

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**

*March 7, 2022 – 6:30PM*

*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, March 9, 2022**. 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.

**AGENDA**

**Board Members Present:** Elizabeth Ashby, Gayle Baron, Michele Birnbaum, Lori Bores, Alida Camp, Anthony Cohn, David Helpen, Jane Parshall, Marco Tamayo, Kimberly Selway (Public Member), and Sharon Weiner

**Resolutions for Consideration:**

**Item 1: 20 East 79th Street (Metropolitan Museum Historic District)**

**Item 2: 38 East 75th Street (Upper East Side Historic District)**

**Item 3: 201 East 65<sup>th</sup> Street (Individual Landmark)**

**Item 1: 20 East 79th Street (Metropolitan Museum Historic District)** - Application is to add a building sign to the frieze of the portico above the main entry door.

**WHEREAS** 20 East 79th Street is a French neo-classical style building designed by C.P. H. Gilbert and constructed in 1912.

**WHEREAS** 20 East 79th Street, formerly partially residential, is now completely occupied by the Skarstedt Gallery; the gallery formerly occupied the three lower floors, but has now taken the entire space;

**WHEREAS** a Certificate of Appropriateness is required since the frieze of the cornice is less than 12" in height — in this case, approximately 10";

**WHEREAS** the proposed signage would be 68.6” wide x 7” high x 1” deep and would be fastened to the limestone frieze with a silicone adhesive — the lettering would not penetrate or disturb the limestone behind it;

**WHEREAS** the signage would replace the smaller, more hidden signage that is currently on the exterior wall behind the entry columns.

**WHEREAS** the applicant is proposing a modest intervention that is contextual and appropriate within the historic district,

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

**VOTE:** 7 in favor (Baron, Birnbaum, Cohn, Helpern, Parshall, Tamayo, Bores), 2 against (Ashby, Camp)

**ONE PUBLIC MEMBER IN FAVOR:** Kimberly Selway

**Item 2: 38 East 75th Street (Upper East Side Historic District)** – *Robert A.M Stern Architects* – A “no-style” row house designed by Thom & Wilson and constructed in 1881-82 and altered by John W. Ingle in 1926. Application is to demo the existing front and rear facades, as well as the upper floors, and construct a new five-story limestone façade with a sixth story mansard and setback bulkheads above.

**WHEREAS**, 38 East 75<sup>th</sup> Street, a non-contributing building in the Upper East Side Historic District, originally built in 1881, was stripped of its façade ornament in 1929; and

**WHEREAS**, applicant proposes to demolish the street façade (north-facing), garden façade, and some of the existing mass at the garden (south-facing); and

**WHEREAS**, by removing some existing floor structure and lowering floor to floor heights, a five-story townhouse become a six-story townhouse while only raising the parapet height by two feet; and

**WHEREAS**, a new rooftop bulkhead while ten feet higher than the existing parapet (and eight feet higher than the proposed parapet), is set back from the street line by about twenty-eight feet; and

**WHEREAS**, a new elevator bulkhead while twenty feet higher than the existing parapet (and eighteen feet higher than the proposed parapet), is set back from the property line by about forty-eight feet; and

**WHEREAS**, neither rooftop addition is visible from any vantage point along the public way; and

**WHEREAS**, the applicants have chosen a Neo-Classical vocabulary for the street façade (north-facing) and a similar, but more restrained vocabulary for the garden façade; and

**WHEREAS**, for the street façade the applicants have chosen to introduce a shallow faceted oriel extending three floors vertically, and nearly the entire width of the building, topped by a columnar balustrade with the fourth and fifth floors aligning with the building immediately to the west. The visible composition is completed by a sixth-floor mansard with projecting round headed windows; and

**WHEREAS**, the openings in the facade are similar in proportion and size to those found on other buildings nearby; and

**WHEREAS**, the materials proposed for the street facing façade are Indiana Limestone, semi-custom wood windows and doors, and copper roofing for the mansard; and

**WHEREAS**, the garden facade (south-facing) presents a largely brick and wood exterior, with a massing that steps back from the existing non-conforming rear yard, allowing more light into the center of the block; and

**WHEREAS**, although somewhat crowded largely on account of the additional floor, the design, materials, and proposed craftsmanship are both appropriate and a welcome addition to the Historic District; but

