

CITY COUNCIL  
CITY OF NEW YORK

-----X

TRANSCRIPT OF THE MINUTES

of the

COMMITTEE ON LANDMARKS, PUBLIC SITING & MARITIME USES

-----X

October 2, 2008  
Start: 11:00 am  
Recess: N/A

HELD AT: Council Chambers  
City Hall

B E F O R E:  
JESSICA S. LAPPIN  
Chairperson

COUNCIL MEMBERS:  
Rosie Mendez  
Charles Barron  
Miguel Martinez  
Maria del Carmen Arroyo  
Leroy G. Comrie, Jr.  
John C. Liu  
James S. Oddo

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

Diane Jackier  
Director of External Affairs  
Landmarks Preservation Commission

Andrea Goldwyn  
Director of Public Policy  
Landmark Conservancy

Christopher Flag  
Employee of owner  
Terminal Stores

Steven Honig  
General Counsel  
Waterfront New York

James Pastrich  
Owner  
Pinetree Group

Edward Kirkland  
Chair of Landmarks Committee  
Community Board 4

Simeon Bankoff  
Executive Director  
Historic Districts Council

CHAIRPERSON LAPPIN: All right.

We're in business. Let's start again. Good morning. Welcome to the Land Use Subcommittee on Landmarks, Public Siting & Maritime Uses. My name is Jessica Lappin. I'm the Chair. We're joined today by Council Member Rosie Mendez of Manhattan, Council Member Charles Barron of Brooklyn, Council Member Miguel Martinez of Manhattan, Council Member Maria del Carmen Arroyo of the Bronx, Council Member Leroy Comrie of Queens and Council Member John Liu of Queens.

There are two items on the agenda. We're going to lay over the third, which is in Council Member Dickens' District, at her request. She's in support of the item, but wanted to give members of her community a greater opportunity to come and testify. So, we're going to lay that over to the next meeting. And, we're going to start with the item in Council Member Ignizio's District, the George Cunningham store at 172 Main Street in Staten Island.

And, Diane Jackier, from the Landmarks Preservation Commission is here. And, as Diane comes up, I wanted to remind, before

1  
2 people may step out, remind the members of the  
3 Committee that Friday, October 3<sup>rd</sup>, which is this  
4 Friday, which is tomorrow, it's a long week, we're  
5 having the Oversight hearing that we mentioned  
6 joint with Education about school overcrowding;  
7 the first of two. The meeting tomorrow we'll  
8 discuss the planning process; how the Department  
9 of Education and SCA develops their capital plan  
10 and goes about their overall planning process.  
11 The second meeting will be more specific to the  
12 siting process; once they identify a need, how  
13 they find locations for schools. So, we will be  
14 discussing that issue. We will also be discussing  
15 a Resolution I introduced with the Manhattan  
16 Borough President and some of our other colleagues  
17 about the issue. So, that will be tomorrow  
18 morning, 10 a.m., preceded by a rally at 9 a.m. on  
19 the steps.

20 With that, Diane. 9 a.m. tomorrow,  
21 there'll be a rally with the Borough President,  
22 other elected officials, Randi Weingarten,  
23 etcetera. And then, the hearing will begin at 10  
24 with the public expected to begin their testimony  
25 at 11:30.

1

2

COUNCIL MEMBER LIU: Is that today?

3

CHAIRPERSON LAPPIN: That's

4

tomorrow.

5

COUNCIL MEMBER LIU: I mean, here?

6

CHAIRPERSON LAPPIN: Here in the

7

Chambers.

8

COUNCIL MEMBER LIU: The rally?

9

CHAIRPERSON LAPPIN: The rally will

10

be on the steps. All right. Miss Jackier, please

11

begin.

12

DIANE JACKIER: Good morning

13

Council members. My name is Diane Jackier,

14

Director of External Affairs for the Landmarks

15

Preservation Commission. I am here today to

16

testify on the Commission's designation of the

17

George Cunningham Store, located at 173 Main Street

18

in Staten Island.

19

On April 10<sup>th</sup>, 2007, the Landmarks

20

Commission held a public hearing on the proposed

21

designation. Six people spoke in favor including

22

representatives of the Tottenville Historical

23

Society, the Preservation League of Staten Island,

24

the Westerleigh Improvement Society, the

25

Metropolitan Chapter of the Victorian Society in

1  
2 America, and the Historic Districts Council. The  
3 Commission also received letters of support from  
4 the Municipal Art Society. No one spoke in  
5 opposition to designation. On July 15, 2008, the  
6 Commission voted to designate the building a New  
7 York City landmark.

8           Built around 1892, the George  
9 Cunningham Store is a rare and intact vernacular  
10 Queen Anne-style building from the significant  
11 period of development for Tottenville. Its robust  
12 bay windows with decorative brackets are rare  
13 survivors of a once popular feature of early  
14 American commercial architecture. The building  
15 also features a distinctive decorated gable end  
16 that gives this small one-story building great  
17 presence on the street. It is the best preserved  
18 of the early shops remaining on Tottenville's Main  
19 Street and perhaps one of the few shops with bay  
20 windows remaining in New York City.

21           Founded in the 1840s on the  
22 industries of oyster fishing and shipbuilding,  
23 Tottenville became the largest town on Staten  
24 Island's South Shore in the nineteenth century.  
25 This little shop represented the emerging

1 commercial success of the town's Main Street. From  
2 1892 to 1913, it served as George Cunningham's  
3 Butcher Shop. From 1913 to 1957, it was Benjamin  
4 Williams's Real Estate and Insurance Office. Their  
5 combined occupancy, spanning 65 years, documented  
6 Main Street's long-lasting commercial viability.  
7 The building currently serves as an office for a  
8 heating-supply company. The Commission urges you  
9 to affirm the designation.  
10

11 CHAIRPERSON LAPPIN: And, my  
12 colleagues have any questions? Great. Thank you.  
13 I should note that Council Member Ignizio, who  
14 does not always support Landmark designations, is  
15 in support of this designation. And, we have  
16 Andrea Goldwyn here from the Landmarks  
17 Conservancy, who is the only other person signed  
18 up to testify on this. Is that correct? Okay.

19 ANDREA GOLDWYN: Thank you. Good  
20 morning, Chair Lappin and members of the City  
21 Council. I'm Andrea Goldwyn, speaking on behalf  
22 of the New York Landmarks Conservancy. The  
23 Conservancy supports the designation of 173 Main  
24 Street, Staten Island, as an individual landmark  
25 and urges the Subcommittee, and eventually the

1  
2 full City Council, to affirm this designation.

3 173 Main Street in Tottenville,  
4 Staten Island, was built in 1892 as a vernacular  
5 structure with Queen Anne-style details that were  
6 typical of the late 19<sup>th</sup> Century. The one-story  
7 commercial building conveys a particular charm as  
8 it has retained many of its original elements,  
9 including wooden clapboards and fish scale  
10 shingles, an elaborate wooden gable end feature  
11 and projecting storefront windows supported by  
12 carved wooden brackets. Overall, it's a nicely  
13 preserved example of a vernacular commercial  
14 building enlivened by well-crafted details.

15 Furthermore, the building recalls  
16 the 19<sup>th</sup> century history of Staten Island. Fueled  
17 by the oyster and shipbuilding industries,  
18 Tottenville was the largest town on Staten  
19 Island's South Shore when George Cunningham had  
20 his butcher shop at 173 Main. While much of Main  
21 Street's historic fabric has been lost to  
22 demolition and new development, 173 Main Street is  
23 an intact reminder of that previous era.

24 In conclusion, the Conservancy  
25 finds that 173 Main Street, Staten Island, the



1  
2 former George Cunningham Store, possesses the  
3 special character required for Landmarks  
4 designation and supports this designation as an  
5 individual landmark and is one of a series of  
6 recent designations on Staten Island. Thank you  
7 for the opportunity to present the Conservancy's  
8 views.

9 CHAIRPERSON LAPPIN: Thank you.

10 Any questions? Seeing none, the hearing on this  
11 item is closed. I'm going to open the hearing on  
12 the item that's in Speaker Quinn's district, the  
13 West Chelsea Historic District, Item Number 884  
14 and ask Miss Jackier to come back and testify on  
15 that item.

16 DIANE JACKIER: Good morning  
17 Council members. My name is Diane Jackier,  
18 Director of External Affairs at the Landmarks  
19 Commission. I'm here to testify on the  
20 Commission's designation of the West Chelsea  
21 Historic District in Manhattan.

22 On May 13<sup>th</sup>, 2008, the Commission  
23 held a public hearing on the proposed designation.  
24 Ten people spoke in favor, including  
25 representatives of City Council, Speaker Christine

1  
2 Quinn, Borough President Scott Stringer, State  
3 Senator Thomas Duane, Assembly Member Richard  
4 Gottfried, Manhattan Community Board 4, the  
5 Historic Districts Council, the Municipal Art  
6 Society, the Landmarks Conservancy, the Council of  
7 Chelsea Block Associations and Save Chelsea. One  
8 of these speakers expressed interest in expanding  
9 the boundaries to include additional properties  
10 not included within the proposed district.

