Nicholas Viest Chairman

Latha ThompsonDistrict Manager



505 Park Avenue Suite 620 New York, N.Y. 10022 (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

<u>Landmarks Committee, April 16, 2012 – 6:30PM</u> Marymount Manhattan College, 221 East 71st Street, Regina Peruggi Room, 2nd Fl

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

Absent Excused: David Liston, Kenneth Austin

1. **28 East 70th Street (Madison Avenue) – Upper East Historic District –** *Mr. Angelo Costa, Architect* – Application is to enlarge a window opening at the 15th floor.

WHEREAS, 28 East 70th Street is an apartment building designed by Emery Roth.

WHEREAS, the proposed new window on the 15th floor was not shown in the context of the building façade.

WHEREAS, the window is dissimilar to the other windows in that it is taller than the windows either side and not in line with the window below.

WHEREAS, the window is set too close to the corner for a masonry building of this style and period,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this application is **disapproved** as presented.

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

2. 149 East 73rd Street (aka 1019-1029 Lexington Avenue aka 145-151 East 73rd Street – Upper East Historic District Extension– *Mr. Doug Simpson, Panorama Windows* – Application is for a Master Plan for window replacement.

WHEREAS, 149 East 73rd Street is a Renaissance Revival-style apartment building designed by J. E. R. Carpenter and constructed in 1924.

WHEREAS, the original J. E. R. Carpenter design for the building included 8 over 8 windows for the large openings and 6 over 6 windows for the small openings; these windows were replaced in 1984 with one over one aluminum double hung windows.

WHEREAS, the Upper East Side Historic District Extension includes 149 East 74th Street; a Certificate of Appropriateness is required from the Landmarks Preservation Commission for a window Master Plan.

WHEREAS, the applicant now wants to establish a Master Plan that would upgrade the windows so that they would be more energy efficient and that would maintain the one over one windows; the new windows would be constructed of aluminum-clad wood or be all aluminum.

WHEREAS, J. E. R. Carpenter was one of the great designers of luxury apartment buildings in New York City; the 1984 window replacement diminished the building considerably.

WHEREAS, a new Master Plan for the windows at 149 East 73rd Street must reflect the original fenestration (8 over 8 windows for the large openings and 6 over 6 openings for the small windows).

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this application is **disapproved** as presented.

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

3. **1511 Third Avenue (aka 1511-1515 Third Avenue aka 201-203 East 85th Street) [Yorkville Bank Building]** – A request to landmark the building. (Laid over from March 19th meeting)

WHEREAS, 1511 Third Avenue is an Italian renaissance Revival style structure built in 1905 by Robert Maynicke.

WHEREAS, this well preserved building has maintained its architectural integrity.

WHEREAS, this building, which was once the Yorkville Bank Building, is a rare, fully intact survivor in a neighborhood that has undergone significant change.

WHEREAS, the building is an important example of the German community that once populated Yorkville.

WHEREAS, the building is significant for its social and cultural heritage as well as its distinctive architectural presence.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this application is **approved** as presented.

VOTE: 8 in favor (Ashby, Birnbaum, Davis, Evans, Helpern, Parshall, Slater, Tamayo)

4. **121** East 64th Street (between Park and Lexington Avenues) - Upper East Side Historic District – *Higgins Quasebarth & Partners, LLC* - A residence originally designed by John McCool and built in 1876-77, altered by James E. Casale with a neo- Tudor style façade in 1919-22. Application is to restore the facade and replace ironwork.

THIS APPLICATION IS DIVIDED INTO TWO PARTS: PART 1 – THE FRONT ELEVATION AND PART 2 – THE FENCE AT THE FRONT

PART 1 – THE FRONT ELEVATION

WHEREAS, 121 East 64th Street is a residence designed by John McCool and constructed in 1876-77 and later altered in the neo-Tudor style in 1919-22 by Frederick J. Sterner.

WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to restore the front elevation to the 1919-22 neo-Tudor redesign. **WHEREAS**, the applicant would remove the non-original thick, heavy stucco coating that now exists and would reapply a smoother coating that would duplicate the original historic coating – at the upper floors the coating would present as a slightly rougher stucco finish and the oriel [the large bay window that projects out] at the 3rd floor as well as the base and the balustrade at the second floor would be clad in a less textured, smoother stucco finish.

