

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, June 13, 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, June 15, 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, Gayle Baron, Michelle Birnbaum, Alida Camp, Sarah Chu, Christina Davis*, David Helpen, Jane Parshall, Kimberly Selway*, and Marco Tamayo.

*Public Members

Resolutions for Approval:

Item 1: 1002 Madison Avenue Disapproval

Item 2: 2 East 88th Street Approval (Unanimous)

Item 3: 105 East 64th Street Disapproval (Unanimous)

- 1. 1002 Madison Avenue (Upper East Side Historic District) – Tom Hut presenting for HS2 Architecture** – A Neo-Federal style building designed by Cross & Cross and built in 1930-31. Application is for a new street entrance, new elevator bulkhead and repair and restoration of street façade.

WHEREAS 1002 Madison Avenue is a neo-Federal style building designed by Cross & Cross and constructed in 1930-31;

WHEREAS Cross & Cross, prolific architects, shaped the street scape and skyline of New York City in the 1920s and 1930s;

WHEREAS among other notable designs, including the Tiffany's building at 57th Street and Fifth Avenue and the Links Club on East 62nd Street, Cross & Cross designed the building at 1002 Madison

Avenue for the Fulton Trust Company in 1930 — its first branch since the bank was established in 1890.

WHEREAS the subdued red brick design incorporates a bust of Robert Fulton at the top of the front elevation;

WHEREAS 1002 Madison Avenue has now been purchased by WHITE CUBE, an art gallery, to replace the HSBC bank branch that was formerly located on the site;

WHEREAS at the front elevation that wood entrance door and the existing fanlight are not original having replaced the historic window and door during an earlier renovation; the mullions on the replaced fanlight are not in the same position as the original mullions;

WHEREAS at the front elevation the applicant proposes to remove the existing fanlight, the wooden entry doors and columns on either side of the doors and replace with larger scaled, more simplified glass steel-framed doors to provide more flexible access into the interior space;

WHEREAS the existing fanlight will be replaced with a fanlight that presents as a single pane of glass;

WHEREAS there will be a white metal lining around the door and around the fanlight to present a “cleaner” look to the new entrance;

WHEREAS at the front elevation at the second floor, the applicant proposes replacing the existing HSBC signage, 10” high white letters will describe the new tenant, WHITE CUBE;

WHEREAS at the front elevation inset near the top of the first floor, there are two small symmetrical historic plaques that refer to Robert Fulton’s bank; HSPC covered them with sheet metal; the applicant proposes to remove the sheet metal and replace with a different historic material;

WHEREAS the applicant proposes to remove the two non-historic scones from the front elevation;

WHEREAS the applicant proposes to clean and remediate, where needed, the front elevation;

WHEREAS at the rear, the applicant proposes to replace the existing stair bulkhead with a new elevator bulkhead; the new elevator bulkhead will be a little lower than the existing stair bulkhead;

WHEREAS the applicant’s new design for the entrance is a complete departure and changes dramatically Cross & Cross’s original and subsequently modified design for the entrance;

WHEREAS even though the existing doors and fanlight are not historic, their design is contextual and do not significantly differ from the original Cross & Cross design;

WHEREAS the juxtaposition of a modern entrance with the traditional design of the building looks out of place and is not in scale with the rest of the building;

WHEREAS the applicant is to be commended for keeping the image/medallion of Robert Fulton at the top of the building; the other two historic plaques should be left uncovered since they also represent a part of the social history of our city;

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

VOTE: 7 In Favor (Ashby, Baron, Birnbaum, Camp, Chu, Parshall, Tamayo)

1 Opposed (Helpert)

1 Public Member in Favor: Kimberly Selway

1 Public Member Opposed: Christina Davis

2. **2 East 88th Street (Expanded Carnegie Hill Historic District)** – *Steven Harris Architects* – An Art Moderne style apartment building designed by Pennington & Lewis, Inc. and constructed in 1929-1930. Application is for alterations at floors 14-16, specifically modifying window openings, masonry repair, recladding a portion of the 15th floor, and construction of an addition at the 15th floor west terrace and pergola at the 16th-floor rooftop.

WHEREAS the penthouse apartment includes the 14th 15th and 16th floors;

WHEREAS the 14th floor is the top floor of the building prior to the setback for the penthouse structure;

WHEREAS the 14th floor acts as the top of the main structure as it is set above a cornice molding between the 13th and 14th floors;

WHEREAS the penthouse structure, the crown of the building, is an asymmetrical structure that sits on the roof of the fourteenth floor close to the western edge of the building;

WHEREAS the windows on the 14th floor are being replaced with single pane windows similar to the single pane windows that exist;

WHEREAS the penthouse structure has two lower floors that are occupied, and piers and stacks that extend vertically the equivalent of another two floors in height;

WHEREAS the penthouse is made up of the vertical mass and a one-story horizontal extension;

WHEREAS changes have been made to the penthouse over time that include adding infill with brick that does not match the original brick; changing window sizes; and extending windows below the string course, interrupting the element that set a datum integral to the design;

WHEREAS the existing non-historic greenhouse of about 250 square feet will be replaced with a masonry and glass vertical extension at the eastern face of the penthouse structure;

WHEREAS a new exterior stair will be inserted between the 15th and 16th floors adjacent to the new vertical extension of the building replacing the greenhouse;

WHEREAS the new exterior stair will have a brick parapet to match existing masonry;

WHEREAS the string course above the 15th floor has been lowered to recreate the original continuity and to enable taller windows on the 16th floor;

