Latham notes that there is a lot of hardscape on the property that would not have been a part of the historic fabric of the property.

Motion by Chair second by J. Gregory

To **adjourn** the application of **Beechwood Latch, LLC to the January 10, 2022 meeting**

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

On the application of **BHNH, LLC**, 109 Hampton Road, John Bennett and John Grew are here to represent the applicant. This is essentially a legal presentation. Mr. Bennett submitted to the board December 9th his interpretation of the code in question. They are proposing a dormer to increase the ceiling height in a set of stairs. This is a level 2 alteration, this triggers the need for increased headroom in the stairwell to meet current code as this is a means of egress. In order to obtain proper height of 6'8" in the stairwell a dormer is needed. Ms. Cooley was not able to find any clear case law regarding this matter, she has requested additional information from New York State to provide additional guidance. Mr. Bennett suggests speaking with Mr. Smith in the state who deals with the state building codes. Mr. DeWitt would like to know why the applicant cannot move the stair; the board is asked to allow a change to the exterior of a historic structure when a solution can be found internally. Ms. Latham feels that a tread removal would be a solution to this problem. Mr. McIntire has gone back to the original drawing. This solution still does not solve this problem, the landing can be lowered giving the required headroom. Chair states that the applicant purchased a historic house, they came before the board previously and agreed not to put dormers on this house. If every historic house that was remodeled had to meet current codes - what historic homes would be left? He agrees with his fellow board members that there is an internal solution to this problem and exterior changes are not necessary. Chapter 11 of NYS code outlines different stages of renovation and the need for the conformity to current

Inc. Village of Southampton
Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation
December 13, 2021

building codes. Mr. Benincasa, retired Town of Southampton Building Inspector is here to explain to the board how these codes apply to this project. Any new elements added need to be compliant with New York State Building Code, this is a new stairway and therefore needs to meet code.

Motion by Chair second by J. Gregory

To **adjourn** the application of **BHNH LLC** to January 10, 2022

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

On the application of **Post Crossing, LLC**, this matter is adjourned pending Zoning Board of Appeals

On the application of **Fairlane Realty Corp**, 242 S. Main Street, there is a request for an adjournment to January 24th 2022

Motion by Chair second by J. Gregory

To **Adjourn** the application of **Fairlane Realty Corp** with the requirement that the applicant repost and mail the property

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

On the application of **Alvise Orsini and Geoffroy VanRaemdonck**, 143 Herrick Road John Bennett and Lisa Zaloga are here to represent the applicant. Chair notes that in conversations with the Zoning Board of Appeals Chair, they have discussed collaboration on this project. Mr. Bennett would like to note that the application currently before the ZBA is withdrawn. Mr. Gregory says that there was confusion on the part of the applicant, the board had referred the applicant to the zoning board to find what can be done on the lot. Mr. Bennett feels that the conversation between the zoning board of appeals chair and the ARB chair regarding a pending application before solely the ARB was not appropriate and he is in objection. Ms. Zaloga is here to present the plans. The original structure was constructed somewhere around 1909 and has had many different uses in its lifetime, both residential and commercial. The current owner has a family and would be using it as their home. There is a good portion of the house that cannot be accessed from the interior of the house. The primary goal is to create lower level bedrooms and an internal stair. The scope of work has been reduced since the original proposal. The current design includes a 19.5' projection, the addition will be glass that is similar to the glass entry that has been seen in several of the old photographs. The existing stairway is going to remain as is, with the exception of putting the glass facade back underneath the existing overhang as shown in historic photos shared with the board. The addition has been reduced by about 57% in the projection to the south property line. The entire south brick facade will be maintained. Ms. Zaloga believes these changes address the concerns that the board has previously shared. There has been some conversation as to whether the addition should just project to the west and not to the south. Ms. Zaloga also shares some photos of the pool and gazebo area to demonstrate the relationship that they have. Both structures can be seen on the Sanborn map, the pool was put installed in the 1980s. After reviewing the guidelines provided for adding on to a historic house, Ms. Zaloga feels that have hit all of the suggestions. This house is on a corner lot so there is no place in which the an addition would not be visible from the street. They have put it in a location that does reduce the line of site from the street. They have placed the additions in a way that they would be able to removed leaving the original structure intact. The materials that are proposed are in keeping with the existing structure. They have lowered the height of the pavilion

