

Inc. Village of Southampton
Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation
Monday, April 11, 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 in the municipal board room of Village Hall at 23 Main Street, Southampton, NY and via Videoconference on Monday, April 11, 2022 at 7pm.

Board members Chair Jeffrey Brodlieb, Sarah Latham, Peter DeWitt, M. McIntire are present. Board member J. Gregory is participating via videoconference

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. Alex Wallach, Planner Director is present via videoconference.

Motion by Chair second by J. Gregory

To **approve** the minutes of March 14, 2022

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

On the application of **Tate's Bakeshop**, there is a written decision in the file.

Motion by Chair second by P. DeWitt

To **approve** the application of **Tate's Bakeshop** as written

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

On the application of

Motion by Chair Second by M. McIntire

To **approve** the application of **Seersucker**

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

On the application of **39 Lewis Street, LLC**, 39 Lewis Street, Anthony Vermandois and owner, Jim Hausman are here to represent the application. The inside wall of the porch you would see a big open section in the middle where the current bay is and another large opening into the dining room. Looking at the front elevation, the irregular spacing of the posts will be retained. The design around the front door was changed to reflect a design closer to the original design as seen in photographs. The shingle pattern will remain. Ms. Latham feels that it is the Board's job to retain as much of the historic fabric of the structure. Reflecting on that desire, the hinged storm windows should be retained. The interior wall is not being protected and the configuration and the windows are not being kept. Ms. Latham is worried that they will be left with something that is not in keeping with their responsibility to preserve as much material as possible. Mr. DeWitt notes the original light pattern isn't being kept. The north and south elevations – the two porch walls are divided into two separate windows; he wonders if the operable windows could be changed to the end. The south elevation as a door and a window that can easily become two operable windows side by side. He understands Ms. Latham's concerns. The porch is

Inc. Village of Southampton
Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation
Monday, April 11, 2022

intended to be stepped up. Mr. DeWitt would prefer to see the original porch elevation maintained. He would like the porch front inside wall needs to be beefed up, especially where it is against the northern wall. The opening in the original exterior wall on the north elevation will remain as a window. Mr. DeWitt feels that the center opening at the width shown is too wide and compromises the integrity of the original exterior walls. His suggestion would be to make that narrower. Mr. McIntire does applaud the applicant for their willingness to work with the Board and their ability to make changes to a tricky property. He agrees with Mr. DeWitt that he would like to see the center opening made smaller. He also agrees that the height of the porch should be maintained. Mr. Gregory agrees with his fellow Board members; the windows need to be retained. He believes that the interior wall should be maintained as much as possible as well as that step down into the porch. The historic elements of this property need to be retained. Looking at photographs of the house throughout history, there appears to be louvered and operable shutters. Chair feels there has been a lot of good effort to keep this house intact. They are balancing making this house more livable for a contemporary family vs. maintaining the historic charm of the house. They are about ninety percent there. The interior wall being opened as much as it is, is a loss for the Board as are the windows. Mr. Vermindois wonders if the windows themselves, if it comes down to the point of making sure all the light patterns are the same, they can make the operable windows on the north and south sides to better work out in keeping the design. He wonders if the shutters will be required to move forward with the design; the Board will refer to the historic consultant on that as well as the large opening in the wall.

The interior opening on the right-hand side will be reduced to 14'. Mr. McIntire believes this will help maintain the historic design. Ms. Latham would like to see the opening on the south side reduced to six feet. There was concern about the height of the porch. A photograph was shared that shows there is about a four- or five-inch threshold from the porch to the actual entry of the house.

Motion by Chair second by P. DeWitt

To **adjourn** the application of **39 Lewis Street, LLC**

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

On the application of **1 Hampton Road JNH, LLC**

Motion by Chair second by M. McIntire

To **adjourn** the application of **1 Hampton Road JNH, LLC**

On the application of **Daniel Brockett**, 292 Ox Pasture Road, applicant requests an adjournment to April 25, 2022

Motion by Chair second by P. DeWitt

To **adjourn** the application of **Daniel Brockett**

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

On the application of **Anthony and Elizabeth Signore**, Giuseppe Adragna, is here to represent the applicant. It was suggested at the last hearing that the dormers match on both sides. The roof is more symmetrical and blends into the gambrel roofline behind it. Mr. DeWitt feels it looks a lot better; though e

Mr. McIntire thinks that the changes to the garage a great. He does share in the concerns of his fellow Board members in regards to the windows.