11           The owners and/or representatives of  
12 two properties, with a total of ten speakers, were  
13 opposed to including their properties or portions  
14 of their properties in the proposed district.  
15 Representatives of two properties, a total of five  
16 speakers, took no position on the proposed  
17 district. One witness, representing an owner,  
18 asked for zoning changes in order to support the  
19 proposed district. Another owner requested that  
20 the hearing be continued.

21           On June 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2008, the Landmarks  
22 Commission held a continued public hearing on the  
23 West Chelsea Historic District. Four people spoke  
24 in favor, including representatives of the  
25 Roebling Chapter of the Society for Industrial

1  
2 Archeology and the Chelsea Waterside Park  
3 Association. The owners and/or representatives of  
4 two properties, with a total of eight speakers,  
5 were opposed to including their properties or  
6 portions of their properties in the proposed  
7 district. Two letters were also presented to the  
8 Commission in support.

9                   On July 15<sup>th</sup>, 2008, the Commission  
10 voted to designate West Chelsea a New York City  
11 Historic District.

12                   Located along the Hudson River  
13 waterfront in Manhattan, the District is a rare  
14 surviving example of New York City's rapidly  
15 disappearing industrial neighborhoods. During much  
16 of the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, the area was home to  
17 some of the City's and the country's most  
18 prestigious industrial firms, including the Otis  
19 Elevator Company, the Cornell Iron Works, the John  
20 Williams Ornamental Bronze and Iron Works, and the  
21 Reynolds Metal Company. The district encompasses  
22 parts of seven blocks, with approximately 30  
23 structures in total, dating from 1885 to 1930.

24                   West Chelsea was first developed  
25 with a mixture of working-class residences and

1 industrial complexes beginning in the late 1840s, at  
2 the moment when Manhattan was becoming the most  
3 important center of manufacturing in the United  
4 States. Rows of simple tenements were erected in  
5 close proximity to large iron works, lumber and coal  
6 yards, steam-powered saw mills, and stone dressing  
7 operations. The small stable building at 554 West  
8 28<sup>th</sup> Street, which was erected in 1885 for  
9 Latimer E. Jones' New York Lumber Auction Company,  
10 is the only reminder, within the Historic District,  
11 of the lumber yards that were once a prominent  
12 feature of the neighborhood.  
13

14 By the 1920s, nearly all of the  
15 area's original small-scale buildings had been  
16 replaced with larger, more substantial industrial  
17 structures. Many were built at least in part as  
18 speculative ventures. The structure at 548 West  
19 28<sup>th</sup> Street, for example, was commissioned in 1899  
20 by real estate investor Augustus Meyers and was soon  
21 leased to the Berlin Jones Envelope Company. The  
22 architect, William Higginson, was a prolific  
23 designer of factory buildings, including several  
24 located in the DUMBO Historic District in Brooklyn.  
25 The building possesses many of the features of the

1  
2 American Round Arch style that characterized  
3 industrial architecture at the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup>  
4 century, including a simple brick façade, arched  
5 openings, rhythmically placed windows recessed  
6 between vertical brick piers, horizontal banding,  
7 and a corbelled brick cornice. The Conley Foil Co.  
8 building, at 521 to 537 West 25<sup>th</sup> Street, built in  
9 1900 on a site formerly occupied by the Cornell  
10 Iron Works, employs many of the same architectural  
11 elements.

12           The pace of redevelopment in West  
13 Chelsea quickened during the second decade of the  
14 20<sup>th</sup> century as new industries moved into the  
15 neighborhood. In 1910, the H. Wolff Book  
16 Manufacturing Co. opened its new factory at 518  
17 West 26<sup>th</sup> Street on a parcel of land that had  
18 previously been occupied by the Cornell Iron Works.  
19 It was the first of several publishing-related firms  
20 that would settle into the neighborhood. And, in  
21 1914, the New York Times proclaimed the area between  
22 West 23<sup>rd</sup> Street and West 42<sup>nd</sup> Streets the new  
23 center of the city's printing industry.

24           The Wolff building was also one of  
25 the first structures within the historic district

1  
2 to take advantage of the emerging technology of  
3 reinforced concrete that was revolutionizing the  
4 design of industrial buildings in the early 20<sup>th</sup>  
5 century. The reinforced concrete structure offered  
6 substantial improvements in fireproofing, floor load  
7 capacities and vibration dampening. The material  
8 also allowed for larger windows that increased  
9 light and ventilation in factory buildings and for  
10 fewer columns and overhead beams, thereby  
11 increasing available storage space in warehouses.

12           While reinforced concrete would soon  
13 surpass all others as the preferred material for  
14 industrial building construction, similar  
15 advantages were obtained from the older technology  
16 of steel internal frames and terra cotta floors  
17 such as the Otis Elevator Company Building at  
18 260 Eleventh Avenue, erected in 1911 to 1912 and  
19 designed by the noted architectural firm of Clinton  
20 & Russell. The structure originally housed the  
21 corporate headquarters of the famed elevator  
22 manufacturer, as well as a regional sales office  
23 and fabrication facilities for the firm's  
24 construction, repair and research and development  
25 departments.

1  
2 In addition to its manufacturing  
3 operations, West Chelsea also became a major center  
4 of warehousing and freight handling activity  
5 beginning in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century. The Terminal  
6 Warehouse Company opened its massive Central Stores  
7 complex in 1891 on land recently reclaimed from the  
8 Hudson River. Its owners were closely associated  
9 with the New York Central and Hudson River  
10 Railroad, whose tracks entered directly into the  
11 building through the massive round-arched entrance  
12 fronting 11<sup>th</sup> Avenue.

13 In subsequent years, the waterfront  
14 property immediately surrounding the Central Stores  
15 was converted to freight-related uses by railroad  
16 companies that had moved to the area after being  
17 displaced by the construction of the Gansevoort and  
18 Chelsea Piers. The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad  
19 purchased the land bounded by West 25<sup>th</sup> and West 26<sup>th</sup>  
20 Street in 1897 and, in 1912 to '13, improved its  
21 operations by erecting a large reinforced concrete  
22 warehouse at the northeast corner of the yard. At  
23 the time of its opening, it was said to be the  
24 largest concrete building in New York City and the  
25 first to employ the flat plate construction

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

techniques.

The block immediately between the Central Stores and the B&O freight yard was acquired in 1900 by the Lehigh Valley Railroad and was used as an offline freight yard until it was improved in 1930 by the erection of the Starrett-Lehigh Building, an individual landmark in the District. This structure endures as one of the great early Modernist designs in the country, whose cantilevered floor slabs, continuous strips of windows and innovative interior circulation pattern represents a radical new approach to industrial architecture.

The ensemble of buildings within the West Chelsea Historic District reflects important trends in the development of industrial architecture in the United States and in New York City. They convey a well-defined sense of place and a distinct physical presence which sets the neighborhood apart from other parts of Midtown Manhattan. Despite a decline in industry and freight-related activity in West Chelsea during the mid-20<sup>th</sup> century, the Historic District still retains nearly all of its historic building stock



1  
2 and represents a unique and enduring part of New  
3 York City's architectural and cultural heritage.  
4 The Commission urges you to affirm the designation.

5 CHAIRPERSON LAPPIN: So, we're going  
6 to hear, in a couple of moments, from one of the  
7 owners, who is in opposition at the Terminal Stores  
8 piece. So, can you talk a little bit more about  
9 why it's so important to include that in the  
10 District?

11 DIANE JACKIER: I think that the  
12 Commission feels very strongly about this building  
13 to the extent that it could even probably be an  
14 individual landmark. It's so important in terms of  
15 its warehousing history. The trains used to come  
16 directly through this building. It was part of  
17 when, you know, all this redevelopment was going  
18 on, the railroads were built. This was the point  
19 where people—they realized this was like the  
20 perfect place to have this warehousing. It's 26  
21 individual, you know, stores, for lack of a better  
22 word, that were all designed to look as one  
23 imposing presence.

24 And, actually, on page 88 of the  
25 Designation Report, there is, you know, a little

1  
2 bit more of a description of the building. I can  
3 sort of read, you know, a few sentences from that  
4 paragraph, if you would like.

5 I can just read really briefly for  
6 you. The Central Stores were erected in 1890 to  
7 '91, according to the plans of George B. Mallory.  
8 The complex was designed to appear as a single  
9 monumental structure and its simple brick façade,  
10 articulated primarily by the rhythmic placement of  
11 arched window openings and a corbelled cornice,  
12 gave the buildings an appropriately imposing  
13 presence to customers seeking a secure place to  
14 secure their possessions. The solidity of the  
15 building's primary façade along 11<sup>th</sup> Avenue is  
16 enhanced by the vast expanses of unbroken masonry,  
17 as well as the massive round-arched entrance and  
18 the castle-like projecting corner towers.

19 So, it really has this great  
20 architectural presence. And, it's also important  
21 for its cultural and historical significance in New  
22 York City's importance as a warehousing and, you  
23 know, industrial [off mic] area.

