

Valerie De La Rosa, *Chair*
Eugene Yoo, *First Vice Chair*
Donna Raftery, *Second Vice Chair*



Antony Wong, *Treasurer*
Emma Smith, *Secretary*
Mark Diller, *District Manager*
Brian Pape, *Assistant Secretary*

Community Board No. 2, Manhattan

3 Washington Square Village
NEW YORK, NY 10012-1899

www.manhattancb2.org

P: 212-979-2272 F: 212-254-5102 E: info@manhattancb2.org

Greenwich Village ♦ Little Italy ♦ SoHo ♦ NoHo ♦ Hudson Square ♦ Chinatown ♦ Gansevoort Market

November 21, 2025

Sarah Carroll, Chair
NYC Landmarks Preservation Commission
One Centre St., 9th Floor North
New York, New York 10007

Dear Chair Carroll:

At its Full Board meeting on November 20, 2025, Community Board #2, Manhattan (CB2, Man.) adopted the following resolution:

FIRST LANDMARKS MEETING

1. *18-20 Christopher St. (Greenwich Village Historic District)– Application is to legalize installation of shutters, windows, and entrance transom that do not conform to the approved LPC permit.

Whereas:

- A. This application did not originally have a public hearing before the CB2 Landmarks Committee, the work was approved by LPC, and it is only now, in order to resolve violations for work that varied from what the Commission had approved, that the Committee is being asked to review the work; and
- B. In order to evaluate requests for recommendation, the Committee's practice is to review the existing conditions requiring legalization according to the same standards that would have been used had the work been presented in a regular application; and
- C. The non-historic windows, the very considerably modified design of the dormers, and the absence of hinges on the shutters do not meet the standard for a recommendation of approval; and
- D. The entry transom appears to be a reasonably faithful reproduction of the existing transom; now

Therefore be it resolved that CB, Man. recommends:

- A. That the application be revisited by the Commission; and

- B. That the dormer and dormer windows be reconstructions of the original condition historic designs;
and
- C. **Approval** of the transom window.

Vote: Unanimous, with 38 Board members in favor.

Valerie De La Rosa, *Chair*
Eugene Yoo, *First Vice Chair*
Donna Raftery, *Second Vice Chair*



Antony Wong, *Treasurer*
Emma Smith, *Secretary*
Mark Diller, *District Manager*
Brian Pape, *Assistant Secretary*

Community Board No. 2, Manhattan

3 Washington Square Village
NEW YORK, NY 10012-1899

www.manhattancb2.org

P: 212-979-2272 F: 212-254-5102 E: info@manhattancb2.org

Greenwich Village ♦ Little Italy ♦ SoHo ♦ NoHo ♦ Hudson Square ♦ Chinatown ♦ Gansevoort Market

November 21, 2025

Sarah Carroll, Chair
NYC Landmarks Preservation Commission
One Centre St., 9th Floor North
New York, New York 10007

Dear Chair Carroll:

At its Full Board meeting on November 20, 2025, Community Board #2, Manhattan (CB2, Man.) adopted the following resolution:

2. *432 Hudson St. (Greenwich Village Historic District) – Application is to restore the front façade, remove metal fire escape, replace windows, install shopfront at street level, add stair bulkhead & mechanical equipment at roof level, construct 2-story extension at rear yard, install terrace pavers and window monitors at existing roof over 1st floor in rear yard.

(Laid Over)

Valerie De La Rosa, *Chair*
Eugene Yoo, *First Vice Chair*
Donna Raftery, *Second Vice Chair*



Antony Wong, *Treasurer*
Emma Smith, *Secretary*
Mark Diller, *District Manager*
Brian Pape, *Assistant Secretary*

Community Board No. 2, Manhattan

3 Washington Square Village
NEW YORK, NY 10012-1899

www.manhattancb2.org

P: 212-979-2272 F: 212-254-5102 E: info@manhattancb2.org

Greenwich Village ♦ Little Italy ♦ SoHo ♦ NoHo ♦ Hudson Square ♦ Chinatown ♦ Gansevoort Market

November 21, 2025

Sarah Carroll, Chair
NYC Landmarks Preservation Commission
One Centre St., 9th Floor North
New York, New York 10007

Dear Chair Carroll:

At its Full Board meeting on November 20, 2025, Community Board #2, Manhattan (CB2, Man.) adopted the following resolution:

3. *59 Morton St. (Greenwich Village Historic District) – Application is to construct a 2-story rear addition and replace the existing rear windows.

