



August 13, 2015

Preservation Committee Meeting

Attendees: Gabby Palitz, Jay Adolf, Miki Feigel, Louisa Craddock, Mark Diller, Meisha Hunter Burkett, Peter Samton

Item 1. Resolution recognizing the 50th anniversary of the NYC Landmarks Law and the Value of Preservation.

Resolution to approve: 6-0-0-0

Item 2. 32 West 76th Street (Columbus Avenue – Central Park West). Application to the Landmarks Preservation Commission to add a staircase bulkhead and small greenhouse and excavate.

Presenter: Brian Connolly, Zivkovic Architects

Zoning consultant – Basic Group, Brooklyn NY

- Part of a group of 6 brownstones built in 1891, uniform cornice line, string course lines; 32 is a pair with the neighboring rowhouse (but without the projecting bay window on front façade)
- Façade restoration to be reviewed at staff level by LPC; AC units mounted on steel beams above PH addition; open space from front to rear of roof required by Fire Department will be provided
- Existing pattern of other rear extensions and roof additions within the block
- To be converted to single family residential
- Depth of lot and depth of building – 102 feet lot depth, approx. 92 feet depth of building; shallow rear yard approx. 8 feet
- Proposed one story penthouse and mechanical equipment– PH addition not visible from the public way based on mock up; bulkhead for stair and elevator overrun; remove existing roof stair bulkhead; 2 chimneys to be raised, one by 7'-0", another by approx. 7'-0" raised and repaired; warm gray colored rain screen and stucco cladding
- Proposed rear elevation alterations – extension of 4th floor, open up rear façade to provide more light to interior; new balcony extension and conservatory; new covered terrace at basement with stucco cladding (scoop out), no intention to close this area off seasonally; proposed curtain wall at rear wall; flat opaque spandrel panels at floors between glazed portions of curtain wall; brick framing;
- Rear elevation: multi-light window articulation recommended by LPC staff; will propose Hopes or other steel framed curtain wall system; black color for framing and spandrels between floors; use salvaged bricks from removals; above 3 story rear projection, build lighter framed projection spanning the existing roof with similar glazing system; warm gray color rain screen at fourth floor and bulkhead addition; operability of windows – “L shaped portions are operable”; keep windows on 1st and 2nd floors;
- Excavation of rear yard and create new rear yard grade level, excavation more than 13'-6"; new structural glass block; geotechnical engineer Ray Volpe Geotech Engineering Options; Structural Engineer RSE Associates and Liam O'Hanlon Structural Engineer; test pit; Velley Map (date?) illustrated ravine in this area, which was filled in later and leveled the whole street; prior to excavation install whallers, braced between with steel, then excavate, repeat steel beams, matt slab as lowest level bracing; horizontal bracing; vertically cantilevered concrete wall; new retaining wall; neighbor is at roughly the same level (close); will comply will TPPN 10/88 for protection of historic properties



- Ground will be pitched to drains, Pump system and back up pumps, sewer ejector
- Certificate of Non Harassment being handled by the Owner; no pending suits known by architect

Public Comment

- Joseph Bolanos, President W 76th Park Block Association, lives at 34 West 76th Street: FAR limit to be exceeded? Architect confirmed “no”; construction began in March 2015; Egbert Velle map shown streams heading out of Central Park on West 75th Street/West 76th Street; stream runs 22 feet below the street; series of sinkholes on this block over the past several years; strongly opposed to excavation at this project site; May 1st contractor at this site created a sinkhole cave in in front of 32 West 76th Street; Nos. 8, 10, 14 and 16 W 76th Street already have sinkholes; asbestos removal occurred on roof of this site ABR builders were contractors, not compliant with code requirements for HAZMAT remediation;
- Louise Magers, 30 West 76th Street, member of 30 W 76th Street LLC: concerned about proposed excavation at 32 W 76th Street; Architect confirmed buildings are standing on bedrock; test pits went down to 13’-6” feet and rods were inserted to probe beyond that level; Pumps – what happens in case of electrical failure and effects to neighbors? Architect notes that back up pumps will be installed and possibly a mini generator as well; cellar floor will be built almost like a concrete tank

