APPENDIX A
Historic Resources

APPENDIX A.1

Historic Alternatives Analysis for Domino Sugar Site

October 7, 2008

HISTORIC ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS FOR DOMINO SUGAR SITE BROOKLYN, NY

I. INTRODUCTION

The Refinery LLC is proposing to redevelop the former Domino Sugar site along the East River waterfront in Williamsburg, Brooklyn. The project site is located along the west side of Kent Avenue between Grand Street and South 5th Street and the east side of Kent Avenue between South 3rd and South 4th Streets (see Figures 1 and 2). The proposed project would include residential, including a significant affordable housing component; retail/commercial; and community facility uses and publicly accessible open space. Ground floor retail will be located along both sides of Kent Avenue, with community facilities in the Refinery.

Within this new development, three significant historic buildings would be retained and reused: the Filter, Pan, and Finishing Houses at 292-314 Kent Avenue, known collectively as the Refinery. All other buildings located on the waterfront project site would be demolished to accommodate the proposed project. CPC Resources supported the designation of the Refinery as a New York City Landmark in September 2007, and intends to adaptively reuse the Refinery as part of the proposed project (see Figure 1). The proposed alterations to the Refinery were approved by the New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission on June 24, 2008. The full waterfront Domino Sugar site has been determined eligible for listing on the State and National Registers of Historic Places (S/NR). A Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) is being prepared to assess the potential impacts of the Domino Sugar Rezoning.

Refinery LLC has evaluated the potential for retaining and reusing the remaining buildings on the project site. This analysis, presented below in greater detail, found it infeasible to retain any remaining Domino Sugar buildings other than the Refinery which the project has already committed to preserving and adaptively reusing.

II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Refinery LLC is owned by Refinery Management LLC, which is a joint venture of CPC Resources, Inc. and Katan Group LLC. CPC Resources is the Managing Member of Refinery LLC and is the for-profit development arm of the Community Preservation Corporation, a not-for-profit corporation formed in 1974 that specializes in financing affordable housing. CPC Resources was created in 1992. Its mission is to increase the amount and quality of housing affordable to people of low and moderate means by developing affordable housing in communities throughout New York and New Jersey. Since its inception, CPC and CPC Resources have financed over 145,000 units of affordable housing, including over $1.7 billion invested in Brooklyn, and $200 million in the Williamsburg and Greenpoint neighborhoods alone. As part of their affordable housing mission, CPC and CPC Resources have restored historic and landmark quality structures throughout New York State, with an emphasis on not only preserving the buildings themselves, but on making strategic investments that help shore up and preserve entire neighborhoods. Refinery LLC has committed to provide 30% of the units at the redeveloped Domino Sugar site as affordable—a 50% increase over that required on other waterfront parcels.

Refinery LLC proposes to develop approximately 2,860,000 gross square feet (gsf) of floor area above grade at the Domino site. Approximately 2,640,000 gsf would be dedicated to residential use, up to 120,000 gsf to retail/commercial use, and up to 100,000 gsf to community facility use. The proposed project would include new residential structures along the waterfront between Grand Avenue and South 2nd Street, and between South 3rd and South 5th Streets, and on the east side of Kent between South 3rd Street and South 4th Streets.

The Domino Sugar site is located adjacent to a large area that was rezoned in May 2005. As part of the Greenpoint-Williamsburg Rezoning, approximately 184 blocks were rezoned for residential and mixed residential/industrial use. The Domino Sugar site was not included in this rezoning as the site was still an active factory in 2002, at the time when the City of New York began formulating and analyzing the rezoning proposal. The 2005 rezoning was enacted to facilitate residential development and to provide public waterfront access and open space in the Greenpoint-Williamsburg area. Also included in the Greenpoint-Williamsburg Rezoning was an inclusionary zoning mechanism to incentivize the development of affordable housing. The incentive permitted a zoning bonus in exchange for the proviso that 20% of created units be affordable to households earning 80% of the Area Median Income (AMI).

The proposed project seeks to meet the following objectives:

- In accordance with CPC Resources' mission, and to address community concerns that affordable housing is still not achievable for existing working-class residents, the proposed project will offer 30% of the development's total units as affordable with a portion of those units affordable to income levels reaching as low as 30% AMI. This goal exceeds the incentive zoning requirements of the Greenpoint-Williamsburg Rezoning by 50%. To provide such significant levels of affordability, the proposed project will cross-subsidize affordable units with the proceeds from market-rate units;
- Adaptively reuse the three buildings that make up the structure known as the Refinery, as discussed below;
- Redevelop a former waterfront industrial site into an economically integrated mix of residential, retail/commercial, and community facility uses with a high quality design, including massing consistent with the redevelopment of nearby waterfront sites to the north and south and complementary to the existing neighborhood; and
- Create physical and visual access to the waterfront, include a substantial amount of public open space (approximately 4.3 acres), and link the site to the existing Grand Ferry Park to the north of the project site and to South 5th Street to the south of the site (see Figure 3). The new open spaces include a new public esplanade, a large lawn, gathering spaces and playgrounds, and four approximately 60-foot wide visual and pedestrian corridors—the extensions of South 4th, 3rd, 2nd, and 1st Streets—which would connect the east-west streets with the esplanade. The open spaces would be accessible to the residents of Williamsburg, who currently have few open spaces in their neighborhood. Critical to the success of the master plan for the project is the creation of a large public open space at the center of the site that not only further enhances the public space of the project, but creates the additional benefit of highlighting and framing the Refinery as the centerpiece of the overall development. Industrial artifacts from the site are envisioned to be located within the proposed open spaces.

PRESERVATION OBJECTIVES

Refinery LLC worked with and supported the New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission's designation of the three buildings that make up the Refinery. The Refinery occupies the largest parcel on the site, representing 20-25% of the total area. Adaptively reusing the Refinery represents a major preservation component of the project.

It should be noted that the cost of adapting the Refinery for the proposed residential, community facility, and retail uses is approximately 20 to 25% more than the cost of new construction. This is due to, among other issues, additional premiums for abatement, shoring of the existing facades, more complex foundation systems, more complicated and labor intensive steel erection, masonry restoration, and overall logistics and safety. The existing structural frame is inadequate for residential use, and the dismantling of the existing interior—filled as it is with manufacturing equipment—must be handled in a careful and extraordinarily costly manner.[1]

Due to the increased cost in adaptively reusing the Refinery, any further additional costs for potentially reusing other structures on the site would affect the ability of the project to cross-subsidize the affordable housing proposed on the site.

II. EXISTING CONDITIONS

HISTORY OF DEVELOPMENT

In 1857 Frederick C. Havemeyer began construction of a sugar refinery in Williamsburg[2] along the East River. By 1860, the building was the largest refinery in the world, having an output of 400 barrels of sugar a day. Its footprint covered an area of 200 by 250 feet, with six stories plus a basement and was constructed of brick and iron. On January 8, 1882 the main refinery building of Havemeyer & Elder's original 1860 plant was totally destroyed by fire.

After the fire, Fredrick Havemeyer and his sons, Theodore and Henry, immediately began work to rebuild the destroyed buildings. It is unknown who was the architect of the new plant, however it is possible that Theodore Havemeyer, documented designer of the original plant, also designed the second.

By 1887, the sugar refinery plant expanded and covered about half of its present area. In addition to a new Refinery, the site also contained a machine shop, a blacksmith shop and carpenter shop as well as a power plant. The remainder of the site was either undeveloped or contained three-floor wood frame dwellings, stores or medium sized industries.

By 1904 the refinery expanded to encompass the Brooklyn Sugar Refining Company, and at least twenty-two boilers were added to the facility. The refinery continued to expand and modernize, and by 1950 the plant was concentrated to the west of Kent Avenue except for a large garage, offices, and shipping/receiving facilities that were located on the site of the former stable on the east side of Kent Avenue.

By 1965 the plant and its processes reflected the changes that had occurred in American transportation. Trucks replaced railroads as commodity freight carriers. The Austin Company

[1] Issues with respect to the adaptive reuse of the Refinery are addressed in separate submissions.

[2] By 1851, when Williamsburg became an official City, the "h" was dropped from its name.

designed and built an improved packaging, warehousing and shipping facility in 1959 on the site, just to the south of the Refinery. This facility had a cafeteria on its second floor and truck loading bays on the ground floor. The new facility allowed for the screening, storing and packaging of sugar. Other functions included a bulk loading house, storage bins, raw sugar storage and packaging and boxing facilities. Sugar was transported to this facility via an enclosed belt conveyor and a bucket conveyor. The former refined sugar wharf was renamed a "Truck Roadway."

Later changes to the site included the construction of a research and development laboratory on the site of the former bag cleaning and storage facility at the southwest corner of Kent Avenue and Grand Street and the removal of the receiving pier and shed in the East River where the Packaging House and Bin Building are currently located.

Domino Sugar continued operations on the site until 2001, when the company was acquired by American Sugar Refining. American Sugar closed most operations on the site in early 2004 and the buildings were mostly vacated. The project site was purchased by Refinery LLC in June 2004, subsequent to the closure of manufacturing operations.

All of the buildings on the site are currently vacant.

SHPO SIGNIFICANCE

The National Register form indicates that the site,, whose earliest buildings date to 1883, meets **Criterion A** in the area of industrial history as one of the nation's most important sugar refineries. The Havemeyers became the first Manhattan sugar manufacturers to select Brooklyn as a plant site. Soon the low transportation costs associated with a dockside location attracted other refiners, and eventually Brooklyn supplanted Manhattan as the nation's sugar refining center. Over the years, Havemeyer and his successors modernized the facilities and erected new buildings. In addition to the significant industrial history represented here, the factory had an economic and social impact on the development of north Brooklyn, employing recent immigrants, many of whom lived in the surrounding neighborhood.

The site also meets **Criterion C** for the three different periods of industrial design represented here. The site includes significant industrial buildings from the refinery's earliest period of construction, 1883-84, as well as a number of buildings from expansion and modernization programs in the mid 1920s and late 1950s-early 1960s. The period of significance for the buildings span from 1883, the date of the earliest surviving buildings on the site, up to industry's final expansion and new building campaign which ended in 1962.

The American Sugar Refining Company site is also significant under **Criterion B** for its association with the Havemeyers, one of New York's most influential families. The key official of the company was Henry O. Havemeyer, whose family had been in the sugar refining business in New York almost since the beginning of the 19th century. According to economic historian Richard Zerbe, Havemeyer "fits well into that famous notion of his time of captains of industry." Havemeyer was "so closely . . . identified with the sugar trust," says Zerbe, "that he became the symbol of the sugar monopoly itself, even as Rockefeller became the symbol of the oil monopoly."

