

Jacqueline Ludorf
Chair

Latha Thompson
District Manager



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

The City of New York Manhattan Community Board 8

June 17, 2010

Hon. Robert B. Tierney, Chair
NYC Landmarks Preservation Commission
Municipal Building
One Centre Street, 9th Floor
New York, NY 10007

Re: 66 East 93rd Street– Carnegie Hill Historic District

Dear Chair Tierney:

At the Full Board meeting on Wednesday, June 16, 2010, the board adopted the following resolution regarding **66 East 93rd Street– Carnegie Hill Historic District – Mr. Oliver Cope, Architect**. Application is for alterations to the front and rear facades.

THIS APPLICATION IS DIVIDED INTO TWO PARTS: Part 1: The front elevation and Part 2: The rear elevation.

Part 1: The front elevation

WHEREAS 66 East 93rd Street was designed by A. B. Ogden & Son in the Queen Anne style and constructed in 1890-91.

WHEREAS 66 East 93rd Street is the last one remaining of three small “apartment flat” buildings all designed by A. B. Ogden & Son; the basement and street level are stuccoed and the remaining three stories are red brick with brownstone trim.

WHEREAS 66 East 93rd Street is surrounded by buildings designed by some of the most famous residential architects in the history of New York, including the Baker house designed by Delano and Aldrich, the Loew house designed by Walker and Gillette, and the Virginia G. F. Vanderbilt house designed by John Russell Pope. **WHEREAS** much of the fabric that was original to the façade has either been removed or allowed to deteriorate.

WHEREAS the proposed design for the façade will retain intact the upper three floors of the building, including the arched windows at the top floor, the frames around the windows, the original brickwork and the original cornice.

WHEREAS the applicant is proposing a two-story limestone base that will lighten the façade and emphasize the new “parlor floor”. [Since the building was originally built as apartments, there was no “parlor floor”; the building is being turned into a single family house.]

WHEREAS the applicant proposes to change the door at the entrance from a double door to a single door and thus keep the vertical protruding bay on the west side of the building intact for all five floors.

WHEREAS the two-story limestone base provides a solution to the problem of the bottom two floors and the applicant’s desire to preserve the bay– a characteristic of the original design of the building.

WHEREAS the new design for the front elevation, while not a replication of the original Queen Anne style, except for the top three floors, is not out of character within the historic district.

THEFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Part 1 of this application – the front elevation - is approved as presented.

This resolution was approved by a vote of 40 in favor, 0 opposed and 2 abstentions

Part 2 – the rear elevation

WHEREAS the rear yard is approximately 29’ deep.

WHEREAS the applicant proposes to remove an existing 13’ extension (approximately 560 sq. ft.) and an existing fire escape.

WHEREAS at the top floor (the fifth floor) the applicant proposes pulling back the wall to create a roof terrace within the body of the 5th floor.

WHEREAS at the 3rd and 4th floors the applicant proposes a zinc-coated copper bay that projects out 18”.

WHEREAS at the ground and 2nd floors the applicant proposes two floors of glazing with a window 18 ½” high and 14’ wide within a metal frame.

WHEREAS the existing extension to be demolished has 10 windows. The applicant is not creating any further window area since the removed windows from the extension will be equal to the amount of new glazing being created at the rear.

WHEREAS the applicant proposes filling in the rear yard by 3 ft. so that one can step directly out into the garden which will now be at the level of the rear entry to the house.

WHEREAS the proposed modern rear elevation reads as a contemporary elevation and is out of context and uncharacteristic within the historic district.

WHEREAS there is no relationship between the front elevation and the rear elevation.

WHEREAS the choice of fenestration -- in particular, the oversized 18 ½’ high window – intrudes into the donut that are the rear yards of the surrounding houses.

THEFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Part 2 of this application – the rear elevation - is **disapproved** as presented.

This resolution was approved by a vote of 24 in favor, 14 opposed and 3 abstentions

Sincerely,

Jacqueline Ludorf
Chair

Jane Parshall and David Liston
Co-Chairs, Landmarks Committee

cc: Hon. Michael Bloomberg, Mayor of the City of New York
Hon. Scott M. Stringer, Manhattan Borough President
Hon. Liz Krueger, NYS Senate Member
Hon. Jonathan Bing, NYS Assembly Member
Hon. Micah Kellner, NYS Assembly Member
Hon. Daniel Garodnick, NYC Council Member
Hon. Jessica Lappin, NYC Council Member
Oliver Cope, Architect