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ABSTRACT

The Bluestone Organization has retained Chrysalis Archaeological Consultants (Chrysalis) to undertake a Phase IA Documentary Study and Archaeological Sensitivity Assessment for the proposed Westchester Square Development Project. The proposed project will develop a subdivision of the historic St. Peter’s Episcopal Church and Cemetery complex and an adjacent developed corner lot located in the Westchester Square section of Bronx County, NY. The project was identified by the City of New York - Landmarks Preservation Commission (NYC LPC) as having potential cultural sensitivity thereby requiring this Phase IA Sensitivity Assessment.

St. Peter’s Episcopal Church and Cemetery complex (St. Peter’s) is a National Register of Historic Places and New York City landmark property. Though the current building dates to 1853, the use of the property dates to the seventeenth century. The current cemetery incorporates the earlier Friends Burial Ground, an eighteenth-century burial ground associated with the Quaker congregation that once occupied the property. A subdivision south of the extant cemetery and the no longer extant, or visible, St. Peter’s Drive and an adjacent lot are slated for the development of affordable housing by The Bluestone Organization.

The purpose of this Phase IA study is to document the history of the project area and assess the potential impacts of proposed development, specific to the Westchester Square Development project within the Area of Potential Effect (APE). More specifically, the goal of the study was to assess the prehistoric and historic potential of the APE with regard to buried and/or extant cultural resources including the potential to impact the adjacent cemetery. Part of this is to determine if there is historic information available to confirm the boundaries of the historic cemetery. The APE is defined as any area in which activities related to the project have the potential to disturb ground surface and in turn potential cultural resources.

Based on a result of the Phase IA, it is recommended that the project move to the next phase of the Cultural Resource Management (CRM) process, the Phase IB. Phase IB Archaeological Field Test should be undertaken to determine the presence or absence of buried cultural remains and stratigraphic levels including the potential for seventeenth to eighteenth century building structures (including wells, privies and cisterns) and the potential for buried human remains.

The project should open a dialogue with NYC LPC to determine the best course of action regarding the recommendations presented above. Before any Phase IB work can be undertaken a detailed Archaeological Work Plan must be written in accordance with the Guidelines for Archeological Work in New York City and submitted to NYC LPC for approval. As stated above, Phase IB Archaeological Field Testing determines presence or absence, if cultural resources are found to be present it may be necessary, in consultation with NYC LPC, to move on to the next phase of the process, Phase II Archaeological Survey.

Alyssa Loorya, Ph.D., R.P.A. and Elissa Rutigliano authored this report and it was edited by Christopher Ricciardi, Ph.D., R.P.A., on behalf of Chrysalis
I. INTRODUCTION

The Bluestone Organization has retained Chrysalis Archaeological Consultants (Chrysalis) to undertake a Phase IA Documentary Study and Archaeological Sensitivity Assessment for the proposed Westchester Square Development Project. The proposed project will develop a subdivision of the historic St. Peter’s Episcopal Church and Cemetery complex and an adjacent developed corner lot located in the Westchester Square section of Bronx County, NY (Maps 01 and 02). The project was identified by the City of New York - Landmarks Preservation Commission (NYC LPC) as having potential cultural sensitivity thereby requiring this Phase IA Sensitivity Assessment.

St. Peter’s Episcopal Church and Cemetery complex (St. Peter’s) is on the National Register of Historic Places and is a designated New York City landmark. Though the current building dates to 1853, the use of the property dates to the seventeenth century. The current cemetery incorporates the earlier Friends Burial Ground, an eighteenth-century burial ground associated with the Quaker congregation that once occupied the property. A subdivision south of the extant cemetery and a majority of the no longer extant, or visible, St. Peter’s Drive and an adjacent lot are slated for the development of affordable housing by The Bluestone Organization (Map 02).

The purpose of this Phase IA study is to document the history of the project area and assess the potential impacts of proposed development, specific to the Westchester Square Development project within the Area of Potential Effect (APE). More specifically, the goal of the study was to assess the prehistoric and historic potential of the APE with regard to buried and/or extant cultural resources including the potential to impact the adjacent cemetery. Part of this is to determine if there is historic information available to confirm the boundaries of the historic cemetery. The APE is defined as any area in which activities related to the project have the potential to disturb ground surface and in turn potential cultural resources.

This study assessed if the site has the potential to contain significant buried cultural resources, including but not limited to unmarked burials that would be impacted by the proposed development of the APE. It will also consider historic resources and information that may help to more definitively delineate the boundaries of the historic cemetery. This study provides recommendations for further study should the potential for disturbance to potential buried or extant cultural resources and/or unmarked burials exist.

All work was conducted in accordance with the NYC LPC’s Guidelines for Archaeological Work in New York City (NYCLPC 2018); and the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966, as amended, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation’s “Protection of Historic and Cultural Properties” (36 CFR 800), the New York State Historic Preservation Act (SHPA), New York State Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation (NY SHPO) guidelines (New York Archaeological Council [NYAC] 1994; 2000; 2002), the (New York) State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA), and the (New York) City Environmental Quality Review Act (CEQRA).

Alyssa Loorya, Ph.D., R.P.A. and Elissa Rutigliano authored this report on behalf of Chrysalis (see Appendix B for resumes).
**PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

The Bluestone Organization proposes a two-phase development located along Westchester Avenue, south of St. Peter’s Church and Cemetery. It will include the demolition of the existing building on the corner of Westchester Avenue and Herschell Street (Block 3848/Lot 1). The project incorporates a subdivision of St. Peter’s Church (Block 3848/Lot 6) and the corner property (Block 3848/Lot 1). It will merge the zoning of Block 3848 Lots 1 and a portion of Lot 6.

The development plan will:

- include two independent mixed-use, mixed income developments
- include residential rental housing across a range of affordability levels
- include senior housing units under the AIRS program
- include community facility space to serve various community needs
- include retail and/or commercial space along Westchester Avenue

The first phase of the project will be located at the northern portion of the site, with a 10’ setback from the sidewalk and 61’ of frontage along Westchester Avenue and extending eastward to the rear of the site. The building will include approximately 155,045 gross square feet (GSF) of residential space, 6,926 GSF of community facility/retail/commercial space, and 16,721 GSF of cellar space (including parking and mechanical spaces) Phase 2 will be located at the southern portion of the site, with a 10’ setback from the sidewalk and 175’ of frontage along Westchester Avenue. Phase 2 will include approximately 99,757 GSF of residential space, 7,657 GSF of community facility/retail/commercial space, and 10,179 GSF of cellar space (including parking and mechanical spaces) (Bluestone Organization 2019).

Per Bluestone Organization’s Development Bid “the large unused tract of land south of the cemetery creates an unbalance on the site. The concept is to juxtapose the church with a midrise mixed-use building on the vacant portion of the site. The new structure will be set back from the street line”. The setback will allow the continued continuation of the wrought iron fence that runs along the entire Westchester Avenue frontage, and it creates a front yard to match the street wall established by the church and chapel.

**PROJECT INFORMATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Westchester Square Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street Address</td>
<td>2450 Westchester Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2452/2458 Westchester Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borough/Block/Lot</td>
<td>Bronx/3848/1 and a portion of Bronx/3848/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPC PUID (If Yet Assigned)</td>
<td>The Bluestone Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant Name</td>
<td>Housing Preservation and Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Map 02: NYC Street map (OASIS Project 2019).
Figure 01: Proposed subdivision and development footprint (Crown Architecture and Consulting for the Bluestone Organization 2017 modified by Chrysalis).
II. SYNTHESIS OF PREVIOUS WORK

A review of NYC LPC files and the NYSHPO CRIS system did not identify any relevant archaeological projects within a .5 mile radius of the project area. The sole cultural resources project within this boundary is a Phase IA assessment for Proposed Zerega Avenue School, Block 3834, Lot 70, Bronx County, New York (John Milner and Associates 2000) for which no further work was recommended.

The NYSHPO CRIS system places the project APE in an archaeologically sensitive area as based on predictive models. There are several above ground (architectural) resources in the area (Map 03) and the St. Peter’s complex is a New York City Landmark (Map 04). The APE is adjacent to a known historic cemetery, part of the landmarked St. Peter’s Church and Cemetery Complex.

Map 03: NY SHPO CRIS map – the greyed area represents an archaeologically sensitive area (NY SHPO 2019).
III. CONTEXT AND RESEARCH DESIGN

The project is located in the Westchester Square neighborhood of the Bronx, Bronx County, New York. The neighborhood is in the eastern section of the Bronx, its eastern end bordered by Westchester Creek. The project area itself is bounded by Westchester Avenue to the west, and Herschell Street to the south. The eastern boundary of the project area is divided between a private industrial lot at the corner of Butler Place and Rowe Street and residential lots that front Herschell Street. The northern boundary of the project area is the cemetery of St. Peter’s Episcopal Church, south of St. Peter’s Drive, a dirt path that was not visible during a recent site visit (Map 02).