The refinery continued to be a major processor throughout the 20th century. In 1970 American Sugar changed its name to Amstar Corp. In 1988, Tate & Lyle acquired Amstar's American Sugar Division and renamed the company Domino Sugar Corp. All the buildings that make up the site were closed by 2004 and are presently vacant.

TYPES OF BUILDINGS AND THEIR CONDITIONS

The project site consists of 14 buildings that fall into three general categories: 1) small buildings with small footprints, 2) one- to three-story buildings with large footprints, and 3) bulkier structures containing four or more stories. The buildings have been altered through time, some more so than others, and structures have replaced others over time. This discussion focuses on all of the buildings on the site except those that compose the Refinery, which, as has been described above, is being retained and adaptively reused as part of the proposed project.

SMALL BUILDINGS WITH SMALL FOOTPRINTS

A few buildings, while relating to the operations of sugar processing on the site, are very small structures with small footprints and are not highly visible on the site. These include the Turbine House, Pump House, Power House, and Syrup Station.

Turbine House

The Turbine House was built in 1927 and is located between the Power House and the Pump House (see Figure 4, #1 and Figure 5). The rear of the Turbine House abuts the Boiler House. The Turbine House is a 62-foot-tall brick and concrete structure without floors. Large openings, some of which retain their multi-pane windows, are located on the east façade of the building. Some of the windows have been replaced with glass block or filled in with brick. There is an entrance containing paired wood doors with a glass transom above. Metal piping runs across the building between the first and second stories, between the second and third stories, and projects from an opening on the ground floor. The building measures 90 feet by 50 feet.

Pump House

The south and east facades of the Pump House are attached to the Boiler House and Turbine House, respectively (see Figure 4, #2 and Figures 5 and 6). The Pump House, also constructed in 1927, is 48 to 62 feet in height and clad in brick and has no floors. The north facade has no openings, except for three windows in the third set-back story, and is lined with piping. On the first floor of the west façade there are three large square openings which have been filled in with glass block; there are no openings on the second floor. The third floor has three rectangular, multi-paned windows. The building measures 90 feet by 50 feet. There is a large and wide structural crack spanning the height of the building on the north (South 2nd Street) façade.

Power House

The Power House is 51 feet in height and the interior does not have any floors. It has a slightly gabled parapet roof (see Figure 4, #3 and Figure 5). It was constructed in 1901. The Power House is located between the Filter House and the Turbine House. The building has one opening with two wooden doors on the ground floor. The second story has two openings: one is deeply recessed and is covered in a metal roll-down gate while the other is covered with metal vents. The openings on the third floor have been bricked over. A brick corbel course runs below the roof pediment. Much of the façade has been refaced with new brick; the original brick cladding is located above the corbelled round arches that once framed the three arched three-story windows. A variety of piping runs across the building at the ground floor and at the third story. This small building measures 90 feet by 30 feet.

Syrup Station

The Syrup Station is located south of the Boiler House and west of the Filter House and faces the East River and South Third Street (see Figure 4, #4 and Figure 7). This one-story brick structure measures approximately 60 feet by 80 feet. It is topped with 15 tall, metal silos that are approximately two stories in height. There are large openings on the west and south facades of the building which have been either filled-in with brick or covered in metal cages or metal roll-down gates.

ONE TO THREE STORY BUILDINGS WITH LARGE FOOTPRINTS

There are also a number of low-scale buildings with large footprints. These include the Research and Development Lab Building, Raw Sugar Warehouse, and the Packaging House.

Research and Development Lab Building

This plain brick building is 26 feet in height and is located at the northwest corner of Kent Avenue and Grand Street (see Figure 4, #5 and Figure 8). Constructed in 1958-61, it is clad in brick with a row of shallow aluminum strip windows on the Kent Avenue façade that wrap around to the Grand Street façade. On Grand Street, the building has a larger set of louvered windows, approximately midway in the façade of the building. There are 2 vehicular entrances with roll down metal gates on this façade. The building measures approximately 220 feet square. The building steps up to three-stories moving west from Kent Avenue as the topography slopes down to the East River. This building took the place of a number of structures that had previously occupied that site.

Raw Sugar Warehouse

This plain, concrete and brick warehouse is located along the East River and Grand Street (see Figure 4, #6 and Figures 8 and 9). It is 56 feet in height. Constructed in 1927, it replaced an earlier sugar warehouse that was located on a pier projecting into the East River between South 1st and 2nd Streets. The present structure is rectangular in shape and measures approximately 435 by 120 feet. The west façade faces the East River, the north façade faces Grand Street, and the south façade faces South 2nd Street. A portion of the east façade abuts the Research and Development Lab Building. The building was designed essentially as a large bin structure where sugar was stored once delivered from the ships. The raw sugar was dumped in the building by a conveyor system that went the length of the building and evenly distributed the sugar throughout the structure. As such, this building has no internal floor systems.

Along the East River (west) facade, the first and second stories are windowless. The Raw Sugar Warehouse originally had a one-story brick section running the full length of the East River elevation, which faced onto the Raw Sugar Wharf. Historically, cranes were set on top of the one-story portion of the building, and were used to load raw sugar cane from ships docked at the Raw Sugar Wharf into the Raw Sugar Warehouse. This portion of the building has been removed and only two small one-story pavilions remain at the north and south ends of this building; the space in between was converted to an open conveyer area. The façade at the ground level where the one-story building extension was once located has been clad in corrugated metal siding. The third story has primarily large industrial-sash steel windows.

There is no consistent window fenestration on the other three facades. The east (Kent Avenue) façade has a varied fenestration with grouped, multi-paned windows on the second and third floors, with some sections of the second floor having no windows at all. The ground floor has

numerous metal pipes stretching across the façade. Located within the east side of the Raw Sugar Warehouse are the Wash House and two Raw Sugar Bins. Unprocessed sugar was stored in the raw sugar bins and then carried via conveyers to the wash house where it was washed with hot water and then melted to form syrup.

The south (South 2nd Street) façade has six large windows and two smaller windows on the third floor. There are no windows on the first and second floors. The first floor of the Wash House has large openings covered with roll-down gates.

The north (Grand Street) façade has a similar fenestration pattern as the south façade: it contains six windows centrally located on the façade at the third story. There are no windows at the first and second floors (see Figure 8).

Packaging House

This warehouse, 30 feet in height, was built in 1960, replacing a number of 1882 structures that served similar functions, and the current building has frontages on Kent Avenue, South Third Street, and the East River (see Figure 4, #7 and Figure 10). It housed the Machine Shop and Soft Sugar Storage Building, the Sugar Handling Building, a cafeteria and a large air conditioning machine. The Packaging House is irregular in shape and is connected to Adant House (described below). The building is primarily a large warehouse space with a few very tall floors to accommodate stacked materials.

The structure has almost no fenestration and is a very deep structure that extends between Kent Avenue and the East River. On Kent Avenue, the building is clad in red brick and has no windows except in the location of the Machine Shop, located at the corner of South 3rd Street. The Machine Shop has a narrow ribbon of windows at the first and second stories. A recessed entryway is the only access point into the building from Kent Avenue. The Sugar Handling Building has four floors, and is clad in red brick. It is located between the Machine Shop and Soft Sugar Storage building and the Bin Building (described below) and is connected to the Finishing House via a metal bridge on the third floor. The only windows for the Sugar Handling Building are located on the third and fourth floors of the south and east facades. These factory-style windows are single-pane and separated with metal strips.

The cafeteria area faces the East River and is clad in ridged metal panels with a row of aluminum strip windows at the third floor. The second floor contains only very few small windows. The ground floor is a series of vehicular loading bays. The north and east elevations are clad in brick. The Kent Avenue façade is approximately 170 feet long while the East River façade is approximately 330 feet in length. The north façade is approximately 245 feet long. The air conditioning machinery, located to the south of the Bin Building, rises an additional story above the Packaging House building.

BULKIER STRUCTURES CONTAINING FOUR OR MORE STORIES

Boiler House

The Boiler House was constructed in 1927. It ranges in height from 84 to 118 feet, It is essentially a floor-less structure that houses large, multi-story pieces of machinery, including boilers and electrical equipment. Catwalks and platforms extend around portions of the building's interior to provide access to the equipment (see Figure 4, #8 and Figures 6 and 11). The Boiler House measures approximately 100 feet by 100 feet. The main west elevation faces onto the East River; the north façade is connected to the Pump House, the Turbine House, and

the Power House while the south façade is connected to the Filter House. The building is clad in red brick and has a gambrel roof. It retains its original multi-light industrial windows on portions of the upper floors of the East River façade, but below this point there are no windows. There are some widely spaced windows on the north façade above the Pump, Turbine, and Power Houses, and double-height windows on the south façade, which reflect the lack of floors within the building. Above the fifth floor of the west façade is a recessed area with two tall, round pipes.

Bin Building

The Bin Building was constructed in 1960 and at 170 feet it is the tallest building on the site (see Figure 4, #9 and Figure 12). It is constructed of reinforced concrete and capped with a three-story blue glass section. It is boxy in form and measures approximately 60 feet by 60 feet. With the exception of the blue glass crown, the building is essentially featureless and windowless. The sixth floor of the Bin Building is connected to the Filter House via a metal conveyor bridge, which carried finished sugar from the Processing House of the Refinery to the top of the Bin Structure. Once in the Bin Building, sugar was sorted into silos by type and grade. As such, it contains no floors. On the east façade, which faces the East River, is a yellow, formerly illuminated, "Domino Sugar" sign. This sign is the same logo as used on the boxes of Domino Sugar.

Adant House

Adant House is located on the northwest corner of Kent Avenue and South 5th Street (see Figure 4, #10 and Figure 13). It is 45 feet in height and extends north for approximately 210 feet on Kent Avenue and west for approximately 150 feet on South 5th Street. It is irregular in shape, with a footprint of approximately 22,300 sf. Adant House was constructed in the 1880s and was originally 7-stories in height. From the silos of the Bin Building, discussed above, finished sugar was transferred to Adant House for processing into cubes, or directly to the Packaging House for packing.

Sometime after 1930 the penthouse and top two floors were removed; the building is currently 4-stories above grade. Adant House is clad in red brick and has round-arch windows. The windows are spaced roughly 3'-7" on Kent Avenue (with 4'-4" of brick between the windows) but much more widely spaced on South 5th Street, with windows occurring roughly every 7'-11". Most of the original multi-pane windows have been replaced. In addition, larger round-arch windows on the first floor have been filled-in with bricks. Exterior decoration is minimal and is limited to brick arching around the windows. The north and west facades are connected to the Packaging House. In some areas these facades are visible from within the Packaging House and the windows have been sealed.

