	-
ı	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	Transcript of the Public Hearing
10	before the
11	LANDMARKS PRESERVATION COMMISSION
12	on Tuesday, November 26, 2002
13	at
14	One Centre Street, 9th floor
15	New York, New York
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	ORIGINAL
23	AR-TI RECORDING COMPANY, INC. 305 Madison Avenue 142 Willis Avenue
24	Suite 449 P.O. Box 347 New York, N.Y. 10165 Mineola, N.Y. 11501
25	(212)349-9692 (516)741-5235

		2
1	Hearing convened at 4:00 p.m.	
2	PRESENT	
3	SHERIDA PAULSEN, Chair	
4	JAN POKORNY, Commissioner	
5	MEREDITH KANE, Commissioner	
6	CHRISTOPHER MOORE, Commissioner	
7	RICHARD OLCOTT, Commissioner	
8	JOHN WEISS, ESQ., Deputy Counsel	
9	BRIAN HOGG, Director of Preservation	
10	JENNIFER FIELD, First Deputy Director of Preservation	
11	PICSEL VACION	
12 '	•	
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

PROCEEDINGS

MR. HOGG: The next two items will be heard together, Items 9 and 10, Commissioners.

The first, Item 9, is an application for a Modification of Use and Bulk in Manhattan. Docker 032-2653, lot 122, Block 36 and 37, 8 West 70th Street - Congregation Shearith Israel - an individual landmark also located in the Upper West Side/Central Park West Historic District.

An Academic Classical and Beaux-Arts style synagogue, designed by Brunner & Tyron and built in 1896-'97, the application is a request that the Landmark Preservation Committee issue a report to the City Planning Commission relating to an application for a special permit pursuant to Section 74-711 of the Zoning Resolution.

Item 10 is an application for a

Certificate of Appropriateness in Manhattan. Docket

03-2628, block 1122, lot 36 and 37, 8 West 70th

Street - Congregation Shearith Israel - an

individual landmark located in the Upper West

Side/Central Park West Historic District.

An Academic Classical and Beaux-Arts style synagogue designed by Brunner & Tryon and built in 1896-'97. Application is to demolish the

existing community house and construct a new 14-story building.

CHAIRMAN PAULSEN: Meisha?

MS. HUNTER: Good afternoon,

Commissioners. Meisha Hunter preservation staff.

This is an application for alterations at the site of Congregation Shearith Israel as well as complex community house and vacant lot adjacent to the community --

AUDIENCE: Could you speak louder?

MS. HUNTER: Yes. Is that better?

And there is a large team to present today so I am not going to be speaking too long. We will begin with the counsel for the team.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Good afternoon,
Commissioners, Shelly Friedman, Friedman & Gotbaum.

You have before you the applications on behalf of the 450 families of Congregation Shearith Israel for a 14-story building adjacent to its landmark. It is interesting to note that if you do a research of the literature, you will find several references, none of them attributable to the congregation, referring to the congregation as, quote, "The Mother Congregation of American Jewery."

This is an odd statement and it is at

www.protectwest70.org

odds with Jewish tradition as there is no hierarchy among its houses of worship as with other religions. Yet, for what it represents, both in the congregation's historic role as the pre Revolutionary War birthplace of the American Jewish experience and its equally historic role of the centuries old migration of the Jewish people into the New World, the building at 70th and Central Park West was already an international landmark long before its designation by the Commission in the 1970s.

Each succeeding generation of congregants has taken it as a matter of pride that they are the stewards of the world-renowned physical icon of faith, liberty, perseverance and history. The continuing preservation of the synagogue for what it represents to its past and its future is to this congregation already an article of faith.

With that in mind, the congregants come before you today fully supportive of your mission and view it as identical to their own.

This generation of congregants needs your assistance. Not once in its 350-year history on Manhattan has it asked for such assistance from the City of New York. It needs to produce a modest

economic engine, 10 or 11 apartments, to further its preservation program for the landmark; to restore adjacent parsonage, which is, in fact, one of the true remaining single-family, built as a home on Central Park West; and to replace a dysfunctional and utterly unattractive community house located in the historic district.

1

We are requesting a Certificate of
Appropriateness and for a report one exception
74-711 special permit is essential to these needs.
Our presentation today will hopefully demonstrate to
you the care with which the congregants have
approached this request. The formal presentation
will consist of remarks by Rabbi Marc Angel
following myself. He will be followed by Peter
Neustater, who is the president of the board of
trustees. They will discuss the commitment to
preservation purpose that the synagogue has long
adhered to and is certainly willing to adhere to as
We move forward through this process.

They will be followed by Steve Tilly.

Steve Tilly has been a preservation architect since 1999, has been working on the synagogue itself, and will talk to you about the steps which have already been taken to stabilize it, but for the important

work that remains especially to maintain the building and to bring it up to first class condition.

He will be followed by Elise Quasebarth, Elisa Quasebarth, who will speak about the context of building in the historic district, as an individual landmark and as across the street from a scenic landmark. And, then, she will be followed by Charles Platt and Paul Byard who will take you through the building.

Then, if you wish, I can return to talk about some of the zoning aspects that are being requested in the Section 74-711 application. And, of course, we are all here to respond to your questions.

CHAIRMAN PAULSEN: Thank you.

RABBI ANGEL: Thank you for very much for giving us this opportunity to make our presentation. My name is Marc Angel, I am the Rabbi of the congregation. I began serving Congregation Shearith Israel in 1969. I was a young kid in those days. When I first came to the synagogue and sat at the reader's desk, the person immediately to my right then Rabbi Emeritus, David Sol Pool. Dr. Pool began Shearith Israel in 1907. Dr. Pool's

predecessor began in 1877. To make a long story short, since 1768, I am the eighth rabbi in the congregation's history. This is a sense of history.

When one comes into this congregation one has a sense of generations holding hands with generations. When I said that to Dr. Pool, I was talking about the members all the way back to the days of the American Revolution. Our little synagogue that we pray in every morning is a replica of the first building that was built in 1730. We pray at the same reader's desk and sit on the same furniture that our ancestors sat on in 1730 and all the generations since. In our main sanctuary, the reader's desk where our prayers are recited, the floors are the same floors as our synagogue building in 1730. We literally walk in the footsteps of our ancestors.

I tell you all of this to give you a sense of the culture of the congregation of which I am honored to be a Rabbi. This is a congregation that respects its history, that respects its connectedness from one generation to the next. This is a congregation which does everything slowly, carefully, very thoughtfully. When I was a young Rabbi, I thought it was too slow, now I think it is

just right. But the congregation is based very much in its history.

This congregation has played a part in American life since day one. In the early days, our members fought in the American Revolution. Each year on Memorial Day we go to our cemetery downtown and put flags on the graves of those of our congregants who fought in the American Revolution. In 1671, a member, Asher Levy, contributed to the establishment of the first Lutheran Church in New York.

In 1695, 34 members of Shearith Israel contributed to establishing Trinity Church on 7th and 11th, building the steeple of Trinity Church.

In 1847 they had a special service for Irish famine relief. In the late 1800s, when tremendous numbers of immigrants were coming into the United States, they found a great voice in one of our members, Emma Lazarus, who formed the words for the Statute of Liberty.

In early 1930 a great voice for justice in America was our member United States Supreme Court Justice Benjamin Nathan Cardozo. In more recent history, and certainly well-known to all of you, is our illustrious member Alvin Henry

Goldstein, who was not only a great architect but a person very dedicated to the historic preservation of the City of New York.

So this is congregation of Shearith

Israel is a congregation rooted in history,

conscious of who we are, conscious of a tremendous

responsibility to society at large and to our own

immediate community as well.

In the 1920s -- I found a document in our archives written by our previous Rabbi, Dr. David Sol Pool. Dr. Pool thought that the west side was going down the drain and there was no future there. He made a recommendation to the board of trustees to move to the east side, that's where the future was. The board, in its infinite wisdom, decided to stay where it is, the synagogue on Central Park West.

When I first came to the synagogue in 1969, there were a lot of people moving out of New York. We first lived on 85th Street and Central Park West, and we were warned, this block you can walk on, that block you can't because this one is dangerous. You didn't walk down Columbus Avenue. It has changed since then, but there were times not that long ago when the situation on the west side was very vulnerable and deteriorating.

I had a conversation as a young rabbi with our President Edgar J. Nathan III. I said, "Edgar, we have no future here. We should be looking someplace else. The demographics are not with us." It shows how wrong a rabbi can be, especially when he is young.

Edgar, who was wiser, said, "You know what, We are part of the demographics here. When our synagogue stays here, that's a vote for this neighborhood, that's a vote for stability. That we are committed to the future of this neighborhood, of this congregation, of this area. When we stay here, our families stay here and the neighborhood resumes its stability."

This is the kind of commitment that
Shearith Israel had, and the one word that comes to
mind is stewardship. We have, it sounds a little
bit too proud, but I am proud, very proud, proud of
our members and proud of our history. We have a
very beautiful and wonderful building that we treat
with ultimate respect. We respect it not just
because it is a building and a sanctuary to God, but
because it is a visible symbol of our history and
our traditions and our generations.

In the last five or six years, our

congregation has spent a lot of time and effort raising funds, repairing the building, doing a hole lot of work that had to be done. The incredible devotion of our board and of our committees is something that is absolutely a wonder. They did this not for self-gain, not because they thought they would get anything out of it, but just for the love of the building, love of the congregation and love of the community.

As the Rabbi of this congregation, I can say the following: We have pushed ourselves, we have taxed ourselves mercilessly. And every dollar that we invest in the building is a dollar we are not investing in youth programs, in programs for the elderly, in social action commitments, and programs of a community important to us and to our community at large.

The synagogue doesn't exist for the building, the building exists for the congregation. And right now, the financial burden of the running this building is so high and future commitments are so high, that I believe, speaking as a Rabbi, that this imperils our mission as a religious institution and as a civic institution.

In 1897 when we built our building on

Central Park West, this was a duck farm. The only building in the area, I believe, was the Dakota at on West 107th Street. All the other buildings in the neighborhood since 1897 blocked our views, interrupted our lives, caused all kinds of commotion, but you know what, this is a growing city and we are part of it and we did our best to adapt and to be a very good neighbor.

In sum, Shearith Israel has proven over the years its seriousness, its integrity and its commitment to New York and its commitment to the West Side. We have invested time, we have invested money. This building, this area is not only our past, we believe it is also our future. We ask you to help us maintain the standards for which this congregation is famous. We owe this respect and reverence to the generations that have come before us, and perhaps, more importantly for this evening, we owe this standard of commitment and reverence to the generations yet to come.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN PAULSEN: Thank you.

MR. NEUSTATER: My name is Peter

Neustater. I am the "Pinnas" (ph) of Congregation

Shearith Israel Spanish and Portugese synagogue in

the City of New York.

2.5

In 1654, 23 Sephardic Jews claimed a position in Portuguese Brazil. They were making their way back to Amsterdam when they were captured by pirates, rescued by a French ship and dropped off destitute two weeks before Rosh Hashana here in New Amsterdam. That Rosh Hashana service, held September 1654, marked the beginning of Jewish life in North America. Even at that time, they had the historic foresight to name their newly formed congregation Shearith Israel, remnant of Israel.

Congregation Shearith Israel, the subject of this application, residing in its fifth synagogue building on 70th and Central Park, is not only the oldest Jewish congregation in North America, but also the oldest in the English- speaking world. These Jews from the beginning fought not to be tolerated, but to be equal citizens. They fought with the Dutch against the British. They fought with the British against the Indians and with George Washington for the independence of the United States.

On exactly this date, November 26, 1789, President George Washington declared a national day of Thanksgiving. Our congregation 213 years ago

celebrated this first Thanksgiving ever in the City of New York. The 1730 synagogue that this Thanksgiving was celebrated in still exists today next to our main sanctuary. It has been carefully preserved and restored and is used every morning and evening for services.

We sit on the original 1730 benches. The Torah scrolls are kept in the 18th Century Ark, lit by 270 year old eternal light. Pre Revolutionary War era bells crown the Torah scrolls. One set of these bells in the main sanctuary was made by the famous colonial silversmith Ron Myers, a contemporary of Paul Revere and the "Pinnas" (sic) of this congregation during the colonial period.

In the Ark there are Torah scrolls that were slashed by British soldiers when they entered the synagogue during the war. The Chazan would read on the 1730 reader's platform surrounded by the Milano style candlesticks. In the main sanctuary the loose floor boards under the reader's platform were taken from the 1730 synagogue building.

This Friday afternoon we will be lighting a Chanukah Menorah that predates Christopher Columbus. As you can see, Shearith Israel's mission is about preserving the past and carefully handing

it down to the next generation. For hundreds of years we acted as a landmark and preservation group before this concept was popular.

During the early 19th Century, the

Congregation of Turo Synagogue, the oldest building
in the United States, dwindled and could not main
their synagogue building. It was Shearith Israel
that took over the building, maintained it until the
congregation was revitalized at the end of the 19th
century. Today Turo Synagogue, still owned

Congregation Shearith Israel, was the first
religious institution to join the National Trust.

Shearith Israel, throughout its 348-year history has always been at the forefront of historic preservation. To think that we are going to do less is inconceivable. Our goal today is still the same, preserve the past through the landmark, hand it down to the next generation restored, and provide the means for future generations to maintain it. Even before the fire at the Central Synagogue, the trustees of the congregation ordered an engineering study of our 100-year old building.

The engineers reported that the south wall and parts of the ceiling were in danger of collapse. The turn of the century electrical wiring

with a staple installation was a fire hazard and there was, in fact, evidence of earlier electrical fires that, thank God, did not spread. Water leakage from the roof and walls were causing damage to the magnificent scagliola. Tiffany glass was falling out of its frames, and limestone masonry was in danger of falling off the building.

