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ABSTRACT

Phase 1A documentary research was undertaken for the New York City Department of Housing Preservation and Development (HPD) through DAS Resources, Inc. to evaluate the archaeological potential of Lots 49 and 50 on Block 1770 in Manhattan. The assessment was made at the request of the New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission in preparation for development. The research indicated that the remains of an early-19th century structure, possibly a slaughter house belonging to Thomas Dunning, a Harlem butcher, that dated at least to 1818, might be a potential resource. Located on what became Lot 49, remnants of this structure could conceivably survive in the former backyard where development was minimal or did not occur at all. Therefore, testing with heavy equipment (backhoe) is recommended for Lot 49 where it is possible that evidence of what might be a unique, early-19th century structure that should be documented prior to construction may be found.

160 E 122 St (49)
150 E 122 St
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INTRODUCTION

This report presents the methods and findings of a Phase 1A documentary study that evaluates the archaeological potential of Lots 49 and 50 on Block 1770 in Manhattan (Figures 1 and 2). It was prepared for the New York City Department of Housing Preservation and Development (HPD) through DAS Resources, Inc. The research and report fulfills a request made by the New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission for this evaluation (LPC 1/17/01). The goal was to create social and development histories of the two lots in order to assess the likelihood of finding intact archaeological resources that meet established criteria of significance. It was understood that should this research identify the potential for finding significant resources, recommendations would be made for appropriate field testing. This could take the form of backhoe-excavated test pits and/or trenches or, less likely in an urban situation, shovel tests. The intent of the recommended field procedure (to be undertaken in another phase) would be to establish if viable archaeological resources may be impacted by the proposed undertaking and, if found, to assess their integrity and significance.

It should be noted that significant archaeological resources in a 19th-century, urban, residential setting are most likely to be the abandoned and filled privies (outhouse pits) and cisterns (water storage) found in undeveloped backyards, or parts of backyards, of former house lots. Therefore, a lot’s development history is a major consideration to urban archaeologists. Its social history identifies the cultural significance of the material that may be recovered. This applies to both artifactual material and structural features.

METHOD

Research for this assessment entailed review of historical maps, photos, tax assessment records, deeds, wills, death certificates, New York City directories, church records, federal and state census manuscripts, published histories, and newspaper accounts. In addition, relevant reports on file were researched at the New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The project site is located in the part of Upper Manhattan now known as East Harlem. However, in the mid- to late-17th century, it was situated within the core area of Haerlem, or Nieuw Haerlem (hereafter referred to as Harlem), a village that developed a half century after, and at a considerable distance from, the original Dutch settlement of Nieuw Amsterdam at Manhattan’s southern tip. Today, however, the project site as defined for this study comprises two vacant lots on the south side of East 122 Street, just east of Lexington Avenue, in what is now a predominantly Puerto Rican neighborhood. While there is a five-story brick apartment building just up the block at the corner of Lexington Avenue and East 122 Street, other vacant lots are located east and west of Lots 49 and 50 as well as across the street. A chain-link fence runs along the property line of the two lots, and temporary structures were observed on both of them during a recent site visit. A Puerto Rican flag flies from a gate post at the entrance to Lot 50 at 158 East 122 and from at least one other lot to the west (Figures 3 and 4). The last structures standing on both lots were relatively small 19th-century residences. These structures are documented in a tax photo taken in about 1940 (Figure 5).
BLOCK 1770 Block 1770 [East] with Project Lots and Early Ownership Indicated
(Index to Deeds 1916, Block 1770, detail)

---

**Project Block**

- **Project Lots**
  1. Lot 50 (158 E. 122 St.)
  2. Lot 49 (160 E. 122 St.)
Lots 49 and 50 looking southeast from the north side of East 122 Street just east of Lexington Avenue. The two lots are vacant, as are the lots immediately east and west of them, except for temporary structures. (Geismar 10/12/01)

Lots 49 and 50 looking south from the north side of East 122 Street. Parked cars and a makeshift structure can be seen in Lot 50. Puerto Rican flags (arrows) fly from a gate post at Lot 50 and at least one other lot on the block front. (Geismar 10/12/01)
Tax photo of 158 and 160 East 122 Street c. 1940.
HISTORICAL AND PHYSICAL CONTEXT