Inc. Village of Southampton
Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation
Monday, April 11, 2022

The floor to ceiling stairwall is an issue with the Chair, he feels it takes away for the agrarian design of the house.

Mr. DeWitt notes there is a sunken court in the rear; he feels it is a little strange. There will be glass rails. The single on the house, window casing and the trim will be white. Mr. Adragna feels the double window should be changed to match the rest of the light patterns. Chair thinks it should be one window as opposed to two. Mr. Gregory suggests using two of the proposed windows on top of one another.

Motion by Chair second by P. DeWitt

To **adjourn** the application of **Anthony and Elizabeth Singore**

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

On the application of **Patrice Magee and John Cuzzocrea**, applicants have requested an adjournment to April 25th.

Motion by Chair second by S. Latham

To **adjourn** the application of **Patrice Magee and John Cuzzocrea**

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

On the application of **Charles Falcao**, there is a request for an adjournment to May 9th

Motion by Chair second by

To **approve** the application of **Charles Falcao**

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

On the application of **Steven Boyd**, 104 Foster Crossing, Raymond Renault is here to represent the applicant. The columns have been changed per Board comments made at the last hearing.

Motion by Chair second by P. DeWitt

To **approve** the application of **Steven Boyd**

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

On the application of **Andrew Spreitzer**, there is a request for an adjournment to April 25th, 2022

Motion by Chair second by P. DeWitt

To **adjourn** the application of **Andrew Spreitzer**

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

On the application of **Ring of Fire, LLC**, mailing and posting was not completed. The Board will bring to the building inspector's attention, discrepancies between the approved plan and what is currently built.

On the application of **Juan Romero and Andrea Grimaldo**, 63 Armande Street, John McNeill is here to represent the application. This is for the construction of a portico. The portico does encroach within the front yard setback; however, a zoning variance was obtained. Materials are to match the existing house with cedar shingle and white trim and columns. Mr. McIntire wonders if the existing light fixtures on either side of the door would remain or be removed; Mr. McNeill believes they are to be retained. Ms. Latham wonders if a shed roof projection on

Inc. Village of Southampton
Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation
Monday, April 11, 2022

brackets could be considered; Mr. Gregory agrees. This is a simple house that should be kept simple. Chair agrees with his fellow Board members as proposed the extension is incongruous to the simple design of the house. **Juan Romero and Andrea Grimaldo**

Motion by Chair second by

To **adjourn** the application of **Juan Romero and Andrea Grimaldo**

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

On the application of **Bruce Holley**, 170 Meeting House Lane, James McChesney is here to represent the applicant. This is to amend a prior approval; they are looking to add one window on the front elevation. Mr. DeWitt thinks it looks better without the window; he wonders if it would be more acceptable if the crown was removed. Ms. Latham agrees. Mr. McChesney explains it will bring a lot of natural light into the interior of the space. Mr. DeWitt doesn't deny the desire to have it. Ms. Latham has an issue with the lanterns – those have not been chosen yet. Mr. McChesney wonders if a smaller window would be more acceptable. Mr. Gregory thinks it interrupts the symmetry of the house and prefers the house without it; Ms. Latham agrees completely. Mr. McChesney will come back with some other options.

Motion by Chair second by

To **adjourn** the application of **Bruce Holley**

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

On the application of **Tamara Carmichael and Todd Grossman**, 93 David Whites Lane, Steven Ciquane, architect is here to represent the applicant. This is for alterations to a previously approved pool house and garage. The windows and door packages have changed due to supplies available. Mr. McIntire notes that when you take the mullions out of the windows it takes the personality away and less interesting. The windows over the garage doors got larger and is now out of scale when the mullions are removed. Ms. Latham agrees. The original design was interesting, it now looks rushed. Mr. DeWitt prefers the original design. Mr. Gregory agrees, in addition there is a difference in the height of the windows. Chair agrees with his fellow Board members.