The project site consists of New York City Block 3848 Lot 1 and a portion of Block 3848 Lot 6. Lot 1 is a 25.25' x 100.42' with a 22’ x 52’ building fronting Westchester Avenue. Lot 6 is part of the St. Peter’s Episcopal Church and Cemetery complex, a designated New York City landmark (NYC LPC 1976). The Landmark Designation consists of the Church property (Block 3848, Lot 18) and a portion of the cemetery yard (Block 3848, Lot 6). The landmarked portion of Lot 6 is noted as “that portion of the lot extending to the western boundary of the cemetery which stretches from Westchester Avenue to Butler Place” (NYC LPC 1976:1). The project site consists of all the remainder of Lot 6 that is outside the landmark designated portion and a small portion of the landmarked area at the southwestern corner of the lot (Figure 1 and Map 4).
The topography of the larger project area and vicinity is the result of glacial activity during the Wisconsian glaciation. The retreat of the ice sheet left behind glacial debris forming low hills or moraines. Prior to development this area of the Bronx consisted of wetlands and marshland. Immediately east of the project area is the aforementioned Westchester Creek, a tidal creek that was utilized for grist mills during the colonial period (Milner 2000).

Prior to the consolidation of New York City (1895-1898) this area was part of Westchester County. This area remained relatively rural until more widespread development of New York City began to occur in the early twentieth century. Presently the area surrounding the APE is highly developed by residential and industrial construction, an elevated rail line runs alongside the western edge of the property.

The United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Web Soil Survey identifies the project area as containing 86% GUAw (Greenbelt-Urban land complex, very deep water table, 0 to 3 percent slopes, cemetery), 9.9% UtA (Urban land, till substratum, 0 to 3 percent slopes) soils, and 4.1% UGA (Urban land-Greenbelt complex, 0 to 3 percent slopes) (United States Department of Agriculture 2019).

This Phase IA Documentary Study is designed to assess the potential sensitivity of the proposed project to contain cultural resources and/or unmarked burials associated with the religious institutions that once occupied this area.

IV. PROJECT METHODS

Standard documentary research methodologies were utilized in gathering information for this study. This included a review of existing cultural resource reports within the repositories of the NYCLPC and NY SHPO, a review of historical maps, and other documentary information from various online and library/museum repositories, information provided by the project, and a pedestrian survey of the area. Online repositories utilized included the New York Public Library, the Library of Congress, New York State Archives, and David Rumsey Historical Map Collection. A selection of relevant historic maps is provided in Section V.

In addition to standard methodologies documentary resources and records from St. Peter’s Church were also utilized. This information included deeds, burial records and church minutes. Visits were also made to the Bronx County and Westchester County Historical Societies to attempt to find additional information regarding burial usage of the property by the Quaker Friends congregation that dates to the 1600s.

V. DOCUMENTARY RESEARCH RESULTS

This section provides a brief overview of the pre-historic period, and a more detailed account of the historic period to determine the potential sensitivity for the APE to contain cultural resources and/or unmarked burials. The history of the project APE extends back to the mid-seventeenth century. Historically the project area and vicinity were part of the town Common lands and would house multiple structures for the congregations of St. Peter’s Episcopal Church and the Quaker Society of Friends, among others. Though the main portion of St. Peter’s Church and Cemetery
The history of St. Peter’s is included in the following for context.

PRE-HISTORIC PERIOD

The prehistory of Eastern North America is commonly divided in the three major temporal periods: Paleo-Indian, Archaic and Woodland. These may in turn be further subdivided based upon adaptive strategies associated with subsistence patterns and tool-making technologies.

The Paleo-Indian period is the earliest dating ca 12,500 – 10,000 BP. The most recent is the Woodland Period dating ca. 3,000 BP – European Contact. The Native American groups associated with this section of Bronx County are part of the Algonquin language group. The group most relevant to the project area are traditionally the Siwanoy. They were known to have occupied the eastern half of the present-day Bronx (east of the Bronx River) and the Long Island Sound with their influence extending into southwestern Connecticut. Another influential group in the area at the time of European Contact, the Weckquaesgeek, a Wappinger tribe, had established major villages in Westchester County (Boesch 1997).

There are no Native American sites within a half mile radius of the project area. However, within 2 miles of the project area there are more than a dozen sites as reported in the 2000 John Milner and Associates report for the nearby Zerega Avenue school. NY SHPO models place the project APE in an archaeologically sensitive area.

HISTORIC PERIOD – WESTCHESTER SQUARE

The land north of the Hudson River, comprising the modern-day borough of the Bronx and Westchester County, had been purchased by the Dutch West India Company in 1640. The region was named Vredeland (Vriedelandt), or ‘Land of Peace,’ and the Dutch colony was sought out as a religious refuge by English Puritans as early as 1643 (Bolton 1881:243). The Dutch had a liberal attitude toward religious acceptance, which prevailed into policy as they established themselves in the new world. As stated by Robert Bolton, “It is apparent that a perfect toleration for all religious opinions had been guaranteed from the first settlement of the province” (Bolton 1855:xiii). As a result, small pockets of English settlements cropped up across Dutch-owned territories. These were emigrants of variegated religious denominations from the New England colonies. These groups, whose varying faiths had left them subject to religious persecution in the New England colonies, looked to the Dutch-ruled New Netherland as a place where they could exercise their religious principles with full freedom (Jenkins 1912:251). English Puritans founded what would become the earliest settlements in Westchester. What would become the village of Westchester was first settled by Puritans in 1647, when a group of roughly ten to twelve families from Connecticut settled on the outskirts of Vredeland. The settlement was known to the Dutch as Oostdorp2, which is today known as Westchester Square (Greene et al. 1913:237; Bolton 1881:314).

1 John Throckmorton and a following of thirty-five families settled the area of Throg’s Neck in 1643
2 Oostdorp, meaning ‘east farms’, named for its location in relation to the Bronx River (Cook 1913:174; Shonnard et al. 1900:227).
The boundaries of the settlement were defined westerly by the Bronx River and easterly by the Long Island Sound; it would later be bordered to the north by the settlement of Fordham Manor and south by ThrockMortons Neck and the East River (Scharf 1886:808). The settlement itself bordered Westchester Creek (Bolton 1881:295). It was here that the settlers established the Town Green (known also as the Commons, or the ‘sheep pasture’) – a 400-acre tract of salt meadow and forested upland situated at the heart of the village, set aside by the freeholders for common use. At the epicenter of the town green was a town house – known to the inhabitants as the Meeting House – which was erected within the first several years of settlement and was the first non-residential structure in the village (Bolton 1881:293) (Map 05). As the purpose for settling Oostdorp had been the freedom of religious practice, the Puritan emigrants prioritized establishing a place of worship within the town. Thus, Thomas Scharf writes that the commencement of the Meeting House was coeval with the settlement of the town (Scharf 1886:810).

From the outset of its settlement, “Westchester village was the seat of the earliest organized and successful English settlement in the province north of the Harlem River” (Bolton 1881:227). Shonnard et al. elaborates on the establishment of this rural community as the town square during the seventeenth century in their description of the village, “(As a) thriving democratic town, whose settlement antedated that of any of the (neighboring) manorial estates, and which was more important than any of them in the matter of population and development” (Shonnard et al. 1900:227). In 1667, Governor Richard Nicolls granted the first patent for Westchester (Bolton 1881:287). By the late 1670’s, a house was built upon the town green to serve as a court and jailhouse, situated adjacent to the Meeting House (Bolton 1881:298). In 1683, the county of Westchester was organized, with Westchester Square selected as the “shire town” and legislative capital of the county (Bolton 1855:229). Three years later, the second patent of Westchester was granted by Gov. Thomas Dongan, officially entitling Westchester Square with the ability to name freeholders of the town and to elect representatives to the General Assembly (Scharf 1886:808). In 1696, Gov. Benjamin Fletcher deemed, by royal charter, Westchester Square as a Borough-town (Bolton 1881:303). In 1700, a third structure was built upon the town green – the first episcopal church edifice that would become the first St. Peter’s Church.