An evaluation undertaken by Robert Silman Associates (see attached June 30, 2008 report) identified the building as a load-bearing brick structure. While the east (Kent Avenue) building walls are in fair condition, the south side is in a significant state of disrepair. Conditions include large cracks and structural breaches, including large holes in the walls that have been filled in either with new brick or cement. Portions of the wall have been repointed, and with the patched holes, this wall has a patchwork quality. The lower levels of bricks were not properly fired and are presently falling apart due to the harsh weather conditions on the waterfront.

The framing system of the building varies, and includes predominantly heavy timber or cast iron columns. Brick walls within the building also serve as structural support, taking the place of

columns. The columns are laid out in a dense grid of 10’ x 11’-6” foot bays (see Figure 14). The columns are organized such that every few bays, the column row lines up either fully or partially in front of the windows (see Figure 14). In the northern half of the building along Kent Avenue, a large number of the columns are placed directly in front of the windows, blocking light and sightlines (see Figure 15).

An analysis of the wood columns indicates that they were designed to carry a larger load than the present four stories (as described above the building originally had two additional floors and a penthouse that have been removed). However, the cast iron columns may be under-designed from a load-bearing perspective, building codes at the time the building was built did not yet understand the brittleness of cast iron, and it is not clear how much, if any, additional load the cast iron columns could support.

Above the columns are girders that span from column to column. Many of the girders have been encased in cement for fireproofing. The girders support the floors above, which are composed of primarily wood decking and steel plates. In a number of locations there are large openings in the floors, likely for hoisting equipment and machinery, and a double height mezzanine area runs along the east side of the building along Kent Avenue spanning between the third and fourth floors (see Figure 15).

The floor-to ceiling-heights in the building are very low. The second floor above grade has a height between the floor and the bottom of the girders of 8’-3” (where the girders are not encased) and 8’-1” where the girders are encased. The third floor above grade has a height between the floor and bottom of the girders (all encased) of 7’-8’. The fourth floor above grade has the lowest floor-to-floor height, with a height of 6’-9” from the floor to the bottom of the girders (all encased).

III. ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS

A. REUSING BUILDINGS FOR MANUFACTURING

Domino Sugar ceased most refining operations in early 2004 and the site was purchased by Refinery LLC in June of that year for redevelopment into a mixed-use project. Manufacturing uses in Williamsburg have declined, leaving former industrial sites along the waterfront vacant. The City proposes to rezone the Domino Sugar site to make it consistent with the adjacent Greenpoint-Williamsburg rezoning of 2005, which was enacted to facilitate residential development, to provide waterfront access and open space in the Greenpoint-Williamsburg area, and which contained an affordable housing initiative.

Recent and anticipated trends in the area—which reflect an increase in residential development and a decrease in industrial and manufacturing uses—together with the City’s goals with respect to redeveloping the Greenpoint-Williamsburg area and the specific designs of the buildings to process sugar, make it infeasible that the existing buildings on the site could be reused for manufacturing purposes. The buildings were designed, built, and rebuilt in specific sizes and configurations for sugar processing. The most obvious of these include the Bin Building, a structure containing sugar sorting silos, and the Syrup Station, containing large tanks for the storage of liquid sugar products. The other buildings were also designed to accommodate specific equipment and processing methods and with floor layouts conducive for storing and packaging sugar. Adaption for other manufacturing purposes, if such use were viable, would

require substantial alteration and/or demolition of the existing buildings, and the construction of new structures that would meet the needs of the new industrial use.[1]

The feasibility of adaptively reusing the buildings on the site for residential use (excluding the Refinery, which will be retained and adaptively reused as part of the project) is assessed below.

B. RETAINING AND ADAPTIVELY REUSING BUILDINGS ON THE SITE FOR RESIDENTIAL USE

It is not feasible to retain and adaptively reuse the existing Domino Sugar buildings for residential use. As described above, the buildings on the Domino Sugar site were built as specialty industrial structures to store, process, and package sugar. Due to their design as industrial buildings, their adaptability to residential use is limited. With the exception of the vacant area on Kent Avenue between South 2nd and South 1st Streets, and the narrow area between the buildings and the East River, the site is densely built with structures that do not provide appropriate footprints, configurations or sufficient floor area for residential use (see Figure 16). Presently, the buildings on the Domino Sugar site collectively include approximately 966,050 gsf. The project is seeking to develop approximately 2,860,000 gsf above grade. Therefore, the existing buildings on the site contain 60% less floor area than is proposed.

Specific issues with respect to converting the buildings are described below.

ALTERATIONS TO MEET NEW YORK CITY BUILDING CODE

Any residential reuse would require that the exterior walls and roofs of the existing structures be completely upgraded to meet appropriate New York City Building Code requirements for thermal insulation and waterproofing. The interiors of the buildings would need to be completely renovated, including updating interior finishes, floors, walls, and ceiling assemblies to make the spaces usable for residential occupancy. All mechanical, electrical, plumbing and fire protection systems would need to be brought up to current code, with a complete retrofit of new building systems appropriate for residential use. These major alterations would need to be performed to comply with all the current code and safety requirements. Converting the buildings to residential uses would require changing the use group of the buildings from industrial to residential. Therefore, the use group change would trigger a mandatory upgrade to current code requirements for items such as sprinklers, egress, ADA requirements, etc. This could also trigger a mandatory upgrade of the structural systems of the buildings. If this is the case, the structural systems (e.g. framing, connections, foundations, etc.) would need to be upgraded to resist the current seismic and wind loads now required by the New York City Building Code. These upgrades would result in substantial alterations to, and removal of, the existing structural fabric of the buildings.

[1] Since the Refinery is a New York City Landmark, demolition would be prohibited. Alterations to the Refinery require a review of appropriateness by the New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission.

ALTERATIONS TO REUSE BUILDINGS ON THE SITE

Requirements for Residential Use

Construction of residential units must meet certain requirements, among them that natural light from window areas be equal to or greater than 10% of the floor area, that there be natural and/or mechanical ventilation, and that habitable space have a depth of no greater than 30' from a light and air source. Typical structural grids in New York residential construction are generally 12' to 14' on center, or a multiple of that dimension. Typical floor to floor height is 9'-10', and floor to ceiling height under the New York City Building code must be no less than 8'-0".

Power House, Turbine House, Pump House, Syrup Station

A number of the existing buildings on the site are small structures with small footprints. These include the Power House, Turbine House, and Pump House on South 2nd Street. Reusing these structures for residential or commercial use would require that the buildings essentially be demolished to remove the structural party walls between them so as to create usable space within the buildings. New structural systems would then have to be built. The facades of the buildings would also need to be substantially altered to allow for appropriate fenestration and to meet code requirements for light and air. This would include installing new windows in the Power House and Pump House, which currently are essentially windowless. The windows in the Turbine House would have to be replaced, as presently these are either factory style multi-pane windows or windows openings filled with glass block. The piping on the facades – including piping that extends out of the windows and across the facades of the buildings – would also need to be removed and the brick patched. New floor systems would be required in the Power House, Turbine House and Pump House. These alterations would substantially alter the industrial character of these structures. Further, a large structural crack visible on the north (South 2nd Street) façade of the Pump House suggests structural instability of the building.

The Syrup Station, a one-story structure, has little floor area and no windows.

There is little architectural distinction to these structures, as they were plainly designed (the Pump House, Turbine House, and Syrup Station), or have been substantially altered from their original design through removal of windows and façade recladding (as in the Power House).

Research and Development Lab Building, Raw Sugar Warehouse, Packaging House

Other buildings on the site are also low-rise, but have larger footprints. These include the Research and Development Lab Building, the Raw Sugar Warehouse, and the Packaging House. These buildings range in height from 26- to 56 feet, some without any floors inside. Though the buildings have larger floorplates, they are low-rise and occupy significant lot area. Retaining them would result in a significant reduction of floor area and thus the number of affordable housing units that could be provided. These buildings were designed to bear their current loads and not the addition of a substantial number of residential stories above. Additionally, adding height to these structures would alter their industrial, low-rise character.

As has been described above, these large footprint buildings possess minimal fenestration. Where windows exist, they are either narrow strip windows (the Research and Development Lab Building, and the Kent Avenue and South 3rd façade of the Machine Shop of the Packaging House), or are primarily located on only one floor of the structure (Cafeteria of the Packaging House and most facades of the Raw Sugar Warehouse). The strip windows do not meet industry standards, and in some cases, building code, for residential buildings. For example, the majority

of the strip windows at the Research and Development Lab Building are fixed and not operable. In addition, though not mandated by code, sill heights should not be higher than 2'-6" off the ground to provide light and air and to provide visual connectivity to the outside, and to make the units marketable. Therefore, portions of the facades of the Research and Development Lab Building and the Machine Shop would need to be substantially altered by removing the portions of the facades beneath the windows to achieve the appropriate sill height. Where there are no windows, such as in the entire Kent Avenue façade of the Packaging House (with the exception of the Machine Shop and the two lower stories of the building containing the cafeteria), many new windows would need to be inserted to provide required light and air. The east façade of the Packaging House is clad in metal panels, which would require new cladding for conversion to residential use. In addition, as described above, the Packaging House is designed with only a two floors with extremely tall floor-to-floor heights. The building is extremely deep, spanning between Kent Avenue and the East River, and would require substantial alterations and removal of large sections of the building to meet light and air code requirements.

The windows in the Raw Sugar Warehouse, where present, are multi-pane factory style windows. Similar to other buildings on the site, the windows in this building are not located consistently across the facades on all three stories. The existing windows would need to be retrofitted with appropriate windows for residential use, adjusted where applicable to lower sill height and supplemented by many new windows inserted into the building façade to provide the required light and air for reuse. Additionally, at ground level on the East River façade, the building has many large openings that are currently covered in corrugated metal. These openings would need to be reclad and new openings inserted to allow a new use. Finally, the Raw Sugar Warehouse building does not have floors, and thus any reuse of the building would require the construction of a new framing system, including floors and columns, to bear residential loads.

Alterations required to allow new uses in these buildings would dramatically alter the facades with the addition of new windows and entryways, and the removal of exterior piping. As industrial buildings built specifically for the processing, warehousing, and packaging of sugar, these structures were built with limited fenestration. The modifications required to convert the buildings to the proposed residential uses would be counter to the purpose for which the buildings were designed and would result in a significant loss of the buildings' integrity.

Boiler House, Bin Building, and Adant House

A number of buildings on the site are larger structures consisting of four or more stories. These structures, which include the Boiler House, Adant House, and the Bin Building, are more prominent on the site due to their location and architectural attributes.

Boiler House

The Boiler House is an 84- to 118-foot-tall building with an approximately 100 foot square footprint. Window spacing, with the exception of the south façade which has large multi-pane factory style windows, is sporadic. The Boiler House is connected to the Power House, Turbine House, and Pump House to the north. It is also located directly adjacent to the Filter House of the Refinery, which is being retained and adaptively reused, to the east.

