CITY COUNCIL
CITY OF NEW YORK

----- X

TRANSCRIPT OF THE MINUTES

Of the

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES

----- X

July 11, 2016

Start: 11:27 a.m. Recess: 1:28 p.m.

HELD AT: 250 Broadway-Committee Rm., 16th fl.

B E F O R E: Peter A. Koo

Chairperson

COUNCIL MEMBERS:

Annabel Palma
Deborah L. Rose
Rosie Mendez
Stephen T. Levin
Inez D. Baron
Ben Kallos

Corey D. Johnson David G. Greenfield

A P P E A R A N C E S (CONTINUED)

John Jurenko

Vice President for Intergovernmental Relations and Planning of NYC Health & Hospitals

Gregory Calliste
Chief Executive Officer at Woodhull Hospital

Doctor Rosa Gil
CEO of Comunilife, Inc.

Lauren George Director of Intergovernmental Affairs at Landmarks Preservation Commission

Michael Owen Community Outreach Program Manager at Landmarks Preservation Commission

Simeon Bankoff Historic Districts Council

Henry Euler Bayside Historical Council

Robert Rubin Owner of Ahles House

Jordan Most
Representing Robert Rubin, Sheldon Lobel, P.C.

Frank Prial

Vanderbilt Cemetery Association; Architect with Beyer Blinder Belle

A P P E A R A N C E S (CONTINUED)

John Casson Historic Districts Council

Judith Lief
Park Slope Civic Council; REBNY

Peter Bray
Park Slope Historic District Committee

	4

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES 5

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

CHAIRPERSON KOO: Good morning. Good morning. I am Council Member Koo, Chair of the Subcommittee on Landmarks, Public Siting and Maritime Uses. We are joined today by Council Members Palma, Mendez, Kallos, and Johnson. We will be holding public hearings and voting on ten items today, eight landmark designations, one historic district designation, and one hospital lease. We will start with Pre-considered LU Application Number 20165648 HHK for the approval of a hospital lease pursuant to the Health & Hospitals Corporation Enabling Act. This will facilitate the development of a six-story building with 89 studio apartments for low income individuals. This proposed development is located in Council Member Cornegy's district, and he submitted a letter in support of the designation. I will now open the public hearing for this item. Doctor Rosa Gil and Gregory Calliste from Woodhull Hospital and John Jurenko from NYC Health & Hospitals. Please identify your name and start. Thank you.

JOHN JURENKO: Good morning. My name is

John Jurenko, and I'm the Vice President for

Intergovernmental Relations and Planning for New York

City Health & Hospitals. Thank you for the

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES 6 opportunity to testify in support of a proposed lease agreement between HHC and Comunilife, Incorporated for a parcel of land located on the campus of NYC Health & Hospitals/Woodhull at 179 Throop Avenue. I'm joined here today by representatives of New York City Health & Hospitals/Woodhull and Comunilife, Mr. Greg Calliste and Doctor Rosa Gil, and we have colleagues from HPD in the crowd as well. Comunilife is a community-based health and housing services provider that serves more than 3,000 New Yorkers each They own or manage more than 1,600 units of supported transitional and permanent housing, operate a full service mental health clinic which provides 23,000-plus outpatient visits annually and also operates the Life is Precious Program, a suicide prevention program for girls. As some of you know, New York City Health & Hospitals has engaged in several collaborations with housing providers and developers to create affordable, supportive and sustainable housing on parcels of land that is no longer needed for healthcare services. This proposed lease would allow New York City Health & Hospitals and Comunilife to proceed with the construction of a six-story building containing 89 units of housing.

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES 7 Thirty-five of the units would be for low income individuals, and 54 units would be for low income individuals living with mental illness who are appropriate for independent living in the community. Comunilife will provide onsite case management services as well as 24-hour building security. will be responsible for the cost associated with the construction of the building and the development and operation of the housing program. In addition, the annual rent will be 75,000 dollars per year. New York City Health & Hospitals Board of Directors conducted a public hearing in Brooklyn on January 7th, 2016 with respect to the proposed leasing, and the Board of Directors subsequently authorized the leasing of the property on February 25th, 2016. Thank you for your consideration on this proposed lease. I will now turn to Comunilife for a brief presentation.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

ROSA GIL: Good morning, Council Members, and thank you so much for giving us the opportunity to present to you what I think is a very innovative and a good thing for the community. As Mr. Jurenko said, this is a building that is located on Throop Avenue and Park Avenue, and it will have six-story

building. We will provide the social service component by having case managers in the building and we will help those individuals who are challenged by mental illness to keep their appointments in the hospital and to make sure that their needs will be met. The remaining apartments would be for persons from the community who made the criteria of 60 percent area median income or less. And this is a building that we have presented to the community, and we have gotten input from them, and we have made changes accordingly to their input. And I think that this is a good project that also will enable and help our colleagues at Woodhull. So perhaps I can turn this over to Executive Director.

2.2

2.3

everyone. I'm Gregory Calliste. I'm the Chief

Executive Officer at Woodhull Hospital. This project
is a win/win/win for Woodhull Hospital, it is for the
community, and it is for the patients. At this point
in time several, you know, very often we have a lot
of patients who are stuck at Woodhull who have mental
health conditions, but the only reason why they are
there is because of disposition problems. We can't
get suitable housing for them in the community. So

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES 9
this project will actually enable us to be able to
discharge patients based on their need. Once we have
taken care of their healthcare needs, we would be
able to discharge them into the community. So, I see
this as a win/win for everyone.

CHAIRPERSON KOO: Thank you. Any members have any questions? So, seeing no questions. Thank you.

JOHN JURENKO: Thank you.

members from the public who wish to testify on this item? Seeing none, I will now close the public hearing on this item. We will now move onto landmark designations in historic districts on our calendar.

Because of the number of items we have today, we are going to start with the presentation from Landmarks

Preservation Commission on all of the items. After

LPC has completed their testimony, we will give members of the public opportunity to testify on each item separately. I will turn over to LPC for testimony on landmarked historic district designations. We have Lauren George and Mr. Michael

Owen from LPC. Please identify yourself and start.

2.2

2.3

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES 10

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

LAUREN GEORGE: [off mic] Sorry, one moment. Yeah. Sorry for the delay on that. Let me just get this started. But just to begin, I'm Lauren George, Director of Intergovernmental Affairs and Community Affairs at Landmarks Preservation Commission New York City. Thank you so much for the opportunity to speak with you today. Wanted to first go through the explanation of our backlog project. Thank you. One moment. So, in July of 2015, the LPC initiated an 18-month plan to-- in collaboration with a wide cross-section of stakeholders to address a backlog of 95 properties that were calendared prior to 2010, but not acted upon. Eighty-five percent of these sites were calendared more than 20 years ago. The Backlog Initiative allowed for extensive public comment period followed by four special public hearings. Commissioners heard over 12 hours of verbal testimony from more than 300 speakers and received additional written testimony submitted by the public. Based on extensive feedback and LPC research Commissioners decided to prioritize 30 properties for designation by the end of 2016, putting them on the path to becoming NYC landmarks. The remaining sites were removed from the calendar as

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES 11 not a priority, based on their lack of merit or sitespecific issues, such as their relative significance, alterations that have reduced site's historical features, or the presence of other regulatory controls that would protect the structures from alteration or demolition. The Commission prioritized properties in all five boroughs representing a variety of building ages and typologies that reflect the diversity of the City. We're on track to complete these designations by the end of this calendar year. The first property we are looking at today is the Schofield House. The William H. Schofield House was part of the backlog hearing on October 8th, 2015. Six people spoke in support of the hearing and the Commissioner received several letters in support of designation. This transitional Italianate style farmhouse was constructed around 1860 as part of the estate of William Schofield, a member of one of the first families to settle City Island. The house is located at the corner of Schofield Street and William Avenue in this section of City Island, which was first settled as an English settlement in 1654 when the English Crown granted Thomas Pell [sp?] ownership of the Island. City

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES 12 Island was privately owned until 1819 when it became part of the town of Pelham in Westchester County. Ιn 1896 residents of the City Island voted to become part of New York City Proper. This house represents the period of progress for the island when it began to transition to a suburban residential community, concurrently developing from farmland to industries unique to the island, such as oyster fishing and ship building which played an important role during the 19th and 20th centuries. The house has undergone a recent sensitive restoration by its current owners, and the addition they added is appropriate to the style of the house. Sixty-five Schofield Street is one of the earliest and most intact examples of the transitional Italianate style on City Island significant for its association with this prominent early City Island Family known for their connection to the Island's oyster industry. Accordingly, LPC urges you to affirm this designation today. Okay, next up we have Greenwood Cemetery, the Fort Hamilton Parkway Entrance and the Chapel. Greenwood Cemetery was considered as part of the backlog hearing on October 8th, 2015. The entire cemetery, all of lot one shown here, was calendared and heard several

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES 13 times before. At the backlog hearing there was general support for the designation of selected buildings but not the entire cemetery. individuals representing the cemetery spoke against designation of the entire site. Greenwood is an active cemetery, and the bulk of the 478 acres consists of 46,000 separate lots and 100,000 monuments owned by an estimated 200,000 living owners. Last year, they had 1,200 burials and erected 200 new monuments. Given the potential complications of regulating an active cemetery, LPC designated only selected buildings and features of the lot and removed the rest of the lot from the calendar. designated buildings before you today are the most architecturally significant in the cemetery. Fort Hamilton Parkway Entrance is located on the southeastern side of the cemetery. It includes not only the buildings but also the brownstone gate posts, the iron gates, the low wall, and associated fencing. It was designed by Richard Mitchell Upjohn and built in 1876. The Chapel is located near the main entrance at Fifth Avenue and 25th Street and consists of the building and the front stairs. was designed by Warren and Wetmore and built in 1911.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES 14 Greenwood Cemetery was established in 1838 as one of the country's earliest and largest rural picturesque cemeteries influenced by the English Garden Movement. The Gothic Revival style was an integral part of cemetery design and was used at this time in memorials, monuments and structures. Both the Fort Hamilton Parkway entrance and the Chapel continue this gothic revival tradition that began during the cemetery's early development. This style is particularly evident in the main entrance gates shown here center and New York City landmark since 1966. The Fort Hamilton Parkway entrance was designed by Richard Mitchell Upjohn, as I said, well known for his skill in adapting Gothic Revival Style to various building types. The entrance is an excellent example of high Victorian Gothic popular during the post-Civil War years. The brownstone residence at the entrance features tall, tower-like sections, arched windows, decorative dormers, and a front and rear ornamental wooden porches. Also shown in the photograph are the inner gates, posts and fencing installed as part of the entrance complex, and map here shows the landmark site that was designated around the residence. The visitor's lounge features

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES decorative carved details and stained glass as well as four sculptured panels illustrating the four ages by John Moffitt. The Greenwood Cemetery Chapel, built from 1911 to 1913 designed by eminent [sic] architectural firm of Warren and Wetmore, best known for Grand Central Terminal 1903 to 1913. The Chapel is an excellent example of late Gothic-inspired building with both arts massing giving it a pavilionlike presence within the landscape embellished with delicate carved ornaments and stained glass windows with delicate stone tracery. The Chapel and Fort Hamilton Parkway Entrance buildings and features have excellent integrity of materials and design, and today these structures remain significant examples of Gothic-Revival style harmonious incorporate into a rural picturesque cemetery landscape. Accordingly, LPC urges you to affirm this designation. Moving on to the next item, the Van Sicklen House at 27 Gravesend Neck Road in Brooklyn. The backlog hearing for the Van Sicklen House took place on October 8th, 2015. The owner did not testify at the hearing, but subsequently sent a letter expressing opposition to the designation. At the hearing there were eight speakers in support of the designation, and the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES 16 Commission also received many written submissions in support. The Van Sicklen House is among the oldest surviving Dutch-American houses in Brooklyn, and the only known extant 18th-century house largely of stone construction in the borough. Located in the historic town center of Gravesend, the house is linked to the earliest colonial history of Brooklyn and that I occupies part of the lot of the home of Lady Deborah Moody who founded Gravesend in 1640. In 1702, farmer and property owner, Ferdinandus Van Sicklen, Jr., acquired the land around this house. Members of the Van Sicklen Family built the house in sections, beginning in the early 18th century and occupied it for the following 200 years. In the mid-18th century when the rear additions were added, the roof was recentered to a gently sloping pitch and wide spring eaves creating a profile that's typical of mid to late 18th century Dutch-American houses. Other 18th century features that make it an excellent example of Dutch-American style include its low proportions, rectangular plan, gabled end-walls in the location of door and window openings on the western façade. 1904, the house was acquired by realtor William Platt who made extensive alterations, including the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES 17 addition of dormer windows, incorporating decorative elements inspired by the Colonial Revival style in the prevalent arts and crafts movement at the time. The Platts were responsible for popularizing the longstanding idea that this had been the ancient home of Lady Deborah Moody. Agency research concluded that despite the alterations made in the early 1900's, the house largely retained its 18th century form, massing, proportions, and a large degree of its original window openings, and a number or significant architectural elements such as its spring eaves. Additionally, its subsequent alterations are significant it their own right, reflecting changes in aesthetics over time. The house remains on the original site and is located across the street from the Gravesend Van Sicklen Cemetery. The structure is one of the few remaining buildings that represent the early history of Gravesend, a significant New York colonial community. Accordingly, LPC urges you to affirm this designation. Moving to Manhattan, 57 Sullivan Street. The backlog hearing on this item was held November $5^{\rm th}$, 2015. The owner spoke in opposition to the designation. There were five speakers in support of the designation.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES 18 Commission also received many written submissions in support of the designation. Located on a portion of the South Village just north of Canal Street, developed between 1810 and 1820's, this building was constructed in 1816 as a speculative property by Carter Frederick Youmans. A three-bay, wood-framed row house, it's a fine example of the Federal style. While there have been some alterations over time, including being raised to a full third story in 1858, the building retains many significant Federal The 1858 edition is typical of the historic details. evolution of Federal-style buildings and as a significant layer in its history. In the second half the 19th century after the Civil War, the house was subdivided into apartments, which were occupied by members of the Irish immigrant owner and tenants, primarily tradesmen and craftsmen. By 1875, the basement had been converted to commercial use and was occupied by the Knickerbocker, a bar with an African-American proprietary and a multi-racial clientele. Through the 20th century most of the occupants were Italian immigrant working class families. A post 1995 restoration of the house included new entry doors at the basement and first story, new windows

