



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: 06/17/16	EXPIRATION DATE: 2/16/2022	DOCKET #: LPC-18-4516	COFA COFA-18-7438
ADDRESS: 269 WEST 11TH STREET		BOROUGH: Manhattan	BLOCK/LOT: 623 / 49
Greenwich Village Historic District			

Display This Permit While Work Is In Progress

ISSUED TO:

Ram Sundaram
269 West 11th Street, LLC
60 East 88th Street
New York, NY 10128

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 February 16, 2016, 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 forth in your application completed on January 21, 2016, and as you were notified in Status Update Letter 18-2281 (LPC 17-6671), issued on February 16, 2016.

The proposal, as approved, consists of the removal of the fire escape from the front facade; the construction of a new cast-concrete masonry stoop leading to a new parlor-floor cast-concrete masonry entry-surround, both to have a brownstone stucco finish to match the historic brownstone, with the new stoop to feature simple iron handrails with decorative base panels to match the base of the existing areaway railing and a metal security-grille door at the understoop entry to match the historic basement window security grilles in terms of design and detail, all to be painted black, and with the new entry surround to feature lateral piers and a simple entablature with a shallow projecting cornice, a paneled wood reveal and two paneled wood doors surmounted by a single light wood transom, all painted black, as well as a recessed lighting-fixture at the wood soffit; lengthening the parlor-floor window openings by lowering the sills, and the installation of new nine-over-nine double-hung wood windows in the new openings; the removal of the plain brick rear facade and the existing full-height brick rear extension and the construction of a new full-height, full-width rear addition, to be set-back 6'-4" from the plane of the existing extension, to be faced in grey stucco

and to feature a central, projecting, aluminum and glass bay surmounted by a roof terrace with glass guard rails at the basement through third floors, a tripartite glass sliding-door assembly at the fourth floor, to provide access to the roof terrace at the projecting bay, and a metal deck and stairs at the first floor; the related excavation of a portion of the cellar and the rear yard below the new addition and to accommodate headroom at the cellar as well as a shallow sunken basement-level patio and stairs up to the rear yard; the construction of a one-story stucco, glass and wood-slat stair and elevator bulkhead at the central portion of the roof adjacent to the eastern party wall, to be surmounted by a set-back one-story wood-slat elevator overrun enclosure; the installation of three (3) rooftop air conditioner condensing units on concrete pads at the front portion of the roof, to be set back from the front roof cornice; and the extension of existing masonry chimneys, as shown in photographs and drawings labeled L-001 through L-041, all dated (revised) February 3, 2016, prepared by Selldorf Architects, submitted as components of the application and presented at the Public Hearing and Public Meeting.

In reviewing the proposal, the Commission noted that the Greenwich Village Historic District Designation Report describes 269 West 11th Street as a Greek Revival style rowhouse, built in 1836 and altered prior to 1940; 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. The Commission further noted that the building was constructed concurrently with the adjacent building at 271 West 11th Street; that the front facades of the subject building and that at No. 271 were altered prior to 1940 by the additions of full fourth stories with matching Italianate-style cornices; and that by c. 1940 the subject building's stoop and entry surround were removed and its entry was relocated to the basement, while No. 271 retained its stoop, parlor-floor entry and entry-surround.