The need to comply with the New York City Building Code, the building's lack of internal floors, and the lack of consistent fenestration in the building, would require that substantial alterations be made to the building to allow residential use. Any residential conversion would also require the removal of the large sections of piping and other equipment attached to the exterior of the building, which covers areas that would require windows but which give this

building its industrial character. These alterations would significantly compromise the integrity of this structure and dramatically alter its historic appearance.

Bin Building

As described above, the Bin Building is essentially a 170-foot-tall windowless concrete silo structure with no internal floor systems. The building is topped with glass, and the Domino Sugar sign is attached to the west façade. The building's small footprint and lack of fenestration does not make it compatible with residential reuse. The only way to make the building usable would be to add floors within the building and to add window openings at each new floor. This would substantially alter the structure's original configuration as a storage building for processed sugar and adversely impact its integrity.

Adant House

Adant House has a large, deep, and irregular footprint, and stands at 4-stories above grade (or 44 feet in height). This is the only building on the site that possesses a consistent fenestration pattern. The windows are very widely spaced on the South 5th Street façade. Although the original building has been substantially altered with the removal of two stories and a penthouse, the building's facades on Kent Avenue and South 5th Street retain a late 19th century industrial character. The west and north facades of the building are directly adjacent, and attached, to other buildings.

It is not feasible to adaptively reuse Adant House for residential occupancy. The building was designed for manufacturing purposes and as such is configured for industrial, and not residential needs. This building contains a dense and irregular column grid with columns that directly obstruct windows. It also contains extremely low floor-to-floor heights which would not meet code requirements for residential use, a lack of light and air to interior spaces due to deep floorplates, a lack of consistent floors throughout the building, and the very wide window spacing on South 5th Street. Further, issues with respect to the condition of its severely deteriorated south wall, potential fire-code non-compliance of cast iron columns, and deteriorated mortar pose additional reuse constraints (see attached report from Robert Silman Associates).

Adant House is laid out in a dense grid of 10' x 11'-6" bays. The building's columns are not consistent to window spacing, and in many areas, columns line up centrally in front of windows, at the edge of windows, and in between windows. On Kent Avenue in the northern half of the building, many of the columns are placed directly in front of the windows (see Figure 15). This would make the layout of apartments extremely difficult since units with columns blocking the windows are not marketable. As described above, the windows on the South Fifth Street façade are widely spaced and the light that enters through those windows would need to be maximized. Any obstructions would both reduce light into the building and create non-saleable units.

The floor-to-floor heights, measured from the floor to the bottom of the existing girders, measures from 8'-3" to 6-9" on the second through fourth floors of the building (for analytical purposes it is assumed that ground floor would be used for retail and lobby space). The third and fourth floors, with floor-to-floor heights of 7'-8" and 6'-9" respectively, are not code compliant for residential use. These are well below the industry standards of 9'-0" to 10'-0" floor-to-floor heights, and New York City building codes require that habitable rooms require a minimum clear ceiling height of at least eight feet for residential occupancy. The addition of dry wall to create ceiling beneath the girders would further reduce floor-to-floor heights by another six to

eight inches, rendering the possible residential floors on the second through fourth levels of the building non-compliant with the New York City building code.

Additionally, residential units must meet certain light and air requirements to be compliant with building codes. For analytical purposes, it is assumed that reuse of the existing building could yield approximately 36 residential units, with 12 units located per floor on floors 2-4. This is a conservative analysis as this does not take into consideration the issues posed by the restrictive and awkward column grid or the low floor-to-floor heights described above. To yield the greatest number of apartments on each floor with the fewest modifications to the historic structure, the design would need to utilize an L-shaped, primarily single loaded corridor that conforms to the footprint of the building. Under this scenario, the potential building would be only 71% efficient, with a large central portion of approximately 6,300 gsf on each floor rendered uninhabitable and unmarketable due to code restrictions relative to light and air. The only viable use for the over 6,000 square feet on each of the three residential floors would be storage space. A courtyard would not be a feasible solution as it would face the corridor, not the residential units, and hence would not add any benefit of light and air.

Other alternatives for improving the efficiency of the building were studied, including adding additional floors on top of the building to increase the number of apartments, and constructing a courtyard in the center of the building. Neither solution substantially increases efficiency and both options compromise the historic fabric of the building. Increasing the number of units in Adant House by building new floors on top of the existing building would substantially alter its historic character and would result in minimal gain. As a combustible timber structure, the maximum permissible height of this building under the New York City Building Code is seven stories, which would conservatively translate to only three additional floors of apartments, or 36 units.

In addition, the reuse of Adant House would require a new west façade to be built, including the insertion of all new windows on the west façade of the building where it presently is connected to the Packaging House.

As noted above, the floors in Adant House are composed of different materials and the building contains large openings and mezzanine areas. Any reuse of the building would require a new, consistent flooring system to be constructed. The combination of the restrictive column grid, columns that block windows, low floor-to-floor heights, the depth of the building, and the lack of consistent flooring would require that substantial alterations be made to the interior structure of the building. As noted in Robert Silman's attached June 30, 2008 report, it would be very difficult to selectively remove columns of the building due to the interconnected nature of the building's continuous wood framing system. Further, increasing the column spans to create larger unobstructed spaces would by definition require a greater depth of any new ceiling beams. As discussed above, the floor-to-floor heights are an issue and increasing the depth of any new beams would exacerbate the problem. Therefore, it would be necessary to remove most if not all of the existing structure in the building and rebuild within the exterior shell to create a marketable residential building at Adant House.

Removal of the interior structure of the Adant House would further alter the integrity of a building which has already been compromised by the removal of its upper two floors and penthouse. Removal of the original structural elements and bracing of the exterior structure would pose extraordinary costs to the project on top of those that would be incurred by the adaptive reuse of the Refinery, and which the project could not support. It should also be noted that the floor-to-floor heights of the building are dictated by the existing window pattern. Even

if the building were to receive a new interior structural system, the units would need to be designed with double height floors which would further reduce the number of units that could be put in the building.

As described in Robert Silman's report, due to the conditions of the brick, approximately 25% of the south wall (the lower portion) would need to be replaced. Holes that have been patched and replaced with cement would need to be repaired and the prior repointing episodes, clearly visible on the south façade, would need to be evaluated to determine what further degradation past repointing and past cleaning episodes may have had on the integrity of the brick. In addition, the south façade would need to be repointed. This work would result in additional costs to the project that could not be justified. In summary, the alterations that would be required to convert Adant House to residential use, together with the alterations that have previously been undertaken, would significantly compromise its integrity. Furthermore, the costs to remove and build a new internal structural system while bracing the existing exterior structure along with repairs to the façade would incur substantial and unsupportable additional costs to the project.

V. CONCLUSION

It is not feasible for the site to be reused for manufacturing purposes nor is it feasible to retain and adaptively reuse for residential use the S/NR-eligible buildings on the site other than the three buildings that compose the Refinery.

The existing buildings were built for specialty sugar storage, processing and packaging uses, and do not meet requirements for residential uses such as consistent fenestration, New York City code requirements for light and air, consistent floors (many structures have no floors and in Adant House the floor to ceiling heights would be below code requirements for residential use), and appropriate footprints (building footprints are small, or very large with deep floorplates that restrict light and air into the interior of the buildings). The buildings would need significant modification to allow residential and retail uses. Alterations needed would include the insertion of new openings for windows and access, full interior reconstructions and renovations, and removal of portions of the buildings to meet light and air requirements, all of which would adversely impact the industrial character of these buildings, dramatically alter the facades, remove original building material, and significantly compromise their historic integrity. Converting the buildings to residential use would alter the buildings to such an extent that they would no longer reflect the purpose for which they were built.

Even with such alterations, the resulting number of units would not justify the expense, especially when combined with the increased costs of rehabilitating the Refinery, the project's major preservation component and centerpiece of the proposed development. Furthermore, the existing buildings are densely spread across the site, with footprints, floor area, and configurations that are not adaptable to residential use. Collectively, the existing buildings are a total of 966,060 gsf, or 60% less floor area than is needed in the proposed project to reach affordable housing goals.

The proposed project is consistent with the Greenpoint-Williamsburg rezoning and the City's goals for Williamsburg, and proposes to redevelop the site with residential, retail, and community facility uses and a significant affordable housing component and generous open space, all of which are in great need in Williamsburg. Refinery LLC will explore and develop appropriate mitigation measures in consultation with OPRHP to partially mitigate any adverse impacts from the proposed project. ✷

APPENDIX A.2
LPC Correspondence

THE CITY OF NEW YORK LANDMARKS PRESERVATION COMMISSION
1 Centre St., 9N, New York, NY 10007 (212) 669-7700

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

DCP /LA-CEQR-K — 06/20/07
PROJECT NUMBER — DATE RECEIVED

PROJECT

DOMINO SUGAR REZONING:

[ ] No architectural significance

[X] No archaeological significance

[ ] Designated New York City Landmark or Within Designated Historic District

[ ] Listed on National Register of Historic Places

[X] Appears to be eligible for National Register Listing and/or New York City La Designation

[ ] May be archaeologically significant; requesting additional materials

COMMENTS

The LPC is in receipt of the EAS and scope of work for EIS (SEIS) dated 6/8/07. The text is acceptable for historic resources and archaeology.

The Filter, Pan and Finishing Houses at 292-314 Kent Ave. have been calendared by the LPC for LPC designation. Additionally, the SHPO has found that an area containing the complex, bounded by the East River, Grand St., Kent Ave., and S. 5 St. appears eligible for listing on the State and National Registers. The SHPO is also studying the area east of Kent Ave. across the street from the complex.

