

Design Review Board
April 16, 2019

Those present were:

Bruce A.T. Siska, Acting Chairman
C. Sherrill Dayton, Member
Robert D. Caruso, Member
Kristin Corwin, Member
Linda Riley, Village Attorney
J. Kent Howie, Ordinance Inspector
William Hajek, Village Planner
Robert J. Hefner, Village Director of Historic Services
Gene E. Cross, Agent on behalf of 80 North Main Street LLC and Judi Desiderio
Thomas Prendergast, Applicant, Hook Mill Resort Properties
Russell Blue, Architect, Hook Mill Resort Properties
Pamela J. Bennett, Deputy Clerk

The Acting Chairman called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m., and the following official business was discussed:

1. **80 North Main Street LLC – 78 & 80 North Main Street –**
SCTM #301-4-1-36 and Judi Desiderio – 76 North Main Street –
SCTM #301-4-1-35

The Board is in receipt of a letter and plans prepared by Gene E. Cross Jr., both marked received April 1, 2019, pursuant to the recommendation by the Committee to combine the development potential of the two lots into a single building by creating a “significant space between buildings” consistent with the Commercial District Design Guidelines for North Main Street. Mr. Cross stated that the site plan accomplishes a 40-foot-wide open space along the sidewalk, 20 feet in depth, and it provides the same amount of parking that would otherwise be permitted if the properties were improved separately. The plan requires variances for coverage, transitional yard setback, and parking. Mr. Cross requested conceptual approval so the application can go to the Zoning Board.

Mr. Siska stated that the Board is in receipt of a memorandum of review from Village Planner Billy Hajek dated April 11, 2019. Mr. Hajek stated that the revised conceptual plan is based upon the previous discussions that the design was linear in fashion and took up most of the frontage along North Main Street.

Comments from the Board asked for consolidation and this plan seems to accomplish that. The redevelopment is roughly over the existing footprint of the building and it maintains some greenspace to the south which follows the North Main Street Guidelines. The plan is still a large increase in the amount of commercial space and it is driven by the desire to maintain three apartments on the property. The plan is to increase the footprint and absorb the first-floor apartment space with commercial space and have three apartments on the second floor. Mr. Hajek continued that the proposed plan appears to be considered an entitlement based upon the merger of two tax lots and cautioned the Board on granting conceptual approval for an application that requires such a large parking variance. Mr. Siska stated that Mr. Hajek's memo also indicates that there is a lot of information that is not included in the submission. Mr. Hajek said the Board should see the floor plans and elevations as this is a site plan application; to grant conceptual approval on sketches is not normal operating procedure, however, the Board can give comments on the general layout, the mass of the building, and the size of building. The plan indicates potential integration for parking with the parcel to the south although based upon the shape of that lot and the location of the building on that lot, it seems unlikely as it would split the lot in half.

Mr. Hefner commented that the open space to the south of the building is a big improvement but in looking at the other buildings on North Main Street and the existing building to be replaced, which had a porch that was then enclosed, and then the building is stepped back again, the step back of the second floor from the first floor is very important. Mr. Hefner stated that he would like to see alternatives indicating the reduction in size of the second floor to get an enclosed porch storefront and the main mass set back from the street.

Ms. Corwin asked if the parcel to the rear of this parcel is residential or commercial. Mr. Hajek stated that it is residential so the applicant needs to provide a transitional yard setback. Ms. Corwin asked if the first floor will be used as commercial. Mr. Hajek said yes, two commercial units to be used as office or retail; the existing commercial uses are considered wet uses by the Health Department and going to dry uses will be a reduction in sewage flow which is a good thing.

Mr. Caruso stated that he does not think this is the best solution for the area to absorb all that mass. Mr. Siska stated that it is a large volume for that corner. Mr. Caruso stated that he understands that they want to maximize it but questioned whether they are maximizing it to the detriment of the area. It is a lot of commercial space with three apartments, and the parking will not be enough. Mr.

Dayton stated that only five parking spaces are proposed. The Board agreed that the plan needs to be refined before sending it off to the Zoning Board; the Committee will meet with the applicant.

Mr. Cross stated that in prior submissions there was a Plan A and a Plan B; Plan A proposed two buildings, one building on each parcel, and the Committee suggested that the mass of two buildings be created into one building to provide open space. The Zoning Code permits apartments on the second floor so the existing apartment on the first floor is being moved to the second floor and the development potential of a building on the smaller lot is being added to justify the expansion of the retail. Mr. Cross stated that the alternative is for the applicant to pursue this as two separate applications and no one is in favor of that.