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES 19 and ironwork. Today, the 57 Sullivan Street House survives as a fine example of the Federal style and a tangible reminder of the rich multicultural heritage of the South Village. Accordingly, LPC urges you affirm this designation. Thank you. Moving uptown we have Saint Michael's Episcopal Church, Parish House and Rectory. This was heard as part of the backlog initiative hearing in November 2015. owner spoke in opposition to the designation of the entire complex, but supported designation of the church. Nine people spoke in favor of designating the entire complex. In addition, the Commission received many written comments in support of designation. Saint Michael's Episcopal Church, Parish House and Rectory is meritorious as an exceptionally fine Ecclesiastical complex. Located at the northwest corner of West 99th Street and Amsterdam Avenue, Saint Michaels is organized by wealthy parishioners of Trinity Church to provide a house of worship for those who had built summer homes in the Bloomingdale section of Manhattan. Under the leadership of a single family of rectors from 1820 to 1919, Saint Michaels not only grew with the Upper West Side, but was responsible for establishing

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES 20 schools, charitable organizations and new parishes. By the end of the 19th century this church was built as improved transportation led to increased development and population growth in the Upper West The church is a Romanesque Revival and Neo-Flemish style designed by Robert Gibson and built circa 1890. The architects incorporated a number of stylistic motifs and the design to create a singularly eclectic composition sited around a landscaped courtyard. Of note are the stained glass windows from leading designers such as Tiffany Glass Studios. The rough-based limestone and tan brick Parish House designed in 1896 by F. Carles Merry and completed in 1901 by Robert Gibson employs bold Romanesque Revival-style forms such as the Palladian windows and asymmetrical massing shown here. rough-based limestone rectory also by Robert Gibson 1912 to 1913 while more upstairs [sic] similar in style and serves as an integral part of the complex. Saint Michael's Church, Parish House and Rectory is an exceptionally fine Ecclesiastical complex built at the turn of the 20th century, and all three buildings are remarkably intact and form a beautiful ensemble with significant presence on the Upper West Side.

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES 21 Accordingly, we urge you to affirm designation today. Thank you. Okay, moving to Queens, the John William and Lydia Ann Bells Ahles House from 3924 to 3926 213th Street in Queens. The backlog hearing on this item was held on October 8th, 2015. The owner's representatives spoke in opposition to the designation, and there were eight speakers in support of the designation. The Commission also received several written submission in support of the designation. The owner who opposed this designation submitted materials outlining alterations to the building and questioning whether it merits designation. Research staff undertook an extensive study of their submission and ultimately concluded that many of the alterations date to architect Lewis Walsh's 1924 redesign of the house and are significant in their own right. This impressive Second Empire-style residence updated in 1924 with Colonial Revival alterations is a rare reminder of 19th century Bayside when it was a village of substantial farmhouses and suburban villas. Now located on 213 Street in Bayside, the Ahles House was built only a few years after railroad service reached Bayside in 1866, and residential subdivisions began

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES 22 to replace farms. It's the only remaining example of the Second Empire buildings erected in Bayside during 1870's and 1880's. It retains the cubic form and dormered Mansard roof typical of the Second Empire style as well as details such as the molded cornice and hexagonal slate shingles. Very few 19th century houses survived in the borough of Queens, making the Ahles House a rare example of this period. house was constructed in 1873 by Farmer Robert Bell for his daughter Lydia and her husband John Williams Ahles, a prominent grain merchant and officer of the New York Produce Exchange. It remained in the ownership of the Ahles family until the 1940's. house was moved from its original site to its present location in 1924 to allow Christy Street, now 213th Street, to be cut through to 41st Avenue. It was then that architect Lewis Walsh, a prominent exponent of the Colonial Revival style who specialized in the revitalization of Victorian houses, simplified the building's façade by removing the original wraparound porches, bay window and scroll brackets, and replaces the original clapboard siding with stucco and installed new panel doors and multi-pane windows. The overall effect of Walsh's alterations was to

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES 23 create a building that retained its cubic massing, Mansard roof and cornice of its Second Empire origins while incorporating Colonial Revival, Arts-and-Crafts inspired 20's design elements. The relocation and alterations of the Ahles House are significant in their own right, because they reflect the historical context of the transformation of Bayside from a rural community to a commuter suburb in the early 20th century. Today this house is one of the oldest surviving in Bayside and is a significant reminder of the neighborhood's past. Therefore, we urge you to affirm this designation. Also in Queens is the Pepsi-Cola sign at 4-0947th Road, Long Island City. One of the best-known features of the New York City waterfront, the Pepsi-Cola sign has become an iconic piece of the urban landscape representing commercial advertising in American industry. Land marking the sign received a great deal of support from the public throughout the backlog process. The owner testified in opposition as well as one individual. Council Member Van Bramer supports the designation. Pepsi-Cola sign was constructed in 1940 and erected on the roof of the Pepsi-Cola bottling facility in Long Island City. Contemporary accounts attribute

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES the design to the General Outdoor Advertising Company, one of the largest advertising companies of its time. At the time of its construction the sign was the longest electric sign in New York State. Situated on the edge of the East River, the sign was clearly visible from Manhattan's eastside and the recently completed FDR. The sign's design closely reflects the company's 1939 trademark logo with red neon tubing incorporated around the edges of the letters. The 50-foot painted Pepsi bottle was probably replaced in the 70's with an updated bottle featuring the company's contemporary design. 1993, the 53-year-old sign was rebuilt due to significant deterioration. Art Craft Strauss [sic] Sign Corporation, a company that produced some of the most memorable Times Square spectaculars of the 20th century, oversaw the work and the sign was restored in a manner in keeping with the design, colors and details of the original sign. In 2003, Pepsi sold their facility to the Queens West Development Corporation. The Pepsi-Cola bottling facility was demolished and the sign was temporarily relocated. Today, the sign stands within feet of its original location inside Gantry Plaza State Park. Changes to

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES 25 the zoning code in the latter half of the 20th century and early 21st century have contributed to a reduction in the number of large illuminated signs which once crowned the factories and warehouses of many of Long Island City's most prominent companies. The Pepsi-Cola sign remains one of the most conspicuous features of New York's waterfront and serves as a reminder of Long Island City's industrial path. Accordingly, LPC urges you to affirm the designation. Thank you. Going to Staten Island now to the Vanderbilt Mausoleum. The Vanderbilt Mausoleum was heard at the special backlog hearing on October 22nd, 2015. At that hearing, six people including a representative of the Vanderbilt Cemetery Association spoke in support of the designation, and there were no speakers in opposition. At previous hearings, all of lot 250 was heard, but LPC designated only selected features of the lot, which I'll describe in detail. The Mausoleum is located at Richmond Road and Altamont Street in Staten Island. The Vanderbilt Mausoleum is an extraordinary monument to America's Gilded Age built by the country's wealthiest family at the time and combining the talents of two of America's greatest designers,

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

Richard Morris Hunt and Frederick Law Olmsted. was hailed as the most magnificent tomb of any private individual and the most costly Mausoleum in America following its 1886 completion. It was planned by William H. Vanderbilt, the son of the "Commodore" Cornelius Vanderbilt, Staten Island native who had amassed his steamboat and railroad lines, which played a major role in the 19th century development of New York City and State. When he died in 1885, William H. Vanderbilt was the richest person in American history. Dramatically sited near the apex of Toad Hill, the Mausoleum has an imposing structure with grey Quincy granite. Its location within a large private cemetery was especially rare and prestigious at a time when most ultra-wealthy New Yorkers were interred in suburban public cemeteries. Hunt's design is primarily Romanesque Rival in style featuring three arch doorways, keyhole opening and luxurious carved tympana. The country's most celebrated landscape architect, Frederick Law Olmsted designed the mausoleum grounds, although most of the original Olmsted plantings have been lost. One of the earliest collaborations between Hunt and Olmsted, the mausoleum was their first joint effort for the

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES 26

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES 27 Vanderbilt family and led to their subsequent hiring by George W. Vanderbilt for his North Carolina State Biltmore in 1889, one of America's most acclaimed unions of architecture and landscape design. LPC designated four landscape features at this site, the broad terrace in front of the mausoleum in its base and walls which were designed by Hunt and Olmsted, the Hillock [sic] enclosing the mausoleum which originally covered its roof, the entrance arch and gates adjoining the stone retaining walls at the plot's entrance, and the winding pathway connecting the entrance arch with a terrace. Internment within the mausoleum was reserved for those with the Vanderbilt family name. It houses the remains of all four of William H. and Maria Vanderbilt's sons and three of their wives who are best remembered for their matchless [sic] homes designed by outstanding American architects. Like these houses, the Vanderbilt Mausoleum is an exceptional remnant of the Gilded Age, constructed by Vanderbilt family members at the height of their wealth, power and prominence when they were commissioning some of America's finest and most enduring works of architecture.

Accordingly, the Landmarks Preservation Commission

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES 28 urges you to affirm this designation. Thank you. That concludes the backlog items, and now we're moving to the historic districts, the Park Slope Historic District Extension II. On October 28th, 2013, the LPC held a public hearing in the proposed designation of the Park Slope Historic District Extension II. Eighteen people spoke in favor of designation including representatives of the Brooklyn Borough President Marty Markowitz, Council Members Brad Lander and Steve Levin, Assembly Member Joan Millman, as well as representatives of New York Landmarks Conservancy, the Park Slope Civic Council, the Real Estate Board of New York, and the Historic Districts Council. One person testified in opposition. The Commission also received 21 letter and 84 signed petitions in favor of designation. Park Slope Historic District Extension II outlined in red here includes 292 buildings located just below Flatbush to the west of Grand Army Plaza. At the public hearing on October 29th, 17 people testified in favor. Five sections of the Park Slope Historic District Extension II are adjacent to the northern part of the existing historic district, which was designation by the LPC in 1973 and contains 1,948

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES 29 buildings. The first Park Slope Historic District Extension located in the south and east sides of the original district took place in 2012 and includes 613 buildings. The two most important factors that contributed to the growth of this neighborhood during the 19th century were transportation improvements and the development of the park, Prospect Park. Large scale development started in the 1860's close to Flatbush Avenue which was an early transportation artery through the area. The neighborhood was steadily developed with masonry row houses. The Park Slope Historic District II was largely developed between 1870 and the early 1900's. It consists of rows of well-designed masonry houses and distinguished institutional buildings designed by some of Brooklyn's leading architects. The historic district includes a catalogue of mid to late 19th century styles such as Italianate, Gothic Revival, Neo-Grec, Second Empire, Queen Anne style, Romanesque Revival, and Renaissance Revival. There are several notable apartment and institutional buildings in the historic district, including the Queen Anne style apartment houses at 76 to 82 Saint Marks Ave, designed by the popular Brooklyn Architect Montrose

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES Morris [sp?], the Renaissance Revival style Carlton Club at 85 Sixth Avenue, the Medieval Revival style apartment building at 47 Plaza Street, one of the few large apartment buildings in the district, and the Gothic Revival style Saint Augustine's Roman Catholic Church at Sixth Avenue and Sterling [sic] Place. Augustine's in another backlog property that was removed from the calendar as it is included in the boundaries of this historic district. The Park Slope District Extension II contains some of Brooklyn's most beautiful and well-preserved residential streets featuring a broad array of outstanding buildings and Ecclesiastical architecture as shown here. neighborhood contains its cohesiveness due to its streamlined street's consistent scale, residential character and architectural integrity. Accordingly, we urge you to affirm designation of this district today. Thank you.

