



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: 11/20/17	EXPIRATION DATE: 8/15/2023	DOCKET #: LPC-19-18664	COFA COFA-19-18664
ADDRESS: 55 EAST 92ND STREET		BOROUGH: Manhattan	BLOCK/LOT: 1504 / 26
Expanded Carnegie Hill Historic District			
Carnegie Hill Historic District			

Display This Permit While Work Is In Progress

ISSUED TO:

Matthew Harris
55 East 92nd Street
New York, NY 10128



Pursuant to Section 25-307 of the Administrative Code of the City of New York, the Landmarks Preservation Commission, at the Public Meeting of August 15, 2017, 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 June 22, 2017, and as you were informed in the Status Update Letter 19-06659 (LPC 19-6659) issued on July 20, 2017. This approval will expire on August 15, 2023.

The proposed work, as approved, consists of removing a wood-paneled door at the westernmost basement opening of the primary façade, raising the lintel, and installing a curved pediment and entrance surround at the enlarged opening, removing an addition at the roof of No. 55, constructing a one-story rooftop addition featuring concrete walls and metal-and-glass windows and doors, removing rear yard “ells” at No. 53 and No. 55, constructing a four-story rear yard brick addition and basement, featuring steel multi-light windows and doors, and a 4”-deep reveal between the two buildings, and excavating to construct additional sub-cellar floors within the footprint of the building and within the rear yard. The proposal, as initially presented, included no delineation between the two buildings at the rear façade of the rear addition, and excavating to the rear lot line, and was shown in a digital presentation including 30 slides, titled “55 East 92nd Street,” prepared by Steven Harris Architects, LLP, and consisted of historic and existing condition photographs, drawings and color renderings.

In reviewing this proposal, the Commission noted that the Carnegie Hill Historic District Designation Report describes 55 East 92nd Street as two Romanesque Revival style rowhouses designed by Louis Entzer, Jr. and built in 1893-94 and altered in 1946-47 by James E. Casale; and that the buildings' style, scale, materials and details are among the features that contribute to the special architectural and historic character of the Carnegie Hill Historic District. The Commission further noted that this pair of rowhouses, No. 53 and No. 55, were altered in 1946-47 with the removal of stoops and façade alterations. The Commission finally noted that CNE 06-3901 issued on November 21, 2005 for enclosing an existing rooftop garden by installing glass windows within an existing addition; removing through-the-wall air conditioning units at the front and rear façades; installing brick infill; and replacing a metal railing and windows at the rear façade.

With regard to this proposal, the Commission found that enlarging the door opening at the westernmost bay, and removing a minimal amount of non-historic plain masonry at the lintel, will not eliminate significant architectural features of the front façade; that the proposed curved pediment and entrance door surround will relate to the original projecting elements and detailing found on the façade; that because the projecting bays at the basement through second floor are located adjacent to each other, the elimination of the party wall will not be perceptible from the street; that the removal of the rooftop addition at No. 55 will eliminate an unsympathetic alteration and allow the restoration of the original two window openings at the top floor and brick sawtooth cornice; that the construction of the proposed rooftop and rear yard additions will not damage any significant architectural features; that the rooftop and rear yard additions will not be visible from a public thoroughfare; that the presence of a modern design at the rear of the combined buildings, within the context of the surrounding mix of altered and enlarged rear sections of neighboring buildings, will not detract from the character of the block; that the punched openings at the proposed rear façade will recall in a contemporary manner the divisions, floor levels, and scale of the historic buildings; that the excavation and landscaping at the rear yards will not significantly alter the perceived scale of the building or detract from surrounding yards, which are separated by existing walls; that this row features a variety of grades at the rear yards and therefore, the excavation will not significantly diminish the relationship of this yard to the neighboring yards within the greenspace; and that the proposed excavation for a new sub-cellar floor, executed in conjunction with the excavation of the rear yard, will be designed and built in compliance with Department of Buildings regulations under the supervision of a licensed professional engineer to protect the building and the adjacent buildings. Based on these findings, the Commission determined that the proposed work is appropriate to the building, and voted to approve this application.

The Commission authorized the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness upon receipt, review and approval of two or more sets of signed and sealed Department of Building filing drawings showing the approved design and incorporating that the rear façade be articulated in a way that recalls the historic separation of the houses; and that the excavation at the rear be set back 5 feet from the property line to provide the potential for the planting of mature trees.