As noted above, the project site is situated in the core area of what was the village of Harlem. Riker, in his *History of Harlem*, tells of the people, the motivations, the frustrations, and the ultimate success of creating the village in the 17th century (Riker 1904:125ff). Settlement was first attempted in 1636, but this was only one of several made by the Dutch, French Huguenots, and others that were thwarted by politics and Indian strife. In 1658, Peter Stuyvesant, the last Dutch Director General and perhaps the source of the name “Nieuw Haarlem,” finally established a settlement in “the lush bottomland” between the Harlem River and what is now Morningside Heights. This small village, located “about ten miles from the little town of New Amsterdam,” was situated on an Indian trail that became Kingsbridge Road and later Broadway (WPA 1939:254). For 200 years, the area retained its “pastoral charm and separateness...while the town below expanded northward and became the country’s most important commercial center” (WPA 1939:254).

In the beginning, under Dutch rule, the village was not only geographically removed from New Amsterdam to the south, but also politically independent. But even before the English takeover in 1664, its separateness began to slip away, and it lessened with time. For example, as early as 1665, Thomas Nicholls, the English governor, found it necessary to declare that all the inhabitants of Manhattan, including those in New Harlem “...shall bee for ever...one Body Politique & Corporate, under a Mayor, Aldermen, and Sheriffe” (Peterson 1917:6). In 1686, the Donegan Charter reinforced and expanded this fusion, but even so, the New Harlem settlement maintained its separateness, at least to a degree.

In the 17th century, this Dutch enclave was delineated by several roads at a time when roads were scarce in Upper Manhattan. To the west was the aforementioned Kingsbridge Road—perhaps more accurately called *the road to Kingsbridge Road*. Immediately to the east was the “old Post road” as it was referred to in an 1818 deed (Liber of Deeds [LD] 157 1818:323) and elsewhere variously called the Eastern Post Road, the Post Road to Harlem Bridge, or merely the Harlem Bridge Road (e.g., Stokes III 1918:Landmark Map). Just to the south, approximately between East 120 and East 121 Streets, the Harlem Road or Lane branched out to the east. These roadways, and other incidental lanes or roads, formed what was referred to as the “Five Corners” (DeVoe 1862:588) with the larger roads providing water access: the Kingsbridge Road to Spuyten Duyvel on the west, side of Manhattan, and the other two to the nearby Harlem River (or Creek) on the east side.

By 1660, numerous land grants had defined the settlement (Figure 6). This included the Kerk Lot, or Church Farm, belonging to the Reformed Low Dutch Church (Riker 1904:238n; Figure 7). The third church structure, built on a part of this lot in 1825, stood on the northeast corner of Block 1770, at the corner of Third Avenue and East 121 Street (Stokes III 1918:935).

While there was Revolutionary War activity in this part of Manhattan, none is documented in the immediate project area (e.g., Figure 8). The Commissioners’ map, which gridded all of Manhattan, at least on paper, depicts the village of Harlem as it appeared shortly after it became part of the 9th Ward created in 1803, when the number of wards in the city increased from seven to nine (Figure 9). Twenty-two years later, in 1825, to accommodate the city’s continuing expansion, it became part of the 12th Ward (Stokes V 1918:1403).
During the first half of the 19th century, access to the village was provided by the Harlem River Railroad built in the 1830s, and later by the Third Avenue Horse Railroad established in the 1850s. Throughout this period, the most efficient transportation of all may have been the steamers that made the trip from Peck Slip in Lower Manhattan to 125th Street in one and a half hours (WPA 1939:256).

Mid-19th-century conditions in the 12th Ward are well documented in a landmark health and sanitation report produced in 1865 as *The Report of the Council of Hygiene and Public Health of the Citizens' Association of New York Upon the Sanitary Conditions of the City*. Described in the "Report of the Twenty-Ninth Sanitary District," which covered the area bounded by the Harlem River, the East River, East 86th Street, and 6th Avenue, the report notes many of the district's details: Third Avenue was "macadamized" while other streets were simply graded; the "few" existing sewers were oval; of the 260 "squares" (blocks) in the district, 200 were in "good sanitary condition." There were 1,820 buildings,1 1,360 of them one- or two-family dwellings and another 160 tenements housing three or more families. There were also 110 "drinking saloons," 172 grocery or other stores, and nineteen markets. Almost all the houses had gas and Croton Water, and "those of recent building [had] all the modern improvements." In addition to these structures, there were 330 shanties occupied by "squatters" identified as Irish (Citizens' Report 1865:346-347).2 Just how these statistics related to the immediate project area remains a question. However, they provide a general context for its 19th-century development and for the nature of the area.