(To be Reviewed at Staff Level)

Valerie De La Rosa, *Chair*
Eugene Yoo, *First Vice Chair*
Donna Raftery, *Second Vice Chair*



Antony Wong, *Treasurer*
Emma Smith, *Secretary*
Mark Diller, *District Manager*
Brian Pape, *Assistant Secretary*

Community Board No. 2, Manhattan

3 Washington Square Village
NEW YORK, NY 10012-1899

www.manhattancb2.org

P: 212-979-2272 F: 212-254-5102 E: info@manhattancb2.org

Greenwich Village ♦ Little Italy ♦ SoHo ♦ NoHo ♦ Hudson Square ♦ Chinatown ♦ Gansevoort Market

November 21, 2025

Sarah Carroll, Chair
NYC Landmarks Preservation Commission
One Centre St., 9th Floor North
New York, New York 10007

Dear Chair Carroll:

At its Full Board meeting on November 20, 2025, Community Board #2, Manhattan (CB2, Man.) adopted the following resolution:

4. *252 W. 11th St. – Application is to replace windows, create new windows and door openings, reframe roof to make it level, install new railing at roof, renovate the rear yard, repair small retaining wall, install a new roof bulkhead, install new rooftop mechanical units (also vents), rebuild bay window, fill in existing through-wall ac units, brownstone repairs, paint/repair door, paint/repair railings/fence and extend existing curb under fence, replace and relocate light fixtures

Whereas:

- A. The building is being restored to single family use from the current multi-family configuration; and
- B. The building has been poorly maintained and much of the proposed work is to make necessary restoration and repairs; and
- C. The west facade current condition is original full size historic blind windows and the proposal is to replace them with non-historic half size windows at the sides at each position in order to accommodate the relationship of the existing chimney flues and this disturbs the original design of blind windows, which are prevalent at the street -facing sides of row houses in the district; and
- D. The wood trim for windows and the front door is black and the door would be better in an approved color typical of the neighborhood; and
- E. The garden will be restored with bluestone; and

- F. Mechanical equipment is optimally placed, not visible from the street, and stair bulkhead is clad in vertical metal siding in an objectionably dark color, making it more obtrusive than necessary; and
- G. There are appropriate lighting fixtures at the front and garden; now

Therefore be it resolved that CB2, Man. recommends:

- A. **Approval** of the general restoration, black trim, excepting the front door, garden design, and lighting fixtures; and
- B. **Denial** of the black color for the front door and that it be in an approved historic color similar to examples in the district; and
- C. **Denial** of the proposed narrow windows on both ends of the west facade and that the blind windows remain at the front and full-size windows be inserted into the blind window recesses at the rear; and
- D. That the stair bulkhead be made less obtrusive by being painted in a lighter approved historic color.

Vote: Unanimous, with 38 Board members in favor.

Valerie De La Rosa, *Chair*
Eugene Yoo, *First Vice Chair*
Donna Raftery, *Second Vice Chair*



Antony Wong, *Treasurer*
Emma Smith, *Secretary*
Mark Diller, *District Manager*
Brian Pape, *Assistant Secretary*

Community Board No. 2, Manhattan

3 Washington Square Village
NEW YORK, NY 10012-1899

www.manhattancb2.org

P: 212-979-2272 F: 212-254-5102 E: info@manhattancb2.org

Greenwich Village ♦ Little Italy ♦ SoHo ♦ NoHo ♦ Hudson Square ♦ Chinatown ♦ Gansevoort Market

November 21, 2025

Sarah Carroll, Chair
NYC Landmarks Preservation Commission
One Centre St., 9th Floor North
New York, New York 10007

Dear Chair Carroll:

At its Full Board meeting on November 20, 2025, Community Board #2, Manhattan (CB2, Man.) adopted the following resolution:

5. *48 Commerce St. – (Greenwich Village Historic District) – Application is to restore the front façade at basement through level 3, remove and replace front facade at level 4 with new dormer and mansard roof, restore cornice to the front facade, replace metal stoop, replace windows, replace door at basement, replace door and transom at level 1, add gas lantern on post, remove and add windows on south facade, remove and add windows on rear facade, add stair bulkhead & mechanical equipment at roof level, install terrace pavers on pedestal system at new roof.

