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 9, 2014, following the Public Hearing and Public Meeting of December 2, 2014, voted to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed work at the subject premises, as put forward in your application completed on November 6, 2014 and as you were notified in Status Update Letter 16-5737 issued on December 9, 2014. The approval will expire December 9, 2020.

The proposed work, as approved, consists of constructing a three-story rear yard addition clad in painted brick with a setback at the upper two stories, featuring at the third story, three one-over-one double-hung wood windows in a black painted finish, at the second story, one assembly of fixed multi-lite steel and glass window with two three-lite steel and glass doors in a black painted finish, with a black painted metal railing at the terrace; and at the first story, one new paired three-lite steel and glass door flanked on each side by one three-lite steel and glass sidelight in a black painted finish. The work was shown on presentation boards and handouts, all prepared by Hottenroth + Joseph Architects, and presented at the Public Meeting of December 9, 2014.

In reviewing this proposal, the Commission noted that the Expanded Carnegie Hill Historic District designation report describes 129 East 94th street as a neo-Grec style rowhouse designed by F.S. Barus and built in 1878-79; 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 the proposed rear yard addition will not be visible from a public thoroughfare; that the rear of the building has no significant architectural features which would be lost or damaged by the construction of the proposed rear yard addition; that the row features other three-story rear yard additions of a similar depth and width; that other rear yard incursions and larger tenement and apartment buildings exist within the block and that this proposed addition will not substantially eliminate or reduce the presence of open space at the interior of the block; that the rear addition will not rise to the full height of the building; that the rear of the building will retain the scale and character of an individual rowhouse; that the rear addition will utilize materials which will be in keeping with the materials palette of the building; and that the work will not detract from the special character of the Expanded Carnegie Hill 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.

The Commission authorized the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness upon receipt, review, and approval of two sets of signed and sealed Department of Building filing drawings showing the approved design.

Subsequently, on February 23, 2015, the Commission received drawings L001 through L018, A001.00 through A017.00, dated (revised) February 17, 2015, and prepared by David Richard Hottenroth, RA; drawings M100.00, M200.00, M201.00, M300.00, P100.00, P200.00, P201.00, dated (revised) February 13, 2015, and prepared by Robert J. Divilio Jr, PE; drawings S100.00, S200.00, S210.00, S400.00, S401.00, S410.00, S411.00, S500.00, S501.00, dated January 29, 2015, and prepared by Dominick Richard Pilla, PE; written conditions report, dated March 11, 2015, and prepared by Christian Louis Martos, PE; and drawings SOE001.00, SOE 002.00, dated March 6, 2015, and prepared by Philip D. Murray, PE. Accordingly, staff reviewed these materials and noted that they include a modification consisting of eliminating the upper two stories of the approved three-story rear yard addition resulting in a one-story extension. Staff also notes additional restorative work at the primary south façade, including removing the existing non-historic 1st and 3rd floor metal window guards; replacing all existing multi-lite and one-over-one double-hung wood windows with new one-over-one double-hung wood windows in a black painted finish; at the 1st floor, reconstructing the missing brownstone door enframement and window enframements, entrance stoop, areaway curb and steps to match historic documents and the intact historic features within the row at 125 and 133 East 94th Street; reconstructing the missing cast iron stoop railing, areaway iron fence and gate, iron gate beneath the stoop; and iron window grilles at the basement, all in a black painted finish; at the areaway, installing bluestone pavers; at the 1st floor, installing one new paired wood and glass paneled entrance door in a black painted finish; and at the basement, replacing the existing wood entrance door with one new paneled wood and glass door in a painted black finish; and façade repairs, including chipping away the deteriorated original brownstone and subsequent stucco coating; and re-surfacing with a stucco coating to match the color, texture, ornament, and tooling of the historic brownstone; and painting the existing wood cornice in a black finish; installing one new light fixture east of the 1st floor entrance door at the plain masonry façade; and installing one new light fixture beneath the stoop; at the non-visible secondary north façade, removing three existing metal window guards at the 3rd floor; at the 2nd and 3rd floors, replacing six existing one-over-one double-hung wood windows with six new one-over-one double-hung wood windows in a black painted finish; and replacing two existing metal louvers with brick masonry infill; at the 1st floor, replacing two existing one-over-one double-hung windows and transom with two new paired multi-lite wood and glass doors and two-lite transom in a black painted finish within enlarged masonry openings; at the roof, installing four new non-visible mechanical units and associated steel dunnage and one new non-visible skylight; and interior alterations, including demolition and construction of nonbearing partitions and finishes, excavation at the cellar level; as well as mechanical, electrical, plumbing, and structural work.
With regard to the modifications, staff finds that eliminating the upper two stories of the rear yard addition will not compromise the design and will retain more of the historic material; and that the resulting one-story rear yard addition will be consistent with the design approved by the Commission; with regard to the additional work, staff finds in accordance with the provisions set forth in RCNY, Title 63, Section 3-04 (c), that the new windows at the primary façade will match the historic windows in terms of configuration, operation, details, material and finish; in accordance with Section 2-17, (c)(1), that the proposed restoration of the brownstone façade, entrance stoop and areaway, and metal work is based on historic documents and on matching buildings; 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; and that the work will return these significant elements to their historic appearance; with regard to doors, that the proposed entrance doors are in keeping with the age, type and style of the building in terms of configuration, materials and details; and that the finish is in keeping with the types of finishes found on doors in this historic district; with regard to light fixtures, that the installation will not cause damage to, or loss of any significant historic fabric; that the light fixture is well scaled to the façade; that the finish of the proposed light fixture will not call undue attention to its presence; and that there will be no visible electrical conduit; that the proposed paint color is harmonious with the building's existing color palette; and that the proposed work will protect the building's façade and structure from future damage due to water infiltration and aid in the long term preservation of the building; in accordance with Section 3-04 (d), that the proposed windows at the non-visible secondary north façade, will be installed in existing window openings and in locations where existing openings are to be enlarged in height and width according to § 2-15 of this title; that such enlargement or reduction also does 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 are not to be enlarged or reduced; and that they do not replace "special" windows as defined in the definitions (§ 3-01) and illustrated in Appendix A of this chapter; with regard to rooftop installations, in accordance with 2-19(e)(1), that the installation will consist solely of mechanical equipment; that the installation will not result in damage to or demolition of a significant architectural feature of the roof; that it will not be visible from any public thoroughfare; and that it will not adversely affect significant architectural features of adjacent improvements; with regard to excavation, that the proposed excavation work will provide for additional height at the cellar and will occur entirely within the footprint of the existing building; 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; and 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 16-8973 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.

PLEASE NOTE: This permit is contingent upon the Commission's review and approval of samples of brownstone masonry 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 csrh@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 Cara Soh.

Meenakshi Srinivasan
Chair

PLEASE NOTE: PERFORATED DRAWINGS AND A COPY OF THIS PERMIT HAVE BEEN SENT TO:
Diana Rodriguez, William Vitacco Associates Ltd.

cce: Caroline Kane Levy, Deputy Director of Preservation, LPC