



**TESTIMONY OF THE GREENWICH VILLAGE SOCIETY FOR HISTORIC PRESERVATION  
IN OPPOSITION TO VARIANCE APPLICATION 299-12-BZ  
40-56 10th Avenue, Manhattan  
June 17, 2013**

**Greenwich  
Village  
Society for  
Historic  
Preservation**

252 East 11th Street  
New York, New York 10005

(212) 475-9585  
fax: (212) 475-9582  
www.gvshp.org

*Executive Director*  
Andrew Berman

*President of the Board*  
Arthur Levin

*Vice-Presidents*  
Leslie Mason  
Kate Bostock Shefferman

*Secretary / Treasurer*  
Katherine Schoonover

*Trustees*  
Mary Ann Arisman  
John Bacon  
Penelope Bateau  
Tom Birchard  
Elizabeth Ely  
Cassie Glover  
Justine Leguizamo  
Ruth McCoy  
Andrew S. Paul  
Cynthia Penney  
Robert Rogers  
Allan G. Sperling  
Judith Stonehill  
Fred Wistow  
Linda Yowell  
F. Anthony Zunino III

*Advisors*  
Kent Barwick  
Joan K. Davidson  
Christopher Forbes  
Margaret Halsey Gardiner  
Elizabeth Gilmore  
Carol Greitzer  
Tony Hiss  
Martin Hutner  
James Stewart Polshek  
Elinor Ratner  
Henry Hope Reed  
Martica Sawin Fitch  
Anne-Marie Sumner  
Calvin Trillin  
Jean-Claude van Itallie  
George Vellonakis  
Vicki Weiner  
Anthony C. Wood

Good afternoon Commissioners, my name is Andrew Berman, and I am the Executive Director of the Greenwich Village Society for Historic Preservation, the largest membership organization in Greenwich Village, the East Village, and NoHo. On behalf of our membership, I strongly urge you to reject the variance application for a 34% increase in bulk for a proposed development at this location based upon a purported "hardship."

The notion that this applicant would suffer any hardship in trying to develop this property under the existing zoning strains credulity. Numerous developments have gone up in the immediate vicinity with the same or less favorable conditions and, under the same zoning restrictions, have managed to profit handsomely. The subsurface conditions underneath this site are far from unique, and are found up and down the Manhattan waterfront. The notion that the High Line covering a tiny fraction of the site is a net negative for development is baffling at best. The unique proximity and relationship to the High Line that any development on this site will enjoy increases its value, and its profitability, exponentially. Additionally, any development here will have virtually unimpeded Hudson River views, a unique amenity.

Other developments in the vicinity have been built under the allowable floor area ratio of 5 without some of the advantages this development would have, and have suffered no "hardship." The new home of the Whitney Museum will be located just a block and a half south of this site where derelict buildings once stood, no doubt increasing greatly the profitability of the proposed development. Pier 57, which was a noisy bus garage or a derelict hulk when some of these other developments went up, is set to be transformed into an "innovative hub of cultural, recreational and public market activities," according to the Hudson River Park Trust. And the High Line itself was still an abandoned and disused rail trestle when some of these neighboring developments went up under the existing zoning restrictions, as opposed to the world-class destination it has now become.

We have no objections to the proposed development setting back differently than the zoning requires, as this would have no negative impact upon the surrounding neighborhood. Increasing the bulk of the proposed development, however, would have such a negative impact. If multiple nearby property owners can abide by the existing zoning and make a more than reasonable return on their investment, there is no reason why this developer cannot as well. I urge you in the strongest of terms to reject the requested bulk variance.

Thank you.