Whereas:

- A. The building lies in a special corner of Greenwich Village in a street with the oldest house in the village, the Cherry Lane Theatre and the notable “two sisters” houses; and
- B. The building is being restored to single family use from the current multi-family configuration; and
- C. Replacement of windows is to be reviewed by Commission staff; and
- D. The fourth-floor addition façade aligned with the original front facade is proposed to be replaced with a light-colored mansard roof, awkwardly placed on, rather than behind, the cornice, and an ill-proportioned narrow central white dormer with a pointed top; and
- E. A roof deck behind the mansard is not visible; and
- F. Mechanical equipment is on the northwest corner of the roof directly below the windows of a neighboring building and could be repositioned to the opposite side; and

- G. The wide bulkhead in zinc coated copper is visible from public thoroughfares and is typical of the visible bulkheads in the neighborhood; and
- H. The rear facade parlor basement and parlor floor windows are full width and typical of the neighborhood; and
- I. The garden is to be excavated to a depth of 12” and clear of the property line and the applicant represented that it does not require underpinning of neighboring properties; and
- J. The curved metal front stairs are to be replaced with a similar design; and
- K. The basement security bars are of an unacceptably modern design following the pattern of the window mullions rather vertical spindles with historic reference; and
- L. An unusually wide and impractical security gate is proposed and would better be a typical double, self-closing gate; and
- M. A member of the public spoke against the positioning of the mechanical equipment and the stair bulkhead; now

Therefore be it resolved that CB2, Man. recommends:

- A. **Approval** of the mansard and dormer provided that the mansard is set behind the cornice, the dormer is wider and generally better proportioned, and that the mansard is in a subdued historic color; and
- B. That the mechanical equipment be repositioned to the southwest corner of the roof away from neighboring windows and that suitable measures are taken to shield the noise from surrounding buildings; and
- C. **Approval** of the rear basement and parlor floor windows and the rear garden excavation provided that care is taken to preserve the integrity of adjoining properties and the subject property; and
- D. **Approval** of the replacement curved metal entrance stairs similar to the existing stairs; and
- E. **Denial** of the wide security gate and that it be replaced with the usual double self-closing design; and
- F. **Denial** of the basement window bars and that they be of historic spindle design in keeping with the stair railings

Vote: Unanimous, with 38 Board members in favor.

Valerie De La Rosa, *Chair*
Eugene Yoo, *First Vice Chair*
Donna Raftery, *Second Vice Chair*



Antony Wong, *Treasurer*
Emma Smith, *Secretary*
Mark Diller, *District Manager*
Brian Pape, *Assistant Secretary*

Community Board No. 2, Manhattan

3 Washington Square Village
NEW YORK, NY 10012-1899

www.manhattancb2.org

P: 212-979-2272 F: 212-254-5102 E: info@manhattancb2.org

Greenwich Village ♦ Little Italy ♦ SoHo ♦ NoHo ♦ Hudson Square ♦ Chinatown ♦ Gansevoort Market

November 21, 2025

Sarah Carroll, Chair
NYC Landmarks Preservation Commission
One Centre St., 9th Floor North
New York, New York 10007

Dear Chair Carroll:

At its Full Board meeting on November 20, 2025, Community Board #2, Manhattan (CB2, Man.) adopted the following resolution:

6. *83 & 85 Sullivan St. (Sullivan-Thompson Historic District.)– Application is to combine the two houses, install new two-over-two wood windows, new shutters, reconstruct the deteriorated side and rear walls at 85 Sullivan, excavate at the rear yard, and install new additions at the roof, rear, and side alley.

