

Alida Camp
Chair



505 Park Avenue, Suite 620
New York, NY 10022
(212) 758-4340

Will Brightbill
District Manager

(212) 758-4616 (Fax)
info@cb8m.com – E-Mail
www.cb8m.com – Website

The City of New York **Community Board 8 Manhattan**

Landmarks Committee
Thursday, September 6th, 2018 – 6:30PM
Marymount Manhattan College – Regina Peruggi Room
221 East 71st Street (between 2nd and 3rd)

Please note: The resolutions contained in the committee minutes are recommendations submitted by the committee chair to the Community Board. At the monthly full board meeting, the resolutions are discussed and voted upon by all members of Community Board 8 Manhattan.

PLEASE NOTE: When evaluating Applications for Certificates of Appropriateness, the Landmarks Committee of Community Board 8M ONLY considers the appropriateness of the proposal to the architecture of the building and, in the case of a building within an Historic District, the appropriateness of the proposal to the character of that Historic District. All testimony should be related to such appropriateness. The Committee recommends a Resolution to the full Community Board, which votes on a Resolution to be sent to the Landmarks Preservation Commission. These Resolutions are advisory; the decision of the Landmarks Preservation Commission is binding.

Applicants and members of the public who are interested in the issues addressed are invited, but not required, to attend the **Full Board meeting on Wednesday, September 12th, 2018, at the New York Blood Center Auditorium (310 East 67th Street, between 1st and 2nd Avenues) at 6:30PM.** They may testify for up to three minutes in the Public Session, which they must sign up for no later than 6:45PM. Members of the Board will discuss the items in executive session; if a member of the public wishes a comment made or a question asked at this time, he or she must ask a Board Member to do it.

MINUTES

Present: Elizabeth Ashby, P. Gayle Baron, Michele Birnbaum, Anthony Cohn, Jane Parshall, Marco Tamayo

Absent: Sarah Chu.

Absent (Public Members): Kimberly Selway, Christina Davis

Excused: Alida Camp, Alexandra Harrington, David Helpern

1. **14 Henderson Place (between East 86th and East 87th Streets) – Henderson Place Historic District** *Agathe Ceccaldi, Junior Architect, The Fractal Group, LLC.* – Application is for a vertical extension for a 180 square foot penthouse.

WHEREAS 14 Henderson Place is a Queen Anne style residence designed by John C. Henderson and constructed in 1881.

WHEREAS the applicant proposes to add a 143 sq. ft. addition that will increase the overall height of 14 Henderson Place by 14’ including mechanical equipment.

WHEREAS the penthouse addition will be set back 23’ from the front elevation and 3’ from the rear elevation.

WHEREAS the penthouse addition will be clad in gray stucco with a set of sliding glass doors framed in black leading to a patio.

WHEREAS the penthouse addition is not visible from the public way because of the setback at the front elevation.

WHEREAS the applicant also proposes to extend two sets of chimneys as required by the Building Code.

WHEREAS the visible chimney extensions will match the red brick Queen Anne style of the existing chimneys

WHEREAS other roof-top additions have been added to houses within the Henderson Place Historic District.

WHEREAS the houses within the Henderson Place Historic District are unique and present as a unified whole; the architect, John Henderson, designed 14 Henderson Place as 1/2 of a pair of houses with symmetrical front elevations.

WHEREAS this symmetry is compromised with the proposed penthouse addition.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT this application is **APPROVED** as presented.

VOTE:

3 in favor (Ashby, Cohen, Parshall)

2 against (Baron, Tamayo)

1 abstention (Birnbaum).

2. **20 East 95th Street (between Madison and Fifth Avenues) – Expanded Carnegie Hill Historic District** *Joan Humphreys, ARCitecture* – Application is for new masonry openings at the rear façade, top floor.

THIS APPLICATION WAS WITHDRAWN AFTER THE SEPTEMBER MEETING. THE APPLICANT WILL RETURN TO THE LANDMARKS COMMITTEE WITH A REVISED APPLICATION IN OCTOBER.

3. **50 East 69th Street (between Park and Madison Avenues) – Upper East Side Historic District** *Ger Brennan, Selldorf Architects* – Application is for the rear façade, including removal and replacement of windows.

THIS APPLICATION IS DIVIDED INTO TWO PARTS: PART A - The proposed changes to the bay windows at the rear elevation and **PART B** - The proposed changes to the windows at the 2nd floor and the proposed change to the punched masonry opening at the 3rd floor.

WHEREAS 50 East 69th Street is a 7 story neo-French “Classic” style residence designed by Henry C. Pelton and constructed in 1917-18.

WHEREAS the rear elevation is dominated by monumental copper clad bays at the 3rd and 4th floors;

WHEREAS the configuration of the bays is as follows: each bay at the left and right of the rear elevation presents as a two story tall bay encompassing the 3rd and 4th floors; at the 4th floor between the two bays, there is an additional one story bay with a leaded punched stained glass window below. (To clarify, there are 3 bay windows at the 4th floor and 2 bay windows at the third floor with a punched window between the bays at the third floor.)

