James G. Clynes Chairman

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

The City of New York Manhattan Community Board 8 Landmarks Committee Marymount Manhattan College 221 East 71<sup>st</sup> Street, Regina Peruggi Room Monday, May 18, 2015

**Present:** Elizabeth Ashby, Michele Birnbaum, David Helpern, Jane Parshall, Marco Tamayo, Christina Davis, Sarah Chu, Susan Evans, Glen Pandolfino

Absent excused: David Liston

1. **825 Fifth Avenue (between 63<sup>rd</sup> and 64<sup>th</sup> Streets)**—**Upper East Side Historic District** – *Michael A. Peterman, Architect*-A Neo-Classical style apartment building designed by J.E.R. Carpenter and constructed in 1926. Application is for sidewalk replacement.

**WHEREAS** 825 Fifth Avenue is a neo-Classical style apartment building designed by J. E. R. Carpenter and constructed in 1926.

**WHEREAS** 825 Fifth Avenue is 70' wide; the applicant proposes to exchange the existing concrete sidewalk across the width of the building with a new bluestone sidewalk.

**WHEREAS** the proposed new sidewalk would be comprised of 10' x 10' blocks of bluestone set on top of a reinforced concrete slab.

**WHEREAS** the applicant also proposes to move the front planter wall approximately 4/5' into existing space in front of the building so that it aligns with the buildings immediately to the north and immediately to the south of 825 Fifth Avenue. [The width of the planted areas in front of all three buildings will now match each other.]

**WHEREAS** 820 Fifth Avenue and 828 Fifth Avenue, the two buildings to the north and south of 825 Fifth Avenue now have concrete sidewalks and will continue to have concrete sidewalks.

**WHEREAS** because there is a change to the existing materials, a Certificate of Appropriateness is required from the Landmarks Preservation Commission.

**WHEREAS** the application is contextual and appropriate within the historic district. **THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** that of this application is approved as presented.

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

8-0-0

2. **121 East 78<sup>th</sup> Street (between Park and Lexington Avenues)-Upper East Side Historic District**-*Halsted Wells, Halsted Wells Associates*-An Italianate style residence designed by an unknown architect and constructed in 1871. Application is for sidewalk replacement.

**WHEREAS** the existing bluestone sidewalk has a random pattern;

**WHEREAS** the existing bluestone sidewalk has heaved so that the bluestone flags are uneven and present a tripping hazard;

WHEREAS five of the bluestone flags have deteriorated;

**WHEREAS** the existing tree planter in the southeast corner of the sidewalk is undersized and framed by four small pieces of bluestone, two either side;

**WHEREAS** all the bluestone flags will be removed and re-set over a new four inch thick concrete slab to create an even walking surface and to preclude heaving in the future;

**WHEREAS** the deteriorated bluestone flags will be replaced with new bluestone flags to match the existing;

**WHEREAS** the existing tree pit will be extended to the west, to the property line;

**WHEREAS** the exiting tree pit will be extended slightly to the north to eliminate the slight offset in the east–west joint line immediately to the north of the tree pit;

**WHEREAS** the two small pieces of bluestone and one large flag to the east of the tree pit will be replaced by one bluestone flag approximating the size of the three existing flags;

**WHEREAS** the existing random pattern will be retained with the exception of the area around the tree pit;

**WHEREAS** the bluestone sidewalk is contextual and appropriate within the historic district.

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

**VOTE:** 8 in favor (Ashby, Birnbaum, Chu, Davis, Evans, Helpern, Parshall, Tamayo).

8-0-0

3. **NEW BUSINESS** - Discussion of Intro 775, which imposes strict deadlines and penalties on the Landmarks Preservation Commission's ability to consider potential landmarks. [BEN KALLOS, WHO IS ON THE LANDMARKS COMMITTEE OF THE CITY COUNCIL, WAS PRESENT TO DISCUSS HIS OPPOSITION TO INTRO 775.] The following resolution was drafted:

**WHEREAS** Intro 775 is too restrictive and places an unacceptable time burden on the Landmarks Preservation Commission.

**WHEREAS** the Landmarks Preservation Commission has an unpredictable slate of applications that it must address; the Landmarks Preservation Commission cannot adhere to a strict calendar or timeline for the applications that are calendared for public hearings.

**WHEREAS** Intro 775 does not address how to accommodate the current backlog of 100 calendared items.

**WHEREAS** a critical component of Intro 775 treats as <u>*EQUAL*</u> [and without a thoughtful evaluation of any difference in the three categories] a) a disapproval, b) a failure to hold a hearing, and c) a failure to designate.

**THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** THAT COMMUNITY BOARD #8M urges the City Council to strongly oppose Intro 775.

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

8-0-0