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### Statement of Significance
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<tr>
<td>[X] A</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] B</td>
<td>Property is associated with the lives of persons significant in our past.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<tr>
<td>[X] D</td>
<td>Property has yielded, or is likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.</td>
</tr>
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</table>
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- Ethnic Heritage: Italian-American
- Social History
- Architecture
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**Significant Dates:**
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**Cultural Affiliation:**

- ETHNIC HERITAGE: European-American;
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
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Section 7 – Narrative Description

SUMMARY
The Chinatown and Little Italy Historic District is located in a 38-block area of lower Manhattan roughly bounded by East Houston, Elizabeth, Worth, Baxter, Centre, and Lafayette streets. A majority of mid-nineteenth through early twentieth century buildings remains intact in the district, contributing to the neighborhood’s historic context, feeling, and readily identifiable sense of place. Though the neighborhood's history is a continuum extending both forward and backward from the period of significance, the architectural periods represented in the Chinatown and Little Italy Historic District span early nineteenth century through 1965. The range of vernacular and nationally-popular styles has produced a multi-textured and visually appealing streetscape composed of buildings that are typically brick, four bays wide and three to seven stories in height. There are no setbacks or front yards; therefore articulation in the streetscape comes from the variety of styles of buildings and often elaborate wrougth or cast iron fire escapes mandated after 1867.

The predominant, character-defining building type in the neighborhood is the mid-nineteenth through early twentieth-century tenement. Other contributing resources include intact and modified examples of Federal and Greek Revival townhouses; late-nineteenth-century and early-twentieth-century factories and loft buildings, utility buildings, clubhouses, former stables, churches, schools and other non-residential building types; and two public parks resulting from two separate periods of slum clearance: Columbus Park (1897); and DeSalvio Playground (1954).

The historic district is composed of 624 contributing resources (621 buildings, one structure, and two public parks). In addition, there are seven previously listed contributing buildings in the district:

Stephen Van Rensselaer House, 149 Mulberry Street

Old St. Patrick's Cathedral Complex, at Mulberry, Prince & Mott Streets
(complex includes 4 bldgs.: cathedral, St. Michael’s Chapel, rectory, and orphanage)

14th Ward Industrial School, 256 Mott Street

Church of the Transfiguration (former English Lutheran Zion Church), 25 Mott Street

Scattered about the district are 77 non-contributing buildings which include altered historic buildings and structures constructed after 1965 – the end date for the district’s period of significance.

The district boundaries encompass the historic extent of Little Italy and the original historic core of Chinatown. The two communities have co-existed and overlapped for nearly a century and a half. The Italians once populated the area from Bleecker Street on the north to Bayard Street and Mulberry Bend; and from the Bowery to Lafayette, concentrating residential and commercial development on Elizabeth Street, northern Mott Street, Mulberry Bend, Baxter, Bayard, Prince, Spring, Broome, Grand and Hester Streets. Today the “Italian” neighborhood has contracted, and Mulberry Street between Prince and Canal is now the commercial core of
Little Italy. The Chinese first settled around Mott Street south of Canal, including Mulberry Street, Bayard, Pell, and Worth Street to Chatham Square. From this historic core, Chinatown has more recently grown to encompass much of historic Little Italy and beyond.

The district is inward-oriented and excludes the Bowery (to the east) which was the historic dividing line between Chinatown/Little Italy and the Jewish and German immigrant districts of the Lower East Side. East Houston Street, another major artery, defines the northern boundary of the district. The western boundary of the district along Lafayette Street, Cleveland Place, Centre Street and Baxter Street divides the Chinatown and Little Italy Historic District from the SoHo Cast Iron Historic District (National Register listed) – a district of commercial/industrial loft buildings -- located one to two blocks to the west. Excluded from the district’s northwest corner is the National Register-listed and locally designated Puck Building, a large-scale Romanesque Revival brick industrial building at 295-309 Lafayette Street that takes up an entire city block and represents a different historical context than the district.

At the southwest corner of the district the boundary excludes the Lower Manhattan Detention Center, the NYC Criminal Court, and the State Office Building. The southern boundary at Worth Street excludes a modern, glass office building and a group of highly altered buildings between Mott and Doyers as well as wide expanse of Worth Street to the south.

RESIDENTIAL ARCHITECTURE

Late Eighteenth-Mid-Nineteenth Century

Because residential architecture dominates the neighborhood, architectural analysis first addresses townhouses and tenements.

Colonial, Federal and Greek Revival Periods

Townhouses

The colonial and early republic periods in New York were dominated by vernacular single family dwellings interspersed with mixed-use buildings built in vernacular and national styles, such as Georgian or Federal. Frame, stone and brick dwellings had been constructed throughout the neighborhood by the late eighteenth century, with extensive development along Elizabeth Street and the area south of Canal. No evidence of the neighborhood’s late-eighteenth century buildings remains visible from the street.

The popular local type during the late-eighteenth and first quarter of the nineteenth century was a two-and-one-half-story, three-bay-wide, side-gabled or gambrel-roofed brick house typically featuring two dormers. Extant examples of this type can be found at 190 and 192 Grand Street (ca. 1820, Federal), both designated as Buildings of Special Significance (BSS) in the Little Italy Special District (NYPC 1977). The former house standing on the corner of Elizabeth and East Houston (73 East Houston, Federal) is another largely intact example of the type.

Many of the early houses in the neighborhood were frame, sometimes with a brick facade. Two examples are apparent in the neighborhood. The Stephen Van Rensselaer House (NR-listed), built in 1816 at 153 Mulberry
was moved in 1841 to its present location, 149 Mulberry Street. The two-story wood-frame house with brick facing sits on a brownstone foundation. A two-and-one-half-story brick and frame townhouse at 201 Mott Street is faced in brick laid in a Flemish bond. The door lintel is decorated in a late Federal/early Greek Revival incised geometric design, seen on late-Federal townhouses throughout the district.

Other early buildings including the former Banca Stabile building currently housing the Italian-American Museum, which is part of a modestly elegant row of late Federal/early Greek Revival buildings at the southwest corner of Mulberry and Grand Street (181-189 Grand Street; ca. 1830). The former Banca Stabile, 189 Grand, retains a simple Doric door surround and architrave over first-floor show windows.

By the late nineteenth century, townhouse half-stories were typically raised to a full third floor, the most common modification in the district to the single-family dwelling. These changes took place throughout the century, but many roof-raising occurred during the 1870-1900 period, according to building permit applications archived at the Municipal Archives. Canal, Lower Mott and Mulberry streets contain examples of this modification, and also include the application of ornament and Italianate cornices to update buildings to a later period.

Often the only evidence that the original building was a Federal- or early Greek Revival-period townhouse is the intact incised brownstone lintels above first and second story windows. This detail is evident at 16 Mott Street; the four-story, three-bay wide building was a 2-1/2-story Federal townhouse, before being raised to three stories by architects Kurtzer & Rohl in 1888, when it became the offices of the Chung Wah Gong Shaw; and then to four stories in 1896, when it became the offices of the Chinese Consolidated Benevolent Association.

Potential archaeological sites are likely to exist in the rear yards of houses and other buildings confined to the front of their lots; this would typically apply to buildings from ca. 1800 to the 1860s, such as the Stephen Van Rensselaer House, for example.

Tenements

Beginning in the early 1820s, new incentives to develop tenement houses emerged. From the early 1820s until 1837, a frenzy of unfettered bank lending and real estate investment coincided with a steadily-growing immigrant population in need of housing. The transition of the 6th Ward and later the 14th Ward from “owner-occupied” neighborhood to a rental district is substantiated architecturally as single-family houses were enlarged and/or converted to boarding houses, tenements and commercial buildings. All of the approximately 48 Federal and Greek Revival townhouses extant in the neighborhood were modified into tenements and/or commercial buildings, with the exception of two on Mulberry Street: St. Patrick's Old Cathedral rectory (263-65 Mulberry; ca. 1830s and later) and the neighboring townhouse (261 Mulberry; 1827).

By far, the dominant building type district-wide is the tenement, built in a mix of architectural styles dating from the 1820s into the mid 1920s, a period of immigration to which a large percentage of Americans today can trace their roots. Tenements were built by investors who saw an opportunity to make money by crowding as many poor and immigrant renters as possible into their tenements. The streets are lined largely with five- to six-story brick tenements with stone, cast-iron, brick or terra-cotta trim and galvanized-iron cornices. Most of the tenements retain moldings, cornices, and distinctive wrought iron balconies and fire escapes. Many of the tenements were built with first-floor retail space, and some of the old storefronts, both wood and cast iron,
remain intact, especially along upper Elizabeth Street and on Mulberry between Prince and Spring.

Pre-Law Tenements
Purpose-built tenements were first constructed during the 1820s. The tenement at 65 Mott Street, reportedly built in the mid-1820s, is considered by many to be the first tenement in the city (Ford 1936:18). Such tenements were basic brick structures, three- to seven-stories high, built to fill the front half or more of a 25-foot-wide by 100-foot-deep lot. Early tenements, whether barracks, packing box or railroad flats, were designed to hold a maximum amount of people for a maximum return on investment, with little regard for ventilation, light, convenience or comfort.

The constraints imposed by the 25-foot-wide building lot compounded the deficiencies of tenement design. What would become Chinatown and Little Italy had been laid out during the mid-eighteenth century as the Outward, well before the City's grid was enshrined in 1811. Angled streets and irregular blocks, especially below Canal Street, resulted in the creation of many building lots far smaller than the 25x100 standard—some only 17- or 20-feet wide, others only 25-feet deep.

Mid-Nineteenth Century
The Panic of 1837 resulted from the bursting of a housing bubble inflated by nearly a decade of rampant real estate speculation and reckless bank lending. Very little new construction was undertaken during the ten-year depression that followed the Panic. To accommodate the massive influx of “famine Irish” immigrants during 40s, many older single-family dwellings were shoddily converted into multi-family tenements during this period.

Italianate Style
By the time of the economic recovery, new housing construction of the mid-century tenement era would not be as elegant as the high-style townhouses of the earlier period. Utilitarian forms, nearly devoid of ornament, predominated in tenement house construction during the mid-nineteenth-century. A denticulated or bracketed cornice might be the sole decorative feature of a tenement of this period. Generously labeled “Italianate,” these were very often simple vernacular structures, built to suit a utilitarian purpose with a nod to appearances.

Window hoods, projecting sills and bracketed cornices are hallmarks of the Italianate, however more modestly ornamented examples are common. Many buildings have ornament of a later period applied to an earlier building, resulting in a number of mixed-style buildings, most of which incorporate the Italianate in some fashion.

By the late 1860s and early 1870s, a more elaborate Italianate style featuring elaborate bracketed cornices and projecting cast iron or stone window hoods and sills, was coming into style in the neighborhood. Often pairs or entire rows of uniform Italianate tenements were built by a single developer, such as the five buildings at 244-252 Elizabeth Street (Rabold & Postvein, 1869); or the brownstone-faced pair at 6 & 8 Spring Street (architect unknown, ca. 1870).

Rear Tenements
During the mid-nineteenth century, the phenomenon of the rear tenement emerged, a means of packing more people into a narrow but deep building lot. In certain egregious cases, three, four- to six-story buildings might be built on a single lot, with 10-foot-wide patches of ground between them—just enough space to install a cistern or toilet pit. Constructed well before the advent of electric lighting, the lower floors of a rear tenement were almost entirely dark. With windows on only one side (the side facing the rear of the front tenement), rear tenements always lacked adequate ventilation.

Between 1936 and the early 1940s, many rear tenements were dismantled through the slum clearance efforts undertaken by the WPA. Though not visible from the street, within the historic district at least 61 rear buildings still stand, including: Five six-story rear tenements (66 Bayard, 15 & 17 Mott, 60 & 87 Mulberry); twenty-one five-story rear tenements (79, 119 & 121 Baxter; 102 & 104 Bayard; 228 Elizabeth; 188 Hester; 13, 57, 59, 65, 66, 115, 143 Mott; 115, 167, 239 & 243 Mulberry; 16, 18 & 52 Spring); twenty-four four-story rear tenements (241 Elizabeth; 165, 167, 169, 171, 183, 185 & 187 Hester; 45, 109, 113, 127, 129, 131, 135, 137, 217 & 229 Mott; three behind 22 Mulberry; 121 & 140 Mulberry; 9 Pell); nine three-story rear tenements (9 & 125 Elizabeth; 176 Hester, 39 & 275 Mott; 79, 88 & 119 Mulberry; 21 Prince); one two-story rear building at 265 Elizabeth; and one one-story building behind 11 Pell. Integrity could not be assessed for these buildings, however the rear tenement phenomenon is significant to the history of the neighborhood, and therefore these rear buildings are included in the resource count as contributing.

Tenement House Act, 1867

The deficiency of the available housing stock coupled with extreme overcrowding was manifested in recurrent, deadly cholera and typhoid outbreaks, especially devastating in the 6th ward during the 1840s (Griscom 1845: 15-16). By the 1860s, the immigrant population in the 6th Ward had grown exponentially, and severe overcrowding and unsanitary conditions of both shoddily converted and purpose-built tenements induced the city and state to start to regulate the industry of housing the poor.

In 1866, improved building codes for New York City were defined. A corollary, the more specific Tenement House Act of 1867, first codified standards for the design of “low-cost housing.” (Plunz 1990: 22.). A major safety feature was the provision for fire escapes, but this was not regularly enforced. The goal of reducing density was not achieved by this law.

As defined by the 1867 statute, a tenement was any “house occupied by three or more families, living independently and doing their cooking on the premises; or by two or more families on a floor, so living and cooking and having a common right in the halls, stairways, yards . . . .” (as cited in Riis 1890: How the Other Half Lives, 15). Furthermore, the tenement was categorized as “generally a brick building from 4-6 stories high . . . frequently with a store on the first floor” (Plunz 1990: 16). Examples of this building type, generally modest structures with Italianate detailing, are found throughout the district.

Old Law Tenements, 1879-1901

The first, most significant update to the 1867 Tenement House Act came in 1879, when the law was changed to require that a building cover no more than 65% of a building lot. The competition to design a new model tenement fitting the requirements of what is today called the “Old Law” tenement, was won by architect James E. Ware. The architectural result of the 1879 mandate and Ware's winning design was the development of the
distinctive “dumb-bell” tenement—creating a dumb-bell-shaped footprint by carving light and ventilation shafts out of the sides of tenements. There was no shortage of criticism at the time, both of Ware's plan and of the limitations of the 25'x100' building lot in general. Nonetheless, the Board of Health adopted and enforced Ware's plan, as deficient as it was in providing adequate light or ventilation, for the next twenty-two years (Plunz 1990:24-27; Vaux 1879: Letter to the NY Times, 03/09/1879).

Examples of this type of tenement can be found at 246-252 Mott Street. These four six-story brick Renaissance Revival buildings have the typical dumb-bell plan that made it possible for the owner to meet minimum housing standards and still crowd just as many apartments on a 25 by 100-foot lot. In his book The Battle with the Slum, Jacob Riis described the crowding in one such building on Elizabeth Street, “Upon each floor were four flats, and in each flat three rooms that measured respectfully 14 x 11, 7 x 11, and 7 x 8-1/2 feet. In only one flat did we find a single family. In three there were two to each. In the other twelve each room had its own family living and sleeping there” (Riis 1902: 100). By 1894 the Tenement House Commission described the “improved plan of 1879” as “the one hopeless form of construction.” (Riis 1902: 101-102; in Gardner 1979: 7.2).

Late-Nineteenth Century: Late-Victorian Eclecticism

In addition to the mandatory changes to tenement house plans, tenement house design of the 1870s and 1880s underwent an aesthetic transformation. The Italianate standard was joined by a profusion of styles with eclectic influences. Beginning in the 1870s and continuing through the early twentieth century, tenements in the district exhibit an eclecticism and architectural exuberance that would seem unexpected in rental property. Some of the most successful architects and firms in New York were engaged in designing this most common housing type. Some designs were for new buildings to replace old; many were reconfigurations of older buildings into seemingly entirely new buildings.

A handful of textbook examples of Late Victorian styles are evident in the district. Many buildings, however, are hybrids of styles, incorporating elements from several prevailing decorative schemes into remarkably busy facades. The Queen Anne, Neo Grec, Italian Renaissance Revival, Beaux-Arts, Romanesque Revival and Colonial Revival styles dominate this era. No matter how elaborate the exterior, interior configurations of the tenements generally manifested a dull sameness dictated by the limitations of lot size, zoning, economics, and the current tenement house law.

Neo Grec

Transitioning from the Italianate, the Neo Grec style gained in popularity during the 1870s and remained a dominant style in the neighborhood through the 1880s. While elements can be attributed to other design traditions, such as the Italianate, hallmarks of this style include Greek-inspired ornament and architectural elements, such as the pediment; and often features projecting stone or metal window hoods, commonly with incised or embossed floral bosses or stylized floral motifs, such as the anthemion.

A notable Pre-Law example of a Neo Grec tenement block stands at 83-89 Bayard Street/66 Mulberry Street (1874). This five-story, 16-bay-wide brick quadruple tenement features limestone belt courses and lintels. The elaborate stylized door surround on the 66 Mulberry Street entrance includes a large anthemion above the door.
A distinctive and restrained version of an Old Law Neo Grec tenement is found in a building developed by William Astor and John Jacob Astor in 1884. Number 260-268 Elizabeth is a five-story, ten-bay-wide tenement with full-width wrought iron balconies and fire escapes. Though the cornice is now missing, modest anthemion ornaments remains below what would have been cornice corbels. This building designed by Halsey C. DeBand was designated a Building of Special Significance in the Little Italy Special District.

**Queen Anne**

By the 1880s in the district, the Queen Anne style came into fashion. Ornate friezes, complexly textured facades, oriel windows are hallmarks of this style. Numerous examples are found in the neighborhood, often eclectic admixtures of late Victorian styles.

Several of the Queen Anne buildings, many built below Canal Street, were designed for Jewish clients by Herter Brothers (5 Elizabeth, Herter Brothers, 1887; 60 Bayard, 1887) or Schneider & Herter (61-63 Mott, 1887; 55-57 Bayard, 1891; 72-74 Bayard, 1891). Two tenements, 375 Broome (Herter Brothers, 1886, a Building of Special Significance in the Little Italy Special District); and 60 Bayard (Herter Brothers, 1887), employ elaborate terracotta ornament, including large Star of David motifs, similar to the Herter Brothers' use of ornament on the landmark Eldridge Street Synagogue (1887, NHL).

The Queen Anne style was favored by many Jewish tenement developers in the 1880s and 90s, but not exclusively. Many other developers chose to build Queen Anne-style buildings. Other architects who designed examples of the style include Fred Ebeling (7 Elizabeth Street, 1887, with an ornately carved Moorish portico, for a Jewish client); and Kurtzer & Rohl, who created three identical buildings with balconettes, terracotta and limestone ornament at 219, 223 & 117 Mott Street (1893, for the Gardner estate).

**Late Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Century**

**Slum Clearance and Small Parks Act of 1887**

Despite the many regulations enacted to improve the conditions of newly-built tenements, there remained in the 6th Ward one of the most notorious and deadly slums, known as Mulberry Bend. Containing a mix of rotting frame houses; front, middle and rear tenements; blind alleys and flooded but still occupied basement dwellings, the squalor and chaos of Mulberry Bend was well known by 1829, when the Common Council first proposed clearing the block. The epicenter of numerous cholera and typhoid outbreaks, the Bend, even more notorious and still standing by the late nineteenth century, was well-documented by Jacob Riis, a champion of slum clearance (Plunz 1990: 51-52; Riis 1890).

Inspired in part by Riis's agitation and recurrent public health crises, under Mayor Abram Hewitt, the City enacted the Slum Clearance and Small Parks Act of 1887. The act mandated the creation of new public parks for the poor in some of the most overcrowded tenement districts. One of the projects, Mulberry Bend Park, was designated by the Health Department with the goal of replacing the ancient slums that crowded into the block bounded by Mulberry, Baxter, Bayard and Park Streets with a park (the park now extends south to Worth
Calvert Vaux modeled his design for Mulberry Bend Park on Parisian parks, which he considered to be the height of perfection (Conan & Quilter 2008: 90-92).

The Vaux plan for the park was filed in 1888, but park construction was delayed by graft in the Grant (1889-92) and Gilroy (1893-4) administrations and the market crash of 1893 (Conan & Quilter 2008: 90). Appropriations were made in 1894, to purchase and demolish the existing buildings in the bend (NYT Archive 12/7/1894: Condition of Mulberry Bend). In 1895, the buildings were cleared, displacing 2,643 people in less than three acres. The clearance resulted in a new kind of neighborhood hazard: open cisterns and cellar holes into which neighborhood children could and did fall (NYT Archive 7/12/1896: “Queer Foreign Quarter”). There is a high likelihood of future archaeological discoveries in this area that could reveal information about the residential life of this former slum. As evidenced by recent archaeological work at Block 160 in Five Points, just across Worth Street from the district, extensive archaeological features and artifacts can remain intact below modern fill. The proximity to Block 160 and the cultural continuity between that block and the district makes it possible for us to predict the types of resources likely to be found.

In 1897, the park plans were revived when Mayor William Strong created the Small Parks Advisory Committee, which included Jacob Riis and former Mayor Hewitt. Finally, two years after the death of its designer, Calvert Vaux, and ten years after it was originally proposed, Mulberry Bend Park was built and dedicated in 1897 (Tolman 1904:33). To honor the Italian community, the park was rededicated as Columbus Park in 1911.

**New Law Tenement, 1901**

Social reformers had succeeded in establishing open space in the neighborhood, but tenement house plans were still the source of social and public health concern. As a result of the efforts of reformers like Riis and Lawrence Veiller, restrictive legislation passed in 1901 set up new requirements for tenements that eliminated many of the early abuses. The Tenement House Law of 1901 (“New Law”) demanded better ventilation and greater natural lighting. To overcome the limitations of a 25-foot lot, New Law tenements were constructed on double lots, or sometimes three or four lots. A single lot was no longer a readily developable unit. One result of the New Law was effectively to consolidate real estate power and money in the hands of those who could acquire enough contiguous lots to build New Law-compliant buildings (Plunz 1990: 48-49).

**Renaissance and Colonial Revivals**

New Law tenements in the district were most commonly designed in the Renaissance Revival or Colonial Revival styles. The largest concentration of New Law tenements in the district is found along Kenmare Street, the last street to be cut through the neighborhood in 1903, opening up street frontage for development.

Common elements of the Renaissance Revival style include hierarchical design schemes in which each floor is treated with distinct elements particular to that floor, and commonly the schemes are less elaborate on the higher floors; rustication, and the use of terra cotta ornament in an elaborate decorative program (masks or geometric relief). Some overlap between Italian Renaissance Revival and Colonial Revival is common in the neighborhood.

The Renaissance Revival actually predates the New Law in the neighborhood. Examples of the Renaissance Revival date from the 1880s to the early twentieth century, and vary from modest brick tenements with stone
beltcourses and round-arched windows; to more elaborate examples, such as the nearly identical corner
tenements at Prince & Mulberry (46 Prince, Kurtzer & Rohl, 1899) and Prince & Mott (30 Prince, Schneider &
Herter 1899), both six-story buff brick corner tenements with Corinthian pilasters and terracotta trim. New Law
examples include William A. Boring's unique design for a six-story brick tenement with terracotta trim and a
deep overhanging cornice at 53 Bayard Street (1903).

The Colonial Revival was popularized by the Centennial (1876) and the Jamestown Tricentennial (1907).
Typically red-brick Colonial Revival buildings feature quoins, splayed or jack arches (decorative or functional),
elaborate door surrounds with sidelights and transoms, and divided multipane windows (6/6 being common).

A classic example of the Colonial Revival in the neighborhood is 150-152 Baxter, a six-story red brick tenement
with heavy terra cotta trim, designed by Horenburger & Straub (1904). Neville & Bagge's 1904 tenement at 230
Mott, a six-story brick tenement with rusticated buff and contrasting red brickwork, terracotta trim and quoins,
also typifies the style. Another example of a New Law tenement in the Colonial Revival style is at 195-199
Mulberry. This six-story white brick tenement was designed by Bernstein & Bernstein. Built in 1910, it has a
large air shaft and features terra-cotta ornament and an elaborate cornice.

By the 1910s, many Pre-Law and Old Law tenements were sitting vacant, but just as many remained
overcrowded. The flight to newly-built neighborhoods uptown and in other boroughs accounted for some of the
vacancies; some buildings, however, were just too old or beyond repair to be inhabitable. Many rear tenements
had been abandoned—either they couldn't be retrofitted to comply with ventilation and light requirements, or
perhaps given the choice of New Law apartments, renters were growing more selective (Gabaccia 1984:77). The
Pre-Law buildings that remained inhabited were seldom improved unless landlords were charged with violations
by the city. New sanitary laws induced a number of landlords to install indoor plumbing or “improved” school
sinks in rear yards during the first quarter of the twentieth century (Gabaccia 1984:68; NYC Municipal Archives
BBL Files).

By 1915, vacancy rates were on rise in the neighborhood, especially in older buildings, such as the barracks-type
front and rear tenements and railroad flats. New apartment buildings were the only buildings with full
occupancy (Gabaccia 1984:77). One cause for increased vacancy may have been the return to Italy of many
Italians during World War I (Speranza, letter to the NY Times, 8/1/1915). The most obvious reason was the
improved, new housing stock being built, some in Little Italy and Chinatown, and most in new residential
neighborhoods in other boroughs.

During the boom years of the 1920s, a flurry of tenement building took place in both Little Italy and Chinatown.
At least five buildings were developed in Little Italy, at least two of which were designed by an Italian architect
for Italian clients (285 Mott & 255 Lafayette, Ferdinand Savignano for Dominick Abbate and District Welfare
Realty).

In Chinatown, three buildings were built on lower Mott Street for Chinese clients: 26 Mott, built in 1925 for
Foon Poos; 33-37 Mott (Hoy Sun Ning Yeung Benevolent Association; 1925, although this may be the 1914
Sun Lau building, designed by George Frederick Pelham) and 47-49 Mott (Lin Sing Association Club Rooms;
Charles Clark, 1926), which house associations as well as residential tenants (NYCDB: BBL files). After 1926,
there appears to have been no new tenement construction until the late 1940s or early 1950s, when tenements at 1 Doyers Street (Chinatown) and 86 Elizabeth Street (Little Italy) were constructed.

**Chinese Building Modifications and New Architecture**

New York's Chinatown was not built by the Chinese as a Chinatown, but rather pre-existing buildings were modified and molded to conform to Chinese use and taste. From the 1880s through the early 1950s, a number of modifications to older tenement buildings were undertaken by the Chinese. An observer in 1904 noted that in Chinatown, “conventional houses are here transformed, sometimes by an odd-shaped balcony, sometimes by an awning of unique design . . . .” (Tolman 1904:29). The alteration of standard tenements with Chinese ornament and architectural elements prevailed in lower Mott, Doyers and Pell Streets, creating an “exotic” ambience that tourists believed was for their benefit.

Period accounts tell of the *Chung Wah Gong Shaw* at 16 Mott being constructed as “the first genuine Chinese building New York” (NYT Archive 1888: “A Chinese Clubhouse” 06/18/1888). Architectural evidence suggests this building was actually a renovated Federal-period townhouse, only enlarged to accommodate the *Chung Wah Gong Shaw* in 1888. An 1887 newspaper article described the building as a “three-story brick, with mansard roof, originally built for a dwelling . . . . and facing the third floor is a balcony of fanciful Chinese design” (NYT Archive 1887: “A Chinese Scheme” 04/17/1887). The richly embellished exterior of the completed *Chung Wah Gong Shaw* featured elaborately carved wooden balconies crafted by Chinese artisans (Hall 1998: 91; NYCDB: BBL Files). In 1896, the building was again enlarged to house the Chinese Consolidated Benevolent Association (CCBA).

Building permit files from the late nineteenth century are full of applications by Chinese to build clubrooms, dormitories or *kung shih fang*, in tenements and spaces to accommodate family organizations, fan tan parlors, merchant associations, a Chinese hospital or native-place associations. While the Chinese were modifying buildings to their taste and use by the 1880s, most of the external evidence—the elaborate early iron and wood balconies and Chinese roofs of this period, were removed by the 1930s.

A new wave of Chinese modification to tenements appears to have started in the 1920s. The most common feature during the 1920-1950 period—seen predominantly in buildings housing merchant, family or native-place associations, is the second-story inset porch carved out of the building, a retrofitted terrace (Li, Personal Communication). Bold plaques in Chinese are affixed to the front of important buildings, as seen on many of the association buildings. Scaled-down Chinese pagoda-esque porch roofs reappear in this period. The distinctive “swallowtail” eave and tiled roof is most commonly deployed as a decorative porch element over first floor commercial space, such as the corner building at 77 Bayard (at Mott Street). First Chinese Baptist Church/New York City Baptist Mission Society (21 Pell; 1935), employs cast stone to create a Chinese-style entrance surround on and otherwise plain brick building.

During the 1940s and 50s, a modern aesthetic is evidenced in tenements pared down by the Chinese to sleek facades faced in marble or cast stone, sometimes with asymmetrically-placed windows. There are a number of the ca. 1940s and 50s modernizations housing Chinese associations that stand out on Mott Street, including the ca. 1950 Eng Suey Sun Association at 5 Mott, a four-story brick building with a symmetrical facade faced in cast stone. The building features an inset second-floor inset porch in the Chinese style.
According to architecture professor Xiao Wei Lo of Tongji University, Shanghai, the Chinese motifs exhibited in Chinatown's architecture are related to Southern Chinese architectural traditions. The marble or cast stone facing and asymmetry of the modernized association buildings, however, appear to be a hybrid—not fully Chinese nor strictly American (Xiao Wei Lo 1981).

Number 41 Mott houses the On Leong Tong Chinese Merchants Association and Lee Family Association. This six-story building features a marble-faced asymmetrical facade with green marble plaques; an inset second story balcony; and a pagoda on the roof.

The Lee Family Association was designed ca. 1950 by Poy G. Lee, A.I.A. (1900-1968), one of the only known Chinese-American architects practicing in Chinatown. The American-born son of Chinese immigrants, Mr. Lee trained at Pratt Institute in Brooklyn. Between 1923 and 1945, Lee worked in Shanghai, first designing gyms and hospitals for the Y.M.C.A., and later in his own practice. Among his major works in China are the Sun Yat Sen Mausoleum in Nanking and the Sun Yat Sen Memorial Hall in Canton (Guangzhou). In Chinatown, Mr. Lee completed several restaurant designs, and designed the American Legion building, 191-193 Canal Street (ca. 1950), of which he was a member. Lee created the original design for the new CCBA building during the late 1950s. He is also the designer of the Kimlau Memorial Arch in Chatham Square (American Institute of Architects Archive: Poy G. Lee).

