

Antony Wong, Treasurer
Susan Kent, Secretary
Keen Berger, Assistant Secretary

COMMUNITY BOARD NO. 2, MANHATTAN

3 Washington Square Village New York, NY 10012-1899

www.cb2manhattan.org
P: 212-979-2272 F: 212-254-5102 E: info@cb2manhattan.org

Greenwich Village * Little Italy * SoHo * NoHo * Hudson Square * Chinatown * Gansevoort Market

July 30, 2014

Robert B. Tierney, Chair NYC Landmarks Preservation Commission One Centre St., 9th Floor North New York, New York 10007

Dear Chairman Tierney:

At its Full Board meeting on July 24, 2014, Community Board #2, Manhattan (CB#2, Man.) adopted the following resolution:

1ST LANDMARKS MEETING

1 - LPC Item: 16 - 40 Mercer Street, aka 465 Broadway & 106-114 Grand St - SoHo-Cast Iron H.D.

A steel-and-glass building designed by Atelier Jean Nouvel and built in c. 2006. Application is to alter granite sidewalk

Whereas, *LPC violation WL14-0554* was issued on January 7, 2014 for gross, illegal signage on several ground-floor display windows of this building, a condition that existed for many months prior to the violation; and, further,

Whereas the Landmarks Preservation Commission's publication *The Certificate of Appropriateness Public Hearing: Information for Applicants* states that "applicants are strongly encouraged to contact the Community Board to arrange for review of the proposal before the public hearing"; and

Whereas the applicant did not contact the Community Board or appear before the Landmarks Committee to present this application; now

Therefore, be it resolved that CB2 recommends denial of this application for failure to adhere to this important step in the review process; that is, presenting to the community board, and

Further, be it resolved that CB#2, Man. strongly recommends that the applicant cure the existing LPC violation before any further discussion on new applications is continued.



Antony Wong, Treasurer
Susan Kent, Secretary
Keen Berger, Assistant Secretary

COMMUNITY BOARD NO. 2, MANHATTAN

3 WASHINGTON SQUARE VILLAGE NEW YORK, NY 10012-1899 www.cb2manhattan.org

July 30, 2014

Robert B. Tierney, Chair NYC Landmarks Preservation Commission One Centre St., 9th Floor North New York, New York 10007

Dear Chairman Tierney:

At its Full Board meeting on July 24, 2014, Community Board #2, Manhattan (CB#2, Man.) adopted the following resolution:

2 - LPC Item: 17 - 35 Great Jones Street-NoHo Historic District

A Romanesque Revival style store and loft building designed by Cleverdon & Putzel, built in 1893-94. Application is to legalize sidewalk work completed in non-compliance with Landmarks Preservation Commission permits.

Whereas, little of the sidewalk-vault metal grid and its glass crystals were extant, and we realize the difficulty and expense in keeping these sidewalk elements waterproof; and

Whereas, although the sidewalk work was done in non-compliance, the end result is not a disaster. Indeed, it may well likely may have been approved initially had the applicant tried; now

Therefore, be it resolved that CB#2, Man. recommends approval of this application.



Antony Wong, Treasurer
Susan Kent, Secretary
Keen Berger, Assistant Secretary

COMMUNITY BOARD NO. 2, MANHATTAN

3 Washington Square Village New York, NY 10012-1899

www.cb2manhattan.org

July 30, 2014

Robert B. Tierney, Chair NYC Landmarks Preservation Commission One Centre St., 9th Floor North New York, New York 10007

Dear Chairman Tierney:

At its Full Board meeting on July 24, 2014, Community Board #2, Manhattan (CB#2, Man.) adopted the following resolution:

3 - LPC Item: 19 - 383 Lafayette Street, aka 383-389 Lafayette Street, 22-26 East 4th Street - NoHo Historic District and NoHo Historic District Extension

A simplified neo-Classical style store and loft building designed by Gronenberg & Leuchtag and built in 1913; and a parking lot with a concrete-block wall.

