

Inc. Village of Southampton  
Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation  
December 28, 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, December 28, 2021 at 7pm.

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

MOTION by Chair second by J. Gregory

To open tonight's meeting.

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

Counsel for the board, Alice Cooley is present.

Motion by Chair second by P. DeWitt

To approve the minutes of December 13, 2021

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

This is an extra meeting, any adjournments tonight will be without prejudice to January 10th, 2022

The matter of **Beechwood Latch, LLC** there is a request for an adjournment to January 10th

Motion by Chair second by P. DeWitt

To **approve** the applicant's request for adjournment

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

On the application of **Alvise Orisini and Geoffroy VanRaemdonck**, 143 Herrick Road, John Bennett and Lisa Zaloga are here to represent the applicant. The columns in the front were reduced, stairway from the proposed terrace was removed, he hopes that they are where they need to be for approval. He would like to thank the board for working with them on this application. Ms. Zaloga they have maintained the existing openings for their new proposed entryway. They are keeping the interior brick wall, switching the door and the window. They removed the stair on the patio that went to the east. She shared a historic photo that included detail that they plan on retaining. They have lightened the posts to create something very simple. The west elevation will be a light glassy facade. The south elevation shows the facade without the stair, the maintenance of the corbel and lighter columns. Mr. DeWitt thinks this is a difficult building to adapt. His problem remains with the plinth that extends south beyond the room. He does agree it looks better without the stairs to the east. He wonders if the second stair could be in the North west turret. This would push the addition back off of Herrick Road.

In terms of the interior, trying to put the stairs in the towers is very difficult. It is currently a spiral stair that does not meet code as its preexisting non-conforming. A new stair would not meet code according to Ms. Zaloga. Mr. DeWitt will look into the code on spiral stairs. Mr. Gregory thinks that most of the issues they had previously had were addressed. He thinks that the front looks great. He appreciates additional comments being made, but feels that this accomplishes what they have asked for. Mr. McIntire would like to know if there is a step before getting into

Inc. Village of Southampton  
Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation  
December 28, 2021

the house; there is. As long as the door opens inward, there is no issue with a step up. Mr. McIntire feels that their concerns have been addressed. The idea of excavating out to create light for the downstairs bedrooms is an interesting idea. Ms. Latham thinks that the rendering that appears to go below the corbels on the west elevations is preferable to the drawing that shows it above. Ms. Zaloga will make sure that it is the case. Ms. Latham still feels that the addition is still chunky. It appears to be the same width as the original structure, with that she does not feel it is subservient. The original proposal had window wells, in the hearing in which those were discussed the board had expressed concern with the change it would cause to the elevation. Chair feels that it looks more massive and less subservient than desired. Mr. DeWitt offered a suggestion that would mitigate that issue in his opinion. Ms. Zaloga expresses that her client is not amenable to putting the staircase in the turret, it is a safety concern having children in the house. Mr. Bennett is frustrated; he feels there has been a lot of push and pull in this process. They have made a lot of changes, complying with a lot of the Board's requests. Mr. DeWitt understands that the windows are beyond his purview, he was just hoping to improve the building. He is still concerned with the projection of the plinth. Ms. Latham doesn't think until they see sections and moldings, they can't make a decision. She would not be in favor of the design as is, she feels that it is still too chunky and not subservient to original building. Ms. Zaloga explains that their goal is to recreate what is in the photograph that was provided; no drawings have been prepared. Mr. Gregory thinks that the design is where it needs to be, but given the historic significance of this structure warrants the additional detail.

Motion by Chair second by J. Gregory

To **adjourn** the application of **Alvise Orisini and Geoffroy VanRaemdonck**

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

On the application of **27 Gin Lane, LLC**, 27 Gin Lane, Christopher DiSunno is here to represent the applicant. This is an application for a small addition. They are bumping out a few feet to enlarge two interior rooms. It will step in at the corners so it is narrower than the existing building and it will be six feet deep. Mr. Gregory would like to confirm that the terrace above is only six feet wide. Mr. DiSunno confirms it is a Juliette balcony. They will be matching all existing materials and details. There is no public comment.