Gina Santucci — 07/06/07
SIGNATURE — DATE

THE CITY OF NEW YORK LANDMARKS PRESERVATION COMMISSION
1 Centre Street, 9N, New York, NY 10007 (212) 669-7700 www.nyc.gov/landmarks

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING/LA-CEQR-K 1/28/2008

Project number **Date received**

Project: DOMINO SUGAR REZONING

The following properties possess architectural significance:

Comments: The LPC is in receipt of "Table 1, Potential Architectural Resources in the Study Area". The LPC concurs with the SHPO determinations with the following additions. Properties that appear eligible for LPC designation are as follows: #11, Matchett Candy Factory; #15, 103-107 S. 6th St.; #43-48, Broadway Buildings; and #39, the North Side Savings Bank. Item #37 appears eligible for S/NR listing.

cc: SHPO

1/31/2008

SIGNATURE DATE



7523_FSO_GS_01312008.doc

THE NEW YORK CITY LANDMARKS PRESERVATION COMMISSION
1 CENTRE STREET 9TH FLOOR NORTH NEW YORK, NY 10007
TEL: 212 669-7700 FAX: 212 669-7780

06·26·08

APPROVED

June 26, 2008

ISSUED TO:

Susan Pollock, Sr. Vice-Pres.
Refinery LLC
c/o CPC Resources, Inc.
28 East 28th Street, 9th floor
New York, NY 10016

Re: **STATUS UPDATE LETTER**
LPC - 084774
SUL 09-1233
292-314 KENT AVENUE
HISTORIC DISTRICT
INDIVIDUAL LANDMARK
Borough of Brooklyn
Block/Lot: 2424 / 1

This letter is to inform you that at the Public Meeting of June 24, 2008, following the Public Meeting of March 4, 2008 and the Public Hearing and Public Meeting of February 5, 2008, the Landmarks Preservation Commission voted to approve the construction of a rooftop addition, portions of which are three stories and portions of which are four stories; the construction of rooftop bulkheads, a one-story addition at the western side of the Filter House, and balconies at the southern facades of the Filter and Finishing Houses; the creation of a central courtyard; modifications to existing masonry openings; the creation of new masonry openings; and the installation of windows, entrances, shopfronts, canopies and signage.

PLEASE NOTE: THIS IS NOT A PERMIT. No work may begin until a Certificate of Appropriateness is issued. This approval is not in effect until the Landmarks Preservation Commission receives and approves two sets of the final signed and sealed drawings, showing the approved proposal, at which time, a Certificate of Appropriateness will be issued; the drawings will be marked approved by the Commission with a perforated seal; and the permit and perforated drawings may be submitted to the Department of Buildings. Approval for this project expires on June 24, 2014.

The Commission voted to approve the proposal, finding that the removal of the existing rooftop accretions, construction of additions and bulkheads and creation of a central courtyard will not eliminate any significant historic elements; that the existing buildings were constructed as part of a complex of industrial buildings, which historically featured visible rooftop accretions, including bulkheads and mechanical equipment, therefore the presence of rooftop structures will be in keeping with the character of the buildings; that the contemporary use of metal-framed glazing at the rooftop addition and metal cladding at the bulkheads and their placement, set back from the parapets of the Filter House's primary facades, will help to differentiate the addition and bulkheads from the original building and support their identity as secondary elements; that the scale and massing of the rooftop addition and bulkheads, featuring variations in heights and facade planes, will recall the irregular massing of utilitarian rooftop accretions at industrial buildings of this age and help these elements to harmonize with the building's overall form; that the asymmetrical, regularized pattern

of the simply-detailed, substantial metal framing at the rooftop addition and balconies will evoke both the evolutionary development of these specific buildings and the outward representation of structure, a character-defining feature of industrial buildings; that the presence of the Domino sign will reflect the developmental history of the buildings and site; that the Domino sign will visually mitigate the presence of the addition and be well integrated into the overall design; that the balconies and recessed infill will reference, in a contemporary manner, the former presence of the conveyor bridges and the significant historic evolution of the buildings as a functioning refinery complex; that the construction of the one-story rear addition and terrace will not eliminate or conceal any significant features of the western façade of the Filter House; that the proposed rear addition and terrace will be well-scaled to the Filter House and simple in design and form and will match the building in materials, thereby helping the addition and terrace to be both secondary to the historic building and well-integrated into the overall complex; that the proposed central courtyard will not be visible from any public thoroughfares and will not disrupt the perceived massing of the buildings; that except at the eleventh floor, the proposed new and enlarged masonry openings at the upper floors will not eliminate any decorative brickwork; that the replacement of limited area of pattern brickwork with the proposed new window openings will retain the presence of a horizontal band at the roofline termination of the building; that the proportions and spacing of the proposed new and enlarged upper floor window openings, matching the historic window openings, in conjunction with the selective use of straight-headed lintels at new vertical rows of windows, will help support a harmonious fenestration pattern and the primacy of the original masonry openings; that although the proposed multi-light metal windows, within original masonry openings, will not match the historic wood windows in materials and exact framing dimensions, the proposed windows will match the historic windows in operation, configuration, and finish and will closely replicate the overall appearance of the historic windows; that the proportions, configuration, details and finish of the proposed multi-light windows, within the new and enlarged masonry openings, as well as historic masonry openings without a known historic window type, will replicate these aspects of the historic windows, thereby helping to integrate the proposed windows into the building's overall fenestration patterns; that the historic infill at the ground floor of the buildings has already been largely replaced, therefore the removal of the remaining historic window at the ground floor and modification of these masonry openings to create entrance and shopfront infill will not disrupt an intact ground floor composition; that the limited enlargement of the ground floor masonry openings will not significantly alter the ratio of masonry to infill or diminish the prominence of the large round-headed masonry openings, both significant features of the American round-arch style of the buildings; that the simple design of the ground floor shopfront infill will unify the base of the buildings and recall, in a contemporary manner, loading docks in keeping with the industrial character of the buildings; that the design of the ground floor infill, featuring prominent vertical mullions and entrance framing, will reference the tripartite divisions of the building's historic ground floor infill; that the proposed painted signage over the entrances, as well as the bracket signs and back-painted signage on display windows, will be in keeping with style and placement of traditional signage found at buildings of this type, style and age; that the metal material, gray finish and simple detailing of the proposed canopies will help these installations to be harmonious with the industrial character of the building, as well as to remain secondary features that do not draw undue attention to themselves; and that the proposed signs and canopies will be well-scaled to the building entrances and shopfronts, non-illuminated, and limited in number, and thereby will not overwhelm the ground floor of the buildings. Based on these findings, the Commission determined the proposed work to be appropriate to this Individual Landmark.

Please note that all drawings, including amendments which are to be filed at the Department of Buildings, must be approved by the Landmarks Preservation Commission. Thank you for your cooperation.

Bernadette Artus

Please Note: THIS IS NOT A PERMIT

cc: Caroline Kane Levy, Deputy Director of Preservation/LPC; John Weiss, Deputy Counsel/LPC; Mark Levine, Esq./Herrick Feinsten LLP

THE CITY OF NEW YORK LANDMARKS PRESERVATION COMMISSION
1 Centre Street, 9N, New York, NY 10007 (212) 669-7700 www.nyc.gov/landmarks

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING/07DCP094K 9/25/2008

Project number **Date received**

Project: DOMINO SUGAR REZONING

Comments: The LPC is in receipt of the PDEIS Historic Resources chapter dated 9/12/08. LPC findings of 1/31/08 remain in effect as follows: properties that appear eligible for LPC designation: Matchett Candy Factory; 103-107 S. 6th St.; Broadway Buildings; and the North Side Savings Bank. The remaining potential architectural properties are not significant for LPC designation.

10/8/2008

SIGNATURE DATE



7523_FSO_GS_10082008.doc

THE CITY OF NEW YORK LANDMARKS PRESERVATION COMMISSION
1 Centre Street, 9N, New York, NY 10007 (212) 669-7700 www.nyc.gov/landmarks

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING/07DCP094K 10/16/2008

Project number **Date received**

Project: DOMINO SUGAR REZONING

Comments: The LPC is in receipt of Chapter 23, "Mitigation" of the PDEIS, dated 10/8/08. Comments are as follows.

Section D, "Historic Resources", at the bottom of page 23-3.

After the sentence, "The demolition of the S/NR eligible buildings would constitute a significant adverse impact on architectural resources.", insert: "Measures to mitigate the project's adverse impacts would be developed in consultation with the SHPO between the draft and final EIS". Add the following at the end of the paragraph: "The mitigation measures would be set forth in a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) to be signed by the project sponsors, SHPO, and the United States Army Corps of Engineers."

10/29/2008

SIGNATURE DATE



7523_FSO_GS_10292008.doc

THE CITY OF NEW YORK LANDMARKS PRESERVATION COMMISSION
1 Centre Street, 9N, New York, NY 10007 (212) 669-7700 www.nyc.gov/landmarks

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING/07DCP094K 11/6/2009

Project number **Date received**

Project: DOMINO SUGAR REZONING

Comments: The LPC is in receipt of the Historic Resources chapter of the DEIS dated 9/29/09.

In order to complete the review, the following items are needed:

Site plans and Elevations of the proposed new residential structures
Appendix A, "SHPO Feasibility Study"
Shadow chapter

cc: SHPO

Gina Santucci

11/9/2009

SIGNATURE DATE

7523_FSO_GS_11092009.doc

THE CITY OF NEW YORK LANDMARKS PRESERVATION COMMISSION
1 Centre Street, 9N, New York, NY 10007 (212) 669-7700 www.nyc.gov/landmarks

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING/07DCP094K 11/9/2009

Project number **Date received**

Project: DOMINO SUGAR REZONING

The LPC is in receipt of the PDEIS chapters as follows: Project Description, Shadows, Appendix A (Alternatives Analysis) and Historic Resources, all dated 9/29/09. The Mitigation chapter should also be submitted for review and comment.

As of this date, the LPC has not issued a Certificate of Appropriateness for this project. On June 28, 2008, LPC issued a Status Update Letter 09-1233 (attached) for the project.

LPC concurs with the historic resource identification and evaluation as presented in the Historic Resources chapter and in Table 8-1, "Architectural Resources on the Site and in the Study Area".

The Contextual Impact section of the Historic Resources chapter should include a discussion of the impact of the proposed project residential towers surrounding the S/NR eligible and LPC designated Refinery site as per the CEQR Technical Manual:2001, Chapter F, Section 322.4, "Future Action Conditions" and Section 420, "Architectural Impacts."

If a Section 106 consultation document is produced upon formal identification of the lead Federal agency, LPC should be contacted regarding inclusion in the document.

Cc: SHPO
Attachment (efile)

Gina Santucci

11/13/2009

SIGNATURE DATE

7523_FSO_GS_11132009.doc

THE CITY OF NEW YORK LANDMARKS PRESERVATION COMMISSION
1 Centre Street, 9N, New York, NY 10007 (212) 669-7700 www.nyc.gov/landmarks

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING/07DCP094K 11/18/2009

Project number **Date received**

Project: DOMINO SUGAR REZONING

Comments: The LPC is in receipt of the historic resources section of the Mitigation chapter, and the revised draft historic resources chapter of 11/20/09. The text of the revised draft historic resources chapter is acceptable. The text of the mitigation chapter should indicate what type of instrument will be used to partially mitigate the demolition of the S/NR eligible properties on the project site--Letter of Resolution? Restrictive Declaration?

