

**Victorian Society Testimony for June 10, 2025: 95 Horatio Street (LPC-25-09309); 594 Broadway (LPC-25-07868); 80 Washington Place (LPC-25-10684); 62 Prince Street (LPC-25-07682); 172 St. Paul's Avenue (LPC-25-10179); 48 Garden Place (LPC-25-10354); 117 State Street (LPC-25-07793)**

***Approximate time: 9:30; join Zoom by: 9:30***

**LPC-25-09309 -- 95 Horatio Street (aka 91-111 Horatio Street, 521-252 West Street, 84-108 Gansevoort Street, 802-816 Washington Street, and 76-82 Gansevoort Street) - Gansevoort Market Historic District, Manhattan**

Good morning commissioners, \_\_\_\_\_ for the Victorian Society New York.

The Victorian Society does not support the creation of a new window on this well balanced, carefully detailed façade.

The designation report for this group of conjoined buildings notes that their “monumental scale, well-crafted Classical Revival details, and historic significance make them a major presence in the district.”

Commissioners, there is nothing “random” or “ad hoc” about the street facades of 95 Horatio. They are organized in the traditional formal parti used by many architects working in the Classical Revival style – two story base, three story shaft, one story crown. Bands of windows run in straight lines up each bay. Every bay retains a uniform window composition from bottom to top. The original designers chose to provide only one window in this bay. This was a conscious decision. It should be respected. We urge you to deny this application.

***Approved 9-0.***

**LPC-25-07868 -- 594 Broadway - SoHo-Cast Iron Historic District, Manhattan**

***Approximate time: 9:45; join Zoom by: 9:30***

Good morning commissioners, \_\_\_\_\_ for the Victorian Society New York.

It's the position of the Victorian Society that after many decades of approvals of flagpoles and banners on commercial buildings, especially in this district, there are now too many of them; it's time to start saying "no." Flagpoles and banners were deemed appropriate early in the district's history, when a few galleries and retail stores were opening on long blocks of derelict, underused, and vacant industrial buildings. There was a need to call attention to the few outposts of galleries and retail stores. This time has long since passed.

Today, the banners are physically getting in the way of each other. The resulting cacophony and clutter means that each additional banner adds less and less benefit for its owner, while diminishing the shared resource that is the historic district. It's an example of the tragedy of the commons. Actions taken for individual benefit eventually degrade the common resource. Everybody loses.

***"I'm with the Victorians on this one." (Goldblum)***

***"I'm a Victorian now." (Bland)***

***No action; blade sign possible at staff level; or rearrange flagpoles to better relate to the building.***

**LPC-25-10684 -- 80 Washington Place - Greenwich Village Historic District, Manhattan**

***Approximate time: 10:00; join Zoom by: 9:30***

Good morning commissioners, \_\_\_\_\_ for the Victorian Society New York.

When our Preservation Committee reviewed this application, we found the information on the history of the areaway fence confusing.

The 1913 photo of 80 Washington Place shows ironwork at the stoop and areaway which matches the areaway fence now in place on Boards 3 and 6. It matches the areaway fence at its neighbor, 78 Washington. At the time the 1940 tax photo was taken, both the stoop and areaway railing at 80 were gone. The areaway railing at 78 remained. And an examination of the areaway railings now in place at 78 and 80 show an extremely close match.

There seem to be two possible explanations. The first is that the railing at 80 had been temporarily removed at the time the tax photo was taken, and later reinstalled. The second is that the railing which is now in place is a replacement railing which is an astonishingly close match to the original.

In either case, we believe that the existing railing should remain in place. It helps to unify these two houses, which were built as a pair. It matches the house's original railing. It's well sized and detailed and maintains continuity in the streetscape. The new proposed railing, on the other hand, has no historic association with the house. We ask that the replacement of the railing, and the proposed gate posts and light fixtures attached to the posts be denied.

We have no objections to the proposed change to the rooftop addition.

Thank you, commissioners.

***Approved 9-0.***

**LPC-25-07682 -- 62 Prince Street - SoHo-Cast Iron Historic District Extension,  
Manhattan**

***Approximate time: 10:15; join Zoom by: 9:30***

Good morning commissioners, \_\_\_\_\_ for the Victorian Society New York.

