

Valerie S. Mason
Chair

Ian McKnight
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, January 12, 2026 – 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, January 21, 2025**. 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, Michele Birnbaum, Alida Camp, Anthony Cohn, Miles Fink, David Helpern, John McClement, Kimberly Selway, and Marco Tamayo.

Approximate Number of Public Attendees: 10

Resolutions for Approval:

Item 1: 31 East 63rd Street

Item 1: 31 East 63rd Street (Upper East Side Historic District) – *Chad Firmstone, AIA* – A no-style building designed by Treanor & Fatio and constructed in 1915. Application is for enlargement to rooftop addition.

WHEREAS 31 East 63rd Street is five stories high; and

WHEREAS the building has a rooftop bulkhead addition with a skylight over the center stair; and

WHEREAS the applicant seeks to enlarge the existing rooftop addition into a new floor for an office in the front and a bedroom at the rear; and

WHEREAS the front façade is clad in stone; and

WHEREAS the windows are multi-pane; and

WHEREAS the type of stone and the material for the frames and sashes of the windows were not identified; and

WHEREAS the front façade of the new floor will be constructed of precast concrete; and

WHEREAS it was not shown if the stone cladding and the precast were to match in texture and color or to be different; and

WHEREAS the design of the new windows was minimally shown and details were not included; and

WHEREAS it was not shown if the new windows were to be related to the existing windows in color and material for the frames and sashes or purposefully not related; and

WHEREAS a new railing was shown to be added above the top of the existing low parapet at the face of the roof of the fifth floor; and

WHEREAS the front face of the new floor was set so that it would not be seen from the sidewalk directly across the street per the sight line diagram; and

WHEREAS in the rear the fifth floor is set back from the four floors below; and

WHEREAS in the rear the face of the new floor was set just behind the face of the fifth floor; and

WHEREAS the representation of the new material for the rear façade was different from the precast but was not identified; and

WHEREAS what appeared to be mechanical elements at the rear edge of the new floor were not identified; and

WHEREAS the photographs of the mock-up were taken on the roof and not from the street; and

WHEREAS not having photos of the mock-up from the street precluded an understanding of the visibility or lack thereof of the proposed new floor; and

WHEREAS the trees in the renderings block views of the relationship between the existing building and the proposed new floor; and

WHEREAS the presentation did not fully describe the design for the exterior of the new floor; and

WHEREAS the design intent that was visible did not create a cohesive design for the building; and

WHEREAS the proposed new floor is not contextual or appropriate within the historic district;

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

Board Members in Favor: 9-0-0-0 (Ashby, Birnbaum, Camp, Cohn, Fink, Helpern, McClement, Selway, Tamayo)

2. New Business/Old Business

Co-Chair David Helpern brought up the application for 133 East 95th Street, which had appeared before the Committee and the Board in September and December of 2025. The application was disapproved in both September and December, following discussions regarding the proposed scope of work. Although the Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC) took most of the recommendations from CB8M's into consideration, they did not act on the Board's recommendation for disapproval regarding the proposed fence encasing the front of the property, which was a concern for both the Board and Carnegie Hill Neighbors. The Committee reached a consensus to send a letter to the LPC reiterating the disapproval of the proposed fence before the LPC approves the application at the staff level.

Additionally, Alida Camp brought up an issue in New Business. Many on both the Landmarks and Zoning, Development and Housing Committees have expressed frustration with the language that developers use to describe the height of their projects. Often, the height is expressed in “stories”, which most casual observers interpret as units of ten feet in height. This is frequently misleading, as building stories vary between ten and fourteen feet as a matter of course, and the insertion of mechanical equipment and amenity floors often further exaggerate the height of the project. Alida proposed conforming the language used to describe building height to a ten feet per floor description. A 350 foot tall building would, under this language, be described as a 35-story building, regardless of the number of actual floor levels it contains.

While there was general agreement that the current set of descriptors can be misleading, there was not consensus as to whether this reclassifying made sense. After all, some commented, announcing the height of the building in feet and inches already serves the purpose of revealing the true height. At least one Committee member suggested that this discussion might be better taken up by the Zoning, Development and Housing Committee.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:06 PM.

Anthony Cohn, David Helpern, and Jane Parshall, Co-Chairs