It was obvious to the trustees that we could not wait to go through this lengthy procedure to start the repairs. Our historic building had to be protected and stabilized immediately. We did the responsible thing, we started a major capital campaign and spared no expense to protect the landmark. New electrical systems, state of the art fire detection and suppression systems were installed.

The first mist suppression system in the City of New York was put in place. Leaks were fixed, walls were reinforced and fire-retardant materials pumped in. During the restoration, our architects discovered that not only did Louis Tiffany design the windows, but, also, Tiffany did the entire interior. I think you will find of interest the original list of invoices presented to the trustees in 1898 that were found by architects

in our archives, if you would pass that around.

1.5

We have restored the interior to the original 1897 Louis Tiffany color scheme. We all knew that our synagogue was magnificent, but when the interior scaffolding came down, it was beyond expectations. New York City has one of the greatest synagogues in the world.

While we have stabilized and protected the landmark, much work is still left to be done. Our restoration architect, Steve Tilly, will give a detailed report on the extensive work that remains undone on the exterior of the landmark and the parsonage.

In addition, the community house next to the landmark on 70th Street is in terrible condition and has to be torn down and rebuilt. The trustees of the congregation have decided not to proceed with the developer for this application. We wanted to take control over the process. We are the ones that are going to be here years after the developer has left. The goal of the developer would not necessarily coincide with the needs of the landmark in this community.

To achieve this, we have interviewed architects and consultants that have a reputation

for historic conservation and preservation. We asked them to design the minimum size building that could become the economic engine for us to finish the restoration, rebuild the community house and provide the endowment for continued maintenance of the landmark.

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

We feel our proposal is responsible, one that highlights and supports the landmark building, enhances the skyline of Central Park West, and complements the neighborhood. Many people have asked why don't we just raise the money from the congregation and finish the restoration and rebuild the community house? Before we submitted this application, I met with our budget finance and campaign committee, the main supporters of the congregation. In today's world where there is such great demand on every dollar, both here in New York and abroad, I can tell you definitively that it would be impossible to raise the sum of money required from the congregation. There is no chance that the congregation will be able to finish the restoration of the landmark, continue the maintenance of the landmark, and rebuild the community house without the economic engine that this process provides.

We will not be able to finish our task without this approval. 100 years from now when our grandchildren and great-grandchildren will be sitting on the same benches that our ancestors sat on during the first Thanksgiving in 1789, we hope that they, at that time, will thank this generation of congregants, this generation of New Yorkers, and especially this landmark committee for providing us with the ability to pass this precious heritage to them in a condition that will make us all proud.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN PAULSEN: Thank you.

MR. TILLY: My name is Steve Tilly. My architectural team has been shepherding the master planning and restoration process to this point.

As you can see, the time frame of Shearith Israel is long, looking back as well as looking ahead, and it is has been a thrill for us to join this for the last tiny segment and to try to help look ahead for the next several hundred years.

When we arrived and started working with Peter and Rabbi Angel and the committee trying to develop a preservation-based master plan, we looked at obvious riches that we needed to preserve and restore. We also saw obvious problems, an abundance

of problems that had to be dealt with immediately. With the object lesson of Central Synagogue firmly in mind, we saw a set of baseline improvements that needed to be started to make it possible for us to then continue with the restoration process safely.

Those problems were problems with the infrastructure, problems with the building envelope, water was pouring in through the structure, problems with the decorative finishes that resulted from the water migrating through the building, and also problems with the basic circulation on the site.

Shearith Israel actually consists of three -- it appears to be three independent buildings: The parsonage, the synagogue and the sanctuary, which faces Central Park West. Those are the original composition from 1897 of Arnold Brunner. And then the community house, which is actually a couple of brownstones which had a facade pasted on them in the 1950s. But, in fact, it is an interconnected whole -- a single complex that's interconnected on several levels so that the mechanical systems and all of the circulation is really of a piece.

Our work in phase one -- our master planning dealt with this entire property, but our

work in phase one is really concentrated on the individual landmark, the sanctuary. And that is really the masterpiece of the site. We have done an ambitious phase one. We have arrested the water migrating from the building, we have dealt with a lot of the basic building systems and we have laid the foundation for the future, but there is a lot of work remaining to be done on the structure.

The magenta, if you see that, gives you an idea of the quantity of work on the exterior that you see in the plan and in the elevations. This is the elevation, obviously, facing Central Park West, 70th Street, the community house; the south elevation with the parsonage blocking part of it; and then looking from the west at the back of the parsonage.

You can see, if you think of the three buildings or the three portions, having dealt with the synagogue we have not dealt with this rare commodity, the townhouse on Central Park west. That really is lingering, it needs immediate work. There are a lot of issues to be addressed in that structure, and ,of course, we haven't dealt with the community house.

CHAIRMAN PAULSEN: Before you go on, the

areas shaded in purple represent the entire scope of preservation work that you need?

MR. TILLY: The areas in purple represent those areas that need to be addressed in the continuing preservation work.

CHAIRMAN PAULSEN: How much of this has already been accomplished?

MR. TILLY: The purple is what remains.

CHAIRMAN PAULSEN: The purple is the what remains?

MR. TILLY: Right. The gray tone area indicates the surfaces we have dealt with to this point, but the purple hasn't been dealt with.

Which, again, there are quibbles on that, because, for example, the largest piece of purple that you are seeing here is the roof of the sanctuary, and that we have put a temporary roof on, we put a membrane roof on, and that we have done in a way sitting on plywood which will allow to restore the standing seam metal roof which we found underneath the asphalt.

So there is a major expensive piece of work that needs to be done, that roof is actually visible up and down Central Park West. That is, restoring that roof. The entire roof of the

parsonage needs to be replaced. If we look at the photographs, over here it shows the parsonage. The mansard roof on the parsonage, which is both a decorative finish and a building envelope, it is actually beyond the end of its useful life so that needs to be completely redone.

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

We have serious limestone staining that remains on the parsonage from copper and other kinds of growth, that we actually will need to replace the The front steps of the parsonage need limestone. to be replaced. There are Tiffany windows that haven't been dealt with. There was a program on the major Tiffany windows four or five years ago, the windows that they could not reach and that the budget would not stretch to, which are in back. These windows are in the back of the small synagogue which is adjacent to the large synagogue. These are on the south wall. Those are beginning to show signs of buckling, so we need to begin restoration and protect those windows in the back.

These pictures show you the parsonage roof. This shows you the membrane of the roof on the sanctuary which is being installed in copper hatch. We have done penetration for the future for ACHV systems, and that is awaiting the copper. This

is the detail of the copper maynard that needs preservation.

On the sanctuary, there is an inappropriate railing. The front steps are really -- we deferred -- the scope of work that we done was really everything that we did not need scaffolding for. So we scaffolded the exterior and we scaffolded the interior, just the work that could be done from ladders on the ground. The front of the synagogue facing Central Park West has seriously deteriorated limestone steps, inappropriate railings, a set of grades which do not meet access codes, so we are in the process of restoring those.

A set of railings in front of the parsonage and the parsonage steps which is in need of repair. The areaway around the sanctuary, we still have water, the potential for water to migrate in at the foundation. We arrested the water that was moving through the rest of the structure, but that needs to be attended to. The hen house was recently removed by the MTA, so that leaves the railings leading down and the stairways leading down to that areaway also remaining to be done.

So those are really the symptomatic highlights of the degree of deterioration on the

exterior.

At the end of our master plan, we return to issues of, as I said, there were circulation issues, there also were the substandard issues in the community house itself. So that we turned to the notion of the new building on the community house site for those three reasons, in order to replace the substandard facilities in a building that was, again, beyond the end of its useful life, to solve the interior circulation problems, and also to act as an economic engine for the rest of the preservation program that we have mapped out.

Now I think Elise will talk about the concept of the new building.

Thank you,

CHAIRMAN PAULSEN: Stephen, do you have a full scope of work regarding the preservation that you are proposing for the historic building?

MR. TILLY: Yes.

MS. QUASEBARTH: Good afternoon,

Commissioners. My name is Elise Quasebarth,

preservation consultant for this project.

We have worked with the team to take a look --

AUDIENCE: Can you speak up, please.

MS. QUASEBARTH: Certainly.

My firm, Higgins & Quasebarth, has worked with the team, particularly after Stephen Tilly worked on the master plan, to take a look at the context for the proposed new building and to see what might be possible and appropriate to the site. Just so that we are clear, Central Park West is here and the synagogue is here, the parsonage is just to the south facing Central Park West, and the existing community house faces 70th Street. There is an adjacent empty lot which is part of the site directly to the west of the community house. The existing synagogue is the individual landmark and rest of the site is in the historic district.

The story of the development of the site is interesting and helps illustrate the iterative and thoughtful process that the congregation has gone through over generations to accommodate the space that they need for their community facilities and educational purposes.

The synagogue as a congregation started in Mill Street downtown and moved uptown in several stages, from Mill Street to Crosby Street (ph), then to 19th Street, and in 1895 they purchased six lots at the corner of 70th Street and Central Park West.

They hired Arnold Brunner to design the classical building for them and a residence next door. That construction was completed in 1896. They had two additional lots where the community house is now to the west. They didn't use them and sold them in 1897 and these two buildings we see in the 1940s photograph were constructed shortly after the sale.

Early in the history of the congregation on this site, they needed new space and in 1902 constructed a mansard roof and an addition to the back of the residence on Central Park West. This is a 1900 photograph of the site showing the buildings as they were constructed originally. And this photo here, 1928, shows the view from the south with its mansard roof on it and some of the construction in the back.

In the 1940s, the congregation again considered needing new space and went through a whole planning process which resulted in their repurchasing the buildings to the west of the synagogue, these two small apartment buildings. And they actually filed a building permit for a new building in 1949 but then did not build the building. They went through a whole new process of evaluating what kind of space they could work with

and hired an architect in the 1950s to reconfigure this building, take off the top floor and put this face on the building. So the building you are looking at here was constructed in 1953. This is the place where the new building will be constructed.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

The adjacent lot was acquired in the '60s and the building that was constructed there was demolished in 1970. So this gives you some clarity on how the site developed over time.

As the congregation went forward, you may remember the proposal from the mid 1980s where the congregation actually worked with a developer for a proposal that was a 42-story building that came forward to the Landmark Commission. That was procedure to the designation of the historic district.

In looking at the site and what might be possible, we looked first at the individual landmark itself. Actually, I want to show one other thing on this board. These historic photos show not only what was happening with the site itself, it also shows how the city grew up around the building and around the site.

This photo from 1900 shows a view down

and a row of brownstones, and on Central Park West a smaller apartment building. This photo from 1928 shows an excavation site, this building on Central Park West was demolished to make way for the 16-story apartment building which exists today. The apartment building here, just to the north of our site, was demolished to make room for the building that exists today at 101 Central Park West. So as you can see, the city started to grow up around the institution. Indeed, these views from the 1940s down 70th Street also show apartment buildings where there had been row houses.

This board shows different views of the synagogue itself. This is from the northeast showing the landmark in conjunction with the apartment building to the south, and on this one from the southeast showing a clearer modern-day view and another view down 70th Street. We also looked at widening the scope a little bit, what west 70th Street looks like today. And this context map, which you will be able to appreciate in the board but when you have opportunity to get up and really look at the model, this really tells the story most graphically.

In our context here, this is right here on 70th Street, we have the taller buildings along Central Park West and interspersed with the row the houses along the side of the street are, indeed, apartment buildings: Two on West 70th Street and one immediately adjacent to the site and one a few doors down. And on 69th Street as well, three apartment buildings there, so there is also a mixed context; it is not simply a brownstone context on the side streets.

б

1.0

And you will also note over here that the .
Central Park West apartment building which is directly north of the site is quite deep into the side street. That's true also of the building on West 69th Street, so that this is really directly across the street from our site. These are just photographs of buildings on 70th and 69th Streets adjacent to the synagogue.

Finally, we looked at the Congregation

Shearith Israel synagogue in company with B'nai

Brith on Central Park West, it is the other

institution. And we have illustrated here the

eloquent institutions that line Central Park West

from 63rd Street up to 96th Street: The Society for

Ethical Culture, Holy Trinity, the Second Church of

Christ Scientists, 68th Street; this is Congregation Shearith Israel synagogue, the New York Historical Society, 76th Street; the New York Choral Society, Museum of Natural History and the First Church of Christ Scientists at 96th Street.

Many of these buildings are individual landmarks, most are in the historic district with the exception of the First Christ Scientists, which is 96th, just north of the district. What we note is the monumentality of the individual institutions and their very special design, but we also note that they are all within the context of an urban environment and there are tall buildings around them. This is particularly -- well, it is noted in almost every case, what we do see is that the taller buildings as they juxtapose with the institutions generally have their side walls overlooking the institution. And this is very clear at the First Church of Christ Scientists, particularly the Historical Society.

Our thought in looking at these two contexts, particularly the West 70th Street context as well as the Central Park West context, is that there is a place here in this particular site for an apartment building, scale building. And as I said

www.protectwest70.org

before, when you have an opportunity to look at the model, it will really show that very clearly.

I think Paul Byard and Charles, the architects, will describe it.

MR. BYARD: Thank you. I am Paul Byard

MR. PLATT: And I am Charles Platt.

MR. BYARD: And we will talk about the architecture.

MR. PLATT: But before we do, I just want to point out what a seasonal model this is.

This was entirely green when we started the project and the trees have changed now and if you look closely you will see that the leaves are now all over Central Park West, and by tomorrow, there will be snow on the model.

Let me see if I can simply frame the discussion of the architecture a little bit. Our job, as I think you appreciate, is to produce essentially a work of art that will work with the other works of art that it is charged to bring together. There are at least three pieces that have to be brought together: The synagogue, the Central Park West Streetscape and the historic district itself.

It is not just any building that can bring these together. It has to have a certain strength and that is what we've tried to give it while working with the things that we need to reconcile. This one is, of course, crucial. This is the whole site, as has been pointed out, this is the existing building and this is the portion, the community house, that we get to work with to build the building. It is a block of space. You can see it there.