More specific to the project assessment, East 122 Street was officially opened between Third and Fourth (Park) Avenues in 1854; twenty years later Lexington Avenue was opened between East 102 and East 131 Streets and the Harlem River (Street Opening Book N.D.). Regarding sewers, records indicate that a 15-inch sewer was constructed in East 122 Street between Lexington and Third Avenues in 1868 (Manhattan Topping N.D.). A sewer was installed on the west side of Lexington Avenue a year later. This suggests that Lexington Avenue—an apparent dividing line—was a feature on the landscape well before its official opening in 1874.

DEVELOPMENT HISTORY OF THE PROJECT LOTS

Early Ownership and Development

Lots 49 and 50 on Block 1770 shared a common early ownership. Initially, both were included in the aforementioned Church Farm (see Figures 6 and 7). It appears that part of the farm was occupied by Thomas Dunning, a butcher, by 1808 when he is found on the 9th Ward Tax Assessment. However, his ownership status remains a question since there are no deeds available from this period.

Like many Harlem residents, Dunning owned more than one piece of property. Or, he at least

---

1 These were described as "houses" in the report, but buildings seems more accurate. The number of structures in this enumeration is actually 1,821.

2 Fifteen years later, the 1880 federal census documents at least forty-two 12th Ward families living in shanties between Fifth and Madison Avenues. Most of the household heads were from Ireland, but some were from Germany, a few were from New York City, one was from Scotland, and another from Italy.
paid taxes on multiple properties. One of them, a house and two lots, is documented on the 9th Ward Tax Assessment for 1808, the earliest available. Ten years later, a deed "Between the Ministers Elders and Deacons of the reformed Low Dutch (sic) Church of Haerlem" and "Thomas Dunning of Haerlem" describes the property he was then acquiring as five 100 by 25-foot lots fronting on the "Old Post Road to Harlem Bridge." This property, which was then "part of the ground leased to John Cornwell," included a dwelling house already occupied by Dunning and a slaughter house (LD 157 1818:323ft). Based on the deed description, and on Dunning's neighbors in 9th Ward Tax Assessments, it appears that he had been paying taxes on this house and two of the lots since at least 1808. His 1818 purchase apparently gave him title to this land as well as to three additional lots, all of them part of the Church Farm.

The aforementioned 1811 Commissioners' Map documents two structures on the Dunning property. It appears one of these structures may have been located on what later became Lot 49 (see Figure 9 inset). A subsequent map, the 1820 Randel Farm Map (not illustrated), does not show this structure, but does document others on the property along the Road to Harlem Bridge. At least one of them belonged to Dunning and was probably his house located beyond the project lots. This structure may have persisted into the 1890s (9th and 12th Ward Tax Assessments [TA] 1808-1894).

Parenthetically, Thomas DeVoe in his Market Book tells us that Dunning had received permission to erect a temporary shed as a market house near the above-mentioned "Five Corners" in 1807. This market, which predated an official Harlem Market by more than three decades, was meant to follow established rules, but Dunning apparently did not understand this (or chose not to), and for two years failed to pay market fees (DeVoe 1862:588-589). While this was ultimately rectified, entries in the Minutes of the Common Council suggest that his non-payment may have extended beyond Market fees. In 1814, Dunning was elected Collector of Taxes for the 9th Ward, but he was apparently loathe to hand over assessments, causing a running battle with city authorities that ended either shortly before or at his death in 1822 (Minutes of the Common Council [MCC] 1917:VIII:86, XI 1917:463; Death Certificate 1822). Dunning may have died intestate, or at least no will has been located, nor have any Letters of Administration been found.

Lot 49 (160 East 122 Street) Post 1835 (Table 1)

Thirteen years after Dunning's death, his three sons, who were "heirs at law"—one of them a New Yorker, one residing in Rahway, New Jersey, and the third in Southold on Long Island—sold the above-described Harlem property, including Dunning's house, to Peter Pinckney (LD 333 1835: 569ff). Charles C. and Joseph C. Pinckney, two of Peter's sons, inherited their father's Harlem property in 1847. At the time, it apparently still included Dunning's house on "the old post road (sic) at Harlem" (Liber of Wills [LW] 93 1847:390). Dunning's slaughter house was apparently long gone.