WHEREAS the windows in the bays are of stained glass with stained glass transoms above— all of the stained glass in each of the transoms contain decorative elements, for example, medieval shields, that add to the character of the bays.

WHEREAS for some windows at the 3rd and 4th floors, the stained glass was removed and exchanged for plate glass, and for some transoms, the stained glass was removed and exchanged for plate glass.

WHEREAS as a result of the above modifications to the bays, the windows and transoms in the bays do not present as uniform and do not present as the original condition of the bays (note that some of the stained glass has been damaged over the years).

WHEREAS as a result of so much existing stained glass, the interior of the rear of the house is dark.

WHEREAS the applicant proposes to treat the existing stained glass in the bays and in the transoms in three different ways.

WHEREAS 1) clear glass will be inserted into all the windows of the bays on the third floor and clear glass will be inserted into all of the transoms on the 3rd floor.

WHEREAS 2) stained glass will remain in the 2 flanking windows of the 3 bays on the fourth floor

WHEREAS 3) stained glass will remain in the transoms of all of the 4th floor bays.

WHEREAS all the windows and transoms on the two 3rd floor bays will be of plate glass and present as uniform — the stained glass will be removed and plate glass inserted. (N.B., a punched window presents between these two bays — see below.)

WHEREAS to summarize, the center window on each of the three 4th floor bays will be of plate glass, the flanking windows on each of the three 4th floor bays will retain original stained glass, and the transoms above all of the windows — both the center windows of each bay AND the flanking side windows of each bay — will retain original stained glass.

WHEREAS there will be some rearrangement of the stained glass between the bays on the third floor and the bays on the 4th floor in an attempt to recreate the damaged flanking windows and all of the three transoms in each bay from old stained glass.

WHEREAS all the lovely detailed leading for the bays will be retained.

WHEREAS any stained glass element that is not reused (for instance, the stained glass that will be removed from the center window in each bay) will be restored and stored on site.

WHEREAS the copper on the bays will be restored and will retain its tarnished character.

WHEREAS at the second floor, there is now a row of adjoining stained glass windows with stained glass transoms above.

WHEREAS the transoms contain the same decorative elements in their centers as the transoms on the bays.

WHEREAS the applicant proposes to drop the sill of this set of windows (and a door adjoining at the left) and insert a new window/door combination 20' 8" wide x 10' high; the new window/door combination will have divided lights with clear glass.

WHEREAS at the third floor, between the two bay windows, is a single punched opening with divided leaded stained glass lights with a stained glass transom above.

WHEREAS the applicant, for this window, proposes to replace all of the stained glass with a single pane of clear glass.

WHEREAS the applicant is to be commended for the complicated and jigsaw puzzle-like plan for the bay windows as a way of bringing more light into the building and, at the same time, retain and capture some of the original material of the bays.

WHEREAS all stained glass that is not reused will be stored on site

THEREFORE PART A of this application, the proposed changes to the bays at the rear elevation, are **APPROVED** as presented.

VOTE:

4 in favor (Ashby, Baron, Parshall, Cohen)

2 against (Birnbaum, Tamayo)

PART B: The proposed changes to the row of windows at the 2nd floor and the 3rd floor punched masonry opening.

WHEREAS the proposed changes to the window/door combination at the 2nd floor presents as too much glazing and is not contextual and is inappropriate to the rest of the rear elevation.

WHEREAS the proposed change to the 3rd floor window (between the 2 second floor bays) with a single pane of glass instead of divided lights is out of context and is inappropriate to the rest of the rear elevation.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT Part B of this application, the windows at the 2nd and 3rd floors, is **DISAPPROVED** as presented.

VOTE:

6 in favor (Ashby, Birnbaum, Baron, Parshall, Tamayo, Cohen)

4. **781 Fifth Avenue (Delvaux, between East 59th and East 60th Streets) – Upper East Side Historic District *Mattia Monti and Paolo Casero, Valerio Inc.*** – Application is for the storefront awning and enclosed window displays.

WHEREAS 781 Fifth Avenue is a hotel building combining the neo-Romanesque and neo-Gothic styles designed by Schultz and Weaver and constructed in 1926-27.

WHEREAS the applicant was not present.

WHEREAS the applicant is invited to come back and present at another Landmarks Committee meeting.

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

VOTE:

6 in favor (Ashby, Birnbaum, Baron, Parshall, Tamayo, Cohen)

5. **1082 Park Avenue (between East 88th and East 89th Street) – Park Avenue Historic District**
Rick Azar, Azar Associates Inc. – Application is for a rooftop addition and rooftop mechanical equipment.

WHEREAS 1082 Park Avenue is a 5-story residential building originally designed by Frederick T. Camp; the existing Mediterranean revival style elevation designed by Augustus Allen.

WHEREAS there is an existing tiled shed extension roof.

WHEREAS behind the parapet is a greenhouse; next to the greenhouse is 49 square foot space.

WHEREAS there is an L-shaped hallway at the roof between the existing mechanical equipment and a rear-facing terrace.