The On Leong Merchants Building (Andrew J. Thomas, 1948-52), a modern pagoda erected at the southwest corner of Mott and Canal in 1948, is a character-defining building in the district. On Leong Merchants Building, the Lee Family Association, Lin Sing Association (47-49 Mott Street; Charles Clark, 1926); and the CCBA building at 60 Mott (Poy G. Lee, Ben Ronis, 1959), are among the only purpose-built buildings (as opposed to being modified earlier structures) in the neighborhood, built for Chinese clients using Chinese architectural elements and motifs.

**Slum Clearance and the Lower Manhattan Expressway**

During the mid-1930s, the city—with funds and labor supplied by the Works Progress Administration WPA—undertook an ambitious program of slum clearance to remove individual blighted buildings throughout the district. Between 1936 and the early 1940s, WPA-employed workers demolished over 20 buildings in Chinatown & Little Italy, including nineteenth century front and rear tenements, Federal-period houses, and factories. No new tenements were constructed during this period. Some tenements were altered during the 1920-1950 period, most commonly by refacing with brick or stucco, or with parapets replacing cornices (NYCD: BBL Files).

In 1941, the city approved a regional plan that included the Lower Manhattan Expressway. The expressway, advocated by Robert Moses, would have linked the Holland Tunnel with the Manhattan and Williamsburg Bridges by means of elevated highways slicing through the heart of the Chinatown and Little Italy neighborhood (NYCPC 1941). The threat of this plan and its negative impact on property values was a disincentive for landlords to invest in their properties or to upgrade them. Consequently, the historic buildings of SoHo, Little Italy and Chinatown remained largely untouched. It was not until 1971 that the plans for the Lower Manhattan Expressway were finally abandoned.

The land for DeSalvio Playground, at the southeast corner of Spring and Mulberry, was acquired by the city
through condemnation in 1954. The playground, dedicated in 1955, honors the DeSalvios, John and Louis, two generations of New York politicians raised in the local Italian community (NYC Parks 2009).

**NON-RESIDENTIAL, INDUSTRIAL AND COMMERCIAL ARCHITECTURE**

Industry has been a constant presence in the neighborhood from its earliest development, though the earliest industrial and commercial architecture of the neighborhood—the tanneries, slaughterhouses and factories of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century, are no longer standing. By the mid-nineteenth century, the neighborhood had emerged as a center of furniture manufacture, and large loft and factory buildings were erected on Canal, Mulberry, Mott, Elizabeth, Hester, Pell, Prince and Grand Streets. By the early twentieth century, large loft buildings were replacing residential buildings on Centre, Lafayette, Crosby and Broadway, so that the predominantly Italian residential core was confined to Mulberry, Mott and Elizabeth, and the cross streets.

**Italianate and Italian Renaissance Revivals**

The most common style for the extant factories in the neighborhood is by far the Italianate and Italian Renaissance Revivals, though most of the buildings are more utilitarian than stylish. The row of ca. 1860 commercial/industrial buildings at 203-211 Canal were built in the Italianate style. The elegant four-story brick buildings retain their bracketed cornices.

The seven-story, ten-bay-wide bedstead and mattress factory at 118-122 Baxter, is a brick structure with a corbelled brick cornice, designed for J. Hamburger by William Jose, 1881; 1887. Its neighbor, 114 Baxter (corner of Canal) is a six-story corbelled brick building with metal cornice, designed for Martin Schrenkeisen by Henry Fernback, 1882.

A more ornate loft building was built for Herman’s Furniture Factory, 368-370 Broome. The massive six-story corner building of brick with stone trim includes tile inlays and corbelled brickwork. William Graul designed this building in the Renaissance Revival style in 1890.

**Richardsonian Romanesque**

The Richardsonian Romanesque, with its imposing mass and solid forms, was chosen for several of the loft and factory buildings in the late 1880s and early 1890s. A classic example is the former chair factory at 49-51 Elizabeth, a six-story brick and brownstone factory with cast iron front and an ornate molded brick or terracotta plaque featuring the date of construction: “1888.”

The Knitting Mill at 176-180 Grand is a massive six-story brick and brownstone loft with a tripartite facade of round arches, cartouches, elaborate corbelled brickwork, molded brick & terracotta ornament, built ca. 1888.

The five-story brick building at 11 Spring Street has elements of the Romanesque and Renaissance Revival styles. Designed by J.B. Snook, the building was erected in 1895 as a stable.
One of the most substantial loft buildings is the former Frank A. Ferris Provisioners building at 262 Mott. The massive five-story, five-bay building is faced in rubbed red brick and sits atop a smooth granite base. Elements of the Romanesque and Renaissance Revivals are evident in the segmental and round arch window openings, composite pilasters, lion head masks, and a peaked parapet with arcade of corbelled brick. The ca. 1889 building is considered a Building of Special Significance in the Little Italy Special District.

### Colonial Revival

The Colonial Revival persisted in the neighborhood, as it did nationwide, into the middle of the century. Examples from the 20s and 30s employ elements of the Colonial Revival—brick laid in Flemish bond, contrasting quoins, architraves, but apply those elements to modern forms. Two notable examples of this include: Knickerbocker Ice/Consolidated Gas, 354 Broome/146-50 Elizabeth, a five-story brick ice plant with corbelled quoins and limestone trim (James Hunter, 1928); and the United Edison Light & Power/NY Edison Substation, 204-206 Elizabeth, and an asymmetrical brick industrial building with large loading dock designed by Otto Spin (1934), evoking both the Colonial Revival and the International Style.

### Classical Revival

The Classical Revival, popularized by the 1893 World's Columbia Exposition in Chicago, was combined with modern high-rise architecture to create a hybrid Commercial-Classical Revival. The twelve-story white brick and limestone loft at 237-239 Lafayette was developed by local real estate magnate Dominick Abbate and designed by William Birkmire (1910).

The largest building in the district, the Italian Savings Bank (225 Lafayette), is a twelve-story brick, limestone and granite bank tower with a first-floor colonnade in the Corinthian order. Designed by C.P.H. Gilbert in 1925, this Classical Revival bank symbolizes the success of Italian bankers and business people in the neighborhood by the 1920s.

### Commercial Style

Commercial or loft buildings of the late nineteenth century were not lacking in detail, though typically they were less extravagant than the tenements. Commercial buildings built during the mid-nineteenth through twentieth century range from more stylish to more utilitarian as the decades progressed. In general, style is subordinate to utility, so a bank of windows may dominate over marginal stylistic features, such as quoins or a cornice. The Commercial Style dominates new non-residential building construction in the 1920-60s.

Nam Wah Tea Parlor, 11-13 Doyers, typifies the utilitarian commercial style. The two-story golden brick store with flat lintels has been home to the Nam Wah Tea Parlor, the oldest operating tea parlor in Chinatown, since it was constructed around 1920. Across the street, the store at 10-14 Doyers is a plain two-story yellow brick building with modest green cast-stone Chinese ornamental motifs (Sydne Schleman, 1941).

A factory & showroom at 217-219 Hester (also 200 Centre) is a larger version of the commercial style—the tripartite three-story yellow brick commercial building has a simple roof parapet (Julius Eckman, 1926).

One-story commercial buildings include the one-story yellow brick store with parapet at 213-217 Canal (C.N. Whinston or Julius Bleich, 1935); and 59 Spring, a one-story brick store with pedimental parapet developed by
Nicholas Agnelilli and designed by Ferdinand Savignano, 1925.

In addition to purpose-built commercial buildings, several older buildings of a variety of uses (mixed use or domestic) were remodeled during the 1920s, resulting in the removal of cornices and other ornament, and often the smoothing of surfaces with stucco. Parapets were built and typically included polychrome or articulated brick designs.

The increasing reliance on the automobile is visible in the architecture of the 1920s onward. At least six gas stations and commercial garages were built in the neighborhood between 1919 and the mid 1950s. A two-story brick garage with stepped parapet, developed by Salamone, Lambreto, Pellegrino, was built at 142-144 Mulberry (Philip Bardes, ca. 1919). The two largest “historic” garages are both three-story white glazed brick parking garages, 196-204 Mulberry/75 Kenmare (A.B. Berger, 1922); and 224-228 Mulberry (Murray Klein, 1925). The garage at 39 Kenmare is one of the smallest “historic” garages: the one-story brick building has only a single garage bay (Lama & Proskauer, 1939). The garage at 8 Prince is another one story brick garage, now converted to an art gallery (William J. Russell, 1951).

Industrial architecture was also on the rise during the first half of the twentieth-century, most of which takes the form of styleless, utilitarian boxes. The machine shop & warehouse at 122 Mott is an unadorned two-story brick industrial building designed by Levy & Berger in 1942. The commercial architecture of the same period—stores and offices, are minimally designed and also utilitarian in form.

**CHURCHES**

**Georgian/Gothic Revival**

The earliest extant buildings in the district with definitive construction dates are the two landmark churches, Church of the Transfiguration (25 Mott; 1801; 1815; 1861-1868) and Old St. Patrick's Cathedral (Mott, Mulberry & Prince Streets; Joseph Mangin, 1809-1815 and later), which act as twin anchors at either end of the district. Both are listed individually in the National Register and have achieved New York City Landmark status. Transfiguration, first built in 1801 as the Zion English Lutheran Church, became in 1853 the Catholic Church of the Transfiguration, established to serve the majority Irish population in the neighborhood at the time. Irish Catholics were followed by Italian worshippers around the turn of the century, and since the mid-twentieth century, Chinese Catholics have worshipped at Transfiguration. The church’s transformation over time mirrors the demographic transformation in the neighborhood during the same period. As the second Catholic Church in New York and the Church of the Holy See for the first 60 years of its existence, St. Patrick's has been central to the local Catholic community for 200 years.

During the middle of the nineteenth century, a number of Lutheran and Protestant Churches were built and then replaced by factories and tenements and their parishioners moved out of the neighborhood.

**Romanesque Revival**

In 1901, two churches were built specifically for Italian immigrants. The restrained variety of proto-Gothic Romanesque Revival chosen for both Church of the Most Precious Blood and Church of San Salvatore was clearly an echo of the early Christian and pre-Renaissance churches of Italy.
Church of the Most Precious Blood (113 Baxter; Schickel & Ditmars for Ireland, 1901), is a tripartite, symmetrical Romanesque Revival church with central gable and flanking towers. The church is faced in stuccoed masonry with struck joints atop a stone foundation of coursed ashlar. Most Precious Blood was begun in 1891 by the Scalabrinian Fathers, who built the basement chapel before running out of funds. The church was completed by the Franciscans in 1901.

The Church of San Salvatore (now Holy Trinity Ukrainian Church), 359-361 Broome, was built by the Italian Mission of the Protestant Church of New York. Designed by architects Hoppin & Koen and built in 1901, the Romanesque-style church of pale striated brick with a central rose window.

The Romanesque Revival was employed again twenty-five years later, when the three-story brick Church of the Most Holy Crucifix, Church & Convent was erected (378 Broome; Robert J. Reily, 1925).

Chinese-stylistic influences
Just as the Romanesque was used for the Italian community, Chinese style decorative elements were used on Chinese churches. The First Chinese Baptist Church and New York City Baptist Mission Society (21 Pell; 1935), is a five-story, three bay brick building with a cast stone Chinese-style pent-type “roof” above the first floor.

True Light Lutheran Church (191 Worth; 1948), built for a largely Chinese congregation, is a Modern Gothic brick church with cast stone trim and stylized “Chinese” copper elements.

CIVIC ARCHITECTURE

Fire Houses
The earliest fire houses in the district would have been converted residential or commercial buildings, such as the former Rutgers Fire House at 3 Mott Street. These early fire companies were, at their heart, gangs and social clubs, and would fight fires only by subscription and payoff. By the late nineteenth century, when firefighting was professionalized, elegant examples of civic architecture were built to house the companies. The highest-style firehouse in the district is Engine No. 55 (363 Broome Street), a three-story Indiana limestone engine house with mansard roof clad in slate and copper. Robert H. Robertson designed this Beaux-Arts-style building, which was built in 1898. It is now a New York City Landmark and a Building of Special Significance in the Little Italy Special District.

A second extant firehouse is the former Hook & Ladder No. 9 (209 Elizabeth; ca. 1885), a stylistically unique building in the district, the design of which was inspired by the Aesthetic movement and the Renaissance Revival. This three-story, three-bay brick building is decorated with a limestone belt course and extensive use of
molded brick tiles and corbelled brickwork, and features a well-preserved cast iron garage bay. It, too, is a Building of Special Significance in the Little Italy Special District.

**Police and Fire Stations**

Two precinct buildings designed by police-department architect N.D. Bush are located in the district. The 10th Precinct Police Station & Jail (201-205 Mulberry; 1870-72), is a six-story (reading as 4-1/2 from the street) brick building with tall Mansard roof in the Second Empire style. Bush's design for the 5th Precinct Police Station, Lodging House & Prison: (19-21 Elizabeth; 1881) is a four-story, five-bay brick building with pedimental window hoods in the Italianate/early Neo Grec style.

**Schools**

At least six public schools have served the neighborhood since the early nineteenth century; only two public school buildings, designed by the board of education's in-house architect, C.B.J. Snyder, remain standing in the district today. Public School 23 (70 Mulberry; 1891-93), is a five-story fortress-like Romanesque and Renaissance Revival brick school on a battered, rusticated brownstone ashlar base. P.S. 23 housed the Museum of the Chinese in the Americas until its recent move to Centre Street. Public School 130/DeSoto School (137 Baxter; 1910; 1919-1921), is a five-story buff brick school building on battered granite base, inspired by Colonial Revival and Renaissance revival styles. DeSoto School is the only operating public school in the district. Architect C.B.J. Snyder is recognized as an innovator in the field of school design. His tenure took place at a time of great social and educational change. Schools like the two in the district were built in response to the booming immigrant population and educational mandates. Snyder had a tremendous influence on the developing New York City school building, both its exterior appearance, as well as on its components and their arrangement. Not only was Snyder successful in addressing the practical side of school design, but his historical-based designs represent the increasing importance of aesthetics in school design.

Two Children's Aid Society schools remain in the district. The 14th Ward Industrial School, built in 1888, is one of the most unique buildings in the district, owing much to the Aesthetic Movement and late Victorian eclecticism. Designed by Calvert Vaux of Radford & Vaux, the school is individually listed in the National Register, and is both a City Landmark and a Building of Special Significance in the Little Italy Special District. The 14th Ward Industrial School no longer houses the English classes, club meetings, health education, and cooking classes sponsored by the Mulberry Community House but the distinctive three-and-one-half-story brick and terra cotta structure serves as a striking symbol of the educational and social welfare work once conducted here (Gardner 1979: 7.9-10). The Italian School, a massive, nine-story Colonial/Classical Revival edifice, stands at the corner of Hester and Elizabeth Streets (Parish & Schroeder, 1912). The Italian School had been an institution in the Italian community since its establishment at Five Points in 1855.

**ARCHITECTURAL INTEGRITY**

The architectural stock of the historic district is consistent across the district, evidence of concurrent periods of development in Chinatown and Little Italy. The district retains a high degree of architectural integrity to the period of significance, ca. 1800 to1965. The majority of buildings are residential, most commonly with first-floor retail or commercial space. A large number of historic storefronts remain intact along Elizabeth, Mott and Mulberry Streets.
In 1951, the China Village Plan, a Title I urban renewal plan, would have demolished most of the historic core of Chinatown and replaced the apartments and businesses with large-scale housing projects. (Umbach & Wishnoff 2008). The plan was vigorously opposed by the Chinese Consolidated Benevolent Association (CCBA) and other community advocates, and ultimately abandoned.

On the planning books from 1941 until 1971, the threat of the Lower Manhattan Expressway to the community may have had an important role in the renewed appreciation of the cultural and architectural heritage of the neighborhood. Starting in the 1960s, when New Yorkers were developing an awareness of the threats to and loss of their architectural heritage, local community groups began organizing to protect and promote the neighborhood.

By the early 1970s, Little Italy, and Chinatown were considered run-down neighborhoods with diminished economic power. In 1974, the Little Italy Restoration Association (LIRA) petitioned the city planning commission for planning assistance and zoning regulation to protect the scale and character of the Little Italy neighborhood. LIRA was also concerned by the loss of Italian population and Italian “character,” and a rising Chinese population in the neighborhood.

New York City's Planning Commission has been designating “Special Zoning Districts” since 1969. The Special District is an “affirmative” zoning technique employed “to achieve specific planning and urban design objectives in defined areas with unique characteristics. Each special district designated by the Commission stipulates zoning requirements and/or zoning incentives tailored to distinctive qualities that may not lend themselves to generalized zoning and standard development.” (NYCPC 2009).

The City granted Little Italy Special District status in February 1977. The boundaries of the Little Italy Special District overlap with the portion of the historic district north of Canal Street. The special district zoning capped building heights at seven stories, mandated first-floor commercial space for restaurants and diverse specialty stores, and identified 23 buildings of special significance to the neighborhood (noted in the building index). While Special District zoning may not have achieved all of its goals—one of which was to reduce traffic in the neighborhood and minimize pedestrian/vehicle conflict, the results of Special District zoning are evident in the uniform scale and character of the neighborhood, particularly with respect to in-fill development, and the thriving retail and restaurant economy.

ARCHAEOLOGY
There is a high likelihood of future archaeological discoveries in the historic district especially in undisturbed rear yards of tenements and Columbus Park, where some preliminary archaeological work has recently been done. (See Section 8 – Statement of Significance for research questions that can be potentially addressed by future excavation projects within the historic district.)

Building-by-building description

Data primarily based on field survey and culled from Building Permit applications in the Municipal Archives, where
Building summaries are organized by street and block location, i.e., Street Name; Street Face (cardinal direction) and block (between bounding cross streets). Streets are listed in alphabetical order. Individual building data is organized and formatted as follows:

Block/Lot Address  Type or Name of Building. Description. Developer (if known) Architect (if known), year built or estimated date range

ARCHITECTURAL STYLE

The use of style classifications can be problematic for buildings with many periods of alteration and for those that are generally vernacular but with some minor reference to a particular style. Classifications, therefore, are based on major stylistic elements, and include the category Eclectic, when many styles of a particular period are used, and Mixed, to denote evidence of more than one style from two or more periods. One of the most common architectural styles noted in this index is ITALIANATE/NO STYLE, referring to a minimally Italianate but largely utilitarian vernacular tenement type.

Non-contributing buildings are noted on the list. These are buildings that are either built after 1965 or are altered historic buildings that no longer retain period integrity.

Key to abbreviations:
ALT: Alteration
BSS: Special District Building of Special Significance
Landmark: New York City Landmark
NR: National Register Individual Listing

**Baxter Street, east side, from Bayard to Canal**

199 1  79 Baxter Tenement (front & rear). Five-story brick tenement with stone lintels and intact cornice. Five-story rear tenement. Mid 19C and later ITALIANATE/NO STYLE


QUEEN ANNE


199 5  87 Baxter Tenement. Six-story brick tenement with stone lintels. Tall windows, intact metal cornice (89 Baxter was its twin before replacement). Built and designed by Michael Murray, 1873 ITALIANATE

199 6  89 Baxter Non-Contributing Building

199 7  91 Baxter Tenement. Six-story, four-bay-wide tenement with articulated outer bays, elaborate tripartite cornice, floral plaques. Developed by Morris Rosendorf. Schneider & Herter, 1887 RENAISSANCE REVIVAL

199 8  93 Baxter Tenement. Seven-story rusticated buff brick tenement with intact cornice. Developed by Seraphino Piana. Horenburger & Straub, 1900 COLONIAL REVIVAL

**Baxter Street, east side from Canal to Grand**

available.
National Register of Historic Place
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206 1  113 Baxter  Church of the Most Precious Blood. Tripartite, symmetrical Romanesque revival church with central gable and flanking towers. Stuccoed masonry with struck joints. Granite foundation with coursed limestone ashlar. Elaborate wrought iron gates.  BSS Schickel & Ditmars for Ireland, 1901 ROMANESQUE REVIVAL

206 4  119 Baxter  Tenements (front & rear). Six-story, four-bay-wide brick tenement with brownstone lintels, missing cornice. Five-story rear tenement. mid 19C ITALIANATE/NO STYLE


206 7501  123 Baxter  Non-Contributing Building


235 18  148 Baxter  Loft. Five-story, three-bay-wide loft of Philadelphia brick with corbelled cornice ca. 1880s ITALIANATE

235 19  146 Baxter  Tenement. Five-story, four-bay-wide brick tenement. Cast iron store front. Cornice missing. mid 19C ITALIANATE/NO STYLE


235 21  142 Baxter  Storefront. One-story brick commercial building. Stanley Rappaport, 1957 COMMERCIAL/NO STYLE

235 22  140 Baxter  Tenement. Five-story, four-bay-wide brick tenement with rebuilt corbelled cornice. mid-19C; 1920s ITALIANATE/NO STYLE

207 17  118-122 Baxter  Factory: Metal Bedstead and Mattress Factory. Seven-story, ten-bay-wide brick factory with corbelled brick cornice. Built for J. Hamburger (German) William Jose, 1881; 1887 ITALIANATE


Bayard Street, south side, from Mulberry toward Bowery

164 21  83 Bayard  Tenement. Five-story, four-bay-wide brick tenement with pressed metal lintels. Cornice removed and parapet built. 1874 ITALIANATE/NEO GREC

164 22  81 Bayard  Tenement; Yee Fong Toy Association. Six-story, four-bay-wide white brick tenement with floral swags, volutes, shell niches. Developed for Aronson & Baum. Gross & Kleinberger, 1910 ECLECTIC: RENAISSANCE REVIVAL/QUEEN ANNE


163 18  69-73 Bayard  Tenement. Seven-story, four-bay-wide buff brick tenement with round-arch windows, pilasters and terra cotta ornament. One of three built at the same time for the Aronson family (63, 67, 69 Bayard) and similar to 65 Bayard. Schneider & Herter, 1901 RENAISSANCE REVIVAL

163 21  67 Bayard  Tenement. Seven-story, four-bay-wide buff brick tenement with round-arch windows, pilasters and terra cotta ornament. One of three built at the same time for the Aronson family (63, 67, 69 Bayard) and similar to 65 Bayard. Schneider & Herter, 1901 RENAISSANCE REVIVAL
65 Bayard Tenement Seven-story, four-bay-wide buff brick tenement with round-arch and flat-lintel windows, pilasters and terra cotta ornament. Similar to the three tenements designed by Schneider & Herter for the Aronson family (63, 67, 69 Bayard, 1901). Schneider & Herter, 1901? RENAISSANCE REVIVAL

63 Bayard Tenement. Seven-story, four-bay-wide buff brick tenement with round-arch windows, pilasters and terra cotta ornament. One of three built at the same time for the Aronson family and Alfred Wagstaff (63, 67, 69 Bayard) and similar to 65 Bayard. Schneider & Herter, 1901 RENAISSANCE REVIVAL

61 Bayard Tenement “BAYARD”. Five-story, four-bay buff brick tenement with floral plaques and oriel/balconies. BAYARD embossed in metal cornice. Developed by Sevestre & Cusack. Charles Rentz, 1891 QUEEN ANNE


57 Bayard Tenement Five-story, four-bay buff brick tenement with floral plaques, masks, shields and bracketed cornice. Same as 55 Bayard. Developed by Weil & Mayer. Schneider & Herter, 1891 QUEEN ANNE

55 Bayard Tenement Five-story, four-bay buff brick tenement with floral plaques, masks, shields and bracketed cornice. Same as 57 Bayard. Developed by Weil & Mayer. Schneider & Herter, 1891 QUEEN ANNE

53 Bayard Tenement. Six-story brick with terracotta trim and deep cornice. William A. Boring, 1903 RENAISSANCE REVIVAL

51 Bayard Tenement; Tai Pun Residents Association. Five-story brick tenement remodeled ca. 1950s with inset Chinese-style second- and third-story porches. ca. 1870s; 1950s CHINESE MODERN


47 Bayard Loft; Wheelright Four-story brick with metal cornice. Raised from 3 stories after fire in 1890. Julius Boekell 1884 ITALIANATE/NO STYLE

Bayard Street, north side, from Elizabeth to Baxter

60 Bayard Tenement. Six-story, four-bay brick tenement stone & terra cotta trim; deep shell niches over windows; round arch pediment cornice. Eight bays on Elizabeth Street. Star of David terra cotta ornament. Herter Brothers, 1887 QUEEN ANNE


68 Bayard Store & Workshops; Bakery (1896); Club (1928). Six-story, three-bay-wide workshop, store and bakery. Shell motif in central bay. Paired windows under segmental arch openings. Developed by Peter & Maria Herter. Herter Brothers, 1890 ECLECTIC: RENAISSANCE REVIVAL/QUEEN ANNE

70 Bayard Tenement Seven-story buff brick with splayed jack arches over windows and decorative volute keystones. Developed by Gordon, Levy & Co. John P. Cleary, 1901 COLONIAL REVIVAL


76 Bayard Tenement. Also 55 Mott. Four-story brick tenement with stone lintels. Intact cornice. 1878 ITALIANATE
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**Name of Property**  
Chinatown and Little Italy Historic District  
New York County, New York  

**County and State**  
New York County, New York  

**199 27 94-96 Bayard**  
Non-Contributing Building. Also 69 Mulberry. Lacking Integrity.  

**199 31 102 Bayard**  
Tenements (front & rear). Five-story brick tenement with 1920s parapet. Five-story rear tenement. mid 19C; 1920s ITALIANATE/NO STYLE  

**199 32 104 Bayard**  
Tenements (front & rear). Five-story brick tenement with wood cornice. Retrofit with bathroom windows post 1901. Five-story rear tenement. mid 19C ITALIANATE/NO STYLE  

**199 34 106-108 Bayard**  
Tenement; Sunshine Settlement. Also 73-75 Baxter. Seven-story double tenement corner building; eight bays on Bayard; ten bays on Baxter. Buff brick with splayed arches, terra cotta trim and intact cornice. Developed by Louis Pierano (Italian). Horenburger & Straub, 1900 RENAISSANCE REVIVAL  

**Broome Street, south side, from west of Mulberry to Elizabeth**  

**471 13 389 Broome**  
Factory. Three-story, three-bay brick factory building with stone trim. Charles Wright, 1869 ITALIANATE  

**471 14 387 Broome/177 Mulberry**  
Tenement. Six-story corner tenement of brick with terracotta trim, brick quoins, wrought iron fire escape. Cornice missing. William Rouse, 1904 COLONIAL REVIVAL  

**471 36 385 Broome**  
Loft. Five-story, four-bay brick with stone belt course and lintels. Some 2/2 sash windows. Intact cornice. Patrick Skelly estate, developer. J.B. Snook, 1884 NEO GREC  

**471 38 383 Broome**  
Townhouse/Tenement. Three-and-a-half-story, three-bay brick tenement with stone lintels. Cornice covered. Mid 19C NO STYLE  

**471 39 381 Broome**  
Non-Contributing Building. New Construction  

**471 37 380 Broome**  
Tenement. Two-story, four-bay brick tenement/store with cast iron storefront, corbelled parapet (building shortened). 1878 NEO GREC  

**471 35 379 Broome**  
Tenement. Five-story, four-bay brick tenement, similar to 379 Broome Street (same lintels). Cornice intact. Intact storefront. 1878 NEO GREC  

**471 34 377 Broome**  
Tenement. Five-story, four-bay brick tenement with elaborate terracotta ornament, including shell niches, Stars-of-David, and large male bust, possibly Moses or Abraham, in cornice. Pedimental window hoods. Intact cornice. BSS (attributed to Herter Brothers,) 1886 QUEEN ANNE  

**471 33 375 Broome**  
Tenement. Six-story, four-bay brick tenement with elaborate terracotta ornament, including shell niches, Stars-of-David, and large male bust, possibly Moses or Abraham, in cornice. Pedimental window hoods. Intact cornice. BSS (attributed to Herter Brothers,) 1886 QUEEN ANNE  

**471 32 373 Broome**  

**470 9 365-369 Broome**  

**470 12 363 Broome**  
Firehouse/Engine No. 55. Three-story Indiana limestone engine house with mansard roof clad in slate and copper. BSS/Landmark Robert H. Robertson, 1898 BEAUX ARTS  

**470 13 359-361 Broome**  
Church of San Salvatore/Holy Trinity Ukrainian Church. Tripartite church of pale striated brick with central rose window. Built by the Italian Mission, Protestant Church of New York. Hoppin & Koen, 1901 ROMANESQUE REVIVAL  

**470 16 355 Broome**  

**Broome Street, north side, from Elizabeth to west of Mulberry**  

**478 7501 354 Broome/146-50 Elizabeth**  

**479 34 356 Broome/143 Elizabeth**  
Commercial Building. Two-story brick commercial/industrial building. 1942 COMMERCIAL  

**479 35 358-360 Broome**  

**479 37 362 Broome**  
Tenement “The Flora” Part of 366 Broome. ca. 1890 QUEEN ANNE
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479 39 **366 Broome** Tenement “The Arrow” Five-story, ten-bay brick tenement with terracotta trim. Cornice missing. ca. 1890 QUEEN ANNE

479 40 **368-370 Broome** Factory: Herman’s Furniture Factory Building/Loft. Massive six-story corner building of brick with stone trim, tile inlays and corbelled brickwork. Fourteen bays on Mott; One bay at corner; Seven bays on Broome. William Graul, 1890 RENAISSANCE REVIVAL

480 37 **372-374 Broome** Factory: Carriage Factory. Six-story corner loft building with corbelled brickwork. Recently remodeled with new windows. ca. 1880s COMMERCIAL/ITALIANATE

480 39 **376 Broome** Office Building. Six-story, three-bay loft with pressed metal window hoods and corbelled cornice. ca. 1880s COMMERCIAL/ITALIANATE

480 40 **378 Broome** Church of the Most Holy Crucifix, Church & Convent. Three-story brick church with corbelled arches and cast-stone or limestone ornament. Robert J. Reily, 1925 ROMANESQUE REVIVAL

480 41 **380-382 Broome** Tenement. Six-story double tenement with projecting bays, rusticated brickwork and intact cornice. Sass & Smallheiser, 1902 BEAUX ARTS

480 1 **388 Broome** Tenement. Seven-story corner tenement with elaborate corbelled brickwork and terracotta trim. Cornice missing. Schneider & Herter 1900 RENAISSANCE REVIVAL

481 35 **390-394 Broome** Apartment Building. Triple seven-story brick apartment building (described in building permit application as “flats”). Ornate wrought iron fire escapes. Very similar to SE corner of Kenmare & Mulberry. A.G. Rechlin or Sass & Smallheiser, 1901 COLONIAL REVIVAL/RENAISSANCE REVIVAL

481 39 **396 Broome** Tenement. Six-story, four-bay glazed white brick tenement with stepped parapet. Developed by Vincenzo DeLucia. Adolph Mertin, 1915 NO STYLE

**Canal Street, south side, from Baxter toward Bowery**

199 11 **218-220 Canal** Tenement; Clothing House (1899). Five-story, four-bay brick tenement. Cornice missing. Part of a triple tenement with 216 Canal. mid 19C ITALIANATE/NO STYLE

199 12 **216 Canal** Tenement. Five-story, four-bay brick tenement. Cornice missing. Part of a triple tenement with 218-220 Canal. mid 19C ITALIANATE/NO STYLE

199 13 **214 Canal** Tenement. Seven-story, four-bay brick and terracotta tenement. John P. Cleary, 1901 COLONIAL REVIVAL

199 7501 **210 Canal** Banking; Factory; Chinese Restaurant. Two, six-story, six-bay corner bank buildings. Red brick with contrasting stone trim. Corbelled brickwork. ca. 1885 ITALIANATE

200 12 **202-204 Canal** Non-Contributing Building

200 7501 **198 Canal** Non-Contributing Building

200 16 **196 Canal** Non-Contributing Building/Factory: Mantle Manufacturer (1902) Six-story factory. No integrity.