According to the 1867 Dripps map, the part of the property that included the project site was then vacant land (Figure 10). In 1871, Charles sold his share to Joseph (LD 1172 1871:459ff). Tax Assessments indicate a "small house" on the eastern part of the 100- (or 133) foot lot, probably on what later became Lot 44. Sometime between 1859 and 1860, Lot 49 ½ was formed from the rear

---

3This was only one of several properties devised by the elder Pinckney, including his residence and other houses in Manhattan, one in Westchester, and 80 acres in Illinois (LW 93 1847:388ff).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Tax Assessment/Deed Information</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c.1660-</td>
<td>Reformed Low Dutch Church of Harlem</td>
<td>The Ministers, Elders, and Deacons of the Reformed Low Dutch Church of Harlem receive permission to sell part of the Church Farm; parcel is bounded NW by lands of John Adriance, SW by road to the Kingsbridge Road, S by E 121 Street, and E by Third Avenue (Deed Index Book, 1916)</td>
<td>2 structures depicted on 1811 Commissioners' Map (see Figure 11); one on modern Lot 49, which was acquired by Dunning in 1818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1818</td>
<td>Thomas Dunning</td>
<td>The first recorded deed that separates the farm property into lots dates from 1818 when the Church sells five lots [46- 491/2], each 100 x 25, to Thomas Dunning (LD 157 1818:323)</td>
<td>1818 deed notes a dwelling and slaughter house belonging to Dunning, on property, suggesting Dunning’s occupation prior to official ownership; also notes p/o property leased to John Cornwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1835</td>
<td>Peter Pinckney</td>
<td>Thomas, George, and John Dunning, the children and heirs of Thomas Dunning, sell their five lots to Peter Pinckney for $2,000 (LD 333 1835:569)</td>
<td>Property in Dunning’s name through 1822; TA lists it in the Estate of Thomas Dunning from 1829 to 1836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1855</td>
<td>J.C. and C.C. Pinckney</td>
<td>Taxes now paid by Joseph C. and Charles C. Pinckney; “shed” is indicated on the TA; property value $800</td>
<td>Dripps 1851 (not illustrated) shows no development on lot; TA notes house, but not on project lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1859</td>
<td>J.C. and C.C. Pinckney</td>
<td>Property value almost doubled to $1,400, No recorded structure</td>
<td>House, probably Dunning’s, elsewhere on property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1863</td>
<td>J.C. and C.C. Pinckney</td>
<td>Unidentified structure indicated in TA; value $1,600</td>
<td>Probably same as above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1866</td>
<td>J.C. and C.C. Pinckney</td>
<td>Unidentified structure indicated in TA; value $2,200</td>
<td>Probably same as above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1868</td>
<td>J.C. and C.C. Pinckney</td>
<td>TA lists lot sizes and structures; Lot 49 is 100 x 70 w/ a “small house”; value $2,750</td>
<td>Dripps (1867) shows no development on project lots (see Figure 10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1869</td>
<td>J.C. and C.C. Pinckney</td>
<td>Lot 100 x 70 irreg, “small house”; value reduced to $2,500</td>
<td>Note in TA Remarks: “H. A. Anderson Mar 12/69” (lessee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>Joseph C. Pinckney</td>
<td>Lot now 131.3 ½ x irreg; “small house” 30 x 65, 2-stories, wood; apparently two houses are on the lot; value $5,200; Anderson’s name crossed out and J. C. Pinckney written in</td>
<td>1871 NYC Directories list Theodore P. Anderson as having a livery stable at 176 E 122 St; Perris &amp; Browne 1870 depicts “Livery Stables”(see Figure 11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Tax Assessment/Deed Information</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>Joseph C. Pinckney</td>
<td>Charles C. Pinckney sells his half of the moiety to his brother, Joseph C., for $2,000 (LD 1172 1871:459)</td>
<td>Deed subject to 5 year lease to Theodore P. Anderson (5/1/1869) and assessments levied for building of 122nd St sewer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1872 - 1873</td>
<td>Joseph C. Pinckney</td>
<td>Value is corrected to $6,000. Possibly 2 houses on the lot, east of modern Lot 49; there are no structures noted on any map that comply with the number of houses or dimensions given in the TA between 1868 and 1890; an 1879 map does show one structure that could be the “small house,” but it does not appear again.</td>
<td>Anderson’s livery stable listed in Directories through 1872; 1874 Anderson listed as notary at 171 E 122nd St is no longer leasing the property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874 - 1879</td>
<td>Joseph C. Pinckney</td>
<td>Theodore P. Anderson crossed out in 1874 TA, J.C. Pinckney written in, in 1874 Pinckney and Hannah Brooks owner of Lot 50, sell each other small gores adjoining their two lots (LD 1307 1874:174; LD 1322 1875:101)</td>
<td>Robinson 1879 (see Figure 12) shows a structure on what is now Lot 44, possibly the “small house” noted above; rest of the property is vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880 - 1884</td>
<td>Joseph C. Pinckney</td>
<td>Lot 49 is sub-divided creating five lots (including - 49) each 16.8 x irrreg w/ 2-story brick structures valued at $2,500; lot values rise yearly, by 1884 each is $3,200</td>
<td>Joseph C. Pinckney dies March 12, 1881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>John Mitchell</td>
<td>Mitchell pays taxes on Lots 48 and 49 until 1894; no deed to Mitchell located, he is apparently leasing the houses from Pinckney’s estate</td>
<td>Subdivided lots documented on Robinson 1885 (see Figure 13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td>Joseph Conselyea</td>
<td>Executors of Joseph C. Pinckney, Charles C. And George B. Pinckney, sell No 160 E 122 St to Joseph Conselyea in 1887 and again in 1888 to rectify mistake made in 1887 deed; 1888 deed includes surveyor’s drawing showing a 17 x 40 brick house, fenced backyard, and sheds at rear of property; house shares a party wall with 162 E 122 St (Lot 48) (LD 2179 1888:121)</td>
<td>In his will Pinckney left property in trust to Conselyea (LW 282 1881:395) until he reaches the age of twenty-five; by 1888 Conselyea has taken the name of Joseph C. Pinckney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897</td>
<td>George and Louisa Finck (Fink)</td>
<td>Lot stays in Pinckney family until it is sold in 1897 (LD 38 1897:428)</td>
<td>Sanborn1896 (see Figure 14) depicts the brick house and a shed at the rear of lot; the house remains until at least 1975 (Manhattan Land Book 1975, not illustrated)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tax Assessment Records on microfilm at the Municipal Archives stop after 1894. Later dates, which were not researched, are at the Marine Terminal in Brooklyn.