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

CHAIRPERSON KOO: Thank you, Ms. George and Mr. Owen. I also want to use this opportunity to thank the Chair of the LPC and her staff, working hard to remove all of backlogged items on LPC calendar, and we also want to announce that we are joined by Council Member Greenfield, Chair of the

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES 31

Land Use Committee. Do any members have any

questions or remarks? Council Member Johnson?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

COUNCIL MEMBER JOHNSON: Thank you, Chair Koo for the opportunity to testify. I want to thank you and the Subcommittee for holding this public hearing today and giving New Yorkers the opportunity to testify on the great importance of these individual landmarks. I wanted to speak today about 57 Sullivan Street, which is a spectacular Federal style building in the West Village with extraordinary history and architectural significance, and it is most deserving of designation as an individual landmark. It is one of the oldest remaining buildings of its kind in Lower Manhattan and has retained its original 19th century Federal architectural style for hundreds of years. Its unique architectural characteristics are one of a kind. From its red brick façade to its paneled stone arch and its simple fan light, this small three-story gem embodies the rustic architectural history of the early 1800's. Fifty-seven Sullivan Street does not just stand out for its architectural achievements. It also plays a role in lower Manhattan's rich and vibrant history. Built in 1817, the building was erected on the former

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES 32 estate of America's third Vice President, Aaron Burr. By the 1880's, the neighborhood around Sullivan Street began to change. The industrialization of Lower Manhattan brought an influx of Italian immigrants. The old and elegant Saint John's Park which at one time was lined with beautiful Federal mansions similar to 57 Sullivan had been transformed into a freight rail terminal. Fifty-seven Sullivan was a tenement building in the early 20th century, housing many hardworking blue collar families, and it has long served as a beautiful reminder of the strong Italian heritage of Sullivan Street in the South Village. Walking around the West Village and the South Village, one is consumed by a sense of history that few other places enjoy. This is because of buildings like 57 Sullivan Street. We have a strong responsibility to safeguard these treasures for New Yorkers of today and for future generations. Testimony for designation of this site was first heard in 1970, 46 years ago. I hope that with your support we can end the long preservation limbo of this important historical site that is endured and give it landmark designation it so greatly deserves.

I want to thank the Commission for handling this on

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES 33 the backlog, and I ask my colleagues-- I'm not a member of this Subcommittee. I ask my colleagues to vote in favor of designation. Thank you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

CHAIRPERSON KOO: Thank you, Council Member Johnson. Any other members? Chair Greenfield?

COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: Thank you Landmarks Preservation Mr. Chairman. We appreciate it. I will note that Commission team. I'm actually pleased today because eight of these items are in fact backlogged items, items that the Commission has worked on with our encouragement and with the incarvent [sic] of our legislation that was signed into law last week, 775A, that actually requires the Commission to get through the backlog, and to your credit you've jumped on top of this and you've enthusiastically supported our legislation and the efforts, and I think it just proves the point that good government ends up with good results. In this case, eight new landmarks that we'll see in the city that we would not have seen, but for this effort. So, yes, consider this an opportunity for me to gloat a little bit about hard-fought legislation.

I do have a quick question, though, on the Park Slope

Historic District Extension II. Can you give us a little more details as to the importance of this extension and specifically the breadth? It seems a little bit large. I mean, you're going to have around two and a half thousand homes in one district. Are there any other areas that are as large, and what makes this so unique that it warrants this large designation? I'm in all in favor of the designation in general in terms of the area, I'm just curious about the breadth of the designation. It seems like a lot of homes.

LAUREN GEORGE: Okay, well this district was— it has been designated because of the fact of the special architectural features in the area, and it is one of the largest areas of consistently well—designed homes of this period and style. So, from the beginning this was seen as an area that was studied as a whole, as a large area, and it was taken in sections merely because the research required for such a large district takes a lot of time. So, I mean, I can't speak to why the whole entire district was not done together, but I think as for its size, because it's a very significant area.

2.2

2.3

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES 35

2 COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: Okay. I
3 appreciate the answer, none of which answered any of
4 my questions. Let me just be specific if you don't
5 mind. Specifically, what other district are of this
6 scope? Can you give me some other comparisons on

7 districts that are of this scope?

MICHAEL OWEN: Sure. The recently designated Bedford-Stuyvesant extension is close to 1,000 buildings. Central--

COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: [interposing]
Two and a half thousand.

MICHAEL OWEN: No, I know, just alsoyou're right. Also just speaking on the top-- of the
top of my head. Also recently, just talking about
recent designations that are-- have a lot. Central
Ridgewood extension was also about a thousand
buildings, and I think that Park Slope near Prospect
Park was the development was sort of very cohesive
when it was built, and it is perhaps a little bit of
unique because it's so near the park. So, it was
hard. Drawing boundaries is always a challenge for
the Commission, when to stop, and the, you know, the
research and the Chair felt that when you walk the

2.2

2.3

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES 36 blocks, it really is continuity of architecture. So, that also contributed to just so how many.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: Once again, I'm not-- I have no problem with what the Commission's doing. I just want to understand the rationale. So, effectively what the Commission is saying is that this area in Park Slope is the most historically significant area in New York City, because you've decided that you want to designate two and a half thousand homes in that area. If that's what you're saying, I'm okay with that. I just want to understand the rationale for designating such a large swath of the neighborhood where in your own testimony, you actually said this in your testimony, that part of the growth of this community was in fact the fact that we have a world-class park there and mass transit, and now this would effectively limit that growth. So, once again, I have no problem with the decision. I'm just trying to understand the rationale, and I'm trying to understand the message that this sends. So is effectively the message that the Commission is sending today is that Park Slope is the most historically significant neighborhood in New York City, and therefore it warrants an extension

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES 37 1 2 which will in total encompass two and a half thousand 3 homes? 4 LAUREN GEORGE: No, that is not what the Commission is asserting with this designation. So, I 5 would correct that for the record. I don't think--6 7 COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: [interposing] So, what are you--8 LAUREN GEORGE: that would mean--COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: [interposing] 10 11 So what are you asserting, and then please just 12 explain why it is that you've decided to designate so 13 many homes? Once again, I'm not against the 14 designations. I'm all for designations, obviously. 15 I'm just trying to understand the logic behind it. 16 MICHAEL OWEN: One other, I think, reason 17 for such a large area was the amount of support, but 18 even though it does seem like a large district, 19 we're--20 COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: [interposing] 21 To be clear, it doesn't seem like a large district. 2.2 It may in fact be the largest district in the City of

MICHAEL OWEN: No, you're correct.

2.3

24

New York.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES 38 1 LAUREN GEORGE: We'll have to get back to 2 3 you with that fact, figure. 4 MICHAEL OWEN: It is very large. 5 now as we speak, the community and the preservation groups are asking for more. There is a lot of owner 6 7 support and even testimony. A lot of the emails and 8 response we heard was even about why won't you include my block as well. So, even though--COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: [interposing] 10 11 I mean, Corey Johnson would volunteer right now to landmark his entire district, and I'm certain -- just 12 13 to be fair, I'm certain we could get Corey to get 14 support for all of that, and so would Ben Kallos. 15 Corey, is that a fair statement? 16 COUNCIL MEMBER JOHNSON: I just want seven 17 blocks in the South Village. 18 COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: Okay. 19 Kallos is that a fair statement? Okay. So, 20 effectively what the Commission is saying is that if 21 neighborhoods decide they want to-- if they want to--2.2 if they want to landmark a district, as long as there 2.3 is community support regardless of the merits, that

LAUREN GEORGE: [interposing] No.

that's going to--

24

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES 39

2.2

2.3

and they're going to be able to get whatever they want. Once again, I'm also okay with that. Simeon Bankoff just jumped up. He was very excited to hear the news. I have no problem with that. I just want to understand what the policy is of the City of New York, and this seems like a relatively large shift in terms of the policy of the Landmarks Preservation Commission.

LAUREN GEORGE: Well, I would say that under this Chair, you will note that there has been a reduction in the amount of designation overall, besides the backlog that we're dealing with. So, you know, we're-- we inherited the district which had been heard previous to this current Administration. So, I don't think that that signals a policy shift in that direction, and again, this is an area that's meritorious as a designation for the historic architectural features, and we always consider many more things than the support for a district when it comes--

COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: [interposing]

Sure, but once again, I don't want to beat a dead

horse, but I do want some clarity over here. You

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES 40 guys didn't expand it on the first time. You didn't view this as suitable. The second go-around is when you decided to expand it, and collectively but effectively we're now saying is that this is the most historically significant area in New York City because we're designating such a large slot. Once again, I have no problem with any of this, I really don't. I just want to understand what the rationale. I think it's only fair for those folks who read the tea leaves including Council Members who are here today. Folks want to have a good sense of, you know, where things are at and where's the Commission going. So, just to be clear, you're not saying that if a neighborhood decides they on their own unilaterally would like to designate themselves as a landmark, that is now the new policy of the LPC, that that is in fact -- that's what I heard, just respectfully. You're saying it's not the case. Just to be clear, that's not the case.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

LAUREN GEORGE: That is correct. The agency is mandated by the Landmarks Law as the form of expert in designating landmarks around the City, and we take support as one of the factors, mostly relying on our research and agency expertise.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES 41

2.2

2.3

council Member Greenfield: Okay. So, I'm going to leave you this final question that I just still don't understand which is what made this neighborhood so unique. Honest question. I really want to understand this. Why is this neighborhood so unique that we've decided to designate more homes here than any other neighborhood in New York City?

LAUREN GEORGE: I can't speak to previous

Administrations that designated this, the other

extensions here, so I'll have to get back to you with

more detail.

COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: Okay. I'm looking forward to that. Thank you folks.

CHAIRPERSON KOO: Thank you, Councilman Greenfield. Next we have Council Member Kallos.

appreciate the fact that the Land Use Committee is a place for debate where colleagues can respect one another but vehemently disagree and engage in zealous advocacy. It's a testament to democracy. With regards to the timeline, I heard credit being taken for specific legislation which passed very recently. Did that legislation have any impact on these items coming to the City Council today?

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES 42

2 LAUREN GEORGE: Actually--

2.2

2.3

COUNCIL MEMBER KALLOS: [interposing] Did everything you did happen before that legislation passed?

LAUREN GEORGE: Yes. The backlog plan was developed in between 2014 and 2015. So, this plan had been in place and in effect.

COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: After we introduced the legislation, Council Member Kallos. It was a good attempt, though. I appreciate it.

COUNCIL MEMBER KALLOS: And how much is left on the backlog at this point?

LAUREN GEORGE: So, we just designated another crop of eight properties, I mean groups of eight properties on June 28th. So, you'll be seeing those soon, and that's half of the 30 that have been prioritized for designation. So there are about 15 more properties to go.

COUNCIL MEMBER KALLOS: Great. And then, just in defense, I actually—— I've given funding, member item funding, to Friends of the Upper East Side Historic District and HDC and others to try to find anything they can that is historic about my council district, and sadly most of the places have

been. As far as I understand, if something is sent to LPC like a wonderfully historic 1980's 210-foot skyscraper that that might not actually—sorry, 210-foot building, not a skyscraper, that that likely wouldn't be historic in your eyes or worthy of preservation.

2.2

2.3

LAUREN GEORGE: I mean, it depends, honestly. You know, that's why we have-- the Landmarks Law has a 30-year cut-off because things change, tastes change and things become historic as every generation advances. So, you know, even post-modern buildings will be historic at some point.

COUNCIL MEMBER KALLOS: And then in terms of my colleague's concern about Park Slope, would the Upper West Side's Central Park West Historic District or the Upper West Side's Riverside West End Historic District, or the Upper East Side's Historic District or the Greenwich Village Historic District be similar in size to Park Slope?

total number of buildings in those districts I don't have off the top of my head, but geographically I know that the village actually is one of the largest and the Upper West Side including the Riverside

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES 44

Extension that was just done last fall would total similar amount.

2.2

2.3

COUNCIL MEMBER KALLOS: And one of my colleagues objects to the focus of landmarks in Manhattan. How many Council Members are you hearing from that would like to bring landmarks and historic districts to boroughs outside of Manhattan? Is there a great need? I seem to recall during the Introduction 775A the number one complaint from colleagues was that they wanted a historic district too.

