

Valerie S. Mason
Chair

Will Brightbill
District Manager



505 Park Avenue, Suite 620
New York, N.Y. 10022-1106
(212) 758-4340
(212) 758-4616 (Fax)
www.cb8m.com – Website
info@cb8m.com – E-Mail

**The City of New York
Community Board 8 Manhattan
Landmarks Committee
Monday, May 19, 2025 – 6:30 PM
*This meeting was conducted via Zoom.***

PLEASE NOTE: When evaluating Applications for Certificates of Appropriateness, the Landmarks Committee of Community Board 8 Manhattan ONLY considers the appropriateness of the proposal to the architecture of the building and, in the case of a building within a Historic District, the appropriateness of the proposal to the character of that Historic District. All testimony should be related to such appropriateness. The Committee recommends a Resolution to the full Community Board, which votes on a Resolution to be sent to the Landmarks Preservation Commission. These Resolutions are advisory; the decision of the Landmarks Preservation Commission is binding.

Applicants and members of the public who are interested in the issues addressed are invited, but not required, to attend the **Full Board meeting on Wednesday, May 21, 2025**. They may testify for up to two minutes in the Public Session, which they must sign up for no later than 6:45PM. Members of the Board will discuss the items in executive session; if a member of the public wishes a comment made or a question asked at this time, he or she must ask a Board Member to do it.

MINUTES:

Board Members Present: Elizabeth Ashby, Gayle Baron, Michele Birnbaum, Alida Camp, Sarah Chu, David Helpen, John McClement, Jane Parshall, Kimberly Selway, and Marco Tamayo.

Approximate Number of Public Attendees: 26

Resolutions for Approval:

- Item 1:** 1060 Fifth Avenue
- Item 2:** 809 Madison Avenue
- Item 3:** 23 East 92nd Street
- Item 4:** 128 East 73rd Street

Item 1: 1060 Fifth Avenue (Expanded Carnegie Hill Historic District) – *Ferguson & Shamamian Architects* – A neo-Renaissance style building designed by J.E.R. Carpenter and constructed in 1927-1928. Application is for modification to an existing opening at the 10th story Fifth Avenue façade to match the windows below.

WHEREAS 1060 Fifth Avenue is a neo-Renaissance style building; and

WHEREAS the original design of the Fifth Avenue Façade was perfectly symmetrical; and

WHEREAS the windows from top to bottom and north to south were organized with a pair of individual windows, brick wall, single window, brick wall, row of seven individual windows, brick wall, single window, brick wall, and pair of individual windows; and

WHEREAS all windows are one over one double hung; and

WHEREAS the portion of the vertical brick wall set between the southerly window of the row of seven windows and the single window (third and fourth windows from the eastern edge) has been demolished to enable a tripartite window with a large single sheet of glass, commonly known as a picture window, between the double hung windows on floors 7, 8, and 9; and

WHEREAS the applicant wants to match the tripartite windows in the referenced vertical row of windows on the 10th floor; and

WHEREAS the creation of the tripartite windows was not informed by a windows master plan; and

WHEREAS the proposed tripartite window changes the proportion of brick to windows, thereby making the former vertical wall of brick into more of a vertical row of windows than a vertical wall of masonry; and

WHEREAS the rationale for creating the tripartite arrangement is to provide a direct view of Central Park from the elevator lobby; and

WHEREAS the architect intended the view of Central Park to reveal itself as one entered the apartment and viewed through the windows as originally placed; and

WHEREAS the direct view from the elevator lobby is not sufficient reason to change the symmetrical façade; and

WHEREAS the proposed insertion on the tenth floor of the additional tripartite window detracts from the symmetrical design of the building; and

WHEREAS the proposed insertion on the tenth floor of the additional tripartite window is not contextual or appropriate to the design of the building or to the historic district; and

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that this application is **DISAPPROVED**.

Board Members in Favor: 8-0-0-0 (Ashby, Baron, Birnbaum, Camp, Helpert, McClement, Selway, Tamayo)

Item 2: 809 Madison Avenue (Upper East Side Historic District) – *Robert A.M. Stern Architects* – A Neo-Renaissance style building designed by F.B. & A. Ware and constructed in 1924-1925. Application is for the comprehensive restoration and redevelopment of the building, including side and rear yard extensions, rooftop addition and mechanical enclosure, modification of window openings, window replacement, and installation of a new entrance canopy.