Application is to replace storefront infill, reconstruct the facades, install an entrance canopy, install rooftop mechanical equipment and bulkheads and construct a new building on the vacant lot. Zoned M1-5B

Whereas, we commend the applicant for a remarkable restoration project on the Lafayette Street building, including, but not limited to: the reconstruction of the parapet; the replacement of damaged bricks and non-historic masonry; and restoration of the upper floor windows to a more historic configuration; and

Whereas, the rooftop equipment will not be overly obtrusive from the street; and

Whereas, the new building proposed is well designed and will enhance the Lafayette Street building, as well as the historic district; and

Whereas, we applaud the applicant, NYU, for respecting the height of the surrounding buildings by not building as high as permitted under the zoning; and

Whereas, much of the work proposed for the storefront is appropriate; but

Whereas, we rarely see in the urban context — let alone historic districts — such an expanse of ground-floor glazing; and

Whereas, consequently, with so much continuous glass, the storefront seems to crawl out of the building and the upper floors appear to float by magic; and

Whereas, the storefront transoms should have more articulation; and

Whereas, the side loading-dock of this building, which long-housed a paper distributor, actually required an overhang to protect the paper products. Moreover, few would commonly refer to such a structure as a "marquee" as this applicant does; and

Whereas, this type of protective roof-like structure is the only example of its kind in any of the NoHo Historic Districts; and, again, it was for this special instance of protecting paper products from the elements; and

Whereas, the old loading-dock overhang was on a side street; the marquee is proposed for a very wide street, something not ever present historically in NoHo; and

Whereas, the two large NYU banners that the applicant has proposed — and of which we approve — will certainly announce the presence of this college administrative building, without the applicant having to resort to a marquee — an element commonly associated with theaters, hotels, hospitals, or train stations, and not college administrative buildings; and

Whereas, the is no rhyme or reason for an incongruous element like a marquee to announce a college administrative building, since the building will not be open to, or attract, the general public; now

Therefore, be it resolved that CB#2, Man. recommends approval of the new building, the rooftop mechanicals and bulkheads, and the restoration of the windows, parapets and masonry; but

Further, be it resolved that CB#2, Man. recommends interrupting the proposed expansive coursing of glazing with more articulation and divisions, so that the storefront is more anchored to the facade of the building's upper floors – and not appear to float, as is proposed; and,

Further, be it resolved that CB#2, Man. recommends approval of the two NYU banners, but recommends denial of the superfluous, distracting and non-historic marquee proposed for the college administrative building.



Antony Wong, Treasurer
Susan Kent, Secretary
Keen Berger, Assistant Secretary

COMMUNITY BOARD NO. 2, MANHATTAN

3 Washington Square Village New York, NY 10012-1899

www.cb2manhattan.org

July 30, 2014

Robert B. Tierney, Chair NYC Landmarks Preservation Commission One Centre St., 9th Floor North New York, New York 10007

Dear Chairman Tierney:

At its Full Board meeting on July 24, 2014, Community Board #2, Manhattan (CB#2, Man.) adopted the following resolution:

4 - LPC Item: 20 - 152 West 13th Street-Greenwich Village Historic District

A Greek Revival style rowhouse built in 1846.

Application is to construct rooftop and rear yard additions, and replace windows. Zoned R6

Whereas, the rooftop addition is not glaringly visible from the street and will be partly covered by the code-required chimney extension; but

Whereas, in the Greenwich Village Historic District, since we try to be restrained with our rooftop additions, the rear of this building would be improved by decreasing the 12-foot height of the proposed rooftop extension; and

Whereas, the proposed large slider-door seems suburban and not appropriate for a masonry building in the Village; and

Whereas, the design for the rear facade is visually incoherent, unartistic and unappealing. The fenestration needs more symmetry; now

Therefore, be it resolved that CB#2, Man. recommends general approval of the rooftop addition, but recommends denial of the asymmetric and unappealing design of the rearward addition.



