Nicholas Viest Chair

Latha Thompson 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 Manhattan Community Board 8 Landmarks Committee, Monday, March 17, 2014 – 6:30PM Marymount Manhattan College, 221 East 71<sup>st</sup> Street, Regina Peruggi Room, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor

**Present:** Elizabeth Ashby, Christina Davis, Susan Evans, David Helpern, Jane Parshall, Teri Slater, Marco Tamayo **Excused:** Michele Birnbaum

1. **19 East 70<sup>th</sup> Street (between Fifth and Madison) INDIVIDUAL LANDMARK – Upper East Side Historic District –** *Peter Alter, Architect.* Application is to restore front elevation and rebuild rear elevation.

**WHEREAS** 19 East 70<sup>th</sup> Street (formerly the Knoedler Gallery), is a neo-Italianate Renaissance style building designed by Thornton Chard and constructed in 1909-10 for David Morris and his wife, Alice Vanderbilt Morris on land formerly owned by James Lenox.

**WHEREAS** 19 East 70<sup>th</sup> Street was designated an individual landmark in 1974; the Landmarks Preservation Commission cited its architectural distinction, noting its simplified but sophisticated version of the early Italian Renaissance style.

WHEREAS at the front elevation the existing limestone façade will be completely restored.

**WHEREAS** at the front elevation at the ground level, there is a loggia entryway with 3 arches, 6' deep (recessed) with gates on the two left arches and the entry door at the 3<sup>rd</sup> arch. The applicant proposes to replace and raise the existing guard rails with new ones (including a new one at the 3<sup>rd</sup> bay) that will be 5' high instead of the existing 3'. [NB: The rail to the left has a gate that swings in and the rail to the right at the entrance is actually a pair of gates that swing out.] The new black painted metal guardrail and gates will be designed to match the existing window guards which will be restored.

**WHEREAS** the applicant proposes octagonal-shaped decorative lanterns for each of the 3 bays to replace the existing hanging small white globes.

**WHEREAS** the applicant proposes new dark-stained oak double entry doors with in-kind panel details to replace the existing non-original arched-topped entry doors with a fan-window/transom above. There will be an iron grille in front of the fan window that will include the house number; the fan window will have a dark stained wood frame that will match the doors.

**WHEREAS** applicant proposes to replace the existing non-historic storm doors in front of the entrance doors with new open metal-work doors.

**WHEREAS** at the front elevation at the 5<sup>th</sup> story there is a set-back balcony with 3 openings (two double hung wooden windows and one French door); the applicant proposes to replace the two existing windows with French doors so that there will be now three French doors instead of one French door with windows on either side.

**WHEREAS** at the roof, the applicant proposes to replace/modernize the existing elevator/stair bulkhead to minimize its massing and to replace the mechanicals which are not visible from the public way. The mechanicals will be enclosed by a painted metal screen.

**WHEREAS** at the rear elevation, there is a series of stepped conditions, a bay windows and brick wall at the first floor that was formerly a large window with a curved skylight. {NB: The bay windows are on the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> floors.] **WHEREAS** the applicant proposes to reconstruct the entire back wall of the property to create a series of skylights; to create the skylights (some of which will be ventable), the stepped or setback condition of the rear elevation will be maintained – the existing bay will not be retained. The depth of each stepback/setback will range from 24" to 36". [NB: The setbacks provide legal light and air to interior dwelling rooms.]

**WHEREAS** at the rear elevation, the applicant proposes an insulated glazing system and a dark painted insulated metal panel system at the ground floor and the first floor.

**WHEREAS** the applicant proposes stucco rendered façade panels on either side of the insulated glazing system with a cast stone coping above to match façade panels.

**WHEREAS** at the rear elevation, the applicant proposes a new brick façade to match the original building brick at the third, fourth and fifth floors.

WHEREAS at the rear elevation, the applicant proposes dark painted metal penthouse façade panels. WHEREAS the proposed changes to both the front and rear elevations are contextual and appropriate both within the historic district and for an individual landmark of this stature. THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this application is approved as presented.