One of the wonderful things about dealing with a landmark is that the zoning resolution allows you to model the placement of the bulk in a way that will work best for the landmark so that we get the chance to concentrate what we want to do on that particular site as a single block of space that then relates to the landmark.

Let me put, first of all, the context by itself with nothing in it where we started. And the pieces, again, are the landmark itself, the Central Park West skyline, which is what the Rabbi pointed out, nearly drove Shearith Israel away when these buildings were first built. Now we all love them with a passion and you can see it in relationship to them.

www.protectwest70.org

This is the first illustration of the size of the block that we are working with, and you see it particularly vividly in the context model. It is a deliberately reduced size of the volume of space, concentrated in a block at a height with relationship to the --

MR. PLATT: I just want to interject there. When we first came on the project, it was my feeling, if not that of all of my colleagues, that from an urban design and sculptural, compositional point of view, this was too low, but it was made very clear to us -- this is not a self-serving argument, I made this right away, that from a compositional point of view, it would be better if this were higher -- it was made very clear, however, that the needs of the synagogue limited and that they wanted very much to limit it to the absolute necessities which they had to support their project.

MR. BYARD: So that's the sources of the block and you can see the way it fits here.

You can also begin to see, which will be more vivid when we get the bigger renderings up, how we have chosen to relate the block in this direct juxtaposition with the old building. And when you join one piece to another, you have lots of choices.

You can basically seal it up with some kind of a joiner or you can pull it apart with some kind of a reveal. And the way we have chosen to do it, you will see it more vividly on the other, is to set it 10 feet off the back of the old building, in the classic version of a reveal to set one off from another. We'll come back here, but it is a single block against the synagogue.

2.0

Now what we might start with and then go on with other aspects is to start principally with the synagogue. In working out an expression for the apartment block, we have been trying to think of all three contexts. We have to have a presence of our own and we have to find a way to make all of the parts work together in the combined work of art which we will get when we succeed in bringing them together.

The synagogue itself is a very strong, small block of masonry, and it is very strongly organized. Outside, edges symmetrically are edged around the middle. The middle -- the solid outside holds the glass middle. The glass middle is what goes into the synagogue, which allows light in and allows, obviously, the synagogue to appear outward, and it is divided in an order of three, which is

perfectly stable. The same order is done on the side. In fact, it is a rather longer expanse, but two side pieces, three pieces in the middle, a very important glass surface which is modeled between and held in the shadow of the columns and its surrounding masonry.

What we felt we needed to do was to think about issues of masonry being next to a masonry building to be sure that what we did gave them the sense of masonry, a texture, a richness. Because, remember, we want to participate with these buildings, we want to have the strength to participate with them. And then we thought we would work particularly on the conjunction as you see it on this elevation.

Here the matter is the centering of our apparent facade on the Central Park West side.

There is another landmark in all of this, probably most important of all, that is to say, Central Park. And we have a very important relationship addressing, as it were. Central Park across the top of the synagogue, and that relationship calls for a certain strength in this building, which even though it is a hundred and so many feet back still has some kind of relationship and dialogue with the park.

You see the three-part division, the centering of that facade so that it works with the old facade below. Here the issues become more richer and more complicated. The reveal is fairly clear, the ten feet seems about right to us. The tower, then, if you can even call it that, the apartment building then is independent here and it is locked together with a piece that relates to the community uses.

In section, this building is four stories of community uses. Just to be absolutely sure that's what was going on here, here is the synagogue, here is the sanctuary, this is the community portion of the new building, spaces for synagogue uses, and the apartments begin one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten apartments, in fact, eleven because one is two. But the community spaces are different uses within the building and they are culled out by the glass facade of the lower portion which is in the three parts of glass but handled differently and brought across the reveal to tie them all together. Then the building itself goes up and resolves itself at the top with three large glass studio windows.

Now, you all know the windows of the

neighborhood include the extraordinary studio windows, particularly on 65th Street where you will have, in some instances, art glass on the top and clear glass on the bottom, and they are two-story studio rooms that are used by artists. And that, we thought we would take that idea and use it as a device to resolve the building at the top and, once again, using the rhythm of three, the form of three to pull it together and end the building clearly at the top.

So those are the basic givens of the idea; it is masonry, glass and composed as you see it.

MR. PLATT: It is more than that, actually. It is a classically composed building of base shaft and capital here. And we have used, as Paul pointed out, devices that are used elsewhere in the historic district; the great double height windows that are so famous on the artist buildings.

The way we composed this, again, is to place this tripartite frame, really, on the building with the corners revealed as they are so prominently in other parts of Central Park West within the district. Here you see some rather typical examples of how the window at the corner takes on a

particular importance. And we have done that as well.

This is definitely a building in the round here. It is not in the usual sense simply just a corner building with party walls with a secondary facade. Our only secondary facade is facing west on the property line. We have looked very carefully at this and there is no question but that from the Park and, in fact, right across Central Park West you can see the south facade. You can see this facade around the corner.

We have not done a colored rendering of it, but it is treated the same way. We have a black and white which I will show you, but the three facades here are very important to us and the expression of those going with this expression, which we believe is very complimentary and works with the plastic qualities of the existing synagogue.

The materials are very simply this is a type of limestone which is represented here, which if you look at this model, this is the 70th Street facade, Central Park West, only showing a portion of the synagogue and the sanctuary, and here the interior court, which is built up, and this

represents the community facility. There is an extension of some of the facilities below out into the existing yard here, all below the 23 feet permitted by zoning.

ı

13.

And you can see it, if you will look at this later you will see it very clearly here in this small model. The materials are again this limestone, which is shown rather pinker here than it actually is. There is a good deal of zinc which is here, which is on the area between, the piece joining the linking here is zinc; the metal of the windows and here, which you see, is painted metal, not zinc. There is a distinction, although in this light it is very hard to tell, this is darker, this is lighter, and has a lot more reflective quality than shows here.

The base on 70th Street, which is here, does have bronze on it. I should point out that the apartment tower descends to 70th Street at this point, so that the expression comes down here this way, and the community facility is shifted slightly this way and it relates then back to the synagogue itself. But the tower, as it were, comes down to street at this point and is expressed in bronze which exists in the synagogue. This is a wood door,

but there are bronze elements elsewhere.

б

What wasn't said by Steve Tilly is that this solves a lot circulation problems, among them the entrance to the synagogue itself which now takes place through this door, not through the front runner at the front door here, but because of liturgical and functional reasons, it is through here, but it is not handicap accessible now. The sanctuary level is up about five feet from the street level, and there are all sorts of problems dealing with that, which we now solve by being able to enter here two elevators that serve only this, the lower portion, the two below grade here as well, and then can take people to any of the levels in the sanctuary itself, if necessary.

The elevators for the residential tower are exclusively in this portion of the building over here. If I can find a plan, I will show you a typical floor, which is very simple. These, of course, are very early plans, but it is a very straightforward building with, again, these glass corners, the masonry portion on the three facades, the north, east and south, and the party wall conforming to code requirements with limited percentage of glass overlooking the apartment

building to the west.

This is brick here and I think it is actually best seen in the model as to the feeling and coloring. This is brick, and brick complementary to the stone, this is the brick we are planning to use here. There is also in the windows of the tower and in the lower portions here a bit of corrugated glass which doesn't even show as corrugation here, but there it is. That also relates to, again, where the arts building has -- or had, rather, I should say when it was constructed, portions of this were frosted and corrugated glass. So we picked that up and used it.

There is also a relationship, it is not supposed to be a direct relationship but let's call it a happy coincidence with the windows that are in the synagogue sanctuary itself, which are bordered, as are we here, by the different expressions.

MR. BYARD: They are really very strong, these windows, as part of the composition and the texture is very important.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Commissioners, I want to briefly conclude by talking about the 74-711 application which we have requested. Obviously, part of our request is for a certificate of

appropriateness, the standards, which you well know well. Under 74-711, there is really only one finding that you make, and that is a plan of continuing maintenance that has been derived from the preservation of the building and that the design and modifications that are being requested address those preservation purposes.

б

and in that case, we believe that we have made that primary finding. The principal part of this application, the principal effect of the zoning modifications is to move the floor area back off the top of the synagogue and onto the developing site. This is a single zoning lot and has been one for several decades, this is not about transfers of floor area, this is about transferring across the zoning district boundary as a result of moving approximately 9,000 square feet more than we would be permitted from the R-10A to the RAB portion of the lot.

The previous application is, in and of itself, is going to be an adequate preservation purpose. You did that in the case of Saks Fifth Avenue, the Swiss Bank building, in order to preserve the strong facade of Saks Fifth Avenue, the view to the south of St. Patrick's Cathedral and in

order to relate more harmoniously to the smaller buildings of Rockefeller Center directly across the street, that preservation purpose was deemed served by moving it into the mid Plaza zoning district.

This is on that precedent.

1.0

The other, as a result of moving that floor area across the district boundary, certain other aspects of the zoning resolution need to be made. As Elise just told you, there is a very strong street wall sense in this historic district where there are mid-block street walls for apartment buildings, and in fact, this application requests that the remainder of the street wall apartments we would like to make between R and B, so that those street walls would be be retained to their height of 157 feet to the parapet and the building immediately to its east. Also the RAP is already 100 feet to the parapet.

The other zoning action required in the rear yard for the residential portion of the building, the top ten floors, we are respecting the 30-foot rear yard requirement. As you know, the first floor we get a 23-foot full lot coverage, no rear yard requirement there. With floors two, three and four, the zoning would require a 30-foot rear

yard for the community facility, we are providing a 20 foot rear yard for the programmatic needs of the community facility space right now. So for those ten feet, floors two, three and four, we are requesting a waiver of the rear-yard requirement. Those are behind the synagogue and that aspect will never be seen, but it is a programmatic requirement of the synagogue.

In addition to that, when you trip across the rear-yard requirement, you get a lot coverage issue as well for those three floors, so we are also asking for a waiver on those three levels of lot coverage.

Those are the zoning actions that bring us to you with a request for a report under 74-711 so that we can go to City Planning and seek the waivers. Of course, none of that happens unless and until you approve the certificate of appropriateness in the first place. That is also an issue.

So that concludes our presentation. We are very grateful for your time and happy to answer any questions that you may have.

Questions?

CHAIRMAN PAULSEN: We will begin taking public testimony. Before we begin, I want to make

very clear that this is the first public hearing for this project, that there will be many public hearings for this project. I am sure it is extremely complicated, there is much public interest, and today is the first time that the Commissioners, including myself, have seen a full presentation of this project in its totality.

The question before us, as articulated by counsel, is to find, first, if this new building that is being proposed is appropriate to this historic district. This is a new building in the district, this is not an addition to an individual landmark. So it is very important in your comments that you evaluate the appropriateness of this building within this district; is it harmonious in its scale, materials and relationship to the other buildings in this district?

The Commission has frequently evaluated the immediate content in making those determinations and your comments, hopefully, would be focused on that. The Commission does not have jurisdiction over issues of traffic, construction and the other jurisdictions that are the subject of the City Planning Commission, so we will not be reviewing those kinds of impacts heres. The applicants have

offered, I understand, to do a shadow study on the scenic landmark of Central Park, so we will await that information when it is available.

So those are the basic issues of the certificate of appropriateness. If we were to find this building appropriate, then the request is for us to make an application, or support a report for an application for a 74-711 modification of bulk regulations if a preservation purpose is achieved. That preservation purpose could be achieved through the movement of the bulk and massing, if it is found to be appropriate within the historic district, but also the preservation purpose must be achieved by undertaking restoration work and establishing a continuing maintenance program that will preserve the landmark building in perpetuity.

It would require that that restoration work bring each building up to a first-class condition in order for the Commission to support that modification. Some buildings do, obviously, require more restoration than others, but each must ultimately be in a first-class condition as a result of the restoration work.

The restricted declaration that each applicant must sign spells out not only the

restoration work that is required to bring the building up to a first-class condition, but also what has to be done, presumably, a cyclical maintenance program that is required by the restricted dec. We are currently requiring that the inspections be performed every five years. The inspections include not only the exterior elements of the building, but also portions of the interior that have an effect on the exterior, such as mechanical systems. And the building owner is required to correct any problems that are identified in the inspection.

And that restrictive declaration, I believe many of you know, is filed with the property's file at the County Clerk's office amid the binding obligations that rest in perpetuity with the property. So I think it is important if you are going to comment on the preservation purpose aspects of this, the two issues before us are: (A) Is the bulk appropriate, and does the relocation of the bulk serve the preservation's purpose?

Secondly, does the preservation work proposed for this project rise to the level, and in most cases it is to restore the building to a first-class condition and enter into the cyclical

maintenance agreement?

Those are the main issues before us. We look forward to your comments. We are going to alternating, we will be calling five people for, five people against. I am willing to sit here as long as possible, but I would again stress that you will have many, many opportunities to comment and that we have received I think almost 80 to 90 letters regarding this project, either by snail mail, e-mail, and all varieties. So we are very interested in hearing your comments.

I will first call Jack Rudin, and then Leon Levy, and then Dr. Michael Feldberg.

MR. RUDIN: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen of the Commission.

I come as a lifetime neighbor in the upper west side between 86th Street, Central Park
West and 84th Street where I live now. I come as a thirty-plus year member of the board of trustees of the synagogue. I come as somebody who found this building in its earliest stages, many years ago, not to my liking, it was too high. I come as somebody who sees a need to develop architecturally and economically this building to support the synagogue, to support the void in the neighborhood

architecturally.

I urge the Commission to take a favorable look because of the sensitivity of the architects and the congregation. This synagogue, somebody alluded to the fact that 30 years ago the neighborhoods were changing. My father and I prevailed upon the leadership of the synagogue not to sell and move to the east side, that the west side was the future of this city. So it is with strong feelings that I urge that you approve this design.