2. Hook Mill Resort Properties - 3 Therese Court – SCTM #301-4-4-1.1

Messrs. Prendergast and Blue appeared and submitted revised plans for both the proposed barn and the house pursuant to the comments at the Board's last meeting. Mr. Blue stated that the labeling of the windows and porch were a concern at the last meeting. Mr. Hefner stated that the revised house plans answer all the questions. The listing of the porch on the first page, Sheet Ex-1, has been revised to indicate that it is not going to be removed but it is going to be lifted and fixed in place; Sheet A-1 shows two windows that are bubbled indicating that the historic casings will be maintained; and Sheet A-2 has three bubbles indicating that the new windows will have custom casings, heads, and sills that will match those of the original windows. Ms. Riley asked if the doors from the house to the screened porch are exterior doors. Mr. Blue stated that the screened porch is not a conditioned space. Mr. Siska stated that what Ms. Riley is asking is are the doors from the kitchen and the stair hall exterior doors. Mr. Blue said yes. Ms. Riley asked if there is a basement under the screened porch. Mr. Blue said no. Mr. Dayton stated that he understands the house will be lifted and a new basement placed underneath. Mr. Blue said yes. Mr. Caruso asked about the depth of the foundation. Mr. Blue said it will be nine feet and change. Mr. Dayton asked if there will be a water problem. Mr. Blue said no, the only problem was water coming through the roof.

With reference to the barn, Mr. Blue stated that he also consulted with Mr. Hefner on this but is not sure about the previously existing size of the barn. The plans submitted indicated a barn height of 24 foot 10 inches which does not meet Code and will require a variance. Mr. Hefner stated that the barn is a pretty important issue and the applicant wishes to maximize the gross floor area for an

accessory building. Mr. Hefner stated that he did measure the barn that existed on the property before it was taken apart (shown on the plan marked received April 10, 2019). The historic barn was 28 feet 6 inches by 31 feet and the applicant's proposed barn is 30 feet by 37 feet; there is a big difference in volume and form from the original barn. Mr. Hefner submitted a possible solution, plan marked received April 16, 2019, indicating the barn the way it was later in time with a lean-to on the east end; 28 feet 6 inches by 31 feet with an 8-foot lean-to which yields 1,111 square feet which is identical to what is being proposed for the first floor which is much more compatible with the setting of the house. Mr. Prendergast stated that he was given a picture by Mr. Hefner of the original Stephen Hedges barn and that barn is larger than the measurements indicate and that barn has the doors, not in the center, but on the left-hand side. Mr. Prendergast stated that he is trying to maximize the space for storage and that his proposal matches closer to the picture that was provided him. Mr. Hefner stated that the Stephen Hedges barn is older than the house and had gunstock posts and was a timber frame barn. In the 20th century that barn was expanded by 10 feet at one end and garage doors were installed in the gable end which was more of a garage addition to the existing barn; the barn did ultimately become a larger volume so there is an original and an expanded. Ms. Riley asked the reason for the storage. Mr. Prendergast stated that he has six children and he needs storage space; he lives in a 9,000 square foot house and every square foot is filled. There is not enough attic space in this house and that he intends to move into the house which will be his permanent residence and that is the reason for maximizing the storage space in the barn. The Board found that Mr. Hefner's suggested barn size acceptable; Ms. Riley noted that that is not the applicant's proposal. Mr. Caruso stated that he likes the barn with the lean-to; Messrs. Siska and Dayton agreed. Mr. Siska stated that the Board can vote on the changes to the house but the barn requires a variance. Mr. Prendergast stated that he would like to make sure that what he wants to do with the barn will be approved by the Board. Mr. Siska stated that the consensus of the Board is that the barn, as shown in Mr. Hefner's plan submitted today, would be acceptable.

Upon motion of Robert D. Caruso, duly seconded by C. Sherrill Dayton, the Board unanimously granted the Certificate of Appropriateness for the renovation/addition to the house only as indicated on plans dated revised April 2, 2019, marked received April 4, 2019, and with further revisions to Sheets Ex-1, A-1, and A-2 dated revised April 9, 2019, marked received April 16, 2019. The barn will require a variance from the Zoning Board and if granted, will come back to the Design Review Board for approval.

3. Quiet Clam – Premises of F. F. & G. Realty Co. – 100 Montauk Highway

This application is tabled as the applicant is still waiting for the preparation of surveys.

4. White's Apothecary – Premises of 81 NYCO LLC – 81 Main Street – SCTM #301-3-6-17.1

This application is tabled as the applicant is in the process of preparing revised lighting plans.

Upon motion of Kristin Corwin, duly seconded by Robert D. Caruso, the Board unanimously adjourned the meeting at 9:30 a.m.

FILED
VILLAGE OF EAST HAMPTON, NY
DATE May 7, 2019
TIME 2:00 p.m.

