

Alan D. Sugarman
Attorney At Law

17 W. 70 Street
Suite 4
New York, NY 10023
212-873-1371
mobile 917-208-1516
fax 212-202-3524
sugarman@sugarlaw.com

April 5, 2006

Fax 212-669-7960

E-mail rtierney@lpc.nyc.gov , comments@lpc.nyc.gov

Robert B. Tierney -
Chair
Landmarks Preservation Commission
1 Centre Street
9th Floor
New York, NY 10007

RE: 8 West 70th Street - Congregation Shearith Israel Synagogue

Dear Chair Tierney:

I am writing to obtain a copy of the “resolution” passed at a March 14, 2006 LPC meeting purportedly approving a certificate of appropriateness for the proposed project of Congregation Shearith Israel for a building at 8 West 70th Street. I have obtained a not very audible recording of that meeting and am unable to follow the exact words.

Second, in the recording, there is a reference to the taking of a transcript of the meeting. I would like to obtain a copy of that transcript.

Third, I was shocked to discover that the meeting was more than a meeting: additional testimony was taken by the Commission from the architects of the applicant, over 20 additional drawings and renderings were provided to and referred to in the testimony and relied upon by the members of the Commission, and, indeed, the Chair “reopened the hearing.” Indeed, the Chair did such, noting the concern by the Commission counsel, who no doubt was aware of the infirmity thereby being created.

Thus, this was a **hearing**, not a meeting. There was no notice of hearing published in the City Record at least ten days prior to the hearing as required by Section 25-313 of the Administrative Code. There was no notice, indeed, that this was to be a hearing as contrasted with a meeting. Indeed, notice of a meeting concerning this matter was not circulated until about 4:00 PM on the preceding Friday, March 10, just one business day in advance. This was accomplished by an agenda posted on your web site that Friday afternoon.

Sugarman to Landmarks Preservation Commission
Shearith Israel
April 5, 2006
Page 2 of 2

I further note that the drawings provided by the applicant were individually dated March 14, 2006, and one wonders when and how those were prepared and dated for submission if they were prepared after Friday, March 10. No public substantive testimony was permitted as to the new information.

Quite clearly, the hearing was improper, and the subsequent “vote” taken is a nullity. Accordingly, I ask that the resolution be vacated and that a new public hearing be scheduled after proper notice in the City Record.

Moreover, materials to be considered by the Commission should be made available for public inspection in advance – not two weeks after a hearing.

I also request that new sight-lines be provided that show the top of the proposed and adjacent buildings, and that views from the park not be obscured by trees. The sight lines provided by the applicant were wholly lacking in seriousness, and, do not comply with the requirements of the Rules of the Commission relating to rooftop additions.

I am an “interested” person in that my home overlooks this site, which is only 40 feet away.

Thank you.

Sincerely

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Alan D. Sugarman".

Alan D. Sugarman