Inc. Village of Southampton
Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation
December 13, 2021

that they are adding on. They have shortened it by about six feet in an attempt to minimize the projection south. The glass is very reminiscent of the existing light cuts and the gazebo. The goal is to paint the windows and the addition a grey color. There was some conversation as to whether or not it was ever white; the inventory form does indicate that it was. Ms. Zaloga shares a photo of the Rogers Memorial Library, which was once painted red and has recently been painted white and grey. Mr. Bennett would like to say that this house makes its presence known on Little Plains Road where the tower is facing, it does not carry the same presence on Herrick Road. They are trying to protect as much of the fabric of the dwelling as much as possible. He feels that they are in adherence with the codes, they are under the allowable GFA by a considerable amount. If this were to be continued along the west, Mr. Bennett feels that it would go against the historic guidelines - to make it subservient and removable. Mr. DeWitt has a minor point he would like to make, he would ask that all existing openings and tracery on the west elevation be maintained, he understands that these would open to an interior space. Mr. Bennett believes that this could be achieved. Mr. DeWitt wondered if it would be possible to extend the first floor to the north. It would provide for another four feet and would allow the addition project that much less to the south. Mr. Gregory agrees with Mr. DeWitt especially in regards to the western wall. His only concern with the last design was the two rooflines at the same height. This new design however, looks more massive; it reminds him of a caboose on a train. Mr. Bennett agrees that he prefers the prior design as well. Mr. McIntire agrees with Ms. Zaloga regarding the relationship of the pergola and pool and does not think that should change. However, he feels that the columns look heavy and contemporary against the original structure. Referring back to the historic photos shares, he notes there is a lighter feel to it. He does like the subservient roof line. Ms. Zaloga imagines that this could be recreated, there are currently four posts that would need to be removed. She wonders if the boards would be comfortable with the removal of those posts. What is there will stay there. It is the rendering that is making the columns look heavier than they are. Ms. Latham reviewed the nomination report from the state, and the front area was a long glass area at one point in time. She notes that the brackets nor the cornus details are included on the current proposal. Ms. Zaloga explains the rendering was taken off of a photo and they just infilled the glass doors, this is the current roofline and the current posts. Mr. McIntire thinks that the columns are not as wide, but you are seeing the frame work of the windows behind. Ms. Latham would like to see the heavier muttons and mullions as shown in the second design. Ms. Zaloga sites the they can go back to that and create rectangular panes. Mr. DeWitt would like to see a scrape to see what was there first. Ms. Latham notes that this can come from Mr. Sofield, a prior owner as he did a sypctrofotometry analysis on the paint. As far as the addition goes, she finds the front stoop a bit odd. Perhaps the steps could be on the west side, removing the flanking stairs. Ms. Zaloga wants to know if the board would like to go back to the second design that was proposed at the last hearing with the change of the roofline to make it subservient to that of the existing house. Mr. McIntire thinks that the simple projection with one roofline is successful. Mr. DeWitt suggests designing the entry with the heavy muttons and keep the addition light and airy. Ms. Latham is in agreement with that, it creates contrast. Mr. Bennett is not unappreciative of the direction, but has concern with agreeing to something that requires the approval of the Zoning Board of Appeals. This matter does not meet the five hardship test and an approval is not guaranteed. He is happy to make the application, however they would need the support of the ARB to go forward. Mr. Gregory does not think ZBA would be necessary, the board has provided feedback and thinks that a solution has been found that would not encroach on setbacks.

Inc. Village of Southampton
Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation
December 13, 2021

Motion by Chair second by M. McIntire

To **adjourn** the application of **Alvise Orsini and Geoffroy VanRaemdonck** to December 28, 2021

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

On the application of **Diane Pisido**, 172 Sommerset Avenue, this is an application for driveway gates. Affidavits of mailing and posting have been submitted to the file.

Motion by Chair second by

To **adjourn** the application of **Diane Pisido** to December 28, 2021

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

On the application of **252 First Neck Lane, LLC**, 252 First Neck Lane, Oliver Cope is here to represent the applicant. This is an application for a pergola, as discussed at the last hearing, the column spacing was changed to A-B-B-A on both sides, and he reduced the massing and scale. The board members are happy with the changes.

Motion by Chair second by P. DeWitt

To close the application of **252 First Neck Lane, LLC** for written decision

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

On the application of **Hamptons Harbor LLC**, 103 Great Plains Road, John Bennett is here to represent the application. This is a demolition request. The property is located within the Historic District and that's why he is before the board tonight however, this house was built in 2011. Mr. McIntire would like to note that there are specimen trees on the property. Because this property is in the historic district, further Board approval would be necessary for landscaping and the removal of those trees. According to the Chairman this application is for just the house and structures on the property and not any trees. Mr. Bennett states that there are two trees on the property that are tagged for removal, they do not have any limbs left. There is plenty of room to demolish the structures without disturbing any trees.