I am not the developer of this property, of this building, but I represent a family that has ten apartment houses between 67th Street and 86th Street on the west side. We have great faith in these properties as rental real estate, as rental property that is needed, and we have not gone into condo or cooperatives because there is a need for less expensive -- in the long run, less expensive rental property.

I think the architects have produced an example of sensitivity and good taste that complements the historic synagogue, that does not demean in any way the neighbors, the properties of the neighborhood, and I hope that you will look upon

this application as appropriate and favorable.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN PAULSEN: Thank you.

Mr. Levy?

б

MR. LEVY: Good evening, my name is Leon Levy. I am a past chairman of the Conference of the Presidents of American Jewish Organizations. I am presently a long-time president of the American Sephardic Federation.

I took very seriously your comments about preservation, long-time preservation. As a Sephardic Jew, I see the need and the necessity of planning properly and doing it in good taste that the synagogue be forever enshrined in this neighborhood, as it has been here already for 105 years, and that it serves, I can tell you on an international scale, as a beacon of light. There is not a Sephardic Jew in the world that does not know about this historic synagogue.

When dignitaries come to the United

States, they know that the one place that they will

be accepted warmly and where they will come will be

at this synagogue, so it is important that we

continue with the tradition of Sephardic Jewery as

that began over 500 years ago when my ancestors, and

many of the ancestors of the people in this room were expelled from Spain and continued on with their historic tradition.

It is important that this preservation be done, and I believe that by following along this quite modest approach of creating the necessary underpinnings to guarantee that the synagogue will continue for many, many generations to come, that I would ask that you approve the project so that we can look forward for many, many years, for a long time, that this part of the west side will be preserved.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN PAULSEN: Thank you.

Dr. Feldberg and then David Nathan.

DR. FELDBERG: I am Michael Feldberg, the Executive Director of the American Jewish Historical Society. The society was founded in 1892 and it is one of the oldest Jewish organizations in the United States, but it is not nearly so old as this congregation. In fact, in the archives of the society are some of the first records of the congregation, the founders of the congregation who pledged themselves to each other and to the Jewish community of North America. They signed some

founding papers that sit in our archives on 16th

Street, so it gives me some sense of the long-term

commitment that this congregation has had to serve,

as Mr. Levy said, as a beacon not only for Sephardic

Jewery, but, really, for the Jewish community of the

United States.

In 2004 it will mark 350 years from the landing of the first 23 Jews who came here and who have been meeting continuously as a congregation that is now the owner of this building, so I have great faith that in dealing with this organization you are dealing with an organization that not only has a sense of its history, but has kept a careful record of its history, has maintained its archives through hundreds of years, and that has a real understanding of what the obligation of historic preservation means, what historical continuity means.

Sephardic Jews -- I guess I can say this because I am not one, I am an Ashkenazic Jew, my family is from the Ukraine and eventually the lower east side -- they are known to have a sense of worldliness, sophistication, good taste, good judgment, and ability to live well with their non-Jewish neighbors. And I think that is a fair

thing to say, that I have every confidence that if the congregation feels that this building is an appropriate neighbor, that the congregation has thought long and hard about not offending, not intruding and not getting into conflict with their neighbors. That has been the tradition of Sephardic Jewery which has lived in Moorish countries, Arab countries, which has lived all over the world and has been an ambassador of Jewish people all over the world. I don't think this congregation, knowing that tradition, would violate that sense of being a good neighbor.

I am also very pleased as somebody who just completed the development of a rather large facility called the Center for Jewish History down on 16th Street in New York to know that the congregation is willing to sign a covenant with the city saying that it will maintain -- that it will create a preservation endowment, an endowment to assure that not only will this current renovation get done, but the resources will be there then to maintain it and to live up to standards every five years.

I hadn't known that until I sat at this hearing, but it is a very wise program for the city

to have and it is very wise of the congregation, I think, to want to sign such a covenant and maintain it forever. I think that nonprofit institutions that have programmatic needs have a well-established history, and I am guilty of it myself, of putting money into programs rather than facilities and to spend money on human needs rather than maintenance of their facilities. But this is such an important building, this synagogue and this congregation, so historically important, that if they are committing to a preservation plan long-term, the entire Jewish community of the United States and of the City of New York should be grateful to have this kind of commitment.

With that, I thank you. I hope you will permit this.

CHAIRMAN PAULSEN: David Nathan and then Lloyd Zuckenberg.

MR. NATHAN: Thank you.

I am a vice president of the congregation. I happen to be a member of the family that was among the founders of our congregation, but I stand here today as one of the many young families that are very much a part of this very active, vibrant and growing community. If I can observe,

there is a reason that this congregation is still here and is still vibrant, and I think that is because I think always, we have always looked to the future and always planned well and always tried to make sure that we were taking steps to ensure that we would be true to our mission of preservation, and at the same time true to our mission in the community, and in terms of staying active, young, vibrant and growing.

We have many, many young families today. We stand ready and we ask for the Commissioners' help in this next stage of planning for the future and we are prepared to do our part.

CHAIRMAN PAULSEN: Thank you.

Lloyd, and then Jennifer Hoppa.

MR. ZUCKENBERG: My name is Lloyd
Zuckenberg. I am a member of the congregation since
1994 and I care deeply about the built environment,
as does everyone probably in the room today.

I also care about the future of this congregation. I am not, however, willing to place the interests of my spiritual home above the interests of the community, and that is why I have been involved in this effort since 1996 when David invited me to do so, and why I speak with great

pride in support of the building before you.

What we are asking for is reasonable and appropriate. If it wasn't appropriate, I would not be standing here today asking for your approval. In its bulk and its massing, our objective is not to maximize our profit. It is to do what is reasonable and appropriate and contextual and still permit us to create an endowment to maintain our landmark sanctuary.

Seven weeks ago I held my newborn son at the ceremony of the circumcision, or brit milah, as we call it, in the newly restored sanctuary, nearly completely restored but not completely restored. I report proudly that this was the first ceremony of its kind in the sanctuary since it reopened after its partial restoration.

I look forward, with my wife and my three children to celebrating generations of happy occasions in this unique spiritual home, unique in a way that I have never seen in any other Jewish congregation I have ever been involved in because I had not been in this congregation prior to 1994.

And I am confident that this building will provide us with the resources that we need to be careful and appropriate stewards of our landmark for generations

to come.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN PAULSEN: Thank you. Jennifer and then Kate Wood.

MS. HOPPA: Good afternoon, Chair Paulsen and Commissioners. My name is Jennifer Hoppa, and I am here to read the testimony of the Manhattan Borough President C. Virginia Fields.

"Thank you for the opportunity to express
my concerns regarding the
modification of use and bulk and
the certificate of appropriateness
application for the venerable
Congregation Shearith Israel
Synagogue.

"An academic classical and Mozart styled synagogue designed by Brunner & Tryon and built in 1896 and '97, this individual landmark graces

Central Park West at West 70th

Street and has influenced the design of an abundance of synagogues nationwide. The synagogue is also within the Central Park West Historic

60

residential side streets and Romanesque Revival, Queen Anne and near Renaissance row houses.

to transfer unused development rights to this property blessed with a synagogue to construct a 14-story residential community The transfer of development rights, proposed demolition of the community house and the extensive changes to the site's zoning results in an inappropriate 157-foot building. This high structure radically compromises the individual landmark and immensely detracts from it at numerous vantage

integrity of the Central Park Historic District with its slow rise of roof houses on both the north and south side of West 70th

25

Street. Given the extent of 1 alterations to the site zoning the 2 synagogue to secure and facilitate 3 the development, the preservation 4 purpose of this application is of 5 particular importance. 6 Unfortunately, up to this point, 7 8 the applicant has not been adequately clear on this point. 9 "I urge the Commission to secure a firm 10 commitment from the synagogue to 11 12 direct resources gained from any development for the preservation 13 of the individual landmark 14 15 synagogue, in addition to ensuring that any unused development rights 16 17 are retained by the synagogue 18 site. The proposal before the 19 Landmark Preservation Commission 20 today raises considerable concerns 21 about the precedent this project will set for other institutions 22 along Central Park West. 23 Residents, preservationists and 24 the Landmarks Preservation 25

Commission have worked diligently to bring about Central Park West's Historic District designation.

Institutions should be directed to preserve its character and its iconic skyline.

"Thank you for the opportunity to

testify. I am hopeful that under

the Commission's leadership a

lower-scaled, contextual and

historically appropriate project

can be brought to fruition that

aids the synagogue in their

on-site restoration work and helps

meet their needs for a community

facility."

CHAIRMAN PAULSEN: Thank you.

Kate Wood.

MS. WOOD: I would like to make my statement after Norman Marcus and Mark Lebow. It will make more sense after their presentation, if that's all right with the Chair.

CHAIRMAN PAULSEN: Mark was third from now, but if that's the order in which you want to proceed.

MR. MARCUS: Good evening, members of the Commission. I appreciate the opportunity of this preliminary meeting on this application to give you the benefit of some insights that I have had both as a land-use lawyer for the City Planning Commission going back to 1963, and, as well, when I left the Commission in '85, I did participate in the zoning study which was a building study of the area that was subsequently designated as the Upper West Side Central Park West District.

And just to recall, and we have this in the record, the facts which showed three prototypical kinds of buildings within this historic district, the Central Park West street wall buildings, which were street wall when they were built to bulk --

CHAIRMAN PAULSEN: Norman, I am sorry, can you state your name for the record.

MR. MARCUS: Sorry. Norman Marcus, I live at 91 Central Park West and I am a land-use lawyer.

I think the three types of buildings are very much at the heart of the issue before you, which is an issue of appropriateness. If this is an inappropriate application of building, then it seems

to me the zoning questions beyond it fall away. Is a 14-story building in a mid block an appropriate building?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I would argue no. The study of all of the buildings in this district which was used and relied on when the historic district was adopted here, which I believe is one of the largest in the city if not the largest, showed three types of buildings. The Central Park West iconic built to bulk wall buildings similar to 91 and 101, where there were such buildings, but Central Park West also had the individual contributing or landmark institutional buildings. This Central Park West wall is a highly idiosyncratic wall, it is not really a complete wall, it goes up and down. If you remember the old planetarium, you could see it from the planetarium and you could see it going up and down, up and down. It is a classical New York Central Park West skyline.

This proposal, although it is set back over 100 feet, would read as a wall from the park itself, which is a historic landmark. The other buildings, they were avenue buildings, Columbus and Amsterdam Avenue buildings, and were lower than the Central Park West buildings. And then there were

the mid blocks, and the study found that an unusually high survival rate occurred in the mid blocks at the time this historic district was designated. More than 85 percent of those buildings were row house type, 55 to 60 feet high.

Ultimately, that style -- it contained, of course, exceptions, and there are two exceptions to the west of the site, but those were nine-story prewar buildings, built without setback and were within the district when it was designated.

Were they the new wave of the mid block?

I doubt it. Certainly, those two nine-story

buildings would not be any kind of context for the

proposal. The context, I would argue, is the north

side of 70th Street which has the perfect rows,

which is where the shadow of this proposal would

fall, and the south side which is predominantly row

house but does have two prewar nine-story buildings.

These are the types of buildings we have in the district. I heard someone say that because this application is only 14 stories, it is, therefore, contextual. I think what the speaker meant to say was that it was more contextual than the earlier application which was 42 stories. But 14 stories does not fit within the historic mid

block, and when one looks at the other institutions on Central Park West and one grapples with the idea here, which is that it is necessary to allow an inappropriate building to serve as an economic engine to preserve landmarks, I suspect that this Commission is at the threshold of a very slippery slope and a slope that will really lead, I think, to severe depredations within the historic district, which is, after all, about preservation, not about economic engines.

As far as expectations, I think a religious institution, a charitable institution, they have purposes for which they are chartered which have to do basically with morality, goodness, the state of the soul, these are all terribly important. The properties were acquired in 1895, we heard. I think those properties were acquired in pursuit of the synagogue's incredibly moving history, namely, to provide a place for worship.

These properties were never intended to support real estate development, albeit dedicated to the religious purpose. This Commission was a party to a litigation over 20 years ago involving the Society of Ethical Culture where Ethical Culture attempted to get the right to build residentially

and use the development rights that were under the zoning resolution to support their institution.

They claimed it was a taking of their property not to be able to do that, but the courts did not accept that argument. In fact, the court said this is not the expectation of a charitable or religious institution.

CHAIRMAN PAULSEN: Norman, with all due respect, the synagogue had made many presentation statements regarding the endowments and other things, but the first structural question is, of course: Is this building appropriate?

MR. MARCUS: Yes, I understand.

I think on that score, when you see the model, it sort of looks like it is from another planet. It is a Central Park West building that has been moved around the corner. That's really all I can say here.

I just -- I find it hard because I have prayed in this synagogue on mornings when dominion was lacking and I have been in that old synagogue, it is a wonderful. And I will continue to do that, I hope. I live next door and I hope they will be with us for a long time to come. And I suspect that if this building is found inappropriate, the

Commission will stay and perhaps come back another day with a better proposal.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN PAULSEN: Thank you.

Mark, and then Kate Wood.

MR. LEBOW: My name is Mark Lebow, together with my brother, Norman Marcus, we are the lawyers for the neighborhood and the surrounding buildings and, naturally, we are opposed to this application.

I think as your Chair announced, the basic is, is this building appropriate? If I could meander just a little bit --

CHAIRMAN PAULSEN: I am sorry. You have to speak from the lectern.

MR, LEBOW: Okay, I will point long,

Take a look at that model, folks. This model and this particular proposed building has been called a work of art. You and I have been around long enough to see works of art and know what a work of art is. That is not a work of art.

What it is, it is a 14-story luxury condominium building that, as my brother Norman Marcus said, meandered from another planet into a mid block on one of the most beautiful streets in

the city.