With regard to this proposal, the Commission found that the proposed removal of the utilitarian fire escape from the front façade will not eliminate a significant architectural feature from this mid 19th-century rowhouse or from the streetscape, in which fire escapes are not original significant historic features; that the proposed removal of the fire escape and restoration of the stoop and parlor-floor entrance will help to return the façade closer to its historic appearance as evidenced by a historic photograph of its sister building at No. 271 West 11th Street; that the design, scale and materials of the proposed parlor-floor cast brownstone entry-surround, while simplified in design, are in keeping with those of the historic entry at the building's sister building at No. 271, as evidenced in the historic photograph, as well as with those of entries at similar adjacent buildings in the streetscape; that the enlarged parlor-floor window openings and 9-over-9 window configuration are evidenced by historic photographs of the neighboring sister building, and therefore correspond to the buildings historic condition when a stoop was present; that the proposed replacement of the rear façade, which was previously altered by the addition of a full story and a simple, two-bay, full-height common-brick el, will not eliminate significant historic features from the building or row; that the depth and width of the proposed rear addition will approximate those of surrounding buildings to the east and west in this streetscape; that the proposed rear addition, which is decreased in depth from that of the existing el, will serve to increase the open space within this block; that the projecting glass bay at the proposed rear addition will further minimize its apparent bulk within the block and as viewed from West 4th Street, and will recall bay windows found traditionally at rear facades at rowhouses; that the stucco, dark-bronze colored metal and clear glass materials of the proposed rear addition are in keeping with the materials and palette of rear additions and projecting steel rear-window bays sometimes found at rowhouses; that the proposed excavation will be limited in scope and will maintain the historic grade of the rear yards within in this block; that the work will be undertaken under the supervision of a registered architect and will not damage or destroy significant features of adjacent premises; that the proposed rooftop bulkheads, mechanical equipment and extended chimneys will not be visible from a public thoroughfare; and that the proposed work will maintain the scale and character of the building as an individual rowhouse, as well as the special architectural and historic character of the building, the row and the Greenwich Village Historic District. Based on these findings, the Commission determined the work to be appropriate to the building and to the

Greenwich Village Historic District and voted to approve this application.

However, in voting to grant this approval, the Commission stipulated that two 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 April 12, 2016, the Landmarks Preservation Commission received final drawings G-000.00, G-001.00, G-002.00, G-003.00, Z-001.00, Z-002.00, Z-003.00, DM-100.00, DM-101.00, DM-102.00, DM-103.00, DM-200.00, A-100.00, A-101.00, A-102.00, A-103.00, A-104.00, A-200.00, A-201.00, A-202.00, A-203.00, A-204.00, A-300.00, A-301.00, A-320.00, A-321.00, A-322.00, A-480.00, A-520.00, A-530.00, A-600.00, A-610.00, A-611.00 and A-650.00, all dated December 9, 2015, and prepared by Annabelle M. Selldorf, R.A.; SOE-100.00, SOE-101.00, SOE-102.00, SOE-201.00, SOE-301.00, SOE-302.00, SOE-401.00, BR-100.00 through BR-107.00, BR-201.00 BR-202.00, BR-203.00, BR-301.00 and BR-302.00, all dated December 9, 2015 and prepared by Douglas Steven Roy, P.E.; S001.00, S002.00, S003.00, S101.00, S102.00, S103.00, S104.00, S301.00, S401.00, S402.00, S403.00, S411.00, S421.00, S431.00 and S441.00, all dated December 9, 2015, and prepared by Philip T. Khalil, P.E.; and M-000.00, M-100.00, M-101.00, M-102.00, M-103.00, M-104.00, M-300.00, M-301.00, P-001.00, P-002.00, P-100.00, P-101.00, P-102.00, P-103.00, P-104.00, P-200.00, P-201.00, P-202.00, P-203.00, SP-000.00, SP-001.00, SP-002.00, SP-100.00, SP-101.00, SP-102.00, SP-103.00 and SP-104.00, all dated (revised) March 22, 2016, and prepared by Kari A. Nystrom, P.E.; on June 17, 2016, the Commission received a letter incorporating a feasibility report, dated June 17, 2016, from Douglas Steven Roy, P.E./GZA GeoEnvironmental of NY; and on June 21, 2016, the Commission received an email, incorporating a specification for finishing new masonry components at the facade. Accordingly, the staff of the Commission reviewed the drawings and letter, and found that the proposal approved by the Commission had been maintained, and that the drawings additionally show alterations at the previously altered front areaway, including the removal of bluestone-tile paving, the replacement of the masonry steps adjacent to the facade with new reconfigured masonry steps and the installation of new stone paving; the replacement of the modified iron security grille at the eastern basement window opening with a new iron security grille to match the adjacent historic grille to remain; the installation of a new lighting fixture at the basement facade, adjacent to the new understoop entry; the replacement of eleven (11) windows at the front facade, including the two (2) two-over-two double-hung windows at the basement, the three (3) six-over-six double-hung windows at the second floor and the six (6) one-over-one double-hung windows at the second and third floors, with new, six-over-six double-hung wood windows, and finishing all thirteen (13) windows at the front facade in black paint; masonry work at the front facade, including the installation of a new vertical expansion joint at the western edge of the facade, cleaning the brick upper stories, brownstone trim and brownstone-stucco basement facade, repairing brownstone and stucco with new brownstone patching mortar as necessary, and raking deteriorated brick-joint mortar and repointing joints as necessary; and at the roof, the in-kind reconstruction of brick party-wall parapets, the construction of a new low, stucco-faced parapet wall across the front portion of the roof and behind the new air conditioners, the replacement of a simple metal picket-style railing at the rear portion of the roof with a new glass guard-rail and the installation of new rooftop planters; as well as interior alterations at the cellar through the fourth floor, including the demolition and construction of floors, stairs, partitions and related structural and framing, fixtures and finishes, and bracing, mechanical, plumbing and fire-safety systems work.

