



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: 08/03/17	EXPIRATION DATE: 5/2/2023	DOCKET #: LPC-18-7184	COFA COFA-18-07184
ADDRESS: 36 COMMERCE STREET		BOROUGH: Manhattan	BLOCK/LOT: 584 / 28
Greenwich Village Historic District			

Display This Permit While Work Is In Progress

ISSUED TO:

Rotem Reshef
36 Commerce Street LLC
215 West 90th Street
New York, NY 10002

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 May 2, 2017, 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 March 29, 2017.

The proposal, as approved, consists of modifying the existing slightly pitched roof to feature a raised flat center portion, a lower flat portion at the rear, and sloping roof at the remainder, in conjunction with increasing the height of the south (rear) facade by 4'-0"; extending southern portions of the existing west and east parapets, aligning in height with the rear facade parapet; extending one chimney by 1'-6"; installing metal railings and mechanical equipment at the roof; and enlarging window openings at the top (third) floor of the rear facade, in conjunction with removing the existing six-over-six double-hung windows and installing new, larger six-over-one double-hung windows, as well as excavating the rear yard by 2'-9" in depth, as shown in a digital presentation, titled "LPC Public Hearing Presentation, 36 Commerce Street," dated May 2, 2017, and prepared by Ampersand Architecture, including 22 slides, consisting of photographs, drawings, and renderings, all presented as components of the application at the Public Hearing and Public Meeting.

In reviewing this proposal, the Commission noted that the Greenwich Village Historic District Designation

Report describes 36 Commerce Street as a Greek Revival style rowhouse built in 1841; 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 Greenwich Village Historic District. The Commission also noted that the stoop was removed prior to the designation of the historic district and the construction of a new stoop was approved under Certificate of No Effect 95-1856 (LPC 95-3348), which was issued on May 8, 1995.

With regard to this proposal, the Commission found that the proposed work will not damage or destroy any significant architectural features of the building; that the increase in height of the parapets and chimney and proposed rooftop mechanical equipment and railings will only be minimally visible from public thoroughfares at a distance over secondary facades and will be consistent with parapet and rooftop conditions at other buildings within the historic district; that the building is not part of an extant row, therefore slightly increasing the height of the parapet and modifying the window openings at the top floor of the rear façade will not detract from a unified grouping of houses; that the change in grade at the rear yard will not detract from a continuous central greenspace; and that the excavation and related 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. Based on these findings, the Commission determined the work to be appropriate to the building and the historic district and voted to approve it with the stipulation that the applicant work with staff to see if there are less visible alternatives for the rooftop railings.

The Commission authorized the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness upon receipt, review and approval of two or more sets of signed and sealed Department of Building filing drawings showing the approved design and incorporating alternatives for the railings, as required.

Subsequently, on June 20, 2017, the Commission received filing drawings G-001.00, G-002.00, G-003.00, G-004.00, G-005.00, DM-100.00, DM-101.00, A-100.00, A-101.00, A-103.00, A-104.00, A-202.00, A-204.00, A-500.00, A-600.00 through A-605.00, A-700.00, A-810.00, A-811.00, A-812.00, and A-813.00, dated (revised) June 5, 2017; A-102.00, A-200.00, A-201.00, A-203.00, A-205.00, A-300.00, A-301.00, and A-800.00, dated (revised) June 20, 2017, and prepared by Amy Jane Lopez-Cepero, RA; and M-001.00 through M-005.00, M-100.00 through M-104.00, M-200.00 through M-204.00, M-401.00, M-402.00, M-501.00, M-502.00, M-503.00, M-601.00, M-602.00, and M-603.00, dated (revised) June 5, 2017, and prepared by Marina Solovchuk, PE.

Accordingly, staff reviewed these materials and noted that they include modifications to the previously approved proposal, including reducing the diameter of the posts and rails at the railings at the roof from 1 1/2" to 1", and painting the railings a light grey instead of black, as well as additional work, consisting of exterior alterations at the north (Commerce Street) facade, including replacing ten (10) black painted double-hung wood windows throughout the facade in-kind, including six-over-two windows at the parlor floor, six-over-six windows at the second and third floors, and six-light awning windows at the basement level; repairing the brownstone at the basement level using a patching compound; installing two reddish-brown painted metal cameras at plain brickwork at the east and west sides of the first floor; installing a black painted metal intercom at the wood main entrance surround; installing two (2) black painted metal window boxes at plain brickwork, below the parlor floor windows; and installing a black painted metal gate at the side of the stoop, as well as restorative work at the existing modern stoop, including replacing existing precast concrete treads and risers in-kind, recoating the stucco-clad precast concrete cheek walls with a cementitious brownstone stucco, and replacing the black painted metal handrails in-kind; alterations at the east (side) facade, including creating new openings in plain brickwork at the second and third floors and installing six-over-one double-hung windows; alterations at the south (rear) facade, including replacing three