Gina Santucci

12/2/2009

SIGNATURE DATE

7523_FSO_GS_12022009.doc

THE CITY OF NEW YORK LANDMARKS PRESERVATION COMMISSION
1 Centre Street, 9N, New York, NY 10007 (212) 669-7700 www.nyc.gov/landmarks

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING/07DCP094K 12/3/2009

Project number **Date received**

Project: DOMINO SUGAR REZONING

Comments: The LPC is in receipt of the revised Mitigation Chapter dated 12/2/09. The text is acceptable.

cc: SHPO

Gina Santucci

12/3/2009

SIGNATURE DATE

7523_FSO_GS_12032009.doc

THE CITY OF NEW YORK LANDMARKS PRESERVATION COMMISSION
1 Centre Street, 9N, New York, NY 10007 (212) 669-7700 www.nyc.gov/landmarks

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING/07DCP094K 5/27/2010

Project number **Date received**

Project: DOMINO SUGAR REZONING

Comments: The LPC is in receipt of Comment and Response 8-1 from the FEIS. The Austin, Nichols & Co. Warehouse remains eligible for designation as an individual landmark. The LPC Environmental Review Division does not have access to the full development history of the project and therefore cannot comment on that portion of the response.

5/27/2010

SIGNATURE DATE

7523_FSO_GS_05272010.doc

APPENDIX A.3
SHPO Correspondence

Eliot Spitzer
Governor

Carol Ash
Commissioner

New York State Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation

Historic Preservation Field Services Bureau • Peebles Island, PO Box 189, Waterford, New York 12188-0189
518-237-8643
www.nysparks.com

October 25, 2007

Elizabeth Meade
AKRF
440 Park Ave. south
New York, NY 10016

Dear Ms. Meade,

Re: CORPS/DEC
Domino Sugar Rezoning
Brooklyn, Kings County, NY
07PR05124

Thank your for requesting the comments of the New York State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) with regard to the potential for this project to affect significant historical/cultural resources. SHPO has reviewed your recent submission of historic map data regarding the Area of Potential Effect (APE) for this project. Based on this review, SHPO has no further archaeological concerns for the current APE. Please continue to consult with our technical review staff on other aspects of this project.

Please contact me at extension 3291, or by e-mail at douglas.mackey@oprhp.state.ny.us, if you have any questions regarding these comments.

Sincerely

Douglas P. Mackey
Historic Preservation Program Analyst
Archaeology

Eliot Spitzer
Governor

Carol Ash
Commissioner

New York State Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation

Historic Preservation Field Services • Peebles Island, PO Box 189, Waterford, New York 12188-0189

518-237-8643

www.nysparks.com

March 12, 2008

Claudia Cooney
AKRF
440 Park Avenue South
New York, NY 10016

Re: Corps/DEC
Domino Sugar Rezoning
Kings County
07PR05124

Dear Ms. Cooney:

Thank you for requesting the comments of the New York State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) for the proposed rezoning and redevelopment of the Domino Sugar Plant in Brooklyn. In cases where a state agency is involved in an undertaking, it is appropriate for that agency to determine whether consultation should take place under Section 14.09 of the New York State Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation Law. In addition, if there is any federal agency involvement, then review would take place in accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 and the relevant implementing regulations. Since the property is located along the river, we assume that the Army Corps of Engineers may be involved and our review, until further information is available, will be in accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Based upon our review, we offer the following comments:

1. Kathy Howe of our National Register Unit notes that the former American Sugar Refining Company located on Kent Avenue along the East River between South 5th and Grand Streets is eligible for listing on the State and National Registers of Historic Places.
2. Based on our review of the information submitted, we note that the plans include the demolition of all buildings but one on the site. Our regulations are clear that demolition of historic properties, either eligible or listed on the National Register of Historic Places, is deemed an Adverse Effect. That finding requires an exploration of prudent and feasible alternatives that might avoid or reduce the project effects. As a matter of police and practice, this exploration must occur before mitigation measures can be developed and before demolition can occur. If no prudent and feasible alternatives are identified, we would enter into a formal agreement document, which would identify proper mitigation measures to be incorporated into the work.
3. Documentation in the submission includes presentation material for the "Landmarks Submission" dated February 5, 2008. The documentation is for the Domino Sugar Refinery Building redevelopment. The remainder of our comments in this letter will address the proposed treatment of this historic structure. We are pleased to see that it is proposed for redevelopment as it is one of the oldest buildings on the site.
4. Based on our review of the Preliminary Structural Engineering Report dated September 7, 2006, from Robert Silman Associates, we concur that the interior of the building will not be structurally suitable for carrying the loads needed for an adaptive reuse as housing or a community center. We further understand the proposed rehabilitation retains the existing historic masonry load bearing walls and that new floor slabs and structural framing will be constructed within the shell of the masonry walls.
5. After review of the proposed building renderings, we note that the proposed addition on top of the refinery building is not appropriate. In this case, the size of the addition changes the buildings physical character and detracts from the tall and

slender character-defining chimney. Our guidance from the National Park Service provides that rooftop additions should not be visible from public thoroughfares, should be set back from the building facades by one bay and should not be taller than one-story. We hope you will re-evaluate the proposed rooftop addition and, given the magnitude of the proposed adjacent construction, will be able to preserve the historic appearance of the Sugar Refinery Building. For your use, we have enclosed our "Guide to Compatible New Construction" and Preservation Brief 14 "New Exterior Additions to Historic Buildings: Preservation Concerns".

6. We have concerns regarding the proposed retail storefronts as shown on LPC.4.9. Large plate glass windows are not appropriate in these openings. Where windows have been bricked closed and are being re-opened, the openings should appear as windows and be reflective of the design of the historic multi-lite windows. Where openings were large or were originally loading docks, the openings should reflect their original use; this can be accomplished with the use of multi-lite windows that reflect the original use design.
7. From LPC.1.1 we note that the East River side of the Refinery Building is proposed as open space. It is our preference that the riverfront space retains its industrial character, and appropriate setting for the Refinery Building. The landscaping should include few, if any trees and low shrubbery surrounded by hardscape materials.
8. We note that a number of additional windows are proposed for the building façades. Please explain the need for these openings. Since all that remains of the historic building is the masonry façade, it should be kept as unaltered as possible. At first review, there appear to be enough windows in the building to meet the light and egress needs for a residential conversion.

We understand that your project is in the beginning stages of design and review. As such, we look forward to continued consultation as the design progresses. Thank you for your consultation. If you have any questions, I can be reached at (518) 237-8643, ext. 3282. Please refer to the SHPO Project Review (PR) number in any future correspondences regarding this project.

Sincerely,



Beth A. Cumming
Historic Preservation Specialist – Technical Unit
e-mail: beth.cumming@oprhp.state.ny.us

enc: Preservation Brief 14
Guide to Compatible New Construction

RESOURCE EVALUATION

DATE: October 27, 2006 STAFF: Kathy Howe

PROPERTY: American Sugar Refining Company
(Domino Sugar Refinery) MCD: Brooklyn

ADDRESS: Kent Avenue along the East River between South 5th and Grand Streets COUNTY: Kings Co.
USN: 04701.000070

I. ☐ Property is individually listed on SR/NR:
name of listing:

☐ Property is a contributing component of a SR/NR district:
name of district:

II. ☒ Property meets eligibility criteria.

☐ Property contributes to a district which appears to meet eligibility criteria.

Pre SRB: ☐ Post SRB: ☐ SRB date

Criteria for Inclusion in the National Register:

A. ☒ Associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history;

B. ☒ Associated with the lives of persons significant in our past;

C. ☒ Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period or method of construction; or represents the work of a master; or possess high artistic values; or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction;

D. ☐ Have yielded, or may be likely to yield information important in prehistory or history.

STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE:

The former American Sugar Refining Company complex is one of the most visually prominent and historically significant industrial sites on the East River waterfront in Brooklyn. Situated just north of the Williamsburg Bridge on five blocks bounded by Grand Street and South 5th Street, the East River and Kent Avenue, the origins of the complex date to the mid-1850's when the Havemeyer & Elder Co. built a new plant on this site. A disastrous fire in 1882 destroyed the original plant, but the company rebuilt the following year. By 1892-93 the refinery was known as the American Sugar Refining Company and noted as "the greatest manufacturing industry in the vicinity of New-York City."[1] The factory

[1] Moses King, *Kings' Handbook of New York City* (Boston: 1892-93), 918.

had "a capacity of . . . 22,000 to 25,000 barrels of sugar a day, which [was] more than one-half the entire consumption of the United States."[2]

The extant complex whose earliest buildings date to 1883 meets **Criterion A** in the area of industrial history as one of the nation's most important sugar refineries. The Havemeyers became the first Manhattan sugar manufacturers to select Brooklyn as a plant site. Soon the low transportation costs associated with a dockside location attracted other refiners, and eventually Brooklyn supplanted Manhattan as the Nation's sugar refining center. Over the years Havemeyer and his successors modernized the facilities and erected new buildings. In addition to the significant industrial history represented here, the factory had an economic and social impact on the development of north Brooklyn, employing recent immigrants, many of whom lived in the surrounding neighborhood.

The complex also meets **Criterion C** for the three different periods of industrial design represented here. The complex includes significant industrial buildings from the refinery's earliest period of construction, 1883-84, as well as a number of buildings from expansion and modernization programs in the mid 1920s and late 1950s-early 1960s. The period of significance for the complex spans from 1883, the date of the earliest surviving buildings on the site, up to industry's final expansion and new building campaign which ended in 1962.

The American Sugar Refining Company complex is also significant under **Criterion B** for its association with the Havemeyers, one of New York's most influential families. The key official of the company was Henry O. Havemeyer, whose family had been in the sugar refining business in New York almost since the beginning of the century. According to economic historian Richard Zerbe, Havemeyer "fits well into that famous notion of his time of captains of industry." Havemeyer was "so closely . . . identified with the sugar trust," says Zerbe, "that he became the symbol of the sugar monopoly itself, even as Rockefeller became the symbol of the oil monopoly."[3]

The refinery continued to be a major processor throughout the 20th century and into the early years of the 21st century. In 1970 American Sugar changed its name to Amstar Corp. In 1988, Tate & Lyall acquired Amstar's American Sugar Division and renamed the company Domino Sugar Corp. The refinery was closed in 2004 and is presently vacant.

If you have any questions concerning this Determination of Eligibility, please call Kathy Howe at (518) 237-8643, ext. 3266.

---

[2] King, 918.

[3] Richard Zerbe, "The American Sugar Refinery Company, 1887-1914: The Story of a Monopoly," *Journal of Law and Economics*, XII (October, 1969), 350.