With regard to these additional changes, the Commission finds that the reconfiguration of a portion of the front areaway is necessary in order to accommodate access to the new understoop entry; that the removal of the existing bluestone-tile paving and non-historic masonry steps from this portion of the areaway will not eliminate significant architectural fabric from the building or district; that the new paving and steps will match the materials of the existing areaway stairs to remain and will be in keeping with the dimensions and joint-pattern of paving found traditionally at areaways at buildings of this type; that the new stair railing in

the reconfigured areaway will match the existing areaway railing to remain in terms of material, design, detail and finish; that the replacement of the previously modified basement window security grille with a new grille to match the adjacent historic grille to remain is restorative in nature, and will help to return this grille and the basement facade to their historic appearances; that the installation of the new light fixture at the basement facade will not cause damage to or loss of any significant historic fabric; that the light fixture is well scale to the facade; and that the black finish of the proposed light fixture will not call undue attention to its presence; and that there will be no visible electrical conduit; the Commission also finds, in accordance with the provisions set forth in RCNY, Title 63, Section 3-04, that the new windows at the primary façade will match the historic windows in terms of configuration, operation, details, material and finish; and the Commission further finds that the installation of an expansion joint at the western edge of the front facade is necessitated by code requirements; that the sealant at the expansion joint will be finished to help it blend with its surrounding context; that the masonry repair work is restorative in nature; that cleaning the bricks and stucco will utilize the gentlest effective means available without damaging the masonry; that deteriorated stucco will be cut back to a sound base and new surfaces keyed into the sound base and built up in successive layers using a cementitious mix with the top layer tinted to match the original brownstone texture and color; that the raking of brick mortar joints will not damage surrounding bricks; that repointing mortar will be compatible with the masonry in terms of composition and will match the historic mortar in terms of profiles, texture and finish; that rebuilding the party-wall roof parapets is warranted by their condition and in order to accommodate the new rooftop addition; that the new masonry party-wall parapets will match the existing in terms of their materials and exterior brick facing will match that of the surrounding party walls; and that this work will support the long-term preservation of the building; the Commission further finds, in accordance with the provisions set forth in RCNY, Title 63, Section 2-19(e)(1), that the rooftop additions including the parapet wall, glass guardrail and planters will consist solely of mechanical equipment; that their installations will not result in damage to or demolition of a significant architectural feature of the roof; that the glass guardrail will be only minimal visible from a public thoroughfare to the east and the new parapet wall and planters will not be visible from any public thoroughfare; and that these installations will not adversely affect significant architectural features of adjacent improvements; and the Commission further finds that the interior alterations will have no effect on the significant protected features of the building. Based on these and the above findings, the drawings have been marked approved with a perforated seal, and Certificate of Appropriateness 18-7438 is being issued.

PLEASE NOTE: The issuance of this permit is contingent upon the Commission's review and approval of samples of masonry cleaning, masonry-joint cutting and pointing, stucco finish and repair mortar, new brick, pointing mortars, paving components and sealant. 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 kredd@lpc.nyc.gov for review. This permit is also contingent on the understanding that only low-pressure water rinses not to exceed 500 psi will be used at the facade, and 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: 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 Katherine Redd.

Meenakshi Srinivasan
Chair

PLEASE NOTE: PERFORATED DRAWINGS AND A COPY OF THIS PERMIT HAVE BEEN SENT TO:
Jeanette Trudeau, Selldorf Architects

cc: Caroline Kane Levy, Deputy Director, Preservation/LPC