

Inc. Village of Southampton  
Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation  
February 14, 2022

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, February 14, 2022 at 7pm.

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

MOTION by Chair second by S. Latham

To open tonight's meeting.

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

Counsel for the board, Alice Cooley is present. Alex Wallach, Planner Director is present.

Motion by Chair second by P. DeWitt

To approve the minutes of January 24, 2022

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

On the application of **Alvise Orsini and Geoffroy VanRaemdonck**, 143 Herrick Road, there is a written decision in the file. This property is not located within the historic district, however it is one of five landmarked properties in the Village. The trim color has not been determined in this decision; the applicant will need to come back to the Board for additional approvals.

Mr. DeWitt would like to note that this application should not have been heard on January 10<sup>th</sup>. Due to weather, the building department was closed and Mr. DeWitt does not feel that there was adequate time given for the Board to properly review the plans enough to make a decision.

Motion by P. DeWitt second by S. Latham

To open the matter of **Alvise Orsini and Geoffroy VanRaemdonck**

Aye: P. DeWitt, S. Latham

Nay: Chair, J. Gregory, Mc. McIntire

Motion by Chair second by J. Gregory

To **approve** the written decision

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

Nay: S. Latham, P. DeWitt

On the application of **BHNH, LLC**, 109 Hampton Road, John Bennett is here to represent the application. A letter was submitted by the building department that while dormers can solve the problem, there are other solutions. Lision Lamnica and Jonathan Avedon are also here to discuss the application.

Mr. Lamnica presented plans showing what is currently built as well as the alternative plan that the board has suggested. In this alternative, the plumbing in the bathroom and some HVAC would need to be moved, it would also make the doorway too narrow to comply with code. As well as the additional burden of work this alternative imposes, Mr. Bennett also claims that it will be a financial burden to the applicant as well. Mr. Avedon from Koral Bros. prepared a cost estimate based on the alternative revisions to the plan. The work proposed is significant and would be an estimated \$85,725.00. Mr. Bennett mentions that this cost would be the same,

Inc. Village of Southampton  
Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation  
February 14, 2022

regardless of if you're moving a wall one inch or six inches. He notes that there were two letters submitted to the file, one from the granddaughter of the prior owner in support of the application and the other from a professor at Yale, who does not find this home to be a Greek Revival home. Ms. Latham would refer to the Architectural Design Guidelines (Section 7), this is a Greek Revival home. She wonders why the original stair was ever removed in the first place, this is a self-created hardship in her opinion. Mr. DeWitt feels that there are many alternatives to solve the problem that they have. Mr. McIntire notes that they are asking for a dormer for proper headroom, but the plan shows two dormers. Why are two needed? He also doesn't feel that this is an accurate representation of cost; if they were to add the dormer, they would need to do a significant amount of work, which too would be an additional cost. Mr. McIntire agrees with Ms. Latham, this is a self-created hardship. Chair shares the original decision where the home is described as a Greek Revival home. The decision also details the discussion of dormers during the first round of hearings; the board has always been opposed to dormers on this house. It would, in Chair's opinion, add a contemporary element to this otherwise historic home. Mr. Bennett feels that the point being missed by the board is the stair. This is a level 2 renovation; the stairs had to come out to comply with building code. Mr. Bennett does agree with Mr. McIntire, the second dormer is not required by code. He thinks eliminating this second dormer is reasonable. Mr. Bennett shared a few Greek Revival homes with dormers. Chair notes that this is a Greek Revival in the Village of Southampton, not elsewhere. It is that the reason they are not getting enough head room is because they needed to replace the rafters to support the new roof. Counsel reminded the Board that the interior is not within their jurisdiction, that is why this application was referred to the Building Inspector