“On the transfer of the New Netherland colony to the British, in 1664, the worship of the Church of England was introduced” (Disosway 1864:54). In 1692, Benjamin Fletcher – an ardent churchman – assumed the Governorship of New York and set out to establish the Church of England as the official church (Disosway 1864:60). In 1693 the Westchester parish, which comprised the towns of Westchester, East Chester, Yonkers and Pelham Manor, was established by the Colonial Assembly and an accompanying act was passed for the provision of a church building and a “good, sufficient Protestant minister”3 (Bolton 1881:316). In 1696 the village trustees set aside a glebe4 of twenty acres of land overlapping the town green for the purpose of a church building and parsonage5 (Bolton 1855:xvi). Though the land had been set aside, it took four

3 The provision for the building and the salary for the minister would be levied upon the town itself and raised via taxes on the inhabitants (Disosway 1864:61).
4 A glebe is a piece of land forming part of a clergyman’s benefice and income.
5 The twenty-acres making up the glebe were given to the town by its trustees. According to Bolton, four acres “at an inconvenient distance” were donated by Edward Collier; a twelve-acre donation was divided between Samuel Palmer, Israel Honeywell, John Hunt, Joseph Hunt Jr., and Miles Oakley – names that feature prominently throughout narratives of Westchester’s history; and the remaining eight acres were land from the lot “fronting the sheep pasture” (Bolton 1881:336).
years for the structure to be built, and another two for it to receive a Minister. This was in some part due to the lack of qualifying persons who could fill the ministerial role. Although the Assembly Act did not initially designate the position for any religious denomination specifically, Edward Corwin writes, “It was well understood (that the real design of the law) would call only Episcopalians; that it was a virtual establishment of the English church by law” (Corwin 1879:21). Most of the Assembly at the time were considered Dissenters, other Christians (Disosway 1864:61). Bolton writes that the county of Westchester, which included present day Westchester Square, “grew up under non-Episcopalian supervision” (Bolton 1855:xiii). Westchester county was made up almost entirely of Puritans, Independents, and Quakers (Scharf 1886:809). Most of the Assembly were disinclined to set up a Church of England within their town and attend to the financial burden of it. Puritan inhabitants of Westchester county used the lack of specificity in the Act to their advantage, and by utilizing loopholes they tried securing a “Dissenting” minister of their own faith (Scharf 1886:809). Thus, effectuating the Act stalled in the village of Westchester in part because the town pushed back against it.

The inhabitants of the village pushed for Reverend Warham Mather to be their town clergyman. Mather first appears in town records in 1684 and can be found associated with the regular religious life and activities of the town through 1695. He was not affiliated with the Church of England, as evidenced by an excerpt from the personal account of Reverend John Millner in 1695, “There is a meeting house at Westchester, and a young man (Mather) coming to settle there without orders” (Jenkins 1912:253). In 1696, after setting aside the glebe, the town trustees enabled Col. Heathcote, an ardent Episcopalian, as the town mayor in the hope that Heathcote could mediate a relationship between Mather and the Venerable Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, where the minister would be recognized before the Church of England. Heathcote, however, rejected the proposal “on the grounds of establishing the Episcopacy” (Leggett 1913:4).

The latter half of the seventeenth century saw the rise of Quakerism in the village of Westchester. The origin of Quaker religion dates to the early seventeenth century, when George Fox – an English shoemaker’s apprentice – became disillusioned with the Church of England. He began preaching independently in England, circa 1647, to a small but dedicated following known as the Religious Society of Friends (Robbins 2014). Scharf credits the Society of Friends as being the result of a religious awakening that followed the Reformation in England (Scharf 1886:28). The Friends valued respect and appreciation levied towards all humanity, conscience-driven morality, and a fervent belief that a threat to the humanity of one person or culture was a threat to all humanity. Their ideals and practices were seen to be so extreme and divergent to the convention of the church that people considered them to be dangerous. Labelled ‘religious dissenters’, the Society sought refuge in the New World and Quaker communities were soon founded in Rhode Island, Pennsylvania, Flushing and Westchester (Robbins 2014). Scharf traced the origins of Westchester Quakers to their arrival in Massachusetts upon Robert Fowler’s ship, the Woodhouse, circa 1657. Finding the New England colony to be hostile, they emigrated to the Dutch-ruled New Netherlands – much like the first Puritan settlers of Westchester, Quakers too hoped for religious tolerance amongst the Dutch and the freedom to enjoy their religious beliefs (Scharf 1886:29).

The Quakers became a dominant presence in the early years of the village of Westchester. Patrick Raftery states that, “The first definitive reference to Quakers in the Bronx dates from 1684, at which time the Flushing Quarterly Meeting decided to establish a preparative meeting in
Westchester” (Raftery 2016:291). This was, in part, due to the 1695 acquisition of Harrison’s Purchase made on behalf of the Society of Friends. The purchase was a catalyst that sparked the growth of the Quaker population throughout the Westchester area. The purchase is described by Scharf as being, “A great moment in the future settlement of Friends in Westchester County… A movement began that placed the Quakers in possession of a large portion of the central line of the county, (and) into this the Quakers rapidly pushed” (Scharf 1886:29).

The village of Westchester is where the first meeting in America for the Society of Friends was supposedly held; and it is rumored that George Fox preached in the village in 1672 (Scharf 1886:812). That the community was prominent and influential within the village is evident – their appearance is prevalent throughout the correspondence between the rectors of the new Episcopal church and the Society for the Propagation of the Faith in Foreign Parts between the years of 1702 and 1767.

“Quaker life in Westchester was marked by simplicity and a homely lifestyle. Westchester Quakers were stewards of the community who promoted human rights and rallied against slavery, poverty and prejudice in all forms. As early as 1767, Westchester Quakers denounced slavery as being non-Christian and donated plots of land to freed African-Americans. They defended conservationism and environmental protection, and in later years were champions of the underground railroad who supported the Civil Rights Movement. Quakers residing in Westchester likewise denounced alcohol, tobacco, dancing, and ornate clothing; and they refused to pay taxes to the Church of England, take legal oaths in Court, or follow the custom of removing their hats to acknowledge those in power – as this conflicted with their belief in all peoples being equal” (Robbins 2014).

In 1702, the village – comprised mainly of Puritans, Independents and Quakers – was described by the church Reverend, John Bartow, as being desperate and “parched of adequate religion” (i.e. adequate being the approved order of the Church of England). As quoted by Bolton, the Reverend writes, “I can’t repeat to you the many janglings and contentions I have had with Quakers and Dissenters; nay, I may say Athiests and Diests” (Bolton 1881:328). Bartow – a missionary of the Venerable Society for the Propagation of the Gospel – was recruited to Westchester parish by the town Mayor, Col. Heathcote in 1702 (Shonnard et al. 1900:233). From the outset, Bartow endeavored to establish a “ministry and its maintenance” for the parish and prioritized the development of the church in Westchester (Bolton 1881:320). Col. Heathcote reiterated these statements two years later in his own letter to the Venerable Society for the Propagation of the Gospel – describing the majority of the village inhabitants as “rude and heathenish,” and imposters of the Christian faith (Bolton 1881:332). Bartow again mentions the Quaker community in the village in 1710 and 1711. In 1724, Bartow writes of his parish as being, “12 miles in length, 70 in breadth,” and with roughly 200 families belonging to the congregation (Corwin 1879:343). Five years later, in 1729, Bartow’s successor writes that there were no more than three or four families within the town who were “well affected” to the Church of England, as the majority of the inhabitants were Quakers (Scharf 1886:811). The Reverend goes on to say that, “The whole parish, as to their manners, are somewhat Quakerish” (Jenkins 1912:273). In 1767, correspondence between the church and the Venerable Society for the Propagation of the Gospel reflects on the inconsistent attendance of the congregation in a village with few communicants, and “a good many Quakers” (Bolton 1881:378).
Map 05: Circa 1711 – 1713 *Map of the Township of West Chester* depicting the Common and West Chester church (St. Peter’s Church)
(State Engineer and Surveyor. Survey maps of lands in New York State. Series A0273-78, Map #424 on field with New York State Archives).
HISTORIC LAND USE OF THE APE AND IMMEDIATE VICINITY

The proposed development site is a portion of the present-day St. Peter’s Episcopal Church complex. The development overlaps with the location of the original town meeting house and subsequent Friends Meeting House and cemetery (Map 06).

As stated, many who emigrated to the village for religious freedom had prioritized securing housing for religious practice. From the outset, the meeting house was established as a place of worship. Throughout the latter part of the seventeenth century, the meeting house functioned for both worship and secular matters in the town congregation. Stephen Jenkins phrases it as such, “Like their New England brethren, they combined town matters with religious ones … the inhabitants constituting the congregation, and vice versa” (Jenkins 1912:252).

The earliest reference to religious life in the village and the meeting house as being its place of practice is found in early Dutch administrative documents dating to January and August of 1657, respectively. In late December of 1656, several Dutch commissioners were dispatched to the village to witness the inhabitants pledge an oath of allegiance to the Dutch administration. Two excerpts of their recollections, as recorded in their journal to the Governor, are printed below. Both reflect upon the religiosity of the village; the former highlights the town inhabitant’s observation of the Sabbath, while the latter demonstrates practices as being well-established, as according to an Independent order, so early on into the town’s settlement.

