

Valerie S. Mason
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, February 12, 2024 – 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, February 21, 2024**. They may testify for up to two 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, P. Gayle Baron, Michele Birnbaum, Alida Camp, Anthony Cohn, David Helpen, John McClement, Jane Parshall, Abraham Salcedo, and Marco Tamayo.

Approximate Number of Public Attendees: 20

Resolutions for Approval:

Item 1: 128 East 64th Street - Unanimous Approval

Item 2: 1295 Madison Avenue East - Unanimous Disapproval

Item 3: 5 East 63rd Street – Unanimous Disapproval

Item 4: 828 Madison Avenue – Unanimous Disapproval

Item 1: 128 East 64th Street (Upper East Side Historic District) – *Julie Shih/Paula Damasceno* – A Neo-Grec style building designed by James E. Ware and constructed in 1899. Application is to replace a window at the basement level with a door, with the door installation imitating the appearance of the existing window and with the goal of significantly improving the functionality of the space.

WHEREAS 128 East 64th Street is a neo-Grec style house designed by James Ware and constructed in 1899;

WHEREAS the current access to the basement is below the stoop and requires a sharp turn from the entrance gate;

WHEREAS by changing the existing window to the right of the stoop to a door, the applicant will now have direct access from the street into the basement;

WHEREAS the existing window has a vent directly beneath it;

WHEREAS the proposed door installation will imitate the appearance of the existing window; because of the to-be-removed vent, the difference between the visual look of the door vs. the window is minimal;

WHEREAS the applicant does not plan to alter the existing masonry opening;

WHEREAS the applicant will replicate the existing historic iron grillwork on the glass of the proposed new door;

WHEREAS the basement level is 18” below grade so that the proposed change from window to door is not visible unless one is standing at the gate to the areaway;

WHEREAS the application presents as a very sensible solution for providing direct access to the basement level;

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

Committee Members in favor: Ashby, Baron, Birnbaum, Camp, Cohn, Helpen, Parshall, Tamayo

Board Members in favor: McClement, Salcedo

Item 2: 1295 Madison Avenue East (Expanded Carnegie Hill Historic District) – *TPG Architecture* – A Neo-Renaissance style building designed by Louis Korn and constructed in 1899, opening to the public in 1902. Application is to install non-illuminated building signs.

WHEREAS the applicant seeks approval for two non-illuminated signs for Chase Manhattan Bank that were installed without a Certificate of Appropriateness;

WHEREAS the one sign is on a Madison Avenue storefront, and the other sign is on an East 92nd Street storefront;

WHEREAS the applicant showed Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC)-approved Chase Manhattan Bank signs for 120 Broadway and Columbus Avenue and West 86th Street that were similar to the proposed signs for Madison Avenue and East 92nd Street;

WHEREAS the applicant showed similar sized signs for banks in the Upper East Side that were not in the landmark district;

WHEREAS the LPC-approved signs were set within the masonry openings;

WHEREAS the signs for 1295 Madison Avenue spanned the storefront windows and were attached to the masonry piers;

WHEREAS the signs are made of twelve-inch-high aluminum plate letters with a white coating;

WHEREAS the letters are set on thirty-eight-inch-tall aluminum plate panels;

WHEREAS the sign on Madison Avenue is 105.5 inches long and the sign on East 92nd Street is 132 inches long;

WHEREAS the storefront window conditions are different on Madison Avenue and East 92nd Street;

WHEREAS the windows on Madison Avenue are set within masonry frames and the top of a window meets the underside of a beam or lintel below the cornice;

WHEREAS the top of the sign on Madison Avenue meets the underside of the cornice and is not in line with the top of the storefront window;

WHEREAS the repeat of the frames of the windows on Madison Avenue is interrupted by the sign;

WHEREAS the windows on 92nd Street are narrow;

WHEREAS the tops of the windows meet the underside of the cornice;