LAUREN GEORGE: There definitely have been several Council Members form outer non-Manhattan boroughs that have approached us with interest in supporting community groups who are interested in land marking. In this Administration in general has the priority and the goal of land marking the diversity of our city and looking across the city at areas that aren't well-represented by landmarks on its own initiative as well.

COUNCIL MEMBER KALLOS: Thank you, and please keep up the good work, and we look forward to expanding historic districts as communities are able to move forward, and I would encourage my colleagues

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES 45 to invest their member items wisely into their communities so that their communities can in turn invest in historic districts.

CHAIRPERSON KOO: So we will now move on.

Any more remarks from our members? Okay, no. Seeing now, we will now move on to— thank you, Ms. George and Mr. Owens. We will now move on to public testimony on LU 413, designation of the William Schofield House as a historic landmarks. This house was originally constructed in 1860 and is located on City Island in Council Member Vacca's district. The Council Member supports approval of this landmark designation. I will now open the public hearing on LU 413, and Mr. Simeon Bankoff from HDC.

SIMEON BANKOFF: What? Thank you. So kind of you. Good afternoon, Council Members.

Simeon Bankoff, Historic Districts Council. You're going to be hearing quite a bit from me, because we are in favor of all of these items. Surprise. I'll keep it-- sorry?

22 UNIDENTIFIED: [off mic]

SIMEON BANKOFF: And yours.

UNIDENTIFIED: And Mendez's district.

2.3

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES 46 1 SIMEON BANKOFF: And in Council Member 2 3 Greenfield's district, too. 4 COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: Simeon, can 5 you make it interesting for us. We know you're in favor. Can you tell us in order how much in favor 6 7 you are? Like, rank them for us. 8 SIMEON BANKOFF: Well I just--9 COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: [interposing] That way at least--10 11 SIMEON BANKOFF: want to do this all at 12 once. COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: That way at 13 14 least it'll be a little more entertaining, yes. 15 SIMEON BANKOFF: Right, right. Actually, 16 I'm going to just say just about the Schofield Street 17 House--18 COUNCIL MEMBER JOHNSON: [interposing] 19 You're land marking all of Midwood. All Midwood's 20 getting landmarked. 21 SIMEON BANKOFF: One can only hope. 2.2 COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: Exciting. 23 SIMEON BANKOFF: My father lives there, so you know. 24

```
SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES 47
 1
 2
                COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: Your father is
 3
    my constituent?
                SIMEON BANKOFF: I think that he was re-
 4
     districted into Council Member Williams' district.
 5
                COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: Oh, sorry for
 6
 7
    this loss.
                SIMEON BANKOFF: Do you take the-- do you
 8
 9
    have the APNY [sic] Way [sic] subway stock [sic]?
                COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: No.
10
11
                SIMEON BANKOFF: Yeah, yeah, he used to
    be Council Member Felder's district that was
12
     redistrict--
13
14
                COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: [interposing]
15
     I have a good neighbor policy. If he needs anything,
    he can still feel free to call.
16
                SIMEON BANKOFF: Kind of you. Do
17
     something about Coney Island Avenue. It's a wreck.
18
19
    Anyway, so Schofield Street House is a simply
    beautiful house. I would recommend to all of the
20
     Council Members to take a look up at City Island.
21
     is a remarkable collection of 19th century village
2.2
23
    homes, some of which are preserved, some which re
     not. There were a number of houses that were actually
24
```

on the backlog that we're not actually forwarded into

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES 48 the designation, but we're very pleased that the Schofield Street House is one of them. Thank you, and I will continue on. You'll talk to me later.

Don't we just stay here? Let me get my stuff.

CHAIRPERSON KOO: Any more members from the public want to comment on this item? No? Okay, now then— yeah. I will now close the public hearing on this item. We will now move on to LU 414, the designation of Greenwood Cemetery Chapel and Fort Hamilton Parkway Entrance as a historical landmark. These structures are located in the historic Greenwood Cemetery in Council Member Menchaca's district, and he supports the designation. I will now open the public hearing for LU 414. We have Mr. Bankoff and also Jenny Fernandez want to make testimony.

SIMEON BANKOFF: You want to go first, Jenny?

JENNY FERNANDEZ: Sure, yes.

CHAIRPERSON KOO: Due to the volume of the material, we limit each speaker to three minutes. Thank you. Please start. Identify yourself and start now.

2.2

2.3

1

JENNY O'CONNOR: It's very nice seeing 2 3 everyone again. It's my first time back before the 4 committee. Good morning, Chair Koo, members of the Committee. My name is Jenny Fernandez from the firm of Cozen O'Connor, and I am here to testify on behalf 6 of our client, Greenwood Cemetery, on the designation 8 of the Chapel and Fort Hamilton Parkway Entrance. Thank you for the opportunity to speak before you today. Greenwood Cemetery, a National Historic 10 11 Landmark, is home to well over half a million 12 internment and includes the graves of some of 13 America's and New York's most prominent residents, making Greenwood a popular tourist destination. 14 15 Greenwood has become an important repository for 16 historical and artistic collections and has been a 17 carful and dedicated steward of its grounds and 18 buildings including several landmarks for over 177 19 Although recognized for its historic and 20 architectural significance, Greenwood remains a very active cemetery with over 1,200 burials and the 21 2.2 instalment of 200 new monuments in just one year. 2.3 Designation of the entire cemetery's grounds pose significant legal and other issues to the cemetery. 24 25 We are pleased that the Landmarks Preservation

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES 50 1 Commission determined that the individual designation 2 3 of the Chapel and Fort Hamilton Parkway Entrance was 4 the appropriate action, and the Commission has specified those features for which these structures have been deemed significant and have been designated 6 7 in its reports. Thank you for the opportunity to 8 testify before you today. 9 CHAIRPERSON KOO: Thank you. Bankoff. 10 11 SIMEON BANKOFF: Good afternoon, Council Simeon Bankoff, Executive Director of the 12 Members. 13 Historic Districts Council. We are firmly in favor of the items in front of you regarding the Greenwood 14 15 Cemetery. Let me just say as a personal note, I am going to be a permanent resident of Greenwood 16 17 Cemetery or future resident as it were, and while I--18 COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: [interposing] 19 Hopefully no time soon. 20 SIMEON BANKOFF: Well, that is the goal. 21 COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: Okay. SIMEON BANKOFF: But and while I do--2.2 2.3 would not personally object to land marking, we did understand both of the regulatory problems as well as 24

the resource problems that the Landmarks Commission

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES 51 1 would face having to write a proper and precise 2 3 designation report on 480 acres of sculpted and 4 landscaped land which is being well stewarded, well 5 cared for, and truly well-groomed by Greenwood Cemetery who is becoming in the process of doing a 6 7 very interesting transition of changing itself slowly 8 from being the working cemetery it will always be to being one of New York City's premier cultural institutions. 10 11 COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: Just out of 12 curiosity, Simeon, what is a -- what does a residence 13 go for at Greenwood Cemetery? You mentioned that you've--14 15 SIMEON BANKOFF: [interposing] I bought 16 my--17 COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: purchased a location. 18 19 SIMEON BANKOFF: Yeah, no, I bought my

SIMEON BANKOFF: Yeah, no, I bought my plot about 13 years ago, so I really couldn't say, but I would recommend that question to Rich Moreland [sp?] who's sitting up there, or you could call them, and—

24

20

21

2.2

```
SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES 52
 1
                COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: [interposing]
 2
 3
     Is it a spacious spot, or is it just like a basic
 4
     spot? What kind of spot did you--
                SIMEON BANKOFF: [interposing] OH, okay.
 5
    Well, I actually got a spot--
 6
 7
                COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: Curious, any
 8
     amenities?
                SIMEON BANKOFF: Yeah, actually it is.
                COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: Yeah.
10
11
                SIMEON BANKOFF: I got a spot not far
12
     from Peter Cooper's [sp?] spot, sort of between
13
     Cooper and Hewitt [sp?] where the new Hewitt column
14
    has been put.
15
                COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: Nice.
16
                SIMEON BANKOFF: I was actually part of
17
     one of the original plots. It's enough room for
18
    three internments and three cemeteries. Sorry, three
19
     crematoriums.
20
                COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: Stretch out a
21
    little bit.
2.2
                SIMEON BANKOFF: Exactly, my wife, you
23
    know, some good friend perhaps also. Are you asking?
     I could give you a lease. And also you can even put
24
```

plantings there if you wish.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES 53

2 COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: That's nice.

2.2

2.3

And what was your issue with Coney Island Avenue before? I just want to see--

SIMEON BANKOFF: [interposing] Well, as I go visiting both your district and my father--

COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: [interposing]
Yeah.

SIMEON BANKOFF: up and down from Windsor Terrace to the area. Coney Island Avenue in and of itself seems to have absolutely no urban design whatsoever. There's -- you're always seeing thing torn own, some real God awful ugly stuff, a whole nightmare of signs, and I just would think--

COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: [interposing]

Three points on Coney Island Avenue. The first is

that I actually, under my tenure we turned it into a

slow zone. So it's much safer now.

SIMEON BANKOFF: Okay.

COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: As a result of my NYC Clean-up initiative, we now have people cleaning the stretch of Coney Island. Obviously it's much actually cleaner. Then the New York Times actually did an article a couple years ago embracing Coney Island Avenue as a sign of how great Brooklyn

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES 54 1 is, because if you drive from the beginning of Coney 2 3 Island Avenue, you literally hit every ethnicity in 4 Brooklyn, and so it's like the cultural change 5 through your car window as you drive down Coney Island Avenue. So, I'm looking from a more positive 6 7 perspective. 8 SIMEON BANKOFF: As somebody who grew up 9 in deepest, darkest Brooklyn and is well accustomed to the Coney Island Avenue bus, it can say it's a 10 11 little bit of a visual cacophony, and it could 12 probably use a little better, but I'm glad to hear that it's safer. 13 14 COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: Yeah. 15 SIMEON BANKOFF: And the bus does come periodically. 16 17 COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: And it's 18 cleaner as well. 19 SIMEON BANKOFF: Yeah. 20 COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: Absolutely. 21 CHAIRPERSON KOO: Thank you. Any more 2.2 members from the public who wish to testify. 2.3 COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: Oh, sorry, I'm still genuinely curious about what a plot goes 24

for. Do we know what's the growing rate?

```
SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES 55
 1
 2
                JENNY FERNANDEZ: We'll be happy to get
 3
    that information.
 4
                COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: I thought we
 5
    have an expert sitting right here.
                SIMEON BANKOFF: I don't like to just--
 6
 7
    [off mic]
                COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: No, ball park
 8
 9
    me, come on.
                SIMEON BANKOFF: $17,000 and up.
10
11
                COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: Pretty good
     deal, 17,000 gets you a lifetime space.
12
13
                SIMEON BANKOFF: No monthly maintenance.
     They can't evict you.
14
15
                COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: Wow.
16
                SIMEON BANKOFF: You're there forever.
17
                COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: Excellent.
18
     Talk about rent control, huh?
19
                CHAIRPERSON KOO: It's a good deal.
20
                COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: Alright.
21
     Thank you folks.
                CHAIRPERSON KOO: So, seeing none, I will
2.2
23
    now close the public hearing on this item. We will
    now move on to LU 415, the designation of the Van
24
     Sicklen House as a historic landmark. The Van
25
```

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES 56

Sicklen House is one of the oldest surviving Dutch—
American houses in Brooklyn. Originally constructed in the early 18th century. The house is located in Council Member Treyger's district, and he supports the designation. I will now open the public hearing for LU 415, and Mr. Simeon Bankoff?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

SIMEON BANKOFF: Good afternoon, Council Simeon Bankoff, Historic Districts Council. We are very strongly in favor of the Lady Moody house, which I insist on calling it. As growing up in Brooklyn, it has always been called the Lady Moody House, although it's more properly known as the Van Sicklen House. I just have to say that one of the interesting things about this particular house in addition to its historic merit is how it kind of encompasses the change in owner's feelings about land marking over years. Mrs. Slomo [sp?] whose family owned the house from the 1940's into about 2006 originally several times objected to the land marking of the house, which is one of the reasons why it was never designated, but then upon learning more about it, upon doing what she had to do to the house and then eventually selling the house itself and not end up taking a loss because of that, had turned around

```
SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES 57
 1
     and testified in favor of designation of this
 2
 3
    property when it came up for the public hearing.
 4
                COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: To be fair,
 5
     though, I think the current owners are opposed to the
     designation.
 6
 7
                SIMEON BANKOFF: That would be-- that
 8
    seems to be the case. However, I mean, I'll just
     say--
10
                COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: [interposing]
11
     Okay.
12
                SIMEON BANKOFF: So, what are we saying
13
    here?
14
                COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: No, no, no,
15
     no. We're not saying anything. I'm just--
16
                SIMEON BANKOFF: [interposing] Right.
17
                COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: My point is--
    by the way, I'm in favor of the designation. I'm
18
19
     just saying that to be fair. I do want the record to
20
    reflect that the current owners are--
21
                SIMEON BANKOFF: [interposing] Yes, the
2.2
     current owners--
23
                COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: [interposing]
    are opposed to it. I thought you were going to
24
```

```
SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES 58
 1
    mention the interesting part of the houses that
 2
 3
     apparently it wasn't Lady Moody's house.
                SIMEON BANKOFF: Oh, no, no one ever
 4
     though it was Lady Moody's house.
 5
                COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: I think it was
 6
 7
    a well-spread rumor for many years.
                SIMEON BANKOFF: Oh, it's part of Brooklyn
 8
 9
     folklore that--
                COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: [interposing]
10
11
     Folklore, okay.
12
                SIMEON BANKOFF: But that's, you know,
13
    that just adds--
14
                COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: [interposing]
15
    It's similar to the folklore actually that Cornelius
    Vanderbilt invented the -- helped invent the potato
16
17
     chip, but when he visited--
18
                SIMEON BANKOFF: [interposing] I'm not
19
     familiar with that one.
20
                COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: when he
21
    visited a restaurant in Saratoga, but apparently that
     is also not accurate. So today we're-- this our
2.2
2.3
     Subcommittee Myth Busters hearing here.
                SIMEON BANKOFF: I would recommend at
24
```

some point that an investigation of the village grid

of Gravesend be looked at just because it actually is one of the last 17th century village grids that still exist on the streets, and some level of commemoration should happen.