24 CHAIRPERSON LAPPIN: Do any of my  
25 colleagues have questions? Okay. Well, let's hear

1  
2 from Mr. Flag [phonetic] and Steven Honig. Hold on  
3 one moment. Yes, go ahead, push that in. When the  
4 light is off, you're on.

5 CHRISTOPHER FLAG: I'm learning  
6 here. I'm learning. Good morning. My name is  
7 Christopher Flag. And, I work for the owners of  
8 the Terminal Stores.

9 Last meeting, Coley [phonetic] Burke  
10 learned that the West Chelsea Historic District was  
11 political. And, if the Speaker wants the  
12 landmarking, no one on the Committee would oppose  
13 it. The Speaker learned the 26 Terminal stores  
14 were to be sold to the related companies during the  
15 RFP process for the responses to the City for the  
16 Hudson Yards. The 26 Terminal stores were included  
17 in the related proposal. The Speaker, the  
18 Landmarks Commission and the Planning Commission  
19 all knew of the related connection.

20 Landmarks has, in its files and in  
21 written statements, that the Terminal Stores were  
22 to be converted to apartments. Community Board 4  
23 has sought, for years, to bring more apartments to  
24 Chelsea. The Planning Department kept the zoning  
25 in this area M2-3, despite all knowledge that no

1  
2 manufacturing would return to the District. The  
3 obvious intent was to prohibit development and  
4 apartments.

5 Landmarks and Planning were all  
6 joined in a political effort to stop development.  
7 Since the landmarking was intended to stop  
8 development to the detriment of the owner of the  
9 Terminal Stores, the loss incurred by the owner as  
10 appraised by Cushman and Wakefield in the  
11 Landmarks' files, is \$100 million. As soon as City  
12 Council votes the Speaker's proposal on October 7<sup>th</sup>,  
13 this will be the loss incurred.

14 CHAIRPERSON LAPPIN: I'm sorry, but  
15 one thing doesn't really have anything to do with  
16 the other. Whether we vote to approve this or  
17 disapprove this, you can't put residential units in  
18 this building. Is that correct?

19 CHRISTOPHER FLAG: That's correct.

20 CHAIRPERSON LAPPIN: Okay. So, what  
21 we do today has absolutely no bearing on the future  
22 value of this property as a manufacturing versus  
23 residential-zoned property. Is that correct?

24 CHRISTOPHER FLAG: Respectfully,  
25 Cushman and Wakefield appraised the property under

1

its current zoning, current uses.

2

3

CHAIRPERSON LAPPIN: Yeah. This is not a Zoning Committee. This is a Landmarks Committee. We don't vote on the zoning of this property. And, that's not what's before us today.

4

5

6

7

CHRISTOPHER FLAG: Okay.

8

9

10

11

12

CHAIRPERSON LAPPIN: And, if this were zoned residential, regardless of whether it was landmarked, you could use it for whatever interior use you so chose. So, I just want to make that very clear. Council Member Barron.

13

14

15

16

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Just a little advice. Strategically, it's not smart to come here and insult us and say that no matter what the Speaker wants, that's what's going to happen--

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

CHRISTOPHER FLAG: Um, hm.

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: --because you might be prophetic and get that. And, if you want to really win people over, it's good to state your position and then let each individual member decide on the merits of that position. I certainly am one who understands that the Speaker has a tremendous amount of influence--

25

CHRISTOPHER FLAG: Um, hm.

1

2

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: --over

3

individual members. But, I just don't think it's

4

wise for you to come here and trying to get support

5

for something and start off like that.

6

CHRISTOPHER FLAG: I appreciate your

7

advice. I understand your advice. In a meeting

8

that Coley Burke attended, that was what was

9

related to him. So, I'm simply restating something

10

that happened in the meeting--

11

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Well, I

12

don't mean to--

13

CHRISTOPHER FLAG: --that he

14

attended.

15

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: --kill the

16

messenger, but sometimes, you shouldn't relate

17

certain things if you're trying to make some points

18

and persuade people to a certain position. Even

19

when you hear something, you have to be wise and

20

digest and determine what you're going to share

21

here what you've heard and what you're going to

22

leave out.

23

CHRISTOPHER FLAG: Um, hm. Thank

24

you.

25

CHAIRPERSON LAPPIN: Council Member

1

2

Comrie.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: Yeah, I just want to second the comments to what Council Member Barron said because we have voted against landmark buildings that have been suggested to us on this Committee. We do look at things independently. And, frankly, I'm insulted that you didn't come to us individually to let your position be known. So, clearly, you're trying to state this for some other reason that you might want to do, as opposed to going through the process and talking to the members. So, for whatever court action you may be trying to do in the future, good luck to you. But, clearly, that was an insult to our Committee and to us as individuals. And, we will remember that.

CHRISTOPHER FLAG: Okay. Well, speaking to the Committee, my understanding is that the owner of the property was not given the opportunity to speak to individuals of the Committee.

COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: Then, obviously, you, as their representative, didn't do a good job of researching how you lobby City Council members or advocate for property. And, any

1

2 one of the advocates can tell you they don't have  
3 any reason not to call us on any item. And, any  
4 individual could reach out to us on any item. So,  
5 you didn't do your homework.

6 CHRISTOPHER FLAG: Okay. Thank you.

7 CHAIRPERSON LAPPIN: Thank you. The  
8 next speaker is Jim Pastrine [phonetic]?

9 JAMES PASTRICH: [off mic] Pastrich  
10 [phonetic].

11 CHAIRPERSON LAPPIN: And, you are?

12 STEVEN HONIG: Actually, I'm Steven-

13 -

14 JAMES PASTRICH: I'm an owner of the  
15 property [off mic].

16 CHAIRPERSON LAPPIN: Have you filled  
17 out a slip?

18 JAMES PASTRICH: [off mic] the  
19 Landmark, yes.

20 CHAIRPERSON LAPPIN: Okay. And,  
21 what's your name?

22 JAMES PASTRICH: Jim Pastrich.

23 CHAIRPERSON LAPPIN: That's who I  
24 just called.

25 STEVEN HONIG: Madam Chair, my name



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

is Steve Honig. You had called me--

CHAIRPERSON LAPPIN: I did.

STEVEN HONIG: --in tandem with Mr. Flag. And, I would like to make a separate statement.

CHAIRPERSON LAPPIN: Okay. That's fine.

STEVEN HONIG: Yeah, I will defer to Mr. Pastrich if you--

CHAIRPERSON LAPPIN: No, no, go ahead.

STEVEN HONIG: --so decide.

CHAIRPERSON LAPPIN: It doesn't matter which order you speak in.

STEVEN HONIG: Thank you. Good morning. My name is Steven Honig. I'm the general counsel for Waterfront New York and Blue Group Colorado, LLC and, opposed to the West Chelsea Historic District because the boundaries are arbitrary and capricious.

I represent the block on 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue and 27<sup>th</sup> Street to the north, 28<sup>th</sup> Street to the south and 11<sup>th</sup> Avenue to the east. It consists of 20-odd separate buildings, known as Terminal

1  
2 Stores. It is the only waterfront property that is  
3 in this District that has not previously been  
4 landmarked. It consists over a million square feet  
5 of space. I also represent the B&O Railroad  
6 Building on 26<sup>th</sup> Street and 11<sup>th</sup> Avenue, which  
7 consists of over 200,000 square feet of space.

8 We have provided testimony in front  
9 of Landmarks and the City Planning Commission, by  
10 planners, architects, engineers, realtors,  
11 appraisers, historians and members of the Hudson  
12 River Park Trust. This is an ill-conceived  
13 designation as it relates to the Terminal Stores.  
14 There is nothing unique as a historical matter with  
15 respect to the Terminal Stores building. The area  
16 of the District, if we were to truly include  
17 buildings that were similar, we'd include a much  
18 larger area. The selection of this area is clearly  
19 arbitrary and capricious.

20 We have been advised by the City  
21 agencies on the record, that they would work with  
22 us to provide additional uses and adaptive reuse.  
23 However, when subsequent discussions were engaged  
24 in, the staff has taken a contrary position to that  
25 which the City has stated on the record.

1  
2 In conclusion, this is an arbitrary  
3 and capricious proposal and should be voted down or  
4 modified as it relates to the Terminal Stores.

5 Respectfully submitted, Steven Honig.

6 CHAIRPERSON LAPPIN: Thank you for  
7 your testimony. Do any of my colleagues have  
8 questions? Okay. Thank you.

9 JAMES PASTRICH: Hi, Committee  
10 Members. I'm Jim Pastrich. I have to tell you, we  
11 are, unlike our neighbors, not big property owners.  
12 The only way we could lose a \$100 million is if we  
13 won the next Lotto and got the right six in the  
14 supplemental. We don't live in that world. And,  
15 the people that my neighbors have put together to  
16 try to convince Landmarks not to landmark them,  
17 they're not available to me.

18 Very candidly, I spoke to certain  
19 people. A lot of people were afraid even to  
20 represent us before Landmarks, which was a very  
21 real issue that we had. People said we don't want  
22 to go before Landmarks because we need their  
23 approval ultimately on the projects that we do.