Antony Wong, Treasurer
Susan Kent, Secretary
Keen Berger, Assistant Secretary

COMMUNITY BOARD NO. 2, MANHATTAN

3 Washington Square Village New York, NY 10012-1899

www.cb2manhattan.org
P: 212-979-2272 F: 212-254-5102 E: info@cb2manhattan.org

Greenwich Village * Little Italy * SoHo * NoHo * Hudson Square * Chinatown * Gansevoort Market

July 30, 2014

Robert B. Tierney, Chair NYC Landmarks Preservation Commission One Centre St., 9th Floor North New York, New York 10007

Dear Chairman Tierney:

At its Full Board meeting on July 24, 2014, Community Board #2, Manhattan (CB#2, Man.) adopted the following resolution:

5 - LPC Item: 23 - 470 6th Avenue, aka 466 to 470 6th Avenue-Greenwich Village Historic District

A vernacular style house built in 1844.

Application is to modify storefront infill installed in non-compliance with Certificate of Appropriateness

Whereas, the exiting infill was installed in non-compliance and it removes the storefront from an historical configuration; and

Whereas, the community board and the Landmarks Preservation Commission in 1992 spent time and effort at designing a Master Plan for the set of buildings of which this is one; now

Therefore, be it resolved that CB#2, Man. recommends denial of this application and suggests the applicant simply defer to the LPC's original Master Plan.



Antony Wong, Treasurer
Susan Kent, Secretary
Keen Berger, Assistant Secretary

COMMUNITY BOARD NO. 2, MANHATTAN

3 Washington Square Village New York, NY 10012-1899

www.cb2manhattan.org
P: 212-979-2272 F: 212-254-5102 E: info@cb2manhattan.org

Greenwich Village * Little Italy * SoHo * NoHo * Hudson Square * Chinatown * Gansevoort Market

July 30, 2014

Robert B. Tierney, Chair NYC Landmarks Preservation Commission One Centre St., 9th Floor North New York, New York 10007

Dear Chairman Tierney:

At its Full Board meeting on July 24, 2014, Community Board #2, Manhattan (CB#2, Man.) adopted the following resolution:

2nd LANDMARKS MEETING

6 - LPC Item: 8 - 434 Lafayette Street - Individual Landmark-NoHo Historic District A Greek Revival style townhouse with a two-story Corinthian colonnade, attributed to Seth Geer, built in 1832-33.

Application is to install a marquee, signage and lighting

Whereas, the proposed replacement of the marquee sign for the Blue Man Group theatrical production is to be of a translucent material, lit from behind; and

Whereas, the supporting structure and the band at the top of the sign will remain; and

Whereas, the proposed design of the graphics are substantially calmer than the present sign; now

Therefore, be it resolved that CB#2, Man. recommends approval of this application provided that the level of illumination of the sign does not exceed the level of the present sign and that the band above the sign remain the present light metal color.



Antony Wong, Treasurer
Susan Kent, Secretary
Keen Berger, Assistant Secretary

COMMUNITY BOARD NO. 2, MANHATTAN

3 Washington Square Village New York, NY 10012-1899

www.cb2manhattan.org
P: 212-979-2272 F: 212-254-5102 E: info@cb2manhattan.org

Greenwich Village * Little Italy * SoHo * NoHo * Hudson Square * Chinatown * Gansevoort Market

July 30, 2014

Robert B. Tierney, Chair NYC Landmarks Preservation Commission One Centre St., 9th Floor North New York, New York 10007

Dear Chairman Tierney:

At its Full Board meeting on July 24, 2014, Community Board #2, Manhattan (CB#2, Man.) adopted the following resolution:

7 - LPC Item: 9 - 380 Lafayette Street-376-380 Lafayette Street Building - Individual Landmark - NoHo Historic District (North West corner of Lafayette and Great Jones Street)

A Romanesque Revival style store and loft building designed by Henry J. Hardenbergh built in 1888.

Application is to replace doors.

Whereas, the current double door in the central opening does not meet code requirements and will be replaced by a wooden door with glass, copying the "roundels" in the circular transom above and that, despite its being shown in a vague rendering, appears to be of proper design for the building; and

Whereas, the utilitarian lighting fixture above the door will be replaced with a hanging lantern patterned after the metal brackets on the façade above the ground floor; and

Whereas, there will be general restoration of the intact surround and the transoms; and

Whereas, the sidewalk immediately in front of the door will be replaced with stone and the number in metal will be recessed into the stone; and

Whereas, great sensitivity and respect for the style of the building are shown in the restoration and the creation of the new elements; now

Therefore, be it resolved that CB#2, Man. recommends approval of this application.