Я

Now, I know that many of you have seen the particular site, and if I were up there, I would point to that building all the way on the right, which is what Norman has described as somewhat out of context, a building from a long time ago. But on the entire south side of the street, we have a row of four to six-story brownstones and the same thing is true across the street, as it is in most of the streets between 68th Street north between Central Park West and Columbus Avenue.

Here is what the City Planning Commission wrote about this neighborhood and what is appropriate for it, way back on April 9, 1984, way prior to the creation of this historic district.

The City Planning Commission said it was concerned about the effect of new construction there. It described the mid block area around West 70th Street in the following language: "The typical mid block building is the three to six story, 55 to 60 foot high brownstone, limestone or less frequently tenant, usually not built to the street line but forming a wall of varying length with repeated setback and rear yard lines."

The report continues: "The consistency

with which these building sites north of 68th Street repeat themselves is the key to the strength and clarity of the image of the west side. Over 85 percent of the structures in the mid blocks," talking about this mid block in particular, "conform to this mid block type. New development will weaken the quality and intactness of the existing context by introducing buildings that are out of place."

That is what is appropriate to this neighborhood. That work of art is not.

Now, as you know, the neighborhood is hysterically against this particular building. They all appeared at Community Board Number 7 at the Landmarks Committee Meeting, and I was sort of proud of Community Board Number 7 because it unanimously found that this building was inappropriate after a session that lasted practically until breakfast.

Now, as some of you know, I am a former chairman of the Community Board, but I have a sort of healthy regard for Community Boards, sometimes they make the right recommendations and sometimes they don't. But this one listens very, very carefully, whenever it comes to what is appropriate, that points to a particular block, a particular part of a block, and even a particular building in a

block. So if you ever listen to a Community Board, if any of its decisions make any sense, this is one that makes sense.

I can hardly ever remember, at least in my Community Board, a unanimous recommendation for anything. I suppose that they have an occasional certificate of appropriateness, but they are very rare, at least in my experience.

Now none of us means any disrespect to the Congregation Shearith Israel. They have been around since 1654; they will be around in 2254, I hope. I wish my congregation had Jack Rubin and Leon Levy and the Nathan family. Don't worry about them, they will do fine. They just spent \$6 million to fix up this landmark. It is a work of art.

The landmark is a work of art. As I understand it, it is in better shape than it has been since about 1890. It is certainly in better shape than I have ever seen it in at least 25 years. Ladies and gentlemen, I have a dream about Congregation Shearith Israel; it has had a magnificent history, it has taken care of a new Trinity Church and everything else in the neighborhood and it will continue to do that, and a 100 years from now, the grandchildren of Jack Rudin

and the Nathan family will walk out on 70th Street, out of Congregation Shearith Israel, and they will say to themselves, because this inappropriate addition will not be there, "We have continued our tradition of being good neighbors. There is no luxury condominium behind our beautiful synagogue. We have not caused a virus that has affected every similar building up and down Central Park to happen." And they will say with great pride that they have continued their tradition since 1654 of serving the community and at the same time being a good neighbor there.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN PAULSEN: Thank you.

Kate?

1.0

MS. WOOD: Thank you, Commissioners.

Kate Wood speaking on behalf of Landmark West, the Committee to Preserve the Upper West Side. Landmark West does oppose Congregation Shearith Israel's proposal to build a 14-story 167-foot tower in the mid block of West 70th Street between Central Park West and Columbus Avenue.

I just want to put something on the table which -- I am not able to hear very well so I am not sure if it has been mentioned before, but a lot of

people in this room have very long memories and they remember a proposal that was put forward by the synagogue back in the '80s, it was a 42-story building, I think with a 440/480 foot tower. That was something that I just want to get out there, because it was raised at previous presentations. It was printed in the New York Times. It is something that people have in the back of their minds.

And I just want to up front dispel any notion that had proposed that the building is modest or harmonious or reasonable or appropriate, even by comparison to that building. I do want to point out, and this is just to reiterate what was presented by Mark Lebow and Norman Marcus, about the fact that the historic district designation in 1990, and the creation of a contextual RAB zoning district in 1984, that tower proceeded both of those districts.

Back then, the only relationship that was under Consideration really was the relationship between the proposed tower and the individual landmark. Today the Landmarks Commission has the opportunity and the responsibility to insure that new construction on this site not only relates appropriately to the landmark, but also reinforces

the character of the surrounding historic district.

Both tests must be met in order to find that this

proposal is appropriate.

The proposed tower, we feel, meets
neither test. I just want to, first of all, focus
on the impact of the proposed tower on the landmark
synagogue. While it is not the sliver tower of
years past, the 157-foot building would,
nevertheless, overshadow the synagogue, eight floors
of approximately 3,500 square feet each not
including mechanicals, would rise up beyond the
cornice lines of the synagogue and create an
overbearing presence that would compete visually
with the landmark as part of the Central Park West
streetscape and sever its relationship with the
predominantly low rise mid block.

Now, as significant as the individual landmark is, it is only one building. The historic district, on the other hand, is a total environment with a strong identity and sense of place. This, too, or perhaps above all, must be respected. The proposed building is incompatible with the dominant character of the West 70th Street mid block, a quintessential brownstone block in the upper west side in Central Park West Historic District.

Landmarks and City Planning Commissions to work together to ensure that zoning matches the existing built fabric within historic districts in order to reinforce heighborhood character and prevent avid-right blockbusters, so-called, from destroying the contextual integrity of landmark protected areas. In fact, this was one of the four planks of the preservation platform which was spearheaded by Landmark West, the Historic Districts Council, The Municipal Art Society, New York Landmarks Conservancy, and was supported by over 125 groups citywide.

A unique and enviable situation exists on the mid blocks of the upper west side where landmark protection and zoning really do go hand in hand. Here the zoning is perfectly in line with the goals of the historic district and vice versa, and I would just like to quote a couple of excerpts from the Historic District Designation Report which describes the neighborhood as follows: "This district evokes the distinctive qualities of the Upper West Side from the powerful iconography of the twin towers along Central Park West, to its active commerce along Columbus Avenue, to its residential side

streets. On most of the side streets, the district's scattered maynard apartment buildings have interrupted the original roads. But in general, the surviving row houses present a strong coherency and are the major element in creating a special sense of place, particular to this district on Manhattan's Upper West Side. The interplay between the low scale character of the row house groups which dominate the side streets and the large scale character of the taller buildings that terminate these blocks on Central Park West reinforces that role of the avenue as an eastern frame of the district."

2.0

I just want to turn for a moment to the City Planning Commission's 1984 report which Mark Lebow has already quoted from, but it does say that a major concern raised by the study would be the effect of new construction on the scale and urban design characteristics of the west side. The study area offers a special resource in the city. Its low rise townhouse mid block, its residential boulevard, and its highly identifiable profile on Central Park West.

It says, "Even structures of lesser individual value reinforce the human scale and

identifiable urban design characteristics with notable consistency." So, as I said, we have an enviable situation where these two, the zoning resolution as well as the historic district designation, really do reinforce one another. They are beautifully in sync, but only, only if we adhere to the sound principles that were established in the landmark and zoning regulatory scheme.

If we falter, if we surrender on a case-by-case basis to the particular pressure of a particular developer, the soundness of the principled approach is diminished and so is the landmark and so is the historic district. So I urge you to deny both the application for the certificate of appropriateness and for a 74-711.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN PAULSEN: Thank you.

Lisa Kersavage.

MS. KERSAVAGE: Lisa Kersavage, with Friends of the Upper East Side Historic Districts.

Friends is testifying on this issue today because both the east and west sides share a common pressure characteristic, low rise mid block residential buildings. This building pattern is essential to preserve in order to maintain a sense

www.protectwest70.org

of place in both neighborhoods. This proposal to build a 14-story building on a mid block is very inappropriate.

2.2

In order to receive a modification of the use and bulk regulations under Section 74-711, the Commission must find that the bulk of the modifications relate harmoniously to the landmark building or buildings in the historic district. It is eminently clear that the proposed 14-story building is not harmonious to the landmark synagogue itself, nor to the dominant character of the mid blocks on the Upper West Side Central Park West Historic District.

The character of that district is of low rise buildings on the mid blocks and taller on the avenues. And this proposal is contrary to that pattern. Because the proposed building would be a domineering presence over the synagogue and contrary to that building pattern, it would destroy it and should not be approved.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN PAULSEN: Thank you.

Dr. Altchek and then Marian Weston.

DR. ALTCHEK: My name is Edgar Altchek,

I am a trustee of Congregation Shearith Israel. My

(516) 741-5342 AR-TI RECORDING COMPANY (212) 349-9692

family and I have a long history with the synagogue.

My parents were married in the chapel you saw before
in 1938.

I am familiar with the project and I find it entirely appropriate. I believe it is in keeping with the history, the values and the tradition of the our synagogue, and at the same time, it is considerate and respectful of the needs and interests and concerns of our neighboring community.

I thank you for this opportunity to speak.

CHAIRMAN PAULSEN: Thank you very much.

Marian Weston and then Jeffrey Mosseri.

MR. SOLOMON: I have been asked to take her place. My name is Lou Solomon, and I am a resident of the upper west side and a member of the congregation.

I speak in favor of the proposal. I think when you have preeminent architects and preeminent preservation people coming and trying their best to find something appropriate, if it is not appropriate for the synagogue which needs the funds to be arguing in favor of their preservation use at this time, then I don't think it is appropriate for the Commission to hear that the

synagogue has lots of rich members so the Commission shouldn't really care.

This is an appropriate building because people who know a lot about it and who are more sensitive to these issues believe that it is an appropriate building, and I speak in favor of it.

CHAIRMAN PAULSEN: Thank you.

Jeffrey Mosseri -- is Mr. Mosseri here?

AUDIENCE: No.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

1.4

15

1.6

17

1.8

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN PAULSEN: Lucienne Bulow.

MR. BULOW: I am George Bulow. Lucienne stepped out for a moment, if I may.

CHAIRMAN PAULSEN: You were next.

MR. BULOW: So I will speak and she will be back by then.

CHAIRMAN PAULSEN: Go ahead.

MR. BULOW: I am George Bulow, I am a 30 year or more resident of the Upper West Side and I am a member of Congregation Shearith Israel, and very proud of it. I do not live at 91 Central Park West, as do some of the speakers. I do not live at 101 Central Park West, nor do I live at 18 West 70th Street, the three buildings which adjoin the site we are talking about today.

There are in this audience, however,

members of the cooperative corporations which constitute those buildings who are also members of this congregation who are in this room, and I have not heard one of them stand up and say that they agreed automatically that all the people who live in those buildings are all against it. So this is something you also need to bear in mind.

These are members of our congregation and they feel, as do I, that it is appropriate. This building is a frame, and it should be looked at as a frame. It is a method of focusing one's eye, whether it is from the park or from the adjoining catty-corner to the beauty of the jewel that lies before you, a landmark. This building has done a great deal to frame that jewel in a way which will draw the eye to the bulk, to the limestone front of that building, and to give you a sense which is quite important.

As the architects have said in speaking about the themes which Brunner brought forward -- I might add, I am not an architect, nor am I a lawyer, but I can speak to the artistic merits of this. The three windows then, which one sees carried forward both on the 70th Street side as well as on the Central Park side, are echoed in the building which

lies behind it.

To characterize the 14-story building as a tower, particularly in the context of New York and even in the context of this historic district, strikes me as a bit of an anomaly. Yes, it is an apartment house and, yes, it is not five stories tall, but it would hardly be a tower around the context of any of the other apartment towers we are seeing built of late.

In addition, if there is to be a complaint on the part of the building, I think it is very difficult for someone in a building which is 200 feet or more high, which constitutes the solid block front on Central Park West to complain about a 157 and a half foot building. There are people who live at 18 West 70th Street, which, again, is not a brownstone and people have made the statement, well, since it is not a brownstone, but it was grandfathered, it should not be part of this context. And they have attempted to describe the building.

Our congregation stands and is asking to allow it to be built as an appropriate facility with the necessary changes, as one which, in fact, matches and carries on the site lines that that

building at 18 West 70th Street constitutes. So to describe us as either a mid block building, which it clearly is not -- yes, it is not on the avenue, that is very clear, but that does not necessarily mean it is a mid block building -- and to constitute it as something which casts a shadow throughout the neighborhood, as if the 200-foot buildings alongside it do not have or have not, or that a 125-foot building to its west has not, is, I think, a bit disingenuous.

I hope that you will consider this to be an appropriate structure. I hope that you will bear in mind what has been said so eloquently by the other speakers who have come before me on behalf of the synagogue in the sense that we are members of this community, we want very much to stay there and continue to be part of it. We all live there and we are all your neighbors, but at the same time, we have an obligation which we take quite seriously, and this is the first time in our history we come to ask the city's agencies and governmental bodies to support us in our ability to continue to keep that landmark, the jewel that it is, on the Upper West Side.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN PAULSEN: Thank you.

Is Lucienne here?

MS. BULOW: My name is Lucienne Bulow, I live on the west side. I am a neighbor and I have been a member of the Congregation for the past 30 years. This Congregation has been at the corner of Central Park West and 70th Street for more than a hundred years, and for all our hundred years it had the right to expand to fulfill its needs, but it did not. It chose to only consolidate two brownstones to use as its community house, to have its office, its school -- and if you look at it, it is pretty unattractive anyway.

The passage of time should not take away the right that the Congregation has to build an appropriate building. And what you have as a proposal is definitely an appropriate building. It is a modest proposal, I would say, and it is sensitive to its neighbors and to the neighborhood, and as you have heard, it is needed to continue to have the Congregation maintain its landmark status with its landmark building. It is very expensive to maintain, and maintaining it is also a credit and an asset to the neighbors of the congregation.

So I would really ask you to accept the

proposal.

CHAIRMAN PAULSEN: Thank you.

Dr. Alan Singer and then James Greer.

DR. SINGER: My name is Alan Singer, I am the Executive Director of Congregation Shearith Israel.