2.2

2.3

COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: Alright, take a look at that. Thank you.

there any more members of the public who wish to testify? Seeing none, I will now close the public hearing on this item. We will now move onto LU 416, the designation of the Sullivan Street House as a historic landmark. The Sullivan Street House was originally constructed in 1816 in the South Village. This item is located in Council Member Johnson's district, and he supports the designation. I will now open the public hearing for LU 416. Mr. Bankoff, please testify.

SIMEON BANKOFF: Good afternoon. Simeon
Bankoff, Executive Director of the Historic Districts
Council. We are in favor of this house which as
Council Member Johnson quite rightly said is one of
the oldest houses in Lower Manhattan and definitely
one of the few wood framed houses left in the
section. I would like to say that it has been on

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES 60 people's radar screen, definitely since 2002 as part of the Federal Rural House Project that was initiated by the Landmarks Conservancy and the Greenwich Village Society for Historic Preservation, and we are pleased to see it finally take action.

2.2

2.3

CHAIRPERSON KOO: Thank you. Are there any more members of the public who wish to testify? Seeing none, I will now close the public hearing on this item. Now we will move to LU 417, the designation of Saint Michael's Episcopal Church as a historic landmark. This proposed landmark is comprised of 30 buildings, the Church, the Parish House and the Rectory. These items in Council Member Levin's district, and he submitted a letter in support of the designation. I'm sorry, Mr. Levine's district, and he submitted a letter of support of the designation. I will now open the public hearing on LU 417. Mr. Bankoff, you again. Okay.

SIMEON BANKOFF: Me again, and will I be joined by anybody?

CHAIRPERSON KOO: Thank you.

SIMEON BANKOFF: It's okay. I'm getting used to this seat. Simeon Bankoff, Executive

Director of the Historic Districts Council. Thank

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES 61 you so much for hearing me today. I will keep this very brief. This is a beautiful, beautiful church that— and building. It's truly a remarkable architectural landmark for the area. I would like to note that the interior windows are done by Tiffany. They are not covered by the landmark designation, but you know, hopefully the additional protections that landmark designation will give will hopefully focus more attention on these and should they ever need to be replaced, repaired, helped, I think that there would be lots of people who are willing to help them. Thank you.

2.2

2.3

CHAIRPERSON KOO: Council Barron just joined our committee. Thank you. Are there any members of the public who wish to testify? Seeing none, I will now close the public hearing on this item. We will now move on to LU 418, the designation of the John William and Lydia Ann Bell Ahles House as a historic landmark. This house is located in Council Member Vallone's district, and he submitted a letter of support for the designation. I will now open the public hearing for LU 418. We have Mr. Bankoff, Mr. Robert Rubin and Henry Euler, and Jordan Most to testify.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES 62

2 UNIDENTIFIED: [off mic]

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

CHAIRPERSON KOO: Okay, he's going to speak on behalf of them, okay. Thank you. Please start--

HENRY EULER: [interposing] My name-CHAIRPERSON KOO: Yeah, please start now.

HENRY EULER: My name is Henry Euler. Today I come to speak in support of land marking Ahles House in Bayside, Queens. As a lifetime member and parent recording secretary of the Bayside Historical Society, as a lifetime member of the Queens Historical Society, and as a member of Queens Preservation Council and Historic Districts Council, I feel it is important to preserve our historical past for the benefit of today's and tomorrow's generations. The Ahles House was constructed circa 1873 in the Second Empire style of architect. Robert M. Bell of the founding Bell Family of Bayside had the house constructed as the wedding present for his daughter Lydia and her future husband John William Ahles. The house itself is situated on land that has been part of the Lawrence Family Farm. The property was purchased by Mr. Bell a few years after his marriage to Catherine Lawrence. The Ahles family

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES 63 lived in the house built on the property for almost 70 years. Because of the link to the Bell and Lawrence families, two of the most prominent in Bayside's founding families, this house is believed to be the oldest standing home in Bayside. It has a unique architectural style when compared to other homes in Bayside. But even more importantly is the historical aspect of this particular site. As a lifelong resident of Bayside I have witnessed firsthand the desecration and destruction of many historic buildings in my community including the Bell homes on Bell Boulevard and 38th Avenue, the Bell Estate on 43rd Avenue and Clark Kennedy [sic] Street, the Wedding Fell [sic] Farm on Bell Boulevard near Rocky Hill Road, the Tad Dorgan [sic] House on Two Ninth Street near 43rd Avenue, and many home taken for the Clearview Expressway in 1960, including the Jacob Ruppert Mansion that was located on 42nd Avenue and 207th Street. Slowly but surely, all of our precious history is disappearing. That's why I urge the Subcommittee, this Subcommittee, the Land Use Committee and the Full City Council to landmark the Ahles House before it meets the same fate as many of our other historical Bayside homes. I also endorse

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

the land marking of the Pepsi-Cola sign being considered today and the entire Bowne Street

Community Church in Flushing which should be coming before the City Council in the near future. I also hope that the LPC and City Council will soon be considering the land marking the proposed Broadway Flushing Historic District. Queens County has many historical buildings and districts that merit landmark designation, and preservationists will continue to advocate for landmark status of these sites. Thank you for letting me testify.

2.2

2.3

CHAIRPERSON KOO: Thank you, Mr. Euler.
Mr. Bankoff?

Members. Simeon Bankoff, Executive Director of the Historic Districts Council. This home is the oldest known structure in Bayside and the last survivor of many homes once belonging to the Bell family, who were influential in the development to the early Bayside as Henry just said. This house was stuccoed [sic] and the porch was removed in the 1920's after it was moved to make room for street improvements and development. However, that is indicative of the Colonial Revival style, and these historic

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES 65 1 alterations do not detract or obscure its 2 3 characteristic Second Empire style. In fact, it's the only surviving example of that style in the area. 4 The last surviving residence other than this one located at 3808 Bell Boulevard was demolished in 1971 6 7 despite preservation efforts at the time. 8 Unfortunately, that house was replaced by a funeral home and is now used as a drab suburban office building. We are very thankful that the Landmarks 10 11 Preservation Commission has taken action to prevent 12 that from happening to this house, which is so very important to the history and understanding of the 13 14 Bayside community. Thank you. 15 CHAIRPERSON KOO: Thank you. Are there 16 any more members of the public who wish to testify?

Oh, okay. Two more, okay. We have Jordan Most and Robert Rubin.

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

JORDAN MOST: My name's Jordan Most. representing Robert Rubin. Robert Ruben is the owner of the house. I'm from the office of Sheldon Lobel, P.C. We've represented Robert Rubin actually since 2009. He's lived in that house since 1981 as a tenant and purchased the house in early 2000's. It was a backlog, obviously calendared item back in

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES 66 2009. Mr. Rubin has opposed designation since then, and is a longtime, again, resident in this house and care-er [sic] of this house, custodian of the house, but he is opposed to landmark status. And I think that a number of things that were mentioned are important to note and to draw out a little bit. house and the basis for the designation has not been so clear that originally the house-- it was the position that had been taken was that it was an excellent example of Second Empire architecture. as was actually just stated and is noted in a number of my papers and submissions, it is not anymore-- no longer a representation of Second Empire. The house was so dramatically changed that it bears very little except for possibly the slate roof and the mansard roof, are really the only aspects of Second Empire traits that are left. The house was dramatically changed in the 1930's. The house was moved also earlier. So, it's not even in its original location. It bears no resemblance, and we've shown early photographs of porches and a number of different elements. We submitted paperwork back in 2009 and again in 2015 that showed about eight different Second Empire houses that had been landmarked over

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES 67 the years by LPC, and they all retain between 60 and 100 percent of the various Second Empire traits. Whereas we found that this house had been so dramatically changed that only 20 percent of its Second -- original Second Empire traits remain intact. And I think that there's a-- I don't want to call it confusion, but I think when we responded to LPC, LPC looked a little harder and came up with some different arguments as to why this house should be landmarked. So it went from being a Second Empire house to maybe being based on certain historical elements, which are not necessarily so convincing. While it's affiliated to the Bell family, it's not Abraham Bell who's the more significant Bell of the Bell Boulevard of the Bells of Queens, and also then it became a house of fusion traits. It became a house of several different characteristics, that it was sort of melded together. So, we just feel that this house doesn't really represent a style as historically significant. I think there's a -- there is admittedly is there's -- it's an old house, and it's a nice looking house, and therefore people are scrambling to say what is a nice old house, but not

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

```
SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES 68
 1
    necessarily a historically significant house. You
 2
 3
    want to say something? Yeah, yeah, yeah.
                ROBERT RUBIN: Alright, when this was
 4
    started back in 2009--
 5
                COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: [interposing]
 6
 7
    Who are you? I'm sorry, sir.
 8
                JORDAN MOST: Robert Rubin.
 9
                ROBERT RUBIN: Rob Rubin. I'm the owner.
                COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: If you could
10
11
     identify yourself, please.
12
                ROBERT RUBIN: Oh, alright. I'm the
13
     owner.
14
                COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: Thank you.
15
    Yes?
                ROBERT RUBIN: I'm moving because I have
16
17
    Parkinson's, so please forgive me--
18
                COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: [interposing]
19
     Oh, no, no worries.
20
                ROBERT RUBIN: if I move around a little
21
    bit.
2.2
                COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: Just for the
23
    record. Thank you.
                ROBERT RUBIN: Alright. When this
24
```

started with Tony Avela [sp?], there were reports in

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES 69 newspapers that the owners lived in Florida, that he was saving the house from demolition, and it must be reserved, and it's an Empire style, it's just like its original form, and it snowballed into this big story. You know, I've been living there for 38 years now, and not once did anybody in all the years that I'm living there approach me or ring my doorbell and say, "You know, Mr. Rubin, this is a great old house and we're thinking about land marking it because of x-y-z." Never happened. He thought that -- everybody started to fear monger that it was going to be torn I'm going to spend the rest of my life in that house. I already spent 38 years, and where am I going at 62 years old? And I intent to stay there for the rest of my life. I have no desire knocking it down, but it's my home. I worked 28 years to save money to buy the house, and everybody should have the right to do what they want to do, when they want to do it, if they want to do it, of course apply for city permits, but I have no intention of changing it. I could have flipped the house for money any time I wanted between all this time. I bought the house at a very modest price because the owner was like a father to me, and I paid rent all these years, and he

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES 70 wanted to make my life easier as I get older, and that's the whole idea is to get life easier. He also was opposed when I told him all about this. So, this is all about my little [sic] life, and I think the biggest privilege in the world is to own your own home. I don't want to own a co-op. I didn't want to own a condo. I lived here since in my 20's, and I had a dream of buying it and creating my own home, and that's what I've been doing. I've been maintaining it for all these years, and I do everything myself. Unfortunately, I got Parkinson's now. It's going to get a little bit more difficult for me, but it's supposed to be an easy time as I get older, and the stress is killing me, and it really-- it's so different than what it was. I mean, there's a whole side of the wall missing if you look at the pictures of what it was and what it is. It's just amazing. There was two windows on the side, and now there's-there was three. They're taking pictures of the house like they bagged a lion, "We saved this house." They never saved it. It's not going anywhere. are they saving? They made a whole story about the lost -- all the Bayside was built the Lawrence land. And then this architect who never performed anything

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

```
SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES 71
else in Bayside, and they fear mongered the whole
place, and I people coming in my yard in the middle
of the day. I had illegal pictures taken from the
back of my house on my own property. I can't sit in
my home without people walking on it and saying, "Oh,
this is the Ahles House. Can I have a tour?" It's
not a dentist office. It's not a, you know, a
office. It's not a store. It's a home, and it's my
home, and it's being violated every single week by
people just gallivanting on my property and walking
in my yard to take pictures. It's ridiculous.
           CHAIRPERSON KOO: Thank you, Mr.--
           ROBERT RUBIN: [interposing] Rubin.
           CHAIRPERSON KOO: Rubin. Any of you have
questions?
           COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: I do indeed.
Robert was it?
           ROBERT RUBIN:
                          Yes.
           COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: Yes.
                                             Well,
thank you so much for coming out and testifying
today. So, I just I want to-- I just want to be
clear on what your objections are.
```

ROBERT RUBIN: Right.

