



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: 01/12/18	EXPIRATION DATE: 7/18/2024	DOCKET #: LPC-19-19574	COFA COFA-19-19574
ADDRESS: 524-536 HALSEY STREET		BOROUGH: Brooklyn	BLOCK/LOT: 1665 / 33
Bedford Stuyvesant/Expanded Stuyvesant Heights Historic District			

Display This Permit While Work Is In Progress

ISSUED TO:

Boaz Gilad
308 Malcolm X Boulevard
Brooklyn, NY 11233

NOT ORIGINAL
COMPUTER-GENERATED COPY

Pursuant to Section 25-307 of the Administrative Code of the City of New York, the Landmarks Preservation Commission, at the Public Meeting of July 18, 2017, following the Public Hearing and Public Meeting of March 28, 2017, voted to approve a proposal to demolish the one-story garage building and construct a new building; alter the front and rear facades of the three-story garage building; construct a rooftop addition; alter the front areaway; replace the sidewalk; and excavate at the rear yard, as put forward in your application completed on March 2, 2017, and as you were notified in Status Update Letter 18-03361 (LPC 18-3361), issued on July 25, 2017.

The proposal, as approved, consists of, at the ground floor of the three-story garage's (534 Halsey Street) front façade, modifying existing window and door openings; creation of new door openings; installation of black painted wood infill featuring multi-light, wood paneled doors with single-light transoms, paired double-hung two-over-two wood windows with single-light transoms, fixed multi-light and casement wood windows, four-over-four, double-hung wood windows and paneled wood infill; at the rear and side facades, the demolition of the majority of the brick masonry façade; cutting back the plane of the rear façade by approximately 24 feet, with exception one section of the existing brick façade, which will be maintained, and construction of a new brick façade, featuring a setback at the 4th floor, punched window openings with four-over-four double-hung windows, cast-stone lintels and sills, metal balconies with metal railings, and multi-light doors; installation of brick infill at segmental arched windows of the historic façade to remain;

excavation work at the new rear yard, including a sunken patio at the basement floor; at the roof, the construction of a brick clad rooftop addition, featuring punched window openings with two-over-two and two-over-four, double-hung windows, fixed multi-light windows, rooftop mechanical enclosure with a red-brick colored stucco finish, and brick cladding; at the existing historic rooftop elevator bulkhead, removal of a portion of the secondary west and south brick infill to create an open pergola; demolition of the one-story garage (524 Halsey Street), and construction of a three-story building with a one-story rooftop addition that is set back approximately 30 feet from the primary façade, designed as two attached rowhouses, each featuring three bays of punched window openings with one-over-one, double-hung wood windows at the second floor and above, single-light casement windows with metal infill and single-light transoms and paneled single-light metal doors at the ground floor, steel lintels and sills, terra cotta rain screen façade, and a black finished metal cornice; the rear façade features a setback at the second floor of the rear façade, punched window openings, metal balconies, and a brick masonry wall; and creating new areaways along the entire facade of the garage and the new building, including resetting existing bluestone paving and existing and salvaged Belgian blocks; installation of new Belgian blocks, simple designed metal picket fencing, and planting beds; as shown in a digital presentation of 47 slides dated March 28, 2017, and a digital presentation of 42 slides dated July 18, 2017, both titled "524 Halsey Street," prepared by ROART, and submitted as components of the application and presented at the Public Hearing and Public Meetings

As initially proposed, the work included, at the three-story garage building, a different configuration of the windows and doors at the ground floor, demolition of the entire rear façade and not maintaining a portion of the historic masonry wall, at the new building, a different design of the cornice, larger, more visible, rooftop additions and more balconies at the rear façade of both the garage and the new building.

In reviewing this proposal, the Commission noted that the Bedford Stuyvesant/Expanded Stuyvesant Heights Historic District Designation Report describes 524-540 Halsey Street as an altered Queen Anne style garage building designed by Axel S. Hedman and built c. 1904, and a one-story utilitarian garage building built in the 20th century; 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 Bedford Stuyvesant/Expanded Stuyvesant Heights Historic District. The Commission further noted that the Bedford Stuyvesant/Expanded Stuyvesant Heights Historic District Designation Report does not identify the utilitarian style 20th century garage typology as a building type for which the district was designated, and that the one-story utilitarian style garage proposed for demolition does not have its own building entry, and is described under the category "Other Structures on the Site."