WHEREAS, the applicant would repair and replace, if necessary, any limestone elements on the front elevation, including window surrounds and clean, paint and restore ground level door and window limestone surrounds.

WHEREAS, the applicant would recreate the arch-termination detail at the service entrance at the ground floor and the two existing carriage lights that now flank the entry door would be removed – one to be centered over the service door and one to be centered over the entry door.

WHEREAS, Sterner houses are special and rare. In addition to being involved with the design of many prominent buildings in the United States, he was known for remodeling brownstones into houses of artistic merit in New York City.

WHEREAS, he proposed restoration of the front elevation is lovely and will return 121 East 64th Street to its neo-Tudor glory and is a great improvement over the existing condition with its heavy stucco finish

WHEREAS, the proposed restoration of the front elevation is contextual within the historic district.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Part 1 of this application – the restoration of the front elevation – is **approved** as presented.

VOTE: 8 in favor (Ashby, Birnbaum, Davis, Evans, Helpern, Parshall, Slater, Tamayo)

PART 2 – THE PROPOSED FENCE

WHEREAS, the applicant proposes replacing the existing non-historic fence at the base of 121 East 64th Street with a more Gothic design based on a fence at a similar building in the neighborhood.

WHEREAS, the more Gothic design would include cage piers with an arch at the top of the gate at the main entrance and a flat gate with spikes at the service entrance.

WHEREAS, the current fence is 4'6" high; the new fence will be 5'4" high and 6' high to the crown of the piers that will flank the fence at the entry.

WHEREAS, the house at 18'7" isn't wide enough to take such a tall fence and obscures the neo-Gothic architectural detailing of the house.

WHEREAS, the height of the fence is not appropriate in the historic district.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Part 2 of this application – the proposed fence -- is **disapproved** as presented.

VOTE: 6 in favor (Ashby, Davis, Evans, Helpern, Parshall, Slater), 2 against (Birnbaum, Tamayo)

5. 122 East 95th Street (between Park and Lexington Avenues) – Expanded Carnegie Hill Historic District– *Michael Zenreich Architects*, *PC* – Application is to replace windows and doors.

WHEREAS, 122 East 95th Street is a Queen Anne style row house designed by C. Abbott French & Co.

WHEREAS, the main entrance door will be changed to simulate the original wood entrance door that was on the second floor at the top of the original stoop that had long since been removed.

WHEREAS, the two new windows on the second floor, in the location of the original entrance door, match the other four windows on the second floor.

WHEREAS, the brick infill below the new second floor windows is slightly recessed to evoke the memory of the original doorway.

WHEREAS, the new pairs of windows on either side of the central window on the fourth floor are reminiscent of the design of the original windows.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this application is **approved** as presented.

VOTE: 8 in favor (Ashby, Birnbaum, Davis, Evans, Helpern, Parshall, Slater, Tamayo)

6. **170** East 75th Street (between Lexington and Third Avenues) – Upper East Historic District Extension– *Mr. Thomas M. Felton, Architect* – Application is for a rooftop addition and for a window enlargement at the ground floor of the front elevation.

WHEREAS, 170 East 75th Street is an Arts & Crafts style rowhouse designed by B. Muldron and constructed in 1880-81; altered by Hill & Stout in 1902.

WHEREAS, 170 East 75th Street is one of a row of 5 townhouses constructed at the same time. **WHEREAS**, there is a commercial space at the ground level with apartments above; the applicant proposes to return 170 East 75th St. to a single family dwelling.

WHEREAS, the applicant proposes extending out the first floor at the rear by 7'; the integrity of a 30' rear yard will be maintained.

WHEREAS, the applicant proposes adding a new 5th floor plus a stair bulkhead; the new 5th floor will be set back 10' from the front elevation and at the rear will be flush with the rear elevation. **WHEREAS**, 170 East 75th Street is now 43'11' high; the new 5th floor will be 14' high and the

bulkhead will be 4' high so that the new overall height of 170 East 75th St. will be approximately 63' high.

WHEREAS, at the front elevation on the 4th floor, a dormer window was altered in the 1970s and new presents as a large plate glass window with two divided lights on either side; this window is not contextual within the historic district.

WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to bring back/replace the side windows with 6 over 6 wooden windows and replace the single plate glass window with a 5 over 5 wooden window; the panes of these new windows would be in proportion to the panes in the windows on the rest of the front elevation. [All the windows on the front elevation are wood windows.]