Committee Discussion

- Peter: concerned about rooftop bulkhead, much higher than it needs to be; will stick out like a sore thumb; rear façade ok; would be helpful to show color with rendered elevations on future project presentations;
- Miki: agree with Peter re height of bulkhead; no real issues with rear but don’t like all the small flap windows; basically appropriate; concerned about rear excavation; stretching a house to more than it is takes away from the original intent of the building
- Louisa: very concerned about sinkholes on the street and history of this street; excavation seems essential part of proposed design; don’t have enough information about the sinkholes but still a grave concern; serious issue;
- Mark: trying to stretch a house to be more than it is; didn’t talk about the 4th floor extension – small extension as well as rooftop addition; very deep incursion already exists into the rear yard; not inclined to support more incursions; troubled by rooftop addition trellis “steel beam” utilitarian; height of addition and utilitarian highway overpass are very problematic; concerned by color palette; rear fenestration otherwise appropriate; excavation and translucent element are not appropriate; troubled by precedent setting
- Meisha: supportive of façade restoration; undermining the pair with 34 W 76th; no respect for the pair condition; profoundly concerned about excavation; no issue with rooftop addition;



- Gabby: concur with Meisha; decomposed the entire rear wall at bottom of addition; looks more massive than it probably will be; not concerned with 4th floor extension; deconstructed part of a pair and not respecting a neighbor
- Jay: rooftop addition will probably be acceptable by LPC; rear yard additions are evaluated by LPC – evolution by LPC Commissioners over time; CB7 concerned with rear yard and donut; CB7 has approved creative designs at rear yard; look at the proposed work in realistic context; rooftop addition is acceptable; concerned about engineering and structural issues – issues for another venue but needs to be pursued; consistency or respect for neighbor – CB7 has approved striking rear yard additions next to neighbors; nothing redeeming about designs of the particular facades;
- Gabby: typically when we see this type of treatment, lop off dogleg addition; put a full width addition; here we have an addition in the same plane, and have a concern; this is still immediately adjacent to 34's utilitarian façade; creating a new façade within an old structure;

Resolution to approve rooftop addition: 4-3-0-0

Resolution to deny rear façade and excavation changes: 6-1-0-0

Item 3. 470 West End Avenue (82nd-83rd Streets). Application to the Landmarks Preservation Commission for window replacement and through-wall air conditioner master plan.

Presenter: Douglas Lister Architect

Proposed scope:

- Window master plan – to be reviewed by LPC Commissioners
- AC master plan – to be reviewed by LPC Staff
- Historic Windows were 6/1 on street elevations and first bay of secondary elevations; current windows 1/1 throughout
- All windows replaced in 1989 with 1/1 windows except for 3 lines of fire rated windows (stairwell windows – steel clad wood windows); not changed in 1989 replaced because owners don't change the windows due to cost;
- West elevation: stairwell window with 6/1 window
- Some windows with stained glass not to be altered
- Typical conditions: 1/1 single, paired and tripartite aluminum windows with center mullion
- Stairwell windows to be retained and repainted
- Fit proposed replacement window panning tight over original framing
- Aluminum anodized windows, similar finish to existing

Committee Discussion

- Gabby: not sure what the master plan windows is modeled on; Architect – probably are different thickness of mullions but didn't survey and measure all of them;
- Mark: different wall widths
- Miki: need to see a master plan that makes sense; not clear; master plan will be a mish-mosh over years



- Meisha: need to have 4 typical conditions in Master plan – single, paired, triple and bathroom windows plus historic 6/1 windows to be retained
- Louisa: LPC staff recommended 6/1 windows; building already has 99% changed to 1/1 windows, building would like to propose 1/1; strongly endorse staying with 1/1 windows; need specific dimensions for each type of windows
- Gabby: tenant by tenant? Architect: will be implemented over many years
- Peter: a few buildings on CPW with the same issue; LPC demanded 6/1 windows; applied a muntin grid to look like 6/1 which looks awful; ferret this out;
- Meisha: can't support this; 6/1 would add back a significant architectural feature to the façade
- Gabby: master plan needs to be more fully developed

Public Comment

- Tony Vaccione, resident of 470 WEA: Architect: mullion conditions varies based on whether a wall is behind it or not;

Resolution to approve with recommendation to specify window types: 5-1-1-0

Item 4: 320 West 101st Street (Riverside Drive - West End Avenue). Application to the Landmarks Preservation Commission for front façade restoration work, window replacement, new 4 story rear yard addition and cellar expansion, and new stair bulkhead.