I believe that the proposed building is not only appropriate, but it is a necessity. I would like to explain several ways that Congregation Shearith Israel serves the community since it is the community house that we now seek permission to replace.

First and foremost, our religious services are open to the public twice daily, 365 days a year, even on the high holidays we go out of our way to accommodate visitors who make prior arrangements with our security department. We provide many classes and lectures open to the public.

Second, tour groups. Thousands of individuals per year from across the United States of all ages, of all religions, participate in guided tours of our historic landmark. In addition to taking great pride in showing others our beautiful sanctuaries, we proudly fulfill our responsibility

to explain the history of America's first Jewish congregation. Our one of a kind archives are made accessible to scholars and museums worldwide. In fact, the new space that we are proposing will allow us to better serve the academic community by returning 50 percent of our historic documents back to our facility from the off-site warehouse on 110th Street where we currently rent space.

Throughout our history, we have been asked by communal and governmental bodies to host community-wide events which we were always happy to accommodate. In June 2002 at the request of the Manhattan Borough President, C. Virginia Fields, Shearith Israel hosted an evening of Jewish Heritage Commemoration, which was attended by over 200 people and the general public was invited.

In March of 1997, having just completed the restoration of our Tiffany glass windows, our synagogue hosted a workshop in stain glass restoration at the request of the New York Landmarks Conservancy which was attended by 185 individuals. This past May, at the request of the New York Landmarks Conservancy, Shearith Israel for the first time in anyone's memory opened its historic West 21st Street cemetery to the general public to

provide hands-on experience in a program titled

"Preserving Historic Burial Grounds." 50

reservations were received in advance of the

workshop and over 180 people actually participated.

And this coming January, Shearith Israel has gladly agreed to host another program of the New York Landmarks Conservancy which is a forum on decorative paint finishes to which we will, again, be happy to invite the entire community.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN PAULSEN: Thank you.

Mr. Greer, and then Jonathan Baker.

MR. GREER: Members of the Committee, my name is Jay Greer. I reside at 101 Central Park West, where I am a director of the board of directors and immediate past president.

I am under a considerable disadvantage, both I and my directors. Our first notice of this, as far as I can tell, came about five weeks ago. Our first board meeting came before the first meeting. That board, having heard the information that was in the press and some that we gleaned from our friends at 91, took the unanimous view that this was not an appropriate building to be put in across the street on 70th Street, for all the reasons that

I think have been amply laid out, they really have, before this gathering this evening.

I happen to share those. I might say only one of the directors has a view that will be affected by this. Mine will not. There is nothing personal in this.

Responding to Mr. Bulow's comment, I am sure that there are members of the congregation who live at 101 Central Park West who support this.

There are, however, a great many people who have made it very, very clear to us that they do not support this. This is not a popularity contest, but there is a very, very serious outcry about this.

I also met yesterday with Rabbi Angel,
Dr. Neustater, Mr. Friedman, six out of the nine
directors, to hear their story face to face for the
first time. We said at that meeting -- first of
all, we tried to make it very, very clear that we
respect enormously their incredible tradition, which
was brilliantly laid out this evening. We
understand -- and I want to say this from a personal
standpoint, I understand the importance of landmarks
in general and this landmark in particular. It is a
very pivotal piece of a wonderful neighborhood.

I also think that it was said in the

testimony, and I say that as a now retired lawyer, that there was no other way to finance the preservation work, some of which clearly has to be done, the roof you have to fix or it will leak all over the gorgeous interior. Rabbi Angel very graciously took us through it yesterday. That would be a crime.

We also tried to make it clear that we do not have any problem with tearing down the very ugly, I will call it the social hall, it is not a community house. It may serve the community of the congregation and I have to say that we do hold our annual meetings in the basement sometimes, but it is hideous, and undoubtedly, for all the reasons that were laid out here, needs work.

The thing that we left with them, that we are not persuaded that there is, as was testified earlier, there is no other way of financing the necessary work. My mother came from Missouri and she would say, "Show me." And we offered to meet with them after this hearing, which is our first opportunity to hear the full presentation, and see whether they could persuade us, so we in turn can persuade the unhappy members of our household that this is not a bad thing. Our offer, I will now say

on the record, still stands. Absent that, however, I think that you will find our board will continue with its unanimous opposition to this proposal as quite inappropriate.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN PAULSEN: Thank you.

Jonathan Baker and then Sandra Levine.

MR. BAKER: My name is Jonathan Baker, I live at 31 West 69th Street where I have lived for 31 years.

You have asked a very direct question, you have asked us whether this is compatible with the Code. Our answer is dramatically no, it is visibly out of character. It is rather like the old fable of the Emperor with no clothes, you are asked to believe that this disproportionately tall building is proportionate. We can see it is not.

That's really not the argument that has been presented. The argument that has been presented is that this building is necessary for the economic vitality of the synagogue in order to propel itself forward as a preservationist. I would propose this is a false dilemma. What we have is a middle to upper class prosperous synagogue of 650-plus families that has been able to afford to

keep this building, the temple itself, in condition.

What this building does, it is 14 stories and it is not perhaps limited to 14 stories, by the way, is that it denigrates the character of this historic block. You will see that we residents, we who really live there, are highly protective of that character.

What has been presented here is a kind of blackmail, if you don't give us this 14-story building, well, we are not going to do these renovations. It is not said directly, it is implied, but it is a very strong implication. We reject this quid pro quo. It is a false proposition. Therefore, what is the basis of this building? It is visibly out of character, dramatically so. The only argument is that the money is needed.

I will conclude with just an anecdote that really pins this down. As a full-time liturgical musician for churches and synagogues, full time for more than 30 years, I have been all over these monkey bars for decades. The problem is that you take an example that was presented up on the board of the churches and the various institutions along Central Park West that are

protected. I have been at those institutions, both of the Christian Science churches I have been director of in my capacity. With far smaller congregations and far smaller budgets, they have been able to maintain the architectural integrity of their buildings.

1.3

A very dramatic case, and I will probably have to present this again at a further hearing, when I was at 96th Street and Central Park West as the director of the First Church Christian Science Church, I can tell you if you go in there on any Sunday morning or Wednesday evening, you will see 30 active members in that congregation, never more. It is tiny. When I was there, they had a portfolio of just over \$200,000; yet, they were totally dedicated to maintaining that building and they do.

Therefore, I am astounded that a 14-story tower is necessary for this congregation, which is already quite prosperous, to function.

What they have proposed, in their own words, as an economic engine, is really a cash cow that is not necessary, and for us who live in the neighborhood, this cash cow is a white elephant. It is out of proportion.

Thank you for the time.

CHAIRMAN PAULSEN: Thank you.

Sandy, and then Bob Mattson.

MS. LEVINE: Sandra Levine, Historic District's counsel.

HDC does not support this proposal.

Shearith Israel synagogue is an individual landmark that is also in the Upper West Side Central Park West Historic District. The proposed new building affects both the distinguished individual landmark and the historic district in which it is located.

Regrettably, the effect on both is negative.

Putting aside all reasons and focusing instead on the esthetics, a 14-story building that might be appropriate at that height on an avenue, is being proposed for mid block. The designation report for the district notes that row houses on the side streets that form the heart of the district are the predominant residential building type.

Eighty-five percent of the buildings in the district are row houses.

The character of the Upper West Side

Central Park West Historic District is defined by

rows of brownstones on the side streets. The

contextual zone district, RAB, in which the proposed

building is located, reflects the low rise character

of the mid blocks that both the zoning and the historic district are supposed to protect. To the extent that the north side of West 70th Street, between Central Park West and Columbus Avenue, looks almost exactly like the illustration for RAB districts in the zoning handbook, if this building were proposed for a site, say, two lots farther towards Columbus Avenue, there would be no question about its inappropriateness.

The building proposed is an avenue building on a mid block. On that basis alone, it should not receive a permit. Rising above the synagogue, the 14-story tower will disrupt the iconic skyline of Central Park West by looming over the synagogue itself. In very general terms, the design of the proposed building, as well as its height, raises additional concerns about its appropriateness.

Its orientation is problematic. The entrance to the building is on West 70th Street; yet, the structure reads as a Central Park West building. The east facade faces Central Park West, is actually the side facade, not the front, and it is designed as such. The west facade, equivalent of the rear facade, is at a right angle to West 70th

Street, and at a right angle to West 70th Street is very visible along West 70th Street. This is a facade of the building that would normally face the garden core.

More specifically, the design shows insufficient deference to the landmark and to the major avenue of the historic district. It is unlike any other building on Central Park West in terms of ornamental massing or gold detailing such as a pediment at the roof that characterizes buildings on that avenue. Neither is it a bold modern design that would afford a lively contrast to other buildings in the historic district. With its open glass corners, neither does it relate well to the streetscape.

on 70th Street, we question the choice of exterior grilles rather than interior blinds for the privacy of the offices. The asymmetrical treatment below the floors of the facade do not relate to the brownstones on the street. A more carefully thought out design that would allow the building to make a contribution to the historic district is needed.

As for the special permit being sought under 74-711 of the zoning resolution, the preservation purpose remains unclear. The

Congregation has been a wonderful steward of this extraordinary building and has substantially restored the building.

To conclude, applying out of the zoning to the side street will result in an erosion of the character of the Upper West Side Central Park West Historic District that the Landmarks Preservation Commission is supposed to protect. The applicant has tried to orient the building to Central Park West, but in fact, its entrance is on West 70th Street. When the character of West 70th Street is considered, everything that is inappropriate about the design becomes clear.

Without any waivers or variances, the synagogue could construct a six-story building. If the design were appropriate, a building of that height would be supportable. This one is not. We ask the Commission to deny the application.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN PAULSEN: Bob Mattson and then Deborah Platt.

MR. MATTSON: My name is Bob Mattson, I live at 300 Central Park West, the El Dorado, which itself is an individual landmark building. I happen to be on board of that building, but I am not

appearing in that context. Another, I also belong to a synagogue, an upper west side historic synagogue that has similar needs to this synagogue. I would like to make only two points.

One, with regard to the skyline, not speaking as a neighbor on the blocks adjoining this temple, the southern skyline would clearly be unalterably affected by this building, and I think that's inappropriate.

The second point is, we are working on a major project, preservation project, as you probably know, at the El Dorado, and there are also reasons, economic, personal, major reasons of tenants and others who would like to have variances and thank God for the Commission. You hold us to standards that I think are appropriate. This is not one of those applications that should be approved. As a precedent, it would be a terrible precedent.

The synagogue that I belong to right now has a terrible roof problem. We have space that we would love to build and I guess to build eight or ten million dollar apartments and have all revenue from that, that would help us to meet our needs, reasonable needs as well; however, it would be destructive of the neighbor.

Again, I hope you oppose this 1 application. 2 3 CHAIRMAN PAULSEN: Thank you. Deborah Platt and Angelo Abdela? 4 Is Deborah Snyder Platt here? 5 (No response.) 6 Angelo Abdela? 7 AUDIENCE: He's not here. 8 9 CHAIRMAN PAULSEN: Florie Algranti 10 Charles and then Myron Smith? 11 MS. CHARLES: I am Florie Algranti 12 I am a member of the congregation and I 13 don't live on the Upper West Side, I live up in

Charles. I am a member of the congregation and I don't live on the Upper West Side, I live up in Inwood. I have been a member of this congregation for 26 years, and the reason was that I was raised Sephardic and 26 years ago, when it was time to raise my son in the tradition I was raised, my choice was here was here or Co-Op City, so I chose here. They have been extremely welcoming.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I am not a Central Park West person.

When they asked for contributions for the refurbishing of the synagogue, I sent them a couple of hundred dollars, because that's all I could afford; however, when they started a homeless program years ago and they asked us to be part of

it, we used the Town House in Manhattan. The men came and they were our guests for the evening. We welcomed them, and the synagogue is a welcoming place.

I looked at The New York Times article that was talking about what they were building and the level of how high it was seemed to be the same size as the buildings around it. I feel that the synagogue goes out of its way to be part of the community. They did a blood program, but I couldn't be part of that because I can't give blood, but they have been involved in community affairs and have always tried to reach out.

They welcomed my son and I when I went there 26 years ago, and it wasn't like, "Well, can you afford this and can you afford that?" It wasn't like that at all. So when we characterize our congregation as it's very wealthy, maybe some people are, but not all of us; and there are people who come from all over. I found out about this synagogue, I didn't really know much about it, when I was in Lauderdale Road in London, 27 years ago. I said, "This is like what I remember from when I was being raised on Allen Street downtown, the synagogue I went to. And they said, "Well, there's one just

like this in New York," and I went there. I knew nobody and I was very welcomed and I have been welcomed for 26 years.

I think if the synagogue feels that they can do this now, and they have lowered their scale and lowered their scale. I notice when they did their restorations -- in fact, we didn't have the main sanctuary for about a year until this past Rosh Hashana -- it was so beautiful. My son said something to me. He's living in Chicago, he was in Germany in the U.S. Army for a few years, he said, "Mom, how could you take me to that synagogue?"

I said, "What did I do wrong?"

He said, "You spoiled me for every other synagogue I have ever gone to since."

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN PAULSEN: Thank you.

Myron Smith and then Naomi Sutton.

MR. SMITH: I am Myron Smith. I am a resident of the West Side for 44 years and I reside in Majestic Apartments. I have seen many changes on the West Side, other buildings going up and all for the good. I think this building is entirely appropriate. It is not a mid block building, it is more towards the corner, and I appeal to the

Commission to approve this project because it will enhance the entire neighborhood and will also enhance 70th Street.

Thank you very much.

1

CHAIRMAN PAULSEN: Thank you.

Naomi Sutton and then Colonel Jonathan de Sula Mendes.

MR. KELLER: No, I don't look like Naomi Sutton, she has asked me to speak in her stead. My name is James Keller (ph), I am a trustee of Congregation Shearith Israel. My wife and two children are members. My wife and I have been members since we have been married at the congregation in 1985.