24 I am a historically sensitive owner.  
25 We're little owners. We have two buildings. The

1  
2 first thing I took exception to that Landmarks said  
3 was, at the June hearing, only two owners of  
4 property spoke. I personally represent two owners  
5 of property and there were a lot of other property  
6 owners speaking as well. So, there are more  
7 opposition.

8 But, again, we are little owners of  
9 properties. We have two buildings. One of them is  
10 six stories, maybe arguably it could be a landmark.  
11 The other is a two-story building and it truly is  
12 going to be, if this Committee ultimately approves  
13 the District, that the least significant landmark  
14 in Landmarks' entire portfolio. The only way I can  
15 describe the building is the best Landmarks came up  
16 with was that it was built by this very, very well-  
17 known convicted felon, who no one has ever heard of  
18 and that they found obscure clippings of.

19 I have to just describe the two  
20 properties to you, as a Committee, and try to give  
21 you their flavor. They were described by  
22 Landmarks. One is a six-story wood and brick  
23 building. It's basically all wood inside. We  
24 cannot add to it in any way because of its  
25 construction. It is all wood beams, wood columns,

1 wood joists. It is architecturally impossible.  
2 The other is a two-story truly architecturally non-  
3 descript. I would turn to anybody's pa [phonetic]  
4 and say look at it or look at a picture of it.  
5 It's 554 West 28<sup>th</sup> Street. And, it is the most  
6 architecturally indistinguished building,  
7 certainly, in this entire plan; probably in  
8 Landmarks' entire portfolio. It's old. That's the  
9 only thing that anybody has been able to say. And,  
10 a guy who stole a lot of money and then ran off to  
11 England built it. It is the only part of our  
12 little site that we have any hope whatsoever to be  
13 able to build on at any point in the future.

14  
15 Landmarks, when I asked them, I  
16 said has any neighborhood that you guys planned  
17 ever failed to get passed. That was one of my  
18 early questions. They said yes, in the '80s,  
19 Brownsville. I knew I was in trouble. I  
20 understand your Committee ultimately makes this  
21 decision. Well, I would love for neither property  
22 to be landmarked. But, I think they have at least  
23 an argument on the six-story building. It's  
24 pretty. It's a nice building. Do I think it's  
25 landmark quality? I think landmarks really is to

1  
2 save things that truly are important and  
3 significant to our City. But, I understand it on  
4 547 West 27<sup>th</sup> Street. I understand it on, at least,  
5 on 548 West 28<sup>th</sup> Street, which is one building going  
6 straight through the block. On 554 West 28<sup>th</sup>  
7 Street, I don't understand it.

8           What I was told is that they cannot  
9 really draw around it. And, since they've drawn  
10 it, I'm stuck. I don't really believe that that's  
11 fair. And, I don't believe that that's equitable.  
12 And, I don't believe that that is how the Landmarks  
13 process is supposed to function. We, as property  
14 owners, have survived a whole bunch of obstacles.  
15 We survived the point when, after 9/11, when I  
16 couldn't rent space for a year and a half. I  
17 survived the point when our loan got bought by  
18 somebody whose sole goal was to foreclose on us. I  
19 survived assuming lots of debt to continue to be in  
20 business and run these properties. We have 60-some  
21 odd small tenants. We're happy to be there.

22           I understand that this Landmarks  
23 process and they've told me how much they're going  
24 to help me. And, I know every time we file to do  
25 anything for those 60-some odd small tenants, our

1  
2 life is going to be harder. It's going to take  
3 longer. It's going to cost more.

4           You know what, 547 West 27<sup>th</sup> and 548  
5 West 28<sup>th</sup> Street, at least there's a compelling  
6 argument. 554 West 28<sup>th</sup> Street, there is no  
7 compelling argument for landmarking this property.  
8 It really should not be landmarked. And, I truly  
9 hope that this Committee will exercise its power  
10 and will use it and leave it out. I listened when  
11 I went to the hearing. And, I listened to somebody  
12 quote about how significant it was. And, I sat  
13 there and said to myself, the only way anybody  
14 could call it significant is if they haven't stood  
15 across the street and looked at it.

16           I turn to you. You are my last  
17 stop. We are a little company. We own two  
18 buildings in New York City. This is it. Please  
19 don't landmark 554 West 28<sup>th</sup> Street. If you could  
20 leave out 547 West 27<sup>th</sup> and 548 West 28<sup>th</sup>, as well,  
21 we would be the happier. But, please don't  
22 landmark 554 West 28<sup>th</sup> Street. Thank you.

23           CHAIRPERSON LAPPIN: I think the  
24 issue, which you identified in your testimony,  
25 however, is that the Commission isn't looking to do

1  
2 individual landmark designations. They're looking  
3 to do a District. And, your property is not on  
4 the, the one that you're discussing, is not on the  
5 boundary.

6 JAMES PASTRICH: But, as I pointed  
7 out to the Landmarks Commission, they managed to  
8 leave in pieces of buildings. There's one building  
9 in which they managed to literally cut the  
10 building. The building has three pieces and they  
11 only included one and they left out two. They  
12 managed to draw the map that way.

13 I understand that the Committee is  
14 being presented with it as a fait accompli. And,  
15 that's why, on some level, I have nothing to do  
16 except to turn to you, Committee members, and say  
17 please don't do this to this little 25 by 100  
18 building that really shouldn't be landmarked. Yes,  
19 I understand that the other things—I met with  
20 Landmarks Commission. Landmarks Commission's  
21 response, okay, I worked to get our neighborhood  
22 rezoned. We work to support the High Line. We  
23 worked to do a really beautiful building next door  
24 to it. I turn to Landmarks Commission, he said,  
25 oh, we might allow you to add another floor on it.



1  
2 Economically, it is a nightmare for us. It is our  
3 only possible site on the entire property.

4 CHAIRPERSON LAPPIN: Is it a  
5 contributing building or a non-contributing  
6 building?

7 JAMES PASTRICH: They've labeled it  
8 contributing. There is nothing contributing. I  
9 challenge them to read their description to you.  
10 It is a truly nothing building.

11 CHAIRPERSON LAPPIN: Well, we'll  
12 get--

13 JAMES PASTRICH: I didn't--

14 CHAIRPERSON LAPPIN: --into that.

15 JAMES PASTRICH: --say that about  
16 547 West 27<sup>th</sup> and 548 West 28<sup>th</sup> Street. I think  
17 they have an argument there. While, I'm against  
18 it, I do understand it at least. 554 West 28<sup>th</sup>  
19 Street should not be landmarked. Look at it. Look  
20 at the picture.

21 CHAIRPERSON LAPPIN: Questions? Do  
22 we have questions? Council Member Comrie.

23 COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: I don't have  
24 a picture for 547. Is that the same building as  
25 548?

1  
2 JAMES PASTRICH: It is. The same  
3 structure goes through the block, correct, sir.

4 COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: Okay. So,  
5 that's why [crosstalk]

6 JAMES PASTRICH: It is a six-story,  
7 pretty-looking, old building that, at least, I  
8 understand their thinking.

9 COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: So, it goes  
10 from one end of the block to the other.

11 JAMES PASTRICH: Correct, sir.

12 COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: Okay. And,  
13 you have two entrances to the building?

14 JAMES PASTRICH: Correct, sir.

15 COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: And, 554  
16 West 28<sup>th</sup> Street, what is that now? Warehouse?

17 JAMES PASTRICH: It is, right now,  
18 it's a bar.

19 COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: It's a bar.

20 JAMES PASTRICH: It's a bar.

21 COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: Oh.

22 JAMES PASTRICH: It was a warehouse.

23 We--

24 COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: And, what's  
25 on the second floor?

1  
2 JAMES PASTRICH: The second floor is  
3 the second floor of the bar. They occupy the  
4 entire structure.

5 COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: On the  
6 picture, they have where the shutters are down.  
7 So, you can't tell what is--

8 JAMES PASTRICH: When we took over,  
9 it was being used for a repair place to repair  
10 high-pressure steam boilers. Our taxes on the  
11 property, from once we changed it, have quintupled.  
12 Economically, it isn't viable. And, there is no  
13 logical reason, is as unexceptional a building.  
14 Again, I turn to any Committee member, I will  
15 happily get in the taxi with them and show you the  
16 building. It should not be landmarked.

17 COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: Are there  
18 any cornices or--

19 JAMES PASTRICH: Nope.

20 COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: --ornamental  
21 work on it?

22 JAMES PASTRICH: Nope.

23 COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: I don't see  
24 any pillars on the building or any--is there any  
25 detail in the--

1

JAMES PASTRICH: Nope.

2

COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: --brickwork?

3

And, this eagle that's on there--

4

JAMES PASTRICH: The eagle has been on there for five years. That's the symbol of the bar. It is not a landmarked item. I even heard somebody, at one of the hearings, talk about the symbolism of the eagle. And, I said what they're trying now to do is push a public policy. It's a five-year-old bar. It seemed not exactly what the purpose of landmarking was. Five years, it seemed more like recent history to me.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: Is the brickwork contiguous with any of the other [crosstalk]?