Whereas:

- A. The two houses, 83 and 85 Sullivan Street were built as identical row houses in 1825 following an 1819 fire that destroyed the original buildings. They are located within the Sullivan-Thompson Historic District and were designated as individual landmarks in 1973, prior to the creation the district in 2016; and
- B. It is a policy of the Landmarks Commission that the designation as an individual landmark that lies within a landmark district adds an extra layer of protection for the property and an expectation that owners exercise diligence in preserving these special historic buildings; and
- C. The rare pair of buildings is among the few remaining row houses that were prevalent prior to the area's industrialization and are additionally rare in being designated as a pair; and
- D. The demolition of 87 some years ago and the site's now being used as a parking lot creates an unusual degree of visibility of the garden of 85; and
- E. Throughout the two buildings, considerable restoration will be required. In particular the rear and north facades of 85, vacant and neglected for a number of years, are represented by the applicant as too deteriorated to be repaired and must be rebuilt; and

- F. The extension at 83 and the stucco small addition to 85 are to be removed; and
- G. The design for windows on the rear facades is in a disorderly configuration of a combination of past intervention and new placements and have no reference to historic design; and
- H. The single pane modern windows amplify the unsuitability of the rear fenestration and are unacceptable; and
- I. The rear step-back extension side wall in adobe colored stucco is blatantly visible which further emphasizes their unsuitability and destruction of the integrity of the building; and
- J. The modern glass extension with hanging garden balconies is alien to the building and the very sense of historic preservation with the visibility of the rear facades through the glass makes them an artifact on display rather than honoring the purity of the original buildings; and
- K. There is a deep cellar excavation below the extension, some of which requires underpinning of adjacent properties and a smaller excavation for the elevator on the south side of 83 which requires underpinning of the adjacent house; and
- L. The alley (horse walk) is proposed to be enclosed with an unsuitable entrance that denies its historic appearance; and
- M. The front facades will be repaired and new windows of historic design and shutters are to be installed and certain detailed drawings and designs were missing from the presentation; and
- N. Designation Photos show different front doors and a 1940 photograph provides design for the proposed replacements; and
- O. The proposed very large penthouse makes little distinction between the two houses, serves to unite the appearance rather than preserve the separation of two houses, and is completely visible from public thoroughfares and overwhelms the modest houses; and
- P. The proposed copper material is being used in a manner without precedent in the district, unduly asserts itself with a vast, highly visible area, and underlines the non-historic interventions prevalent in the overall design; and
- Q. Throughout the presentation the applicant was unable to provide details of materials, designs, and other matters which made proper evaluations impossible in a number of instances; now

Therefore be it resolve that CB2, Man. recommends:

- A. **Approval** of the rebuilding of the masonry of the rear and north facades of 85 and the removal of the extensions; and
- B. **Denial** of the window configuration and modern one pane windows in the rear facade and that the configuration follow historic design of punched double hung windows with tripartite placement and that the windows be historic wooden double-hung design and size; and
- C. **Denial** of the rear extension with its highly visible side walls, astonishingly inappropriate glass walls, balconies, hanging garden plantings and relighting of the rear facade as an artifice; and

- D. **Approval** of the excavation of the new cellar and elevator provided that care is taken to follow engineering principals and regulations with the underpinning for the integrity of adjacent properties and the subject property; and
- E. **Denial** of the street facing entrance to the alley (horse walk) and that it be preserved in the historic manner; and
- F. **Approval** of the front facade restoration, shutters, windows, and doors provided that Commission staff ensure that the details, missing from the presentation at the public meeting, are appropriate; and
- G. **Denial** of the rooftop addition as overly large with a highly visible roof in an inappropriate copper material, and erasing the important distinction of two separate buildings; and
- H. That throughout Commission staff verify the appropriateness of details such as materials and colors missing from the public meeting presentation.
- I. That the commission take "no action" on the application at this time and instruct the applicant to return to the Community Board Landmarks Committee with a revised application that respects the preservation of these historic houses and affords them the special consideration due any landmark property and especially a pair of individual landmarks.

Vote: Unanimous, with 38 Board members in favor.