(3) six-over-one double-hung windows at the second floor in-kind; replacing a six-over-one double-hung window and single-light transom and a pair of doors and single-light transom at the first floor in-kind; removing an existing pair of doors and a single-light transom at the first floor and installing a six-over-one double-hung window and single-light transom, in conjunction with infilling the remaining opening with plain brickwork; removing a one-over-one double-hung window and a multi-light door at the basement level and installing a larger one-over-one double-hung window and paired doors, in conjunction with removing a portion of the adjoining stucco-clad masonry; replacing a one-over-one double-hung window at the basement level in-kind; replacing existing metal straight stairs and landing at the rear deck at the first floor with a new metal spiral stair and landing; alterations at the rear yard, including replacing existing stairs and a gate at the east side of the yard in-kind, installing stairs at the south side of the yard, adjacent to an existing door, and installing planters and paving; and alterations at the roof, including replacing roofing membrane in-kind; removing an existing defunct brick chimney; and installing two (2) skylights and a hatch.

With regard to the modifications and additional work, staff found that the reduced size of the posts and rails, in conjunction with the proposed light colored finish, will help the railings remain a discreet presence in streetscape views; that the railings will be minimally visible, if at all, from a distance at limited vantage points and within the context of other, similar rooftop accretions; that, in accordance with the Rules of the City of New York (RCNY), Title 63, Section 3-04, the proposed replacement windows at the front facade will match the historic windows in terms of configuration, operation, materials, and details, and will be installed in existing masonry openings; that the windows to be removed are not special windows, as defined by Section 3 or Appendix C of the Rules; that the proposed finish of the windows will be easily reversible and will match the finishes at the cornice at the front facade, as well as the lintel above the parlor floor entrance, thereby helping to support a unified composition; that the replacement windows at secondary facades will be installed within existing masonry openings and in openings to be enlarged and reduced in accordance with Section 2-15 of the Rules, and that such modifications will not alter or destroy protected features; that, in accordance with the provisions of Title 63 of the RCNY, Section 2-15, the new window openings at the secondary facade will not alter or destroy any protected features, nor will they detract from such protected features by proximity to such features; that the new window openings will not be visible from a public thoroughfare; that the intercom, security cameras, and window boxes will be simply designed, well-scaled to the building, and typical in terms of placement; that the intercom and camera will be finished to match the surrounding context; that the cameras will be placed at a distance from each other in discreet locations which will not draw undue attention to them and that no exposed conduit will be included with the installations; that the proposed gate at the side of the stoop will be simply designed and typical for metalwork throughout the historic district at buildings of this type, style, and age in terms of placement, materials, and finish; that the replacement of the treads and risers at the stoop will return the stoop to a sound and stable condition; that the recoating of the cheek walls will help return them to a condition more closely recalling brownstone; that the patching compound will be compatible with the masonry in terms of composition and will match the historic masonry in terms of texture, finish, profiles and details; that the replacement of the existing modern doors and the landing and stairs at a secondary facade will not eliminate any original historic fabric or diminish any significant alterations, added over time; that the replacement stoop handrails will be simply designed and typical in terms of placement, size, details and finish for installations of this type found at stoops of buildings of this type, style, and age within this historic district; that the replacement brickwork will match the historic brickwork in terms of placement, dimensions, texture, finish, profiles and details; that the pointing mortar will be compatible with the masonry in terms of composition and will match the historic mortar in terms of profiles, texture, and finish; and that, except for a portion of the previously approved mechanical equipment and railings, none of the modifications or additional work at the roof, rear or east facades will be visible from any public thoroughfare. Additionally, staff found that the design approved by the Commission has been maintained and that the required change has been incorporated. Based on these and the above findings, the drawings have been marked approved with

a perforated seal, and Certificate of Appropriateness XX-XXXX (LPC 18-7184) is being issued.

Please note that this permit is being issued contingent upon the Commission's review and approval of brick, pointing mortar, patching, and stucco samples 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 Julianne Wiesner-Chianese for review. This permit is also contingent on the understanding that the masonry 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 Julianne W Chianese.

Meenakshi Srinivasan
Chair

PLEASE NOTE: PERFORATED DRAWINGS AND A COPY OF THIS PERMIT HAVE BEEN SENT TO:
Teresa Tejed-Melo, Cross River Zoning Associates

cc: Bernadette Artus, Deputy Director; Teresa Tejed-Melo, Cross River Zoning Associates