WHEREAS the applicant proposes an extension of the existing greenhouse that would stretch across the front elevation and capture the 49 square foot space; the L-shaped hallway would also be captured and become part of the rooftop addition.

WHEREAS the extension of the greenhouse is visible from the public way, but presents as completing the vertical greenhouse and is behind the parapet.

WHEREAS the rooftop extension into the L-shaped alleyway is not visible from the public way.

WHEREAS the work also includes cleaning up the hodge podge of mechanical equipment on the roof and consolidating it at the rear of the roof; the new mechanical equipment is not visible from the public way.

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

VOTE:

6 in favor (Ashby, Birnbaum, Baron, Parshall, Tamayo, Cohen)

6. **160 East 70th Street (Between 3rd and Lexington Avenues) - Upper East Side Historic District**
Alan Berman, Architect – Application is for full renovation, including work on the front and rear façades.

WHEREAS 160 East 70th Street is an Italianate style residence with some neo-classical elements originally designed by William McNamara and constructed in 1872-74; existing front elevation designed by Thomas Lehreche and constructed in 1961.

WHEREAS the applicant proposes to make the front elevation fully neo-classical.

WHEREAS at the front elevation, the applicant proposes to center the front door, add an iron fence and gate, enlarge and extend the entryway beyond the property line into the sidewalk, change the windows to single pane casement windows, and clad the front elevation in limestone

WHEREAS the applicant also proposes a 9' high penthouse addition.

WHEREAS to accommodate the height of the new 9' high penthouse, the applicant proposes to raise the height of the building from 55' to 60' and to depress/realign the top two floors at the rear.

WHEREAS the 43 1/2' in length and 19'9" in width penthouse addition will contain 826 sq. ft.; there will be an elevator and stair bulkhead above with a guard rail at the top of the bulkhead.

WHEREAS the penthouse will be set back approximately 18' from the front elevation and is invisible for the public way.

WHEREAS at the rear, there is an existing extension which will remain.

WHEREAS the applicant proposes to add 400 sq. ft. at the rear by building out the floors at the parlor level and above.

WHEREAS the applicant proposes to build out the 4th, 5th and 6th floors by 2'9"; there will be a new terrace at the rear of the 4th floor.

WHEREAS the parlor floor and the 3rd floor will be built out by 7'6" so that that part of the rear elevation aligns with the rear elevation of the basement and cellar. The 4th, 5th and 6th floors will still be set back since they will only be built out by 2'9".

WHEREAS the 30' rear yard remains intact.

WHEREAS the rear elevation will be clad in red brick.

WHEREAS at the front elevation, the applicant proposes a rusticated limestone base with limestone cladding above.

WHEREAS at the front elevation the applicant proposes a set of tripartite doors at the 2nd floor and a set of tripartite windows that are the same dimension as the 2nd floor windows; both the 2nd floor doors and the third floor windows would have transoms above.

WHEREAS the windows/will not have mullions, will be made of wood and the existing masonry between the existing windows at the 2nd and 3rd floors will be deleted. There will be a wrought iron railing in front of the windows/doors at the 2nd and 3rd floors.

WHEREAS at the rear, the applicant proposes two matching sets of windows/doors at the 1st and 2nd floors with divided lights to replace the existing openings.

WHEREAS at the 3rd floor, the applicant proposes a window opening with divided lights that will match the window directly below it at the 2nd floor. (This will be the only window at the 2nd floor.)

WHEREAS these 5 openings are 7' wide x 8' tall with a door set into the middle of each window.

WHEREAS at the front elevation at the 4th, 5th and 6th floors, are a series of one-over-one windows without divided lights.

WHEREAS at the rear elevation, the windows on the 1st, 2nd and 3rd floors are framed in wood; the windows below (1st, 2nd, 3rd floors) are framed in steel.

WHEREAS at the front elevation, the applicant proposes casement windows without divided lights.

WHEREAS at the front elevation the applicant proposes casement windows at the 4th and 5th floors.

WHEREAS the applicant is extending the areaway into the public way by 3'.

WHEREAS proposed new front elevation above the ground floor presents as modern.

WHEREAS the proposed casement windows on the front elevation do not have divided lights — divided lights are typical of the neo-classical style.

WHEREAS the plate glass to be used for these windows is inappropriate within the historic district.

WHEREAS lack of masonry between the windows at the 2nd, 2rd and 4th floors — neo-classical front elevations typically have masonry between the window openings — is inappropriate within the historic district.

WHEREAS at the rear elevation, the proposed windows at the 4th, 5th and 6th floors do not have divided lights and are inappropriate within the historic district.

WHEREAS the extension of the areaway into the public way is inappropriate within the historic district.

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

VOTE:

5 in favor (Ashby, Birnbaum, Baron, Parshall, Cohen)

1 against (Tamayo)

7. New Business

Discussion of amended proposed changes to the Landmarks Preservation Commission's rules. Discussion of testimony to be presented at the October Public Hearing of the amended proposed changes.

**Respectfully Submitted,
Jane Parshall and David Helpert, Co-Chairs**