(Gabby notes she knows Perla Delson but believes she can be impartial)

Presenter: Christopher Alker, Delson or Sherman Architects

Proposed scope:

- South side of street, north side of block
- Multiple dwelling – not inhabited
- Part of row designed by George Pellam
- 5 story rowhouse with stone façade and rear extension
- 3 scope elements: ground floor front façade, enlarge rooftop bulkhead with new glazed box and skylight on top with new solar collectors (not visible from street), and rear extension – remove existing rear extension and construct new full width extension and increase depth of yard
- Zoning R8B (currently underbuilt; will reduce zoning square foot by 71 square feet)
- Front façade – not proposing to salvage or reinstall historic stained glass windows; install new wood windows at front façade (Marvin Ultimate Wood Double Hung Double Glazed); match black rounded corner/radialed wood 1/1 windows and brick molds; remove basement entry and install 2 new windows (1 at basement; 1 at parlor floor) to be more consistent with other buildings in the row; install new ceiling mounted light fixture at soffit above entry door; no exposed conduit;
- Rear addition: remove dogleg; construct new full width addition with aluminum glazing system; common brick to match existing; 4th floor windows to be removed and replace with one large glazed system accessing open-aired terrace above addition; steel lintels will be black;



- Rooftop bulkhead will be stucco and glass; 2 sides of glass; color of stucco not determined;
- New sprinkler system, new AC

Committee Discussion

- Louisa: why not keeping the stained glass? Architect: owner didn't want to keep them
- Peter: rear – elevation and section don't match; presentation lacks detail; Architect didn't draw the staircase through; windows appear asymmetrical; Architect: windows centered on property lines, appears off set because of shared property wall on one side;
- Gabby: rear yard? Architect: New bluestone pavers = extend out to yard, with separated open joints for drainage; new 8'-0" stockade wood fence
- Jay: campaign to eliminate stained glass windows on UWS? Wants them to stay. Architect: alright condition, covered in dirt, doubtful that removal of stained glass would be approved by LPC
- Miki: stained glass windows are consistently found on the street; removal is shameful; otherwise I am perfectly happy with the proposed plans
- Gabby: inconsistent treatment in this proposal with LPC at top floor of rear elevation – removing windows and creating large new opening for glazed window system; recommend keeping punched openings
- Peter: buildings further west – 3 openings; maybe make 3 openings at top floor; glazing system needs a fair amount of work; minimally shown and need more details; massing is fine; detail is lacking;
- Louisa: agree with Peter. question about windows at 3rd floor - top windows are thicker. Why? Architect: transoms open, in-swinging. Long poles or motorized
- Miki: install new residential elevator. Impact for sound and vibration. Architect ; not top roped; won't go to top floor; 14 inch party wall between 2 properties
- Louisa: change the 4th floor window configuration; thanks for respecting the original building – cellars, rear yard, etc; stained glass windows add something no matter what and are part of the house;
- Mark: agree with colleagues re reservations on top floor windows; concerned re stained glass windows; stucco on east facing part of new addition; concerned about a full width addition; boxing in a narrow lightwell at building to east; volume of glass on 1st, 2nd and 3rd floors concerning – too much glass; glad that the brick is remaining;
- Meisha: support front façade restoration; can't support stained glass removal; OK with rooftop addition; revise top floor of rear elevation to have punched openings; not supportive of full width rear extension
- Gabby: fenestration looks institutional; feels like double hung proportion windows even though they are not; feels like utilitarian windows; wish the lintels were not black – this will look heavy/overwhelming; bulkhead is OK; shame to lose stained glass on front;

Public Comment



- Shawn Khorsandi, LW!: new exposed side of the dogleg; Architect: made for parking exposed brick; will be painted on the neighbor's exposed dogleg wall;
- Stan Putko: on the East lot line wall, no windows? Architect confirms no; no excavation;

Resolution to disapprove unless stained glass is retained at the front: 5-0-2-0

Recommend 3 punched openings at top floor at rear elevation

Item 5: 324-326 West 108th Street (Riverside Drive – West End Avenue). Application to the Landmarks Preservation Commission for a front façade restoration, window replacement, rear yard alteration and 6th floor addition.