201 13 **178-182 Canal** Non-Contributing Building/Bank. Three-story modern bank. Altered from original design. Alfred Easton Poor, 1957; 1980s remodeling COMMERCIAL


201 16 **172-1/2 Canal** Non-Contributing Building

201 17 **170-172 Canal** Non-Contributing Building

201 18 **164-168 Canal** Factory: Furniture Factory; Cigar Factory. Six-story brick and stone corner building with extensive corbelled brickwork. 1880s RENAISSANCE REVIVAL

202 12 **160-162 Canal** Townhouse. Pair of three-story, three-bay brick townhouses with later alterations. Federal-era peaked roof raised to three stories from 2-1/2. Cornice added. e19C; late 19C FEDERAL/ITALIANATE

202 14 **158 Canal** Townhouse. Three-story, three-bay brick townhouse with later alterations. Federal-era peaked roof raised to three stories from 2-1/2. Cornice added. e19C; late 19C FEDERAL/ITALIANATE
### Centre Street, east side, from Hester to Grand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>235 1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>235 4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206 Centre/138 Baxter</td>
<td>Factory. Six-story, three-bay brick and stone loft. Some 2/2 wood sash windows, deeply recessed. Richard Berger, 1892 RENAISSANCE REVIVAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>235 5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208 Centre</td>
<td>Tenement. Three-story, four-bay glazed yellow brick with parapet roof. ca. 1925 NO STYLE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>235 6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210 Centre</td>
<td>Loft. Six-story, four-bay brick loft with corbelled brickwork and partial cast iron facade. Louis Heinecke, 1898 RENAISSANCE REVIVAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>235 8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214 Centre</td>
<td>Tenement. Five-story, four-bay brick tenement. Missing cornice. mid 19C NO STYLE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Canal Street, north side, from east of Elizabeth to Baxter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>202 15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>204 27</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167-169 Canal</td>
<td>Commercial Building. 1880s building with 1928 facade. Brackets on Elizabeth Street elevation. Five-story brick loft-style building with banks of windows. Peaked parapet roof. Facade built when Canal Street was widened in 1928. ca. 1880; a. 1928 COMMERCIAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>204 29</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>204 31</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175 Canal</td>
<td>Commercial Building. Five-story brick loft-style building with banks of windows. Stepped parapet roof. ca. 1928 COMMERCIAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>204 32</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177 Canal</td>
<td>Commercial Building. Five-story brick loft-style building with banks of windows. Stepped parapet roof. ca. 1928 COMMERCIAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>204 33</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179 Canal</td>
<td>Commercial Building. Five-story brick loft-style building with banks of windows. Stepped parapet roof. ca. 1928 COMMERCIAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>204 34</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181 Canal</td>
<td>Commercial Building. Five-story brick loft-style building with banks of windows. Stepped parapet roof. ca. 1928 COMMERCIAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>204 35</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183 Canal</td>
<td>Non-Contributing Building</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>205 30</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185-187 Canal</td>
<td>Non-Contributing Building/Store</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>205 32</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>205 34</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195-197 Canal</td>
<td>Commercial Building. Two-story yellow brick commercial building. ca. 1935 COMMERCIAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>206 26</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203-205 Canal</td>
<td>Factory &amp; Furniture Warehouse (1878). Part of a row (203-211 Canal) of ca. 1860s commercial/industrial buildings built on the cusp of Greek Revival/Italianate transition. Five-story (raised from 4) brick with bracketed cornice. ca. 1860 ITALIANATE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>206 28</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207 Canal</td>
<td>Factory/Saloon/Concert Hall. One of a row (203-211 Canal) of ca. 1860s commercial/industrial buildings built on the cusp of Greek Revival/Italianate transition. Four-story brick with bracketed cornice. ca. 1860 ITALIANATE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>206 29</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209 Canal</td>
<td>Factory. One of a row (203-211 Canal) of ca. 1860s commercial/industrial buildings built on the cusp of Greek Revival/Italianate transition. Four-story brick with bracketed cornice. ca. 1860 ITALIANATE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>206 29</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211 Canal</td>
<td>Factory. One of a row (203-211 Canal) of ca. 1860s commercial/industrial buildings built on the cusp of Greek Revival/Italianate transition. Four-story brick with bracketed cornice. ca. 1860 ITALIANATE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>206 31</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213-217 Canal</td>
<td>Store. One-story yellow brick with parapet. C.N. Whinston or Julius Bleich, 1935 COMMERCIAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>206 34</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219 Canal</td>
<td>Loft/Tenement. Five-story, three-bay brick with intact cornice. ca. 1870s ITALIANATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**235 9  216 Centre Tenement.** Five-story, four-bay brick with arched window hoods and metal sills. Corbelled parapet. 1878 ITALIANATE

**235 10  218 Centre Lofts.** Five-story, four-bay brick with arched window hoods and metal sills. Corbelled cornice. Moran & Armstrong, Builders, 1870 ITALIANATE

**235 11  220-222 Centre Tenement; Factory (lace, printing, old furniture).** Pair of five-story, three-bay brick tenements/factory building with simple metal cornice. mid 19C NO STYLE

**Cleveland Place**

**481 8  17 Cleveland Place Tenement.** Five-story, four-bay brick tenement, heavily influenced by Aesthetic Movement. Heavy window hoods and incised geometric and floral designs. Quoins; intact cornice and cast iron fire escape. Similar to and completed for the same owner as 21 Cleveland Place—a German client, Peter Liebertz. Julius Boekell, 1877 NEO GREC/AESTHETIC MOVEMENT

**481 9  19 Cleveland Place Tenement.** Remarkably staid building from one of the most famous architects practicing at the time. Five-story, four-bay brick tenement with metal window hoods and sills—cast iron or pressed galvanized iron. George B. Post; Kurtzer & Rentz ALT; Straub storefront, 1877 ITALIANATE

**481 10  21 Cleveland Place Tenement.** Five-and-a-half-story, four-bay brick tenement with cast iron storefront in basement level, incised geometric and floral designs in heavy window hoods. Quoins and leaf motif in metal cornice. Similar to and completed for the same owner as 17 Cleveland Place—a German client, Peter Liebertz. F.W. Klemt, 1880-1881 NEO GREC

**Doyers Street**


**162 28  11-13 Doyers Nam Wah Tea Parlor.** Two-story golden brick store with marble lintels. Home to Nam Wah Tea Parlor, the oldest operating tea parlor in Chinatown (1920). ca. 1920 COMMERCIAL

**162 30  9 Doyers Loft.** Four-story, three-bay brick loft with brick textured stucco. 1880s or earlier NO STYLE

**162 33  3 Doyers Tenement.** Five-story, five-bay brick with wood and metal cornice. Round arch pediment in cornice. Refaced with brick textured stucco. 1876s;1920s ITALIANATE/NEO-GREC/MIXED

**162 38  5 Doyers Loft.** Five-story brick and brownstone loft building; Corbelled cornice and replacement windows. Brickface stucco over oilstock brick. 1870s; 1920s ITALIANATE/MIXED

**162 133  1 Doyers Tenement.** Four-story, five-bay brick building faced in brick textured stucco. Cornice missing. ca. 1950 NO STYLE

**162 47  10-14 Doyers Store.** Two-story yellow brick store with green cast-stone Chinese ornamental motifs. Sydne Schleman 1941 COMMERCIAL/CHINESE

**162 48  16 Doyers Store.** Two-story, two-bay yellow brick store. ca. 1920s COMMERCIAL

**162 49  18 Doyers Restaurant/Club/Office.** Also 17 Pell. Five-story brick apartment/club/restaurant with three bays on Pell; four bays on Doyers. Brick quoins. Patrick Murray, 1928 COMMERCIAL

**Elizabeth Street from Canal to Bayard**

**202 11  28 Elizabeth Townhouse.** Three-story, three-bay brick & frame house, raised to four stories in 1927. Stuccoed facade. Cornice intact. ca. 1820; 1887; 1927 FEDERAL

**201 20  19-21 Elizabeth Police Station House, Lodging House & Prison: 5th Precinct.** Four-story, five-bay brick civic building with pedimental window hoods. N.D. Bush, 1881 ITALIANATE/NEO GREC
Chinatown and Little Italy Historic District  
New York County, New York  

### Name of Property

- **7 Elizabeth** Tenement. Five-story tenement on raised basement. Ornate Moorish entrance portico. Developed by Abraham Levinson. Fred Ebeling, 1887 REnaissance REVIVAL; MOORISH/EXOTIC  
- **5 Elizabeth** Tenement. Five-story, five-bay brick tenement. Cornice missing. Developed by Wolf Baum; Rachel Kurtzman. Herter Brothers, 1887 QUEEN ANNE  

**Elizabeth Street, east side, from Canal to Hester**  
- **38 Elizabeth** Stores & Offices. Also 161-165 Canal. Two-story yellow brick commercial building with parapet roof. Frank D. Clark 1929 COMMERCIAL  
- **40 Elizabeth** Factory: Gulden’s Mustard, Pickles & Catsup Factory. Five-story, seven-bay stuccoed brick factory building with intact cornice. Elisha Sniffen, 1882 COMMERCIAL/ITALIANATE  
- **54-56 Elizabeth** Tenement. Seven-story, twelve-bay brick & terracotta tenement. Developed by Leopold Kaufman. Schneider & Herter, 1901 RENAISSANCE REVIVAL  
- **58 Elizabeth** Tenement. Six-story brick tenement with terracotta trim. Intact cornice. Charles Straub, 1907 COLONIAL REVIVAL  

**Elizabeth Street, west side, from Hester to Canal**  
- **53-55 Elizabeth** Factory: Chair Factory/Loft. Seven-story corbelled brick and cast iron facade. Triple arched facade. ca. 1897 COMMERCIAL/RENAISSANCE REVIVAL  
- **49-51 Elizabeth** Factory: Furniture/Chair Factory/Loft. Six-story brick and brownstone factory with cast iron front. Molded brick or terracotta plaque with “1888.” 1888 RICHARDSONIAN ROMANESQUE  
- **41-47 Elizabeth** Factory: F. Mohr Furniture Factory. Seven-story pale brick factory building with stone lintels. ca. 1890s COMMERCIAL/RENAISSANCE REVIVAL  

**Elizabeth Street, west side, from Grant to Hester**  
- **95 Elizabeth** Tenement. One part of a triple, six-story, twelve-bay brick & terracotta tenement (91-95 Eliz.). Intact cornice. Richard Rohl, 1903 RENAISSANCE REVIVAL  
- **91-93 Elizabeth** Tenement. Two parts of a triple, six-story, twelve-bay brick & terracotta tenement (91-95 Eliz.). Missing cornice. Richard Rohl, 1903 RENAISSANCE REVIVAL  
- **89 Elizabeth** Non-Contributing Building  
- **87 Elizabeth** Non-Contributing Building  
- **83-85 Elizabeth** Tenement. Six-story, eight-bay wide double tenement with intact cornice. Corbelled brickwork. Developed by Patrick McManus. A.B. Ogden & Son, 1887 NEO GREC/RENAISSANCE REVIVAL  
- **77 Elizabeth** Townhouse/Tenement. Three-story, three-bay brick with stone lintels, metal cornice. e19C FEDERAL  
- **75 Elizabeth** Townhouse/Tenement. Three-story, three-bay stuccoed brick with stone lintels, metal cornice. e19C FEDERAL
Elizabeth Street, east side from Hester to Grand

239 7501 80 Elizabeth Consolidated Edison Storehouse & Office Four-story plus roof addition. Flemish bond brick with cast stone or limestone belt courses and minimal cornice. Also 157 Hester. James Hunter, 1928 COLONIAL REVIVAL

239 8 84 Elizabeth Tenement. Six stories on raised basement. Rusticated brickwork with limestone trim. Wrought iron fire escapes. Similar to 88 Elizabeth. Developed by Louis Rinaldo. Michael Bernstein, 1901 RENAISSANCE REVIVAL

239 9 86 Elizabeth Tenement. Five-story, four-bay brick and cast-stone tenement. 1952 COLONIAL REVIVAL

239 10 88 Elizabeth Tenement. Six stories on raised basement. Rusticated brickwork with limestone trim. Wrought iron fire escapes. Similar to 84 Elizabeth. Developed by Louis Rinaldo. Michael Bernstein, 1901 RENAISSANCE REVIVAL

239 11 90 Elizabeth Tenement “GIOIELLO”. Six-story, four-bay brick & terracotta tenement with intact cornice. GIOIELLO (means “jewel” in Italian) embossed in cornice. Developed by Michael Voccoli. Horenburger & Straub or Neville & Bagge, 1903 RENAISSANCE REVIVAL/colonial revival


Elizabeth Street, west side, from Broome to Grand

470 17 127 Elizabeth Church Mission House/Gallery. Two-story, three-bay hip-roofed brick building with front pediment. 1873 ITALIANATE

470 19 125 Elizabeth Tenements (front & rear). Pair with 123 Elizabeth. Five-story, four-bay tenement with intact cornice. Three-story rear tenement. ca. 1870s ITALIANATE

470 20 123 Elizabeth Tenement. Pair with 125 Elizabeth. Five-story, four-bay tenement with intact cornice. ca. 1870s ITALIANATE

470 21 119-121 Elizabeth Tenement. Six-story, five-bay “Harvard” brick tenement with terracotta trim and Indiana limestone sills. Similar to 158 Mott. Charles M. Sutton, 1905 COLONIAL REVIVAL

470 23 117 Elizabeth Tenement. Part of triple tenement, 113-117 Elizabeth. Five-story, four-bay brick tenement with pedimented cornices (113 & 117; 115 has flat cornice). Metal window hoods and sills. Elaborate cast iron fire escapes. ca. 1870s NEO GREC

470 24 115 Elizabeth Tenement. Part of triple tenement, 113-117 Elizabeth. Five-story, four-bay brick tenement with pedimented cornices (113 & 117; 115 has flat cornice). Metal window hoods and sills. Elaborate cast iron fire escapes. Condemned in 1938 as “Unfit for Human Habitation.” ca. 1870s NEO GREC

470 25 113 Elizabeth Tenement. Part of triple tenement, 113-117 Elizabeth. Five-story, four-bay brick tenement with pedimented cornices (113 & 117; 115 has flat cornice). Metal window hoods and sills. Elaborate cast iron fire escapes. ca. 1870s NEO GREC

Elizabeth Street, east side, between Grand and Broome

470 37 116 Elizabeth Tenement. Five-story, four-bay brick & stone tenement. Stone trim, corbelled brickwork, including cornice. Richard L. Walsh, 1889 RENAISSANCE REVIVAL

470 38 118 Elizabeth Tenement. With 120 Elizabeth: Six-story, eight-bay grey brick tenement with terracotta trim and intact cornice. Developed by Edward Poerscke. Charles Rentz, 1899 RENAISSANCE REVIVAL

470 39 120 Elizabeth Tenement. With 118 Elizabeth: Six-story, eight-bay grey brick tenement with terracotta trim and intact cornice. Developed by Edward Poerscke. Charles Rentz, 1899 RENAISSANCE REVIVAL

470 42 126 Elizabeth Tenement. Six-story, four-bay brick and stone tenement. Developed by Edward Poerscke. Kurtzer & Rohl, 1898 RENAISSANCE REVIVAL

470 7501 122 Elizabeth Non-Contributing Building New Construction. Vijay T. Kole, 1986
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Elizabeth Street, east side, from Kenmare to Spring


168 Elizabeth Tenement. Six-story, four-bay glazed brick tenement with stepped parapet and contrasting brickwork. ca. 1920s NO STYLE

170 Elizabeth Tenement. Four-story, three-bay textured brick building with stepped parapet. May be an earlier building under a new facade. ca. 1920s and earlier NO STYLE

172 Elizabeth Townhouse/Tenement. Three-and-a-half story townhouse with mansard roof. Stoop removed and entrance changed to basement level. Early/mid 19C GREEK REVIVAL/SECOND EMPIRE

174 Elizabeth Townhouse/Tenement. Three-and-a-half story townhouse with mansard roof. Stoop removed and entrance changed to basement level. Early/mid 19C GREEK REVIVAL/SECOND EMPIRE

Elizabeth Street, west side, from Spring to Broome

171 Elizabeth Tenement. Three-story, five bay with same lintels and cornice details as 14 Spring. mid 19C ITALIANATE

167 Elizabeth Tenement. Five-story, four-bay brick tenement with arched cast iron window hoods and intact cornice. ca. 1870 ITALIANATE

165 Elizabeth Non-Contributing Building New Construction

149-151 Elizabeth Tenement. Six-story brick tenement with limestone or terracotta trim, belt courses and jack arches. Cornice missing. Franklin Baylies, 1907 COLONIAL REVIVAL

147 Elizabeth Tenement. Five-story, four-bay brick tenement with corbelled brickwork and ornate cast iron window hoods. 1874 ITALIANATE

Elizabeth Street from Spring to Prince

190 Elizabeth Non-Contributing Building. New Construction

192 Elizabeth Non-Contributing Building. New Construction

194 Elizabeth Townhouse/Tenement. Four-story, three-bay brick townhouse converted to tenement. Stone lintels and corbelled cornice. early-mid 19C and later MIXED

196 Elizabeth Tenement. Six-story, four-bay brown brick with brownstone or terracotta trim. Deep overhanging cornice, damaged by recent fire. Developed by Pancrazius Grassi. Charles Straub, 1907 RENAISSANCE REVIVAL/Colonial Revival


204-206 Elizabeth UELP; NY Edison Substation. Asymmetrical brick industrial building with large loading dock. Otto Spin, 1934 COLONIAL REVIVAL/INTERNATIONAL STYLE

208-210 Elizabeth Brush Electric Illuminating Co.; NY Edison Substation(1904). Brick with brownstone belt courses and cast iron front Joseph Ireland, 1886 RENAISSANCE REVIVAL/NEO GREC

209 Elizabeth Firehouse: Hook & Ladder No. 9/G. LaRosa Bakery. Three stories plus recent roof addition. Three-bay brick building with limestone belt course and extensive use of molded brick tiles. Corbelled brickwork and well-preserved cast iron storefront/garage bay. A unique building in the district. BSS ca. 1880s RENAISSANCE REVIVAL/AESTHETIC MOVEMENT
Elizabeth Street, east side, from Prince to East Houston

507 2 228 Elizabeth Townhouse. Four-story, three-bay brick & terracotta townhouse with stepped pediment. Five-story rear tenement. ca. 1915 ECLECTIC

507 3 230 Elizabeth Townhouse/Tenement. Four-and-a-half-story, three-bay brick with stone trim, possibly Flemish bond brick? E19C & later FEDERAL


507 6 236 Elizabeth Tenement. Five-story, three-bay brick tenement with intact round arch pediment cornice. Intact wooden storefront. ca. 1870s ITALIANATE

507 7 238 Elizabeth Tenement; Albanese Meat Market. Five-story, three-bay brick with metal cornice and 1920s parapet. ca. 1870s; 1920s ITALIANATE

507 8 240 Elizabeth Tenement. Similar to 244-252 Elizabeth. Five-story, three-bay brick tenement with metal sills and lintels, bracketed cornice. Rabold & Postevin, 1869 ITALIANATE

507 9 242 Elizabeth Factory. One-story orange brick factory with stepped parapet. 1951 COMMERCIAL

507 10 244 Elizabeth Tenement. 244-252 Elizabeth all identical. Five-story, four-bay brick tenement with metal sills and lintels, bracketed cornice. Rabold & Postevin, 1869 ITALIANATE

507 10 246 Elizabeth Tenement. 244-252 Elizabeth all identical. Five-story, four-bay brick tenement with metal sills and lintels, bracketed cornice. Rabold & Postevin, 1869 ITALIANATE

507 12 248 Elizabeth Tenement. 244-252 Elizabeth all identical. Five-story, four-bay brick tenement with metal sills and lintels, bracketed cornice. Rabold & Postevin, 1869 ITALIANATE

507 13 250 Elizabeth Tenement. 244-252 Elizabeth all identical. Five-story, four-bay brick tenement with metal sills and lintels, bracketed cornice. Rabold & Postevin, 1869 ITALIANATE

507 14 252 Elizabeth Tenement. 244-252 Elizabeth all identical. Five-story, four-bay brick tenement with metal sills and lintels, bracketed cornice. Rabold & Postevin, 1869 ITALIANATE


507 16 258 Elizabeth Commercial Building. Three-story textured tan brick with aluminum-framed plate glass windows. 1951 COMMERCIAL

507 17 260 Elizabeth Tenement. 260-268 Elizabeth all part of the same building. Five-story, ten-bay tenement with full-width wrought iron balconies/fire escapes. Cornice missing. Brick jack arches. Modest anthemion ornament at cornice level (below cornice corbels). Building developed by William Astor and John Jacob Astor. BSS Halsey C. DeBand, 1884 NEO GREC

507 18 262 Elizabeth Tenement. 260-268 Elizabeth all part of the same building. Five-story, ten-bay tenement with full-width wrought iron balconies/fire escapes. Cornice missing. Brick jack arches. Modest anthemion ornament at cornice level (below cornice corbels). Building developed by William Astor and John Jacob Astor. BSS Halsey C. DeBand, 1884 NEO GREC

507 19 264 Elizabeth Tenement. 260-268 Elizabeth all part of the same building. Five-story, ten-bay tenement with full-width wrought iron balconies/fire escapes. Cornice missing. Brick jack arches. Modest anthemion ornament at cornice level (below cornice corbels). Building developed by William Astor and John Jacob Astor. BSS Halsey C. DeBand, 1884 NEO GREC

507 20 266 Elizabeth Tenement. 260-268 Elizabeth all part of the same building. Five-story, ten-bay tenement with full-width wrought iron balconies/fire escapes. Cornice missing. Brick jack arches. Modest anthemion ornament at cornice level (below cornice corbels). Building developed by William Astor and John Jacob Astor. BSS Halsey C. DeBand, 1884 NEO GREC

507 21 268 Elizabeth Tenement. 260-268 Elizabeth all part of the same building. Five-story, ten-bay tenement with full-width wrought iron balconies/fire escapes. Cornice missing. Brick jack arches. Modest anthemion ornament at
carnas cornice level (below cornice corbels). Building developed by William Astor and John Jacob Astor. BSS Halsey C. DeBand, 1884 NEO GREC

Elizabeth Street, west side, from south of E. Houston to Prince


508 30 265 Elizabeth Townhouse/Tenement (front & rear). Three-story, three-bay brick with elaborate wrought iron balconies/fire escapes. Two-story rear tenement. mid 19C ITALIANATE/NO STYLE

508 7501 259 Elizabeth Non-Contributing Building (1986)

508 33 257 Elizabeth Non-Contributing Building Heavily altered. Ludwig Bono, 1946 COMMERCIAL

508 34 255 Elizabeth Non-Contributing Building/Garage Heavily altered. John B. Mooney, 1947 COMMERCIAL

508 35 253 Elizabeth Tenement. Five-story plus one-story roof addition. Pale buff brick with stone trim, terracotta ornament, including shell niches, floral plaques and rusticated and corbelled brickwork. Developed for Henry Passinsky. Schneider & Herter, 1892 QUEEN ANNE


508 39 245 Elizabeth Tenement. Triple tenement, 241-245 Elizabeth. Five-story, three-bay smooth brick tenement with metal lintels and bracket cornice. ca. 1870 ITALIANATE

508 40 243 Elizabeth Tenement. Triple tenement, 241-245 Elizabeth. Five-story, three-bay smooth brick tenement with metal lintels and bracket cornice. ca. 1870 ITALIANATE

508 41 241 Elizabeth Tenements (front & rear). Triple tenement, 241-245 Elizabeth. Five-story, three-bay smooth brick tenement with metal lintels and bracket cornice. Four-story rear tenement. ca. 1870 ITALIANATE


508 43 237 Elizabeth Tenement. Five-story, three-bay brick tenement with arched window hoods and bracket cornice. Some 2/2 sash windows. ca. 1870 ITALIANATE

508 44 233-235 Elizabeth Tenement. Six-story, six-bay red and white brick tenement with terracotta trim. Metal frieze intact; cornice missing. Neville & Bagge, 1903 COLONIAL REVIVAL

Grand Street, south side, from Baxter toward Bowery

236 16 181 Grand Townhouse/Factory/Shop. One of an intact row of five, three-story, three-bay brick rowhouses. ca. 1830 GREEK REVIVAL

236 17 183 Grand Townhouse/Jovino Gun Shop. One of an intact row of five, three-story, three-bay brick rowhouses. English bond. ca. 1830 GREEK REVIVAL

236 18 185 Grand Townhouse/Factory/Shop. One of an intact row of five, three-story, three-bay brick rowhouses. English bond. ca. 1830 GREEK REVIVAL

236 19 187 Grand Townhouse/Factory/Shop. One of an intact row of five, three-story, three-bay brick rowhouses. English bond. ca. 1830 GREEK REVIVAL

236 20 189 Grand Townhouse/Stabile Bank/Italian-American Museum. One of an intact row of five, three-story, three-bay brick rowhouses; English bond. Intact Doric door surround. ca. 1830 GREEK REVIVAL

237 12 191 Grand Tenement; Stabile Building/Restaurant/Bakery. Six-story brick & stone tenement. Developed by Francis Stabile. Charles Straub, 1907 COLONIAL REVIVAL

237 13 195 Grand Non-Contributing Building/Ferrara Bakery
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| 237 17 | 203 Grand | Offices/Sons of Italy Original Location. Seven-story brick industrial building with segmental and round arch window openings, corbelled quoins. ca. 1880 COMMERCIAL/RENAISSANCE REVIVAL |
| 238 12 | 205 Grand | Tenement. Five-story, four-bay brick tenement with stone trim. ca. 1880s NEO GREC |
| 238 13 | 207 Grand | Tenement. Five-story, three-bay brick tenement with arched window hoods. Intact cornice. ca. 1870 ITALIANATE |
| 238 16 | 213-217 Grand/97 Elizabeth | Lofts. Two nine-story loft buildings. White brick with pilasters framing banks of windows. Cornice intact on Grand Street. ca. 1910 CLASSICAL REVIVAL/COMMERCIAL |
| 238 19 | 219-221 Grand | Commercial Building. Five-story, five-bay brick building with pedimented cornice and incised window hoods. ca. 1880s NEO GREC/ITALIANATE |
| 239 15 | 223 Grand | Store. Two-story stuccoed brick corner store. ca. 1940s NO STYLE |
| 239 18 | 229 Grand | Tenement; “M. Kessler”. Five-story Philadelphia brick & brownstone tenement with pointed arches and heavy cornice. “M. Kessler Hardware”. Elisha Sniffen, 1885 RENAISSANCE REVIVAL/VENETIAN |

**Grand Street, north side, from Elizabeth to Centre Market Place**

| 470 28 | 214-216 Grand | Tenement. Four-story, five-bay brick tenement with flat lintels. Facade rebuilt in 1905 mid 19C; 1905 ITALIANATE/NO STYLE |
| 470 29 | 212 Grand | Non-Contributing Building |
| 470 30 | 210 Grand | Office Building. Three-story, four-bay brick and limestone office or tenement building. Apparently the only Art Deco building in the district. A.J. Simberg, 1930 ART DECO |
| 471 54 | 198 Grand | Non-Contributing Building |
| 471 58 | 190 Grand | Townhouse/Piemonte Ravioli. Three-and-a-half-story, three-bay Flemish bond brick townhouse with pair of round arched dormers with 8/8 wood sash windows. Pedimental lintels in upper floors; flat lintels on first floor. Part of a row of Federal townhouses, 188-196 Grand. BSS ca. 1820 FEDERAL |
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**471 59 188 Grand** Townhouse/Alleva Cheese. Four-story corner townhouse raised from three-and-a-half-story, three-bay Flemish bond brick townhouse. Pedimental lintels in upper floors; flat lintels on first floor. Extended to the north with large six-bay-deep addition. Part of a row of Federal townhouses, 188-196 Grand. ca. 1820; ca. 1850 FEDERAL & later

**471 22 186 Grand/157 Mulberry** Loft/Factory. Six-story brick loft/factory building with round arch bays. Corbelled brickwork. Blend of Colonial Revival elements with and Romanesque or Renaissance Revival forms. ca. 1895 MIXED

**471 23 182-184 Grand** Loft. Six-story, six-bay brick loft with rusticated brickwork, stone lintels, corbelled cornice. ca. 1890 RENAISSANCE REVIVAL/COMMERCIAL

**471 25 176-180 Grand** Factory: Knitting Mill/Electric Equipment/Lighting Fixtures. Six-story tripartite facade with round arches, cartouches, elaborate corbelled brickwork, molded brick & terracotta ornament ca. 1888 ROMANESQUE REVIVAL

**471 28 174 Grand** Tenement. Four-story, three-bay brick with round arch pediment, elaborate cornice. Flat window hoods. BSS. ca. 1870 ITALIANATE

**Hester Street, south side, from east of Elizabeth to Baxter Street**

**203 16 144 Hester** Tenement. Five-story, four-bay brick tenement with intact cornice and wrought iron fire escapes. mid 19C ITALIANATE

**204 16 154 Hester** Italian School, Children’s Aid Society. Eight-story white brick school. Parish & Schroeder, 1912 CLASSICAL REVIVAL/INSTITUTIONAL

**204 10 156 Hester** Non-Contributing Building.

**205 19 172 Hester** Non-Contributing Building: Townhouse/Tenement. Four-story, three-bay brick tenement. Lacking integrity. mid 19C NO STYLE


**205 17 176 Hester** Tenements (front & rear). Five-story, four-bay brick with stone lintels. Cornice missing. Three-story rear tenement. mid 19C NO STYLE

**205 16 178 Hester** Townhouse. Three-story frame townhouse with brick front, faced in Formstone. ca. 1815; ca. 1950 FEDERAL/NO STYLE

**205 15 180 Hester** Non-Contributing Building.


**206 14 186 Hester** Tenement. Five-story on raised basement. Stoop removed. Brownstone facade. Some 2/2 wood sash windows intact. James E. Ware, 1878 ITALIANATE

**206 13 188 Hester** Tenements (front & rear). Four-story, three-bay brick tenement with later cast-stone jackarches applied. Corbelled cornice on front & rear buildings. Five-story rear tenement. mid 19C NO STYLE

**206 12 190 Hester** Tenement. Six-story, four-bay brick with stone trim and beltcourses, corbelled brickwork. Cornice missing. Mortimer C. Merritt, 1894 RENAISSANCE REVIVAL

**Hester Street, north side, from Elizabeth to Centre**

**238 33 161 Hester** Townhouse/Tenement. Four-story, three-bay brick townhouse /tenement with stone lintels mid 19C ITALIANATE

**238 34 163 Hester** Tenement. Three-stories on a raised basement. Three-bays wide with stepped parapet/ mid 19C/ca. 1930 MIXED

**238 35 165 Hester** Tenements (front & rear). Four-story, three-bay brick tenement with arch window openings and wooden (?) cornice. Four-story rear tenement. mid 19C ITALIANATE

**238 36 167 Hester** Tenements (front & rear). Four-story, three-bay brick tenement with arch window openings. Cornice missing. Four-story rear tenement. mid 19C ITALIANATE
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<tr>
<td>238 37</td>
<td>169 Hester</td>
<td>Tenements (front &amp; rear). Five-story, four-bay brick with some 2/2 wood sash windows. Intact cornice. Four-story rear tenement.</td>
<td>mid 19C ITALIANATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238 38</td>
<td>171 Hester</td>
<td>Tenements (front &amp; rear). Five-story, four-bay brick with intact cornice. Four-story rear tenement.</td>
<td>mid 19C ITALIANATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237 31</td>
<td>181 Hester</td>
<td>Non-Contributing Building. New Construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237 33</td>
<td>185 Hester</td>
<td>Tenements (front &amp; rear). Five-story, four-bay brick tenement with flat lintels and bracketed cornice. Four-story rear tenement.</td>
<td>mid 19C ITALIANATE/NO STYLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237 34</td>
<td>187 Hester</td>
<td>Tenements (front &amp; rear). Five-story, four-bay brick tenement with flat lintels and bracketed cornice. Four-story rear tenement.</td>
<td>mid 19C ITALIANATE/NO STYLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237 35</td>
<td>189 Hester</td>
<td>Tenement. Five-story, four-bay brick with arched window hoods, projecting sills and intact cornice. William Graul, 1873 ITALIANATE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236 31</td>
<td>193 Hester</td>
<td>Tenement. Also 129 Mulberry. Five-story, four-bay brick with stone lintels. Corbelled brickwork. Intact cornice.</td>
<td>ca. 1887 RENAISSANCE REVIVAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236 32</td>
<td>195 Hester</td>
<td>Tenement. Five-story, four-bay brick with corbelled brickwork. Intact cornice. Julius Boekell &amp; Son, 1886 RENAISSANCE REVIVAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235 24</td>
<td>209-211 Hester</td>
<td>Stable/Machine works. Brick industrial building with corbelled brickwork arches over windows. Sixth story added 1902. Louis Heinecke, 1890 RENAISSANCE REVIVAL/COMMERCIAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**E. Houston Street**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Name of Property</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>507 22</td>
<td>73 E. Houston Street</td>
<td>Townhouse. Two-and-one-half-story, three-bay stuccoed brick townhouse with paired dormers in front and lunette windows in side gable roof.</td>
<td>ca. 1800 FEDERAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>507 22</td>
<td>77 E. Houston Street</td>
<td>Tenement; Commercial. Three-story, seven-bay brick tenement with bracket cornice, stone lintels, cast iron store front.</td>
<td>Mid 19C MIXED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Kenmare Street, south side, from east of Elizabeth to Cleveland Place**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Name of Property</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>478 7</td>
<td>24 Kenmare/152-154 Elizabeth</td>
<td>Warehouse/Garage. Four-story brick warehouse with first floor garage/parking entrance. Parapet roof.</td>
<td>ca. 1920s COMMERCIAL/NO STYLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>479 29</td>
<td>30-40 Kenmare</td>
<td>Non-Contributing Building. New Construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Kenmare Street, north side, from east of Elizabeth to Cleveland Place**

478 12 19 Kenmare Tenement Six-story mottled beige brick tenement with terracotta trim, rusticated brickwork deep overhanging cornice. Three bays on Elizabeth; 12 on Kenmare. Oscar Lowinson, 1909 or 1919 COLONIAL REVIVAL.