**WHEREAS**, the existing entry steps at the street facade, which descend to the garden level, project beyond the property line, as do existing garbage bins; and

**WHEREAS**, the applicant proposed to extend that intrusion into the Public Way by centering the steps and moving them to the north, creating planters to either side of the steps, and whose north face aligns with the building to the west; and

**WHEREAS**, the applicants propose a 4'-8" tall wrought-iron fence to enclose the planters with slender limestone pillars marking the entrance, with an out-swinging gate; and

**WHEREAS**, the Committee believes that this intrusion into the Public Way requires a Revocable Consent from the City, and an appearance before the Community Board Eight Transportation Committee; therefore, be it

**RESOLVED**, That Community Board Eight **approves** the proposed renovations and additions to **38 East 75<sup>th</sup> Street** with the **condition** that the applicant appear before the CB8M Transportation Committee and receive a ruling from the Full Board on the proposed front yard extension prior to an appearance before the Landmarks Preservation Commission.

**VOTE:** 7 in favor (Ashby, Baron, Birnbaum, Bores, Cohn, Helpert, Parshall, Tamayo), 1 against (Camp)

**ONE PUBLIC MEMBER IN FAVOR:** Kimberly Selway

**Item 3: 201 East 65<sup>th</sup> Street (Individual Landmark)** – *Adam Kushner, Architect* – A modern style building designed by Mayer & Whittlesy, Skidmore, Owings & Merrill and constructed in 1947-1951. Application is for legalizing installation of entrance awing along East 65th Street for medical office located in the cellar.

**WHEREAS** 201 East 65<sup>th</sup> Street is an international style building constructed in 1951;

**WHEREAS** this full block building is an individual landmark that sets the aesthetic standards for apartment houses in the modernist style;

**WHEREAS** the building is set in a garden open to the sky;

**WHEREAS** there is an original stair in the easterly end of the south side of the garden;

**WHEREAS** the stair, which leads to a lower level of the building, was designed to be open to the sky;

**WHEREAS** the low granite walls on the perimeter of the site enable uninterrupted views into the garden;

**WHEREAS** the space on the lower level is occupied by medical offices;

**WHEREAS** the applicant seeks to cover the stair with a canopy to provide protection from the weather and to provide lighting at night;

**WHEREAS** the canopy will be made of a water repellent fabric;

**WHEREAS** the fabric will have a sand color that is meant to replicate the color of the granite walls;

**WHEREAS** the canopy will have an L shape;

**WHEREAS** the portion of the canopy at the entrance will extend north from the top of the original entrance arch and the face of the canopy will align with the southern face of the original arch;

**WHEREAS** the portion of the canopy over the stair will run east-west, parallel to the sidewalk;

**WHEREAS** the portion of the canopy over the stair will have a downward slope;

**WHEREAS** the portion of the canopy over the stair will be 7'-0" wide by 10'-11" long;

**WHEREAS** the portion of the canopy over the stair will be 9'-9" wide by 17'-8" long;

**WHEREAS** each section of the canopy will have a gable shape with an overall height of 36 inches;

**WHEREAS** the gable will be 18 inches high, and the vertical sides will be 18 inches high;

**WHEREAS** there will be identification signs on the south and east faces of the canopy;

**WHEREAS** there will be a directory sign on the eastern face of the western leg of the arch;

**WHEREAS** the underside of the canopy will be lit, but only when the medical practice is open;

**WHEREAS** the overall shape of the proposed canopy is awkward and ungainly;

**WHEREAS** the proposed sand color is significantly different from the color of the granite walls;

**WHEREAS** the proposed canopy will block the view across the low stone wall and garden to the building;

**WHEREAS** the proposed canopy will be a visual intrusion into the garden setting for the building;

**WHEREAS** the proposed canopy is not in the spirit or character of the original design;

**WHEREAS** the proposed canopy appears to be a temporary solution and not integral to the overall composition of the building and garden;

**WHEREAS** the canopy is not appropriate and contextual with the modernist aesthetic of the building and site;

**THEREFORE**, this application is disapproved.

**VOTE:** 10 in favor: (Ashby, Baron, Birnbaum, Boris, Camp, Cohn, Helpern, Parshall, Tamayo, Weiner)

**ONE PUBLIC MEMBER IN FAVOR:** Kimberly Selway

*David Helpern and Jane Parshall, Co-Chairs*