WHEREAS the sign on East 92nd Street is in line with the tops of the windows and the underside of the cornice;

WHEREAS the sign on East 92nd Street spans across two windows;

WHEREAS the window heights are different on Madison Avenue and East 92nd Street;

WHEREAS the sign locations are not consistent with the window heights in that the top of the Madison Avenue sign extends above the top of the window and the top of the East 92nd Street sign is in line with the top of the window;

WHEREAS there are two former menu boards on each face of the corner pier;

WHEREAS there are Chase logo signs within the frames of the former menu boards;

WHEREAS the Chase logo signs are incidental and do not impose on the architecture of the building;

WHEREAS the sign locations for the two large signs are not consistent with the tops of the storefront windows and are not respectful of the architectural design of the different widths and heights of the windows on Madison Avenue and East 92nd Street;

WHEREAS the two large signs, as already installed, are not appropriate and contextual within the historic district;

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

Committee Members in favor: Ashby, Baron, Birnbaum, Camp, Cohn, Helpen, Parshall, Tamayo

Board Members in favor: McClement, Salcedo

Item 3: 5 East 63rd Street (Upper East Side Historic District) – *Edward Shalat* – A Neo-Classical style building designed by Heins & LaFarge and constructed in 1900, with façade modifications and added upper stories by Harry Hurwuit in 1942. Application is for a new cornice on the street façade, replacement of double-hung windows with casement windows on the front and rear facades, modifications to the existing stair bulkhead on the roof, replacement of lot line windows, and the addition of a new skylight on the roof.

WHEREAS 5 East 63rd Street is a neo-Classical style building designed by Heins & LaFarge and constructed in 1900, with façade modifications and added upper stories by Harry Hurwuit in 1942;

WHEREAS at the front elevation the applicant proposes to infill existing windows at the roof and install a fiberglass cornice that will not replicate the original historic cornice;

WHEREAS other proposed restoration work at the front elevation has already been approved at the staff level at the Landmarks Preservation Commission;

WHEREAS at both the front and rear elevations at all six floors, the applicant proposes to replace the existing one-over-one windows with new multi-light casement windows;

WHEREAS at the east elevation at the 6th floor, the applicant proposes to infill one lot line window to the west of a space formerly a small terrace; the applicant also proposes to replace the directly adjacent lot-line window with a new casement window;

WHEREAS the applicant proposes to remove the existing above-mentioned small terrace at the east elevation as part of a program to reconfigure part of the 6th floor so that a larger terrace can be carved out utilizing part of the 6th floor;

WHEREAS the applicant proposes a new skylight over the now enclosed space that was formerly the terrace;

WHEREAS at the roof, the applicant proposes to enlarge the existing stair bulkhead and to clad the entire bulkhead, including the new portion, in brick to match the rest of the house;

WHEREAS the applicant proposes to cover the extended bulkhead with a new skylight;

WHEREAS the proposed new bulkhead will extend horizontally three feet forward and will be visible from the public way; the existing bulkhead is minimally visible;

WHEREAS at the west elevation at the 6th floor, the applicant proposes to replace an existing multi-light lot-line window with a fixed single pane window;

WHEREAS at the rear elevation at the 6th floor, the applicant proposes to remove the windows and to remove a portion of the roof so that the proposed open courtyard/terrace can be carved out;

WHEREAS the open courtyard will have three walls and three openings where there were formerly windows;

WHEREAS double hung wood windows go with the style and time of the original historic house; the applicant could not say with certainty that the original windows were double hung;

WHEREAS the proposed casement windows are not contextual within the historic district;

WHEREAS the proposed fixed single pane lot-line window at the east elevation at the 6th floor is out of character with the rest of the house;

WHEREAS Heins and LaFarge were responsible for the original Romanesque-Byzantine east end and crossing of the Cathedral of St. John the Divine as well as the architecture and details for the Interborough Rapid Transit Company among other notable projects;