479 26 37 Kenmare Non-Contributing Building; Originally New Deal Petroleum Corporation. One-story stuccoed cinderblock building. Lacking integrity. 1948 NO STYLE.

479 125 39 Kenmare Garage. One-story brick building with single garage bay. Lama & Proskauer, 1939 NO STYLE.

481 32 86-96 Kenmare Tenement. Similar to 195-199 Mulberry on opposite corner. Glazed white brick with terracotta shields, intact cornice. Developed by Michael Briganti. Bernstein & Bernstein, 1911 COLONIAL REVIVAL.

---

**Lafayette Street, east side, from Spring to Jersey**

481 7502 225 Lafayette Italian Savings Bank. Twelve-story brick, limestone and granite bank tower. Corinthian order. C.P.H. Gilbert 1925 CLASSICAL REVIVAL/COMMERCIAL.

495 1 231 Lafayette Tenement. Four-and-one-half-story corbelled brick with brownstone trim; mansard roof and dormers. ca. 1870 SECOND EMPIRE.

495 1 233 Lafayette Stable. Five-story, five-bay corbelled brick and brownstone stable. William Howe, 1892 RENAISSANCE REVIVAL/NO STYLE.

495 1 235 Lafayette Tenement. Five-story, four-bay brick and brownstone tenement. ca. 1860s ITALIANATE.


510 7501 285 Lafayette Factory: Hawley & Hoops Candy Factory. Also 10 Jersey, 267-271 Mulberry. Cast iron, brick and stone factory/loft building. ca. 1880s COMMERCIAL/RENAISSANCE REVIVAL.

---

**Mosco Street**

164 43 103 Mosco Tenement; Store, Bakery. Four-story tenement with bakery in cellar, similar in style to 26-32 Pell, built the same year. Developed by Bartolomeo Gauzza. Mathew Del Gaudio, 1912 NO STYLE.

164 44 105 Mosco Transfiguration Salesian Fathers Residence/Adult English Center. Five-story, three-bay limestone and yellow brick church building, similar in style to the Transfiguration School on Mott Street. John H. Tiemeyer, Jr., 1924 COLLEGIATE GOTHIC REVIVAL.

---

**Mott Street, east side, from Worth to Bayard**

162 8 14 Mott Lofts and Store. Four-story, three-bay-wide brick loft building refaced in pale yellow bricks ca. 1920. Louis F. Heinecke 1894 MIXED.

162 9 16 Mott Townhouse/Chung Wa Gong Shaw Society,1896; CCBA, 1899. Four-story, three-bay wide formerly 2-1/2-story Federal town house, raised to three stories by Kurtzer & Rohl (1888) and to four in 1896, with towers at the parapet; Cast iron store front by Chas. Reid, 1899. ca. 1820; 1888; 1896 FEDERAL/CHINESE.

162 10 18 Mott Tenement. Five-story, four-bay-wide brick tenement with foliate terra cotta plaques and metal cornice. Kurtzer & Rohl, 1888 QUEEN ANNE.

162 11 20 Mott Non-Contributing Building.

162 12 22 Mott Chinese Masonic Association. Five-story brick Masonic lodge. Stepped parapet and stone arch lintels; Masonic symbols on doors and in parapet. Inset second floor balcony in the Chinese style. 1870s; 1920s ITALIANATE/CHINESE/OTHER.
Mott Street, west side from Bayard to Worth

164 45 21 Mott Tenement, Store & Restaurant. Five-story, four-bay-wide brick with arched window hoods and intact arched pedimented cornice. Identical to 19 Mott Street. ca. 1870 ITALIANATE

164 43 45 Mott Tenement; Wing On Wo & Co. Six-story, four-bay-wide tenement and store of glazed brick laid in Flemish bond with pedimented parapet, no cornice. One of the few semi-intact Chinese store interiors. Developed by Foon Poos. Arthur Wiendorf, 1925 NO STYLE

164 42 44 Mott Factory; Hok Shan Building. Five story loft/factory building. One-story roof raising (1889), plus late 20C roof addition. Arched window hoods, corbelled cornice. Facade stuccoed. 1871; 1886 ITALIANATE

164 41 43 Mott Tenement. Six-story, four-bay-wide brick tenement with terracotta plaques, stone lintels, corbelled brickwork and metal cornice. 1886 NEO-GREC

164 40 42 Mott Tenement; Joss House; Store. Five-story, four-bay-wide brick tenement with stone jack arches and belt courses. Pedimented cornice. Tall first story with cast iron store front. John A. Hamilton 1896 COLONIAL REVIVAL with NEO GREC pediment


164 38 40 Mott Tenement. Also 36 Pell. Five-story tan brick with terra cotta trim, polychrome glazed terra cotta shields and inset tiles; green tile parapet roof. Lama & Proskauer 1929-1930 SPANISH ECLECTIC

164 37 39 Mott Tenements (front & rear). Five-story, four-bay-wide brick tenement with stone lintels and metal cornice. Three-story rear tenement. Mid19C ITALIANATE


164 35 37 Mott Tenement; Sun Lau/Hoy Sun Ning Yung Benevolent Association. Six-story tenement with eight bays broken into five bays plus three bays at bend in Mott Street. Red brick with glazed white brick decorative insets. Brick parapet. Possibly George Frederick Pelham, 1914; cited elsewhere as 1925 COLONIAL REVIVAL/OTHER

164 34 36 Mott Non-Contributing Building: Townhouse. Early 19C townhouse, heavily altered. FEDERAL/MIXED


164 32 34 Mott Tenement; Joss House; Store. Five-story, four-bay-wide brick tenement with Terracotta trim. Good Fortune Gifts has an intact wooden storefront and well preserved interior. Developed by James Poggi. Louis Heinecke, 1897 RENAISSANCE REVIVAL

164 31 33 Mott Tenement. Six-story, four-bay-wide brick tenement with terracotta plaques, stone lintels, corbelled brickwork and metal cornice. 1886 RENAISSANCE REVIVAL

164 30 32 Mott Tenement. Also 36 Pell. Five-story tan brick with terra cotta trim, polychrome glazed terra cotta shields and inset tiles; green tile parapet roof. Lama & Proskauer 1929-1930 SPANISH ECLECTIC

164 29 31 Mott Tenement. Five-story, four-bay-wide brick tenement with stone lintels. Some 2/2 wood sash windows remain. Cornice missing. 1886 NEO-GREC

164 28 30 Mott Townhouse/Tenement. Three-story, three-bay brick house laid in Flemish bond; converted to tenement by A.R. McElwaine (1894). Window hoods and metal cornice. Early 19C; 1894 FEDERAL/ITALIANATE

164 27 29 Mott Tenement. Also 36 Pell. Five-story tan brick with terra cotta trim, polychrome glazed terra cotta shields and inset tiles; green tile parapet roof. Lama & Proskauer 1929-1930 SPANISH ECLECTIC

164 26 28 Mott Tenement. Five-story, four-bay-wide brick tenement with stone lintels. Some 2/2 wood sash windows remain. Cornice missing. 1886 NEO-GREC

164 25 27 Mott Tenement. Five-story, four-bay-wide brick tenement with bracketed cornice, arched window hoods. Mid-19C ITALIANATE


164 22 24 Mott Tenement; Sun Lau/Hoy Sun Ning Yung Benevolent Association. Six-story tenement with eight bays broken into five bays plus three bays at bend in Mott Street. Red brick with glazed white brick decorative insets. Brick parapet. Possibly George Frederick Pelham, 1914; cited elsewhere as 1925 COLONIAL REVIVAL/OTHER

164 21 23 Mott Church of the Transfiguration and School. Church: Ashlar and brownstone gable front church with copper tower. School: Four-story, five-bay yellow/tan brick school with cast stone or limestone trim. School: Frederick J. Schwartz Church: 1801; 1815; 1861-68. School: 1923 GEORGIAN-GOTHIC; COLLEGIATE GOTHIC. NR/Landmark.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>164 46</td>
<td><strong>19 Mott</strong> Tenement, Store, Restaurant; Office of Chinese Benevolent Society (1899). Five-story, four-bay-wide brick with arched window hoods and intact arched pedimented cornice. Identical to 21 Mott Street. ca. 1870 ITALIANATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164 47</td>
<td><strong>17 Mott</strong> Tenement. Five-story, four-bay-wide brick tenement with stone lintels, articulated facade and intact cornice. Six-story rear tenement. Schneider &amp; Herter, 1889 QUEEN ANNE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164 48</td>
<td><strong>15 Mott</strong> Tenements (front &amp; rear). Five-story, four-bay-wide brick tenement with arched metal window hoods and metal cornice. Six-story rear tenement. mid 19C ITALIANATE/COMMERCIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164 49</td>
<td><strong>13 Mott</strong> Tenements (front &amp; rear); Joss House; Temple; Postal Substation. Five-story, four-bay-wide brick tenement with brownstone lintels. Cornice missing. Five-story rear tenement. mid 19C ITALIANATE/NO STYLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164 50</td>
<td><strong>11 Mott</strong> Tenement. Five-story, four-bay-wide brick tenement with brownstone trim. Elaborate cornice, terracotta plaques. William Graul, 1887 QUEEN ANNE/RENAISSANCE REVIVAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164 51</td>
<td><strong>9 Mott</strong> Factory, Mattress &amp; Bedding; Port Arthur Restaurant. Six-story, six-bay-wide brick mattress factory building, site of the infamous Port Arthur Restaurant. Brownstone lintels. 1885 or earlier ITALIANATE/COMMERCIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164 53</td>
<td><strong>5 Mott</strong> Tenement; Eng Suey Sun Association. Four-story brick building with symmetrical facade faced in cast stone. Inset second-floor porch, ca. 1952 in the Chinese style. See Also 199 Worth Street. late 19C; ca. 1952 MODERN/CHINESE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164 54</td>
<td><strong>3 Mott</strong> Tenement. Four-story, three-bay-wide brick tenement with metal cornice. ca. 1850s ITALIANATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164 54</td>
<td><strong>1 Mott</strong> Store, Loft, Tenement. Four-story brick flatiron with five bays on Worth and Five on Mott, with a single bay at the corner. Some extant 2/2 wood sash windows. Flat stone lintels. mid 19C ITALIANATE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mott Street, west side from Canal to Bayard**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>200 17</td>
<td><strong>83-85 Mott</strong> Chinese Merchants Association Concrete and steel with masonry veneer; ornamental pagoda tower. Steel casement corner windows. Andrew J. Thomas, 1948-52 MODERN/CHINESE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 21</td>
<td><strong>77 Mott</strong> Factory: Coach Factory (1872); Stable (1886). Four-story, four-bay brick with brownstone lintels. Rebuilt parapet. 1870; 1920s ITALIANATE/NO STYLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 22</td>
<td><strong>73-75 Mott</strong> Tenement. Five-story, five-bay brick with brownstone lintels. Intact cornice. mid 19C ITALIANATE/NO STYLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 24</td>
<td><strong>69-71 Mott</strong> Tenement. Six-story, six-bay brick and terracotta tenement. Charles Straub, 1907 COLONIAL REVIVAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 26</td>
<td><strong>67 Mott</strong> Tenement. Five-story, four-bay brick with pedimental window hoods. 1874 ITALIANATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 28</td>
<td><strong>63 Mott</strong> Tenement. Pair with 61 Mott. Six-story, four-bay brick tenement with deep overhanging cornice. Developed by Barney Isaacs. Schneider &amp; Herter, 1887 QUEEN ANNE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 29</td>
<td><strong>61 Mott</strong> Tenement. Pair with 63 Mott. Six-story, four-bay brick tenement with deep overhanging cornice. Developed by Barney Isaacs. Schneider &amp; Herter, 1887 QUEEN ANNE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 30</td>
<td><strong>59 Mott</strong> Tenements (front &amp; rear). Five-story, four-bay pale brick tenement with terracotta trim. Five-story rear tenement. Developed by Sarah Levy. Schneider &amp; Herter, 1892 QUEEN ANNE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 31</td>
<td><strong>57 Mott</strong> Tenements (front &amp; rear). Five-story, four-bay brick and terracotta tenement. Missing cornice. Five-story rear tenement. Developed by Isaac Marks. Fred Wandelt, 1890 QUEEN ANNE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Mott Street, east side from Bayard to Canal

201 2 58 Mott Non-Contributing Building: Tenement Five-story, four-bay brick tenement. Missing cornice and faced in formstone/stucco. Lacking integrity. mid 19C NO STYLE

201 4 60 Mott Chinese Consolidated Benevolent Association (CCBA). Five-story glazed white brick community center with wrought iron screen shielding interior balconies. Also 11 Elizabeth. Poy G. Lee and Ben Ronis 1959 MODERN/CHINESE

201 6 66 Mott Non-Contributing Building: Tenements (front & rear). Four-story brick, remodeled in mid 20C. One-story rear building. Lacking integrity. mid 19C; mid 20C NO STYLE

201 7 68 Mott Soo Yuen Benevolent Association/Tenement. One of four (68-74 Mott) five-story, four-bay Philadelphia brick tenements laid in Flemish bond. Pedimental window hoods. Cornice replaced by elaborate Chinese-style balcony and porch. William E. Waring, 1874; 1920s ITALIANATE/CHINESE

201 8 70 Mott Tenement. One of four (68-74 Mott) five-story, four-bay Philadelphia brick tenements laid in Flemish bond. Pedimental window hoods. Each with a unique, elaborate cornice. Bake oven installed, 1892. Compare to 85 Mulberry. William E. Waring, 1874 1874 ITALIANATE

201 9 72 Mott Tenement. One of four (68-74 Mott) five-story, four-bay Philadelphia brick tenements laid in Flemish bond. Pedimental window hoods. Each with a unique, elaborate cornice. Compare to 85 Mulberry. William E. Waring, 1874 1874 ITALIANATE

201 10 74 Mott Tenement. One of four (68-74 Mott) five-story, four-bay Philadelphia brick tenements laid in Flemish bond. Pedimental window hoods. Each with a unique, elaborate cornice. Compare to 85 Mulberry. William E. Waring, 1874 1874 ITALIANATE

201 11 76 Mott Non-Contributing Building/Tenement. Four-story, three-bay brick tenement. Heavily altered. Lacking integrity. E19C; mid 19C

Mott Street, east side, from Hester to Canal

204 1 94-98 Mott Factory: Shirts. Six-story tripartite loft building. Corbelled brick and cast iron facade. ca. 1890s RENAISSANCE REVIVAL/COMMERCIAL

204 4 100 Mott Non-Contributing Building/Tenement. Five-story brick tenement with intact cornice, all clad in vertical metal siding. Lacking integrity. mid 19C

204 5 102 Mott Tenement. Five-story, four-bay brick tenement. Repointed brick. Cornice missing. Rear buildings torn down. mid 19C ITALIANATE/NO STYLE

204 5 104 Mott Tenement. Five-story, four-bay brick tenement. Repointed brick. Cornice missing. Rear building torn down. mid 19C ITALIANATE/NO STYLE

Mott Street, west side, from Hester to Canal

205 19 119 Mott Tenement; Vincent’s Restaurant. Five-story brick corner building with 1920s parapet. E20C NO STYLE


205 21 115 Mott Tenements (front & rear). Five-story, four-bay brick tenement with stone lintels, bracket cornice. Five-story rear tenement. Mid 19C ITALIANATE/NO STYLE

205 22 113 Mott Tenements (front & rear). Four-story, four-bay brick with stone lintels & bracket cornice. Four-story tenement. Mid 19C ITALIANATE/NO STYLE


205 24 109 Mott Tenements (front & rear). Five-story, four-bay brick tenement with stone lintels, bracket cornice. Four-story rear tenement. mid 19C ITALIANATE/NO STYLE

205 25 107 Mott Non-Contributing Building/Store
205 7501 103 Mott Factory: Furniture Factory. Six-stories raised to seven-story “Calabough” brick factory with corbelled brickwork and cornice. George Frederick Pelham, 1882 COMMERCIAL/RENAISSANCE REVIVAL.

205 28 101 Mott Factory. Seven-story, three-bay brick with brownstone trim. Eared lintels. Intact cornice ca. 1880s NEO GREC

**Mott Street, west side, from Grand to Hester**

237 19 145 Mott Tenements (front & rear). Pair with 143 Mott. Five-story, four-bay brick tenement with arch windows. Intact cornice. Five-story rear tenement ca. 1870s ITALIANATE

237 20 143 Mott Tenement. Pair with 145 Mott. Five-story, four-bay brick tenement with arch windows. Intact cornice ca. 1870s ITALIANATE

237 21 139 Mott Non-Contributing Building; Stable; 1922 converted to laundry. Three-story, three-bay brick building faced in polished granite. Lacking integrity. J.H. Valentine, 1889 NO STYLE

237 22 137 Mott Tenements (front & rear). Five-story, four-bay brick tenement with cast iron window hoods, intact bracketed cornice. Four-story rear tenement ca. 1870 ITALIANATE

237 23 135 Mott Tenements (front & rear). Five-story, four-bay brick tenement with cast iron window hoods, intact bracketed cornice. Four-story rear tenement ca. 1870 ITALIANATE

237 24 133 Mott Tenements (front & rear). Five-story, four-bay brick tenement with cast iron window hoods, intact bracketed cornice ca. 1870 ITALIANATE


237 27 127 Mott Tenements (front & rear). Five-story, four-bay brick tenement refaced in 1940s. Missing cornice. Four-story rear tenement mid 19C; 1940s ITALIANATE/NO STYLE


**Mott Street, east side, from Hester to Broome**

238 3 122 Mott Machine Shop & Warehouse. Two-story brick industrial building. Also 79 Elizabeth. Levy & Berger, 1942 & later NO STYLE


238 9 134-138 Mott Factory: Mietz Building. Massive, seven-story orange brick factory/loft building with curved facade following the streetline. Cornice intact. Elaborate wrought iron fire escapes. BSS Theodore DeLemos of DeLemos & Cordes, 1897 RENAISSANCE REVIVAL

470 2 154 Mott Non-Contributing Building/Tenement Five-story, four-bay tenement. Lacking integrity.

470 3 156 Mott Non-Contributing Building

470 4 158 Mott Tenement. Six-story “Harvard” brick tenement with terracotta trim and Indiana limestone sills. Similar to 119-121 Elizabeth Charles M. Sutton, 1905 COLONIAL REVIVAL

National Register of Historic Place
Continuation Sheet

Chinatown and Little Italy Historic District
Name of Property
New York County, New York
County and State

Section 7 Page 38

470 6 162 Mott Tenement. Five-story, four-bay brick tenement with brownstone lintels and beltcourse. Intact cornice. ca. 1880 NEO GREC

470 7 164 Mott Tenement. Six-story, four-bay brick tenement with heavy window hoods, stone belt courses. Intact cornice. ca. 1880s NEO GREC

Mott Street, west side, from Broome to Grand


471 46 167 Mott Tenement. Seven-story, four-bay brick with terracotta trim, brick quoins, intact cornice. John P. Cleary, 1901 RENAISSANCE REVIVAL/COLONIAL REVIVAL

471 47 165 Mott Tenement. Five-story, four-bay brick with brownstone lintels and belt course. Rusticated brick and terracotta plaques. Rebuilt parapet. Ernest Greis, 1886 RENAISSANCE REVIVAL


471 49 161 Mott Tenement. Pair with 163 Mott. Five-story, four-bay brick with pedimental window hood. Cornice missing. 1875 ITALIANATE

471 50 159 Mott Non-Contributing Building New Construction 1986

471 51 157 Mott Commercial Building. Two-story, two-bay pale yellow brick commercial building with stepped parapet. ca. 1935 COMMERCIAL

Mott Street, east side, from Broome to Spring

479 1 180-182 Mott Loft/Herman Lumber Co. Six-story two-bay white glazed brick and granite loft building. Jacob H. Amsler or Sommerfeld & Steckler, 1907 COMMERCIAL

479 3 184-186 Mott/52 Kenmare Tenement. Six-story corner tenement of beige brick with terracotta trim and round corner bays, wave frieze detail and intact cornice. Identical to 192-194 Mott, across Broome Street. Developed by Susswein & Herman. Jacob H. Amsler, 1907 COLONIAL REVIVAL/BEAUX ARTS

479 5 192-194 Mott Tenement. Six-story corner tenement of beige brick with terracotta trim and round corner bays, wave frieze detail and intact cornice. Identical to 180-182 Mott, across Broome Street. Jacob H. Amsler or Sommerfeld & Steckler, 1907 COLONIAL REVIVAL/BEAUX ARTS


479 11 200 Mott Tenement. Seven-story, four-bay brick tenement with terracotta trim and corbelled brickwork. Developed by Kidansky & Levy. Horenburger & Straub, 1901 RENAISSANCE REVIVAL/BEAUX ARTS

Mott Street, west side, from Spring to Broome

480 25 201 Mott Townhouse. Two-and-one-half-story brick and frame townhouse with brick laid in Flemish bond. Incised geometric early Greek Revival detail over door. Mid-19C cornice. ca. 1820s; 1886 FEDERAL


480 33 185 Mott Tenement. Also 58 Kenmare. Five-story, one-bay by four-bay brick & terracotta tenement. Cornice missing. May be rebuilt northern elevation of earlier building post-Kenmare street cut. William Graul, 1873; 1884; 1906 RENAISSANCE REVIVAL

480 34 183 Mott Tenement. Five-story, four-bay brick with rustication, plaques and intact cornice. ca. 1890 RENAISSANCE REVIVAL
Mott Street, west side, from Spring to Prince

494 24 **231 Mott** Tenement. One of a pair, with 229 Mott. Five-story, four-bay brick tenement with metal window hoods and sills. Bracketed cornice. mid 19C ITALIANATE

494 25 **229 Mott** Tenements (front & rear). One of a pair, with 231 Mott. Five-story, four-bay brick tenement with metal window hoods and sills. Bracketed cornice. Four-story rear tenement. mid 19C ITALIANATE

494 26 **227 Mott** Tenement. Same as 219 & 223 Mott. Five-story, four-bay brick with limestone or cast stone quoins and trim, plaques, masks, balconettes. Developed by the Gardner estate. Kurtzer & Rohl, 1893 QUEEN ANNE

494 27 **225 Mott** Tenement. Three-story, four-bay brick tenement--possibly shortened. Developed by McNamara. 1869 ITALIANATE/NO STYLE

494 28 **223 Mott** Tenement. Same as 227 & 219 Mott. Five-story, four-bay brick with limestone or cast stone quoins and trim, plaques, masks, balconettes. Developed by the Gardner estate. Kurtzer & Rohl 1893 QUEEN ANNE

494 29 **221 Mott** Tenement Five-story, four-bay brick tenement with metal window hoods and bracketed cornice. 1870s ITALIANATE/NEO GREC

494 30 **219 Mott** Tenement. Same as 223 & 227 Mott. Five-story, four-bay brick with limestone or cast stone quoins and trim, plaques, masks, balconettes. Developed by the Gardner estate. Kurtzer & Rohl 1893 QUEEN ANNE

494 31 **217 Mott** Tenements (front & rear). Five-story, four-bay brick tenement with bracketed cornice and stone lintels. Four-story rear tenement. mid 19C ITALIANATE/NO STYLE


494 34 **211 Mott** Non-Contributing Building. New Construction

Mott Street, east side, from Spring to E. Houston

493 9 **228 Mott** Tenement. Five-story tenement raised to six; four-bays wide. Stone lintels and sills. Smooth brick with narrow joints. Cornice missing. Rear building demo’d. mid 19C or earlier GREEK REVIVAL

493 10 **230 Mott** Tenement. Six-story brick tenement with rusticated buff and contrasting red brickwork, terracotta trim, quoins, intact cornice. Neville & Bagge, 1904 COLONIAL REVIVAL

493 11 **232 Mott** Non-Contributing Building. New Construction

493 12 **234 Mott** Tenement. Six-story buff brick with cast stone or limestone quoins, lintels and jack arches. Missing cornice. Developed by Michael Scangarella. Horenburger & Straub, 1905 COLONIAL REVIVAL

508 1 **246 Mott** Tenement. One of four identical tenements: 246-252 Mott. Six-story, four-bay corbelled brick with terracotta ornament, including masks. Shallow cornice. Developed by Weil & Mayer. Schneider & Herter, 1896 RENAISSANCE REVIVAL

508 1 **248 Mott** Tenement. One of four identical tenements: 246-252 Mott. Six-story, four-bay corbelled brick with terracotta ornament, including masks. Shallow cornice. Developed by Weil & Mayer. Schneider & Herter, 1896 RENAISSANCE REVIVAL

508 1 **250 Mott** Tenement. One of four identical tenements: 246-252 Mott. Six-story, four-bay corbelled brick with terracotta ornament, including masks. Shallow cornice. Developed by Weil & Mayer. Schneider & Herter, 1896 RENAISSANCE REVIVAL

508 1 **252 Mott** Tenement. One of four identical tenements: 246-252 Mott. Six-story, four-bay corbelled brick with terracotta ornament, including masks. Shallow cornice. Developed by Weil & Mayer. Schneider & Herter, 1896 RENAISSANCE REVIVAL
Mott Street, west side, from south of E. Houston to Prince

508 6  256 Mott School: Children’s Aid Society 14th Ward Industrial School Four-story brick and molded brick school building with slate and brownstone trim. Built by the Children’s Aid Society. BSS/Landmark/NR Vaux & Radford, 1888 AESTHETIC MOVEMENT

508 8  260 Mott Non-Contributing Building/Tenement. Five-story, two-bay brick tenement with missing cornice. Lacking integrity, but maintains the fenestration and scale of the streetscape. DeLemos & Cordes, 1886 NO STYLE


508 16  278 Mott Non-Contributing Building/Tenement. Lacking integrity. 1871 NO STYLE

508 17  280 Mott Tenement. Five-story, four-bay brick with bracket cornice. Metal window hoods and sills. 1871 ITALIANATE

Mulberry Street, east side, from Worth to Bayard

164 62  20 Mulberry Town House/Tenement. Four-story, two-bay brick townhouse laid in Flemish bond. Parapet roof. 1830s & Later. NO STYLE

164 63  22 Mulberry Tenements (front & rear). Pair with 24 Mulberry. Five-story, two-bay brick tenements faced in glazed brick ca. 1920s. Three, four-story rear tenements in back yard. mid 19C; 1920s MIXED

164 64  24 Mulberry Tenement. Pair with 22 Mulberry. Five-story, two-bay tenement with stepped parapet, refaced in 1920s in glazed brick. mid 19C; 1920s NO STYLE


164 66  28 Mulberry Tenement; Bank (1890), Store. Six-story, four-bay brick tenement with brownstone trim, elaborate marble pedimented portico and cast iron store front. Antonio Cuneo’s bank (1890). John McIntyre, 1886 RENAISSANCE REVIVAL

164 1  30 Mulberry Tenement. Also 100 Mosco. Six-story tan brick tenement; four bays on Mulberry, ten bays on Mosco. Limestone trim; metal cornice. 1887 RENAISSANCE REVIVAL/COLONIAL REVIVAL

164 2  32 Mulberry Tenement; “Moneta’s”. Five-story, three-bay-wide brick with stone lintels and belt course, corbelled brickwork. Missing cornice. ca. 1890 NEO GREC/RENAISSANCE REVIVAL
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164 3  34-38 Mulberry M. Berardini State Bank/Tenement and Store. Six-story ten-bay-wide triple building of buff brick with terracotta trim, cornice engaged pilaster bank front. ca. 1901 RENAISSANCE REVIVAL/CLASSICAL REVIVAL/COMMERCIAL

164 40 Mulberry Tenement. Six-story, four-bay-wide brick tenement with round arch pedimented window hoods, laurel belt course. Cornice missing. Developed by Pasquale Pantano. M. Bernstein, 1901 RENAISSANCE REVIVAL

164 7 42 Mulberry Tenement. Four-story, three-bay wide brick tenement with stone lintels. Cornice missing. 1885 ITALIANATE

164 44 Mulberry Tenement. Four-story, four-bay Neo Grec tenement with early 6/6 window sashes on 2nd & 3rd floor. 1886 NEO GREC

164 46 Mulberry Tenement. Five-story, four-bay-wide brick tenement with stone belt courses and lintels. Anthemion in cornice pediment. 1886 NEO GREC

164 48 Mulberry Tenement. Built in the bend: Three bays plus seven bays. Brick with brownstone lintels corbelled brick and simple metal cornice. Intact cast iron storefront. 1878 MIXED

164 52 Mulberry Non-Contributing New Construction

164 54-56 Mulberry Tenement. Six-story, seven-bay-wide pale buff brick tenement with terra cotta trim, elaborate wrought iron fire escape. 1907 BEAUX ARTS/RENAISSANCE REVIVAL

164 58 Mulberry Tenement. Three-story, four-bay brick tenement with rebuilt 1920s parapet. mid 19C; 1920s NO STYLE


164 66 Mulberry Tenement. Four buildings, 85-91 Bayard. A five-story, 16-bay-wide brick quadruple tenement with limestone belt courses and lintels. Intact cornice. Elaborate carved door surround on 66 Mulberry entrance. 1874 or 1884 NEO GREC

Mulberry Street, west side, from Canal to Bayard

199 91 Mulberry Tenement. Five-story, four-bay brick with stone lintels. Intact cornice. mid 19C ITALIANATE

199 89 Mulberry Tenements (front & rear). Five-story, four-bay brick with projecting stone lintels. Cornice missing. mid 19C ITALIANATE/NO STYLE

199 87 Mulberry Tenements (front & rear). Five-story, four-bay brick with deep window hoods and elaborate cornice. Six-story rear tenement. ca. 1880 ITALIANATE/NEO GREC

199 85 Mulberry Tenement. Five-story Philadelphia brick laid in Flemish bond, stuccoes. Window hoods removed; cornice intact. Compare to 68-74 Mott Street. William E. Waring, 1874 ITALIANATE

199 83 Mulberry Tenement Pair with 81 Mulberry. Five-story, four-bay brick--refaced in 1920s or 30s?. Cornice missing. 1871-73; mid 20C ITALIANATE/NO STYLE

199 81 Mulberry Tenement Pair with 83 Mulberry. Five-story, four-bay brick--refaced in 1920s or 30s?. Cornice missing. 1871-73; mid 20C ITALIANATE/NO STYLE

199 79 Mulberry Tenements (front & rear). Five-story, four-bay brick with flat stone lintels. Three-story rear tenement. mid 19C ITALIANATE/NO STYLE

199 77 Mulberry Tenement. Six-story, four-bay buff brick, terracotta and stone tenement. Developed by Gerardo Marino. Louis Heinecke, 1901 QUEEN ANNE/RENAISSANCE REVIVAL

199 75 Mulberry Non-Contributing Building


199 71 Mulberry Non-Contributing Building. Lacking integrity.