I would like to speak very briefly talk about the preservation that has been debated today.

History is littered with fallen giants, so as much as I am cheered by my proposed confidence that our grandchildren of will walk out of Congregation Shearith Israel in I think the Year is 2254, regardless of the decision which you will make, I think it would not behoove us to imagine that depressions and especially the good fortune which has kept our synagogue building standing and in reasonably good repair for a hundred years will

endure forever.

Congregation Shearith Israel is at its core a community of families, not very different from those who have spoken up against this building. Families like mine, with mortgages to pay, with children to education. Musicians, librarians, museum curators, school teachers -- we're not all lawyers and doctors -- all of whom have reached deep into their pocket to fund the restoration that has been affected today, but we cannot continue to do so indefinitely.

We are indeed fortunate to have generous members like Messrs. Rudin and Levy, but these gentlemen are not regrettably eternal. The congregation needs your approval to in order to create a trust which will ensure its future and transcend that commitment to its benefactors.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN PAULSEN: Colonel Mendes -- is Colonel Mendes here?

AUDIENCE: He just stepped out.

CHAIRMAN PAULSEN: Gilda Angel, is she

here?

MS. ANGEL: Ladies and gentlemen, I've lived on the West side --

CHAIRMAN PAULSEN: State your name, please.

б

MS. ANGEL: I'm sorry, Gilda Angel.

I've lived on the West Side with my family for 30 years. As a matter of fact, for 27-and-a-half of those years we lived on West 70th Street, on the same block as the synagogue. It was our neighborhood, it is still our neighborhood, and the synagogue was so central to the lives of so many people who hoped for many, many years that it would be able to maintain itself. The building proposal that you have heard today will give us the means to do so.

We feel that the building is appropriate. I feel that the building is appropriate for the neighborhood. There are many different styles of buildings along Central Park West, some modern, some not so modern. There's a variety of styles to be contended with. There is certainly no uniformity along Central Park West, and this building which backs up the synagogue certainly acts as a beautiful back drop to set off the synagogue as the jewel that it is.

We feel that the proposed building will serve not only the congregation but also the

community at large with the dignity and distinction which is the hallmark of all Congregation Shearith Israel projects and activities. We hope that you will approve the proposal for this project.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN PAULSEN: Thank you.

Is Gloria Mosseri still here?

No. Then James Platt.

AUDIENCE: I think they had to go.

CHAIRMAN PAULSEN: Okay. Marc Daniel?

MR. DANIELS: Sorry. Thank you very much. I was just telling my wife that I was going to be late for an event at my daughter's school, sorry for walking in late.

My name is Marc Daniel. First, I wanted to thank the Chair for their understanding in agreeing to continue the hearing and to hear additional testimony at a later date. I would ask that I and the other speakers tonight be allowed to speak again at other moments, should the committee members not present today be present at future events.

CHAIRMAN PAULSEN: If I could respond to that request. We have a stenographer present today who is making the transcript that will be available

to all Commissioners. Because of the great number
of people who we anticipated would be here, we do
want to provide that written record to all
Commissioners who are not present today. At future
meetings and hearings, we will open the record
obviously for testimony. We will ask people to
speak to issues that are different or if they have
further thoughts at the next meeting.

MR. DANIELS: But people may speak again if there is additional testimony?

CHAIRMAN PAULSEN: If there is additional information, they will obviously be able to come and offer additional information.

MR. DANIELS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN PAULSEN: You're welcome.

MR. DANIELS: In the interests of time, I will speak briefly and very briefly reiterate some things people have said.

I am a long time West Sider. I am

Treasurer of the Board at 18 West 70th Street and my
son has attended school at Shearith Israel, so we
have many ties to both the community and to the
synagogue.

There are two preservation goals and only one is agruably supported by this proposed building.

Equally important is the goal that some of the people in the community have spoken about today, which is the preservation of the West Side historic district as represented by 70th Street, and the precedent this sets for historic districts throughout the city.

One speaker, a couple of speakers have actually said that this is not a mid block building. That reminds me of saying it depends on what the definition of "is," is. The building would be in the middle of block; it is a mid block building.

The first gentleman who made that reference also talked about the size of other buildings in the neighborhood, including my own building, Number 18 and Number 30, all of which, I would argue, is irrelevant to the appropriateness question before the Commission, because these buildings have existed since the 1920s.

I would also like to agree with Rabbi
Angel. He noted earlier today, way back in the
beginning, how wrong a rabbi can be. The community
-- what he did not hear is the speakers who came
after him and he did not hear the testimony given
before the Community Board Landmark Committee last
week, but it was very clear that there is broad and

wide spread community opposition to this.

The Community Board, as you are aware, Community Board Landmarks Committee and other Community Board members were present there last Thursday, and unanimously voted that this tower is not appropriate and is too big for the site. Dozens of people from the community spoke against this proposal, and as far as I am aware, no non-member of the synagogue tonight or then spoke in favor of the proposal, or President or Assemblyman, or Councilman and other representatives and political figures also oppose this.

Over 100 residents of my building, Number 18, some of them are members of the synagogue, many of them have lived here for decades, have asked me to speak on their behalf, and they strongly feel that this tower is inappropriate, and I share that with all the Commission members here and I thank you for the time.

CHAIRMAN PAULSEN: Thank you very much.

Myles Weintraub, then Dana Miller.

MR. WEINTRAUB: Good evening. My name is Myles Weintraub. I'm a resident of 18 West 70th Street. I am an architect, and I was co-founder of the urban design group of the New York City Planning

Commission in the late 60s.

2.0

2.2

I will try to be very brief. The issue to speak to is the question of appropriateness in the historic district, and I urge you to turn the models around so you can see the models from the west, and then answer that question. Is the proposal appropriate to the historic district?

On another point, it was said before that 74-711 allows this proposal. 74-711 allows the application. 74-711 is a special permit proceeding, not an as-of-right proceeding.

We first saw drawings of the proposal on November 6th. We have started our own analyses of the impact of the building on surrounding buildings with drawings. We are not complete. We are cheered to hear that the hearing will be extended, and we will present our information graphically at that point.

Even though we aren't complete, last

Thursday night, without the benefit of presentations

like the applicant, the Landmarks Committee,

Planning Board 7, each member expressed clearly his

and her decision as to the inappropriateness of the

project.

AR-TI RECORDING COMPANY

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN PAULSEN: Thank you. Dana Miller and then Ron Prince.

2.0

MS. MILLER: Hi. My name is Dana Miller and I live at 110 West 90th Street, so I am not a person who would be directly affected if the building went up; however, for the last 18 years the Upper West Side has been my home. My first apartment rental after graduating college was on the Upper West Side. When we were married we purchased our condominium on the Upper West Side. My husband opened two restaurants on the Upper West Side, and our son goes to school on the Upper West Side.

When I had my son Marco eight years ago and would take him out in the stroller, I started developing a new appreciation for the beautiful blocks on the Upper West Side, in the Central Park West Historic District. As Marco grew older, pushing to stroller gave way to walks and even field trips through those same blocks. You could say that I inadvertently developed a lay person's interest in preservation.

There are favorite blocks that were regularly ventured down. Many are in the lower 70s and 70th Street is one of them. When I turn east on 70th from Columbus and take a few steps, I feel like

I could be in a time decades ago. The north side of the street in an uninterrupted line of houses. The south side is largely brownstones, some with dramatic stairways leading up to the entrances. There are a couple of taller buildings, but all prewar and none taller than 10 stories.

A 14 story, nearly 160 foot tower would loom over this block. Anyone approaching from Columbus Avenue would have an entirely changed experience of this block. Turning on to 70th Street wouldn't be transporting any more, it would be saddening. I am not an architect, I'm not a lawyer, but shouldn't I be able to enjoy the feeling of history in our historic district? And shouldn't I also be able to trust that my son will be able to when he is taking his children to the park?

In my own synagogue we are asked to dig in deep for buildings funds and special drives, and yes, we grumble, but the money gets raised. Here we are asked to believe that the only way this established, successful congregation can finance its new facility is through a high rise luxury condo? I don't understand it and I promise you, no one in New York will understand it either.

Congregation Shearith Israel is the

going to go up, it didn't. We now have this incredible offer to build a short tower. So much is in the telling of the story. Everything is in the telling of the story. The other day Kelly Friedman was asked over at 91, she said, "I have been meeting with community groups three times a week." Somebody said, "For how long?" She said, "For one week".

So which way is it? Is it in the middle of the block? Is it Central Park West? It is tied together, it's referential, all this is bogus. This is a condominium tower. The only honest word is "tower." If you walk down the block, it is a block that doesn't want a tower. If you go stand on the block -- I am not an architect and I am not a zoning specialist, but I am a walker and I love the historic district, it has a kind of social conscience.

Mr. Rudin referred to an architectural void on the Upper West Side; I don't think so, and I don't think the historic district is about an architectural void. My friends in Texas say, "If you want to see old buildings go to Europe." I am a New Yorker, and I think we can do better. I think we can take care of what we have got. We don't have to build this thing.

oldest established synagogue in the U.S. It should be a voice of treasuring history not a threat to it. If the congregation will not play the role that it should, then this Commission must. This building plan will be a major blow to the historic district and it seems a nasty precedent to establish. Please do the right thing on this important issue.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN PAULSEN: Thank you. Ron Price and then Michael Marsh.

MR. PRINCE: I am going to make my remarks at a later meeting. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN PAULSEN: Thank you. Michael Marsh?

MR. MARSH: I am Michael Marsh. I am a resident of 101 Central Park West. If I crane my neck around I would see this new building. I live in New York City out of choice. I grew up in the Texas Panhandle, I came to New York when I was 19, I love New York. A friend of mine from Texas and I, we walked to the mid 60s, we walked almost every street of Manhattan, every week we walked and walked and walked. I moved to the Upper West Side in 1967, I love it. I am still a walker.

I lived in 101 when the big tower was

I got married recently. My wife had a baby. I would like to add on to my apartment, I need more space, and I can make a really good case that I need more space, so what? I have got to live with what I've got, I've got to live within my means with what I have got. So I am not a pro, but I love my neighborhood and I love the streets, I love walking the streets of the Upper West Side, and we don't need more, we don't need more.

1.4

2.0

I agree with Marc, these institutions, if they have survived, will continue to. I have been there for 25 years, it seems to be doing just fine. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN PAULSEN: Thank you. Alvin Deutsch?

MR. DEUTSCH: Thank you, Madam Chairman and members of the Commission. I am Alvin Deutsch. I was formally President of the congregation until my retirement in April, and I was the president at the time that we did this extraordinary fund-raising to preserve our congregation, to preserve our sanctuary.

I just want to tell you it was not easy.

It is the first time in the history of this 105 year old building that we went to our members asking for

direct contributions for this kind of work. Indeed, we do have some people of means in our congregation, but as Ms. Charles told you, we have an abundance of people not in that category. That's why I am here today. We are not a museum, we are a living body.

We have members of our congregation who are struggling, as my co-trustee said, to raise their kids, to pay for apartments adjacent to our synagogue; many of them have to walk to attend Sabbath services and, therefore, they have to be in the immediate neighborhood. We rely on those people for our future.

We must look ahead to who is going to fill the social needs of our synagogue. Community house can not do it. We need better classroom. We need a library. We need facilities for our historic documents, and the only way that this is going to be achieved is by your approving this program, which is within the needs of the congregation and neighbors. Let us not become a relic. Let's not depend upon what has gone on before. We must look ahead to those members who in the future will be supporting this, and at the present cannot do so because their own economic needs yet need the services of our congregation as a house of worship, not a museum.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN PAULSEN: Pedro Gonzalez?

MR. GOLDSTEIN: I am Gabriel Goldstein.

I am the curator of Yeshiva University Museum. I am an art historian and specialize in Jewish visual culture. I am also married to a trustee of the congregation. She takes great pride to be a trustee of the congregation.

Addressing the building in terms of its architectural content, firstly, the building, I think, is conceptual, not only in terms of its presence by 518, which is not a traditional brownstone; the block does not contain merely traditional brownstones, there are obviously larger buildings. It's obviously very close to Central Park West, that is mid block or not, it is relatively eastward on the block, and, therefore, conceptualized with the larger buildings on the south side.

Treatment of the facade, in terms of the use of materials, in terms of echoing architectural elements based on the treatment of other Central Park West landmark buildings -- and we checked this with our own congregational building, but also with 67th Street larger studio windows. That places it

firmly within an architectural content.

The synagogue is a landmark. It's a landmark technically and it is a landmark also conceptually. It's a landmark for the multicultural nature of New York City, being a Jewish house of worship which was established in New Amsterdam, and there's a continuity then of the multiculturalism of various communities from that point onward through today and into the future.

We were able to afford to preserve our sanctuary partially. In order to be able to preserve our congregation, we most go elsewhere. As a museum professional, I am very aware of the cost of preservation activities, and it is unfortunately impossible for a relatively small community, a community which contains members of means, as was said, and many members who have to struggle to live in Manhattan, to afford to preserve such an important landmark, landmark in terms of historic import, in terms of beauty, in terms of aesthetics, and in terms of a faith community. We must look to another source of income for this purpose.

I think as a community which recognizes the importance of preservation as part of an historical community recognizing historical

legacies, we must look to how not to profits will be able to find money to preserve their heritage, architectural heritage, conceptual heritage and faith heritage. They do not have a source of income.

The congregation is proposing a relatively modest and sensitive architectural enterprise to be able to continue forward. We must continue forward with this legacy for our congregation and for all New Yorkers.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN PAULSEN: Thank you Barbara Smith. Is Ms. Smith here? And then Saul Laniato (ph).

MS. SMITH: Thank you for this opportunity. My name is Barbara Haran Smith and I am very proud to lend my support to this project.

I'm a life-long West Sider and part of a family, devoted congregants of Shearith Israel.

