

Nicholas Viest  
Chairman

Latha Thompson  
District Manager



505 Park Avenue  
Suite 620  
New York, N.Y. 10022  
(212) 758-4340  
(212) 758-4616 (Fax)  
[www.cb8m.com](http://www.cb8m.com) - Website  
[info@cb8m.com](mailto:info@cb8m.com) - E-Mail

The City of New York  
Manhattan Community Board 8

Landmarks Committee, Monday, July 15, 2013 – 6:30PM  
Marymount Manhattan College, 221 East 71<sup>st</sup> Street, 2<sup>nd</sup> Fl, Regina Peruggi Room

**Present:** Jane Parshall, Elizabeth Ashby, Marco Tamayo, Susan Evans, Michele Birnbaum, David Helpern

**Absent Excused:** David Liston, Teri Slater, Christina Davis

1. **136 East 65<sup>th</sup> Street (between Lexington and Third Avenues) – Upper East Side Historic District Extension** – *Michael Goldman, Architect* – A Colonial Revival style rowhouse designed by Frederick S. Barus in 1870-1 and altered in 1922 by James Gamble Rogers. Application to alter the rear/garden facades and add new windows, doors and rooftop A/C units.

**THIS APPLICATION IS DIVIDED INTO TWO PARTS: Part A: The application as presented with the exception of the windows and French doors in the rear façade. Part B: The windows and French doors in the rear façade.**

**Part A: The application as presented with the exception of the windows and French doors in the rear façade.**

**WHEREAS** the basement and the first floor are being extended 14'-0" into the rear yard;  
**WHEREAS** the second floor is being extended 9'-6" into the rear yard;  
**WHEREAS** terraces are being created on the top of the first and second floors;  
**WHEREAS** about 50% of the houses on the block have rear extensions;  
**WHEREAS** there is a wide variety of extensions into the rear yards on the block with no particular precedents to be emulated;  
**WHEREAS** the extensions are modest in scale;  
**WHEREAS** the brick and lintels are to match the existing;  
**WHEREAS** the windows and French doors are symmetrical; and  
**WHEREAS** the two new condensing units on the rear of the roof are relatively small;  
**THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** that this application is approved as presented.

**VOTE:** 6 in favor (Ashby, Birnbaum, Evans, Helpern, Parshall, Tamayo)

**Part B: The windows and French doors in the rear façade.**

**WHEREAS** the windows and French doors will be steel sash with insulating glass instead of the existing mahogany windows with single pane glass;  
**WHEREAS** the two asymmetrical arched openings on the second floor will not be replicated in the three new symmetrical openings on the second floor;  
**WHEREAS** the arched transom windows above the French doors set within rectangular openings will not be replicated in the proposed new transom windows on the third floor; and  
**WHEREAS** the proportioning of the muntins in the new windows is not as elegant as in the existing windows  
**THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** that this application is disapproved as presented.

**VOTE:** 3 in favor (Ashby, Birnbaum, Evans) 3 in opposition (Helpern, Parshall, Tamayo)

The Committee has no position on Part B.

2. **1 East 94<sup>th</sup> Street (off Madison, adjacent to the Williard Straight House at the corner of 94<sup>th</sup> and Madison) – Expanded Carnegie Hill Historic District) - – Mr. John Woell, Steven Harris Architects, LPC** – Application is to alter the front and rear facades.

**WHEREAS** 1 East 94<sup>th</sup> Street is a Neo-classical style townhouse originally constructed in 1893-95 and altered by Cass Gilbert in 1925-26.

**WHEREAS** at the front elevation, the applicant proposes to restore the existing front door metalwork and to replace the clear glass panel behind the metalwork with a frosted glass panel.

**WHEREAS** at the front elevation, at the rooftop, there is an existing addition clad in stucco that reads as a small penthouse that is visible from the public way.

**WHEREAS** at this existing addition, the applicant proposes to: a) eliminate one existing window from the west elevation; b) reclad all existing stucco surfaces in standing-seam, lead-coated copper c) at the south or front elevation, replace the existing aluminum sliding door system with painted steel French doors; d) clad the existing chimney wall in copper and relocate the existing roof access ladder, painted to match the new copper cladding.

**WHEREAS** at the rear elevation, the applicant proposes to add, at the third floor, two new wood double hung windows with cast stone lintels; the windows will be in alignment with the windows at the fourth floor

**WHEREAS** at the rear elevation, at the first or parlor floor, the applicant proposes to replace the existing French doors and transom with new steel French doors and transom with more regularized lights than the existing system.

