



THE NEW YORK CITY LANDMARKS PRESERVATION COMMISSION
 1 CENTRE STREET 9TH FLOOR NORTH NEW YORK NY 10007
 TEL: 212 669-7700 FAX: 212 669-7780



PERMIT CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

ISSUE DATE: 05/04/16	EXPIRATION DATE: 12/8/2021	DOCKET #: 182396	COFA #: COFA 18-5455
ADDRESS: 134 EAST 62ND STREET <u>HISTORIC DISTRICT</u> UPPER EAST SIDE		BOROUGH: MANHATTAN	BLOCK/LOT: 1396 / 59

Display This Permit While Work Is In Progress

ISSUED TO:

Abigail Hirshhorn
134 East 62 Street
New York, NY 10065



Pursuant to Section 25-307 of the Administrative Code of the City of New York, the Landmarks Preservation Commission, at the Public Meeting of December 8, 2015, following the Public Hearing of the same date, voted to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed work at the subject premises, as put forward in your application completed on November 12, 2015, and as you were informed in Status Update Letter 17-9814 (LPC 17-2946), issued on December 8, 2015.

The proposed work, as approved, consists of replacing a metal window grille with a new metal grille featuring a different design at the ground floor of the front facade; replacing the existing areaway fence with a taller fence and gate; and replacing existing painted masonry, which serves as both the coping of the below-grade retaining walls and as curbing for the perimeter of the areaway with new cast stone units, with a brownstone finish. The work was shown in a presentation dated November 6, 2015, and consisting of six digital slides featuring drawings, photographs, and photo montages, all prepared Anna Jachnik, RA, and presented at the Public Hearing and Public Meeting.

In reviewing the proposal, the Commission noted that the Upper East Side Historic District Designation Report describes 134 East 62nd Street as an Italianate style residence designed by John Sexton and built in 1869, with alterations in 1920 designed by Peabody, Wilson and Brown; and that the building's style, scale, materials and details are among the features that contribute to the special architectural and historic character of the historic district.

With regard to this proposal, the Commission found that although the grille to be removed may be historic, it does not feature a unique or intricately designed pattern and is not part of a uniform pattern of grilles at the row, and, in its current altered state, it does not relate well to the design of the building; that the presence of an areaway fence of this height in front of a building modified in the early 20th century and at the end of a row, with a neighboring apartment building on one side, and with a similar tall fence and context at the opposite end of the row, will be compatible with the specific conditions at this site and row; that the proposed fence and security grille will be simply designed and consistent with the ironwork found throughout the block and the historic district in terms of materials, details, and finishes; that the cast stone coping at the existing retaining wall which will also serve as the areaway curbing, will be simply designed, well-scaled to the areaway and finished to match the brownstone at the façade, helping it to remain a harmonious and discreet presence; and that the proposed work will not diminish the special architectural and historic character of the building, streetscape, or historic district. Based on these findings, the Commission determined the proposed work to be appropriate to the building and the historic district and voted to approve the application with the stipulation that the western corner of the fencing be modified to feature a more transitional design in terms of its relationship to the neighboring areaway.

The Commission authorized the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness upon receipt, review and approval of two sets of final filing drawings showing the approved design, with the required modification.

Subsequently, on February 23, 2016 and April 20, 2016, the Commission received drawings A-002.00 through A-004.00, dated February 16, 2016; and drawing A-001.00, dated April 19, 2016, and prepared by Anna Jachnik, as well as a project manual, dated June 19, 2015. Accordingly, staff reviewed the submitted materials and noted that the design of the fence at the western corner has been modified to slope downward from the west corner towards the building, and that the drawings include additional work at the areaway and front facade of the building, including removing the existing concrete steps, paving, and a wall within the areaway; installing grey-tinted concrete steps at the west side of the areaway and grey-tinted concrete paving throughout the remainder of the areaway; applying a stucco system to the inboard site of the below-grade concrete areaway retaining walls; removing paint from the façade with a chemical remover (Peel Away Smart Strip Pro, or equivalent); selectively patching brownstone at the facade with a masonry patching compound (Jahn M70 or equivalent); replacing existing sealant at the perimeter of the cornice, in-kind; replacing the modern steel service door at the easternmost bay at the ground floor with a wood panel door installed within the existing opening, but set closer to the exterior plane of the building than the existing door; re-painting the windows, doors, and cornice black; installing a dome shaped security camera at the eastern corner of the ground floor; replacing two intercoms at the returns of the main and service entrances with new intercoms at the same locations; and replacing lighting at the service and main entrances with new fixtures, with a dark bronze finish.

