

Valerie De La Rosa, *Chair*
Eugene Yoo, *First Vice Chair*
Donna Raftery, *Second Vice Chair*



Antony Wong, *Treasurer*
Emma Smith, *Secretary*
Brian Pape, *Assistant Secretary*
Mark Diller, *District Manager*

Community Board No. 2, Manhattan

3 Washington Square Village

NEW YORK, NY 10012-1899

www.manhattancb2.org

P: 212-979-2272 F: 212-254-5102 E: info@manhattancb2.org

Greenwich Village ♦ Little Italy ♦ SoHo ♦ NoHo ♦ Hudson Square ♦ Chinatown ♦ Gansevoort Market

February 20, 2026

Hon. Shampa Chanda
Chair
Board of Standards and Appeals
22 Reade Street
New York, NY 10007

Re: Variance Application – 51 Little West 12th Street
BSA Cal. No. 2025-22-BZ
Hearing Date: February 24, 2026

Honorable Chair Chanda:

At its December 9, 2025 meeting, the NYC Board of Standards and Appeals (BSA) held a hearing for an application for a Zoning Variance (BSA Cal. No. 2025-22-BZ) pursuant to Section 72-21 of the Zoning Resolution (ZR § 72-21) to permit the construction of a 14-story, mixed-use commercial and residential building in an M1-5 Zoning District located at 51 Little West 12th Street (Block 645, Lot 21) in Manhattan.

At this public meeting, the Board heard from the applicant, and also referenced the Community Board #2, Manhattan (CB2, Man.) **Resolution on 51 Little West 12th Street (2025-22-BZ)** adopted at its Full Board meeting on September 18, 2025, recommending **denial** of this application.

Among various comments and concerns raised by the Board, the Chair stated that should the applicant wish to return, they could revise their variance application solely on the basis of the uniqueness of the 25-foot width of the lot.

On February 5, 2026, the applicant submitted a revised application for a variance, and this will be heard and discussed at the next scheduled hearing on [February 24, 2026](#).

The revised variance application reduces the bulk of the proposed building from a Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 7.02 to 4.89, reduces the height from 14 stories (176 feet) to 10 stories (133 feet, four inches) and changes the proposed terrace from an unenclosed one to one that is enclosed for the commercial space. The application also includes a revised Statement of Facts and Findings (SOF) that discusses the previous building height, revises the floor descriptions and revises the factors the applicant claims contributes to the site's uniqueness. A revised Economic Analysis also accompanies the revised variance application.

The revised variance application does not change CB2/M's recommendation of **denial** of this application, and supports the view that the applicant continues to fail to meet all five findings needed for the granting of a variance according to ZR § 72-21.

1. **Site conditions.** CB2 is filled with lots that are 25-foot wide, similar to the applicant's 25' x 103.25' lot size.
2. **Rate of return.** The revised Economic Analysis still does not investigate a single-family residential building.
3. **Neighborhood character.** The applicant's reliance on any proposed development at Gansevoort Plaza is premature, and the Meatpacking's M1-5 zoning still does not permit residential development as-of-right. The form of the proposed building is still that of a looming building next to an historic district.
4. **Self-created hardship.** The history of the lot has not changed, and still supports the narrative of a self-created hardship resulting from the applicant's failure to protect their property from damage during construction on the adjacent property.
5. **Minimum variance.** The existing deficiencies in the applicant's Rate of Return does not change CB2/M's statements that the applicant has not submitted enough evidence to determine whether the proposed variance is the minimum variance required.

The applicant's revised variance application supports CB2/M's initial resolution recommending denial of this variance application. Even with the revised plans for a smaller structure and revised supporting materials (SOF, Economic Analysis), the applicant's application for a variance continues to fail to meet all five findings required for the granting of a variance according to ZR § 72-21.

Respectfully submitted,



Valerie De La Rosa
Chair, Community Board 2/Manhattan



Eugene Yoo
Chair, CB2/M Land Use Committee

VDLR/fa

cc: Hon. Brad Hoylman-Sigal, Manhattan Borough President
Hon. Julie Menin, NYC Council Speaker
Hon. Erik Bottcher, NY State Senate, 47th District
Hon. Deborah J. Glick, NY State Assembly, 66th District

Valerie De La Rosa, *Chair*
Eugene Yoo, *First Vice Chair*
Donna Raftery, *Second Vice Chair*



Antony Wong, *Treasurer*
Emma Smith, *Secretary*
Mark Diller, *District Manager*
Brian Pape, *Assistant Secretary*

Community Board No. 2, Manhattan

3 Washington Square Village
NEW YORK, NY 10012-1899

www.manhattancb2.org

P: 212-979-2272 F: 212-254-5102 E: info@manhattancb2.org

Greenwich Village ♦ Little Italy ♦ SoHo ♦ NoHo ♦ Hudson Square ♦ Chinatown ♦ Gansevoort Market

September 26, 2025

Hon. Shampa Chanda
Chair
Board of Standards and Appeals
22 Reade Street
New York, NY 10007

Dear Chair Chanda:

At its Full Board meeting on September 18, 2025, Community Board #2, Manhattan (CB2, Man.) adopted the following resolution:

Resolution on 51 Little West 12th Street (2025-22-BZ)

1. **Discussion of Resolution for 51 Little West 12th Street**, New York, NY 10014 – Application to the Board of Standards and Appeals (BSA) for a Zoning Variance pursuant to ZR 72-21 to permit the construction of a 14-story, mixed-use commercial and residential building in an M1-5 Zoning District.