15

16

17

JAMES PASTRICH: Not at all, sir. It was not built at the same time and is not contiguous.

18

19

20

COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: Are the windows, anything special about them?

21

22

JAMES PASTRICH: The windows have all been replaced over the life of the building, as has the doors. The door on the right hand side was not in the original structure. I would say 50 to

23

24

25

1  
2 60% of the two-story façade, including the cornice,  
3 has been replaced over the life of the building, as  
4 have all the windows, as have all the doors, as  
5 have all the shutters.

6 COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: And, what's  
7 the name of your company?

8 JAMES PASTRICH: Name of our company  
9 is the Pinetree Group. These are the only two  
10 buildings that we own.

11 COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: In the City?

12 JAMES PASTRICH: In New York City,  
13 correct, sir.

14 COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: And so,  
15 you're saying that there's nothing about this  
16 building that meets any of the--

17 JAMES PASTRICH: That--

18 COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: --style--

19 JAMES PASTRICH: That is correct,  
20 sir.

21 COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: --like the  
22 rest of the block?

23 JAMES PASTRICH: That is correct,  
24 sir. I had an architect, who I brought before the  
25 Committee. Unfortunately, my architect, at 50-

1  
2 something, died about a month and a half ago or, he  
3 would be here with me this morning. And, he would  
4 be answering those questions.

5 COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: Hmm.

6 JAMES PASTRICH: I could not find  
7 historic experts, however, sir, who were willing to  
8 appear, as they put it, against the Landmark  
9 Commission, without charging incredible fees that,  
10 as a small property owner, I could not afford.  
11 They basically said pay us five figures.  
12 Otherwise, we were not willing to appear before the  
13 Landmarks Commission. And, I finally got my  
14 personal architect, who does interior work for us,  
15 and he was willing. But, the historic  
16 preservation-type architects are very loath to  
17 appear against Landmarks, even though they conceded  
18 that it shouldn't be landmarked.

19 COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: And, this  
20 two-story building, is this the wood building that  
21 you're talking about?

22 JAMES PASTRICH: No, it is brick,  
23 sir.

24 COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: So, which is  
25 the wood building? The other--

1  
2 JAMES PASTRICH: The six-story  
3 building, essentially, has brick façades, but all  
4 of the interior columns, beams, joists are all  
5 wood.

6 COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: Um, hm.

7 JAMES PASTRICH: It's huge pieces of  
8 wood, essentially, holding up the six-story  
9 building, which is why we cannot add to it in  
10 height in any way. I mean, a steel structure, you  
11 can typically go in and add, you know, another  
12 piece of steel on it. New York City's height limit  
13 on wood buildings is six stories. We cannot add to  
14 that structure, sir.

15 COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: So, your  
16 plan for 554 was to do what?

17 JAMES PASTRICH: At some point in  
18 the future, we believed that we were going to use  
19 the air rights and build a building commensurate  
20 with the buildings around it, which are at least  
21 six stories high. It is surrounded. It basically  
22 sort of sits in a valley. There's a six-story  
23 building on this side; six-story building on this  
24 side; six-story building on this side. And, a two-  
25 story, very unexceptional building that sits in the

1

2 middle of them. It is a 25 by 100 building, sir.

3

4 COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: You weren't  
5 planning on doing anything to 548?

6

7 JAMES PASTRICH: We cannot, unless  
8 we tear the building down. And, I do not believe  
9 that we are going to prevail on it not being  
10 landmarked. And, it's a really pretty building.  
11 And, I'm probably loath to tear it down anyway.

12

13 So, I would not want that to happen. So, I  
14 understand that. So, the answer is yes.

15

16 COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: Hmm.

17

18 JAMES PASTRICH: A little long. I  
19 apologize.

20

21 COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: Okay. All  
22 right. Thank you. Thank you.

23

24 JAMES PASTRICH: Any other questions  
25 I could answer for you--

26

27 CHAIRPERSON LAPPIN: Council Member  
28 Barron.

29

30 COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: She does  
31 that part of it, you know.

32

33 JAMES PASTRICH: Oh, I'm sorry.

34

35 COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: That's all  
36 right.

37



1

JAMES PASTRICH: I apologize.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: I have a question for the Chair. Just procedurally, so, we have to vote on this as a package because this is a part of this package? Or, could we say no to this and—oh, this is it. This is the only thing on the table now. Or, is it a part of--

CHAIRPERSON LAPPIN: It's part of a Historic District.

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Right. So, the whole Historic District—how do we, 'cause compelling testimony, I agree with you. I don't see the historical significance in this. And, if it means that you have to vote against the whole Historical District just to get this out, or do they go back to the drawing board to renegotiate because I think this is compelling testimony? It's making sense to me. And, I don't see why we would want to include this in the landmarking. So, I'm asking a procedural question, 'cause I do plan on voting no if this is included in it, 'cause the testimony makes sense.

CHAIRPERSON LAPPIN: We've never done something like this, which isn't on the edge

1

2

of a boundary. And, I think we will not vote on this so, people can have an opportunity to go and take a look at it--

3

4

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Excellent.

5

6

CHAIRPERSON LAPPIN: --if they'd like to. And, counsel, will, as we lay it over, can answer some of those procedural--

7

8

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Excellent.

9

CHAIRPERSON LAPPIN: --questions.

10

11

JAMES PASTRICH: Can I add that I would like to, if any Committee members would like--

12

13

COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: You got to--

14

JAMES PASTRICH: --to see the

15

property--

16

COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: --address--

17

JAMES PASTRICH: I'm sorry.

18

COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: You got to

19

address--

20

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: I think you

21

need to quit while you're ahead.

22

COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: Yeah.

23

JAMES PASTRICH: No, I just wanted

24

to say I would be happy to meet any Committee

25

1

2 Member--

3

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: I know. I

4

know.

5

JAMES PASTRICH: --and show them the

6

property.

7

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: We got that.

8

We got that.

9

JAMES PASTRICH: Thank you.

10

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Madam Chair?

11

CHAIRPERSON LAPPIN: Yes.

12

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: So, we're

13

not voting on this today. But, just procedurally--

14

CHAIRPERSON LAPPIN: We will close

15

the hearing--

16

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: All right.

17

CHAIRPERSON LAPPIN: --in a moment

18

or two. There's still other people signed up to

19

testify.

20

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Right.

21

CHAIRPERSON LAPPIN: And, we--

22

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: On this--

23

CHAIRPERSON LAPPIN: --will--

24

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: On this

25

topic?

1  
2 CHAIRPERSON LAPPIN: --lay over the  
3 vote so that the Committee members have an  
4 opportunity to--yes.

5 COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: And--

6 CHAIRPERSON LAPPIN: Are you done  
7 with your questions?

8 COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Just one  
9 further question that I wanted to ask. Would you  
10 be willing to build a six-story building that's  
11 contextual with the façades on the rest of the  
12 landmark properties?

13 JAMES PASTRICH: I would certainly  
14 build something that belonged with the things that  
15 are around it. Yes, sir. Though I do not have a  
16 plan--

17 COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: A building  
18 that--

19 JAMES PASTRICH: --that I'm ready to  
20 present.

21 COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Right. But,  
22 you would be willing to continue to consider  
23 building a building that looks like a Landmarks  
24 building on that site?

25 JAMES PASTRICH: I would build

1  
2 something that I certainly think goes with the  
3 buildings around it and is contextual, yes. That  
4 would certainly be a logical thing for--

5 COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Were you  
6 given that option by Landmarks?

7 JAMES PASTRICH: No, I was not given  
8 that option at all.

9 COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: So, it was  
10 either take it or--

11 JAMES PASTRICH: It was either  
12 accept it, we've drawn the boundary. This is our  
13 boundary and this is what we're doing. And, if  
14 you're really nice to us, we'll let you add a floor  
15 on it maybe was what I was told in my personal  
16 meeting with Landmark Commission. And, we have a  
17 lot of unused air rights. So, that didn't seem  
18 like a good--

19 COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Have you  
20 done anything in writing to Landmarks regarding--

21 JAMES PASTRICH: I have not done  
22 anything in writing to Landmarks Commission, no,  
23 sir.

24 COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Okay.

25 CHAIRPERSON LAPPIN: Council Member

1

2 Martinez.

3

4

5

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Just one other procedural question. So, we have not done a carve-out?

6

7

8

CHAIRPERSON LAPPIN: We have. And, counsel can talk to you, as well. You know, this is a District. It's not an individual--

9

10

11

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Right.

CHAIRPERSON LAPPIN: --landmark.

So--

12

13

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: I understand the District.

14

15

16

17

CHAIRPERSON LAPPIN: So, this is not a property that is on the boundary or the edge of the District, which complicates it. So, that's what we need to--

18

19

20

21

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Work on.

JAMES PASTRICH: Can I just say, the boundary actually is to our north. It isn't surrounding us. But, it is to our north.

22

23

CHAIRPERSON LAPPIN: Right. But, you're not, right, on the edge--

24

JAMES PASTRICH: Okay.