LD = Liber of Deeds; LW = Liber of Wills; TA = Tax Assessment records (9th and 12th Wards)
BLOCK 1770 Project Area 1867 (Dripps 1867, detail)
of the property, creating an inside, trapezoidal lot that belonged to the Reformed Dutch Church and shortening the Pinckney holding by about 30 feet or so (12th Ward TA 1860; see Figure 11).

Joseph C. Pinckney, who, according to his 1881 obituary in the New York Times, distinguished himself during the Civil War, went on to have an equally distinguished political career. Prior to the war he had been an organizer of the Republican Party and had helped nominate Abraham Lincoln at the 1860 convention. Although apparently disabled during the war, he later served as City Alderman and as a councilman, and was almost appointed Police Commissioner in 1879. Pinckney lived at 27 Stuyvesant Street, far from his Harlem property.

In 1865, Charles and Joseph C. Pinckney had leased their East 122 Street property to Theodore P. Anderson for five years (cited in LD 1172 1871:460). According to an 1870 map and the New York City Directories, a livery stable operated by Anderson was then located on the site (NY City Directories 1870; Perris & Browne 1870; Figure 11). The stable comprised two frame buildings, with 1 and 2-story components directly on what would become Lot 49 (see Figure 11).

The directories indicate that Anderson’s livery stable was at 168 East 121 Street in 1870, but by 1871, the address was 176 E. 122 Street. This, and the aforementioned 1870 map that shows the livery stable partially on Lot 49, suggest that the 1870 directory address may be a typographical error. Anderson, who was then 37 years old, lived nearby with his wife and two young children—first on 122 Street east of Second Avenue and then directly across from the site. He operated the stable until 1872 or 1873, probably until his lease was up. After that he was a notary located on Third Avenue, but he continued to live across from the site of his former livery stable through 1875, albeit at various addresses. After this, he disappears from the directories (Federal Census 1870; NY City Directories 1873-1876).

In October 18, 1879, Pinckney filed a building application for five, 2-story, brick row houses on the former stable property, but the project was “abandoned” two days later (Building Application 1879:No.799). Although no subsequent application was located, the 12th Ward Tax Assessment documents the subdivision of Pinckney’s East 122 Street property and the construction of the row houses on Lots 46 through 49 in 1880. This was shortly before his death in March 1881 (NY Times 1881).