Mulberry Street, east side, from Bayard to Canal
**Mulberry Street, east side from Canal to Hester**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Name of Property</th>
<th>County and State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>200 1</td>
<td>42</td>
<td><strong>70 Mulberry</strong> Public School 23. Five-story fortress-like brick school on battered, rusticated brownstone ashlar base.</td>
<td>New York County, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 5</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>76 Mulberry</strong> Tenement. Five-story, four-bay brick. Cornice missing. Mid 19C NO STYLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 6</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>78-80 Mulberry</strong> Tenement Six-story, seven-bay brick and terracotta tenement. Developed by Gordon, Levy &amp; Co. Alfred Badt, 1904 RENAISSANCE REVIVAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 8</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>82 Mulberry</strong> Tenements (front &amp; rear). Five-story, four-bay brick with metal window hoods. Cornice missing. Ca. 1870s ITALIANATE</td>
<td>Chinatown and Little Italy Historic District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 9</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>84 Mulberry</strong> Townhouse/Tenement. Three-story, three-bay brick townhouse faced in glazed brick. E19C; E20C NO STYLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 10</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>86 Mulberry</strong> Tenements (front &amp; rear). Five-story, four-bay brick tenement retrofitted with bake oven in 1891. Mid 19C ITALIANATE/NO STYLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 11</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>88 Mulberry</strong> Tenements (front &amp; rear). Five-story, four-bay brick tenement. Missing cornice. Three-story rear tenement. Mid 19C ITALIANATE/NO STYLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mulberry Street, west side, from Hester to Canal**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Name of Property</th>
<th>County and State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>205 2</td>
<td>42</td>
<td><strong>102-104 Mulberry</strong> Lofts &amp; Stores. Also 201 Canal. Three-story white brick commercial building. Ca. 1920s COMMERCIAL</td>
<td>New York County, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205 6</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>110 Mulberry</strong> Non-Contributing Building/Tenement Five-story, four-bay stuccoed brick. Lacking integrity. William Graul, 1872-1873</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205 7</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>112 Mulberry</strong> Non-Contributing Building/Tenement Five-story, four-bay stuccoed brick. Lacking integrity. William Graul, 1872-1873</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205 10</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>118 Mulberry</strong> Factory. Five-story, two-bay brick factory building with stone lintels. Intact wood cornice. Five-story tenement built 1870. Mid 19C; 1870 ITALIANATE/NO STYLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205 11</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>120 Mulberry</strong> Tenement. Five-story, four-bay brick with stone lintels. Bakeoven added 1911. Mid 19C ITALIANATE/NO STYLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205 12</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>122 Mulberry</strong> Townhouse. Three-story, three-bay brick townhouse laid in Flemish bond. Incised stone lintels. Original peaked roof flattened in 1885 when owned by Augustus Sbarbaro. Ca. 1820 FEDERAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205 13</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>124 Mulberry</strong> Townhouse. Three-story, three-bay brick townhouse laid in Flemish bond. Incised stone lintels. Ca. 1820 FEDERAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205 14</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>126 Mulberry</strong> Tenement. Five-story, three-bay brick with stone belt courses. Cornice missing. Andrew Spence, 1885 RENAISSANCE REVIVAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mulberry Street, west side, from Hester to Canal**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Name of Property</th>
<th>County and State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>205 19</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>121 Mulberry</strong> Tenements (front &amp; rear). Five-story, four-bay brick with stone lintels. Elaborate tripartite cornice with “Anna Esposito 1926”. Four-story rear tenement. Mid 19C and later MIXED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205 20</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>119 Mulberry</strong> Tenements (front &amp; rear). Four story, three-bay with projecting stone lintels, metal cornice. Similar to 123-125 Mulberry. Three-story rear tenement. Mid 19C ITALIANATE/NO STYLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205 21</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>117 Mulberry</strong> Tenement. Seven-story, four-bay white brick tenement with terracotta trim. Horenburger &amp; Straub, 1900 RENAISSANCE REVIVAL/BEAUX ARTS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205 22</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>115 Mulberry</strong> Tenements (front &amp; rear). Four-story, two-bay brick tenement with rebuilt facade with parapet. Five-story rear tenement. P. Moran (ALT 1873) Mid 19C; 1920s NO STYLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205 23</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>113 Mulberry</strong> Tenements (front &amp; rear). Five-story, four-bay brick with stone lintels; corbelled cornice. Four-story rear tenement. Mid 19C ITALIANATE/NO STYLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
109-111 Mulberry Street, west side, from Kenmare to Grand

San Gennaro Shrine/ Most Precious Blood Rectory. Three-story free-standing brick building set into parking lot/memorial garden. Vincent S. Todaro, 1945 NO STYLE

Mulberry Street, west side, from Grand to Hester

151 Mulberry Street. Two-story brick restaurant, ca. 1950s COMMERCIAL
145-147 Mulberry Street. Pianoforte. Six-story, five-bay factory with corbelled arch windows and corbelled cornice. William Meader, 1873 ITALIANATE/COMMERCIAL
143 Mulberry Street. Non-Contributing Building
141 Mulberry Street. Tenement. Five-story, four-bay corbelled brickwork and brownstone lintels. Intact cornice. Similar to 139 Mulberry. Charles Rentz, 1887 RENAISSANCE REVIVAL
139 Mulberry Street. Tenement. Five-story, four-bay corbelled brickwork and brownstone lintels. Intact cornice. Similar to 141 Mulberry. Charles Rentz, 1887 RENAISSANCE REVIVAL
133-137 Mulberry Street. Factory. Six-story, nine-bay brick factory with stone lintels, corbelled brickwork, tripartite facade framed with rusticated pilasters. 135-37 Mulberry was site of Public School No. 1 for Colored Children (Perris 1853). Julius Kastner, 1887 RENAISSANCE REVIVAL
131 Mulberry Street. Tenement. Five-story, six-bay brick tenement with stone lintels. Cornice missing. mid 19C ITALIANATE

Mulberry Street, east side from Hester to Grand

140 Mulberry Street. Tenements (front & rear). Five-story, four-bay brick tenement with intact cornice. Four-story rear tenement. mid 19C ITALIANATE/NO STYLE

Mulberry Street, west side, from Kenmare to Grand

201-205 Mulberry Street. Police Station & Jail: 10th Precinct. Six-story (reads as 4 1/2 from the street) brick police station and jail with Mansard roof. N.D. Bush 1870-1872 SECOND EMPIRE
185 Mulberry Street. Tenement, Store, Bakery. Massive glazed brick six-story building with projecting metal bays, terracotta ornament, including masks and plaques; metal cornice. Developed by Rocco Marasco & Dominick Abbate. Sass & Smallheiser, 1901 BEAUX ARTS
175 Mulberry Street. Non-Contributing Building
173 Mulberry Street. Tenement Five-story, four-bay brick tenement with arched window hoods, projecting sills. Cornice missing. Retrofit. ca. 1905 with bathroom windows. William Jose, 1872 ITALIANATE
171 Mulberry Street. Non-Contributing Building; Tenement. Six-story, four-bay brick tenement--upper 2 stories rebuilt. Lacking integrity. ca. 1870s ITALIANATE
169 Mulberry Street. Tenement. Six-story asymmetrical three-bay tenement with single offset projecting bay. Jack arches. ca. 1906 COLONIAL REVIVAL/OTHER
167 Mulberry Street. Tenements (front & rear). Five-story, four-bay brick with quoins and flat lintels. Bracket cornice. Five-story rear tenement. ca. 1870s ITALIANATE
Mulberry, east side, from Spring to Prince

494 1 224-228 Mulberry Garage. Three-story glazed white brick with contrasting green brick trim in a geometric pattern. Murray Klein, 1925 COMMERCIAL/NO STYLE

494 4 230 Mulberry Tenement. Pair with 232. Five-story, four-bay pale buff brick tenement with elaborate terracotta masks, niches, shell motifs and plaques. 1889 QUEEN ANNE

494 5 232 Mulberry Tenement. Pair with 230. Five-story, four-bay pale buff brick tenement with elaborate terracotta masks, niches, shell motifs and plaques. 1889 QUEEN ANNE

494 6 234 Mulberry Tenement. Five-story, four-bay brick with inset central bays, bracketed cornice elaborate cast iron fire escape and wooden storefront. Stone belt courses and corbelled brick work. 1885 NEO GREC

494 7 236 Mulberry Tenement. Five-story, four-bay brick with inset central bays, bracketed cornice elaborate cast iron fire escape. Stone belt courses and corbelled brick work. 1885 RENAISSANCE REVIVAL

494 8 238 Mulberry Non-Contributing Building. New Construction

494 9 240 Mulberry Tenement. Five-story, four-bay smooth brick with pedimental metal window hoods and heavy bracketed cornice. 1874 ITALIANATE

494 10 242 Mulberry Tenement. Six-story, four-bay brick with rusticated brownstone jack arches, rusticated ashlar first floor facade. Corbelled cornice and simple metal architrave. James E. Ware, 1885 ROMANESQUE REVIVAL/RENAISSANCE REVIVAL

494 15 244-246 Mulberry Commercial Building. One-story brick garage/commercial building. 1949. NO STYLE

494 12 248 Mulberry Tenement. Five-story, three-bay brick tenement with corbelled brick work and metal cornice. Developed by John McKeon J.B. Snook, 1885 ITALIANATE
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**Mulberry Street, east side, from Prince to E. Houston**

509 1  **256-276 Mulberry** St. Patrick’s Old Cathedral  
BSS/Landmark/NR  
Joseph Mangin, et. al 1809  
GEORGIAN/GOTHIC REVIVAL  

509 1  **268 Mulberry** St. Patrick’s Youth Center  
One-story red brick & cast stone gymnasium building.  
Anthony De Pace, 1951; 1954 COLONIAL REVIVAL/INSTITUTIONAL  

509 1  **266 Mulberry** St. Michael’s Chapel.  
Three-story tripartite corbelled red brick & limestone chancery/chapel.  
BSS/Landmark/NR  
Renwick & Rodrique 1859 GOTHIC REVIVAL  

509 13  **278 Mulberry** Tenement. Four-story, three-bay buff brick tenement on raised basement.  
Simple parapet with small cast stone heart stamped “1927”.  
1927 NO STYLE  

509 14  **280-282 Mulberry** Tenement. Six-story, asymmetrical buff brick tenement.  
Rusticated brickwork. Intact cornice.  
Developed by Michael Briganti.  
Charles M. Straub, 1907 COLONIAL REVIVAL  

509 15  **276 Mulberry** Tenement. Four-story, three-bay buff brick tenement.  
ca. 1827 FEDERAL/GREEK REVIVAL  

509 18  **288 Mulberry** Townhouse/Tenement. Three-story, three-bay Flemish bond brick with stone lintels.  
Corbelled cornice.  
ca. 1820 & later FEDERAL/MIXED  

---

**Mulberry, west side, from Jersey Street to Spring Street**

510 21  **263-265 Mulberry** Townhouse/Old St. Patrick’s Rectory.  
Three-story & half-story, five-bay brick townhouse with brownstone lintels.  
Mansard roof. Elaborate door surround.  
ca. 1828 & later GREEK REVIVAL.  
NR/Landmark  

510 23  **261 Mulberry** Townhouse. Three-story, three-bay Flemish bond brick townhouse.  
ca. 1827 FEDERAL/GREEK REVIVAL  

495 22  **249-255 Mulberry** Non-Contributing Building (1986)  

495 26  **247 Mulberry** Tenement. Five-story, four-bay brick tenement with terracotta ornament, brownstone trim and intact cornice.  
Pair with 245 Mulberry.  
Developed by Joseph Schwartzler.  
Thom & Wilson, 1886  
RENAISSANCE REVIVAL/NEO GREC  

495 28  **245 Mulberry** Tenement. Five-story, four-bay brick tenement with terracotta ornament, brownstone trim and intact cornice.  
Pair with 247 Mulberry.  
Developed by Joseph Schwartzler.  
Thom & Wilson, 1886  
RENAISSANCE REVIVAL/NEO GREC  

495 29  **243 Mulberry** Tenements (front & rear). Five-story, four-bay brick tenement with brownstone trim and intact bracketed cornice.  
Five-story rear tenement.  
ca. 1870s ITALIANATE  

495 30  **241 Mulberry** Tenement. Six-story, four-bay corbelled brick tenement with quoins.  
Cornice missing.  
John Brandt, 1884 RENAISSANCE REVIVAL  

495 31  **239 Mulberry** Tenements (front & rear). Six-story, four-bay brick with limestone lintels.  
Cornice missing. Five-story rear tenement.  
Joseph M. Dunn, ca. 1870s ITALIANATE/NO STYLE  

495 32  **235 Mulberry** Tenement. Five-story, four-bay with repaired brick work.  
Missing cornice.  
mid 19C NO STYLE  

495 33  **229-233 Mulberry** Non-Contributing Building  

495 37  **223 Mulberry** Garage. Two-story textured brick garage.  
1940s NO STYLE  

495 38  **219-221 Mulberry** Tenement. Six-story, six-bay brick and elaborate terracotta trim.  
George B. Pelham, 1903 COLONIAL REVIVAL/RENAISSANCE REVIVAL  

495 40  **217 Mulberry** Tenement. Six-story, three-bay pale tan brick tenement with limestone pedimental lintels.  
Kurtzer & Rohl, 1897 CLASSICAL REVIVAL/NEO GREC  

495 41  **215 Mulberry** Tenement. Five-story, three-bay brick with stone lintels.  
Bracket cornice.  
ca. 1860s ITALIANATE  

495 42  **213 Mulberry/51 Spring** Tenement. Six-story corner tenement.  
Red corbelled brickwork with limestone window hoods. Shallow cornice.  
Stepped parapet on Mulberry Street elevation.  
1886; 1920s NEO GREC  

---

**Pell Street, south side, from Mott to west of Bowery**
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162 23  23 Pell  Tenements; Lau Gar Society, 1920. Five-story, three-bay orange brick tenement with ornamental brickwork and parapet. Charles Reid (ALT) mid-19C; 1920s NO STYLE

162 24  21 Pell  Church: First Chinese Baptist Church; New York City Baptist Mission Society (1935)/Chinese Seaman’s Club (1940s) Five-story, three bay brick church with cast stone “pagoda” as first floor entrance. 1935 MIXED/CHINESE

162 25  19 Pell  Commercial/Tenement. Five-story, three bays on Pell/six bays on Doyers. Brick with brownstone beltcourses and corbelled cornice. Max Muller, 1878 ITALIANATE/RENAISSANCE REVIVAL

162 50  15 Pell  Tenement; Hip Sing Association (1962). Five-story, four-bay brick building. Cornice missing. 1880s ITALIANATE/NO STYLE

162 51  11 Pell  Loft. Five-story, four-bay brick loft building with arch windows and metal cornice. Arthur Morgan, 1885 INDUSTRIAL

162 52  9 Pell  Tenements (front & rear). Four-story, four-bay brick building with flat lintels. Corbelled cornice in place of missing cornice. Four-story rear tenement. E/Mid19C MIXED

Pell Street, north side, from west of Bowery to Mott

163 38  8 Pell  Townhouse/Lodging House. Four-story, three-bay brick townhouse with later bracketed cornice. ca. 1830s MIXED

163 1  10 Pell  Chinese Association/Factory/Wheelright shop. Five-story, four-bay brick building. Metal cornice and window hoods. Fifth-floor Chinese-style balcony. 1860s; 1940s ITALIANATE/CHINESE

163 2  12-14 Pell  Tenement Five-story, seven-bay brick building with marble or limestone sills and lintels. Modillion cornice. 1887 ITALIANATE

163 4  16 Pell  Tenement; Pell Street Social Club Association. Four-story, three-bay tenement with elaborate metal balconies in the Chinese style. Inset porch at fourth floor. mid 19C; 1920s MIXED/CHINESE

163 5  18 Pell  Factory: Chair factory Five-story, three-bay brick building with projecting window hoods and metal cornice. 1882 ITALIANATE

163 6  20-22 Pell  Factory: Woodworking Factory Six-story, eight-bay brick factory building. Corbelled pediment and cornice, arched cast iron window hoods and sills. ca. 1870 ITALIANATE

163 8  24 Pell  Townhouse/Tenement Three-story, three-bay brick building with Neo Grec and other details. 1890s NEO GREC/MIXED

163 9  26-28 Pell  Tenement. With 30-32, a pair of four-story, seven-bay grey brick tenement with overhanging cornice and stepped parapet with towers. Mathew Del Gaudio, 1912 ECLECTIC

163 11  30-32 Pell  Tenement. With 26-28, a pair of four-story, seven-bay grey brick tenement with overhanging cornice and stepped parapet with towers. Mathew Del Gaudio, 1912 ECLECTIC

163 13  34 Pell  Restaurant. Three-story brick building faced in a ca. 1950 pierced “bronze” screen, with Chinese cloud pattern motif. J.B. Snook, 1886; 1950s MIXED/CHINESE

Prince Street, north side, from east of Elizabeth to Lafayette


### Prince Street, south side, from Mulberry to east of Elizabeth

**46 Prince**  
Tenement. Six-story ten brick tenement with Corinthian pilasters, terracotta trim and corbelled brickwork. Cornice missing. Similar to 30 Prince. Kurtzer & Rohl, 1899 CLASSICAL REVIVAL/RENAISSANCE REVIVAL  

**40-44 Prince**  
Tenement; Glass Factory/Paper Box Factory. Two buildings melded into one. Three-bay, four-story brick tenement plus three-story, eight-bay building, both with three-story roof addition. Window hoods, cornice. See also one-story commercial building at 244-246 Mulberry (1949) 1874 ITALIANATE

**38 Prince**  
St. Patrick’s Church School/Asylum & Convent, Sisters of Charity Three-and-a-half-story Flemish-bond brick on schist and granite base. BSS/Landmark/NR James E. Ware (ALT 1886). FEDERAL and later

**30 Prince**  

**28 Prince**  
Garage. One story brick garage, modernized to house art gallery. William J. Russell, 1951 NO STYLE

**26 Prince**  
Tenement. Five-story, four-bay brick tenement with arched and pedimented window hoods and arch pediment cornice. William Graul, 1871 ITALIANATE

**24 Prince**  
Tenement. Five-story, three-bay brick tenement with pedimental window hoods and elaborate metal cornice. 1876 ITALIANATE/NEO GREC

**20-22 Prince**  

**16 Prince/211-215 Elizabeth**  
Non-Contributing Building. New Construction

**8-14 Prince**  
Tenement. Five-story, fifteen-bay brick tenement—several ca. 1870s buildings cobbled together. Quoins, stone or metal projecting window hoods and sills William E. Waring and others, ca. 1874 ITALIANATE/MIXED

---
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### Chinatown and Little Italy Historic District

#### Section 7 Page 48
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*Spring Street, south side, from east of Elizabeth to Lafayette*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>478 21 6 Spring</td>
<td>Tenement. One of a pair (with 8 Spring) of five-story, four-bay brownstone tenements with bracket cornices. One of only three extant examples of the brownstone facade in the neighborhood. ca. 1875 ITALIANATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>478 20 8 Spring</td>
<td>Tenement. One of a pair (with 6 Spring) of five-story, four-bay brownstone tenements with bracket cornices. One of only three extant examples of the brownstone facade in the neighborhood. ca. 1875 ITALIANATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>478 19 10 Spring</td>
<td>Townhouse/Tenement. Four-story, three-bay brick townhouse laid in a Flemish bond on a brownstone base; projecting brownstone lintels. Cornice. ca. 1820s FEDERAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>478 18 12 Spring</td>
<td>Townhouse/Tenement. Four-and-a-half story, three-bay brick townhouse laid in Flemish bond; upper 2 stories, including Mansard roof, added in 1870. E19C/1870 FEDERAL/SECOND EMPIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>479 21 14 Spring</td>
<td>Tenement. Five-story, three-bay brick tenement with stone lintels and corbelled cornice. mid 19C ITALIANATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>479 17 22 Spring</td>
<td>Tenement. Five-story, four-bay brick tenement with incised arched window hoods. ca. 1877 NEO GREC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>479 16 24 Spring</td>
<td>Non-Contributing Building. New Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>480 24 30 Spring/203 Mott</td>
<td>Tenement. Five-story, four-bay brick with corbelled brickwork, stone trim. 1874 ITALIANATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>480 23 32 Spring</td>
<td>Tenement. Five-story, four-bay brick tenement with brownstone lintels. Cornice missing. mid 19C ITALIANATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>481 22 48 Spring</td>
<td>Tenement. Five-story, four-bay brick tenement with arch stone lintels window hoods and quoins. Intact cornice. ca. 1870 ITALIANATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>481 21 50 Spring</td>
<td>Townhouse/Tenement. Four-story, three asymmetrical bays. Entrance on parlor floor. Raised to 4 stories from 2-1/2 or 3. E/mid 19C and later MIXED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>481 20 52 Spring</td>
<td>Tenements (front &amp; rear). Five-story, three-bay brick and limestone tenement with intact cornice. Five-story rear tenement. Babcock &amp; McAvoy (1882); John Morrow (owner 1874) 1874; 1882 NEO GREC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>481 19 54 Spring</td>
<td>Non-Contributing Building New Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>481 18 56 Spring</td>
<td>Non-Contributing Building New Construction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Spring Street, north side, from Elizabeth to Lafayette**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>492 41 5 Spring</td>
<td>Tenement. Five-story, four-bay brick and brownstone tenement with elaborate arch pediment in cornice box window hoods, anthemion design in cornice. William Jose, 1873 ITALIANATE/NEO GREC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>492 42 7 Spring</td>
<td>Tenement. Five-story, four-bay brick tenement with arched cast iron window hood, sills; intact cornice. 1866 ITALIANATE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>492 43</td>
<td><strong>9 Spring Tenement.</strong> Seven-story, four-bay white brick and terracotta trim, including masks. Rusticated brickwork. Round arch and pedimental window hoods. George Frederick Pelham, 1901 <strong>ECLECTIC</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>492 44</td>
<td><strong>11 Spring Stable.</strong> Five-story pink brick with limestone quoins, base and trim. <strong>BSS</strong> J.B. Snook, 1895 <strong>ROMANESQUE/RENAISSANCE REVIVAL</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>493 41</td>
<td><strong>13 Spring Non-Contributing Building/LIRA New Construction</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>494 35</td>
<td><strong>29 Spring Tenement.</strong> Five-story grey brick and cast stone tenement with balconettes. One bay by seven bays. 1923 <strong>NO STYLE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>494 36</td>
<td><strong>31 Spring Townhouse.</strong> Three-story, three-bay early townhouse. Stuccoed and cornice removed. Lacking integrity. <strong>E19C FEDERAL/NO INTEGRITY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>494 37</td>
<td><strong>33 Spring Townhouse.</strong> Three-story, three-bay brick townhouse refaced in brick face stucco. E19C; 1930s <strong>FEDERAL/MIXED</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>494 38</td>
<td><strong>35 Spring Non-Contributing. Building New Construction</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>494 39</td>
<td><strong>37 Spring Tenement.</strong> Five-story, four-bay stuccoed brick tenement with bracketed cornice Julius Boekell, 1872 <strong>ITALIANATE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>494 40</td>
<td><strong>39 Spring Non-Contributing Building: Moving Picture &amp; Factory.</strong> Three-story, four-bay brick and stone movie house and factory with later alterations. Heavily altered. Lacking integrity. Sommerfeld &amp; Steckler, 1910 <strong>NO STYLE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>494 41</td>
<td><strong>41 Spring Tenement.</strong> Five-story, four-bay tenement with bracket cornice, stone lintels. ca. 1870s <strong>ITALIANATE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>494 43</td>
<td><strong>43 Spring Tenement.</strong> Five-story, four-bay brick with stone belt course, pedimental window hoods, intact cornice. ca. 1880s <strong>NEO GREC</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>494 44</td>
<td><strong>45 Spring Tenement.</strong> Six-story, four-bay by ten-bay buff brick with terracotta window surrounds and plaques. Intact bracket cornice. Wooden store fronts on Mulberry. Kurtzer &amp; Rohl, 1898 <strong>BEAUX ARTS/RENAISSANCE REVIVAL</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>495 43</td>
<td><strong>53 Spring Townhouse/Tenement; Original Lombardi Restaurant.</strong> Four-story (raised from 2.5 or 3), three-bay Flemish bond brick with simple cornice. Building at an unusual angle to the street. ca. 1820 <strong>FEDERAL &amp; later</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>495 44</td>
<td><strong>55 Spring Tenement.</strong> Five-story, four-bay brick with arched window hoods, projecting sills. Cornice missing. Pair with 57 Spring Street. 1871 <strong>ITALIANATE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>495 45</td>
<td><strong>57 Spring Tenement.</strong> Five-story, four-bay brick with arched window hoods, projecting sills. Intact bracketed cornice. Pair with 55 Spring Street. 1871 <strong>ITALIANATE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>495 46</td>
<td><strong>59 Spring Commercial Building.</strong> One-story with pedimental parapet. Developed by Nicholas Agnelilli. Ferdinand Savignano, 1925 <strong>COMMERCIAL</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Worth Street**

164 53 | **199 Worth Tenement Four-story, four-bay brick tenement with terra cotta trim. No cornice. See Also 5 Mott. COLONIAL REVIVAL** |
164 58 | **197 Worth Tenement Four story, six-bay brick tenement laid in a five course bond. Stepped parapet, cornice replaced. 1940s storefront. mid-19C MIXED** |
164 61 | **191 Worth True Light Lutheran Church & School Brick with cast stone trim. Modern Gothic with Chinese elements. 1948 MIXED/CHINESE**

**PARKS**

165 1 | **Columbus Park** is bounded by Baxter, Worth, Bayard, and Mulberry Streets. Originally known as Mulberry Bend Park. Designed by Calvert Vaux in the 1880s. Designed by Calvert Vaux in the 1880s; the park was completed in 1897. It was rededicated as Columbus Park in 1911. It was the site of early industry and later a
dense residential slum. High potential for archaeological remains. Includes a contributing Pavilion at the north end of park. Southern end of park has been rehabilitated for playing fields.

Section 8 – Statement of Significance

SUMMARY
The Chinatown and Little Italy Historic District is nationally significant under Criterion A in the areas of Chinese-American and Italian-American ethnic heritage and social history, particularly in association with the history of immigration in America. Immigration, and the resulting diversity of cultural influences, has been – and remains – one of the central themes of American history and a key factor in defining an American identity. The district is the setting in which the immigrant experience has occurred and continues to occur to the present day. The district’s period of significance, c. 1800 to 1965, incorporates the historical and architectural evolution of the neighborhood and its development into a vibrant immigrant community. The historical significance of the district is enhanced by the high potential for intact late eighteenth-, nineteenth-, and early twentieth century archaeological deposits in the rear yards of the district’s old town houses and tenements, and in and around the vicinity of Columbus Park, the former location of early industry and the infamous Mulberry Bend slum. The district meets Criterion D for its potential to yield important information about housing, commerce, industry, health and sanitation, ethnicity, wealth, religion, and recreation of the inhabitants of the area during the period of significance. It is also nationally significant under Criterion C for architecture, particularly for its numerous tenements which reflect the evolution of housing reform laws of the late nineteenth- and early twentieth centuries. The tenement is a distinct housing type associated with a way of life that is significant in American urban history. The tenements of Chinatown and Little Italy, like those elsewhere in the Lower East Side, housed immigrants to New York during the greatest wave of immigration in American history (1880 to 1921). The tenement buildings also reflect the importance of commerce to this densely populated area, since most have shops or restaurants at the ground floor. In addition, the Italian and Chinese identity of the district is also evident in some of the alterations made to existing buildings that housed churches, clubs, and other organizations and businesses central to these communities.

