



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: 09/04/15	EXPIRATION DATE: 8/11/2021	DOCKET #: 175824	COFA #: COFA 17-6274
ADDRESS: 10 EAST 78TH STREET <u>HISTORIC DISTRICT</u> UPPER EAST SIDE		BOROUGH: MANHATTAN	BLOCK/LOT: 1392 / 65

Display This Permit While Work Is In Progress

ISSUED TO:

David Fiszel
10 East 78th Street Owners LLC
960 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10028

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 11, 2015, following the Public Meeting and Hearing of May 5, 2015, voted to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed work at the subject premises, as put forth in your application completed on April 9, 2015, and as you were notified in Status Update Letter 17-5274, issued on August 11, 2015.

The proposal, as approved, consists of redesigning the front and rear facades, rear ell, and areaway, including replacing the existing brick clad front façade with a new slightly taller front façade, featuring classically inspired elements, including limestone cladding and ornamentation, multi-light, wood and aluminum-clad wood windows, and decorative ironwork doors and grilles; modifying the existing areaway in front of the entire property and associated fencing to include a limestone step at the central entrance, flanked by two limestone-paved sections with decorative metal fencing on limestone curbing, with a gate at the fencing at the eastern section, raising the western section to align with the sidewalk level, and lowering the eastern section in conjunction with a limestone stair with metal railing leading to a basement service entrance; and applying off-white stucco cladding at the existing brickwork at the rear façade and ell in conjunction with slightly raising the height of the rear façade, removing the top portion of the ell, modifying existing masonry openings, creating new masonry openings, and replacing infill with new single light windows and doors, as well as installing light fixtures at the front façade and a deck and stairs at the rear facade, constructing a rooftop stair and elevator bulkhead and mechanical room; and installing metal railings at roofs.

The proposed work as previously proposed and presented on May 5, 2015, featured, at the front façade and areaway, different classically inspired elements in a different compositional arrangement, including decorative ironwork and balconettes at the second floor and third floors, a projecting band course above the fourth floor, a dentiled cornice above the fifth floor, single light windows throughout the façade, simpler window surrounds, and a more curvilinear pattern of ironwork; and at the rear façade and roofs, more complex profiles at the stucco banding, paired windows and transoms, and more decorative railings.

The proposed work, as approved, was shown in a digital presentation titled "10 East 78th Street Townhouse," dated (received) August 10, 2015, and consisting of 82 slides. The proposal presented on May 5, 2015, was shown in a digital presentation titled "10 East 78th Street Townhouse," dated (received) April 30, 2015, and consisting of 52 slides. Both of the presentations included drawings, photographs, and photo montages, and were prepared by studioMDA, and presented at the Public Hearing and Public Meetings.

In reviewing the proposal, the Commission noted the Metropolitan Museum Historic District Designation Report describes 10 East 78th Street as a rowhouse built in 1886-1887, and altered in 1946; and that it is not one of the buildings for which the Metropolitan Museum Historic District was designated.

With regard to this proposal, the Commission found that the existing simply designed brick front façade, with modest ornamentation, is not part of a significant redesign of the building or reflective of significant aspects of the development of the historic district; that the design and details of the front and rear facades and ell are no longer well related to the original row, therefore the proposed redesign will not diminish the unity of an intact row; that no significant architectural features at the highly altered front façade and the simply designed rear façade, ell and roof will be lost as part of the proposed work; that the moderate increase in height of the building will maintain typical proportions for townhouses within this historic district and will be in keeping with the range of building heights within this streetscape; that the streetscape is presently made up of houses of a variety of materials, and that the proposed limestone is a material commonly found on facades throughout the historic district; that the overall composition of the front façade, in terms of its materials, finishes, symmetry, fenestration, level of articulation and use of classical elements evokes the 20th century Renaissance and Beaux Arts styles found on many rowhouses in this historic district that were altered in the early 20th century; that the hierarchical organization and proportional relationship of façade elements will be consistent with historic classically inspired buildings and supportive of a cohesive design; that the front façade will feature elements typical of buildings throughout this streetscape and historic district, including multi-light casement windows and transoms, paired primary entrance doors, decorative metalwork, a cornice, sills, surrounds, and band courses, with proportions and profiles which help these elements to maintain a unified composition and relate well to neighboring properties throughout the streetscape; that the level of ornamentation at the front façade and areaway will be compatible with the scale and style of the building and commensurate with decorative elements at neighboring properties, and therefore will not draw undue attention to the building; that the placement and height of the areaway fencing will align with fencing at neighboring properties, supporting a unified streetscape composition; that the lowered portion of a section of the areaway will be a discreet presence and in keeping with areaways, adjacent to similar service entrances throughout the historic district; that the slight increase in height of the rear façade and reduction in height of the rear ell by removing a floor level, will maintain a typical massing at the rear of the building; that the stucco coating at the rear façade and ell will be in keeping with typical modifications to the rear of buildings throughout the historic district and will be simply designed, helping it remain in keeping with the character of secondary facades throughout the historic district; that the masonry openings and windows at the rear façade and ell will remain residential in scale and maintain a level of articulation in keeping with the character of the historic district; that the rooftop addition will be set back from the front and rear façade and its size will not overwhelm the building; that the proposed rooftop

bulkhead will be simply designed and finished in a neutral color, helping it remain a discreet presence; and that the alterations to the rear façade and ell and addition at the roof will only be visible from a public thoroughfare from a limited vantage point from East 77th Street, looking through a service alley.

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.

Subsequently, on August 18, 2015, the Landmarks Preservation Commission received final drawings T100.00 through T104.00, EN100.00, A100.00 through A106.00, A200.00, A201.00, A300.00, A301.00, D100.00 through D106.00, A110.00 through A117.00, A210.00 through A212.00, A310.00 through A314.00, A400.00 through A403.00, A410.00 through A419.00, and A506.00, dated August 13, 2015 and prepared by Kevin S. Byrne, RA; drawings FO-100, S-101 through S-107, S-200 through S-203.00, and S-400, dated January 30, 2015 and prepared by Nathaniel Ezra Oppenheimer, PE; drawings SOE-100.00 through SOE-102.00, SOE -201.00, and SOE-301.00, dated March 27, 2015 and prepared by Douglas Steven Roy, PE; and drawings M-100.00, M-200.00 through M-203.00, M-300.00, P-100.00, P-200.00 through P-203.00, SP-100.00, SP-200.00, SP-203.00, and EN-100.00, dated January 30, 2015 and prepared by Robert J. Divilio, Jr.

Accordingly, the staff of the Commission reviewed the drawings, which also included interior alterations throughout the building, including excavation at the cellar for an elevator pit, as well as the demolition and construction of nonbearing and bearing partitions and finishes, mechanical, electrical, plumbing, and HVAC work. With regard to the additional work, the Commission finds that that the proposed excavation work will consist of construction of an elevator pit and will occur within the footprint of the existing building; and that the excavation and underpinning will be done in compliance with Department of Buildings regulations under the supervision of a licensed professional engineer or registered architect to protect the building's façades and the adjacent buildings. Additionally, the Commission finds that the design approved by the Commission has been maintained. Based on these and the above findings, the drawings have been marked approved with a perforated seal, and Certificate of Appropriateness 17-6274 is being issued.

PLEASE NOTE: 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 Anne Jennings.

Meenakshi Srinivasan
Chair

PLEASE NOTE: PERFORATED DRAWINGS AND A COPY OF THIS PERMIT HAVE BEEN SENT TO:
Rick Azar, Azar Associates

cc: B. Artus, Deputy Director of Preservation, LPC; Rick Azar, Azar Associates