(We requested) to have the inhabitants summoned in the morning at daylight … He responded, ‘It is our Sabbath tomorrow; the inhabitants will not come.’ We asked to learn the opinions of the principal settlers at once, as we could explain our business in half an hour, without hindering their service … (We were given) for answer, no, that they were in no way so inclined. Although we would have preferred to reach home by Sunday noon, we were obliged to remain there until Monday, as they would not be persuaded to assemble on Sunday. (Journal of Mission to Oostdorp. 2003:114)

Cornelius van Ruyven went to the house where they assemble on Sundays, to observe their mode of worship, as they have not as yet any clergyman. There I found a gathering of about 15 men and 10 to 12 women. Mr. Baly made a prayer, which being concluded, one Robbert Bassit read a sermon from a printed book composed and published by an English minister … After the reading Mr. Baly made another prayer and they sang a psalm and departed. (Journal of Mission to Oostdorp. 2003:115)

Additionally, the Dutch Reverend’s Johannes Megapolensis and Samuel Drisius wrote, on August 5, 1657, of the religious state the New Netherland colony. They noted of the settlement in Westchester:
On the west shore of the East River, about one mile beyond Hellgate … is another English village, called Oostdorp, which was begun two years ago. The inhabitants of this place are also Puritans or Independents. Neither have they a preacher, but they hold meetings on Sunday, and read a sermon of some English writer, and have a prayer. (Ecclesiastical Records 1902:397)

Furthermore, town records for the village during the last half of the seventeenth century indicate religious practices – such as marriage ceremonies and baptisms – were occurring regularly; and several names of Ministers are shown as transiently officiating the congregation at the meeting house⁶.

By 1696, the Meeting House had fallen into decay. There is no indication that this state of decay was the result of disuse, but rather of age, the structure would have been at least thirty years old by then (Jenkins 1912:250). The village voted for its repair, to be made that same year by Gabriel Leggett and Josiah Hunt. Though the resolution passed, it coincided with the English governor’s localized introduction of the Church of England into Westchester – thus, plans for the reparations of the Meeting House stalled for several years before being abandoned altogether (Bolton 1881:318). By 1699, the Provincial Assembly passed an act for the provision of town churches that were aligned with the Episcopacy to be levied as a tax on all town inhabitants, irrespective of religious denomination. As a result, a new church building was to be constructed on the town green; and any plan to repair the old Meeting House, or to erect a new one in its place, was abandoned (Jenkins 1912:250).

For the duration of the seventeenth century, neither the meeting house, nor any other non-residential building in the village, had been dedicated exclusively to worship. This changed with the construction of the neighboring church building; and at some point, around the turn of the century, the old Meeting House became the gathering place for the Quaker community in Westchester village (Scharf 1886:804).

The earliest date found for the sole use of the Meeting House by Quakers is provided by Scharf, who states the “decayed” meeting house as being built by Quakers and in use by the Society of Friends no earlier than 1685 (Scharf 1886:812). Similarly, Stephen Jenkins also posits that the Quaker meeting house was erected before 1700 (Jenkins 1912:214). In 1707, the Yearly and Quarterly Friends Meeting recorded the appointment of a committee to purchase a house, on behalf of the Society of Friends from Richard Ward⁷, in the village of Westchester for the purpose of being used as a meeting place.

---

⁶ Records for marriage ceremonies and baptisms, dating as early as 1680, were performed by Rev. Morgan Jones (Bolton 1881:315; Scharf 1886:810). Rev. Warham Mather was appointed in 1684 by the village vestrymen as minister for one whole year – this is the first formal measure taken by the town to procure a minister (Bolton 1855:232). The second formal measure taken by the town occurred in 1692, when the town voted to procure an Orthodox minister for the village, with Mather in mind (Bolton 1881:312).

⁷ Richard Ward built the original church edifice in the village in 1700 for £40 (Bolton 1881:319).
The Society of Friends built their meeting house in 1723 on the village green (Raftery 2016:291). It was built directly upon the foundations of the old meeting house (Scharff 1886:806) (Maps 06 and 07). In 1723, the site was officially recognized as a Quaker place of worship and the building as the Orthodox Friends Meeting House. Scharff states, “the Friends built their meeting house to the south of St. Peter’s Church” (Scharff 1886:812). Cook notes, “beyond the Sunday school building, a short distance south of the church, stood the ancient Orthodox Quaker Meeting House, built in 1723” (Cook 1913:182) (Maps 06 and 07). By 1725, the Orthodox Friends of Westchester village were established as a Preparative Meeting and an extension of the Flushing Society of Friends. The Yearly Meeting records that the Monthly Meeting of Friends was appointed to be held at the Westchester village meeting house “on the ninth day of the fourth month” in this year (i.e. 1725) (Scharff 1886:812). The Orthodox Friends of Westchester village remained a part of the Preparative Meeting until 1787, when it became its own division (Jenkins 1912:273). In 1826, the Orthodox Friends Meeting House changed to the Hicksite party, following a split in the Quaker community that left the Friends divided into either one of the two branches (Cook 1913:182).

By 1890, the building was considered to be unused, though also considered by the town to be an ancient landmark (Jenkins 1912:274). In 1893 a series of fires, set by a seditious group of rebels and protestors in the village, targeted the Meeting House and burned it to the ground. “A series of incendiary fires occurred in the town; and barns, stables and outhouses began to burn up with alarming frequency. The incendiaries had a regular organization … and stated meetings at which the places to be fired were selected and lots drawn as to who should light them. The incendiaries were recruited from the tough element of the town, who set the fires for the sake of the excitement … among the buildings fired were the two Quaker meeting houses” (Jenkins 1912:275). Both Quaker meeting houses were targeted and destroyed by the fires on the same night.

By 1912, only the foundations of the building remained (Jenkins 1912:274). This coincides with historic maps which show the property where the Friends Meeting House stood as vacant as early as 1905 (Maps 08, 09 and 10).

For centuries, the Quaker meeting house neighbored the church edifice. The original church building had been constructed on the same site as the present-day St. Peter’s Church – on the glebe that had been set aside for the use of a parsonage – and adjoining the former court and jailhouse (Cook 1913:182). The original wooden church building was a 28 square foot quadrangular structure, replete with a pyramidal-shaped roof and a bell turret that made up a second floor (Bolton 1881:319). Sometime between the years of 1758 and 1759, the court and jailhouse adjoining the church were destroyed by fire. A parochial school affiliated with the church took its place. In 1880, a stone building constructed “very nearly” upon the site of the former court and jailhouse was used by the church as both a chapel and as a Sunday school (Jenkins 1912:266). In 1762, a royal charter was granted for St. Peter’s Church in the Borough-town of Westchester (Bolton 1881:368). The first church minister, Reverend John Bartow, remained in constant communication with his sponsors at the Venerable Society for the Propagation of the Gospel during his tenure in the village of Westchester, and his letters between the years of 1762 to 1767 reflect on the development of

---

8 Following the transfer of the Meeting House to that of the Hicksite party, in 1828 the Orthodox Friends established their own second meeting house on the opposite side of the street. It was located on Westchester Avenue, between Raymond Street and St. Peter’s Street (Jenkins 1912:274).
the church building and the activities occurring on site. His letters inform of the constant upgrades the first church building underwent and that it did not survive the ensuing American Revolution.

“At the commencement of the American Revolution, there was much animosity manifested towards the Episcopal or Church of England” (Disosway 1864:56). Like many Episcopal churches throughout the colonies, St. Peter’s church was closed during the Revolution and services were not held for thirteen years. Like other church buildings in the Westchester area, the building was repurposed by British forces to function as a stable and/or hospital (Jenkins 1912:263). In 1776, after the Declaration of Independence was issued, the seated Reverend shut the church and left Westchester village, where he was a target of Rebel forces. In response to the Reverend’s departure, the Rebels in the area took over the church building, “tearing off the covering and burning the pews,” and converting the building into a hospital (Jenkins 1912:261).

Following the Revolution, Westchester became a town operating under the state government (Scharf 1886:808). In 1784, the State Legislature passed an Act that allowed for the incorporation of St. Peter’s Church, finalized in 1788. The church reinstated a board of trustees, who immediately set about rebuilding the dilapidated church. Through funds raised, the board commissioned a new church edifice to be constructed by John Odell in 1790 for £336. The old building was purchased and removed by Sarah Ferris; and its replacement was erected upon the same site and completed by the end of the year (Jenkins 1912:264). The new church edifice was to be built, “on or near the same ground where the church of St. Peter, late removed, stood” – order of the vestry, as paraphrased by Bolton (Bolton 1881:387). Additionally, this building is referred to in various texts as the “church building of 1790” or “the wooden church of 1790”.

The building of 1790 was later destroyed by fire. A new church was built 1853-1855, either upon or near to the site of the former church (Jenkins 1912:265). Though portions of this building were damaged by fire this is the currently extant St. Peter’s Church (Image 01).
Image 01: St Peter’s Church and Cemetery, looking north.
Map 06: 1868 Map of project area with APE overlay from Atlas of New York and vicinity from actual surveys by and under the direction of F.W. Beers (Beers, Elli, and Soule 1868).
Map 07: 1881 map of project area. Map of West Chester, Schuylerville from *Atlas of Westchester County, New York. From actual surveys and official records by G.W. Bromley & Co., Civil Engineers* (Bromley 1881).
Map 08: 1905 Atlas depicting no structures within the project APE. (Sanborn 1905).
Map 09: 1905 topographic map depicting no structures within the project APE.
(New York City Topographical Bureau, 1905).
Map 10: 1913 Atlas depicting a structure on Lot 1 within the project APE. (Bromley 1913.)
Cemetery and Burial Customs

Both the Quaker meeting house and the Episcopal church were situated adjacent to the ancient burying ground, which was coeval with the commencement of the original Puritan settlement in the village (Bolton 1881:404). Of the burial ground, Jenkins writes, “The cemetery adjoining the church has been used as a burying-ground from the time that the town was under the Dutch jurisdiction as Oostdorp” (Jenkins 1912:266). This assessment would place the burial ground as first being active no later than 1664; however, it is unclear from the text whether Jenkins’ derives his source from official town records or town legend. The specific boundaries of this early burial ground are unknown.