Motion by Chair second by P. DeWitt

To close the application of **BHNH, LLC** for written decision to deny

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

Nay: J. Gregory

On the application of **Smithtown Partners, LLC**, 40 Meadow Lane, Michael Sendlenski, Josh of ADP Architects, Steve Nieroda and Ted Fire, owner's representative are here on behalf of the applicant. A lighting plan was submitted to the file that drastically reduces the exterior lighting. Chair has requested the lumens be provided. The lighting on the second floor has also been reduced and will not be replaced. Mr. Sendlenski notes that they have reviewed the plans with the neighbors who after being walked through, are in favor of the proposed plans. The windows facing the west neighbor will be treated to reduce reflectivity and light transmittance. The proposed elevation has not changed at all. They would like the ARB input on the design before they go before the ZBA so they know what the required relief would be. In a letter from the Building Inspector the Chair and Counsel, he states that a variance would be required for the proposed addition. In Chair's opinion this addition takes away from the design of the house and makes the house more massive. He would prefer not to see the addition at the front of the house. Mr. DeWitt questions the lighting on the south side. Mr. Sendlenski explains that they are in the process of reprogramming the backyard lighting. Mr. DeWitt is still concerned with the lighting as seen from the beach. Mr. McIntire doesn't think that they should be discussing the lighting that was previously approved and it not being presented as part of this application. He feels that the addition is a reasonable ask. Mr. Gregory would have to disagree; the design of the house is dramatically changed. Ms. Latham doesn't think that the house should be looked at straight on, she doesn't think the addition is going to be highly visible. Mr. Gregory thinks it's important to

Inc. Village of Southampton  
Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation  
February 14, 2022

look at this straight on, it is the view of the house from the street, which is where you would see it. Mr. DeWitt thinks that the architects did a good job, his is more concerned with the lighting on the beach. Chair does not agree with the design, he believes it is massive and has greatly changed the design of the house. Mr. Sendlenski states that the elevator is a need for the mobility of his client. Because of the pre-existing non-conforming nature of the building, a variance would be required regardless of the location of the addition. This location works for the architecture of the house and he feels it is the best solution. Mr. Gregory doesn't agree with the comments made about addressing the board's concerns, while a lot has been done to mitigate the lighting concerns, he doesn't think a real crack has been taken to the design.

Motion by S. Latham second by

To close the application of **Smithtown Partners LLC**

On Vote: S. Latham, P. DeWitt, M. McIntire

Nay: Chair, J. Gregory

On the application of **Tates Bake Shop**, 43 N. Sea Rd

Motion by Chair second by M. McIntire

To **adjourn** the application of **Tates Bake Shop**

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

On the application of **Park Slope Investments**, 81 Jobs Lane, this is an application for a color change to the exterior of the building. The board would like to see an actual color sample

Motion by Chair second by M. McIntire

To **adjourn** the application of **Park Slope Investments**

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

On the application of **Seersucker I, LLC**, Stephen Chrisman, David Gilmartin, Conor Moran and Perry Guillot are here on behalf of the applicant. They are proposing to remove a one-story wing, replace the wing with a modest one-story addition and to renovate the residence. They would like to remove some windows that they feel are crowding the design and taking away from the symmetry. The porch that is being proposed is more in scale with the building. The division of the lights on the first floor is 8/8 which feels out of keeping, they are proposing 6/6 to match those on the second floor. On the side, the addition will match the existing materials. There is a link that separates the original house to the addition. There are little changes to the north side aside from changing to six over six light patterns in the windows.

Gates being proposed will match those to the neighboring property. Ms. Latham would like the Village historian, Sally Spamburgh to review the property so she can make an appropriate decision. Mr. McIntire agrees that she can help the Board with the history they need and help guide them. Chair notes that the rear elevation has a lot of glass. He would like to see a combined site plan with the neighboring property. Mr. McIntire questions the shutters on the rear; the shutters were added to the addition to help distinguish the original from the new. Mr. Crisman states if they are of concern, they can be removed. The board would like to hear from their consultant before making any decisions.