In 1887, Joseph C. Conselyea, conceivably Pinckney’s young, possibly illegitimate, married son, acquired Lot 49 that had been left to him in trust in Pinckney’s will (LD 2179 1887:121ff). At Pinckney’s death, he had been a widower for many years and his obituary mentions only one child, a son “about”

---

4It is hard to say if the glowing obituary is completely accurate since a New York Times article regarding his potential appointment to Police Commissioner in 1879 is far from laudatory (NY Times 1879). On the other hand, other articles, even those written after his death, appear to confirm his distinguished career (e.g., NY Times 1877, 1887).

5The lots in this development were numbered 46 1/2, 47, 47 1/2, 48, and 49.

6At least he thought he acquired this lot. It seems the 1887 deed mistakenly described Lot 48 rather than 49. This was rectified a year later, and several deeds had to be rewritten to set everything right (LD 2179 1888: 121; LD 2179 1888:124; LD 2179 1888:126).
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project lots

1  wood "shanty" (built 1870), Lot 50
2  part of a livery stable with frame structures, Lot 49
19 years old, even though his will names only his daughter, Mary Caroline Ludlow (LW 282 1881:395). This same will, however, names Joseph Conselyea, son of “one Annie Gallagher,” as heir to his house at 160 East 122 Street (Lot 49) when he reaches the age of 25. Conselyea acquired title to the house in 1887, when the son mentioned in Pinckney’s will would have been 25 or 26 (LD 2142 1887:431ff). An 1888 deed notes that Conselyea had by then taken the name of the deceased Joseph C. Pinckney (LD 2179 1888:121). A wrinkle in what is otherwise a fairly smooth deduction is that an Annie Gallagher, a servant living at 23 Stuyvesant Street in 1880 and therefore a logical candidate to be Conselyea’s mother, was then only 25 years old (Federal Census 1880), a mere 5 or 6 years older than the son mentioned in Pinckney’s obituary.

The house, as indicated on a sketch in the 1888 deed, was 40 feet long by 17.4 feet wide, with “sheds,” approximately 5 or 6 feet deep, across the back of a 23-foot (irregular), fenced yard. It apparently remained a rental property until 1897, when it was sold by the younger Pinckney’s wife, Nellie, ending Pinckney ownership (LD 38 1897:428). The rear sheds persisted through at least 1896 (see Figure 14), and while a large structure replaced three of the five row houses by 1911 (see Figure 16), the one on Lot 49 and its neighbor on Lot 48 persisted until at least 1975 (Sanborn 1955 updated to 1975; not illustrated). Development after 1870 is illustrated in Figures 12 to 17.

Lot 50 (158 East 122 Street) Post 1835 (Table 2)

Private ownership of this lot occurred considerably later than documented for Lot 49. Also part of the Church Farm, Lot 50 was included in a parcel sold by the church to Isaac Aiken of Ramapo, Rockland County, in 1859 (LD 795 1857:49). According to a deed recorded in 1860 Aiken, in turn sold the parcel to Richard Amerman, a New York City surveyor (LD 1860 799:562). After several transactions, Hannah Brooks acquired Lot 50, which was then vacant, from William A. Butler and his wife Kate E. Butler in 1868 (LD 1044 1868:483ff). Like Lot 49, this 22 by 100-foot lot was developed as a rental property.

Hannah’s husband Thomas S. Brooks was a builder who may have erected what is described as a “shanty” by 1870; this structure persists in tax assessments through 1875 (12th Ward TA 1870-1875). While the 1870 Perris & Browne map does depict a small building at the back of the lot (see Figure 11), an 1875 alteration application describes the existing structure as a free-standing, peak-roofed, 2 1/2-story, wood building with a stone foundation (Alteration Docket 1875:No. 339). This is a far cry from an 1865 description of a shanty as a poorly-made structure of rough boards set directly on the ground, or slightly raised, and only 6 to 10 feet high (Citizens’ Report 1865:200). Both the siting of the house and its description suggest the shanty at the back of the lot was replaced sometime between 1870 and 1875. If so, this was done without any acknowledgment in the tax assessment record and without an application for a building permit, and it was this new house that was altered in 1875.