The Chinatown and Little Italy neighborhoods in Manhattan were forged in same dynamic period of American history, the mid nineteenth through early twentieth century; a time when waves of immigrants from all corners of the world came to New York seeking opportunity. New York City and, in particular, the neighborhoods of Chinatown and Little Italy, and the Lower East Side, are significant within the history of immigration because the scale of the phenomenon as it occurred there, far outweighed that in any other city in the United States. Immigration to the United States, the most substantial part of a great national migration of peoples to the Western Hemisphere, was (and continues to be) an extraordinary phenomenon in human history. During the peak period, between 1880 and 1921, over 23,500,000 people took advantage of America’s lenient immigration policies to seek new opportunity in this country. To help put this figure in perspective, the population in the United States in 1880 was about 50,000,000. There is no precedent in modern history for such an immense voluntary movement of people, or for a nation voluntarily opening its gates to a mass of impoverished immigrants of varied origins . . . .

The popular perception of New York City as a city of immigrants and the city in which immigrant culture reached its fullest development has a solid statistical base. Of the 23,500,000 immigrants
who arrived in America during the peak period, some 17,000,000 entered through the port of New York. Immigration to New York City was of an order of magnitude some five times greater than that to Philadelphia or Chicago and eight or nine times that of Boston . . . (Lowenthal, Dolkart, and Baumwoll 1993: 9).

While immigration was a widespread phenomenon, Chinatown and Little Italy, along with the Lower East Side, absorbed large numbers of immigrants. The historic district’s converted row houses and tenements housed waves of immigrants that varied from year to year and by ethnic composition. Ultimately, the neighborhood became best-known for the Italian-Americans and Chinese-Americans who settled here. These areas are, in fact, one of New York City’s few neighborhoods whose names reflect the historical ethnic make-up.

The Chinese and Italian immigrants who made this neighborhood their home shared many parallel experiences including fleeing civil unrest and dwindling opportunities in their homelands, settling among fellow countrymen for linguistic and socio-cultural reasons, and seeking new economic opportunities. By the 1870s, Chinese and Italians began settling along Mott and Mulberry Streets and the intersecting cross streets, bringing their respective cultures to New York. The contributions of Chinese and Italian immigrants constitute a large part New York’s cultural history, which remain relevant and resonant today. The historic boundaries within which the Italians and Chinese first settled are still clearly identifiable and cohesive as a historic district, with consistent architectural stock delimited by definitive boundaries. This single district encompassing the historic core of Little Italy and Chinatown acknowledges the long and ongoing relationship and common history of these two immigrant populations.

The Chinese and Italian communities have co-existed and overlapped—and occasionally conflicted, for nearly a century and a half within the historic boundaries of the neighborhood, over 38 city blocks in the area roughly bounded by East Houston, Elizabeth, Worth, Baxter, Centre, Cleveland Place, and Lafayette Streets in Manhattan, including Columbus Park. The Chinese and Italian immigrants of the neighborhood were preceded, of course, by other groups. As such, the historic district represents shifting demographics where immigration occurred in waves, varying not only from year to year, but by ethnic composition. The first major wave of immigration to the area was primarily associated with the Irish, Russian and Polish Jews, and Germans, who replaced the earlier Dutch, English, and African Americans.

The Chinatown and Little Italy Historic District is characterized by uninterrupted rows of mid- through late-nineteenth-century Pre Law and Old Law tenements [Mott, Mulberry and Elizabeth Streets]; numerous examples of post-1901 New Law tenements [Kenmare Street]; intact rows of Federal-era townhouses [Grand Street], nineteenth and early-twentieth-century commercial and industrial architecture [Elizabeth, Baxter, Canal, Grand]; an eclectic array of school buildings [14th Ward Industrial School, PS 23, DeSoto School, Italian School]; landmark examples of religious architecture [Transfiguration, St. Patrick's Old Cathedral]; and one of the most historically significant public parks in New York City, Columbus Park (designed by Calvert Vaux), which, when opened in 1897, replaced the most notorious slums of Mulberry Bend.

The evolution of the neighborhood from an industrial zone to an unrestricted mixed residential, commercial and industrial district began in earnest in the early decades of the nineteenth century, and its transformation into vibrant immigrant community during the mid-nineteenth century is clearly linked with the similar transformation of the Lower East Side. Once considered the most reprehensible slums, Chinatown and Little Italy today are two of the most popular tourist attractions and among the most valuable real estate markets in
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Manhattan. Over two centuries of development and redevelopment have resulted in a dense, cohesive neighborhood containing important examples of domestic, religious, commercial, industrial, civic, recreational and educational architecture. The historical themes for Little Italy and Chinatown extend beyond the traditional nineteenth-century immigration narrative to encompass architecture, ethnic heritage, social history and tourism.

The period of significance, c. 1800 to 1965, encompasses the historical and architectural evolution of the neighborhood from an industrial zone to a mixed residential, commercial and industrial district with a vibrant and diverse immigrant community best known for its association with Chinese and Italian settlement. While the contributions of the Italian and Chinese residents whose cultures defined the neighborhood constitute the central argument for the historic significance of the district, well over a century of settlement and development took place before the first concentrated populations of Chinese and Italians settled here. The date of c. 1800 represents the oldest surviving property in the district – the Church of the Transfiguration. Originally built as the English Lutheran Church, it later became a Catholic church serving the Irish in the mid-nineteenth century, Italians around the turn of the century, and Chinese since the mid-twentieth century. The church’s transformation through the years mirrors the demographic shifts occurring in the neighborhood. The period of significance includes the dates or eras of various waves of immigration and related immigration laws, and the tenement reform laws which had an impact upon the development of the district. The district continued to evolve in the years following World War II up to the 1960s when the Italian population began to contract as many moved to the suburbs. The concept of Little Italy as an iconic touchstone of Italian-American identity came to the fore in this era as more tourists came to enjoy the food and ambience. Chinatown continued to thrive during this period serving the needs of the local Chinese population and the tourist trade. The passage of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965 is an exceptionally significant event to the history of Chinatown and the United States. It was through this Act that the closed door policy of the Immigration Act of 1924 was abolished, allowing Chinese and others to immigrate to the U.S. As a result, between 1965 and 1970 immigration numbers doubled in the U.S. The geographic extent of Chinatown was dramatically altered after 1965 as it moved well beyond the boundaries of its historic core.

NARRATIVE HISTORY

The vicinity of Five Points (near today’s Columbus Park) and the Collect Pond (the location of the City’s courts complex) was an inhospitable slum and industrial district inhabited by Africans and immigrant Irish into the mid-nineteenth century. These early settlers were soon joined by immigrant Polish and Russian Jews and Germans, and all were joined and then replaced by the Chinese and Italian immigrants who began arriving in large numbers during the 1870s. While the contributions of the Italian and Chinese residents whose cultures now define the neighborhood constitute the central argument for the historic significance of the district, well over a century of settlement and development took place before the first concentrated populations of Chinese and Italians settled the neighborhood. This early history set the stage for the arrival of the Chinese and Italians.

EARLY NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT

Collect Pond
The Collect Pond, the largest surface source of fresh water in colonial New Amsterdam and New York, was located well beyond the city limits until the late eighteenth century. Beginning in the mid-eighteenth century, the vicinity of the Collect Pond was an active industrial district, and the location of some of the City's most noxious and dangerous businesses. Slaughterhouses, tanneries and a rope walk lined the east bank of the Collect Pond, near what is today Baxter Street and Columbus Park. All of these businesses relied on Collect water for cleaning and discharging waste.

The Collect served incompatibly as a source of drinking water and an open sewer until the turn of the nineteenth century. In March 1803, the Common Council proposed filling the Collect, and ordered that the spoil from the leveling of hills and grading of streets be dumped into the pond, offering 5 cents a cartload (NY Common Council 1803, Vol. 3: 219, 253, 341). In the spring of 1804, high spots on Mott and Elizabeth Streets were leveled and the spoil was dumped into the Collect (NY Common Council 1804, Vol 3: 533).

**Bayard Farm**

Bayard Street, running three short blocks from the Collect Pond to the High Road to Boston (the Bowery), formed part of the southern boundary of the extensive eighteenth-century farm of Nicholas Bayard, nephew of New Amsterdam's mayor, Peter Stuyvesant.

Other than Bayard Street, which preserves the name and approximate southern boundary of the Bayard farm, the only other physical remnant of the Bayard estate is the location of Broome Street, which started out as "Bayard's Lane", extending from the Bowery to the Bayard estate just east of present-day Broadway. The lane was flanked by a formal allee of trees lining the approach to Bayard's estate; the estate's formal gardens and grounds were depicted in some detail on the Ratzer Map of 1766-67. Bayard's Lane, named Bullock Street by 1803, was renamed Broome Street after John Broome, Lieutenant Governor of New York State in 1804 (Bridges Plan 1807). Broome, the first city alderman after the British evacuation in 1783, made his fortune in the China trade, importing two million pounds of Chinese tea to New York after the Revolutionary War (Moscow 1979).

**Outward and Street Grid**

Much of what is today the Chinatown and Little Italy area was mapped by 1755 as a street grid labeled “Outward” (Maerschalk 1755). The Maerschalk Plan of 1755 is one of the earliest maps drawn from detailed surveys of early New York. The Outward, east of the Fresh Water or Collect Pond, is shown as an established grid of streets extending from the Collect Pond to the Bowery and from Roosevelt Street to what is now Broome Street. This early mapping of the Outward depicts named streets laid out during the 1740s and early 1750s, including Mulberry, Mott, Elizabeth, Bayard and Hester Streets; and also maps the routes of Baxter Street (then Orange), Canal Street (then Nicholas), Grand Street (then Judith), and Broome Street (then Hevins) (Cohen & Augustyn 1997: 64-65; Maerschalk 1755).

Elizabeth Street was laid out sometime in the 1740s or early 1750s. It originally extended from Bayard Street to the base of Mount Pleasant at present-day Grand Street, once lower Manhattan's highest point. A windmill shown on the 1755 Maerschalk Plan operated for many years on Elizabeth Street north of Nicholas (Canal Street). By 1789, Elizabeth terminated at Bayard's Lane (Broome Street). By 1816, Elizabeth was extended to Bleecker Street (Bridges Plan 1807). Due in part to its proximity to the bustling Bowery, Elizabeth Street was one of the first streets to be developed early in the Outward period.

**Sixth & Fourteenth Wards**
Numbered New York wards were first designated in 1791. As the city expanded northward, more wards were added to the map. The Outward was divided and numbered as the 6th and 14th wards, corresponding generally to what we now know as the Chinatown and Little Italy neighborhoods, with Canal Street as the dividing line between the two wards.

Historic Chinatown—the area between Chatham Square, Worth Street, Baxter Street and Canal, corresponds to the eastern portion of the old 6th ward, which also included the City Hall Park and the notorious Five Points area. During the twentieth century, much of the western portion of the ward was redeveloped into the Federal and City courts complex, obliterating the residential blocks, including the notorious Five Points intersection, that once stood south and west of what is today Columbus Park.

The area now mapped as Little Italy conforms to the eastern two-thirds of the former 14th Ward. From 1800 to 1850, the 14th Ward was populated primarily by native-born protestant land owners, some of whom had moved north from the growing immigrant-populated 6th Ward (Gabaccia 1984: 66-67). As industry developed in the 14th Ward and immigration brought more residents into the neighborhood, the native-born landowners moved out, often retaining their property in the neighborhood to rent out to the new arrivals.

**Development of an Early Industrial District**

Slaughtering and its related business, tanning, were foul-smelling, messy and toxic public nuisances, consistently pushed farther and farther from the “civilized” residential settlements of lower Manhattan. In 1750, Nicholas Bayard, assistant alderman, managed to convince the Common Council to allow him to construct a “public” slaughter house on his land located near the Collect Pond in the vicinity of what is now the southwest corner of Bayard and Mulberry Streets where Columbus Park is located. There is a high likelihood of future archaeological discoveries in this location that may reveal information on this early industry.

All slaughter business in the city was directed to this slaughterhouse. Tanyards grew up around the Collect, taking advantage of access to fresh hides and also to the water of the Collect, used for washing hides and discharging the toxic waste associated with the business of tanning.

The land around the slaughter house was fenced for livestock holding pens. The Bowery became a busy drovers road, and taverns sprouted up along the road to serve those passing through. During the Bayard slaughterhouse era (officially ca. 1750-1784, but probably still operating into the nineteenth century), many butchers built houses along the Bowery on land purchased from Nicholas Bayard, and maintained meat cutting facilities to the rear, along Elizabeth Street. In 1784, Bayard's slaughterhouse “for want of due attention and frequent cleaning is become intolerable to the neighborhood”; It was declared a public nuisance and ordered to be abandoned (NY Common Council 1784, Vol. 1: 32, 44).

Early streets in the neighborhood commemorate the business of the neighborhood: Mott Street was named for Joseph Mott, a butcher who operated a tavern uptown in pre-Revolutionary New York (Moscow 1978). Though Mott did not live in the neighborhood, Mott Street was squarely in a slaughter district, and a butcher's name would be appropriate to commemorate.

---

3 The ward system was abolished in 1938.
Similarly, Pell Street was named for a butcher who resided on the eponymous street (Moscow 1978). Pell Street, extending one block from Bowery Lane to Mott Street appears on the Taylor-Roberts map of 1797. It may be depicted as an unlabeled dashed line on earlier maps, such as the Directory Plan of 1789 (Cohen & Augustyn 1997).

The 6th and 14th Wards were both historically unrestricted by zoning. Slaughterhouses, ironworks, ropewalks, stables, coal yards, mahogany yards and manufacturers of bedsteads, mattresses, chairs, soap, candles, candy, silverware, tinware, paper boxes, shirts, piano fortés, carriages and condiments were interspersed with mixed-use residential and commercial buildings, schools, firehouses and churches from the very beginning of the neighborhood’s development, and many industrial enterprises continued throughout the twentieth century.

**Five Points**

The Collect was filled, and by 1808, the street grid extended over top of it. A new street, Anthony Street, was extended from the west to meet the intersection of Cross (later Park) and Orange (later Baxter). The irregular, five-cornered intersection was soon called by its descriptive name: Five Points (Yamin 2000: 28).

Irish and German immigrants of the first quarter of the twentieth century found housing in Five Points among the “native” Protestant residents and Africans and African-Americans who had been a presence in the area since the Dutch colonial era (Yamin 2000: 28).

Houses were built atop the filled Collect, and in a matter of years, foundations were undermined and basements filled with seepage from natural springs and buried waterways that once fed the pond. By the 1820s, unsanitary conditions in the 6th Ward—bad water, repeated typhoid outbreaks, outdated housing stock, and industrial pollution, pushed the well-to-do, including resident landowners of the neighborhood, farther northward into the 14th Ward. Native and immigrant poor flooded into the 6th Ward.

The famine Irish of the 1840s created a population explosion in Five Points, as well as a public health crisis compounded by overpopulation and substandard housing. By the mid-nineteenth century, Five Points' immigrants were joined by a raft of health and social welfare reformers—mostly Protestant missionaries, determined to correct what they perceived as the moral deficiencies of the local population. The Five Points House of Industry began operations at 155 Worth Street in 1850, as a school and refuge for poor and homeless children. Italian and Chinese Schools and missions were soon to follow.


**Neighborhood Demographics: Early Tenants and Landlords**

Changing demographics and new developments in Manhattan and Brooklyn induced several demographic shifts in the neighborhood from the eighteenth through the twentieth centuries. Sub-neighborhoods developed as concentrations of particular ethnic groups settled in enclaves around businesses, churches or social centers.

New immigrants and other poor occupying the tenements were not the owners or developers of the tenements in
which they lived, at least not until they had moved far enough up the social ladder to begin investing in real estate. During the mid to late nineteenth century, rent consumed 20% to 50% of an average unskilled laborers salary, making it all but impossible for the majority of renters the neighborhood to ever hope to own property (Gabaccia 1984:74-75).

By the time the landless Italian peasant arrived from southern Italy, and the Chinese bachelor arrived from California or Taishan, they found rental housing in a neighborhood owned primarily by their immigrant predecessors: Irish, Jewish and German landlords (NYCDB: BBL Files).

**Africans and African-Americans**

The African-American history of the neighborhood is rich and significant, however no extant buildings clearly associated with the early African-American history of the neighborhood are known to exist. The possibility of archaeological evidence may exist in the former locations of schools and churches.

The earliest residents in the area east of the Collect were enslaved Africans, dispatched by the Dutch to settle the area in the 1660s. The Dutch used the African farmers as a buffer against hostile incursions by Native Americans. For many decades, African farmers worked the land in this area, called the “Negro Coast”, and buried their dead in a massive cemetery south and west of the Collect (Yamin 2000: 19). It was on the banks of the Collect that in 1741, Africans participating in a slave revolt were hanged.

A large enough African population existed in the neighborhood in the late eighteenth century for a new church to be established. The roots of the African Methodist Episcopal (AME) Church in America can be traced to the Zion Chapel, established in a former stable and cabinet shop on Cross Street between Orange (Baxter) and Mulberry in 1796 (Cross Street, later known as Park Street, was erased from the map when Mulberry Bend Park was built in its place in the 1890s). Mulberry Bend Park, later renamed Columbus Park, has the potential to yield information on the former AME Church which was not only the first such congregation in America but the first anywhere in the world. Free black Methodists incorporated the AME Zion Church as a separate entity from the Methodist Episcopal church in 1801 (Moore 1884:17). While the congregation was of African descent, the Zion Chapel was still subject to white church government, including white preachers.

In 1813, expelled church member and trustee Thomas Sipkins, intending to break from the white church authority, founded Asbury Church, located on Elizabeth Street between Hester and Walker (Canal) (Moore 1884: 31). A schism in the Asbury church resulted in the formation of a third African church in a former school on Mott Street. Bethel Church was dedicated on July 20, 1820. That same year, AME Zion withdrew from the white Methodist Episcopal church. Asbury and A.M.E Zion Church joined into one body to form the African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church in America (Moore 1884:64).

The African Free School No. 2, also known as the Mulberry Street School, was established by New York Manumission Society in 1820. The handsome temple-front brick edifice stood at 135 Mulberry Street, between Hester and Walker (now Canal) Streets. General Lafayette, while touring the country, visited the school in 1824. In 1832, The female department of the free school was reorganized as African Free School No. 4, housed in the Mulberry Street location (Andrews 1850: 74-75). By 1834, the African school was absorbed into the public school system as African Public School No. 1.
New York State abolished slavery in 1827, but tensions remained high between the pro- and anti-slavery factions. Mobs ran rampant through the Five Points neighborhood in 1834, destroying homes and property of the anti-slavery whites and free Blacks. African-Americans were both tolerated and abused by their fellow New Yorkers. While the census indicates that Irish immigrants and African-Americans lived together in the 6th Ward, race riots during the volatile antebellum period resulted in the severe persecution and outright murder of African-Americans by predominantly Irish mobs. By the post-Civil War-era, most people of African descent had dispersed to other neighborhoods.

**Irish**

Immigrant Irish settled south in 6th Ward beginning in the early years of the nineteenth century. The famine Irish of the 1840s soon followed, and the Five Points area of the 6th Ward was a predominantly Irish neighborhood into the 1870s. Church of the Transfiguration (25 Mott Street), first built in 1801 as the English Lutheran Church, became in 1853 the Catholic Church of the Transfiguration, established to serve the majority Irish population in the neighborhood at the time.

As the Irish became established and politically connected by the 1850s, the well-to-do began moving north into the 14th Ward. Natives moved yet farther north. As the Irish gained a toehold in society, they began buying up tenements and land in the 6th and 14th Wards. The Irish rented to recent immigrants from Italy, Poland, Russia and Germany.

Irish heritage of the neighborhood, as well as the Tammany political machine, are commemorated in Kenmare Street, named in 1911 for the Irish village in County Kerry that was the birthplace of the mother of Tammany boss "Big Tim" Sullivan (Moscow 1978). Sullivan was born on Baxter Street in the Five Points neighborhood in 1862 (now the location of Columbus Park), a time when the neighborhood was still strongly Irish. From his office on the Bowery (207), Sullivan “ruled supreme in politics south of Fourteenth Street” throughout the late nineteenth and early twentieth century (NY Times Archive 1913: “Thousands Mourn at “Big Tim's” Bier,” 09/15/1913). Kenmare Street, the last street to be cut through the neighborhood, was planned as a three-block extension to Delancey Street to provide direct access to the new Williamsburg Bridge, which opened in 1906.

**Russian and Polish Jews**

Russian and Polish Jews settled along Baxter Street by the mid-1850s, where they established the first garment district in New York (Yamin 2000: 74-77). Between the 1880s and 1910, Mott Street was heavily populated by “Russians” according to the census, likely Russian Jews. Elizabeth south of Canal was also heavily populated by Jewish residents into the first decade of the twentieth century. As they moved up the social ladder and out of the neighborhood, Jewish investors bought up real estate in the 6th and 14th Wards, building some of the most distinctive tenements in the neighborhood. The Weeks and Aronson families were among the most land-rich real estate investors in the 6th Ward during the second half of the nineteenth century (NYCDB: BBL Files).

The 1900 City Directory shows Jewish tailors and Jewish-owned clothing, rag, shoe, cloaks, hat, leather goods, pocket book and woolens businesses on Bayard, Baxter and Elizabeth. Jewish-owned clothing and furniture stores were concentrated on Canal from Center to the Bowery (City Directory 1900). Some business owners lived in the neighborhood, but many lived on the Lower East Side south of Houston Street and east of the Bowery.

**Germans**
Germans immigrants began arriving in the 6th Ward by the turn of the nineteenth century. By the third quarter of the nineteenth century, many German-owned factories were built along Mulberry and Elizabeth Streets. Germans settled in great numbers along Elizabeth Street in the 6th and 14th Wards during this period, and a Lutheran Church stood at the corner of Elizabeth and Broome, likely serving the German population of the neighborhood.

By the turn of the twentieth century, German settlement was concentrated in Kleindeutschland. Building permits record than many of the German factory owners of the neighborhood were residents of Kleindeutschland, around Second Avenue (NYCDB: BBL Files).

The Chinese and Italian Quarters
When Italian and Chinese immigrants began settling New York in the mid-nineteenth century, many chose to settle in the 6th and 14th Wards, which correspond roughly to the current locations of historic Chinatown (6th) and modern Little Italy (14th).

Nascent Chinatown, populated by fewer than 100 Chinese in 1880, was soon dwarfed by a Little Italy that spanned both the 6th and 14th wards, extending from Bleecker to Worth, and Baxter to Bowery. The neighborhood was home to thousands of southern Italian immigrants who arrived during a period of massive immigration to the U.S. (1880-1923).

It can be argued that insularity in the face of racism was a major factor in the development of both Chinatown and Little Italy—both groups were looked down upon by the dominant Protestant majority and by the Irish, who arrived just decades before. While the Chinese and Italians maintained separate cultural traditions, they settled in ethnic enclaves within a common geographic area. These two groups were clearly encountering one another on a daily basis, whether walking down the street or in the park; shopping in the same neighborhood—even learning enough Chinese or Italian to patronize each others businesses.

Historic settlement patterns of the Chinese and Italians do not conform strictly to ward boundaries. For example, perhaps the most famous Chinese in New York in the 1850s, Quimbo Appo, lived and worked at a tea shop at 50 Spring Street, near the corner of Mulberry, in the 14th ward (Tchen 1999: 90-92). Shung H. Lee who was born at 21 Mott Street in 1921 recalls that his was the first Chinese family to move into the building, the other residents were Italian (Lee 2003: Historic Resources Inventory Form on 19 & 21 Mott St.).

The parallels in the Chinese and Italian experience are many: Both groups sought to settle among their compatriots for linguistic, kinship and socio-cultural reasons; both groups were fleeing civil unrest and dwindling opportunities in their homelands; and large numbers of both groups thought their sojourn to the U.S. would be temporary.

CHINATOWN

Chinatown is a growing and dynamic neighborhood with deep roots in New York history. While Little Italy remains as an iconic presence, Chinatown thrives with the authenticity of an active, self-sustaining community.

Chinese immigrants first settled Mott Street south of Canal, southern Mulberry Street, Bayard, Pell, Doyers and Worth Streets to Chatham Square during the 1870s and 1880s. From this historic core, modern Chinatown has grown to encompass much of historic Little Italy and the Lower East Side. Over the course of a century, Chinatown grew from a small enclave of bachelors to the largest Chinatown in the West (Pan 1990:304-305).

1840s-1860s

The nineteenth century, the waning century of the Chinese Manchu Dynasty (1644-1911), was a period of internal strife and unrest, worsened by hostile, empire-building western countries forcing their way into trade “partnerships” with China. Civil and social instability was acutely felt in rural agrarian southern China. The first Chinese immigrants—those who came to settle in the U.S., if only for a short time, departed from the treaty ports of southern China, opened by the first Opium War that ended in 1842 (Hall 1998: 11).

By 1856, Britain was again dumping opium on China and forcing the Chinese into the second Opium War. This coincided with clan wars in Taishan; and the home-grown Taiping Rebellion, which from the early 1850s until it was quashed in 1864, caused havoc and destruction across southern China. Until the 1970s, almost three-quarters of all Chinese immigrants to the U.S. were from the Taishan district in Guangdong province in southern China (Pan 1990:306).

When reports of gold strikes in California reached the treaty ports of southern China by 1850, many Chinese men were inspired to seek their fortune in “Gold Mountain.” The intention of the majority of these fortune seekers was to make enough money in North America to return to their Chinese villages wealthy. Most men left behind wives and children, fully intending to return rich.

The Sino-American Burlingame Treaty of 1868 established full diplomatic relations between the U.S. and China. The treaty officially opened American doors to Chinese immigration, though the American motivation was to open Chinese doors to commerce and missionary activity (Hall 1998: 19). Legally able to immigrate and settle in the U.S., Chinese begin arriving in New York in greater numbers during the 1870s.

Many Chinese immigrants arrived in New York from the west, where they had been miners or employed as coolies on the transcontinental railroad, completed in 1869. Some were brought East by factory owners seeking hardworking, non-unionized labor. The Chinese, with few other options for employment, were willing to work very hard for very low pay. Chinese were vilified by organized labor as strikebreakers and scabs, which added to increasing anti-Chinese sentiment.

The Emergence of a Chinese Quarter

1870s

From the earliest Chinese settlement in the mid-nineteenth century until the repercussions of a restrictive racist immigration policy were felt post-1882, the Chinese lived interspersed among the other immigrant populations.

in New York’s 4th, 6th and 10th Wards. During the 1870s, the Chinese began to concentrate settlement around Mott Street south of Canal Street, an area that had been settled by Polish and Russian Jews, Africans and Irish immigrants before them.

The 1870 census indicates that 96 Chinese-born individuals lived in Manhattan, though it is likely an inaccurate number—not all Chinese may have been counted. Forty-one Chinese living in the 6th Ward were counted, the highest number of any ward. Most of these men lived together in boarding houses. Mott and Baxter Streets emerged as a hub of the Chinese community as mutual aid societies and Chinese-owned businesses were established. The portion of the 6th ward between Chatham Square, Walker Street, Bowery and Broadway, was becoming known as the Chinese Quarter by the end of the decade (Tchen 1999: 232-233; 239).

By comparison, there were 101 Italians counted in the 6th Ward in 1870—many living squarely in the “Chinese Quarter,” on Mott and Bayard. Polish and Russian Jews populated the neighborhood along Bayard, Baxter and Elizabeth Streets. The second highest concentration of Chinese, 21 people, was in the tiny 4th Ward. Located on the waterfront, the 4th Ward was where many of the earliest Chinese residents—many of them seamen, settled into boarding houses in the 1820s, 30 & 40s (Tchen 1999:77).

The Five Points Mission opened its Chinese School at 14 Mott Street in 1879, one of many efforts by Protestant reformers to educate and “reform” the Chinese. English classes and Christian religious instruction were the main offerings of the school, which closed down within a decade (Hall 1998: 65-66).

1880s
By 1880, out of the 747 Chinese individuals enumerated in the census, only 72 were counted in the Chinese Quarter. Twenty-three Chinese resided in the 14th Ward, over 10 times as many as in 1870. Those Chinese in the 14th Ward lived on Mulberry, Elizabeth, Mott, Broome and Grand Streets, interspersed among Italian, Jewish, English, German and Irish neighbors. Chinese, almost exclusively men, were working as cooks, teashop owners, laundrymen, grocers, clerks, cigar makers, and candy sellers.7

The dispersal of Chinese across the city was in part a result of the establishment of the Chinese in the laundry business. Chinese were not laundrymen in China, but found that there was little competition for this backbreaking labor in the U.S., and the cost of starting up a laundry was relatively small. Chinese often lived in their laundries to further save money to remit to their families in China.

Though there were more Chinese living outside of the “Chinese Quarter” than in it by 1880, the Chinese Quarter was the location of Chinese grocery stores, general stores, restaurants, mutual aid societies and boarding houses to accommodate the large population of Chinese “bachelors” (Anbinder 2001: 406-407). By the time Wong Ching Foo began publishing the Chinese American newspaper in 1883, Chinatown had over ten groceries, six pharmacies or herb shops, many restaurants, and garment factories trading with Hong Kong (Hall 1998, quoting Wong Chin Foo: 70; Tchen 1999: 281).

---

5 Many Chinese also resided in 4th and 10th Wards, which, throughout the late nineteenth and most of the twentieth century, remained a relatively diverse immigrant community of Chinese, Italians, Irish, and Jews (often enumerated as Russian or Polish). The 4th & 10th wards are today part of the modern Chinatown, populated mostly by Chinese immigrants arriving post-1965.
The first documented purchases of real estate by the Chinese take place on lower Mott Street in 1883, when grocer Wo Kee purchased 8 Mott ($8,500); Tom Lee (Wong Ah Ling), who arrived in New York in 1878, bought 16 Mott ($15,000); and Chinese merchants purchased 10 & 12 Mott: Kwong Hing Lung bought number 10; Man Lee purchased 12 Mott (Anbinder 2001: 406; Hall 1998:64). These purchases of property are significant—it was not long before this time that the staunchly anti-Chinese Irish in control of Transfiguration Church preemptively rented a row of townhouses from Pell to Park (Mosco) to deny Chinese residence; and the owners of the former Rutgers Fire House, 3 Mott Street, refused to lease the vacant building to Chinese (Anbinder 2001: 404-405).

Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882

The 1868 Burlingame Treaty was renegotiated in 1880 to preserve American trade interests, but to limit the free movement of Chinese immigrants. Soon after, the culmination of increasing anti-Chinese sentiment was manifested in the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882, a racist federal immigration policy cited as “the first American immigration legislation to bar a particular group because of race and class” (Chin 2000, introduction by Wong: xiii-xiv). The 1882 act excluded Chinese laborers from immigrating or otherwise legally entering the U.S., but, in the interest of preserving trade, allowed merchants (those who could meet the stringent burden of proof), students, travelers, diplomats and the children of U.S. Citizens, to enter.