Though it is stipulated that the burial ground had been in use as early as 1672, the earliest interment recorded dates to 1702 (Bolton 1881:404). However, as demonstrated earlier in this text, the town green – upon which the burial ground is situated – was set aside from the outset of settlement in part for the practice of religion, and well-established religious practices had been occurring on this site as early as 1657. This likely included burial rituals. During the Colonial period, the ideal burial, particularly in English colonies (and for those who did not have family burial plots) was to bury their dead in churchyards and within close proximity to the church (or corresponding place of worship). Many seventeenth century towns, particularly in New England, set aside land as places for common community burial grounds (U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service). This is supported by Raftery who writes that it is likely the Friends property had been used as a burial ground in the 17th century, “as the original settlers of the community were from New England, they likely followed that religion’s custom of establishing a community burial ground” (Raftery 2016:168). Furthermore, seventeenth century burials would not necessarily have evident markers. Traces of funerary equipment and coffin hardware do not appear in Colonial burials prior to the eighteenth century; and early puritan funerals would have consisted of little more than a graveside prayer. Gravestones, if any, would have been plain (Daniels 1995:28). “Unmarked burials of the 16th and 17th centuries provide evidence for identifying the historic locations of successors to the founding church sites that gradually disappear in the layer’s of later town development” (U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service). In contrast to the ornate headstones that occupy the current church cemetery, the Quakers buried their dead without monument. Prior to the mid-19th century, there was a customary aversion throughout the Quaker community towards headstones and grave markers (Raftery 2016:291). The graves of Friends that are accounted for are adorned with small markers that are uniform in shape, size, and wording (Twomey 2007:187). Correspondence between the Reverend Samuel Seabury and the Venerable Society dating to 1767 records Seabury reflecting on the burial customs of the town inhabitants – there were no burial fees collected, however tokens such as scarves were given to the minister by wealthier families on occasion (Jenkins 1912:266).

The burial ground in Westchester village was owned by the town and belonged to its inhabitants until the turn of the nineteenth century. It lies adjacent to the location of the original meeting house, with the meeting house abutting its southerly border. The first church building of 1700 was parallel to this and constructed along the burial ground’s northern border. This presumably places it within the confines of the existing St. Peter’s cemetery. Though belonging to the town, the burial

---

9 Jenkins describes the former location of the Friends meeting house as being “immediately south of the ancient burying ground” (1912:274)
ground overlapped with the churchyard, and it was utilized by the church throughout the eighteenth century for departed parish members.

It is in the eighteenth century where we first see a separation of burials based on religious denomination and faith. After the adoption of the old Meeting House by the Quaker community, the remaining property was utilized as a Friends burial place. It is unclear whether the Friends plans for a distinct burial ground coincided with the establishment of their Meeting House between 1707 and 1723; or if these plans were a response to the town decision of 1795 to release the burying ground into the possession and care of the church, as the earliest Quaker interment on record occurs in 1780. A photograph taken from 1910 shows a fence separating the Meeting House and burial ground from that of the adjacent St. Peter’s Church and cemetery, however a date for the erection of the fence is not given (Raftery 2016:289). Earlier burials are likely to be unmarked and lie outside the still extant markers.

The release of 1795 constituted a portion of the burial ground, comprising roughly one acre, that had at that time been recently enclosed and fenced (Bolton 1881:389-390). It was sold to the church under the provision that the church would continue to bury their dead without fee or compensation, and that family members would be kept together and not separated. It was designated that decisions regarding the vacant parts of the lot were left to the discretion of the church (Bolton 1881:390). “All that certain lot, piece and parcel of ground on which the Episcopal Church of St. Peter’s is erected, and also the Burying Ground adjoining the said church, as it is now enclosed and fenced, and which has heretofore been used for a Burial Place by the inhabitants of the Township, containing about one acre, be the same more or less” - Excerpt of 1795 town release of the cemetery (Jenkins 1912:263).

The sale did not include the Quaker portion of the burying ground, which was located at the south end of the property.

Fordham Morris, who addressed the Westchester County Historical Society in October of 1896, is quoted by Shonnard et al. as stating:

The Quakers had established their meeting house in the town almost as early as the Church of England edifice was erected, and its graveyard is still be found, adjoining the Episcopal churchyard, though the meeting house and those who were moved by the spirit within it have long since departed. (Shonnard 1900:232)

An inventory dated January 1910 (Cemetery Inscriptions, St. Peter's P.E. Church of Westchester, Ferris Family Cemetery, Friends (Or Fox) Cemetery, Methodist Cemetery & Interment Book of the St. Peter's P.E. Church, All of Westchester, N.Y) recorded 88 burials and their corresponding inscription. This is attributed to James Minor Lincoln whose manuscript was transcribed by W.A. Hildebrand.

---

10 Patrick Raftery lists the Quaker Burial Ground as being active between the years of c.1723-1927, which would indicate that the Quaker community’s establishment of a distinct burial ground was coeval with the establishment of their meeting house (Raftery 2016:291)
In 1921, Francis F. Spies surveyed the Quaker burial ground and compiled an inventory of seventy-four extant grave markers and, if available, their corresponding inscriptions. The Spies documentation reflects that the heaviest concentration of interments that have markers occurred during the eighteenth century. The seventy-four markers include individuals of at least seventeen families in the village, most of whom feature prominently in early town records. Additionally, family members tended to be buried together or near each other and – while certain elements of inscription repeat throughout Spies inventory – each family had its own preferred style of inscription that was found consistently on their markers.

The Spies inventory recorded 73 Quaker burials. However, it seems somewhat unlikely that only 73 Quakers were deceased throughout the eighteenth century. These individuals may have been buried elsewhere, possibly in family cemeteries.

The Spies inventory (1921) was the inventory referenced by St. Peter’s Church during the purchase of the Quaker cemetery. This inventory recorded 15 fewer burials than the 1910 Lincoln inventory. A comparison of the two documents also notes that only 65 persons are found in both inventories. Four burials are not recorded in either inventory but are known of from other sources (Genealogical books or photographs). In combination this represents 100 unique burials attributed to the Friends cemetery. Table 01 presents a comparison of known Friends cemetery burials relative to their documentary source.