The proposed alteration, begun on April 26, 1875, was completed on July 29 of the same year (Alteration Docket 1875:339). Classified as an exterior alteration, it added a half-story and changed the roof from peaked to mansard, although tax assessment records do not identify it as a 3-story structure until 1883 (see Table 2). A later alteration may have added the bay window seen in the previously-mentioned tax photo (see Figure 3). It is assumed that the dwelling on this lot was among those single-family houses with “all the modern improvements” erected in the 12th Ward beginning in the mid-1860s.
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project block
project lots

1 Lot 50 (158 E. 122 St.) (note structure)

2 Lot 49 (160 E. 122 St.), vacant
BLOCK 1770  Project Block and Lots 1896 (Sanborn 1896, detail)

[122 STREET]

LEXINGTON

[121 STREET]

- - - - project block

- - project lots

1 Lot 50 (158 E. 122 St.)

2 Lot 49 (160 E. 122 St.)

dwelling

1-story shed or other out building
BLOCK 1770 Project Block and Lots 1897 (Bromley 1897, detail)

- project block
- project lots
- Lot 50 (158 E. 122 St.)
- Lot 49 (160 E. 122 St.)
- structure
BLOCK 1770 Project Block and Lots 1934 (Bromley 1934, detail)

LOT 50 (158 E. 122 St.)
LOT 49 (160 E. 122 St.)
structure
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>TA/LD Information</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c.1660 -</td>
<td>Reformed Low Dutch Church of Harlem</td>
<td>The Ministers, Elders, and Deacons of the Reformed Low Dutch Church of Harlem received permission to sell part of the Church Farm; the parcel is bounded NW by lands of John Adriance, SW by the Kingsbridge Road, S by E.121 Street and E by Third Avenue (Deed Index Book, 1916)</td>
<td>The 1811 Commissioners’ Map indicates development in the area (see Figure 9 and see Table 1) none shown on what is now Lot 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1855</td>
<td>Reformed Low Dutch Church of Harlem</td>
<td>Includes vacant Lots 33,34,50 -53; value $2,500</td>
<td>Dripps 1851(not illustrated) shows no development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1859 - 1860</td>
<td>Reformed Low Dutch Church of Harlem</td>
<td>Lots 50-53; value of lots is $1500; the Ministers, Elders and Deacons of the Reformed Low Dutch Church of Harlem sell to Isaac Acken (LD 795 1859:49); the next year Acken sells lots to Richard Amerman (LD799 1860:562)</td>
<td>Church also owns several other lots on the block; while the Harlem Library located on the same block is tax exempt the church pays taxes until 1860.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1863 - 1864</td>
<td>Richard Amerman</td>
<td>Lots 50-54, the TA shows no structures on the five lots, value $1,600; Amerman sells to Philip Fitzpatrick (LD891 1864:288)</td>
<td>No development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1864 - 1865</td>
<td>Philip Fitzpatrick</td>
<td>Lots 50-54, 1864 value $1700; 1865 TA indicates Lot 55 added to Fitzpatrick’s holdings; value $2000</td>
<td>No development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1867 - 1868</td>
<td>Philip Fitzpatrick</td>
<td>1867, Fitzpatrick owns only Lots 50-51 value $800; 1st description of lot size in 1868, Lot 50 is 22.5 x irreg, Lot 51 is 25 x 100; combined value $1000</td>
<td>No development; see Dripps 1867 (see Figure 10) Fitzpatrick listed as the owner in TA, but deeds indicate Lot 50 was sold several times between 1865 and 1868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1868 - 1869</td>
<td>Hannah Brooks; wife of builder Thomas S. Brooks</td>
<td>Hannah Brooks buys Lot 50 from William A. Butler (LD 1044 1868:482); no structures indicated; value $1000 for the single lot</td>
<td>Fitzpatrick crossed out in 1869 TA and Hannah Brooks written in; the owner of Lot 51 is listed as “unknown”; no development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870 - 1875</td>
<td>Hannah Brooks</td>
<td>1870 to 1875 TA “Shanty” on lot; value remains $1000</td>
<td>Perris &amp; Browne 1870 (see Figure 11) shows a 1-story shed at the rear of the lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>Hannah Brooks</td>
<td>Shanty remains</td>
<td>Alteration Docket No.# 339 (1875) to add ½ story to structure and replaced peaked roof w/ mansard roof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876 - 1882</td>
<td>Hannah Brooks</td>
<td>1876 TA lists a 22 x 30, 2-story frame house with brick front (BF); value increased to $2.500. No house listed on the 1882 TA and no value is attached to the property</td>
<td>A structure is indicated on the Robinson 1879 at the front of the lot (see Figure 12)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>TA/LD Information</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1883</td>
<td>Hannah Brooks</td>
<td>The TA 1883 notes that the house is replaced by a 3-story 22 x 33 brick structure; lot size remains the same; value is $3000</td>
<td>Actually became 3-stories in 1875 (see above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885 - 1894</td>
<td>Hannah Brooks</td>
<td>The 1886 street address is No. 158 (1st listing of street numbers); description of house remains unchanged until at least 1894 TA; in 1886 the value increased to $4,000; increases by only $200 over the years</td>
<td>A small structure is shown on the Robinson 1885 (see Figure 13); the 1888 deed from Charles C. and George B. Pinckney to Joseph C. Conselyea (LD 2179 1888:121) includes a sketch that depicts the structure as frame with a brick front and an independent wall separating it from the structure on Lot 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896</td>
<td>Hannah Brooks</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Sanborn 1896 (see Figure 14) depicts a large 3 story house on the front of the lot and a small 1-story shed at the rear property line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>Devisees of Hannah Brooks, Amanda M. Tompkins, and Anna M. Thompson</td>
<td>Devisees of Hannah Brooks sell to Emma J. Velders (LD149 1909:34); NYC forecloses on Lot 50 in 1977 and sells it at auction in 1993 to Behcet Dogan for $13,500</td>
<td>3-story brick house in 1911 (Bromley; see Figure 16); still standing in 1975 (Manhattan Land Book 1975; not illustrated)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tax Assessment Records on microfilm at the Municipal Archives stop after 1894. Later dates, which were not researched, are at the Marine Terminal in Brooklyn.

