

Russell Squire
Chair

Will Brightbill
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
Community Board 8 Manhattan
Landmarks Committee Meeting
Monday, June 14, 2021 – 6:30 PM
This meeting was conducted via Zoom**

PLEASE NOTE: When evaluating Applications for Certificates of Appropriateness, the Landmarks Committee of Community Board 8 Manhattan ONLY considers the appropriateness of the proposal to the architecture of the building and, in the case of a building within a 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, June 16, 2021 via Zoom**. 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:

CB8 Members Present: Elizabeth Ashby, P. Gayle Baron, Michele Birnbaum, Alida Camp, Anthony Cohn, David Helpern, May Malik, Jane Parshall, and Marco Tamayo. Public members, Christina Davis and Kimberley Selway, were also present.

Resolutions for Consideration:

Item 1 – 1022 Lexington Avenue Disapproval (Unanimous)

Item 2 – 15 East 91st Street Approval (Unanimous)

Item 3 – 1083 Fifth Avenue Approval (Unanimous)

- 1. 1022 Lexington Avenue (SW corner of Lexington Avenue and 73rd Street) — Upper East Side Historic District Extension.** *Theodore Bodnar, Architect.* Application is for first floor facade redesign and for infill at the upper two floors.

WHEREAS 1022 Lexington Avenue is a neo-Grec brownstone row house designed by Thom & Wilson and constructed between 1880-1881;

WHEREAS the Landmarks Preservation Commission previously approved a Certificate of Appropriateness for 1022 Lexington Avenue in October, 2020 for changes to the windows at the 1st and 2nd floors on both the Lexington Avenue elevation and the 73rd Street elevation;

WHEREAS the applicant now proposes to install full height glass doors in place of the approved first floor windows on both the Lexington Avenue elevation and the East 73rd Street elevation to gain access to the outdoor eating areas for the new restaurant that has taken the space;

WHEREAS the windows approved in the applicant's previous application would now be dropped to the floor with sliding or operable glass openings (the previously approved application indicated 16" of brick below the windows);

WHEREAS the openings include 5 sliding windows along Lexington Avenue and 4 bays, a glass door and an entry door to the residential component along 73rd Street;

WHEREAS the applicant also proposes moving/shifting the entry to the west from the previously approved entry point on the 73rd Street elevation;

WHEREAS to summarize — along 73rd Street as one moves west, first the glass entry door, then 4 bays, then the entrance to the residential part of the building (floors 3 and 4) which retains the original wrought iron door for residential component - the entry door was formerly on Lexington Avenue;

WHEREAS there will be approximately 70' of solid plate glass along East 73rd Street;

WHEREAS the applicant proposes to add to two floors of infill (10' x 17') at the most westerly part (western corner) of the building — to be differentiated [as requested by the Landmarks Preservation Commission] from the original historic brick building by having a stucco finish;

WHEREAS there is too much continuous plate glass along East 73rd Street which is primarily a residential block;

WHEREAS there is a disembodied quality to the proposed windows on the first floor as they relate to the proposed and previously approved divided lite windows at the 2nd floor;

WHEREAS divided lights would be more appropriate for all of the windows along both elevations and more contextual within the historic district;

WHEREAS the proposed infill removes the interest of the existing building; the existing fencing at the 2nd floor, which would be removed for the infill, adds to the charm of the historic building;

WHEREAS the proposed stucco cladding for the infill to distinguish it from the original historic brick building is inappropriate within in the historic district; extending the language of the existing building would be a more appropriate solution;

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

VOTE: 9 in favor (Ashby, Baron, Birnbaum, Camp, Cohn, Helpern, Malik, Parshall, Tamayo)

TWO PUBLIC MEMBERS IN FAVOR: Christina Davis, Kimberly Selway

- 2. 15 East 91st Street (NW corner of 91st Street and Madison Avenue) — Expanded Carnegie Hill Historic District.** *Mary Dierickx, Architectural Historian, presenting for the applicant.* Application is for restoration of original balcony to south facing elevation at the 4th floor and for approval of walls attached to window mullions at the restored facade after balcony reinserted [*The applicant proposes to build two partitions within the apartment interior demising or ending at the windows.*]

WHEREAS 15 East 91st Street is an apartment building designed by Leonard Schultz's & Associates and constructed in 1945-47.