11 Though the inventory goes up to #74, it skips/misses #53, making the total number of persons recorded 73.
## Table 01: Friends Cemetery Known Burials.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Spies Inventory (1920)</th>
<th>Lincoln Inventory (1910)</th>
<th>Alt. or Other Source</th>
<th>Most recent photo</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Ann ‘Betsey’ Stinnard Arnow</td>
<td>#1</td>
<td>1134</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amelia Crane Bowne</td>
<td>#2</td>
<td>1120</td>
<td>Yes (1915)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calhoun Bowne</td>
<td>#3</td>
<td>1123</td>
<td>Yes (2016)</td>
<td>Listed in Spies as ‘Catharine’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lionel M. Bowne</td>
<td>#4</td>
<td>1124</td>
<td>Yes (2016)</td>
<td>Listed in Spies as ‘Honeywell’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josiah Quinby Bowne</td>
<td>#5</td>
<td>1118</td>
<td>Yes (2016)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary A. Bowne</td>
<td>#6</td>
<td>1114</td>
<td>Yes (2016)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidney Breese Bowne</td>
<td>#7</td>
<td>1116</td>
<td>Yes (2015)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jemima Honeywell Hunt Bowne</td>
<td>#8</td>
<td>1117</td>
<td>Yes (2016)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidney F. Bowne</td>
<td>#9</td>
<td>1121</td>
<td>Yes (2016)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phebe Ann Bowne</td>
<td>#10</td>
<td>1122</td>
<td>Yes (2016)</td>
<td>Listed in Lincoln as ‘Theresa’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Hunt Bowne</td>
<td>#11</td>
<td>1115</td>
<td>Yes (2015)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidney Franklin Bowne</td>
<td></td>
<td>1119</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert M. Bowne</td>
<td></td>
<td>1125</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward S. Brigg</td>
<td>#12</td>
<td>1150</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Brigg</td>
<td>#13</td>
<td>1149</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Brigg (most likely Elizabeth Varian-Brigg)</td>
<td>#14</td>
<td>1146</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Brigg (most likely Elizabeth Brown-Brigg)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1132</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. M. C.</td>
<td>#15</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. C.</td>
<td>#16</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. C.</td>
<td>#17</td>
<td>1153</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. C.</td>
<td>#18</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Coggeshall</td>
<td>#19</td>
<td>1094</td>
<td>Yes (2016)</td>
<td>All three are on the same stone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Coggeshall</td>
<td>#20</td>
<td>1095</td>
<td>Yes (2016)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Spies Inventory (1920)</td>
<td>Lincoln Inventory (1910)</td>
<td>Alt. or Other Source</td>
<td>Most recent photo</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. W. Coggeshall</td>
<td>#21</td>
<td>1096</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes (2016)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Clement</td>
<td>#22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannah D. Clement</td>
<td>#23</td>
<td>1127</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Listed in Lincoln as ‘Johannah’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Clement Jr.</td>
<td>#24</td>
<td>1112</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes (2016)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth B. Clement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnathan Clement</td>
<td>#25</td>
<td>1113</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes (2016)</td>
<td>Listed in Lincoln as ‘Nathan’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Cromwell</td>
<td>#26</td>
<td>1099</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes (2016)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Matilda Bowne Cromwell</td>
<td>#27</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes (2016)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert B. Cromwell</td>
<td>#28</td>
<td>1101</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. D.</td>
<td>#29</td>
<td>1139</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary F. Drake</td>
<td>#30</td>
<td>#1145</td>
<td></td>
<td>Photo</td>
<td>Yes (2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. G. D.</td>
<td>#31</td>
<td>1142</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. D.</td>
<td>#32</td>
<td>1140</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Listed in Lincoln as ‘E.D.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. D.</td>
<td>#33</td>
<td>1143</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Listed in Lincoln as ‘C.D.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. A. D.</td>
<td>#34</td>
<td>1144</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Henry Fox</td>
<td>#35</td>
<td>1083</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes (2016)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannah Clarissa Austen Fox</td>
<td>#36</td>
<td>1082</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Shotwell Fox</td>
<td>#37</td>
<td>1086</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes (2016)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca L. Fox</td>
<td>#38</td>
<td>1087</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry Leggett Fox</td>
<td>#39</td>
<td>1073</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes (2016)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William James Fox</td>
<td>#40</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ebenezer Haviland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ancestry book (Stahr 2001) records markers as being present in 1897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane ‘Jenny’ Burling Haviland</td>
<td>#41</td>
<td>1130</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes (2015)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humphrey Hill</td>
<td>#42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary H. Hill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Spies Inventory (1920)</td>
<td>Lincoln Inventory (1910)</td>
<td>Alt. or Other Source</td>
<td>Most recent photo</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathaniel Hill</td>
<td>#43</td>
<td>1128</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellington S. Hill</td>
<td>#44</td>
<td>1129</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levi Hunt</td>
<td>#45</td>
<td>1151</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick Lawrence</td>
<td>#46</td>
<td>1133</td>
<td>Yes (2015)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannah Leggett</td>
<td>#47</td>
<td>1103</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Leggett</td>
<td>#48</td>
<td>1078</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. D.</td>
<td>#49</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin Merritt</td>
<td>#50</td>
<td>1084</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliza F. Merritt</td>
<td>#51</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily Fearsall Merritt</td>
<td>#52</td>
<td>1085</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Listed in Lincoln as ‘Amy Pearsall’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James S. Oakley</td>
<td>#54</td>
<td>1104</td>
<td>Yes (2016)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Oakley</td>
<td>#55</td>
<td>1147</td>
<td>Yes (2016)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. D. S.</td>
<td>#56</td>
<td>1138</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Listed in Lincoln as ‘E.D.’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augustus Stinnard</td>
<td>#57</td>
<td>#1136</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily D. Drake Stinnard</td>
<td>#58</td>
<td>1141</td>
<td>Yes (2016)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick ‘Steinhart’ Stinnard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Photo</td>
<td>Yes (2012)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob Stinnard</td>
<td>#59</td>
<td>1135</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. B. S.</td>
<td>#60</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Stinnard</td>
<td>#61</td>
<td>1137</td>
<td>Yes (2015)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna F. Tucker</td>
<td>#62</td>
<td>1080</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrie Fearsall Tucker</td>
<td>#63</td>
<td>1081</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James W. Tucker Jr.</td>
<td>#64</td>
<td>1076</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Listed in Lincoln as ‘William Jr.’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ester Fox Tucker</td>
<td>#65</td>
<td>1071</td>
<td>Yes (2016)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James W. Tucker</td>
<td>#66</td>
<td>1077</td>
<td>Yes (2015)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliza F. Thorne</td>
<td>#67</td>
<td>1072</td>
<td>Yes (2016)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Tucker</td>
<td>#68</td>
<td>1079</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John R. Walker</td>
<td>#69</td>
<td>1075</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Listed in Spies as ‘John B.’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert L. Walker</td>
<td>#69</td>
<td>1074</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Spies Inventory (1920)</td>
<td>Lincoln Inventory (1910)</td>
<td>Alt. or Other Source</td>
<td>Most recent photo</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnes Walter</td>
<td>#70</td>
<td>1098</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes (2016)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah Coggeshall Walter</td>
<td></td>
<td>1091</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes (2016)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Walter</td>
<td></td>
<td>1088</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes (2016)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth H. Bowne Walter</td>
<td>#71</td>
<td>1092</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes (2016)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellwood Walter</td>
<td>#72</td>
<td>1090</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes (2016)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emile Walter</td>
<td>#73</td>
<td>1093</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes (2016)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Walter</td>
<td></td>
<td>1089</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes (2016)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Walter</td>
<td>#74</td>
<td>1097</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes (2016)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliza Palmer</td>
<td></td>
<td>1102</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E x W</td>
<td></td>
<td>1105</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. H.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1106</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. H.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1107</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. H.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1108</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. H.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1109</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. P.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1110</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. P.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1126</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. S.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1131</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Earliest burial in Lincoln is dated 1754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. C.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1148</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. L.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1152</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia Frost</td>
<td></td>
<td>1154</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant son of Cynthia and John B. Frost</td>
<td></td>
<td>1155</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Drawing of full inscription in Lincoln 1910:257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Adaline (Frost)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1156</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnathan (Frost)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1157</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown Frost burial</td>
<td></td>
<td>1158</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Quaker cemetery and adjoining Meeting House lot was sold in 1925 by Austin J. Fox to St. Peter’s Church, containing in total 144 hundredths acres of land. For the church’s part, their need for this land was necessitated by the culmination of several centuries of prior activity which threatened to overcrowd their cemetery. To expand their burial ground, the vestry then enacted a committee to purchase the Friends property west of the churchyard (Raftery 2016:173). Several provisions were made for the care of the burial place, and are stated as follows:

That, “(St. Peters Church) will mark the boundaries thereof by suitable stone posts at all corners, connected them by fences or hedges, or paved paths or walks”

That, “The party of the second part (St. Peters Church) for itself its successors and assigns, ... agrees with the said Austin J. Fox, and his heirs, executors and administrators, that (the Church) and its successors and assigns will forever maintain as a burial ground all that part of the said premises which heretofore has been used as a burial ground and will not (indecipherable) suffer it to be used for any other purpose; and will maintain it as a burial ground exclusively for the bodies of persons connected at the time of their death with the Society of Friends, or the descendants of persons whose bodies have been or shall be interred in the said burial ground”

That, “Subject however to any rights of interment heretofore created and now subsisting, will not suffer or permit the remains of persons heretofore buried therein to be disturbed, and will maintain it in the same manner and with the same reverent care as is and they shall main(tain) the burial ground of the Church of St. Peter adjacent to the said premise”

Vestry minutes of the Church for the year of 1925 state that the Quaker Burying Ground Committee made arrangements for the purchase of the ‘Old Friends Meeting House Lot’ adjoining the Quaker cemetery in September of that year, and that the title for the Quaker burying ground had been approved in October of that year.

Vestry minutes of the Church for the year of 1926 record the Churchyard Committee as stating that $7000 funding was needed for the improvement of the entire burying ground of the church, the purchase of the Quaker burying ground being included in this cost; furthermore, that during this year two men were employed at the Friends portion of the burying ground for the purpose of “preparing it for future use,” and that “graves will be sold in the new portion at a cost of $75.00 per grave.”

In accordance with their purpose to expand their cemetery ground, St. Peter’s preserved the Quaker graves and utilized the remaining acquired land for new burials. A memorial slab commemorating Westchester’s World War I veterans was erected in the Quaker section of the cemetery shortly after its purchase; and Raftery maintains that most interments made over the last century have occurred in the northwest corner of the new section (Raftery 2016:173).

12 In 1923, the lack of cemetery space resulted in the Church Sexton limiting the burials that would take place thenceforth (Raftery 2016:173).
Aside from this, it is important to mention that Raftery states that the cemetery has been used sparingly by the church over the last seventy years (Raftery 2016:173).

The present-day churchyard is mostly occupied by the cemetery, excepting the proposed site for development in the southern half of the churchyard (Images 02 and 03). This area is clear of grave markers, with the exception of one imposing marble vault located along the eastern boundary of the property, bordering Butler Place. This vault belongs to the family of Robert D. Smith and was constructed after the purchase of the Quaker burial ground in 1925 (Raftery 2016:293). The proposed site for development (which will herein be referred to as the churchyard) is separated from the cemetery by an overgrown dirt pathway.