Motion by Chair second by M. McIntire

To **adjourn** the application of **Tamara Carmichael and Todd Grossman**

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

On the application of **Lux Construction**, 80 Harvest Lane, Esra Ozcan, architect is here to represent the applicant. This is for a two-story addition and alterations. They are proposing an inset front porch and tried for a more symmetric front elevation. It is a farm house style design they are aiming for. The west elevation will remain garage space. They are removing the existing pergola and they are proposing a deck. There was an existing second floor balcony that is being replaced with a much smaller area, brought down to a lower elevation. The southern elevation is a little more modern to bring light into the house. The east elevation retains the chimney. The windows will be Marvin windows painted white and the siding being proposed is five-inch clapboard painted white. Mr. Gregory thinks they've removed any elements he once found objectionable about the house; he likes the design. The lighting within the entryway will be down light. The trim detail around the front porch area is a little casual in Mr. McIntire's opinion. Opening this area all the way up will make the front door more inviting. Mr. DeWitt wonders what a pair of columns would look like at two feet from the edge of the openings with

Inc. Village of Southampton
Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation
Monday, April 11, 2022

the same chamfered look. Mr. Ozcan explains the intent of the front porch to be homey; it would be furnished. The proportion of the opening vs. the double height section of the house is too big for Mr. McIntire. The sliding glass doors on the back of the house look a bit too contemporary in his opinion as well. A division may add some dimension and make the house look more cohesive. Mr. DeWitt agrees. There is a stucco house on Herrick Road between Little Plains and South Main, number 112 Herrick Road, that Mr. DeWitt and Ms. Latham would suggest the applicants look, it has a successful recessed porch.

Motion by Chair second by P. DeWitt

To **adjourn** the application of **Lux Construction**

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

On the application of **301 Murray Place, LLC**, 301 Murray Place, Thaxton and Ian from the Laguardia Design Group are here to represent the applicant. This is an application for a driveway gate. They are a simple white, painted mahogany gate, six feet, eight inches tall. The columns are one by one square without any lighting. The bottom one foot three inches of the gate will be solid panels with spindles greater than 50% transparency between. This will be an automatic gate with an access keypad out front. Chair explains that the Board has been requesting that applicants not have external gooseneck mechanisms. Mr. Gregory thinks that the gate is too high. Mr. DeWitt thinks it can be lowered at least eight inches. Mr. Hanbach notes that they struggled with getting to a 50% transparency while keeping proportions. He would be open to lowering the gate to six feet without having to change the area of the solid panel on the bottom of the gate. Thomas Murray is here; he has no issues with the gates at all.

Motion by Chair second by P. DeWitt

To **adjourn** the application of **301 Murray Place, LLC**

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

There is a pre-submission conference tonight for the Nugent Street Post Office. Ken Lunstead is here to represent the applicant, Brown Harris Stevens. They are looking to redevelop the old post office into a brokerage office. This is a more modern design. They are proposing grey horizontal cedar with clear glass windows. There will not be any digital graphics out front, but possibly behind the glass to display the properties. The materials are not decided, but the thought is soft and welcoming. Ms. Latham would suggest looking at the approved plan for the bank next door. The Board would be interested in seeing how this design will fit in with the newly approved neighboring building. The Board suggests that the applicants look at the Home Nature building on Pond Lane. There is work being done to the Master Plan, perhaps the applicant can get a copy of the draft. Any additional review would require a public hearing to be scheduled.

Discussion:

There is the opportunity for the Board to meet at an earlier time, as early as 5pm. The thought is 6pm would be better for applicants.

Motion by Chair second by S. Latham

To **close** the meeting of April 11, 2022

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

Inc. Village of Southampton
Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation
Monday, April 11, 2022
Respectfully submitted by Jacqueline Allen 4/11/2022

Village Clerk