**WHEREAS** at the rear elevation, at the ground level, the applicant proposes to replace the existing 3 wooden doors, each with a cast-stone lintel above, with a new painted steel and glass French door system and a new cast stone continuous lintel that runs across the length of the new system.

**WHEREAS** the proposed changes to the rooftop structure will upgrade and enhance the streetscape along 94<sup>th</sup> Street.

**WHEREAS** no historic photographs are available for the rear elevation; thus, the architect did not have a point of reference when planning the work at the rear, especially for the blank wall at the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor.

**WHEREAS** the changes proposed by the applicant to both the front and rear elevations are minimal within the historic district.

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

**VOTE:** 6 in favor (Ashby, Birnbaum, Evans, Helpern, Parshall, Tamayo)

3. **730 Park Avenue, Apt. 19C (between 70<sup>th</sup>/71<sup>st</sup> Streets) – Upper East Side Historic District - Jeremy A. Kruska, Architect** – A neo-Renaissance/neo-Jacobean style apartment building designed by Lafayette A. Goldstone and built in 1928-29. Application is to replace the solarium.

**WHEREAS** the location and size of the new solarium will be the same as the size of the existing solarium;

**WHEREAS** the solarium will have an angled glass roof instead of a curved glass roof;

**WHEREAS** the horizontal mullions will be eliminated to create simple planes of glass;

**WHEREAS** the mullions will be dark bronze anodized aluminum to match the original mullions and the color of the windows of the building;

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

**VOTE:** 6 in favor (Ashby, Birnbaum, Evans, Helpern, Parshall, Tamayo)

4. **965 Fifth Avenue (between 77<sup>th</sup> and 78<sup>th</sup> Streets) Upper East Side Historic District – Higgins Quasebarth & Partners**– Application is to add new windows and doors in existing and new openings on all facades on the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> floors.

**THIS APPLICATION IS DIVIDED INTO TWO PARTS: Part A: The application as presented with the exception of the asymmetrical window on the front elevation at the 19<sup>th</sup> floor; Part B: The asymmetrical window on the front elevation at the 19<sup>th</sup> floor.**

**Part A: The application as presented with the exception of the asymmetrical window on the front elevation at the 19<sup>th</sup> floor.**

**WHEREAS** 965 Fifth Avenue is a “classicizing” Modern-style apartment building designed by Irving Margon and constructed in 1937.

**WHEREAS** 965 Fifth Avenue contains a variety of window types on the main body of the building (Floors 1-17); 965 Park Avenue does not have a Master Plan for window replacement; some 8 over 1 and 6 over 1 windows (the original design for the windows) remain.

**WHEREAS** in 2004, steel, white-painted, multi-paned windows were installed at the penthouse level at the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> floors; the applicant was unable to locate the original design for the penthouse windows.

**WHEREAS** the applicant now proposes to change all of the 44 existing windows and existing French doors with new windows and doors on all 4 elevations.

**WHEREAS** in general, the work on the 44 window and/or French doors will include enlargement of existing windows or the insertion of new windows or the deletion of existing windows. Most of the rectangular openings now existing will be larger in dimension; windows/doors will be raised either at the top or at the bottom. Some existing windows will be replaced by French doors.

**WHEREAS** the larger openings will also allow for the sidelights that are characteristic of the French doors and some of the windows to be dropped so that they are at the same height of the contiguous doors/windows.

**WHEREAS** the applicant proposes to delete the multi-paned character of the existing windows and doors and replace with a simple, minimalist intervention with steel frames.

**WHEREAS** on the west elevation (the front elevation), there is an existing railing broken by a parapet that conceals the lower part of the windows at the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> floors; thus, there will be minimal visibility of the proposed changes to the windows/door at the front elevation.

**WHEREAS** the East elevation at the 19<sup>th</sup> floor sets back 10’ from the parapet and contains one set of French doors with sidelights; the applicant proposes a major change to his general window replacement plan by replacing this one opening with a series of French doors and sidelights that will project out approximately 14” and will present as rectangular bays. (NB: the center part of the East elevation at the 18<sup>th</sup> floor is not set back; thus the changes to the windows are visible from the public way. At the 19<sup>th</sup> floor, there is a continuous terrace around the entire floor; however, at the 18<sup>th</sup> floor, the terrace is not continuous and so that the center part of the 4 elevations on the 18<sup>th</sup> floor are on the same plane as the rest of the apartment building.