Subsequently, on October 31, 2017, the Landmarks Preservation Commission received photographs and unlabeled window and areaway drawings; and drawings G-101.00, G-102.00, G-103.00, DM-101.00 through DM-107.00 and A-101.00 through A-116.00 dated October 28, 2017, signed and sealed by Steven Harris, R.A.; S-001.00, S-002.00, FO-101.00, FO-102.00, S-103.00 through S-109.00, S-301.00, S-302.00, S-501.00 through S-504.00 and S-601.00 dated October 20, 2017, signed and sealed by Nathaniel Ezra Oppenheimer, P.E.; and SOE-101-00 through SOE-105-00 dated October 23, 2017, signed and sealed by Raymond Volpe, Jr., P.E. Accordingly, staff reviewed the drawings and found that the design approved by the Commission has been maintained, that the required changes have been incorporated by redesigning the rear façade of the addition to feature a 4"-deep reveal between the buildings; and setting back the excavation 5' from the rear property line; and that the work also included, at the primary façade, removing wood-paneled doors and surrounds at the easternmost and westernmost bays at the basement, raising the lintel of the western door

opening, and installing steel-and-glass gates within the new entrance door openings and surround; replacing twenty-four (24) wood one-over-one double-hung windows with twenty-four (24) wood one-over-one double-hung windows; and replacing and installing eight (8) wood single-light fixed transoms and sashes, painted with a dark finish (Benjamin Moore 2124-10 "Wrought Iron"), at the basement through fourth floor of the primary façade; installing stuccoed lintels at select window openings painted to match the historic sandstone; repointing the brick façade at select locations; installing two (2) intercoms at the returns of both basement entrances; and installing two (2) cameras at the eastern and western first floor window jambs; at the areaways, removing a painted masonry kneewall and black metal railings; and installing a black-painted steel fence; and installing flush-mounted light fixtures below-grade at the areaway wall; at the rear façade, restoring and reconstructing the fourth (top) floor with four (4) punched openings, consisting of three (3) windows and one (1) door, and a decorative brick parapet with saw-tooth detailing; at the roof, constructing a stair bulkhead; installing a metal railing attached to the interior of the rear parapet wall; installing HVAC units on dunnage; installing exhausts; and raising chimney flues; and interior alterations, including the demolition and construction of non-bearing and load bearing partitions, finishes and fixtures. With regard to the additional work, the Commission finds that the replacement of the existing modern doors will not eliminate any original historic fabric or diminish any significant alterations added over time; that the proposed doors will be compatible with the existing modern entrances in terms of its materials, design, details and finish and will not draw undue attention to this; that the new painted stone window lintels will return this element to a condition more in keeping with its original appearance; and that the basis for the design of the proposed restoration's authenticity is documented by historic photographic evidence; in accordance with the provisions set forth in Title 63 of the Rules of the City of New York, Title 63, Section 2-14, that documentation reveals that the existing brownstone surface is exfoliating, damaged or otherwise unsound; that the original texture, color, profiles and details of the brownstone will be replicated; that the damaged stone will be cut back to sound stone and the new surface will be keyed into the sound stone and will be built up in successive layers using a cementitious mix with the top layer tinted and finished to match the original brownstone texture and color; and that the methods and materials proposed by the contractor have been provided in the form of written specifications; that the pointing mortar will be compatible with the masonry in terms of composition and will match the historic mortar in terms of profiles, texture, and finish; in accordance with Section 3-04(c)(2)(i), that the new windows at the primary façade will match the historic windows in terms of configuration, operation, details, material and finish; that the cameras will be placed at a distance from each other in discreet locations which will not draw undue attention to them; that the installation of the intercom will be typical in placement; that the proposed alterations at the areaway will not result in damage to or loss of any significant historic fabric; that the design, details and finish of the proposed railings will be in keeping with other railings found within the historic district; that the light fixtures will be simply designed; and that no exposed conduits or junction boxes will be included; in accordance with Section 2-17(c)(1), that the basis for the design of the proposed restoration's authenticity is documented by matching buildings; and that the restoration will not cause the removal of significant historic fabric that may have been added over time and that are evidence of the history and development of a building, structure or site; in accordance with Section 3-04(d)(2), that the proposed windows and door at the secondary rear façade will not be visible from a public thoroughfare; that they will be installed in existing window openings or existing openings that are to be enlarged or reduced in height or width according to §2-15 of this title; that the enlargement will not alter or destroy protected features or detract from the significant architectural features of the building or adjacent buildings; that the windows on the top floor of a rear façade of a row house will not be enlarged or reduced, with the exception of one window opening; and that they will not replace "special" windows as defined in the definitions (§3-01) and illustrated in Appendix A of this chapter; and in accordance with Section 2-19(e)(1), that the proposed rooftop installations will consist solely of mechanical equipment; that it will not result in damage to, or demolition of, any significant architectural features of the roof of the building; that it will be minimally visible or not visible from a public thoroughfare; and that the installation will not adversely affect any significant architectural features of adjacent improvements. Based on this and the above findings, the drawings are marked approved with a

perforated seal, and Certificate of Appropriateness 19-18664 is being issued.

PLEASE NOTE: This permit is contingent upon the Commission's review and approval of brownstone stucco and mortar samples 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 cpasion@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.

As the approved work consists of subsurface work, the applicant is required to strictly adhere to the Department of Buildings' TPPN 10/88 governing in-ground construction adjacent to historic buildings. It is the applicant's obligation at the time of applying for their DOB permit to inform DOB that the TPPN applies.

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 Caroline Pasion.

Meenakshi Srinivasan
Chair

PLEASE NOTE: PERFORATED DRAWINGS AND A COPY OF THIS PERMIT HAVE BEEN SENT TO:
Abir Ahmad, Steven Harris Architects LLP

cc: Jared Knowles, Director; Abir Ahmad, Steven Harris Architects LLP