WHEREAS 809 Madison Avenue is a neo-Renaissance style building; and

WHEREAS the two distinct scopes of work in the application to this neo-Renaissance style building require two parts for this resolution: Restoration and Enlargement;

PART A, RESTORATION

WHEREAS the exterior of the original building is to be restored except for the penthouse, which will be replaced; and

WHEREAS the restoration will include cleaning, repointing, and repair of the limestone, brick, and terracotta façade; and

WHEREAS previous patching of the limestone and brick is visible; and

WHEREAS the patching of the limestone is less visible than the patching of the brick; and

WHEREAS the limestone can be matched more easily than the brick; and

WHEREAS the existing brick has a range of colors and a textured finish; and

WHEREAS the proposed brick for patching has a range of colors that are complementary to the existing but not a match; and

WHEREAS the proposed brick for patching has a smooth finish as opposed to the existing textured finish; and

WHEREAS patching with the proposed brick will be visible; and

WHEREAS existing brick for patching could be salvaged from the eastern wall which is to be demolished as part of the enlargement; and

WHEREAS the restoration will include replacing existing windows with high performance windows that emulate the character of the existing windows; and

WHEREAS some windows will be enlarged to meet the requirements of the new floor plans; and

WHEREAS existing six over six windows will be enlarged to match existing eight over eight windows; and

WHEREAS masonry between existing pairs of bathroom windows will be demolished, and bathroom windows will be combined with a new center window to create four over four outer windows and six over six central windows; and

WHEREAS base will be restored except for area of retail condominium to remove non-historic storefront and replace with replicas of original windows; and

WHEREAS applicant has observed that even with the new windows, the proportion of opening to solid is consistent with or less than similar buildings; and

WHEREAS the restoration will include repairing the entry door and recreating a fabric canopy; and

WHEREAS this restoration and adaptations to meet new plan requirements is contextual and appropriate within the historic district;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that **PART A** of this application is **APPROVED AS PRESENTED**.

Board Members in Favor: 10-0-0-0 (Ashby, Baron, Birnbaum, Camp, Chu, Helpen, McClement, Parshall, Selway, Tamayo)

PART B, ENLARGEMENT

WHEREAS the existing penthouse, elevator bulkhead, and water tower are to be removed from this twelve-story building; and

WHEREAS the building will be enlarged to the east and south by filling in existing courtyards; and

WHEREAS the infill to the south will rise the full 12 stories; and

WHEREAS the infill to the east will rise 11 stories with a covered terrace on the 12th floor; and

WHEREAS the eastern enlargement will have façades of complementary brick and

WHEREAS the eastern enlargement will have windows in the north and east façades that match the windows in the restoration; and

WHEREAS a two-story penthouse apartment with a mechanical floor above will be added to the top of the 12-story structure; and

WHEREAS the penthouse will be setback from the north and west facades; and

WHEREAS the mechanical penthouse will be setback from the penthouse; and

WHEREAS the two-story penthouse and mechanical floor will have west, north, and east facades of complementary brick; and

WHEREAS the two-story penthouse and mechanical penthouse above will be in line with the southern face of the southern enlargement; and

WHEREAS the southern façade will be of complementary brick with windows at the west and east ends, blind windows in the center, and openings with louvers the size of windows at the mechanical floor, all in scale with the west, north, and east facades of the building; and

WHEREAS the combination of the duplex apartment and the mechanical penthouse create a three-story penthouse; and

WHEREAS the proposed three-story penthouse visually overwhelms the 12-story building on which it sits; and

WHEREAS the applicant deserves credit for proposing that the south lot line will be made of an articulated brick façade; and

WHEREAS the eastern enlargement and penthouse are seen by the applicant as a frame for the original 12 stories; and

WHEREAS the penthouse portion of the frame is too large in contrast with the original one-story penthouse; and

WHEREAS the enlargement of the building is not contextual and appropriate within the historic district;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that **PART B** of this application is **DISAPPROVED**.

Board Members in Favor: 10-0-0-0 (Ashby, Baron, Birnbaum, Camp, Chu, Helpen, McClement, Parshall, Selway, Tamayo)

Item 3: 23 East 92nd Street (Carnegie Hill Historic District) – *Steven Levine* – A Renaissance Revival style building designed by A.B. Ogden & Son and constructed in 1889-1890. Application is for the reconstruction of an existing three-story rear yard extension, removal of a rear fire-escape, construction of a non visible rooftop stair and elevator bulkhead, and masonry restoration across the building's front façade.