**VOTE**: 7 in favor (Ashby, Davis, Evans, Helpern, Parshall, Slater, Tamayo)

 740 Madison Avenue, 23 East 64<sup>th</sup> Street and 25 East 64<sup>th</sup> Street -Upper East Side Historic District – Mr. Louis Lisboa – 740 Madison Avenue is a neo-Georgian style two-story commercial building, 23 East 64<sup>th</sup> Street is a neo-Federal style five-story row house and 25 East 64<sup>th</sup> Street is an Italianate style four-story residence. The application is to renew the permit for a façade renovation.

This application is divided into two parts:

**Part A:** To approve the façades with the exception of the plate glass window in the base of 25 East 64<sup>th</sup> Street **WHEREAS** this application is to renew the permit;

WHEREAS this application is to renovate and restore the facades;

**WHEREAS** this application was previously approved by Community Board 8 provided a horizontal element was introduced to match the limestone base that differentiates floors 1 and 2 on the façade of 740 Madison Avenue; **WHEREAS** the applicant provided the horizontal element in limestone as recommended;

**WHEREAS** the application will return 25 East 64<sup>th</sup> Street to its original brownstone façade on the upper floors; **WHEREAS** the application will repair the brick on 23 East 64<sup>th</sup> Street and on the upper floors of 740 Madison Avenue;

WHEREAS this proposal is appropriate to the historic district;

**THEREFORE** be it resolved that Part A of this application is approved.

Vote: 7 in favor (Ashby, Davis, Evans, Helpern, Parshall, Slater, Tamayo)

**Part B:** To disapprove the plate glass window on the ground floor of 25 East 64<sup>th</sup> Street

WHEREAS 25 East 64<sup>th</sup> Street was originally designed as a five story brownstone residence;

**WHEREAS** the application proposes to replace the garage door on the ground floor with a large, plate glass window because of the intended commercial use;

WHEREAS the plate glass window is not compatible with the residential character of the house;

**WHEREAS** the application does not propose to replace the garage door on the ground floor of 23 East 64<sup>th</sup> Street so that the residential character of this adjacent house is maintained;

**WHEREAS** the proposed plate glass window in 25 East 64<sup>th</sup> street would also not be compatible with the residential character of the adjacent 23 East 64<sup>th</sup> street house;

**THEREFORE** be it resolved that Part B of this application is disapproved.

Vote: 7 in favor (Ashby, Davis, Evans, Helpern, Parshall, Slater, Tamayo)

3. **20 East 63<sup>rd</sup> Street (between Fifth and Madison Avenues) – Upper East Side Historic District --** *Steven O'Neil, Architect.* Application is to renovate the front façade, install new awnings, incorporate new iron rail work and replace windows with new windows in existing openings.

# THIS APPLICATION IS DIVIDED INTO TWO PARTS: PART A – The Front Elevation excluding the brownstone stucco facing for the upper 3 floors and PART B – The brownstone stucco facing for the top three floors.

**WHEREAS** 20 East 63<sup>rd</sup> Street is a neo-Grec style building designed by Gage Insiee and constructed in 1876. **WHEREAS** 20 East 63<sup>rd</sup> Street is a retail building just set off of Madison;

**WHEREAS** many years ago the stoop was removed, the decoration was stripped off and the building now has an undistinguished modern brick façade; when the stoop was removed, the building was extended out. The front elevation is now brownstone stucco over brick.

**WHEREAS** the applicant proposes to bring back scale and proportion to the building by creating an articulated limestone base for the first two floors, with a decorative ironwork fence at the ground floor at the windows framing the entry door.

**WHEREAS** at the  $2^{nd}$  floor the applicant proposes a new dark gray French door with muntins topped by a dark gray half circle picture window with muntins with a window on either side to be framed in limestone. Above the half circle picture window will be a new limestone ornament engraved with the building number.

WHEREAS the double entry doors will be mahogany with beveled glass and polished brass hardware.

**WHEREAS** all the windows on the entire elevation will have dark brown fabric awnings which will be fixed on all floors, except at the ground level where the awnings will be retractable.

**WHEREAS** the proposed design with its aristocratic French style for the first and second floor is contextual and appropriate within the historic district.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Part A of this application is approved as presented.

**VOTE**: 7 in favor (Ashby, Slater, Davis, Evans, Helpern, Parshall, Tamayo)

### PART B – The brownstone stucco facing on the top three floor

**WHEREAS** at the top three floors the applicant proposes a brownstone stucco facing and new in-kind windows with limestone surrounds

WHEREAS the brownstone stucco facing creates too much of a contrast with the proposed limestone base.

**THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** that Part B of this application be disapproved as presented.

VOTE: 3 in favor (Ashby, Evans, Slater), 3 against (Davis, Helpern, Parshall, 1 abstention (Tamayo)

### NO RECOMMENDATION

Second Vote

**THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** that Part B of this application be approved as presented.

VOTE: 3 in favor (Davis, Helpern, Parshall), 3 against (Ashby, Evans, Slater), 1 abstention (Tamayo)

## NO RECOMMENDATION

4. New Business -- Picasso Curtain at the Four Seasons Restaurant in the Seagrams Building

The Committee discussed whether to request Landmark Designation from the Landmarks Preservation Commission for the Picasso Curtain in its location at 99 East 52d Street. The Committee considered this in light of a request from Community Board 5 to support its resolution in favor of Landmark Designation for the Curtain. The committee was also briefed by Gus Christensen, a board member of the New York Landmarks Conservancy. Thus the CB8 Landmarks Committee formulated a resolution to request Landmark Designation for the Curtain based on the resolution passed by CB5 as follows:

"WHEREAS, The Four Seasons Restaurant, located at 99 East 52<sup>nd</sup> Street, was created by Mies van der Rohe (building) and Philip Johnson (restaurant) in 1959 and designated as an interior landmark in 1989; and

WHEREAS, One critical element of the restaurant is a portion of a painted curtain created by Pablo Picasso for Serge Diaghilev's Ballets Russes production of "Le Tricorne" in 1919; and

WHEREAS, The curtain is 19 feet high and 20 feet wide and is the largest painting extant by Picasso with the exception of "Guernica," which is located in Madrid; and

WHEREAS, The curtain is, in and of itself, an important work from Picasso's White Period and is unique in terms of its purpose, materials and size and, while valued monetarily for insurance purposes, is critically considered to be priceless; and

WHEREAS, The Picasso Curtain has hung on a travertine wall in the corridor between the Grill Room and the Pool Room of The Four Seasons from the first day of the restaurant's opening in 1959; and

WHEREAS, The curtain is considered an integral part of the design and concept of the restaurant, which was created to be a complete and full artistic experience, including all furnishings, sculpture, art, decoration, tableware, and additional design elements; and

WHEREAS, The importance of the curtain to the concept and execution of the restaurant was such that the section of wall on which it hangs was never clad in travertine by Mr. Johnson; its finish being deemed unnecessary as the curtain was intended to always hang in this location; and

WHEREAS, At the time of the interior landmark designation of The Four Seasons in 1989 it was deemed that the curtain not be included due to both a narrow reading of landmark criteria which saw it as a "removable element" and in recognition of the need to do everything possible to ensure that the restaurant interior gain landmark protection due to the danger of it being dismantled; and

WHEREAS, Legislation following the interior landmark ruling both upheld the designation and made it clear that additional elements, which would clearly have included the Picasso Curtain, would have also been designated if they had been included in the request; and

WHEREAS, The curtain has been regularly recognized as important to the overall design concept of the restaurant and has remained in its original location for 55 years; and

WHEREAS, Its current situation without designation leaves its status as culturally and artistically important and as an essential element of The Four Seasons to the subjective vicissitudes of those in control of the building at any given time; and

WHEREAS, Other elements considered removable, such as lighting fixtures and art, have appeared in many interior landmark designations, such as at The Plaza hotel, further indicating that a designation of curtain is appropriate and within Landmarks Preservation Commission jurisdiction; and

WHEREAS, Beyond the consideration of the Picasso Curtain as an integral element of the landmarked interior and its artistic and cultural significance, the curtain is in an extremely fragile and dangerous state and may not survive a removal from its location;"

**THEREFORE** be it resolved that Community Board Eight **submit a Request for Designation** of the Picasso Curtain in its exact location at 99 East 52<sup>nd</sup> Street as an Interior Landmark and as an addendum to the interior landmark designation of The Four Seasons restaurant with a letter to the Landmarks Preservation Commission similar to the letter sent by Community Board Five, to be signed by The Chair of Community Board Eight and the Co- Chairs of the Community Board Eight Landmarks Committee.

David Helpern and Jane Parshall – Co-Chairs, Landmarks Committee