Motion by Chair second by P. DeWitt

To **Close** the application of **Hamptons Harbor LLC** for written decision

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

On the application of **Smithtown Partners LLC**, 40 Meadow Lane, Michael Sendlenski is here to represent the applicant along with Stuart Diston of Austin Patterson Diston Architects and Steven Neroda of Araiys Design. They are proposing the addition of an elevator to provide access to all levels of the home. This will require roof line changes. This addition is going to push the house out to the north 3 feet 3 inches. They have designed the limited use elevator, something that is small and will carry two occupants at a time. This is a mobility issue for the homeowners. They are taking the existing facade three feet to the north and then they will reconnect it to the front of the addition, making room for the elevator while maintaining the elevation. The actual roofline encompassing the elevator will be a change. They are proposing a zinc roof and are mirroring it on the east elevation for symmetry. They are working with the landscape architects to mitigate any change that may be seen from the street. As Chair looks at the renderings he feels that the perspective is not true, he thinks that three feet on a house of this size can be significant. Mr. Gregory is concerned with the changes to the street facing view, While he appreciates the struggle to find an appropriate site for the elevator, he feels the

Inc. Village of Southampton
Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation
December 13, 2021

additions give it a more commercial look. Ms. Latham agrees with Chair that the perspective is not quite accurate, however in the scheme of things she does not have particular issue with the changes proposed, she appreciates the symmetry. Mr. DeWitt agrees it does have more of a commercial look, however the thought and care that went into this is evident and would tend to agree with it. Mr. McIntire agrees with Ms. Latham that the symmetry is something to appreciate, though it gives a more commercial look. He confirmed that this addition is within the allowable setbacks. He would be inclined to approve the application. Mr. Gregory wonders if the second story balconies have been removed? They have not, they are existing behind the facade. Chair encourages his fellow board members to drive by at night, he feels this addition would increase the light pollution. Mr. Gregory feels that this is a problem that is already there, while does he particularly like the design, he doesn't feel three feet would make a difference at this point. The windows will be opaque panels. Chair feels that the size of the house and the massing would be affected by the addition. This is a large house, space can be found to house an elevator internally. Mr. DeWitt agrees with Chair after a closer look. The balconies had lended themselves to the dimension of the house, now that they are gone the house appears more massive and boxier. Mr. Sendlenski wonders if there is any guidance as to where they would like to see the elevator. Mr. Gregory says that it is not necessarily the location, but the design. There are other options to be explored. Ted Fire, owners representative is here. He wonders if the architects look at softening the color of the dormers at the top to better blend them into the structure, if the Board would be more amenable to the design. They did explore several other locations for this elevator and this has appeared to be their best option. Mr. DeWitt thinks that the design is well done aside from the loss of dimensionality. He does not think it is the material selection that is an issue. Mr. Diston notes there is a way to reduce the elevator cab slightly, this may push them back 10 inches creating more dimension. Mr. Gregory thinks that they are headed in the right direction with that idea. Mr. DeWitt wonders if a shed roof would work. Mr. Diston explains that in exploring that it created more volume. He thinks the solution would be lower and tighter. It is clear to Mr. DeWitt that a lot of thought was put into this and he appreciates that.

Motion by Chair second by M. McIntire

To **adjourn** the application of **Smithtown Partners, LLC** to January 10, 2022

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

On the application of **9toCNL LLC**, 92 Coopers Neck Lane, Melissa Dedovitch and Thomas Kligerman are here to represent the applicant. Affidavits of mailing and posting have been submitted to the file. This is a 4.6 acre property that receive approval from this board previously for the construction of the dwelling. They are now before the board for four accessory structures in the rear yard. There will be a pool pavilion and two garden buildings connected by a pergola. This will be well planted out to be made not visible from the street. The colors and materials are to match the existing building. Mr. DeWitt feels the design is masterful. Mr. McIntire agrees, the scale is wonderful.

