

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
Monday, April 11, 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, April 13, 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.

MINUTES

Board Members Present: Elizabeth Ashby, Michele Birnbaum, Alida Camp, Anthony Cohn, Christina Davis*, David Helpern, Jane Parshall, Kimberly Selway*, Barry Schneider and Marco Tamayo. Gayle Baron's absence was excused.

*Public Members

Resolutions for Consideration:

Item 1: 201 East 65th Street

Item 2: 210 East 62nd Street

1. **201 East 65th Street (Individual Landmark: Manhattan House)** *Adam Kushner, Architect*. A modern style building designed by Mayer & Whittlesy, Skidmore, Owings & Merrill and constructed in 1947-1951. Application to remove the existing awning installed without permits and replace with a new awning.

WHEREAS 201 East 65th Street a modern style building designed by Gordon Bunshaft of Skidmore, Owings & Merrill and constructed in 1947-1951, occupying the entire block between 65th and 66th Streets, 3rd Avenue to 2nd Avenue (The entrance to the apartment complex is at 200 East 66th Street.);

WHEREAS 201 East 65th Street/200 East 66th Street was designated as an **INDIVIDUAL LANDMARK** in 2007 by the Landmarks Preservation Commission for its influential mid-century modernist architecture;

WHEREAS this is the third time the applicant has appeared before the Landmarks Committee with a design for a commercial canopy to provide protection for the stairs leading down to the sub cellar;

WHEREAS the site for canopy is at the SW corner of 65th Street and Second Avenue;

WHEREAS the two previous proposals for canvas canopies with obtrusive large lettering advertising the medical practice occupying the sub cellar were turned down by the Committee; the color of the canvas and the oversized white lettering were considered — *twice* — to be inappropriate for the site, given the individual landmark status;

WHEREAS the applicant now proposes a fixed canopy to be made of 1” thick frosted plexiglass, measuring 25’8” long x 8’ wide (equal to the width of the stairwell); the design for the canopy is based on an existing storefront design;

WHEREAS the canopy will be framed in an anodized aluminum material; signage in the same material will be at the front of the canopy — 4” in height x 6’ long — spelling out the name of the medical offices;

WHEREAS there will be downlighting along the canopy as well as at the stair railings;

WHEREAS ADA access to the medical offices exists through the residential lobby at the 66th Street entrance;

WHEREAS an office directory as well as an ADA access note will be placed on the existing concrete framed entryway;

WHEREAS the applicant’s design is a vast improvement over the two previous applications; the minimalist design is more contextual and less intrusive;

WHEREAS *however* because the canopy does not step down as the stairs descend, there is no protection from rain, wind and snow; the applicant has presented a design for a canopy looks more appropriate but the applicant has also presented a design for a canopy that doesn’t work;

WHEREAS the material for the canopy, frosted plexiglass, stains easily over time and yellows over time; glass would have been a better material;

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

VOTE:

2 In Favor (Cohn, Tamayo)

5 Opposed (Birnbaum, Camp, Helpert, Parshall, Schneider)

1 Abstention (Ashby)

2 Public Members in Favor: Christina Davis, Kimberly Selway

2. **210 East 62nd Street (Treadwell Farm Historic District)** – *Arctangent Architecture* - A neo-Grec style building designed by F.S.Barnes and constructed in 1870. Application is for roof addition, rear yard extension, and interior renovation.

WHEREAS 210 East 62nd Street had their application for a Certificate of Appropriateness approved by Community Board 8 in 2016;

WHEREAS 210 East 62nd Street received a Certificate of Appropriateness (C of A) in 2017 for a rooftop addition and a rear extension;

WHEREAS the construction was not in compliance with the drawings approved by the Landmarks Commission and the Department of Buildings;

WHEREAS 210 East 62nd Street submitted an application to the Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC) for a C of A for the built condition that was not approved;

WHEREAS 210 East 62nd Street submitted a new application for a roof addition, rear yard extension, and interior renovation;

WHEREAS 210 East 62nd Street is a four-story building above grade with a basement, three floors above the basement, and a cellar below the basement;

WHEREAS the built condition has a rooftop addition that is the full width of the lot as approved, but is 2'-6" higher at the peak;

WHEREAS the new application reduces the size of the rooftop addition to make it less visible;