Revised over time to exclude greater numbers of Chinese, even some of those who had once been legal residents of the U.S., the Chinese Exclusion Act and its revisions and renewals (Scott Act 1888; Geary Act 1892; 1902, 1904) effectively closed the “golden door” to Chinese immigration for over sixty years. Chinese men were stranded in the States away from parents, wives and children, unable to leave for fear of never being allowed to return; Many others were unable to return from China, and forfeited property, businesses and relationships in the States. Those who managed to travel back and forth between China and the U.S. with the requisite documentation faced hostile scrutiny and an assumption that all Chinese were illegal immigrants.

Bachelor Society

Many Chinese came to America, like the Italians, expecting to stay long enough to make their fortune before returning home to their native country. Many left wives and families to come to America. As the Chinese quarter started growing, it was populated almost exclusively by men between 20 and 50 years of age. These men formed Chinatown's bachelor society—even though most may not have been true bachelors, but solo sojourners intending to return their families in China. Many long-distance relationships failed, however, and some men remarried or never returned (Chin 2000; Hall 1998).

Bachelor Chinese packed into tenements modified into dormitories and “bed houses.” Gambling was a popular diversion for Chinese men. One of the most popular games was fan tan, and parlors could be found throughout the neighborhood. In the early 1890s, fan tan was played at 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 22, 36 Mott; 8, 16 Doyers; and 11, 12, 21 Pell. Attempts were made by the city authorities to close fan tan parlors as illegal gambling outposts, however judges repeatedly declared that the past-time was a harmless game, not illegal gambling (NY Times Archive 1892: “Fan Tan Parlors Closed and Reopened 02/24/1892).

Chinatown residents and visitors reported seeing very little street life in Chinatown during weekdays and evenings. Men spent free time in club rooms in the upper floors of association buildings, which also house businesses and kung shih fang, dormitories for bachelor residents and visiting association members. Hours were
spent socializing, gambling, and networking for those seeking work in laundries or restaurants (Chin 2000:29-30; Hall 1998: 112).

Streets in Chinatown were quiet during the week, but Sundays were bustling. Chinese and Chinese-Americans have made pilgrimages to Chinatown since Chinatown began. Perhaps the most regular visitors were Chinese laundrymen, dispersed across the city, who came into Chinatown to shop, eat and socialize.

### Fongs, Tongs, Mutual Aid and other Associations

In the face of oppressive racism, the Chinese could rely on no one but themselves. The system of tong and fongs, mutual aid societies, native place and family associations brought from China, became the most important lifeline for the Chinese in America. Family name, clan and village associations remain central to the social organization of Chinatown. Tongs represent businesses or families; Fongs are family or village associations. There are numerous tongs and fongs in Chinatown today; they can be identified by distinctive balconies or inset porches and large plaques carved with Chinese characters embellishing the façades.

On Leong Tong was so named in 1890. Led by Tom Lee and other prominent Chinatown merchants and fixers, the organization was originally incorporated as the *Long We Tong Eng Wi* (popularly known as the Chinese Freemasons), when it was operating from 18 Mott Street during the 1880s (Hall 1998: 59-61). On Leong Tong moved to 10 Pell Street in 1888; and later, to 41 Mott Street. The On Leong Merchants Building (southwest corner of Canal and Mott), a modern pagoda and a character-defining building in the district, was completed in 1950 (NYCDB: BBL files).

The main territorial competition to the On Leong Tong came from the Hip Sing Tong, established as advocates for the working class, including the many Chinese laundry workers (Chin 2000: 17; Pan 1990: 350). Hip Sing established headquarters first at 13 Pell, and later, in 1949, at 16 Pell. Each tong was dedicated to representing and defending its members. Fiercely territorial, the On Leong and Hip Sing tongs ran protection rackets, and early on were involved in opium, gambling and police payoffs (Chin 2000:17-18; Hall 1998: 132-134).

A violent and protracted war between the On Leong and Hip Sing tongs during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries provided sensational fodder for the New York press. Street shootouts, shakedowns, and murders were widely reported in gory detail. The Tong Wars, like the Mafia association with Little Italy, permanently colored the public's perception of the Chinese and Chinatown culture.

### Chung Wah Gong Shaw/Chinese Consolidated Benevolent Association

In 1887, members of the *Chung Wah Gong Shaw* purchased Tom Lee's building at 16 Mott Street (Hall 1998: 74; NY Times Archive 04/17/1887: “A Chinese Scheme”). *Chung Wah Gong Shaw*, superseded by the Chinese Consolidated Benevolent Association (CCBA), has been considered the City Hall of Chinatown since its founding at 10 Chatham Square in 1883.  

---

6 Chung Wah Gong Shaw translates as “Chinese public assembly hall.” (Tow 1923: 101). The New York branch of the Chinese Consolidated Benevolent Association was founded in 1883, to provide support and assistance to the Chinese who settled in the area. The CCBA remains a parallel government for Chinatown, encompassing 60 sub-groups of merchant, cultural and community organizations. The current CCBA building on Mott Street was built in 1959. CCBAs are now found in all major Chinatowns outside of China.
The founders were merchants from southern China, who, as merchants, were still eligible to immigrate to the U.S. along with their families post-1882 Exclusion Act. It was modeled after the original CCBA founded in San Francisco in 1869 (Wong 1982:15-16). Chung Wah Gong Shaw registered with the Peking Government in 1884, and incorporated in New York State as the Chinese Charitable and Benevolent Association in 1890 (Chin 2000:30-31; Chinatown History Project 1988).

Chung Wah Gong Shaw originally represented seven organizations: the Hoy Sun Ning Yeung Association, Lin Sing Association, On Leong Chinese Merchants Association, Hip Sing Association, Chinese Chamber of Commerce, Chinese Masonic Association, and Kuo Min Tang Eastern Region Office (CCBA 2009). Since 1922, the presidency of the CCBA has alternated between members of the Hoy Sun Ning Yeung Association, which represents the interests of Hoy Sun (Taishan) natives, once the predominant native place of Chinatown residents; and Lin Sing Association (“United Formation”), representing all other combined Chinese native-place interests (CCBA 2009). Since 1948, CCBA has represented 60 clan and family organizations, tongs, and merchant groups.

The organization mediates in disputes; acts as middlemen in business transactions; and advocates for the rights of Chinese and Chinese-Americans (Chin 2000:30-31). The CCBA is allied with Chinese Nationalist government in Taiwan (Kuo Min Tang or Guomintang) (Chinatown History Project 1988; Pan 1990: 306), and flies the Nationalist Flag above its headquarters at 62 Mott Street.

1890s

Bachelors packed into the Chinese Opera House (5 Doyers Street), opened by actor Chu Fong in 1892 or 93 (Hall 1998: 98-99). Performances of traditional Chinese opera were held there until sometime around 1905, when deadly Tong violence broke out on Doyers Street. Tom Noonan's Bowery Rescue Mission took over the space soon thereafter (Hall 1998: 141). Dr. Sun Yat Sen, Chinese Nationalist leader, delivered a speech to the residents of Chinatown from the former Chinese Opera House at 5 Doyers in 1911.

Chinese Restaurants, first serving Chinese bachelors, became very popular with white New Yorkers, and a restaurant boom buoyed the Chinatown economy. Mott and Pell were lined with restaurants serving traditional Chinese food along with the requisite American fare of chop suey and egg rolls. The Port Arthur Restaurant, 7-9 Mott Street, remained a popular restaurant, opulently decked out in inlaid teak tables, carved screens and Chinese lanterns, until it closed down in the 1970s. In its early days, the restaurant catered to the New York elite who wanted a taste of exotica (Lee 2003: 1).

The joss house, of great curiosity to western newspaper reporters, was a fixture in Chinatown from the very beginning. Many of Chinatown's residents are Taoist, worshipping ancestors and various deities appropriate to the occasion. The term “joss house” was an American invention to describe the incense-filled shrines in which the statue of the appropriate deity was venerated. There were always a number of “joss houses” in the neighborhood, some open to the public, such as 20 Mott, others tucked away in Tong headquarters.

In the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, Chinese were a never ending source of fascination and revilement for press and populace. Regardless of the subject of the report—a real estate sale, birth of child, Chinese New Year, a visit to a joss house or man-on-the-street reportage, the New York Times colored every story with gross stereotypes, derogatory language, and alleged “quotations” of Chinese, written out in the most exaggerated and unflattering Pidgeon English.
Chinatown was a tourist attraction by the last quarter of the nineteenth century, and the economy of Chinatown relied on tourism then as it does today. The practice of “slumming”—the well-off visiting sensational ghettos with police escort, may have originated in Chinatown. Fanfare surrounding the 1896 visit of the prestigious Chinese viceroy, Li Hung Chang, spurred seekers of exotica to visit. “Slumming parties” would come to see the exotic “Celestials,” tour “opium dens,” eat Chinese food and shop in tchotchke shops (Meloney 1909: 229-241). One particularly anti-Chinese article from the New York Times (1907) labeled Chinatown an “ulcer of Oriental vice,” and described the Chinese “gulling” visitors by selling them “Chinese” tourist trinkets allegedly made by “white men in New Jersey.” Chinese merchants grew rich on the import trade of Chinese merchandise for sale to both Chinese customers and tourists—it is unlikely they were importing much from New Jersey.

1900-1920

By the turn of the twentieth century, the effect of the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882 is clearly seen in the census data—while the local Italian population rises exponentially every 10 years from 1870 onward, New York's Chinese population, especially those China-born, remains flat—and even drops off between 1900 and 1910. By 1900, 45,109 Italian-born people lived in New York City, over 10 times as many as the 4,378 Chinese, all but twelve of whom were born in China. Mott Street below Canal was largely Italian and Russian-Jewish in 1900, as was Bayard Street. Chinese were living in Doyers, Pell, Mott and Bayard, and in their businesses dispersed throughout the City.

Fewer Chinese were enumerated in 1910 than in the previous census. Only 2,975 Chinese were counted City-wide, of whom 2,740 were noted as having been born in China. By 1910, Lower Mott, Pell, and Doyers Streets were almost exclusively Chinese, with the occasional Italian family interspersed.

Those not living in Chinatown were dispersed across all wards of the city, many operating laundries. The census shows a clear geographical concentration of Chinese men below Canal Street: Mott Street below Canal, heavily Italian in 1900, was predominantly Chinese by 1910, though a lone Italian family still lived among the Chinese at 18 Mott Street.

There were Chinese families in Chinatown, though Chinese women were outnumbered by Chinese men by an estimated 200:1. In the first decades of Chinatown, Chinese men who married in New York often married Irish women. Men of the merchant class were more likely to have Chinese wives, but with so few Chinese women in the city, this was not common in the early twentieth century. Nonetheless, by this time, a handful of fully Chinese children were being raised as first generation Chinese-Americans.

The Chinese School was founded in 1910. Unlike the earlier Chinese School, founded by reformers to teach English to Chinese, the Chinese School was formed by the CCBA to teach Chinese language, arts and culture to young Chinese men in the U.S. (CCBA 2009; Hall 1998:178).
From 1918 until 1955, the Moo Tie Temple at 13 Mott Street, with its three altars, ceremonial drum, Chinese-style balcony and swallowtail eaves, served double duty as a United States Post Office, Ng Que, postmaster (NYPL Millstein Collection: Chinatown Clipping File).

An important business that opened during this period was the general store known as Quong Yuen Shing on the ground floor of a tenement building at 32 Mott Street. “More valuable than mere groceries for the community of uprooted, single male workers were the general store’s sleeping lofts, safes in the storerooms that provided an informal bank, and a wire rack that served as a post office to receive mail from home... The informal social services provided by businesses like the Quong Yuen Shing general store were critical... [When the store opened in this location in 1899 it] specialized in elegant silks and satins, but was also well-stocked, like other stores in the area, with vegetables, medicinal herbs, spices, and supplies for laundries and restaurants that were the other Chinese entrepreneurial mainstays of New York” (City Lore 2004: Entry on 32 Mott Street General Store in Census of Places that Matter, accessed online).

1920-1930
Bowery, Chatham Square, Pell, Doyers and Mott Street in the 6th Ward were, by 1920, almost uniformly Chinese. California, New York and Oregon are the most frequently listed birthplaces for the US-born Chinese in the 1910 and 1920 New York census, indicating that emigration from the West Coast and births to Chinese New Yorkers were primarily responsible for a small rise in New York’s Chinese population by 1920.

Food is central to the culture of Chinatown. The Chinese population in New York by the 1920s, was large enough to sustain a specialty food industry. Chinese farmers on Long Island began growing Chinese vegetables, such as bitter melons, long beans, bok choy, and mustard greens, and trucking the produce into Chinatown daily (NYPL Millstein Collection: Chinatown Clipping File).

Chinatown of the 1930s was confined to the three blocks of Mott south of Canal and two blocks on Bayard and the entirety of Pell and Doyers Streets. Mott and Bayard were controlled by the On Leong Tong; Pell and Doyers by the Hip Sing Tong (Chin 2000:29). In 1930, 4,075 Chinese were counted in New York—303 fewer than in 1900.

1940s
China and the U.S. had spent two years as allies in World War II, before the exclusion laws were eased in 1943 (Chin 2000: xiii; Chinatown History Project 1988). The Magnuson Act of 1943 allowed Chinese already living in the U.S. to apply for naturalization; and it established an immigration quota of 105 Chinese per year (Chinatown History Project 1988). Unlike European quotas based on country of citizenship (rather than country of origin or ethnicity), the Chinese quota was based strictly on ethnicity. Two years later, the War Brides Act of 1945 enabled returning GIs to bring foreign-born wives, including Chinese, to live in the U.S. (Chinatown History Project 1988).

1950s
The McCarran-Walter Act (1952) maintained the national origins quota system of the Immigration Act of 1924, which gave preference to immigrants from the United Kingdom, Ireland, and Germany. Though the 1952 act ended the policy of racial discrimination in the naturalization process, national origin immigration quotas were still enforced.
In the early 1950s, an urban renewal proposal, called the China Village Plan, threatened to gut Chinatown's historic core, replacing the businesses and residences with a large-scale housing project. Community advocates fought the plan, which would have destroyed the local Chinatown economy. The plan was abandoned.

1960s
Only through the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965 was the national origins quota system, in place since the Immigration Act of 1924, abolished. The law, which went into effect in 1968, enabled 170,000 immigrants from the eastern hemisphere to immigrate annually. Additionally, the law provided an unlimited amount of visas for family members of U.S. citizens. As a result of the 1965 act, immigration doubled between 1965 and 1970. Post-1968, a new wave of Chinese immigrants began to settle Chinatown. The influx of Mandarin and Fujianese speakers helped Chinatown expand its boundaries from the historic seven-block area around Mott and Mulberry Streets to an estimated 55-block area from the East River to City Hall and from St. James Place to well-north of Canal Street, eradicating the traditional “dividing line” between Little Italy and Chinatown.

Chinatown Today
The rapidly growing Chinese community has continued to expand well beyond its historic boundaries, with other Chinese neighborhoods taking root in Brooklyn and Flushing, Queens. By 1980 the Chinese community in New York City was the largest in the country, surpassing the one in San Francisco (Renqiu Yu 1995: 218).

The historic core of New York’s Chinatown is still home to many long-time Chinese residents as well as many new Chinese immigrants and it remains the social, cultural, political, and commercial heart of New York’s Chinese community. The National Register nomination of New York’s Chinatown as a place significant in our nation’s history will serve to honor the long-standing contributions of this immigrant group to our nation’s history. Other Chinatown’s that have been listed to the National Register include the Chinatown Historic Districts in Honolulu, the Seattle Chinatown Historic District, the Portland New Chinatown-Japantown Historic District, and the Chinatown Historic District in Riverside, California.

As middle-class Chinese move out of Chinatown, many return on a regular basis for the same reasons Chinese have done so for over a century: to participate in Chinatown society and to do their food shopping (Pan 1990:304).

Chinatown is a thriving food market, with produce and fish stalls along Mott Street north of Canal, and pushcart produce stands on Canal Street. South of Canal, in the traditional core of Chinatown, the tourist trade is thriving. Restaurants and import shops are most numerous in this core.

LITTLE ITALY
New York City was home to at least six ethnically Italian enclaves established during the period of massive Italian immigration from 1880 to 1923. 8 Italians once populated the area from Bleecker Street on the north to Worth Street and Mulberry Bend; and from the Bowery to Lafayette, concentrating residential and commercial development on Elizabeth Street, northern Mott Street, Mulberry, Baxter, Bayard, Prince, Spring, Broome, Grand and Hester Streets.

---

8 1). Along Mulberry Street, considered the oldest; 2). west of West Broadway (South Village); 3). Upper East Side; 4). east of Park Row, from Pearl to Catharine; 5). east of 2nd Ave from 8th to 19th Streets; 6). Bronx, from 149th to 159th Street from Morris to Courtlandt Avenues.
Today the “Italian” neighborhood has contracted, and Mulberry Street between Spring and Canal is now the commercial core of Little Italy. Over the course of the past 50 years, lower Manhattan’s Little Italy has been distilled into an essence of Italian-American popular culture. Perhaps due to an American fascination with portrayals of Italian-Americans in popular culture, Little Italy has become a mythic and iconic touchstone of Italian-American identity.

Tourism, the remaining “Italian” industry in the neighborhood, keeps alive the religious feasts and food culture central to the Italian-American experience. The former immigrant ghetto is considered today as a tourist ghetto, but there remain authentically Italian-American businesses and institutions, links back to the community’s history (Conforti 1996). Fraternal organizations founded in Little Italy, such as the Sons of Italy, are now national in scope.

1840s-1860s
The first significant Italian immigrants began arriving in the Five Points neighborhood of the 6th Ward during the late 1840s. These early immigrants were likely from the City-States of northern Italy, in turmoil during the fight for Italian independence (Yamin 2000:42). The entirety of the Italian peninsula would soon feel the effects of the Risorgimento (resurgence), the movement to unify the disparate City-States of Italy, which created internal political upheaval leading up to Italian unification in 1870. By 1860, the census counted 1,464 foreign-born Italians, mostly northern Italians who had begun settling the area north of Canal Street, between Broadway and the Bowery, during the 1850s (Kessner 1977: 14).

The Italian immigrants who moved into the 6th Ward from the 1840s to the 1860s were settling in one of the worst slums in the city. Italians incurred the highest death rates in during cholera and typhoid outbreaks of the mid-nineteenth century. Many recent Italian immigrants were country people, not previously exposed to these diseases. The age and condition of housing stock, along with the highly concentrated population, were primarily to blame for the unsanitary conditions (Ford 1936: 188).

An Italian School was set up in the Five Points House of Industry in 1855, originally as a primary school for the children of recently-arrived immigrants (Anbinder 2001:367; Yamin 2000: 42). Run by the Charles Loring Brace's Children's Aid Society, the Italian School received funding from the Italian government and from Italian-born Egisto Fabbri, one of the wealthiest men in New York in the late nineteenth century. English and trade skills were taught to children and adults (Brace 1872:194-199; Tolman 1904: 37-38). The Italian School occupied at least five separate locations in and around the neighborhood, culminating in the construction of a nine-story school building at Hester and Elizabeth Street in 1912.

1870s
After the Italian unification in 1870, the contadini, the landless peasants of southern Italy, were denied access to adequate land to grow crops. According to historian Thomas Kessner, this “skewed land system, [was] not unlike the system that drove landless Irish from Ireland” (Kessner 1977: 15). Increasing “globalization” of markets during the late nineteenth century also proved ruinous to the regional economies of Italy—Florida & California citrus groves began competing with Calabria, Sicily and Basilicata; and punitive tariffs imposed by France damaged Italy's wine industry (Kessner 1977: 15). Italians departing from the major ports of Naples and Genoa flooded into New York in the 1870s and 1880s. Southern Italians started populating the area around Mott and Mulberry streets in large numbers starting in the 1870s. These new immigrants settled among Russian Jews,
Chinese and Germans in an area that had been predominantly Irish before them. In 1870, 101 Italian-born individuals were found to be living in the 6th Ward, south of Canal; 56 lived in the 14th Ward.

The earliest Italian immigrants were mostly men, unskilled laborers who came seeking work in the difficult years of the *Risorgimento*. Early southern Italian immigrant considered their move to New York temporary, and many were unwilling to invest too much time in learning English. A fear of losing touch with their native culture combined with generally low literacy rates among southern Italian immigrants, meant that English was not picked up quickly among recent arrivals, keeping Italian regional dialects alive on the streets of a burgeoning Little Italy.

**1880s**

By 1880, the traditional start of the period of the mass Italian immigration (1880-1923), 12,170 Italian-born individuals lived in New York; They had settled in great numbers on Pell Street, Baxter and Worth; and along Bayard and Mulberry from Worth to Houston. Italian laborers, musicians, barbers and tradesmen were enumerated in the census.

Italian immigrants sought the comfort of their native land abroad, choosing to live in regionally-specific enclaves, settling among neighbors and family members from their home villages and towns. Many Genoese chose Baxter Street; Sicilians settled on Elizabeth and Prince Streets; Napolitani on Mulberry Street; Mott between East Houston and Prince was populated by Napolitani on one side, Basilicati on the other; Calabresi settled on Mott between Broome and Grand. Hester Street attracted immigrants from Apulia (Kessner 1977: 16).

Self-segregation occurred within the Italian community. There was little intermixing among the Italians during the early years of immigration—all had come from a recently fragmented Italy, and allegiances were to their respective regions, not a nation.

**1890-1910**

A reporter for the New York Times strolling on Mulberry Street in July 1896, reported that “the people, the signs, the merchandise and the customs are as purely Italian as any city in [Italy] (NY Times Archive 1896: “Queer Foreign Quarter” 07/12/1896). As in Chinatown, food is a central component of the culture of Little Italy. Several food businesses established in the 1890s and early 1900s remain fixtures in Little Italy today. Among them is Caffe Roma, 385 Broome Street. The Zeccardi family has been baking Italian pastries in the same location since 1891. The following year, Pina Alleva, recently arrived from Benevento, established her cheese shop at the corner of Grand and Mulberry (1892). Now considered New York's oldest cheese shop still in operation, Mrs. Alleva's descendants are still making ricotta and mozzarella to her specifications at 188 Grand Street. Another cheese maker, Savino DiPalo of Basilicata, started making cheese in Little Italy in 1910. In 1925, DiPalo's daughter Concetta set up shop at the corner of Grand and Mott, making fresh cheeses and later aged cheeses. The shop continues to provide Italian specialty foods in the same location.

Pushcart selling was a way for Italian immigrants to make a (difficult) living without the overhead of a retail shop. Italian pushcart operators could rent a cart and stock it with lemons, oranges, tomatoes, and fennel, garlic; fish, clams, and seafood; or nuts, sweets, candy or cigars. The neighborhood by 1900 was so densely settled, that a pushcart operator would not have to push the cart very far in a day. Soon stationary pushcart markets could be found. Two pushcart markets operated on Elizabeth Street: Fish and cheese were for sale near Grand Street;
Fruit & vegetables could be bought between Prince and East Houston. Many peddlers chose to live near their markets, and for a time, the buildings at 125 and 115 Elizabeth were entirely occupied by fish peddlers (Bluestone 1991: 71-72; Gabaccia 1984:78).

The thriving pushcart markets of Mott and Elizabeth Streets provided Little Italy residents with fresh fish and seafood, meats cheeses and the fresh fruits and vegetables abundant in Italian cuisine. Sicilians and Elizabeth Street residents Giuseppe and Carmela Siano first parked their clam and scungilli cart at the southwest corner of Mott and Hester Streets in 1894. By 1904, the Siano's moved their business indoors, establishing Vincent's Clam Bar (named for their son) at 119 Mott, corner of Hester. Vincent's Restaurant is still operated by cousins of the original owners (Tallmer 2004).

In 1905, Gennaro Lombardi started selling a Neapolitan specialty food out of his grocery store at 53 Spring Street: tomato pies, called pizza. Operating out of the same store until 1984, Lombardi's was considered by many to be the birthplace of the Americanized Italian food, the pizza. A new Lombardi's is now open at 32 Spring Street.

The Church

The Roman Catholic church was central to lives of many Italian immigrants, but the New York church was dominated by Irish Catholics. The Italians' demonstrative form of devotion—processions and festas (feast days), was looked down upon by Irish Catholics and Protestants alike. During the third quarter of the nineteenth century, Italian congregants had been denied full access to the Catholic churches of St. Patrick's and Transfiguration, where they were sent to the basement to worship.

John Baptist Scalabrini and his Scalabrinian missionaries (the order founded in 1887 to assist Italian immigrants), laid the foundation for what would become Most Precious Blood, in 1891. Church of the Most Precious Blood of St. Michael was to be built at 113 Baxter Street, specifically devoted to the needs of Italian Catholics.

In 1894, the church was purchased by the Franciscans of the Immaculate Conception Province, who were already engaged in building St. Anthony of Padua on Sullivan Street in the heavily Italian South Village. At the time, only the basement was constructed and roofed-over, and masses had been celebrated in the incomplete building. The cornerstone was laid for the Church of the Most Precious Blood on July 7, 1901, presided over by New York's Archbishop Corrigan (NY Times Archive 1901: “Cornerstone Laid,” 07/08/1901). To honor the majority Napolitani population of Mulberry Street, the shrine located on Mulberry Street commemorates San Gennaro (Saint Januarius), the Patron Saint of Naples.

The New York Protestant Episcopal City Mission Society established missions for the Italians of Little Italy. The Church of San Salvatore (359-61 Broome Street; 1901), designed by architects Hoppin & Koen, provided services in Italian. The parish house (127 Elizabeth Street), housed an employment bureau. St. Barnabas House, 304-06 Mulberry Street, north of Houston, was a shelter for women and orphans, in part supported by the St. Barnabas Clothing Bureau, an adjoining thrift store; God's Providence House, 330-332 Broome Street, also ministered to Italians (Tolman 1904:119).

The Broome Street Tabernacle, 395 Broome (demolished), opened by the New York City Mission & Tract Society, included sewing school and cooking classes, and a “Little Housekeepers Class” for Italian children.
Next door at 9 Centre Market Place were “The People's Baths,” operated from October 1 to April 30 by the New York Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor.

In addition to explicitly religion-based social welfare programs, settlement house work and philanthropic endeavors provided more resources for Italians. The Sunshine Settlement, 106 Bayard Street, assisted working girls, and provided training in job skills and domestic arts (Tolman 1904). The Italian Free Library, 149 Mulberry Street, was established by philanthropist Mrs. Anson Phelps Stokes. When it opened in 1894 (replacing an Italian cheese factory), the library contained over 3000 volumes in Italian, plus periodicals. Many of the volumes were donated by the Italian government. English and sewing lessons were also available at the library. Library manager Rev. Antonio Arrighi told the New York Times that the purpose of the library was to “Americanize Italian immigrants” (NYT Archives 1894: “An Italian Free Library,” 7/23/1894; Tolman 1904:120).

1900s
In the first ten years of the twentieth century, at the height of immigration to the U.S., about 200,000 Italians arrived in the U.S. annually. By 1900, Palermo, Sicily, was one of the major ports of departure for Italian immigrants. That year, at least 45,109 Italian-born people were living in New York City, over 10 times as many as the 4,378 Chinese.  

By 1900, the San Raffaele Society (Italian Immigration Society), Italian Welfare League, and the Society for the Protection of Italian Immigrants all operated outposts serving Little Italy's immigrant population. L'Ordine Figli d'Italia, the Order of the Sons of Italy, was designed by its Italian immigrant founders, including Dr. Vincenzo (Vincent) Sellaro and Dr. Vincenzo (Vincent) Buffa, as a support system to assist immigrants in their transition to American citizens. The organization was founded at 203 Grand Street in Little Italy in 1905, one of the first “homegrown” Little-Italy-based Italian mutual aid societies. By 1921, 125,000 members met in 887 lodges country-wide. In the 104 years of its existence, Sons of Italy has grown into a national organization promoting study, understanding and appreciation of Italian-American heritage (OSIA 2009).

The 1900 City directory lists a large number of Italians in neighborhood who were in the business of food and drink. Neighborhood-resident Italians were grocers, liquor store operators, beer sellers, candy sellers, “eating house” operators, and meat, fruit and fish sellers. Italian laborers (skilled and unskilled), carpenters, barbers, and dress makers added to the local economy. To help manage all the income of the hardworking residents of Little Italy, there were many Italian bankers listed in the directory. Bankers Giovanni Lordi, Antonio Cuneo and Carmine Cava were three of the most successful real estate moguls in the neighborhood, likely using banked money to invest in their own real estate empires.

**Italians and Real Estate**
By 1900, a handful of Italian landlords were developing tenements, and in the process, becoming rich and politically connected. At the turn of the century, Giovanni Lordi, banker of 62 Mulberry Street, controlled about $1,000,000 worth of real estate, while Augustino Sbarbaro, a former police sergeant, owned about $800,000 worth. Dominick Abbate, Antonio Cuneo, (a non-neighborhood-resident banker with offices at 28 Mulberry)
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9 Actual number of ethnically Italian residents is far greater, due to increasing number of New Yorkers born of Italian parents.
Carmine Cava (a banker at 46 Mulberry Street) and Rocco Marasco were all increasing their real estate holdings in the neighborhood. By 1903, Marasco had built one of the first New Law tenements in Little Italy, at Mulberry and Broome (NYT 10/25/1903).

Italian-born Rocco Marasco arrived in New York as a child, where he rose from bootblack to financially and politically connected real estate magnate, presidential elector, and close associate of local Tammany boss Big Tim Sullivan. Marasco amassed a real estate portfolio of at least 25 tenements, mostly in Little Italy. He was a generous donor to Italian charities, vice president of the Italian Savings Bank and a founder of the Italian Hospital. In 1913, rather than recuperate from pneumonia at his country estate in Mamaroneck, Marasco chose instead to stay in his Little Italy home at 57 E. Houston (corner of Mott Street), where he died in January at age 50 (NYT 01/16/1913).

Dominick Abbate, who came to New York from Italy at age 9, died in 1939 at age 70. His obituary in the New York Times told of his rise to prominence in New York's real estate business from an initial investment of $150. Abbate and Marasco partnered in tenement ownership in Little Italy. Abbate also operated several real estate companies that developed tenements in the nearby Italian enclave of the South Village, including forward-thinking model tenements designed and built in the early 1910s (Dolkart 2006:40-41).

While a few wealthy investors could purchase and build tenements outright, long-term leases may have been the most common method of gaining control of a tenement. Around 1900, a fully-occupied six-story apartment with 14 rooms on a floor would have an annual rent roll of $3500. A lessee would lease the building for $2800 from the owner, often an estate that had controlled the land since the early nineteenth century, or far-flung absentee landlords. With a minimum of investment in repairs, it was estimated that a lessee would clear $350 year. A lessee could make enough to purchase the property outright, or clear enough profit to build his or her own tenement (NYT 10/25/1903). The cost of constructing a six-story tenement averaged about $30,000, in 1900 (NYC Department of Buildings: BBL Files). With a $3,500 to $4,000 annual rent roll, an investment might pay off in a decade.