Antony Wong, Treasurer
Susan Kent, Secretary
Keen Berger, Assistant Secretary

COMMUNITY BOARD NO. 2, MANHATTAN

3 Washington Square Village New York, NY 10012-1899

www.cb2manhattan.org
P: 212-979-2272 F: 212-254-5102 E: info@cb2manhattan.org

Greenwich Village * Little Italy * SoHo * NoHo * Hudson Square * Chinatown * Gansevoort Market

July 28, 2014

Robert B. Tierney, Chair NYC Landmarks Preservation Commission One Centre St., 9th Floor North New York, New York 10007

Dear Chairman Tierney:

At its Full Board meeting on July 24, 2014, Community Board #2, Manhattan (CB#2, Man.) adopted the following resolution:

8 - LPC Item: 10 - 31 Bond Street-NoHo Historic District Extension

A Renaissance Revival style store and loft building designed by DeLemos & Cordes and built in 1888-

Application is to alter the ground floor, install storefront infill, replace windows, construct a new rear facade and rooftop addition, and excavate the cellar.

Zoned M1-5B

Whereas, the non-historic infill in the three front façade bays are to be replaced with double doors in the center, a required egress door with matching fixed panel in the left opening and a pair of fixed panels replicating the design of the doors with required ventilation louvers in place of bulkhead panels in the right opening; and

Whereas, the considerable, well preserved brownstone and cast iron elements and the transom are to be repaired and restored; and

Whereas, the existing elevator shaft on the roof at the front of the building is to be removed and a stair bulkhead and overrun for the new elevator will be constructed behind the existing chimney, which will remain; and

Whereas, the roof additions are somewhat visible, though not intrusive, the roofscape is considerably improved by the elimination of the existing elevator shaft, giving a welcome openness above the front façade as seen from both near and distant locations; and

Whereas, The original, rear façade and parts of the rear side walls are to be demolished to provide rear yard clearance varying from 18' to 30'; and

Whereas, it is unclear to the Committee why an 18' clearance would be permitted, thus rendering the design of the rear façade unworkable; and

Whereas, the new rear wall is to be constructed entirely in glass with metal frames and will have balconies on each floor all of which are out of character for Great Jones Alley and the building; and

Whereas, a portion of the rear side wall, clearly visible from Lafayette Street down Great Jones Alley has floor to ceiling glass panels and white stucco which greatly intrude on the historic view down the alley which is otherwise undisturbed by contemporary alterations to other buildings in the alley; and

Whereas, the treatment of the rear of the building is completely without historical reference or context the building and neighborhood; and

Whereas, as represented by a knowledgeable resident of the district and leader of a community group, other buildings on Great Jones Alley and elsewhere in the NoHo historic district and extension were required to treat the rear facades with respect for historical reference and context of the buildings and the neighborhood; and

Whereas, several of these buildings will be severely impacted by the introduction of the proposed rear façade into Jones Alley; now

Therefore, be it resolved that CB#2, Man. recommends approval of the façade and roof work; and

Be it further resolved that The Board recommends denial of the rear façade which is non-contextual to the building and to the district and which disturbs one of the few remaining alleys in the City, which is otherwise remarkably well preserved.



Antony Wong, Treasurer
Susan Kent, Secretary
Keen Berger, Assistant Secretary

COMMUNITY BOARD NO. 2, MANHATTAN

3 Washington Square Village New York, NY 10012-1899

www.cb2manhattan.org
P: 212-979-2272 F: 212-254-5102 E: info@cb2manhattan.org

Greenwich Village * Little Italy * SoHo * NoHo * Hudson Square * Chinatown * Gansevoort Market

July 30, 2014

Robert B. Tierney, Chair NYC Landmarks Preservation Commission One Centre St., 9th Floor North New York, New York 10007

Dear Chairman Tierney:

At its Full Board meeting on July 24, 2014, Community Board #2, Manhattan (CB#2, Man.) adopted the following resolution:

9 - LPC Item: 12 - 31 West 11th Street-Greenwich Village Historic District

A neo-Classical style apartment building designed by Browne and Almiroty and built in 1910. Application is to legalize the removal of lampposts without Landmarks Preservation Commission permits

Whereas the Landmarks Preservation Commission's publication *The Certificate of Appropriateness Public Hearing: Information for Applicants* states that "applicants are strongly encouraged to contact the Community Board to arrange for review of the proposal before the public hearing"; and

Whereas the applicant did not contact the Community Board or appear before the Landmarks Committee to present this application; now

Therefore, be it resolved that CB#2, Man. recommends denial of this application in the absence of this important step in the review process.



Antony Wong, Treasurer
Susan Kent, Secretary
Keen Berger, Assistant Secretary

COMMUNITY BOARD NO. 2, MANHATTAN

3 Washington Square Village New York, NY 10012-1899

www.cb2manhattan.org
P: 212-979-2272 F: 212-254-5102 E: info@cb2manhattan.org

Greenwich Village * Little Italy * SoHo * NoHo * Hudson Square * Chinatown * Gansevoort Market

July 30, 2014

Robert B. Tierney, Chair NYC Landmarks Preservation Commission One Centre St., 9th Floor North New York, New York 10007

Dear Chairman Tierney:

At its Full Board meeting on July 24, 2014, Community Board #2, Manhattan (CB#2, Man.) adopted the following resolution:

10 - LPC Item: 13 - 340 West 12th Street-Greenwich Village Historic District An Italianate style rowhouse built 1859-60.

Application is to construct a rooftop addition, alter the rear facade, and perform excavation

Whereas, new steps, stoop, and entryway are to be constructed to match the presumably historically accurate ones of the neighboring building to the east; and

Whereas, the proposed ironwork, also matching the neighboring building is not correct in style, period and design for the building; and

Whereas, the areaway is to be excavated to provide entrance below the new stoop to the basement level and the areaway windows are to be lowered proportionally; and

Whereas, the front façade parapet is to be lowered one foot to align with the neighboring building; and

Whereas, shutters are proposed for the front windows with no evidence that any ever existed on the building nor with convincing evidence that they would have been original to similar buildings in the district; and

Whereas, there is to be excavation of 4.5 feet in the cellar and adjacent side passage to provide headroom in these areas and an excavation of 12.5 feet of the entire rear yard and the area under the rear house to provide underground rooms; and

Whereas, new, improved windows will replace existing ones in the existing opening at the basement level of the rear façade and the access door to the garden will be lowered to grade level; and

Whereas, a parlor floor window wall will necessitate considerable removal of historic material and will not reflect the three bay division of the rear façade which is historical and intact; and

Whereas, a balcony is to be added at the parlor level with a spiral staircase leading down to the garden; and

Whereas, the rear house facade is to be rebuild with windows similar to those in the lower level of the main house; and

Whereas, the existing skylight in the rear house is to be replaced in kind; and

Whereas, the exiting sloping roof will be replaced by a penthouse at the rear and a terrace in front and the construction is respectful of the design of the rear façade and will not be visible from a main thoroughfare; now

Therefore, be it resolved that CB#2, Man. recommends approval of the steps, stoop, entryway, and areaway modifications; and

Be it further resolved that the Board recommends approval the alterations to the roof and front parapet, the excavation of the cellar, side passage, and below the rear house; and

Be it further resolved that the Board recommends approval of the modifications to the basement portion of the rear façade and the rear house; and

Be it further resolved that the Board recommends denial of the copying of incorrect ironwork from the neighboring house in the interest of uniformity of the row at the expense of historically correct design of the new ironwork and does not approve of the shutters with no evidence that there have ever been shutters, original or later, on the house and that the introduction of shutters would disburse the unity of the row far more than would correct ironwork; and

Be it further resolved that the Board recommends denial of the excavation of the garden/patio area, which would forever, prohibited an historical, landscaped garden in this area: and

Bet it further resolved that the Board recommends denial of the alterations to the parlor floor rear in that considerable historical material is being destroyed and an intact façade is being altered beyond recognition, and we also request that the rhythm of the three bays of windows be preserved, perhaps by lowering the existing window openings and fitting them with French doors; and

Be it further resolved that the Board recommends denial of the spiral stair which is without historical character and context.