WHEREAS, at the rear, the new bulkhead would have a paned window to bring light into the stairwell.

WHEREAS, all the windows on the rear elevation would be steel casement windows; the windows at the first and second floors would have doors in the middle for access to both the garden and the terrace at the second floor.

WHEREAS, at the front, at the ground or 1st floor, the center tri-partite window, which now extends to the ground, would be shortened. There will be brick infill below the new window. [The part of the window that will be removed now presents as painted wood paneling.]

WHEREAS, the existing painted wood panel that is part of the window at the ground level adds charm and whimsy to 170 East 75th Street.

WHEREAS, a part of the new 5th floor and a part of the new bulkhead are partially visible only from Madison Avenue, but are otherwise not visible from the public way; the architect did not present sightlines from Madison Ave. but did present sightlines from the immediate neighborhood.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this application is **approved** as presented.

VOTE: 5 in favor (Ashby, Davis, Evans, Helpern, Parshall), 3 against (Birnbaum, Slater, Tamayo)

7. **63** East 92nd Street (between Madison and Park Avenues) – Expanded Carnegie Hill Historic District – *Brendan Coburn, Architect* – Application is to alter the façade and enlarge the penthouse.

WHEREAS, 63 East 92nd Street is a Neo-Colonial style row house designed by John Brandt and altered by Edward Webber.

WHEREAS, the extension of the front areaway would replace a public sidewalk with a private entrance way.

WHEREAS, the existing front façade has a delicacy and a scale appropriate to a small row house and the proposed limestone and brick appear too grand.

WHEREAS, the roof top addition would be visible from the Street.

WHEREAS, the squared off expansion of the rear of the ground floor would replace a unique and charming curved wall with curved windows.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this application is disapproved as presented.

VOTE: 8 in favor (Ashby, Birnbaum, Davis, Evans, Helpern, Parshall, Slater, Tamayo)

8. **126** East 62nd Street (between Park and Lexington Avenues) – Upper East Historic District – *Ms, Raffaella Bortoluzzi, Labo LLC Architecture* – Application is to replace windows and enlarge the 3rd floor.

WHEREAS, 126 East 62nd Street is an Italianate style brownstone designed by John Sexton and constructed in 1871.

WHEREAS, the applicant is proposing the add 120 sq. ft. (9'6" x 12' 6") at the 3rd floor at the rear elevation; the addition will cantilever or project out from the rear elevation.

WHEREAS, similar enlargements in the exact same dimensions now exist at the first floor and at the second floor; the new enlargement at the 3rd floor will mimic these existing enlargements.

WHEREAS, the enlargement will have a metal grid parapet that will be covered with climbing ivy to match similar treatments at the 1^{st} and 2^{nd} floors; it will be made of steel.

WHEREAS, the application respects the 30' rear yard requirement.

WHEREAS, at the front elevation at the ground level there are two windows to the right of the entry door that do not align; both windows will be replaced with wooden double hung windows that replicate the original windows.

WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to extend the window at the far right down 4" to correct the alignment.

WHEREAS, both the enlargement the 3rd floor and the alignment and replacement of the windows at the front elevation at the ground level are contextual and appropriate within the historic district.

WHEREAS, the applicant is to be commended for including a model of the proposed new rear elevation as part of his presentation.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this application is **approved** as presented.

VOTE: 8 in favor (Ashby, Birnbaum, Davis, Evans, Helpern, Parshall, Slater, Tamayo),

9. **21** East 69th Street (between Madison and Park Avenues) – Upper East Historic District – *Mr. William Leeds, Architect* – Application is for an enlargement of the building.

WHEREAS, 21 East 69th Street is a Neo-Georgian style building erected in 1885-86 by Charles Buck & Co. and altered in 1926-27 by Sloane and Robertson.

WHEREAS, the enlargement of the building using the full depth of the site would eliminate the open space in the rear of the building.

WHEREAS, the proposed bulk of the building would be out of scale with the massing of the existing residentially scaled buildings.

WHEREAS, the proposed enlargement would significantly reduce the light and air to the garden level of the adjoining buildings.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this application is **disapproved** as presented.

VOTE: 8 in favor (Ashby, Birnbaum, Davis, Evans, Helpern, Parshall, Slater, Tamayo)