Whereas:

- 1) 51 Little West 12th Street (Block 645, Lot 21) is a vacant, 2,581-square foot lot located adjacent to the High Line and directly south of the Standard Hotel.
- 2) The applicant is asking for a variance to permit a larger structure with a FAR of 7.02, with a total of 18,128 square feet and a total height of 176 feet, consisting of 14 stories plus a cellar. Furthermore, the variance asks for a change in use to permit residential use across 12 floors, and 2 floors of commercial and retail use.
- 3) The as-of-right uses permitted at this location allow for a FAR of 5.0 for manufacturing and commercial uses, and a FAR of 6.5 for community facility uses.
- 4) The lot is currently vacant and has been since 2010. Prior to that, there was a 4-story commercial building extant on the site. The applicant claims that construction of the Standard Hotel led to building instability, which ultimately resulted in the Department of Buildings (DOB) issuing an emergency declaration to demolish the building in 2010.
- 5) The applicant has claimed that this address meets the five findings necessary for a variance as follows:
 - a) **Site conditions.** According to the applicant the following conditions are unique: poor subsurface conditions, the lot's small size does not allow conforming uses, and the lot is currently vacant.

- b) **Rate of return.** The applicant claims that there are no allowable uses that would produce a reasonable rate of return.
- c) **Neighborhood character.** The applicant claims that there is considerable existing and planned residential development nearby.
- d) **Self-created hardship.** The applicant claims that the hardship is not self-created.
- e) **Minimal variance necessary.** The applicant claims that this is the minimal variance needed for a reasonable return.

Therefore be it resolved, that CB2, Man. recommends **denial** of this application on the basis that the applicant has failed to meet all five findings needed for the granting of a variance according to ZR 72-21:

1. Site Conditions

- a) Subsurface conditions: All the lots in this area and south of it in our Community Board have similar subsurface conditions, as the waterfront was built on landfill. The subsurface conditions are not unique.
- b) Size of the lot. The lot size is 25' x 103.25'. CB 2 is filled with lots of this size (25' x 100'). There is nothing unique about the size of the lot.
- c) Lots of this size have conforming uses on them. This will be further discussed in the reasonable return section.
- d) The lot is vacant. The reasons for this fact will be discussed in the hardship section.

2. Rate of return

- a) The Committee finds that the applicant did not pursue all possible uses. There was no exploration of a boutique hotel such as Restoration Hardware on a neighboring Street. There was no exploration of a single-use commercial or single-family residential building.
- b) The Committee finds that the applicant did not use current figures for either prevailing commercial or residential return in the area.

3. Neighborhood character

- a) The Committee finds that the applicant did not analyze the neighborhood correctly. This area is a commercial area, not a residential area.
- b) The Committee finds the applicant's citing of the proposed Gansevoort Square project premature and incomplete. This project is merely proposed so should not be cited as the current character. Also, most of this project's footprint will be museum space, not residential space.
- c) Finally, the applicant's building is a looming building next to an historic district and in an outlier area with few models to provide a model.

4. Self-created hardship

- a) The applicant originally had a building on the lot.

- b) During the construction of the adjacent Standard Hotel, the building was undermined and eventually condemned by the NYC Department of Buildings. Its demolition was required by the agency.
- c) Upon Committee questioning, the applicant stated that he had not pursued any pre-construction protections from the Standard Hotel and after construction had not pursued legal action against the Hotel for the damage to his building.
- d) The Committee finds that the hardship of the vacant lot is self-created inasmuch as the applicant did nothing to protect his property from this damage which led to demolition.

5. Minimum variance

- a) The applicant has not submitted enough evidence for the Committee to determine whether or not this is the minimum variance.
- b) The Committee has found higher returns on both commercial and residential projects in the area. These returns suggest that the applicant could build a conforming building that would yield a good return. But the applicant did not fully explore conforming scenarios.

Vote: Passed, with 28 Board members in favor, and 1 in opposition (R. Sanz), and 4 abstained (R. Kessler, J. Liff, E. Siegel, E. Smith).

We respectfully request that your agency take action consistent with the positions expressed in the above.

Respectfully submitted,



Valerie De La Rosa
Chair, Community Board 2/Manhattan



Eugene Yoo
Chair, CB2/M Land Use Committee

VDLR/fa

cc: Hon. Mark Levine, Manhattan Borough President
Hon. Adrienne Adams, NYC Council Speaker
Hon. Erik Bottcher, NYC Council, 3rd District
Hon. Brad Hoylman-Sigal, NY State Senate, 47th District
Hon. Deborah J. Glick, NY State Assembly, 66th District