25

CHAIRPERSON LAPPIN: --of the

1

2 District. Council Member Martinez.

3 COUNCIL MEMBER MARTINEZ: Thank you,  
4 Madam Chair. I would like, for the benefit of the  
5 Committee members, if we can, like some sort of  
6 outline or-'cause I know when we're presented with  
7 Historical District, and I'm glad this issue come  
8 before us, in terms of, after the Landmark does  
9 what Landmark does, which is they do their own  
10 hearings, when it comes to the Council, in terms of  
11 how much flexibility do we have to carve out, even  
12 if it's the tip of the District or the middle of  
13 the District, how much can we, the Committee,  
14 change or carve out any--

15 CHAIRPERSON LAPPIN: We can never  
16 expand the District. We can only potentially--

17 COUNCIL MEMBER MARTINEZ: Not  
18 expanding--

19 CHAIRPERSON LAPPIN: Right.

20 COUNCIL MEMBER MARTINEZ: --taking  
21 out.

22 CHAIRPERSON LAPPIN: We can only  
23 potentially reduce. But, the concept of a District  
24 is that it's an area that has a distinct sense of  
25 place, that is cohesive and that is a community.

1

2 You can't have holes right in the middle of the  
3 District--

4

COUNCIL MEMBER MARTINEZ: Correct.

5

6 CHAIRPERSON LAPPIN: --because,  
7 then, it's not a contiguous area with a distinct  
8 sense of place. So, it's a--

9

10 COUNCIL MEMBER MARTINEZ: But, the  
11 question, this is perfect example, there's no  
12 historical perspective, you know, that we want to--

13

14 CHAIRPERSON LAPPIN: And, I would  
15 prefer if we discussed this with counsel--

16

COUNCIL MEMBER MARTINEZ: Okay.

17

18 CHAIRPERSON LAPPIN: --after.

19

20 COUNCIL MEMBER MARTINEZ: Sounds  
21 good.

22

JAMES PASTRICH: Can I just--

23

COUNCIL MEMBER MARTINEZ: Right.

24

25 JAMES PASTRICH: --add one more  
26 thing to the Committee.

27

28 COUNCIL MEMBER MARTINEZ: I think  
29 you have to ask the Chair for permission for that.

30

31 JAMES PASTRICH: Madam Chair, may I  
32 please add one more thing to the Committee--

33

34 CHAIRPERSON LAPPIN: Yes, you may.



1  
2 JAMES PASTRICH: --before--my one  
3 thing is look at that map. And, these are not  
4 actually contiguously laid out blocks. Turn back  
5 to your map. It isn't like they said the following  
6 four blocks. They actually did pick, choose, cut,  
7 cut buildings in, cut buildings out. Look at 27<sup>th</sup>  
8 Street and you will note, if you look along the  
9 south side of West 27<sup>th</sup> Street, that, indeed  
10 buildings and properties that are old, forget the  
11 ones that are new even, were cut out of their map.  
12 They absolutely could do that. They refused to do  
13 that when I met with them. Thank you, Committee.

14 CHAIRPERSON LAPPIN: Okay. Counsel  
15 Member Mendez.

16 COUNCIL MEMBER MENDEZ: Thank you,  
17 Madam Chair. Sir, you didn't have written  
18 testimony. So, I've had a little trouble following  
19 some of the addresses you threw out. And, I was  
20 trying to co-relate that with the map and with some  
21 of the pictures here. So, if you could--

22 JAMES PASTRICH: Let me, please,  
23 repeat them. Not a problem. The three addresses  
24 we own, which represent two properties. One is a  
25 larger, six-story building. It is located at 547

1  
2 West 27<sup>th</sup> Street and it goes through to 548 West  
3 28<sup>th</sup> Street. It's a six-story brick building that  
4 certainly does possess architectural charm and  
5 distinction. The other property--

6 COUNCIL MEMBER MENDEZ: Hold on.  
7 Goes to on 28<sup>th</sup> Street, what's the address that it  
8 goes to on 28<sup>th</sup> Street?

9 JAMES PASTRICH: 548 West 28<sup>th</sup>  
10 Street. I'm sorry.

11 COUNCIL MEMBER MENDEZ: And, it's,  
12 again, it's a six-story building that stretches  
13 from West 27<sup>th</sup> to West 28--

14 JAMES PASTRICH: Through to West 28<sup>th</sup>  
15 Street, correct.

16 COUNCIL MEMBER MENDEZ: Okay.

17 JAMES PASTRICH: And then, the other  
18 property of which I spoke is 554 West 28<sup>th</sup> Street.

19 COUNCIL MEMBER MENDEZ: And, that's  
20 the two-story building that's--

21 JAMES PASTRICH: That is the two-  
22 story building.

23 COUNCIL MEMBER MENDEZ: --the bar.

24 JAMES PASTRICH: Correct.

25 COUNCIL MEMBER MENDEZ: And, that is

1  
2 on the map. That would be between what two Avenues  
3 and where about approximately on...?

4 JAMES PASTRICH: They are both on  
5 the block on 27<sup>th</sup> Street to 28<sup>th</sup> Street, between  
6 Tenth and 11<sup>th</sup> Avenues, closer to 11<sup>th</sup> Avenue.

7 COUNCIL MEMBER MENDEZ: Okay.

8 JAMES PASTRICH: If you like, I  
9 would--

10 COUNCIL MEMBER MENDEZ: All right.

11 JAMES PASTRICH: Can I identify it  
12 on the map for you? If that would be okay?

13 COUNCIL MEMBER MENDEZ: I think I  
14 could spot them here.

15 JAMES PASTRICH: Okay.

16 COUNCIL MEMBER MENDEZ: But, I think  
17 many of us are interested in getting a tour. So,  
18 I'm sure the Chair will make those arrangements--

19 JAMES PASTRICH: I would be happy--

20 COUNCIL MEMBER MENDEZ: --for us.

21 JAMES PASTRICH: --to--

22 CHAIRPERSON LAPPIN: I won't make  
23 them formally, because then, if you don't attend,  
24 you'll be marked absent, but, encourage everybody  
25 to informally tour the property.

1  
2 JAMES PASTRICH: Could I provide the  
3 Chair with my contact information and--

4 CHAIRPERSON LAPPIN: Sure, why--

5 JAMES PASTRICH: --they could then--

6 CHAIRPERSON LAPPIN: --don't you--

7 JAMES PASTRICH: --anybody who would  
8 like it, I am happy to meet and show it to. Thank  
9 you.

10 CHAIRPERSON LAPPIN: Great.

11 COUNCIL MEMBER MENDEZ: Thank you,  
12 Madam Chair. And, I certainly love attending all  
13 of your tours, whether it's an official--

14 CHAIRPERSON LAPPIN: Formal or  
15 informal.

16 COUNCIL MEMBER MENDEZ: --or non-  
17 official meeting.

18 CHAIRPERSON LAPPIN: The informal  
19 ones are more fun.

20 COUNCIL MEMBER MENDEZ: Right.

21 JAMES PASTRICH: Thank you,  
22 Committee members.

23 CHAIRPERSON LAPPIN: You're welcome.

24 JAMES PASTRICH: Thank you.

25 CHAIRPERSON LAPPIN: We have three

1  
2 people signed up to testify in favor. But, I was  
3 going to ask Diane Jackier to come back and  
4 potentially—oh, please come sit. Before we ask or  
5 give Committees members the opportunity to ask  
6 questions of Miss Jackier regarding this property,  
7 I was going to, and Mr. Liu, before you walk out of  
8 the room, give the Council an opportunity to call  
9 for a vote on the other item that's on the agenda  
10 in case people have to leave. And, I recommend a  
11 favorable vote.

12 CLERK: Chair Lappin?

13 CHAIRPERSON LAPPIN: Aye.

14 CLERK: Council Member Barron?

15 COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: This is on,  
16 so I can be clear.

17 CHAIRPERSON LAPPIN: This is on  
18 the--

19 COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Oh, that  
20 other one's laid over, so it's just this one.

21 CHAIRPERSON LAPPIN: --the item in  
22 Council Member Ignizio's District--

23 COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Right.

24 CHAIRPERSON LAPPIN: --on Staten  
25 Island, the store.

1  
2 COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Okay. I  
3 vote aye on that. And, just-well, aye.

4 CLERK: Thank you. Council Member  
5 Comrie?

6 COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: Aye on the  
7 Staten Island item.

8 CLERK: Council Member Liu?

9 COUNCIL MEMBER LIU: Madam Chair, I  
10 vote yes. And, I agree with your decision to give  
11 us an opportunity to take a lot at the other  
12 place.

13 CLERK: Council Member Martinez?

14 COUNCIL MEMBER MARTINEZ: I vote  
15 aye and I also want to thank you for give us some  
16 time.

17 CLERK: Council Member Arroyo?

18 COUNCIL MEMBER DEL CARMEN ARROYO:  
19 Yes.

20 CLERK: Council Member Mendez?

21 COUNCIL MEMBER MENDEZ: Aye.

22 CLERK: By a vote of seven in the  
23 affirmative, none in the negative and no  
24 abstentions, the aforementioned item is approved  
25 and referred to the full Committee.