Presenter: Jackie Urra, DRPILLA and Dominic Pilla, DRPILLA

Proposed scope:

- September 22 2015 public hearing
- Street façade: windows and doors to be replaced; Rooftop addition which is anticipated to not be visible from the street; and rear elevation alterations
- Two buildings on a single lot (324 on the east; 326 on west)
- Was a rehab facility for St. Vincent's Hospital; proposed multi-family with 14 units; condo ownership
- Windows and doors are in very poor condition; lots of dry rot on sills and frames; operational issues; sashes falling apart; termite damage; jamb loose at door
- Top 3 floors (floors 3-5) – replace windows with 1/1 to match historic; brick mold to remain;
- 2nd floor – replace with new wood casements and transoms; historic condition was non-divided lite casements and transoms; proposed divided lights not matching historic condition to enhance the 2nd floor; 2 different widths; paired doors facing street will be wider; single doors on either side of projecting bay will be narrower;
- 1st floor – variety of windows and doors (steel and wood); steel door to be replaced in kind;
- 1st floor – single center door at 324 is and will remain primary entrance; replace gate and door behind with new door, mounting iron grille directly onto new door; paired iron doors at 324 to match 326 condition, but using iron material, black finish; Reilly steel door fabrication; door and gate in front of door at 326 will be replaced; door will have a new window and fixed panel below, with iron gate mounted in front; not all iron gate and grille details were original, want to introduce more order to the design; lots of variety at the 1st floor
- Rooftop addition: one unit; set back 15'-0", not anticipated to be visible from street; rooftop access; new stair and elevator bulkheads; new mechanicals; no mock up installed yet; PH floor to ceiling is 9'-0", 10'-6" to roof; stair and elevator bulkhead 8'-0"; elevator override 5'-0"
- Rear elevation: 2 existing rear "L" extensions to be demolished; proposed full width rear addition; face of 6th floor to match plane of 5th floor of building to west (328); plane of 5th floor to match 6th floor of building to the east (322); new red brick veneer to 5th floor; switch to cementitious fiber board to look like limestone (including faux lines to emulate limestone grouting); PH will use stucco cladding; windows will be aluminum tilt and



turns, black finish; balconies will be concrete with glass panels; non operable/fixed transoms; garden level to provide light and access to cellar from rear yard (fitness room and building office program); no windows facing west at all;

Committee Discussion:

- Jay: would be better to have balance/ consistency at 1st floor grilles
- Mark: would prefer that the buildings be considered separately; question carrying motif of western door to be used on eastern door; diamond pattern existing to remain at 1st floor windows? Architect confirmed yes.
- Gabby: have some variety in doors; but have more consistency in windows; really need elevations;
- Miki: have seen many buildings with iron work with little circles; overused; have you thought about placing mechanicals somewhere else?
Architect: won't be a problem for dweller of PH unit;
- Louisa: both doors will have same kind of door pattern?
Architect: yes
- Peter: need to include plans of lower floors; one scissor stair?
Architect hasn't updated plans for stairs

Public Comment

- Barbara Shore: live at 329 West 108th Street; lived here 30 years; will block air in front of my house; very concerned; added 23 feet of something in front of my building; also need to register concern about next application
- Mina Elahi: live at 329 W 108th Street, concerned with the rooftop addition which will block light;
- Sima Kharazmi: 322 W 108th Street; rooftop addition will block view of Hudson River; noise travels; concerned about balconies which will add a lot of noise pollution to neighborhood; no windows at side.
- No other balconies in the donut.
- Rostam Afshim: 307 W 107th; one window with view of rooftop; will lose small bit of sky I have though lot line window
- Dana Lehman, 241 W 108th Street: glad that this property is being spiffed up; major eyesore; will lion heads be maintained on top of doors? Architect confirms yes

Committee Discussion

- Peter: not a fire-proof building; keeping existing floors; DOB objection sheet? Yes; lacks detail in rear; no major problems; difficulty with rooftop construction; early in design;
- Miki: don't like balconies at back; unhappy with bulk at roof could be handled differently; too massive; developer trying to squeeze every nickel; don't like the circles at iron work;
- Louisa: two buildings and how to handle them; but not doing this at rear; not sure what is happening on the right; rooftop addition is too high; front seems to be



separated; confused presentation. Metalwork is replacing something interesting with something pedestrian. Could still achieve a feel of two separate buildings without these choices. Applicant: Only two sets of iron work that are matched are the doors on the east and west side doors.