Motion by Chair second by M. McIntire

To **close** the application of **9toCNL LLC** for written decision with the intent to approve

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

On the application of **The Bathing Corporation of Southampton**, 14 Gin Lane, Don King, Kerin Guidera and Tony Panza are here to represent the application. Affidavits of mailing and

Inc. Village of Southampton
Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation
December 13, 2021

posting have been submitted to the file. They are proposing the addition of an arcade and faux chimney over an existing brick patio. This is to mimic the addition done to the main cafeteria building. The materials will match existing, stucco and red roof tiles. The only view from the street that will change is the chimney. Mr. DeWitt thinks it looks great and does not have any issues. Mr. Gregory agrees, he's happy to see the exhaust fans disappear. The view from the street will be improved.

Motion by Chair second by M. McIntire

To **close** the application of **The Bathing Corporation of Southampton** with the intent to approve the application

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

On the application of **DCK Windham, LLC**, 35 Herrick Road, the chair has advised the building inspector that the gates have been installed without approval.

Motion by Chair second by J. Gregory

To **remove** the application of **DCK Windham, LLC** from the agenda

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

On the application of **Heart of the Hamptons**, this matter has been adjourned

On the application of **31 Rosko Developer LLC**, the applicant has requested an adjournment.

At the last hearing the board noted that they would like a stop work order in place. He feels that this application would require re noticing. Mr. Gregory feels that due to the nature of the application the adjournment request shouldn't be granted. Ms. Cooley feels the application should be re posted and emailed

Motion by Chair second by M. McIntire

To **adjourn** the application of **31 Rosko Developer LLC** to January 24th, 2022 with the requirement that they readvertise.

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

On the application of **Margaret Lewis** 63 Dale Street, there is a request for an adjournment

Motion by Chair second by P. DeWitt

To **adjourn** the application of **Margaret Lewis** to December 28, 2021

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

On the application of **John Browne**, 94 Pelletreau Street, BJ Steinbrecher and Steven Naroda of Araiys Design are here to represent the applicant. They have lowered the entire structure plus patios and porches by one foot. On the east side they changed the roof from a Gabel to a hip roof, this has reduced the massing on that elevation. They have changed on the front elevation the front door; they now have a single door. They have reduced the picture window above the front door to three feet to match. They reduced the grill patterns to lessen how busy they appeared. The original design had one large garage door, this new proposal splits it into two 9' doors. Mr. DeWitt wonders if a west end hip roof was ever submitted. Mr. Steinbrecher states one was never submitted, however he did create a rendering where both the east and west elevation were changed to a hip roof. The board is favorable of the hip roof on both sides. Mr. McIntire thinks that the front door without sidelights looks a little light Mr. DeWitt agrees, given the size of the house the may want increase the size of the door. Mr. Steinbrecher agrees, he will

Inc. Village of Southampton
Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation
December 13, 2021

change that to a 42” door. Ms. Latham would like to see divided light in the picture window. She would also like to note that she feels the scale and the massing is out of character with the neighborhood. She does feel this will be helped with the change in roof line. Steve Neroda is here to discuss the landscaping plan. He has looked at the mature landscaping that is on the property already, there are some that will require to be removed. They would introduce a 6-7’ hedge planted around the main portion of the property, a 4’-5’ hedge along the pole portion of the lot; boxwood and hydrangea along the foundation of the house. Mr. Gregory thinks the landscaping plan looks fine. John Lu of 96 Pelletreau Street is here, he goes back to his comments from the last meeting and the letter he sent to the board previously. He feels strongly that all existing trees should be saved at all costs. The previous owner was a landscaper himself and tended to the property. The trees have been here a long time and Mr. Lu feels that they are part of the heritage of the neighborhood. Along with the concerns with the landscaping, he would like to echo the concerns of Ms. Latham in that the massing of the house is out of scale with the rest of the neighborhood. Hemming in the properties with arborvitae has created a feel of artificialness to Ms. Latham, you loose the feel of the neighborhood. Mr. Neroda notes that there is a lot of competition along the perimeter with trees shadowing others out. The removal of some of these trees will allow for the ones that are left to thrive and preform better. Chair would like to walk the property with Mr. Neroda to better understand the landscaping plan.