Antony Wong, Treasurer
Susan Kent, Secretary
Keen Berger, Assistant Secretary

COMMUNITY BOARD NO. 2, MANHATTAN

3 Washington Square Village New York, NY 10012-1899

www.cb2manhattan.org
P: 212-979-2272 F: 212-254-5102 E: info@cb2manhattan.org

Greenwich Village * Little Italy * SoHo * NoHo * Hudson Square * Chinatown * Gansevoort Market

July 30, 2014

Robert B. Tierney, Chair NYC Landmarks Preservation Commission One Centre St., 9th Floor North New York, New York 10007

Dear Chairman Tierney:

At its Full Board meeting on July 24, 2014, Community Board #2, Manhattan (CB#2, Man.) adopted the following resolution:

11 - LPC Item: 14 - 1 Perry Street, aka 57 Greenwich Avenue-Greenwich Village Historic District A Greek Revival style residence built in 1844-45.

Application is to install rooftop mechanical equipment.

Whereas, the applicant has made a good faith effort to find the least obtrusive placement for the equipment and has presented the shortcomings of the alternate placement clearly and convincingly;

Therefore, be it resolved that CB#2, Man. recommends approval of this application.



Antony Wong, Treasurer
Susan Kent, Secretary
Keen Berger, Assistant Secretary

COMMUNITY BOARD NO. 2, MANHATTAN

3 Washington Square Village New York, NY 10012-1899

www.cb2manhattan.org
P: 212-979-2272 F: 212-254-5102 E: info@cb2manhattan.org

Greenwich Village * Little Italy * SoHo * NoHo * Hudson Square * Chinatown * Gansevoort Market

July 30, 2014

Robert B. Tierney, Chair NYC Landmarks Preservation Commission One Centre St., 9th Floor North New York, New York 10007

Dear Chairman Tierney:

At its Full Board meeting on July 24, 2014, Community Board #2, Manhattan (CB#2, Man.) adopted the following resolution:

12 - LPC Item: 16 - 155 Becker Street-Greenwich Village South Historic District A stick-frame federal style rowhouse built prior to 1900 with an altered commercial base. Application is to install storefront infill and illuminated signage.

Whereas the Landmarks Preservation Commission's publication *The Certificate of Appropriateness Public Hearing: Information for Applicants* states that "applicants are strongly encouraged to contact the Community Board to arrange for review of the proposal before the public hearing"; and

Whereas the applicant did not contact the Community Board or appear before the Landmarks Committee to present this application; now

Therefore, be it resolved that CB#2, Man. recommends denial of this application in the absence of this important step in the review process.



Antony Wong, Treasurer
Susan Kent, Secretary
Keen Berger, Assistant Secretary

COMMUNITY BOARD NO. 2, MANHATTAN

3 Washington Square Village New York, NY 10012-1899

www.cb2manhattan.org
P: 212-979-2272 F: 212-254-5102 E: info@cb2manhattan.org

Greenwich Village * Little Italy * SoHo * NoHo * Hudson Square * Chinatown * Gansevoort Market

July 30, 2014

Robert B. Tierney, Chair NYC Landmarks Preservation Commission One Centre St., 9th Floor North New York, New York 10007

Dear Chairman Tierney:

At its Full Board meeting on July 24, 2014, Community Board #2, Manhattan (CB#2, Man.) adopted the following resolution:

13 - LPC Item: 17 - 277 West 10th Street-Greenwich Village Historic District Extension

A Romanesque Revival style warehouse building designed by Martin V.B. Ferdon, and built in 1894-96 and a one-story building built.

