July 19, 2019

Sarah Carroll, Chair
NYC Landmarks Preservation Commission
One Centre St., 9th Floor North
New York, New York 10007

Dear Chair Carroll:

At its Full Board meeting on July 18, 2019, Community Board #2, Manhattan (CB2, Man.) adopted the following resolution:

1. **PETITION *50 W. 12th St.* – Petition seeking CB2, Man. support for the installation of a plaque designating this building as an individual landmark of author/illustrator Eric Carle

**Whereas:**

A. Mr. Carle is a well-known graphic illustrator and later in his career he wrote and illustrated children’s books.

B. The petitioner is requesting that the Board support designating the building where his apartment was for some years during which time he wrote many of his most notable works; and

C. The building, while typical of the gold coast streets, is not especially distinguished; and

D. No precedent was offered for the designation of a home’s being landmarked to honor a living person; now

**Therefore, be it resolved** that CB2, Man. recommends that instead of seeking landmark status for the building, the petitioner undertake the installation of a plaque on the building to honor Mr. Carle.

Vote: Unanimous, with 35 Board members in favor.
July 19, 2019

Sarah Carroll, Chair
NYC Landmarks Preservation Commission
One Centre St., 9th Floor North
New York, New York 10007

Dear Chair Carroll:

At its Full Board meeting on July 18, 2019, Community Board #2, Manhattan (CB2, Man.) adopted the following resolution:

2. 15 7th Ave. – Application is to alter interiors, including partitions at two windows.

(To be reviewed at LPC staff level)
July 19, 2019

Sarah Carroll, Chair
NYC Landmarks Preservation Commission
One Centre St., 9th Floor North
New York, New York 10007

Dear Chair Carroll:

At its Full Board meeting on July 18, 2019, Community Board #2, Manhattan (CB2, Man.) adopted the following resolution:

3. **99 Spring St. - Application is to modify the existing storefront by constructing a display window in the freight elevator bay to match the existing retail display window.**

**Whereas:**

A. The existing, original freight elevator is intact and is set back from the cast iron pilasters and is typical of freight elevators from the era of light manufacturing in Soho; and

B. The proposal is to install an infill, matching the infill in the opposite bay, that covers the elevator and to demolish the corner bumper guards and other original materials relating to the use of the bay as an elevator entrance; and

C. The proposed show window is a 9 1/2 inch vitrine, thus making it impossible to place any illuminated sign 18” from the window; and

D. The structure of the showcase involves an invisible door for access to the elevator that swings into the sidewalk; and

E. The masking of the elevator with a contemporary show window infill erases an important indication of the original design and purpose of the building as a light manufacturing site; and

F. The existing condition, different from the existing condition presented by the applicant, is a double door like painted panel filling the bay to cover the elevator door; now
Therefore be it resolved that CB2, Man. recommends:

A. **Denial** of the application because it obscures the emblematic Soho elevator from view and thus modernizes an intact historic building; and

B. That staff review the actual existing condition for its possibly being in violation.

Vote: Unanimous, with 35 Board members in favor.
July 19, 2019

Sarah Carroll, Chair
NYC Landmarks Preservation Commission
One Centre St., 9th Floor North
New York, New York 10007

Dear Chair Carroll:

At its Full Board meeting on July 18, 2019, Community Board #2, Manhattan (CB2, Man.) adopted the following resolution:

3. **85 Sullivan St.** - Application is to renovate interior and restore exterior, including rebuilding of structurally damaged side and rear facades, and construct a 3,156 square foot 3-story addition

**Whereas:**

A. The building proposed is a rear yard structure in the backyard of an individual landmark with a “connector” structure and modification of the rear façade of the row house; and

B. The application was heard earlier and has been improved only to the extent that the rear building is now presented as the same height as the row house and the frosted glass wall has been replaced by masonry and punched windows; and

C. The style of brick of the rear yard building, its color, and the plain single pane windows have no historical reference and are not in harmony with either the row house or the historic district; and

D. The rear building is out of character with the row house and with the neighborhood typography and its position on the site makes it clearly visible from the public thoroughfare (Sullivan Street) as illustrated in a photograph provided by a member of the public and the materials presented by the applicant make the new proposed building far less visible than the actual situation and the side alley which is part of this property affords a view of the building within the lot line of the property; and

E. The applicant has not sought a waiver from the Department of Buildings to permit that a separate back house structure be located where it was originally at the rear of the garden and without a built connection between the two structures; and

F. The portion of the rear façade of the row house that is not obscured by the connector is in material to simulate wooden siding revealed in probing; and
G. The design revisions, the modifications to the height, and the position of the rear building in the middle of the garden do not elevate the new design to an acceptable standard for this historic house and the district; now

**Therefore be it resolved** that CB2, Man. recommends

A. **Approval** of the materials for the north and east facades of the existing row house; and

B. **Denial** of the connector, as it obscures one third of the rear façade of the row house; and

C. **Denial** of the application as the proposed addition is unsuitable to the property in design, bulk, materials, and fenestration; and recommends that if any rear yard structure is permitted that it be located at the rear of the garden, no more than two stories high and be set back from the path of the alley.