Motion by Chair second by S. Latham

To **adjourn** the application of **John Browne** to December 28, 2021

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

On the application of **Robert M. Roberts** , 75 Heady Creek Lane, Gary Hartmann and Paul Clinton are here to represent the applicant. Mr. Clinton is the architect on the project. The plan is to isolate the construction to the north portion of the house. The existing house has a garage and they are looking to add 12.5 feet to the garage to create an office space, bathroom and stairway. A second floor addition would consist of additional bedrooms and bathroom. This project has been before the Zoning Board of Appeals and relief for side yard setback has been granted. They plan on keeping the existing plantings. The house has a low hip roof, they are proposing modifications to that. They will keep all of the existing trim and siding, will be replacing windows in kind. Ms. Latham notes that the elevations and the drawings are conflicting, one shows vertical siding whereas the other horizontal. New plans would need to be submitted that shows the proper materials. This is not a design that Ms. Latham believes is not appropriate for the Village of Southampton. Mr. McIntire and Mr. DeWitt would have to agree, changes need to be made. Mr. Hartmann notes that they started out by trying to create an office and additional bedrooms for the family. They were faced with the challenges of wetlands on the property which constricts the area of the lot that is buildable. As they designed the addition they did realized it is a little out of scale for the existing house.

Motion by M. McIntire second by P. DeWitt

To **adjourn** the application of **Robert M. Roberts**

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

On the application of **Eric Ruttenberg**, 96 Captains Neck Lane, Will Shultz is here to represent the applicant. Affidavits of mailing and posting have been submitted to the file. The house is preexisting nonconforming, the property is undersized in the R40 zoning district. The property is imposed with two front yards. The property is well screened with mature landscaping. They

Inc. Village of Southampton
Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation
December 13, 2021

have split up the parking area to three cars in the front and two additional cars in the back to lessen the amount of gravel on the street. This is a one story addition. The windows and door will be marver, the roof and siding will be red cedar to match existing, the soffits are white beaded and center beaded, the covered porch deck will be mahogany. Mr. Gregory likes the sprawling ranch look.

Motion by Chair second J. Gregory

To **approve** the application of **Eric Ruttenberg**

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

On the application of **Alice Maria Guimarin**, 82 Prospect Street, Ms. Guimarin, Kyle Collins and Perry Sayles are here to represent the applicant. The project includes the renovation of covered porch, the addition of shed dormers and a small addition. Prospect street is characterized by properties that are fairly well screened. The proposed additions will be to the rear of the house and incorporated into the north / south ridge line. Mr. Sayles explains that they are turning the existing porch into a year round sun room with a small addition. They have extended the dormers to create more usable floor space. They are planning to move the driveway and add a door into the existing mudroom. The sunroom at the rear will have sets of double hung windows, two thirty inch double hung windows separated by supports and there will be a set of French doors to the pool area. They have added a small railing along the top of the sunroom. Mr. McIntire notes that the drawings shown are different that what the board members have received. The material will be mostly glass with board and batten. The original proposal had sliding windows, after further discussion they have decided to go with the double hung. The file at this time would be incomplete due to these inconsistencies. Mr. McIntire and Mr. Gregory feel as though the railing along the top can be eliminated. Mr. DeWitt has done a site visit, he feels the proposal is appropriate. While accurate plans would need to be submitted, he does not foresee having an issue with the main house. He does have concern with the porch area. Rather than fill in the screen with double hung windows he thinks that single pane tilt windows would create a more consistent design. Ms. Latham finds the roof slope and the jut over the window to be a bit awkward on the west elevation. Mr. Sayles explains this should be the same as above, the plans are not consistent with his design. Mr. Gregory agrees with Mr. DeWitts suggestion on the back porch, sometimes less is more.

Motion by Chair second by S. Latham

To **adjourn** the application of **Alice Maria Guimarin** to December 28, 2021

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

On the application of **Seersucker II, LLC**, 385 South Main Street, affidavits of mailing and posting have been submitted to the file. David Gilmartin, Stephen Chrisman and Perry Guillot and Conor Moran are here to represent the applicant. The new house will be setback approximately 140 feet from South Main Street. The new driveway will be a reduction of the existing paved area. The front door of the house faces south, directly onto the parking area. The front elevation is designed to be in keeping with local Southampton architecture, they are using shingle roof, painted windows and cedar siding. This property is located in the within the historic district. Ms. Latham would like to remind the board of the discussion that was had surrounding the importance of keeping the trees on this property. Mr. DeWitt cannot see a thing wrong with it, it is a beautiful design. Mr. McIntire agrees with Mr. DeWitt, this is a lovely design. He also believes that Ms. Latham is correct in her recollection, it is important for the

Inc. Village of Southampton
Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation
December 13, 2021

mature trees to be saved on the property. Mr. Chrisman notes that the only trees that will be removed have been noted in red on the plan as well as the trees that exist where the house is to sit. Chair would like the opportunity to walk the property and review the landscape plan. The brick Pilars to the original estate have been retained, they are proposing a wooden gate to replace the current dilapidated gates. The board is happy with the design of the gates. The pedestrian gate will also retain the brick piers and replace the gate itself.