WHEREAS the windows on the 15th and 16th floors have been reconfigured;

WHEREAS the non-historic masonry infill on the southwest corner will be replaced with a glass corner that extends the new window system;

WHEREAS the one-story easterly extension has been visually separated from the main penthouse structure with a cast stone cladding;

WHEREAS the new windows in the easterly extension are the same system as the windows in the main penthouse structure;

WHEREAS all new windows are operable;

WHEREAS the new floor to ceiling windows on the roof of the fourteenth floor, in both the penthouse structure and the easterly extension, include French doors;

WHEREAS the new windows and the French doors on the 15th and 16th floors are multi-pane with bronze frames and mullions;

WHEREAS the new windows on the fourteenth floor will also have bronze frames;

WHEREAS the eastern extension will have a cast stone canopy on the north and east;

WHEREAS a wood pergola and gas fireplace will be built on the roof of the extension;

WHEREAS the railings on the 14th floor and the penthouse structure terraces will be steel railings to match existing;

WHEREAS the guard rails on the top of the extension will be glass;

WHEREAS the screen for the relocated mechanical equipment will be metal;

WHEREAS the bulkhead for the new access stair to the roof will be zinc with standing seams;

WHEREAS the proposed design eliminates infill that did not match the existing masonry;

WHEREAS the proposed design uses a multi-pane glazing system that integrates with the masonry and encloses space without compromising the clarity of the original penthouse structure;
WHEREAS the proposed design creates a composition that seamlessly marries new elements with the original masonry;
WHEREAS the proposed design celebrates the visibility of the penthouse;
WHEREAS the proposed design is appropriate and contextual within the historic district;

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

VOTE: 8 In Favor (Ashby, Baron, Birnbaum, Camp, Chu, Helpern, Parshall, Tamayo)

2 Public Members in Favor (Davis, Selway)

3. **105 East 64th Street (Upper East Side Historic District)** – *Jason Allen, Workshop DA, Cas Stachelberg, Higgins Quasebarth.* – A rowhouse designed by W. P. & A. M. Parsons built in 1881-1882, and later altered c. 1941. Application is to alter and enlarge the building, including replacing the facades.

WHEREAS 105 East 64th Street is a no-style row house designed by W.P. & A.M. Parsons constructed in 1881-1882 and altered in 1941;

WHEREAS 105 East 64th Street was one of a row of houses at 101 to 113 East 64th Street;

WHEREAS 101 East 64th Street was subsequently demolished to make space for 603 Park Avenue — that Christopher Gray described in a March, 1989 column in the NYT, “...the grandest single family residence in New York....of variegated red brick and decorated with restrained marble detailing...”

WHEREAS 105 East 64th Street now presents as a brownstone coated rowhouse;

WHEREAS the Upper East Side Historic District Designation Report considers 105 East 64th Street a “no-style” building;

WHEREAS the applicant proposes to replace the front and rear elevations and to add a new 6th floor;

WHEREAS there will be a new limestone fronted facade with classically inspired details with a contemporary expression; the base in the tripartite scheme will be heavily rusticated and the entrance will be raised to grade and centered;

WHEREAS the applicant proposes a larger grouping of windows at the second or parlor floor with decorative iron work that presents as a narrow balcony;

WHEREAS the third through fifth floors will have punched windows with some decorative iron work;

WHEREAS the new cornice will be made of sheet metal, very simple in design;

WHEREAS above the cornice, the applicant is utilizing a mansard zinc roof with three dormers with rounded tops

WHEREAS the applicant proposes limestone caps at the party walls and brick on the sidewalls (lot line walls);

WHEREAS at the rear there is an existing 33’5 3/4” rear yard; the applicant proposes to reduce the rear yard to 30’ and add a small extension at the 1st through 4th floors creating an additional 1200 sq. ft. of interior space;

WHEREAS at the rear elevation, the proposed mansard roof is set back 14’5”; the mansard will add an additional 10’ to the height — the roofing system and parapet will increase the overall height by approximately 4’; 105 East 64th Street will now be 70’6” high from grade to the top of the mansard;

WHEREAS at the rear elevation, the predominant material is brick; a steel window system will be used; the windows will not have divided lights;

WHEREAS the windows will be enframed in limestone - a nice interruption on an otherwise brick facade;

WHEREAS glass balustrades that present as modern will be used at the 3rd, 4th and at the terrace at the 5th floor; there is a setback at the 5th floor that creates space for a terrace;

WHEREAS there is little correlation between the front and rear elevations; the applicant is attempting to combine classical elements with contemporary elements — all the windows are steel framed at both the front and rear elevations as part of this “modernism” vocabulary;

WHEREAS the mansard is an overly “ambitious” solution to a new 6th floor, is very visible from the public way and is too tall and top heavy for the simpler elevation below it;

WHEREAS the insertion of the mansard with its fussy dormer windows into the roofscape along 64th Street detracts from the restrained elegance of the south facing elevation of 603 Park Avenue (formerly 101 East 64th Street);

WHEREAS the mansard presents as the most important component of the new front elevation; a less “ambitious” solution would be more appropriate within the historic district:

WHEREAS the applicant is to be commended on the beauty of the front elevation up to the new cornice;

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

VOTE: 7 In Favor (Ashby, Baron, Birnbaum, Camp, Helpern, Parshall, Tamayo)

2 Public Members in Favor: (Davis, Selway)

David Helpern and Jane Parshall, Co-Chairs