Pursuant to Section 25-307 of the Administrative Code of the City of New York, the Landmarks Preservation Commission, at the Public Meeting of June 10, 2014, following the Public Hearing of June 3, 2014, voted to approve a proposal for certain work at the subject premises, as put forward in your application completed on May 8, 2014. The approval will expire June 10, 2020.

The proposal, as approved, consists of the demolition of the existing rear facade, an existing rear yard extension and a modern fire escape in the rear yard; the reconstruction of the subcellar and cellar, extending to the rear property line, the construction of a terrace on the roof of the cellar level, with French doors from the ground floor leading to the terrace, and the construction of a new rear facade, set 30 feet from the rear property line, with limestone cladding at the ground floor and garden walls, brick cladding on floors two through five, a wrought iron balcony and French doors at the second floor level, and a copper clad mansard roof at the sixth floor, as shown in drawings 1 through 12, with a copy of the original architect's drawing of the front facade, photographs and materials samples, all prepared and submitted as components of this application by David Bae Architect, P. C. and presented at the Public Hearing and the Public Meeting.

In reviewing the proposal, the Commission noted that the Upper East Side Historic District designation report describes 45 East 65th Street as a neo-Georgian style rowhouse designed by Hoppin and Koen 1909-10; and that the building's style, scale, materials and details are among the features which contribute to the special architectural and historic character of the Upper East Side Historic District. The Commission further noted that the rear facade is not visible from the street. The commission finally noted that there is a copper...
clad bay window at the top floor of the rear facade; that the building was converted from residential use to institutional use in 1929; that the building underwent renovations in the 1930, 1945, 1971 and in 1983; that these renovations included alterations to the rear facade and the construction of the exterior fire escape; and that the bay window was likely added during these renovations.

With regard to this proposal, the Commission found that the proposed alterations will not be visible from any public thoroughfare; that, with the exception of the removal of the bay windows, the work will not result in removal of any significant historic fabric; that because the existing building is not part of a row of matching buildings, the proposed alterations will not diminish the unity of a group of buildings; that because this block is significantly developed with no single central greenspace, removing the fire escape and demolishing the previously altered rear extension and construction a new rear wall set back from the adjacent building with a new terrace at the level of the first floor will not adversely impact any rear yards, and will increase the greenspace in the center if the block; that French doors opening to rear gardens and balconies are a common feature of rowhouses and mansions within the Upper East side Historic District and that the proposed rear façade will maintain the residential character and scale of this type of building as an individual residence; that the proposed mansard roof and symmetry of the proposed rear façade will relate well to the formal character of the front façade and with the varied character of the rear facade within the block; and that the proposed work will not diminish the special architectural or historic character of the building or the Upper East Side Historic District. The work, therefore, is approved.

However, in voting to grant this approval, the Commission stipulated that the applicants document the condition of the bay windows and explore the feasibility of reusing the bay window in the design of the new rear facade if that could be achieved without requiring full reconstruction; and that two sets of final signed and sealed Department of Buildings filing drawings showing the approved proposal be submitted to the Landmarks Preservation Commission for review and approval.

Subsequently, on June 11, 2014, the applicant submitted documentation on the condition of the bay window, dated June 11, 2014, prepared after review with Walter B. Melvin Architect. Accordingly, staff reviewed the materials and found that the bay is in an unsound condition and would require full reconstruction if relocated; that the bay window is not original to the building or part of a significant redesign of the building; and that given these facts, the removal of the bay is consistent with the Commission’s comments at the Public Hearing.

On June 12, 2014, the applicant submitted drawings A-000.00, Z-001.00 through Z-005.00, DM-100.00 through DM-104.00, A-100.00 through A-104.00, A-150.00, A-151.00, A-155.00 through A-157, A-200.00 through A-204.00, A-500.00, A-510.00, A-700.00, A-701.00, all dated December 12, 2013, A-601.00, A-602.00, A-604.00, A-605.00, A-610.00, A-611.00, A-620.00, A-621.00, A-631.00, A-632.00, A-640.00, A-650.00, A-651.00, FO-100.00, S-101.00 through S-104.00, FO-200.00 through FO-203.00, S-300.00S-301.00, S-400.00, all dated November 22, 2013, M-001.00, M-100.00 through M-104.00, M-200.00 through M-204.00, M-300.00 through M-304.00, M-400.00 through M-405.00, M-500.00 through M-502.00, M-600.00 through M-602.00, P-001.00, P-100.00 through P-105.00, P-200.00 through P-203.00, P-300.00 and P-400.00, all dated March 14, 2014, and an undated Zoning Diagram, all prepared and submitted by David Bae Architect and Walter B. Melvin Architects. Accordingly, the staff of the Commission reviewed the drawings, and found that the proposal approved by the Commission has been maintained, and that the drawings additionally show interior alterations at all floors; replacement of the painted wood double-hung wood windows and French doors at the front facade in kind; the removal of modern ironwork grilles on a pair of windows on the ground floor; facade repairs; and the installation of HVAC equipment on the roof. The Commission finds, with regard to the proposed window replacement on the front facade, 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; that the removal of the existing ironwork grilles on the first floor, that the grilles are not shown on the original drawings of the front façade; that the grilles are not visible in the tax photo; that the grilles do not match the historic ironwork, visible in the tax photo and still in place on the building, in terms of details or configuration; and that the removal of the ironwork will not destroy any significant historic material; and that, concerning the installation of the roof-mounted HVAC equipment, set behind the mansard roof on the front façade, in an area which is not visible from the street, the Commission finds, in accordance with the provisions set forth in RCNY, Title 63, Section 2-19(e)(1), that the rooftop addition will consist solely of mechanical equipment; that its 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. Based on the above findings, the drawings have been marked approved with a perforated seal, and Certificate of Appropriateness 15-8995 is being issued.

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 John Graham.

Robert B. Tierney
Chair

PLEASE NOTE: PERFORATED DRAWINGS AND A COPY OF THIS PERMIT HAVE BEEN SENT TO:
David Bae, Principal, David Bae Architect

cc:  David Bae Architect