

February 15, 2008

DRAFT – 2/13/08

The Honorable Robert B. Tierney, Chairman
N.Y.C. Landmarks Preservation Commission
Municipal Building, 9th Floor, 1 Centre Street
New York, New York 10007

Subject: **Proposed Additions and Alterations
to Domino Sugar Manufactory**

Dear Bob:

The Landmarks Conservancy's Public Policy Committee held a meeting on February 13, where its members were briefed by the architects and developer for the adaptation of the Domino Sugar Manufactory on the Brooklyn waterfront in Williamsburg to predominantly residential use. This letter contains our comments on the proposal. We appreciate your courtesy of holding the record open so that our views may be considered before the Commission's decision.

We found much to applaud about this project, including: the open space treatment and resulting esplanade; the inclusion of a very substantial number of affordable apartments; the extensive efforts to reframe and repair this massive utilitarian structure; and, the proposed fenestration and storefront solutions. We can even accept the rather inelegant addition which provides access to the basement for deliveries and parking.

However, The Landmarks Conservancy cannot support the project as proposed. We found the arguments for the design of the proposed rooftop addition to be unconvincing. We are confident that a solution could be found to achieve this programmatic objective, whether in glass or another material, but this proposal is, in our view, not sympathetic to the landmark or its surroundings. We are not opposed to adding FAR to achieve the desired density, but we feel a more aesthetically pleasing solution is essential.

We encourage consideration of a solution which recreates the original roof line on the waterside of Domino Sugar. In this regard, the design approach reminds us of your recent experience with the Battery Maritime Building, where the proposal to put back the historic cupolas helped make the proposed rooftop addition more appropriate.

We also found the design for the bay windows at the former bridge connections to be inappropriate. We urge the Commission to take a hard look at the proportion, scale, and detailing of these two facade features.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit The Landmarks Conservancy's views

Sincerely,

Peg Breen
President