- Gabby: Introducing more variety to the iron work is making the situation more confusing; ok to have differences, but the new proposed designs are visually “cheap.”
- Mark: Appreciate that the rear façade planes will be aligned without creating a narrow light well. Wrought iron detail on the east building is what is typical in the Morningside Heights area; the west door should be the anomalous contrast. Concern about the cementitious board – and especially about the use of faux detail. Prefer better materials, but the faux detail is particularly problematic. Not a material that has parallel in the context (especially if made to look like limestone blocks on the top floor).
- Gabby: Agree about wrought iron. Concern about the front French doors with the divided light. Penthouses are not appropriately scaled as would be typical of typical additions. Should consider Juliet balconies instead of these apartment building balconies.
- Jay: No problem with the rear façade. Divided lights on the front French doors could be appropriate (appropriate either way). Iron work on the east should be replicated with minor variations. Having the far east and west doors with bookend wrought iron should be maintained.
- Peter: Rear façade cantilevered balconies – looks more like a small apartment building than a townhouse, especially with one balcony overlooking another. Should find a way to make balconies cut into the rear façade.

Proposed resolutions:

Rear: Disapprove unless:

- Reduce bulkhead and penthouse height
- Preference for Juliet balconies more in keeping with pre-War design.

Front:

Concerns: Iron work must be harmonized.

Applicant:

- Can agree to change wrought iron to meet the concerns articulated.
- Balconies in the back are small – highly unlikely that everyone will be on them at the same time. Will dress up the façade with depth and dimension (with possible plantings).
- Mechanicals – can try to relocate units and cut back the scale, although would prefer to keep at the roof.
- Elevator bulkhead is already as low as it could be.
- Design is well within the allowable FAR, and a 9 foot ceiling is not unreasonable.

Front façade – resolution to approve, noting that applicant has agreed to replicate design from the east doors.

VOTE: 6-0-0-0.

Rear and rooftop – resolution to disapprove unless:



- Reduce the height of the rooftop and mechanicals;
- Reduce the parapet and replace on the 6th floor with a railing.
- Reduce the size of the balconies.

VOTE: 6-0-0-0

Item 6. 328 West 108th Street. Application to the LPC for front façade restoration work, window replacement, new 4-story rear yard addition and cellar expansion, and new elevator and stair bulkhead.

Presentation by Chris Alker and Laura Sanz, Delson or Sherman Architects PC

- Converting a 5-story rowhouse into a single-family dwelling.
- Exterior work includes removal of stair bulkhead, existing 3-story extension and bay window
- Creation of new 4-story rear yard extension.
- Front:
 - Restoration without change in design – replacing wood windows, removing existing storm windows, keeping existing curved transom mullions, replacing French casement balcony windows.
 - Keeping existing divided lights on the French doors (wood).
 - Keeping existing wrought iron window guards; replacing in kind the existing diamond-shaped divided light on the ground floor.
 - Replacing and replicating the existing brick molds.
 - Replacing upper floor windows with wood (replacing existing aluminum).
- Roof:
 - New stair and elevator bulkhead – will be minimally visible from the corner of RSD and West 108th (railing alone would be visible from between buildings on RSD).
-- not visible from within Riverside Park.
 - Rooftop structures will only be stair and elevator bulkheads – no habitable space.
 - New mechanicals would not be visible from any public way.
 - Separate stair and elevator bulkheads so that they can reduce the height of the stair bulkheads.
 - Surrounds of the front and back of the stair bulkhead front and back will be cement board a bright-ish white; elevator bulkhead will be stucco to match the cement board.
 - Will install a sound attenuating screen to surround the mechanicals.
- Rear:
 - Remove existing rear extension and existing small bay window (believe that the rear bay window is not original – no counterpart in the group).



- Propose a full-width extension composed of red brick, with black steel window systems with divided lights (wide metal systems on the basement and parlor floors; narrower on the upper floors).
 - Window systems will have brick surrounds.
 - Top floor will have black aluminum windows.
 - Keeping brick corbelling and common roof line at the top floor.
- Rear yard:
 - Planters with pavers that are installed with gaps to allow water to run off.

Community Comment (none).

Committee Discussion

- Miki: Believes the bay window is original, and is utterly charming and should be retained. Other buildings may have been built at different times.
- Gabby: Rear yard addition is appropriate. Differing scale of windows on the lower floors than upper floors is appropriate. Still believe that the upper floor (which is in the same plane as the original rear façade) should have punched windows instead of the wide panels proposed.

Resolutions

Front: approve as presented:

VOTE 5-0-0-0.

Rear: Disapprove unless punched openings on the top floor.

VOTE: 5-0-0-0.