25

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES 72

COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: So let's just put it in perspective, right? You know, I chair the Land Use Committee and I see people have these concerns all the time. So, objectively speaking, just so that you know, designating your home as a historic landmark will not diminish the value of your home. If anything, especially because it's so unique and it's such a particular neighborhood, it probably will actually increase the value of the home. So, if that's a concern, I honestly don't think you should be concerned about that. I do want to understand your other concerns, though, which is you're saying that you're worried about people trespassing or about making changes. What-- I just-- I really want to get a better sense of what your concern is, but I want to assure that most studies that have been done, especially for something I think is unique and, you know, I have-- because Simeon's on the panel, I'm happy to have him jump in here as well as an expert. Especially something unique as this, I actually don't think the value of your home will go down. I think the value of your home will actually go up once your home is designated. So, do you have other concerns

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

1	SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES 73
2	particularly about designating your home as a
3	historic landmark?
4	ROBERT RUBIN: There are a lot of
5	concerns, and it's not about money mind you.
6	Alright? Because I could have as I said, I could
7	have flipped this house and made money
8	COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: [interposing]
9	NO, but I want to assure you I think it's an
10	important point though, which is that
11	ROBERT RUBIN: [interposing] Not
12	everybody not everybody cares about money.
13	COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: No, I
14	understand that, but I don't want you to think you're
15	going to lose out from a financial perspective.
16	ROBERT RUBIN: But it's regulatory.
17	COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: Okay.
18	ROBERT RUBIN: If I wanted to do
19	something
20	COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: [interposing]
21	Yeah.
22	ROBERT RUBIN: I should never ask for
23	approval to do something.
24	COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: Yeah.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES 74 1 ROBERT RUBIN: I don't care if goes for 2 3 painting, changing my windows. 4 COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: Yeah. 5 ROBERT RUBIN: How dare someone say to me, "Well, you have to get permission." It's my 6 7 home. No one should go through that, and it is not 8 what it was. It's changed so drastically, and I don't want to go through red tape, filling out forms, you know--10 11 COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: [interposing] 12 I hear you. 13 ROBERT RUBIN: to do something that I have perfectly right to do because it is my home. 14 15 grew up and my father he did his own work, and it's a pleasure. Part of -- I live for this house, 16 17 especially now with Parkinson's. It is my lifeblood. 18 I'm not going anywhere. I love my garden. I love my 19 I love painting. I love fixing it. I love house. 20 repairing it. I don't need to be regulatory. I don't 21 need to be told what to do, what to do with it, how to do it. 2.2 2.3 COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: Fair enough.

ROBERT RUBIN: It's crazy.

25

2 COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: So, the other 3 thing I will just point out, which I think is 4 important, and once again, you know, this is -- you're obviously not new to the process because you've been 5 doing it for a few years, but I can't recall you 6 7 coming before us. I just think it's worth mentioning 8 which is that part of the reason that we designate homes or even buildings as historic, it's not because of you. I want to be clear by the way. If you ask 10 11 me, just from having you up here for five minutes, do 12 I trust Robert to do the right thing? A hundred 13 percent I trust you, and I am a pretty good judge of character, and I think you're going to do the right 14 15 thing. I think the concern is that none of us, right, 16 because we were joking before Simeon Bankoff owns a 17 plot in Greenwood Cemetery, none of us are going to 18 live forever, and we're not worried honestly about 19 Part of the purpose of designating a home as 20 historic, is we're worried about the future, right? 21 So, 20 years, 40 years, 50 years, 100 years down the 2.2 road, and quite frankly the reason in fact that there 2.3 have been so many changes to this home is that the Landmarks Law wasn't even in existence before the 24 25 changes actually happened, and so we weren't able to

preserve homes like this. But Counselor, I actually have a question for you. You know, we've been told-are you disputing this? We've been told that this is in fact the oldest known structure in Bayside and the last of the homes belonging to the Bell family, albeit perhaps not the most famous of the Bell family folks, but is that not correct or is that correct? This is an important point.

2.2

2.3

JORDAN MOST: Yeah, I don't know if it is the oldest structure in Bayside.

COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: Okay. I think that's-- I think that is what we have been told. So, my only point is that I hear the frustration, and I understand that-- and we're always reluctant to landmark homes and buildings when landlords are opposed, but you know, just because they didn't necessarily get it right the first time doesn't mean they didn't get it right, in all fairness, and I just want to put that out there. And I do think that it's important to point out that, you know, there are very good reasons for land marking a home if it is in fact the oldest known structure. If it's the only structure that is left over by the Bell family, I mean, that-- and yes, albeit that it's not entirely

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES Second Empire style, I think there are still some features that are remaining, and in fact, if you look at the previous house that we did, just so that-similar example, the Lady Moody House, a very similar in the sense of, you know, very old home in Gravesend. Owner is not thrilled. Has been changed, but once again, it's kind of a chicken versus the egg problem, which I want to point out not just for you but for the folks who are watching at home as well, which is that if you don't landmark a house, then the house is going to consistently change, and the reason that these homes have changed is because there was no land marking when they changed the homes. So, it's a complicated issue. So, my only point to you, Counselor and to Robert, is that, you know, it's not-- this isn't you, and I am sorry even though I don't know who these people are. I'm sorry that people have turned this into a crusade and made it about you and somehow have implied that you don't -- not interested in the best welfare of the house. I don't think any of that is true, and I would encourage you, honestly, if anyone trespasses on your property call 911 and have them arrested. I'm serious by the way.

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

- SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES 78
- 2 ROBERT RUBIN: They told me to get an
- 3 | electrical fence.

- 4 COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: Okay. I don't
- 5 know about an electrical fence.
- 6 ROBERT RUBIN: That's what they told me,
- 7 | because it happened way too many time.
 - COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: Okay.
- 9 ROBERT RUBIN: I have a fence and they
- 10 climbed over my fence--
- 11 | COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: [interposing]
- 12 | That's terrible.
- 13 ROBERT RUBIN: to take pictures.
- 14 COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: And we should
- 15 | call the police, and that's unacceptable. Nowhere
- 16 | should anyone do that. I want the record to reflect
- 17 | from my perspective as the Chair of the Land Use
- 18 | Committee that I think you're doing a fine job with
- 19 you home. I'm sure you care about your home. I
- 20 really don't think that's the motivation here today.
- 21 | I think really we're just worried about keeping
- 22 | something that does seem to be historic and making
- 23 | sure that it's in tact for generations to come beyond
- 24 | all of us who are sitting here. So, I hear you.

- SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES 79
- 2 ROBERT RUBIN: Well, I can assure you,
- 3 I'll be around for generations. I'm not going
- 4 anywhere and I don't think the house is going
- 5 anywhere.

- 6 COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: No, no, I
- 7 understand that. But you know, even I think the
- 8 | oldest person, the oldest person in America is 110
- 9 | years old, right?
- 10 ROBERT RUBIN: Right.
- 11 COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: And so the
- 12 point is that even if all of us live to 110, that's
- 13 | still another 50 or so years, and what we're talking
- 14 | about over here is multiple generations and
- 15 | centuries, and we're trying to preserve things well
- 16 beyond us, but I certainly hear your concerns, and I
- 17 | appreciate you coming out here today, and we'll take
- 18 | it under advisement. Thank you.
- 19 CHAIRPERSON KOO: Thank you. Council
- 20 Member Barron?
- 21 COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Thank you, Mr.
- 22 Chair. To the panel, before you leave, I just have a
- 23 few questions I want to ask. Yes. Thank you.
- 24 ROBERT RUBIN: My pleasure.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES 81 1 2 COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: [interposing] You 3 don't rent it out. 4 ROBERT RUBIN: I'm not after rentals. 5 COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Okay. ROBERT RUBIN: I always had a dream of 6 7 living in the whole house myself. I lived on the 8 downstairs--9 COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: [interposing] 10 Okay. 11 ROBERT RUBIN: twenty-eight years telling 12 the landlord, who I loved desperately, I'm going to 13 own it one day. He said, sure, sure, sure, sure. He said, "Save your money." So, I saved my money. 14 15 saved my money. Then the time came. He said, "Now 16 you're ready to buy it?" I said absolutely, and I 17 lived a dream to move upstairs, and I created the 18 whole-- the-- all the floors. The upstairs is the 19 bedrooms. The middle floor is living rooms, and the 20 bottom floor is like a basement, because I really 21 don't have a basement. So, it's like a guest room. 2.2 COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Okay. 23 ROBERT RUBIN: So, I occupy all the

24

floors.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES 82

the record, I always believe that we certainly have to look forward to the future, but I don't know that we want to have a negative impact on the present to be able to preserve what's going forward in the future, and I think that anyone who owns their own home should have greater weight in the decision as to what happens with their property.

ROBERT RUBIN: Thank you. Absolutely.

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Thank you.

ROBERT RUBIN: Thank you. Can I just add one thing?

CHAIRPERSON KOO: Yeah, go ahead. Yeah, go ahead.

ROBERT RUBIN: You know, if it was really worth land marking, I would be the first to say go do it. I have high integrity. I don't lie. I don't cheat. I live my life very cleanly. I'm an inventor. I lived there my whole entire life, just about my whole adulthood, and if it— I would be the first to stand behind it. It is so not what it was. It's ridiculous. Just if it was something of value, I would say go do it, I'm right behind it.

2.2

2.3

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES 83

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

JORDAN MOST: Well, I think the evidence of that is that there-- evidence of that, I think, in support of what Mr. Rubin is saying is that in 2009 I think Landmarks realized that at least with what was in front of them that it was clearly not a clear case, and it was-- there were so many dramatic changes to this house which was a wood clapboard house centrally located on an enormous piece of land with porches and dormers and many elements that are now gone, elements that have been added to the house, and that it becomes very much a hybrid house of varying different styles and elements, and anyway, that I think is what really what Mr. Rubin is pointing to, is that he felt a little like this was a bit grasping at the end of the day, and that's really I think where we come out on it.

CHAIRPERSON KOO: Okay, thank you. Yeah, we will take your concerns seriously.

ROBERT RUBIN: I hope so. Thank you so much.

CHAIRPERSON KOO: Are there any more members of the public who wanted to testify on this item. Seeing none, I will close the public hearing on this item. Now, we'll move on to LU 419, the

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES 84

designation of the Pepsi-Cola sign as a historic

landmark. This item is located in Council Member Van

Bramer's district and he supports the designation. I

will now open the public hearing for LU 419, and we

have Mr. Bankoff.

SIMEON BANKOFF: Good afternoon, Council Members. Simeon Bankoff, Executive Director of the Historic Districts Council. If I may be completely honest, and I think at this point in the hearing I should be, there was a lot of discussion among my board and among us about whether or not we truly supported this as a landmark. The concern coming down to the actual regulation of the property, because under the First Amendment you really can't regulate. The Landmarks Commission cannot regulate content of a sign, that this could become the Simeon Bankoff sign if they kept an appropriate font. However, during the long public hearing and a lot of discussions, we discovered that actually there are easements and agreements that are protecting this It's a very unique kind of situation so that the landmark designation of it is actually appropriate, especially when viewed in the light of

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES 85 its extraordinary public awareness in the City. So, for those reasons we support this designation.

CHAIRPERSON KOO: Thank you. Are there any more members of the public who wish to testify? Seeing none, I will now-- oh, okay. Council Member Barron?

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Yes, I have a question. Did you say that the Council Member was in favor or was opposed?

CHAIRPERSON KOO: He's in favor.

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Okay, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON KOO: Mr. Greenfield?

COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: Thank you,

Mr. Chairman. How do you feel about the fact that

Michael Bloomberg would say this encourages folks to

drink soda and therefore be obese and gain weight?

Does that concern you at all, as--

SIMEON BANKOFF: You know, I mean a similar question could be brought up with regards to elevator buildings, you know?

COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: But I don't think we're having a hearing today on elevator buildings.

2.2

2.3

```
SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES 86
 1
                SIMEON BANKOFF: Well, you know, some of
 2
 3
     these buildings might have-- actually, none of these
 4
    buildings. None of these have elevators.
 5
                COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: And quite
     frankly, quite a few people who live in those
 6
 7
    buildings are disabled, so I wouldn't agree with you-
 8
 9
                SIMEON BANKOFF: [interposing] Oh, that is
    true. I would not -- but you know what I mean.
10
11
                COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: on that.
                SIMEON BANKOFF: I think that--
12
13
                COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: [interposing]
14
     The Pepsi-Cola sign, we're encouraging people to
15
     drink sugary drinks--
16
                SIMEON BANKOFF: [interposing] If we're
17
     really--
18
                COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: which is a
19
    huge, huge cause of obesity in this country.
20
                SIMEON BANKOFF: On the other hand, as an
21
     aesthetic object, can one subtract the content from
     the form?
2.2
2.3
                COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: I want the
     record to reflect that I'm very excited that come
24
    August that there's going to be the return of Crystal
25
```

```
SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES 87
1
    Pepsi which I had when I was a teenager, and that is
2
3
     Pepsi-Cola without the food coloring. So, I'm
4
    actually looking forward to that. Highly recommend--
5
                SIMEON BANKOFF: [interposing] Are they
    ever going to bring back what was it, Pepsi-Free
6
7
     [sic]?
8
                COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: I hope they
9
    never bring that back.
10
                SIMEON BANKOFF: Yuck.
                COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD:
11
                                             Thank you.
12
                CHAIRPERSON KOO: Thank you.
                                               Council
    Member Barron?
13
14
                COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Thank you.
                                                     In
15
    terms of the finances associated with this sign, it's
16
    actually a form of free advertising or broad
17
     advertising. What financial benefit does the City
18
     accrue from Pepsi-Cola by Pepsi having this free
19
    advertising?
20
                SIMEON BANKOFF: I would actually-- I'm
21
    not privy. It's a very complicated situation with
2.2
    regards to the -- with regards to the development in
2.3
    Queens West behind it, and I know that there was--
    there were a lot of negotiations, so I can't really
24
```

answer you that on.

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: So, are there restrictions as to what can be built adjacent to this sign so that the view is not blocked or that the sign remains prominent? What are those restrictions?

SIMEON BANKOFF: I would actually ask if the LPC, because this one is a complicated kind of development issues.

LAUREN GEORGE: Hello, Council Member Barron.

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: $\operatorname{\text{Hi}}$, thank you.

LAUREN GEORGE: So, to answer your question, the City does not--

COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: [interposing]

If you could just state your name for the record.

LAUREN GEORGE: Sorry, Lauren George,

Landmarks Preservation Commission. To answer your

question about the sign and the benefit to the City,

land marking this does not require Pepsi to pay the

city in any way. It's recognizing this as a part of

the historic industrial past of the waterfront, and

so the sign would have been there regardless, I guess

is the answer, so it doesn't change that. So we're

not amplifying the sign physically in any way by land

marking it, but I think the restrictive covenants

that are in place, there are covenants and easements in place with Queens West Development Corporation when it was sold that would remain— that keep the site there in perpetuity where it is. So, you can't build— the way that the development have been built around it was specifically designed to keep the sign in a prominent location.

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: So, when a billboard goes up there's some finance arrangement that's involved with the person who owns the property putting it up. So the City now wants to landmark this, but we won't get any financial benefit.

LAUREN GEORGE: Because the-- we're not allowing it to go up for the first time. It's already been there, so it's-- you know, it's not like a new commission or it's not a new placement of the sign. It's merely acknowledging the importance of this sign and sort of the history and the industrial past of the waterfront. That's our purpose for land marking it.

22 COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON KOO: Kallos?

1 SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES 90

COUNCIL MEMBER KALLOS: Do we know the last time Pepsi paid for this advertisement for this sign?

2.2

2.3

this land was owned by the bottling plant when it was purchased by Queens West that would be the last time I understand the transaction to have taken place, when Queens West purchased the property and then demolished the plant.

COUNCIL MEMBER KALLOS: And so I'm eternally grateful to the Historic Districts Council for their knowledge and expertise. I didn't realize we could actually change the lettering provided that the font and—

SIMEON BANKOFF: [interposing] Yeah.

COUNCIL MEMBER KALLOS: So--

SIMEON BANKOFF: [interposing] If you look at the W Hotel in Union Square, which is the Guardian Life building, it used to say Guardian Life, and now it says W Hotel, and that was a landmarked property.

COUNCIL MEMBER KALLOS: Okay, so even with this landmark perhaps what we could start doing is exploring as a Council in order to, as our Land

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES 91

Use Chair acknowledged, not encourage sugary drinks,

start to try to see if we could change it to say--

2.2

2.3

SIMEON BANKOFF: [interposing] Carrots.

COUNCIL MEMBER KALLOS: David Greenfield or Queens West or something similar so that it's not a free commercial, but keeps the spirit but changes the messaging to something that is New York City-branded.

about that. I think this is where we're going to engage in our open and public debate. I think honestly the reason that we want to preserve this is that the Pepsi-Cola sign and the bottle is unique. I'm not convinced that we're simply trying to preserve advertising space. I think the goal over here of this particular landmark, even though we can't landmark the actual lettering, is to encourage current and future owners to keep this intact, because there is something wonderful about the historic nature of this sign that was built in a very particular design in 1936.

SIMEON BANKOFF: I'm actually just-
COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: [interposing]

And as much as I would love to have Greenfield

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES 92 Village emblazoned, I would actually defer, believe it or not, to the Pepsi-Cola sign because I think there is something nice and a unique characteristic of this some 80-year-old sign.

COUNCIL MEMBER KALLOS: And as a full testament to the Landmarks Preservation Law, I look forward to a future where Pepsi is no longer in business and children ask their parents, "What is Pepsi-Cola and why do they have a sign?" And that might be a future with less obesity, but yes.

CHAIRPERSON KOO: Thank you. Now, I must say, I concur with Chair Greenfield on his point.

This is strictly to-- we do this for historic purpose. Thank you. Anymore members from the public want to testify? So we're going to close on this item. We will move on-- no, we will move on to LU item 420, the designation of the Vanderbilt Mausoleum as an historic landmark. This item is located in Council Member Mathieu's district, and he has no objection to the designation. I will now open to the public hearing on LU 420 with Mr. Bankoff and also Mr. Frank Piel [sic], Prial to testify. Thank you. Please identify your name and begin.

2.2

2.3

2 FRANK PRIAL: Thank you. My name is 3 Frank Prial. I'm an architect with the firm of Beyer Blinder Belle in New York, and I'm also a trustee of 4 the Vanderbilt Cemetery Association, and I thank you for giving me opportunity to speak. I would like to 6 7 read from a letter that was prepared by the Association. On behalf of the Board of Trustees at 8 the Vanderbilt Cemetery Association, we write regarding the proposed designation of the Vanderbilt 10 11 Mausoleum in New Dorp, Staten Island as a New York 12 City landmark. As long as the Vanderbilt family and Vanderbilt descendants continue to have the right to 13 14 burial in the mausoleum and in related cemetery areas 15 of approximately 16 acres, we are in favor of the 16 designation. Furthermore, we recommend that the 17 designation if awarded include the stone entrance 18 arch to the mausoleum, the driveway and esplanade in 19 front of the tomb. All are important components of 20 the overall original design. The Vanderbilt 21 Mausoleum was commissioned by William Henry 2.2 Vanderbilt, 1821 to 1885, principal heir of 2.3 "Commodore" Cornelius Vanderbilt, 1794-1877, the founder of the New York Central and Hudson River 24 25 Railroad, builder of the first two Grand Central

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES terminals, an originator of the nation's first laws of interstate commerce. The mausoleum which was built between 1881 and 1889 is a true relic of America's Gilded Age. It represents and extraordinary collaboration by the period's foremost architect Richard Morris Hunt and landscape architect Frederick Law Olmsted. It is the largest private tomb in the country and contains the remains of six generations of Vanderbilt's, a family whose name is uniquely associated with New York's civic, social and transportation history. With a clear understanding that the Vanderbilt continue to reserve their longheld right to burial in the mausoleum and on the property, we respectfully submit that this structure, its entrance arch, driveway and esplanade merit designation as a New York City landmark. Thank you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

CHAIRPERSON KOO: Bankoff?

SIMEON BANKOFF: Good afternoon. Simeon Bankoff, Executive Director to the Historic Districts Council. We are very much in favor of this designation. We thought it was—we think it's terrific that the Vanderbilt Family Association is very strongly in favor. We reached out to them among other people and they were thrilled, and it was

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES 95 terrific to get their support. I would like to just state for the record, earlier today when the Landmarks Commission talked about how they made their choices with regard to the backlog, one of the things that was a-- it fell within the realm of why they chose not to move on things, had to do with owner consent or owner objection. While we have seen a number of owner objections today, by in large the vast number of properties they chose not to move on was because of owner objection, and the vast number of those properties were in Staten Island as well. So, we would like to ask that the Council support as Council Member Greenfield so beautifully spoke about the Ahles Bell House, support the Landmarks Commission in when it is a truly worthy and meritorious designation to move forward as when things are meritorious. Thank you so much.

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

CHAIRPERSON KOO: Thank you. Any questions for the members? No? Seeing none. Are there any more—thank you. Are there any more members of the public who wish to testify? Seeing none, I will now close the public hearing on this item. We'll now move on to LU 421, the designation of the Park Slope Historic District Extension II.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES 96

This historic district would include a total of 292

buildings, mostly three to four-story row houses in

the Park Slope neighborhood of Brooklyn. This item is

located in Council Member Lander's district, and he

has submitted a letter in support of the designation

with the boundaries that were established by the

Landmarks Preservation Commission. I will now open

the public hearing on LU item 421. We have Mr. Peter

Bray, Mr. Lief, L-i-e-f? Lief, Mr. Lief-- Mrs.,

okay, sorry. Mrs. Lief and John Casson, and of

course Mr. Bankoff. Okay, so please identify

yourself, and then you can start. Each one has three

minutes to speak.

2.2

2.3

JOHN CASSON: Hello. My name is John
Casson. Before I present my remarks, I'd like to
answer the question, "Why is this neighborhood so
unique?" Because I'm in a unique position to answer
this question. My wife and I purchased our brownstone
in Park Slope a half century ago. Ours is a truly
historic home, for its first owner was C. C. Martin,
Chief Engineer of Prospect Park who was responsible
for implementing Olmsted and Vaux's [sic] design for
the park. He later was hired by John and Washington
Roebling and became their most senior engineer

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES involved in all cases of the construction of the Brooklyn Bridge. And this, in 1983 when the bridge was opened, he was appointed superintendent and Chief Engineer of the bridge, and he purchased the home which my wife and I live in. now, my home was completed in 1883, and this was when Park Slope really took off with a very short period of time, but two things caused it: Prospect Parks development and then the opening of the bridge which improved transportation to the area dramatically. So, Park Slope really grew very quickly in a very short period of time, and it became a very large area, a very desirable area to live and became one of the fanciest areas to live in in New York city as evidence by the mansions that were once lining Prospect Park and Eighth Avenue, and then most of which are no longer there. So, that is one of the things that really did make Prospect -- Park Slope so unique and caused so many houses to be built in such a relatively short period of time. Okay. My name is John Casson--COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: [interposing] To be clear, by the way, because I asked the question. The question wasn't why it was so unique.

I know what it's unique. The question is why is it

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES 98 more unique than everywhere else in New York City, but I appreciate the answer.

2.2

2.3

I understand.

JOHN CASSON: Well, it's unique and then since it developed in a short period of time-
COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: [interposing]

JOHN CASSON: relative to other areas in New York City, and so-- and as a result they use more-- the building designs were very more similar. There was less contract [sic].

COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: I hear you.

JOHN CASSON: Okay. My name is John

Casson and I'm here to testify that I'm emphatically in favor of the Second Extension of the Park Slope

Historic District. When we came to Park Slope it was 50 years ago. It was a neighborhood in decline that many of its residents were fleeing crime including muggings, burglaries and were rampant. Crack houses were commonplace and buildings were being abandoned.