With regard to the proposal, the Commission found that the majority of the existing garage door openings will be kept in place, and that the new and altered masonry openings will relate well to the scale and character of the ground floor, while maintaining the ad hoc rhythm of the original building; that the multi-light fenestration at the ground floor residential infill relates well to the historic multi-light fenestration of the existing garage doors; that the design, material and finish of the proposed wood infill is based on the historic infill; that the existing Belgian block and bluestone paving will be salvaged and re-used in the proposed areaway; that the proposed areaway design, featuring planting beds, metal picket fencing, and stone paving is in keeping with the proportions and configuration of areaways found in the streetscape and historic district; that the proposed two-over-two windows are in keeping with the Queen Anne style of the building; that the modification of the two garage openings is in keeping with the height and width of the historic garage openings and therefore will not call undue attention to itself; that the proposed work at rear façade will not be visible from any public thoroughfare; that the existing rear façade is simple in design without any ornament or significant architectural features, and that cutting back a portion of the rear wall to create a code compliant rear yard will facilitate the adaptive re-use of the building for residential use; that the rear of the building will be reconstructed using salvaged and new brick to match the historic material, and will include punched openings, reflective of the scale and character of the rear wall; that the existing

rooftop bulkhead will be maintained and incorporated into the design as an open pergola and will serve to obscure certain views of the rooftop addition; that the materials and color palette of the rooftop addition, consisting of common red brick, is compatible with the materials palette of the building and streetscape; that the existing garage is anomalous to the district in terms of its height, setback, long street frontage, and scale, and the building is not a significant example of garage typology, therefore the demolition of the building will not eliminate significant historic fabric; that the two part expression in the façade design reflects the rowhouse module predominant on the block in terms of cornice height, width, and three bay wide fenestration; that the façade will align with the adjacent rowhouses, stepping back from the historic garage building, resulting in a forecourt that provides a transition between the garage building and the adjacent historic row; and that the materials and design of the façade, consisting of terra cotta rain screen scored in a pattern that reflects the scale of brick at the upper stories and brownstone at the base, a metal cornice with simplified, stylized brackets, double-hung windows with metal lintels and sills, is inspired by and expresses in a contemporary manner the materials palette and architectural features of the historic garage. Based on these findings, the Commission determined the proposed work to be appropriate to the building and the Bedford Stuyvesant/Expanded Stuyvesant Heights Historic District and voted to approve it.

However, in voting to approve this proposal, the Commission stipulated that the rooftop addition be reduced where visible over the lot line facades; that the balconies at the rear façade be reduced; and that the cornice be more robust, with a deeper projection, and more substantial bracket elements; and that two complete sets of signed and sealed Department of Buildings filing drawings be submitted for review and approval by the staff of the Commission.

Subsequently, on November 11, 2016, the staff received drawings labeled T-001.00, G-001.00, G-110.00, G-120.00, G-121.00, G-122.00, Z-001.00 through Z-003.00, EN-001.00, EN-100.00 through EN-103.00, R-101.00, DM-100.00 through DM-104.00, A-001.00, A-100.00 through A-106.00, A-150.00 through A-156.00, A-200.00, A-210.00, A-250.00, A-251.00, A-350.00, and SR-001.00, dated November 13, 2017, prepared by Paul Gregory, R.A.; S-001.00, FO-101.00, FO-201.00, FO-201.00, FO-202.01, S-101.00 through S-106.00, S-202.01, S-301.00, and S-401.00 through S-406.00, dated November 3, 2017; and SOE-001.00, SOE-002.00, SOE-101.00, SOE-201.00 through SOE-203.00, SOE-301.00, SOE-302.00, and SOE-401.00, dated December 28, 2017, prepared by George J. Cambourakis, P.E.; and M-001.00 through M-009.00 and P-001.00 through P-012.00 dated November 1, 2017, prepared by Boris Levin, P.E..