With regard to the modifications and additional work, the Commission finds that the design of the fence at the western corner has been modified to feature a transitional element which helps it relate to neighboring fences; that none of the work will result in damage to or loss of any significant historic fabric; that the modifications at the areaway will be consistent with areaways at houses of this type, style, and age in terms of materials, design, and details; that the removal of concrete steps, paving, and wall at the areaway, and door and paint at the front facade, will not eliminate original historic fabric or significant later alterations added over time; that the removal of the paint will reveal the color and texture of the historic masonry, thereby returning the building closer to its historic appearance; that the removal of the paint will utilize the gentlest effective methods available and without damaging the masonry; that the patching compound will be compatible with the masonry in terms of composition and will match the historic masonry in terms of texture, finish, profiles and details; that the in-kind replacement of sealant at the perimeter of the cornice only will help protect the facade against water infiltration; that the proposed door will be simply designed and in keeping with modern entrance doors found at ground floor entrances added to the base of buildings

after removal of a stoop in the early-20th century within this historic district in terms of its placement, materials, and finish, thereby helping the door remain a typical secondary presence which will not draw undue attention to itself; that the proposed finish for the windows and cornice will be in keeping with the historic color palette of Italianate style rowhouses of this age; that the intercoms, camera, and light fixtures will be small in size, simply designed, and only attached to plain masonry; that there will be no visible electrical conduit; and that the work will not detract from the special architectural or historic character of the building or historic district. Additionally the Commission finds that the overall design approved by the Commission has been maintained and the modifications required by the Commission have been incorporated. Based on these and the above findings, the drawings have been marked approved with a perforated seal and Certificate of Appropriateness 18-5455 is being issued.

PLEASE NOTE: This permit is contingent upon the Commission's review and approval of samples of masonry patching compounds prior to the commencement of work. Samples should be installed adjacent to clean, original surface(s) being repaired; allowed to cure; and cleaned of residue. Submit digital photographs of all samples to ajennings@lpc.nyc.gov for review. This permit is also contingent on the understanding that the work will be performed by hand and when the temperature remains a constant 45 degrees Fahrenheit or above for a 72 hour period from the commencement of the work.

This permit is issued on the basis of the building and site conditions described in the application and disclosed during the review process. By accepting this permit, the applicant agrees to notify the Commission if the actual building or site conditions vary or if original or historic building fabric is discovered. The Commission reserves the right to amend or revoke this permit, upon written notice to the applicant, in the event that the actual building or site conditions are materially different from those described in the application or disclosed during the review process.

All approved drawings are marked approved by the Commission with a perforated seal indicating the date of the approval. The work is limited to what is contained in the perforated document. Other work or amendments to this filing must be reviewed and approved separately. The applicant is hereby put on notice that performing or maintaining any work not explicitly authorized by this permit may make the applicant liable for criminal and/or civil penalties, including imprisonment and fine. This letter constitutes the permit; a copy must be prominently displayed at the site while work is in progress. Please direct inquiries to Anne Jennings.

Meenakshi Srinivasan
Chair

PLEASE NOTE: PERFORATED DRAWINGS AND A COPY OF THIS PERMIT HAVE BEEN SENT TO:
Anna Jachnik

cc: B. Artus. Deputy Director of Preservation, LPC