LD = Liber of Deeds; LW=Liber of Wills; TA=Tax Assessment records (9th and 12th Wards)
Only one, very transient tenant has been identified for 158 East 122 Street. The 1880 census, the first federal census to provide street addresses, indicates that Thomas J. Hume, a 27-year-old merchant tailor, born in New York City whose father and mother were Canadian and English respectively, occupied the house in June 1880. In his household was his young wife, his son, who was 2, his year-old daughter, and a 17-year-old, English-born, female servant. His was a single-family occupancy, and New York City Directories indicate it lasted for only one year (NY City Directories 1879-1880). His address both before and after this was on East 92 Street.

Thomas Brooks apparently predeceased his wife who, at her death in 1907, was residing in Brooklyn. Hannah's three nieces, Amanda M. Tompkins, Anna M. Thompson, and Anna J. Velders, inherited the house on Lot 50 (LW 388 1907:482ff). Two years later, Anna Velders acquired the property from Thompson and Tompkins (LD 149:1909:34). Like its neighbor at 160 East 122 Street, this structure was demolished between 1975 and 1980. Once again, see Figures 12 to 17 for illustrations of this development after 1870.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

It was noted in the introduction that privy pits and cisterns are the features most often sought after and documented by urban archaeologists working on domestic sites. However, when development post-dates the introduction of indoor plumbing, these features are less likely to be an issue. Research for the evaluation presented here indicated that 19th-century privies and cisterns were probably not a concern. Instead, the potential resource are the remains of an early-19th century structure, possibly a slaughter house belonging to Thomas Dunning, a Harlem butcher, that dates at least to 1818. It appears this structure may have been partly located in what became the backyard of Lot 49 (see Figure 9 inset). Subsequent development on the lot included a wooden stable in 1869 or 1870, a 2-story brick residence at the front of the lot in 1880, and 1-story sheds at the back of the lot by 1888 that persisted at least through 1896 (see Figure 14). However, remnants of this earlier structure could conceivably survive where development was minimal (the sheds) or did not occur at all.

Given this information, archaeological field testing with heavy equipment (backhoe) is recommended for Lot 49 where it is possible that testing will reveal evidence of what might be a unique, early-19th century structure. If found, the resource should be documented prior to development. Figure 18 illustrates the location of the potentially sensitive area of the lot.
based on Index to Deeds 1916, Block 1770, detail

Approved Oct. 5, 1916
Chef Surveyor.

project block
project lots

1 Lot 50 (158 E. 122 St.)
2 Lot 49 (160 E. 122 St.)

recommended test area re possible Dunning slaughter house or other 17th century structure
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