Motion by Chair second by M. McIntire

To **adjourn** the application of **Seersucker I, LLC**

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

Inc. Village of Southampton  
Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation  
February 14, 2022

On the application of **39 Lewis Street, LLC**, Anthony Vermindois, architect and Jim Hausman, owner, are here. The house is gambrel roofed house with a main north / south orientation. The front porch was enclosed at one point, they believe it to have been originally open. There is a gambrel that is facing Lewis Street, they also believe this to be an addition, though not built too long after the original house. They are proposing to remove the glass panels and return the front to an open front porch. The gambrel roof facing Lewis Street would remain, but they would remove the dormers sticking out from the sides. On the rear they would like to add two gambrels with a shed dormer in the middle and an open porch. The changes to the footprint are minimal aside from cleaning up the back elevation. The garage will remain the same. They are also proposing a small pool house, it too will have a gambrel roof to match the house. Ms. Latham notes that they have very fine, spindly columns, she wonders if that is enough to support what they are proposing. Mr. DeWitt and Mr. McIntire question the removal of the windows across the front, they would like to defer to Ms. Spanburgh. Mr. Hausman met with Mary Cummings and with the Bishop family who have owned it for 120 years, it is his intent on keeping the historic integrity. Leaving the glass in the porch has made it unusable as it gets extremely hot with little ventilation. They will be lifting the house, it will not change the elevation.

Motion by Chair second by P. DeWitt

To **adjourn** the application of **39 Lewis llc**

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

On the applications of **DCK Windham, LLC**

Motion by Chair second by M. McIntire  
to **adjourn**

**Paul Fagan,**

Motion by Chair second by M. McIntire

To **adjourn**

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

On the application of **31 Rosko, LLC**, the applicant requested an adjournment to February 28, 2022

Motion by Chair second by M. McIntire

To **adjourn** the application of **31 Rosko, LLC**

On the application of **Margaret Lewis**, 63 Dale Street, James Bennett is here to represent the applicant. The roof pitches have been adjusted and the windows have been changed to address the Board's comments. Mr. DeWitt would like to see a different eave, he shared two alternatives. He does appreciate the changes made. On the north side of the porch, Mr. DeWitt wonders if the return should be a shed roof, it might be stronger. Mr. Gregory agrees. The trim will be painted white wood. Mr. McIntire thinks Mr. DeWitt's comments about the eaves stand true for the back of the house as well.

Motion by Chair second by P. DeWitt

To **adjourn** the application of **Margaret Lewis**

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

Inc. Village of Southampton  
Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation  
February 14, 2022

On the application of **Robert Roberts**, nobody is here to represent the applicant. They will need to repost and re mail

Motion by Chair second by M. McIntire

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

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

On the application of **Ansari**, 306 Hill St

Motion by Chair second by M. McIntire

To **adjourn** the application of

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

On the application of **Michael Minnick and Anne Mahoney**, 40 Hildreth Street, Jim McChesney, architect and Anne Mahoney, owner are here to present the application. They simplified the front entryway, changed the front porch to a shed roof and eliminated the eyebrow window. They increased the roof pitch, added a bay window and a freeze board. On the back the eliminated the roof deck, it is now a pitched roof. The chimney will be red brick with a brick cap. Mr. Gregory likes the changes made. Mr. McIntire thinks the changes have made a word of difference. The windows and trim will be white.

Motion by Chair second by

To **approve** the application of **Michael Minnick and Anne Mahoney**

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

On the application of **SKV Wickapogue, llc**, 508 Wickapogue Rd, Siyu Lu is here to represent the applicant. They have completely redesigned the house from the last presentation. The amount of glass in this design is much less than originally proposed. The materials will be board and batton, and barn doors. Dean Gamolka, Landscape architect is also present. A landscape plan was submitted to the file. Mr. Gregory likes the landscape plan, it fits its surrounds. The design of the house is disjointed for him; the front and the back are two different houses. He still has concern over light pollution. The barndoors on the front do not work for him. Mr. McIntire would have to agree with Mr. McIntire, the barn doors are out of place for him, they only add to the massing and weight of the front. They have come along way from the original design, he does agree that the huge window in front of the staircase can be reduced. Mr. DeWitt thinks it is much better scaled project. He does agree with his fellow board members about the doors. He thinks some tweaking needs to be done to the roof lines before they are there. Ms. Latham thinks some of the fenestration patterns are a great improvement. The stacked two-story element on the left is incongruous with the rest of the design. The materials have come a long way. Ms. Latham thinks the design is in the right direction. Chair echoes the comments of his fellow board members.