1

2

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Madam

3

Chair?

4

CHAIRPERSON LAPPIN: Great.

5

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: If I may,

6

just while Landmarks is here. I think it'll make

7

our job easier if items that are included in the

8

Historical District, if they obviously don't have

9

historical value—and I'm not saying everything he

10

testified is true, we don't have any written

11

testimony, so, we just heard him verbally. But,

12

let's say, everything he said is true, then it

13

makes our work easier if that's not brought before

14

us. If there's some kind of way that that's not

15

included in the Historical District, so that we

16

don't then have to exercise our authority to

17

reduce the Historical District and get into all of

18

this because it can be screened by Landmarks and,

19

perhaps, it wouldn't even get to this level. But,

20

that's a whole another issue.

21

CHAIRPERSON LAPPIN: Well, let's

22

let Landmarks respond to the testimony that

23

there's no historical value to--

24

DIANE JACKIER: Right.

25

CHAIRPERSON LAPPIN: --this

1  
2 property. And, explain why it's been included in  
3 the Landmark District.

4 DIANE JACKIER: Yeah, I think that  
5 this is a building, actually, that the Commission  
6 did think has historical value and is something  
7 that should be included. So, there is a  
8 difference of opinion, obviously, with the owners,  
9 which happens. The Commission does, you know, we  
10 wish we could have 100% support for every District  
11 that we do. But, that doesn't happen.

12 COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: I  
13 understand that. If I may, I don't mean to cut  
14 you off. But, was it changed? Did they change  
15 windows and doors?

16 DIANE JACKIER: There were some  
17 alterations. But--

18 COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Right. So-  
19 -

20 DIANE JACKIER: --this is actually  
21 the oldest building in the district.

22 COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: I  
23 understand that. But--

24 DIANE JACKIER: And, so--

25 COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: --if it's



1

2 already--

3

DIANE JACKIER: --it's a great

4

survivor.

5

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: I got that.

6

But, even if it's the oldest building--

7

DIANE JACKIER: Um, hm.

8

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: --if all of

9

those alterations have taken place already--

10

DIANE JACKIER: Um, hm.

11

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: --and then,

12

there's a reasonable question of its historical

13

value, 'cause the purpose of preserving is that

14

you don't get a chance to make those kinds of

15

changes.

16

DIANE JACKIER: A lot of buildings,

17

actually, have a lot of alterations. Buildings

18

that are--

19

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Would all

20

of this--

21

DIANE JACKIER: --100 years old for

22

a lot of them.

23

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: I got you.

24

DIANE JACKIER: So--

25

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: All right.

1  
2 DIANE JACKIER: --the alterations  
3 to this building were that the right pedestrian  
4 entrance was cut through the brick façade. The  
5 ground floor entrances were covered with roll-down  
6 metal security gates. The windows were replaced.

7 COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: I'm on  
8 that.

9 DIANE JACKIER: And, metal fence  
10 encloses rooftop terrace. So--

11 COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: It's almost  
12 a new building.

13 DIANE JACKIER: But, what it  
14 doesn't--

15 COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Oh, okay.

16 DIANE JACKIER: --say, it's not a  
17 whole new façade. It actually--

18 COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: All right.

19 DIANE JACKIER: I mean this  
20 building's from 1885--

21 COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: All right.

22 DIANE JACKIER: --and has a nice  
23 corbelling brick on, you know--

24 COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: I got you.

25 DIANE JACKIER: --below the windows

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

and above the--

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: But, we  
can't--

DIANE JACKIER: --windows--

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: --be  
preserving stuff 'cause they got some bricks and a  
few things here and there.

DIANE JACKIER: But, I think, just  
in general, the style of this building, it is the  
oldest building in the District--

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: I got you.

DIANE JACKIER: --and, is something  
that the Commission really felt was important  
enough in a District like this to represent what  
used to be there. There used to be very low-  
scale, you know, buildings--

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: I got you.

DIANE JACKIER: --there that were  
replaced in the early 1910s, 1920s with warehouse  
buildings. But, this was one of the very few that  
remained that showed what it used to be like in  
the 1850s and '60s, '70s. So, you know, it is a  
difference of opinion.

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: A little

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

bit.

DIANE JACKIER: I understand.

COUNCIL MEMBER BARRON: Got you.

Thank you. Thank you, Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON LAPPIN: Council Member  
Martinez.

COUNCIL MEMBER MARTINEZ: Just from  
listening to your explanation in terms of when we  
do a District and how it has to be contiguous and  
has to be, you know—but, when you look at this  
map, there are a lot of properties that are carved  
out.

COUNCIL MEMBER MENDEZ: There are  
holes in it.

COUNCIL MEMBER MARTINEZ: A lot of  
holes in it. And, you know, I guess we'll wait  
and have a further discussion about this.

DIANE JACKIER: And, I just--

COUNCIL MEMBER MARTINEZ: But, this  
map--

DIANE JACKIER: I just wanted to  
say--

COUNCIL MEMBER MARTINEZ: --speaks  
for itself.

1  
2 DIANE JACKIER: --I think the only  
3 District that I know of that is really like a box  
4 that has--just basically, it's a big rectangle that  
5 includes everything in it, is SoHo.

6 COUNCIL MEMBER MARTINEZ: Yeah.

7 DIANE JACKIER: The SoHo-Cast Iron  
8 District which was designated in 1973. Almost all  
9 of our other Districts do have these sort of  
10 jagged boundaries--

11 COUNCIL MEMBER MARTINEZ: Correct.

12 DIANE JACKIER: --that do include  
13 things and--

14 COUNCIL MEMBER MARTINEZ: Yeah.

15 DIANE JACKIER: --exclude things.  
16 But, this building was included because the  
17 Commissioners did think that it was historically  
18 significant, contributed to the sense of place of  
19 the District and was important.

20 COUNCIL MEMBER MARTINEZ: But, when  
21 you look at this map, this gentleman's property is  
22 right here.

23 DIANE JACKIER: Right.

24 COUNCIL MEMBER MARTINEZ: So, it's  
25 almost at the southern end. And, from all the

1

2 changes that have occurred in this building, from  
3 everything you described that used-

4

DIANE JACKIER: Right.

5

COUNCIL MEMBER MARTINEZ: --to be  
6 in the building that's no longer--

7

DIANE JACKIER: But--

8

COUNCIL MEMBER MARTINEZ: --in the  
9 building

10

DIANE JACKIER: I mean, I think the  
11 only change that probably is that the windows were  
12 replaced. I don't think there were other major  
13 changes.

14

COUNCIL MEMBER MARTINEZ: Looking  
15 at the line, that line could be moved back.

16

DIANE JACKIER: And then, the other  
17 building would--

18

COUNCIL MEMBER MARTINEZ: Yeah.

19

DIANE JACKIER: --be taken out

20

COUNCIL MEMBER MARTINEZ: Right.

21

DIANE JACKIER: --the 548 West 28<sup>th</sup>  
22 Street would be taken out.

23

COUNCIL MEMBER MARTINEZ: Well, I  
24 guess we'll go over it. Thank you.

25

DIANE JACKIER: You have any other

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

questions?

CHAIRPERSON LAPPIN: Council Member Mendez.

COUNCIL MEMBER MENDEZ: Miss Jackier, I know, from looking a lot of these Historic Districts, sometimes buildings are carved out 'cause they landmarked or there's another adjoining Historic District. Do you have that information now? Or, could you provide that to the Committee about any of these other properties that seem to have been excluded?

DIANE JACKIER: I don't have information on them. But, we could certainly get it to you.

COUNCIL MEMBER MENDEZ: Okay.

DIANE JACKIER: The buildings on 11<sup>th</sup> Avenue between 25<sup>th</sup> and 26<sup>th</sup> Street? We could get that information--

COUNCIL MEMBER MENDEZ: Yes.

DIANE JACKIER: --for you. And then, the other buildings along West 27<sup>th</sup> Street--

COUNCIL MEMBER MENDEZ: And, on--

DIANE JACKIER: --between Tenth and 11<sup>th</sup>?

1  
2 COUNCIL MEMBER MENDEZ: Yeah, Tenth  
3 Avenue, yeah, West 27<sup>th</sup> and--

4 DIANE JACKIER: Yep.

5 COUNCIL MEMBER MENDEZ: Yeah.

6 DIANE JACKIER: We can get that for  
7 you.

8 COUNCIL MEMBER MENDEZ: I know we  
9 did a District in mine and Alan's District and a  
10 lot of my buildings on the north side were kept  
11 out, but they were already individual landmarked  
12 buildings--

13 DIANE JACKIER: Right.

14 COUNCIL MEMBER MENDEZ: --which  
15 was--

16 DIANE JACKIER: Right.

17 COUNCIL MEMBER MENDEZ: --the  
18 reason why.

19 DIANE JACKIER: Right.

20 COUNCIL MEMBER MENDEZ: So, just  
21 like to get more information.

22 DIANE JACKIER: Sure.

23 COUNCIL MEMBER MENDEZ: I think it  
24 would benefit--

25 DIANE JACKIER: We can get that



1

2 for--

3

COUNCIL MEMBER MENDEZ: --the

4

Committee to have--

5

DIANE JACKIER: --you. We have

6

pictures of them.