Valerie De La Rosa, *Chair*
Eugene Yoo, *First Vice Chair*
Donna Raftery, *Second Vice Chair*



Antony Wong, *Treasurer*
Emma Smith, *Secretary*
Mark Diller, *District Manager*
Brian Pape, *Assistant Secretary*

Community Board No. 2, Manhattan

3 Washington Square Village
NEW YORK, NY 10012-1899

www.manhattancb2.org

P: 212-979-2272 F: 212-254-5102 E: info@manhattancb2.org

Greenwich Village ♦ Little Italy ♦ SoHo ♦ NoHo ♦ Hudson Square ♦ Chinatown ♦ Gansevoort Market

November 21, 2025

Sarah Carroll, Chair
NYC Landmarks Preservation Commission
One Centre St., 9th Floor North
New York, New York 10007

Dear Chair Carroll:

At its Full Board meeting on November 20, 2025, Community Board #2, Manhattan (CB2, Man.) adopted the following resolution:

SECOND LANDMARKS MEETING

7. * 41-43 Mercer St. (SoHo Cast Iron Historic District) – Application is to demolish an existing garage at #41 and construct a new building in its place and to combine the new building with #43 which is to have a rooftop addition and storefront alterations.

Whereas:

- A. The proposal includes demolishing the non-historic garage building, lately used as an antique shop, at 41; and
- B. The house at 43 has had several enlargements over time and most recently was converted to industrial use; and its intricate, historic fire escape is to be retained; and
- C. The design for the 41 facade in off-white aluminum is drawn from an existing building and rendered with contemporary modifications of the proportions, pilasters, detailing and varying ceiling heights all of which, apart from detailing in certain pilasters, are appropriate to the district; and
- D. Certain pilasters are fitted with glass window panels which disturb the rhythm of the strictly historically regular facade and would present an odd, decorative appearance and would call undue attention to themselves when lit in the evening; and
- E. The ground floor at 41 is two central fixed windows with doors on either side and the spacing of infill with windows continues through the upper stories, giving a vertical thrust typical of So-Ho cast iron buildings; and

- F. At 43 there is typical contemporary infill with a large central plate glass show window with flanking entrances and it disturbingly has no bulkhead, a feature shown in the examples presented by the applicant and are a historic feature prevalent in the district; and
- G. The roof-top extension at 43 is a full width artist skylight with setback sixth and seventh levels which are not visible from the front of the building and minimally visible from a block away along an alley; and
- H. The existing rear facade is four stories and the addition above is a continuation of the existing front floors; and
- I. There is a minimal ramp at 43 for accessible entrance; and
- J. The cellar is 10' high and no excavation or underpinning will be required; and
- K. The distinctively different design of the facades commendably keeps the appearance of two separate, unrelated buildings; and
- L. Members of the public spoke in support of the application; now

Therefore be it resolved that CB2, Man. recommends:

- A. **Approval** of the facade design and overall design of 41 with the exception of the pilasters with glass windows; and
- B. **Denial** of the inappropriate pilasters with glass windows and that they be replaced with pilasters identical to the solid examples elsewhere the facade; and
- C. **Approval** of the facade and extensions of 43 with the exception of the ground floor infill; and
- D. **Denial** of the ground floor infill at 43 and that the infill be framed in wood with substantial bulkheads found elsewhere in similar buildings in the district.

Vote: Unanimous, with 38 Board members in favor.

Valerie De La Rosa, *Chair*
Eugene Yoo, *First Vice Chair*
Donna Raftery, *Second Vice Chair*



Antony Wong, *Treasurer*
Emma Smith, *Secretary*
Mark Diller, *District Manager*
Brian Pape, *Assistant Secretary*

Community Board No. 2, Manhattan

3 Washington Square Village
NEW YORK, NY 10012-1899

www.manhattancb2.org

P: 212-979-2272 F: 212-254-5102 E: info@manhattancb2.org

Greenwich Village ♦ Little Italy ♦ SoHo ♦ NoHo ♦ Hudson Square ♦ Chinatown ♦ Gansevoort Market

November 21, 2025

Sarah Carroll, Chair
NYC Landmarks Preservation Commission
One Centre St., 9th Floor North
New York, New York 10007

Dear Chair Carroll:

At its Full Board meeting on November 20, 2025, Community Board #2, Manhattan (CB2, Man.) adopted the following resolution

8. *79 Christopher St. (Greenwich Village Historic District) – Application is to construct a visible rooftop addition, raise the west side roof parapet for the addition, raise and construct a brick chimney at the east side, install visible south and west rooftop guardrails, and alter the rear facade window openings

Whereas:

- A. The house is 16' wide, tapering narrower toward the rear and build as a rectory for the adjoining church; and
- B. The proposed rooftop addition is set back from the front facade in line with the front of the existing stairwell and the existing end curved stair configuration is to extend to the roof; and
- C. The penthouse is in brick with a peaked metal roof and occupies the full width of the house and the roof design and width were represented by the applicant as being required by fire department regulations for access to the back of the roof; and
- D. The front wall is full length windows framed in wood and there are open arch “wing” returns at the east and west of the windows; and
- E. A new rear chimney is at the rear of the addition, and both chimneys are extended to meet code requirements; and
- F. A parapet is added and railings are added at the front; and
- G. The material is brick similar to the existing material with a metal roof; and

H. The full view of the penthouse from a medium distance on a public thoroughfare is amplified by its unusual design with a peaked roof and there is lesser visibility from nearby; now

Therefore be it resolved that CB2, Man. recommends:

- A. Denial of the penthouse unless it is moved to the rear of the staircase landing with a usual sloped roof for the portion of the staircase forward of the landing and that, fire department regulations permitting, the rest of the roof be flat, all to minimize visibility; and
- B. Approval of the parapet, railing, and chimney extensions.

Vote: Unanimous, with 38 Board members in favor.

Valerie De La Rosa, *Chair*
Eugene Yoo, *First Vice Chair*
Donna Raftery, *Second Vice Chair*



Antony Wong, *Treasurer*
Emma Smith, *Secretary*
Mark Diller, *District Manager*
Brian Pape, *Assistant Secretary*

Community Board No. 2, Manhattan

3 Washington Square Village
NEW YORK, NY 10012-1899

www.manhattancb2.org

P: 212-979-2272 F: 212-254-5102 E: info@manhattancb2.org

Greenwich Village ♦ Little Italy ♦ SoHo ♦ NoHo ♦ Hudson Square ♦ Chinatown ♦ Gansevoort Market

November 21, 2025

Sarah Carroll, Chair
NYC Landmarks Preservation Commission
One Centre St., 9th Floor North
New York, New York 10007

Dear Chair Carroll:

At its Full Board meeting on November 20, 2025, Community Board #2, Manhattan (CB2, Man.) adopted the following resolution

8. *390 Avenue of the Americas (Greenwich Village Historic District) – Application is to replace the existing 2nd and 3rd floor ribbon fixed windows, replace ground floor entrance storefront, install new windows and doors, enlarge the stair bulkhead, add privacy fences on 3rd floor and rooftop.

Whereas:

- A. Two buildings will be combined, and the upper floors will be converted to residential and the lower floors commercial; and
- B. The windows on the front (west) facade are to be changed to a similar design in the existing openings with overly narrow side casements for ventilation in the residential floors and new similar casement windows in secondary facades; and
- C. Privacy screens 6' high in a dark grey wood pattered composite material are, on both buildings, highly visible from public thoroughfares; and
- D. There is a modest addition toward the northeast corner for egress and, though moderately visible blends into the surrounding roofscape; now

Therefore be it resolved that CB2, Man. recommends:

- A. The approval of the installation of the front facade casement windows provided that they are wider to present a better proportion in the strip openings, and approval of the secondary facade windows as presented; and
- B. Approval of the privacy screens that, though visible, do not disturb the roofscapes; and

C. Approval of the modestly visible egress addition at the roof.

Vote: Unanimous, with 38 Board members in favor.

We respectfully request that your agency take action consistent with the positions expressed in the above.

Sincerely,



Chenault Spence, Chair
Landmarks Committee
Community Board #2, Manhattan



Valerie De La Rosa, Chair
Community Board #2, Manhattan

VDLR/fa

cc: Hon. Daniel Goldman, U.S. Representative, 10th District
Hon. Mark Levine, Manhattan Borough President
Hon. Brian Kavanagh, NY State Senate, 27th District
Hon. Brad Hoylman-Sigal, NY State Senate, 47th District
Hon. Grace Lee, State Assembly, 65th District
Hon. Deborah J. Glick, NY State Assembly, 66th District
Hon. Erik Bottcher, NYC Council, 3rd District
Hon. Christopher Marte, NYC Council, 1st District
Steven Thomson, Director of Community and Intergovernmental Affairs, LPC