Motion by Chair second by P. DeWitt

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

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

On the application of **Seersucker II, LLC**, 385 S. Main Street, Connor Moran, Stephen Chrisman and Perry Guilott are here to represent the applicant. There were some questions regarding the landscaping at the December 13th hearing. On December 17th there was a site visit done by Ms. Latham and Mr. Gregory. Ms. Latham explains that they walked the property with Mr. Guilott who was very helpful in explaining their reasoning for any tree removals. There is a pine tree, halfway down the site line near the Gin Lane property boundary that was agreed between parties to save. Mr. Guilott confirms that this is a Spruce tree that will be maintained. It is not in the way of construction or grading; they are happy to keep it. There were no additional concerns with the landscaping. Mr. McIntire confirms with the applicant that the brick pillars will remain with new gates to be constructed.

Motion by Chair second by J. Gregory

Inc. Village of Southampton  
Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation  
December 28, 2021

To **close** the application of **Seersucker II, LLC** for written decision subject to the submittal of an updated landscaping plan

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

On the application of **John Browne**, 94 Pelletrau Street, BJ Steinbrecher and John Browne are here to represent the applicant. On the west elevation the gable roof was changed to a hip roof. The front windows were changed and they widened the front door to meet board member's comments. Mr. DeWitt thinks it looks good. Mr. McIntire notes that the front door on the rendering looks narrower than on the drawing. Mr. Steinbrecher notes this is an error, the elevation drawing is correct. The metal roof over the entry way will be a bronze color, standing seam, the house will be Sea Coast Grey. Mr. McIntire thinks they've done a good job addressing their concerns. His only suggestion would be to change the metal roof to a lead color. Chair requests that they specify the colors on the plans submitted to the building department. The roof will be cedar. A landscape plan has not been prepared for this meeting. John Liu, owner of 96 Pelletreau Street is here with a few questions. A concern was raised with the size of the mass and scale of the house, he shared this concern and wonders how that was addressed. His other concern was regarding the landscaping. Chair explains this matter will be deferred to the next meeting. He and Ms. Latham walked the property and believes the intent is to keep what landscaping they can. Chair also explains that the board does not have preview over the size in terms of square footage; this is determined by code. They have discussed over the course of the last few weeks, ways they can reduce the scale and mass of the structure. He feels they have been successful in this. Mr. Liu wonders how the board defines harmony. The board is charged with using its judgements. Mr. Liu feels that the surrounding homes are significantly smaller. He does not see how this large house can be in harmony with this neighborhood. There has been conversation surrounding the colors, shapes and windows, he doesn't feel the scale was addressed. Mr. DeWitt explains that the rooflines have been reduced massively, window configurations and sizes have been changed - these are items that reduced the the scale. The foundation has been lowered a foot and the overall height has been reduced. Harmony is an evolving thing, the older homes in the neighborhood will soon be the minority. Ms. Latham explains that as of right, the applicant could have built this house larger. The board has mitigated the impact that this project could have had.

Motion by Chair second by P. DeWitt

To **approve** the **building** only and **adjourn** the matter of landscaping to the January 10th, 2022 hearing

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

Nay: S. Latham

On the application of **Alice Maria Guimarin**, 82 Prospect Street, Alma Guimarin is here to represent the applicant. She would like to thank the board, specifically Mr. DeWitt; changes that he had requested made a positive impact on the design. They have removed the railing and the transom windows on the east elevation. The roof will be the existing roof, expanding it slightly adding a fireplace. The materials will be cedar siding and cedar roof to match the existing house. The siding on the sunroom will be vertical boards. Mr. Gregory thinks the changes look fine. Mr. McIntire agrees, his only suggestion would be to raise the chimney. Ms. Guimarin explains the fireplace will be gas.