Application is to demolish the one-story house, and construct a new one-story building, enlarge the rooftop addition, install rooftop mechanical equipment, alter the facade and install windows. Zoned C1-7

Whereas, the non-contributing, much altered one story building on the street and another one story building of no distinction on the back of the lot are to be demolished; and

Whereas, a new one story building, represented by the applicant as evoking the original or similar garage, is to be constructed and the remainder of the lot devoted to outdoor terrace space; and

Whereas, the new building, to serve as a lobby entrance to the adjacent apartment building, is in a type of brick similar to utilitarian buildings in the area with a large opening infilled with considerable glazing and contemporary style black steel framing with large, raised wooden planter boxes on either side of the entrance; and

Whereas, the new building relates to garages in the neighborhood only in the use of simple brick and having a large opening; and

Whereas, the façade will be repaired and restored as required by conditions and the air conditioners will be removed from the windows; and

Whereas, the present entrance to the apartment building on 10th Street will be reconstructed as an egress similar to the existing door on Washington Street; and

Whereas, the windows on the principal facades (south and west) are to be replaced with better insulated widows and the replacements in the arched openings will have curved, operable upper sashes; and

Whereas, the lot line windows (north and east) are to be, in some instances, enlarged which will give a symmetry to these facades and there was no representation as to the percentage of the openings to solid walls on these lot line windows conforming to applicable building regulations; and

Whereas, some alterations are to be made to the mechanical structure on the roof, including removal of the wooden water tank; and

Whereas, considerable penthouse living space and private terraces are to be added to the roof which were depicted with a large number of enhanced photographs that purported to show visibility of the rooftop additions from a number of vantage points both close to the building and far away; and

Whereas, mockups of what will clearly be highly visible additions were not placed on the roof to verify the actual visibility of the rooftop additions, thus depriving the Committee and the public from being able to make an accurate assessment about the visibility of the additions; now

Therefore, be it resolved that CB#2, Man. recommends the approval of the demolition of the one story structure; and

Be it further resolved that the Board recommends approval of the replacement of the windows (in the case of the lot line windows if they conform to regulations), repair and restoration of the façade, construction of the new entrance on West 10th. Street; and

Be it further resolved that the Board recommends denial of the new one story building which makes only imaginary reference to a garage building that might have been originally build on the lot or is to be found in the district and especially, the windows and planters are aggressively contemporary in design and feeling and are a jarring intrusion into the district; and

Be it further resolved that the board recommends denial of the rooftop modifications owing to the failure of the applicant to construct a boldly visible mockup of the rooftop alterations and additions so that they may be viewed in situ by members of the public and by members of the Committee and to present photographs of the mockups from a variety of vantage points, which is an absolute requirement for any visible modifications to a building in the district, and

Be it further resolved that he Board strongly urges the Commission not to consider alterations to the rooftop until the mockup has been constructed, photographed and presented to the Landmarks Committee of the Board at a regular meeting of the Committee.

Vote: Unanimous, with 37 Board members in favor.

NOTE: The applicant, when questioned about there not being photographs of mockups, replied that the mockups were to be put up the next day. It was made clear by the chair of the meeting that this was not satisfactory. I subsequently visited the site and observed scaffolding that must be intended as mockups though they were not clad in the usual orange netting. The representations were far more visible and intrusive than the photo montages presented at the Committee meeting showed.

Please advise us of any decision or action taken in response to this resolution.

Sincerely,

Doris Diether, Co-Chair

Landmarks & Public Aesthetics Committee

Join Dirther

Community Board #2, Manhattan

Sean Sweeney, Co-Chair

Sean Sweening

Landmarks & Public Aesthetics Committee

Community Board #2, Manhattan

David Gruber, Chair

Community Board #2, Manhattan

I and The

DG/fa

c: Hon. Jerrold L. Nadler, Congressman

Hon. Sheldon Silver, State Assembly Speaker

Hon. Brad Hoylman, NY State Senator

Hon. Daniel L. Squadron, NY State Senator

Hon. Deborah J. Glick, Assembly Member

Hon. Gale A, Brewer, Man. Borough President

Hon. Corey Johnson, Council Member

Hon. Margaret Chin, Council Member

Hon. Rosie Mendez, Council Member

Alize Beal, CAU

Jenny Fernandez, Director of Government & Community Relations,

Landmarks Preservation Commission