David A. Paterson
Governor

Carol Ash
Commissioner

New York State Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation

Historic Preservation Field Services • Peebles Island, PO Box 189, Waterford, New York 12188-0189

518-237-8643

www.nysparks.com

August 29, 2008

Claudia Cooney
AKRF
440 Park Avenue South
New York, NY 10016

Re: Corps/DEC
Domino Sugar Rezoning
Kings County
07PR05124

Dear Ms. Cooney:

Thank you for requesting the comments of the New York State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) for the proposed rezoning and redevelopment of the Domino Sugar Plant in Brooklyn. In cases where a state agency is involved in an undertaking, it is appropriate for that agency to determine whether consultation should take place under Section 14.09 of the New York State Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation Law. In addition, if there is any federal agency involvement, then review would take place in accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 and the relevant implementing regulations. Since the property is located along the river, we assume that the Army Corps of Engineers may be involved and our review, until further information is available, will be in accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

After review of our file, we note that the plans continue to include the demolition of all buildings but one on the site. As stated before, our regulations are clear that demolition of historic properties, either eligible or listed on the National Register of Historic Places, is deemed an Adverse Effect. That finding requires an exploration of prudent and feasible alternatives that might avoid or reduce the project effects. As a matter of policy and practice, this exploration must occur before mitigation measures can be developed and before demolition can occur. If no prudent and feasible alternatives are identified, we would enter into a formal agreement document, which would identify proper mitigation measures to be incorporated into the work.

In our previous letter dated March 12, 2008, we commented on the proposed redevelopment of the Refinery Building based on the "Landmarks Submission". We note that this submission includes an updated "Landmarks Submission" dated June 24, 2008. The remainder of the letter will address specific design details proposed for the site, but we cannot commit to these comments without a state or federal agency involved or an appropriate alternatives analysis. We are commenting at this stage since it is in the best interest of the Refinery Building to comment on possible impacts to the building as early as possible.

1. After review of the updated proposed building renderings, we note that they are much improved. However, we continue to note that the proposed addition on top of the Refinery Building is not appropriate. In this case, the size of the addition changes the buildings physical character and detracts from the tall and slender character-defining chimney. Our guidance from the National Park Service provides that rooftop additions should not be visible from public thoroughfares, should be set back from the building facades by one bay and should not be taller than one-story. We hope you will continue to re-evaluate the proposed rooftop addition and, given the magnitude of the proposed adjacent construction, will be able to preserve the historic appearance of the Refinery Building. We continue to encourage you to consult the "Guide to Compatible New Construction and Preservation Brief 14 provided in our last letter.
2. We have reviewed the proposed new ground floor openings for the Refinery Building and find that they are not appropriate. Guidance from the National Park Service, requires us to retain the character-defining features of the building

wherever and whenever possible. In this case, windows should remain windows except in rare cases where an entrance is required. In those cases, the entrance should appear as a window that has been dropped to a door. Original doors in the large arched openings at the ground floor should be retained. There are only a few of these doors and it seems possible to retain them in place as doors or retain them in placed with a glazed opening and fixing the doors in the open position on the interior.

3. Based upon our review of the proposed windows, we note that the proposed windows are not a good match. If custom profiles are being created, then these should match the historic. In addition, it is not appropriate to apply the muntin to the interior and exterior without a spacer bar between the panes of glass.
4. We have reviewed the landscape plan and find it to be interesting. We like the use of industrial artifacts and how they tell the story of sugar manufacturing.

At this time, we are not able to provide more substantive comments until a State or Federal agency is identified and an alternatives analysis is provided. It is not appropriate for us to discuss mitigation measures without an involved State and/or Federal agency since they should participate in such discussions. Finally, we urge you to consult with preservation architects on the proposed Refinery Building work. At this time, with the large addition on top and the modern storefront windows and doors proposed at street level, the project appears to be more a new design project than a preservation project.

We look forward to continued consultation as the project progresses. Thank you for your consultation. If you have any questions, I can be reached at (518) 237-8643, ext. 3282. Please refer to the Project Review (PR) number in any future correspondences regarding this project.

Sincerely,

Beth A. Cumming
Historic Preservation Specialist – Technical Unit
e-mail: beth.cumming@oprhp.state.ny.us

David A. Paterson
Governor

Carol Ash
Commissioner

New York State Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation

Historic Preservation Field Services • Peebles Island, PO Box 189, Waterford, New York 12188-0189

518-237-8643

www.nysparks.com

November 6, 2008

Claudia Cooney
AKRF
440 Park Avenue South
New York, NY 10016

Re: Corps/DEC
Domino Sugar Rezoning
Kings County
07PR05124

Dear Ms. Cooney:

Thank you for providing the requested Alternatives Analysis for comment by the New York State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) for the proposed rezoning and redevelopment of the Domino Sugar Plant in Brooklyn. In cases where a state agency is involved in an undertaking, it is appropriate for that agency to determine whether consultation should take place under Section 14.09 of the New York State Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation Law. In addition, if there is any federal agency involvement, then review would take place in accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 and the relevant implementing regulations. Since the property is located along the river, we assume that the Army Corps of Engineers may be involved and our review, until further information is available, will be in accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. These comments are those of the SHPO and relate only to the Historic/Cultural resources. They do not include other environmental impacts to New York State Parkland that may be involved in or near your project. Such impacts must be considered as part of the environmental review of the project pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act and/or the State Environmental Quality Review Act (New York Environmental Conservation Law Article 8).

Based upon our review of the Alternatives Analysis dated October 7, 2008 we understand that the Adant House is structurally compromised and would require extensive changes to convert it to residential uses. We further understand that the remainder of the buildings where specifically designed to support the processing of sugar. Adding floors, windows and residential requirements would likely significantly alter the character-defining features of these buildings which contribute to the historic significance of the Domino Sugar Site. As such, it is the SHPO's opinion that there are no prudent and feasible alternatives to demolition of all the buildings on the Domino Sugar Site besides the three buildings that compose the Refinery, which are schedule for adaptive reuse.

If you have any questions, I can be reached at (518) 237-8643, ext. 3282. Please refer to the Project Review (PR) number in any future correspondences regarding this project.

Sincerely,

Beth A. Cumming
Historic Preservation Specialist – Technical Unit
e-mail: beth.cumming@oprhp.state.ny.us

cc: N. Handell – CORPS (via e-mail)

An Equal Opportunity Employer/Affirmative Action Agency

New York State Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation

Historic Preservation Field Services • Peebles Island, PO Box 189, Waterford, New York 12188-0189

518-237-8643

www.nysparks.com

David A. Paterson
Governor

Carol Ash
Commissioner

December 17, 2008

Cara McAteer
AKRF
440 Park Avenue South
New York, NY 10016

Re: Corps/DEC
Domino Sugar rezoning and redevelopment
Kings County
07PR05124

Dear Ms. McAteer:

Thank you for providing the Project Description, Analytical Framework, and Historic Resources chapters of the Domino Sugar PDEIS for comment by the New York State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) for the proposed rezoning and redevelopment of the Domino Sugar Plant in Brooklyn. In cases where a state agency is involved in an undertaking, it is appropriate for that agency to determine whether consultation should take place under Section 14.09 of the New York State Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation Law. In addition, if there is any federal agency involvement, then review would take place in accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 and the relevant implementing regulations. Since the property is located along the river, we assume that the Army Corps of Engineers may be involved and our review, until further information is available, will be in accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. These comments are those of the SHPO and relate only to the Historic/Cultural resources. They do not include other environmental impacts to New York State Parkland that may be involved in or near your project. Such impacts must be considered as part of the environmental review of the project pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act and/or the State Environmental Quality Review Act (New York Environmental Conservation Law Article 8).

Kathy Howe of our National Register unit has reviewed the information in the Historic Resources chapter. Based on the limited documentation submitted and her field assessments, the SHPO concurs with the finding that the architectural resources listed in Table 8-1 are eligible for listing on the New York State and National Registers of Historic Places. The American Sugar Refinery Company (Domino Sugar Refinery) complex (ref. nos. 1-11) and the Williamsburg Bridge were previously determined eligible by the SHPO. Please note that Austin, Nichols & Co. Warehouse at 184 Kent Avenue is now listed on the State and National Registers. The Resource Evaluation for the remaining properties in the study area is attached to this letter for your records.

Based upon our review of the proposed adaptive reuse of the buildings known as the Refinery, we continue to have concerns regarding the impact of the proposed adaptive reuse to this historic building. The number of interventions is, in our opinion, adverse to the Refinery as stated in our previous correspondence. In addition to impacts upon the Refinery building, we continue to have concerns with the number of trees proposed around the Refinery. The Refinery is an industrial building which historically would not have lawns or trees surrounding it. We hope these can

be minimized so that the setting for the Refinery will not be adversely affected. We look forward to continued consultation to eliminate or minimize these adverse effects to the Refinery.

Once a Federal Agency is formally identified, we look forward to continued consultation regarding the development of mitigation measures and an appropriate agreement document under Section 106. As you know, demolition of properties eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places constitutes a finding of Adverse Effect requiring the development of an appropriate agreement document and mitigation measures. We concur that the construction protection plans for historic structures within 90 feet of the proposed construction is appropriate.

If you have any questions, I can be reached at (518) 237-8643, ext. 3282. Please refer to the Project Review (PR) number in any future correspondences regarding this project.

Sincerely,

Beth A. Cumming
Historic Preservation Specialist – Technical Unit
e-mail: beth.cumming@oprhp.state.ny.us

cc: N. Handell – CORPS (via e-mail)
enc: Resource Evaluations

David A. Paterson
Governor

Carol Ash
Commissioner

New York State Office of Parks,
Recreation and Historic Preservation

Historic Preservation Field Services Bureau • Peebles Island, PO Box 189, Waterford, New York 12188-0189
518-237-8643
www.nysparks.com

RESOURCE EVALUATION

DATE: December 17, 2008

STAFF: Kathy Howe

PROPERTY: various (see below)

MCD: Brooklyn

PROJECT REF: 07PR05124

COUNTY: Kings Co.

****

ELIGIBLE PROPERTIES:
Based on the limited information currently available, the following properties appear to meet the criteria for listing on the State and National Registers. Interiors were not evaluated as part of these assessments. The properties in the study area have been organized thematically by historic context.

Industrial
The properties in this group appear to meet Criterion A for their association with the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century industrial growth and development of Williamsburg. They also appear to meet Criterion C as representative examples of local industrial architecture of the period.

Rokeach & Sons Warehouse, 63-81 North 3rd St./242-250 Wythe Ave.
Four-story concrete slab industrial building erected in 1929 as a kosher food plant. Nine-bay-wide façade with large window openings separated by piers. The original windows appear to have been replaced.

Former U.S. Printing Warehouse, 83-97 North 3rd St./209-219 Wythe Ave.
Five- and six-story red brick industrial building constructed 1905-1907 as a printing warehouse. Repetitive fenestration with segmental arched window openings. Converted to residential use.