Staff reviewed these materials and noted that the visibility of the rooftop addition was reduced by setting it back 22 feet from the primary façade, 16 feet from the secondary east façade, and removing a corner at the west façade from the proposed design; that the amount of balconies at the rear façade was reduced, and that the balconies are more modest in design and dimensions; and that the cornice at the new building has a larger projection from the façade and thereby creating a larger, more robust, presence. Furthermore, staff noted the inclusion of the following work: at second floor and above of the primary façade of the three-story garage building, replacing all one-over-one and two-over-two, double-hung wood windows with two-over-two, double-hung wood windows with a black finish; at the ground floor, removing any deteriorated stucco and brownstone surfaces and patching with a Portland cement and lime based mortar; re-painting the base of the building in a brownstone color, matching the existing finish; at the second floor and above removing the existing coating from the brick with a chemical paint remover (Prosoco Sure Klean) and cleaning the façade with low pressure water rinses; repointing of the masonry joints with a Portland cement and lime based mortar; removing all security cameras and light fixtures and patching with a repair mortar; installing a section of new metal cornice with a black finish where missing and matching the existing historic cornice; at the roof terrace of the new building, the installation of one metal and glass railing set back 3'6" from the parapet wall; and at the sidewalk, replacing concrete sidewalk paving in-kind, and installation of new tree pits along the width of the building; and at both the new building and historic garage, excavation work with underpinning to create a cellar space.

With regard to this additional work, the Commission finds in accordance with the Rules of the City of New York, Title 63, Section 3-04, that the replacement windows at the primary façade will match the historic windows in terms of material, configuration, operation, details and finish. The Commission further finds, in accordance with Section 2-14, that the existing surfaces of the façade are exfoliating, damaged, or otherwise unsound; that the original texture, color, profiles, and details of the brownstone will be replicated; that the damaged stone wall will be cut back to a sound base and the new surface will be keyed into sound brick and built up in successive layers using a cementitious mix with the top layer, tinted and finished to match the original brownstone texture and color; that the methods and materials proposed by the contractor have been provided in the form of written specifications. Furthermore, the Commission finds that the cleaning of the facades will be done in the gentlest effective method without causing damage to the masonry; that the water pressure will not exceed 500 psi; that the base of the building was painted at the time of designation; that the new mortar will match the historic mortar in terms of color, texture, and tooling; that the cutting of the vertical joints will be done by hand; that the proposed paint color will match the existing paint color and will mimic a brownstone finish; that the proposed metal cornice will match the historic cornice in terms of materials, design, dimensions, details, and finish. Furthermore, the Commission finds that, in accordance with Section 2-19 (c), that the installation of the rooftop terrace railing will not result in damage to, or demolition of, a significant architectural feature of the roof of the structure; and that the installation is not visible from a public thoroughfare. Furthermore, the Commission finds that the new tree pits are a typical feature of the streetscape in this historic district; that the existing concrete sidewalk is not a significant feature of the building or district; that the new untinted concrete sidewalk, scored to align with adjacent sidewalks, will be harmonious with the building and the adjacent sidewalks; that the work will help maintain a consistent sidewalk treatment on the street and in the district. Finally, that the overall design approval by the Commission has been maintained. Based on these and the above findings, the drawings have been marked approved by the Landmarks Preservation Commission, and Certificate of Appropriateness 19-19574 is being issued.

PLEASE NOTE: This permit is contingent upon the Commission's review and approval of samples of masonry cleaning, joint cutting method(s), brick, stucco, terra-cotta rain screen, pointing and repair mortar, and cornice shop drawings 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 estolk@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.

PLEASE ALSO NOTE: that 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 Egbert Stolk.

Meenakshi Srinivasan
Chair

PLEASE NOTE: PERFORATED DRAWINGS AND A COPY OF THIS PERMIT HAVE BEEN SENT TO:
Ran Oron, ROART

cc: Caroline Kane Levy, Deputy Director; Ran Oron, ROART