Motion by Chair second by P. DeWitt

To **adjourn** the application of **Seersucker II, LLC** to the December 28th meeting

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

On the application of **Kaveh Ansari**, 306 Hill Street, affidavits of mailing and posting have been submitted to the file. John McNeill is here to represent the applicant. This is an application for a second story addition to an existing one story dwelling. The facade materials will be a white painted cedar shingle, the windows are black aluminum with wood on the inside, all windows and doors would be trimmed in white PVC, all corbels, trim boards etc, will be PVC as well. The second floor addition was meant to stay in the foot print of the exiting building except for the cantilevered section. On the rear of the house they have added French doors. They have proposed transom style windows to provide for maximum light as well as wall space for furniture in the bedrooms. Ms. Latham is concerned that the vocabulary does not match that of Hill Street, the use of PVC is especially troublesome. Mr. McNeill states he can go to a painted cedar or a wood based trim. Mr. DeWitt has greater design concerns. The roof lines are busy and the windows are inconsistent. Mr. Gregory agrees with these concerns and would also add the color of the windows, the concern for light pollution created by the large windows. The board is in agreement that this design is disharmonious with the neighborhood and to the Village as a whole.

It is suggested that Mr. McNeill revisit the ARB guidelines and revisit the design.

Motion by Chair second by P. DeWitt

To **adjourn** the application of **Kayeh Ansari**

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

On the application of **Apogee Building Co, LLC**, affidavits of mailing and posting have been submitted to the file. Brian Glasser and Kevin Wells are here to represent the applicant. This is an application for a new single family dwelling with a two car attached garage. They have created a sweeping gable look with a brick veneer, a red cedar shingle, trim details will be PVC painted light grey. There will be Marvin windows with a brick frame painted grey. Mr. DeWitt thinks it is a typical Southampton house and it will fit into the character of Corrigan Street as it is evolving. Mr. Gregory has a concern with the sight line from the second floor deck in consideration of the privacy of the neighbor. Mr. Glasser has thought of the in their design, the property next-door is owned by the same owner and the deck is only accessible from the master bedroom. While a house does not exist next-door now, doesn't mean that one will not one day. Chair would still like to see a line of sight. Other than the privacy concern the material choices are nice and the design is well done.

Motion by Chair second by M. McIntire

To **adjourn** the application of **Apogee Building Co, LLC** to December 28, 2021

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

Inc. Village of Southampton
Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation
December 13, 2021

On the application of **90 Toylsome LLC**, 90 Toylsome Lane, affidavits of mailing and posting have been submitted to the file. Greg Tankersley from McAlpine Architects is here to represent the applicant. This is an application for a new dwelling. The rear of the house has a centered gable, similar to the front but more glass. There is a small one story carriage house attached by a port cochre. The windows are wood, cedar roof, exposed foundation walls and the chimneys will be a beige brick. Mr. DeWitt thinks it is beautiful. Mr. McIntire wonders if the garage counts as a front yard accessory building in a non waterfront yard, he would like to look at the village code again. He agrees that the house itself is gorgeous. Mr. Gregory wonders the distance to the south property line. There is a lot of glass in the back and front of the house and light pollution would be a concern of his. This will be white cedar, white painted windows. He would like to see a plan showing structures on the adjacent properties shown on it.

Motion by Chair second by S. Latham

To **adjourn** the application of **90 Toylsome LLC** to December 28, 2021

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

On the application of **Lee Roy and Tandy Mitchell**, 21 Terry Court, John Bennett is here to represent the applicant. This is an application for driveway gates, they have increased the transparency to 58% and have lowered it by a foot. They have removed the gooseneck key pad and they will be using a weight sensor.

Motion by Chair second by J. Gregory

To **approve** the application of **Lee Roy and Tandy Mitchell**

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

On the application of **John Kuitwaard** is adjourned

On the application of **Karen Williams**, 127 Wickapgoue Road, affidavits of mailing and posting have been submitted to the file.

Motion by Chair second by J. Gregory

To **adjourn** the application of **Karen Williams**

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

Motion by Chair second by P. DeWitt

To **close** the meting of December 13, 2021

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

Respectfully submitted by Jacqueline Allen 12/13/2021