Concrete warehouse at 67-73 Metropolitan Avenue
Five-story reinforced concrete warehouse built ca. 1906 for Igoe Brothers as a paper storage facility. Five-bay-wide façade defined by piers with multi-light industrial sash and paneled spandrels in each bay. The ground floor has large openings with roll-down gates. The building appears to retain a relatively high degree of period integrity.

Fulton Bag and Cotton Mills Company, 328-336 Wythe Ave./50-58 South 1st St.
Eight-story reinforced concrete industrial built constructed in 1914. Five-bays on each façade are nicely articulated by heavy piers having two multi-light windows in the outer bays and groups of three multi-light windows in the three inner bays. Original windows have been replaced; building converted to residential use. The Fulton Bag and Cotton Mill Company, based out of Atlanta, had plants in many cities and produced paper bags, canvas goods, and other materials. This building was later sold to the Esquire Shoe Polish Company.

An Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Agency

printed on recycled paper

Former David Weil & Sons Lithographic Warehouse, 313-323 Berry St.
Seven-story reinforced concrete industrial building erected in 1924 as a lithography warehouse. The five-bay-wide by three-bay-deep building has large window bays defined by vertical piers. The original windows have been replaced.

Fomer Matchett Candy Factory, 386-394 Wythe Ave./52-58 South 4th St.
The six-story Romanesque Revival brick factory was constructed ca. 1905 to replace the candy company' original factory that was destroyed by fire. Character-defining features of the style include round-arched and segmental-arched openings, projecting brick piers, and extensive brick corbelling. Though the windows appear to be replacements, the building retains a relatively high degree of period integrity.

Former Schaefer & Buddenberg Co. building, 334-346 Berry St./81-87 South 5th St.
Seven-story, reinforced concrete building constructed in 1914. Each of the window bays is defined by tall piers and has multi-light steel windows with paneled spandrels below. The building appears to retain a relatively high degree of period integrity.

Former Gretsch Building #1, 109-115 South 5th Street
Built in 1903, this six-story L-shaped reinforced concrete factory with multi-light casements is one of four Gretsch Company buildings in the area. The Gretsch Company, a major manufacturer of musical instruments, was founded in Brooklyn by German-American immigrant Friedrich Gretsch in 1883. After Gretsch died in 1895 his fifteen-year-old son, Fred Gretsch, took over the family business. Early on the company became known for its drums and guitars.

Former Gretsch Building #2, 104-114 South 4th St.
(See Gretsch Building #1 above for history of the Gretsch Company.) This six-story concrete building was built in 1910 by the Gretsch Company. The facades feature large, multi-light windows between vertical piers.

Former Gretsch Building #4, 54-82 Broadway
(See Gretsch Building #1 above for history of the Gretsch Company.) Large-scale, ten-story concrete factory building was built in 1915-16 by the Gretsch Company. The building has a rusticated base at the first and second stories with a smooth surface above. The roofline has a parapet inscribed with the words "Gretsch #4." The building has been altered by the replacement windows and the conversion to housing.

Former stable and livery at 103-107 South 6th St.
This four-story, Romanesque Revival brick building was constructed prior to 1887 as a stable and livery. Distinctive features include the rusticated corner piers, turrets, round and square medallions, and round-arched windows on the upper floor. The first floor is undergoing renovations. This is a relatively rare surviving building type.

Former T.W. Keily building, 292-296 Wythe Ave.
Red brick warehouse built ca. 1905 for T.W. Keily Hardware Manufacturer. Distinctive features include the bays defined by brick piers, brick corbelling at the cornice, and pedimented parapet at the center bay. The windows have been covering in metal screens.

Residential
Apartment buildings at 91-95 South 2nd St.
Intact row of three, four-story brick apartment buildings built prior to 1905 with Romanesque Revival details. The row appears to meet Criterion C as representative residential architecture with integrity of design, materials, and craftsmanship.

Institutional

Our Lady of Consolation Church complex, 172-190 Metropolitan Ave./137 North 1st St.
This religious complex consists of a church (at 172-180 Metropolitan Ave.), rectory (at 184 Metropolitan Ave.), and school (137 North 1st St.). The Neo-classical brick buildings were designed by architect Robert J. Reiley and constructed between 1910 and 1929. Common design elements include the three-story height, use of dark brown brick, bold cornices with large brackets, and stone trim The complex meets Criterion C as representative ecclesiastical architecture which retains integrity of design, materials, and craftsmanship. Additional research may reveal significance in the areas of social and ethnic history.

McCadin Memorial Hall, 288-292 Berry St.
Three-story brick and stone Romanesque Revival building erected in 1897. This highly ornate building has an elaborate arched entrance with an entablature supported by large, paired brackets. Above this, at the second story is a carved balconet. On either side of the center entrance are groups of three round-arched windows with drip moldings. The building is crowned by a denticulated cornice and stone pinnacles. The building meets Criterion C as an outstanding example of Romanesque Revival institutional design with a high degree of period integrity. Additional research may reveal significance in the areas of social history.

Rectory for Saints Peter and Paul Roman Catholic Church Complex, 71-73 South 3rd St.
The three-story, brick rectory meets Criterion C as an intact example of Georgian Revival inspired institutional design. Characteristic elements of the style include the symmetrical façade, use of brick, rusticated base and quoins, keystones at windows, front entrance emphasized by a projecting hood with paired scrolls, arched windows (at second floor) with fanlights, and classical cornice with dentils and modillions. Additional research may reveal significance in the areas of social and ethnic history.

Commercial

Relish Diner, 221-227 Wythe Ave.
Manufactured in 1952 by the Mountain View Diner Company in Singac, New Jersey, this diner meets Criterion C as an intact example of roadside commercial architecture from the post-World War II era. The metal diner with bands of turquoise chrome was moved from Queens to its current location in 1967.

Building at 16 Broadway
This narrow, four-story sandstone-clad commercial building was built before 1887. It meets Criterion C as a distinctive example of Romanesque Revival design with a high degree of period integrity.

Former Manufacturer's National Bank, 84-88 Broadway
Five-story, brick commercial building with stone base and details was built ca. 1900. Located at the corner of Broadway and Berry Street the building has a curved corner entrance framed by ornate columns. The building has a rusticated stone base and rusticated brick quoins. The ground floor openings are round-arched with keystones. The highly articulated Neo-Classical style building meets Criterion C and retains a high degree of design, materials, and craftsmanship.

Smith, Gray & Company Building, 103 Broadway
This highly intact, five-story, cast-iron-fronted commercial loft building was built in 1870 from plans by William H. Gaylor. The Italianate style building has segmental arched windows framed by cast-iron columns and keystones, a delicate cornice, and a wood storefront. The building meets Criterion C as a significant example of cast-iron commercial architecture with a high degree of integrity.

Former Nassau Trust Company Building, 134-36 Broadway
This five-story stone building was built in 1888 as a bank. It meets Criterion C as an intact example of Classical Revival design. Characteristic features of the style include the extensive use of rustication, entrances with Ionic order columns, balustraded balconets, Ionic order pilasters, and heavy modillioned cornice.

Former Northside Savings Bank, 33-35 Grand Street
This distinctive one-story bank building is a contributing building in the Grand Street Historic District (see below). It also appears to individually meet the Criterion C as an outstanding example of Romanesque Revival commercial architecture. It was built in 1889 by local architect Theobald Engelhardt and has a rusticated stone facade with round-arched openings and a parapet with multi-curved pediment.

Grand Street Historic District, 30-72 Grand St., 126-170 Grand St., 31-171 Grand St.
The Grand Street Historic District consists of approximately 70 commercial buildings dating from the mid- to late-nineteenth century. It meets Criterion A for its association with the early commercial development of Williamsburg which was spurred on by the opening of a ferry at the end of the street connecting the commercial interests of this area with Manhattan. Most of the buildings in the district are brick, three to four stories in height, and designed in the Italianate and Romanesque Revival styles.

Dunham and Broadway Historic District, 31-45 Broadway, 2-18 Dunham
This small district consists of six buildings constructed prior to 1887. The focus of this enclave is the five-story, red brick, Romanesque Revival building at 31-35 Broadway/2-12 Dunham Place which was built for the Kings County Milling Company. The other buildings at 37-45 Broadway are three- and four-story, red brick, Italianate structures. The district meets Criterion C for its association with the early commercial development of Williamsburg.

Please contact Kathy Howe at 518-237-8643 ext. 3266 with any questions. Be sure to use the project reference number (PR) in all future correspondence.

David A. Paterson
Governor

Carol Ash
Commissioner

New York State Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation

Historic Preservation Field Services • Peebles Island, PO Box 189, Waterford, New York 12188-0189

518-237-8643

www.nysparks.com

February 4, 2010

Robert Dobruskin
New York City Department of City Planning
22 Reade Street, Room 4E
New York, NY 10007

Re: Corps/DEC
Domino Sugar rezoning and redevelopment
Kings County
07PR05124

Dear Ms. Dobruskin:

Thank you for providing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Domino Sugar Rezoning for comment by the New York State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO). In cases where a state agency is involved in an undertaking, it is appropriate for that agency to determine whether consultation should take place under Section 14.09 of the New York State Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation Law. In addition, if there is any federal agency involvement, then review would take place in accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 and the relevant implementing regulations. Since the property is located along the river, we assume that the Army Corps of Engineers may be involved and our review, until further information is available, will be in accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. These comments are those of the SHPO and relate only to the Historic/Cultural resources. They do not include other environmental impacts to New York State Parkland that may be involved in or near your project. Such impacts must be considered as part of the environmental review of the project pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act and/or the State Environmental Quality Review Act (New York Environmental Conservation Law Article 8).

Kathy Howe of our National Register Unit has reviewed the historic resources identified in the DEIS and notes that a minor correction is needed in Table 8-1. The former Nassau Trust Company Building is eligible for listing on the State and National Registers of Historic Places.

We continue to have concerns regarding the proposed adaptive re-use of the buildings known as the Refinery. Once a Federal Agency is formally identified, we look forward to continued consultation regarding the development of mitigation measures and an appropriate agreement document under Section 106. As you know, demolition of properties eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places constitutes a finding of Adverse Effect requiring the development of an appropriate agreement document and mitigation measures.

If you have any questions, I can be reached at (518) 237-8643, ext. 3282. Please refer to the Project Review (PR) number in any future correspondences regarding this project.

Sincerely,

Beth A. Cumming
Historic Site Restoration Coordinator
e-mail: beth.cumming@oprhp.state.ny.us

cc: N. Handell – CORPS (via e-mail)
Cara McAteer – AKRF (via e-mail)