**WHEREAS** all the windows will be painted black (all of the existing windows in the entire building are black, bronze or white with a medium bronze being the predominant color); the profile of the new windows/doors will be essential the same as the existing profile.

**WHEREAS** the windows/doors on the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> floors are so high up and on the West elevation (the dominant elevation) are behind the existing rail and existing parapet and so are not visible from the public way. [*To clarify: at the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> floors at the front/ west elevation there is a parapet broken by a railing with conceals the lower part of the windows. At the south, east and north elevations at the 19<sup>th</sup> floor, there is a railing that conceals the lower part of the windows. For the rest of the 18<sup>th</sup> floor, the terrace is not continuous so that the windows/doors are visible when there is no terrace with the railing to conceal them in any way.*]

**WHEREAS** at the south elevation at the 19<sup>th</sup> floor, one window will be closed in so that a fireplace can be installed; the flue for the fireplace will be on the exterior on the south elevation and will

project out a little less than 12” -- the new flue will mimic the flue on the north elevation and a new window will be created to the west of the new fireplace.

**WHEREAS** the proposed changes to the 44 windows/doors are appropriate within the historic district and are minimally visible from the public way.

**WHEREAS** the asymmetrical opening at the front elevation at the 19<sup>th</sup> floor will be discussed in Part B of this application.

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

**VOTE:** 6 in favor (Ashby, Birnbaum, Evans, Helpern, Parshall, Tamayo)

**Part B: The asymmetrical window at the west/front elevation on the 19<sup>th</sup> floor**

**WHEREAS** at the top of the center part of the penthouse at the 19<sup>th</sup> floor, there is very pretty decorative stone work that enframes the center part of the front elevation; there is a decorative shell design set into the very center of the stonework at the roofline at the top of the 19<sup>th</sup> floor. The stonework with the centered shell focus the eye as one looks at the front elevation in its entirety. Below the decorative stonework are 3 vertical windows with masonry on either side.

**WHEREAS** the applicant proposes to eliminate the masonry on the south side of the center window to create a larger window that would take the window to the corner of the south side of the west elevation.

**WHEREAS** there would now be an asymmetrical relationship to the windows on the front elevation at the 19<sup>th</sup> floor; the symmetry at the graceful top floor of the penthouse with its decorative elements would be destroyed.

**WHEREAS** the new asymmetrical relationship of the windows would be visible from the public way, especially from Central Park when one looks back at the entire front elevation.

**WHEREAS** the proposed asymmetrical window is out of context and inappropriate within the historic district.

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

**VOTE:** 6 in favor (Ashby, Birnbaum, Evans, Helpern, Parshall, Tamayo)

5. **66 East 91<sup>st</sup> Street (between Madison and Park Avenues) – Expanded Carnegie Hill Historic District – Hottenroth + Joseph Architects** – A modernized w/ Neo-Classical elements rowhouse designed by Snelling & Potter and designed in 1909. Application is to rebuild the rear extension and restore the front façade.

**THIS APPLICATION IS DIVIDED INTO TWO PARTS: Part A: The front façade and areaway; Part B: The rear façade.**

**Part A: The front façade and areaway**

**WHEREAS** the front façade will be fully restored; whereas new windows will match existing;

**WHEREAS** the cornice will be restored to match the cornices on the buildings on either side;

**WHEREAS** the roof top addition will receive new slate;

**WHEREAS** new roof top condensers will not be visible from the street;

**WHEREAS** the gate at the entrance door with the decorative grillwork and numerals will be repaired and painted;

**WHEREAS** the glass in the front door will be replaced with etched glass;

**WHEREAS** the original side railings will be extended across the front of the areaway;

**WHEREAS** the brick planters will be coated with stucco to match the brownstone; and

**WHEREAS** the steps into the areaway and the paving within the areaway will be bluestone;

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

**VOTE:** 6 in favor (Ashby, Birnbaum, Evans, Helpern, Parshall, Tamayo)

**Part B: The rear façade**

**WHEREAS** the proposed four story extension into the rear yard would replace an existing three story extension that matches the three story extension of the building to the east;

**WHEREAS** the proposed four story extension would use the full width of the property;

**WHEREAS** the existing three story extension did not use the full width of the property;

**WHEREAS** the fourth story of the proposed extension would block light and air from the third floor terrace of the adjoining building to the east;

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

VOTE: 5 in favor (Birnbaum, Evans, Helpern, Parshall, Tamayo) 1 abstention (Ashby)

**David Helpern and David Liston, Co-Chairs**