The Victorian Society finds that the changes proposed for this 21<sup>st</sup> century building would have no significant effect on its appropriateness, or lack thereof, to the historic district. However, we believe that in exchange for allowing this major alteration, the Commission should require removal of the enormous billboard and its structure that are currently on the property. The supports for this billboard extend right through the proposed expansion of the building's enclosure; to indicate that it's "excluded" from the project is arbitrary. This is a chance for the Commission to use its regulatory power to eliminate inappropriate features from historic districts.

Also, the very visible exposed conduit, which we doubt was approved by the Commission, should be removed or camouflaged.

***Approved 8-0.***

*lunch*

**LPC-25-10179 -- 172 St. Paul's Avenue - St. Paul's Avenue-Stapleton Heights Historic District, Staten Island**

***Approximate time: 1:15; join Zoom by: 12:15***

Good afternoon commissioners, \_\_\_\_\_ for the Victorian Society New York.

The side portico would be appropriate if it were properly redesigned. That means eliminating the strange cutout in the pediment and adding capitals to the columns. Other details may also need to be adjusted.

The metal porch railings installed without a permit are not appropriate, unless there is documentation for historic metal railings at *this* porch, not at some porch in New Orleans. The porch railings should be wood, and they should match those removed or be based on documentation for historic railings at this house. We note especially that the unusual turned wood newel posts may have been original features.

We also note the removal of wood lattice below the porch. This should be restored. And we wonder whether the design of the column capitals and change to the porch fascia, all work which seems to have been done without permits, is based on documentation.

***Approved 8-0 with modifications: refine details, including filling cutout in portico, extending dentils to the sides, and adding capitals; and modifying the porch fence by removing the ornamental panels and attaching the panels at the column sides instead of fronts; or changing the front railing to wood with staff approval.***

**LPC-25-10354 -- 48 Garden Place - Brooklyn Heights Historic District, Brooklyn**

***Approximate time: 1:45; join Zoom by: 12:45***

Good afternoon commissioners, \_\_\_\_\_ for the Victorian Society New York.

The Victorian Society supports modifications to the areaway at 48 Garden Place to create a larger sunken terrace in front of the iron gate leading into the basement. However, this can be done without dropping the windowsills of the existing basement windows. The handsome proportions of this pair of windows, and their relationship to the well detailed masonry adjacent to them, should not be altered. The string course running below them should be retained. The new section of façade exposed when the sunken terrace is enlarged should be detailed to match the section of sidewall adjacent to the existing sunken terrace shown in the photos.

Thank you, commissioners.

***Approved 8-0.***

**LPC-25-07793 -- 117 State Street - Brooklyn Heights Historic District, Brooklyn**

***Approximate time: 3:15; join Zoom by: 2:15***

Good afternoon commissioners, \_\_\_\_\_ for the Victorian Society New York.

The Victorian Society is happy to see many of the changes which the applicants are proposing. However, we feel that the presentation lacks some important details and believe the applicant has ignored significant historic material.

On the front façade, removal of the modern infill and creation of a new stoop, parlor floor entrance and door surround, and addition of cast stone lintels at the parlor floor windows will bring this rowhouse much closer to its original appearance. But there aren't any notes explaining what will happen to the historic iron window grilles at the basement level, front façade. These appear to match the window grilles at 109 State Street, the inspiration for the new stoop and areaway railings. The basement grilles should be retained.

We also saw, on board 10, photo 4, what appears to be a 12 foot long section of historic iron railing at the parlor floor balcony, rear façade. A modern extension was attached, but the historic material appears to be intact. It should be salvaged and reused on site if there's a possibility it's original to this house.

The applicant constructed a mock-up of the rooftop addition, but there aren't any photos from street level which indicate its visibility above the front facade. There are no notes on its visibility on the section drawing, A-111. Without photos or notes we have no way to determine if the addition will be seen from the street. This information should be provided.

The rear addition will be visible from Sidney Place, but in context with other rear additions, from a distance of 100 feet. We find this acceptable.

We were happy to see that the addition will leave the upper two floors intact. We also liked that the tri-partite façade of the rear extension resembles historic tea porches.

Thank you, commissioners.

***Approved 6-2 (Bland, Goldblum).***