WHEREAS the Heins and LaFarge front door at 5 East 63rd Street is a bold expression of the modern French movement at the turn of the century;

WHEREAS the proposed replacement fiberglass cornice doesn't have the gravitas that 3 East 63rd Street deserves and is too small for a building of this size;

WHEREAS if a replacement cornice is to be considered it should be made of limestone and replicate the original majestic cornice;

WHEREAS the proposed open space at the 6th floor presents as an artificial opening and reads as vacant because of the removal of the windows and is not contextual within the historic district;

WHEREAS bringing forward the bulkhead makes it too visible from the public way;

WHEREAS the application doesn't rise to what the building once was; the wonderful proportions of the original building are completely lost;

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

Committee Members in favor: Ashby, Baron, Birnbaum, Camp, Cohn, Helpen, Parshall, Tamayo

Board Members in favor: McClement, Salcedo

Item 4: 828 Madison Avenue (Upper East Side Historic District) – *Design Republic* – A Neo-Renaissance style building designed by George F. Pelham and constructed in 1925-26. Application is to install storefront infill and signage at the building's southern seven storefront bays along East 69th Street and Madison Avenue.

WHEREAS the applicant proposed to install storefronts and signage in the building's southern end -- three bays on East 69th Street and four bays on Madison Avenue;

WHEREAS the Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC) had approved a storefront master plan for the building in 2018;

WHEREAS the master plan included a granite base, two-inch bronze storefront window frames; and canvas awnings;

WHEREAS the LPC approved storefronts and signage for the thirteen bays to the north of the bays under consideration in the subject application;

WHEREAS neither the approved storefronts nor the applicant's proposed storefronts conform with the master plan;

WHEREAS the approved storefronts have a granite base, bronze frames with four-inch-deep bottom mullions, and canvas awnings;

WHEREAS the approved storefronts do not comply with the master plan in the four-inch-deep bronze frames at the bottoms of the storefront windows;

WHEREAS the proposed storefronts have a granite base, two-inch bronze frames with eleven-inch-deep top mullions to provide surfaces for signs;

WHEREAS the northernmost proposed storefront has a two-inch deep top mullion and a wide vertical mullion on the northern side;

WHEREAS the storefront frames will be a medium statutory bronze to match the master plan requirement;

WHEREAS the proposed storefronts do not comply with the master plan in the eleven-inch-deep top mullions, wide side mullion, granite that is lighter in color, and the lack of awnings;

WHEREAS the proposed entrance doors are either side of the southeast corner pier;

WHEREAS the proposed service door is at the western end of the western bay of the southern end of the building;

WHEREAS signs will have six-inch-high blackened bronze letters on the medium statutory bronze mullions;

WHEREAS the blackened bronze signs will be on the upper mullion in the center bay on East 69th Street and on the upper mullions in the two center bays on Madison Avenue;

WHEREAS there will be a vertical, blackened bronze sign at the top of the wide mullion in the northernmost bay on Madison Avenue;

WHEREAS there will be etched signs in the two glass entrance doors;

WHEREAS there will be blackened bronze signs on the two faces of the corner pier and on the piers either side of the corner storefronts;

WHEREAS the existing sconces will be removed;

WHEREAS the proposed storefronts have elegant detailing, they are not as consistent with the master plan as the proposed storefronts in the remaining thirteen bays;

WHEREAS the bays of the building could accommodate some differences, the proposed changes from the master plan go beyond theme and variations by eliminating the awnings and sconces and changing the proportions of the windows;

WHEREAS the proposed changes from the master plan eliminate the positive repetition of architectural elements in common;

WHEREAS the proposed application to install storefronts that differ from the master plan is not appropriate and contextual within the historic district;

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

Committee Members in favor: Ashby, Baron, Birnbaum, Cohn, Helpern, Parshall, Tamayo

Board Members in favor: Salcedo

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 8:36 PM.

David Helpern and Jane Parshall, Co-Chairs