WHEREAS 15 East 91st Street was designed in the modern style; each apartment had its own balcony distinguished by moderne or stream-lined railings; most balconies were removed over the years;

WHEREAS while there is a Master Plan for the windows at 15 East 91st Street there is **no** master plan for the balconies or for the windows and doors that are part of the apartment behind the balcony;

WHEREAS the applicant proposes, as part of a renovation for Apartment 4A, to restore a balcony terrace and to add doors and a window to the new wall behind the terrace; (*On the south facing elevation there are now two windows — the original terrace having been removed and the brick facade pushed out.*)

WHEREAS as part of an interior renovation, the applicant — as part of the project to reinsert the balcony — is creating two new rooms where formerly there was one room — the walls of the two

new rooms end at the mullions (*go directly to the windows so that the mullions hide the walls behind*);

WHEREAS interior walls that are perpendicular to a window and that do not demise or end at a masonry wall (in this case ending at a vertical mullion) require a Certificate of Appropriateness and cannot be approved at the staff level;

WHEREAS the Landmarks Preservation Commission also is requiring a Certificate of Appropriateness for the reinserted balcony; an application for a reinserted balcony for 15 East 91st Street has not been previously requested of the LPC;

WHEREAS formerly the wall behind the terrace/balcony had a large central window and a door to provide access to the balcony, the applicant proposes a French door and one window; the proportions for the proposed configuration will match the proportions of the original configuration;

WHEREAS there is limited visibility of the new door/window configuration from the street; the reinserted balcony blocks the view of the new door/window configuration;

WHEREAS even though the now-flat facade of the south elevation will be disrupted by the balcony, *there were formerly balconies for every apartment on the south elevation*;

WHEREAS the reinsertion of the balcony with its streamlined “moderne” railing reminiscent of an ocean liner, will return a original feature to the otherwise bland building;

WHEREAS the Landmarks Committee of Community Board 8M would like to see more balconies reinserted; a building Master Plan for restoration of the balconies is encouraged;

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

VOTE: 9 In Favor (Ashby, Baron, Birnbaum, Camp, Cohn, Helpern, Malik, Parshall, Tamayo)

TWO PUBLIC MEMBERS IN FAVOR: Christina Davis, Kimberly Selway

3. **1083 Fifth Avenue (Expanded Carnegie Hill Historic District)** –*Zivkovic Connelly Architects*—A Beaux-Arts style townhouse designed by Turner and Kilian and built in 1901-02. Application is to extend elevator bulkhead.

WHEREAS 1083 Fifth Avenue was designed by Turner and Killian and built in 1901-02, and altered by Ogden Codman in 1913-15;

WHEREAS this building is being restored to a private residence;

WHEREAS the restoration of this building has been approved by the Landmarks Preservation Commission except for the proposed elevator bulkhead;

WHEREAS the elevator bulkhead will be set above the existing stair bulkhead;

WHEREAS the elevator bulkhead will rise 7’-3” above the stair bulkhead and will have a volume of 555 cubic feet;

WHEREAS the size of the elevator bulkhead has been kept to a minimum under the New York City Building Code;

WHEREAS the north face of the existing stair bulkhead and the north face of the proposed elevator bulkhead are on the secondary wall of the building;

WHEREAS 1083 was to have been within a row of buildings and the north wall was not to have been visible;

WHEREAS the north wall remained visible because the construction of the Church to the north of 1083 Fifth left a view corridor to the east between the buildings;

WHEREAS the north wall was constructed of brick masonry with bricks ranging in color from red to brown;

WHEREAS the stair bulkhead was built as a later addition when the building required fire stairs because of a change of use;

WHEREAS the stair bulkhead was made more visible than it might have been because it was finished in a white stucco that contrasted with the dark brick wall;

WHEREAS the former recess for the lightwell on the north wall has been filled in and salvaged brick from the three walls of the light well used to create a visually seamless closure of the wall;
WHEREAS the balance of the salvaged brick will be mixed with similar new brick and used to replace the stucco on the existing bulkhead and to clad the elevator bulkhead;
WHEREAS the face of the north wall, including the exiting bulkhead and the extension for the elevator bulkhead, will be of brick masonry in the same color range as the original brick masonry;
WHEREAS the existing bulkhead and the extension for the elevator bulkhead will appear to be part of the original brick masonry wall;
WHEREAS the dark color of the elevator bulkhead, achieved by matching and extending the existing brick masonry, will make it far less visible than the white stucco that will be replaced on the existing bulkhead;
WHEREAS the elevator bulkhead will be set well back from Fifth Avenue and will not be visible from the sidewalk directly across Fifth Avenue;
WHEREAS the proposed elevator bulkhead will be visible intermittently from Engineers Gate and the track in Central Park;
WHEREAS the proposed elevator bulkhead will be seen as an integral part of the wall and the rooftop and not as an addition;
WHEREAS the proposed elevator bulkhead will hardly be visible and, if seen, will not detract from the architectural character of the building;
WHEREAS the proposed elevator bulkhead is appropriate and contextual within the historic district;

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

VOTE: 9 In Favor (Ashby, Baron, Birnbaum, Camp, Cohn, Helpern, Malik, Parshall, Tamayo)

TWO PUBLIC MEMBERS: Christina Davis and Kimberly Selway

David Helpern and Jane Parshall, Co-Chairs