None the less in the late 1960's and 1970's, young couples that rejected the idea of living and raising a family in the suburbs recognized Park Slope's great potential. Despite its problems, there's still many attractive blocks lined with trees and handsome

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES historic homes. Park Slope offered many other advantages. The houses were large, but their prices in real estate taxes were low. It was a short inexpensive subway ride to Manhattan where many of us worked and within walking distance of many shops, Prospect Park, the Central Library, Brooklyn Museum, Botanic Garden, and BAM [sic]. Several subway lines connect this to Manhattan's numerous fractions. Perhaps the most enticing incentive at the time were the people who were moving here. They were friendly, welcoming and helpful people who were reviving the neighborhood. Those of us who moved there when we did contributed to Park Slope's transformation from an Arian decline into the dynamic and economically and social viable neighborhood it is today. Those of us who are still here want to see this attractive appearance of our beloved neighborhood protected by an expanded historic district. Based on my experience as a former Trustee of the Park Slope Civic Council and a member of its Historic District Committee, I help gather several hundred signatures from residents who support the expansion of the historic districts. I found that residents moved here-- who moved there after the initial land marking

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES 100 in 1973 also recognized that why maintain the appearance of Park Slope is so essential. historic appearance of a neighborhood is why so many people want to dine and shop and be entertained here. It is why so many domestic and foreign tourists spend time here. It is why so many movies, television shows and commercial s are filmed here. It is why so many people continue to move here. A failure to expand the boundaries to Park Slope Historic District will have an adverse effect on the historic neighborhood's appearance and heritage, and as a result, the City's economy. When the -- since the Park Slope Historic District was created in 1973 I've seen how our homes and other buildings in our block have benefit from being landmarked. We have also seen how a great many blocks have been irreversibly disfigured because they are outside the boundaries of the Park Slope Historic District. Recently, developers of historic structures and Lief [sic] block [sic] have this-- I'm sorry-- demolished--CHAIRPERSON KOO: [interposing] Please

JOHN CASSON: Okay. Just this demolished

historic structures on these blocks and erecting

1

2

3

4

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

wrap up your comments.

```
SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES 101
1
    buildings that are in congress and made the
2
3
     appearance of this historic neighborhood.
4
     Inappropriate renovations have transformed [sic] many
5
     handsome homes on these blocks into eyesores.
     result of these changes, blocks that the Landmarks
6
7
    Preservation Commission would once have included
    without reservation in an enlarged historic district
8
    are now being rejected for land marking by the LPC
    because they are now-- now too many buildings on
10
11
    these blocks that are incompatible with Park Slope's
12
     original historic structures. Expanding the Park
13
     Slope Historic District will ensure that attractive
14
    blocks that are in the neighborhood are protected.
15
     Please prevent the blocks that you are considering
16
     land marking today from being disfigured by
17
     irresponsible developers and renovators, and approve
18
     Park Slope Historic District Extension II.
19
    you.
20
                CHAIRPERSON KOO: Thank you. Now Mrs.
    Lief?
21
2.2
                JUDITH LIEF:
                             My name is Judith Lief.
2.3
     I'm a 32-year resident of Park Slope. I am Co-
    president of the Park Slope Civic Council, and I'm
24
```

also a member of REBNY. I wanted to first thank

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES 102 Council Members Lander and Levin for their ongoing support of the expansion of our historic district. I'm reading a letter written by David Alquist who's a member of the Park Slope Civic Council Historic District Committee. "We of the Park Slope Civic Council Historic District Committee respectfully urge the Council to approve this second extension of Park Slope's Historic District as originally designated by the Landmarks Preservation Commission. Park Slope's residents have for decades wanted our woefully small historic district to be extended. The Civic Council organized and advocated tirelessly for years on behalf of this extension, marshalling the process through door-to-door outreach through research and historic building records, through public meetings and hearings. We followed the letter and the spirit of the mandated process in bringing this historic district extension into reality. We urge the Landmarks Subcommittee to respect the work of the Landmarks Preservation Commission and to adopt this extension as designated by them. You should not second guess the work of those dedicated public servants charged with preserving the heritage of New York's unparalleled built environment for future

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES 103 generations. One example in our second extension is 184 Sterling Place, not far from Flatbush Avenue. This Neo-Classical building was constructed in 1912 by owner Peter Winchester Raus [sp?] to designs by architect Gostav Erda [sp?]. Raus, a prosperous dry goods merchant with a business in Manhattan had previously built an enormous mansion now demolished on Prospect Park West at Garfield Place. The huge arch central bay of his Sterling Place building together with its extra deep footprint expresses its original use as a carriage house or automobile stable. One imagines Raus in his Prospect Park West mansion telephoning his chauffer in Sterling Place to bring around the horses' carriage to his mansion. This beautiful building speaks volumes about the history of Park Slope in New York City. We have a responsibility, one the Landmark Subcommittee should share, to respect and to preserve our architectural heritage for the future. We urge this Subcommittee to support the designation of Park Slope Historic District Extension II as originally designated by the Landmarks Preservation Commission." I would also add that I'm sorry that Council Member Greenfield left the hearing, I think, because he had so many concerns

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

about the size of the expansion of Park Slope's historic district. He might have benefitted from further testimony. Thank you.

1

2

3

4

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

CHAIRPERSON KOO: Thank you. We are also joined by Council Member Steve Levin. So, sir, please identify yourself and start.

PETER BRAY: Yeah. So, I'm Peter Bray. I'm the Chair of the Park Slope Historic District Committee. I'm also a Trustee of the Park Slope Civic Council. We are here today because four elements of the land marking process work together to arrive at this last step. One, the Civic Council actively undertook a lengthy open and transparent dialogue with the community. Every property owner in the district has been aware of this process. owners have overwhelmingly endorsed the historic district through their support letters and petitions. Speaker after speaker spoke in favor of this extension at the LPC's public hearing. Three, Council Members Lander and Levin have been unwavering in their support. I want to thank them for shepherding this district through the process. Finally, the LPC exercised great discernment -- I wish Council Member Greenfield was here to hear this

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES 105 point -- in finding that just 292 buildings of the 700 buildings in this study area were worthy of protection. They had not designated every single building or every single building that owners wanted to be in the historic district. They rejected threequarters of the buildings in the study area, and the City Planning Commission has endorsed their decisions. Now, I understand that the Fortis Property Group is asking this Subcommittee to remove 184 Sterling Place from the district. They bought this building well into the process, so they understood its status and could not now claim any economic hardship because it's in the district. Instead of participating in the public process like every other public -- like every other property owner had an opportunity to do so. They seek an inappropriate favor form the subcommittee. I'm asking the subcommittee not to grant this favor. subcommittee initiated Intro 775A because it sought to hold the LPC accountable to the land marking process. For this reason, it should not permit a developer to game the process at the last minute. Moreover, granting their favor would be tantamount to lifting the deed restriction like was done on

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES 106 Rivington House. It would confer an inappropriate economic benefit on this developer without regard to the public interest, that the LPC and the City Planning Commission have upheld and is their duty to ensure the public interest. I ask that you be accountable to the public interest and the public process by keeping this district intact. And I just wanted to mention that the reason why the Park Slope Historic District is so large is because it's an enormous neighborhood. It's on the order of 150 I would invite any Council Member here. invite Council Member Greenfield to walk every single block with me. You cannot judge this neighborhood unless you've actually walked those blocks, and you'd see the tremendous consistency and integrity of Park So, it's not a numbers game. It's not why should it be 2,500 buildings. The real question is why shouldn't it be 4,000 buildings or 5,000 buildings? And the answer is, is that the LPC has suffered in terms of having the smallest budget of any city agency in the City. If it had the requisite resources in order to address Park Slope or any other neighborhood t once, today I would be four or five thousand buildings.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES 107

2 CHAIRPERSON KOO: Thank you.

3 PETER BRAY: Thank you.

1

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

CHAIRPERSON KOO: Mr. Bankoff?

SIMEON BANKOFF: Good afternoon, Council Members. Simeon Bankoff, Executive Director of the Historic Districts Council. We stand in firm support of the LPC's action to designate Park Slope Extension II which is just the latest in over 50-year attempt to preserve the historic character of this neighborhood. The preservation of Park Slope began in the 1960's when Everett and Evelyn Ortner [sp?] and Clen Lebline [sp?] and others came to-- began to buy houses in the Slope, recognized its Victorian architect and sought to become a historic district. Originally, they were before the Landmarks Commission in 1968. However, at the time, the Landmarks Commission had a moratorium for three years, which they were not allowed to act in between. They could only act for six months every three years. So, in 1972 they had a wait for three years, and during that three years they did more research, and they came back and came back with a larger historic district. And in fact I have-- I've read letters from the Landmarks Commission saying, "Well if we don't do

```
SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES 108
this now, they're just going to keep coming back with
bigger and bigger and bigger because the area is that
good. So, 1973 we got a Park Slope historic
district. Then for the ensuing however many years
that is-- I can do map-- 38 years, actually until
2000, in starting the 2000's, the Park Slope Civic
Council started agitating to finish the job and
actually protect it. This was actually-- the
Landmarks Commission was sued in a court of law for
not having looked at the rest of the Park Slope
Historic District. That suit was settled in 2005,
and then Peter and this team, the latest leadership
of the PSCC continued to outreach constantly.
They've done a fantastic job really keeping it on the
front burner of the community talking with their
elected officials, Council Member Lander, Council
Member Levin, before them Council Member de Blasio
and Council Member Yaski [sp?], before them Council
Member Fisher and Council Member Dibrienza [sp?]. We
have been working with the community for such a long
time that this is, however, not the end, but pretty--
getting closer and closer. That's it.
                                        Thank you.
           CHAIRPERSON KOO: Any questions from our
```

Mr. Levin?

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

members?

No?

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES 109

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

COUNCIL MEMBER LEVIN: Thank you. I just want to thank everybody that's here and the Park Slope Civic Council. I don't represent Park Slope anymore, but when I did in the previous term I was very proud to work with the Park Slope Civic Council and the expansion in the north Slope and, you know, the-- Park Slope is a wonderfully preserved neighborhood, and that's in large part due to owners that take care of their buildings and care about historic preservation and care about the structural integrity, the landmark integrity of this neighborhood, and that's why I fully support the, year the full expansion and commend Park Slope Civic Council on all the work that you all have done in cataloguing every single building, and to all the owners in the neighborhood, in the Historic Districts Council, and all the owners in the neighborhood for preserving their buildings and such responsible fashion. Thanks.

CHAIRPERSON KOO: Thank you. So, thank
you all for taking time to come in to testify. Are
there any more members of the public who wish to
testify? Seeing none, I will close the public
hearing on this item. That was the last item we have

1	SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES 110
2	on our calendar year for today. So, we'll now move
3	on to a vote. We are voting to recommend approval
4	for all items in the calendar except we are moving
5	to recommend approval on all items on the calendar
6	except LU 418, which we are holding which we are
7	laying over. We are voting now to approve all the
8	items. We are now voting to approve the pre-
9	considered hospital lase, LU 413, 414, 415, 416, 417,
10	419, 420, and 421. And LU 421, the designation of
11	Park Slope Historic District, historic extension II.
12	I will couple all these items on the vote for
13	approval. Counsel, please call the roll.
14	COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Chair Koo?
15	CHAIRPERSON KOO: I vote aye.
16	COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Council Member Palma?
17	COUNCIL MEMBER PALMA: I vote aye.
18	COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Council Member
19	Mendez?
20	COUNCIL MEMBER MENDEZ: Aye on all.
21	COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Council Member Levin?
22	COUNCIL MEMBER LEVIN: Aye on all.
23	COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Council Member
24	Barron?

Τ	SUBCOMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING AND MARITIME USES III
2	COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Permission to
3	explain my vote?
4	CHAIRPERSON KOO: Go ahead.
5	COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Thank you. On
6	419, the Pepsi-Cola sign, is it my understanding
7	that is it correct that the sign can in fact at
8	some point in the future carry a different message?
9	CHAIRPERSON KOO: Yes.
10	COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Okay. Then I'm
11	abstaining on 419, and I vote aye on the others.
12	COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Council Member
13	Kallos?
14	COUNCIL MEMBER KALLOS: Aye on all.
15	COMMITTEE COUNSEL: By a vote of 6 votes
16	in the affirmative, 0 in the negative and 0
17	abstentions, all items are approved and referred to
18	the Full Land Use Committee with the exception of LU
19	419 which is approved with votes of 5 votes in the
20	affirmative, 0 in the negative and 1 abstention.
21	CHAIRPERSON KOO: Okay. So meeting
22	adjourned. Thank you.
23	[gavel]

World Wide Dictation certifies that the foregoing transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings. We further certify that there is no relation to any of the parties to this action by blood or marriage, and that there is interest in the outcome of this matter.



Date July 15, 2016