Motion by Chair second by P. DeWitt

To **adjourn** the application of **SKV Wickapogue LLC**

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

On the application of **Mark Kaffaga and Mike Mengia** are here to represent the applicant. There was a site visit done. They would like measured drawings to be done. The Board will refer to Ms. Spanbough. Mr. Kaffaga would like the ability to close it up and protect it to the elements. They can wait to see what windows they can put in. The measured drawings would

Inc. Village of Southampton  
Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation  
February 14, 2022

show what is original. This would be a frame work for what is being saved and where the new material needs to go.

Motion by Chair second by S. Latham

To **adjourn** the application of **Nicole Gallagher**

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

On the application of **980 Meadow Lane, LLC**, 980 Meadow Lane, Mickey Bennson and Benjamin Moore, architects are here to represent the applicant. This is an amendment to a prior application. They are proposing to change the windows on the front. The two sets of windows flanking the door will become two groups of three windows. They are also proposing a third window above the garage door. There is a small bump out to accommodate a breakfast room. The last change is to add a false chimney over the metal flue pipe. Mr. DeWitt prefers the original north elevation, but this is so well done he can't oppose it.

Motion by Chair second by M. McIntire

To **approve** the application of **980 Meadow Lane, LLC**

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

On the application of **100 Halsey Lane LLC**, 144 Pulaski Street, Mehran Tali, architect is here to represent the applicant. The house will be cedar siding painted white, board and baton painted white. The windows are a charcoal grey. Mr. DeWitt thinks it is good looking. He would like the eve lines to meet the center windows, he would also remove the element above the second-floor windows. The porch facia is divided into two, if the lower facia was pulled in to align with the columns below, it would lighten the feel. Ms. Latham agrees with Mr. DeWitt that the leuver can be removed and that the eve should meet the window. Mr. McIntire likes the grey in the design, but he would like the windows to be painted white. Mr. Gregory and Mr. DeWitt agree, white windows with grey trim. The front door will be changed to a solid door. Lighting will be shown on the revised plan.

Motion by Chair second by P. DeWitt

To **adjourn** the application of **100 Halsey Lane, LLC**

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

On the application of **Thomas Appio**, 160 Breese Lane, Brad Grossman is here to represent the applicant. They are proposing blue stone pillars with cedar gates to match the materials already present on the property. Lights and key pad are on the pillar. The highest point of the gate will be 5 feet. The spindles are three inches with spaces of 1.5" between. The columns are six feet, two inches. Chair notes that there is one set of driveway gates on Breese Lane, they are nearly completely transparent. This design is too formal for the neighborhood and out of character. Mr. Gregory agrees, this isn't an estate section, the gate is a bit heavy. Mr. McIntire points out that the rendering is off from the drawing – the drawing is much opaquer. Mr. DeWitt thinks they need to be more of a country fence, he would like to see it lower, straight across. Smaller azek columns would be more appropriate.

Motion by Chair second by

To **adjourn** the application of **Thomas Appio**

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

Inc. Village of Southampton  
Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation  
February 14, 2022

On the application of **Pashal Holdings, LLC**, 520 Captains Neck Lane, David Bae is here to represent the applicant. The driveway gates are proposed more than 300 feet from the roadway. The gate is a simple design, Alaskan yellow cedar left to weather naturally. There will be a wire mesh inlay with 1.5 inch spacing. There will be no lighting associated with the gate. The gate will be so far setback that a stand-alone keypad would not be an issue with the board.

Motion by Chair second by J. Gregory

To **approve** the application of **Pashal Holdings, LLC**

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

Motion by Chair second by P. DeWitt

To **close** the meeting of February 14, 2022

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

Respectfully submitted by Jacqueline Allen 01/24/2022