There are two distinct concentrations of Friends interments within the church cemetery. The larger of the two is situated at the center south end of the cemetery. Its boundaries are clearly defined, and its burials separated by four surrounding stone markers, with the northwest marker bearing a plaque reading “Friends Burial Place” (Image 04). A number of recent interments, conducted within the last century, were located south of the Friends Burying Place and outside of the defined markers. The smaller concentration of Friends interments is situated at the southeast corner of the cemetery. A similar plaque bearing ‘Friends Burial Place’ (Image 05) lies parallel to the cemetery fence bordering Butler Place. The burials are clearly ordered in a N/S-oriented line, and the plaque identifies this area as being a place of Quaker interments; however, there are no other markers to designate the boundaries, if any, that distinguish this concentration of interments from any other within the cemetery. In addition, several of the southern-most interments in this group extend beyond the pathway that separates the cemetery from the rest of the churchyard, and into the churchyard itself.
Image 02: Project APE looking southwest toward structure on Lot 1 (also within the Project APE).

Image 03: Project APE looking south toward structure on Lot 1 (also within the Project APE) from St. Peter’s Drive.
Image 04: Friends Burial Place marker.

Image 05: Second Friends Burial Place marker.
Cemetery Survey

In 2016 GeoModel, Inc performed a Ground Penetrating Radar (GPR) survey of the project area for PWB Management Corporation. The GeoModel report (Appendix A) states the purpose of the survey was to define the limits of the cemetery south of St. Peter’s Drive (the aforementioned dirt path). The survey was performed within a portion of St. Peter’s Drive and a portion of the area south of the drive. The map provided within the report does not specify the precise area or limits of the survey, nor does the text. The report states that transects were placed “a few feet apart across the survey area in parallel directions” (GeoModel 2016:1).

The results were examined by a geologist in the field who detected no graves within or south of St. Peter’s Drive including the “large grass lawn area south of St. Peter’s Drive” (GeoModel 2016:1).

Block 3848 Lot 1 and Remainder of the APE

There is little specific history for Lot 1 or other portions of the APE that lie outside the footprint of the Friends Meeting House property. The information that is available has been gleaned from historic maps and general information associated with the neighboring Friends’ property. The remainder of the APE, outside the Friends’ property, appears to have been undeveloped until the twentieth century. It was likely part of the Common during the seventeenth century. The 1868 Beers map (Map 06) shows this area, and what would become Lot 1, as part of the “Catholic protectory” property. The New York Catholic Protectory had moved to the Bronx from Manhattan in 1865. The organization had purchased the 114-acre William Varian Estate located where the present day Parkchester Housing complex stands (Munch 2015). This is less than one mile from the Project APE.

No further information was found regarding the ownership or use of this portion of the APE. Historic maps demonstrate that the area is divided into separate property lots by 1881 (Map 07). The 1905 New York City Topographic Bureau shows the undeveloped area plotted in its present-day configuration (Map 09).

The first development on Lot 1 is post 1905. The 1913 Bromley Atlas (Map 10) shows the one-story structure that is currently extant on Lot 1. There is no indication of any other development within present-day Lot 6 outside the footprint of Friends’ property.
VI. CONCLUSIONS

Though the project area is within an archaeologically sensitive area according to NYSHPO models, it is considered to have a low sensitivity for the presence of prehistoric cultural resources. This is based upon the fact that there are no other known sites within a half mile radius despite its proximity to Westchester Creek.

Based on the available documentary resources and historic maps a portion of the project APE overlaps with the historic Friends Meeting House and Cemetery. This is most evident on the Beers 1868 map when overlaid with the project APE footprint (Map 11). According to historic accounts, primarily secondary histories that refer to original documents (e.g. Bolton and Jenkins), the property of St. Peter’s Church and the project APE are located in the vicinity of the original town Common and the earliest known Meeting House dating to the seventeenth century.

As Scharf noted in 1886, the Quaker Society of Friends built their meeting house directly upon the foundations of the old meeting house in the early eighteenth century (Scharf 1886:806). Various sources point to the earlier Meeting House having been constructed sometime in the mid-seventeenth century. A Meeting House stood on this location, in some form, until the end of the nineteenth century.

Maps from 1905 onward depict the former location of the Friends Meeting House as vacant. There is no indication that the structure was anything other than leveled to the surface. Jenkins mentions as such stating that there was nothing other than foundations left in 1912 (Jenkins 1912:274). In 1925 the property on which the Meeting House and its cemetery once stood was sold and incorporated into the St. Peter’s Church property.

There are several aspects to consider with regard to cultural resources sensitivity associated with the Friends Meeting House. First is post-occupational development; there is none. Once acquired by St. Peter’s Church the Friends’ property became an extension of their yard. Portions of the property, outside the Project APE, were incorporated into the St. Peter’s cemetery and used for burials. Areas south of St. Peter’s Drive were not used for burials and remained undeveloped. As a result, any potential building remnants and/or other cultural resources are likely to remain beneath the surface. The second consideration is what type of cultural resources may potentially be located within the footprint of the former Friends Meeting House property.

The property was occupied by a structure, predominantly used for religious purposes as early as the seventeenth century. Records speak of the Meeting House as early as 1685. The second, purpose-built Meeting House was constructed in the early eighteenth century and a structure stood in that location until the late nineteenth century. These structures were constructed prior to the advent of running water or indoor plumbing and would have utilized wells, privies, and/or cisterns.

Considering there was no post-occupational development of the property it is highly probably that foundation remains of the Meeting House and remnants of structures such as wells or privies remain buried on the property.
A third consideration is the property’s use as a burial ground for the Friends congregations. Records note marriages and baptisms occurring within the Meeting House. Based upon the known fact that there was a cemetery associated with the Meeting House it is a natural conclusion that burial, or end of life rituals, also occurred on the property throughout its history. It is documented that the earliest burial within St. Peter’s cemetery is dated 1702. A recent survey noted markers dated 1775 (Image 06) and 1777. Attention has been given to the marked Quaker Friends Burial Place and the 73 recorded Quaker markers located within St. Peter’s Cemetery. The majority of these date to the eighteenth century or later.

However, it is important to take into consideration various factors regarding burials associated with the Meeting House, whose occupation dates back to the seventeenth century, with regard to the potential of the project to encounter burials. The abovementioned Friends Burial Place lies outside the Project APE but, the Project APE does overlap a portion of the Friends property. It is possible, and must be considered, that burials could have extended beyond the marked Friends Burial Place area. Prior to the eighteenth-century Quaker burials were often unmarked. The presences of grave markers cannot solely be relied upon to indicate burials. It must also be questioned as to whether 73, or even 100, burials are an accurate representation of deaths within the congregation from the mid-1600s onward. Or that all were laid to rest within the confines of the currently extant markers.

A walkover survey of the site by Chrysalis noted burials beyond the extant markers. Image 07 shows the line of sight from one of the markers intersecting a row of grave stones. Additionally, there is a row of grave markers well outside the boundaries of the Friends Burial Place (Image 08). One of these dates 1808 (Image 9).

The 1910 document contains three sketches of the Friends and St. Peter’s properties with written measurements (Figure 02). It is noted that there are some inconsistencies between the three sketches. Among these are different measurements for the north boundary of the St. Peter’s property and a different orientation of the boundary line between St. Peter’s and the Friends properties. These inconsistencies are documented in Table 02. It is also notable that the dimensions of the property differ significantly from what is depicted on the 1863 Beers map. This can be seen on the multi-layered Archaeological Sensitivity Map (Map 12).
Table 02: Inconsistencies between 1910 property sketches. The sketches are referenced 1, 2 and 3 (top to bottom) in Figure 02.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature/Item</th>
<th>Sketch 1</th>
<th>Sketch 2</th>
<th>Sketch 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North boundary of St. Peter’s property</td>
<td>Not depicted</td>
<td>303.97</td>
<td>372’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Peter’s property along Westchester Avenue</td>
<td>Not depicted</td>
<td>378.56</td>
<td>322’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends property along Westchester Avenue</td>
<td>228.43</td>
<td>221.43</td>
<td>227’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North/South turn along boundary between Friends and St. Peter’s property.</td>
<td>21.5 - turns in opposite direction to other sketches</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South boundary of Friends property</td>
<td>287.5</td>
<td>287.5</td>
<td>288’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation of North arrow</td>
<td>Parallel to Westchester Avenue</td>
<td>45° to Westchester Avenue</td>
<td>Not depicted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With regard to the sketches in the 1910 document, adjustments were made in an attempt to best overlay the noted boundary dimensions on the present-day map. For example, the present-day measurement of the north boundary of St. Peter’s property with those on the 1910 sketches and utilizing the one that was most comparable. The one sketch that depicts an alteration in the direction of the boundary line between the two properties was discounted. If necessary, differences in dimensions were averaged along with a present-day boundary dimension if available. While this will render some margin of error it was necessary to account for the inconsistencies of measurements noted alongside the 1910 sketches which are not to scale. Figure 03 overlays the result onto a Google Earth satellite image. The result is also incorporated into the Archaeological Sensitivity Map (Map 12).