WHEREAS 23 East 92nd Street is a Renaissance revival style building designed by A. B. Ogden & Son and constructed in 1889-1890; and

WHEREAS at the rear elevation, extensions were added in 1902, 1939 and 1958; and

WHEREAS at the rear elevation, the applicant proposes to remove an existing fire escape and to remove an existing rear extension at the 2nd floor; and

WHEREAS at the rear elevation, the applicant proposes a 6' extension into the rear yard, thus shortening the existing rear yard and diminishing the donut typical of contiguous backyards within the historic district; and

WHEREAS at the rear elevation at the ground floor, the applicant proposes a window wall 8'6" high x 66' wide with a french door in the center; the window wall will have steel muntins and presents as a greenhouse; and

WHEREAS at the rear elevation at the first floor, the applicant proposes one french door in the center with a window on either side; and

WHEREAS at the rear elevation at the 2nd and 3rd floors the applicant proposes a new rear yard extension; at the 2nd floor, two new wood windows 3' wide x 8'8" high will be inserted with a new french door between them and a new wrought iron railing; at the 3rd floor, three new wood windows 3' wide x 7' high will be inserted with new limestone sills and lintels; and

WHEREAS at the rear elevation at the 4th floor, the applicant proposes a new french door in the center with a window on either side with a new brock corbel cornice above; and

WHEREAS at the roof, the applicant proposes a new wrought iron railing, a new elevator, and stair bulkhead to be clad in zinc metal seam siding; at the cornice the overall height of the building is approximately 56'; the height increases to approximately 72' with the addition of the new elevator and stair vestibule and elevator overhead (the roof mechanicals were approved at staff level); and

WHEREAS the entire rear elevation will be clad in red brick with the exception of the roof bulkheads (see above); and

WHEREAS the 8 1/2' height per floor of the 3-story of the rear extension (at 1st, 2nd and 3rd floors) presents as too much massing, takes light and air away from the neighboring houses, and is not contextual within the historic district; and

WHEREAS the 6' intrusion into the rear yard is not contextual or appropriate within the historic district; and

WHEREAS the proposed rooftop additions are dramatic and should have been part of this application; and

WHEREAS the applicant is to be commended for the proposed wood windows at the rear elevation;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT this application be **DISAPPROVED** as presented.

Board Members in Favor: 9-0-0-0 (Ashby, Baron, Birnbaum, Camp, Chu, Helpen, Parshall, Selway, Tamayo)

Item 4: 128 East 73rd Street (Upper East Side Historic District) – Trimble Architecture – A Neo-Georgian style building designed by Wallace McCrea and altered in 1928, built originally as a Neo-Grec style building designed by William McNamara and constructed in 1879-1880. Application is to resurface the rear brick façade with stucco and to construct a rear parapet extension to provide proper roof pitch to a series of controlled flow roof drains (stormwater detention).

WHEREAS 128 East 73rd Street is a neo-Georgian style building designed by Wallace McCrea and altered in 1928; and

WHEREAS 128 East 73rd Street was originally designed by William McNamara and constructed in 1879-1880; and

WHEREAS Landmarks Preservation Commission approval was received in 2022 for the work at the rear elevation to deal with existing drainage issues uncovered by the removal of an existing chimney mass that ran the length of the building; metal flues were penetrating the masonry wall; and

WHEREAS the Landmarks Commission asked the applicant to return to us for a review of the as-built condition of the rear elevation, which deviates from the recommended red brick that the Commission approved in 2022; the rear elevation is now clad in stucco; and

WHEREAS at the rear elevation, post demolition of an existing chimney, cavities or holes in the brick were exposed. requiring reconstruction at the rear elevation; and

WHEREAS thus the now as-built elevation includes 1) traditional 3-coat stucco assembly with drainage plane over existing masonry 2) parapet to capture required assembly to pitch storm water to controlled flow roof drains 3) one fixed lite window below a 6 over-9 double hung window at the 2nd floor on the left side of the façade, which does not match the window on the right side of the facade; and

WHEREAS the applicant would like to validate the use of stucco on top of the existing masonry; even though the stucco represents a material change from the brick, it was perceived as a more economical solution to prevent water penetration into the interior; and

WHEREAS Landmarks Commission Certificate of Appropriateness in 2022 required brick at the rear elevation; this committee cannot validate the change from brick to stucco; and

WHEREAS the stucco cladding over the masonry is inappropriate and non-contextual within the Carnegie Hill Historic District; and

WHEREAS the fixed light window at the second floor below the 6-over-9 window violates the symmetry of the 2nd floor rear elevation;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT this application be **DISAPPROVED** as presented.

Board Members in Favor: 9-0-0-0 (Ashby, Baron, Birnbaum, Camp, Chu, Helpern, Parshall, Selway, Tamayo)

Items 5&6: Old Business/New Business

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 9:21 PM.

Anthony Cohn and David Helpern, Co-Chairs