WHEREAS the newly proposed rooftop addition ranges in width from 7'-5" at the front to 6'-3" at the rear, is 2'-1" further from the front, is 2'-0" lower than the as-built roof, but 1'-6" higher than the approved rooftop addition;

WHEREAS this change in the size of the rooftop addition reduces the visibility of the proposed rooftop addition in relation to the built condition as seen from Third Avenue;

WHEREAS the floors on the interior have been incrementally raised so that the top of the third floor is 1'-7" higher than the approved floor and the roof is 3'-2" higher than the approved roof;

WHEREAS the bulk of as built condition is enlarged not just by the bulkhead but by the additional 3'-2" of height across the whole roof;

WHEREAS the current application maintains the cornice at the original and approved height;

WHEREAS the third floor is 1'-7" closer to the cornice due to the raising of the floor;

WHEREAS the third floor was raised above the sill of the third-floor windows and the first and second-floor windows were set closer to the sills than in the approved design;

WHEREAS the approved and built rear yard addition extend 16'-6" into the rear yard and the proposed rear yard addition will extent 16'-7" into the rear yard;

WHEREAS the rear yard addition interrupts the "donut" with its unprecedented bulk;

WHEREAS the built condition makes clear that the rear yard addition is not appropriate and should not have been approved by CB8 and LPC;

WHEREAS the top of the proposed rear yard addition will be 2'-3" higher than the approved height, adding substantially to the bulk;

WHEREAS this additional height will exacerbate the intrusion of the rear yard addition into the "donut";

WHEREAS the additional height of the roof and the additional height of the rear yard addition add considerable bulk to the building which will be visually apparent;

WHEREAS the top of the cornice and the top of the roof are at about the same height;

WHEREAS the cornice functioned as the parapet in the approved design, prior to the roof being raised, a contemporary glass railing is being added to provide the required 42” high parapet on the front of the building;

WHEREAS the rear addition is also being provided with a contemporary glass railing to create the required 42” high parapet;

WHEREAS the sight line from directly across the street just touches the top of the glass railing in the front, this modernist railing, which is not perfectly transparent, will act like a mirror and be reflective dependent upon lighting conditions;

WHEREAS the glass railing will be seen obliquely from a variety of viewpoints;

WHEREAS the LPC and DOB violations, fines, and encroachments are well documented including excavating the cellar without authorization, underpinning adjacent properties without authorization, and overlapping adjacent properties;

WHEREAS the applicant did not protect the building from the weather thereby allowing the building to deteriorate and to create a blight in the Treadwell Farm community;

WHEREAS the DOB and HPD had to issue an emergency declaration order for dangerous and unsafe conditions;

WHEREAS the applicant stated that it was in the interest of the neighbors to have the applicant make the proposed change to reduce the size and height of the rooftop addition and complete the construction as quickly as possible—but not include other corrective work to the rest of the built condition;

WHEREAS the community stated that constructing the project right is much more important than constructing it fast;

WHEREAS the as-built condition adds significantly to the height and bulk of the approved design;

WHEREAS the changes in the heights of the floors change the relationships from interior and exterior as seen in and/or out through the windows;

WHEREAS the experience of the as built condition as it relates to the relationship of the floors to the windows will be inappropriate and disproportionate in relation to the original design of the house and the approved design;

WHEREAS the egregious actions of the applicant demonstrate a complete disregard for the Treadwell Farm community and the Landmarks Preservation Commission;

WHEREAS the applicant has had five years to comply with the requirements of the 2017 Certificate of Appropriateness and has not;

WHEREAS the applicant has not committed to the LPC in this new application that it will demolish the inappropriate construction;

WHEREAS the built condition with the adjustments proposed in this new application are not contextual and appropriate within the Landmark District;

WHEREAS the status of this project mandates the LPC to revoke the 2017 Certificate of Appropriateness due to the applicant's not building the approved design, allowing the historic fabric of the building to deteriorate, and not committing to re-building in compliance with the approved design;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that this new application for a Certificate of Appropriateness is **DISAPPROVED**.

VOTE:

8 In Favor: (Ashby, Birnbaum, Camp, Cohn, Helpern, Parshall, Schneider Tamayo)

2 Public Members in Favor: (Christina Davis, Kimberly Selway)

David Helpern and Jane Parshall, Co-Chairs