1622

CITY OF NEW YORK

MANHATTAN COMMUNITY BOARD FOUR

330 West 42nd Street, 26th floor New York, NY 10036 tel: 212-736-4536 fax: 212-947-9512 www.nyc.gov/mcb4

JOHN WEIS Chair

ROBERT J. BENFATTO, JR., ESQ. District Manager

December 8, 2010

Hon Robert B. Tierney Chair, Landmarks Preservation Commission Municipal Building, 9th floor One Centre Street New York, NY 10007

Re: 467 West 21st St., Chelsea Historic District

Dear Chair Tierney:

Manhattan Community Board is writing about an application for work on the front and rear façades of 467 West 21st Street in the Chelsea Historic District Extension. On November 17th the architect made a presentation to the Landmarks Committee of the Board, which recommended approval together with suggestions for minor changes that the architect orally accepted. The Board ratified this recommendation at its regular meeting on December 1, 2020.

Since the committee meeting the Board has learned that the Commission has issued a violation for work in the rear of the building done without permits, apparently general stuccoing in the rear, and that a hearing is to be held on an application to legalize this work. The Board has received no information whether this work is fully consistent with the materials and presentation shown the committee, although the rear façade currently appears less blue than both recent memory and a photograph supplied by the applicant suggest. In the absence of full documentation at the time of the full meeting the Board cannot comment on the application for legalization.

The only work in the rear of the building actually presented to the committee concerned the windows and doors proposed for the existing rear extension. The rear of the building is fully visible from Clement Clarke Moore Park and largely so from 22nd Street just north of the park, at least in the leafless season. The proposed configuration and operation of the windows and the replacement of the existing unhistoric aluminum sash and muntins by wooden ones with profiles consistent with historic types found in rowhouses of the period will improve significantly the historic character of the rear façade, as will the repair of existing stucco window lintels. We note that the detailed materials provided indicated a

proposed stuccoing of the rear walls that appeared generally acceptable in principle but provided no details, in particular as to color.

The work on the front façade appeared largely appropriate as well, although fewer detailed materials were available. The new windows will be consistent with the historic ones in appearance, while being environmentally more sensitive by reducing heat loss though the panes. The architect agreed to ensure that the details of the existing doorway would be made consistent with those of the front windows insofar as feasible and appropriate. The work on the sidewalk in front of the fenced front garden will incorporate the significant existing pieces of stone paving into the proposed leveled and tinted concrete walkway and appears careful and appropriate. Enlargement of the existing tree pit as part of this work is acceptable, but we do query the prominent presence of a small boulder occupying much of the front garden space as inconsistent with the typical intention of Clement Clarke Moore to require planting in front of row houses. The new lightpole will be consistent with others in the row. We could wish there were greater consistency in the placement of lightpoles in the front of the houses in this handsome row; if locations were as consistent as the fixtures, all the members of the row would have a finer effect.

Sincerely,

John Weis

flasher

Chair

Manhattan Community Board 4