Vote: Unanimous, with 35 Board members in favor.
July 19, 2019

Sarah Carroll, Chair
NYC Landmarks Preservation Commission
One Centre St., 9th Floor North
New York, New York 10007

Dear Chair Carroll:

At its Full Board meeting on July 18, 2019, Community Board #2, Manhattan (CB2, Man.) adopted the following resolution:

4. *421 W. 13th St.* – Application is to legalize the installation of signage without LPC permits.

Laid over.
July 19, 2019

Sarah Carroll, Chair
NYC Landmarks Preservation Commission
One Centre St., 9th Floor North
New York, New York 10007

Dear Chair Carroll:

At its Full Board meeting on July 18, 2019, Community Board #2, Manhattan (CB2, Man.) adopted the following resolution:

5. *17 E. 9th St.* - Application is to renovate the existing façade, modify the interior layouts from multi-to single-family, and rear yard and bulkhead additions.

**Whereas:**

A. The facade is reasonably intact apart from the stoop having been removed and replaced by a basement entry and three assorted rear additions, one of which compromises the required 30” depth of the rear yard.

B. The building is being joined together with the restored adjacent house and the front will be restored with windows replaced in kind and the ground floor and window detailing will be restored or replaced with cast stone; and

C. The rear additions will be removed and a new 8’ extension extending the full height of the building is proposed with a non-historic pattern of four single hinged floor to ceiling windows/doors per floor and of equal height on different floors creating a too tall scale for the upper floors and each window/door has a glass railing and the proposed masonry is detailed with odd, non-historic horizontal banding of the brick; and

D. The full height addition completely obscures the rear façade, calls for the demolition of the historic building’s entire rear wall, and a two or three story similar extension is typical and preferred to maintain the original rear cornice line and massing of the adjacent and original buildings and is typical of row houses in the district.

A. The rooftop bulkhead and structure are clearly visible from University Place a public thoroughfare; and
B. The cellar will be lowered three feet with underpinning on each side; and

C. There was public testimony opposing the rooftop extension as unsightly and unsuited to the neighborhood; now

**Therefore be it resolved** that CB2, Man. recommends:

A. **Approval** of the restoration of the front façade; and

B. **Approval** of the excavation provided that care it taken to ensure that the building and adjacent structures are monitored and that their integrity is assured; and

C. **Denial** of the rear extension bulk unless it is limited to the basement and parlor floor only with the rear façade above the extension restored with original materials and fenestration or replaced with replications; and

D. **Denial** of the rear extension’s non-historic window configuration and non-historic style and size of the windows; and

E. **Denial** of the clearly visible bulkhead and roof structure.

Vote: Unanimous, with 35 Board members in favor.
July 19, 2019

Sarah Carroll, Chair
NYC Landmarks Preservation Commission
One Centre St., 9th Floor North
New York, New York 10007

Dear Chair Carroll:

At its Full Board meeting on July 18, 2019, Community Board #2, Manhattan (CB2, Man.) adopted the following resolution:

6. *317 W. 11th St. and 319 W. 11th St.* – Application is to install a rooftop addition, excavate to enlarge existing cellar, and modify the front façade, areaway, and existing rear yard addition.

Whereas:

A. The two buildings, 317 and 319 are distinctly separate row houses that are to be combined into a one family house and the 317 modifications are, in general, patterned after the recently approved and carried out work on 319.

B. A tile roof from the 20”s and brick parapet are being removed and a new cornice patterned after 319 will be installed; and

C. The entrance is to be removed, leaving the odd appearance of a row house without an entrance and the basement and parlor floors will have three matching windows on each level in place of an entrance door at the basement level; and

D. The areaway, fencing and paving will be copied to 319 in design and materials; and

E. The rear addition will have windows the entire width of the building to match 319 on the bottom three floors and punched single pane casement windows on the top floor; and

F. The cellar is to be excavated 4’-1” and extends 12’-3” toward the rear; and

G. The rooftop addition is setback 17’-3” front the front façade and has a sloping roof to minimize its visibility; and
H. The elevator bulkhead rises 10’ above the new roof line with footprint of 8’-2” x 8’-3” and is aggressively visible from a public thoroughfare, appears massive on this small building, and this visibility is not mitigated by its being painted black in an effort to have it blend with a neighboring building; now

**Therefore be it resolved** that CB2, Man. recommends:

A. **Approval** of the removal of the non-historic parapet and tile roof and areaway modifications; and

B. **Approval** of the excavation provided that care it taken to ensure that the building and adjacent structures are monitored and that their integrity is assured; and

C. **Approval** of the rear façade modification in that, though it is regrettably non-historic, does copy an approved rear façade on the adjacent building; and

D. **Denial** of the replacement of the basement street entry doorway with a window, giving the odd appearance of a building without an entrance and making two historic row houses into a single mansion house; and

E. **Denial** of any façade treatment that suggests that the two row houses are one building; and

F. **Denial** of the overly large, highly visible elevator bulkhead that is not placed in a position that would afford minimal or no visibility.

Vote: Unanimous, with 35 Board members in favor.
Please advise us of any decision or action taken in response to this resolution.

Sincerely,

Carter Booth, Chair
Community Board #2, Manhattan

Chenault Spence, Chair
Landmarks & Public Aesthetics Committee
Community Board #2, Manhattan
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   Hon. Deborah J. Glick, Assembly Member
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