7

COUNCIL MEMBER MENDEZ: Thank you.

8

CHAIRPERSON LAPPIN: Great. There

9

are three other people signed up to testify.

10

Andrea Goldwyn, you can all come up together,

11

Edward Kirkland, of course, from Community Board 4

12

and Simeon Bankoff.

13

ANDREA GOLDWYN: Good morning,

14

Chair Lappin and members of the City Council. I'm

15

Andrea Goldwyn, speaking on behalf of the New York

16

Landmarks Conservancy. The Conservancy supports

17

the designation of the proposed West Chelsea

18

Historic District and urges this Subcommittee, and

19

eventually the full City Council, to affirm the

20

designation. Conservancy staff have visited the

21

proposed District and reviewed the documentation

22

prepared by the Landmarks Commission. We strongly

23

support this designation and commend these

24

proactive steps to protect this significant and

25

intact part of New York's industrial heritage.

1  
2 The West Chelsea Historic District  
3 contains approximately 30 structures, ranging from  
4 mid-size factories, large terminals and low-scale  
5 buildings, which embody the industrial activities  
6 of the late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> century. The mostly  
7 brick-faced buildings include important examples  
8 of industrial architecture that were home to some  
9 of the City's and the nation's most prestigious  
10 firms. A notable mention is the R.C. Williams and  
11 Company building at 259 Tenth Avenue. This ten-  
12 story reinforced concrete warehouse was designed  
13 by Cass Gilbert, architect of the Woolworth  
14 building and the U.S. Customs House.

15 The Conservancy believes this  
16 designation is setting an important example in  
17 continuing to protect the City's industrial  
18 heritage. Although often underappreciated, these  
19 buildings represent an important part of our  
20 nation's architectural, economic and social past.  
21 They were the engines that help drive New York's  
22 economy in the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries.

23 Protection of West Chelsea is  
24 important now, given the development pressures  
25 associated with the redevelopment of the nearby

1  
2 High Line. As we have seen in other localities,  
3 designation of industrial neighborhoods has  
4 created successful synergies between the private  
5 sector, not-for-profit organizations and cultural  
6 groups for reuse opportunities that economically  
7 benefit landlords, tenants and the City at large.

8 In conclusion, the Conservancy  
9 supports the designation of the entire West  
10 Chelsea Historic District for its contribution to  
11 New York's industrial, maritime and transportation  
12 past and for the unique sense of place it  
13 maintains. Thank you for the opportunity to  
14 present the Conservancy's views.

15 CHAIRPERSON LAPPIN: And, we've  
16 been joined by Council Member Jimmy Oddo. And, I  
17 wanted to give Council the opportunity to ask him  
18 to vote on the item that we've already voted on,  
19 which is in Council Member Ignizio's District and  
20 he supports it.

21 COUNCIL MEMBER ODDO: Yes.

22 CLERK: Council Member Oddo?

23 COUNCIL MEMBER ODDO: Yes.

24 CLERK: The vote stands at eight in  
25 the affirmative, none in the negative and no

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

abstentions.

COUNCIL MEMBER ODDO: Although, with all the flip-flopping going on these days, if you ask me again, I might say no.

CHAIRPERSON LAPPIN: Getting ready for the debate tonight.

[off mic]

CHAIRPERSON LAPPIN: Mr. Kirkland, please.

EDWARD KIRKLAND: My name's Edward Kirkland. And, I am actually the Chair of the Landmarks Committee of Manhattan Community Board 4. And, I should say that this, we, there have been so many arguments against this, we actually invented this District or discovered it, I should better say, in the 1990s when we were planning for West Chelsea. And, we are very glad that it was included in actually, or referred to, in the points of agreement into West Chelsea rezoning.

This is the kind of place that people never used to go. It wasn't even safe. But, when they go there, they say I never knew that anything like this was there. It is a reminder that part of Manhattan was a part of the

1  
2 greatest manufacturing city in the world. There  
3 were two kinds of buildings here, both  
4 manufacturing buildings, like the ones in which  
5 they made Reynolds Wrap or the headquarters of  
6 manufacturing companies, like the Otis Elevator  
7 Company, which has been referred to, and there  
8 were the warehouses. One of these warehouses was  
9 the Williams warehouse, which has been referred  
10 to, which was built for the High Line, built to be  
11 served by the High Line. The platform is still  
12 there. It is being included in the High Line  
13 design and therefore, this District, actually,  
14 does contribute to the historic environment of the  
15 High Line.

16           Then, in the west, there are three  
17 buildings, which are all connected by another kind  
18 of connection to the water; that is they were all  
19 served by float transfer bridges that carried  
20 freight cars over from New Jersey. And, there are  
21 three of these. There's the Baltimore & Ohio,  
22 which has been referred to earlier reinforced  
23 concrete building, which was actually the--when the  
24 Hudson River Park was designed, they raised the  
25 old float bridge that served it. And, it's still

1

2 there has an Historic District.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The glorious Starrett-Lehigh Building and also the Central Terminal Stores. And, since I should talk about this, this building has been praised by architecture critics from Russell Sturgis in 19<sup>th</sup> century to Christopher Gay in the present century. And, when Lewis Mumford went and reviewed, the famous critic, Lewis Mumford, went and reviewed the Starrett-Lehigh Building when it was new, he looked at the Terminal Stores and he said, this is an admirable brick building, he said, from the 1980s or whatever year it was, and it is a glorious building and the contrast of the two building add so much to the waterfront. And, it's true.

And, the owner of the building, as was said, he wanted to open up to the waterfront. What he intended to do was to build a tall building on that site, possibly leaving the ends out for its historic elements. That's not how you open up the waterfront. That opens it up to a few people who can afford to live there and it shadows the Park and creates a wall of buildings. So, but, the real way to approach the waterfront is to

1  
2 go down the cobble street between the Terminal  
3 Stores and the Starrett-Lehigh Building and to  
4 come out extraordinary sight and it is on the  
5 Landmarks material, you come out and suddenly you  
6 see the waterfront, the Park, the float bridge,  
7 which served other building before you. It is a  
8 glorious experience. And, therefore, I believe  
9 this is clearly part of the District.

10 I should also like to say, since I  
11 know, personally, the building at 554 West 28<sup>th</sup>  
12 Street, it is essentially an intact building.  
13 It's been tinkered with, you know, with windows.  
14 But, the windows look like the other ones. It,  
15 essentially, is the one building in the District  
16 that says what was here before the District. It  
17 says this is what it is. It's not of any  
18 particular architecture importance. But, it's of  
19 major historic importance because it says this is  
20 what was here before all this industry came in.  
21 It was probably even may have been—it looks as if  
22 it had been a kind of row house. And, although  
23 it, like many others, it may have had  
24 manufacturing in the upper levels. So that, it  
25 is, I think, very important to the District 'cause

1  
2 it reminds it of the really past past, the very  
3 first kind of thing that was there before this  
4 industrial wave spread over it.

5 [off mic] Okay, fine, thank you.

6 SIMEON BANKOFF: Good afternoon,  
7 Council Members. Simeon Bankoff, Historic  
8 Districts Council. I'll keep this very brief.  
9 The HTC supports the designation of this entire  
10 District. Boundary issues are always the hardest  
11 thing when dealing with the designation of a  
12 Historic District. And, in fact, we had requested  
13 that the boundaries be broader than what was  
14 eventually designated. Therefore, and I would  
15 still recommend that they would be broader.  
16 However, the Landmarks Commission made its  
17 decision and we feel that they made their  
18 decisions quite carefully, in fact, we think even  
19 too conservatively.

20 That being said, that one can say  
21 that they are carefully drawn boundaries. And,  
22 that each individual property within in adds to  
23 the sense of the Historic District, adds to the  
24 essence of the Historic District. And, it has  
25 been mentioned by Ed, by Diane, by others, that



1  
2 the building on 28<sup>th</sup> Street is the oldest building  
3 in the District. If we're going to start saying  
4 that buildings with replacement windows don't  
5 deserve to be in Historic Districts, we're going  
6 to lose about half of the 25,000 buildings in the  
7 Historic Districts within New York.

8                   So, again, it's the oldest building  
9 in the Historic District. It represents the era  
10 of development that really doesn't have any other  
11 evidence in this area. And, we recommend that the  
12 Council vote to affirm the designation in its  
13 entirety. Thank you.

14                   CHAIRPERSON LAPPIN: Thank you.  
15 Seeing no one else here to testify, this hearing  
16 is closed. And, this meeting is adjourned.

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, DeeDee E. Tataseo certify that the foregoing transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings. I further certify that I am not related to any of the parties to this action by blood or marriage, and that I am in no way interested in the outcome of this matter.

Signature

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "DeeDee E. Tataseo". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned above a horizontal line.

Date October 8, 2008