1910s
The 1910 census counted 101,228 Italian-born individuals in New York, double the number from the previous (1900) census. Mulberry Bend Park, constructed in the 1890s, had been rededicated as Columbus Park in 1911, as a gesture to the exponentially growing Italian community.

At the outbreak of war in Europe in 1914, many Italians returned to Italy. The end of the Great War—World War I, resulted in a wave of return immigration as Italians who had been living in New York before the war returned in great numbers. The slump in the neighborhood during the 1910s, when many buildings were vacant, seemed to be ending. More Italians were getting into the real estate market, and new construction during the booming 1920s brought new types of buildings to the neighborhood—automobile repair shops and parking garages, and one-story workshops and factory buildings, many built by Italians.

1920s
By 1920, the length of Mulberry Street, from Worth to Houston, was solidly settled by Italians. Little Italy extended from Bleecker Street on the north side to Worth on the south, and from Lafayette Street to the Bowery.
From the earliest days of Italian immigration, Italians has been looked down upon as a dirty, uneducated and superstitious lot (Brace 1872). Sensational tales of La Mano Nera (the Black Hand) and reports of the Mafia's growing presence in organized crime and racketeering in the 1920s, like the stories of the Chinese Tong Wars, colored the popular perception of Italians as a group. The sheer number of Italian immigrants arriving weekly also raised fears among the “native” White population—fears of being outnumbered by foreigners. Restrictive immigration acts during the 1920s, inspired by bias against certain classes of immigrants, effectively ended the era of the great Italian immigration.

The 1921 Emergency Quota Act, "an Act to limit the immigration of aliens into the United States," was designed to limit the number of southern and eastern European immigrants entering the country. The act established "that the number of aliens of any nationality who may be admitted under the immigration laws to the United States in any fiscal year shall be limited to 3 per centum of the number of foreign born persons of such nationality resident in the United States as determined by the United States census of 1910" (United States Statutes at Large [57th Cong., Sess. I, Chp. 8, p. 5-7]). The Emergency Quota Act limited Italian immigration to 42,057 persons annually.

The Immigration Act of 1924 further limited the number of allowable immigrants to only 2% of the number residing in the county in 1890. Germany, Britain and Ireland and other northern European countries were granted 86% of the 155,000 annual visas; Only 3,845 Italians per year were admitted entry.

For those Italians already living in Little Italy, life continued apace. Pushcarts still plied the streets—in 1925, 32% of all fruit and vegetable pushcart operators city-wide were Italian (Bluestone 1991: 74). In recognition of the large local Napolitani population, the Feast of San Gennaro, patron saint of Naples, was first celebrated on Mulberry Street in September 1926.

1930-1940s

By the early 1930s, Italians made up an estimated 98% of households in the neighborhood (WPA 1939:118). Italian vendors still hawked their food and wares in the Mott Street pushcart market between Canal and Broome Streets. Italian specialties like olives, artichokes, cheeses, and fennel could be purchased. Prepared foods, like pizza, were also for sale. As described in 1939 by a writer for the Federal Writers' Project, pizza was “an unsweetened pastry filled with tomatoes and cheese, meat or fish” (WPA 1939: 118). Only after World War II would pizza become a popular and well-known American staple.

Tourism

Little Italy was a tourist attraction by the 1940s, and many of the first tourists were Italian-Americans coming back for feasts, to shop in Italian food shops or to eat Italian food. Authentic Italian food shops remain in Little Italy, which many Italian-Americans frequent to stock up on Italian specialties. Food is central in both Chinese and Italian cultures, and the prevalence of Chinese and Italian food stores and restaurants is a major character-defining feature of the district.

The Italian merchants of Little Italy trade on the notion of the iconic Little Italy as the birthplace of Italian-American culture. Historically, each street in Little Italy was populated by particular regional groups—Napolitani, Calabrese, Siciliani, Basilicati. Today, the neighborhood is identified with a broader “Italian” culture—an Italian-American culture, rather than the regional cultures that predominated during the period of the
great migration. By embracing the more general Italian-American culture, rather than the region-specific culture, Little Italy is available as a cultural touchstone for all Italian-Americans, not just Siciliani or Napolitani.

1950s-1965
The Italian population contracted dramatically starting the 1950s, when like so many Americans, large numbers of the middle and upper classes moved to the growing suburbs. A core of restaurants, cheese shops and pastry shops remained, and the annual feast celebrations, notably San Gennaro, continued to draw Italian-Americans from across the region and world to celebrate a common cultural heritage.

Little Italy Today
Little Italy has contracted in size, and today its core is centered on the restaurants, cafes and food shops of Mulberry Street between Canal and Spring Streets. Italian and non-Italian tourists continue to flood into Little Italy as a rite of pilgrimage to an iconic neighborhood and a well-promoted tourist activity. Most tourists to Little Italy are not of Italian descent, but come to satisfy their interest in a popular culture version of Italian-American culture.

Many tourists, however, are Italian-American, and there remains in Little Italy a deeply resonant cultural significance. The neighborhood retains authentic traditions; The Feast of San Gennaro, one of the most popular tourist attractions, is at its heart a true expression of devotion to the church, both the Roman Catholic tradition in general, and specifically the traditions of Most Precious Blood, built to accommodate the Italians who where once shut out of worship services at Transfiguration and old St. Patrick’s. The Feast of San Gennaro (celebrated on Mulberry Street annually since September 1926), along with an abundant food culture, remain the major demonstrations of cultural continuity in Little Italy.

TENEMENT HOUSE DESIGN AND REFORM EFFORTS
The blocks of the Chinatown and Little Italy Historic District contain a wide range of buildings that reflect the history and evolution of these ethnic communities. Intermingled with residential buildings are commercial, industrial, religious, educational, and other public buildings. While all of these historic buildings and the street pattern contribute to the character of the area, it is the ubiquitous tenement that most defines the district. The evolution of the tenement represents social and architectural responses to housing the poor and working class, particularly immigrant populations.

As the neighborhood steadily gained in population from the 1850s onward, new incentives to develop tenement houses emerged. The overcrowding and unsanitary conditions of many shoddily converted or purpose-built tenements induced the City and State to regulate the industry of housing the poor. Physical results of laws enacted or updated in 1867, 1879 (Old Law) and 1901 (New Law) are visible either in plan, footprint or in aesthetic impacts on the streetscape, such as the façade-mounted fire escapes. Buildings constructed prior to 1879 are considered "Pre-Law," and the footprints are typically rectangular with no light or airshafts. Between 1879 and 1901, buildings are considered "Old Law," and are characterized by hourglass- or dumbbell-shaped
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10 Much of the context for urban housing reforms in this section is quoted from Lowenthal, Dolkart, and Baumwoll 1993: 17-21 with specific building references to the Chinatown and Little Italy Historic District added to the text.
footprints. After 1901, buildings are defined as "New Law" and have more generous, rectangular light and air shafts.

The passage of the Tenement House Act of 1867 established a precedent for government regulation of conditions in tenement houses. This was the first law that had any effect on pre-existing buildings. Among the requirements of this law were the provision that one toilet or privy be provided for every twenty people, that privies be connected to sewers where these were available, and that all interior bedrooms be provided with a three-foot-square transom over the door (Lowenthal, Dolkart, and Baumwoll 1993: 18-19).

Demands for stronger laws governing the design of tenements continued in the 1870s, culminating in the Tenement House Act of 1879 (Old Law). This law outlawed tenements with contained interior rooms with no windows (Lowenthal, Dolkart, and Baumwoll 1993: 19). An example of an Old Law dumbbell-plan tenement block in the district is Schneider & Herter’s 246-252 Mott Street (1896, Renaissance Revival).

The tenements of Chinatown and Little, like elsewhere in New York, were clearly intended as money-making ventures. As such, they achieved economic viability by crowding the greatest number of people into the smallest possible space (Lowenthal, Dolkart, and Baumwoll 1993: 14). In his book, The Battle with the Slum, Jacob Riis described the crowding of one such building on Elizabeth Street: “Upon each floor were four flats, and in each flat three rooms that measured respectively 14 x 11, 7 x 11, and 7 x 8-1/2 feet. In only one flat did we find a single family. In three there were two to each. In the other twelve each room had its own family living and sleeping there” (Riis 1902: 100). Thus by 1894 the Tenement House Commission described the “improved plan of 1879” as “the one hopeless form of tenement construction.” (Riis).

Despite the piecemeal efforts at amelioration, conditions in tenement districts continued to appall middle-class reformers. The prevailing attitude of the city’s opinion-shapers was summarized in a New York Times editorial of November 29, 1896:

The chief objections to the old-style tenements are contracted quarters, lack of family privacy, and promiscuous toilet arrangements, inviting moral deterioration; lack of light and air, and of sanitary accommodations, insuring a large death rate, and danger from fire – that ever-present tenement horror. All of these are wickedly cruel with such houses are new; when they become old, dilapidated, infested with vermin and infected with disease germs, they are a disgrace to humanity and a menace, not only to the health of the unfortunate residents therein, but to the health of the whole community.

Under the leadership of Lawrence Veiller, a high-minded man of upper-class origins, and the Charity Organization Society of the City of New York, the movement to improve tenement conditions broadened. Their work culminated in the passage of the Tenement House Act of 1901 (Lowenthal, Dolkart, and Baumwoll 1993: 20).

The 1901 act, the most far-reaching of all the tenement reform bills, not only set standards for new construction but mandated major changes in existing buildings. These regulations, passed and enforced against often strenuous opposition by some landlords and builders, emphasized improvement in lighting, ventilation, and sanitation facilities (Lowenthal, Dolkart, and Baumwoll 1993: 20). An example of a New Law tenement in the district is the Beaux-Arts building by Sass & Smallheiser at 179-185 Mulberry Street which has greatly large air shafts and courtyards.
Like the tenements of the Lower East Side and Two Bridges historic districts (both National Register listed at the national level of significance), the Chinatown and Little Italy Historic District tenements are humble buildings that housed immigrants to New York during the greatest wave of immigration in American history. The range of Pre Law, Old Law, and New Law tenements represents the evolution of this housing type to accommodate a growing immigrant population. The tenements of Chinatown and Little Italy represent the critical transition stage in which newly-arrived immigrants launched their struggle for a better life. The district today still reflects its historic appearance and character from the period of peak immigration, and the majority of tenements within the district retain their historic function.

ARCHITECTS
A number of notable New York architects and firms were engaged in tenement house design during the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. George B. Post, designer of elegant commercial and civic structures, designed one of the blandest tenements in the district, the marginally Italianate building at 19 Cleveland Place (1877). Herter Brothers, designers of the celebrated Eldridge Street Synagogue (1887, NHL), and some of the fanciest exteriors of tenements in this district, were repeatedly cited in building permit applications for excessive lot coverage and inadequate ventilation and light. A descendant firm, Schneider and Herter, specialized in tenement design, as did several others whose names appear repeatedly on building permit applications, including Bernstein & Bernstein, Max Müller, George Frederic Pelham, Charles Rentz, Charles E. Reid, Herman Horenburger and Horenburger & Straub, James A. Ware, William E. Waring, and Fernando Savignano.11

Other types of buildings were designed by well-known firms, such as Calvert Vaux and Vaux & Radford. The Vaux-designed Children's Aid Society 14th Ward Industrial School (256 Mott Street, 1888; NR, NYC Landmark; BSS), was inspired by the Aesthetic Movement and late Victorian eclecticism. Mulberry Bend/Columbus Park, designed by Vaux in 1887, was only completed in 1897, two years after his death.

Hoppin & Koen designed an elegant Romanesque/ proto-Gothic building for the Church of San Salvatore (359-361 Broome, 1901). Hoppin & Koen were preeminent designers of country houses for the very wealthy, and would soon design the landmark Edwardian Baroque and Beaux-Arts-inspired New York City Police Headquarters (1905-1909, NR) just blocks as away at 240 Centre Street.

C.P.H. Gilbert's Italian Savings Bank (225 Lafayette, 1925), a 12-story Classical Revival bank tower, is the largest building in the district. Gilbert's specialty, however, was designing elaborate mansions for New York's elite—over 100 mansions in Manhattan and Brooklyn, some on Riverside Drive, others on Prospect Park, were designed by Gilbert (Gray 2003).

There are likely more attributable buildings, but permit records were only maintained after 1866, and those permit files in the Municipal Archives are not complete. The professionalization of architecture practice that began in earnest during the 1870s and 80s, coincided with the boom in new tenement construction. The variety of architects engaged in the design of this dominant building type is evidence of not only the lucrative nature of the business, but of the attempt of architects to specialize and thus professionalize the field. Many early permits

11 This data comes directly from the building permits located in the Municipal Archives. Available Buildings Department documents filed by blocks and lots within the district were examined. The available data is included in the building-by-building descriptions, which follow the narrative description in Section 7.
list masons and carpenters as architects of record; By the 1880s, most list record trained architects and architecture firms in this capacity.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL DATA POTENTIAL
Areas of the district including Columbus Park and undisturbed rear yards of old town houses and tenements offer significant opportunities to consider questions about the lives of immigrants in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. This district of tenements has been well-preserved and has not undergone much of the intensive development seen in other parts of Manhattan, thus providing unparalleled opportunities for future archaeological discoveries. Undisturbed areas of the historic district offer exceptional archaeological potential to yield information about important questions regarding the lives of immigrants including questions about daily activities, interaction within their communities and with the outside world, socio-economic stratification within their enclaves and within the larger population structure, adaptations to life in a foreign land, evolution of the communities in response to technological and social change, and many more. Many of the same issues considered in the history and setting of the architectural features may be addressed from a more “person” oriented perspective by archaeological investigation. In addition, there is potential for rare evidence of early New York industries in the vicinity of the Collect Pond.

There is also a potential for archaeological deposits which predate the period of significance of the historic district. During the eighteenth century this area held numerous farmsteads, estates and industrial establishments, such as tanneries and slaughter houses. Although minor changes would occur later, the basic street pattern of the District appears to have been in place by 1755 as recorded on the Maerschalk Map.

During the Revolutionary War both the Americans and the British developed defensive works within the District. The Americans first built the Bunkers Hill Redoubt within the area currently bounded by Hester, Mott, Grand and Baxter Streets. After chasing the Americans from Manhattan, the British strengthened the redoubt and built an additional defensive line that diagonally spanned the historic district from east to west in the general vicinity of current Grand Street (British Headquarters Map 1782). This line consisted of at least a series of redoubts and may have included more extensive works as well. Although it appears that extensive landscape modification occurred in this area during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, any original landforms that remain intact, or that may have been buried by filling actions are likely to contain deposits associated with these defensive works.

Studies to date
Prior archaeological investigations within the district and within adjacent areas have demonstrated a tremendous potential for important archaeological studies and research. Work already conducted within the boundaries of the district includes projects at Columbus Park, Baxter and Grand Streets, Hester and Mott Streets, and 62-64 Mulberry Street. The limited studies completed within the district boundaries have demonstrated the
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archaeological potential of the area.

Columbus Park
Columbus Park is located between Worth, Baxter, Bayard, and Mulberry streets in the southern part of the district. This area was originally an industrial quarter with a public slaughter house, rope walks, and a tannery. Nearby to the west was the Collect Pond which local industry relied upon for cleaning and discharging waste. After the collect was filled in (1808) the area became developed for housing and commerce. The population was transient in nature with poor and working class immigrants. By the 1890s, the area became known as Mulberry Bend and was densely packed with early rowhouses and tenements. In 1895, the buildings were cleared, displacing 2,643 people in less than three acres. The land was then developed into a city park to the designs of Calvert Vaux.

Archaeological monitoring done in conjunction with work at the Pavilion at the north end of the park at Bayard Street was done in October 2005, and between January 2006 and January 2007 (see Loorya and Ricciardi 2005 and 2007). Monitoring in 2005 for the removal of gasoline storage tanks and the construction of an ADA ramp was conducted on the north side of the pavilion at Bayard Street. Excavation revealed a disturbed area and a large amount of twentieth century deposited soils that were apparently placed to raise the level of the park to the current street. The remains of two brick walls were uncovered on the north side of the pavilion. Based on their location and the information revealed in the various maps studied, they formed the basement walls of 101 Bayard Street, the Ward School. Both walls were faced with plaster. With the exception of one small pearlware green edgeware shard, no artifacts were recovered (Loorya and Ricciardi 2005: 31).

The monitoring done in 2006-2007 revealed a brick cistern near the southeast corner of the pavilion. The feature was not excavated and remains in situ, undisturbed. Because the cistern was left in situ, it is not known if it is filled or empty. Cisterns have been known from other excavations to be filled with refuse materials when they become obsolete. Trash deposits have the potential to provide a wealth of information on the residents who lived in the area, the types of materials available and used, economic conditions, food and health and hygiene issues (Loorya and Ricciardi 2007: 26).

The archaeologists noted the potential for future discoveries in the park stating that “The lack of below ground works, as noted in the Parks history, means that the potential exists to uncover in situ artifacts that relate to the transient population and growing working class of the nineteenth century. Like the Five Points site, which is less than a city block away, this site may further add to the known history of this population and continue to dispel the stereotypical myths of this group and era” (Loorya and Ricciardi 2005: 30).

Rear Yards

Board of Education. CEQR 88-236M.
Yards located behind the district’s old town houses and tenements most likely possess a high potential for intact late eighteenth century and nineteenth century archaeological deposits particularly at abandoned privies where household garbage may have been dumped. Archaeological deposits associated with the full range of the period of significance are likely to be present in the form of scattered yard deposits, however more substantial deposits are likely present for the first half of the period, before technological and health related advances led to changes in sanitation and water delivery systems. Early nineteenth century disposal patterns often led to “kitchen middens” of scatters of trash in yards, while the lack of water delivery and waste removal systems led to wells, cisterns and privies at most lots. These types of structures or shaft features often accumulated artifactual deposits during their use and once citywide systems were available they would have been filled and sealed, resulting in deposits that were well protected from later activities that may have impacted surface layers.

The archaeological discovery and investigations of the privy vault in the Tenement Museum’s rear yard located in the Lower East Side Historic District, for example, contributed to the understanding of health and sanitary progress in New York City during the nineteenth century. The development patterns of the Lower East Side with its densely packed tenements and rear yards are very similar to that found in the Chinatown and Little Italy Historic District so it is likely that similar remains exist in the historic district.

The archaeological discovery and investigations of the privy vault in the Tenement Museum’s rear yard located in the Lower East Side Historic District, for example, contributed to the understanding of health and sanitary progress in New York City during the nineteenth century. The development patterns of the Lower East Side with its densely packed tenements and rear yards are very similar to that found in the Chinatown and Little Italy Historic District so it is likely that similar remains exist in the historic district.

The archaeological discovery and investigations of the privy vault in the Tenement Museum’s rear yard located in the Lower East Side Historic District, for example, contributed to the understanding of health and sanitary progress in New York City during the nineteenth century. The development patterns of the Lower East Side with its densely packed tenements and rear yards are very similar to that found in the Chinatown and Little Italy Historic District so it is likely that similar remains exist in the historic district.

Five Points

Just outside the historic district, between Worth and Pearl Streets, is the 27-story Foley Square U.S. Courthouse built in the 1990s. The federal courthouse stands on the site that was once part of the infamous Five Points (see attached map). The Five Points was named for the points created by the intersection of three streets: Orange (now Baxter), Cross (now Park), and Anthony (now Worth). The southern portion of the Chinatown-Little Italy Historic District overlaps with the notorious Five Points slum. The extensive archaeological findings done at
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the Five Points site in 1991 as part of the courthouse project, point to a high likelihood of future archaeological discoveries in the district located less than one block away to the north.

The Five Points site is extensively documented in *Tales of Five Points: Working-Class Life in Nineteenth-Century New York*, Volume 1 (Yamin 2000). Although a parking lot covered the Courthouse project site from 1961 to 1991, a complex of tightly packed tenement foundations, cellar floors, and courtyards was discovered beneath the pavement. In addition, nearly a million artifacts were recovered which have revealed much about the daily lives of the people who lived in Five Points. The proximity and the cultural continuity between this block and the southern part of the historic district makes it possible to predict the types of resources likely to be found.

**Historic Maps**

A preliminary review of historic maps offers insights into the development of the district and the types of resources once located here which are expected to have produced archaeological components that are still *in situ* (see attached maps with historic district overlay). Historical and architectural evolution of the district study area originates from the eighteenth century landscape as characterized by farmsteads, estates and industrial uses including tanneries and slaughter houses). Although the district continued to evolve, its basic street pattern appears to have been in place by 1755 (see Maerschalk Map 1755; also see Montresor Andrews Map, 1766).

The 1782 *British Headquarters Map* created by the British military when they controlled New York City during the American Revolution, illustrates the Collect Pond whose eastern bank extended to the area of present day Columbus Park. The map also shows the location of a palisade that cuts across the center of the district, separating the settled city to the south from the less developed and quasi-wilderness areas to the north.

The “Kollect Map” offers a glimpse of the early nineteenth century landscape of the southern portion of the district. This map was sketched ca. 1800-1825 by a laborer who lived and worked here. It shows the street grid, a tanning shed, a public slaughterhouse, rope-walks, the African Zion Church, and some housing (Loorya and Ricciardi 2005: 9).

After the Collect Pond was filled in (1808) the area quickly transitioned into a densely developed, multi-ethnic neighborhood known as “Five Points” characterized by both residential and commercial settlement along with a host of cottage industries. New growth took place in accordance with the street grid pattern that was first recorded on the 1755 Maerschalk map. In the early 1800s, previously mapped and rough cut streets were graded and regulated across a once diverse landscape of post glacial topographic features and incongruent farmstead property line boundaries (1803 Mangin).

The 1852 Dripps map shows the dense development found in the entire historic district from the Five Points area well below Canal Street to Worth Street and the area north of Canal to East Houston Street. The detailed George Bromley map of 1891 is useful in that it indicates construction types (brick, wood, stone). Many of the wood structures, which are smaller in number than brick buildings, appear to be early nineteenth century residences with substantial backyards. Many of the newer-vintage brick tenements were long and
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narrow with several rooms on each floor and a commercial shop at street level. These represent the trend of making use of more of the lot for housing. This map also shows many separate rear tenements, not visible from the street.

The 1911 Bromley map shows the loss of more frame houses and their replacement by larger brick tenements. It also shows the large swath of buildings removed between Bayard, Mulberry, Park, and Baxter streets to form the new Mulberry Bend Park (today’s Columbus Park).

Research Questions
Future archaeological excavations within the historic district combined with analysis of historic maps, archival literature, deed registers, city directories, water and sewer installation records, census records, tax assessments, and material culture would allow one to address the following broad domains of research:

1. The socioeconomic and ideological processes that contributed to the evolution of this densely developed immigrant neighborhood;
2. The construction of class, race, and ethnicity in an urban context;
3. The nature of family, kinship, and household organization;
4. Work, industry, and commercial enterprise in a developing capitalist economy;
5. Health and hygiene in an urban context;
6. Reconstruction of dietary preferences; and,
8. Technology and extent of British and American Fortifications associated with the Revolutionary War.

Should undisturbed areas be excavated they may provide insights and answers to many questions which cannot be addressed by the study of the above-ground historic resources alone. Archaeological deposits are expected to be found in the relatively undisturbed back yard areas of many of the structures. Potential archaeological features that would likely be discovered might include foundation walls, courtyards, cellar floors, backyard features such as privies and cisterns, and artifacts related to late eighteenth-, nineteenth-, and early twentieth century history. In addition to these typical backyard features, previous investigations in the area of the Collect Pond and other areas of Manhattan have demonstrated that early and continued modification of the landscape has resulted in the deep burial of many archaeological deposits. In areas such as the African American Burial Ground (NHL/NR), located within blocks of the district, the original land surface was so deeply buried that it survived beneath 19th century basements (Perry et al. 2006). Since part of the district lies within the Collect Pond area, there is similar potential for such deep deposits at some locations. Likely resource and artifact types would represent industrial, commercial, residential, religious, recreational, cultural, health, and immigration themes. The district’s history encompasses several different demographic groups and waves of settlement. Future archaeological discoveries may provide important information on the Dutch, the English, Africans and African-Americans, Irish, Russian and Polish Jews, Chinese, and Italians.
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<td>Kurtzer &amp; Rentz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurtzer &amp; Röhl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lama &amp; Proskauer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lama, Proskauer &amp; Prober</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langer, Nathan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee, Poy G.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenky, Hyman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levy &amp; Berger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowinson, Oscar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangin, Joseph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, Mr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McElwaine, A.R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGurk, Bernard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meader, William</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meli, Cyrus P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merritt, Mortimer C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mertin, Adolph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meyers, Charles B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meyers, Edward A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller, George</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mook, Robert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mooney, John B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moran, P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moran &amp; Armstrong (builders)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Müller, Max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray, Michael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray, Patrick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neville &amp; Bagge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ogden, A.B. &amp; Son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelham, George Frederick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petione, Vespucci</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollock, Robert S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor, Alfred Easton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post, George B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potter, William A.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Rabold & Postevin
Reichlin, Adolph G.
Reily, Robert J.
Reilly & Steinback
Reissmann, O.
Rentz, Charles
Rentz & Lang
Robertson, Robert H.
Rohl, Richard
Sass & Smallheiser
Savignano, Ferdinand
Schickel & Ditmars for Ireland
Schickler, William
Schleman, Sidney
Schneider & Herter
Sexton, John
Simburg, A.J.
Slevin & Sheeran (mason & architect)
Smith, David M.
Sniffen, Elisha
Snook, J.B.
Snyder, C.B.J.
Sommerfeld, William C.
Sommerfeld & Steckler
Spence, Andrew
Straub, Charles M.
Thom & Wilson
Thomas, Andrew J.
Todaro, Vincent S.
Trowbridge & Livingston
Valentine, J.H.
Vaux & Radford
Wagner, Albert
Walsh, Richard L.
Wandelt, Frederick
Ware, James E.
Waring, William E.
Weiher, Lorenz
Weindorf, Arthur
Whitehall, William
Wright, Charles
Zipkes, Maximillan
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10. Geographical Data (continued)

UTM References

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Easting</th>
<th>Northing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>585025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>584784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>584571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>584431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>584416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>584514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>584797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>584868</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Boundary Description
The Chinatown and Little Italy Historic District encompasses the following area: Beginning at the intersection of Mott and Worth Streets, running two blocks west to Baxter Street; running north along the east side of Baxter street to Canal Street, continuing north along Baxter to Hester Street; running one block west to Centre Street; running north along the east side of Centre to just south of Grand Street; cutting east through the block to Baxter Street; running north to cross Grand at Centre Market Place, then cutting east behind buildings fronting Grand to the middle of the block; then running north through the middle of the blocks until Kenmare Street; running ½ block west to Cleveland Place; running north along the east side to Cleveland Place, which turns into Lafayette Street at Spring Street. Continuing north on Lafayette to Jersey Street; turning east on Jersey to Mulberry; Running north on Mulberry to just below East Houston Street, then running eastward behind the buildings fronting East Houston until Elizabeth Street; Running north on Elizabeth to encompass two buildings facing East Houston at the northeast corner of Elizabeth; running south through the center of the block (between Elizabeth and the Bowery) to Bayard Street; running east on Bayard to just short of Bowery, running south between 45 & 47 Bayard, crossing Pell and intersecting Doyers Street just west of the U.S. Post Office; turning east then southwest to cut out the buildings fronting Chatham Square, intersecting Mott between 12 & 14 Mott Street, then turning southeast to return to the point at the beginning, Mott and Worth Streets. See attached Sanborn Map for boundaries.

Boundary Justification
The district boundaries encompass the historic extent of Little Italy and the original historic core of Chinatown. The two communities have co-existed and overlapped for nearly a century and a half. This boundary encompasses a majority of architecturally intact nineteenth through mid-twentieth century tenements, churches, schools, commercial and industrial buildings in the neighborhood.
Nomination researched and written by: Kerri Culhane, Architectural Historian, 107 N. River Road, Fort Miller, New York 12828 (518) 695-5508 -for- Two Bridges Neighborhood Council, 275 Cherry Street, New York, New York 10002 (212) 566-2729.

Photographs
Chinatown & Little Italy Historic District
Photographs by: Kerri Culhane
Date of photos: April 2009
CD of TIFF images on file at the New York State Office of Recreation, Parks and Historic Preservation.

1. First Chinese Baptist Church, 21 Pell Street. Looking south-east.
2. Pell streetscape, looking north-west from near 8 Pell Street.
3. Doyers streetscape, looking south-east toward Chatham Square/Kimlau Square from the bend.
4. Mott streetscape, 1-9 Mott, looking north-west from Mott & Chatham Square
5. Transfiguration Church and lower Mott streetscape. Looking south-east.
7. Mott streetscape, looking south-west from Canal & Mott.
10. Mott streetscape, 252-242 Mott, looking south-east.
12. Columbus Park Pavilion south of Bayard Street. Looking north-west.
15. Tenements, north-east corner Broome and Mulberry. Looking north-east.
21. Church of San Salvatore (359 Broome) and Engine Co. 55 (363 Broome). Looking south.
27. Cleveland Place streetscape. 25-15 Cleveland Place. Looking east.
30. Gee How Oak Tin Building, 64 Bayard Street. Looking north.
Chinatown and Little Italy Historic District, New York County, NY.
Boundary indicated by dark line. Not to scale.
(See attached oversized Sanborn maps for scaled maps showing building footprints; non-contributing buildings.)
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HISTORIC MAPS

Duyckinck Maerschalk Map, 1755.
(Approx. boundary of historic district indicated by red line.)

Montresor Andrews Map, 1766.
(Approx. boundary of historic district indicated by red line.)
**HISTORIC MAPS**

*British Headquarters Map.* Map of New York. 1782.
(Approx. boundary of historic district indicated by blue line.)

*Detail of British Headquarters Map,* 1782. Note the palisade in the general vicinity of current Grand Street.
(Approx. boundary of historic district indicated by red line; locations of current streets also noted.)
Map showing the Five Points intersection with overlay of southern portion of the Chinatown and Little Italy Historic District shown by hatching. (Map from Yamin 2000: 3).
HISTORIC MAPS

Joseph Fr. Mangin. *Plan of the City of New York*, 1852. (Approx. boundary of historic district shown by red line.)
Matthew Dripps. *Map of the City of New York*. 1852. (Approx. boundary of historic district shown by blue line.)
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Map 1 of 2 (showing northern half of the historic district; approx. boundary of hist. district shown by blue line).

HISTORIC MAPS

Map 2 of 2 (showing southern half of the historic district; approx. boundary of historic district shown by blue line).
Map 1 of 2 (showing northern half of the historic district; approx. boundary of historic district shown by blue line).

Map 2 of 2 (showing southern half of the historic district; approx. boundary of historic district shown by blue line).