I consider the proposed project appropriate, tasteful, and an enhancement of our West Side Historic District. I most respectfully urge you to approve it.

Thank you again.

CHAIRMAN PAULSEN: Thank you.

Saul Laniato (ph), and then Naomi Dovdavany.

AUDIENCE: She left.

MR. LANIATO: Ladies and Gentlemen, my name is Saul Laniato. I have been a member of the congregation for the past 56 years. I'm just concerned that other people in this audience have no idea of the inner workings of our congregation, of the financial structure; what the cost to our congregation was to come this far in the restoration of our building, of our historic building, and I would urge you that this building is both appropriate and necessary for the community. I would urge you to support it.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN PAULSEN: Thank you.

Cornell Mendez?

am a retired trustee of Congregation Shearith

Israel. My family's roots go back to the colonies

before the American Revolution, and we have been

here for all these years. Because our footsteps are

deep in the sands of time of the history of the

congregation, I feel a responsibility to think about

its future, and to speak out about its future.

It is clear to the current trustees and past trustees like myself that the congregation has outgrown its present facilities. We don't have the facilities to do the things that we are responsible for doing to enhance the Jewish life of our congregants. We are blessed with having the remnants of Israel -- Shearith Israel in Hebrew is the remnants of the seed, the remnants of the departing of all the Sephardim from all over world to come to New York, and come to worship with us. We have to provide for them the framework that they left abroad in the Mediterranean countries. come here not as wealthy people, they come here tired and the poor, those who were expelled, and it is our responsibility to provide the framework for these people to worship appropriately.

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

We are not a rich congregation as has been suggested by a number of people who oppose the project. That is a fiction. We are not a rich Congregation. We struggled to raise the money to renovate our hundred year old synagogue building, and it wasn't easy and we are not finished yet.

The word "appropriate" or "inappropriate," I am not competent to judge appropriateness or inappropriateness with respect to

the standards that you have before you and that you must make a judgment on, but I do want to say this: You will recall our famous Senator Daniel Webster. He argued a case before the Supreme Court, a Dartmouth College case in the State of New Hampshire, and his closing words before the Supreme Court were, "It is a small school, but there are those of us who love it." Congregation Shearith Israel is a small congregation but there are those of us who love it.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN PAULSEN: Thank you very much.

Ruth Schulson, is Ms. Schulson here?

MS. SCHULSON: Yes.

I am Ruth Schulson, and I want to say that I am for this proposal. Shearith Israel has always contributed to New York City, to the community since they first came here. So I feel that it should -- and we need a community house with more space.

My family has been here since the very beginning so I don't know what has gone on over there, but I heard about it.

MS. PAULSON: Thank you.

Steven Neuwirth?

MR. NEUWIRTH: Good evening. My name is Steven Neuwirth and I would like to address, as you requested, the appropriateness of the building.

I think it is important, just by looking at the drawings that are up on board, to think about both 91 and 101 Central Park West when judging the appropriateness of this building. Compared to those two buildings, this is a modest contribution to both the Central Park West skyline and to West 70th Street. I invite you to come to West 70th Street, to look how far into the mid block 101 Central Park West actually goes, and then to go to 69th Street and to look at 91 Central Park West. This is not an intrusion into the mid block, but it is a contextual contribution that will support the synagogue and how it looks on Central Park West.

I am not an expert in city planning or in landmarks preservation, but I did have the good opportunity in the early 1980s to work with Con Tou (ph), who was then head of the Manhattan Office of the City Planning Department on the work that that office did on mid blocks and addressing the problem of sliver buildings, which you will recall was a major problem at that time. And I got to work with Con on the City Planning Department's report, which

ultimately led to the rules that the City Planning Commission adopted to deal with sliver buildings.

I believe that this building which has been proposed is fully consistent with the principles that were behind that work by the City Planning Commission. First, not to disrupt mid blocks. Second, to preserve the integrity of street walls. Third, to create a graceful transition from mid blocks to avenues. And, fourth, to maximize the beneficial use of air rights that exist on historic buildings like Congregation Shearith Israel.

I think that what has been proposed here makes a contribution to the skyline, makes a contribution to the block. It is a wonderful thing about the Upper West Side that people walk on the mid blocks. I walk down West 70th Street almost every morning to pray at our synagogue, and I can tell you that if you come and walk from Columbus Avenue to Central Park West, consider the existence today of 101 Central Park West on that block; I think you will easily be able to see that this building is consistent with and contributes to the integrity of that street, and the suggestion that only a six-story building should be built is absolutely inconsistent with the other buildings

that would be adjacent to the lot that is now standing.

б

So I strongly support the proposal. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN PAULSEN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN PAULSEN: Michael Katz.

MR. KATZ: My name is Michael Katz, I am a trustee of Congregation Shearith Israel and resident of the Upper West Side at 86th Street.

I would like to speak to some personal experience that I have with the maintenance of the building. It has been my privilege as a trustee over the past six or seven years to be intimately engaged in the renovation of the stained glass windows, as well as having the responsibility of maintaining the building.

With respect to what Norman Marcus said, for 25 years, the building was not well maintained. And when a group of us took on the trusteeship, we began to examine the infrastructure of the building, and we were shocked that despite the appearance, the real infrastructure was in serious decay, and we began -- without a fund-raising program, simply because it had to begin -- we began a project of maintaining and upgrading the existing building,

utilities and, as I mentioned, the window.

We have experienced -- I used to come to the budget meetings and see the administrator, who was treasurer at the time, and he said, "Here's the biggest item in the budget," because even more than salaries and any other item, the cost of maintaining the building and bringing it up to what were minimal standards were the largest capital expenses out of our operating budget that we had for many, many years. I can assure you that without the endowment that the economic funds from this new building will provide us, we will not be able to maintain the building on a five- year cycle.

Up until when we began the project six or seven years ago, it hadn't been maintained on a five-year cycle probably forever, but we realized what the cost of it was. It is our sincere dream that this building will enable us to do that on a regular basis and will enable us to protect the building the way the building really needs to be protected.

Like Steve, it is my privilege also to walk to 70th Street every morning. I begin my morning by leaving 86th Street and Central Park West and walking down to 70th Street. I see different

degrees of sunlight, different degrees of shade, and I have really learned to enjoy the various distinctions as Central Park West changes. say that, number one, there is no uniformity. Certainly 101 and San Remo are so looming that they are a little frightening to these eyes, but when I turn the corner and see our building, it gives me great pride that we have presented a true landmark, something that is appropriate and sensitive, appropriate for the context and also a project that we have struggled so hard for so many years to develop that it will serve the needs of our landmark and will enable us to use our funds for our programming, which is the most appropriate use of our funds, and will also be within the context of the West Side historic district.

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

CHAIRMAN PAULSEN: Israel Goldstein.

AUDIENCE: He's left.

CHAIRMAN PAULSEN: Suzanne Stern?

Dennis Freilich?

MR. FREILICH: Members of the

Commission, my name is Dennis Freilich. I am

speaking as a supporter of this proposal. I have

been a member of the Congregation Shearith Israel

for 40 years. I have raised my children here, all

four of which are now members and have growing young families and are struggling like everybody else to be able to live in Manhattan.

I think that I don't want to repeat a lot of things that have already been said, but I am a former President of the congregation. I know the problems that the congregation had in trying to raise the funds to do what we have already done, and I think that, as you have heard, there are some members of means and there are also many members struggling, who are struggling, who cannot afford to finance a complete and ongoing renovation without help from the City Commission dealing with this question.

I want to just express my opinion that I think to a city that is full of large towers, a 14 story building, to say that this is a tower, is a little bit disingenuous, and I would just like to urge the Commission to approve this proposal.

CHAIRMAN PAULSEN: Thank you.

Stan Towne?

MR. TOWNE: Good evening. My name is Stan Towne. I am resident of Manhattan and a member of Shearith Israel. I am here to speak in favor of the proposal.

I have looked at the drawings and seen
the models and it seems to me, although I am not an
architect, that a 14-story building, immediately to
the north is another 14-story building, immediately
to the south is another 14-story building, it is
contextual and will present a very nice arrangement
at the end of West 70th Street.

I don't think that a person walking along the street considers this mid block. You would consider this an extension of the end of the block.

So I urge you to find it is an appropriate building.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN PAULSEN: Are there any other people who wish to speak this evening? If so -- yes?

AUDIENCE: For some reason I signed up and my name didn't pop up, so ...

CHAIRMAN PAULSEN: There were a number of people whose names I called who had left the room.

MR. WRIGHT: I am Peter Wright of Six
West 77th Street, so, no, I don't live on the
adjacent block. I am a long-time West Side activist
with significant involvement in projects relevant to
this, and I want to speak to them. I am also a

former vestriman and Chairman of the capital campaign at Christ and Saint Stevens Episcopal Church, which is just two blocks west of this particular synagogue.

б

In thinking of this synagogue's long and distinguished history, and moving up from downtown as did Christ and Saint Stevens, I think we have many such institutions on the West Side and, unfortunately, if we took every single one of them which have a leaky roof, as mine did, and we had a capital campaign and successfully raised the money to replace it, if every single leaking roof sanctuary problem, problematic, not for profit on the West Side were able to build whatever it wanted to, wherever it wanted, I wonder what the West Side would look like?

I think we are addressing two issues and I want to address the second one: The first is: Is this in context appropriate physically? It certainly isn't. It's a simple building, 100 feet off Central Park West, but I want to address this whole business of preservation purpose. It seems to me the reason this thing is being considered is the idea that economically somehow it's going to pay for what needs to be done to keep this hallmark in great

shape and keep the institution moving forward. I went through this at Christ and Saint Stevens, a little church, 150 families, we raised some money, solved the problem.

I was a founding Director, and all of you around remember this one, the Fourth Universalist Church -- "Save our Universalist landmark's soul," remember that one -- where that thing was a slam dunk hardship because all religious sanctuaries are uneconomic. They aren't office buildings, they aren't rentals set up by Jack Rudin, they aren't economic. That's not why they are built. So the Universalist was a slam dunk for hardship, if you remember, and it almost became an apartment building in the Horace Mann School, by that much.

The neighborhood got involved and raised the money, non-Unitarians, some were Episcopalian, and it is still there and it is doing just fine, and there's no tower.

Last, and certainly not least, is the building right next to where I live, the New York Historical Society, which is the other celebrated 74-711. We all remember, and I remember oh so well -- by the way, I'm a former Director of Landmark West, and I am on the New York Historical Society

Advisory Committee, currently dormant and so forth.

I have been around. I was on the Riverside South

Planning Board with Donald Trump too. I remember

that whole story and the hardship almost and the

this and the that.

We were going to have this big tower -remember the Hough Hardie tower -- and the closer we
got to the Historical Society, and the closer we got
to the real numbers and to the tower, the more we
saw, in that case -- and I am not saying in this
one, we don't know, this my final point -- that the
money wasn't going to solve their problems. Then
The New York Times broke some stuff and you all
remember what happened.

The real problem I have here is that aside from the red herring of this wonderful institution's history, Christ and Saint Stevens has a long history too.

CHAIRMAN PAULSEN: Mr. Wright, I'm sorry, try to speak to us. We are the ones that want to hear what you have to say.

MR. WRIGHT: I'm sorry.

The thing to me that is critical to discover, which may in fact make this thing more viable, is we talk about the economic engine that

the Rabbi earlier referred to, of selling, I gather, eight or nine or eleven park view condominiums of 3500 square feet for four or five million dollars or whatever, and to me, if you are going to consider what is, I think on the surface it is plainly inappropriate if not contextual, then the question of hardship, which has been kind of skirted this evening, is, "Okay, what is your endowment now? What is your cash flow?"

CHAIRMAN PAULSEN: I'm sorry, Mr.

Wright, this is not a hardship application. We have
to first review this building in terms of, A, is it
appropriate? And, then, B, is there a preservation
purpose to be served by approving this application?

So I appreciate your comments, but please

MR. WRIGHT: How do you know that there is a preservation process being served without seeing numbers? In the case of the three things that I mentioned, Christ and Saint Stevens, the Universalist Church --

try to stick to those two points.

CHAIRMAN PAULSEN: Mr. Wright, if you weren't here earlier, I outlined the issues that we must find in order to approve this project, in order to approve this project and prepare a report that we

would issue to the City Planning Commission.

MR. WRIGHT: Thank you, I understand.

CHAIRMAN PAULSEN: Thank you, Mr.

Wright.

Is there anyone else who wishes to speak this evening?

This hearing is going to be continued, I wanted to stress that again. Please come forward.

MS. WRIGHT: I am Carol Wright. I live at 91 Central Park West. I live next door to the synagogue, and I feel very fortunate to live next to it because I think it is a, beautiful magnificent building, but I also loved Penn Station, and we lost Penn Station. Penn Station was what moved everybody to get into landmarking, preserving neighborhoods. We finally managed to that, we do not want to chip away what we have gained.

CHAIRMAN PAULSEN: Thank you very much.

I want to thank everybody for your patience, for your respect and for the very, very high quality of the comments that you have made this evening. I look forward to hearing from you again, as well as all the Commissioners, and I will move that we continue to a date that will be set as notified in the City Record, and we will be reaching

```
133
       out to all of you to let you know when that is.
 1
 2
                   Could I have a second to that motion?
 3
                    (The Commissioners all say "aye.")
 4
                   CHAIRMAN PAULSEN: All in favor?
                    (Chorus of "Ayes.")
 5
                       (Time Noted: 7:30 p.m.)
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

<u>C E R T I F I C A T I O N</u>

and a Notary Public, do hereby certify that the

stenographic notes.

foregoing is a true and accurate transcription of my

I, MARGARET EUSTACE, a Shorthand Reporter

I further certify that I am not employed

б

by nor related to any party to this action.

Shorthand Reporter

(516) 741-5342 AR-TI RECORDING COMPANY (212) 349-9692