In consideration of the above, it must be considered that burials associated with the Friends Meeting House exist beyond the boundaries of the extant markers.

Although the 2016 GPR survey, summarized above, found no evidence of burials south of St. Peter’s Drive; the results of this survey cannot be considered definitively conclusive. This assessment is based, in part, on GeoModel’s own disclaimer, the fact that the boundaries of the survey are not known, and that GPR has been known to provide false readings in heavily urbanized areas.

The documentary evidence, post-occupational history, and the consideration of cultural practices strongly favor the potential for the presence of buried cultural resources, including interments within the footprint of the former Friends Meeting House property. Based on this information the portion of the Project APE overlaps with the former Friends Meeting House property and is determined to be highly sensitive for potential buried cultural resources.

There is no evidence to suggest that the portion of the Project APE outside the footprint of the Friends Meeting House property was ever developed or occupied prior to the twentieth century construction currently extant on Lot 1. In consideration of this it is determined that the remainder
of the Project APE has a low sensitivity for the presence, or impact, of significant cultural resources.

Map 12 outlines the area of high archaeological sensitivity within the Project APE.

Map 11: Zoom of 1868 Beers map depicting the Friends Meeting House property with an overlay of Project APE.
Image 06: Gravestone dated 1775 within St. Peter’s Church cemetery.

Image 08: Burial markers dating to the turn of the nineteenth century.

Image 09: Inscription from burial marker dated 1808 from section in above photograph.
Figure 02: Sketches (1, 2 and 3 - top to bottom) of the Friends and St. Peter’s properties with measurements noted (Lincoln 1910).
Figure 03: Friends Church and Cemetery and St. Peter’s Church and Cemetery property boundaries based on Lincoln 1910 (Google Earth 2019).
Map 12: Archaeological Sensitivity Map.
VII. RECOMMENDATIONS

Considering the high sensitivity for the presence of cultural resources associated with the Friends Meeting House property it is recommended that the project undertake Phase IB Archaeological Field Testing to determine the presence or absence of cultural resources including further determining if the project APE contains potentially unmarked graves.

The project should open a dialogue with NYC LPC to determine the best course of action regarding Phase IB Archaeological Field Testing. Before any Phase IB work can been undertaken a detailed Archaeological Work Plan must be written in accordance with the Guidelines for Archeological Work in New York City (NYC LPC 2018) and submitted to NYC LPC for approval. As stated above, Phase IB Archaeological Field Testing determines presence or absence, if cultural resources are found to be present it may be necessary, in consultation with NYC LPC, to move on to the next phase of the process, Phase II Archaeological Survey.

No further work is recommended for other areas of the Project APE, those outside the footprint of the Friends’ property, determined to have a low sensitivity for the presence of cultural resources.
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Introduction

On August 13, 2016, GeoModel, Inc. conducted a Ground Penetrating Radar (GPR) survey for PWB Management Corporation (Cypress Villa, LLC) at the St. Peter’s Episcopal Church at 2500 Westchester Avenue, Bronx, New York. The purpose of the survey was to define the limits of the cemetery south of St. Peter’s Drive in the cemetery. The area surveyed included the portion of the cemetery south of and including St. Peter’s Drive.

GPR Equipment and Transect Locations

The survey area was scanned with a GSSI SIR-3000 GPR digital control unit and a 400 MHz antenna. Subsurface reflections at the site were observed on the computer screen of the SIR-3000 field computer.

GPR transects were made a few feet apart across the survey area in parallel directions to detect any graves. The transects were made perpendicular to the orientation of the graves in the cemetery for optimum coverage.

Results

The data from the ground penetrating radar (GPR) survey was examined and interpreted by a GeoModel, Inc. professional geologist in the field. The GPR survey data was examined for anomalies that represent possible graves.

GeoModel, Inc. marked out with paint and survey flags the locations of the existing graves at the edge of the cemetery north of St. Peter’s Drive. These graves were generally marked with headstones but one grave was unmarked. These graves represent the southern extent of the cemetery limits north of St. Peter’s Drive.

No detectable graves were found south of or in St. Peter’s Drive. This area includes the large grass lawn area south of St. Peter’s Drive.

Limitations

Although GPR can detect buried graves in most conditions, in some areas of the survey area, the GPR data may be incomplete. The results of this report represent the best information that can be determined from the data obtained from this GPR survey.

As with any remote sensing tools, the results of this survey are, in part, interpretive. This survey was conducted using instrumentation considered in good working order and the interpretation provided uses our best judgments. However, as with other remote sensing tools, we cannot guarantee the accuracy of this survey, nor can we accept responsibility for actions taken as a result of this survey.
Appendix B:

Resumes
Ms. Loorya is founder and president of Chrysalis Archaeological Consultants. For nearly twenty years she has worked in cultural resource management and public education devoted to preserving cultural resources and communicating their value to local communities. She has completed over sixty technical and academic reports and has delivered dozens of presentations concerning preservation compliance, New York City historical development, and educational curricula. Her extensive experience lends itself to her roles in developing and executing research and excavation plans, project management, regulatory compliance and report production.

**PROJECTS BY STATE**

**New York:**

102 Franklin Avenue, Brooklyn, NY, Phase IA, 2006
147 Hicks Street, Brooklyn, NY, Phase IB, 1998
156 Rivington Street, New York, NY, Phase IA, 2012
210 Broad Street, Staten Island, NY, Phase I 2009
221 Main Street, Sag Harbor, NY, Phase IA, 2016
246 Front Street, New York, NY, Phase I, 2012
265 Front Street, Brooklyn, NY, Phase I, 2016
275 Myrtle Avenue, Brooklyn, NY, Phase IA, 2016
311 Broadway, New York, NY, Phase IA, 2005
404 Littleworth Lane, Sea Cliff, NY, Phase IB 2016
50 Bowery, New York, NY, Phase I, 2014
63-65 Columbia Street, Brooklyn, NY, Phase IA, 2004
79 Christopher Street, New York, NY, Phase IB, 2008
Alcoa Powerhouse, Massena, NY, Phase IA, 2016
Bronx River Greenway, Bronx, NY, Phase IB, 2016
Brooklyn Navy Yard, Brooklyn, NY, Phase IB, 2017-presnt
Carroll’s River, Babylon, NY, Phase IA, 2017
Chambers Street, New York, NY, Phase I, 2005
Charles Point Waterfront Trail, Peekskill, NY, Phase IB, 2016
City Hall Park, Fuel Cell Project, New York, NY, Phase IB, 2013
City Hall Park, New York, NY, Phase IB, II, 2012
City Island Bridge, Bronx, NY, Phase IB, 2014-present
Columbus Park, New York, NY, Phase I, 2007
Conference House Park, Staten Island, NY, Phase IB, 2018-present
DEP Water Tunnel - Shaft 4, NY, Phase IB, 2013

**AREAS OF EXPERTISE**

- National Historic Preservation Act
- Section 106 Compliance
- Material Collections Analysis
- Archaeological Survey and Excavation
- Public Outreach

**EDUCATION**

- Ph.D., Anthropology and Archaeology: 2018, CUNY Graduate School
- M.A., Anthropology and Archaeology: 1998, Hunter College

**CERTIFICATIONS**

- Register of Professional Archaeologist
- 10-Hour OSHA Construction Safety
- 30-Hour OSHA Construction Safety
- 40-Hour OSHA HAZWOPER
- SWAC - Secure Worker Access Consortium

**PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE**

- 2001-Present: Chrysalis Archaeological Consultants
- 2006-2010: URS Corporation, Principia Investigator
- 2007-2010: Gray & Pape, Supervisory Consultant

**CONTACT INFORMATION**

aloorya@chrysalisarchaeology.com
Elissa Rutigliano, B.A. | Archaeologist

Ms. Rutigliano has two years of experience working in all phases of archaeological excavation around the New York City area.

SELECTED PROJECT EXPERIENCE BY STATE

New York

Washinton Square Park – Phase IB (2016 to present)
New York, NY
Monitored replacement of utility lines in archaeologically sensitive areas surrounding the park.

Myrtle Avenue – Phase IB (2017 to present)
Brooklyn, NY
Phase II excavation of several shaft features including wells and cisterns.

Van Onerdonk House (2017 to present)
Queens, NY
Assisted the Principal Investigator with test excavations as part of an after-school program.

AREAS OF EXPERTISE
Archaeological Survey and Excavation

EDUCATION
B.A., Archaeology: 2017
Brooklyn College

CERTIFICATIONS
10-Hour OSHA Construction Safety Training (2015)

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE
2016-Present: Chrysalis
Archaeological Consultants

CONTACT INFORMATION
e.rutigliano@me.com