Motion by Chair second by J. Gregory

Inc. Village of Southampton  
Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation  
December 28, 2021

To **approve** the application of **Alice Maria Guimarin**

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

On the application of **Apogee Building Co, LLC**, 134 Corrigan Street, Brian Glasser is here to represent the applicant. The covered patio and the rooftop deck off of the master was a concern of the board at the last hearing. There will be 14-16' green giants along the property line as well as two 14-16' river birch trees to screen that deck area. A line of site drawing was prepared by Mr. Glasser and submitted to the file. It is not just a line of site issue for Mr. Gregory, the way sound carries is also a concern of his. When you take the noise off of the ground, the sound carries. He could not approve the house with the large deck. Mr. Glasser notes that the deck size was reduced by two feet. This is a narrow lot, Mr. Gregory thinks it is important to protect the neighbors from any sound pollution. Ms. Latham isn't thrilled with the use of green giants to line the property lines. She is of the opinion that a species like bayberry or a privet hedge could be used. Mr. Gregory and Mr. DeWitt agree that arborvitae are not the solution they are looking for. The board is generally supportive of the design minus the roof deck, there are no other concerns.

Motion by Chair second by M. McIntire

To **adjourn** the application of **Apogee Building Co, LLC**

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

On the application of **90 Toylsome LLC**, 90 To9ylsome Lane, Greg Tankersley is here to represent the applicant. There were two items of concern at the last hearing: the row of windows on the back of the house. It was requested that Mr. Tankersley provide a visual of where the surrounding houses are situated around this property. There is approximately 160 feet between the windows and the house that would be most impacted. There is also a 10' tall privet hedge that runs between the two properties. The second item of concern was the garage being forward of the house. Mr. Tankersley confirms that he had the conversation with the building department and that is the case. To rectify this, they have glassed in the porte-cochere making it a breezeway. It will be conditioned space, they'll be using it as a mud room. Because the property is under 40,000 sq. ft. The setbacks are dictated by the 4/10ths rule, they have removed a one story bump out to meet those setbacks. Mr. DeWitt thinks it looks fine. Mr. Gregory appreciates the materials provided regarding the surrounding neighbors. That has mitigated his concern with the ground floor windows. He still has concern with the center portion - there is another set of windows on top. He feels this could be a source of light pollution. Mr. McIntire would be more concerned if there was a chandelier hanging from a vaulted ceiling.

Motion by Chair second by P. DeWitt

To **approve** the application of **90 Toylsome LLC**

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

On the application of **John Kuitward**, 102 White Street, the matter is adjourned

On the application of **Diane Pisido**, 127 Somerset Avenue, Diane Pisido is here to represent the applicant. This is an application for driveway gates. Safety is a concern of Ms. Pisido, she is hoping that the gate will provide the layer of protection she is seeking. The gate spacing between the one-inch pickets is approximately three inches. This will be painted white aluminum and there will not be any light fixtures on it. The gates will be automated, the board would like

Inc. Village of Southampton  
Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation  
December 28, 2021

to see the keypad incorporated into the column. They would not want to see a gooseneck or other freestanding keypad. Mr. Gregory would like to note for the record that the approval for the gate would be based on the design itself and not with the applicants felt need for them.

Motion by Chair second by M. McIntire

To **approve** the application of **Diane Pisido** subject to the absence of a freestanding keypad  
On Vote: Chair, S. Latham, P. DeWitt, J. Gregory, M. McIntire

Chair would like to discuss the options for new meeting times or a new day so meetings don't run so late. Mr. Gregory would not be available earlier than 6pm during the week. Chair will look into the options the board has for meeting times.

Motion by Chair second by J. Gregory

To **close** the meeting of December 28, 2021

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

Respectfully submitted by Jacqueline Allen 12/28/2021

---

Village Clerk